CHAPTER-II

COMPARATIVE AESTHETICS AND ITS ROLE FOR LITERARY EVALUATION

The Beginning of The Study Of Comparative Aesthetics:

Earlier, the term aesthetics was recognised to be exclusively a subject of the west. Histories of Aesthetics written by Bernard Bosanquet, Bonedetto Croce and Gilbert and Kuhn confined themselves to the critical presentation of aesthetic currents in the west coming since the period of Plato to the post modern period. Oriental aesthetics was ignored by these writers, perhaps, because that such a subject is not available in oriental studies. This happened only due to their ignorance.

During the period of renaissance, interest in oriental studies increased not only in India but in the West also. A.L. Basham has written the first and full chapter on this topic in his famous book The Wonder That Was India\(^1\) Likewise the Indian aesthetics was also started to be studied in international arena\(^1\). Internationalism in aesthetics made a first debut in the first international congress of Aesthetics, held in 1913 in Berlin\(^2\). But it was confined within the limits of Western literature. The gap between the occidental and the oriental aesthetics remained as ever before. But due to the zeal of renaissance spirit Scholars in the East, particularly in India, China and Japan, and orientalists in the West started writing on oriental arts and aesthetics in English and other European languages. Their works made the western aestheticians recognise that “oriental art contains important values not attained by art in the west.”\(^3\) led to the discovery of important insights in oriental aesthetics, applicable to art and aesthetic experience everywhere and made many Western artists and critics believe that the Western art has much to learn from Eastern methods.

Some names of the important orientalists, whose writings on arts and aesthetics have led to the recognition of the significance of oriental
aesthetics, aesthetic currents in India, China and Japan, are as follows:


The most comprehensive publication by a single author on the combined field of Indian and Western aesthetics, as far as I know is the monumental series of volumes by Professor K.C. Pandey of Lucknow University. Of Comparative Aesthetics volume I recently enlarged in a second edition is on Indian Aesthetics; volume II on Western Aesthetics. Dr. Pandey displays in volume II a considerable knowledge of European Philosophy from Plato through Croce.¹


(iii) Writers on Chinese arts and aesthetics:

Oswald Siren A.C. Soper, Wen Fong, E.R. Hughes Achilles Fang.⁵

Now aesthetics is not regarded as an exclusively Western subject, but as a world-wide subject. And plan had been sponsored by UNESCO to bring out twenty volumes presenting different aesthetic currents including Russian Japanese, Chinese, Indian etc. under the common title Source of Aesthetics. Dr. K.C. Pandey has contributed for the volume on Indian Aesthetics.

Before we study about the comparative aesthetics, it is necessary to focus on the meaning scope and span of aesthetics, from Indian and Western viewpoints both.

What is Aesthetics:

The word aesthetics means the study of beauty in all respects. It means that whatever be the subject of beauty in the world, can be the matter of aesthetics. In the context of Indian sense, this word denotes “the science and philosophy of fine art”. And fine art is the art which presents the Absolute in sensuous
garb, and aesthetical relation, as distinct from the utilitarian, with a work of which gives rise or leads to the experience of the *Absolute*.\(^6\) Hegel recognises, architecture, music, poetry, sculpture and painting to be fine arts.\(^7\) But Indian authorities admit the first three only to be fine arts.\(^7\) For they alone have independent being. To painting and sculpture, they give a subordinate position to architecture. Although these two have been included in sixty four number of fine art, mentioned in Vatsyayan’s, *Kamsutra*.\(^8\) Thus Indian aesthetics is primarily concerned with three arts, poetry, music and architecture. So according to Indian view point aesthetics therefore, as philosophy of fine art, has to deal with the philosophic views of these arts known as *rasa brahma vada, nada brahma vada* and *vastu brahma vada*. And similarly *aesthetics* as science of fine art has to concern itself with the technique of each of them.\(^9\)

The word *aesthetics* according to Western sense is somewhat different. It has Greek origin. It meant of or pertaining to things perceptible by senses, things material, as opposed to things thinkable or immaterial. It is the plural of *aesthetic* used as collective singular. It was used in its singular form *aesthetic* by Baumgarten in his doctorate thesis for the first time as the name of a special science. In 1750 A.D. he brought out a voluminous treatise wherein the word *Aesthetica* appeared as its title. According to Baumgarten *aesthetic* was a science of sensitive cognition only or a science that was concerned with the obscure knowledge as obscure, the knowledge in the form of feeling, the knowledge that doesn’t admit of adequate presentation in words.\(^10\)

But as far as the literary study is concerned, we include only the parametres of good poetry, when we study aesthetics. Poetry is the highest of all arts. And drama is the highest of all forms of poetry.\(^11\) The problem of aesthetics as philosophy of fine art in India, therefore, has been studied, not with reference to music, or plastic or pictorial representation but mainly in the context of the dramatic presentation. Music and scenic representations have been regarded auxiliaries to the drama. The reason is obvious. The varied situations of life, which Art makes its province to
depict, lend themselves to a more successful representation in drama than in any other class of art. For drama, appeals to the eye and the ear. The senses which are regarded as pre-eminently aesthetic. Drama marshals all other arts including that type of poetry, to its aid.12

The problem has been approached from three different points of view, namely of the dramatist, of the actor and of the spectator. The study from the first two points of view has naturally been confined to the ways and means-of presentation of drama and the third has been concerned with the analysis of the psychological process involved in the enjoyment and interpretation of its essential nature.13

The Scope Of Indian Aesthetics:

The view presented just above, is based on a study of the available material on aesthetics in works on dramaturgy. There is no doubt, references in the texts, which do not deal directly with art, to other works on aesthetics than those to which we can have access. For instance two works on dramaturgy in sutra from one by Silali14 and the other by Krasava, are referred to in Panini’s sutras 43110-111. Since their contents are not known to us, we can begin our historical account of aesthetics of drama with Bharata (circa 500 A.D., some historians consider this date for the age of Bharata) whose work is the earliest available complete work on the subject. And we can end it with Abhinavagupta (950-1020A.D.)15, whose solution of the problem has been accepted by all the subsequent writers of repute in the filed of poetics and dramaturgy. The text on architecture in which reference to the philosophy of architecture (vastu-brahm-vada) is found in the Samrangana Sutradhara of king Bhoja of Dhara (1018-60A.D.) And the work on music, which talks of the philosophy of music (nada-brahmar-vada) in the Sangeeta Ratnakar of Sarang Deva, who ruled in Devagiri, modern Daulatabad, from 1210 to 1247 A.D.16

No doubt, it is possible to maintain that the history of Indian aesthetics is coextensive with the history of literature on the fine arts. But we confine ourselves to this period, because according to our
present state of knowledge, the philosophy of fine art has been
discussed during this period only. And here our discussion is not
also for other aspects of aesthetics, it is concentrated only to literary
standards.

During the first three hundred and fifty years of this period,
that is from the time of Bharata to that of Bhatta Lollata (circa
850 A.D.), the problem of aesthetics was mainly one of techniques.
In fact, the sole aim of Bharata’s Natya Sastra is to instruct the
dramatist, the stage manager and the actors in regard to the
ways and means of producing the drama, to tell them the
necessary constituents of the drama and the manner and material
of their presentation. The point is made very clear by the frequent
use of such words as Tamabhinaya, Yojijam etc. But there are also
found references to the philosphical and psychological points
which have served as the basis of building up Indian aesthetics.

The Value of Aesthetics In The Present Context:

The value of the aesthetics in the present context has increased very
much. Nowdays fine art has its separate entity because it is recognized
to have an experience that no product of nature can rival it, unless it be
looked upon as a piece of art; and the useful or mechanical arts have
been distinguished from the fine and the philosophical discussion is
related to the latter only. We approach the problem of ‘beautiful’ not only
from the philosophical point of view but also from the technical. But it
may be pointed out here that some writers, deal not only the fine art
but useful art also in their treatment of beautiful. Socrates for instance,
refers to his theory of selective imitation in the course of his talks not
only with Parrhasius, a painter and Cletio, a statuary, but also with Pistias,
the corselet maker. Addison holds that pleasure of imagination is possible
from both art and nature. And Kant recognizes the distinction between
beautiful and sublime and refers to the phenomena of nature as
instances of sublime. A more comprehensive meaning that is
suitable in the present context seems to be science and
philosophy of beautiful and sublime in both art and nature.
Theories Of Aesthetics:

Different theories of aesthetics known to the historians of aesthetics, represent different points of view, from which **beauty** has been studied by different thinkers at different times. The earliest theories (i) **hedonistic** (ii) **regoristic** and (iii) **moralistic** or **pedagogic**, represent a study of the problem from the point of view of the end of art, of what the products of art aim at. Similarly the theories of (i) **imitation** (ii) **illusion** and (iii) **idealized** reproduction have been advanced from the point of view of the artist. They show what the artist does in artistically dealing with the object that inspires him. Confused cognition, inference and mysticism are the theories of art from the point of view of the spectator. They show the nature of experience that a work arouses in the spectator and the means of knowledge, which are employed by him in the acquisition of such experience.

In the West these theories have been propounded on the basis of architecture, sculpture, painting, music, poetry and drama. In fact, Bharata, the author of the Natya Shastra, the earliest available work on the theory of art, gives all other arts only a subordinate position to the dramatic. He emphatically says that there is no such lore, experience, spiritual discipline science, art (fine or mechanical), craft and object as is not employed on some occasion or the other in dramatic presentation. The authorities, however on two fine arts (i) Music and (ii) Architecture, assert the independence of these arts in giving rise to the aesthetic experience. But the influence of Bharata is traceable in the treatment of the emotive aspect of art in the works on the other two arts also.

Indian aestheticians do not recognise sculpture and painting as independent fine arts as does Hegel in his Philosophy of Fine Art. They recognize them as subordinate to architecture. Hence the number of independent fine arts from Indian point of view is three and not five, as from the point of view of Hegel.²²
The Development Of *Comparative Aesthetics*:

According to the subject of thesis now we concentrate our discussion of the *aesthetics* only in literary terms. Oriental school of poetics has six types; *Dhavani, Rasa, Alamkar, Vakroti, Reeti and Auchitya*. The last school is *auchitya* propounded by Kshemendra (*circa* 11 A.D.) After the gap of six hundred years, the name of Panditraj Jagannath can be mentioned, but his theory of poetics can also be included in *rasa-theory*. It should also be kept in mind that all these theories which have been developed are related to poetry. For *dramaturgy* the *Natysashashtra* of Bharat Muni and *Dashroopak* of Dhananjaya, *Sahityadarpan* of Vishvanath Kaviraj are prominent books on the subject. But in Sanskrit tradition *poetics* and *dramaturgy* are interconnected, so that is why, all the three above mentioned books focus on drama and poetry both. After Panditraj Jagannath no-outstanding literary theory was developed and came into being. In the vernacular languages also, no original theory was propounded afterwards.

Where as, the literary criticism of West is concerned, it has been developing since Plato up to the present age. Not only in Greek and Latin, but in European vernacular languages various theories have come out. For instance in English there is long tradition of criticism, since Philip Sidney to Mathew Arnold of Victorian Age. Then modern criticism was started by T.S. Eliot. Which was continued by F.R. Leavis AND I.A. Richards. The contemporary criticism which is known as *New Criticism* or *Post-modern criticism*, it various theories, such as *Post Structuralism, Colonism, Historicism, Feminist criticism, Reader-response theory*, Derrida’s *Deconstruction theory* and various others have come into being. In the passage of time, various literary forms also have developed due to complexity of life in the present age. So the contemporary criticism has
been influenced by various thoughts like *Marxism, Freudianism*. On account of the invention of various scientific instruments, like Telephone, wireless, T.V. Telegramme, Internet, to get information, became easy more and more. Due to this reason, it was sure, that literature of any language was influenced by the literature of any other language. In the field of literary criticism, also it happened.

Since the scope of *comparative literature* has widened, so the literary canons of the literature of any language is applied to evaluate the literature of any other language beyond the frontiers of nations and continents. In recent years much work has been done in this field. There are many scholars, who have sought analogical parallels in the Indian and Western *poetics*.

**Experiments Done In The Field Of Comparative Aesthetics:**

There has since long been a tendency to point out the dichotomy that exists between Eastern and Western literary concepts. On the one hand there have been scholars like Fraz Bopp, Grassman, Schiller, Schopenhaur and Nietzsche who have been attracted by the universal appeal of classical Indian thoughts and on the other hand are the detractors who despise all things Indian.\(^{23}\) However there may be traced various parallels between Indian and Western literature as well as literary theories. For instance, there has been a spurt in the recent times to trace the affinity between Aristotle’s *Poetics* and Indian *dramaturgy*. Noted exponent Bharata, expounding his theory of *rasa theory* took into account not only the Indian world-view but also human psychology, which forms the essence of all great literature.\(^{24}\) His *Rasa-sutra* has never been refuted though it has been appreciated by several followers of Bharata who have added their own perception to it and have thereby enriched it to a considerable extent. Bharat’s *Rasa-sutra* though conceived in fourth century B.C. holds relevance even to-day in as much as the basic tenets of this principle hold true in the present times as much as they did in the ancient times.
Researches have been drawn in this course, some parallels between *anubhava*, a major constituent of *rasa* and T.S. Eliot’s concept of *objective corelative* and also between. *sadharanikarana* - another principle implied in rasa theory and the concept of *negative capability* expounded by Keats. Although these is a basic difference between *sadharanikarana* and *negative capability*, the first appears in common men/readers/viewers, while the second appears in poets but a via media can be traced out between the two.

The Process Of The Employment of Comparative Aesthetics: An Example:

In the sixth chapter of *Natyashashtra*, Bharata expounds his famous rassutra as:

foHkkokuqHkko O;fHkpfj la;ksxknzIfu”ifRr%

*Vibhavanubhava* – *vyabhichari* – *samyagod rasanishpattih*, which is be translated as this:

*Rasa* comes form a combination of *vibhavas anubhavas* and *vyabhichari*. 26

*Rasa* according to Bharata is poetic pleasure. This pleasure comes only when there is a stimulus or *vibhavas* and it does not come to light unless it is manifested through *anubhavas*. A dark deserted place may arouse the emotion of fear hence it will serve as the cause or *vibhavas*. This fear in the heart of the character shall not be known unless it is manifested through horripilation and trembling etc. serve as *anubhava*. These manifestations are simply the physical effects of the emotional state (permanent emotion as well as transient emotion). There is and has to be a casual relation between the stimulus and the emotional state experienced and manifested by the character. For instance the dark, lonely place in the above quoted example must inevitably arouse the emotion of fear, hence the manifestation of fear by the character will sufficiently generate the same emotion in the reader. On the contrary if the writer were to present a well-lit, well inhabited place and the characters were still to experience fear, the readers shall not be
convinced. This disparity between the emotional state shown by the writer and that of the reader will pose serious hindrance in the enjoyment of poetic pleasure or rasa. Bharata talks of two types of manifestations: auditory and visual - angica and vachika. Both these types are essential in a work of literature, Especially in a play the visual manifestation has an important place as it is through this only that the spectator experiences rasa or pleasure. Rasa theory has been discussed in detail in chapter - IV so it doesn’t need to be elaborated here.

In his essay Hamlet and His Problems Eliot puts forward the concept of objective corelative as a kind of meditation between the creator and the reader / spectator. Eliot writes:

The only way of expressing emotion in the form of art is by finding an objective corelative in other words a set of objects a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of the particular emotion, such that when the external facts which must terminate in sensory experience are given. The emotion is immediately evoked:

The very word ‘sensory’ denotes physical effect. This effect may be auditory and it may also be visual. Eliot takes into account all stages of emotional process. The principle of objective corelative presupposes the existence of an emotion in the heart of creator prior to its embodiment in the work of literature. The poet/ playwright experiences the emotion and then he infuses it into his characters that must manifest it through accurate correlatives so that an exact emotion is produced in the heart of the reader / spectator as well. If at any stage any one element is not proper, the realization of pleasure suffers. Eliot takes two examples - one to show how objective corelative works for communication and another to show how the writer fails in communicating the emotion in the absence of the same. Lady Macheth’s sleep-walking in Shakespeare’s Macbeth is taken as a perfect example of objective corelative. The picture of the lady, walking in her sleep, holding a candle brings to the reader’s mind her emotional and mental state. The objective corelative here is
accurate. The dramatist doesn’t need to say anything. The picture stands as an objective symbol of the emotional state. Shakespeare could not transmit the pleasure of the Hamlet to reader/spectator as he failed to create an objective corelative for the purpose of communicating Hamlet’s agony and dilemma.\(^{29}\)

Eliot calls Hamlet an artistic failure because Hamlet’s anguish does not seem accurate in the given situation. Had he been an adolescent, the reader / spectator could still expect or at least accept, such excessive sentimentality from him but keeping in mind his age and calibre one does not understand why he suffers so terribly. Had any other man been in similar situation, he would never undergo the same intensity of anguish. Shakespeare shows such emotional state as is supported neither by the situation nor by the characters. Hence he fails to convince the reader / spectator due to lack of a proper correlative. Thus this principle takes into account the cause as well as the representation of emotional state as manifested through physical effects. Wimsatt and Brooks, however, make a useful distinction between motive (the reason for an emotion and objective corelative (the symbol of an emotion))\(^{30}\) Quoting Yvor Winters who talks about ‘motive’ as a kind of objective corelative, Wimsatt and Brooks make an illumining suggestion:

If the poet is to “control emotion by providing” motives for it, he is indeed compelled to make use of “a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events. These are objectives and can be presented; since the emotion is generated by these objects and actions and, in so far as it is controlled, by the selection and rearrangement of these objectified elements, they may fairly be called the correlative of the emotion. For whether relation to the emotion is that of cause or of symbolic equivalent, their correlative with the emotion is evident: \(^{31}\)

The principle of objective corelative has been interpreted variously by various critics. Mathesson represents the poet’s emotion. Objective corelative then means the objective, concrete form of the subjective and abstract emotion. Thus objective corelative is a means through which the creator can depersonalise
even personal through which the creator can depersonalise even personal emotion while at the same time retaining its human content. The emotional state of fear can be well expressed by trembling and horripilation even without the writer saying a word.\textsuperscript{32} While admiring Dante’s poetry, Eliot praises his visual imagination or the ability to make the reader see what the poet saw. This is possible only when instead of describing the emotion by the help of words; the writer presents a picture of that emotion which becomes synonymous with the emotion itself. So much so that the very picture evokes the emotion immediately. Ezra pound’s remarks in the \textit{Spirit of Romance} may be noticed:

Poetry is a sort of inspired mathematics, which gives us equations, not for abstract figures, triangles, spheres and the like, but equations for the human emotions\textsuperscript{33}

Some interpret \textit{objective corelative} as the effect, some like Frazer understand as the motive or cause. They feel what Eliot wanted to emphasize is that simply the depiction of emotional state doesn’t convince the reader, it is the responsibility of the writer to show why a character undergoes a particular emotional state.\textsuperscript{34}

On close examination one may find a literary equivalent of \textit{anubhava} in T.S. Eliot’s principle of \textit{objective corelative}. Lady Macbeth walking in her sleep is an example of \textit{angica} or \textit{visual corelative} whereas Macbeth’s speech at the death of his wife is that of \textit{vachika} or \textit{auditory correlative}. What Eliot takes as the formula of a particular emotion is naturally the inevitable motive and manifestation of the emotional state. If the creator has a proper knowledge of human psychology, he shall necessarily present only such motives and manifestations as are accurate.

Like Eliot Bharat in his \textit{rasa theory} presupposes the experience of pleasure in the heart of the creator. The creator then conveys it to the reader/spectator by the help of manifestation or \textit{anubhava}. While depicting the emotion of love the creator is helped by the permanent emotion of love in his own heart. This he
projects in his work, the character experiences love which is
manifested through various objective presentations. Restlessness,
perspiration, trembling and anxiety are some manifestations of love.
The speech of Macbeth at the death of Lady Macbeth (Tomorrow and
tomorrow and tomorrow) is also quite comprehensible, as it seems
the inevitable consequence of the tragic death of his wife. Lady
Macbeth’s pitiable condition is caused by her sense of guilt. Hence
her guilt is the vibhava for karuna here. This sufficiently fills
Macbeth’s grief or shoka. Since Macbeth’s grief is rightly caused by
his wife’s sad plight, it successfully generates similar emotions in
the heart of the reader/spectator. Anyone in Macbeth’s place will
experience precisely the same emotions, Lady Macbeth’s
sleep walking and her repeatedly washing her hand serves as the
proper corelative. Hence the poetic pleasure is realized
unhindered. It may also be noted that vibhava or cause and
anubhava or manifestation of the character becomes the cause of
vibhava of the poetic pleasure for the reader/spectator. The
sleep walking of Lady Macbeth is the manifestation of her anguish
but it becomes the cause of grief for Macbeth as well as the
reader. It is this that leads to the reader’s perfect
identification with Macbeth; thereby increasing the scope of
poetic pleasure or rasa. This is how a perfect syllogism is created
which accounts for pleasure or rasa. Thus objective corelative is the
combination of vibhava and anubhava cause and manifestation.\(^{35}\)

The concept of anubhava also takes into account the need for an
objective representation of the subjective emotion. The feeling of anguish
that is there in the mind of Lady Macbeth generates pity into the mind of
the reader. Objective corelative as various interpretations show is the
cause as well as the effect of an emotional state. Eliot takes a complete,
logical as well as psychological view of emotional states which results in the
poetic pleasure. As early as 4\(^{th}\) century B.C. Bharata had evinced a
similarly holistic approach. One notices that what was conceived by an
Indian poetician in as early as 4\(^{th}\) century B.C. was still considered
novel in the 20th century A.D. The principle of anubhava or objective corelative is relevant even today and it is taken as the best method of poetry. The French symbolists based their theory of symbols on this principle (though they preceded Eliot). The anubhava or manifestation or objective corelative may also be taken as the symbol of emotion. Thus it is that one principle moves through different literary principles in different languages, affirming the essential harmony of oneness of all literatures.36

For its realization rasa depends on various constituents but there is one very important aspect which explicit, is implied in Bharata’s Natyashastra and that is the role of the reader/spectator. While defining the mental faculty of sumana Bhatta Nayaka calls this state sadharanikarana37. In the sixth chapter of Natyashastra, Bharata writes about sumanas by which he seems to mean sensitive reader/spectator, one who has a pure mind. Abhinavagupta in his Abhinavabharati has developed this concept of sumana. He interprets it in this way:

With a mind that is completely free from any kind of obstructions from any sense organ (i.e. completely concentrated) because they are completely absorbed in the thrill of imaginative experience.38

This freedom sense organs is a state when the reader goes beyond space and time. This according to Abhinavagupta, is chamatkara. One must be able to transcend one’s ego only then the realization of rasa shall be possible. Bhatta Nayaka calls this sate sadharanikarana. It is in the context of the reader mainly that the concept of sadharanikarana has been expounded. For as long as the reader/spectator remains bound by his ego, he shall not be able to enjoy pleasure. This transcendence leads to generalization of emotions. Sadharanikarana requires total identification of the perceiver with the perceived. This is the ideal state for poetic pleasure. It is a kind of advaita (monism) or oneness between the perceiver and the object of perception. This is the state when one becomes oblivious of all personal boundaries and goes beyond time and
space. This is how pain becomes pleasurable and karuna brings joy. Gnoli has summed up Nayaka’s reasoning quite beautifully:

The mysterious conversion of pain into pleasure, which accompanies the full realization of one’s own self, it is to be found equally in aesthetic experience, which possesses the magical power of transfiguring the greatest sadness into disinterested pleasure contemplation. The disinterested pleasure is poetic pleasure which is attained only by shedding all personal considerations. This could be experienced only by attaining freedom from sense organs.

Sadharanikarana is concept which has been accepted in the sphere of poetry. T.S. Elist’s theory of impersonality bears an affinity to sadharanikarana. But the concept that comes near to Abhinava Gupta’s is the concept of negative capability as conceived by the poet thinker John Keats. Keats believed that poetic pleasure couldn’t be enjoyed unless self effacement is practiced. This concept was first formulated in December 1817, in his letter of 21 December to George and Tom Keats:

Several things dovetailed in my mind and at once it, struck me, what quality went to form a man of achievement, especially in literature and which Shakespeare possessed so enormously - I mean negative capability that is when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts without any irritable reaching after fact and reason.

Thus this quality of self-effacement is necessary not only for the perceiver but also for the creator. In order that the reader/spectator may identify with the object, the creator - at the time of creation must also be able to annihilate his ego. Shakespeare could create Iago as well as Imogen he could transcend his ego. It is because of this that the reader also enjoys both these characters. Keats compares a poet to a chameleon who changes colour according to the object of his perception. He portrays different objects with equal vivacity, which is not possible, if he does not have the ability to depersonalize his personal emotion. Thus in a way Keats says in the context of the creator what rasa theory states in the context of the spectator.

Oscar Wilde in his The Delay of Lying Intentions writes:
The only beautiful things are the things that do not concern us. As long as a thing is useful or necessary to us or affects us in any way, either for pain or for pleasure... it is outside the proper sphere of art. To art’s subject-matter we should be more or less indifferent.\textsuperscript{43}

This indifference is an efficiency to remove one’s personal recognition and to become a part of the universal identity. Unless one gains it, one can’t relish the sublime pleasures afforded by works of art. Personal considerations pose hindrance in the path of aesthetic relishment. Keats mentions the fact that his body becoming numb when he listens to the song of Nightingale (\textit{Ode To Nightingale}); again this numbness of body is equivalent to freedom from sense organs. Shakespeare was capable of creating heroes and villains with equal expertise only because he was capable of postponing or doing his personal while creating away. It is the quality of self disappearance (annihilation) or generalization that enables the writer to make his creations living and enjoyable. One may trace another implication that in the process, the text may transmit pleasure to the reader, the poet must be able to experience it himself.\textsuperscript{44}

Thus with the previous illustrations we can easily understand how the comparative aesthetics is useful in evaluation of any literary work, how its canons can be established. Generally we can say that a person well studied in multi lingual literatures can be the best maker of parametres of \textit{comparative aesthetics}. Many great literary persons thinks alike, it doesn’t matter in which language he writes. Although the writer follows the pattern of literature according to the tradition but the changing surroundings also influence upon the mode and manner of literature. It is due to this cause that various new forms have evolved in Sanskrit literature due to English, Persian, Urdu, Bangla and other languages. \textit{Ghazal} which is a kind of Persian poetry, in which elegiac feelings are expressed, is now composed in modern Sanskrit poetry. A great poet or writer unknowingly uses
such appliances which are analogically similar to the standard of any other literature. The *vyatirek* a popular figure of speech of Sanskrit poetics which has been used by Shakespeare in his comedy *A Midsummernight’s Dream*. In this figure of speech the quality of comparing object supercedes the quality of comparable object. Although Shakespeare is unknown to this critical term *vyatirek* but he uses it very amicably. Actually any great master of any language has not limited the scope of his poetics or critical parameters to the respective language. In the great works of poetics like *Kayaprakash* there are several examples which are of the other language like *Prakrit*. Had the writers of these works known other languages also such as, Greek, Latin, and modern language such as French, German and others, they would have widened the scope of their poetics and literary parameter. It is also true that any vernacular language originated from any language can’t ignore the tradition of its origin. For example to a considerable extent, the verse system and poetics of Hindi is credited to Sanskrit. This fact is applicable to other vernacular languages also. Similarly, the writers of English literature were grateful to Greek and Latin literature not only for their subject matter but for the beauty, style and rhetoric also, great writers like Shakespeare, Milton, and Shelly have amicably employed the knowledge of Greek and Latin literature in their literary works.
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   (ii) fp=s lkn`",dj.ka iz/kkua izfrdhfrZre~
   (iii) dykuka izoja fp=a /keZdkekFkZ eks{kne~A
         ekM~xY;a izFkea pSrnn~x`gs := izfrf"Bre~AA
         ;Fkk lqes#% izojks uxxkuka ;Fkk.Mtkuka x#M% iz/kku%A
         ;Fkk ujk.kka izoj% f{krh`kLrFkk dykukfeg fp=dYi%AA
         fo".qk /keksZRrj iqjk.k 3@43@38@39
   (iv) J`M~xkJ&gkl&d#.k&ohj&jkSnz&Hk;keudk%A
        ohHkRllkn~Hqqkr`kkUr`p uo fp=jlk% Le`rk%AA
        fo0 /keksZ0 iq0 3@43@1 c.
   f. *Ibid.,*
11. We find the same view about poetry :
    (i) Aristotle in the IX Chapter of *Poetics* writes:
        “Poetry therefore is a more philosophical and a higher than history, for poetry tends to express the universal, history the
particular. By the universal I mean how a person of a certain type will on occasion speak or act according to the law of probability or necessity.


“The poetics is chiefly concerned with tragedy which is regarded as the highest poetic form”


(ii) Philip Sidney, *Apologie For Poetry* (1585) was intended as a reply to Stephen Gosson’s *School of Abuse*. (157). In it he expressed the same view about poetry Aristotle did in *Poetics*.

“Since then poetry is of all human learnings the most ancient and of most fatherly antiquity, as from whence other learnings have taken their beginnings; since it is so universal than no learned nation doth despise it, (lines 941-945).c.f. D.J. Enright and Ernst De Chickera (ed.), *English Critical Text* (Kolkata, Oxford University Press 2001) p.27

(iii) P.B. Shelly wrote the *The Defence of Poetry* in A.D. 1821 which was published in 1840 A.D. posthumously. It was a reply against to the charges made against poetry by Thomas love peacock in *The Four Ages of Poetry*:

The whole objection, however, of the immortality of poetry rests upon a misconception of the manner in which poetry acts to produce the moral improvement of man…..But poetry acts in another and divine manner. It awakens and enlarges the mind itself by rendering it the receptacle of a thousand unapprehended combination of thought. Poetry lifts the veil from the hidden beauty of the world” (lines 320-324, 329-332) c.f. *Ibid.*, p.233.

12. This is similar view of Aristotle, Sidney and Shelly.
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