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A BREIF HISTORY OF INDIAN AND WESTERN LITERATURE AND LITERARY CRITICISM

a. History of the Indian literature and literary criticism.
i. History of Sanskrit literature and literary criticism.
ii. A brief overview of the history of The Aucitya (The Propriety).

b. History of the Western literature and literary criticism.
i) A brief overview of the English literature and literary criticism.
ii) A brief overview of the Greek and Roman literature and literary criticism.
iii) A brief overview of the history of the Propriety.

HISTORY OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE AND LITERARY CRITICISM

The some the rudimentary forms of the ‘Kavya’ (Poetics is found in the ‘Rigveda’ (the sacred book of the Hindus) and later the developed form of the (Poetics) and ‘Literary Criticism’ is found in the “Natyasastra” (the dramatic science) of Bhara and later on Bhamaha, Rudrata, Anavdverdhana, Abhinavgupta, Kuntka etc thinkers have also done much work in the field of the Poetics and the Literary Criticism;
and emphasised the value of the Propriety in the art of poetry eg. in the Poetics and used different synonyms for it (Propriety).

There is an interesting passage in the *Cave - mimosa* in which Rajasekhara, while giving us a somewhat fanciful account if the divine origin of Poetics, mentions at the same time the name of the supposed original exponents of the discipline. It is said that the Spirit of Poetry (kavya-purusa), born of the Goddess of Learning (saravati), was set by the Self-existent Being to promulgate the study of Poetics in the three worlds; and he related it in eighteen adhikaranas to his seventeen will-born pupils. These divine sages, in their turn, are sazid to have composed separate treatises on the portions respectively learnt by them. Thus Sahasraksi wrote on Kavirahasya, Uktigarbha on auktika, Suvarnanabha on riti, Pracetayana on anuprasa, Citrangada on yamaka and citra, Seasa on sabda-slesa, Pulastya vastava, Aupakayana on upama, Parasaara on atisaya, Utathya on artha-slesa, Kubera on ubhayalamkara, Kamadeva on vainodika, Bharatqa on rupaka, Nandikesvara on rasa, Dhisana oin dosa, Upamayu on guna and Kucamara on aupanisakika. This tendency on the part of a sanskrit author towards glorifying his scenic and thereby investing it with an ancient unalterable authority is not unusual, and such legendary accounts are often fabricated where the actual origin is forgotten; but it is curious that we do not meet with them elsewhere in Alamkara literature, although they find expression in Bharata and in Vatsyayana with regard to the origin of the allied disciplines of Dramaturgy and Erotics respectively. The historical value of this passage of
Rajasekhara may, indeed, be well doubted; byuht it is possible that this unique account, apart from it obviously mythical garb, embodies an current tradition, implying the actual existence, at some remote and forgotten period, of early expouners of poetic theory, some of whose names are still familiar, but most of whose works have apparently perished. Thus, Suvarnanabha and Kucamara (or Kucumara) are also cited with reverence by the author of the Kama-sutra, both of them as authorities on Erotics, but the latter especially as well-versed in the particular subject of aupanisadika, which is thus

**HISTORY OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE AND LITERARY CRITICISM**

**FROM THE BEGINNINGS TO BHAMHA**

Of the unknown beginnings of Poetics as a discipline, our enquiry in the preceding volume has indicated that we can only make a few surmises, by implication, from the oldest surviving works on the subject, from stray references in general literature, from the elaboration of similar ideas in which would warrant the pre-existence of some doctrines of Poetics regulating its art and usage.

Apart from such surmises, the sixteenth chapter of Bharata's Natya-sastra gives us for the first time an outline of Poetics which is probably earlier in substance, if not in date, than the earliest existing Kavya. In this chapter, one meets with a developed dogma, if
not a theory, of Poetics which enumerates four poetic figures (alamkaras), ten excellences (gunas), ten defects (dosas), and thirty six characteristics laksanas of poetic composition. These apparently constituted the principal contents of the discipline as it existed at a very early period; and this may be taken in the absence of other data, as the first non period in the history of Sanskrit Poetics.

It is proper to note in this connexion, that in the Natya Sastra Bharta is principally concerned with dramaturgy and allied topics, and deals with poetics in so far as it applies to the theme in hand. In later poetic theories, Dramaturgy is taken as a part of the discipline of the poetics, and the drama is accordingly consider to be a species of the Kavya. But there are reason to believe that in older time Dramaturgy and Poetics formed separate disciplines, the former being probably the earlier in point of time, as well as in substance. We have seen that the existence of Nata-Sutras, which were presumably works in the Sutra-Style. On the historionic art, was known even in the time of Panini; but there is no reference direct or indirect to such Alamkara-Sutras, and indeed the term Alamkara itself in the technical sense was known in early literature. The earliest surviving works of Poetics, on the other hand, do not include a treatement of the theme of dramaturgy which having been a study by itself, was possibly excluded from the sphere of Poetics proper. Both Bhamaha and Dandin no doubt speak of Natak as a species of Kavya. But they refer to a specialised treatises for its detailed treatment. Vamana the next important writer on Poetics shows indeed an unusual partiality towards the drama (1.3.30-32), but even he did not
think it proper to devote any special attention to it. Among later writer it is not until become to the time of Hemacandra, Vidyanatha and Visvanatha, when the study was already entered upon a period of critical elaboration and summing-up of results, that we find some special chapters dealing with the topic of Dramaturgy. Of these late writers, Vidyanatha and Visvanatha explicitly refer to an summarise the Dasa-Rupka, a recognised worked on the dramatic art; while the encyclopedic Hemacandra, who professes great admiration of Bharata and his commentator Abhinavagupta, deals with the subject rather summarily, refering the reader to the standard works of Bharat and Kohala.

It seems therefore that the school of Dramaturgy and an existense separate from the orthodox school of Poetic. It is thus not surprising that Bharta should set apart, as he does, a chapter of his work for dealing with the ornaments of Poetry, so for they apply to the drama (natakasraya). In his discussion of the Gunas and Dosas in their application to drama, he expressly designates them as Kavya-Gunas and Kavya - Doshas (xvi. 92, 84) respectively; and with reference to the Alamkaras he Kavyasyaite Hyalamkarah (xvi. 41) making it clear at the same time that he consider them on the as embellishments of the dramatic speech.

Bharat open this chapter on Poetics with the discussion of what he calls the Laksanas (lit. characteristics), which appear to be partly formal and partly material elements of poetry. Bharat mentions 36 of them and devotes a considerable part of this chapter to their definition; and the
whole discipline appears to have received from them the designation of Kavya-Laksana referred to in xvi. 17. From this treatment it appears that he consider Laksanas to be of greater importance than Alamkaras which are mentioned as just a few in number.

It is not very clear, however, from Bharat’s treatment as to what position these Laksanas should occupy in a formal scheme of Poetics; but the functions of most of these is assigned in later Poetics to Alamkaras or Gunas. Dandian mentions them summarily (ii. 366) under Alamkaras in the wider sense along with Samdhya and Vrtyanga which belong properly to the drama and refers to Agamantara (interpreted by Tarunavacaspati as alluding to Bharata) for their treatment. So does Dhananjaya(e. N.S.P. iv 84); while Visvanatha (Ed. Durgaprasad, vi. 171-211, pp. 316-332) takes them in connexion with the drama calling some of them natyalamkara (dramatic embellishment), and is at the same time of opinion that although some of them are properly included under Guna, Alamkara, Bhava and Samadhi, they require a particular mention in as much as in the the drama they are to be accomplished with some care (p.332) in later literature the Laksanas, which linger conventionally in Dramaturgy, entirely disappear from Poetics proper, Jayadevas, Candraloka being the only later work on Poetics which deals with them. This phenomenon would probably indicate no only that the Laksanas were regarded as strictly proper to drama, but also the conclusion that what were in the infancy of Poetics, considered so important as to deserve separate treatment and to be differentiated from the Gunas and the Alamkaras, were with the growth
of critical insight assigned to Gunas and the Alamkaras, themselves to whose sphere in ultimate analysis they were thought properly to belong.

V. Raghvan has already given a detailed account of the history of the concept of Laksana; but since the Laksanapaddhati perished very early, lingered as a superfluous relic in the history of Poetics and Dramaturgy, it is not necessary for us to make more than a passing reference. Abhinava Gupta, while explaining Bharata’s text mentions as many as ten different views considering Laksanas; but it appears that Laksansa otherwise called Bhushana is generally taken (on the analogy perhaps of Samudrika Laksana), to be an innate beautifying an element belonging to the body of poetry or rather as constituting the body itself. Although similar in function to the Alamkara in being a Kavya-sobhakara Dharma, it is not a separate entity, but Aprthak-siddha; that is to say it imparts beauty to poetry by itself and is not added as an Alamkara is added, for extra beauty. It is obvious that the concept of Laksana, even at its birth, had an overlapping of function with Alamkara, which in course of with time swallowed up even as a Nataka-Dharma, connecting with dramatic Samdyangas, it had little individuality, and the attitude of the Dasa-Rupka in not considering it separately is significant. The main view, however, which takes Laksana, like Alamkara, as beautifying characteristics appears to have died out with Abhinavagupta’s somewhat apologetic formulation.

From Laksanas Bharat goes on to the more interesting topic of Kavyaalamkaras or Poetic figures. It appears from his treatment that
only four such Poetic figure were known or recognised in his time, viz. upama (simile), rupaka (metaphor), dipaka (lit. illuminator) and yamka (repetition) of words or syllable similar in sound). The Upama is subdivided into four kinds, according as the object compared (upameya) or the standard of the comparison (upamana) is one or many Bharata expressly making use of these technical terms. From another standpoint, five varieties of Upama are distinguished and illustrated, viz. (1) Prasamsopama (2) nindopama (3) Kalpitopama (4) Sadrśi Upama and (5) Kimcit - Sadrśi Upama, according as these qualifications apply to the Upamana. Bharata is apparently unaware of the finer shades of distinction (grammatical or otherwise) introduced later on into the treatment of Upama by Bhamaha, Dandin and Udbhata or of its comprehensive definition given by Vamana; but the very fact that the idea of comparison was even by this time analysed thus far shows a considerable amount of speculation on this point. Bharata’s first two kinds, however, are criticised by Bhamaha (ii. 37), but accepted by Dandin without question (ii.30-31); while the name, if not the idea, of the third kind lingers in Vamana iv. 2.2 of Rupaka and Dipaka no subvarieties are mentioned, and possibly these were comparatively late inventions. Of Yamka, on the other hand, ten subspecies are elaborately defined and illustrated, a number exceeding even that given by Bhamaha. It would appear that in the earlier stages of Poetics, what in later authors is known as a Sabdalamkara (of which the artifices of Yamka in particular seem to have found the greatest favour) received a more elaborate treatment, although the process repeats itself in comparatively modern decadent authors who delight in such external
poetic Arthalamkara is not referred to by Bharata, as also by Bhamha; but Bharata uses the word Sabdabhyasa with reference to Yamka, which term might have suggested, as Abhinava’s commentary on this point indicates, the later classification, which is implied for the first time by Dandin treatment.

After the Alamkaras, comes the treatment of ten dosas (xvi. 84f) and ten Gunas (xvi 92f), which seem to have constituted the orthodox number of faults and excellences of poetic doctrine of Guna and Dosa in connection with Rititheorists, who for the first time take it up seriously; but it may be pointed out here that Bharata’s enumeration and definition of individual Dosas and Gunas do not exactly correspond to those of his nearest successors. Except keeping to the conventional number of ten (although Bhamaha introduces an eleventh fault from the standpoint of logical correctness and a list of ten intrinsic poetic faults in a different context, as he also mentions only three poetic excellence), both Bhamata and Dandin do not appear to have accepted implicitly this part of Bharata’s teaching.

The faults mentioned by Bhamata (xvi.84) are:"

Brahmata also adds another fault to these ten, viz. the Dosa, which arises from a faulty logical proposition (pratijna). A faulty middle term (hetu), and a faulty logical illustration (drsanta); but this blemish is treated in a separate chapter (ch. v), being interesting to Bhamaha from the standpoint of the logic of poetry. In another context,
while discussing the general characteristics of poetry. (i.37f), Bhamaha mentions ten other details which a poet should avoid, viz.:

After giving these ten Dosas Bhamaha points out (I. 54-58) how these Dosas may sometimes become Gunas. As to how these two different series of ten faults are to be distinguished Bhamaha says nothing; but it is conceivable from his treatise on poetry, while the former refers to only such defects as are more or less external. A glance at these two lists of faults that while some of Bhamaha's faults correspond generally to treatment is certainly more advanced than his predecessor. It is also noteworthy that Bhamaha lays down, in his discussion of the last - named fault of Sruti-Kasta, the general proposition (I.54) that a particular combination or arrangement sometimes make even defective expressions allowable; in other words, a fault sometimes is converted into an excellence. Bharata, excellences to be mere negations of Dosas or faults.

After dealing with the Dosas, Bharata speaks of the Gunas or excellence of composition, which are also enumerated as ten in number. He states summarily at the outset (xvi. 91) that the Gunas are negations of the Dosas (Guna Viparyayad Esam), an opinion which is indeed extraordinarily in view of the fact that later writers like Vamana (ii. 1. 13) rightly consider Gunas in a theory of Poetics to be positive entities, of which the Dosas are the negations known by implication. It appears, on the other hand, that Gunas like Madhurya and Audarya mentioned by Bharata in xvi. 91 and 92 are not really, s defined by himself, negations
of any particular defect discussed by him. Jacobi's explanation is probably right that Bharata's description of the Guna as negations of the Dosas is in conformity with the common-sense view of the matter, for it is not difficult for one to seize upon a fault instinctively, while an excellence cannot be conceived so lightly unless its essence is comprehended by differentiating it from a more easily understood fault. The Gunas, according to Bharata (xvi. 92), are following:

I. Slesa = Coalescence of words, connected with one another through the aggregate meaning desired by the poet, and consisting of a subtlety which in appearance is clear but in reality difficult to comprehend.

ii. Prasada = Clearness, where the unexpressed sense appears from the word used through the relation of the easily understood word and sense.

It will be noticed from this enumeration that in some cases it is difficult to see what Bharata means exactly by a particular Guna, and that the classification is by no means exhaustive Gunas can be taken (as Abhinavagupta takes them) as approximating roughly to the individual Sabda-Gunas and Arthagunas elaborated by Vamana and other later theorists. The development of the Guna-doctrine is intimately connected.
With the central theory of the Riti-School and will be dealt with later; but it may be pointed out here that although the definitions of the individual Gunas, given by Bharata, do not correspond exactly to those of later writers, there can be no doubt that here we have for the first time a definite statement, if not a proper theoretic treatmen, of the doctrine. The disagreement between different theorists with regard to the definitions of individual Gunas is a well known fact in the history of Sanskrit Poetics, and one need not therefore be surprised that later authors give us definitions which do not agree with those of Bharata. To Bharata, again the relation of the Gunas to riti, as elaborated by Vamana, or to Rasa, as firstly clearly enunciated by the Dhvanikara and Anandavardhana, was probably unknown, so was also Vamana’s Distinction between Sabda-Guna and Artha-Guna. Although Bharata’s Ganas are mostly of the nature of Artha-Gunas, and some of them can be interpreted (as done by Abhinavagupta) as constituting Sabda-Gunas as well, but the number and nomenclature of the Gunas as well as the substance of some of them, as outlined by Bharatas, are conventionally adhered to by all later writers, excepting Bhamaha who, as we shall see, was a radical thinker in this respect, until we come to the Dhvanikara and his followers who give a new interpretation to the Guna - Doctrine. It is also important to note that Bharata takes the Gunas, as well as the Dosas and Alamkaras, to subservient to the purpose of awakening Rasa, which is taken as the principal business of the drama. In this he anticipates and probably influences the view of the Dhvanikara and his school who, as we shall see, borrow Bharata’s idea of Rasa from the case of the drama and apply it to that of poetry.
It has been noted above that Bharata makes all these elements, Laksana, Gunas, Dosas and Alamkara, Subordinate to the principle purpose of awakening Rasa in the drama.

These elements constitute what he calls Vacika

THE HISTORY OF AUCITYA IN SANSKRIT POETICS

One of the noteworthy points in the Sanskrit system of literary criticism is that, in an inquiry into a comprehensive philosophy of the literary art, they do not separate poetry and drama, nor prose and verse. Bharata, in his Natya-Sastra has defined Drama as Imitation of the three worlds or representation of the actions of men of various nature; (N.S. I,107,113,120 etc.) Vide also Dasarupaka I,7). Consequently Bharata has perfected a system of ideas of 'Loka Dharmi', which term means 'the way of the world' or to put it short 'Nature', and stands to denote the realistic elements in Bharat’s Stage in the concept of Prakrti, Bharata studies the various kinds of men, minds, and natures found in the worlds. In the concept of Pravrtti he has dressing and other activities. He has elaborately dealt with Aharya-Abhinaya, dress and make-up, which, he says, must be appropriate to the Rasa and Bhava.

He has devoted separate sections to a consideration of the most proper way of correct speaking in the drama according to the emotions (XIX), of the Svaras suitable for each mood and of the musical
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tunes, Jatyyamsakas, appropriate to the varying Rasa and Bhava (XXXIX, I-4). These remarks apply to the artists of the stage and theatre, the actors, the conductor and others. Regarding the work of the poet dramatist, Bharata has analysed the text of the drama and has pointed out how the verbal qualities of sweetness, harshness etc. and the flights of fancies expressed in the form of figures is portrayed (XVII, 108-123). Thus at the end of the treatment of each topic, Bharata has an important section called ‘Rasa-Prayaga’, where he points out what suits what.

So much so that Bharata observes that, in judging drama, the ground of reference for success of the art is the world. He emphasis that one has to know the infinite variety of human - nature - Prakrti and Sila, on which is Natya or drama based

The ‘Pramana’ of Natya is finally only the world. A theorist can give a few indications and the rest can be learnt only from the world. (end of the chapter on dress and make-up). Nature or the three worlds or Prakrti or Sila-all these can finally be referred to by the single word Rasa which is the ‘Soul’ of poetry. Drama is the representation of moods, Bhava-anukirtana, as Bharata puts it. Out of these moods flows everything - the actions, the character, the dress, the nature of one’s speech etc. Thus to this factor, which is at the root of all theses things viz. . Rasa, have these things again to be referred for finding out whether in representing them, there is propriety or appropriateness. Things cannot be estimated by themselves separately
and labelled as good or bad, appearing or otherwise. That is, Gunatva and Dosatva do not inherently pertain to anything eternally but anything, according to the situation where it occurs, is either suitable or not; and in this suitability or otherwise lies Gunatva or Dosatva. What Bharata says of ornaments and decoration in make-up of the characters is true of all other parts of the art of representation by the poet and the production of the drama on the stage by the actors. Bharata lays down that if a thing does not agree or is not proper in a certain place with reference to Rasa, it is the greatest literary flaw. Improper placing, like placing a necklace at the foot and an anklet round the neck, can only produce laughter.

It is serious breach of propriety for a writer to describe a forlorn lady suffering from separation from her lord (i.e., one in Pravasa Vipralambha) as having her body fully decked with jewels. In the realm of artistic expression the same rule holds good. A poet commits the greatest crime against Rasa if he introduces a cartload of ornaments of a verbal character in places where Rasa has to be effectively portrayed and where the absence of any figure is itself the perfection of art. The proper placing of things in such a manner as to suit Rasa and the avoiding of things not suitable form the essence of artistic expression. This is propriety, Aucitya. An anklet adds no beauty as an ornament for the ankle is helpful to beautify one. We can thus see how this doctrine of appropriateness, propriety and adaptation— all comprehended in the one word Aucitya, is directly derivable from quoted, the verse illustrative of the theory of Aucitya given by Ksemendra in his Aucityavcaracarca, in
which work the doctrine of Aucitya had the complete elaboration into a system of criticism, and see:

Thus the first work in the history of Sanskrit Poetics contains implicitly as much of this theory of Aucitya of the Sanskrit Alankara Sastra, as of the other theory of poetry, Rasa, explicitly, even though emphasis on both these- Aucitya and Rasa - was again systematically laid only as late as the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries.

Aucitya is harmony and in one aspect it is proportion between the whole and the parts, between the Angin and the Angas. This perfection is all the morals and beauty in art. At the final stage of its formulation as a theory explaining the secret of poetic appeal, Aucitya is stated to be the 'Jivita', life-breath, of poetry. This Aucitya, which is proportion and harmony on one side and appropriateness and adaptation on the other, cannot be understood by itself but presupposes that to which all other things are harmonious and appropriate in every part and between one part and another, but everything as a whole has to be pronounced proper and appropriate or otherwise by a reference to what constitute the 'Soul' - Atman of poetry viz., Rasa. Thus Bharata speaks of the Rasa-Prayoga of Pravritti, Vritti, Guna, Alankara, Aharyabhinaya, Pathysguna, Svara and Jatyamsa. In later terminology, this Rasaprayoga is Rasaaucitya. But Aucitya is obly implicitly contained in Bharata. It was only rather late that Poetics got itself again wedded and identified with Bharata's Dramaturgy and took its stand scientifically on the two pedestals of Rasa and Aucitya, which it had forgotten for a time as we
shall now see in the following account of the history of the concept of Aucitya after Bharata.

An attempt has been made in the foregoing pages not only to indicate the diversity as well as immensity of Sanskrit Alamkara literature but also to settle its relative chronology as a workable basis for an historical treatement. If we leave aside its unknown beginings and Bharata, the historic period of its growth covers broadly a thousand years from 800 to 1800 A.D. It is marked by a speculative activity, surprising alike for its magnitude and its minuteness. This activity in its early stage centres in Kashmir, to which place belong most of the famous and original writers on Poetics. We do not indeed know the place of origin of the two earliest writers, Bharata and Bhamaha, but immediately after them we find Vamana, Udbhata, Rudra, Mukula, Anandavardhana, Lollata, Bhatta, Nayaka Abhinavagupta, Ksemendra, Kuntaka, Mammata and Ruyyaka flourishing in Kashmir. The only important exception is found in Dandin who was probably a South Indian writer. Coming to later times we find the study extending itself to central India, Gujrat, the Dekkan and Bengal. In South India, no doubt, this study was kept alive by a succession of brilliant, if not very original, writers; but these contributions of later times, though greater in bulk and sometimes superior in a certain acuteness, never supersede the volume of original work done in Kashmir, which may be fittingly regarded as the home-land, if not the birthplace, of the Dekkan and Bengal only carry on the tradition, as well as acknowledge the authority, of the Kashmirian originators of the discipline.
Although our history covers a period of more than a thousand years, it is yet marked by several well-defined stages. With the date of Anandavardhana, we arrive for the first time at a distinct landmark in its chronology as well as its history; and we may take it as the central point from which we may proceed backward and forward, although the system of Anandavardhana itself was raised to almost exclusive recognition by the classical work of Mammata. The mutual relation of this system to the other systems flourishing before and after Anandavardhana furnished the best and safest criterion for the orientation of the divergent systems of thoughts and tendencies which gather together in one clear, dominant and finally authoritative doctrine in Mammata. Indeed, one of the obvious objects of Anandavardhana's work was not only to fix up the rationalise into a synthetic and comprehensive system the already accumulated ideas, elaborated by previous thinkers but flowing through different channels in the respective systems of Bhamaha, Vamana and the post-Bharata dramaturgic Rasa-writers; while Mammata gathered the results up and uttered them in the convenient and concise form of a systematic textbook.

Although in Bhamaha's Kavyalamkara, the earliest known work on Poetics, we meet for the first time with a more or less systematic scheme of Poetics, there is enough evidence to show that it must have been preceded by a period, covering perhaps several centuries, of unknown beginnings. All that we know of this period consists of
glimpses of rhetorical speculations, such as we find in Bharatam int
the recorded opinions of (or stray references to) pre-Bhamaha writers
like Medhavin, or in such treatises on Alamkar as was presumably
utilised by the Kavya-poets in general and by Bhatti in particular. This
period begins with the enumeration and definition of only four poetic
figures, ten Gunas and ten Dosas, but ends with the elaborate
characterisation of thirty-eight independent figures in Bhatti. But what is
important to note in this period is Bharata's more or less elaborate
exposition of Dramaturgy, and incidentally of Rasa, which element,
however, is considered not in relation to Poetry and Poetics, but in
connexion with Drama and Dramaturgy.

This is followed by a comparatively brief but important period
of extraordinary fertility and creative genius, beginning with Bhamaha
and ending with Anandavardhana, in which we find most of the
fundamental problems of Sanskrit Poetics the one hand, Bhamaha,
Udbhata and Rudrata, devoting themselves to the consideration of
those decorative devices of poetic expression which are known as
Alamkaras (poetic figures), and confining themselves chiefly to an
external art or theory of adornment, from which the discipline itself
takes its name and its original tradition. Dandin and Vamana, on the
other hand, emphasise in poetry the objective beauty of representation
realised by means of what they call Marga or Riti (roughly 'diction')
and its constituent excellences, the ten Gunas. Both these systems,
which emphasise respectively the elements of Alamkara and Riti in poetry,
content themselves with the working out of the outward forms of
expression, the advantages of which were considered sufficient for poetry. They point out the faults to be avoided and the excellences to be attained, and describe the poetical embellishments which should enhance its beauty, insomuch so that the whole discipline came to receive the significant designation of Alamkara-Sastra or the Science of Poetical Embellishment.

Side by side with these early writers, however, we have the commentators on Bharata (like Lollata, Sankuka and others) who were bringing into prominence the aesthetic importance of Rasa, the consideration of the moods, sentiments and feelings, which were found reacting upon and influencing even the theorists of rival persuasion (e.g. Dandin, Udbhata, Vamana and Rudrata) who betray themselves more and more alive to the significance of this element in poetry.

But the discussion of Rasa appears to have been, so far, confined chiefly to the sphere of the dramatic art, and its bearing on poetry were not fully realised until the Dhavanikara and Anandavardhana had come into the field.

These new theorists, headed by Anandavardhana, maintain that no system of Poetics, like no system of Dramaturgy, can entirely ignore the moods, feelings and sentiments as essential factors in poetry, and must therefore find an important place for Rasa in its scheme. What was thus already established in the drama was taken over and applied to poetry, profoundly modifying, as it did, the entire conception of the
Kavya. The Rasa came to be considered as the "essence" (atman) of poetry; and in order to harmonise it in poetic theory, the new school evolved a theory of "suggestion" (Dhavani) as the means of its expression. Not satisfied, however, with working up the concept of Rasa into their system, the new theorists devoted themselves to the examination of the already accumulated ideas of Alamkara and Riti (with its constituent Guna and Dosa), with a view to correlate them to the new idea of Dhvani (and Rasa), and thus, by synthesis, evolve a comprehensive theory of Poetics.

The interval between Anandavardhana and Mammata was taken up in settling precisely the details of the new system, which was raised to almost exclusive recognition by the final textbook of Mammata. Its success was so complete that the new concept of Dhavani was unquestionably accepted by most later writers, and the systems which emerged after Mammata could no longer be strictly regarded as entirely independent systems.

But a new theory, however systematic or comprehensive, is never accepted without some opposition. Anandavardhana's system, no doubt, absorbed and overshadowed in course of time all the earlier systems; but in the interval between Anandavardhana and Mammata, while it was still striving for supremacy, we find a few vigorous but short-lived reactionary movements which refused to accept Anandavardhana's new interpretation. Thus, we have Kuntaka who strove to make Bhamaha's concept of Bakrokti elaborate and
comprehensive enough to include the new ideas; Bhatta Nayaka who raised his voice on behalf of the Rasa-System against their acceptance; and Mahimabhatta who attempted to settle the new concept of Dhavani with the technical process of logical inference. All these writers, however, do not deny the newly established doctrine of Dhvani, but they try to explain it in terms of already recognised ideas. In spite of these nonconformist schools, however, whose feeble opposition languished for want of support even in the time of Mammata, the system of Poetics, as finally outlined by Anandavardhana and worked out in detail by Mammata and his followers, was established without question in almost all writings from the 12th century downwards. Here and there we have some surviving exponents of some old tradition, like the Vagbhatas or the followers of Bhoja, as well as specialised departments which stood apart like the group of Kavi-Siksawriters or the erotic Rasa-writers; but in the main, the creative days of the science were, over, and no new theory forthcoming, the system of Anandavardhana, as represented by Mammata, reigned supreme, even influencing, to an obvious extent, the writers who would pretend to stand apart.

These considerations, which will become clearer as we proceed in our study of details in the next volume of this work will enable us to fix the rough outlines of the history of Sanskrit Poetics and divide it, for convenience of treatment, into several periods in conformity to chronology and the stages of development through which its doctrines passed. The dim beginnings of the discipline, like the beginnings of
most other departements of Indian speculation, are hidden from us, until it issues forth in the works of Bharata and Bhamaha in a more or less self-conscious form. Then starts a period, ending with Anandavardhana, which may be characterised as the most creative stage in its history, in which the dogmas and doctrines of the different systems were formulated and settled in their general outlines, giving us at least four different systems which emphasise respectively the theories of Rasa, of Alamkara, of Riti and of Dhbani in poetry. To this period belong Bhamaha, Udbhata and Rudrata, Dandin and Vamana, the commentators on Bharata (Lollata, Sankuka and others), the Visnu-dharmottara and Agni-Purana, and lastly, the Dhavankara and anandavardhana. Between Anandavardhana and Mamatta, we have a third definitive period which ends with the ultimate standardisation of a completed scheme of Poetics, with the Dhvani-theory in its centres, in which the divergent gleams of earlier speculations are harmonised into a focus, and which finds itself finally set forth in a well-defined and precise text-book of Mamatta. To this period also belong reactionary theorists, like Kuntaka and Mahimabhatta, as well as Bhoja who carries on the same tradition as that of the Agni-Purana, and Dhananjaya who writes on Dramaturgy. The period which follows this is necessarily a scholastic period of critical elaboration, the chief work of which consists in summarising and setting forth in a systematic form (generally after Mamatta) the results of the final speculation, and also in indulging in fine distinctions and hair-splitting refinements on minute question. This stage, therefore, is marked by great scholastic acumen, if not by remarkable
originality or creative genius; but at the same time it denotes a progressive deterioration of the study itself. The branching-off some specialised and practical groups of writers from the main stem is to be explained as due rather to this degenerate spirit of the times than to any real split in the domain of poetic theory or to any desire for independent thinking. It is also the age of numberless commentators, and of commentators on commentators, who busied themselves with the hardly inspiring task of explanation, of expansion or restriction of the already established rules. We have also now a number of popular writers who wanted to simplify the study for general enlightenment, the lowest stage being reached when we come to the manuals and school-books of quite recent times.

We may, therefore, conclude here by broadly indicating the bearings of the chronological results of this volume on our enquiry in general, in the light of which (as well as in the light of what follows in the next volume) we may tentatively put forward a rough division of the different groups of writers comprised in them, with a view to facilitate the study of the problems which will confront us in the next volume: we may tentatively put forward a rough division of the different periods of our history, noting the different groups of writers comprised in them, with a view to facilitate the study of the problems which will confront us in the next volume:

I. From unknown Beginnings to Bhamaha to Bhamaha. (Formative stage).
II From Bhamaha to Anandavardhana. Circa middle of the 7th to the middle of the 9th century. (Creative stage).

(1) Bhamaha Udbhata and Rudrata (Alankara-Theory).
(2) Dandin and Vamana (Riti-Theory).
(3) Lollata, Sankuka, Bhatta Nayaka and others (Rasa-Theory).
(4) The Visnu-Dharmottara and Agni-Purana.
(5) The Dhavanikara and Anandavardhana (Dhvanı-Theory).

III. From Anandavardhana to Mammata. Circa middle of the 9th to the middle of the 11th century. (Definitive Stage).

1) Abhinavagupta
2) Kuntaka
3) Rudrabhatta
4) Dhananjaya and Dhanika
5) Bhoja
6) Mahimbhatta

IV) From Mammata to Jagannatha. Circa middle of the 11th to 18th century. (Scholastic Stage).

1) Mammata, Ruuyaka and Visvantha (including Hemacandra, Vidyadhara, Vidyānatha, Jaya-Deva, Appayya and others).
2) The Vagbhata and Kesava Misra.
3) The writers on Rasa, especially Srngara: Sarda-Tanaya, Singa-Bhupala, Bhanudatta, Rupa Gosvamin and others.

4) The writers on Kavi-Siksa: Rajasekhara, Ksemendra, Arisimha and Amaracandra, Devesvara and others.

5) Jagannatha.

Looking at the question from another point of view, we may classify the systems of Poetics broadly into (1) Pre-Dhavani (2) Dhavani and (3) Post-Dhavani systems, taking Dhvani-theory as the central landmark. In the Pre-Dhavani group, we include all writers (flourishing before Ananda-Vardhana), mentioned in Groups I and II above, with the exception of the Dhvanikara and Anandabardhana, with whose names the Dhvani-System is associated. In the Post-Dhavani systems may be comprised the followers of the Dhvani-System may be comprised the followers of the Dhvani-System from Mammata to Jagannatha, together with reactionar or unorthodox authors like Kuntaka or Mahimabhatta, as well as the writers on Srngara and on Kavi-Siksa. On the other hand, the systems of Poetics have been grouped, on the basis of the particular theory emphasised by a particular group of writers, into (1) the Rasa School (2) the Alamkara School (3) the Riti School and (4) the Dhvani School. The convenience of this classification is obvious, but it is doubtful whether we may safely apply the term “School” to indicate affiliation to a particular system of opinion, when we consider that one has to admit a great deal of mutual and (to a certain extent) inevitable contamination of the different “schools”, which makes the existence of any particular school by
itself almost impossible. Thus, the "Dhvani School" admits Rasa and Alamkara as important factors of poetry, which are thus not exclusively monopolised by the so-called Alamkara and Rasa Schools. It is doubtful, again, if a Rasa School, Properly so-called was at all founded by Bharata, who is taken as its original exponent, or a similar Alamkara School by Bhamaha. All that we can say is that Bharata and Bhamaha laid stress on the elements of Rasa and Alamkara which became in course of time established ideas in the realm of Poetics. As a rule, each great writer who puts forward, consciously or unconsciously, a new theory, takes over from his predecessors those ideas which he can combine in a self-consistent system of his own. In this way really valuable ideas have been generally adopted, although sometimes other ideas, perhaps of the same author, have by common consent been rejected. This is illustrated by the case of the Vakrokti-Jivitakar, whose theory of Vakrokti was universally rejected, although the main principle (analysis of an Alamkara) for which he was contending is accepted by Ruuyaka and others. It is not maintained here that the history of Sanskrit Poetics consists of only one stream of development, and that within it we have mere currents and counter-currents. The latter were indeed very important, but they never succeeded in forming into separate rivers; and the different channels originating independently or breaking away from the main course ultimately merge into one dominant and clear stream.
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INTRODUCTION

THE MEANING OF LITERATURE

Hold the hey wey, and lat the gost thee lede.

Chaucer's Truth

On, on, you noblest English, ..... 

Follow your spirit.

Shakespeare's Henry V

The Shell and the Book. A child and a man were one day walking on the seashore when the child found a little shell and held it to his ear. Suddenly he heard sounds, --- strange, low, melodious sounds, as if the shell were remembering and repeating to itself the murmurs of its ocean home. The child’s face filled with wonder as he listened. Here in the little shell, apparently, was a voice from another world, and he listened with delight to its mystery and music. Then dame the man, explaining that the child heard nothing strange; that the pearly curves of the shell simply caught a multitude of sounds too faint for human ears, and filled the glimmering hollows with the murmur of innumerable echoes. It was not a New World, but only the unnoticed harmony of the old that had aroused the child’s wonder.
Some such experience as this awaits us when we begin the study of literature, which has always two aspects, one of simple enjoyment and appreciation, the other of analysis and exact description. Let a little song appeal to the ear, or a noble book to the heart, and for the moment, at least, we discover a new world, a world so different from our own that it seems a place of dreams and magic. To enter and enjoy this New World, to love good books for their own sake, is the chief thing; to analyze and explain them is a less joyous but still an important matter. Behind every book is a man; behind the man is the race; and behind the race are the natural and social environments whose influence is unconsciously reflected. These also we must know, if the book is to speak its whole misusage. In a word, we have now reached a point where we wish to understand as well as to determine some of its essential qualities.

Qualities of Literature: The first significant thing is the essentially artistic quality of all literature. All art is the expression of life in forms of truth and beauty; or rather, it is the reflection of some truth and beauty which are in the world, but which remain unnoticed until brought to our attention by some sensitive human soul, just as the delicate curves of the shell reflect sounds and harmonies too faint to be otherwise noticed. A hundred men may pass a hayfield and see only the sweaty toil and the windrows of dried grass; but here is one who pauses by a Romanian meadow, where girls are making hay and singing as they work. He looks deeper, sees truth and beauty where we see only dead
One who reads only that first exquisite line, "Yesterday's flowers am I," can never again see hay without recalling the beauty that was hidden from his eyes until the poet found it.

In the same pleasing, surprising way, all artistic work must be a kind of revelation. Thus architecture is probably the oldest of the art; yet we still have many builders but few architects, that is, men whose work in wood or stone suggests some hidden truth and beauty to the human senses. So in literature, which is the art that expresses life in words that appeal to our own sense of the beautiful, we have many writers but few artists. In the broadest sense, perhaps, literature means simply the written records of the race, including all its history and sciences, as well as its poems and novels; in the narrower sense literature is the artistic record of life, and most of our writing is excluded from it, just as the mass of our buildings, mere shelters from storm and from cold, are excluded from architecture. A history or a work of science may be and sometimes is literature, but only as we forget the subject -matter and the presentation of facts in the simple beauty of its expression.

The second quality of literature is its suggestiveness, its appeal to our emotions and imagination rather than to our intellect. It is not so much what it says as what it awakens in us that constitutes
its charm. When Milton makes Satan say, "Myself am Hell," he does not state any fact, but rather opens up in these three tremendous words a whole world of speculation and imagination. When Faustus in the presence of Helen asks, "Was this the face that launched a thousand ships?" he does not state a fact or expect an answer.

He opens a door through which our imagination enters a new world, a world of music, love, beauty, heroism, the whole splendid world of Greek literature. Such magic is in words. When Shakespeare describes the young Biron as speaking,

In such apt and gracious words

that aged ears play truant at his tales,

He has unconsciously given not only an excellent description of himself, but the measure of all literature, which makes us play truant with the present world and run away to live awhile in the pleasant realm of fancy. The province of all art is not to instruct but to delight; and only as literature delights us, causing each reader to build in his own soul that "Jordy pleasure house" of which Tennyson dreamed in his "Palace of Art," is it worthy of its name.

The third characteristic of literature, arising directly from the other two, is its permanence. The world does not live by permanent bread alone. Notwithstanding its hurry and bustle and apparent
adsorption in material things, it does not willingly let any beautiful thing perish. This is even more true of its songs than of its painting and sculpture; though permanence is a quality we should hardly expect in the present deluge of books and magazines pouring day and night from our presses in the name of literature. But this problem of too many books is not modern, as we suppose. It has been a problem ever since Caxton brought the first printing press from Flanders, four hundred years ago, and in the shadow of Westminster abbey opened his little shop and advertised his wares as “good and chepe.” Even earlier, a thousand years before Caxton and his printing press, the busy scholars of the great library of Alexandria found that the number of parchments was much too great for them to handle; and now, when we print more in a week than all the Alexandrian scholars could copy in a century, it would seem impossible that any production could be permanent; that any song or story could live to give delight in future ages. But literature is like a river in flood, which gradually purifies itself in two ways,—the mud settles to the bottom, and the scum rises to the top. When we examine the writings that by common condross, we find at least two more qualities, which we call the tests of literature, and which determine its permanence.

Tests of Literature.
The first of these is universality, that is, the appeal to the widest human interests and the simplest human emotions. Though we speak of national and race literatures, like the Greek or Teutonic, and though each has universality certain superficial mark arising out of the peculiarities of its own people, it is nevertheless true that good literature known no nationality nor any bounds save those of humanity.

Moreover, English literature begins with the Anglo-Saxon period most probably in 449 A.D. to onwards Beawolf is the great epic or heroic poem of this period and a few fragments of our first poetry, are 'widsith' Deor's Lament and the Seafarer. Venerable Bede belongs to the Northumbrian school of writers and was the first historian but all his extant work are in Latin. The two great poets are Caedmon and Cynewulf. Northumbrian-Literature flourished between 650-850, and the writing in prose begins with Alfred (848-901) who started to write in prose and thereafter in the Anglo-Norman period. Geoffrey's history which is as valuable as a source book of the literature; since it contains the native celtic legends of the author. The work of the French writers who made the aotherian legends popular and thereafter there are the riming 'Chronicles' i.e. history in doggerel verse, like Layaman's Brut and Metrical-Romances or tales in verse.

History of English Literary Criticism: -
However some literary criticism did exist in England before Dryden but much of it was not worth the name. In general English literary criticism before Dryden was patchy ill-organised cursory, perfunctory, ill-digested, and heavily leaning on ancient Greek and Roman, and more recent Italian and French-criticism. It had no identity or even life of its own, moreover an overwhelming proportion of it was the criticism of the 'Legislative' and little of it that of the descriptive kind. Dryden evolved and articulated an impressive, body of critical principles for Practical literary appreciation, and offered good examples of the 'Descriptive Criticism' himself.

Moreover it was no less exacting a critic than Dr. Johnson who decorated Dryden with the medal of the fatherhood of English-Criticism. 'Dryden', he wrote, "may be properly considered as the father of English-Criticism, as the writer, who first taught us to determine upon principles of the merit of composition". It was said of 'Augustus' that he found Rome brick and left it marble. Saintsbury avers that Dryden's contribution to the English poetry and the literary criticism was the same as Augustus' contribution to Rome. with still more justice we could say that Dryden found 'English Literary Criticism' 'Brick' and left it 'Marble'.
The Literary criticism, as the term is understood today, did not come into being with Aristotle, any more than epic poetry came into being the Homeric poems or English poetry with Chaucer. A very rudimentary form of literary criticism and literature poetry may perhaps be discerned already in Homer and Hesiod, both of whom regard poetry as the product of divine inspiration; for Homer its function is to give pleasure, for Hesiod to give instruction, to pass on the message breathed into the poet by the Muse. A few literary pronouncements are scattered through the odes of Pindar, and the philosophers Xenophanes and Heraclitus both find fault with passages of Homer. Discussion of these first stirrings of the critical faculty will be found in the first volume of J.W.H. Atkins's Literary Criticism In Antiquity (Methuen, 1952). However, nothing more than a handful of sketchy comments on poets and poetry emerges from these early periods. With Aristotle of argument and instruction. In the Birds he has much to say about contemporary lyrical poetry, and in the Wasps something about contemporary comedy.

However, Euripides is the principal object of Aristophanes' literary satire. By some of his contemporaries Euripides was considered to be lowering the dignity of tragedy by his found-ness for maimed and
diseased and 'low' characters and for 'low' diction, and in The Acharnians, the first of Aristophanes' surviving play, written some twenty years before the poets are laid bare; at the same time Aristophanes shows that he is well aware of their many excellences.

For, in spite of the ridicule that he heaps upon him in the various plays in which he appears, it must not be supposed that Aristophanes is merely the detractor if Euripides. Indeed, it is clear that, although there are elements in his plays of which he disapproves, he actually admires him. His admiration is most obviously manifested in his intimate familiarity with the plays of Euripides, a familiarity which enables him always to select the most telling lines or phrases to use against him. Furthermore, while Aristophanes freely employs scurrility and abuse in exposing the vice and the evil motives of those whom he hates or despises - Cleon, for example, and the military and political leaders generally - he is always good-humoured in his treatment of Euripides. He never calls in question his reputation or integrity or personal qualities, as he so often does with those whom he dislikes; and his satire of him in The Frogs is interspersed with what may be interpreted as praise of some of his artistic merits. He grants, in effect, that Euripides has clarified tragedy by his skilful use of prologues which explain details and give a clear picture of anterior events; that he has a feeling for dialogue, in contrast with what might almost be called the set-speech method of Aeschylus; and that his real life than had been achieved by earlier poets. Indeed, on matters relating to the art and craft of tragedy he allows rounded in good sense, and are presented more concretely,
perhaps, than those of any other critic until comparatively recent times; they are concretely presented not only by reason of his setting his authors before us to reveal themselves, but also by his methods of selective quotation with attendant comments, and of brilliantly perceptive parody, which in combination amount to something not unlike the modern analysis of texts. It is not possible, I think, to draw his judgements together into a clearly defined critical code. However, he is consistent in his dislike of excesses and affectations of any kind, and he brings out a fundamental aspect of literary criticism in the importance that he attaches to moral values in the judgement of literature. He is a very important figure in the early history of literary criticism. That other comic playwrights contemporary with and later than Aristophanes were also fond of literary subjects is suggested by several play-titles that have come down to us. For example, Cratinus, who in fact was born about seventy-five years before Aristophanes, wrote a play entitled Archilochoi, which had a chorus of Archilochuses. Archilochus of Paros, who flourished at the turn of the eighth and seventh centuries, was a poet of very high repute among the ancients; among other things, he is generally credited with the establishment of satire as a literary genre, and he was held up as the type of the severe critic. It may be presumed that a play in which the chorus was made up of Archilochuses contained literary satire, perhaps of much the same kind as Aristophanes wrote. Other titles that have survived include The Poet, The Muses, Sappho, The Rehearsal, and Heracles the Stage-Manager; but is these plays are lost, nothing can be said about the way in which they treated literary topics. A fragment remains from a play entitled Poetry, written
by Antiphanes probably about the middle of the fourth century; it concerns the relative difficulties of writing tragedy and comedy.

It is not easy to write briefly about Plato's contribution to literary criticism. His literary judgements are scattered through seven or eight of his Socratic dialogues, and are invariably subordinated to topics - ethical, metaphysical, political, or educational - which are more fundamental to the particular theses that he is at the time developing. Plato's active career coincides almost exactly with the first half of the fourth century.

Everyone knows that Plato attacked poets and poetry, and excluded poets from his ideal republic. It is not so generally known that he attacked them only for particular reasons and in particular contexts. He himself wrote poetry, and wrote very poetically in his prose works; and although there were qualities in much existing poetry of which he did not approve, it is clear from many remarks in the dialogues that, generally speaking, he found much pleasure in poetry. In The Republic, where his so called attack is most fully developed, his main preoccupations are political, not artistic. He banishes literature and the arts because they have no political utility, and may indeed exert an adverse influence on the particular virtues that must be fostered for the proper maintenance of his ideal common wealth. He banishes the poets, but before doing so, he anoints them with myrrh and crowns them with garlands. He must banish them on political grounds, but honours them by other standards.
Plato's discussion of poetry in the Republic is to be found at the end of the second and the beginning of the third Books, and in the tenth Book. In Book III he is mainly concerned with the education of the Guardians of his commonwealth, and he begins with their literary education, which he considers under three heads, theological, moral, and formal.

Now young people are impressionable, says Socrates, and 'any impression we choose to make leaves a permanent mark'. He goes on to argue that God is perfectly good, and therefore both changeless and incapable of deceit, but the poets often show him as falling short in these respects; they misrepresent gods and heroes, 'like a portrait painter who fails to catch a likeness', and thus in the theological sense they are unsuitable preceptors (Republic II, 377-83). On moral grounds, too, most existing poetry is unsuitable for educational purposes, for in their accounts of the gods and of the great heroes of the past the poets have depicted various forms of moral weakness, and here again they will have a bad effect on the minds of the young (ibid. III, 386-92). In the discussion of the form, or manner of presentation, of poetry we encounter for the first time the term mimesis, or imitation, which is to figure so largely again in Book X of The Republic and in Aristotle's Poetics. Here in Book III Plato uses it in a rather specialized sense, perhaps best translated as 'impersonation': that is, what the poet does when he is not speaking in his own person, as he does in lyric, but, by the use of direct speech in drama or in parts of epic, represents or
impersonates another person. In their reading aloud from the poets (which formed a large part of Greek education) the young future Guardians, Plato causes Socrates to say, will learn by the poets' example to depart from their own characters by having to represent other characters, including bad characters. This will not do in a republic in which everyone has to learn how best to play his own part, and not to interfere with the functions of other people (ibid. III, 394-8). For his illustrations of the bad influence of the poets on the bringing up of his Guardians Plato draws chiefly on Homer, Hesiod, and the tragic playwrights.

At the beginning of Book X (595-602) Plato's general argument is that poetry and the arts are illusion. In comparison with the meaning he attaches to it in Book III, he greatly extends and deepens the sense of the term mimesis. He now uses it to signify imitation or representation, in the much wider sense of the copying of reality - of the objects and circumstances of the actual world - by means of literature and the visual arts. In literature this implies the attempt to reproduce life exactly as it is. Of this Plato cannot approve, and he gives the grounds of his disapproval in terms of his Theory of Ideas. According to this theory everything that exists, or happens, in the world is an imperfect copy of an ideal object or action or state that has an ideal existence beyond this world. The productions of the poets (and artists) are therefore imitations of imperfect copies of an ideal life; they are third-hand and unreal, and can teach us nothing of value about life.
Plato goes on to argue in some detail that the appeal of poetry is to the lower, less rational, part of our nature; it strengthens the lower elements in the mind at the expense of reason.

Finally Plato takes up again the charge that poetry is a bad moral influence. But whereas in Book III he had related his argument to the education of his Guardians, here he widens its scope, as he has done with mimesis. He now maintains that poetry, especially dramatic poetry, has a bad moral effect on those who bear it, for they soon learn to admire it, and thence to model themselves on the weaknesses and faults that it represents.

This, in bare summary, is the gist of Plato's attack on poetry in The Republic. It may be objected that, in stressing the demoralizing effect of the worse elements in poetry, he too readily discounts the strengthening and invigorating influence that it might exert by its representation of what is good. However, he is arguing on grounds of political expediency, and, since the poet's potentialities for doing harm seem to him so great, especially by reason of the seductive charm of what he writes, he must exclude from his ideal republic. He will allow entry to the lyrical poet who will sing in praise of the gods and of the virtues of good men, but to no other poet.

In the Laws, where his subject is again the nature of an ideal state, Plato's discussion of the place of literature and art in education is more general. The citizens, he says, must be educated in 'good art', and good
Not only is the imitation - all art being imitative as true as it is possible to make it, but also the object imitated is beautiful or good (Plato's word is kalos, which he uses with the sense of both 'beautiful' and 'good'). Here, then, we have at least a limited acceptance of the value of the arts. In other works, however, his disapproval is more apparent. In the Protagoras (326 a 339 a) Protagoras voices the general current view of the poets: that since Homer they have been accepted as educators, and that their teachings help to make good citizens. In the Lysis (213 e) they are described as 'the fathers and authors of wisdom'. But, in the arguments put forward by Socrates, Plato makes clear his belief that this indiscriminate admiration for the poets is mere superstition, and that their judgements on conduct and morality are unreliable. This unreliability comes from the fact that, as Plato expresses it in the Apology (32c), poets compose their works, not under the influence of wisdom, 'but by reason of some natural endowment and under the power of non-rational inspiration'. This notion of the irrationality of the poets is further developed in the Phaedrus (224) and the Ion (534), where they are equated with madmen and men who merely reproduce in a state of frenzy what the Muse has inspired them to say. Nor will Plato have anything to do with the allegorical interpretation, fashionable in his day, of that which in the poets appears obscure or contradictory. He rejects such interpretations, not only in The Republic, but also in the Protagoras (347 c) and the Phaedrus (229).

Much has been made of Plato's animadversions on poets and poetry, but he is very far from being merely a negative critic. Even in The Republic (607) he is ready to give a favourable hearing to those
who wish to defend poetry, 'as we shall gain much if we find for a source of profit as well as pleasure'; and, as has been shown, he is in The Laws prepared to accept the mimetic arts of epic and drama if only their poets will imitate worthy things.

However, he puts forward more positively constructive views than these. In the Phaedrus (245 a, 265) he gives a deeper meaning to the concept of inspiration than that which has already been mentioned; inspiration can, indeed, give rise to the utterances of a madman, but it can also be 'a divine release of the soul from the yoke of custom and convention'. In the same work (264) he discusses the principle of organic unity, which he considers basic to the whole idea of art. He speaks to the same effect in the Gorgias (503), and touches on it also in The Republic (398). In other respects he inaugurates systems or points of view which have become commonplaces in the criticism of later ages. In The Republic, as has been seen, he draws distinctions, according to their manner of presentation, between epic, lyric, and drama. In The Laws (317) he speaks of the truest tragedy as that which represents the best and noblest type of life, a view later developed by Aristotle, and taken up by Renaissance critics. In The Republic (387, 605) and the Phaedrus (268) he accepts pity and fear as the emotions particularly awakened by tragedy, another conception which was carried further by Aristotle. In the Philebus (47-8) he embarks on a topic which has been much discussed by recent theorists of tragedy, that of 'tragic pleasure' - the special kind of pleasure that critic who is known to have theorized constructively on the nature of comedy, largely in the Philebus (48-9).
And it may be mentioned in passing that he also contributed sensibly to rhetorical theory.

So far Plato has been considered only as a speculative critic. He frequently demonstrates that he is a good practical critic as well. To give only two or three examples, in the Symposium (194-7) he exposes the extravagances and mannerisms of the poet Agathon by means of devastating parody. In the Protagoras (344) he causes Socrates to deride Protagoras and others for their misguided methods in criticizing an ode by Simonides; Socrates himself draws attention to its excellent craftsmanship and its wealth of fine detail, and says that it should be judged according to its total effect, not merely by reference to isolated phrases. Moreover, Plato more than once mocks the sensationalism of contemporary tragic playwrights, and in the Cratylus (425) their excessive use of the deus ex machina to get them out of difficult situations.

Plato is, then, an able and a very influential critic. He is not represented in the translations that appear in this volume only because The Republic and many of the other works which have been referred to are already available as Penguin Classics.

In a work on classical literary criticism which offers no texts earlier than Aristotle's poets it has seemed necessary to give some account of the most significant earlier critics. Aristotle himself and Horace and Longinus may perhaps be dealt with equally briefly, since
they are live to speak for themselves. texts earlier than Aristotle's Poetics it has seemed necessary to give some account of the most significant earlier critics. Aristotle himself and Horace and Longinus may perhaps be dealt with equally briefly, since they are here to speak for themselves. Aristotle, horace and Longinus also offered much for the greek and roman literature and literary criticism.

Aristotle was born at Stagira, in Macedonia, in 384 B.C. At the age of seventeen he went to Athens, where he became a pupil of Plato, at whose death twenty years later he left Athens. In 342 Philip of Macedon appointed him tutor to his young son, later Alexander the Great. On Alexander's succession to the throne in 335 Aristotle returned to Athens, and was put in charge of the Lyceum, a 'gymnasium' sacred to Apollo Lyceus. He was a man of vast erudition; his lectures and writings covered almost every aspect of human knowledge that was studied in his day, and attracted a large number of scholars to the Lyceum. After Alexander's death he was in some quarters regarded with suspicion as a friend of Alexa inadequately, at times almost incoherently, developed. These circumstances have led to a belief that it is not a treatise in anything like a final form, but consists rather of jottings or lecture-notes, whether Aristotle's own notes, or notes taken down by a pupil in a course of lectures. However, condensed as it is, it is more complete and coherent on some of the topics it treats than has always been allowed. Aristotle opens by outlining the scope of the work- a study of the poetic kinds, that is, epic poet, the fact that it must have a beginning, a middle, and an end, and in Chapter 8 the organic
unity of the plot. Chapter 9 begins with the famous digression in which Aristotle argues that 'poetry is something more philosophical and more worthy of serious attention than history', He goes on to draw distinctions between simple and complex plots, and to introduce us to some technical terms that played a large part both in his own and in Renaissance criticism, namely, 'reversal', 'discovery', and 'calamity'. Next he defines the main parts of tragedy, such things as the prologue, the episodes, the exode, and the choral songs. Chapters 13 and 14 contain his well known discussion of what he means by his association of pity and fear with tragedy - a development of his definition of tragedy in Chapter 6, where in one of his most controversial phrases he spoke of their importance among the functions of tragedy: 'by means of pity and fear bringing about the purgation of such emotions'.

The next two chapters are devoted to characterization and the reasons why it is less important in tragedy than plot. Chapter 16 describes the various kinds of discovery that are appropriate to tragedy; and the following two chapters contain what might be called 'rules' for the tragic poet; the careful functions of the chorus, and consideration of scope and structure. Chapter 19 concerns the elements of drama that Aristotle calls thought and diction.

Chapters 20, 21, and 22 consist largely of definitions: of letters, syllables, and parts this will, I hope, have indicated the nature and range of the Poetics, and brought out the comparative thoroughness with which it treats at least tragedy. It will also have shown some of poetry
and Plato's. There is reason to believe that Aristotle wrote a second part, dealing with comedy, which has not survived.

The Poetics is often described as an answer to Plato's views on poetry. It is of course more than this, for Aristotle is much concerned with putting forward views of his own, with studying the methods of the great poets and drawing conclusions from them, and with laying down and defining a critical terminology, in doing which he rendered a valuable service to critics of later periods. Nevertheless, although he never names Plato, it is clear that he is sometimes 'answering' him. For instance, in the matter of imitation, where Plato asserts that the worth of poetry should be judged by the truth to life achieved by the imitation, not by the pleasure it gives, Aristotle argues that correct imitation is in itself a source of pleasure; and where Plato asserts that the object imitated must be beautiful, Aristotle argues that the imitation of ugly things is capable of possessing beauty. Against Plato's objection to poetry on the grounds that it excites the emotions, which ought to be kept under control, Aristotle, while agreeing that it does indeed excite the emotions, claims that in doing so it releases them, and hence has the effect of reducing them. To give one more example, Plato takes exception to poetry as an imitation of an imitation of the ideal, which places it at a considerable remove from the truth; Aristotle's answer is that, in its concern with universal truths, the poetic treatment of a subject is more valuable than a historical treatment, the aim of which is to reach the truth merely by way of facts—poetry is, indeed, more concerned with ultimate truth than history.
In a short introduction it is impossible to do more than touch on a few of the points of special interest in the Poetics. It is still, perhaps, necessary to begin by emphasizing that it is not a manual of instruction for the would-be playwright. Aristotle's main intention was to describe and define what appeared to have been most effective in the practice of the best poets and playwrights, and to make suggestions about what he regarded as the best procedure. The misconceptions still to some extent current, that he was laying down a set of rules for composition arose with the Renaissance critics. For example, it was Castelvetro who, in his edition of the Poetics published in 1570, formulated in rigid terms the 'Aristotelian rules' of the three unities - the unities of time, place, and action. In fact, Aristotle only once mentions time in relation to dramatic action. In Chapter 5, speaking of differences between epic and tragedy, he says, 'Tragedy tries as far as possible to keep within a single revolution of the su, or only slightly to exceed it, whereas the epic observes no limits in its time of action.' Tries as far as possible...'; there is nothing here that can be called a rule; and indeed several of the great Attic tragedies far exceed twenty-four hours in their time of action. Nor does Aristotle lay down any rules about unity of place, or even say that it is desirable to confine the action to a single place. Certainly he insists on unity of action, and that in terms that come as close to the formulation of a rule as anything in the whole of the Poetics; but the doctrine of the three unities, as it has been understood in recent centuries, cannot be laid to his account.
Something must be said about the important principle of organic unity which, as we have seen, is formulated by both Plato and Aristotle, and later also by Horace and Longinus. In Chapter 7, where he is discussing some of the requirements of plot in tragedy, Aristotle says, 'Whatever is beautiful, whether it be a living creature or an object made up of various parts, must necessary not only have its parts properly ordered, but also of an appropriate size, for beauty is bound up with size and order'; and a few lines later, 'Now in just the same way as living creatures and organisms compounded of many parts must be of a reasonable size,... so too plots must be of a reasonable length. Furthermore, in Chapter 2,3, he declares that a well-constructed epic will be 'like a single complete organism'. As Humphry House has pointed out, the comparison of the unity of a literary work with that of a living organism is important because it refutes the charge that 'Aristotle is describing a formal, dead, mechanical kind of unity'. The notion of a living organism, when it is related to literature, implies growth and vigour in that literature, and, too, lack of uniformity, since probably no two living organisms are precisely alike.

Rather more complex is Aristotle's treatment of the relationship between plot and character in drama; but this needs to be studied in conjunction with passages of the Ethics, and this is not the place for such a study. Briefly, Aristotle's view is that in life character is subordinated to action because it is the product of action; it is developed in particular directions by the nature of our actions from our earliest days, and a man's bent of character can be manifested only in his
actions. Similarly, in drama 'character' in its full and proper sense can be manifested only in action, and must therefore play a subordinate part to plot.

The vexed question of what Aristotle means by catharsis, or purgation, can also be fully considered only by reference to others of his writings, especially the Rhetoric and the Ethics. All that I shall say about it here is that I believe that by the catharsis of such emotions as pity and fear (Chapter 6) he means their restoration to the right proportions, to the desirable 'mean' which is the basis of his discussion of human qualities in the Ethics.

Two books which deal fully and helpfully with the points I have dismissed so briefly, and with others I have not mentioned, are Aristotle's Poetics: A Course of Eight Lectures, by Humphry House (Hart-Davis, 1956), and Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument, by Gerald F. Else (Harvard U.P. and O.U.P., 1957).
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Horace was born at or near Venusia, in the south-east of Italy, in 65 B.C. From his early education in Rome under the famous flogging schoolmaster Orbilius Pupillus he proceeded to Athens in order to study philosophy. While he was there Julius Caesar was assassinated, and Brutus, on his way to Macedonia, offered Horace a command in the Republican Army, which he accepted, and fought on the losing side at Phillippi. Although his Italian estates were confiscated, he was allowed to return to Rome, where he served as a clerk to the treasury. Later he was introduced by his friends who in the course of time became his close friend and conferred many benefits on him, including a fine estate near Tivoli. Although much courted by the Emperor Augustus, he held aloof from him for several years, but eventually gave him his warm friendship and admiration, and addressed several of his finest poems to him. Horace died in 8 B.C., a few weeks after his friend Maecenas.

One of the fruits of Horace's friendship with the Emperor is the Epistle to Augustus (Epistles II,1). After the courtly compliments of the opening, the first ninety lines or so are an attack on those who, giving their admiration - or lip-service - to the ancients, express disapproval of contemporary literature. This attack is followed by a perceptive comparison between the origins of Greek and of Roman poetry, on much the same lines as that in the Ars Poetica ('Gravis ingenium... dedit Musa') and by an instructive outline history of Roman poetry. In line 177 Horace turns to the theatre audiences of the day, and reproves them
for preferring mere spectacle to good plays and good acting. Finally he praises the Emperor's good taste, and asks him to give his patronage to other kinds of poetry than the dramatic. The epistle displays a fine independence of judgement. In the critical sense it is important for its historical retrospect; for the view it expresses that poetry should be judged by its intrinsic merits, and not for its antiquity; for its argument that the conditions in which Roman literature developed made it inevitable that it should not achieve greatness until a comparatively late period; and for its claim that such poets as Virgil and Varius were working on the right lines in their progress towards poetic immortality.

The Epistle to Julius Florus (Epistles II, 2) is to some extent autobiographical, and Horace half-playfully gives his reasons for not writing much poetry, especially lyrical poetry, at this period of his life - perhaps round about 16 or 15 B.C. For literary criticism the most important part of this poem is the section near the end in which Horace satirizes the popular but shallow poets of the day and gives his own views on poetic technique, especially the need for the most careful revision in order to ensure that the best words have been found and set down in the best order.

Like these two works, the Ars Poetica is a verse epistle - Epistula ad Pisones; but already within a century of Horace's career, to some time between 12 and 8 B.C. If this dating is correct, the father whom Horace addresses (Piso, pater) would probably be Lucius Piso, who was born in 50 or 49 and who was consul in 15. If this Piso had married fairly
young, he could have had, in the last years of Horace's life, two sons growing towards manhood (iuvenes), and capable of having formed the literary ambitions which Horace attributes to the young men in the poem.

It is clear that the epistle was written primarily for the guidance of the elder son; who had in hand, or at least in mind, some literary project. The father emerges as a man of mature judgement to whom the young man may turn for advice and criticism; and the younger son figures merely as the third member of the family, no doubt also possessing literary potentialities, but too young to show any particular bent. Since so large a proportion of the poem relates to drama, it may be inferred that the elder son was engaged upon or planning some form of dramatic composition. Horace not only gives him specific advice on procedure, but also, like previous critics and like Longinus later, demonstrates that nature ability must be supplemented by careful study and guided by discipline - that literary success depends on a combination of nature and art. Furthermore, the poet must submit what he writes to rigorous criticism, and not give it to the world without the most meticulous revision.

Horace gives us in the Ars Poetica no streakingly profound or basically new critical doctrines. He draws freely on the Greeks and on earlier Roman writers, including Cicero. But we should not on these grounds be led to depreciate his worth as a literary critic; nor should we be deceived be his informal epistolary manner - his discursiveness, his
comparative lack of method, his occasional light-heartedness, His importance lies in his consistently reasonable and practical approach to literary problems, and, it may be added, in the memorable quality that he imparts to his literary judgements.

Although the Ars Poetica contains no discussion of poetry as an imitative art, Horace shows an awareness of the place of imitation in its genesis. 'I would lay down,' he says, 'that the experienced poet, as an imitative artist [doctum imitatorem], should look to human life and character as his models, and from them derive a language that is true to life' (317-18). But just as important to give pleasure (388). He makes more of the aims and functions of poetry, and the terms in which he does so illustrate the memorable quality of his utterance to which I referred in the last paragraph:

\textit{aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae,}
\textit{aut simul et lucunda et idonea dicere vitae} (333-4)

'Poets aim at giving either profit or delight or at combining the giving of pleasure with some useful precepts for life.' And a few lines later:

\textit{omne tuit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,}
\textit{lectorem delectando pariterque monendo} (343-4)

The man who has managed to blend profit with delight wins everyone's approbation, for he gives his reader pleasure at the same time as he instructs him.' This doctrine was endlessly echoed and developed by Renaissance critics.
Horace also has strong views on another function of poetry, the power it possesses, or at least has manifested in the past, of advancing civilization. The clearest expression of this view is found in lines 391-407; and there is a parallel in lines 126-38 of the Epistle to Augustus.

Cicero had advocated the imitation of ancient models, as Longinus was also to do later, but Horace was the first critic to lay down this doctrine with regard to poetry. 'You must give your days and nights to the study of Greek models,' he says (268-9); and his mentioning only Homer and the Attic tragic playwrights makes it clear that he is thinking especially of the great writers of the classical period of Greek literature. This doctrine of imitation of the ancients was also much canvassed at the Renaissance. Other topics on which Horace lays emphasis are the need for organic unity, which had already been stressed by Plato and Aristotle; the need for sound and appropriate subject-matter; and the correct choice of diction and metre.

All these points may be applied to poetry generally. What Horace says specifically about drama and its techniques, although it takes up a large part of the epistle, seems clear enough, and is to some extent familiar from Aristotle; it needs no analysis here.
However, one further matter demands attention, and this is the principle of decorum, which is fundamental to Horace's literary theory, and which is touched on at intervals throughout the Ars Poetica. This doctrine of fitness, or literary propriety, had been discussed by Aristotle, and Cicero made much of it in his rhetorical theory, especially in the De Oratore; but for Horace it constitutes, in the words of J.W.H. Atkins, 'a guiding and dominating Principle'. Horace applies it here particularly to poetry, and especially dramatic poetry. Every part and every aspect he presence of the audience...' The principal of decorum is yet another of Horace's doctrines which pervade the literary criticism of the Renaissance. However a detailed description about him and about his famous composition Ars-poetica. ---The art poetry is being given in the subsequent chapters.

LONGINUS

Longinus — Of Horace and his career we know much of the author of the famous treatise On the Sublime nothing is known, not even his name. The nature and treatment of the subject-matter of this work suggest that it was written of Criticism in Antiquity, Volume II. It should be added that the treatise as we have it is unfinished, and that it is also marred by half a dozen lacunae
amounting to the loss of twenty pages, or perhaps a thousand lines. Grievous as these losses are, the considerably larger quantity that remains is complete and coherent enough to leave us with a critical work of very great interest and value.

I have also followed tradition in translating the key-word of the treatise, (bypsos), as sublimity. However, the word does not, as Longinus uses it, mean precisely what we associate today with sublimity, that is, an outstanding and unusual exaltation of conception and style. As Longinus defines it, it signifies a certain distinction and excellence of expression, that distinction and excellence by which authors have been enabled to win immortal fame. There appears to be no single English word which fully conveys all this, but if Longinus's initial definition is kept in mind, the meaning of 'sublimity' in the translation should also always be clear. I have reserved such possible alternatives as 'grandeur' and 'the Grand Style' for occasions on which Longinus uses compounds of the word ('great').

Although he occasionally digresses, Longinus never loses sight of his subject - the qualities and devices that make for, or militate against, the production of the sublime. Having defined the term, he asks whether there is such a thing as an art of the sublime. His answer recalls what we have already heard from Horace and other earlier critics; sublimity, he says, is innate, an inborn gift, but it must be cultivated, among other ways by
imitation or emulation of writers who have shown themselves capable of achieving sublimity; art is necessary if the natural ability is to be used to the best effect. Longinus does not expect that any writer should maintain an unbroken level of sublimity; even the godlike Homer and Plato have their lapses, and many other writers cannot long sustain the sublimity to which they are capable of rising. However, the writer who can occasionally flash into sublimity is superior to the one who, like Hyperides, does everything well, but never quite achieves the sublime.

The main body of the treatise is concerned with the discussion and illustration of five sources of the sublime. The first and most important source (chapters 8-15) is grandeur of thought, the ability to form grand conceptions. This takes its rise in nobility of soul or character, and Longinus illustrates it from Homer and from the Book of Genesis. It may also result from the right choice and arrangement of the most striking circumstances, as he illustrates by a perceptive analysis of an ode by Sappho. After some consideration of imagery, Longinus speaks of the second source, that is, vehement and inspired passion; however, he does not develop this, but promises to deal with it in a separate work.

The third source of the sublime is the effective use of stylistic and rhetorical figures (chapters 16-29) and Longinus observes that a figure is best used when the fact that it is a figure
escapes attention. The fourth source is to be found in noble
diction and phrasing (Chapters 30-8) this includes the skilful use
of metaphors and other figures of speech. Finally (Chapter 39-40)
comes dignified and elevated composition, that is, an insistence
on the most effective arrangement of words, and the now well
established conception of organic unity.

Longinus's concreteness adds considerably to the value of
his criticism. He keeps it concrete by means of constant
illustration and analysis, often very shrewd analysis. His reference
to the lawgiver often very shrewd analysis. His reference to
lawgiver of the jews and his pronouncement at the beginning of
his Laws, 'God said..... Let there be light, and there was light; let
there be land, and there was land,' is of particular interest, and has
led to much speculation about the currency of the Hebrew
scriptures in Longinus's time; however, it seems profitless to
speculate whether Longinus supplied it from an imperfect
memory of what he had himself read in the septuagint, whether he
derived it from his reading of Cecilius or of some other writer, or
whether it is an interpolation belonging to a later period. There it
stands among the many quotations which establish Longinus as a
fine judicial, as well as speculative, critic. One remembers also
his sensible analyses of many passage of Homer and Plato and
Demosthenes, his admirable comments on the ode of Sappho
which he quotes, and his telling comparisons between
Demosthenes and Cicero and Demosthenes and Hyperides. He
must be ranked as one of the finest and most constructive of the classical literary critics.

A large and important branch of classical criticism is that which relates to rhetorical theory. This has necessarily been excluded from the present work, since it would have opened up a field too vast to be treated in a single volume with the authors here represented.

The texts I have used for the translations in this volume are as follows; for Aristotle the text of Ingram Bywater in the Oxford Classical Texts; for Horace that of E.C. Wickham, revised by H.W. Garrod, in the same series; for Longimus the Cambridge edition, with introduction and translation, of W.Rhys Roberts. For their generous help, both in the solution of difficulties and in matters of expression, my gratitude is due to my colleague at Westfield College, Miss Christina Barratt, to the late General Editor of the Penguin Classics, Dr. E.V. Rieu, and to the present Joint Editor, Mrs Radice.

A BRIEF OVERVIEW ON THE HISTORY OF “PROPRIETY” - (BY THE WESTERN THINKERS)

The western thinkers --- mostly the Greek and Roman thinkers gave much importance to the Propriety, however they used this word with the different synonyms . In the nutshell, we can say
that the alination of the Western Thinkers was towards the Outward Propriety. However further we can say that the Western Tinkers mentioned about the Internal Propriety also. Whereas the alination of Indian thinkers was (extensively) towards both Interaril and External Propriety. Here the brief overview of the thinkings of the Western Thinkers is being given in this way:

**HOMER**

Homer, more than any other, has taught the real of us in art of forming lies in the right way.

--- Aristotle on the Art of Poetry (Bywater)

**SOCRATES**

1.) Socrates betook himself to the place of making definitions of ‘bautifull’ ‘good’ ‘large’ and so on as qualities observed in the several classes of beautiful, good and large material things, and then employing thies propositions, if they appeared to be sound, for the creation of higher Hypotheses.

--- Plato,--- Works V
(by W. R. M. Lamb) --- General Introduction.

**ARISTOTLE**

1.) “The Meno and Georgias set forth the doctrine that kno wledge of righr is latent in our minds.”
2.) "We read now of a 'form' of good to which all thought and action aspire, and which, contemplated in itself, will explain not merely why justice is better than injustice but the meaning and aim of everything."

---Plato --- Works V
(by W. R. M. Lamb) --- General Introduction

HORACE

1.) "It is not enough no harshness gives offence, The sound must seem an echo of sense."

2.) "Nature to all things fixed the limits fit, And wisely curb'd proud man's pretending wit."