CHAPTER II

MAMMATA’S CONTRIBUTION TO INDIAN POETICS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO A CRITICAL AND COMPARATIVE EVALUATION WITH PRE-MAMMATA AND POST-MAMMATA RHETORICIANS

(A) PRE-MAMMATA PERIOD

The history of Sanskrit poetics covers a period of more than thousand years. But it is marked by several well-defined stages. The dim beginnings of the discipline are hidden from us, until we enter the stage of its formulation. The first works of this stage are of Bharata and Bhāmaha. While Bharata’s Nāṭya-Sāstra is concerned with dramaturgy and its allied topics, the work of Bhāmaha namely Kāvyālāmkaṇa for the first time presents the exclusive treatment of poetics with a systematic plan. All that we can say about the period before these two works, is on the basis of stray references in these two works and also in other works. The first period of formulation begins with the enumeration and definition of only four poetic figures, ten Guṇas, ten Doṣas and thirty-six Kāvyalakṣṇas mentioned by Bharata; but ends with the elaborate characterization of thirty-eight independent figures in Bhaṭṭī Kāvyā. The most important point worth noting in this period is Bharata’s standard exposition of dramaturgy and incidentally of Rasa.

This is followed by a comparatively brief but exceedingly important period of great fertility and creative genius. This period which begins with Bhāmaha and ends with Ānandvardhanācārya covers more than three centuries. During
this span of time most of the fundamental problems of the Sanskrit poetics were discussed and settled. This period also gave rise to four distinct schools of opinion, represented respectively by the Alamkāra, Rīti, Rasa and Dhvani systems. Bhāmaha, Udbhata and Rudraṇa concentrate on poetic figures or Alamkāras which have been termed as only external art by the later rhetoricians. Dandī and Vāmana on the other hand emphasise the importance of Rīti or Mārga or diction. This Rīti consists of a harmonious combination of certain Gūnas. Both the schools namely Alamkāra and Rīti deal only with the external form of the poetry.

Side by side these early writers there are commentators on Bharata like Lollāṭa, Śaṅkuka and Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka. These commentators brought into prominence the aesthetic importance of Rasa and sentiments. Though this exposition was related mainly to dramaturgy, yet it regulated the outward expression of poetry. This theory did not, however, exerted much influence on the poetry, until the Dhvanikāra came into the field.

These new theorists maintained that moods and sentiments are essential factors of poetry. The Rasa came to be considered as the essence of poetry and the theory of suggestion was put forth to harmonize it in the poetic theory. From this theory we come to Mammata who has given eminence to both Rasa and suggestion in his treatise.
For properly evaluating Mammata and his work it is essential that we should know something about his predecessors in the field of poetics. Of the three important schools namely Alamkāra, Rīti and Dhvani; we shall take a writer each as representing the school. This comparative outlook will show what is the place of Mammata in Sanskrit Poetics.

**Bhamaha**

First of all we shall have a look on the work and contribution of Bhamaha, as representative of Alamkāra school. His is the earliest work on poetics written on scientific plan. His only work available is Kavyaalamkāra. The contents of this work will show the field of poetics covered by this great poetian. He has stated first of all the purpose of poetry, its definition, the qualifications of a poet and finally the division of Kāvyā. It is a noteworthy point that he has given four different kinds of divisions of poetry.

1. Prose and Poetry
2. Samskṛta and Apabhramśa
3. Vyṛtta-devadīcariitasāmsi, Utpādyavastu, Kālāsārya and Sastrasārya

It may be pointed out here that these are modes of poetry rather than types or divisions. The idea behind this enumeration seems to give a comprehensive list of modes of writing. Bhamaha then defines Guṇas and Alamkāras and also eleven kind of Doṣas. His treatment of the eleventh Doṣa is based on such Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika topics as the number and
definitions of Pramāṇas, definition of 'Pratijñā' and its varieties and also 'Hetu' and 'Drṣṭānta'. Towards the end he gives some practical hints to poets for attaining 'Sausābdya' (The grammatical purity).

Bhāmaha has judiciously assimilated the material available in the writings of his predecessors. He arranged the material on a sound basis with due elaboration and accurate preciseness. This method was his great success.

Bhāmaha has given the easiest and the most convenient expression for denoting what broadly speaking kāvya represents, which is 'Sabdarthau Kāvyam'. It is given by Mammaṭa with some qualifications. The same observation may be made with regard to the divisions of Guṇas. It may be pointed out that Bhāmaha is the first man to give the number of Guṇas as three, which was supported by Mammaṭa vehemently. The next thing worth-noting is the consideration of Vakrokti by Bhāmaha. Vakrokti has played an important role in the history of Sanskrit Poetics. His view is that no Alamkāra is possible without Vakrokti. Ānandavardhana seems to have based one of his assertions about the opponents of Dhvani on this very view of Bhāmaha.

Before pointing out the deficiencies of Bhāmaha,
It is interesting to note the observations made by Dr. S.K. Dey about Bhāmaha's work, in his History of Sanskrit Poetics:

"Bhāmaha attempts to classify poetic expression into fixed Rhetorical Categories; and from this point of view his work possesses the general appearance of a technical manual, comprising a collection of definitions with illustrations and empirical canons for the benefit of the artist desirous of externalizing his ideas."

So it is clear that Bhāmaha was far away from the different finer aspects of the field, for instance he could not reach the soul of the poetry i.e. Dhvani or Rasa. His outlook is more of an enumerating nature rather than critical. He has nowhere tried to give a touchstone to test the quality of the poetry. If we put a glance on his work we come to know that he has missed many important things, which are almost essential in the field of poetics. Missing mention of powers of word and meaning especially the suggestion is conspicuous that is why Dr. S.K. Dey remarks "Regarding Vyanāgārtha or Dhvani, the suggested sense, which plays such an important part in later theories, Bhāmaha nowhere expressly alludes to this idea." In fact Bhāmaha concentrated on external form of the poetry rather than going deep and touching its soul. Hence though he possesses some nice pre-requisites of a poetician, yet he lacks in dealing with finer aspects of the field. This makes the contribution...

---

1 Sanskrit Poetics, p. 47.
of Bhāmaha as not 'parexcellence'.

Vāmana

Vāmana has written, Kāvyaālokaṣṭhakārasūtra. It is written in Sūtra style. This is divided into five Adhikaraṇas and each Adhikaraṇa is further divided into two or three chapters. The total chapters of the book are 12. In the first Adhikaraṇa the purposes of the poetry, qualifications of a poet and the sources of the poetry have been enumerated. Then the famous maxim proving Rīti as soul of the poetry is given, then three types of Rīti and different types of poetry have been explained. In the second Adhikaraṇa Doṣas have been defined. Third Adhikaraṇa deals with the Guṇas and the difference between Guṇas and Alamkāras has been shown here.

The fourth chapter is named 'Alamkārikādhikaraṇa'. The fifth chapter is termed as 'Prayogādīṣṭhikāraṇa'. In this adhikaraṇa the instructions about the usage of the words have been given.

It is very clear from the above description that Vāmana does not touch the two important factors which are related to the poetics (1) The Rasa (2) The Dhvani; while the theory of Dhvani was propounded much later, he has also not cared to pay attention to the Rasa theory the seeds of which were available even in the Nātyasūstra of Bharata.

Another important factor left out by Vāmana is the powers of meaning and words namely expression (Abhidhā), Indication (Lakṣaṇ), and suggestion (Vyañjna).
The theory of 'Rīti' as the soul of the poetry propounded by Vāmana does not come to the standard of appealation; firstly Ānandavardhana and then Mammaṭa has criticised this in his Kav. Pr. The criticism of Mammaṭa is not only apt but also rational and appealing. Out of the three Rītis enumerated by Vāmana only Vaidarbхи is possessive of all the three Guṇas, the other two possess only two Guṇas each. If we accept Rīti as soul of poetry, sometimes a Rīti with all the Guṇas will be poetry and sometimes with only two Guṇas, hence there will be variation in the soul of poetry. Hence the assertion that Rīti is the soul of poetry seems to be lacking some thing striking. The absence of Rasa and suggestion from the poetry is also unthinkable, such a poetry cannot be called the poetry of any good standard. Hence with all his niceties Vāmana's creation cannot be called as complete because of the certain deficiencies pointed out above.

Dr. S.K. Dey remarks about Vāmana "To Vāmana ¹ belongs the credit of being the first writer on poetics, who before the Dhavanikāra, and Ānandavardhana gave us a well thought out and carefully outlined scheme of poetics, which in spite of its theoretic defects is in some respects unique and valuable."

It may be pointed out here that the view of Vāmana

¹Dr. S.K. Dey's Sanskrit Poetics Part II, p. 89.
about poetry is devoid of insight. Visvanatha has termed Riti a formal kind of arrangement, a peculiar disposition or posture of parts; what is called the soul or essence of poetry is something different.

Dr. Dey further remarks about Vamanas theory, "The attempt, therefore to stereotype the entire poetical output into so many ready made dictions and fixed excellences, was bound ultimately to be discarded in favour of other and more penetrating principles."

2. Anandavardhana

Anandavardhanacarya the originator of Dhvani theory was Beacon of light to Mammata. His new theory was almost revolutionary in the field of poetics. The work of Anandavardhanacarya is called Dhvanyalaka. As no other work of the writer on poetics is available and is as much respected as this; so far his evaluation, we see the contents of his book. He has been taken as representative of Dhvani school. In the first chapter he has dealt with the opponents of Dhvani and has cleared all possible attacks on this theory. After showing the historical background of his theory, he has shown the superiority of Dhvani over Denotation and Indication. Kinds of Pratyamana have been enumerated next. In the second chapter he has given subdivisions of Dhvani, based

---
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on Suggestion and in the third chapter the subdivisions of Dhvani are enumerated from the viewpoint of Vyñjaka. Three kinds of Samghataṇā. The relation of Samghataṇā to Guṇas. How Rasa is manifested, how is it to be sustained, the figures favourable to the various Rasas, what things are opposed to the proper evolution of the Rasa; discussion of the difference between Vācyā and Gamya sense, difference between Guṇavṛtti and Vyaṅgya, Vyanjakabhāva is not the same as reference; a second variety of kāvyya called Guṇihūtatyāṅgya its examples; the third 'Citra' variety and its two kinds; the role of poet's 'Pratibhā' and guidelines for a poet and other allied topics.

From the above analysis of the contents of the Dhvanyāloka it is clear that for the first time in the history of Sanskrit Poetics Ānandvardhanācārya has touched the finer aspects in the field. The theory of suggestion or Dhvani was no less than a revolution in the field. This theory was opposed at first, but later on found such great poeticians to establish it as Abhinavagupta and Mammaṭa. The firm ground provided by these great Poeticians made an everlasting impact in the field. Dr. S.K. Dey1 has rightly remarked "No other work on Sanskrit Poetics has indeed exerted so much influence as Dhvanyāloka, which brought to focus the tentative efforts of earlier thinkers and by

1S.K. Dey's Sanskrit Poetics Part II, p. 175.
its thoroughness and masterly exposition, eclipsed all its predecessors, dominating through the generation of theorists even down to the present time."

Dr. P.V. Kane has called the theory of Dhvani \(^1\) as "only an extension of the Rasa theory". But this statement of Dr. Kane seems to be against what the writer has tried to establish in the Dhvanyaloka. According to Ānanda, Dhvani has its varieties Rasa and Figures of speech etc. Hence it includes all these things. If it had been only extension of Rasa theory than the vast field of Dhvani theory would have found its limits narrowed. So such a statement of Dr. Kane as quoted above only undermines the great contribution of this great Poetician. In fact the contribution of Ānanda has been so great that it has been applauded Universally.

Ānandavardhana, certainly propounded, classified and delated upon all the germs and foundations of all the properties of poetry i.e. Rasa, Vastu and Alamkāra. The greatest enunciation rests with him, the earmarking of Dhvani — the Mahāviṣaya and others as Viṣayas. As regards the later classifications and systematic tabulation and categorization rests with these foundations and Mammaṭa took the lead to give them a mirror shape.

But if we leave aside the theoretic contribution of Ānandavardhanācārya and try to evaluate the work

\(^1\)History of Sanskrit Poetics, p. 387.
"Dhvanyāloka" we find that there is a vast field of poetics which has not been discussed in detail by the writer. His concentration is focused only on Dhvani. But the student of Poetics certainly needs information about other aspects as well. Various powers of words, their utility, the process of manifestation of Rasa, various Alamkāras, Ṛtis, Guṇas and Doṣas have not been given in detail by the writer. He has only showed how these things can be included in the vast field of Dhvani, and how they help Dhvani for bringing out finer poetic creations. But the knowledge about the character, definition and their field has been denied by the author. The study of this book requires a pre-existence of sound knowledge in the field of poetics, for which the student has to wander somewhere else. Thus we see that though the contribution of Dhvanyāloka is par-excellence, still it fails to provide a complete picture of the Poetics. This incomplete task was completed by Mammaṭa.

Abhinavagupta

The fourth important school which pre-existed Mammaṭa is Rasa school. The 'Kernel' of this school is to be found in the Nātya-Sāstra of Bharata. Though he has not dealt with it exclusively as poetic subject, but on the other hand has dealt it is context of Drama, yet it is on the basis of this dealing of the subject that we find the present developed form of Rasa theory. In fact all later
writers have only explained the Maxim of Bharata "Rasabhāva" etc. according to their viewpoints and creeds. Ānandavar- dhana was another Poetician who made some sound contribution in this regard.

Abhinavagupta a known Poetician and Philosopher has commented upon the work of Bharata as well as Ānandavardhana. Both his commentaries are rare contribution to the History of Sanskrit Poetics, because of their originality. In fact his learned exposition of Dhvani theory and an elaborate and stupendous commentary on Bharata's encyclopaedic work Nāṭyasāstra are extra-ordinary pieces of literary works.

He may be belonging to that group of faithful commentators who are anxious to interpret as well as incorporate new ideas into the system they comment upon.

It was Abhinava's interest in Dramaturgy that made him interested in the various theories about the origin and function of Rasa in Poetry as well as in Drama. Some important writers on Poetics like Mammaṭa, Hemcandra etc. associate one of the most important theories on Rasa with his name. He in explicit terms has explained the theory, that how the Vyakti or Vyāņjñā and Dhvani theories could be applied to the case of manifestation of Rasa. Thus he was successful in correlating the Rasa doctrine with the Dhvani theory. Most genuinely he furnished a brilliant aesthetic explanation of the concept of Rasa and its place in Poetic theory. This was a marked improvement from the previous explanations.
Abhinavagupta realised the vital role of Rasa in poetry. He boldly asserted that Rasa is only essence or aesthetic foundation of the poetry. This trend is a clearcut departure from the path traversed by Ānandavardhana. This healthy deviation however has influenced all the later writers in the field.

While discussing Ānandavardhana we saw that he considered Rasa only as one of the elements of Unexpressed, which may take other forms in the shape of an Unexpressed matter (Vastu) or poetic figure (Alamkāra). Though in this theory a great emphasis has been laid on the Rasa Dhvani or suggestion in Rasa poetry, yet this theory could not infuse Rasa into the very soul of poetry. Hence the needed importance of the Rasa was not stressed by the earlier writers. They had put it almost at par with Vastu and Alamkāra Dhvani. Thus the emotional element in the poetry was not given its due place. It was only Abhinavagupta who made clear distinctly the need for emphasis on the Emotional element in the poetry. He has declared the essentiality of Rasa in the words "Rasenaivā sarvajīvati Kāvyam". Hence it is clear that he felt that there could be no poetry without Rasa. He has clearly stated that the Vastu and Alamkāra Dhvanis ultimately resolve into the suggestion of Rasa, which in fact is the essence of poetry.

1Commentary Abhinavabhārati on N.S. p.
Thus we see that dynamic presentation of Rasa and Dhvani theories was put forward by Abhinava. But it may be pointed out that he has written only two commentaries. No independent work of his is there on the poetics. Thus though his contribution to the poetics is wonderful, even then, because of lack of any independent work on Poetics, he cannot be graded amongst those who have written independent treatises on the subject. Mere exposition of the theories of Great masters does not enable a man to reach the level of those who present the picture of whole field of poetics in their creations. So it may be concluded that though Abhinavagupta has presented some original views in the field of poetics, still essentially he is a commentator and his works cannot be put together for evaluation with independent works in the field of poetics.

**POST-MAMMATA PERIOD**

There are only two poeticians worth mentioning in the post-Mamaṭa period who have acquired the fame of being good poeticians. These are Visvanātha the writer of Sāhitya-Darpaṇa and Panditarāja Jagannātha the writer of Rasagangādhara of these Visvanātha is popular amongst students for his simplicity and brevity in dealing with the subject matter; while Panditarāja Jagannātha is known for his wide scholarship and capacity of logical arguments. But as we will know from next pages, there was nothing new with them which they could provide to the literature. However, their elucidations
and sometimes criticism of the earlier theories is important. Mammața's maxims are the common points, on which they based their criticism and elucidations.

Visvanātha's Sāhitya Darpaṇa is more known for its compactness, brevity and simplicity than anything else. The poet however has propounded that it is only the Rasa which is most important factor in poetry, and it is on the basis of this factor only that one can define and classify poetry.

Even the definition of Visvanātha, who took upon himself the task of criticising Mammața is open to similar objections and has been criticised in its turn by Govinda

1 Govinda's Pradīpa, p. 10.

2 Rasagāṅgādhara, p. 25.
centre of gravity lies only in the matter or in the imagina-
tive mood.

"Viśvanātha's scheme does not substantially differ
from that of Mammaṭa. In one passage, indeed, he pays an
elegant tribute to his predecessor's work by admitting his
own indebtedness to it. He accepts only two divisions of
poetry viz. Dhvani and Guṇibhūta-Vyaṅgyakāvyya and rejects
the third Citrakāvyya on the ground that it is entirely devoid
of Rasa and thus inconsistent with his own definition of
poetry. He however partially admits the suggestion of Vastu
and Alamkāra, under suggestion of perceptible process,Lakṣya-
Kramavyangya, based on the power of word or sense or both.

Viśvanātha admits the Rātis separately, instead of
comprehending them, as Mammaṭa does, under the Vṛttis or
considering them redundant after the enumeration of the three
Guṇas.

The above sketch of Viśvanātha's general position
will sufficiently indicate that he is more or less a complier
and not an original writer, although he shows some constructive
ability in elaborating a full and compact system of his own,
on the basis of Rasadhvani. His borrowings from Ānanda,
Mammaṭa and Ruyyaka are extensive and sometimes his judgement
forsakes him, making him copy his originale rather slavishly.
Viśvanātha has included dramaturgy in his work, which has
been missing hitherto in other works. This made his work
extremely popular amongst students. The depth of Mamrātā is almost missing in him. His work is meant for the beginners, rather than scholars. Lack of new ideas in the work is the other factor which weighs heavily in determining his place in the field.

JAGANNATHA

The available portion of Rasagaṅgādhara is superb from the viewpoint of style and presentation of subject matter. It is more illustrative than the earlier works on poetics. It is devoid of the defects of Ātivyāpti and Aavyāpti. It is written in prose in the style of Navya-Naiyāyikas. In dealing with the subject in hand Pāṇḍitārāja has gone to the depths unreached. The fact, that it is written in prose, places it in a unique position, because it is in prose that a writer can express himself thoroughly rather than in poetry. Even earlier poeticians had to give vṛtti in prose of their sutras. All sort of discussions which have been going on in the field during a long span of about 700 years have been summed up by the writer and given a new face lift. Because a large number of works in the field were there before this work was written, there was every scope that the deficiencies let in them could be done away in this work. The writer has been very straightforward in putting forth his views. Unlike Kāvyaprabhā, there is little possibility of varying interpretations of this work.
However, the Navyanyāya style of Rasagaṅgādhara is very difficult for a common student. It is not easy to comprehend it until and unless one possesses a sound background of the technical words of Navyanyāya. But Paṇḍitrāja Jagannātha can be excused for this because in his time anybody using a less tough language would have been termed as a person possessing shallow knowledge. That is why a style full of jungling of words is adopted by Paṇḍitrāja. The second reason for adoption of such a style can be the fact that Paṇḍitrāja wanted to produce a work for the scholars and not for every Tom, Dick and Harry. However, this has made the work out of the reach of common student.

Paṇḍitrāja has explained more elaborately the views of Abhinava Gupta and Bhāṭṭanāyaka on Rasa. Another noteworthy point dealt here is that the writer has explained why only the mentioned Sthāyibhāvas can be Sthāyibhavas and others not. What is meant by the two types of Śṛngāra Rasa has been explained by Paṇḍitrāja for the first time. He has explained that Śaṃyoga and Viyoga are in fact the mental states. It is for the first time in Sanskrit Poetics that someone propagates the view that it is only the words which is poetry not both words and meanings. It is the skill in words that can bring to the poetry few good qualities like Mādhurya of words etc. which is not easy to have such a skill in Sanskrit language. Another rare quality belonging to
Panditrāja Jagannātha is that he has used his own verses as examples. He successfully holds out the boast that he shall not use even a single passage or verse of others as example.

Rasagaṅgādhara does not deem it necessary to have Guṇas and Anālākāras in poetry. It also accepts Pratibhā, only as the cause of the poetry. Unlike any other poetician, poetry is of four types according to the writer of Rasagaṅgādhara. New varieties of Vīra Rasa like Dānavira, Uyydhvīra and Dayāvīra etc., have been for the first time propounded, their examples have also been given. Guṇas have been accepted as essential attributes of not only Rasa but also of Words, Meaning and Composition. Dhvanis like Bhāvasānti, Bhāvodaya and Bhāvasābalatā have been included in Bhāvasandhi.

But as the work is left incomplete for the reasons unknown, it does not present a totality of the subject. Dr. S.K. Dey is right when he says, "We do not, however, find in it a complete presentation of the subject."¹

Jagannātha's style is erudite and frightens the student by its involved language and its subtle reasoning.

MAMMĀTA AND HIS CONTRIBUTION

Mammaṭa's importance in the field of Indian poetics and aesthetics is well established. He belongs to a period in which the attainment of maturity in the field of poetics

¹Sanskrit Poetics, p. 252.
was already there. The theorists had put forth their points of view and the poeticians now were engaged in systematizing and explaining these theories. In fact Mammaṭa utilized the theories and principles expressed by the earlier poeticians, in shaping his treatise. But Mammaṭa gave a new theme to what already had been said. Dr. Dey has remarked:\footnote{Sanskrit Poetics, p. 221, (Part II).} "The value of Mammaṭa's work consists not in its originality but in its orderly and concise discussion of the main issues. His definitions as well as general treatment, attempt to cover almost all fields of thought traversed by his predecessors."

If we analyze the treatise of Mammaṭa we come to know that Mammaṭa has tried to put in his work each and every thing which was there in the field. He not only systematized these fundamentals but also standardized them. Starting from the aims of poetry and ending with figures of speech, the 142 kārikās present the entirety of poetics and aesthetics. The whole set up of the treatise revolves around the definition of poetry. The effects and causes of the poetry, divisions of poetry, kinds of words. Indication and its varieties, suggestion and its varieties, the aesthetic experience of Rasa, various theories about it and its kinds; various types of poetry fully explained, defects, poetic qualities, and figures of speech are the topics discussed by Mammaṭa. Each of these topics has been
exclusively treated and still the brevity of Śūtra style presents a novelty. The standards set by Mammaṭa were of so high order that these went on as they were for a long period. In fact Mammaṭa clearly and lucidly worked out the already accumulated stock of Ideas in the light of the new scheme put forward by Ānandavardhana. The merit of conciseness and fulness has been combined in this work. P.V. Kane has rightly remarked about Kāvyaprakāśa "It sums up in itself all the activities that had been going on for centuries in the field of poetics; while it becomes itself a fountain head from which fresh streams of doctrines issueforth."

One great contribution of Mammaṭa in the field of aesthetics is his clearcut views about the aesthetic experience of a reader or spectator. There were at least four types of prominent views, in the field. Except one all other could not be termed right, because there were certain lukeworms in these theories. Mammaṭa clearly pointed out the shortcomings in these views, before upholding the view of Abhinavagupta about Rasa experience. The view thus presented by Mammaṭa is not only psychologically sound, but also poetically charming.

Mammaṭa's views about the defects in the poetry and presentation of a large list of these is also his original contribution.

---

1P.V. Kane, History of Sanskrit Poetics, p. 266.
Mammaṭa's greatest contribution thus can be regarded the synthesis of all the theories, which were present before his time. In spite of his adherence and support of the Dhvani theory, he could not lay aside the claim of an important place for Guṇas and Alamkāras in the poetry, though following Abhinava he has accepted the importance of Rasa, still he does not go on to the length of regarding it as soul of the poetry like Viśvanātha. He has successfully attempted to putforth a balance of all these poetic theories.