CHAPTER- V

ACHARYA SHARMA : AS A POETICIAN

When Acharya Sharma writes in the preface to his famous book — Bhasha Vigyan Ki Bhumika — that "It is a prevalent view relating to me that I have studied something about poetics and to write anything on philology is either an impossibility or nothing but a can't", proves indirectly or a prideless confession of his that he has an iron grip over the subject called poetics without leaving any trace of doubt. To speak it otherwise, Acharya Sharma's extensive erudition in the branch of this field of knowledge requires no better proof than his humble confession as quoted above.

The second striking point in the characteristic of his writing is his humility in speaking the truth like Late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the first and glorious Prime Minister of the Indian Republic who writes in his forewords to his masterpiece book the Discovery of India that he knows no history nor he is a historian but had completed the whole historical survey of India from the Primitive Era to the Modern Age upto 1945 A.D.² Acharya Sharma writes in his Purovak to his illustrious book named Hindi Bhasha Ka Vikas that although
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many learned philologists have thrown light upon the development and nature of Hindi Language, yet there is much to say about the nature and development of Hindi Language; but it never means that he tries to show the extent of his learning nor he intends to find faults or shortcomings of his predecessors. To make it clear he quotes a famous shloka by Acharya Abhinava Gupta that —

Tasmat satamatra Na Dushitani,
Matani Tanyewa Tu shodhitani.¹

That is why the main purpose of Sri Sharma is to correct, if there is any error, to add, if essential, and to drop, what is not required in the statements of his predecessors while he deals with the poetics of the oriental (India) and accidental as well. Acharya Sharma throws glaring light upon the Indian and Western poetics in a very balanced and befitting way when he looks into the long range of the Indian poetics (specially found in Sanskrit Language) he stops at certain features which he calls them its existence and limitation, requires some special attention to be paid to. In his short treatise of nearly Bharatiya Kavya Shastra : Sthiti Aur Seema about twelve pages/Acharya Sharma looks on with a flying eye over thousands of years of the history of the Indian poetics,
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but with very careful scrutiny showing the very inner being of the nature of the poetics of India. In this connection he finds certain characteristics which are roughly speaking the very essence of almost all the Indian poetics. They may briefly be summarised in the following words keeping the very soul of Acharya Sharma's statements: In the very first line of Acharya Sharma's treatise published in the Naya Alochak, Acharya Sharma speaks — To understand the Indian poetics it is essential to evaluate certain characteristics of Sanskrit Literature.

1. The Sanskrit Literature belongs to the bourgeois class which is the offshoot of the feudal system, so whatever be the branch of literature, it depicts the life of feudalism. To exhibit wealth and power is the main theme of this literature. All the branches of Sanskrit Literature, whether it is drama, epic, or prosaic poetry,rooms about the feudal way of life.

1. In the sanskrit drama one will find the exhibition of only two Rasas: Veer and Sringar, that is, Valour and love because of the fact that the feudal lords indulge their lives either:
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in obtaining gross or material pleasure or in war. This was due to the limit or extent of education. Like modern times education was not accessible to all, neither it was thought essential to be. In other words literature was thought to be essential for the ruler and his nobles only. The common people were busy in solving their problems of bread and butter.

2. The other remarkable feature of Sanskrit literature was its confinement to a clique of literatures. This clique consisted of some civilized or cultured and those who understood poetry or literature. The terms 'cultured' and 'civilized' were used then in a very narrower sense. At that time poetry was to be heard and rejoiced, not to be criticized like modern age.

3. The third characteristic to be worth observing was that the literature of those days was idealistic. 'What life is', was not the subject of literature, rather what life ought to be was the matter for discussion in the then literature. This resulted in the belief of rebirth, the immortality of the soul, celestial world or life etc. The principles regarding these beliefs were deeply rooted in
not only the literature of those days, but rather in the very root of the then Indian life. The other result of this idealism was the non-acceptance of the tragic element in the end of literature or any literature. As it is an established fact that literature and society influences each other in many ways without any doubt. Besides the principles of literature are the guide lines of the social trend of life.

The fourth characteristics of the sanskrit literature is its uniformity in nature which is found in every branch of literature, such as, in drama, epic, prose and so on. In this connection Acharya Sharma clearly writes that "Beginning since Aswaghosha to SriHarsha go through the epics, no difference will be found during twelve hundred years. The dramas since Bhas to Vishakhadatta have been composed in the same mould or dice and this is the condition of the prose-poems since Subandhu to Dandeex." Acharya Sharma feels very sorry when he finds the general lack of uses of newness in thousand years life of sanskrit literature.1 Acharya Sharma compares Sanskrit literature with that of Hindi wherein one can not find this sort of confirmity even in Veergatha Kal, Bhakti Kal and Reeti Kal
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which also were flourished in the age of feudalism. That is why, Acharya Sharma says, if we want to divide Sanskrit literature, there is no ground for doing that.

The discussion of the above said characteristics of Sanskrit literature, according to Sri Sharma, is essential to understand the method of its criticism in which we find the following typicalities on the basis of what has been said above:

1. Since Sanskrit literature is idealistic, so is its method of criticism. The strongest proof of it is this that there is unhesitating usage of imperative or didactic in poetics.

2. Secondly, this theory of criticism is theoretical. During long history of Sanskrit poetics, its scholars have tried only to solve the problem as to what is the soul of poetry, that is, what poetry is. No scholar ever thought the necessity of knowing how poetry is. That is why, there is complete lack of practical criticism. There is ample example of the principles of finding faults and qualities but none has tasted or examined the poets on
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those principles. The simple reason of this is that the books which were written on poetics were generally meant only for poets, not for readers or audience.

3. One thing in the tradition of Sanskrit poetics is noticeable that currents of poetry and poetics or criticism have been flowing parallelly irrespective of each other. Both go hand in hand but none touches one another. On account of this neither critic nor poet was benefitted by none of their erudition and knowledge. That is why, when the works of Kalidas were at zenith in their glory, the prosodists, rhetoricians or poeticians were discussing about the ornamentation of poetry; and when phoneticism was established, the artificial and ornamented poetry was being composed like the epic "Shishupal Badha" by Magh.

4. This is the reason that the more the sanskrit poetry declined, the more the developed form of criticism was and when the poetry was at its zenith the criticism was in its infancy. In this connection Acharya Sharma, further, says generally that it is very seen that when literature is immature, criticism or poetics too remain in immature stage and ripeness of literature follows the ripeness of criticism.
But Sanskrit literature is exception to this formula. Grammar has great influence upon the study of figures of speech and on poetics as well. Similarly philosophy also. This influence of Grammar and philosophy on Sanskrit literature effected it in two ways: that in criticising the subject there is accuracy in it; and that the poetics has not been independent of grammar and philosophy, rather it has been the follower of them.

Regarding Indian poetics, Acharya Sharma says, I want to say that there are some accepted facts wherein some corrections are essential. For in Indian poetics there are more than half a dozen of "isms" like "Rasavad", "Alankarvad", "Reetivad", "Dhwanivad", "Abchityavad" and the like. Acharya Sharma is of opinion that they are not separate "isms", rather they are the stages of the development of poetics; because of the fact that all of them have tried to solve the singular question as to "what is poetry"? Besides, none of the theorists has rejected the views of others, rather, all of them accepted all the elements essential for poetry. Even ornamentalists too have not rejected the existence of "Ras", passion, emotion or pure
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poetic pleasure in poetry.

The theory of "Ras" in poetry has been accepted as the supremest by all the schools of poetics, but it has got certain limitations too to which no attention has been paid, Acharya Sharma says. ¹

Finally, Acharya Sharma concludes his treatise consisting of eleven and half pages in the following words peeping through almost all the aspects of the Indian poetics along with its nature, characteristics, situation and limitations etc.:

The I have wanted to draw attention of learneds to certain thinkable points which require rethinking ............. . Therefore, rethinking is more necessary. ²

Dhwani Siddhanta Ki Prishtha Bhumi Aur Prerana:

This short treatise Acharya Sharma begins with a eulogical statement regarding Acharya Anandvardhan in the following terms:

In the history of the Indian poetics the place of Acharya Anandvardhan as the founder of the theory of sound
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(irony in words and meanings together) is incomparable. It is true that his unparallel success was due to the famous commentary of his Dhwanyalok by Acharya Abhinava Gupta paid, the writer of the Dhwanyalok-lochan. Although the author of the Vakrokti Jeewit Kuntak is no less important than Anandavardhan so far the poetic conscience is concerned; yet in the lack of an Abhinava Gupta he did not become so much famous as Anandavardhan became.

Anandavardhan lived during the second half of the ninth century during the reign of Avantivarman (855-883) of Kashmir. Besides his poetics book Dhwanyalok, he was the author of many books like Arjun Charita (Sanskrit epic), Vishamban Leela (Prakrit poem), Devishatak (Sanskrit hymn: poem) and Tattwalok, a philosophical book. That is, he possessed the talents of creative and critical geniuses — that is, he was poet and poetician too. It was Anandavardhan, the first scholar who quoted unhesitatingly the verses from Prakrit in the discussions of his poetics.  
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Dhwanyaloka:

Dhwanyaloka is the only critical book by Anandavardhan which consists of four udyotas or has been divided into four udyotas wherein there are about altogether 116 Karikas. Anandavardhan has adopted three types of methods: (a) in Karika he has represented his propositions in poetic form, (b) in examples, which is also poetical, the matter or proposed things are clarified, and (c) in Vritty, which is completely prosaic in which the matter is beautifully clarified and understandable whereas sometimes Vritti fails to make the point clear.

The very essence of the above said Dhwanyaloka has been glorified and brightened by the commentary of Abhinavagupta pad on this which is known as "Lochan". This Lochan is as much as famous and widely known as the "Mahabhashya" by Patanjali on "Ashtadhyayi" by Panini and the "Shareerik Bhashya" by Adi Guru Shankaracharya on Vedanta.

However, in the long history and tradition of Sanskrit poetics, Dhwanyaloka is the only book which deals with only one element of poetry namely Dhwani or Sound.
The First Udyota:

In this part Anandavardhan chiefly deals with establishment and confirmation of sound (Dhwani) as the soul of poetry, and with the refutation of the challenges levelled against Dhwni and showing the difference between Dhwni or Sound and that of the figures of speech etc.

Second Udyota:

In this udyota the author has dealt with the establishment of the kinds of sound with putting up symbolic or signifying examples, showing the peculiarities of Rasadidhwani (emotion etc. sound) and Ramawad (emotion like) figures of speech and their uses etc.

Third Udyota:

Extension of the kinds of sound, and the discussion of the relations of quality, style, tendency (Gun, Reeti, Vritti) with Ras-Dhwani (sound into emotion or Ras) are the subject-matters of dealing in this udyota.

Fourth Udyota:

This udyota is concluded dealing with the infiniteness of the subject-matters of poetry with the help of the
assimilation of Dhwani (sound), the exhibition of the wonderfulness of the ancient subject-matters and the three kinds of dialogue.

Before Anandavardhan came to the stage of sanskrit poetics Rasa, Alankar and Reeti (Emotion or passion, figures of speech and style) had been extensively discussed. Besides, Guna or quality also was perceived. This means that from Bharat to Rudrata, that is, from 100 B.C. to 9th century had been passed, and the whole writings during this long period were before Anandavardhan.¹

Acharya Sharma is of firm opinion that for the theory of sound Anandavardhan owed greatly to poetry than the poetics preceding him.²

So far the inspiration in writing of Dhwanyalok of Anandavardhan is concerned he was mostly inspired by Grammar. Anandavardhan has himself accepted this:

First of all the grammarians use the sound for the words which are audible. Later on, the other scholars use sound for the word and meaning both. That is, to say otherwise, Anandavardhan was firstly inspired by Grammar, and secondly he was
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benefitted by the poetry or poetics of Bhamah, Dandi, Udbhata etc., who were acquainted with the meaningful sound called ironical sound.

Besides, Anandavardhan was greatly inspired by the poems of Kalidas. In this connection, Acharya Sharma says: This is my clear opinion that in the origination of the theory of sound, the inspiration of the poems of Kalidas is chief.¹

In addition to this, most probably folk-literature also might be helpful for the production of Anandavardhan's Dhwanyalok. Therefore, in my opinion in the composition of the theory of sound by Anandavardhan the latter took the help of different sources, such as, folk use, the poetry of Kalidas, Poetics and Grammar as well.²

Alankar Muktawali:

This book on different figures of speech consists of two hundred pages in which Acharya Devendra Nath Sharma has discussed 81 figures of speech in a very plain, easy and understandable language. The examples of the figures of speech are short in size, easy, simple to get by heart.
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Regarding the list or selection of the figures of speech Acharya Sharma has plainly said in the introduction of the first edition of this book that "I have put here those figures of speech which are really figures of speech and which have got no objection from anybody. It has been my attempt that nothing essential should be left and no unessential would come in." That is the reason that Acharya Sharma has selected those essential undoubtful figures of speech for the convenience of the learners of figures of speech. These figures of speech are as follows: 1. the kinds of alliteration (chhekanupras, vrityanupras, lalanupras), 2. Repitition of some words syllables similar in sounds (yamak), 3. Paronomasia (shlesha), 4. The crooked speech (vakroti), 5. Repetition (vipsa), 6. Similar Tantology (Punaruktavadabhàs). These figures of speech are in word. The figures of speech in sense —

1. Simile (Upama), (a) complete simile (Purnopama); (b) Incomplete simile (Luptopama); (c) Garland simile (Malopama); (d) Rasànopama, (e) Samuchchayopama, (f) Lakshyopama.
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6. Representation (Ullekha), 7. Reminiscence (Smaran),
8. Mistake or Error (Bhranti), 9. Doubt (Sandeh),
10. Concealment (apahnuti), 11. Poetical fancy (Utpreksa),
17. Illustration (Nidrashana), 18. Example (Udanarana),

In this connection it can plainly be accepted that whatever be the number of the figures of speech quoted in the Alankar Muktawali, it is an undoubted fact that language of the book is very helpful for the students on the fact that Acharya Sharma has taken much painstaking in the preparation of Alankar Muktawali in an abridged form for the convenience
of the students in particular and general readers in general.

To make my point clear, a few examples from the book will suffice. For example, defining the figure of speech called Sublime or Udatta, Sri Sharma says simply that "if divine or supernatural grandeur or wealth; or the character of a great man is the part of description, there the figure of speech is Sublime." Take the example of coherence or Anukul: "If contradictory conduct becomes the means for realizing or materializing the end, then there is the figure of speech called Anukul."¹

Likewise, Acharya Sharma has defined almost all the figures in such a fine, clear and lucid language that even beginners can get them by heart. The examples quoted in the book making clear the figures of speech also are very practical, short and understandable: most of the exemplifications are only of two or four lines which are easy to memorise. The exemplifications are mostly from present day Hindi or from Brajabhasha of simpler type.

Besides, the last seven pages of the book known as

---

¹ Alankar Muktawali by D.N. Sharma, pp. 182-183
"the discussion regarding the difference of figures of speech amongst them" (Alankaren Ka Parasparik Vivechan) are greatly useful and of utility. This has enhanced the usefulness of the book more.

In addition to the above mentioned book the other two books by Shri Sharma are more important. They, too, are worth-mentioning. They are "Kavya Ke Tattva" and the translation and commentary of the "Kavyalankar" of Acharya Bhartrah.

In his translated Kavyalankar of Bhartrah he tried his best to make this book easier for the convenience of the students concerned. Acharya is of opinion that "Kavyalankar" by Bhartrah is the first available book on the Indian poetics. That is why he pays his attention to Acharya Bhartrah specially asideing Acharya Dandi, Vaman, Udbhata, Rudrata and so on.

Kavya Ke Tattva:

In this book of poetics Acharya Sharma has described three types of figures of speech: (a) figures in words, figures in sense, and figures in words and sense both; that is, common figures of speech. The number of figures in sense is far greater than the first and the last. The inter relation of the above said figures also are exhibited.
So far the contributions in the field of poetics is concerned one can not ever pass the contribution of Acharya Sharma regarding the western poetics relating to which his book entitled "Pashchatya Kavyashastra". This book is highly estimable and valuable for the students of poetics and the general readers as well. Although it is not a voluminous one and deals with altogether ten of the major critics of poetics of European literature and language, it is by far important than any of such kind. It is of 286 pages, it is very analytic and balanced in nature. Each of the critics or poeticians have been judged keeping three points of consideration or discussion: (a) Biographical and circumstantial environments, (b) representation their texts and (c) the evaluation of their contributions in the field of criticism of literature or poetics. That is, Acharya Sharma has left no corner of any aspect which is able to throw light on their evaluation. The method which Acharya Sharma has adopted in this book is quite rational, analytical, and evidential. Nowhere is Acharya Sharma bias in evaluating either of the critics.

The book mentioned named 'Pashchatya Kavya Shastra' published by National Publishing House, 23, Dariyaganja,
New Delhi- 110 002, second edition in 1987, contains the dealings about the major critics namely, Plato, Aristotle, Horace, Longinus, William Wordsworth, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Mathew Arnold, Benedetto Croce, Thomas Stearns Eliot, and Iklor Armstrong Richards. The object of the deliberations in my paper is the findings of Acharya Sharma regarding the poets or critics mentioned above rather, not the reproduction of the texts or their biodatas or the historical backgrounds or circumstances leading to or guiding their lives. Let me proceed one by one:

1. **Plato (427 B.C. – 347 B.C.)**

   His aversion to renunciation of poetry according to Acharya Sharma, is due to the defeat of Athens at the hands of the Spartans in the Peloponnesian War (431-404 B.C.). This war broke the very backbone of Athens politically. Acharya Sharma attributed this war-results to the exclusion of poetry from the Ideal State of Plato. This conclusion of Acharya Sharma is partially true because of the fact that he derives this fact. If we go through history of a particular age in connection with the study of the biographies of different writers or poets we find the facts somewhat different. For example, the famous poets of Hindi literature
like Jaya Shankar Prasad (1888-1937), Surya Kant Tripathy 'Nirala' (1896-1988), Ramdhari Singh 'Dinakar' (1908-1974), Maha Devi Verma (1907-1988), Hari Vansha Ray 'Bacchan' (1907- ), Sumitra Nandan Panta (1900-1977) were least influenced by the great Indian Struggle for independence although they were born and brought up in the currents of that great struggle under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. The whole population of India was ringing like anything by the great Indian Independence, but these above said writers or poets were writing some thing according to their whims and sentiments which were quite unlike and unnatural to the sentiment of the Movement: Prasad was writing 'Ansu', and 'Kamayani', 'Nirala' was writing 'Anamika', 'Dinakar' was writing 'Urbashi', Maha Devi her personal pathetic tragic lyrics, Harivansha Ray 'Madhushala' and 'Madhubala', and Pant was highly busy in collecting his 'Gumjan'. So, it is not fully justified that the above mentioned defeat of Athens was the root of Plato's dislike or exclusion of poetry from the field of his Ideal State and Republic. Rather, it were the teachings of the master mind, Socrates which turned the poetic heart of Plato to be ideal philosophic throughout his life.
However, in his estimation of Plate Acharya Sharma is quite justified, logical and scientific in his point of view. He evaluates Plato's contribution in the field of poetics in the following words:

1. In the history of western criticism the place and position of Plato is unique and influential as well. Although his real field was philosophy and his aim was to establish Ideal Republic, but he got a poet's heart and in his expression there was the taste and attraction of poetry. That is why, although he is not a critic in true sense, in his writing there are signs which are greatly important and he has influenced and directed his successive criticism in the forms of admission and inhibition both the ways. On the one hand Plato by raising the question regarding the utility of poetry inspired the succeeding critics among which Aristotoles too was for siding poetry while on the other hand supplied the serious philosophic standard for the judgement of art as a subject. Plato is the eldest originator of new ideas related to the form, object and effect of art and poetry.

2. Plato's attitude towards art is normative; he wants to point out that how art should or ought to be whereas the
attitude of Aristotoloes is descriptive and analytical. For example, Aristotoloes examines the merits and demerits of certain famous works in his discussion of what are the constituents of a tragedy and what are their types. Plato does nothing of this sort; he fixes the standard and tell that composition should be of this nature. The composition or work which does not comply with his framed rules or standard, or is not testified by his touch stone, is mean.

3. According to Plato the grandeur or good of literature depends upon how it is capable of upgrading intellect and inspiring soul. A good literature must be powerful enough to improve and satisfy the moral aspect in man. Evidently, Plato is moralist and utilitarian. To him that literature is only beautiful which is good and true. For him beauty, good and truth are like synonyms. That which is not true and good, that is, which is not useful and ethical for society that literature is not acceptable too. Out of two objects of literature: Pleasure (bliss) and moral or teaching, Plato prefers the last. If pleasure is got after getting the moral, he has no objection, Acharyasays, but after teaching, neither before it nor without it ...... .
4. Plato is the innovator of the idea of imitation of Art which was, later on, flourished and formed and shaped as a theory by Aristotoles which was able to be recognised for centuries.

Here it is notable that Plato has used the term 'imitation' in derogatory sense. For, to him in imitation there is falsehood and that which is false, is mean or absurd. It is needless to say that this judgment of Plato is wrong. Plato does not accept the creativity underlying in the art, or perhaps he does not understand that ....... He forgets that an artist not only imitates a thing but he reproduces that thing in an ideal form in which his own genius and art or skill have been exhibited through which the thing is turned to be truly true, good and beautiful approaching to the great truth, good and beauty.

5. Plato regards the divine inspiration as the source of creation of all arts. Genius and practice of an artist, to him play a secondary role in the formation of art. It is the blessing or mercy of the Goddess of poetry that an (artist) or poet, due to which, he succeeds in creating a fine poem. This divine inspiration is a kind of insanity (or intoxicacy)
which captures the mind of the creator who, in that captivated mood, creates something. Although Plato regards the creator divinely inspired, but he does not think or regard his creation something divine or good even if it is a fruit or result under divine inspiration. This is the great fault that lies in the thinking of Plato about art or poetry.

6. The excitement or emotionality which arises out of the observation of tragedy or hearing of the epics' tragic portion, may be thought as the introduction of Katharsis. At the hands of Aristotoles this 'Katharsis', too, was turned to be a fullfledged literary theory.

7. Plato may be regarded as the founder of the Romantic criticism. Romanticism does not obey the rules of Art, it emphasises the effects of art or poetry. Plato has discussed only about the influence of poetry.

8. Plato has said about the permanent enmity between philosophy and poetry. It is wonder to hear such thing from a philosopher like Plato. Really, philosophy and poetics are not enemical to each other. Without the philosophical ground the right criticism of the theoretical
aspect of poetics, which otherwise known as Aesthetics, is not possible. This is the reason that later on Aesthetics developed as a branch of philosophy. The discussions of European philosophers like Kant, Hegel, Coleridge, Croce etc. and the Indian philosophers like Shankuk, Bhattanayak. Abhinawa Gupta etc. are the proofs of this.

9. The over-repetition in the discussion of Plato regarding art. The reason of this is that he has raised this problem in many of his dialogues and solved it. The period of the composition of the dialogues is long. Naturally, maintaining uniformity in them has not been possible. Again the difference of reference made it necessary to raise the same question so many times, and their solutions too have been likewise different. That is, repetition is not due to the inability of Plato as a writer, rather it is due to the compulsion or indispensability of the situation.

10. The reason of Plato is sharp, expression is lucid and style is attractive. The constituents of his personality are that of a poet and he has to do the job of a philosopher. This contradiction or conflict is the main root of all of his paradoxes. However, his contradiction is proved
as a boon for poetry, because the current of the logic or arguments of favour and against has made the land of criticism fertile. The man who has been the bone of debate or the subject of discussion his reference or testimony needs no proof.  

2. **Aristoteles (384 B.C. - 322 B.C.):**

   Acharya Sharma sums up the study of Aristoteles's contribution to the field of poetics in the following words:

   1. George Saintsbury, the famous writer of the European criticism, is of opinion that no literary composition in the world has ever been the subject-matter of criticism during the last 2300 years as this booklet (Peri poetices or English version on poetics) ........... This incomplete and very small work has not still been existing only, its reference too is being maintained even today. Aristoteles was not acclaimed so much by this short-sized fifty paged work out of his so-called four hundred pieces of work.

   2. Although the poetics of Aristoteles depends upon the Grecian literature, it has been successful to raise some of such questions relating to Aesthetics and to solve them

---
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to some extent which are universal and eternal. The critics of Aristoteles have their charge against Aristoteles that before him there was no other literature than that of Greece. So in his judgment or attitude there is no breadth and grandeur which are essential for a critic. This charge may be true, but more true is the fact that on a limited scope of the Grecian literature he created a mansion of criticism and established some principles which stood as the universal and permanent ingredients of criticism.

3. The very philosophism and scientificality which are thought to be the limitations of Aristoteles, they are his peculiarities or specialities too. His philosophic nature of a philosopher and analytic view of a scientist has made the Aristoteles' viewpoint impartial and objective. His putting out of the subject-matter is fact-invention-oriented; there is nowhere motivation in his standpoint. In this respect there is a clear cut difference in his master and him. There is prejudice in Plato, he has cleverness to prove his thought any way he likes. It is very difficult to disagree with Plato if one is not very careful or conscious. This is not the way of Aristoteles. He puts his matter impartially before you; it is upto you to accept or reject it.
4. The great contribution of Aristotoles is the foundation of the autonomy of poetry; to prove poetry as a subject-matter for a serious thinking. The gravity of this thing may be clear if we go through the classical movement in Greece before 400, 500 B.C.: Philosophy was at apex, History was in the second rank, then Politics and Ethics etc. poetry was never found in this circumference. Plate was not only antagonist of poetry, but whenever he got chance he left no stone unturned to belittle and prove poetry to be discardable.¹

To declare poetry to be more philosophic than history against the over-repetitions of the influential master Plato and against the well established and deep rooted tradition was a work of great courage, may, a work of logical proof. The way of his logic is — History narrates that which has been, contrary to this, poetry describes that which can be. If history is the narrative of coming, poetry is the speaker of that which is to come. The subject-matter of the former is the happening, while the subject-matter of the latter is the probability of the happening. History deals with individuals, whereas poetry deals with general. History
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relates to real, poetry relates to ideal. Hence poetry is something higher than history. From the loftier attitude where Aristoteles raised poetry nobody could ever cause it bring down.

5. Plato smashed the genius and position of the poet calling him 'Imitator'. In the system of the layers of the truth, the rank of the poet is inferior to the carpenter even; because he stands thrice removed from the truth while the carpenter is twice removed from it. Aristoteles denies flatly the dictum that 'poet is imitor' instead, he says and argues that poet is the creator of the world of poetry like God. This attitude is a kin to that of the Indian in which poet is regarded as Prajapati, creator:

'Apare kavyasansare kavirewa Prajapatihi
ya thasmai rochate viswam tathed parivartate;¹

6. 'Imitation' too was dragged out of by Aristoteles where Plato had left it. Plato's imitation was a synonym of copy; hence there was a sense of condemnation. Aristoteles changed its meaning into 'idealized representation' and points out that poet does not imitate nature exactly, as it is, he adds something to it from his own side and

¹ Pashchatya Kavya Shastra, p. 65
turns real into beautiful ideal. For poetry it is not always essential that a poet is bound to depend upon nature to do his business, rather he creates something from his own imaginative genius which is finer and subtler than the imitation or idealized representation of nature. This creative imaginative force or faculty makes a poet the master or creator of his own world created in accordance with his own fancy and fashion. This element in poetry makes it more charming, fascinating and good than the so-called real.

7. Proving pleasure to be the object of art and poetry Aristotle brought them out from the ethical and pedagogic fencing. Plato treated poetry to be the means for social and educational reforms. Although Aristotle too did not disfavour the sociability of poetry, yet, unlike Plato, he got its social power in giving pleasure instead of ethical advancement. He removed the doubt of his master that the pleasure obtained by poetry is neither harmful for mind, soul, individual or society. Hence poetry is not a danger to the republic. It is something strikingly strange to note that the work which ought had to be done by the poet Plato, was done by the scientist Aristotle. Since then this contention of the master and the disciple all to what should
be the object of poetry — pleasure or preaching — has been continuing in Europe and according to the influences of the ages one supercedes the other.

8. Aristoteles is the innovator of the formalistic criticism in Europe. Plato had never told any thing about poetry, only on the basis of subject he had declared poetry discardable. It is needless to say that poetry is not only subject but form too; more than that it is more form than subject; form only is the decisive factor of the excellence, beauty, and rise and fall of poetry. Aristoteles thought about style, medium of expression along with the discussion of poetry as a subject; in his discussion he embraced from construction of plot to the aspect of language. Aristoteles is the supporter of clear and lucid expression.

9. The establishment of poetry from the standpoint of effect is the assertion of the importance of the humane values. In Katharsis pathos has more humane value than fear; because it emanates from sympathy and makes men sharer to each other in the miserable conditions of their adverse fortunes.
10. Aristoteles has told a useful thing. The theoretical performance is not an essential factor for the effect of a drama, and emphasised that the tragic effect of a drama should be maintained in the specialities in the style and subject of the drama or in its construction. In other words the success of drama depends upon the facts that it effects, even after reading as it influences after its theatrical performance. That is, the theatrical performance is not an indispensable element of drama, opines Aristoteles.

11. The special proof of the likeness of the poetics of Aristoteles is this that having his formulae the two schools of criticism have been developed in this century. They are (a) American New criticism, and (b) the Chicago school.

12. The expression of Aristoteles is generally crystal, lucid, and meaningful. He is difficult where he is very brief or he has not defined or explained any word. Probably such words were so much in vogue that they needed no explanation, or he wilfully did not explain them; or it might be the consequence of incomplete, scattered or broke-up or faultye scripts; there is no means, today, to decide the matter.
13. The chief limitation of Aristotle is his discussion of tragedy only committing to deal poetry as a whole. He did not even touch lyric; taken leave of fiction or comedy, has discussed about epic to prove the magnificence of tragedy. Thus the Poetics being not the study of poetry, has become the study of tragedy only.

14. Now literature has a revolutionary change in its forms, types and styles. Hence, for their criticism the Poetics of Aristotle has been useless. John Gasner has rightly observed that the attempt to criticise the literature of today is like to try to keep water in a sieve. But the people have tried this too and will have been doing likewise in future too.

15. The serious limitation of the Peri poetics, there is no discussion relating to the language of poetry. Whatever is therein that is so insufficient that on the strength of that it is not possible to enter in the circumference of the criticism of literature. From this stand point the criticisms of language by the Indian scholars are wide, serious and orderly. In the matter of the number of the figures of speech the west is behind India even today.
16. Aristotiles being free from prejudice was determined like a true researcher to analyse the elements of poetry and completed it with earnest honesty. His poetics is the best and first example of the descriptive criticism. Nowhere he has attempted to be a law-giver; but it is a chance that for three centuries (16th century to the 18th century) he was treated to be a law-giver. Then it was a literary offence to neglect his rules. During the neo-classical age the poetics of his was honoured as the Bible. Saintsbury is right when he speaks that "It is impossible for any one who undertakes the office of a critic to omit the study of him without very great harm."

Horace (65 B.C. - 8 B.C.):

The book for which Horace is known to the world of the history of criticism is Epistola ad Pisones or Epistle to the Pisos which was entitled by great Roman writer Quintilian (35 A.D. - 96 A.D.) as Ars Poetics. This is a letter of 476 lines written to a youngman named Piso in the poetic form. This was then as famous as Poetics of Aristotele Estimating Horace's contribution to the field of the history of criticism. Asharya Sharma writes that we must not forget that this booklet is not a book on poetics properly, rather it is a letter in which there is little scope for a fulfledged discussion on any serious thing like poetics. In it one can find certain practical and useful suggestions on poetics.

1. Pashchatya Kavyashasstra, pp. 63-68
2. In the Ars Poetica as we call it the matter is incomplete, irregular and superficial. In a word it has all the limitations which letter must have.

3. Although Horace has not given any reference of Aristotles, yet the influence of Aristotles on him is quite sure. There are certain clearcut differences between Aristotles and him; the style of Aristotles is descriptive and analytical, whereas his style is prescriptive. Aristotles tells that 'this is such' or 'this happens in this way'; Horace tells that 'this should be such'. Aristotles looks at poetics from the stand point of a critic while Horace looks on poetics as an author's point of view. Horace lacks the classical, scientific and inner sight of Aristotles. The range of Horace is limited and facial or trivial.

4. Horace's object of poetry is the combination of the objects of poetry putforth by Plato and Aristotles. Plato was the supporter of education or character building as the object of poetry and Aristotles regarded pleasure or delight as the object of poetry; while Horace summed pleasure and education both as the object of poetry.

5. The credit goes to Horace for the cause that he maintained the dignity and autonomy of poetics and regarded it a separate branch of study. He did not make poetics the subordinate of any branch of study.
6. To George Saintsbury the importance of the Ars Poetica is in the fact that in it one can find the clear glimpse of the form of criticism of the Roman Age.

7. The meaning of 'imitation' propounded by Horace is something different than that of the meaning given by Aristotel. To him 'imitation' means the imitation of the ideals and judgments of the ancient poets. The meaning of 'imitation', in short, is simplified by Horace.

8. In the eyes of Horace propriety or decorum is the chief quality of poetry; but when Horace specifies, defines the form of propriety or appropriateness he belimits it which is nothing but is to include conventionalism, and it is a flaw in the field of literature, specially in the field of literature, specially in the field of criticism.

9. For the new composers or authors the principles of Horace are very useful. They may easily be their safeguards. From this standpoint their utility is everlasting, and this is a great proof of his importance and approval.

10. Although Horace is a great supporter and approver, of the Greek literature, and has held it as an ideal before him, yet has never set aside the national feeling and character from his literature. To speak in brief, Horace likes to fill the treasury of Latin literature by the wealth and splendor.
of the Greek literature.

11. Accepting the importance of genius in creating literature he lays emphasis on study and practice for it. To him labour and exercise are invaluable in his eyes for the creation of Art, that is, poetry.

12. By nature Horace was humorous and lover of ridicule and satires. That was why he is not serious in his writings, even then his language is quite clear, simple and attractive.

13. George Saintsbury holds a different opinion than that of William Wimsat that except some references in Horace there is no enthusiasm, liveliness and idea. Acharya Sharma too differs from the opinion of Saintsbury and clearly accepts that none can compete with Horace so far emotionality and liveliness are concerned.

14. Further, Acharya Sharma sums up that among the Roman critics Horace ranks first and is at zenith. Among classical critics Horace stands second after Aristotoles, although there is elemental difference between them: Aristotoles shines by his own genius and Horace as the result of the genius of Aristotoles. Aristotoles is able to innovate new ideas and Horace is quite able to run on the trodden path beautifully.
and to lead others to as well. It is his credit that the
over influence of Gothicism was checked; the excess of the
Romantic imagination was disciplined; Renaissance criticism
got inspiration and direction. The great English and French
critics like Benjohnson (1573–1637) and Boilean were his
followers. The influence of Horace is great. Leaving aside
Aristotoles, the monopoly of Horace in the field of criticism
remained unbreakable, in a sense. His place among the scholars
of the beginners of the classical criticism is safe and reserved.

4. **Longinus (1–3rd century):**

In his book Paschatya Kavyashastra (Western Poetics)
Acharya Sharma has paid comparatively special attention in
respect of the esteemation of Longinus's contribution towards
the criticism of poetics, specially rhetoric. It is strange
to note that about sixty paged book of Longinus is very out-
standing so far its literary value and influence is concerned.
It is also in the form of letter with differences in certain
points like form, size, language, style etc. May it be a
letter or a series of letters, it is really in the form of a
small book since it contains 44 chapters of unequal sizes
unlike the Ars Poetica of Horace wherein there is no mention-
ing of chapters nor any system like a book or booklet. However,
his 476 lines are not unvaluable.
The substance of the comment on Longinus by Acharya Sharma may be abridged in the following words:

Credit goes to Longinus for the fact that he regarded enchantment or transportation as the object of rhetoric unlike his predecessors who thought persuasion as the only object of rhetoric for it was the fashion of the writers of the then writers, scholars, thinkers or philosophers. It was Longinus for the first that broke the tradition and opened a new pass leaving aside the beaten path; that is, his object of his 'Peri Hupēs' is to discuss and set principles for the establishment of aims and objects of eloquence or rhetoric. The climax of language or speech is sublime which is an experience which is inexpressible in words. That is something supernatural bliss or delight which is completely different from the sensuous pleasure thought before by his predecessors of Greece. The name of that feeling or experience got by speech is 'sublime' given by Longinus.

2. As the field of Longinus's study is wide, similarly his appreciation power is deep. In his book there are references of and extractions from about 50 Grecian and Roman authors; and note on them by him is so glaring and touching that we find in none of the then scholars or authors, not even in Aristoteles. Longinus has wonderful and special cognizance of good and bad of poetry, and forceful language too.
to express them. Much of his extractions taken from the Athenian or Greek writers of whom Homer is main. It is true that he finds faults with Homer too whenever and whenever he got any chance for doing so.

3. According to Longinus the sign of sublime is — the inexpressive height and speciality of (composition or art) expression. This element or sign is very wide which comprises all branches of art or literature. Sublime may remain in a single sentence as well as in long extractions provided in expression there should be the power of (spiritual) transport or enchantment.

4. Comparing Longinus with the dealings of Plato and Aristoteles and Horace regarding poetics or criticism Acharya maintains his utility greater than that of theirs. None of his three predeceors recognised and confirmed the true spirit or essence of poetry. Their criticisms lacked some of the essential points which require for the real cognisance of the true spirit, forme and purpose of poetry.

5. The scope of the criticism of Longinus is wide. Although his principles are specially meant for Rhetoric yet they are equally useful, beneficial and fit for the principles of the art of poetry. In his judgment regarding Longinus Acharya Sharma refutes the view of David Duches who regards
'Sublime' as the 'first affective theory of literature' on the grand that much earlier the Ras Theory of the Indians was propounded. Even the predecessors of Longinus e.g. Plato and Aristotoles too were acquainted with the affectiveness of literature centuries before Longinus.

6. The touch stone of 'sublime' suggested by Longinus so microscopic that very few writings or compositions will withstand it. According to Longinus the existence of 'Sublime' in any piece of composition requires many things like the nobility of the soul in the artist or author, and the grandeur of idea. Since 'Sublimity is the echo of a great soul' so the life and character of the writer must be of grand type. Besides, the writer or author must be well-acquainted with the essential elements which are indispensable for the creation of Sublime like the knowledge of imagery, empathy, figures of speech, language, organic composition etc. Besides, the element of Sublime in the work in no case will be evanescent and will be felt at a glance. The real beauty is evergreen, likewise sublime is everlasting.

7. It was Longinus who for the first time gave poetry a new and larger dimension by putting the creator in the centre for his discussion unlike his predecessors like Plato, Aristotoles and Horace whose central points of discussions
were the creations of the creators. It was Longinus who gave
a new direction for the study of criticism by putting the
creator in the centre of his judgment.

8. When Longinus speaks about the nobility of ideas
which are the fruits of imagination which, in turn, prepare
the ground for creation. Thus, Longinus, in his discussion,
has not only glorified the creator but has emphasised the
need of the process of creation as well.

9. Both of the classical and Romantic groups of critics
tried their best to include in their own group. The arguments of both the camps are equally weighty. So, it is diffi-
cult to call him either classical or Romantic.

10. When Longinus speaks about the order of figures of
speech and word he means to establish the fact that the cre-
tion of any work is its organic whole. It does not require
any imposed or outside element or method. The beauty and
influence of any composition should be judged in its totality
which was formerly pointed out by Plato. Since then it has
been a recurring and static principle for criticism.

11. Longinus accepts the existence of rhythm from begin-
ing to end in prose and poetry both though the critics held
different opinions in this regard.
12. Longinus has raised a very useful and important question as to which of the both is preferable — faulty beat or faultless mediocrity. Longinus is the supporter of the former on the ground that brilliance of sublime over the gloomy side of it whereas fleeting damming is shaded by its major mediocrity.

13. As it is but natural Longinus has certain limitations, for example, to him nobility and sublime are synonymous. Besides, Longinus fails to establish his subject clearly. In his round about and poetic language, the very idea or intention is over-shadowed. Very often he is entrapped in derailment from the subject proper and unnecessary amplification. Brevity of language befitting criticism and meaningful expression are rarely found him. To Reedge Roberts the defects found in Longinus are the defects of his age.

The deterioration of Sublime of his Age is due to the decline of democracy to some he opines, but, he says, indulgences and greediness were more responsible. Saintsbury has volumen tally refuted this remark of Longinus.

14. Out of five sources supposed by Longinus his emphasis is on the first one that is the nobility of thought or idea. To him the lucidity of style may not ever be successful to uplift the nobility of thought. Perhaps that is the reason that
Edmund Burke, the political philosopher of his time (1829-97) says — a clear idea is another name for little idea — Like Longinus Burke too is of the opinion that indistinct, uncertain and unlimitness are closely related to create Sublime.

15. Longinus is the supporter of morality in individual and national life both. This morality, he wants to have in literature too.

16. Longinus is ancient but his principles are quite fresh, new, and relevant today too. He is not new only, but modern too. Longinus is the originator, innovator of comparative criticism which has been the fashion of the modern age. As Saintsbury remarks he is the only critic of his age for more than 1500 years till we come to Coleridge.

The standard of taste is the another side of Longinus's modernity; sublime is that which is appealing to each and all and for all the, it never becomes tasteless after ever repetitions. Again, his outlook towards purity of language (of eloquence or poetry) is a challenge to the classicist age. Faultless mean poetry is far inferior to the faulty grand verse. Here Longinus obviously prefers genius to artistry.

17. Acharya Sharma rightly observes that Longinus is quite near to Kuntak of India, the author of Vakrotijvitan. Briefly speaking Longinus is in many respects akin to Kuntak.
Reedge Roberts concludes his study of "Longinus on the sublime" in the following words:

His deep humanity and broad sympathies have helped him ..... to interpret the spirit of antiquity to the modern mind, have given him a permanent place in the history of literature as the last great critic of Greece and (in some sense) the first international critic of a wider world (p. 37).¹

5.1 Regarding William Wordsworth (1770-1850) Acharya Sharma opines that Wordsworth was neither critic nor he writes criticism for criticism. Wordsworth had to write criticism in reply to his critics of the "Lyrical Ballads" which was published along with the 2nd edition (1800 A.D.) of the "Lyrical Ballads". In this retort there were things worth observing:

(a) the refutation of conventional, artificial and ornamented language of 18th century;
(b) unison of the language of prose and poetry;
(c) uniformity between the poetic and colloquial languages.

Speaking differently, these three things were the different forms of Naturalism. They came into existence in opposition to Neo-classicism.

¹. Pashchatya Kavyashastra, D.N. Sharma, p. 97-108
2. Neo-classicism thought poetry to be a business of laboure and consciousness. Wordsworth repudiates the idea of labourid poetry by defining poetry as "the spontaneous over-flow of powerful feelings." This proves that composition of poetry does not require any precondition of labour or serious effort. However, Wordsworth does not reject the hand of consciousness in the formation of poetry, because he himself preferred his "second thoughts" or expression to the first one — "My first expression I often find detestable; and it is frequently true of second words as of second thoughts, that they are best" — preface to the "Lyrical Ballads". By spontaneity Wordsworth simply meant that artificial and too much ornamented poetry is mean.

3. Wordsworth treats poetry to be pedagogy. To him poetry is a means for man's mental — ethical health and happiness. The other object of poetry is to arouse men by jerking from indifference to love and lead towards the mystery and reality of the world; to illuminate the right feeling and understanding. "A poet should create a great empire of the human society by binding it into the bond of emotion and knowledge .... he should spread kinderhood and politeness among the readers so that they may be reformed and purified." Man is put about, troubled by artificial taboos and traditions and hatred, jealousy, narrowness of social arrogance. Poetry removes these narrownesses and extends out the human feelings.
and thus broadens the path for the welfare, happiness and glory of man.

4. At the beginning Wordsworth esteemed the importance of poetry from the emotional angle of vision, but, later on, accepted the importance of teaching too. Finally he declared that 'every great poet is a teacher' and himself wished 'either to be considered as a teacher or as nothing' —

Preface. To Wordsworth the combination of pleasure and teaching is essential in poetry. He says "the utility of poetry should in the reformation of the frame of the existence of man."

5. For some critics the "Preface" by Wordsworth is the most important in the history of English literature. The reforms which Wordsworth desired were amply helped by this. The "Preface" created a new dimension or angle of vision related to the process, aim, subject and form of poetry.

From the above evaluation it is quite clear that although the "preface" of Wordsworth is not a lengthy (total 30 pages) one, yet its importance has not been diminished till today even if it has several shortcomings like the lack of minuteness of criticism etc.¹

¹. Pashchatya Kavyashastra, D.N. Sharma, pp. 122-124
6. Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834) was the co-writer of the *Lyrical Ballads* along with William Wordsworth. They were friends in deeds and feelings. To some extent they held the same opinion regarding literature, specially poetry. But, later on, Coleridge made a shift and became a harder critic of Wordsworth's view regarding poetry. Wordsworth was simply a poet but Coleridge was a poet, critic and a great scholar, well-versed in philosophy, politics and psychology etc. along with literature. His appreciation in the words of Acharya Sharma is as follows:

1. Coleridge's opinion that the judgment of the process of the formation of poetry is more useful and essential than the criticism of its merit and demerit. This view of Coleridge regarding poetry is as a result of his individual creative experience, the summary of the study of the poetries of many languages, the wide knowledge of philosophy and psychology and serious thinking.

2. The starting point of Coleridge's criticism is feeling and emotion but it ends in understanding. His poetics' principles rest on the duality of emotion and understanding unlike Wordsworth whose principles are based on non-duality of emotion.

3. It is Coleridge who supplied to criticism the stable philosophic and psychological ground. Before him criticism
was either the mechanical use of the traditional rules or the enforcement of one's individual prejudice and presupposition. Coleridge established the newness and theory in place of conventionality and whimsicality.

4. Coleridge is the first man who applied and used the term 'psychology' in criticism. Then the field of psychology was not clearly demarcated from philosophy. By using it he established the autonomy of psychology. The ample discussion of genius, imagination, fancy and poetry-creating process are its examples.

5. Coleridge does not regard imagination indispensable for the creation of poetry only, but for the good criticism too.

6. His criticism of Shakespeare and Wordsworth is the standard form of practical criticism.

7. In short, the criticism of Coleridge is seminal, that is, he innovated many principles but he left them in their seed form which were taken their roots in the succeeding critics like Herbert Reed, T.S. Eliot, I.A. Richards and so on. The elements of Coleridge's criticism like 'reconciliation of opposites', 'the definition of imagination', the 'idea of organic whole regarding poetry', symbol and allegory,
the difference between genius and talent are such which are his historical victory — pillars for his originality, ability, liveliness and power.\(^1\)

7. Mathew Arnold (1822-1888):

1. Arnold has been regarded as the great modern critic for the modern English criticism began with him. Before him only one name is worth mentioning and he is S.T. Coleridge, but there is difference in their angles of vision. Coleridge was the inventor of inner elements of poetry and his standpoint was theoretical. Contrary to it, the attitude of Mathew was purely practical. He was the supporter of freeness and autonomy of criticism through which he wanted to taste the merit and demerit of poetry so that it might purify the taste of the reader.

2. He amplified the symbols pointed out by Wordsworth and declared poetry to be the means for the mental health and assuagement. He emphatically said that through poetry the morality of man can be raised and he may be made civilized. Arnold was of opinion that for the spiritual health of society the rise and growth of culture is necessary and nothing other than poetry can be helpful for the growth of culture. Arnold made the possibility of the revival of Grecian ideals and

---

1. Pashchatya Kavyashastra, D.N. Sharma, pp. 145-146
importance of classicism. He was a bridge between the ancient and the modern. He was of opinion that the modern cut off from the tradition is incomplete and unuseful.

4. Arnold's criticism is not limited to poetry only, rather it includes in it culture, religion and education and so on. To say that "poetry is the criticism of life" means that life should be observed and judged from all respects. When poetry is related to life, criticism too should be related to life. To him the object of poetry is not pleasure only but to make life grand, rich and meaningful.

5. Arnold was out of the reach of the mesh or not of parochialism and narrowness of nationality. He declared in a very bold and firm language that all that is best is not English. His study of poetry was wide -- from Greece to France. So his outlook regarding literature. Comparative study of literature was flourished chiefly due to this broad outlook.

6. Preceding critics of Arnold were influenced by the political, historical etc. preconceptions. They lacked pure literary criticism. Arnold was of opinion that a critic should be in otherwise disinterested.

7. Arnold is of opinion that a piece of work of art should be understood with reference to its owner which is not
always true. It is clear from the fact that Arnold himself has not been free from prejudices while appreciating Shelley and Keats. Every great poet or artist may not have a grand character nor a life of a superb quality. So it is not necessary to know ups and downs of the life of a poet, or one may not have been free from preconceptions formed before hand.

8. The 'touch-stone method' proposed by Arnold is not free from faults because there is no any set formula for picking or selecting out the great or best lines of the great poets.

9. To Arnold the subject and style or expression of poetry should equally be of grand nature like classical wherein simplicity, sobriety and purification must be.

10. Arnold is not interested in lyric like Aristoteles for it is subjective and there is overflow of feelings, and these qualities are against classicism.

11. There is no abstractness and complexity of philosophy in Arnold's criticism. His ideas are clear, and logical, and expression is simple and lucid. His criticism has certain object behind preconceived -- it is for common and uncivilized people.
The observation of T.S. Eliot about Arnold that he "is a missionary of literature, not a critic" is not true. In this connection it is better to quote Scott James, the remarks penned by him about him that —

Which of us would not pay homage to the critic of whom it could be truly said: He freed himself from the cage of life’s machinery, he pursued knowledge for its own sake, he loved ideas for their sweetness and light, he sought unswervingly to make the best ideas prevail and to apply them to life, he communicated to the world the fresh knowledge he had found, he avoided the cross of provincialism, endeavouring always to set himself at the centre of the current of the world's thought?

8.1 Benedetto Croce (1866–1952): The findings of Acharya Sharma regarding may be summarised as follows: The ground of the philosophy of Aesthetic of Croce is Aestheticism and Romanticism. Croce was the great exponent and he provided it with solid philosophic ground.

2. Croce regards art as intuitive. So he is of opinion that art does not take its origin from imitation neither from any mechanism of set or framed rules.

3. So, as a result he is against any educative, informative and objective and disciplined criticism. He says that these sorts of criticism try to search out some different elements in art than the proper art itself. Art is only art, to find out anything from art to forget or leave aside the real form of art.

4. Croce is the lover who prefers to study art synthetically and in its totality. When art is studied partwise its beauty is lost. Totality and syntheticality are essential for understanding art.

5. Besides, Croce is of opinion that the historical background is necessary to study and understand any piece of art meaning thereby that an artist is the product of his time, place and circumstances of the society; so his intuitive art can not be free from those above factors influencing the mind and heart of the artist. In the current of time not only circumstances but language too is changed. Therefore to understand the creation of a poet properly the then language and circumstances both must be known otherwise many important thing may be oversighted.

6. When art is intuitive then it is but natural that Croce is regarding the artist highly. This view of Croce is one-sided because in his book Aesthetic As Science of
Expression And Linguistic very often rejects or denies any external condition for or in the creation of the job of a poet or an artist, even audience or readers are not presupposed. And this is the major flaw in Aestheticism.

7. In the view of Croce the indispensability is automatically left out. It appears the view of critical impressionism which is not a criticism, rather an individual reaction only.

8. The refutation of classification or divisibility of art by Croce leads automatically to the denial of different standards to understand poetry or art.

9. Croce has used the terms-intuition, expression, imagination, fancy, aesthetic etc. synonymously. These would undoubtedly have different meanings to treat and use them to understand the new meanings than the usage is to push the readers onto the difficulty and perplexity without any sufficient rational reason. However, the language of Croce is crystallised and he has endeared philosophy by his writings.

10. On the whole, with certain exceptions of shortcomings the post of Croce among twentieth century critics and aestheticians is important undoubtedly.

---

9. Thomas Stearns Eliot (1888-1965): In the words of Acharya Sharma from the genius and influence Eliot holds the second position, S.T. Coleridge. Eliot is not only the greatest poet of the modern age but an able and powerful interpreter of the critical tendency. Eliot's effort was to establish the harmony and order in the discordant, disharmonious and disordered world. This is why he ends his famous poem 'The Waste Land' by quoting the famous hymn from the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad — Datta, Dayadhwam, Damayat, Shantihi, Shantihi, Shantihi. To sum up, Eliot is of opinion that deterioration of moral sense is the root of all maladies of the world.

2. Eliot has not written any separate book on criticism, nor he has framed any rule for it, nor provided any principle or raised any school for it. Even then his statements changed the course of English Criticism. It is yet to be decided whether he is an important poet or a great critic. Acharya Sharma has shown more than half a dozen of critics' influence on the criticism of Eliot, of them Aristotoles, Wordsworth, Dante, Coleridge, Walter Pater, Arnold etc. but the influence of Arnold on him is the most, which may be point-wise summarised as follows:

(i) To regard poetry as the means for the progress of culture, religion and society.
(ii) To treat the whole Europe as an intellectual confederation to accept good ideas from other lands.

(iii) To understand and treat the works or books of Greece and Rome as invaluable and acceptable ideals.

(iv) The acceptance of the opinion of tradition and understanding of history.

(v) The support of classical symbols.

(vi) The supposition of the objectivity of the creation of art.

(vii) Reformation and purification of taste.

(viii) The structural harmony of poetry.

(ix) The compromise between creative and critical business.

The only difference in them is on this point that Arnold prefers creation to criticism while to Eliot both of them are equally important.

3. Eliot holds opinion that there is an indispensable relation between the artist and his social, political and religious environment. Primarily Eliot was the exponent of the autonomy of poetry. Later on, he was influenced by Arnold.
4. The great contribution of Eliot is to accept the utility and meaningfulness of the whole past ancient literature to the present and the literatures of other countries for one country. This view of his is based on his idea of the acceptance of the knowledge of history and tradition.

5. Eliot is the supporter of impersonality and objectivity in poetry and criticism both. These were the tenets of classicism. In 1928 Eliot declared himself "classicist in literature, royalist in politics and Anglo-Catholic in religion (For Lancelot Andrews, preface)."

6. Eliot does not accept the conscious help of the mind of the poet in the process of creating poetry, it is a medium wherein incongruous ideas, sensation, feelings and emotions which take a form which is quite different than its constituents. This congruity of emotions, feelings sensations and ideas happens inexpressible manner. And, this is also true that these things may not be of the poet concerned, rather, better not to have likewise. This is called by Eliot the 'escape from personality. The more a poet is impersonal in his creation, the more his creation will be of finer spirit, beautiful and communicable.

7. Eliot regards poetic experience something unlike I.A. Richards who thinks it something general. To speak differently,
the poetic pleasure is different from material pleasure. Here Eliot is nearer to the Indian schools of the poeticians who regard it something divine, immaterial and inexpressible.

8. In the beginning Eliot regarded two objects of criticism: (a) the elucidation of the works of art, correction or reformation of taste and (b) understanding and enjoyment which are possible by comparison and analysis. But, later on, Eliot preferred 'understanding' and 'enjoyment'. However, the elucidation of art and the correlation of taste too are the objects of criticism undoubtedly.

9. In the use of language Eliot is very conscious and serious. The complete agreement between the clarity and the meaning of words is his earnest desire. The language of Dante is the ideal of Eliot. So, he too has control over the use of metaphor, simile, terminal beauty, fineness and word limitation. Eliot is highly successful in this regard. His language is inornated, divinely beautiful, lucid, clear, right, cheerful and here and there ironical.

10. The practical criticism was started with Coleridge and of course, Arnold retained it; but it was Eliot who provided it with a firm foundation. His reappreciation of the poets of different languages is in true spirit; it is not mere repetition.
11. For many Eliot is the founder of the American New Criticism, but it is not without doubt because Eliot himself is embarrassed at this:

12. There is some irrelevance in his criticism which he justifies by saying that it is the indispensable result of development which is not totally wrong.

Acharya Sharma ends his appreciation of Eliot with his criticism of Machiavelli saying that "Though he is constructive, he is not a system builder; and his thoughts can be repeated but not summarised." This remark is fit in respect of Eliot too. However, during his life time he was much popular and honoured which few people rarely get during life-time.¹

Ivo Armstrong Richards (1893-1979): Richards is the last figure in the series of Acharya Sharma's discussion in his Pashchatya Kavyashastra. Richards is famous among the twentieth century critics in many respects. About him Acharya Sharma holds the following opinion:

1. It is I.A. Richards who for the first time formed a wide and ordered Aesthetics. Before him the critics considered the critical questions hither and thither.

¹. Pashchatya Kavyashastra, D.N. Sharma, pp. 212-217
2. Richards is of opinion that in the scientific age of today that criticism may be retained which would be scientific, constituted of scientific constituents. For this he adopted psychology as the foundation of the style of his criticism. Besides, he used the new developed sciences like anthropology and economics etc. too.

3. Richards has discussed poetry from the reader's angle of vision, not from the creator's point of view. The psychology of creator is the deserted field of study. Here one can find the clear difference between him and his contemporary Eliot who regarded and discussed poetry from the writer's standpoint.

4. In the centre of Richards's criticism of value is the individual man, not society. The object of art, according to Richards, is to establish order and reformation in the mental anarchy. Perhaps Richards is of opinion that a reformed and corrected individual may lead to the corrected and reformed state of society.

5. In the opinion of Richards value and communication are the ground pillars of criticism. Value is related to the satisfaction of emotions, so, the establishment of value is the subject-matter of psychology, and communication is related to language, therefore, its establishment is the
subject-matter of semantics. That is why the method of the criticism of Richards is called psychological or semantic.

6. To Richards language is of two kinds: (a) scientific and (b) emotive. The former is to apply for the statements of fact and the latter is used for the communication of emotions or feelings. This view of Richards has justly been refuted by Shri Sharma narrating the verdict of Aristotle. Shri Sharma opines that there is no intrinsic difference between the language of science and language of poetry specially of the language stating the fact and the emotion. To Aristotle the poetic truth is greater than the historical truth.

7. Richards speaks that criticism has two sides: (a) critical and (b) technical. In the former the value of experiences is described and in the latter those means or factors are discussed out of which the experiences are produced. This dichotomy of Richards is not logical.

8. According to Richards the relation of balanced poise has with the response of the readers, not with the construction of the work of art. But after accepting this the labour of the analysis of the work of art proves to be futile. If there is no importance of the construction of
the work of art in experience, may it be bad or good, is the same, what is the necessity of analysis of it then? Consequently the very meaning of criticism turns to be void.

9. Richards does not accept any speciality in artistic experience. To him the artistic experience is similar to man's other experiences with only exception that it is a bit of finer spirit. But a group of thinkers of the west and the east have opinions that the poetic experience is immaterial and inexpressible. They are Kant, Eliot etc.; and Anandavardhan, Kuntak, Abhinawa Gupta, Mammat, Vishwanath, Jagannath etc.

10. According to Richards the object of poetry is the satisfaction of emotions by which the balance poise is obtained.

11. The "Principles of Literary Criticism" by Richards is practically the principles of the criticism of poetry, not the whole literature as by the name of the book indicates.

12. However "Practical Criticism" is original in scheming and discussion it has one major defect that its whole discussion rests upon lyric which is unsuitable for epics. And secondly its conclusion is based on the responses and reactions of the immature minded students in the Cambridge University. That is, the "Practical Criticism" stands on a weak foundation
which credibility is undoubtedly doubtful.

13. The whole principle of criticism proposed by Richards is based on the criticisms of Aristotle, Coleridge. Besides, the influence of Longinus, George Santayana, Engene Veron (1825-1889), Tennyson, Watson and Freud too is more or less on him.

14. Richards's criticism is full of circumlocution, lack of sufficient examples for evidence, the statement unnecessary dryness and the tendency to generalization. Richards's criticism led to "New Criticism" in America, and the English critic William Empson is the leader in him.¹

¹. Pashchatya Kavyashastra, D.N. Sharma, }