PREFACE

This thesis attempts a comparative study of the following aspects of Western and Indian poetics:

(1) Art and Reality.
(2) Poetic Imagination.
(3) The Use and Effect of Art.
(4) A Study of Metaphor.

The terms "Western Poetics" and "Indian Poetics" are used here with some qualifications. The term "Western Poetics" is used to refer to the classical, the medieval Renaissance and the modern European theories of literature which represent, in a broad sense, the aesthetic point of view of the West. Accordingly the European context of the Anglo-Saxon literary theories, which are studied here in greater detail, is never overlooked. The term "Indian Poetics" is restricted in this study almost exclusively to Sanskrit poetics for the following reasons:
i) India's most important contribution to poetics is in Sanskrit poetics.

ii) Sanskrit poetics represents the genuine Indian point of view on art, uninfluenced by foreign theories. As against this, literary theories in modern Indian languages are re-statements or modifications, (or both), either of Sanskrit poetics or of Western theories of literature.

iii) Sanskrit poetics has pervasive national influence. It must be added, however, that this study occasionally refers to the aesthetic views of some modern thinkers such as Sri Aurobindo though these views are not expressed in Sanskrit. The reason is that they provide a valuable interpretation of some aspects of ancient Sanskrit poetics.

As a work of comparative literature (or rather of comparative literary theory) this study is different from J.E. Spingarn's Criticism in the Renaissance, Lilian Furst's Romanticism in Perspective or Enid Starkie's From Gautier to Eliot. These works study the relationships and influences in the literary traditions of different nations, trace the continuances of literary
movements and thoughts in them through mutual contact.

But ultimately all the national literary traditions they investigate for the given phase (e.g. the Renaissance, Romanticism, etc.) ultimately belong to one supreme tradition - European tradition which comprehends within its scope all local - national developments. No important phase in the critical consciousness of Europe, in spite the historical circumstances of its origin, remained exclusively national. Every such phase soon became part of the intellectual life of Europe. It is possible, therefore, to trace mutual relationships and influences and continuances in different European literatures, or literary thoughts and movements. This aspect of the comparative study is out of the question so far as the present work is concerned. There is no incontrovertible historical evidence of any mutual relationship, influence (or continuance of critical thought or movement) between Western and Indian poetics before the modern period. Nevertheless, this dissertation is presented as a work of comparative literature because it studies some basic problems of poetics that have been discussed in both Western and Indian critical traditions.
As a systematic theory or doctrine of poetry, or of imaginative writing, poetics deals with two sets of problems: those bearing on the essential nature of poetry, and those pertaining to method and style. Speaking in a general way, topics 1 to 3 mentioned above have a bearing on the essential nature of literature as an art, and raise some of the fundamental philosophical and epistemological problems of aesthetics. The importance of topic No. 4 in any investigation of the method and style of poetry is obvious, metaphor being the characteristic poetic way of using language in dealing with reality. These topics, of course, overlap since method and style are an integral part of the nature of a work of art, and the effect of a work of art cannot be separated from its nature and the style it uses. All these topics are closely interconnected and cover a major portion of the field of poetics.

A work of this kind, it is hoped, can be useful in the following respects:

1) One important aim of comparative literature is to note similarities and differences in different traditions and to try to explain how these come about. It is done in
this study with respect to the topics mentioned above. The aspects of Western and Indian poetics selected in it for a comparative study are, in fact, of general importance.

2) It can explain why different traditions have different answers to the same basic questions about the same phenomenon. It can throw light, for example, on why the Indian poeticsians do not condemn art as Plato does, though like him, they also maintain that it is of the nature of illusion.

3) It can show the comparative strength or weakness of a certain tradition in a given respect. Indian poetics does not have, for example, a theory of the poetic symbol such as was developed during Western Romanticism. Its concept of the imagination consists of some insights into its nature, but it does not have a full-fledged theory of the imagination comparable in epistemological status or function or as a criterion of literary merit for example to Coleridge's theory. Western poetics, on the other hand, does not have any comprehensive theory of aesthetic experience comparable to the Indian theory of rasa.
4) It can enhance our understanding of literature by bringing a different point of view to bear upon a literature in a different tradition. Thus, the Indian concept of *Alamkara* (discussed in Ch. IV in connection with metaphor) can be considerable help in evaluating expressions in poetry. More importantly, one may fruitfully apply a literary doctrine in one tradition to a work of art in another tradition. Thus, the Indian theory of *dhvani* (poetic suggestion) may be tried out occasionally in the study of English poetry, to reveal virtues of that poetry that were not apparent to English critical tradition at one time. The theory of *dhvani* is based on the consideration that a poem may mean much more than what it says. What enables it to do so is the *dhvani* in it. The words in it combine to reveal one predominant sense larger than their denotative sense. If this predominant sense is a sentiment, we get *rasa-dhvani*; if it is a situation, we get *vastu-dhvani*; and if it is a figure of speech, *Alamkara-dhvani*.

In Donne's well-known lines

```
If they be two, they are so two
As stiff twin compasses are two
Thy soul the fix'd foot, makes no show
To move, but doth if the other do,
```
it is suggested that love is a perfect union of souls which abides also in separation, that what affects one of the lovers similarly affects the other, and that separation ends only in union. This is an example of vastu-dhvanî.

A poem with vastu-dhvanî suggests not only a situation but also the poet’s way of looking at it. In most cases vastu-dhvanî has an intellectual rather than an emotional content. This is also the most striking characteristic of metaphysical poetry. The Sanskrit poeticians, therefore, would disagree with Dr. Johnson's verdict.

The theory of dhvani may also be helpful in resolving the controversy over the relative worth of the poetry of statement and the poetry of suggestion. The

1. "In quintessence or soul is the vivid imagining of a moment of experience or of a situation out of which the need to argue, to persuade or define arises."

2. "To the following comparison of a man that travels and his wife that stays home with a pair of compasses, it may be doubted whether absurdity or ingenuity has better claim." (Life of Cowley)
expression "poetry of statement" is sometime used in Anglo-Saxon criticism to describe that kind of poetry in which the meaning of words is so controlled that it is sliced down to the nucleus.

Yet graceful ease, the sweetness void of pride
Might hide her faults, if Belles had faults to hide

-(Rape of the Lock II)

The poetry of statement in this sense is prasada-gupa (perspicuity), according to Sanskrit poeticians. But they would reserve the term "poetry of statement" for poetry of pure denotation. This kind of poetry is not very valuable because the power of words is not fully realized in it to project a larger meaning.

The theory of dhvani is touched upon in this study in Ch. I Sec. I(B) in connection with the problem of the referentiality of literature and in Ch. IV Section II in connection with metaphor and other figures of speech. It must be mentioned, however, that within the defined scope and limits of this study, there was no occasion in it to deal with this important theory in its various aspects.
Now a brief note on the method of investigation I have followed:— In order to keep the enquiry within manageable limits, only the more important theories in both traditions, relevant to the selected topics are discussed. On the Western side figure prominently the theories of Plato, Aristotle, Horace, Longinus, the Renaissance critics and thinkers, Sidney and Bacon; the Neoclassical critics Dryden, Johnson, Pope, the Romantics Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley; the 19th Century critic Arnold, and some modern critics like T.S. Eliot and I.A. Richards. An attempt is made here to present the selected problems of poetics through successive periods of history since the days of Plato to the present Century. The exposition of the Indian point of view begins with Bharata, the father of Indian poetics. Sanskrit poetics with its various schools is looked upon as a single phenomenon because its most important theories of rasa and dhvani (poetic suggestion) subsume all other schools in it. For this very reason the stress in the Indian sections is on representative views, and not on chronological
treatment. The Sanskrit poeticsians who figure prominently are Bharata, Anandavardhana (8th Cent.), Abhinavagupta (10th Cent.), Bhamaha (8th Cent.), Rājasekhara (10th Cent.), Mammatā (11th Cent.), Vāmana (8th Cent.), Bhaṭṭa Lollata (9th Cent.), Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and Srisaṅkuka (both 9th Cent.) (It may be mentioned here that the creative period of Sanskrit poetics mainly ranges between 6th Cent. A.D. to 12th Cent. A.D. Then follows a period of systematization.) For the sake of clarity and continuity of argument the Western and Indian sections are kept separate. Each chapter deals with a different problem of poetics and therefore, each chapter has a separate conclusion given in an exclusive section at the end of each chapter. To illustrate theoretical points under discussion, examples from literature are given. All examples, even in the Indian Sections, are from English poetry. It is hoped that they will provide a better comparative light.

This study is not the first work of its kind. Valuable pioneer work has already been done in this field. We may mention some of the more important landmarks:
Dr. A.K. Coomaraswamy - The Transformation of Nature in Art
(New York, Dover Publications, 1934); Dr. Pravasjivan Chaudhari - Studies in Comparative Aesthetics, (Visvabharati, Santiniketan, India 1953); Dr. K. C. Pandey - Comparative Aesthetics, (Varanasi, C.S.S., 1959); K. Krishna Rayan - Suggestion and Statement in Poetry (Athlone Press, London); G. Hanumantha Rao - Comparative Aesthetics - Eastern and Western, (Mysore, D.V.K. Murthy and Co., 1974). It must be added, however, that not all of these works are exclusively interested in literature. A.K. Coomaraswamy's chief interest, for example, is painting, iconography, architecture and religion. K.C. Pandey devotes most of his volumes to philosophy. Only Krishna Rayan's work is primarily interested in literature, but it deals with only one aspect of poetry. The scope of the present study is much broader, and it seeks to carry the investigation of its problem further afield by conducting its enquiry in greater detail and depth. It is hoped that in its humble way it will contribute to a better understanding of the nature of literary experience.
I may briefly add how I came to embark on this study. Prior to taking an M.A. degree in Sanskrit in 1960, I had spent some time in studying Sanskrit poetics also in the traditional way. Then in 1962 I did an M.A. in English also. This made me aware of the similarities and differences between the two critical traditions, and out of curiosity I began to compare them. The Chapters in this study were prepared over a number of years as independent monographs. This explains their length and some repetition in them.

I am deeply indebted to Dr.S.Nagarajan, M.A.,Ph.D.(Harvard), Professor and Head of the Department of English, University of Poona. But for his constant encouragement, able guidance, kind and sympathetic criticism and unremitting patience, I would never have been able to complete this work. For materials I have depended on the Poona University Jaykar Library, and the Library of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,Poona 4. The staff members of the Poona University of Jaykar Library and the librarian of the Bhandarkar Institute deserve my especial thanks for their full co-operation in making books and periodicals available to me. I also wish to thank Mr.V.V. Sahasrabuddhe who typed the manuscript with great care.

Poona 9.

11th June, 1977. S. V. DHAYAGUDE.
A Key to the Pronunciation of Sanskrit Words.

i) Vowels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) Consonants:

- ñ as in 'sing'.
- c as in 'Chair'.
- ñ as in 'champagne'.
- t, th, d, dh, n & s - retroflexes
- r - retroflex, commonly though not correctly pronounced as 'ri' or 'ru'.
- s as in 'sugar'.