



Theory Of Art For Art / Poetry For Poetry -An Analytical And Critical Study

Nedjim Sata

PhD in Contemporary Arabic Literature, College of Arts and Languages, Department of Arabic Language and Literature, Mohammed Khider University - Biskra (Algeria).
Email Author: sattanad@gmail.com

APA Citation:

Sata, N., (2023). Theory Of Art For Art / Poetry For Poetry -An Analytical And Critical Study, *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 19(2), 1-13; 2023.

Submission Date: 10/04/2023

Acceptance Date: 15/06/2023

Abstract:

This research aims to establish a conceptual framework for the theory of "Art for Art's Sake" as a fundamental element in analyzing the qualitative arguments that have arisen within this theory, both in support and opposition. The study explores the legitimacy of pure art and delves into the necessity of liberating art from ideological constraints. The research utilizes a descriptive methodology based on analytical and deductive approaches, addressing several questions such as: What is meant by the theory of "Art for Art's Sake"? What justifies its existence? Why does the theory emphasize the need to free art from ideological biases?

The research arrives at several conclusions, including: The theory of "Art for Art's Sake" advocates for pure art liberated from moral and ideological purposes, focusing solely on the aesthetic beauty of art itself. This theory establishes boundaries to safeguard the sanctity of art while also inviting criticism, as favoring pure aesthetic qualities over other purposes has not been widely accepted by critics, as it may diminish the role of art in society.

Keywords: theory, Art for Art's Sake, Poetry for Poetry, pure art, ideology, advocacy, opposition.

1. Introduction:

The theory of "Art for Art's Sake" emerged in response to the pressures imposed on art in general, resisting any attempts to use art for utilitarian purposes or to engage with the challenges of everyday life. Advocates of pure art emphasized the need to free art from ideological influences and return it to its original purpose for which it was created as an art form, distinct and separate from any other function. As some scholars suggest, this theory seeks to restore art to its essence. However, discussing this theory of pure art is akin to exposing a naked human body, as one might ask: Can someone truly strip away clothing under the pretense that it is an external entity not inherent to their existence?

If clothing conceals the human body's nudity, external factors and influences fill the artistic gaps present in creative works. Linguistically, for instance, linguistic communities have coined the term "deviation" in its various forms as justification for the anomalies found in texts.

Email Author: sattanad@gmail.com

A poet or artist, for instance, might find themselves breaking linguistic rules due to some urgent necessity. Readers then come in and fill these gaps, arguing that society, for example, is fractured and broken like an injured bird, or that Sisyphus defies carrying the rock, and the phoenix rebels against its people, departing from their norms. Since the reader has labeled this fracture as a departure from the familiar, we can draw inspiration from other aims and references that compensate for any obstacle that arises in the creative work.

Furthermore, advocating for pure art negates the existence of renowned poets like Homer, Shakespeare, John Milton, Wordsworth, and others, by asserting that they were confined by moral guidelines. Dante was an advocate of ethics, and Homer occupied the role of a historian...

If we initially accept the notion of pure art, does that mean that when Tammuz appears in one of the texts carrying his wound, or when the blue pigeon warns us of an imminent danger, does it imply that these voices are calling us for the sake of art and pleasure? Or do they address our consciences in an attempt to save us from a danger lurking, one that threatens to shake our social and political foundations?

Therefore, art is a true reflection of its era and its environment, as it is born from its events. Without this perspective, the concept of art fades away, and its artistic principles erode away from human concerns. In this view, the artist becomes like a psychiatric patient; the more isolated from society, the more he becomes introverted. Or he becomes like a passerby who stumbles upon a wedding banquet; the host invites him, but since he doesn't know the wedding party or the groom, his presence lacks the enjoyment of the celebration, except for partaking in the meal.

Based on the above, the research aims to establish a comprehensive understanding of both art and the theory of "art for art's sake," and then delve into the heated critical scene that has surrounded the theory of "art for art's sake" between supporters and opponents. The research also seeks to examine the legitimacy of pure art. The study employs a descriptive methodology that relies on analytical and extrapolative techniques. Several issues are raised, including: What is meant by the theory of "art for art's sake"? What are the justifications for its emergence? Why did the theory of "art for art's sake" advocate for freeing art from ideological dogmas? And what is the benefit of attaining artistic pleasure in and of itself?

If art deviates from its inherent aesthetic and pure artistic purpose, does it still retain its essence, or does it become something other than art?

2. The Concept of Art:

Art plays a significant role in life, as humans are compelled to enjoy "sculpture, painting, drawing, music, poetry, and theater¹". These pure artistic expressions have a profound connection to the inner essence of humanity or, more accurately, occupy a deep place in the realm of emotional well-being. "Whoever is not moved by spring and its flowers, by the oud and its strings, is of a corrupt disposition with no remedy²". This reiterates that art is an integral part of humanity and a vital necessity in life that cannot be dispensed with.

In its simplest concepts, art is considered "the activity that manifests beauty³" and brings about enjoyment. Since these two aspects cannot be confined to a specific domain, Karalik Bios Karalik parallels art with the five senses. He tells us about the "art of taste, art of smell, art of touch, art of hearing, and art of sight⁴". The philosopher Karalik justifies his choice of the five senses by the adaptability of art to shaping and manipulation, as well as its vast scope that has led to the diversity of its forms (culinary art, painting, architecture, fashion, sculpture, etc.).

As an attempt to strengthen the relationship between art and the theory of art for art's sake, which stems from the pure pleasure of art, we deemed it necessary to study the raw material of art that is attributed to beauty and enjoyment. For example, fabric serves as the raw material for a shirt, and its beauty is derived from the skillful tailoring and weaving of the shirt, not from the physique of the person wearing it. Similarly, in the case of poetry as a form of art, its beauty and the aspect of pleasure lie in the way phrases are crafted and woven together following a well-structured poetic pattern. This delights and astonishes us at the same time, as it constantly breaks the boundaries of our expectations.

Likewise, the theory of art for art's sake regards art as a raw material. Every time it is reshaped and crafted, it remains an art form inherently tied to aesthetic beauty and artistic pleasure.

Abdullah Hamadi voices his message with the tone of rejection, urging the dismantling of barriers and the refusal of constraints:

"Poetry is a terrorism bomb we launch From the mouth of rejection against obstacles⁵".

In parallel to Abdullah Hamadi, the poet Muhammad Ali Said expresses:

"When the bomb crushes me,

Creation is written in what is to come,

And who will come

Will carry life, meaning, and action⁶".

These poetic lines emerged from an unparalleled artistic pleasure, as they symbolically portray the bomb as the resounding cries of the innovators who reject obstacles and barriers that could shackle the poetic experience. Thus, we perceive the bomb as challenging the considerations of writing, undermining them, then reconstructing them according to an eternal dynamic perspective. It serves as a comprehensive destruction of all restrictions standing in the way of renewal. This is also evident in the symbol of terrorism, carrying the connotation of breaking away from sacred frameworks and systems. When the reader reaches this profound meaning, they experience an artistic delight. Hence, art can be considered as something that begins with wonder and ends with pleasure.

In light of this, the philosopher Clive Bell defines art based on his aesthetic experiences in the receivers: "If it stirs in us a special emotion that he calls aesthetic emotion⁷, that is pure art." It should be noted that "aesthetic emotion is a special type of emotion, the emotion aroused by works of art as art. A work of art can evoke various emotions and feelings in us: moral, religious, social, political, romantic, sexual, and so on. However, what distinguishes a work of art as art is that it evokes in us an aesthetic emotion. This emotion is usually characterized by pleasure, openness, cognitive intuition, and ecstasy (...) The depth, strength, and richness of the aesthetic emotion depend on the depth, strength, and richness of the aesthetic quality inherent in the work of art⁸".

We can deduce from Clive Bell's statement that a work of art is governed by aesthetics rather than other perceived purposes in the artwork. Furthermore, the strength of aesthetic emotion distinguishes artistic creations from other historical and sociological works... To further clarify his stance, Clive Bell provides a clear example: "When I read *Anna Karenina* by Tolstoy as a narrative, I do not perceive it aesthetically; I experience it in this case as a story, a history, not as a work of art⁹".

Clive Bell, like other thinkers, relied on the aesthetic autonomy of art. If something other than pure aesthetic pleasure, such as ethical, religious, or social satisfaction, is derived from a work of art, then we find ourselves facing two possibilities: either the attained pleasure is not purely aesthetic, or the

accomplishment is not purely artistic. The latter possibility is plausible, as art often intersects with other domains, especially when the artist incorporates historical, religious, or mythological symbols that become an integral part of the artwork.

Between give and take, Rodane attempts to liberate art from the predicament of pure aesthetics. He envisions art as the creation of symbols parallel to forms of human expression. Thus, art becomes the product of a tripartite equation revolving around (forms of expression, creation, symbols). Forms of expression articulate the references and accumulations that constitute raw material for art, while creation is associated with activating and investing this raw material to produce art. Symbols, in turn, represent an objective equivalent of human forms of expression, a secondary artistic creation.

Returning to forms of expression (such as the lines of a poem), it becomes clear that they are shaped by various purposes. Human expression cannot be restricted solely to pure aesthetics; otherwise, what would be the fate of other theories that have emerged from human expression? Therefore, based on Rodane's perspective, it is appropriate to view art as a parallel artistic binomial to the principle of causality.

Moreover, the downpour of pure art advocated by proponents of the theory of art for art's sake is not a sufficient justification for excluding moral and human values from art.

3. The intended meaning of the theory of "art for art's sake":

Before delving into the theory of "art for art's sake," it is important for us to observe the close relationship among three terms that initially appear to be intertwined to the extent of similarity, and without which art would not have existed. These terms are "art," "aesthetics," and "beauty." Upon examining the contextual uses of these terms, a clear interchangeable mixture becomes evident, allowing them to take turns without ambiguity. Generally, people express their admiration for a subject that has been masterfully designed and splendidly executed, describing it as highly artistic, significantly aesthetic, or beautiful¹⁰.

However, this interchangeable substitution of terms carries numerous misconceptions, as art is bound by inspiration and exertion. It is an activity born out of surprises as much as it involves accumulations and is based on personal experience. On the other hand, beauty is the outcome of awe and enjoyment derived from artistic works that prompt us to experience pleasure and delight, altering our feelings and mood from one state to a more favorable one. As for aesthetics, it signifies perceiving captivating subjects and eagerly anticipating them¹¹.

It becomes evident to us that the theory of "art for art's sake" is based on common elements among "art," "beauty," and "aesthetics." These amalgamations form the fundamental building blocks of pure art, even if the artistic work is devoid of ethical or dramatic intentions. This is because we are studying the artistic composition itself and not the external influences it exerts.

If pleasure, enjoyment, and aesthetics stem from shaping the raw material of the artwork, then that is the essence of pure art. Here, we must differentiate between what we seek from art and the artistic impact it has on us. For instance, the recipient takes pleasure in observing the movement of Sisyphus' rock, whether ascending or descending. The act of ascent and descent varies in each scene. Sometimes the rock approaches the goal, and in another instance, it nearly arrives without reaching the destination. In other scenes, the rock explodes. As Soliman Al-Eissa puts it:

"Sisyphus' Rock

Indeed, we caused the rock to explode"¹²

Or when Sisyphus refuses to carry the rock:

"Sisyphus won't lift the rock,

A feather will not shine in my arrow¹³".

All these struggles bring about a sense of pleasure and delight, making us experience a unique beauty that changes from time to time. This is distinct from surrendering our imaginations to the tragedy and bitterness of the pain endured by hidden nations behind Sisyphus' rock. Such circumstances drive us to forget the artistic work and seek reasons for the rock's existence.

If we delve into this contrary purpose to pure art, we would be approaching the study of the artistic work "as a historian or sociologist would, viewing it as a reflection of the era or civilization in which it was produced. Primitive peoples' drawings, for instance, can help explain their religious beliefs and myths. Early Hemingway writings can be used to study the mental state of America during World War I. In all these cases, the significance of the work is attributed to something external to it – its origin or outcomes. However, this is not the usual way we look at art. We usually read books and listen to music because they are intriguing and enjoyable in themselves. We set aside any concerns that might divert our attention from them¹⁴".

Therefore, it is a fallacy to use the artistic work as a mere tool for studying everything beyond its essence, or to burden it with what it cannot bear. If there are indications and implications that allow such an approach, we should acknowledge and comprehend them within the context of aesthetics. The latter occupies a central position in the creative achievement. As for the other purpose (anything beyond artistic pleasure and aesthetics), we attribute it to the echo, meaning we assign the artistic work the "inherent value or aesthetic value of art (...). Once we do that, we can avoid conflating the value of an artistic subject when enjoyed in itself with the value it holds for other purposes¹⁵".

To further clarify the vision, we provide an example from "Lamiyat Al-Arab" by Al-Shanfara:

"Stand up, O sons of my mother, reveal your hearts' desire

For I am unlike any other people, I shall not yield.

The necessities have been protected, and the night is dark

The folds of tents are tight, and feet are stubborn.

And in the land there are refuges for the noble from harm

And within it, for those who fear the multitude, is isolation.

By your life, the earth is never constricting upon a person

Who sets out desiring or renouncing, and he understands.

They are the ones who are not betrayed by the open secret

Nor is the wrongdoer who seeks evil left unexposed¹⁶".

Indeed, the text is filled with expressions of rebellion against the tribe and criticism of its constitution, which is evident in the use of the letter "Lam" that follows. This phonetic emphasis activated an atmosphere of rebellion and endowed it with an aesthetic quality. One of the characteristics of the letter "Lam" is deviation, as it incites departure from systems and frameworks. Despite the fact that "Lamiyat

Al-Arab" is one of the splendid models of libertine poets, it is known for its recitation. This is indicative that the recipients celebrate the particular artistry without regard to other objectives.

This perspective is characterized by a significant level of objective presentation that runs parallel to the principles of the theory of "art for art's sake." This theory emerged as a reaction against the Romantic movement, which aimed to transform literature into a platform for expressing social interactions. Consequently, it opposes any attempt to take art beyond its original aesthetic confines. Therefore, proponents of the "art for art's sake" theory, such as Hegel, Kant, Eliot, Oscar Wilde, and others, agree on the necessity of distinguishing between two types of imitation: a pure imitation of art and an imitation that uses art as a reflective mirror for nature, religion, society, and so on. There is a clear distinction between seeking artistic impact within the art itself and seeking it in other domains.

The theory of "art for art's sake" then originates from the rejection of the intricacies of ideological attire, and consequently, it refrains from being limited to aesthetics as the subsequent product of art. The proponents of this theory have advocated an idea that asserts that the raw material of art, no matter how often it is repeated, will yield nothing more than pure aesthetics, untethered from all ideological authoritarianism. This is what has rendered art "desired for its own sake," meaning that it serves itself alone. If the researcher were to trace the chronological course of the theory of "art for art's sake"¹⁷, they would discover that its origins date back to ancient times – as we will see – yet the significant crystallization took place during the Renaissance, a period characterized by intellectual freedom that led to the emergence of a distinct artistic project that rejected all connections to the service of the church's ideas and beliefs.

From this, it can be said that the Renaissance era served as a turning point for the study of art for its own sake and in its own right. The theory of "art for art's sake" gained popularity in modern times due to its opposition to the phenomenon of utilitarianism, which viewed art as a means to an end or, more accurately, as mere components.

3.1 The theory of "art for art's sake," its origins, and its evolution:

It is difficult for scholars to trace the chronological path that precisely defines the true beginnings of the "art for art's sake" theory, as the opinions and statements that sought to formalize this theory remained scattered indications in philosophy, literature, and art books in general.

The research aims to approximate different viewpoints in order to find strong foundations that solidify the aesthetic goal stemming from the intrinsic pleasure and artistic delight in and of itself. This pleasure and delight are fundamental aspects of the "art for art's sake" theory. Aristotle, for example, drew artistic inspiration from the theory of imitation, based on the idea of human enjoyment "in the coherence and rhythm that art provides"¹⁸.

And thus, Aristotle gave prominence to the aesthetic observer, then he proceeded to discuss the moral purpose that arises from the impact of art on the audience through purification mechanisms, which has become "a theory not limited solely to the direct pleasure of tragedy, but particularly focused on its deep psychological effects"¹⁹. This means emphasizing the pleasure while not disregarding the psychological aspects that result from it (emotions, feelings, reactions). With this approach, Aristotle paved the way for artistic creativity in the realm of poetry, particularly. In his book "The Art of Poetry," he emphasizes the aesthetic values of poetry and its ability to create pleasure, regardless of the educational and moral context. It's not within the poet's realm to bear a burden unnecessary for them²⁰.

The research aims to trace the tangible foundations of the theory of art for art, and it necessitated beginning with the philosopher Hegel, who constructed his perspective based on the concept of

parallelism to the birth of existence from a single pure truth or mono-affiliation. It acknowledges itself in its own right and for its own sake. Here, it becomes "the thought that converses with itself in an abstract identity²¹", detached from all external affiliations. This cohesion makes its momentum consistent, and from Hegel's perspective, it's not valid for thinking to deviate from the essence of the idea. The proof of this lies in the fact that the idea studies "pure thought in itself and for itself²²". According to this pure principle, Hegel discusses "the absolute thinking in itself²³", where everything in the universe is a manifestation of God's thinking in Himself.

Returning to the beginning, Hegel's unification of religion and philosophy captures our attention as he seeks the absolute and pure truth. In religion, humans elevate themselves beyond personal concerns to reach the truth, just as in philosophy. According to Hegel, art is also studied within the absolute spirit. This implies, firstly, that art transcends nature and surpasses finite spirit. Secondly, it suggests that art is not in harmony with the realm of logic, where thought is stimulated and developed for its own sake²⁴.

Hegel, therefore, confronts the theory of art for art's sake by studying art as an internal structure, self-sufficient and independent of all ideological justifications. Furthermore, Hegel introduces an ideal principle that has often been overlooked by proponents of the theory of art for art's sake: the concept of art's innocence from the contingencies of reality. Art's purpose is not to reference or address the issues of reality, but rather to elevate reality to the ideal and raise it to the realm of spirituality²⁵.

In this way, we should understand art and experience its ideal continuity, rather than having it mirror our reality and devolve into a tool for conveying news that loses its justification once its purpose is fulfilled.

While previous thinkers have approached the theory of art for art's sake conceptually and tangentially, Aristotle grounded it in aesthetic values, and Hegel placed it in the service of the Absolute (God) through religion and philosophy. However, Al-Ghazali – may Allah have mercy upon him – truly embodied the essence of the theory of art for art's sake. He discussed creativity linked to innocent beauty devoid of utilitarian motives in any form, whether moral or material. He stated, "To love something for its own sake, not seeking any gain beyond itself, is to truly love it profoundly. This is the enduring, genuine love. This is like the love of beauty and goodness. Every beauty is loved when the beauty itself is perceived, for the perception of beauty is pleasurable in itself. Pleasure is beloved for its own sake, not for anything else. Do not assume that the love of beautiful images is only conceivable for the satisfaction of desire, as the satisfaction of desire may also love the beautiful image for its own sake²⁶".

Isn't Al-Ghazali's perspective in line with the theory of art for art's sake? He directly hints at a new theory that could be termed "art of art for art," where the theory of art for art's sake serves as its foundation and acts as the protective statements that preserve the purity of pure art.

While we might be enamored with the theory of art for art's sake, derived from finding delight in art for its own sake, Croce presents us with an alternative conception of this theory. He turns it into an independent movement "that calls for denying any connection or affiliation of art with any principle outside of itself, or with any other spiritual activities. The first denial, prompted by Croce's answer, is that art is not related to material reality. In other words, it denies that art is composed of colors or relationships between colors, or sounds and relationships between sounds. This is because matter itself has been reduced by scientists to ether or atoms, and thus, it is meaningless to understand the material aspect of the artwork. Another denial involves Croce's definition of art as intuition, which denies that art is utilitarian. Utilitarian actions always aim to achieve pleasure or eliminate pain, whereas art, by its nature, has no concern for utility, pleasure, or pain²⁷".

It is essential within this complex context to distinguish between two types of pleasure. The first is the pleasure derived from the artwork itself, for its own sake. The source of this pleasure lies in the components of the artwork, its composition, internal and external structure, symbolic focal points, and style. As the poet Zubeir Dardukh beautifully expresses:

"I am still on the shore,
 Building sand castles!
 I color them with dreams,
 And decorate them with songs,
 And conceive them with imagination!
 I am still,
 Collecting from the shore of your eyes,
 The most precious pearls!!
 (...)
 And I dream that when I grow up,
 I will steal that bride,
 The bride of the seas²⁸!!"

The poet remains attentive to the movement of anticipation within the seas, the dwelling place of the beloved. He chooses the shores as his abode, waiting in the hope that a wave might cast her towards him. The wait becomes long, and the poet becomes engrossed in constructing sand castles, only to sigh and rebuild them. These sand castles represent the poems the poet composes, then revisits, reshapes, and colors with hopes – the imaginative realm of the poem (dreams, emotions, the emotional aspect). He engraves them with songs (the musical and rhythmic character of the poem, rhyme, meter, repetition, and recycling).

Yet, there's another type of pleasure that is excluded or contradicts the principles of the theory of art for art's sake – the pleasure derived from the meanings and themes that arise from the artwork, interacting with the recipient's perspective and being interpreted according to their expectations. This is especially true when the recipient believes that their expectations have been fulfilled within the artwork.

Another noteworthy aspect is Benedetto Croce's reliance on intuition to produce pure art. Modern science has demonstrated the use of intuition in acquiring both scientific and artistic knowledge. What scientific knowledge failed to achieve, intuitive knowledge – formed from scientific and artistic knowledge – has succeeded in achieving. Croce's stance, aiming to isolate art completely, lacks objectivity in many ways. His intention seems to strip art of its intrinsic purpose, both within itself and in relation to other aspects. It's like a remedy that eradicates the disease and the patient simultaneously.

After outlining the fundamental principles of pure art, we found it appropriate to delve into further studies that solidify the academic foundation of the theory of art for art. The official proclamation of this theory came from Bradley when he called for a circular process in his book "Oxford Lectures on Poetry." He suggested that during the act of writing poetry, one should start and end at the same point, symbolizing a circular path where the beginning and end are interconnected. This is equivalent to the

connection between the motives of poetic writing and poetry itself, within and for itself. If poetry deviates from this path, Bradley regards it as "anything else but poetry"²⁹.

We do not intend to burden Bradley further in his encounter with poetry as an art with anything else, as if he is inadvertently advocating the doctrine of creation.

4. Supportive views of the theory of art for art:

The blows continued against the utilitarian wall of art, as Wordsworth sees in the preface of his collection "Lyrical Ballads" that poetic writing is obligated to entertain the reader who already understands the poem's content. However, he does not comprehend the embellishments that adapt to the characteristics of the skin. He is like a merchant who possesses high-quality goods but lacks the finesse and promotion techniques to attract customers. Thus, the bond between pleasure and the innocent poetic expression style is evident, free from presenting various references that the reader was conditioned to.

Oscar Wilde reaches an extreme level of exaggeration and extremism, such that he equates a committed writer with another who is not committed. His approach to distinguishing texts is based on the skill of composition, without consideration for utilitarian purposes or future prospects for the audience³⁰.

In line with this, the Symbolists embraced the kiss of art for art's sake and directed their poetic achievements towards it. Charles Baudelaire says, "Poetry has no end beyond itself; if the poet turns toward a created end, he diminishes his poetic power"³¹. Similarly, George Sand states, "Whoever is always morally righteous will never become an artist"³².

Baudelaire and George Sand emphasize the necessity of stripping art from the garment of utility so that it doesn't become a mere reflection of it. Therefore, the purity of art from ethical concerns is a necessary and established condition within the pillars of the theory of art for art's sake.

Returning to Bradley is necessary, as he is among the pioneers who elucidated this theory in one of his lectures, where he stated, "The poem is a successive collection of experiments containing voices, images, thoughts, and emotions. As we traverse it poetically – to the best of our ability – the poem differs from one reader to another. It possesses a multiplicity of existence that is almost inexhaustible. So, what does poetry mean for poetry? Its meaning is that this experience is an end in itself, deserving of the effort expended on it for its own sake. The poetic value lies in that intrinsic worth alone. The poem may have external value, such as serving as a means of culture or religion, conveying teachings, refining emotions, bringing the poet fame or wealth, or easing his conscience – all of which is good, but these values should not impact the poetic evaluation of the poem as a fictional experiment. We judge it from within. As for considering external aims, it diminishes the poetic value because it takes poetry out of its natural sphere of existence. Poetry's natural existence is to be a world in itself, a complete and self-reliant future. To control it, we must enter that world, subject to its laws, and ignore all beliefs and personal circumstances related to our real world"³³.

Bradley proceeds to declare the independence of the poetic text from all external contexts and influences involved in its maturation, which he views as diminishing the value of poetry. He rushes, without considering the consequences, to undermine the identity of the reader and the creator, isolating them from the intellectual and cultural sphere to enable their entry into the world of the text, considering that the creator is the first to give birth to the text. The recipient, on the other hand, is the one who brings the poetic text out of its silence into the field of dynamic interactions after it was dormant, and both fall victim to excessive focus on the text's selfhood.

Furthermore, Bradley forgets that the poetic text is like an enigmatic, coded, and elusive entity that manifests itself to its readers in enticing forms, urging them to ride its boundless seas. As a result, the more paths it takes, the more it transforms and changes. How can we control this mirage if we do not confine it within our heritage, beliefs, and contemporary realities?

Youssef El-Khal observes that contemporary poetry has relinquished accompanying situations, refrained from the role of preaching and guidance, and refused to be a repository of knowledge in its various forms and colors. Instead, it has chosen to don a beautiful artistic cloak, neutral to anything that might turn it into a goal or utility. In doing so, he embodies his desire for artistic pleasure, guided by the secrets of language, music, sculpture, and more³⁴.

Kant delivers two consecutive blows towards the wall of society, insisting that "art is an endeavor aimed at pure aesthetic pleasure, meaning it is free, with no purpose beyond artistic delight, without being burdened by any ideas, philosophies, ethics, or other social values³⁵".

Kant's repetition only served to cast aside the friendship pact that Nizar Qabbani established between poetry and society. That document was akin to a comprehensive statement, a declaration of the poetry's integral place within all realms of existence. Nizar said, "Poetry is a part of the land, the society, the history, the cultural and psychological heritage, and the very essence. Every word the poet puts on paper carries within it the entirety of humanity³⁶".

Kant and others have dismantled the strong and ancient relationship between poetry and humanity. Mahmoud Timor boldly stated that it is time to detach art from the grip of social conformities and their surroundings, and to not allow art to serve as a trumpet for amplifying various voices³⁷.

The protest movement by some poets against the restriction of artistic freedom has been growing, as they condemn attempts to confine art within rigid boundaries that limit its fluidity. Perhaps we wouldn't be far from the truth if we consider the message that poet Freilgrath directed to Karl Marx as the pinnacle of artistic democracy. In the opening lines, he says, "Freedom is a necessity for my nature as it is for the nature of every poet. As for the party, it is more akin to a cage. I prefer that war songs be sung outside the cage. (...) I want to soar on my own wings, and I only belong to myself. Just as I want to have complete control over myself³⁸".

5. The opposing views to the theory of art for art's sake:

The theory of art for art's sake has faced harsh criticism that nearly undermined its identity, attributed to several significant factors. One of the primary concerns is the lack of sufficient framework that clearly outlines the broad lines of this theory in terms of its conceptualization and application. This has led to doubts surrounding its validity, not to mention the outright rejection of the concept of pure art by most scholars.

Supporters of the theory of art for art's sake have remained a minority, as it fails to present legitimate reasons for its existence. Brecht declared a revolution against artistic pleasure, emphasizing that art has a social dimension, and that artistic works should be analyzed in the light of their imagery and symbolic content, irrespective of their aesthetic beauty³⁹.

The hostile spirit that once inflamed our pens with its fervor seems to be fading away, as its sources dry up and its intensity wanes. This has led many scholars to reconsider their stance. Even Mohammed Timor, who had been fervent in advocating for the neutralization of art from social agendas, has expressed remorse and softened his tone. He admitted to his mistake, saying, "We wrong the artistic work when we turn our eyes away from it simply because it addresses a life issue or tackles a societal matter. We should not despise those who argue that art is for art's sake⁴⁰".

Likewise, Mustafa Naseef adopts literary writing as a means of expressing and supporting society, based on the prevailing idea that "nothing comes from emptiness." Literary writing, therefore, has an impact and is affected by the conditions of the era, which form a part of the structure of the artistic work in the sense that, according to Naseef, the conditions do not directly intervene in literary creation and hence do not determine its shape or meaning. Nevertheless, they remain present around the creator and prompt them to think about them⁴¹.

Like other critics of the concept of pure art, Mohammed Al-Fitori does not hesitate to warn against the risks of the theory of art for art's sake. This is evident in his statement: "Poetry must have a cause: poetry does not emerge from emptiness, and poetry does not merely stem from the earth; rather, it springs from the human being, its attachment to the earth and soil. In this perspective, poetry arises from the exploration of poetic form. There is a theory that says: poetry has no connection to reality, no connection to humanity, no connection to historical events. I do not believe in that, but I do believe that there cannot be poetry without a human being behind it, and without a cause and effects that contribute to the flowering and direction of creativity⁴²".

Muhammad Al-Fitori goes on to dismantle the aesthetics of pure art, arguing that poetry arises from human and historical issues that contributed to its creation. Without these, poetry would not exist as poetry. It is clear to the scholar the extent of Al-Fitori's criticism towards the theory of art for art's sake, as he dismisses its justifications and openly expresses his hostility towards it, even though he avoids mentioning its name explicitly. "There is a theory that I do not believe in," he says, using a tone of disdain.

While it is true that poetry as an art is intertwined with human and existential issues in a general sense, for example, Mahmoud Darwish used the earth as a flowing chapter for poetic writing, making poetry a means of addressing various moral and ideological issues is not justifiable. Otherwise, what distinguishes poetry from journalism and history?

6. Conclusion:

After thorough research and deliberation, the study has led to a set of conclusions that can be summarized as follows:

- . Most critics agree that artistic works often remain closely connected to human concerns, and creativity flourishes within an artistic realm. Just as every embryo requires nourishment from various sources to develop fully, artistic creations also need to draw from diverse religious, mythological, social, and political references, as well as ideological foundations, to reach maturity and perfection.

- . The era's circumstances play a role in aiding and motivating creativity. They serve as the tables that feed the river. Once the artistic creation completes its architectural construction, it detaches from the surrounding conditions that influenced its emergence. Hence, no one can argue that the grand river encroaches upon the smaller streams, or else its grandeur and majesty diminish.

- . According to this perspective, art becomes self-sufficient within its realm and relies on its internal laws. By doing so, it establishes the boundaries for the theory of art for art's sake. This theory, which had been subject to negotiation for a long time, now assumes the position of judicial authority, independent of external pressures. It is content with its internal laws, which are a product of legislative authority.

In summary, art is a double-edged weapon, especially when the artist knows how to reinforce the human stance with artistic principles. This harmonizes the essence of art with the essence of ideology without

favoring any particular side. Additionally, it grants the reader moments of pleasure and entertainment from time to time.

7. Footnotes:

1. Lev Tolstoy, "What is Art?", Translated by Muhammad Abdou Al-Najjari, Dar Al-Husad for Publishing and Distribution, 1st Edition, Damascus, 1991, p.19.
2. Abu Hamid Al-Ghazali, "Revival of Religious Sciences," Volume: 02, Dar Al-Maaref, (Undated), Beirut, Lebanon, 1982, p.275.
3. The same reference, p.20
4. The same reference, p.21
5. Abdullah Hamadi, "Diwan Tahzib Al-Ash Ya Laila," Dar Al-Baath, (Edition?), Algeria, 1982, p.193.
6. Muhammad Ali Said, "Pockets of Mist," p.116.
7. Clive Bell, "Art," Translated by Adel Mustafa, Dar Ruya for Publishing and Distribution, 1st Edition, Cairo, Egypt, 2013, p.11.
8. The same reference, p.11/12
9. The same reference, p.11
10. Jerome Stolnitz, "Artistic Criticism: Aesthetics Study," Translated by Fouad Zakaria, Dar Wafa for Printing and Publishing, (Undated), Alexandria, Egypt, 2002, p.40.
11. The same reference, p.41.
12. Sulaiman Al-Ayssa: "Songs of the Day," Kutbat Nashrun, Lebanon, 1986, p.45.
13. Abu Al-Qasim Khmar: "Awraq," National Distribution Company, (Undated), Algeria, 1967, p.34.
14. Jerome Stolnitz: "Artistic Criticism: Aesthetics Study," p.42/43.
15. The same reference, p.43.
16. Thabit Ibn Aus Al-Azdi, "Lamiyat Al-Arab," Translated by Abdul Halim Hanafi, Maktabat Adab, Cairo, Egypt, 1999, p.11.
17. The International Conference for Islamic Youth on the topic of "Brunasiah (The Doctrine of Art for Art's Sake)," Saaid.net, <http://saaid.net/feraq/mathahbe/107.htm>
18. Wafaa Muhammad Ibrahim, "Science of Aesthetics: Historical and Contemporary Issues," Ghareeb Library, Cairo, (Undated), p.29.
19. The same reference, p.30
20. Nabil Ragab, "Encyclopedia of Literary Theories," Egyptian International Publishing Company - Longman, 1st Edition, Beirut, Lebanon, 2003, p.478.
21. Ramadan Bastawisi: "Generalities of the Arts," Egyptian General Book Organization, (2nd edition), Egypt, 1998, p. 35.
22. The same reference, p.36
23. the same reference, P.37
24. the same reference p.104
25. the same reference p.118
26. Al-Ghazali: "Revival of the Religious Sciences," Volume 4, Zahran Library, p. 256.
27. Wafaa Muhammad Ibrahim: "The Science of Aesthetics, Historical and Contemporary Issues," pp. 84/85.
28. The same source, p. 44.
29. Nabil Ragab: "Encyclopedia of Literary Theories," p. 477.
30. Refer to: The same source, p. 484.
31. Ihsan Abbas: "The Art of Poetry," Dar Al-Thaqafa, 2nd edition, Beirut, Lebanon, 1959, p. 181.
32. The same reference, the same page.
33. The same reference, pp. 182/183.
34. Refer to: Yusuf Al-Khal, "Modernity in Poetry," p. 91.
35. Ahmed Kamal Zaki: "Modern Literary Criticism, Its Principles and Trends," Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, (ed.-1), Beirut, Lebanon, (ed.-2), p. 76.
36. Abdullah Al-Ashi: "Poetic Questions," p. 83.
37. Refer to: Mahmoud Timor, "Purposeful Literature," Model Press, (ed.-1), Cairo, Egypt, 1959, p. 65.

³⁸.Amal Dibo: "Commitment in the Poetry of Badr Shakir Al-Sayyab," p. 11.

³⁹.Refer to: Salah Fadel, "Realism Approach in Literary Creativity," pp. 110-111.

⁴⁰.Mahmoud Timor: "Purposeful Literature," p. 51.

⁴¹.Refer to: Kribe Ramadan, "Philosophy of Beauty in Literary Criticism, as Modeled by Mustafa Nasif," Ibn Aknoun University Press, (ed.-1), Algiers, Algeria, 2009, p. 107.

⁴².Kribe Ramadan, "Philosophy of Beauty in Literary Criticism," p. 113.

8. The list of references:

1. Abu Al-Qasim Khemar. 1967. *Leaves*. Algeria: National Publishing and Distribution Company.
2. Abu Hamid Al-Ghazali. 1982. *The Revival of Religious Sciences*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Maaref.
3. Ihsan Abbas. 1950. *The Art of Poetry*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Thaqafah, 1959.
4. Ahmed Kamal Zaki. (n.d.). *Modern Literary Criticism: Its Principles and Trends*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya.
5. Ramadan Bastawisi. 1998. *Essentials of the Arts*. Cairo, Egypt: Egyptian General Book Authority.
6. Thabit bin Aus Al-Azdi. 1999. *Lamiyat Al-Arab*. (Edited by Abdul Halim Hanafi) Cairo, Egypt: Maktabat Al-Adab.
7. Jerome Stolnitz. 2002. *Art Criticism: Aesthetics Study*. (Translated by Fouad Zakaria) Alexandria: Dar Al-Wafa for Printing and Publishing.
8. Zubair Dardouk. (n.d.). *Clusters of Love*. Algiers: Dar Huma.
9. Suleiman Al-Eissa. 1986. *Songs of the Day*. Beirut, Lebanon: Nasherun Library.
10. Abdullah Al-Ashi. 2009. *Poetic Questions: A Study in Poetic Creativity*. Algiers: Dar Al-Ikhtilaf for Publishing and Distribution.
11. Abdullah Hamadi. 1982. *Partying with Love, Laila*. Algiers: Dar Al-Baath.
12. Ali Saeed Muhammad. 2005. *Pockets of Dew*. Algiers: Artistique Publications.
13. Krip Ramadan. 2009. *Philosophy of Beauty in Literary Criticism "Mustafa Naseef Model"*. Ibn Aknoun: University Printing Press.
14. Clive Bell. 2013. *Art*. (Translated by Adel Mustafa) Cairo, Egypt: Dar Ruya for Publishing and Distribution.
15. Leo Tolstoy. 1991. *What is Art?* (Translated by Muhammad Abdou Al-Najjari) Damascus, Syria: Dar Al-Hassad for Publishing and Distribution.
16. Mahmoud Timour. 1959. *Purposeful Literature*. Cairo, Egypt: Al-Model Printing Press.
17. Nabil Ragab. 2003. *Encyclopedia of Literary Theories*. Beirut, Lebanon: Egyptian International Publishing Company - Longman.
18. Wafa Muhammad Ibrahim. (n.d.). *The Science of Beauty: Historical and Contemporary Issues*. Cairo, Egypt: Gharib Library.
19. Youssef Al-Khal. 1978. *Modernism in Poetry*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Tali'a for Publishing and Distribution.