

hard, and very hard to attain there is [poetic] power.” And again—“Poetry is the instrument [in the attainment] of the ‘class of three’ [—viz., Merit, Wealth, and Enjoyment,—see §. 2]”. And in the *Vishnu Purāna* [it is declared]—“And the utterances of Poetry, one and all, and all songs,—these are portions of Vishnu, the great-souled, who wears a form [composed] of sound.”

e. [By the word] “therefore” [in the text—see §. 2—is meant] “for that reason”—[and by the word] “its”—“of Poetry.” The nature thereof—[or what it is that Poetry consists of]—is to be set forth:—and by this [i. e., by the statement, in the text, that the nature of *Poetry* is about to be set forth,] has the subject [of the treatise—viz., Poetry—] been [by implication, and hence all the more ingeniously,] propounded.

The definition of Poetry in the *Kāvya Prakāśa* objected to.

f. In regard, then, to the question—“of what—leaving everything else apart—does Poetry consist?”—a certain person [viz., the author of the *Kāvya Prakāśa*]—says—“This [—i. e., Poetry—] consists of words and meanings faultless, with Style [see Chapter 8th]—and, further, [even though] undecorated.” This requires some consideration—as thus:—if the agreement be this that the nature of Poetry belongs to that only which is *faultless*, then [look at the following speech of Rāvana, in Bhavabhūti’s drama of the *Vīra-charitra*.]—

“For this indeed is an utter contempt of me that there are foes [of mine at all], and amongst these this *anchoret*, too! He, too, even here [in my own island of Ceylon] slaughters the demon-race! Ha! Doth Rāvana live? Fie, fie, [my son—thou] conqueror of Indra! what [avail is there] from Kumbhakarna awakened [untimeously from his six months’ slumber—gigantic ally though he be]—or what from these [my own score of brawny] arms that *in vain* swelled with [the pride of carrying off] the spoils of the poor villages of Heaven?”—

First objection to the definition.

[If *faultlessness*, I say, were essential to Poetry, then] the nature of Poetry would not belong to these verses, by reason of their being tainted with the fault termed “non-discrimination of the predicate”—[see Chapter 7th:—for the expression “in vain” is faultily mixed up in a descriptive epithet applied to the subject—the “arms”—whilst the speaker really intended to say “how vain are now these arms that then did swell”]. On