



UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIALS

M. A. ENGLISH

(Previous)

(1997 Admission)

Paper I

CRITICISM AND THEORY : A SURVEY

CUP 3029/05/1000

Copy Rights Reserved

CUP 11561/16/950

M.A ENGLISH:I: PREVIOUS
PAPER I: CRITICISM AND THEORY: A SURVEY
SYLLABUS

Maximum Marks 12

Section A

- Aristotle : Poetics
 Johnson : Preface to Shakespeare
 Wordsworth : Preface To Lyrical Ballads
 Coleridge : Biographia Literaria (Ch.14&17)

Section B

- T.S. Eliot : "Tradition and the Individual Talent"
 Cleanth Brooks : "The Language Of Paradox"
 Allen Tate : "Tension in Poetry"
 Northrope Frye : "The Archetypes of Literature"
 Victor Shklovsky : "Art as Technique"
 Earnest Jones : "Hamlet: The Psycho-Analytical Solution"

Section C

- S.N. Das Gupta : "The Theory of Rasa"

- Kunjunni Raja : "The Theory of Dwani"
 S.K. De : "Kuntaka's Theory of Poetry"

Section D

- Edmund Wilson : "Marxism and Literature"
 Elaine Showalter : "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness"
 Roland Barthes : "The Structuralist Activity"
 Paul de Man : "Semiology and Rhetoric"
 Wolfgang Iser : "The Reading Process:
 A Phenomenological Approach"

BOOKS RECOMMENDED

- David Lodge (Ed.) : Twentieth Century Literary Criticism
 A Reader, London: Longman, 1972
 David Lodge (Ed.) : Modern Criticism and Theory
 Robert Con Davis (Ed.) : Contemporary Literary Criticism
 Modernism Through Post
 Structuralism. London, Longman
 1986
 William Handy &
 Max Westbrook (Ed.) : Twentieth Century Criticism: The
 Major
 Statements (Indian Rpt. New Delhi,
 Light & Life Publishers (1974)
 Wilbur S. Scott (Ed.) : Five approaches to Literary Criticism.
 New York: Macmillan, 1968.
 V.S. Sethuraman (Ed.) : Contemporary Criticism
 An Anthology Madras: Macmillan,
 1989

all art as initiative, and therefore untrue, and as immoral since it breeds bad examples set before people in the form of narratives about crime and wicked acts.

Aristotle's magnumopus, *The Poetics*, is a fitting reply to Plato's charges against art, especially the art of literature. Since it is in the form of loosely structured lecture notes which he used for his lectures at Lyceum, his own school, it lacks in clarity and comprehensiveness. It is an acrobatic book a book to be understood with the help of other books. Though Plato and Aristotle have basically the same approach to Poetry (for Literature) as something to be evaluated in terms of its relevance to the whole human living, Aristotle believes that poetry has to be admired and judged as a thing having its own unique character and independent existence.

IMITATION

The concept of imitation or representation is the very foundation of Aristotle's theory of art. Though originally propounded by Plato, his master, Aristotle gave it an entirely new meaning.

According to Plato ideas are the ultimate reality. Things are conceived as ideas before they take shape as things. A tree is thus a concrete embodiment of its image in idea. The idea of everything, therefore, is its origin, and the thing itself is its copy. As the copy ever falls short of the original, it is once removed from reality. Now art reproduces things. SO it copies a copy; it is twice removed from reality. According to Plato, art takes man away from reality rather than towards it. So the production of art helped neither to mould character nor to promote the well being of the state the two things by which Plato judged all human activities.

Plato admitted that art had special charm of its own and could attract people very powerfully. According to him this made art all the more dangerous to society. Unfortunately he was not aware of its potentialities for good, for inspiring people to do noble things to

Section A

ARISTOTLE - THE POETICS

Introduction

By Common consent, Aristotle the great philosopher of fourth century B.C. is considered the father of literary criticism, even though criticism of various kinds existed in fragments before him. In fact, his most significant literary pronouncements as preserved in "The Poetics" are replies to his own master's views on fine arts in general and poetry in particular

Plato's objections to poetry are to be found in the second, third and tenth books of his celebrated utopian work, "The Republic". A part of his idealised vision of life, with emphasis on political and moral protection; he finds poetry more of a hindrance than a help, in the moulding of an ideal society. Using the word "mimesis" which is loosely translated as imitation, he attempts to prove that poetry by which was meant the whole of literature those days is an illusion. For this purpose he makes good use of his own theory of ideas or Universals. Ideas, according to Plato, are the ultimate reality. Every object is a concentrated form of an idea or it is an idea incarnate. Therefore, it is once removed from reality or and is a copy. Since art deals with objects, including the living ones, it is twice removed from truth or it copies a copy. Plato unfortunately does not find in art anything that can mould character or promote the welfare of the state. So he denounces

civilize and instruct individuals in their millions.

But, according to Aristotle, imitation is neither mechanical nor degrading. It is a creative process owing to the use of imagination. In fact art is an imaginative recreation of life with all objects, beings, actions, thoughts and feelings within its purview.

Plato's view of poetry is part of his moral perceptions. But Aristotle views poetry as an independent form of mental activity. It has the purely aesthetic function resulting in the creation of beauty. According to him a work of art is a thing of beauty and it affords pleasure. To be beautiful is part of the essence of a work of art. When we say that a poem is good we say that it is beautiful. Order, proportion and organic unity all go into the making of the beautiful. The moral goodness or evil does not disturb Aristotle much even though he has the well being of society at heart.

The process of imitation is such that it brings into existence a new artifact which never existed earlier. All fine arts remain distinguished from other human activities owing to the composite application of experience, imagination, ideals and values with a bearing upon life in general unlike routine acts of every day life.

According to Aristotle, the media or means of imitation are rhythm, harmony and language with varying degrees of importance according to the kind of work involved in the creation of art. The object of imitation are men in action. Divine or semidivine personages and even animals are included. Men in action would mean men in mental and physical action within their characteristics, passions and experiences. Poetic imitation is an imitation of inner human action, symbolized by anger, gentleness, courage etc.

The manner or style of imitation varies as the objects are portrayed as better than they are, or worse, or as they really are. In tragedy the representation is as better and in comedy it is as worse. The serious poets generally imitated noble actions while the more trivial

wrote about the meaner sort of people. While one type wrote hymns and panegyrics others wrote satirical pieces. The subdivisions of the three manners or styles mentioned above are such that they speak of men as they ought to be or as they are thought to be or as they are said to be. In some cases poetry offers images of the ideal, better than that of nature, thus excelling nature. Things or persons as they ought to be need be taken more in an aesthetic sense than in the moral one.

The origins of imitation are many. For one thing, the instinct for imitation is inherent in human nature. It is man's inalienable right as it were. Secondly the process of imitation brings man a lot of happiness. Thirdly, it satisfies the human craving for finding likenesses or similarities. Aristotle's theory of mimesis treats of the perceptive, intuitive imaginative faculty of man. Thus imitation is of the essence of man. The act of imitation is beautiful, and it results in beauty. It deals with and deals in beauty. It gives pleasure to people at large. Being persuasive and convincing it presents as idealised treatment of life, takes us nearer to an ideal vision of life. Though it deals with individuals, it aims at universal truth. Since it appeals to our emotions, its appeal is strong.

Imitation, which meant for Plato removal from reality or distortion of reality, is manipulated by Aristotle to mean something apparently better than reality. While imitating nature art gives a boost to nature in seeking her goal. Every art or educational discipline aims at filling out what nature leaves undone. Art finishes the job where and when nature fails, or supplies the missing parts. Art, in having aims, and working by a plan or idea, parallels the work of nature. When nature makes a horse, an artist makes a poem, an artisan makes a chair, each one complementing and supplementing the others.

Aristotle's theory is based not on unrealized ideal but upon the models before him Homer's epics, the dramas of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. Though he has written only about Greek literature his

ideas are of immense significance to modern students of literature.

ARISTOTLE'S DEFINITION OF TRAGEDY

The Poetics of Aristotle constitutes mostly a study of the fundamentals of the art of tragedy leaving comedy out for a variety of reasons of which the most important is that he wanted to take it up in a separate work. The orientation of the Poetics towards tragedy is such that F.L. Lucas's celebrated commentary on it is titled Tragedy.

"Tragedy has six constituents. They are plot, character, diction, thought, song and spectacle. Of these, according to Aristotle, the most important is plot. By plot is meant the sequential order or structure of the incidents or the action that is imitated. He defines tragedy in the special context of the overall significance of the plot. Tragedy is an imitation not of men, but of an action and of life which consists of action. Action in Aristotle is not purely external act but an act/deed that makes men what they are, but it is by reason of their actions that they are happy or otherwise. Further more, he holds that "there could not be a tragedy without plot, but there could be one without character."

The plot is the first principle and the soul of tragedy, just as the outline of a portrait is more appealing than the flourish of colours. Life consists in action and not qualities.

Character is the sum total of all the characteristics of dramatic personal. The characters in the play remain distinguished because of this. Yet their qualities and marks of distinction are subordinate to and less important than their actions which make up plot.

Diction is the expression of meaning through words or arrangements of verses, modes of utterance or art of delivery.

Thought comes out in what the characters say proving a point or giving an opinion, pertaining to the given circumstances. It is the effect produced by speech.

Song implies the musical presentation of the story.

Spectacle is the totality of whatever things presented on the stage with a visual orientation.

Plot, character and thought make up the matter of a tragedy. Diction and song are the media. Spectacle implies the manner of the art of dramaturgy. These elements demand integration for the unity and reality of the play. A play like "Oedipus" not only presents a unified and significant image or reality but in itself a form of reality.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PLOT

Plot is the whole situation and a good plot is a significant situation, so arranged that its significance is wrung out of it to the uttermost.... a situation in which characters are caught, tried, perplexed, harassed and put to the test by circumstances. This is what Aeschylus and Sophocles did. Hardy and George Eliot did it. For Shakespeare character is an instrument for creating situations.

The characters are thrown up stark against the human skyline under the urge of circumstances. Elements of Aristotelean plot have to be chosen and put together as the elements of a picture are composed. It should be accompanied by constructive imagination which pounces upon something significant and interesting in life.

The plot should have unity-a beginning, a middle and an end. The beginning must have something to follow, the middle naturally follows, precedes something else, the end is that something else. In spite of diversions and details the piece should unfold the author's conception of an individual reacting to certain social forces. Mere realism does not meet Aristotle's demand. He is not concerned with historian's truth or the analyst's truth. It should be aesthetically revealing. The poet is not concerned with what has happened but what may happen. So it is universal and philosophic.

The poet must have the capacity to discern what is universal, see

truth poetically and communicate it. A thing is true for the poet if it is true for the milieu in which his characters are placed. The poet should prefer probable impossibilities to improbable possibilities.

The tragic action must be of a certain magnitude or size. "Beauty depends on magnitude and order." The action of the tragedy may be limited to one day or slightly more, according to Aristotle. The action must be large enough to admit a change from evil to good or from good to evil, large enough to display good and evil adequately. A complex action is better than a simple action. A complex action is one which includes a perpetual or a sudden unexpected turn of events or reversal of the fortunes of the hero. This is accompanied by an anagnorisis or recognition of this turn.

A simple plot is to be avoided. Because in it the change of fortune comes about without peripeteia or anagnorisis. Peripeteia or reversal of fortune occurs when a course of action intended to produce a particular result, produces the reverse of it. Thus the messenger from Corinth tries to cheer up Oedipus and dispel his fear of marrying his mother, but by revealing who he is, he produces exactly the opposite result. In the peripeteia, rightly understood, is implied a whole tragic philosophy of life. For the deepest tragedy is not when men are struck down by the flow of change or fate like Job in the Bible, but when their destruction is the work of their own unwitting hands. For it is the perpetual tragic irony of life that again and again men do thus laboriously contrive their own annihilation, or kill the thing they love. Thus Oedipus runs headlong into the jaws of the very destiny from which he flies; or Shylock is caught in his own trap; when Othello at last sees himself as one who has flung away like an ignorant savage, the priceless jewel of his own happiness; when King Lear delivers himself into the hands of two daughters that despise him and foolishly rejects the only one that loves. All these are peripeteia in the true sense of Aristotle. The most poignant tragedy of human life is the work of human blindness--the tragedy of errors.

Peripeteia, in short, is the working in blindness to one's defeat. Anagnorisis (recognition) is the realization of the truth, the opening of the eyes, the sudden lighting flash in the darkness. The flash of revelation may appear, as Aristotle points out, either before it is too late or after... After the catastrophe, serving only to reveal it, as when Oedipus discovers his guilt, or Rustom recognizes the dying son he has himself slain.

Peripeteia or reversal is a change from one state of affairs to its opposite, from good fortune to bad. Anagnorisis is a change from ignorance to knowledge. It is best when coincident with peripeteia. Both combined will produce pity and fear which are the typical tragic feelings.

Reversal and recognition are inevitably followed by a scene of suffering or calamity. It involves a destructive or painful action as death on the stage, bodily agony, wounds and the like.

Recognition or discovery is of 5 kinds. The first type is by means of signs. The signs are of different kinds. (a) congenital marks like warts and moles (b) marks acquired after birth, namely, scars (as in the case of Odysseus) (c) tokens or necklaces. To use them for express proof is not artistic.

The second type is recognition invented by the poet at will, purposively. It lacks art. An example is Orestes revealing himself to Iphigenia. In effect it is like giving a token.

The third type depends on memory when the sight of some objects awakens a feeling. For example Odysseus hearing the minstrel play the lyre.

The fourth type is by process of reasoning. "Someone resembling me has come; no one resembles me but Orestes; therefore, Orestes has come. The last is that which arises from the incidents themselves where discovery is made by natural means. Such are Oedipus and Iphigenia. The second best is by reasoning.

PLOT VERSUS CHARACTER

Aristotle holds the plot to be the most important constituent while character maintains the second place. By plot he means the structure of incidents or the action that is imitated. He defines tragedy highlighting the significance of the plot. Tragedy is an imitation not of men but of an action of life. Action in Aristotle is not purely external act, but an inward process, a man's rational personality. He agrees that "it is their characters indeed that make men what they are, but it is by reason of their action that they are happy or otherwise". "Happiness or unhappiness is bound up with action not with character". There could not be tragedy without action but there could be one without character".

In the drama the characters are not described, they enact their own story and so reveal themselves. To be dramatic action is thus an absolute must. The plot, then, is the life blood of the action. It embraces not only the deeds, the incidents and situations but also the mental processes and motives which underlie the outward events which result from them.

Character consists of two elements; Ethos is the moral element in character. It reveals a certain state or direction of will. It is an expression of moral purpose, of the permanent disposition and tendencies, the tone and sentiment of the individual. Dianoia is the intellectual element which is implied in all rational conduct through which alone ethos can find outward expression. It is separable from ethos only by a process of arbitration.

The most important of all the elements of tragedy is the plot or the arrangement of incidents. "Tragedy is an imitation not of men. But of an action and of life, and life consists in action. Aristotle says: "Without action there cannot be a tragedy; there may be without character". The plot is the first principle and as it were, the soul of tragedy. A character by himself cannot produce a tragedy. Dramatic action is not aimed at the representation of character.

Character comes in as a subsidiary to the action. The plot contains the Kernel or the nucleus of that action which is the chief end of tragedy to represent.

Plot and character grow harder to separate as the plot takes place more and more inside the character, and the crisis of the drama withdraws into the theatre of the soul.

PLOT CONSTRUCTION

In constructing the plot the poet should place the scene before his eyes. Thus more vividness is achieved. Inconsistencies should be avoided. The poet should work out the play with appropriate gestures. He must emotionalize the incidents and his imagination, must identify himself with the characters. So it becomes more convincing as life-like reality. Poetry implies a frenzy or madness, lifting himself out of his self.

The story, whether his or not, should be sketched in outline first and then episodes filled in and details amplified. Episodes must be relevant to the action. In drama episodes are short. But these give extension to epic. The story of *Odyssey* is brief; the rest is episode. Epic poetry should have as its subject a single action; whole and complete, with a beginning, a middle and an end. It will thus resemble a living organism. History presents not a single action but a single period and all that happened within that period without any connection. Here lies the excellence of Homer who never attempted to make the whole war of Troy the subject of his poem. He detaches a single portion and admits episodes. For this reason the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* furnish the subject of one tragedy or two.

Tragedy depends on histrionics, demands gesture. Therefore, it appeals to an inferior audience. It is lower than the epic. But it produces its effect without action even in reading. Tragedy has all epic qualities. Even the epic metre. It attains its end within narrower limits for its concentrated effect is more pleasurable than

the diluted and watery effect of epic.

Tragedy produces pleasure proper to it, it is the higher art, attaining its end more perfectly.

CATHARSIS

“The immense controversy carried on in books, pamphlets and articles, mostly German, as to what is that Aristotle really meant by the famous words in the sixth chapter of the Poetics, about tragedy accomplishing the purification of our moods of pity and sympathetic fear is one of the disgraces of the human intelligence, a grotesque monument of sterility”. John Morley, quoted in F.L. Lucas, Tragedy.

CATHARSIS IS A MEDICAL METAPHOR, IT MEANS:

1. Purgation in the older sense means removal of impure blood from the system by means of bloodletting
2. It means also a partial removal of excess “humours” based on the theory of the old school of Hippocrates that on a dye balance of these humours depended the health of the body and the mind alike.
3. In the modern sense purgation means complete evacuation of waste products, a clearing of the bowel system.
4. Purification in the religious sense.
5. In Greek medicine any organism could be purged of any undesirable product by administration, in judicious doses, of something similar. “Similia similibus curantur” or “like cures like” as in Homeopathy.
6. Inoculation as a method of preventing illnesses.
7. Excess of anything is unwholesome. The excess has to be levelled down. Catharsis is a means for it. In this sense Catharsis is a dilution of the tragic feelings.
8. Catharsis is metaphor in the religious sense also. In that sense

it means purification. Emotions aroused by the spectacle of evil in life, moral evil, evil of destruction, waste and misfortune are deprived of their evil effect and even made beneficial. The magnitude of evil witnesses prompts us to give up our own, evil tendencies.

9. In the purificatory role Catharsis creates a situation in which the spectators and readers forget themselves and become other centered in relation to the tragic characters.
10. Psychologically it provides a safety valve for disturbing feeling accumulated in the mind.
11. Catharsis means correction of our crude feelings, refinement of passions and sublimation of our psyche.

Tragedy effects purgation of pity and fear by its administration of these very emotions, either because they are unwholesome or tend to be excess. This is confirmed by Aristotle’s remark elsewhere. “Exciting music calms those who are already excited”. The process is accompanied by feelings of pleasure.

Milton supports the ideas in his preface to *Samson Agonistes*, “To purge the mind of these and similar emotions, to temper and reduce them to just measure with a kind of delight, stirred up by reading or seeing those passions well imitated; for in physic, things of melancholic quality are used against melancholia”. Pity and fear are the doses by which the tragedian homeopathically purges his audience into emotional health.

Catharsis is the function of tragedy resulting from the essential nature of tragedy. This is his answer to Plato’s charge that poetry had a radically vicious effect. The idea of Catharsis was so familiar to him and his pupils that he never stopped to explain it.

Let us see how pity is aroused. A virtuous man brought from prosperity to adversity does not excite pity. It merely shocks. A bad man

becoming prosperous is not tragic, does not satisfy the moral sense, does not excite pity or fear. The fall of the villain, on the other hand, merely satisfies our moral sense.

Pity is aroused by seeing unmerited or undeserved misfortune; fear, seeing the misfortune of a man like us. The tragic hero arouses our emotions by making us admire him when he endures misfortune without complaining. "The whole effect of tragedy tends to the debility of its spirit, reason releases its hold on conduct, emotion takes charge." Aristotle agrees that it is characteristic of tragedy to arouse emotions which in themselves are dangerous and unwholesome. Yet we know that tragedy produces love and admiration which are as important as pity and fear in tragedy. Aristotle answers Plato by saying that tragedy not only rouses these emotions but by the way it rouses them, effects a catharsis of them a purgation of them.

At one level of perception the medical analogy fails. For, tragedy, in order to be curative, must first produce the disease to cure. Tragedy produces emotions which in real life would be unpleasant and perhaps dangerously disturbing.

According to some scholars, "Catharsis of such passions does not mean that they are purified and ennobled or that men are purged of their passions; it means that the passions themselves are reduced to a healthy, balanced proportion. Pythagoreans practised Catharsis of the body by medicine, of the soul by music.

The pity that tragedy produces is of 3 kinds; useful pity, useless pity and self-pity.

FEAR IS OF THREE KINDS

1. Fear of horror on the stage.
2. Sympathetic fear for character (Rustic spectator shouting to Caesar among conspirators)
3. General dread of the cruelty of life or ruthless destiny.

Catharsis provides an outlet for emotions which pass through the spectator with a harmless shudder, preparing him for life's disasters.

Hamartia or the tragic flaw which is the hero's own is driven home to the spectator as a possibility in human nature itself. This is the weakness of a strong character. That is why we pity him. It is not the weakness which is tragic but the weakness of those who should know better.

Aristotle's hero is a man in action, a man in conflict with circumstances which are too strong for him. A man, a little idealised, but like ourselves battered and puzzled by the immeasurable forces of universe and brought to disaster when he defies its strength or neglects its laws. It is then that he evokes pity and terror in us.

The audience of a tragedy has such feelings as sympathy and repugnance, delight and indignation, admiration and contempt even though the general electric charge is discharged by the two conductors-pity and fear.

The pleasure of catharsis or emotions relieved is accompanied by pleasure of artistic representation, that of style, metre and music. Our criticism, obsessed with pleasure values, is blind to influence values quite unlike that of Plato and Aristotle who found relation between art and mental health.

Pent-up surpluses of accumulated emotions are relieved by Catharsis.

Many suffer from not excess of emotions but from deficiency of emotions. They need to be fed emotionally and not purged. Hence in their case, catharsis is similar to dining which is purgation of hunger and thirst.

Catharsis justifies modern psychology in seeing the danger of emotional representations, the need for emotional outlets.

The calmative effect of tragedy has intellectual and spiritual di-

mensions.. it remoulds our whole view of life towards something larger, braver towards renunciation and wisdom.

Pity and fear may be aroused by means of spectacle. But it is better to arouse them from the inner structure of the play. Even in hearing it must thrill the hearer as in the case of the story of Oedipus.

Prepared by
Dr. P.M. Chacko
U.C. College, Alwaye.

SAMUEL JOHNSON

His Life and Works

Samuel Johnson (1709-1804) was a remarkable man in many respects. A great writer and a great talker, Johnson was regarded by his contemporaries as a sage a man of profound wisdom and wide reading. Though born poor and he had to endure much hardship, his knowledge of life and letters was truly astounding. Besides English, he knew Greek, Latin, Spanish and French and was at home with the literatures of all these languages. His reading was not limited to literature, but extended to history, culture, biography, law and even science. His practical interest ranged from politics to trade and commerce. A moralist and a man of taste, he was also endowed with abundant common sense. No wonder, he exerted a profound influence up on his age and dominated its literary scene like a colossus. All his works were immensely popular during his time. These include 'Rambler (1750-52) which contained short essays on morals, manners and literature; 'The dictionary of the English Language' the monumental work which he single handedly wrote and which took him seven years to complete (1747-55); the periodical 'Idler; 'Rasselas', his only attempt at fiction writing and which he wrote to defray the expenses in connection with his mother's funeral; the Edition of Shakespeare proceeded by the 'Proposals for Printing the Dramatic Works of Shakespeare', which took him nine years to complete

(1756-65) and the ten volumes of "The Lives of Poets" the first four of which were published in 1779 and the rest two years later.

He was granted a royal pension in 1762 and was later honoured by the University of Oxford, his alma mater, with a doctor's Degree, and by the Royal Academy with a Professorship. He was also given the rare honour of an interview by the king.

Not only was he very popular as a writer, but he was also a very successful conversationalist. In fact, the influence exercised by his conversation on the literary world of those days was something unique. His club, included such eminent writers of the period like Burke, Goldsmith, Garrick, Gibbon and James Boswell, the Scottish man who later wrote the celebrated *Life*.

Although literary criticism formed a major part of his works, it was not his exclusive concern. His literary criticism was born out of his wisdom, extensive reading and common sense. He does not have a very exalted view of the literary critic. He sees himself as the ideal type if that ordinary literate person, 'the common reader' as he calls him, 'uncontaminated by literary prejudices', open minded and communicative, neither pedantic nor dogmatic, neither prejudiced nor committed.

Johnson's literary criticism is contained in a dozen or so Papers in 'Rambler' 'the Dictionary', 'the edition of Shakespeare' and the 'Lives'. In 'Rambler 208' he remarks that 'criticism... in my opinion is only to be ranked among the subordinate and instrumental arts', which is purely ancillary to imaginative literature. 'The Dictionary' in itself is a critical endeavor as well as proof a man skilled in the art of judging literature, a man able to distinguish the faults and beauties of writing. His "Lives", where he treats some 52 English poets from Cowley to Grey and covers a period of hundred years, represents a combination of biography and criticism and is something unprecedented. It is as much history of English poetry of his

period as a work of criticism. No wonder George Watson calls Johnson an unambiguously historical critic and the true father of historical criticism in English. This historical insight and balanced judgment can be discerned in 'Preface to Shakespeare' too.

JOHNSON: A NEO-CLASSICAL CRITIC

Johnson was basically a neoclassical critic, a traditionalist who based his criticism on the fundamental principles of classicism; Johnson, however, was no rigid neoclassicist or a narrow authoritarian. Like the neoclassicist he too insisted on just representation of nature in literature and sought, like Dryden, to determine upon principles the merits of a composition. Like them, he subscribed to the view that the end of poetry is to instruct by pleasing. Like them, he too wanted literature to be related to life and disturbed figurative language and symbolism as these may or hinder the just and direct representation.

But Johnson is not a blind adherent of rules. While he would not do away with rules altogether (for that would open the gates to the anarchy of ignorance and the caprices of fancy), he would not have them on trust either. For him rules are of two kinds, those that are fundamental and indispensable and those that are merely useful and convenient. While the former is based on nature and reason, the latter is based on mere accidental prescriptions of authority hallowed by time and custom. While he would never allow any writer or critic to ignore the former, it is left to the individual whether to follow or not the latter. Johnson also lays down another test for the merit of a composition the test of time, i.e., the length of duration and continuation of esteem.

JOHNSON'S 'PREFACE' TO SHAKESPEARE

Johnson's 'Preface' is an excellent piece of descriptive and theoretical criticism with an appendix on textual criticism and editorial methods. It exemplifies his adherence to the fundamental principles of neoclassicism as well as to contemporary learning

and investigative. The 'Preface' falls into seven parts: Shakespeare is considered a sapoet of nature, a defence of tragicomedy, his 'central' style Shakespeare's faults, defence of Shakespeare's neglect of the unities, the historical background and the editorial methods.

SHAKESPEARE THE POET OF NATURE

This part is more or less a reiteration of neoclassical point of view. Shakespeare is praised from the familiar standpoint of generality, truth and morality. Nothing can please many and please long, but just representation of general nature. Shakespeare is called 'the poet of Nature', the poet that holds up to his readers a faithful mirror of manners and of life. As for his characters they are not modified by the customs of particular places, unpractised by the rest of the world... they are the genuine progeny of common humanity... His persons act and speak by the influence of those general passions and principles by which all minds are agitated; in the writings of other poets a character is too often an individual; in whose of Shakespeare it is often a species.

The best evidence of a work's merit, it is obvious from Johnson's initial remarks, is the general and continued approbation of mankind. Shakespear has it in ample measure and it is because of Shakespeare's relative antiquity and continuances of esteem that he occupies a classical position. Johnson's Preference for generality and truth are quite evident from his subsequent remarks. Literature for him, is not imitation of particular events, but representation of the general, the typical and the universal. Like a neoclassicist, when Johnson talks of literature as a mirror of life he means not depiction of chance of incidents or what is particular, the local or the transient. According to Rene Welleck, Johnson's insistence on truth and suspicion of fiction finds expression in many of his critical judgements. As a matter of fact, Johnson, according to him, treats art not as art, but as a piece or slice of life.

Another principle of Johnson's criticism that emerges from his forgoing remarks is morality. The term 'just' means both true and moral. He makes it all the more clear when he talks of Shakespeare's wide extension of design, from which, so much instruction is derived and that it is this which fills the plays of Shakespeare with practical axioms and domestic wisdom. From his works, says Johnson, may be collected a system of civil and economic prudence and that real power is shown more by the progress of his fables and the tenor of his fables and the tenor of his dialogue. What is more, from Shakespeare a hermit may estimate the transactions of the world and a confessor predict the progress of the passion. But at the same time, Johnson sees no conscious design on the part of the playwright to enforce moral lessons and he later goes to the extent of accusing Shakespeare of lack of morality. He in fact contradicts himself when he speaks later of Shakespeare sacrificing virtue to convenience.

Rene Welleck talks of the three strands of realism, moralism and what he calls obstructionism or generality found in Johnson's criticism. Although these may appear to be mutually exclusive and contradictory they are somehow reconciled in Johnson's mind. When he says nothing can please many, and please long, but just representations of general nature" the three motifs here analysed are kept in balance and stressed according to context. Alternating by turns, apparently without a clear consciousness that these criteria lead to very different conclusions about the nature of art and the value of particular works of art.

As for Shakespeare's characters, Johnson says that they are not modified by the customs of particular places. When Shakespeare draws a character, he makes him not just an individual but a whole species. This is in tune with the neo-classical idea of generality or universality. Elsewhere he says that Shakespeare has no heroes, his scenes are occupied by men who act and speak as the same occasion'. Johnson, however, is at pains to refute the charges levelled

against Shakespeare by Rymer, Dennis and Voltaire who think that Shakespeare's Romans are not sufficiently Romans or that his kings are not completely royal or his senators are not dignified. He accepts Menenius, the clownish senator in 'Coriolanus' and defends the fact that King Claudius is represented as a drunkard in "Hamlet." Shakespeare always makes nature predominant over accident and rightly so, says he. Note how well he defends Shakespeare's portrayal of characters: his story requires Romans or kings, but he thinks only of men. He knew that Rome, like every other city, had men of all dispositions; and wanting a buffoon, he went in to the senate house for that when the Senate house would certainly have afforded him. He was inclined to show a usurper and a murderer not only odious, but despicable; he, therefore added drunkenness to his other qualities, knowing that kings love wine like other men, and that wine exerts its natural powers over kings! A poet rightly should overlook the casual distinctions of country and conditions for the sake of the essence.

Rene Welleck finds fault with Johnson's praise of Shakespeare for its generality or universality and insists that all Shakespeare criticism since Johnson relies on particularization or individualization of characters. He cites the example of Hamlet and says nothing could be more unique than the character of Hamlet. A careful reading of 'preface', however, does make us realise that Johnson is right in insisting on the basic and fundamental human traits in a character. It is this that ensures its performance Hamlet King Lear and Othello are in a way every man and this accounts for their universal appeal.

DEFENCE OF TRAGICOMEDY

In his defence of Shakespeare's tragicomedy Johnson disassociates himself with the neoclassical injunction against the mixing of genera. He agrees that by the rules of critics, tragicomedy stands discredited. But there is always an appeal open from criticism to nature and that true genius is above rules. He defends tragicomedy both

from literary and realistic grounds. For one thing, the alternation of pleasure and pain in a play pleases by its variety. He does not agree that by the change of scenes passions are interrupted in their progression. On the contrary, through the interchange of seriousness and merriment, by which the mind is softened at one time and exhilarated at another. Shakespeare never fails to attain his purpose; moreover, life itself is a mingled yarn, pleasure and pain follow one another. Tragicomedy, by partaking of both tragedy and comedy, approaches nearer than either to deny the distinctions of genres of comedy and tragedy and suggests a distinct series of the dramatic art. Shakespeare's plays are not in the rigorous and critical sense either tragedies or comedies, but compositions of a distinct kind exhibiting the real state of sublunary nature, which partakes of good and evil, joy and sorrow, mingled with endless variety of proportion and innumerable modes of compositions, and expressing the course of the world in which the loss of one is the gain of another. He defends the opening of "Hamlet" by the two sentinels. There is nothing wrong in Iago bellowing at Brabantio's window and there is no impropriety in the character of Polonius and in the scene involving the grave diggers in "Hamlet." All are reasonable and useful.

Johnson, however, makes a distinction between Shakespeare's tragedies and comedies. He agrees with Rymer that Shakespeare's natural disposition led him to comedy. In tragedy he often writes with great appearance of toil and study. While his comic scenes seem natural, his tragic scenes appear to be wanting in something. In short, his tragedy seems to be skill his comedy to be instinct. This judgement of Johnson is sharp; he rated his tragedies much higher than his comedies. Perhaps Johnson's passion for moral truth and his basic neoclassical views make him take such a stand against Shakespeare's tragedies. It is worth remembering that he was in agreement with the general public of his time in preferring a happy ending for "King Lear"!

SHAKESPEARE'S STYLE

While Johnson, being a neoclassical critic, insists on decorum in language, he makes an exception in the case of Shakespeare. Shakespeare is praised especially for the comic dialogue, which seems to him a style which never becomes absolute, a conversation above grossness and below refinement. Where propriety resides. But his praise for Shakespeare is soon followed by a long list of defects, which includes some defects of style too.

SHAKESPEARE'S FAULTS

The extravagant praise bordering on veneration of Shakespeare as the supreme poet of Nature in the first part of 'Preface' is followed by some of the worst disparaging remarks. Johnson here becomes a typical prescriptive neoclassicist. The very first defect Johnson finds in Shakespeare is that he sacrifices virtue to convenience and is so much more careful to please than to instruct, that he seems to write without any moral purpose. Shakespeare, however makes no just distribution of goods and evil, nor is he always careful to show in the virtues a disapprobation of the wicked. The moralist in Johnson asserts himself when he says that it is always a writer's duty to make the world better and nothing can extenuate this lapse on the part of Shakespeare, not even the barbarity of his age.

Other charges follow in quick succession. Shakespeare's plots are loosely formed and that he is at times too careless to comprehend fully his own design. In many of his plays the latter part is evidently neglected. When he found himself near the end of his work he shortened the labour to snatch the profit resulting in improbable and imperfect catastrophes. Shakespeare has no regard for distinction of time and place and he often gives to one age or nation the customs, institutions and opinions of another at the expense not only of likelihood but of judgement.

In many of his comic scenes, Shakespeare indulges in reciprocalations of smartness and contests of sarcasm. Johnson also accuses

Shakespeare of gross and licentious jests. Neither his gentlemen nor his ladies have much delicacy. Besides, Shakespeare is censured for his disproportionate pomp of diction, his humour and his bombast and his wearisome circumlocution. Johnson has nothing but contempt for Shakespeare's use of puns, ambiguities and quibbles. A quibble was to him the fatal Cleopatra for which he lost the world, and was content to lose it. In fact, Johnson goes to the extent of saying that Shakespeare has perhaps not one play which, if it were now exhibited, as the work of a contemporary writer, would be heard to the conclusion. What is more, Shakespeare's language is so ungrammatical, perplexing and obscure that he has corrupted the language by every mode of depravation. Ironically, all these remarks of Johnson are in sharp contrast to his own earlier admiration for Shakespeare and his view that genius is above rules. The very trait in Shakespeare which evoked his praise earlier now becomes the cause for censure! Despite his occasional catholicity of taste, he is basically rooted and enclosed in the tastes of his own age and consequently judges Shakespeare by the idea of his own age.

Defence of Shakespeare's neglect of the Unities of time and place

Perhaps the most important contribution of Johnson to literary criticism is his attack on the unities of time and place. The neoclassical critics insisted on the three unities. Unity of action, unity of time and unity of place. Johnson here rises above the narrow confines of neoclassical system and as in the case of tragicomedy, makes an impassioned appeal from custom to nature and uses rules as 'instruments of mental vision,' to use his own words.

Of the three unities, only the unity of action is justified by reason, says Johnson. 'Time and place are wholly illusory'. The necessity of observing the unities of time and place arises from the supposed necessity of making the drama credible.' The critics hold it impossible that an action of months or years can be possibly believed to pass in three hours. The mind revolts from evident falsehood and fiction loses its

force when it departs from the resemblance of reality. From the narrow limitation of time necessarily arises the unity of place. The spectator who knows that he saw the first act at Alexandria cannot suppose that he sees three next at Rome.

Johnson defends Shakespeare's neglect of time and place by a direct appeal to the nature of imaginative literature and also to the actual experience of everyone. He exposes the hollowness of the unities by using the very arguments used by the supporter of these unities. He reminds them that spectators are always in their senses and know, from the first act to the last, that the stage is only a stage and that the players are only players. The same applies to the passage of time. The truth is that the spectators never mistake the drama for reality. Rene Welleck is of the view that Johnson is aware of what we would now call aesthetic distance. If the unities are not observed, how can the drama become credible? How can it move us? Johnson answers that it is credible, whenever it moves, as a just picture of a real original, as representing to the audience what we would himself feel, if he were to do or suffer what is there feigned to be suffered or to be done. The delight of tragedy, for instance, proceeds from our consciousness of fiction; if we thought murders and treason real, they would please no more. Johnson is right when he says imitations produce pain or pleasure, not because, not because they are mistaken but because they bring realities to mind. In conclusion, Johnson says that the unities of time and place are not essential to a just drama and that they are to be sacrificed to do the nobler beauties of varieties and instruction. The greatest graces of a play are to copy nature and instruct life for which unity of action alone is needed. He echoes the view of Aristotle in these statements. Both seem to agree that drama is not a mere representation of human life, but an imaginative reconstruction of it.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Johnson is unique among the neoclassical critics in yet another

respect. He is the first critic to underline the importance of historical insight for critical evaluation. While, of course, conformity of nature and reason is to be the basic test of literary excellence, and understanding of the connections of the society in which the writer lived and the opportunities available to him goes a long way in evaluating him properly. To judge rightly of an author we must transport ourselves to his time and examine what the wants of his contemporaries were and what his means were of supplying them. This historical, biographical approach, though rudimentary, is something quite new. Johnson follows this method more systematically in his 'Lives'. While Rene Welleck calls these investigations of Johnson's as 'little exercises in literary history' George Watson calls him an 'unambiguously historical critic and the true father of historical criticism in English.

During the Elizabethan age, Johnson reminds us, the English nation was struggling to emerge from barbarity. The society was in a state of literary infancy. Though the age saw the kindling of literary curiosity, it was as yet unacquainted with the true state of things. Violence in Shakespeare's plays is thus accounted for by the primitive tastes of the uncultured audience he had to cater for. The stage was crude and ill-equipped and there was no guidance either, by way of precedents. Besides, Shakespeare himself was born poor and had to face many hardships and difficulties. His learning was not much more than English, and chose for his fables only such tales as he found translated and these were not many. Despite his limitations and lack of technical guidance, his plays reveal an intimate and unrivalled knowledge of humanity as comprehensive as it was profound. His keen observation impregnated by his genius accounts for his depiction of life in all its native colours. Despite many difficulties to encounter and so little assistance to surmount them, Shakespeare has shaken all the encumbrances of his fortune from his mind as dew drops from a lion's mane and he presents life or nature plainly as he has been with his own eyes not weakened or distorted by the

invention of any other kinds. Hence we feel his picture nor merely just, but complete.

Johnson makes a fitting tribute to Shakespeare's genius by comparing him to a forest in which oaks and pines are interspersed with weeds and brambles or an "open mine which contains gold and diamonds in inexhaustible plenty, though clouded by incrustations, debased by impurities and mingled with a mass of meaner minerals",

EDITORIAL METHOD

The last section of the preface is concerned with matters arising from the editorial handling of Shakespeare's work, Johnson gives a brief history of what has happened to the text up to the time of making his own attempt on it. He speaks of his own editorial practice and reflections on some of its practitioners; he ends with the passage on Notes and the peroration.

ESTIMATE OF JOHNSON

Viewed as a whole, Johnson's 'Preface' is not on the lines of strict, narrow neoclassical critical theory. But it is far from true to say that he has delivered criticism from the tyranny of neoclassical critical theory. While his critical views are based on the fundamental and traditional classical theory, he is not a blind adherent to authority. Though he certainly believed that the object of criticism was to lay down the law, ascertain and apply general principles of poetic excellence, he at the same time recognises genius who is above rules. While deeply rooted in classical tradition, especially Aristotle, Johnson with his faint romantic trait is also linked to the subsequent literary criticism. The last great critic of the neoclassical school, Johnson also, in a way, paved the way for the emerging romantic criticism

BIOGRAPHY

1. "Literary Critics" by George Watson
2. Johnson: critic Ed. by John Wain

cup/3029/05- 2

3. A history of Modern Criticism: Rene Welleck
(The later 18th Century)
4. "English Critical Texts" by D.J. Enright & Ernst De Chickera
5. "An Introduction to English Criticism" by B.N. Prasad
6. "English literary Criticism" by J.W. Atkins

WILLIAM WORDSWORTH PREFACE TO LYRICAL BALLADS

INTRODUCTION

Wordsworth's (1770-1850) literary criticism signalled the break with the earlier neo-classical tradition and the beginning of the Romantic Movement. Wordsworth was primarily a poet, who was drawn to literary criticism in a bid to defend the type of poetry he wrote. 'Lyrical Ballads' is a collection of poems by Wordsworth and Coleridge, in the first edition of which he tried to explain what he was doing. In it he stated that the material of poetry can be found in every subject, which interests the human mind and explained that the poems in the collection are experiments written chiefly to ascertain how far the language of conversation in the middle and lower classes of society is adapted to the purposes of poetic pleasure'. A violent attack he faced from the conservative critics later made Wordsworth take up a rigid stand. In the 'Preface' to the second edition of the 'Lyrical Ballads', published in 1800 with an appendix, he elaborated his concepts of poetry and poetic diction. These were further revised and enlarged in the 'Preface' to the 1802 edition. In his eagerness to defend his case, he at times overstated his theories, often resulting in vagueness and contradictions.

Besides these "Prefaces", Wordsworth also wrote 'Essay Supplementary' to the preface to the edition of 1815, three essays upon Epitaphs and his correspondence.

Despite its many drawbacks, the preface to the second edition, 'Lyrical Ballads' published in 1800, was a kind of romantic manifesto and a memorable statement of an expressive theory of poetry'.

POETIC DICTION

Wordsworth in his 'Preface' reacted sharply against the subject matter, Poetic diction and, in fact, the entire value-system of neoclassical poetry. The Neoclassical critics by and large considered poetry as something lofty and above ordinary humanity. Consequently, both the subject matter and style were not to be taken from what they called the vulgar, the crude, the low and the trivial. "generally speaking, neoclassical Poetry was an aristocratic poetry and the style tended to be artificial. They aimed at craftsmanship insisting on utmost finish, correctness and due proportion. Poetry and the style tended to be artificial. Poetry for them was an imitation of human life (a mirror held up to nature) intended to yield both instruction and delight. Poetic diction for them was system of words at once refined from the grossness or domestic use, and free from the harshness of terms appropriate to particular arts. A breeze for them was always a zephyr; a girl, a nymph and a gun, a deadly tube'. They turned the common place into the grand by personification, periphrasis, Latinity and grammatical license. They made use of mythology and pathetic fallacy to evoke the lofty effect. No wonder, their poetry drifted away from the natural expression altogether, and became, in the words of Wordsworth, vicious, distorted and unfeeling.

Wordsworth, who ushered in 'the age of Sensibility', revolutionized both the subject and style of poetry. For the first time perhaps in English poetry, not only ordinary men but also people of total insignificance like the idiot boy, the leech gatherer, the solitary reaper etc. figured in it. He also advocated a simple and natural style for poetry. This is how Wordsworth defends his selection of subjects and his choice of diction: "The principal object, then, proposed in these poems

was to choose incidents and situations from common life, and to relate or describe them. Throughout, as far as was possible in a selection of language really used by men, and at the same time, to throw over them a certain colouring of imagination, whereby ordinary things should be presented to the mind in an unusual aspect; and, further and above all, to make these incidents and situations interesting by tracing in them, truly.... the primary laws of our nature, chiefly, as far as regards the manner in which we associate ideas in a state of excitement". He defends his choice of humble and rustic life because it is in that condition the essential passions of the heart find a better soil in which they can attain their maturity, are less under restraint, and speak a plainer and more emphatic language, because in that condition of life our elementary feelings coexist in a state of greater simplicity, and consequently may be more accurately contemplated, and more forcibly communicated and lastly, because in that condition the passions of men are incorporated with the beautiful and permanent forms of nature. "For choosing their language, this is what Wordsworth has to say: "The language, too, of these men has been adopted (purified indeed from what appear to be its real defects, from all lasting and rational causes of dislike or disgust) because such men hourly communicate with the best objects from which the best part of language is originally derived; and being less under the influence of social vanity, they convey their feelings and notions in simple and unelaborated expressions. "Such a language he also states elsewhere, my purpose was to imitate, and as far as is possible, to adopt the very language of men.' It is from this concept of poetic style, Wordsworth concludes that the language of poetry cannot differ materially from that of prose. He cites a few lines from one of Gray's sonnets and asserts that there neither is, nor can be, any essential difference between the language of prose and that of metrical composition'.

A closer examination of the Preface, however, proves that Wordsworth himself does not subscribe to his theory of similarity of

language in prose and poetry. Besides, he recognises other difference too like choice of words and phrases etc. All these make him later modify his stand and say that the language of poetry...is, as far as is possible, a selection of language really used by men; and that this selection, wherever it is made with true taste and feeling, will of itself form a distinction far greater than would at first be imagined, and will entirely separate the composition from the vulgarity and meanness of ordinary life, and its metre be superadded thereto, I believe that a dissimilitude will be produced altogether sufficient for the gratification of rational mind. 'This is as such as to admit that there is a clear distinction between prose and poetry even apart from metre.

Wordsworth further says, that poetic language must be language in a state of vivid sensation and hence if selected truly and judiciously must necessarily be dignified and variegated and alive with metaphors and figures. Thus he even permits the use of what he earlier objected to. He defends the use of metaphors as they are associated with passion and in passion we are supposed to use figures spontaneously'. A study of Wordsworth's own poems also goes against his theory of simple and natural style. In many of his poems like 'Immortality Ode' or 'Tintern Abbey'. His syntax can be very involved, and he used very bookish polysyllabic words. Besides, many of his poems are full of pathetic fallacy and there are many instances of periphrasis too. Wordsworth, no wonder, became the target of attack by his own friend Coleridge in his respect. What is more, Wordsworth himself admired Milton and Spenser, who were all very learned poets and were far from natural and simple. Again, if we take words at their face value, we find that he goes wrong in suggesting that the language of the common man is the only language for poetry. All these led Rene Wellek to say that Wordsworth, who began attacking the neoclassical practice, actually ends in good neo-classicism especially when he requires the general language of humanity and when he appeals to the common principles which govern frustrated writers

in all nations and tongues. It may also be disputed whether the emotions of a rustic are profound as Wordsworth claimed because his experiences are narrow. Despite these confusions and contradictions, Wordsworth is right in advocating a minimum of stylization and in suggesting that there can be a class of poetry which deals with common life for which such simple language suits. Unlike the neoclassical writers, Wordsworth in his poetic practice does not confine himself to any particular set of subjects and a particular poetic style.

THE POETIC PROCESS

Good poetry, according to Wordsworth is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings. But if it is only this, how can it be reconciled with his own assertion that it is clothed in a selection of language really used by men with metre superadded? Wordsworth however, later modifies his statement and says, "I have said that poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings; it takes its origin from emotion recollected in tranquillity: the emotion is contemplated".

1. The spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings at the sight of something or someone (the daffodils or the solitary reaper). No poetic composition takes place at this stage.
2. The recollection of these objects in tranquillity i.e., the objects are recalled in moments of calm contemplation.
3. The emotion originally aroused by the sight is recreated in contemplation as nearly as possible till it overpowers the mind completely. (It must be noted that the evocation of the past emotion reappears only as a kindred and not identical with what was in the past.
4. Finally these are expressed in poetry. Although Wordsworth gives pride of place to imagination and sensibility, he never neglects craftsmanship or consciousness, reflection and judgement in the making of a poem. In fact, his own poems are the result of constant and meticulous revisions.

FUNCTION OF POETRY

Wordsworth has a very high conception of poetry. Like Aristotle, he too believes that it is the most philosophical of all writings. The object of poetry is truth, not truth individual and local but general and operative poetic truth is general in the sense that it does not depend upon external evidence, but directly affects our hearts through passions. It is operative as it carries its own conviction and we feel it to be true. In other words, it is not the truth of reason or intellect, but the truth of feeling.

Wordsworth tries to explain poetry in terms of the poet. He asks the question, "What is a poet?" in order that it may throw light upon the nature and value of poetry. The poet, according to him, is a man speaking to men: a man it is true, endowed with more lively sensibility, more enthusiasm and tenderness, who has a greater knowledge of human nature and of a more comprehensive soul.... a man pleased with his own passions and volitions, and who rejoices more than other men in the spirit of life that is in him....". The poet, in other words, is not basically different from other men. The difference, however, lies in degree as he is possessed of a superior power to feel and express his feelings. Thus endowed, he has a ready access to the reader's hearts, thereby rectifying their feelings, making their feelings more sane, pure and permanent. The poet in such a state of mind that he considers man and nature as essentially adapted to each other, acting and reacting with each other's so as to create infinite harmony. The poet is aware that basic laws of the human mind are but parts of the larger pattern of the structure of the universe. The poet redeems man from triviality and from selfishness by demonstrating the importance of sympathy and the relation of the vast of human society by revealing the common psychological laws which underlie all sensations and all sensitivity. The poet thus reveals the relationship of men both to each other and to the universe at large. He thus helps in promoting the mental and moral health and happiness of all.

Wordsworth, however, stresses the importance of pleasure. But this pleasure is not something purely sensuous. Poetry binds together the vast empire of human society and the poet is the rock of defence for human nature, an upholder and preserver, carrying every where with him relationship and love. It manipulates our feelings so as to purify them. Poetry for Wordsworth is a great force for good. His own object in writing poetry was to console the afflicted, to add sunshine to daylight by making the happy happier, to teach the young and the gracious of every age to see, to think, and to feel, and therefore, to become more actively and securely virtuous. He has no hesitation to assert that every great poet is a teacher. "I wish either to be considered as a teacher or as nothing", he declared.

Wordsworth, like the other romantics, was hostile to the emerging science and talked of the meddling intellect. But the 1800 Preface makes a connection between science and poetry, of course, to the advantage of poetry. Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge and that it is the impassioned expression which is in the countenance of all science. He seems to predict that the poet will carry sensation into the midst of the objects of the science itself. He perhaps implies that even science will be influenced by poetry and that science will gain in quality in the process. Poetry, in other words, will be necessary for all men at all times. By assimilating all; poetry makes us aware of the nature and mystery of man and nature not by an appeal to our intellect but by direct appeal to our feelings (Felt in the blood, felt along the heart) we are thus 'humbled and humanized'.

WORDSWORTH'S POSITION AS A CRITIC

Wordsworth, according to Rene Wellek, holds a position in the history of criticism which must be called ambiguous or traditional. But despite many drawbacks, and contradictions, Wordsworth's literary criticism opened a new vista. No doubt he was indebted to the earlier for many of his notions. But he adapted them to suit the conditions of his age. He rejected tests based on

ancient models. He stood for liberalism in literature and recognized the importance of originality of genius. Imagination for him holds the central place. It is the power which unifies all and gives us an insight into the unity of being. His theory is neither a return to primitivism nor an entry into emotionalism in the raw. His appeal to emotion and feeling is coupled with a strong moral sense. He insists on the moral dignity of pleasure itself and its universal significance in men and nature. The greatness of a poet, according to Arnold, lies in his powerful and beautiful application of ideas to life - to the question. 'How to live?' Wordsworth deals with life because he deals with that in which life really consists. As a critic he propounds this lofty concept of poetry - the concept of living in harmony not only with oneself but with the world outside.

He advocates simplicity and eschews artifice. For him it is the feeling that matters and it is feeling that gives importance to action and situation. Sincerity thus becomes the greatest virtue in poetry. The notion that poetry combines in itself profound thoughts and deep feelings cannot be disputed.

David Daiches calls Wordsworth the first English poet to explain, defend and define poetry by asking how it was produced. He thus paved the way for many modern critics who are chiefly concerned with the process of creation. His influence not only on subsequent poetry but also on subsequent criticism is profound. Modern literary criticism owes much to the path breaking theories propounded by Wordsworth and Coleridge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "Literary Critics" George Watson
2. "Critical Approaches to Literature"
3. "A critical History of English Literature Vol. 4" by David Daiches.

4. "A History of Modern Criticism -" Romantic Age by Rene welleck
5. A History of Modern Criticism – Romantic Age" By Rene welleck
6. "English Critical Texts" by D.S. Enright & Chickera.
7. "Poetry" by Elizabeth Drew.

S.T. COLERIDGE

BIOGRAPHIA LITERARIA

CHAPTERS XIV AND XVII

INTRODUCTION

One of the seminal minds of all times, Coleridge (1772-1834) was a poet, critic, metaphysician, philosopher, psychologist and aesthete, all rolled into one. Saintsbury and Eliot hail him as the greatest book of criticism in English by many including Arthur Symonds. His influence on succeeding generations has been profound. He is considered the forerunner of many modern schools like imagism and existentialism, to name but a few. I.A. Richards calls him the pioneer of the modern science 'Semantics' and Herbert Read considers him as having anticipated Freud.

Coleridge's views on the organic structure of a poem, unity of being and simplistic imagination and his distinction between fancy and imagination with its further division between primary imagination and secondary imagination, his theory of poetic diction and his remarks on symbol and allegory are still relevant and command respect. Influenced by a number of philosophers and writers of many countries and times, but mostly by the German thinkers like Kant, Schelling, Fichte and Schlegel and fortified by his own native genius,

Coleridge's critical works include besides his magnum opus "Biographia Literaria" Lectures on Shakespeare and other writings like "The Friend" "The Table Talk" etc. As in his poetry, his critical works too suffer from a lack of system and continuity. As a critic he tells us that his attempt was to establish the principles of writings rather than to furnish rules about how to pass judgement on what has been written by others. His task was to reduce criticism to a system. Essentially a theoretical critic he practised descriptive criticism only as an illustration.

"Biographia Literaria" written in 1815 and published in 1817 is a summary attempt to marshal objections against the preface to "Lyrical Ballads" that had been growing up in his mind over the past fifteen years and to provide criticism with a systematic basis of its own. The first half of "Biographia Literaria" is largely metaphysical and the second half is largely critical and occasionally autobiographical.

CHAPTER XIV

Chapter XIV begins with an account of the genesis of the "Lyrical Ballads, its 1800 Preface and the ensuing controversy. The poems in the "Lyrical Ballads" are written by Wordsworth and Coleridge. Their plan and their aims in writing this collection of poems are set out in the beginning of this chapter. The two cardinal points of poetry, according to them, are:

1. The power of exciting the sympathy of the reader by a faithful adherence to the truth of nature and
2. The power of giving the interest of novelty by the modifying colours of imagination.

The symbol of a landscape (representing the familiar and the ordinary) transformed by the magic of moonlight or a sunset (Representing the supernatural) indicates the practicability of combining these two.

Both Wordsworth and Coleridge agree to write two sets of poems. In the one, the incidents and agents to be in part at least supernatural

and in the second case. Subjects were to be chosen from ordinary life, but were to be given the charm of novelty. Coleridge was to make the supernatural appear credible and to procure for these shadows of imagination that willing suspension of disbelief for the moment which constitutes poetic faith. In other words, even while knowing that it is fiction, the reader has to willingly suspend his disbelief of it for the duration of his reading. The reader thus allows himself to be deluded temporarily to be able to enjoy it; his judgement or consciousness is sent to sleep for the time being. As for Wordsworth, he was to propose to himself and excite a feeling analogous to the supernatural, by awakening the mind's attention from the lethargy of custom and directing it to the loveliness and the wonders of the world before us."

PREFACE TO THE 1800 EDITION

Coleridge vindicates Wordsworth's poetical reputation and asserts his right to attach a Preface since the bulk of the contributions came from him. Coleridge refers to the controversy that followed over Wordsworth's insistence on the use of the language of "real life" (the language of the lower and middle classes) Was Wordsworth right in advocating a colloquial style (the language really used by men) to all kinds of poetry, in the second edition of his preface? While Coleridge acknowledges the greatness of Wordsworth and his increasing popularity and denounces his detractors for their harsh and bitter criticism, he on his part, does not wholly approve of many of the views of his own collaborator. As a matter of fact, he makes it known that he is not in agreement with many of the theories of Wordsworth concerning poetry. (Erroneous in principle and as contradictory both to other parts of the same 'Preface and to the author's own practice in the greater number of the poems themselves). Since he was a collaborator and the Preface itself was half a child of my own brain' it becomes necessary for him to declare "in which points I coincide with his opinions and in what points I altogether differ".

DISTINCTION BETWEEN PROSE, A POEM AND POETRY

Coleridge proposes a distinction between a poem and poetry based on philosophical enquiry i.e., first separating the distinguishable parts and later restoring them to their original unity. The distinction Coleridge makes between a poem and poetry, however, is not clear and is ambiguous. When does the difference between a poem and a prose composition lie? The difference cannot then lie in the medium, for both use words. The difference then must consist in a different combination of them, in the consequences of the different objects proposed. A poem combines words differently because it is seeking to do something different. If, however, all that we aim at is to memorize, as in the nursery 'rhyme Thirty days hath september' where metre distinguishes a poem from a prose composition? A mere piece of prose cast into rhymed and metrical form does not it a poem. Metre and rhyme in that case do not arise from the nature of the content, but have been imposed on it in order to make it memorizable. A difference of object and contents supplies an additional and more valid ground of distinction. The immediate aim of poetry is to give pleasure; but then the communication of pleasure may also be the immediate object of a work not metrically composed, as for example in novels. Can we make them into poems by super adding metre with or without rhyme? Coleridge states a very important principle that one cannot derive true and permanent pleasure out of any feature of work. Nothing can permanently please, which does not contain in itself the reason why it is so, and not otherwise. If meter is superadded, all other parts must be made consonant with it. A proper definition of a poem would be a composition that proposes pleasure as its immediate end, and to distinguish it from novels and similar compositions one might say that this pleasure from the whole is with pleasure from the parts. In other words, a poem is an organic unity, the parts of which are interdependent. While we note and appreciate each part, our pleasure in the whole develops

cumulatively out of such appreciation, which is at the same time pleasurable in itself, and conducive to an awareness of the total pattern of the complete poem. A mere narrative interest which hurries the reader to the conclusion out of curiosity to find out what it is does not give real unity to a poem. The parts of a poem must mutually support and explain each other, harmonizing and unifying the purpose. Rhyme and the metre all bear an organic relation to the total work. A true poem is neither a striking series of lines or verses, each complete in itself and bearing no necessary relation to the rest of the work, nor a loosely knit work, where we gather the general gist from the conclusion without having been led into the unique reality of the work by the component parts as they unfolded.

Coleridge makes a puzzling statement that the highest kind of poetry may even exist without metre and cites the writings of Plato and Bishop Taylor as instances. Coleridge perhaps here is talking of 'poetry' as a wider activity than 'a poem', which can be engaged in by painters or philosophers and not confined to those who employ metrical language, or even to those who employ language of any kind. The elements and qualities that characterize poetry is such that a poem of any length neither can be, nor ought to be, all poetry. In a long poem some parts are bound to be only partially gratifying or not so at all. Hence a long poem cannot be all poetry. This naturally leads him to the question 'What is a poet?' The answer to the question what is poetry? is related to the question "What is a poet?" Like Wordsworth, he too talks of poetic process as that would give as an insight into the whole soul of man into activity, with the subordination of his faculties to each other according to their relative work and dignity. He diffuses a tone and spirit of unity that blends and fuses, each by that synthetic and magical power to which we have exclusively appropriated the name of imagination. 'Poetry is the result of the operation of the secondary imagination. Through this synthesizing and integrating

power, the poet balances and reconciles opposing and discordant elements; of seaminess with difference; of the general with the concrete; the idea with the image; the individual with the representative; the sense of novelty and freshness with old and familiar objects; more than usual state of emotion, with more than usual order. Poetry in the larger sense brings all aspects into complex unity. It organizes, reconciles and achieves harmony out of diversity. Immediate pleasure is not its whole function. Being a product of the 'esemplastic power', it enables all the faculties to be brought into play simultaneously, each playing its proper part, to produce a complex synthesis of comprehension.

Coleridge ends this chapter with a conceit in which good sense is the body of poetic genius, fancy the drapery, motion (emotion) its life and imagination the soul that is every where and in each and forms all into one graceful and intellectual whole.

A NOTE ON FANCY AND IMAGINATION

'The philosophical distinction between Fancy and Imagination and its bearing on poetry interested Coleridge all through his life, and is the central issue of 'Biographia Literaria'. In Chapter XIII of 'Biographia Literaria' he says that Fancy deals in 'fixities and definitives'. It is a 'mode of Memory' and can roam at will, but only within the limits of the material world. It is somewhat mechanical and so is looked down upon. It is not a creative power at all as it only combines the things into pleasing shapes instead of fusing them like imagination. It is not a unifying power.

Coleridge distinguishes two types of imagination-primary and secondary. His concepts of primary imagination are vague and are open to different interpretations. "It is an agency which enables us both to discriminate and to order, to separate and to synthesize, and thus make perception possible". It is essentially creative in the sense of bringing of order out of chaos, destroying chaos by making its parts intelligible by the assertion of the identity of the

designer and 'a repetition in the finite mind or the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM.

The secondary imagination is the conscious human use of this power. It is more conscious and less elemental than the primary imagination, but it does not differ in kind from it. It projects and creates new harmonies of meaning. It is, the larger sense, a poetic activity, which is a composite faculty of the soul, consisting of all the other faculties, perception, intellect, will and emotions. A more active agent than primary, "it dissolves, diffuses, dissipates in order to recreate". A shaping and modifying esemplastic power, it identifies the mind with nature and nature with the mind.

CHAPTER XVII

This chapter too begins with the reformation Wordsworth has brought about in poetry, especially in poetic diction. Wordsworth's plea for the use of the natural language of impassioned feeling with its emphasis of truth of passion and nature deserves all praise. Coleridge remembers with gratitude Wordsworth's services in condemning the artificial poetic diction of the 18th century and their use of stock clichés and phrases and substituting them by his use of natural turns of expression. (A girl for them was a 'nymph' and 'wind' 'Zephyr'.) Despite adverse criticism, Wordsworth's popularity is on the rise and this is something truly gratifying to Coleridge. While there remain important points where Coleridge feels his collaborator in the right, there are certain accidental and 'petty annexments' to Wordsworth's theory, which require to be removed, to make it convincing and useful.

COLERIDGE OBJECTIONS - RUSTIC LIFE

Coleridge despite his appreciation for Wordsworth, disagrees with certain parts of his 'Preface'. According to Wordsworth, 'The proper diction for poetry in general consists altogether in a language taken, with due exceptions, from the mouth of men in real life, a language which actually constitutes the natural conversation of men under the influence of natural feelings'. Coleridge maintains that this rule ap-

plies only to certain classes of poetry in a sense which is self-evident, and that as a general rule it is useless if not dangerous. What are the different reasons for a poet to choose rustics and low life for poetry? The first reason is the naturalness of the representation made possible by the poet's own knowledge and talent; and secondly, the reader's conscious feeling of his superiority when compared to the characters presented from the 'Preface' why he has chosen low and rustic life. It is because in the conditions in which rustic and other humble people live, "the essential passions of the heart find a better soil in which they can attain their maturity, are less under restraints, and speak a plainer and more emphatic language... in what condition of life our elementary feelings co-exist in a state of greater simplicity and consequently may be more accurately contemplated and more forcibly communicated... the manners of rural life germinate from those elementary feelings... the passions of men are incorporated with the beautiful and permanent forms of nature". Coleridge asks whether the chief characters in Wordsworth's poem like 'Brothers', 'Michael', 'Ruth', the 'Mad Mother' etc. are typically rustic. Their excellence is due not to their rusticity but to factors which operate also in town and cities, their occupation and abode. 'Education and independence of mind are not excluded from them. The rustics who are portrayed are small landed proprietors under no necessity of working for others, but able to get simple livelihood by strenuous labour. Their education is the outcome of their familiarity with the Bible and the liturgy or hymn book.' Education or original sensibility or both are the stimulants for the mind to improve itself. If these are not enough, the mind contracts and the men become selfish, sensual, gross and hard hearted'.

It is not right, Coleridge argues, to generalise the condition of the rustics as a whole from the condition of a small section of privileged rustics. Coleridge also does not agree with Wordsworth that the influence of low and rustic life in and for itself is always beneficial. It

varies from place to place and from group to group. Aristotle is right in his view that poetry as poetry is essentially ideal, that it avoids and excludes all accidents, and that it deals with the general, not with the exceptional or particular. 'If my premises are right and my deductions legitimate, it follows', Coleridge asserts, 'that there can be no poetic medium between the swains of Theocritus and those of an imaginary golden age'. The characters in 'Michael' and the 'Brothers' are representatives of a class of rustic (not as typical rustics). Nonetheless, they have all the verisimilitude and representative quality that the purpose of poetry can require. 'But in such poems as 'Harry Gill' and 'The Idiot Boy' the rustics who are represented, are quite unimpressive. The feelings are those of human nature in general and not peculiar to the countryside. The poems succeed because they are located in the vicinity of interesting images'. In the 'Idiot Boy', the mother's character especially is not the real and the native product at all. Coleridge is inclined to agree to the two charges levelled against this poem. First, the representation of the boy's disgusting and morbid idiocy despite his intention to the contrary and, second, both the mother and the son are pictures as laughable, the one by his folly and the other by his idiocy. No attempt has been made for a study and display of maternal affection in its ordinary workings.

Coleridge next takes up Wordsworth's 'Thorn', which the poet intended to present as narrated by a talkative, retired seaman. It is not good to imitate truly and dull and garrulous discourses without repeating the effects of dullness and garrulity. In a lyric poem such as it is, long windedness is a fault. The successful example of Juliet's nurse in 'Romeo and Juliet', however, prevents Coleridge from extending his generalization to dramatic poetry.

"Summing up the first part, Coleridge feels compelled to call in question Wordsworth's choice of rustic characters a priori (i.e. on theoretical grounds) and with reference to cases where he tried to practise his theory".

LANGUAGE OF THE RUSTICS

Coleridge next takes up Wordsworth's view that the language of the rustic (purified from all rational causes and dislikes) is the best for poetry. According to Wordsworth, 'such men hourly communicate with the best objects from which the best part of language is originally derived and because they convey their feelings and notions in simple and unelaborated expressions'.

Coleridge argues that a rustic's language, 'purified from all provincialism and grossness and reconstructed and made consistent with the rules of grammar will not differ from the language of any other man of common sense. Moreover, the rustics are not properly trained or educated so that they can only convey facts in isolation. The experience of a rustic is limited and he is unable to discover and express the association and connection of things. Any general inference is beyond him. He is unable to have a comprehensive view of things unlike a trained and an educated person.

Moreover, the rustics' vocabulary is a small collection of terms pertaining to his primary needs and this situation is not very different from that of the calls which birds and animals make. The best part of human language, properly so called, is derived from reflections on the acts of the mind itself. 'In other words, it is the terms and expressions coined, while exercising the thinking faculty at higher levels, which constitute the most efficient and expressive part of the language. It is true that the rustic may sometimes use the words of educated men, but this is because they have parroted them from the pupils and other learned source with which they accidentally come into touch'.

Coleridge further objects to Wordsworth's use of what he calls a purified form of rustic language as a more permanent and far more philosophical language, 'than that which is substituted for it by poets. It is the individual peculiarity in the use of language, a language that conveys good sense and natural feeling, rather than folly and vanity,

that calls for his appreciation. Wordsworth, says Coleridge 'confused the journalistic correctness of Tom Brown and Roger L' Estrange with the simple but profound and original prose of Hooker and Bacon'.

Coleridge then takes Wordsworth to task for his statements a selection of the real language of man; the language of these men' (men in low and rustic life) and his assertion between the language of prose and that of metrical composition there neither is, nor can be, any essential difference. He reveals the hollowness of Wordsworth's use of the word 'real'. There are three concentric areas of language, according to Coleridge. The outermost is what all users have in common, the inner is the language one shares with one's class, Profession etc. The innermost is the circle of one's personal and unique use of language. In other words, every man's language has first its individual characteristics, second, the common properties of the class to which he belongs, and third, words and phrases of universal or general use. It is the innermost use of language that distinguishes a greater writer from a mediocre one. The outermost band is the poorest, the general and the common or the ordinary; and this is the only area that Wordsworth's 'real' language can refer to. It is the poorest and the least productive of poetry. Even this language varies from place to place according to the 'accidental character of the clergymen, the existence or non-existence of schools' etc.

Last of all, Wordsworth tries to defend his case by appending the phrase 'in a state of excitement' to his plea for the 'real' language of men' as the best for poetry. Coleridge argues that 'excitement' cannot create a new language; but can only set 'the general truths, conceptions and images and.... the words expressing them already stored in a person's mind in a state of increased activity. Excitement, says, he, cannot invent; it can only cause a ferment in what already exists. Wordsworth, therefore, is once again proved wrong. Coleridge takes up the issue of poetic diction in chapter XVIII also.

In short, Coleridge contends that every man's language varies according

to the extent of his knowledge, the activity of his faculties and the depth or quickness of his feeling. No two men of the same class or of different classes speak alike. This applies to the language of the rustics and the townsmen, both of which vary from person to person, from class to class and from place to place. (Remember the modern terms 'idiolect' and 'dialect'). Again though the words of prose and poetry are the same, their arrangements are not the same. 'I write poetry because I am about to use a language different from that of prose'. This poetry is defined as 'the best words in their best order'.

Coleridge thus goes into the depth of poetic composition and his pronouncements have an authentic ring about them.

COLERIDGE-BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Literary Critics: by George Watson
2. English Critical Texts: by D.J. Enright & Chickera
3. Critical Approaches to Literature: by David Daiches
4. A history of Modern Criticism-Romantic Age.
5. Poetry by Elizabeth Drew by Rene Welleck
6. An Introduction to English Criticism: by B.N. Prasad
7. A critical History of English Literature: by David Daiches
8. Coleridge- Biographia Lirteraria (Chapters XIV, XVII and XVII by C.A. Sheppard
9. Method and Imagination in Coleridge's Criticism by J.R. de. J Jackson.
10. The Mirror and the Lamp: by M.H. Abrams

Lesson Prepared by

Prof. S. Radhakrishnan Nair

"Sourparnika"

Koppam, Palakkad

something that can be isolated. Eliot does not approve of the attitude. He thinks that every author will be influenced by the past; no accomplished writer can escape the influence of his predecessors. (This view of Eliot is one aspect of his theory of depersonalization).

WHAT IS TRADITION?

Tradition is not a blind imitation of the past. It has a wider significance. It cannot be inherited. It has to be acquired with great effort. The important component of tradition is the historical sense. What is this historical sense? It is the perception of not only the pastness of the past, but of its presence. In other words past is not something dead; it exerts its influence on the present. Or there is the presence of the past even in the present. This awareness makes us recognise that literature is a continuous entity, a chain that runs from the past through the present to the future. And every author is but a link in this long chain. As such, every author comes to have co-existence with this, predecessors. This makes a writer traditional. This feature is referred to by Eliot as one's contemporaneity.

CONFORMITY BETWEEN THE OLD AND THE NEW

It is easy for us to accept the argument that the present can be influenced by the past. But can this process be reversed? Can the present influence the past? Eliot establishes that this is possible. He uses an analogy. When a new item of furniture is brought into the drawing room, the positions of the existing ones are altered in order to accommodate the new arrival. Similarly when a new work of art is created a re-analysis of the existing works is accomplished in order to accommodate the new work. This is called the conformity between the old and the new.

INDIVIDUALITY AND CONFORMITY OF AN AUTHOR

An author is always judged in terms of the standards of the past. It is a judgement, a comparison in which two things are measured. First

SECTION B

TRADITION AND THE INDIVIDUAL TALENT

T.S. ELIOT

THE ENGLISH ATTITUDE TO TRADITION

The word 'tradition' is rather pejorative to the English. Often the word smacks of censure and carries a pleasing archaeological association.

CREATION AND CRITICISM

Every nation has a creative and critical form of mind. But often one is more conscious of creations and less of criticism. The English people admit that the French are too critical. The compliment often implies that the French are not as creative as they are critical. Eliot is of the view that criticism is as inevitable as breathing. An informed reader is an amateur critic also.

STRESS ON INDIVIDUALITY

The ordinary reader often tries to isolate the individual talent of a writer while going through creation. The effort is to find

the search is to measure the presence of individuality in the work; second is the search for conformity of the author with his predecessors. No work can be fully individualistic or fully conforming. These two are the undesirable extremes. A really good work could be fitted at a point nearer to individuality or nearer to conformity.

Work A

Work B

Conformity

Individuality

HOW TO BORROW THE PAST

There are three options available (a) The past is accepted as a whole (b) one private admiration is accepted (c) A preferred period is accepted. None of these methods is desirable. Art never improves; it just changes. Therefore, no author of the past can be ignored. The past should be accepted and treated in such a way that its presence in the present is not explicit. It is there; it could be felt and detected; but it cannot be isolated.

IS ERUDITION (PEDANTRY) A MUST?

Knowledge about the past does not imply a systematic and academic knowledge. Much learning deadens or prevents poetic sensibility. Eliot adopts a compromising stand in this respect. A poet should know as much as that will not hamper his receptivity and sensibility. Academic or formal knowledge is not the requisite. One should procure the 'consciousness' of the past and develop it. This involves a surrender of oneself to a higher authority; the higher authority is undoubtedly tradition.

The first part of Eliot's essay deals with one aspect of the process of depersonalisation. When an author is ready to surrender himself to a higher authority there is an extinction of his personality. There is another aspect of depersonalization associated with the poetic process. This is the topic of the second part of the essay.

POETIC PROCESS: CONDITIONS FOR PERFECTION

There are three factors that influence the perfection of the poetic process.

(a) The mind of the poet has a dual function. It acts both as a catalyst and as a receptacle. The fusion (between emotions and feelings) takes place only when they are present in proportions suited for perfect combinations.

(b) The quality of the product (the poem) does not depend on the quality of the reactants (emotions and feelings); it depends on the intensity of the artistic process i.e. The 'pressure' or 'heat' of creation. (Eliot establishes this by referring to certain part of 'the Inferno' and also to the agony of Othello)

(c) Certain events or elements precipitate the poetic process. The song bird the nightingale, served to bring together a number of feelings in the case of the ode by Keats.

PERSONAL EMOTIONS AND ART EMOTIONS

A common pitfall is the tendency on the part of the reader to relate the emotions present in a poem to the personal emotions of the poet. Eliot wants to discourage this tendency.

CATALYTIC REACTION AND THE POETIC PROCESS

In chemistry we are quite familiar with catalytic reactions. In a catalytic reaction the reactants react to form the products in the presence of a catalyst. But the product is found to be wholly free from even traces of the catalyst. Thus in a catalytic reaction, the catalyst's role is unique. Its presence is essential for the reaction to take place; but it does not form a part of the product.

Eliot compares the poetic process to a catalytic reaction. Here the reactants are emotions and feelings. The catalyst is the mind of the poet. The mind of a Nature poet is a finely perfected medium in which the emotions and feelings enter into new combinations to form poetry

in which the trace of the mind cannot be detected. This is the second aspect of the process of depersonalisation; there is a separation between the man who suffers and the mind that creates. The analogy is diagrammatically as follows:

Catalytic Reaction	Poetic Process
Catalyst	Mind of the poet
Reactants	Product
Emotions	Poem
+	
Feeling	

Impressions and experiences that are important to man may not find a place in poetry; and those which are present in the poem may be irrelevant to the life of the poet. Another point to be discussed is the quality of these emotions. A poet may have in his personal life only emotions that are simple, crude or flat. At the same time, the emotions expressed in his poetry may be very complex. An ordinary man may have in his life more complex emotions than those of a poet. Hence complexity of the emotion is not the criterion for excellence of poetic craft. The talent of a poet is his capacity to transform ordinary emotions into new art emotions.

ATTACK ON THE ROMANTIC CONCEPT OF POETIC PROCESS

Eliot attacks the well known Romantic dictum of the poetic process: 'emotions recollected in tranquility'. All the three components of the definition are modified by Eliot as follows.

- (a) It is not emotions but a number of experiences.
- (b) These experiences are not recollected; there is a process of concentration.

- (c) Poetic process is not a tranquil one; there is a kind of a pressure or 'heat' associated with it.

Eliot also refers to the 'spontaneity' of poetic process (Wordsworth spontaneous overflow of powerful emotions).

There is much that is conscious and deliberate in the poetic process. A bad poet is conscious where he should not be conscious, and is not conscious where he ought to be conscious. These errors make him personal. Eliot closes his essay with the oft quoted remark". Poetry is not a turning loose of emotion; but an escape from emotion; it is not the expression of personality; but an escape from personality".

1. What is the English attitude to traditions?
2. What is the attitude of the English towards the critical talent of the French?
3. What type of tradition is to be discouraged?
4. What are the characteristics of tradition?
5. Define historical sense.
6. What is meant by the presence of the past in the present?
7. What is meant by conformity between the old and the new?
8. How does Eliot prove that the present can influence the past?
9. What should the attitude of a poet toward the past be? How should he treat it?
10. What is the place of scholarship in the poetic talent?
11. The progress of an artist is a continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of personality'- Explain
12. What are the two aspects of the impersonal theory of poetry?
13. How does Eliot compare the poetic process to a catalytic reaction?

14. What decides the sublimity of the poetic process?
15. Define 'art emotion'.
16. How does Eliot attack the Romantic concept of the poetic process?
17. What is meant by 'significant emotion'?

TENSION IN POETRY

ALLEN TATE

Allen Tate made a clear distinction between scientific and literary discourses. He like John Crowe Ransom, was against the abstraction of science. He felt that an absolute scientific view is detrimental to actual human experience and held that all forms of literature have a moral and religious purpose.

Like other New Critics, Tate also was not free from a 'critical monism' viz, 'tension'. He lopped off the prefixes of the logical terms 'extension' and 'intension' and coined the term 'tension'. He believes that the life of a poem lies not in the denotative meaning (extension) or the connotative meaning (intention) but some where in between. In short the term 'tension' is synonymous with the life of poem.

The essay is included in "The Man of Letters in the Modern World: Selected Essays 1928-55".

Every poetic work has a distinct quality. The duty of a critic is to examine and evaluate the configuration of meaning and bring out this unique quality. The New critics in general are bent upon insisting on a single quality of poetic language. Allen Tate also follows the same method and adopts 'tension' as a quality common to all poetic works.

Before defining the term 'tension', the critic has a cursory glance over the present state of poetic language. He feels that because of the existence of a large variety of poetic forms, no single quality (like tension) may be sufficient to cover the entire realm of poetic language. the situation has become more complex because many poets are trying to escape from the deterioration of the common language by inventing private languages.

MASS LANGUAGE

One variety of language that Tate analyses is designated as mass language. mass language is the language of communication. Its use arouses an affective state in one set of terms; suddenly an object quite unrelated to these terms gets the benefits of it. The ultimate effect achieved is sentimentality. The defect of this use of mass language is that those who do not share the feeling of the poet find the work obscure. An instance of this type of poem is Miss. Millay's "justice Denied in Massachusetts". A reader without sufficient background information about the occasion of the poem finds it worthless.

Fallacy of communication: A disturbing trend in poetry that took its birth in 1798 is the fallacy of communication. The poets began to use verse to convey ideas and feelings. This trend also gave birth to a variety of poetry designated as 'Social Poetry'. The pseudo rationalism of social sciences caused a kind of sentimental indication and poetic language sank down in scale. ALlen tate analyses two poems. 'The Vine' by James Thomson and 'Hymn to Light' by Cowley to demonstrate two types of failure of poetic diction.

THE TWO TYPES OF FAILURES

'The Vine' is a failure in denotation: 'Hymn to Light' is a failure in connotation. The poets of the 19th gave up the language of tenotation to the scientists and kept for themselves a continually meaning flux of connotation the poets failed to realise that good

poetry is a nuity of all the meanings from the farthest extreme of denotation and connotation. Tate bases the second part of his extract this sound principle.

In this part of this essay Allen tate explains the term 'tension' which he proposes to use for the analysis of poetic language. two familiar terms associated with literary language are 'denotation' and connotation. 'Denotation refers to the dictionary meaning of term; connotation is the implied meaning. In literary criticism two more terms are used corresponding to these. they are 'extension' and 'intention'. Extension corresponds to denotation and intention corresponds to connotations.

Dictionary.....Denotation.....extension

Implied meaning.....Connotation.....intention

Focussing on extension or intention are two extreme methods in literary criticism. tate wants to evolve a method that is free from the two extremes, viz an emphasis on denotation or an emphasis on connotation. he coins a new term 'tension' by removing the prefixes 'ex' - and 'in'. According to him, the meaning of poetry lies in its tension which comprises of the full organised body of all extension and intention. There is an infinite line extending from extension to intention. The meaning that we select can be assigned to a point on this line, and our choice of the point will depend upon our drive or interest or approach. But we have to admit that the figurative significance (intention) of a poem need not invalidate the literal statement (extension) of a poem need not invalidate the literal statement (extension) or vice versa.

THE POEM

Intension Extension

Tate cites two examples. marvell's 'To His Coy Mistress' may appeal to a Platonist as a defence of immoral behaviour of young

men. This is so because of the emphasis on the literal meaning (extension) of the poem. But if we take into account the implied meaning (intension) also, we will be compelled to agree that the poem is also about sensuality and asceticism.

Another example is Donne's "A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning." The poet makes a statement that the souls of the two lovers are fused together to form a non-spatial entity that would not endure a breach. But the analogy of 'gold' causes some confusion. The finite image of the gold logically contradicts the intensive meaning but it does not invalidate that meaning. Gold is a malleable metal whose surface can always be extended towards infinity. Then the meaning of the poem becomes wholly absorbed into the image of gold. Here intension and extension merge into a single entity.

For a poet the valid limit of expression is his language. The metaphysical poet as rational begins at or near the extensive end; the romantic or the symbolist begins at the intensive end. But each tries to push his meaning towards the opposite end so as to occupy the entire scale. It is difficult to make a choice between the two strategies. Both at their best are great and incomplete.

III

The third part of the essay is devoted for the analysis of a traced from Dante's Comedy. The passage is a supreme example of tension. There is reference to the river Po in a poignant manner. The theme is the illicit love between Paolo and Francesca. Finally the river Po, pursued by its tributaries, becomes identified with Francesca pursued by her sins. The river becomes both a visual and auditory image. The final impact is that Sin, an abstract concept, becomes something that we can both hear and see.

The essay is not a logically concerned one. Allen Tate is always, like other New Critics, obsessed with a critical monism "tension". The

argument that he raises are not fully acceptance.

We also feel that the concept of tension is just a modified version of two quite familiar critical concepts of denotation and connotation.

Short Answer type Questions

1. What is mass language? What is its defect?
2. What is meant by fallacy of communication?
3. What is the characteristic feature of 'Social Poetry'?
4. Define 'denotation'
5. Define 'connotation'
6. What is meant by 'extension'?
7. What is meant by 'intension'?
8. How does Tate invent the concept of 'tension'?
9. What are the two poems quoted by Tate to discuss his concept of tension?
10. How does tension operate in the tercet quoted by Tate from Dante's Divine Comedy?

Prepared by

Prof. P. Damodaran
Govt. Victoria College,
Palakkad

CLEANTH BROOKS

THE LANGUAGE OF PARADOX

INTRODUCTION

Cleant Brooks (b. 1906) was one of the key figures in the rise of the New Criticism in America in the 'thirties and' forties and a leading light of that subgroup within the general movement known as the 'Fugitives' 'Southern Agrarians'. John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate and Robert Penn Warren were among the other distinguished writers in this group, whose principal organ was the *Southern Review*, edited from 1935-42 by Brooks and Warren. Their poetics derived from Eliot, Richards, Empson and Leavis, but in their right wing political views and more or less Orthodox Christianity they owed a special allegiance to Eliot. The text book anthologies edited by Brooks and Warren, *Understanding poetry* (New York, 1938) and *Understanding Fiction* (New York, 1943) were widely adopted in American Universities, and in the opinion of many judges were the principal media by which the orthodoxies of the New Criticism were transmitted to a whole generation of American students of literature.

Cleant Brooks was educated at Vanderbilt College and Tulane University in the United States, and later at Oxford. He was professor of English at Louisiana State University and later at Yale, as Gray Pro-

fessor of Rhetoric. From 1964 to 1966 he was cultural attache at the American Embassy in London. In addition to those already mentioned, his publications include *Literacy Criticism a Short History* (New York, 1957), written in collaboration with W.K. Wimsatt and William Faulkner the *Yoknapatawpha Country* (1963).

Cleant Brooks has been rightly described by his friend and contemporary J.C. Ransom as the most forceful and influential critic of poetry that we have. His *Understanding Poetry*, *Understanding Drama* etc. brought about a revolution in the art of teaching literature. He is perhaps the only critic who has taught the readers of poetry to make the kind of close analysis which would take them to the heart of a poem. He has accomplished this for a very large number of poems.

His critical theory, which is largely based on Eliot, Richards, Empson and Coleridge, is most clearly stated in 'Modern Poetry and the Tradition' and 'The Well Wrought Urn.' It shows a special awareness of the qualities that distinguish the so called 'metaphysical' poetry and looks for similar characteristics such as irony and paradox in all good poetry. One would do well however to remember that 'irony' and 'paradox' are so defined that they can take in a lot more than Donne.

Brooks is also one of the most controversial figures among modern critics; he has been the target of attack by scholars on the one hand and the neo-Aristotelians on the other. Douglas Bush finds him often perverse because he does not make use of the findings of scholarship. There is also the general charge that his poetics is anti-romantic. R.S. Crane and Yvor Winters have accused him of 'Critical monism'.

Brooks is, however, by any standard one of our best 'intrinsic' critics. He finds the locus of all meaning in the context of the poem, and in the words of the poem, and discovers this for us by employing a variety of heuristic devices among which 'irony' and 'paradox' are prominent. If the neo-Aristotelians found fault

with his 'monism', with his a prioristic allegiance of a single principle to judge and evaluate all kinds of poems, it was because they were unsympathetic to his normative poetics designed for all poetry. They were themselves wholly concerned with poem as 'unique structures' whose intrinsic status they would discover by applying a totally different set of inductive criteria. It is a moot point whether they succeeded at all in this. But the fact remains that Brooks has to his credit more applied criticism than all the neo-Aristotelian put together.

'The language of Paradox,' first published in 1942, subsequently appeared in a slightly revised form as the first chapter of Brooks's best known work. 'The swart Wrought Urn'-Studies in the structure of poetry (New York 1947). This essay is entirely characteristic of the New criticism in seeking a formula or category with which to identify the special character of literary language as the medium of a special kind of meaning or knowledge, not accessible to science and scientific discourse.

Also characteristic of the New Criticism is the way Brooks develops his generalisations out of close and subtle analysis of lyric poetry, and his choice of a metaphysical lyric (Donne's 'Canonization') for the most elaborate and exemplary treatment. The approach is antihistorical to the extent that it supposes the existence of some absolute quality in great poetry that transcends the conditions of particular cultural contexts. But, of course, Brooks is far from being innocent of historical knowledge or the ability to deploy it in criticism; and in his essay 'poetry' is made to stand for a value-saturated past that is contrasted with a debased and alien present. there is a certain connection here with the criticism of Leavis and 'Scrutiny'.

NEW CRITICISM

This term, made current by the publication of John Crowe Ransom's Book *The New Criticism* in 1941, came to be applied to a theory and practice that dominated American literary criticism until late in the

1960s. the movement derived in considerable part from elements, such as I.A. Richards "Principles of Literary Criticism" (1924) and "Practical Criticism" (1929), and from the critical essays of T.S. Eliot. It opposed the prevailing interest of scholars and critics of that era in the biographies of the authors, the social context of literature, and literary history by insisting that the proper concern of literary criticism is not with the external circumstances or effects of a work, but with a detailed consideration of the work itself. Notable critics in this mode were the southerners Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, whose text books 'Understanding Poetry' (1938) and 'Understanding Fiction' (1943) did much to make the New Criticism the reigning method of teaching literature in American colleges, and even in high schools, for the next two or three decades. Other prominent writers of that time in addition to Ransom. Brooks and Warren who are often identified as New Critics are Allen Tate, R.P. Blackmur, and William K. Wimsatt. William Empson from the other side of the Atlantic, has been a potent formative influence on the New Critics. It was the influence of Richards which made him a critic of literature.

The New Critics differ from one another in many ways, but the following points of view and procedures are common to many of them.

1. A poem, it is held, should be treated as such in Eliot's words, primarily as poetry and not another thing, and should therefore be regarded as an independent and self-sufficient verbal object. The first law of criticism, John Crowe Ransom said, "is that it shall be objective, shall cite the nature of the object" and shall recognise "the autonomy of the work itself as existing for its own sake". New critics warn the reader against critical practices which divert critical attention from the object itself. In analysing and evaluating a particular work they eschew reference to the biography of the author to the social condition at the time of its production or to its psychological and moral effects on the reader; they also tend to minimise recourse to the place of the work in the history of literary forms and subject matter.

Because of this critical focus on the literary work in isolation from its attendant circumstances and effects, the New Criticism is often classified as a type of Critical formalism.

2. The distinctive procedure of a new Critic is explication or close reading, the detailed and subtle analysis of the implied interrelations and ambiguities' (multiple meanings) of the components within a work. "Explication de text" has long been a formal procedure for teaching literature in French schools, but the kind of explicative analysis characteristic of the New Criticism derives from such books as I.A. Richard's 'Practical criticism' (1929) and William Empson's 'Seven type of Ambiguity' (1930)

3. The Principles of New Criticism are basically verbal. that is, literature is conceived to be a special kind of language whose attributes are defined by systematic opposition to the language of science and of practical and logical discourse and the explicative procedure is to analyse the meanings and interactions of words, figures of speech and symbols. the emphasis is on the "Organic Unity" of overall structure and verbal meanings, and we are warned against separating the two by what Cleanth Brooks has called "the heresy of paraphrases".

4. The distinction between literary genres, although recognized and used, does not play an essential role in the New Criticism. the essential components of any work of literature whether lyric, narrative or dramatic, are conceived to be words, images, and symbols rather than character, thought and plot. These linguistic elements are often said to be organized around a central and humanly significant theme and to manifest high literary value to the degree that they manifest 'tension', 'irony', and 'paradox' in achieving a reconciliation of diverse impulses or an 'equilibrium of opposed forces. The form of a work, whether or not it has characters and plot is said to be primarily a 'structure of meanings which evolve into an integral and free standing unity imply through a play and counter play on the matic imaginary'

and 'symbolic action'.

The basic orientation and modes of analysis in the New Criticism were adapted to the contextual criticism of Elisco Vivas and Murray Krieger who defined contextualism as the claim that the poem is a tight, compelling, finally closed context which prevents our escape to the world of reference and action beyond and required that we judge the work's efficacy as an aesthetic object.

Central instances of the theory and practice of New Criticism are Cleanth Brooks's, *The Well Wrought Urn* (1947) and W.K. Wimsatt's, *The Verbal Icon* (1954). Further light on the critical doctrines of the New Critics would be thrown by a detailed consideration of the work and achievement of individual critics, and this would be a better evaluation of the new Critical Strategies.

THE LANGUAGE OF PARADOX: A SUMMARY

A paradox is a self-contradictory statement or a statement which brings together opposite ideas, which, however, convey some essential truth. A paradox may also be defined as a statement contrary to accepted opinion. Hence, it may be apparently absurd and fantastic but a further reflection shows that it is essentially true. Sophisticated writers make extensive use of paradox to make their readers think and to drive home the truths they want to convey. In the very outset of the essay Cleanth Brooks presents the principal hypothesis that 'the language of poetry is the language of paradox'. The textual explication he engages thereafter subtly precipitates the hypothetical propositions as valid inferences.

Irony and wonder are the twin attributes of paradox. Both irony and paradox are indirect or oblique ways of expression and can be used only by the intellectual and witty. Paradox is the natural language of poetry and a poet cannot help being paradoxical.

Poetry is the language of the soul-an expression of the imagination

tion and emotion-while paradox is the expression of the intellect. We usually associate the terms 'irony' and 'paradox' with a writer like Chesterton: '...out prejudices force us to regard paradox as intellectual rather than emotional, clever rather than profound, rational rather than divinely irrational'. In fact paradox can also be emotional, irrational and profound.

Cleanth Brooks, obsessed with his 'Critical Monism,' then approaches many poems, analytically, to precipitate his theory that the language of poetry is the language of paradox'. Even such a simple and direct poet as Wordsworth cannot avoid using the language of paradox. A typical Wordsworthian poem is based on a paradoxical situation. In one of his better known poems the poet is out in Nature with a simple and innocent girl.

It is a beauteous evening, calm and free

The holy time is quiet as a nun

Breathless with adoration...

The poet is filled with worship, but the girl who walks beside him is not worshipping. The implication is that she should respond to the holy time and become like the evening itself, nun like; but she seems less worshipful than inanimate Nature itself.

If thou appear untouched by solemn thought,

Thy nature is not therefore less divine;

Thou liest in Abraham's bosom all the year;

And worship'st at the Temple's inner shrine,

God being with thee when we know it not.

The lyric is based upon a paradox and the paradox states an essential truth. She is divine and God's chosen, because she is in sympathy with all Nature and not merely with its more noble and solemn as-

pects; her unconscious sympathy is her unconscious worship. She is in communion with Nature, 'all the year' and her devotion is continual whereas that of the poet is sporadic and momentary.

After a close analysis Brooks points out a further paradox in the same lyric. The evening is compared to a nun and obviously the epithets 'quiet', 'calm', 'free' are the outward sign and symbol of the nun called evening. The holiness and innocence of the girl who, however, does not have these external trappings, nor who worships in any formal way, as does a nun, has her carefree innocence, itself a kind of continuous worship.

Another lyric of Wordsworth 'Upon Westminster Bridge' has a combination of irony and paradox.

Silent, bare,

Ships, towers, domes, theatres and temples lie

open unto the fields...

The details are huddled together and we get only a blurred picture. The charm of the lyric arises from the fact that it grows out of a paradoxical situation. Grim, feverish London was not expected by poet to have the charm, and hence his surprised exclamation.

Never did sun more beautifully steep /In his first splendour, valley,
rock or hill...

The 'smokeless air' reveals a city which the poet did not know existed: man made London is a part of Nature too, is lighted by the sun of Nature and lighted to a beautiful effect.

The river glide at his own sweet will...

A river is the most 'Natural' thing that one can imagine; it has the elasticity, the curved line of Nature itself. Uncluttered by barges, the river reveals itself as a natural thing, not at all disciplined into a rigid and mechanical pattern: It is like the daffodils, or the mountain brooks,

artless, and whimsical, and natural as they.

Dear God the very houses seem asleep;

And all that mighty heart's lying still:

The most exciting thing that the poet can say about the houses is that they are asleep. He has been in the habit of counting them dead-as just mechanical and inanimate; to say they are 'asleep' is to say that they are alive, they participate in the life of Nature. In the same way, the trite old metaphor which sees a great city as the pulsating heart of an empire becomes revived. It is only when the poet sees the city under the semblance of death that he can see it as actually alive, quick with the only life which he can accept, the organic life of 'Nature'.

THE PARADOX IN THE ROMANTIC PROGRAMME

The very poetics developed by the romantic apostles, Wordsworth and Coleridge was essentially paradoxical. Their purpose was to make the common look uncommon and to make 'the familiar look unfamiliar' Coleridge has beautifully summarised the whole thing. Wordsworth in short, was consciously attempting to show his audience that the common was really uncommon, the prosaic was really poetic. This is very much in tune with a paradoxical construction. The romantics were concerned with surprise and wonder.

THE NEO CLASSICAL USE OF PARADOXES

The neo-classical poets also made use of paradoxes in abundance. The romantics used them to arouse wonder, and awaken the mind and make it conscious of a new light and beauty in things ignored as common place and trivial. But the neo-classic use of paradox is highly ironical. Opposites are brought together to create the irony of the situation. Alexander Pope writes in his 'Essay on Man':

In doubt his mind or Body to prefer;

Born but to die, and reasoning but to err.

The paradoxes here are ironical, but Pope is trying to see man in a new light arousing wonder too.

BLAKE AND GRAY

Paradox which arouse both wonder and irony are more clearly mixed in the poetry of poets like Blake, Coleridge's 'Ancient mariner' and in 'Gray's Elegy'. The comparisons in Gray, startles, illuminates and shows the peasants in a new light. The paradox is ironical rather than a startling one.

Can storied Urn or animated bust

Back to its mansion call the fleeting breath?

I.A. Richards has pointed out that, the poet must use analogy and metaphor. There are subtle and complex states of emotion which cannot be communicated without the use of metaphor. The use of metaphor forces the poet to resort to the use of paradox. There are necessarily constant adjustments, contradictions and modifications, as Shakespeare has said, we. "By indirections find directions out"

DONNE AND HIS CANONISATION

There are certain poets who use paradox and irony consciously to gain a compression and precision which are not possible otherwise. Donne is one such poet and his poems are based on paradox and steeped in irony. The very title 'canonisation' reflects the paradox. Donne was not treating profane love as divine love nor as a parody of Christian sainthood. A careful reading of the poem shows that Donne takes both love and religion seriously. Through a detailed analysis of the poem Cleanth Brooks shows that the vein of irony is maintained throughout. In the first stanza it is shown that in rejecting life and through their total absorption in each other, the loves actually achieve a more intense life. This paradox has been hinted at in the phoenix metaphor and hence receives a powerful dramatisation. But the lovers in becoming hermits find that they have not lost the world, in-

stead they gained the world in each other.

Who did the whole world's soule contract, and drove

Into the glasses of your eyes.....

The image is that of a violent squeezing as by a powerful hand. The unworly lovers thus become the most "worldly" of all.

It is the paradox an dirony that provide the poem precision compression and effectiveness. Donne could have used the direct method. But "Canonization" goes beyond it and this could have been achieved only by the use of paradox.

Indeed, valuable insights can be conveyed only through the use of paradox with its twin aspects of wonder and irony. Religion makes constant use of it. Deprived of the character of paradox with its twin concomitance of irony and wonder Donne's poem unravels into "facts" biological, sociological and economic.

PARADOXES IN SHAKESPEARE

Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet" would be reduced to the very lowest level without the use of such oblique language.

For saints have hands that palmer's hands to touch

And palm to palm is holy pamer's kiss.

A paradox is a fusion or union of the opposite and the discordant. This fusion is brought about by the combination of the discordant and irreconcilable in new lights. Coleridge has well expressed this qualaity. "It reveals itself in the balance or reconciliation of opposite or discordant qualities; of sameness with difference....." Shakeapeare in one of his poems has given a description that oddly parallels that of Coleridge. A poet cannot do without paradox for in its very nature a paradox is bringing together of opposites and so is metaphor and so also is poetry.

In his "The Phoenix and the Turtle", Shakespeare has dwelt at

length on the magic power of the poetic imagination which unites and has constricted it with Reason which divides and separates.

It is poetry and poetry alone which brings about union of "beauty, Truth and Rarity". And the poet can bring about this rare fusion because he ia gifted with creative imagination which expresses itself through paradox and metaphor which may therefore just be called the natural languages of poetry.

MODEL QUESTIONS

1. Discuss. "The language of poetry is the Language of parados"
2. The Romantic and neo-classical use of paradox
3. Brook's analysis of Donne's "Canonisation".
4. Cleanth Brooks as a new Critic (Cite the new critical strategies)

Prepared by:

Pramod Vellachal S.N. College, Kannur

Northrop Frye

The Archetypes of Literature

Introduction

Northrop (Frye (b.1912) was born in Canada and Studied at Toronto University and Merton college, Oxford moving in to the field of literature after beginning as a student of theology. His first major publication was "Fearful Symmetry" a study of William Blake (1947) but it was the "Anatomy of Criticism" (1957) that firmly established him as one of the most brilliant, original and influential of modern critics.

Like many modern critics from I.A. Richards onwards, he is impatient with the confusions and contradictions of most extant literary criticism, and believes that it should acquire something of the mythological discipline and coherence of the sciences. This in his view, can only be attained by assuming a total coherence in criticism based on a hypothesis about literature of all periods and cultures. This theory is expounded with characteristic lucidity, economy and wit in "The Archetypes of Literature" (1951) much

of which was later incorporated into the *Anatomy*. Literature as Context Milton's *Lycidas*" (1959) as a virtuoso demonstration of Frye's method applied to a single text.

Frye's work has aroused considerable controversy. In particular, his scorn for value judgements, which he consigns to the 'history of taste' has aroused deep hostility among those critics for whom evaluation has always been the raison of detre literary studies. In fact Frye's difference with such critics is not as irreconcilable as it might seem, for he has simply transferred the concept of value from the individual work to the collective work; The total order of words that is literature. Few critics have in fact made such large claims for literature as Frye: Literature intitiates the total dream of man....., he writes in the *Anatomy*, "Poetry unites total rityual, or unlimited social action, with total dream or unlimited individual thought.

Other objections to Frye's criticism are that it is excessively schematic, that it neglects the historical, particular, verbally unique aspects of literary artefacts, and that archetypal criticism, so far from being scientific, is neither verifiable Frye is well able to defend himself against such charges, and has observed reasonably enough that, "many who consider the structure of my view of literature repellent find useful parenthetic insights in me. But the insights would not be there unless the structure were there too"! He is certainly one of the most stimulating, cultured and witty of contemporary literary critics.

ARCHETYPAL CRITICISM

Archetypal criticism as an important antecedent of the literary theory of the archetype was the treatment of myth in writings by a group of comparative anthropologists at Cambridge University, especially James G. Frazer's *The golden Bough* (1880-1915), which identified clemental patterns of myth and ritual that, it claimed, recur in the legends and ceremonies of many diverse and far-flung cultures. Another antecedent was the depth psychology of Carl G. Jung (1875-1961) who applied the term "archetype" to

what he called "primordial images" the "psychic residue" of repeated patterns of experience in the lives of our very ancient ancestors which, he maintained, survive in the "collective unconscious" of human race and are expressed in myth, religion, dreams, and private fantasies, as well as in works of literature.

Archetypal literary criticism was given great impetus by coud Bodkin's "*Archetypal Patterns in Poetry*" (1934), and flourished especially during the 1950's and 1960's. In criticisms the term 'archetype' denotes recurrent narrative designs, pattern of action, character types, or images which are said to be dreams, and even ritualized modes of social behaviour. Such archetypes help to reflect a set of universal, primitive, and elemental mental forms or patterns, whose effective embodiment in a literary work evokes a profound response from the reader. Some archetypal critics have tracked the source of these patterns. In the words on Northrop Frye, this theory is "an unnecessary hypothesis". And the recurrent archetypes are simply there. "however they got there".

Among the prominent practioners of various modes of archetypal criticism, in addition of Maud Bodkin, are G. Wilson Knight, Robert Graves, Philip Wheelwright, Richard Chase and Joseph Campbell.

The critics tend to emphasize the occurance of mythical patterns in literature, on the assumption that myths are closer to the elemental archetype than the artful manipulations of sophisticated writers.

In the remarkable and influential bok the "*Anatomy of Criticism*" (1957), Northrop Frye developed, with the typological interpretation of the Bible and the conception of the imagination in the writings of the poet and painter William Blake (1757-1827) a radical and comprehensive division of traditional grounds both of the theory of literature and the practice of literary criticism. Frye proposes that the totality of literary works constitute a "self-contained literary universe" which has been created over the ages by human imagination

so as to incorporate the alien and indifferent world of nature into persisting archetypal forms that serve to satisfy enduring human desires and needs.

However, it would be wrong to suppose that Archetypal Criticism necessarily goes back to specific myths; it may discover cultural patterns which assume a mythic quality in their permanence within a particular culture. This is what Northrop Frye has done in "The Archetypes of Literature"

THE ARCHETYPES OF LITERATURE - SUMMARY

At the very outset Frye states that science is a systemized and organized body of knowledge, and Nature is the object of its study. Similarly, literary criticism is also a systematised and organised body of knowledge and literature is the object of its study. Literary criticism therefore, being an organised and systematised body of knowledge is at least partly a science, the science which has literature as its object of study.

The principles by which one can distinguish a significant from a meaningless statement in criticism are not clearly defined. Therefore, the first step is to recognize and get rid of meaningless criticism. Yet this kind of scientific criticism is centrifugal, i.e. it takes us away from literature which is its centre of study. Literature is the centre of what are called "The humanities", with philosophy on the one side of it, and history on the other side. A literary critic at present has to depend both on history and philosophy, which provide a sort of back ground to critical study. It is, therefore, essential that there is some central pattern or principle of organization so that criticism may acquire the status of an independent science which studied literature. "Such a pattern can be provided by the Archetypes of literature; hence arises the importance and significance of the archetypes of literature approach. Such a pattern would make criticism to art what philosophy is to wisdom and history is to action.

Textual or formalistic methods study the impact of a book on the

reader and the work of art always remains at the centre of their study. They seek to teach literature through a structural analysis of the work concerned. The one great weakness of such a textual approach is that it is conceived as an antithesis to the centrifugal or "background" approach and so it goes to the other extreme and hence ignores the background totally. It does not provide any explanation as to how the structure came to be what it is, it merely analyses that structure. A co-ordinating principle, a principle which will co-ordinate both the background and the structural approaches is necessary. Hence there should be a central hypothesis which, like the theory of evolution in biology, will see the phenomena it deals with as parts of a single whole. Such a positive organizing principle can be provided by the archetypal approach.

Criticism cannot be a unified and systematised body of knowledge unless it acquired unity and coherent form, and such unity can be imparted by a study of the roots of myths, symbols, and images from primitive cultures used by poets today. Northrop Frye says "the search for archetypes is a kind of literary anthropology, concerned with the way that literature is informed by pre-literary categories such as rituals, myth and folklore. Literature thus spreads out from a simple centre in primitive culture and grows more complex with the passing of time.

There are two methods which may be followed by the critic of literature. First there may be the structural analysis of a work of art and on the basis of such an analysis the critic may proceed inductively, i.e. from particular truths to general truths, and this builds up larger patterns and theories. It is called the inductive method. The second method is deductive, that is to say that of drawing particular truths from the general and larger patterns and theories. Neither of these two methods alone is sufficient, one must be corrected and supplemented by the other.

Under an inductive critical analysis, if it is a successful work then the artist must have been able to cut off his personality entirely from

it. There should be a complete effacement of his self, of his ego, of his private memories, experience and emotions. A psychological approach reveals that the artist has his own private symbols, myths and images of which he may himself be unconscious but their existence is reality and it is revealed by the psychological approach.

The critic has also to examine why a particular work has assumed a particular form, and this leads to a study of genres. There are two approaches to this problem and according to Frye both of them are misleading. "One is the pseudo-Platonic conception of genres as existing prior to and independently of creation. Which confuses them with mere conventions of form like the sonnet. The other is that pseudo biological conception of them as evolving species which turns up in so many surveys of the development of this or that form". These difficulties can be removed, to a very great extent, by the archetypal approach. The archetypal approach unifies and harmonizes the different approaches and shows that they all converge to the same centre. It is centripetal and not centrifugal. For example, the literary anthropologist who chases the sources of the Hamlet(legend) from the pre Shakespearian play to Saxo and from Saxo to nature myths, is not running away from Shakespeare.

Literature is closely similar both to music and painting. Like music it has a rhythm. The pattern of literature is its verbal structure which conveys to the readers its meaning or significance. We hear or listen to a narrative, but when we grasp a writer's total pattern we "see" what he means. It is wrong to suppose that the narrative is merely a sequential representation of events in an outside life and that the verbal pattern that of some external "idea." Northrope Frye calls it "the representational fallacy", for it misrepresents its real nature and significance. The learned critic ultimately arrives at the general truth that there is calls integration between the human and the non-human, between the world of man and the world of Nature, between human ritual and the cyclical change in Nature, and all literature is an

expression of the consciousness of such harmony or integration of man and his environment.

The verbal patterns or patterns of imagery are an expression of the writer's epiphany i.e of his flashes of comprehension, or his seeing into the heart of things in moments of inner illumination. Expressions of such flashes of inner illumination assume the form of proverbs, riddles, commandments and folk tales or parables. However, by the time they assume such forms, a considerable element of narrative is added to them. Such verbal patterns are also encyclopaedic, and together they build up a total structure of significance of doctrine, which is then communicated through narrative.

The myth is the central informing power that gives archetypal significance to the ritual and archetypal narrative to flashes of inner illumination. Hence the myth is the archetype, though it might be convenient to call it myth only when referring to narrative and archetype when speaking of significance. In the solar cycle of the day, the seasonal cycle the year and the organic cycle of human life, there is the single pattern of significance out of which myth constructs a central narrative around a figure who is partly the sun, partly vegetative fertility and partly a god or archetypal human being. The central significance of the myth has been stressed by Jung and Frazer, and more and more writers are now working along these lines. The different phases of such myths may be summarized as follows.

1. The dawn, spring and birth phase. Thus we get myths of the birth of the hero, of revival and resurrection of creation, and (because the four phases are a cycle) of the defeat of the powers of darkness and death. Subordinate characters are introduced such as the father and the mother. Such myths are the archetype of romance and of most lyric poetry.

2. The zenith, summer and marriage or triumph phase. Such are the myths of apotheosis, of the sacred marriage, and of entering into

Paradise. Subordinate characters in such myths are the companion and the bride. These myths are the archetypes of comedy, pastoral and idyll.

3. The sunset, autumn and death phase. Myths of fall, of the dying god, of violent death, and sacrifice and of the isolation of the hero. Subordinate characters introduced are the siren and the traitor. These myths are the archetypes of tragedy and elegy.

4. The darkness, winter and dissolution phase. Myths of the triumph of these powers, myths of floods and return of chaos, and of the defeat of the hero. Subordinate characters introduced are the ogre and the witch. These myths are the archetypes of satire.

Thus Northrop Frye has divided all myths into four categories and has stressed that they recur in and form the basis of all great works of literature.

Instead, it is with reference to them that literature has come to be divided into different genres such as (1) the romance and the Lyric, (2) Comedy, Pastoral and idylls (3) Tragedy and the elegy and (4) Satire.

Model Questions:

1. Discuss how Frye is evolving a new critical approach in his "Archetypes of Literature".
2. "The search for archetypes is a kind of literary anthropology"- Discuss
3. Describe Frye's Inductive and deductive methods.

Prepared by:

Pramod Vellachal

S.N. College, Kannur

VICTOR SHKLOVSKY ART AS TECHNIQUE

INTRODUCTION

Victor Shklovsky (b. 1893) was a leading figure in the school of literary and linguistic theory known as Russian formalism, which flourished in the immediately pre and post-revolutionary period in Russia. Two groups of scholars and students were involved the Moscow Linguistic Circle, whose most famous member was Roman Jakobson and the opayaz group based in St. Petersburg, which was more interested in literary criticism, and whose leader was Victor Shklovsky. Both groups were committed to the study and support of experimental, avant-garde literature and art. Shklovsky's 'Art as Technique' first published in 1917, was described by Boris Eikhenbaum, another member of the opayaz group, as 'a kind of manifesto of the Formal Method'.

Shklovsky's essay begins with a polemic against the symbolist school of poets and critics especially their chief theoretical spokesman Potebnya. Russian symbolism was evidently not identical to the French symbolist movement of the late nineteenth century, which has such a profound effect on English and American modernist writing, though they clearly had a common origin in romantic poets. In any case, it is not necessary to be familiar with Russian symbolism in order to appreciate the more

formal less idealist character of Shklovsky's approach to the question of what makes poetry poetic.

In a significant aside, Shklovsky praises another writer, Jakobson for producing one of the first examples of 'Scientific Criticism'. This dream (or mirage), of making the study of literature, an exact science, inspires the tradition that ran from the Russian formalists, via the Prague school of the 1930's, to the exponents of Structuralism in Western Europe in the 1960's and 70's. It had its equivalent in England and America in the efforts of the New critics, from I.A. Richards to W.K. Wimsatt, to make literary criticism a more precise and objective discipline. There is an obvious parallel between Shklovsky's distinction between poetic and prose language and I.A. Richards's distinction between emotive and referential language.

Shklovsky's crucially important concept of defamiliarization (making strange) is, however, essentially structuralist in that it treats literary technique, as Saussure had treated language, as a "system of differences". What startles us into a new way of seeing is a new way of saying, and we can only appreciate the novelty of that against what is habitual and expected in any given context.

The focus of Russian formalists upon the medium rather than the message of literary artefacts brought it into conflict with the official ideology of post Revolutionary Russia, and under Stalin it was suppressed. Most of its exponents were silenced, or forced into exile. Shklovsky however, by a judicious revision of his views, managed amazingly to survive as a practising scholar and critic into the 1980's.

RUSSIAN FORMALISM

Russian formalism is a type of literary theory and analysis which originated in Moscow and Petrograd in the second decade of the 20th century. At first, opponents of the movement applied the term 'formalism' derogatorily because of its focus on the format patterns and technical devices of literature to the exclusion of its subject matter and social values; later, however, it became

simply a neutral designation. Among the leading representatives of the movement were Boris Eichenbaw. Victor Shklovsky and Roman Jakobson. When this critical mode was suppressed by the Soviets in the early 1930's the centre of the formalist study of literature moved to Czechoslovakia, where it was continued especially by members of the Prague Linguistic Circle, which included Roman Jakobson, Jan Mukarovsky and Rene Welleck.

The initial impetus was provided by the Futurists whose artistic efforts before the First World War were directed against decadent bourgeois culture and especially against the anguished soul-searching of the symbolist movement in poetry of poets such as Brinsov who insisted that the poet was 'the guardian of the mystery'. In place of the "absolute", Mayakovsky, the extrovert Futurist poet, offered the noisy materialism of the machine age as the home of poetry.

However, it should be noted that the Futurists were as opposed to Realism, as the symbolists had been their slogan of the 'self sufficient world' placed a stress on the self contained sound patterning of words as distinct from the ability to refer to things. The Futurists threw themselves behind the Revolution and emphasised the artist's role as (proletarian) producer of crafted objects. Dimitriev declared that 'the artist is now simply a constructor and technician, a leader and foreman'. The constructivists took these arguments to their logical extreme and entered actual factories to put into practice their theories of 'production art'.

From this background the Formalists set about producing a theory of literature concerned with the writer's technical prowess and craft skill. They avoided the proletarian theories of the poets and artists, but they retained a somewhat mechanistic view of the literary process. Shklovsky was as vigorously materialistic in his attitude as Mayakovsky. The former's famous definition of literature as the 'sum total of all stylistic devices employed in it' sums up well the early phase of formalism.

The formalists technical focus led them to treat literature as a

special use of language which achieves its distinctness by deviating from and distorting practical language. Practical language is used for acts of communication, while literary language has no practical function at all and simply makes use of language for its constructed quality. Poetry was treated by the formalists as the quaint, essentially literary use of language; it is "speech organised in its entire phonic texture."

'ART AS TECHNIQUE' SUMMARY

Shklovsky, at the very outset of his essay, says that, the maxim, "Art is thinking in images" are nevertheless the starting point for the erudite philologists, who are beginning to put together some kind of systematic literary theory. Alexander Potebnya is partly responsible for spreading the idea that, without imagery, there is no art. He also added that poetry as well as prose, is first and foremost a special way of thinking and knowing. Hence it permits what is generally called economy of mental effort; a way which makes for a sensation of the relative ease of the process and aesthetic feeling is considered a reaction to this economy. This is how Dimitry Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky, faithfully summarized the ideas of Potebnya. According to Potebnya: (1) "the image is the fixed predicate of that which undergoes change, the unchanging means of attracting what is perceived as changeable and (2) the image is far clearer and simpler than what it clarifies.

The words of Potebnya, if put in another way, may read that the imagery is unnecessary for thought and we must be more familiar with the image than with what it clarifies. But Fyodor Tyutcher's and Nicholas Gogol's bold use of imagery cannot be accounted for by Potebnya's theory. Shklovsky is arguing that writers frequently gain their effects by comparing the common place to the exceptional rather than vice versa. Tyutchev compared summer lightning to deaf and dumb demons and Gogol compared the sky to the garment of God.

Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky attempted to evaluate music, architecture

and lyric poetry as imageless thought. He assigned lyric poetry, architecture and music to a special category of imageless art and defined them as lyric arts, having a direct appeal to the emotions. The maxim 'Art is thinking in images' has survived, especially among the theorists of the symbolist movement.

Images change little and they belong to no one. They are 'the Lords'. What matters in poetry is the techniques that poets discover and share and hence arranging images is more important than creating them.

An expression which is thought to be poetic and to be created for aesthetic pleasure may sometimes be created without such an intent. Annensky's opinion that the Slavic languages are poetic and Andrey Bely's ecstasy over the technique of placing adjectives after nouns, a technique used by the 18th century Russian poets, are to be considered here. And hence a work may be intended as prosaic and accepted as poetic or intended as poetic and accepted as prosaic. What is significant here is the mode of perception and what is referred to by a work of art is works created by special techniques designed to make the works as is obviously artistic as possible.

Potebnya's conclusion can be formulated as 'poetry equals imagery', gave rise to the whole theory that 'imagery equals symbolism'. This conclusion intrigued some of the leading representatives of the symbolist movement like Andrey Bely, Merezhkovsky. The conclusion according to Shklovsky stems from the fact that Potebnya failed to make a distinction between the language of prose and the language of poetry. He really ignored the fact that there are two aspects of imagery; imagery as a practical means of thinking, as a means of placing objects within the categories; and imagery as poetic, as a means of reinforcing an impression. If one wants to attract the attention of a little girl who is eating bread and butter and getting the butter on her fingers and calls 'Hey, Butter

fingers', it will be clearly a prosaic trope. The child is playing with glasses and drops them and if one calls, 'Hey, butter fingers,' then it will be a poetic trope.

Poetic imagery is a means of creating the strongest possible impression. In Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy's 'Language and Art' a little girl calls a ball a little watermelon. Poetic imagery is but one of the devices of poetic language. Prose imagery is a means of abstraction.

Herbert Spencer's law of the economy of creative effort is also a generally accepted one and Richard Avenarius has also supported this view with his stress on the least expenditure of energy. Alexander Veselovsky acknowledged this principle and said, 'a satisfactory style is precisely that style which delivers the greatest amount of thought in the fewest words'. Andrey Bely also talked about the law of the economy of creative effort in his book.

According to Shklovsky, all these ideas about the law and aim of creativity may sometimes be true in their application to practical language. Moreover, Leo Jakubinsky, in his article, has indicated inductively the contrast between the laws of poetic language and the laws of practical language.

Normally speaking, perception becomes habitual and hence automatic; all our habits retreat into the area of the unconsciously automatic; In ordinary speech we leave phrases and words half expressed. In this process, as in algebra, things are replaced by symbols. Alexander Pogodin gives the example of a boy considering the sentence. "The Swiss Mountains are beautiful" in the form of a series of letters. T.S. m, a, b. In this algebraic method, we can understand objects only as shapes with imprecise extensions. It is the main characteristics and configuration that helps, but it is only a shadowy form. The process of algebrization, and the over automatization of an object makes the greatest economy of mental effort.

But Shklovsky says that the purpose of art is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known. The technique of art is to make objects unfamiliar, to make forms difficult, to increase the length and perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged. "Art is a way of experiencing the artfulness of an object, the object is not important".

Though we see an object several times, we do not see it actually. Art has to remove objects from automatism of perception in many ways. One such instance can be seen in Leo Tolstoy, the writer who for Merezhkovsky at least, seems to present things as if he himself saw them. Tolstoy achieves this by not naming the familiar object. When he describes he is doing it as if he were seeing it for the first time. In "Shame" Tolstoy defamiliarizes the idea of flogging in this manner. The familiar act of flogging is made unfamiliar without changing its nature. Tolstoy is constantly practising this technique of defamiliarization. The narrator of "Kholstomer" is a horse's and it is the horse's point of view that makes the story unfamiliar. The horse is killed before the end of the story, but the manner of the narrative, its technique, is not changing. Thus we can see at the end of the story. Tolstoy continues to use the technique even though the motivation for it is gone. In war and peace too Tolstoy uses the same technique in describing whole battles as if battles were something new. In "Resurrection," he describes the city and the court in the same way. He uses a similar technique in "Kreutzer Sonata" when he describes marriage - 'Why, if people have an affinity of souls, must they sleep together?'

The very technique of defamiliarization is not Tolstoy's alone. Shklovsky says that defamiliarization can be seen almost everywhere form is found. So the difference between Potebnya and Shklovsky is that an image is not a permanent referent for those mutable complexities of life. Its purpose is to create a special perception of

the object. It creates a vision of the object instead of serving as a means for knowing it.

The purpose of imagery in erotic art can be studied more accurately Gogol's 'Christmas Eve' provides such an example. Erotic subjects can also be presented figuratively with the obvious purpose of leading us away from their 'recognition'. Sexual organs are referred to in terms of lock and key or quilting tools or bow and arrows. Quite often in literature, the sexual act itself is defamiliarised. That is to transfer the usual perception of an object into the sphere of a new perception and to make a unique semantic modification.

We can see the artistic trade mark everywhere in studying poetic speech in its phonetic and lexical structure as well as in its characteristic distribution of words. It is made so to avoid the automatism of perception. The author's purpose is to create deautomatized vision. A work artistically created is to make greatest possible effect through the slowness of perception. The language of poetry is a difficult, roughened and impeded language.

Russian literary language was originally foreign to Russia, but it has now blended with their conversation. A tendency to use dialects is seen. Maxim Gorky is changing his diction from the old literary language to the new literary colloquialism of Leskov. Literary language and ordinary speech have been changing their place and Khlebnikov was trying to create a proper poetic language. Hence we can define poetry as attenuated, tortuous speech.

Commenting on rhythm Spencer that "if the syllables be rhythmically arranged, the mind economizes its energies by anticipating the attention required for each syllable. According to Shklovsky Spencer's conclusion suffers from the confusion of the laws of poetic and prosaic language. The rhythm of prose is hence an important automatizing element and the rhythm of poetry is not. It is not the systematization, but disordering beyond prediction and that may roughen the language and make it "defamiliar".

MODEL QUESTIONS

1. Consider Shklovsky as a Russian formalist.
2. "Art is a way of experiencing the artfulness of an object, the object is not important" - Discuss

Prepared by:

Pramod Vellachal

SECTION C
INDIAN AESTHETICS
THE THEORY OF RASA

Rasa can be regarded as the cornerstone of Indian aesthetics as there is no aesthetician in India who has not recognised its importance in poetry and drama. It was Bharata, the mythical author of 'Natyasastra' who recognised the pivotal position of Rasa in aesthetics for the first time. Bharata also analysed the constituent elements which give rise to the experience of Rasa. In the sixth chapter of Natyasastra, an encyclopaedic work covering all aspects of the theatre, Bharata deals at length with Rasanipatti, the process of the genesis of Rasa through his famous Rasasutra, the aphorism of Rasa. Bharata's Rasasutra is the aphorism on Rasa. Bharata's Rasasutra is "vibhavanubhavavyabharisamyogad rasanipattih" i.e., the genesis of Rasa occurs out of the combination of Vibhavas, Anubhavas and Vyabharibhavas.

The technical terms used in this definition require some explanation. Vibhava broadly stands for all the causes, direct and circumstantial, which are responsible for the arousal of an emotion. It has two aspects, the Alambana and the Uddipana. The former stands for the person or persons with reference to whom an emotion is aroused. The latter represents all the background

features which enhance the emotion. To illustrate, in Kalidasa's "Sakuntala", Sakuntala can be said to be the Alambana of Dusyanta's love, whereas the beautiful surroundings of the hermitage, the flora and fauna, the river Malini etc. are the Uddipana Vibhavas. The apparition of the dagger, similarly, is the Alambana of Macbeth's fear, and the stark midnight and strange sounds around the Uddipana.

Anubhava literally means that which causes the experience and refers to the psychophysical manifestations of emotions which are their means of communication. In the case of love, longing glances, sighs and smiles can be regarded as the Anubhava. Shouting, clenching the fist and the teeth etc., are the Anubhavas of anger. Anubhavas are represented through acting on the stage, but in poetry proper they can only be described in words and left to the imagination of the reader. That is why drama has always a more universal appeal.

Vyabharibhava means a transitory emotion which is directed towards the basic main emotion. Bharata recognises eight basic emotions only. They are Rati (love), Hasa (comic), Soka (pathos), Utsaha (heroic), Krodha (fury), Bhaya (fear), Jugupsa (disgust) and Vismaya (wonder). Later poeticians speak about Sama (calm) also as the ninth basic emotion. These principal emotions are always Vyabharibhavas. If the basic mental state can be compared to an ocean, the transitory emotion is like a wave which finally resolves into it. Transitory emotions like bashfulness (Lajja) and weariness (glani), thus enhance the basic emotions of love and disappear after their momentary presence. Similarly, a woman separated from her lover, being afflicted with love, may be tossed by different transitory emotions like disappointment at his prolonged absence, anxiety about his condition, jealousy at his intimacy with other women and so on. These transitory mental states

are like fumes in continuous emission of gas and little flames which come and go generating the impression of a continuous flame. Rasa is, thus, an aesthetically aroused dominant sentiment nourished by transitory mental states.

Bharata does not elaborate upon how the combination of vibhavas etc. results in the genesis of Rasa or what exactly is the nature of Samyoga (combination) and Nispatti (genesis) mentioned in the Rasasutra. This had led to diverse interpretations of the Rasasutra, the most important of them being that of Bhatta Lollata, Sankuka, Bhattanayaka and Abhinavagupta. These aestheticians tried to explain the precise nature of the aesthetic emotion and its exact relationship with ordinary emotion which we experience in our real life. It is very important to note that aesthetic emotion (Rasa) is painstakingly differentiated from the basic mental state (Sthayibhavan) by Bharata who uses the words Sringara (love), Karuna (pathos), Vira (heroic), Hasya (humourous), Raudra (furious), Bhayanaka (fearful), Adbhuta (wonder) and Bibhatsa (repugnance) to denote the former in contrast with the words like Rati, Soka etc. mentioned before that used to denote the basic mental state. Most of the commentators of Bharata have explained how the basic emotion develops into the aesthetic emotion in aesthetic contemplation.

BHATTA LOLLATA

Lollata seems to be the representative of the old poetics in general. His views on Rasa are almost identical with those of the early authors like Dandin. Unfortunately, his views as well as those of the other commentators of Natyasastra except those of Abhinavagupta are available only through citations. Lollata seems to have maintained that Rasa, the aesthetic emotion is generated in the fictional characters like Dusyanta and Sakuntala, because of the combined function of the Vibhavas etc. described in poetry and represented in drama. He conceives of the Rasa as a climactic state reached by the basic emotion. The Vibhavas are the causes, the

Anubhavas are the effects and the Vyabharibhavas are the catalysts so far as the basic mental state is concerned. Even though it primarily exists in the character, it is also superimposed on the actor who tries to effect an imaginative identification with the character. Unfortunately, Lollata has nothing to offer by way of explanation for the aesthetic experience of the reader or the spectator.

Many later authors have detected several loopholes in Lollata's theory. Lollata believed that there is a cause-effect relationship between Vibhavas and the Rasa. But Mammata points out that this cannot be substantiated. Mammata examines several options available in this position and points out their weaknesses. The relationship between Vibhava and Rasa is not the cause-effect relationship which exists between the manufacturer and the product, because while the product exists even after the destruction of its manufacturer, Rasa cannot exist if the Vibhavas etc. are removed. Nor can be Vibhavas etc. be regarded as the communicative agent of Rasa. A communicative agent like smoke can cause the cognition of an object like fire if the fire exists already. But Rasa is not a ready-made object available before its cognition. Rasa actually exists only when Vibhavas etc. are present. It exists only as an experience and not as a objective reality independent of our cognition. The sub-consciously existing emotional instincts themselves cannot be regarded as Rasa proper, and they acquire the status of Rasa only when aesthetically aroused and enjoyed. These niceties are not at all accountable in Lollata's explanations.

SANKUKA

Sankuka rejected Lollata's argument that Rasa is a heightened state of the basic emotion. He pointed out that emotions like sorrow, anger and love are seen diminishing in strength with the passage of time rather than growing more intense with the help of Vibhavas etc. as Lollata would imagine. Sankuka maintains that Rasa is actually inferred by the spectator as existing in the actor identified as character. The inference is prompted by Vibhavas etc. presented in drama. Sankuka

likens the identification of the actor with the character to the identification made between a picture of a horse and the actual horse. Even though we fully realise that the picture is different from the real horse, we may refer to the picture as the horse itself. Similarly, in the theatre, when the spectator encounters the actor, he has no problem in imaginatively identifying the latter with the character whom he represents. Thus aesthetic experience cannot be categorically described as real or unreal, since it partakes the characteristics of both. Sankuka's theory goes by the name of Anumitivada (inference theory) and the model provided by him to explain the cognition of the emotion in the actor/character is similar to the inferential knowledge like 'The hill has fire since it has smoke.' In other words, we understand the emotion of the character when we perceive the circumstances prompting such an emotion.

BHATTANAYAKA

Bhattacharya, one of the greatest aestheticians of ancient India gave an entirely new complexion to the problem of Rasa by projecting its experiential aspect. He points out that emotions in our real life are experienced either as belonging to oneself or as belonging to others. We are singularly involved in our emotions and feel them in the most personal manner. On the other hand, we may feel indifference, hostility, or sympathy to other people's emotions on the basis of our attitude to them. In any case, we cannot enjoy, relish or contemplate emotions in our real life, because they are intensely personal. But the selfsame emotions, when imaginatively expressed, are a source of joy for the reader or the spectator. According to Bhattacharya, any satisfactory aesthetic theory has to come to terms with this problem. Precisely it is here that all the earlier theories fail, and Bhattacharya proposes to unravel the mystery with the help of his ingenious theory called Bhuktivada (Enjoyment theory). It is a pity that his celebrated work *Hydayadarpara* has not come down to us and his theory has to be reconstructed from the scattered references in *Abhinavagupta*, who

seems to have been greatly influenced by illustrious predecessor.

Bhattacharya maintains that it is necessary to postulate two more functions to poetic language, in addition to its referential function (*Abhidha*) for a satisfactory explanation of the aesthetic experience. There is a process of de-individualisation or universalisation (*Sadharanikarana*) in poetry and theatre by means of which the purely personal elements of the characters disappear and the poetic theme assumes universal stature. Bhattacharya argues that heroes like *Dusyanta* and *Rama* cease to exist as ordinary individuals separated from the reader in space and time and become transformed into universal realm by virtue of which we are able to transcend our own personal barriers and identify with them in aesthetic contemplation. Art uplifts life from its personal details into universality because of this process and the power which enables art to perform this magic is called *Bhavakatva*. This imaginative contemplation further leads one to the consummation of the aesthetic experience, which Bhattacharya describes as an enjoyment. A picturesque account of this aesthetic experience is given by Bhattacharya who goes to the extent of linking it with the blissful experience of self-realization. During this process, the reader's mind, transcending all the mundane concerns, becomes purified, with the transparent *satvik* element gaining an upper hand and suppressing the *tamasaic* and *rajasaic* elements. Bhattacharya visualises the human mind as the mirror within which reflects the soul shining in its natural way. In ordinary life, the mirror is tainted by the impurities caused by its elements *Rajas* and *Tamas*, which are dark, inert forces dragging it into impurity. But during self-realisation and, to a less degree, during aesthetic contemplation, these elements, are superseded by *Satva* and the mind becomes pure and capable of conveying the blissful nature of the self. The aesthetic experience is therefor blissful in nature and second only to the ultimate experience of the realisation of the self. The poetic function which triggers this experience is called *Bhojakatva*.

The main contributions of Bhattanayaka to aesthetics are his doctrine of Sadharanikarana, the three-tier function of poetry and the conception of Rasa as a subjective experience similar to self-realisation.

ABHINAVAGUPTHA

Abhinavaguptha, who is given the most exalted position among Bharata's interpreters by later poetics, evolved a comprehensive aesthetic philosophy developing the Dhvani doctrine of Anandavardhana and accommodating the aesthetic principles of Bhattanayaka. Abhinavagupta's standpoint is that the suggestive function (vyanjana) of language, postulated in the Dhvani theory can itself account for the aesthetic experience and hence there is no necessity to postulate the functions of Bhavakatva and Bhojakatva as is done by Bhattanayaka. He, however, like Bhattanayaka accepts the process of the de-individualisation and also recognises the basic affinity of the aesthetic experience with spiritual experience. The chief merit of Abhinavagupta's aesthetic theory consists of the convincing manner in which it has explained all the perplexing issues in aesthetics raised by Bhattanayaka, without compromising the basic tenets of Dhvani doctrine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Abhinavagupta came to be looked upon as the most authentic aesthetician of ancient India.

Summarily rejecting the necessity of the functions of Bhavakatva and Bhojakatva of Bhattanayaka, Abhinavaguptha demonstrates how the poetic language triggers the aesthetic process through its suggestive process. In a truly poetic composition, the reader first of all grasps the full significance of the words and their meanings. The poetic language has its own magical properties because it is endowed with various flourishes of expressions (Alankaras) and characteristics excellence (Funas) like sweetness and perspicuity. The function of de-individualisation is a natural property of the poetic language, whose real hall-mark is its suggestive function. As a result of this our

own attitude towards the emotions depicted in poetry becomes essentially different from that of ordinary emotions. The cognition of emotion in poetry is an intensive process, as a result of which all the special and the temporal characteristics of the depicted situation are removed from our consciousness. In other words, not only the poetic situation, but the poetic characters and their emotions also become dissociated from mundane considerations and recognised from a universal perspective. Consequently, we are able to identify ourselves imaginatively with the poetic theme. Since the emotion is experience in its universal aspect without any reference to the specific individual, it loses all its personal stings and becomes a source of pure joy. Abhinavagupta points out that while grief in real life is an unpleasant experience, when it metamorphosises into Karuna rasa, through imaginative representation, it actually becomes a joyful experience. Tragic pleasure, thus is not a contradiction in terms, but an actual experience explainable by the Rasa theory.

Abhinavagupta points out that every individual is endowed with some dormant emotive instincts at his very birth. When a purely universalised emotion becomes an object of cognition, it is invariably related to their deep sub-conscious strata of the human psyche and thus the aesthetic experience penetrates into the deepest realms of one's personality. The aesthetic joy becomes a community experience in the theatre pervading the entire spectators with its universality. Inevitably, a feeling of kinship and identity is established among them. Art, thus, is a great unifier of humanity.

CRITICISM OF MIMETIC THEORY

The problem whether the dramatic art is an imitation of real life has been a subject matter of much debate in ancient India. Aestheticians like Sankuka aver that in the theatre the character is imitated by the actor. This view is closely scrutinized by Bhatta, the celebrated teacher of Abhinavagupta, who summarily rejects it. Bhatta, and following him, Abhinavagupta point out that a

dramatic play is not a physical occurrence like an ordinary incident. The actors who come to the stage donning the guise of *dramatis personae* cannot be looked upon as ordinary individuals whom we encounter in our real life. They cannot be related to their actual names and habitations. On the other hand, it is also obvious that they are not exactly regarded as the fictive characters like Rama, either. Thus the actor/character phenomenon stands midway between pure actuality and pure identity. The theatrical experience, with its music and scenery, adds to this magic. Consequently there occurs in the spectator a unique experience of exhilaration, and the dramatic representation loses the characteristics of the actual occurrences of a character presented. The experience of *Rasa* realisation is brought about at this moment which unites the past impressions and associations inside our mind with the present theatrical experience. A qualitatively different experience of *Rasa* realisation is brought about at this moment which unites the past impressions and associations inside our mind with the present theatrical experience. A qualitatively different experience emerges, which does not have any pleasure and pain resulting from our egotistic impulses so characteristic of normal emotions. Words like *Rasavada*, *Carvana* and *Camatkara* are used to describe this aesthetic contemplation of our own innate emotional trait.... Thus a play should be regarded as the objective content of aesthetic experience and not as an ordinary physical event. There is a fusion of the expression of art and the experience of the individual, which is unique and different from other experiences. We lose sight of these dimensions of aesthetic experience if we look upon the play as a mere imitation of the ways of the world. According to Bhatta Tauta, the techniques used in the production of the play have profound psychological significance. They help us to forget mundane details like the identity of the actor and even the notion of the improbability of the characters of the play actually encountering as in person. There is a two-fold blurring of characteristics in the play-production. On the one hand, the relation

between the play and the actor's personal identity vanished from our mind. On the other, there remains nothing which prevents us from imaginatively identifying the actor with the character prevents us from imaginatively identifying the actor with the character whom he represents. Now it is possible for the suggestive function of art to infuse our mind with the exhilarating experiences of *Rasa* realisation, where in our innate instincts bloom into an emotional surge which is uninhibited and impersonal in its nature. The wealth of the previous impressions of the spectator enhances the richness of this experience, making use of the full potentialities suggested by the dramatic performance.

The process of deindividualisation in the aesthetic experience has two aspects in the first place. Poetry and drama present an experience which is impersonal in its nature. It is the suggestive function of art which brings about the magical transformation. Secondly, this artistic enlightenment assumes a universal nature, capable of being enjoyed by all people. But different people with different personal histories and receptive faculties experience this universalised content of artistic expression in their own way. This explains the diversity received in aesthetic experience across the vast sections of people at the respective end. But it should be emphatically asserted that these differences have nothing to do with the ego of the individual or the considerations prompted by purely selfish or practical motives. Hence aestheticians like Abhinavagupta, use the word *Alaukika* (not belonging to the practical world) in addition to the word *Camatkara*, to describe this experience. *Camatkara* in fact is an umbrella term denoting not only the special aesthetic pleasure and the psycho-physical manifestation brought about by it. It is also used to denote the mental faculty which makes aesthetic experience possible, for without a receptive mould, it is difficult for a person to enjoy art. In short, the analysis of the aesthetic experience made by Abhinavagupta takes into consideration the suggestive function of art, the process of universalisation during the aesthetic experience, the role of innate psychical dispositions and

impressions in the development of the aesthetic state and the transcendental nature of the experience.

KUNTAKA'S THEORY OF POETRY" VAKROKTI

Kuntaka, the 11th century poetician of India has evolved a comprehensive aesthetic theory through his doctrine of Vakrokti, a term signifying the entire gamut of figurativeness in poetic expression. It is very remarkable that he anticipates many insights of New Criticisms and modern stylistics in his perceptive analysis of the poetic language. Kuntaka declares at the outset of his Vakrokti Jivita that his aim is to establish that strikingness (Vaicitraya) brought about by Vakrokti is the source of charm in poetry generating aesthetic experience. According to Kuntaka Vakrokti or obliquity of expression is the very hall-mark of poetry which distinguishes poetic expression from ordinary linguistic usage. Poetic language, according to Kuntaka, is a deviation from normal expression which we see in scriptures, technical writing and ordinary utterances.

Earlier Sanskrit poeticians have defined poetry as consisting of word and sense united, but Kuntaka clarifies that this union should be qualified by the presence of Vakrokti. Poetry is neither a phonetic patterning nor lofty sense emerging from dry prosaic utterances, but word and sense rendered striking by the permeating presence of Vakrokti.

Vakrokti is no mechanical patterning of language. It is intimately connected with the imagination of the poet. It is the basic obliquity of the poet's creative process which manifests itself as Vakrokti at different levels of linguistic expression. Since obliquity is the quintessence of all poetic expression, Kuntaka does not accept realistic description of objects (Svabhavokti) as a poetic figure at all. Earlier poeticians like Dandin consider the intimate description of the nature of objects as a poetic figure, but Kuntaka points out that the nature of objects is not itself an adornment. It is rather the object which is adorned by other embellishment. If the nature of objects itself is

regarded as an adornment there will be nothing left in poetry which is to be adorned. In Kuntaka's opinion a photographic description of an object cannot be reckoned as an adornment at all. This would be tantamount to the admittance of even common place expression into the domain of poetry. However, Kuntaka accepts the innate nature of objects (Svabhava) into the fold of the figurativeness of sentences where the nature of the object either innate (Sahaja) or worked up (Aharya) is regarded as a legitimate theme for heightened expression.

Bhamaha, an earlier poetician, speaks about a heightened turn (Atisayoki) permeating poetic expression and Kuntaka accepts the position that the attainment of climactic level of strikingness is involved in Vakrokti. However, Vakrokti which is a deviation from the norm has to be differentiated from mere eccentric writing, which is also a departure from conventional writing. Vakrokti certainly is a deviation from the normal expressions but all deviations from the norm are not Vakrokti. Kuntaka maintains that the deviation effected in expressions should always delight the discerning reader (Tadvidahladakari). In fact it is the capacity to generate aesthetic delight in the mind of the readers, an essential pre-requisite for all types of Vakrokti, and it is the ultimate test of poetic creativity. Naturally, that involves the concept of an ideal reader, who possesses the requisite degree of culture and aesthetic instinct to appreciate poetry. Sanskrit poeticians have always maintained that all people are not capable of realising the charm of poetry. The ideal reader of refined sensibilities is called Sahridaya or Rasika. Such an ideal reader is not only conversant with all the theoretical details of poetry, but also endowed with an intuitive faculty for aesthetic enjoyment born out of wide culture and imaginative identification with the moods and feelings of the poet. Abhinavagupta has given us a succinct definition of Sahridaya in Dhvanyaloka: "Those people are Sahridayas who possess sympathetic response in their heart because of their capacity for identifying with the described object in their mind which, like a

clear mirror, has become perspicuous due to constant contemplation of poetry. "This definition came to be regarded as the most authentic description of Sahrdaya as is clear from the fact that Hemacandra, a later poetician reproduces it verbatim.

Thus, the ultimate touchstone of Vakrokti is aesthetic value recognised by Sahrdayas. Kuntaka asserts that Vakrokti alone is the only possible embellishment of poetry. He does believe that the bifurcation made between the embellished body and its ornaments is ultimate. Poetry does not admit of such artificial segmentation. The poetic figure and poetry proper are actually inseparable and integrated. There is no question of the separate existence of the bare unadorned poetry to which one is supposed to add figures mechanically. The very constituent parts of poetry are embellished word and sense and it is Vakrokti which encompasses all this embellishment. All the poetic figure recognised by earlier poeticians are actually subsumed by Vakrokti, or to be more precise, Vakrokti manifests at the sentence level.

Though a creative art, Kavivya para, which is the very source of Vakrokti, it is undefinable by its nature. Kuntaka points out that it is manifested at six levels of poetic expression. These are detailed below:

1. **Varnavinyasa Vakrata:** This is obliquity at the phonetic level and includes alliteration, rhyme and all other subtle effects of sound. Repetition of similar sounds at regular intervals gives rise to certain felicitous effects in poetry. Kuntaka accepts onomatopoeic effects also in this variety. Phonetic obliquity includes figures like Anuprasa and Yamaka also, but Kuntaka censures mechanical and ostentatious alliteration which strikes a jarring note. He has elegant sound effects such as "beaded bubbles working at the brim" (Keats "Ode to a Nightingale") in his mind when he refers to this type of alliteration.

2. **Padapurvardha Vakrata.** A word as per Sanskrit grammarian's reckoning consists of the stem and its suffix. It is the lexical item, bereft of the grammatical suffix which constitutes the

basis of the obliquity. Lexical choice seems to be the most fertile field to Kuntaka's approach as also in modern stylistics. Kuntaka refers to several varieties of Padapurvardha Vakrata involving the imaginative use of synonyms (Paryaya), conventional words (Ruthi) metaphor (Upacara), adjectives (Visesana) concealment (Samvrti), compounds and derivatives (Vrtti), action (Bhava), gender (Linga) and verb (Kriya). Here he considers pregnant use of proper names (if, 'That is he that was Othello') the selection of the apt word from several synonyms, concretisation of abstraction ('darkness that can be pierced with a needle') and many other metaphorical expressions.

3. **Pratyaya Vakrata.** This is figurativeness related to grammatical suffixes like those of number, person and case forms. (Kuntaka refers to obliquity caused by the use of tense (Kala) case (Karaka) number (Samkhyā), persons like I, You etc. (Purusha), voice (Upagraha), particles (Nipata), and indeclinable (Avyaya). Kuntaka includes personification and depiction of inanimate objects as animate in this type of obliquity; an example is the Balaramayana passage where in Ravana speaks to Parasurama: "My Candrasa Sword is ashamed of quarrelling with your axe, which has killed a woman." Kuntaka explores all the splendours of Sanskrit language like its capacity to form all types of compounds, evocative power of genders, figurative use of indeclinable and the like in this connection and demonstrates how all these grammatical devices are exploited to the maximum by gifted poets.

4. **Vakyavakrata.** This figurativeness of sentences is its overall effect caused by the artistic skill of the poet permeating all the other elements, akin to the painter's stroke shining distinctively from the material used. Most of the poetic figures are instances of this obliquity.

5. **Prakarana Vakrata.** The contextual figurativeness comprises all the artfulness employed by poets in co-ordinating the various parts of the literary piece. The ingenious invention of the plot, modifications effected in a known story, coordination of the minutest details in the

unfoldment of the story, the presence of a recurring motif, transformation of even stock items into meaningful units of the story, the blossoming of the unexpected emotional mood, the detective story-like complexity of story, the device of a play within a play (Garbhaka).

6. **Prabandha Vakrata.** This is compositional figurativeness and mainly deals with the innovations effected in the story, deletion of unnecessary episodes, developing minor incidents into events of far-reaching consequences etc. as well as the selection of an arresting title for the composition. Kuntaka regards a literary composition as an allegory which conveys some profound moral message and this moral content is also regarded as compositional figurativeness.

KUNTAKA'S CONCEPT OF RITI'S.

Sanskrit poeticians have devoted considerable attention to the problems of poetic diction and style which are referred to by various terms like Riti and Marga. Earlier poeticians like Dandin speak about two Margas, viz. Vaidarbha and Gauda, which seem to be diametrically opposite in nature. While Vaidarbha marga is natural and lucid, the Gauda marga is characterised by pompousness and verbosity. Dandin makes a clear preference for Vaidarbha marga, which consists of all the literary excellence (Gunas), whereas Gauda marga is characterised by the absence of the excellences. Varmana, who comes after Dandin, speaks about a third marga called Pancali, and he also shares Dandin's preference for Vaidarbha, even though he uses the word Riti in the place of Marga.

Kuntaka has surveyed the whole problem from a fresh angle.

He rejects the very nomenclature of Ritis since they have regional connotations, referring as they are to various geographical regions like Vaidarbha Gauda and Pancala. According to Kuntaka, poetic style has nothing to do with regional features. The very methodology of linking style with region is faulty, since it would result in the postulation of an infinite number of poetic styles. The poetic style is rather dependent on the equipment of the poet. It is the imaginative

talent (Sakti) erudition (Vyutpati) and practice (Abhyasa) of a poet which determine his style and not geographical background. Kuntaka also rejects the attempt to evaluate Ritis as superior (Uttama), mediocre (Madhyama) and inferior (Adhama) made by earlier poeticians. It is the best poetry which appeals to men of taste and there is no point in regarding composition of inferior quality as poetry proper. Kuntaka admits that Riti is literary category, but points out that it is the nature of the poet (Kavisvabhava), which determines the differences in various styles, viz. Sukumara (delicate), Vicitra, (ornate) and Madhyama. The first pair represents the extremes of natural and ornate poetry and the third one stands midway between them.

In Sukumara Marga, the poetic art is natural, fresh and unadorned by embellishment. It is the emotive element which dominates expression. Erudition and cultivated skill are minimum and poetry is pervaded by effortless natural grace. Kalidasa is taken to be a representative of this type of poetry by Kuntaka.

On the other hand, Vicitra Marga, is characterised by a preponderance of poetic figures. The genius of the poet is oriented towards ornamentation. The work is pregnant with hidden meanings. Kuntaka points out that this is a very different poetic style, even though it is favoured by most of the poets. Kuntaka considers poet Bana as a representative of this style. The third style Madhyama, combines both natural and cultivated beauty.

Kuntaka speaks of some qualities (Gunas) belonging to all types of poetry, some of which are specific and others general. There are four specific qualities mentioned by him in this connection, viz. Madhyrya (sweetness), Prasada (clarity), Lavanya (sensuous beauty) and Abhijatyā (Nobility). These four qualities differ in nature in Sukumara and Vicitra Margas. Thus, while sweetness in sukumara is absence of compounds, in Vicitra it is avoidance of excessive softness and looseness of structure. Similarly, clarity in sukumara means easy understandability but in Vicitra it stands for the maintenance of certain

vigour in style even when avoiding compounds. Lavanya means beauty of phonetic patterning in the former while in the latter it is the well-knit structure of words. Abhijatyā is the quality pleasing the ear and the mind, in Sukumara. In Vicitra, it is steering clear of either softness or harshness. To these four qualities, two general qualities of propriety (Aucityā) and charm (Soubhagya) are added. The Dhvani theory stresses the importance of propriety in poetry, especially in relation to Rasa. Later poetician Ksemendra has elaborated this concept in all its ramifications in his work Aucityavicāra-cāra.

KUNTAKA'S CONCEPT OF RASA

Kuntaka's aesthetics was oriented towards Vakrokti, and he devotes considerable attention to alankāra, one of the main modes of Vakrokti. Hence it is natural that in his aesthetic scheme, Rasa, the emotive element is relegated to the background. Kuntaka discusses problems related to the Rasa while dealing with the poetic figures of various Margas, as well as with obliquity pertaining to context and composition. Kuntaka's exact attitude towards Rasa is not clearly spelt out in his work. He asserts that the aesthetic quality which makes a poet imperishable is the continuous unfoldment of Rasa, not the base plot. Rasa has necessarily to be accommodated in the scheme of Vakrokti in his scheme. In fact this was the limitation of the Alankāra theorists who have influenced Kuntaka in his theory of Vakrokti. Even when they were convinced of the importance of Rasa, they could not harmonise Rasa with Alankāra, their basic concept. At the best, the Alankāra theorists could treat Rasa as an Alankāra, an embellishment belonging to sound and sense. Thus both Bhamaha and Dandin speak about Rasavat as an alankāra, the theoretical implication of this position would be that Rasa is aroused in poetry not for its own sake, but for the sake of the expressed meaning. There were certain theoretical difficulties for Kuntaka to follow this tradition. The Dhvani theories had by now entirely changed the complexion of the whole issue by projecting Rasa as the central principle upon which

the entire range of poetic expressions is organised. Rasa became the object adorned and not something adorning meaning. Since it was impossible for Kuntaka to reverse this position, it was impossible for him to recognize Rasa as a mere figure.

Kuntaka discusses the problem of Rasa while dealing with the figurativeness of a sentence taken as a whole (Vakyavakrata). According to him, sentient beings become more charming when feelings like love are described in relation to them in poetry. The feelings should not be described by their name, but developed imaginatively. Kuntaka criticises earlier authors like Udbhata who believed that feelings could be expressed by directly mentioning their name. Kuntaka demonstrates how attractive a poem can become if Rasas and Bhavas (transitory feelings) are developed properly, by citing the example of two dramas, Vikramorvasiya and Tapasavatsaraja. The emotion of love in separation (Vipralamba) is developed to the full in the former and pathos (Karuna) in the latter. In this context, he also considers whether a Rasa or Bhava can become an embellishment in poetry. Some earlier poeticians speak of various poetic figures like Rasavat, preyas, Urjasvin and Samahita, which are expressions involving such feelings. Anandavardhana in his Dhvani theory, departs from the earlier position and makes a clear cut distinction between rasadhvani and Rasavadalankāra. When Rasa the emotional element is the most prominent feature of poetry, it is a case of Rasadhvani. When the emotional element is relegated to a secondary position, it becomes a case of Rasavadalankāra. This position also is not acceptable to Kuntaka. Kuntaka points out that Rasavadalankāra is a special instance of Vakrokti, wherein rasa occupies the pivotal position. Thus Kuntaka rejects the view of earlier poeticians that Rasa is always a poetic figure, embellishing other aspects of poetry, and the view of Anandavardhana that sometimes Rasa is relegated to a secondary position. That Rasa is an aspect of poetic figurativeness is his concept.

Kuntaka accepts Rasa as an important source of charm in both Sukumara and Vicitra styles. According to him, poetic charm is always produced by the emotive element. Rasa is also related to the figurativeness pertaining to composition (Prabandhavakrata) and context (prakaranavakrata). The imaginative innovations made in a traditional plot are justified by Kuntaka as instances to the overall emotional effect. Sometimes the climatic height to which a Rasa is developed itself is contextual figurativeness, as is done by Kalidasa in his *Vikramorvasiya* where the separation of the King and Urvasi is vividly portrayed in an emotionally charged situation. Sometimes a recurring emotional motif is sustained throughout a work without any monotony, thanks to the richness of the poetic resources. Kuntaka refers to a story developed with an entirely new emotional complexion by an ingenious author as compositional figurativeness. For example, *Mahabharata* conveys the emptiness and meaninglessness of the bitterly fought epic battle and ends up in the serene mood (Santa rasa) of resignation, but Bhattanarayana shapes an intensely passionate revenge story out of it in his *Veni samhara*, with the aesthetic sentiment of valour (Vira) made predominant.

KUNTAKA AND THE DHVANI THEORY

Kuntaka is a poetician who has proposed an alternative aesthetic philosophy in the place of 'mainstream' doctrines of Rasa and Dhvani. The doctrines of Rasa and Dhvani, originally propounded by Bharata and Anandavardhana respectively are harmonised into an integrated aesthetic philosophy by Abhinavagupta who consistently maintained that Rasadhvani, the suggestion of Rasa is the main source of aesthetic charm in literature. It is clear that Vakrokti, rather than Rasadhvani, is the Key concept of aesthetics. Kuntaka accepts both Rasa and Dhvani as aspects of Vakrokti, which alone is the all comprehensive concept in his aesthetic thought.

An important division of Dhvani is Avivaksitavacya, suggestion through metaphorical expressions. For example, the *Ramayana*

passage. "Yonder moon is like a mirror made blind by sighs" contains the metaphorical expression blind, which suggests the unusual paleness of the mirror (and that of the moon too). Many picturesque expressions of metaphorical suggestions are illustrated by Anandavardhana. Kuntaka incorporates this variety of Dhvani as mode of Vakrokti called Upacaravakrata. Kuntaka demonstrates that it is the metaphorical identification of two similar objects which permeates figures like Rupaka (i.e.- the face is a lotus). The example given by Kuntaka for Upacaravakrata is 'particle of abuse' where the abstract object 'abuse' is linked with 'particle' a material concept.

It is interesting to note that Anandavardhana himself anticipates the view as per which Dhvani, or suggestion can be included in metaphor and he generally refers to this viewpoint as Bhaktavada (Argument that Dhvani can be subsumed under metaphor). Technically Kuntaka can be described as a Bhaktavadin on this count but his attitude is somewhat ambivalent to the doctrine of Dhvani. He does not reject the Dhvani doctrine outright; his position is that Dhvani is perfectly explainable in terms of vakrokti. However, Kuntaka does not brush aside the importance of Dhvani. He acknowledges the presence of suggestion in poetry, and incorporates most of the varieties of Dhvani into his scheme.

Kuntaka refers to the Dhvani doctrine in several places of his work. At the very outset of his work he refers to the words and sense of poetry as suggestive in nature. He refers to the presence of Dhvani both in Sukumara and Vicitra margas, more prominently in the latter. Anandavardhana's two divisions of metaphorical suggestions are also accepted by Kuntaka. Another variety of Dhvani accepted by Kuntaka is sabdasaktimula, involving the employment of words of double meaning, which is recognised as an object of Paryaya Vakrata. Kuntaka entertains the possibility of the nature of object being suggested in some cases of sentential figurativeness (Vakyacakrata). He also refers to the three-fold suggestion of ideas, figures and emotions propagated

in the Dhvani doctrine as an undisputed fact when he deals with the suggestive aspect of some poetic figures.

These facts would lead us to the conclusion that Kuntaka was not against the tenets of the Dhvani theory promulgated by Anandavardhana. He belonged to a group of authors who tried to explain away Dhvani in terms of already established concepts. In several respects, Kuntaka's position is very similar to that of Mahimabhata. Both of them belonged to the early Post-Dhvani period and both of them tried to explain away Dhvani with the help of concepts like Vakrokti and Anumana. When Anandavardhana's Dhvani theory came to be established as the central doctrine of Indian poetics after being systematised by Mammata in his Kavyaprakasa, Kuntaka seems to have been sidelined who fought vainly to revive an old concept of Bhamaha.

THEORY OF DHVANI

The theory of Dhvani propounded by the ninth Century aesthetician Anandavardhana is a brilliant attempt to enlarge the scope of the meaning in poetic language. Indian logicians (Naiyayikas) and ritual philosophers (Mimamsakas) had already explored the scope and magnitude of the expressed meaning and the metaphorical meaning in their discussion. The lexical meaning cognised from language is the expressed meaning. When there is difficulty in accepting the expressed meaning, we pass on to the nearest possible meaning connected with it and this secondary meaning is called the metaphorical meaning. Anandavardhana found that these two levels of meaning cannot by themselves cover the entire meanings in poetry and any poetic theory ignoring these levels would be shallow and superficial. The Dhvani theory explores these unexpressed shades of meaning in poetry.

The inadequacies of a linguistic theory confined only to the individual words and their lexical meaning were exposed several centuries before Anandavardhana by Bhartrhari. Bhartrhari propounded

the doctrine of Sphota to emphasize the importance of a holistic linguistic theory where in the totality of the expression is regarded as the unit language. Bhartrhari also pointed out difficult words. The meaning of a sentence can be arrived at only when we take into consideration all the contextual factors in addition to the separate meanings of individual words. Sometimes a sentence may mean something entirely different from what is being indicated by individual words.

Anandavardhana seems to have been inspired by this integral approach of Bhartrhari in developing the doctrine of Dhvani. He acknowledges the indebtedness of the Dhvani theory to the philosophical concepts developed by grammarians. Anandavardhana's analysis is essentially confined to poetic language naturally, as a poetician, his primary concern was the problems related to the process of comprehension of the poetic meaning.

The presence of unexpressed sense in language had been acknowledged even by the vedic sages who believed that those who try to confine their attention to the expressed meaning have only a very superficial understanding of speech. A Rigveda hymn (x.71.4) refers to two types of people those who understand only the expressed meaning and those who look deeper into the inner significance of language, beyond the literal meaning of individual words. The former sees but does not see; hears but not hear. Speech reveals her body only to the latter, like a loving wife to her husband. Here emphasis is given by the vedic poet on the intuitive capacity of the ideal reader to go deeper into the significance of speech. Another Rigvedic verse (x71.2) speaks about the complementary roles of poets and readers in poetic creation. The poet selects words winnowing away the chaff from the grain, while readers with corresponding intelligence realise their full implications.

The Dhvani theory of Anandavardhana is not a total negation of the linguistic categories and concepts recognised before him. It is

only an enlargement and expansion of the earlier linguistic speculations. It is significant that Anandavardhana does not reject the traditional division and analysis of language in to units like words and sentences. He also accepts the earlier concepts like primary and secondary meanings of language. To illustrate, we take the primary and secondary meanings of the word 'speak' in the following sentences; 'Let him speak' 'let the figures speak for themselves'. The primary and secondary significances of language (abhidha and laksana) are acceptable to Anandavardhana, but he accepts another function called suggestion (Vrayana) also, in addition to these.

We know from our own experience that an ordinary sentence means much more than its literal meaning. Even ordinary greetings like 'How do you do' are not meant to be taken literally. But the philosopher is not bothered about the ranges of meaning which are outside the purview of logical analysis. Naturally, the Naiyayikas and Mimamsakas of ancient India, who evolved their own linguistic philosophy were interested only in the literal meanings, which alone satisfied their insistence on precision and accuracy. But language means much more than this surface meaning, which is only the proverbial tip of the iceberg. Language stretches into several contours of meaning finally merging into the domain of the inexpressible. Poets and critics cannot neglect this area of meaning.

Philosophers like Wittgenstein have expressed the importance of ambiguity related to language usage and confined their attention to statement and propositions. Wittgenstein points out that it is through a complicated process that we understand the meaning of a colloquial expression. These abnormal instances and linguistic discussions must be confined to normal instances, where every word is supposed to have a definite fixed meaning. But this is an inadequate position so far as poetic language is concerned. Angus Sinclair points out that a word does not have any fixed or definite meaning in literary piece be it verse or prose. Every word has a slightly different meaning in every context.

Indian poetics admit that there is indeed a definite and fixed literal meaning for words and sentences. But this is not the be all and the end all of creative literature. Apart from this there is suggested meaning also which varies from context to context, which is the socio-cultural significance of words. Charles C. Fries speaks about recurring responses to utterances in linguistic communities in addition to the regular responses to the lexical items and structural arrangements. Anandavardhana postulates the suggestive function called Vyanjana to account for this meaning.

An important postulate of Anandavardhana is that he includes emotions induced by language in meaning in addition to the information conveyed generally conceived as the normal meaning. This naturally involves the postulation of suggestive power. Even Naiyayikas and Mimamsakas, who do not accept suggestive power, cannot argue that the denotative power (Abhidha) which conveys the primary meaning can communicate and induce emotion. Another significant contribution of Anandavardhana is that he considers a variety of extra linguistic features also as suggestive apart from words and their meanings. Some times contextual features, intonation stress, gestures and postures, musical notes and the like are suggestive. Like Bertrand Russell who considers music as a language wherein emotion is divorced from information, Anandavardhana looks upon gesticulations, intonation and the like as suggestive language, even though they have no literal meaning.

Bhartrhari speaks about two aspects of language sound: the abstract sound patterns called prakrtadhvani and the individual modifications of it called vaikrtadhvanis. The phonetic abstraction 'cow' is an example of the former, and the innumerable ways in which it is pronounced by various individuals the latter. In Anandavardhana's scheme even the letters are suggestive. Language, consequently, has to include several features which are regarded as extralinguistic. It is the set of deviations from normal sound signals which suggest that

the speaker is drunk. A whispering indicates that the message is secret; and the unusual distribution may indicate that the expression is metaphorical in function. In Dhvani theory, Anandavardhana does not include all of these features as suggestive, only aesthetically significant suggestive elements are considered by him for obvious reasons. Naturally, the clue of the identity of an unknown speaker, i.e., whether he is a child, man or woman etc., is irrelevant in an aesthetic evaluation. We can say that by Dhvani Anandavardhana means Vyanjana applied to poetry and not all the suggestive factors we encounter in linguistic communication.

THE DHAVANI THEORY

Anandavardhana himself has acknowledged that the term 'Dhavani' has been taken directly from the grammarians. The Grammatical philosophers like Bhartrhari maintain that Dhavani, the uttered sound, reveals the integral linguistic sign (sphota), which gives the meaning. In the Dhavani theory, the word and its meaning are designated dhvani because they also reveal the suggested meaning, the source of all charm. The word 'Dhvani' is also used in the sense of the suggested meaning as well as the process of suggestion.

The suggested meaning is reckoned as the soul of poetry by Anandavardhana. It shines over and above the various parts of poetry, depending on the whole poem, just as charm shines out in girls which is distinct from the individual parts. The expressed meaning may be sometimes an idea or a figure. On the other hand the suggested may either be an idea, figure or an aesthetic emotion. The expressed meaning can be understood with mere proficiency in grammar and lexicon; but the capacity to grasp the true essence of poetry is necessary to understand the suggested meaning. It is because of the importance enjoyed by the suggested sense that it is regarded as the soul of poetry.

Anandavardhana defines Dhvani as that type of poetry in which the words and their literal meaning occupy a subordinate position and suggest a charming sense. Anandavardhana recognises three types

of poetry. viz Dhvani, Gunibhutavyangya and Citra. When the suggested sense does not occupy a prominent position and is subordinated to the expressed meaning, the poem is Gunibhutavyangya. Several instances of figures of speech like samasoki and paryayokta are instances of this variety. Poetry devoid of suggested meaning cannot be regarded as poetry proper. Anandavardhana calls it pictorial poetry (citrakavya) which is only an imitation of poetry.

DHVANI AND RASA

The Dhvani theory is closely related to the Rasa theory propounded by Bharata. According to Bharata, a dramatic work is always oriented towards a Rasa, the aesthetic emotion. Anandavardhana extends the scope of Rasa to poetry also by combining Rasa with his Dhvani doctrine. It was Anandavardhana who comprehended the importance of Rasa in poetry for the first time. Dhvani and Rasa are not conflicting concepts. While Dhvani is the technique of expression, Rasa stands for the ultimate effect of poetry. Suggestion in abstraction does not have any relevance in art. The suggested meaning has to be charming and it is the Rasa element which is the ultimate source of charm in drama and poetry. The importance of the doctrine of suggestion lies in the fact that it alone offers the key for the expression of emotion.

Bharata's Rasasutra, "Vibhivanubhava vibhivanubhava vyaabharisamyogadrasanispathih" deals with the problem of the realisation of Rasa. It is the combination of Vibhavas, Anubhavas and Vyabharicabhavas which results in the rasa realisation. Vibhavas refer both to the objects arousing and intensifying emotions. Ajubhavas are external manifestations of emotions and vyabharicabhavas are accessory mental tastes which enhance the effect of the Rasa. It is the sthayibhava, the instinctive potential emotion of the reader and the spectator which is revealed and transformed into Rasa by all. Bharata speaks about eight sthayibhavas which, when aroused through a work of art, become aesthetic states (Rasas). These

are rati (love), hasa (laughter), soka (sorrow), Krodha (anger), Utsaha (energy), bhaya (fear) jugupsa (repugnance) and vismaya (wonder). The corresponding Rasas are respectively called Sringara, hasya, karuna, roudra, vira, bhayanaka, bibhatsa and adbuta. Later aestheticians speak of a ninth rasa called santa corresponding to the sthayibhava called nirveda. Time and again, aestheticians like Abhinavaguptha point out that these are only superficial difference and Rasa is basically one and the same. The various mental states (Sthayibhavas) are only enduring of it.

The Rasasutra of Bharata was interpreted in different ways by different scholars. Lollata, the earliest critic assumed that the Rasa is actually produced in the historical character. The spectator ascribes the Rasa to the actor because of the cleverness of the latter in the acting Sankuka maintained that Rasa is the inferred mental state which is supposed to exist in the actor who is identified with the character. These two theories, do not explain how the spectator gets aesthetic pleasure.

Bhattanaka brought forth the subjective aspect of the rasa experience as existing in the spectator. According to him, the poetic language is different from ordinary language in that it has two additional functions of Bhavakatva and Bhojakatva, in addition to the primary significative function called Abhidha. Bhavakatva is the power of universalisation (Sadhanakarana) by virtue of which vibhavas, sthayibhavas etc. lose their individuality in all people, who are endowed with the power of imagination. Finally, there is another power called Bhojakatva, which is responsible for the enjoyment of this generalised sthayibhava by the spectator. This is the aesthetic experience proper, which is very similar to the spiritual experience of the mystic.

Abhinavagupts, the last commentator maintained that it is through the suggestive process that the Rasa is realised. In his view, the sthayibhavas are dormant instincts in all individuals. They are aroused

by Vibhavas etc. and they attain the state of rasa which is nothing but the basic mental state relieved of spacio temporal inhibitions and obstacles caused by other forms of consciousness characteristic of ordinary emotions. He does not accept the function called bhojakatva. According to Abhinavagupts, the very cognition of Rasa is its enjoyment and there is no necessity of postulating any other function for this. The suggestion of Rasa is by the process of vyanjana. In short the basic difference between Bhattanayaka and Abhinavagupts is that the latter explains away the twin functions of Bhavakatva and Bhojakatva through the process of suggestion even when accepting the former's perception of aesthetic experience as a de-individualised experience of emotion akin to spiritual experience.

Abhinavagupts conceives of the realisation of Rasa as involving three psychological stages in literature. In the first stage, the formal and the intellectual elements of the poem are cognised. In the second stage, we idealise the objects presented in literature and drama with our imaginative power. The final stage is the climax of the inexpressible emotional condition. Thus the intellectual and imaginative elements of a poem blend into a predominant sentiment and make simultaneous appeal to awaken the sthayibhava of the reader and the spectator. The resulting state is Rasa, which is a unity in the heart wherein the distinctions of its constituent parts disappear. Rasa's suggestion, the Rasa dhvani, is such a spontaneous process the sequence of which we do not experience properly. Consequently, it is called Asamlakshyakrama i.e., having an imperceptible sequence.

Criticism Against the Dhvani Theory

The Dhvani theory of Anandavardhana had to face stiff opposition from several quarters before it could win universal approbation. Many schools of philosophy like Nyaya and Mimamsa do not accept the suggestive power at all. It is only some later grammarians who accept suggestion as a power of words, apart from poicians.

Anandavardhana himself anticipates some objections against

Dhvani. There may be some people who deny Dhvani altogether and some who would include it in the secondary power (Bhakti) or Lakṣana. Yet some other may aver that even though Dhvani exists it cannot be described with words. Anandavardhana also refers to the view that suggestion is the process of inference. It is significant that Manoratha, a contemporary poet of Anandavardhana, records his strong objection to the Dhvani doctrine. Not less than twelve antidhvani theories are mentioned by Jayaratha in his commentary of *Alankarasarvasva*.

DHVANI AND ANUMANA (INFERENCE)

Among the philosophers the Naiyayika (logicians) do not accept the suggestive power of words. Among poetics it is Mahimabhata who has written a book *Vyaktiviveka*, to demonstrate that suggestive function can be explained away by anumana (inference). Earlier, Sankuka, the commentator of *natyasastra* has argued that Rasa realisation is actually a process involving inference. Anandavardhana himself anticipates the argument that Dhvani can be included in inference. In reply to this argument ascribed to naiyayikas, Anandavardhana points out that we infer only the speaker's intention to produce sounds and to express ideas in language. The meaning expressed itself is not inferred. The main difference between suggestions and inference is that while there may be difference of opinion about suggested meaning, the inferred meaning is invariable and admits of no ambivalence. Actually, the relationship between the expressed meaning and the suggested meaning is not the invariable concomitance (*Vyapti*) between them as that of a lamp and a pot. The lamp can reveal a pot even though they are not invariably related. Similarly, expressed meaning reveals the suggested meaning even though there is no invariable relation between the two. Further, the inferential knowledge is indirect knowledge, involving logical reasoning, but suggestion is like a flash across the mind, an intuitive knowledge which is direct and immediate.

In *Nyayamanjari*, Jayantabhata refers to the Dhvani theory as one propounded by a wiseacre and summarily rejects it as unworthy of consideration by scholars. He avers that the suggested sense of a word is really inference from its primary and secondary meanings. As such, Dhvani can be included in inference.

In logic, precision and accuracy are always stressed. Language is to be disambiguated, and its exact primary meaning be regarded as the real meaning. Logicians accept the secondary meaning in language only when they are forced to do so, it is the incompatibility of the primary meaning which prompts the acceptance of the suggested meaning. But the secondary meaning itself is ascertainable with a fair degree of accuracy. The logicians do not have much patience with the suggested meaning which is vague, fleeting and subjective. This is not surprising since logic can accommodate only those ranges of meaning coming under its regulations of accuracy and precision. The position is reflected in the following statement of Wittgenstein: whatever can be said can be clearly said and what we cannot speak about we must leave in silence (*Tractatus*). This is exactly the range of great poetry, which wants to express the inexpressible, and the only means available is suggestion.

Logicians may reject these aspects of meaning as unreal, but literary critics have to come to terms with them. Poetry appeals more to emotion than to reason, and hence suggested meaning has a great role to play here. If this vast area of meaning coming within the purview of suggestion is rejected, we may be eliminating much that is valuable in human culture. The suggestive power is used to communicate ideas which cannot be directly expressed. In this contest, the words of Bergson are relevant:

“Language is incapable of apprehending and expressing reality. But language may be used in another way, not to represent but to bring the hearer to a point where he himself may transcend language and pass to incommunicable insight. It is dialectical ladder, which

when we have ascended, may be kicked away. (Introduction to *Metaphysics*)”

It is the insight and intuition which incapable of being expressed directly can be communicated through suggestion.

Dhvani and Arthapatti (Presumption)

Arthapatti is a case of immediate inference. The stock example given for Arthapatti is ‘Fat Devadatta does not eat by day’. If Devadatta is fat, he has to eat either by day or night and since we know that he does not eat by day, the presumption is that he must be eating at night. The Bhatta Mimamsaka philosophers maintain that there is such an inference in ordinary sentences themselves. In a sentence, the relationship between words is not exactly stated explicitly, but we cognise it to resolve the apparent contraction between word juxtaposition and the unstated intention of this. To illustrate, in the expression, “Mr. Winston Churchill”, the Prime Minister, we cognise Churchill who is the Prime minister even though this is not explicitly stated. This relation is called “Samsarga” and the Naiyahikas aver that it is cognised automatically (Samsargamaryada). But Mimamsakas maintain that this is actually a secondary sense got through *laksana* and even for this the process of presumption (Arthapatti) is necessary.

According to Prof. Kuppaswamy Sastri, this type of meaning is actually a case of suggestion. He quotes the definition of Jespersen that suggestion is impression through suppression. According to Jespersen, in all speech activity, there are three elements to be distinguished; expression, suppression and impression. “Expression is what the speaker gives, suppression is what he does not give and impression is what the bearer receives”. In impression the suppressed meaning also is received. On the basis of Jespersen’s concept, Prof. Sastri argues that the so called ‘Samsarga Maryada’ stipulates ordinary sentences can themselves be treated as an instance of suggestion.

Actually, poetic suggestion has to be distinguished from Arthapatti, which is a means of valid knowledge (Pramana). The former involves

an implied sense, vague and fleeting; the latter demands accuracy and precision of the implied sense. Further, the poetic suggestion is a creative process requiring a refined sensibility and fine taste. In any case, the *Srutharthapatti* of Bhattas, involving understood elements along with directly stated words has to be definitely distinguished from Dhvani.

Dhvani and *Laksana*

Some poeticsians like Mukulabhata have tried to include suggestion under *laksana*, the secondary power. They recognised the presence of some ideas in sentences in addition to the literal sense. But all such instances can be included in *Laksana* itself. Mukula refers to the view of the mimamsaka scholar Bhartṛmitra in this connection. According to Bhartṛmitra, *laksana* comprises all instances wherein the expressed meaning leads one to any meaning somehow related to it. In this concept even Arthapatti will come under *Laksana*. Mukula maintains that Dhvani, a ‘new’ doctrine propounded by some critics actually falls within the sphere of *Laksana* itself.

But according to Anandavardhana, Dhvani is different from *Laksana* in its nature and scope. There must be some incompatibility in the expressed meaning if *Laksana* were to operate; actually, the expressed meaning is cancelled and the secondary meaning accepted in its place. But in suggestion, the expressed meaning need not be cancelled. The weak point in Anandavardhana’s arguments is that the expressed meaning is not always cancelled. There is a variety of *Laksana* called *Ajahatsvartha*, where the expressed meaning is simply extended to cover the unexpressed meaning, as in “The people with umbrellas are going”. Which signifies a group of people, with and without umbrellas going.

Another important difference between *Laksana* and suggestion is that the former is the primary meaning as in the case of musical notes and gesticulations, which suggest emotions. The emotive element of language cannot be explained in terms of the expressive and secondary

functions. Further, while suggestion gives rise to ideas, figures of speech and emotion. Laksana can convey an idea only.

While suggestion can be thus distinguished from Laksana, there is a suggested element even in Laksana. Laksana is two fold; established (nirudha) and deliberate (prayojanvati). In the latter, the emotive element (prayojana) is given forth by suggestion. To illustrate, we refer to the village near River Ganga as "Village in the Ganges"; in laksana the secondary sense is village on the banks of River Ganges. But the expression also communicates the purity and coolness of the village. This emotive element cannot be communicated by Laksana itself. Laksana requires some inconsistency in the expressed meaning. This inconsistency is rectified when we resort to the secondary meaning. Consequently, the secondary power is not available for the communication of the emotive element of purity and coolness which are actually communicated through suggestion. In other words, there are three conditions necessary for the operation of the secondary power viz, the inconsistency of the primary meaning, a relation between the primary meaning and the secondary meaning and some emotive element. But in suggestion, none of these conditions are necessary. Laksana is actually not even necessary for suggestion. The expression village on the banks of the Ganges is as effective as village of Ganges so far as the suggested content is concerned. But Laksana produces a break in the flow of communication and arrests the reader's attention. It is in this manner that it leads us to suggestion.

DHAVANI AND ABHIDHA

Abhidha is acknowledged by all as the primary significative power existing in words capable of giving out the literal or lexical meaning. Some philosophers like the Prabhakara school of Mimamsa stretch the function of Abhidha to include the suggested meaning also. The Prabhakaras believe in the dictum that the meaning of a word is what is intended by it. They subscribe to the anvitabhitha theory according to which a word conveys not only its meaning but the relation of the word with other words also.

Thus the primary meaning includes the mutual relationship of word suggested by their juxtaposition apart from the lexical items. The Prabhakaras recognise that there may be many suggested ideas apart from the normal sense of the words but all of these come under the Abhidha itself. The primary power, Abhidha, is compared to the function of an arrow which pierces through all the intermediary objects to finally reach its target. Abhidha does not rest until it reaches the final meaning.

Anandhavardhana and others attack this theory on the ground that the suggested meaning does not come under the purview of Abhidha. Abhidha can convey only the conventional meaning directly related to a word. When this function is performed the Abhidha is exhausted. Hence another function is to be recognised for the cognition of the suggested meaning. The suggested sense is known only indirectly through the expressed sense Abhidha also because the former is seen even in places where the latter does not exist. Thus direct connection between the word and its primary meaning. Suggestion cannot be identified with the Abhidha also because the former is seen even in places where the latter does not exist. Thus musical notes and gesticulations have suggestive power even though they do not possess any power of Abhidha. Again, while the primary meaning given forth by Abhidha is fixed, the suggested sense given forth by Dhvani varies according to contexts. Thus, while the word "Rama" gives forth the exact primary sense in all contexts through Abhidha, it suggests different ideas in different contexts like Rama's valour sacrifice and hard heartedness. Above all these, the suggested meaning requires some imaginative skill on the part of the reader whereas mere proficiency in grammar and dictionary is enough in comprehending the expressed meaning.

DHAVANI AND TATPARYAVRTHI

Some Alankarikas accept Tatparyasakti as a power capable of explaining away Dhvani. Thus, Dhanika and Dhananjaya in the Dasarupaka maintain that a separate suggestive power need to be

postulated in language. Since Tatparyavrti can perform this function also, Tatparyasakti is accepted to explain the mutual relationship existing between words in a sentence which is not directly expressed. If Tatparya can convey unexpressed mutual relationship of words, it can also convey the unexpressed suggested meaning, so goes the argument.

But Dhvani theories point out that Tatparyasakti cannot explain the function of Dhvani, because the former operates only within the range of the expressed meaning. Dhvani is related to an entirely different range of meaning. Tatparyasakti can convey only the logical connection existing between the meanings of individual words put together. This is a far cry from the suggested meaning which is like the resonating of a sound occurring for several moments even when the original sound is lost. Further, while Tatparyasakti is centered on language, Dhvani exists even outside the purview of language as in music and gestures. Even in linguistic usage a distinction has to be made between instances which give forth suggested meaning apart from the expressed meaning and instances which do not do so. Only Dhvani can explain this variable function since tatparyasakti is always invariably present in language.

But Dhanamjaya and Dhanika take Tatparyasakti in an extended sense capable of including not only the logical relation existing between word meaning, but also the hidden import of sentences. The interpretation is accepted by some other poeticsians also, even though the majority of poeticsians clearly distinguish between Tatparyavrti and Dhvani.

DHVANI AND VAKROKTHI

Kuntaka, who is the propounder of the doctrine of vakrokti, does not spell out his exact attitude towards Dhvani. Vakrokti comprises the entire gamut of poetic expression and it is interesting to note both these concepts often overlap. Thus, Anandavardhana's divisions of Dhvani like varnadhvani, padadhvani, vakyadhvani etc. have their

couterparts in varnavinyasavakrata, padapurvardha vakrata and Vakyavakrata of Kuntaka. Mahimabhata summarily dismisses Vakrokti as Dhvani theory in disguise.

However, it can be seen that both Vakrokti and Dhvani are complementary to each other. While the Dhvani theory looks upon poetic language from the point of view of the reader, Vakrokti attempts to study language as imaginative expression from the point of view of the poet. If suggested content is the important point in the former, it is the poet's imaginative skill which is focussed in the latter.

CLASSIFICATION OF DHVANI

Dhvani is broadly classified into two: Avivaksitavacya and Vivaksitanyaparavacya, basing upon the nature of the expressed meaning. In the former, the expressed meaning is not intended and is rejected partially or fully. This variety is also known as Laksanamuladhvani since it comprises examples of intentional metaphors which suggest charming ideas. Basing upon the degree of unacceptability of the expressed meaning, this variety of Dhvani is further subdivided into two; Arthantara sankramitacya and Atyantataskrtavacya. These two varieties correspond to the varieties of Laksana called Ajahallaksana and Jahallaksana and in them the literal sense is modified and completely superseded respectively.

An example of Arthantarasamkramita would be "Lotuses become Lotuses when accompanied by the lustre of the sun." Here the second word 'lotus' does not mean its literal sense alone, but gives forth a flood of associated ideas evoked by 'lotus.' Edgerton compares this variety with the emphasis of classical western rhetorics but there are some differences between these two. Actually Arthantarasamkramitavacya comprises the pregnant use of 'words' mentioned by Empson, like the expression of Laksana by ancient Mimamsakas. The Mimamsakas' example is 'Dirty clothes are not clothes (an malinam avasastad') and this expression means that 'dirty clothes are not clothes in the fullest sense of the term'. It is evident that this type

of dhvani occurs in statements negating something also. Thus, when the skylark does not belong to the species of bird, but only that skylark can not be described as an ordinary bird in the fullest sense of the word. Words are here surrounded by the halo of associated imagery heavily charged with emotions.

In the second sub variety viz. the *Atyantatiraskrtavacya* the expressed meaning being logically unacceptable is rejected for the secondary sense and the expression thereafter suggests the emotive elements of such deliberate metaphor. An example is the following expression in Kalidasa's *Meghasandesa*. "Who will forsake one's love lorn spouse when you (i.e. the cloud) are armoured?" Here *Yaksa* refers to the fact that the sight of the cloud enhances the feeling of agony in separation and describes the cloud as armoured to suggest the fact that the cloud's power is irresistible.

VIVAKISTANYAPARAVACYA

This major subdivision of Dhvani is also called *Abhidhamula* since it is based on the primary significative power (*Abhidha*) of words. Here the literal meaning is not rejected. It only paves the way for the suggested meaning.

This variety is further sub-divided into two: *Samlakṣyakrama* (i.e. Dhvani with perceptible sequence) and *Asamlakṣya krama* (Dhvani with no perceptible sequence). The basis of the subdivision is the nature of the cognition of the suggested sense. In the former we are aware of the process of suggestion and the sequence of the primary meaning and the suggested meaning is clearly perceived. In the latter, which involves emotive elements like *Rasa* and *Bhava*, the suggested meaning is cognised and experienced all on a sudden so that we are not aware of their sequence at all. This variety of Dhvani occupies the pride of place since it involves the suggestion of aesthetic emotions. Here the expressed meaning simply describes the *Vibhavas*, *Anubhavas* and *vybhicarabhavas* of *Rasa* and this leads one to the aesthetic emotion almost simultaneously. That is why it is called

Asamlakṣyakrama i.e., Dhvani with no perceptible sequence. But the emotion suggested thus should not be made subsidiary to the expressed meaning in this type of Dhvani. When the emotion suggested is subservient to something else, like, say, the musical notes used in an audio-visual advertisement, this is relegated to poetry of "Subordinate suggestion" called *Gunibhutavyagya*. Further *Rasadhvani* does not always fall under *Asamlakṣyakrama*. When one has to gather the threads of the emotional context for the comprehension of *vibhavas*, *Anubhavas* etc. the sequence of the cognition of *Rasa* becomes very much perceptible and it would fall under the *samlakṣyakrama* variety.

In *samlakṣyakrama*, the suggested meaning is usually an idea (*Vastu*) or a figure (*Alankara*). There is another classification also basing upon the suggestive factor, viz. *Sabdāsaktimula*, *Arthāsaktimula* and *ubhayaśaktimula*. In the former, words can not be replaced; the suggested meaning will be lost then in the second variety it is the primary meaning which leads one to the cognition of the suggested meaning. In the third variety, both words and their meaning perform the suggestive function alike.

The following chart represents the divisions and subdivisions of Dhvani:

- Avivaksitavacya Vivakstianyaparavacya
- Arthantara Atyantati Asamlakṣya Samalakṣya
- Sankramitavacya Raskrtavacya krama krama
- Sabdāsaktimula Arthāsaktimula Ubhayaśaktimula

CRITICISM OF VASTU AND ALANKARA

Anandavardhana refers to three varieties of Dhvani, viz., *Vastu*, *Alankara* and *Rasa*, but the pride of place is implicitly given to *Rasa*. His general statement that Dhvani is the soul of poetry has invited criticism from some quarters. For example, *Viswanatha*, the author of *Sahityadarpana* says that *Rasa* alone should be regarded as the soul. Poetry devoid of *Rasa* cannot be regarded as poetry proper. Mere suggestion is not enough; every sentence contains some suggested

element, and this does not mean that such expressions are poetic. The sentence 'Devadatta goes to the Village' may thus suggest that he was accompanied by his servants in a particular social context, but such unemotive suggested content has no claim for being called poetry. Anandavardhana himself maintains that the very function of figures of speech is the adornment of the emotive element. Abhinavagupta clarifies the standpoint of Dhvani theory that Rasadhvani alone is the soul of poetry and that Vastudhvani and Alankaradhvani also finally resolve into it.

SABDASAKTIMULADHVANI

This variety employs homonymous words. Slesalankara also is characterised by the usage of homonymous words. However, in Slesa both the meaning of the homonymous words are conveyed through Abhidha, the primary power of the word, as both these senses are contextual. But in Dhvani, since one meaning is not contextual, some poeticians like Mammata and Viswanatha point out that the non-contextual meaning is given forth by suggestion (Vyanjana). But Jaganatha Pandita points out that both these meanings are conveyed by Abhidha itself. In the case of words fixed in their meanings other than that is etymological, the etymological sense lies hidden in our cognition and Jaganatha admits that suggestive power is necessary to revive it. Otherwise, suggestion is applicable only to the figure of speech emanating from the expression. This can be illustrated with an example. Suppose the sentence 'A' gives out a meaning related to elephant and another applicable to a king, through the employment of homonymous words signifying both the elephant and the king. According to Jaganatha, suggestion is not to be postulated for the cognition of any of these senses, which are the primary meanings. But afterwards we cognise the similarity between the elephant and king, and for this a suggestive function has to be postulated.

ARTHASAKTIMULADHVANI

Here it is the expressed meaning which gives rise to the

suggested sense which includes, apart from ideas and figures emotive elements also in exceptional cases. Emotion thus suggested is called Vastudhvani, and is to be constructed with Rasadhvani in Asamlakshyakrama variety.

The primary sense of a word may be definite and fixed. But there are many factors like the identity of the speaker, the addressee, the occasion, interrogation, gestures etc. at play by means of which it can suggest other ideas. The suggestive meaning may either be naturally evolved (Svatassambhavi) or deliberately designed by the poet (Praudhoktinispanna).

SUGGESTIVE ELEMENTS

Dhvani is subdivided also on the basis of suggestive elements. In Avivaksitavacya and the Samlakshyakrama variety of Vivaksitanyaparavacya, both words in sentences are suggestive. In the suggestion of emotion, comprising Asamlakshyakrama, the entire gamut of poetic expression is charged with emotion. Hence, all the factors of poetry like the phonemes, morphemes, sentences, texture and compositional structure are recognised as suggestive here. Anandavardhana underlines the importance of a holistic approach to literature, in grasping the overall emotive significance of the poem. This is clear from his approach to epics like the Ramayana and the Mahabharata.

Intonations

The way in which we articulate language is of great importance in determining its suggested meaning. In acting, for example, tone, tempo and pitch of words convey several shades of meanings, Bharata surveys such techniques of acting in his Natyasastra at great length.

Ancient grammarians also refer to the various accents like the high, the low and the circumflex, when discussing the vedic language. They are a part of the phonemic system of a language. There are other personal variations in the modes of address, like pitch and intonations which suggests shades of meaning.

Bharata divides intonations (Kaku) into two: expectant (sankanksa) and non-expectant (nirakanksa): the former suggests the incompleteness of the sentence while the latter suggests its completion. Rajesekhara refers to three types of intonations, signifying disapproval, question and doubt. The non-expectant intonation also sometimes denotes as assertion, answer or a decision. In srngarparakasa, Bhoja also discusses the problems of intonations. Intonation, which brings forth the irony or pathos of a passage can suggest the emotional attitude of the character. If intonation dominates the poetic expression even subordinating the suggested meaning, it gives rise to a variety of Gunidhutavyangya called Kakvaksipta.

CONTRIBUTION OF DHVANI THEORY TO LANGUAGE STUDIES

The main contribution of Dhvani theory to linguistic thought is the enlargement of the term 'meaning' (artha). Meaning in Dhvani school stands for everything conveyed by language. Hence it includes not only the cognitive meaning, but also the emotive elements as well as the socio-cultural significance of utterance suggested with the help of contextual factors. Another significant contribution of Anandavardhana is that he underlined the necessity of a holistic view of language taking into account the basic unity of the sentence meaning. According to J.Brough 'the Dhvani theory to a large extent operates in terms of larger units and not individual words' eventhough analytically, the source of charm of poetic expression can be pinpointed to single words and phrases.

Most of the criticism against the Dhvani theory stands for the fact that these opponents confine themselves to a relatively smaller portion of linguistic behaviour, while the protagonists of Dhvani sought to extend their perception to the entire gamut of human experience, socio-cultural and emotional relms.

Section C: Prepared by
Dr.C. Rajendran
Calicut University

ROLAND BARTHES THE STRUCTURALIST ACTIVITY

INTRODUCTION

Roland Barthes (1915-1980) produced his original observations on semiotics (seeing social and cultural life in terms of signification) when he was convalescing after about of tuberculosis. He also wrote several critical literary essays, on Racine and on photography. One of his early works 'Mythologies' (1957) looked into everyday signs like advertising, sports, consumer goods and so on and subjected them to a unique reflexive scrutiny. Barthes says he 'wanted to track down, in the decorative display of what-goes-without-saving, the ideological abuse which.....is hidden there'. In 'Writing Degree Zero' (1953), Barthes looks at the historicity of literary language and examines how a writer, faced with a language that is at once a system and a system of systems as the only tool, confronted the task of writing. The title indicates the writer's search for a nascent language bare of historicity and the myths of culture (0^o= state of language before it is liquefied by extraneous factors like myth). His later work "S/Z" is an explication of Balzac's short story "Sarrasine". The narrative codes (hermeneutic, semic symbolic, proairetic and the cultural/gnomic code at work in the work are treated like 'a fashion system' that evokes a particular quota of knowledge. Barthes was a creative critic in the sense that he was the first critic to blur the distinction between criticism and creative writing..

THE STRUCTURALIST ACTIVITY' (1963)

There is a halo of mist around the word 'structuralism.' Is it a doctrine? is it a vogue word? Has it got anything to do with Economics? Literature? Barthes says that 'structuralism' stands for the way in which we organise things-'the way in which one mentally experiences a structure.'

Structuralism as an activity stands for 'for controlled succession of a certain number of mental operations'. It is aimed at reconstructing an "object" in such a way as to manifest thereby the rules of functioning of this object'. This could be true in case of literature too.

To make known the structure of an object is not only to create a simulacrum of it but also to make visible something that was not perceptible before. When we compare the two activities-structuring and de-structuring to know the structure-the second reveals its uniqueness; the simulacrum is intellect added to object, and this addition has an anthropological value, in that it is man himself, his history, his situation, his freedom and the very resistance which nature offers to his mind'.

The structuralist activity is not an act of imitation, but one of rendering something more intelligible. Thus considered, it is similar to literature too. Both are based on homology, or the analogy of functions.

According to Barthes, the structuralist activity involves two typical operations: 'dissection and articulation. 'Dissection' refers to the fragments that constitute an entity but which by themselves do not have a value of their own, and which do not permit any change in its configuration. 'Articulation' stands for discovering in the constituent fragment a certain kind of association. The structuralist activity gains in importance because it is not concerned with meaning as such but the production of meanings.

Hegel talks of the Greeks listening to 'the natural in nature'. For the modern man 'nature' is 'culture' and he listens to 'the natural in

culture'. He finds that its meaning is not easy to discover but is embedded in structures (history, tradition, religion, culture) of his own making.

LIST OF BOOKS

1. Susan Sontag (ed.) Barthes Reader, London: Vintage, 1993
2. John Lechte, Fifty Key Contemporary Thinkers, London: Routledge, 1994
3. Raman Selden (ed.) Cambridge History of Literary Criticism Vol.8; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 131-165.

QUESTIONS

1. Structuralism according to Roland Barthes.
2. 'Dissection' and 'articulation' in structuralism.

Prepared by:

Prof. K.Gopalakrishnan Trivandrum.

PAUL DE MAN

SEMIOLOGY AND RHETORIC

INTRODUCTION

If one is to search for an archetypal pattern in the history of ideas, it is easy to find it in de-centering. The heliocentric theory de-centered the geocentric; self de-centered style during romanticism; and reason, self during the Victorian. May be it all began with God decentering man.

The post modern mind, said to have been born with the death of Nietzsche, believed that there were not any facts but only economic factors. The most important de-centering that occurred during this period was that of language. Language does not correspond to reality. A word means only because the meaning was agreed upon. Language cannot overcome rhetoric, *desire* and grammar.

This view was popularised by the post structuralists, mainly Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Hayden White and Paul de Man.

Paul de Man, belonging to the Yale school of critics along with Harold Bloom, Geoffrey Hartman and others, believed that literature was founded upon the awareness of the non-coincidence of sign and meaning. While other discourses like political, historical or philosophical staked a claim to reality, literature knew and owned up honestly that its statements were figurative and fictional. He says that 'tropes' or figures of speech have a dominant influence over language.

This can destabilize not only logic but grammar also. De Man believed that rhetoric often disrupted grammar and forced us to forget grammaticality for the sake of sustenance of meaning.

'SEMIOLOGY AND RHETORIC' (1973)

Literature can never be regarded as a chain of units having referential meaning only. Semiology and rhetoric both enter into the process of reading and provide the reader with just a reading of the text and not its meaning. (Semiology or the science of signs talks about communication through signs like gestures, conventions and even language as a sound pattern agreed to generate meaning. De Man uses 'rhetoric' to mean any figure of speech).

The metaphorical model of literature, de Man says, can be represented as 'a box that separates an inside from an outside'. Reading is the act of releasing what was held captive in the text. Paul de Man says that this metaphor, however, is losing its lustre. He wishes to approach the problem through a less trodden path. Semiology and rhetoric are the tools de Man uses to reach 'meaning' and 'literature'. 'Semiology' is the study of signs or signifiers and looks at how words mean. This study demonstrated that the understanding of literature cannot be merely referential or syntactical.

SUMMARY

Paul de Man says the spirit of our times differs from what it was before in that now the thrust is on the 'nonverbal outside' to which language refers and by which it is acted upon and conditioned. Formalism and intrinsic criticism have become obsolete. Today 'literature' sustains itself not just on its fictional/literary status but on various other factors as well like the self, man, the society (all in a sense 'fictions') and their interplays. 'Literature' has become a complex variable based on several extrinsic factors. With the new emphasis de Man proceeds to look into 'the external politics of literature'.

De Man believes that the nature of history is such that shifts in focus often become the stuff with which it is made. Literary studies

is are no exception. '.....literature cannot be merely received as a definite unit of referential meaning that can be decoded without leaving a residue'. However, since the days of close reading or New Criticism, literary criticism has not managed to be both 'technically original and discursively eloquent'.

Literary formalism had always to be seductive too. But the approach to form as something superficial and expendable has given way to form as 'a solipsistic category of self-reflection'. Internal meaning has become outside reference and the outer form has become the intrinsic structure. Literature is looked upon as 'a kind of box that separates an inside from an outside, and the reader or critic as the person who opens the lid in order to release in the open what was secreted but inaccessible inside'.

De Man goes on to vindicate the choice of the box metaphor. He says that the popular study of semiotics ('the science or study of sign as signifier') does not ask what words mean but how they mean. The demystifying power of semiology aided by the writings of Saussure and Jakobson demonstrated that 'the perception of the literary dimensions of language' is likely to be obscured if there is a one to one correspondence of a word with its meaning. Semiology defies it.

According to De Man there is an increasing incidence of grammatical and rhetorical structures being used in tandem. However, there are many instances where one can discern a tangle between grammar and rhetoric. There could even be a symbiosis between the two (when Archie Bunker's wife asks him whether he wants his bowling shoes laced over or under, he replies "what is the difference?") In the case of Bunker the literal meaning is denied by the existence of the figurative meaning. the very same question when asked by Derrida assumes a totally different posture. Does the question ask or doesn't it?

This problem of grammar vs. Rhetoric is not as simple as it seems to be. It is not merely a question of literal meaning vs. figurative

meaning. On the other hand, it also reveals the inherent defects in a linguistic system where what is uttered is rendered open to interpretation.

It could be said that the literariness of language arised from this kind of a tension between syntas and rhetoric. Monroe Beardsley in an essay called "The Conceit of Literature" says that literary language is characterized by being "disintinctly above the norm in ratio of implicit..... to explicit meaning". The implicit meaning is also rhetorical meaning and the explicit, synactical.

In Yeat's poem "among School Children" there is the famous line: "How can we know the dancer from the dance?" In this instance, if we take the rhetorical meaning it could be very simplistic; it is the literal meaning that adds further layers to the texture of the meaning of the line.

De Man says that there are nor just these extremes of a naive question assuming rhetoricity and a rhetorical question appearing more meaningful when ordinary considered. he goes on to examine Proust's "Swann's Way" where in he finds the juxtaposition of figural and metafigural language. Proust writes 'figuratively about figures'. One can feel the mastery of metaphor over metonymy in the works of Proust. ('Metonymy' is 'a figure of speech in which the name or an attribute of a thing is substituted for the thing itself. Ex. "Crown" for monarchy; 'Church' for religion. In the case of Bunker and Yeats there was the rhetorization of grammar. In the case of Proust, however, there is the grammatization of rhetoric. This is because, in the case of Proust, 'a vast thematic and semiotic network is revealed and remained invisible to a reader caught in native metaphorical mystification. This kind of an analysis could be made applicable to the works of other writers also like Milton or Dante.

Paul de Man concludes the essay by saying that the act of reading of great works of literature is marked by the pathos of anxiety because of 'an emotive reaction to the impossibility of

knowing what it might be upto'. This anxiety makes the language of literature and criticism rigorous and positively unreliable

LIST OF CRITICAL WORKS

1. Alvin Kernan, *The Death of Literature*, London; Yale University Press. 1990, 181-88.
2. Ralph Cohen (ed.) *The Future of literary Theory*, London: Routledge, 1989, 268-80.
3. Martin Coyle, Peter Garside et al. *Encyclopaedia of Literature and Criticism*, NY: Routledge, 1990, 783-88.

QUESTIONS

1. The role of de Man as an exponent of the theory of language as something that 'produces meaning and undoes what it produces'.

Prepared by:

Prof. K. Gopala Krishnan, Trivandrum.

"HAMLET": THE PSYCHOANALYTICAL SOLUTION

ERNEST JONES

A very brief introduction to various schools of criticism

Critical evaluation of a good text is largely interpretive. It is universally accepted that no single critical interpretive approach can exhaust the manifold possibilities of a good literary work. Each approach is handicapped by its peculiar, as also severe, limitations. For instance, "formalistic" criticism has for its sole object the discovery and explanation of FORM in the literary work-which assumes the autonomous existence of the work itself and ignores extra-literary considerations like the life of the author and his place in the socio political and socio economic parameters of the period, psychological implications, relevance, structural organization etc of the work. "Historical-Biographical" approach looks at a literary work as a reflection of its author's life and times or the life and times of the characters in the work. As the French critic H.A. Taine succinctly put it, each literary work belongs to a "Race, Milieu, and Moment". The "moral - Philosophical" approach which is as old as Plato looks upon literature as a tool to teach morality and to probe philosophical issues (especially of a particular period), besides sporting "high seriousness" and considers the literary/rhetorical/figurative elements as secondary. "mythological/Archetypal" criticism deals with the

relationship of literary art to "some very deep chord" to seek out those mysterious elements that inform certain literary works and to elicit, with almost uncanny force, dramatic, universal and perennial human response and relations. The "exponential" approach investigates images, symbols, metaphorical and rhetorical devices and the like which have communicative and evocative powers and which make statements obliquely, besides helping the artistic weaving of the devices into meaningful patterns. In addition to the above, we have approaches like Aristotelian criticism, feminist criticism, genre criticism, linguistic criticism, phenomenological criticism (ie the criticism of consciousness, the experience of the self, sociological criticism, structural criticism, stylistic criticism, rhetorical criticism, criticism based on the history of ideas etc., etc. Moreover, we have a refreshing, new and challenging one: psychological/psychoanalytical criticism (used interchangeably).

INTRODUCTION TO PSYCHOLOGICAL/ PSYCHOANALYTICAL CRITICISM:

Psychological criticism is the most controversial, the most abused, the most misunderstood and also the least appreciated though it can be really fascinating, rewarding and strangely "satisfying". Where many other approaches fail, it fills in the lacunae in many cases. Though it is severely inadequate in the aesthetic domain, it can offer clear clues to solve a literary work's thematic and symbolic mysteries and can help us in "reading beneath the lines".

The human psyche is as old as the human kind. The first taste of psychological criticism as far as we know is given by Aristotle when he talks about the combination of the emotions of pity and terror producing catharsis. During the Renaissance it is taken up by Sir Philip Sidney who talks about the moral effects of poetry. Coleridge, Wordsworth and Shelly talk about the theories of imagination. In short, all good writers and critics are concerned with the psychology of writing and responding to literature.

However, psychological criticism in the present century is usually associated with the psychoanalytical theories of Sigmund Freud (1852-1939) and his disciples and followers. Unfortunately, abuses of the approach are seen as a result of an excess of enthusiasm, a Procrustean intolerance of other approaches, inadequate grasp of psychology and psychoanalysis, insufficient feeling for literature (of psychoanalysts who criticise literature) etc. etc. If appropriately applied it can provide wonderful insights into otherwise opaque areas of literary works.

FREUD'S THEORIES:

The foundation of Freudian psychology is its emphasis on the unconscious aspects of the human mind. Freud states that almost all our actions are triggered by psychic forces over which we have only little or partial control. The human psyche is like the iceberg, four-fifths hidden and one-fifth visible. The heavy and hidden eighty percent lies beneath the surface of the sea and so is the case with the psyche. That is to say, the human psyche is layered. Freud says about the levels of conscious and unconscious mental activity.

"The oldest and best meaning of the word "unconscious" is the descriptive one; we call unconscious any mental process the existence of which we are obliged to assume—because, for instance, we infer it in some way from its effects—but of which we are not directly aware... if we want to be more accurate, we should modify the statement by saying that we call a process "unconscious", when we have to assume that it was active at a certain time although at that time we knew nothing about it."

He asserts that even the "most conscious processes are conscious for only a short period, quite soon they become latent though they can easily become conscious again"

He defines two kinds of consciousness:

"One which is transformed into conscious material easily and under conditions which frequently arise, and another in the case of which such a transformation is difficult, can only come about with a

considerable expenditure of energy or may never occur at all..... We call the unconscious which is only latent, and so can easily become conscious, "the precocious" and keep the name "unconscious" for the other."

The first major premise of Freud is that most of the individual's mental processes are unconscious. The second is that all human behaviour is motivated ultimately by sexuality (which has been rejected by a great many scholars including Jung and Adler, Freud's disciples). Freud designates the prime psychic force as libido, or sexual energy. The third is that since powerful social taboos are attached to certain sexual impulses, many of our desires and memories are repressed (i.e. actively excluded from conscious awareness).

There are three psychic zones of mental activity according to Freud: the id, the ego and the superego. Freud gives the following diagram to illustrate the idea;

Perpetual - Conscious

DIAGRAM

From the diagram we at once learn that the bulk of our mental apparatus is in the unconscious level. The diagram tells us about the relationship between (and amongst) ego, id and superego along with collective relationship to the conscious and unconscious. The id is totally in the unconscious and just a small portion of the ego and the superego is in the conscious. The diagram helps us in defining the character and function of the three psychic zones.

The id is the reservoir of the libido which is the primary source of all psychic energy. It serves to fulfil the primordial life principle, which, according to Freud, is the pleasure principle. Without consciousness or semblance of rational order, the id is characterized by an explosive and amorphous vitality. Freud explains this "obscure, inaccessible part of our personlaity" as a "chaos, a cauldron of seething excitement (with) no organization and no unified will, only an

impulsion to obtain satisfaction for the instinctual needs in accordance with the pleasure principle". Freud emphasizes: "...the laws of logic above all the laws of contradiction - do not hold for processes of the id. Contradictory impulses exist side by side without neutralizing each other - or drawing apart... Naturally the id knows no values, no good and evil, no morality."

The id is, in short, the source of all our aggressions and desires. It is lawless, asocial and amoral. Its function is to gratify our instincts for pleasure without regard for social conventions, legal ethics, or moral restraints. Unchecked, it would lead us on any lengths to destruction and even to self-destruction to satisfy its impulses for pleasure. Safety for the self and for others does not lie within the province of the id; its concern is purely for instinctual gratification, regardless of consequences. For centuries before Freud this force was recognized in human nature but most often attributed to supernatural and/or external rather than to natural and internal forces. Freud's id is identical in many respects to the daemon as defined by theologians. When Virginia Woolf refers to children as "daemons of wickedness and angels of delight" she must have meant precisely what Freud had in mind - the daemon of wickedness. It is one whose id has not yet been brought under proper control by ego and superego. Children are quite often seen to possess certain uncontrolled impulses towards pleasure that often lead to excessive self-indulgence and even to self-injury.

The ego regulates the id to give protection to the individual and society. It is not as powerful as the id. In the layman's language ego stands for reason and circumspection while the id stands for untamed passions.

The superego, another regulatory mechanism, protects society; it is the moral sensory agency, the repository of conscience and pride. In Freud's own words it is the representative of all moral restrictions, the advocate of the impulse towards perfection... it is the higher things in human life. Acting either directly or through the ego, the superego

serves to repress or inhibit the drives of the id, to block off and thrust back into the unconscious those impulses toward pleasure that society regards as unacceptable, such impulses as overt aggressio, sexual passions and the Oedipal instinct. Freud attributes the development of the superego to the parental influence that manifests itself in terms of the punishment for what society considers to be bad conduct behaviour. An overactive superego creates an unconscious sense of guilt (hence the familiar term "guilt complex" and the widespread misconceptions that Freud advocated relaxation of all moral inhibitions and sexual restraints). Whereas the id is dominated by the pleasure principle, the superego is dominated by the morality principle. We may say that the id can make is demons, and the superego angels (or worse, creatures of absolute social conformity); it is the duty of the ego to keep us healthy human beings by maintaining a balance between these two opposing forces. Freud advocated this balance and not a total removal of inhibitions.

Freud's theories concerning the psychology of children are more relevant to us. He believed that infancy and childhood are periods of intense sexual experience (sexual in a very broad sense). In the course of the first five years or so of a child's life, the child passes through a series of phases in his erotic development and each phase is characterised by emphasis on a particular erogenous zone: oral, anal urethral, phallic, oedipal. We know that these zones are associated with pleasure in simulation; besides, they gratify our vital needs - eating and drinking, eliminating and reproducing. Normally, the transfer from one stage to another (in the given order) is smooth and natural, but in certain cases, impediments to gratification of the needs may lead to "fixation". Many behavioural patterns can be explained on this basis. According to Freud normal children reach the stage of "genital primacy" about the age of five. It is normally at this age (stage) the Oedipus complex begins to manifest itself.

The Oedipus complex, in ordinary language, derives from

the boy's unconscious rivalry with his father for the love of his mother (Freud borrows the term from the Sophoclean tragedy - "Oedipus, the king" in which Oedipus, the hero, unwittingly murders his father and marries his mother. In Freud's own words the complex is described as follows:

"The boy deals with his father by identifying himself with him. For a time these two relationships (the child's devotion to his mother and identification with his father) proceed side by side, until the boy's sexual wishes in regard to his mother become more intense and his father is perceived as an obstacle to them; from this the Oedipus complex originates. His identification with his father then takes on a hostile colouring and changes into a wish to get rid of his father in order to have his place with his mother. Hence forward his relation to his father is ambivalent; it seems as if the ambivalence inherent in the identification from the beginning has become manifest. An ambivalent attitude to his father and an object relation of a solely affectionate kind to his mother make up the content of the simple positive Oedipus complex in a boy".

Apart from the above, Oedipus complex implies a fear of castration and identification of the father with strict authority in all forms. Thus in later life a person who hates authority manifests this Oedipal ambivalence.

With this brief introduction we shall now enter our topic of discussion: hamlet: the Psychoanalytical Solution.

The essay is taken from "Hamlet and Oedipus" by Dr. Ernest Jones M.D. Dr. Ernest Jones was born in 1879 and died in 1958. He was the foremost disciple of Freud in England. His work include,

Addresses on Psychoanalysis
Hamlet and Oedipus
Essays in Applied Psychoanalysis
and

Free Associations

The Essay "Hamlet: the Psychoanalytical Solution" was first

published as early as 1910 and later expanded into the book titled "Hamlet and Oedipus". Study the title where we have the word "solution" which suggests a problem. The problem is too well-known to be stated here again.

SYNOPSIS

Why does Hamlet vacillate? Is it because he is unable to act? Is it because it is difficult to carry out? Or is it because it is repugnant to him? Most likely, the last is the reason. Then why is the task repugnant? The following arguments are given to show that the act of revenge is repugnant:

- 1) Hamlet gravely doubted the moral legitimacy of revenge (c.f. 'Vengeance is mine,' sayeth the Lord)-which led to the internal conflict between his natural urge to avenge his father's murder and his highly developed ethical and Christian views.
- 2) The task is very much beneath his dignity.
- 3) He is stalling for time to find out how he can sinlessly commit his heinous sin.
- 4) It is against the law.
- 5) Hamlet suspects the reliability of the Ghost's evidence; he considers the evidence inadequate.
- 6) Hamlet perhaps thinks that if he kills Claudius, he will not only be guilty of regicide but also be guilty of usurpation.

Hamlet gives several excuses for this hesitancy though he never minces his words about his bounden duty. He knows what he ought to do. But he never comes round to do it. And Hamlet himself is unconscious of his repugnance to the task. For a thinking man like Hamlet introspection will reveal the predicament. We cannot rule out the possibility of a conflict between the impulse to carry out the revenge and some special cause of repugnance to it. We have to presume that he did not know the cause of repugnance. In short, everything in the play points to the fact that Hamlet's "hesitancy was due to some special cause of repugnance for this

task and that he was unaware of the nature of this repugnance". Literary texts, according to Freudians, are the direct expression of the author's psyche and as Shakespeare himself was unaware of the nature of the repugnance, he did not make it explicit in the play. In other words, the author is unable to help us. Now we find that the author, the hero and the readers/audience are all the unaware of the conflict, the repugnance and the consequent inaction.

Extensive investigations and researches into clinical psychology reveal that man is "a creature only dimly conscious of the various influences that mould his thought and action and blindly resisting with all the means at his command the forces that are making for a higher and fuller consciousness".

There is no doubt that Hamlet is suffering from an internal conflict. He does not know what its nature is. He knows his duty. He shirks it at every opportunity and he knows that too and suffers in consequence the most intense remorse. This is hysterical paralysis. "Hamlet's advocates say he cannot do his duty, his detractors say he will not, whereas the truth is that he cannot will". This deficient will power is localized to the one question of killing his uncle. It is a specific aboulia (an inability to exercise will power and come to decisions). Investigations in real case studies prove that such aboulias are due to an unconscious revulsion against the act that cannot be performed (or something close or related to it). In other words, whenever a person cannot bring himself to do something that every conscious consideration tells him he should do and which he may have the strongest conscious desire to do- it is always because there is some hidden reason why a part of him does not want to do it; this reason he will not own to himself and is only dimly, if at all, aware of. Hamlet is the living proof for the above. The play abounds in evidences to prove this. Hamlet's "bestial oblivion" may be taken in a literal sense, his unconscious destitution of his task being so intense as to enable him actually to forget it for periods.

The arguments given by Hamlet defending his delay are too

inconsistent, baseless and varied. "The arguments that the reasons given by Hamlet not to kill the king are cogent are irrelevant. For the man who wants to procrastinate cogent arguments are more valuable than mere pretext." When a man gives at different times a different reason for his conduct, it is safe to infer that, whether consciously or not, he is concealing the true reason. This is the case with Hamlet and his alleged motives can be dismissed as being more or less successful attempts on his part to blind himself with self deception. The motives illustrate the psychological mechanism of evasion and rationalization.

Hamlet is too self-critical. He knows his shortcomings, tries hard to overcome them and fails everytime. The long speech in the course of which he contrasts himself with the player playing Hecuba bears testimony to this.

"What's Hecuba..... a scullion" (Act II. Sc. ii) In the course of the speech he refers to how he has been "prompted to my revenge by heaven and hell". There can be nothing more forceful than this prompting. Still Hamlet is unable to bring himself up to the task of revenge. There are other instances where reminders are given. The ghost's words: "Do not forget! this visitation/ Is but to whet thy almost blunted purpose and Hamlet's own words

"Do you not come your tardy son to chide,

That lapsed in time and passion lets go by

Th' important acting of your dread command?"

amply prove the point. Throughout the play clues are provided indicating Hamlet's tortured conscience, some hidden ground which he dare not or cannot avow to himself. So what is the countermotive?

Fruedian psychology tells us about certain kinds of mental processes showing a greater tendency to be inaccessible to consciousness (ie. repressed) than others. The person is unable to realize that such things exist. Researches indicate that the relative frequency of repression can be correlated with the degree of compatibility of these various sets of mental processes with the ideals

and standards accepted by the conscious ego; the less compatible they are with these, the more likely are they to be repressed. The ideals and standards come from the immediate social environment, those processes which are the most disapproved of by the particular circle of society where the person grew up during this formative period (i.e. the impressionable period) are most likely to be repressed. i.e. "That which is unacceptable to the herd becomes unacceptable to the individual member". Hence the obvious fact that moral social, ethical and/or religious tendencies are seldom repressed as they are of the whole community. The individual conforms and so he is not ashamed of them as society approves of them.

Repression is a dynamic process. Thoughts are repressed by a definite force, though the person is rarely aware of this. What is depressed is energetic in its own way and sometimes manifests itself as tendency trend, inclination etc. etc. Usually the repressed things are innate impulses, especially natural, sexual, psychosexual ones. Clinical psychology has proved that many conflicts centre about sexual problems. On the surface this does not appear so, for, through various psychological defence mechanisms, the depression, doubt, despair and other manifestations of the conflict are transferred on to the more tolerable and permissible topics, such as anxiety about worldly success or failure, about immortality and the salvation of the soul, philosophical considerations about the value of life, the future of the world and so on. Ethics does not enter there. Hamlet's high calibre intelligence and rationalization would have made him aware of baseless, simple misgivings. So the repressed inhibiting striving against vengeance arose in some hidden source connected with his more personal, natural instincts. This needs to be investigated.

Claudius is the object of Hamlet's vengeance. Claudius' crimes are incest and murder. Hamlet's attitudes towards him are conditioned by the nature of the offences. Both offences are heinous. But there can be no question as to which arouses in him the deeper loathing.

Whereas the murder of his father evokes in him indignation and a plain recognition of his obvious duty to avenge it, Gertrude's guilty conduct awakes in him the intensest horror. Her offence is disgraceful adultery and incest and treason to his noble father's memory (recall the bed-chamber scene and Hamlet's words: Look here upon this picture and on this.....)

The two crimes of Claudius may have an interrelation too. The criminal is one of the closest relatives. These may have perplexed Hamlet and led to a kind of hysterical paralysis. In the first soliloquy beginning-"O that this too too solid flesh would melt..." he reveals his shock at his mother's misconduct - Frailty, thy name is woman-why, she would hang on him - O most wicked speed, to post with such dexterity to incestuous sheets etc. Recall that he has not heard about his father's murder yet. The very thought of his mother's misconduct prompts him to consider suicide. Why this soul-paralysing grief and distaste for life? What is it really that has produced them? It cannot be his mother's misdemeanour alone. All investigations point at some mental disorder of Hamlet. Is it plain insanity? Is it hysteroneurasthenia: Is it melancholia? Is it hysterical paralysis? The text tells us that the symptoms point at melancholia, manic-depressive insanity. However, on closer clinical examination, it can be identified as a severe case of cyclothemia (the rapid and startling oscillations between intense excitements and profound depression). How does it affect the play? Here Robert Bridges comes to our help).

Hamlet himself would never have been aught to us, or we to Hamlet, were't not for the artful balance whereby Shakespeare so gingerly put his sanity in doubt without the while confounding his reason. (Verse rewritten as prose).

To explain the above we have in psychology the term "psychoneurosis"-a mental disease without any apparent anatomical lesion, a functional disorder of the mind in one who is legally sane and shows insight into his condition. The psycho-neurotic is unduly,

and often painfully, driven or thwarted by the unconscious part of his mind, that buried part that was once the infant's mind and still lives on side by side with the adult mentally that has developed out of it and should have taken its place. It signifies "internal" (mental) conflict. An intelligent explanation is possible only when present manifestations are correlated with the psychic manifestation of the infant of the past and those which are still operating.

Hamlet, as an Infant, must have bitterly resented having had to share his mother's love and affection even with his (own) father, must have resented him as his rival and secretly wished him out of his way so that he might enjoy, undisputed and undisturbed, the monopoly of that love and affection. However, filial piety and education (strong influences) must have "repressed" such thoughts and all traces of them obliterated. The actual realization of this early wish in the death of his father at the hands of a jealous rival would then have stimulated into activity these "repressed" memories, which would have produced, in the form of depression and other suffering, an obscure aftermath of his infancy's conflict. The investigations of all real 'Hamlets' corroborate this conclusion.

"Therefore, the explanation of the delay and self frustration exhibited in the endeavour to fulfil his father's demand for vengeance is that to Hamlet the thought of incest and parricide combined is too intolerable to be borne. One part of him tries to carry out the task, the other flinches inexorably from the thought of it. How fain would he blot it out in that bestial oblivion which unfortunately for him his conscience condemns. He is torn and tortured in an insoluble inner conflict".

To conclude, the ambivalence that typifies the child's attitude toward his father is dramatized in the character of the ghost (the good, lovable, revered father with whom the boy identifies) and Claudius (the hated father as tyrant and rival), both of whom are dramatic projections of the hero's own conscious-unconscious ambivalence toward the

father figure. The ghost represents the conscious ideal of fatherhood. The image that is socially acceptable”.

“.....
see what a grace....
.....
this was your husband”

His view of Claudius, on the other hand, represents Hamlet's repressed hostility towards his father as a rival for his mother's affection. This new Kin-father is the symbolic perpetrator of the very deeds towards which the son is impelled by his own unconscious motives:- murder of his father and incest with his mother. Hamlet cannot bring himself to kill Claudius because to do so he must, in a psychological sense, kill himself. His delay and frustration in trying to fulfill the ghost's demand for vengeance may therefore be explained by the fact that the “thought of incest and parricide combined is too intolerable to be borne. One part of him tries to carry out the task, the other flinches inexorably from the thought of it,” (already quoted).

This seems to be the best explanation for the inordinate delay in Hamlet's carrying out his task of revenge. Hence the importance of psychoanalytical criticism. Where other approaches fail, it offers help in elucidation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A large number of books of Psychology, Applied Psychology and Psychoanalytical Criticism is available in every good library. The following books will be of immense use:

- 1) Roy P. Basker : Sex, Symbolism and Psychology in Literature.
- 2) Frederick C. Crews : Psychoanalysis and Literary Process
- 3) Sigmund Freud : An Outline of Psychoanalysis
- 4) Norman Holland : The Dynamics of Literary Response
- 5) Norman Holland : Contemporary Criticism; Cambridge

(Pages 131-153)

- 6) Ernest Kris : Psychoanalytic Explorations in Art
- 7) Elizabeth Wright : Psychoanalytic Criticism: Theory in Practice
- 8) Hendrik Ruitendbeek : Psychoanalysis and Literature
- 9) Otto Fenichel : The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis

MARXISM AND LITERATURE

EDMUND WILSON

Edmund Wilson was born in 1895. He is a graduate form Princeton University. A journalist by profession, he is recognize as one of the finest American critics of the present century

Wilson has made extensive use of Freudian insights in his study of literature. He has also been under the strong influence of Marxist political ideology. Though strongly influenced by both Freud and Marx, Wilson is neither Freudian nor Marxist, but a proponent of an empirical descroptive literary theory.

This essay is taken from his famous book "The Triple Thinkers". It first appeared in the 'Atlantic Monthly' (1937). Wilson describes his disillusionment with the later phase of Marxist ideology, especially with the arrival of Stalin and dictatorship

SUMMARY OF THE ESSAY

Dialectical Materialism is Karl Marx's view of history as a conflict between two opposing forces, thesis and antithesis, which is resolved by the forming of a new force, synthesis; present conditions are du to a class struggle between the capitalists whose aim is private profit and the workers who resist exploitation. In dialectical materialism the role of literature and art was not ready made or fixed beforehand. Marx and his friend/collaborator Engels conceived the forms of human society in any given time and country as growing out of the methods of production which prevailed at that time and

place; out of the relations involved in the social forms arose a superstructure of higher activities such as politics, law, religion, philosophy, literature and art. Economics cannot satisfactorily explain these activities. Each of the superstructures tries to get way from the roots in the social classes and to form a professional group with its own discipline and standards of value which cut across class lines. They reacted upon one another and then in turn reacted upon the economic base. There was indeed a reciprocal relationship too. Vital and visionary art influenced economic foundations as history testifies. At the same time artists quite frequently worked for the destruction of the social system which trained, supported and encouraged the artists.

Marx and Engels did not set social-economic formulas to test the arts with. They were themselves good poets, responding to imaginative work on its artistic merits. Marx used to say that poets were originals who must be allowed to go their own way, Marx and Engles never judged literature (or power and distinction) in terms of its purely political tendencies. Engles, in fact, warned the socialist novelists against the dangers of ideologically committed literature. Records show how both Marx and Engels were moved by literature, by Aeschylus, Goethe and Shakespeare. Marx had not formulated any systematic explanation of the relation of arts to social arrangements. He even observed: certain periods of the highest development of art stand in no direct connection, with general development of society nor with the material basis and the skeleton structure of its organisation. Marx and Engels never used art as a weapon (instrument of propaganda), as they were strongly under the influence of the Renaissance idea of the complete man.

When Lenin appears on the scene, things changes somewhat, Lenin was a Marxist organizer and fighter. However, he was sensitive to music and great literature like the products of Pushkin, Tolstoy and Gorky. He admired them and lavished praise on thsm. But he was suspicious of people.

Trotsky was a literary man; with profound insight he wrote on the problems arising for Russian writers with the new society of the Bolshevik Revolution. He knew about the question of the 'carry-over-value' of literature. (1) What was to be the value of the literature and art of the age of barbarism and oppression in the dawn of socialist freedom? (2) What in particular was to be the status of culture of the bourgeois society from which socialism had just emerged and of which it still bore the unforgotten scars? (3) Would there be a new proletarian literature with new language, new style, new form to give expression to the emotions and ideas of the new proletarian dictatorship?

Lenin had opposed the new 'Proletcult' (the group which aimed at monopolizing the control of soviet literature) saying that proletariat (or proletarian) culture could not be synthesised by dicta. It had to evolve. Trotsky decried terms like 'proletarian culture' and 'proletarian literature'; he had seen the changes coming over literature, art and criticism and believed that proletarian culture would not displace or replace bourgeois culture. Proletarian culture was purely temporary and a transition phase which would be replaced by a truly human culture. Trotsky said that communism had no artistic culture but only a political one.

Since the Revolution there had been attempts in Russia by cultural groups to dominate literature either with or without the authority of the government. Even Trotsky himself had to be a part of the system. Sympathizers assumed that such censors and controls were part of the realization of socialism and government intervention in matters of culture was desirable. Edmund Wilson observes that it was a mistaken notion. The great Russian literature of the nineteenth century flourished under the Czar and it is noted for its mastery of the art of implication. Ever since the Bolshevik Revolution literature and politics in Russia have remained inextricable and the intelligentsia themselves have been in political power. The identification of literature with politics was liable to terrible abuses. Through Lenin, Trotsky,

Lunacharsky and Gorky tried very hard to keep literature free, they had known that art was a powerful instrument of propaganda. The first soviet films prove the point. When Lenin and Lunacharsky died and Trotsky was exiled, Stalin, unlitrary and uncultivated, started using literature as a tool for the manipulation of people, 70-80% of whom were illiterate. They would never have read any thing discerningly. Gorky attempted liberalism and the opening of Russia for contemporary foreign writing and the Classics. However, under Stalin that did not stimulate or release a living literature. We all know that where political opposition is not possible, there cannot be any political criticism and in Russia political questions involved the fate of society vitally. Aesthetic freedom is meaningless in the absence of social freedom for social minded writers. Writers were imprisoned. The practice of deliberate falsification of social and political history which began at the time of the Stalin-Trotsky crisis had attained such fantastic proportions that the government did not seem to hesitate to pass the sponge every month or so over every thing that the people had been told and to present them with a new and contradictory version of their history, their duty and the character and career of their leaders. This practice corrupted every department of intellectual life, till the serious, the humane and the clear-seeking had to simply remain silent, if they could.

Marxism in Russia had run itself into a blind alley or rather it had been put down a well. The Soviets had not even the Marxist political culture. Inspiration seemed to have vanished.

This is the point at which Edmund Wilson tells us about Marxism and literature ".... Marxism by itself can tell us nothing whatever about the goodness or badness of a work of art. A man may be an excellent Marxist, but if he lacks imagination and taste he will be unable to make the choice between a good book and an inferior one both of which are ideologically unexceptionable. What Marxism can do, however, is to throw a great deal of light on the origins and social

significance of works of art". The study of literature in its relation to society is as old as Herder(1744-1803) and even Vico(1668-1744) (Please refer to Raymond Williams: Marxism and Literature) Coleridge knew about the relation between social and literary phenomena. The great master of this kind of criticism is Hippolyte-Adolphe Taine with his race and moment and milieu though his response was artistic and appreciative. Marx and Engels introduced an economic base to the study and production of art. Wilson warns: a person who does not understand literature really and who tries to apply Marxist principles to study it can go horribly wrong. Great literature is not simple message; it is a complex vision, implicit and not explicit. Morals drawn may be wrong. The more camouflaged the political ideas, the better for the work of art. It is not essential that characters should be represented in conflict representing larger conflicts in the society which might be quite silly from the point of view of the work of art. In art there prevails a sort of law of moral interchangeability. Wilson here talks about Marcel Proust, Thornton Wilder, Upton Sinclair and Ernest Hemingway.

The leftist critic with little or no literary competence tries to evaluate literary works by tests which have no validity in that field. One of his obsessions is to give specific directions and working out diagrams for the construction of Marxist models. Such things are useless. Rules are made afterwards. For instance, Aristotle wrote his 'Poetics' long after the plays of Sophocles, Euripides and Aeschylus were written and performed. In other words, the Greek Masters wrote their plays and these plays later decreed what the salient features of Greek tragedies are.

Wilson refers to Granville Hicks who drew up the following list of requirements which the ideal Marxist work of literature must meet asserting that the primary function of such a work must be to lead the proletarian reader to recognize his role in the class struggles:

1) It must directly or indirectly show the effects of the class struggle.

2) The author must be able to make the reader feel that he is participating in the lives described.

3) The author's point of view must be that of the vanguard of the proletariat; he should be, or try to make himself a member of the proletariat.

Hicks, however, observes that "no novel as yet written perfectly conforms to our demands". The doctrine of socialist realism was only an attempt to legislate masterpieces into existence. This attempt was counter productive. It indicated a sterility on the part of those who engaged in it and it legislated good literature out of existence and discouraged further production. Good literature is not made as per prescription. For instance, if Tolstoy were asked to write as per the dictates of Marxist politicians, he would not have been able to write even a chapter. If morality were to be observed by Shakespeare, he would not have written even one scene. In short, world class literature cannot be made to order as per formulas.

We realise that the formulas were stipulated to make use of literature as an effective tool in the class struggle, i.e. art as weapon. But great art is not great simply because it is a great weapon. Dante and Shakespeare helped the modern European man emerge from the Middle Ages with their literature which can hardly be called a weapon. Long range literature with great carry-over-value attempts to sum up wide areas and long periods of human experience or to extract from them general laws; short range literature preaches and pamphleteers with the view to an immediate effect. Leftists(i.e. writers) seem not to know what their aim is.

Now Wilson discusses the contentious issue of the most favourable periods for works of art. He says that highly developed forms of art require leisure and a certain amount of political stability. He quotes instances to prove the point. Masterpieces are produced not by impending revolutions. The writer may reflect a time of transition but he need not be looking ahead at the future. Wilson refers to Dante and

Virgil to prove his point here. Virgil saw the decay of the Roman Empire and Dante that of the Catholic Church. Therefore, it is impossible to identify the highest creative work in art with the most active moments of powerful social change. Great works are produced when not violent revolutions are going on in the country. The writer may be very critical of his country, but if the country is boiling over, he may not be able to write at all.

Now Wilson proceeds to answer the question: "What about proletarian literature as an accompaniment of the social revolution?"

"Studies tell us that Russian authors trying to eliminate bourgeois point of view from their literary output had pruned their vocabulary and syntax to an absurd level of essentials which resulted in total unintelligibility. However, things looked up a little later when literature was once again built on the classics and those authors who belonged to the pre-revolution era. Even as late (or is it early?) as 1936 literature was acknowledged as enriching the reader's knowledge of life and heightening 'his aesthetic sensibility and his emotional culture'. It was said to have an educational value. 'liberated socialist humanity inherits that is beautiful, elevating and sustaining in the culture of the previous ages', quotes Wilson. Great literature cannot appeal to uneducated people and in Russia the educated were hardly 20% of the total population. Even proletarian literature in the U.S.A in the 1930's and 40's had its roots in the literature of the past, the classics.

Well, Marxism is new in this world. It is a political philosophy leading directly to programmes of action aiming not at production of literature, but a society. In other words, marxism is social engineering. It is society that becomes a work of art under Marxism.

In the early stages it may have teething troubles. Human imagination has come to conceive the possibility of recreating human society. We can scarcely predict accurately what the shape of things to come will be. May be human spirit may transcend literature itself.

Wilson does not elaborate upon Marxist literary theory. He tells us about the basic connection between Marxism and literature, how literature thrives in a socialist country. Marxist literary theory starts from the assumption that literature must be understood, in relation to historical and social reality as interpreted from a Marxist point of view. The fundamental Marxist postulate is that the economic base of a society determines the nature and structure of the ideology, institutions and practices (such as literature) that form the superstructure of that society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

A very large number of books are available on Marxism and Literature. The following will be of immense use.

- 1) Terry Eagleton : Criticism and Ideology
Marxism and Literary Criticism
- 2) Frederic Jameson : Marxism and Form: 20th C.
Dialectical Theories of Literature
- 3) Louis Althusser : Lenin and Philosophy and Other
Essays
- 4) Raymond Williams : Marxism and Literature

Warning: These notes are no substitute for the essay proper. Read the original essay as many times as you can.

birth to contemporary feminist criticism. "Thinking about women" (1968) by Mary Ellman and "Sexual Politics" (1970) by Kate Millett were pioneering works.

The Feminist critics wanted to revise orthodox "male" literary history, expose sexual stereotyping in canonical texts, and reinterpret or revive the works of woman authors. Showalter made significant contributions in the direction but she felt in the late 1970's that feminist criticism had reached a "theoretical impasse". She attributed this impasse to the essentially male character of theory itself.

In this essay she asks: What is the difference in women's writing? The question began the shift from "an androcentric to a gynocentric feminist criticism". Revisionist readings of the male canon can, therefore, no longer contain the momentum of women's criticism. Showalter analyses four theoretical that explore this difference: Biological, linguistic, psychoanalytical and cultural. These models are sequential with each being subsumed and enhanced by the one following. The cultural model provides, "a more complete and satisfying way to talk about the specificity and difference of women's writing". She then begins the work of providing a ground for feminist criticism, a ground that is not "the serenely undifferentiated universality of texts but the tumultuous and intriguing wilderness of difference itself".

FEMINIST CRITICISM IN A NUTSHELL:

Feminist criticism as we understand it at present, is concerned with both women as writers and women as readers (of male and female texts). This kind of criticism is an activity that raises questions of aesthetics and politics and the relationship of women to language. It has recovered lost or neglected writers (women) and highlighted the obstacles facing women as authors. This is where Virginia Woolf's essay "A Room of One's Own" (1929) becomes quite pertinent. It has also established the importance for women of having their own space in which to speak and express themselves, of course, freely. The

FEMINIST CRITICISM IN THE WILDERNESS

ELAINE SHOWALTER

The author, Elaine Showalter, was born in Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1941. She won an M.A. from Brandeis University and a Ph.D. from the University of California at Davis. She taught English and Women's Studies at Rutgers University and now teaches at Princeton. She has edited such volumes as:

- 1) Women's Liberation and Literature
- 2) Female Studies IV
- 3) Women's Studies
- 4) Signs
- 5) Journal of Women, Culture and Society
- 6) The new Feminist Criticism

Her Writings include:

- 1) A literature of their own: British Women Novelists from Bronte to Lessing;
- 2) ALternative Alcott
- 3) Speaking of Gender
- 4) Sexual Anarchy: Gender and Culture at the Fin de Siecle
- 5) Sister's Choice: Tradition and Change in American Women's Writing

It was the women's liberation movement of the 1960's that gave

feminist movement of the 1960s resulted in an explosion of magazines by and for women (eg. Ms. ZSpace Rib, Questions Feministes, Le Torchon, Brule, Signs) and the establishment of feminist publishing houses (Virago, Women's Press, Des Femmes). Women as readers or feminist reading can be divided into Anglo-American (Author-centres) and French (text-centred) traditions. In the case of the former Kate Millett's "Sexual Politics" (1969) was an early challenge to the authority of the author: It questioned, it represented a reading against the grain. Other Anglo-American critics have been uneasy with theory (a male discourse). They have sought to establish the authenticity of the female writer's voice (eg. Showalter on Virginia "A Literature of their own") and to expose the sexual ideology in the work of male and female authors. The French tradition, in contrast, has always been more theoretical and influenced by psychoanalytical theories, Structuralism and Deconstructiojn. It has situated the text (rather than the author) at the heart of critical practice. French feminist criticism (eg. the works of Helene Cixous, Luce Irigaray, Julia Kristeva, Sarah Kofman) had explored the construction of sexuality through the text and questioned the very existence of a fixed (male or female) human subject.

Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness: A summary of the essay

Elaine Showalter refers to the polarisation of feminist literary criticism as mentioned by Carolyn Helnrumsad Catherine Stimpson righteous, angry and admonitory at one pole and interested and seeking the grace of imagination at the ophther and agrees with that both are necessary for a holistic vision. However total distinteretedness is mere illusion at least for the present because of gender discrimination which is as old as human history. Since criticism is in the band of wilderness, feminist criticism too belongs to the band of wilderness.

Until 1975 feminist criticism seemed not to have theoretical manifesto or unified theory. Black writers condemned the massive silence of feminist criticism about black and third world women

authors Marxist feminists demanded the inclusion of class and gendert in literary production; deconstructionists desired a literary criticism which was both textual and feminist. Psychologists, both Freudian and Lacanian, very much liked a theory about women's writing, about women's relationship to language and signification. It was the unwillingness of many women to limit or contain an expressive dynamic enterprise that stalled the theoretical framework. In other words, at least for the Americans the openness of feminist criticism was admirable. many women writers glorified the exclusion of women from make jingoist theory and methodolatry. Thus feminist criticism resisted a theoretical framework and led to " a mode of negation within a fundamental dislectic". It was characterized by "a resistance to codification and refusal to have its parameters prematurely set. "An offshoot of this is the primacy of subjective experience in feminist literary appreciation, as against, and over, an objective, scientific criticism which is male centrues. Biut it was not an impasse, it was evolution. Feminist critics were anxious about their exclusion and isolation from theory and creative production. For some time nothing emerged in the form of theory for want of dialogue or loud thinking. Though there was a flood of writings, it was rather confusing.

One strand of feminist criticism is ideological which is concerned with the feminist as reader and offering feminist readings of texts which consider the images and stereotypes of women in literature, the omissions and minconception about women in criticism and woman-as-sign in semiotic systems. Feminist reading can be a liberating intellectual act as Adrienne Rich remarks.

A radical critique, feminist in its impulse would take the work first of all as a clue to how we live, how we have been living, how we have been led to imagine ourselves, how our language has trapped as well as liberated us, how the very act of naming has been till now a male prerogative, and how we can begin to see and name and therefore live-afresh

Showalter calls this feminist reading or the feminist critique. Coherence, she says, is difficult, as the whole exercise is eclectic. A feminist reading is just one of the many in the interpretive act/field and all the alternatives have built-in obsolescence. Kolodny concedes:

All the feminist is asserting, then, is her own equivalent right to liberate new (and perhaps different) significance from these same texts, and, at the same time, her right to choose which features of a text she takes as relevant because she is, after all, asking new and different questions of it. In the process, she claims neither definitiveness nor structural completeness for her different readings and reading systems, but only their usefulness in recognizing the particular achievements of woman-as-author and their applicability in conscientiously decoding woman-as-sign.

Kolodny believes this to be "the only critical stance consistent with the current status of the larger woman's movements". Nevertheless, Showalter disagrees with Kolodny and her pluralism and insists on a theoretical consensus.

Feminist criticism is revisionist: it "wants to decode and demystify all the disguised questions and answers that have always shadowed the connections between textuality and sexuality, genre and gender, psychosexual identity and cultural "authority" (Sandra Gilbert). This is an ambitious programme. Regrettably, feminist critique is built on existing "male" models which are put forward as universal. This dependence retards progress in evolving a theory and tackling theoretical problems. Androcentrism (male-centredness) inhibits gynocentric theorising and refuses to acknowledge the latter on equal terms. In France this has happened. So Showalter calls for a feminist criticism which is genuinely woman-centred, independent and intellectually coherent which addressed to women's experiences. "I do not think that feminist criticism can find a usable past in the androcentric critical tradition", she says. "It has more to learn from

This can destabilize not only grammar but also De Man believed women's studies than from English studies, more to learn from international feminist theory than from another seminar on the masters. It must find its own subject, its own system, its own theory, and its own voice.... we must choose to have the argument out at last on our own premises".

Defining the feminine: Gynocritics and the woman's text

A woman's writing is always feminine; it cannot help being feminine, at its best it is most feminine; the only difficulty lies in defining what we mean by feminine. (Virginia Woolf).

Feminist criticism is coming of age. What is feminine is getting defined. Feminist criticism is no longer revisionary reading but "a sustained investigation of literature by women as writers and its subjects are the history, styles, theses, genres and structures of writing by women, the psychodynamics of female creativity; the trajectory of the individual or female career, and the evolution and the laws of a female literary tradition. Showalter calls this critical discourse "gynocritics" (gyno means woman). Gynocritics offers several theoretical opportunities and one is looking at women's writings as "woman's writings as totally different from men's writing". Woman is different from man and so woman's writing is different from that of man. Now the question is: What is the difference of women's writing? Patricia Mayer Spacks's book titled "The Female imagination" (1975) marks the shift from an androcentric to a gynocentric feminist criticism. She asks how women's writing had been different, and how womanhood itself shaped women's creative expression. Thereafter, in many books, essays and papers women's writing asserted itself as the central project of feminist literary study.

The shift is not only American but also European. Though the latter has had no intellectual grounding in linguistics, Marxism, NeoFreudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis and Derridean deconstruction, it has a lot in common with radical American feminist theories in terms of intellectual affiliations and rhetorical energies.

The concept of "écriture féminine" (women's writings), the inscription of the female body and female differences in language and text, is a significant theoretical formulation in French feminist criticism, although it describes a Utopian possibility rather than a literary practice. There has not been much so far. Nonetheless, the concept of "écriture féminine" provides a way of talking about women's writing which reasserts the value of the feminine and identifies the theoretical project of feminist contributions made by Julia Kristeva, Helene Cixous and Luce Irigaray in this area. English feminist criticism has started to focus on women's writing. The thrust differs from country to country. English feminist criticism, essentially Marxist, stresses oppression; French, essentially textual, stresses expression. And all have become gynocentric and are struggling to find a terminology that can rescue the feminine from its stereotypical associations with inferiority.

Defining the unique difference of women's writing is difficult. Is it to be based on style, experience or reading? Spacks calls the difference a delicate divergency testifying to the subtle and elusive nature of the feminine practice of writing which is characterized by crucial deviations, the cumulative weightings of experience and exclusion which determine historically women's writings. This history is to be charted and is sure to lead to a solid, enduring, and real awareness of the relation of women to literary culture.

There are four models of difference: biological, linguistic, psychoanalytic and cultural. They try to define and differentiate the qualities of the woman writer and the women's text. Each model also represents a school of gynocentric feminist criticism with its own favourite texts, styles and methods. They overlap, but are roughly sequential in that each incorporates the one before.

BIOLOGICAL

The body of a female is different from that of a male. So biological criticism is the extreme statement of gender difference

of a text indelibly marked by the body. Anatomy is textuality. Biological criticism is also perplexing and crudely phallogocentric or 'ovarocentric' and dangerous in that it may emphasize the male superiority. Literary paternity (NOT maternity) may get emphasis as in the following observation.

In patriarchal western culture..... the text's author is a father a progenitor, a procreator, an aesthetic patriarch whose pen is an instrument of generative power like his penis.

Lacking phallic authority, women's writing is profoundly marked by the anxieties of this difference. If the pen is a metaphorical penis, from what organ can females generate texts?

The analogy is to be condemned. A pen is not a phallus. Women generate texts from the brain which is the metaphorical womb. Literary creativity is like the creation of a child conception, gestation, labour and delivery and is not just insemination which is the only thing that penises do.

Biological differentiation must be redefined; so also its relation to women's writing. "Women's writing proceeds from the body; our sexual differentiation is also our source".

Feminist criticism written in the biological perspective generally stresses the importance of the body as a source of imagery. This gets substantiated in the study of the poems of Whitman and Dickinson. Feminist criticism which itself tries to be biological, to write from the critic's body, has been intimate, confessional and often innovative in style in form. But on many occasions this becomes vulnerable, suicidal and too confessional. Yet in its obsession with the "corporeal ground of our intelligence" feminist biocriticism can also become cruelly prescriptive. "It is dangerous to place the body at the centre of a search for female identity..... The themes of otherness and of the body merge together, because the most visible difference between men and women and the only one we know for sure to be permanent..... is indeed the difference in body". This difference has been used as a

pretext to justify full power of one sex over the other. The study of biological imagery in women's writings is useful and important as long as we understand that factors other than anatomy are involved in it. Ideas about body are fundamental to understanding how women conceptualize their situation in society but there can be no expression of the body which is unmediated by linguistic, social and literary structures. The difference of woman's literary practice, therefore, must be sought in "the body of her writing and not the writing of her body".

WOMEN'S WRITING AND WOMEN'S LANGUAGE

"The women say, the language you speak poison your glottins, tongue, palate, lips. They say, the language you speak is made up of words that are killing you. They say, the language you speak is made up of signs that rightly speaking designate what men have appropriated".

(Monique Wittig)

Linguistic and textual theories ask the following questions:

- 1) Do men and women use language differently?
- 2) Can sex difference in language use be theorized in biological, sociological or cultural terms?
- 3) Can women create a new language of their own?
- 4) Are speaking, reading and writing gender marked?

American, English and French feminist critics have pointed out the philosophical, linguistic and practical problems of women's use of language, the debate over language is an exciting one in gynoritics. "The oppressor's Language" is criticized as sexist and abstract, the problem is not just sexist though. Nelly Furman explains: "It is through the medium of language that we define and categorize areas of difference and similarity, which in turn allow us to comprehend the world around us. male centred categorizations predominate in American English and subtly shape our understanding and perception of reality. this is why attention is increasingly directed to the inherently oppressive aspects for

women of male-constructed language systems".

A similar view is expressed by Carolyn Burke about French feminist theory: "The central issue in much recent women's writing in France is to find and use an appropriate female language. Language is the place to begin: a capture of consciousness must be followed by a capture of speech.... In this view, the very forms of the dominant mode of discourse show the mark of the dominant masculine ideology. Hence, when a woman writes or speaks herself into existence, she is "forced to speak in something like a foreign tongue, a language with which she may be uncomfortable.

So many French feminists advocate a revolutionary linguism, an oral break from the dictatorship of patriarchal speech. Annie Leclerc calls on women "to invent a language that is not oppressive, a language that does not leave speechless but that loosens the tongue". Chantal Chawaf connects biofeminism and dlinguism in the view that women's language and a genuinely feminine practice of writing will articulate the body.

"In order to connect the book with the body and with pleasure, we must disintellectualize writing And this language, as it develops, will not degenerate and dry up, will not go back to the fleshless academics, the stereotypical and servile discourses that we reject".

"..... Feminine language must, by its very nature, work on life passionately, scientifically, poetically, politically in order to make it invulnerable".

But it is quite difficult because it is history that women's language should disrupt. Women's writing that works within "male" discourse should work ceaselessly to deconstruct it to write what cannot be written. The writing women should reinvent language to speak not only against, but outside of the so-called phallogocentric structure to establish the status of which would no longer be defined by the phallacy of masculine meaning.

Research tells us that a woman's language is as old as human

history. The essence of women's language is its secrecy - the enigmatic nature of the feminine. For historical/political reason it went underground. There are evidences to indicate that in several cultures women have evolved a language of their own to communicate with other members of their sex since they are not allowed to speak in public places and about public affairs; so also in religious functions. But secret languages are disastrous because in the past witches were burnt at the stakes as they were suspected of esoteric knowledge and they possessed speech.

There is some parallelism between decolonization and decision on official language on the one hand and the women's liberation movement and women's language on the other. There has been some tension between academic women and non-academic women on the issue of language. Thus a woman's language is a political matter. It has also an emotional value and force. However, there is no genderlect (a word modelled on dialect and idiolect) spoken by females in a society. Researches show that though there do exist certain difference between the language of men and that of women, they are mostly stylistic and hence superficial.

Showalter believes that the right task for feminist criticism is to concentrate on women's access to language, on the available lexical range from which can words be selected, on the ideological and cultural determinants of expression. Women have been denied the full resources of language and have been forced into silence, euphemism or circumlocution, Woolf protested against censorship and envied the freedom of expression of James Joyce which is denied to women. "All that we have ought to be expressed - mind and body". Women's range of language should be opened and extended and no longer be repressed.

WOMEN'S WRITING AND WOMEN'S PSYCHE: PSYCHOLOGICAL

Psychoanalytically oriented criticism locates the differences of

women's writing in the author's psyche and in the relation of gender to the creative process. It incorporates the biological and the linguistic models of gender difference in a theory of the female psyche or self, shaped by the body, by the development of language and by sex role socialization. Freudian theory calls for updating here to make it gynocentric. Grotesque theories have been advanced - like penis envy, castration complex, oedipal phase etc. Lacan, the most famous French Freudian, talks about Oedipal phase, gender identity and language acquisition. If language is patriarchal, it is phallogocentric and women are handicapped by the lack of a phallus in them. Though Freudian psychology is a powerful tool of literary criticism, feminist criticism suffers on account of the lack of a phallus in them as Freud constantly harps back upon the phallus and the lack of it. The absence of a penis is a painful, debilitating inadequacy for women. Their writing suffers from "inferiorization". Freudian interpretation of women's writing has been unfair because of the phallogocentric and gynocentric orientations.

However, there have been feminist criticisms different from Freudian-like Jungian history of female archetypes, the divided self of R.D. Laing, inner space of Erikson and a new theory emphasizing the development and construction of gender identities. The most dramatic and promising new work in feminist psychoanalytic criticism looks at the pre-Oedipal phase and the process of psycho-sexual differentiation and gender identity in the context of the mother who is a woman and who becomes and remains for children of both genders the other, or object.

Feminist psychoanalytic criticism takes a critical interest in the mother-daughter configuration as a source of female creativity. It tries to explain the psychodynamics of female bonding. Feminist literature and criticism deserve a theory of influence attuned to female psychology and the woman's dual position in literary history.

Women's texts from various nations have been studied; the studies

emphasize "the constancy of certain emotional dynamic" depicted in diverse cultural situations. This constancy is accompanied by immutability too. Although psychoanalytically based models of feminist criticism can now offer us remarkable and persuasive reading of individual texts and can highlight extra ordinary similarities between writing in a variety of cultural circumstances, these models cannot explain historical change, ethnic difference or the shaping force of generic and economic factors. This is where culture studies come.

WOMEN'S WRITING AND WOMEN'S CULTURE: CULTURAL

Showalter recommends a theory based on a model of a women's culture to provide a more complete and satisfying way to talk about the specificity and difference of women's writing. The "culture" theory is preferable to those based on biology, language and psychology. Culture theory, in fact, subsumes the other three and interprets them in relation to their cultural environment. Their language and conduct are determined by culture. A cultural theory acknowledges that there are important differences between women as writers: class, race, nationality and history are literary determinants as significant as gender. Yet women's culture forms a collective experience within the cultural whole, as experience that binds women writers to each other over time and space.

Hypotheses of women's culture have been developed in order to stay away from masculine systems and to get at the primary and self defined nature of female cultural experience. Women have been left out of history as all theories of the past have been male-centred. So the need of the hour is a women-centred historical enquiry. We ought to consider a women's culture within the general culture shared by both men and women. That is to say history must include female experiences too. The question, therefore is: What would history be like if it were seen through the eyes of women and ordered by values they define?

Until recently, there were roles, conduct, responsibilities etc, assigned separately to men and women. This was, of course, done by men. Women's culture, therefore, ought to redefine women's activities and goals from a women centred point of view. It should demand equality with men, as awareness of sisterhood, the community of women. Women's culture refers to the "broad-based community of values, institutions, relationships and methods of communication".

The present state of feminism has been seen as the movement from women's sphere to women's - rights - activism as the consecutive stages of an evolutionary negotiation taking place between women's culture and the general culture. However, women's culture is not to be seen as a substitute. Women ought to be seen as members of the general culture and as partakers of women's culture.

Time and again it has been pointed out that androcentric models of history are inadequate and incomplete as tools to study female experience. Reference is made to the "muted" and the "dominant" groups the former being the female and the latter the male. Female experiences which differed from those of the male were said to be deviant because of the "muted - "dominant" dichotomy. As the name suggests, the "dominant" controls the "mute". So they suggest both power and control, both male, the word "muted" suggests "lacking speech" and so women, if at all they are not mute, have to speak the male language. Beliefs of women are, therefore, expressed in ritual and art and they can be deciphered by disinterested ethnographers. Edwin Ardener and his wife, Shirley, who are the advocates of this theory give a diagram where the two intersecting and partly overlapping circles represent the male and the female.

DIAGRAM

The darkened area-the wild zone is exclusively female with no access to men.

This can be seen specially, experientially, or metaphorically. It will always be outside men's area and absolutely female consciousness. A

woman who journeys through this exclusive domain can write her way out of the "cramped confines of patriarchal space".

For some this female space (the wild zone) must be the address of a genuinely women-centred criticism, theory and art, whose shared project is to bring into being the symbolic weight of female consciousness to make the invisible visible, to make the silent speak. French feminist critics would like the wild zone to be the theoretical base of women's difference. In their texts the wild zone becomes the place for the revolutionary women's language, the language of everything that is repressed and for the revolutionary women's writing.

American radical feminism asserts that women are closer to nature, to the environment, to a matriarchal principle at once biological and ecological. Mary Daly's expression Gynecology reveals this. It was reported in 1977 that a feminist publishing house - Daughters Inc. - was publishing the working models for the critical next stage of feminism; full independence from the control and influence of male dominated institutions (like) the news media, health, education, legal systems, the art, theatres, and literary worlds, the banks. However, since the male is always there, all feminist writing has to always accept the male dominated society. Hence women's writing is always a double voiced discourse embodying the social, cultural and literary heritages of the muted and the dominant. Women's writing must be seen in relation to men's writing and then only its difference can be understood. Showalter illustrates the point using a black woman's writing.

The first task of gynocentric must be to plot the precise cultural locus of female literary identity and to describe the forces that intersect an individual woman writer's cultural field. It would also situate women writers with respect to the variables of literary culture such as modes of production and distribution, relation of author and audience, relations of higher to popular art, and hierarchies of genre. It should help women's writing forcibly admitted to an irrelevant grid. It has made known that blank periods were not blank at all, as

women writers were producing works of art. They were blank only in relation to the absence of male productions. This has now been acknowledged and rectified. Current literary theories of literary influence need to be tested in terms women's writing which can tell the world how men's writing has resisted the acknowledgement of female precursors.

One of the great advantages of women's culture model is that it shows how the female tradition can be a positive source of strength and solidarity as well as a negative source of powerlessness; it can generate its own experience and symbols which are not simply the obverse of the male tradition.

One implication of the women's culture models is that we can read women's fiction as a double-voiced discourse, containing a dominant and muted story. Another interpretive strategy is the contextual analysis thick description insisting on gender and a female literary tradition to make it as complete as possible.

When all is said and done, feminist writing and criticism belong to the tumultuous and intriguing wilderness of difference itself woman as different from man in biological, linguistic, psychological and cultural terms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Josephine Donovan : Feminist Literary Criticism
 Mary Ellmann : Thinking ABOUT Women
 Mary Jacobus (ed) : Women Writing and Writing about women
 Kate Millet : Sexual Politics
 Humm M : Feminist Criticism: Women as contemporary Critics
 Elaine Showalter : The new Feminist Criticism
 Mary Eagleton (Ed) : Feminist Literary Theory: a Reader

Apart from the above a large number of papers have been published on the subject. They are easily available in critical anthologies

THE READING PROCESS :

A PHENOMENOLOGICAL APPROACH

WOLFGANG ISER

A major difference between recent literary theory and earlier critical approaches such as Russian formalism, the New Criticism and the first phase of French Structuralism is that there has been a shift of emphasis towards the reader in much recent theory. In both Reception Theory and Reader Response Criticism the role of the reader is seen as particularly crucial. Though Reception theory has had its greatest impact in Germany and Reader-Response Criticism mainly with American criticism there is some continuity between the two particularly through the work of Wolfgang Iser who is commonly included in both.

Wolfgang Iser was born in 1926. He has been professor of English and comparative literature at the University of Constance, West Germany. He has taught at many Universities in America and Europe. Reception Theory (Rezeption - Aesthetik), one of the unique German schools of criticism and a modern literary is attributed to Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser. Reception Theory owes a lot to phenomenology that began with Edmund Husserl and to the aesthetics of the Polish scholar/Philosopher/theorist, Roman Ingarden and the Hermeneutics of the German philosopher, Hans Georg Gadamer. Let us first learn something about the following.

PHENOMENOLOGY

Phenomenology is a philosophical method founded by the German philosopher, Edmund Husserl (1859-1938). It attempts to overcome the division between subject and object, of the mental and the material by examining consciousness and the object of consciousness simultaneously. Consciousness is regarded as intentional, that is, all states of consciousness must be understood as intending something or directed to an object. Husserl sought to create an alternative philosophical position to both idealism which collapses the material into the mental and materialism which collapses the mental into the material. He developed methods of studying consciousness in its intentional mode of operation, for example, by suspension (epoche) or bracketing by which all presuppositions or preconceptions about both subject and object are kept in abeyance so that the operation or consciousness can be analysed phenomenologically.

Roman Ingarden applied Husserlian phenomenology to the study of literature. He saw literary works as especially appropriate to a phenomenological approach because consciousness operating intentionally is necessary to bring them into existence. Criticism should be concerned with neither the literary work as object nor the reader as subject but with the fact that the work has no existence other than as an object presented to consciousness. A major concern of his is with the mode of existence of a literary work since it is neither pure object nor pure subject. He sees that existence has several layers: words, sounds, sentences or semantic units, represented objects and what he calls schematized views or aspects of reality which cannot be completely but only schematically depicted in a literary text. All of these layers constitute a "schematized structure" which must be completed by the reader. For the literary work as aesthetic object to be brought into existence it must be concretized by the reader since the work will inevitably be schematic or indeterminate in many respects. For example, a character in a novel cannot be described fully. The

reader must fill in any gaps or indeterminacy in the description if the character is to come alive on the printed page. Such concretization must be done repeatedly if a work is to live. Though it can be done only at the individual level Ingarden believed that certain concretizations were more adequate than others and that the work itself exerted controls so that concretizations were not completely subjective.

Phenomenological criticism does not lead to subjectivism or scepticism about literary value or literary knowledge, argues Ingarden.

Phenomenology has influenced many forms of literary criticism and theory in a more indirect way. The Geneva School (of Georges Poulet) focussed on the literary work as the **embodiment of the unique consciousness of the author**. Authentic reading, therefore, involves the reader achieving identification with the consciousness embodied in the work. Thus such elements of a literary work as form, style, mode, genre etc, are seen as secondary to questions of consciousness. The Geneva School tends to conclude not on single works but on the "oeuvre" (total output) of an author. The mind of the artist, a consciousness, has created an art object, or a number of them, with which the mind of the reader, a different consciousness, must interact in a dynamic process of perception, so dynamic that objects may cease to exist as objects, becoming subsumed in the subjective reality of the reader's consciousness.

In other words, when a reader places himself in the hands of an author surrendering his time and attention to that author's creation he begins to live within the world that the author has created. conversely, **the text, which has been waiting for a reader, begins to come alive, for the text can live only when read.** The space and time dimensions of the reader's everyday life and **the facts of the life do not cease to exist, of course, but they are augmented by the space-time relationships and the facts of the fictive world that the reader now inhabits.** In addition, the manner in which the reader now lives, discovers and

experiences in that world is akin to the manner in which he lives, learns and experiences in "real" life; his subjective world (i.e. consciousness) is involved in that world and seemingly objective data are important to him to the extent that they merge into his subjective consciousness. In the first half of the 20th Century the perceptions of the phenomena of reality became the concern of phenomenology and psychology. In the second half, the phenomena of the fictive world; the perceptions within that world, the very process of reading, the understanding of consciousness (the author's and the critic's) have become the subject matter of literary criticism as well.

David Halliburton, using a concept attributed to Hans George Gadamer, has suggested art "is not a means of securing pleasure, but a revelation of being. The work is a phenomenon through which we come to know world".

Iser's essay gives a helpful overview of the process of reading as seen phenomenologically, laying stress on not only the actual text but also, in equal measure, the actions involved in responding to that text. Among other things, Iser deals with time and its importance in the reading process. For example reading a work of fiction involves us in a process that has duration and necessarily involves a changing self as the reader reads. Similarly, subsequent readings of a text create an interaction between text and reader that is necessarily different, because he now knows what is to come, and read in a different way from his initial reading, thus experiencing the phenomenon in a different way. (Cary Nelson uses space, while Iser uses time).

Sometimes this kind of criticism is referred to as 'criticism of consciousness'. The following extract from J. Hillis makes the point clear.

Literature is a form of consciousness, and literary criticism is the analysis of this form in all its varieties. **Though literature is made of words, these words embody states of mind and make them available to others.** The comprehension of literature is a process of what Gabriel

Marcel calls "intersubjectivity". Criticism demands above all that gift of participation, that power to put oneself within the life of another person which Keats calls negative capability. If literature is a form of consciousness, the task of a critic is to identify himself with the subjectivity expressed in the words, to relive that life from the inside and to constitute it anew in his criticism" (The Disappearance of God).

From the above it becomes quite clear that in contemporary literary theory the role of the reader has become increasingly prominent. An orientation towards the text-reader nexus has been taken up in structuralist, post-structuralist, formalist, feminist and psycho analytic criticism. However, there has also been a body of work produced that specifically concentrates upon the reader and whose primary orientation is towards the process of reading. Basically, two linked trajectories can be noted. The first, often called the "Aesthetics of Reception" (which I have already mentioned in the foregoing account) develops out of phenomenology (reading in relation to the reader's consciousness) and the "Reader-Response theory" largely American in origin coming in a variety of forms, lacking coherence and cogency, developed by Norman Holland and David Bleich (psychologistic frame), Michael Riffaterre (semiotics) and Stanley Fish (affective stylistics), the last concentrating upon reading as a temporal experiential process and developing the idea of interpretive communities with shared practices and competence.

SYNOPSIS OF ISER'S ESSAY:

While considering a literary work both the text and the actions involved in responding to the text should be considered. A text can be concretized in many ways. There are different schematized views. The subject matter coming to light is "Konkretization".

A literary work has two poles: (1) artistic and (2) aesthetic; the former is created by the author, the latter realized by the reader. From this it follows that the literary work is not identical with the text or its realization. It is in the middle. The text comes alive only if and

when it is read/realized and reading/realizing is dependent on the individual disposition of the reader, which is conditioned by the different patterns of the text. It is in the convergence of text and reader that we discover the existence of the literary text. The dynamics of the text gives the reader different perspectives; he relates them and the schematized views thus set the work in motion. It is this process that awakens responses in the reader. The imaginative participation of the reader and the acknowledgement/recognition of his role are at least 200 years old. Reading is pleasurable and so profitable only when it is active and creative. The text may bore or overstrain the reader depending on its challenge being either inadequate or too much.

The participation of the reader in the creation of a literary work is illustrated by Iser using Woolf's observations on Jane Austen. The reader's imagination gets animated, fills the gaps and pauses in the text whereby a dynamic interaction between the reader and the text is sustained.

But how to describe it? Psychology helps in a limited way. This is where phenomenology steps in.

A text is made up of sequent sentences acting upon one another. The world of the text is the result of intentional sentence correlative. It is the different forms of link ups that account for the various genres like the short story, the dialogue or a theory in science. The component parts and the variations within present us with a purely intentional correlative of a complex of sentences which if they form a literary work, give the world presented in the work. The components give the reader differing perspectives, as also subtle connections revealing meaning through interactions. Accepting one, or a few perspective(s), the reader climbs aboard the text and starts tackling the component sentences which mean more than what they say and which can say much more than what they have already said. It is this process that reveals the text and its contents. Edmund Husserl calls this pre-intentions. Every originally constructive process is inspired by pre-

intentions, which construct and collect the seed of what is to come as such and bring it to fruition. This is where the active reader and his imagination come to play their role. In order to keep imagination alive and dynamic expectations are hardly ever fulfilled in good literary texts. To suggest is to create; to decline is to destroy. These expectations are constantly modified as the reading advances. (Recall "suspense" in literature). Again, the original perspective (s) keep (s) on changing, as newer territories are covered. The net result is that the reader in establishing these interrelations between and amongst past, present and future causes the text to reveal its potential multiplicity of connections: which are the outcome of the interaction between the text and the reader's active mind and imagination. This describes, as also explains, the active involvement of the reader in the process of reading. The text activates the creative faculty of the reader. We call it the "virtual dimension" of the text. It is neither the text by or in itself nor the imagination of the reader. It is the coming together of text and reader's imagination.

Reading may be seen as a kaleidoscope of perspectives, preintentions and recollections. Every sentence is a link between what precedes and what follows. Every sentence modifies the one earlier and anticipated those that come later. This entails multiplicity of connections. So the virtual dimension of a text may be brought into being in a number of (or numberless) ways. In other words, the flow of sentence thought anticipates the next thought, that the next and so on, while at the same time, they constantly modify the earlier thoughts. Any break in the even flow of thought, a hiatus, may surprise the reader, or annoy him. This blockage is to be overcome to restart the flow. This blockage is a flaw and a serious one, though blockages are inevitable. This has a positive role too. Whenever blockages are felt, the reader tries to overcome them by bringing into play his creative imagination to establish connections to fill in gaps. As every reader is different, the process of connecting and filling gaps varies from reader

to reader and so the same text has to have different realizations. Though in earlier traditional texts this is infrequently felt, in modern literature the role of the reader is freely exploited, making the text as fragmented as possible. In the latter cases the text refers back directly to our own perceptions, which are revealed by the act of interpretation that is the basic element of the reading process. This leads to the conclusion that with literary texts the reading process is selective and the potential text is infinitely richer than any of its individual realizations. People admit that their second, third and subsequent readings are all different from the first.

Reading is a process taking place over a stretch of time and so there is always a time perspective which is in constant motion. After the first reading when a reader starts a second reading his extra knowledge influences the process, the extent of comprehension and the like because of change in perspective. The second reading will certainly be quite different from the first, the third from the second and so on ad infinitum. This explains why and how we understand better, the oftener we read a text.

The manner in which the reader experiences the text will reflect his own disposition. The reality created will certainly be different from his own. The impact this reality has on him will depend largely on the extent to which he himself actively provides the unwritten part of the text and yet in supplying the missing links he must think in terms of experiences different from his own. It is only by leaving behind the familiar world of his own experience that the reader can truly participate in the adventure the literary text offers him. (We are reminded of the "willing suspension of disbelief" and the "transmigration of soul" as in the case of Sankaracharya's soul entering the deadbody of the King of Kasi.

The process of reading which is an active interweaving of anticipation and introspection, turning into a kind of advance retrospection on second reading differs from person to person, though

always circumscribed by the textual boundaries. An author using the entire array of techniques before him goads his reader through the text hoping to involve him and to enable him to realize the intention of his text.

With literary text a reader can only picture things which are not there: the written text gives the reader the knowledge, the unwritten one the opportunity to picture/imagine things. It is the elements of indeterminacy (the gaps in the text) that call for the use of imagination. This is borne out by the remarks of the people who have read a novel and seen its film version-where their conceptualization is not in agreement with the execution. The reader's imagination and perception are far richer, more varied and private than the "reality" which gets "concretized".

A reader looks for consistency and to that effect synthesizes the input materials despite their continual modification and expansion. He creatively contributes and supplements in order to arrive at the consistency until he is satisfied. The organized whole (form, shape, pattern etc. i.e. gestalt) and it is inseparable from the reader's expectations. This is where the writer uses illusion to starting effects. Whenever consistent reading suggests itself.....illusion takes over." Illusion "is fixed or definable and reality is best understood as its negation. However, it is only illusion it will wean the reader away from reality-which is the worst of escapism." Women's magazines (the so-called romances which are innumerable) are the best examples Illusion is necessary and resistance to it is the consistent pattern underlying the text. Modern texts, through their very precision, increase indeterminacy; details contradict one another, stimulating and frustrating readers at the same time, resulting in the disintegration of the imposed 'gestalt' of the text. Illusions familiarize us to the world of the text, thus making the text accessible and readable. This process is hermeneutic. The text provokes certain expectations which in turn we project onto the text in such a way that we reduce the polysemantic possibilities to a single interpretation in keeping with the expectations aroused, thus extracting an individual configurative meaning. The

multiplicity of meaning of a text goes against the illusion-making of the reader. Too strong illusion destroys polysemanticity. Too strong semanticity destroys all illusion. So it is the incompleteness of illusion that gives the text its productive value, rousing the active reader's imagination leading to multiple meaning. Walter Pater has referred to the lingering brainwave generated by words and their associations.

Search for consistency may result in the discovery of incompatible and loose ends which resist integration. In other words, the potential is far richer than the actuality. Therefore, the configurative meaning can only be a part for the whole fulfillment of the text. The awareness of richness takes precedence over configurative meaning (e.g. Eliot's "The Waste Land")

The alien associations, a necessary concomitant of the reader's search for consistency, show that while forming an illusion we also produce a latent disturbance of the illusion. This is another proof for the active imagination of the reader. Illusion wears off once the expectation is stepped up. Elusions, needless to say, are transitory. This is revealed to the full in the reading process.

As the illusion are always accompanied by alien associations (inconsistent with the illusions) the active reader constantly lifts the restrictions he places on the meaning of a text. There is continuous oscillation between the two. It is these oscillations and attempts to strike a balance between the two as also the shattering of certain expectation already entertained that are integral to the aesthetic experience. Aesthetic experience tends to exhibit a continuous interplay between deductive and inductive reasoning resulting from frustration and surprise which prompt our exploration. These deductive frustration and surprise which prompt our exploration, These deductive and inductive processes give rise to the configurative meaning of the text, and not the individual expectations, surprises or frustrations arising from the different perspectives. The process represents something that is unformulated in the text and yet represents its

intentions. Thus reading gives us the unformulated part of the text; the indeterminacy drives us towards a configurative meaning and gives us freedom to do so. Search for consistent patterns yields different interpretations which indicates further areas of indeterminacy. This is quite natural too. As we read, perspectives change and in the light of newer developments say, in the novel, the relative significance of events, characters, backgrounds etc. etc. change³s. This is the result of the birth of new possibilities, leading us to the conclusion that a novel is "true-to-life".

As we read, we make and break illusions, make trial and error attempts, organize and reorganize data and so to arrive at the interpretation. If this process is similar to the one made by the author, so much the better. Without this kind of an act of recreation, the object is not perceived as a work of art. This act of recreation has its interruptions blockages etc which are essential to make reading efficacious. We look forward, we look backward, we decide, we change our decisions, we form expectations, we are shocked by their non-fulfilment, we question, we muse, we accept, we reject-this is the dynamic process of recreation. This process is activated and controlled by the repertoire of familiar literary patterns and recurrent literary themes, together with allusions to familiar social and historical contexts and the techniques or strategies used to set the familiar against the unfamiliar. Elements of the repertoire are continually back grounded or foregrounded with a resultant strategic over-imagination, trivialization or even annihilation of the illusion. The defamiliarization (Russian) causes tension between trust and distrust of expectations. Blockages necessitate rethinking on perspectives., (Consider authorial voice creeping into narrative. His impressions may oppose those of the readers. Hence reading a recreation.

Iser gives an example from James Joyce's 'Ulysses' to drive home this point. It is through die entanglement of the reader that reading becomes recreative. However, the reader does not know that entanglement entails, Hence his desire to talk about it, seek enlightenment and satisfy curiosity and desire.

Let us now have a rapid review of what has been said above. The three important aspects that form the basis of the relationship between reader and text are

- 1) The process of anticipation and retrospection
- 2) The consequent unfolding of the text as a living event and
- 3) The resultant impression of life-likeness.

The attempts on the part of the reader to comprehend the unfamiliar gets him entangled in the text, its gestalt, which he is himself responsible for. He also leaves behind his own preconceptions. This is what Shaw seems to mean when he says: "You have learnt something, that always feels at first as if you had lost something." It is only on the willing suspension of the personality of the reader that he can experience the unfamiliar world of the literary text. Now something happens-the so called identification of the reader with the text.

This is nothing but entering a ground on which the unfamiliar is getting familiar. However, identification is just a stratagem to lead to the end mentioned already. There is participation, though.

While reading, the reader becomes the subject that does the thinking, though the text is the thought of its author. The subject object division gets suspected-which makes reading unique. May be, this is behind identification. Here we have to quote Georges Pulet :

Whatever I think is a part of my mental world and yet here I am thinking a thought which manifestly belongs to another mental world which is being thought in me just as though I did not exist. Already the notion is inconceivable and seems even more so if I reflect that, since every thought must have a subject to think it, this thought which is alien to me and yet in me, must also have in me a subject which is alien to me.....Whenever I read< I mentally pronounce an I, and yet the I which I pronounce is not myself.

The reader internalizes the author's ideas and thoughts. He gives the text both existence and awareness of existence. In his consciousness the author and the reader become one. This depends on two conditions.

- 1) The life story of the author must be shut out of the work
- 2) the individual disposition of the reader must be shut out of the act of reading

The reader ceases to exist as reader, the author ceases to exist as author. This results in the self-presentation or materialization of consciousness. It comes alive.

To conclude, let us quote the text, as it defies paraphrasing.

If reading removes the subject-object division that constitutes all perception, it follows that the reader will be occupied by the thoughts of the author, and these in their turn will cause 'the drawing of new boundaries. Text and reader no longer confront each other as object and subject, but instead the division takes place within the reader himself. In thinking the thoughts of another, his own individuality temporarily recedes into the background since it is supplanted by these alien thoughts which now becomes the theme on which his attention is focused. As we read, there occurs an artificial division of our personality because we take as a theme for ourselves something that we are not. Consequently, when reading we operate on different levels. For although we may be thinking the thoughts of someone else, what we are will not disappear completely: it will merely remain a more or less powerful virtual force. Thus in reading there are those two levels-the alien 'me' and the real, virtual 'me' which are never completely cut off from each other. Indeed, we can only make someone else's thoughts into an absorbent theme for ourselves, provided the virtual background of our own personality can adapt to it. Every text we read draws a different boundary within our personality, so that the virtual background is what makes it possible for the unfamiliar to be understood.

In this context there is a revealing remark made by D.W.Harding, arguing the idea of identification with what is read: What is sometimes called wish-fulfilment in novels and plays can more plausibly be described as wish-formulation or the definition of desires. The cultural levels at which it works may vary widely, the process is the same....It seems nearer the truth to say that fictions contribute to defining the reader's or spectator's values, and perhaps stimulating his desires, rather than to suppose that they gratify desire by some mechanism of vicarious experience. In the act of reading, having to think something that we have not yet experienced does not mean only being in a position to conceive or understand it; it also means that such acts of conception are possible and successful to the degree that they lead to something being formulated in us. For, someone else's thoughts can only take a form in our consciousness if, in the process, our unformulated faculty for deciphering those thoughts is brought into play-a faculty which in the act of deciphering, also formulates itself. Now since this formulation is carried out on terms set by someone else, whose thoughts are the theme of our reading, it follows that the formulation of our faculty for deciphering cannot be along our own lines of orientation.

Herein lies the dialectical structure of reading. The need to decipher gives us a chance to formulate our own deciphering capacity i.e. we bring to the fore an element of our being of which we are not directly conscious. The production of the meaning of literary texts- which we discussed in connection with forming the gestalt of the text does not merely entail the discovery of the unformulated, which can then be taken over by the active imagination of the reader; it also entails the possibility that we may formulate ourselves and so discover what had previously seemed to elude our consciousness. These are the ways in which reading literature gives us the chance to formulate the unformulated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1) Rober Holub : Reception Theory – a Critical
introduction
- 2) Jane Tompkins (Ed.) : Reader
Response

Criticism : From Formalism to Structuralism

- 3) Umberto Eco : The Role of the Reader
- 4) Raman Selden : The Theory of Criticism from Plato
to the Present
- 5) Susan Suleiman & Ubge Croseman (eds.) : The Reader in the

Text : Essays on Audience & Interpretation

Lessons Prepared by :
Prof.G.S.Ramakrishnan (Retd.)
Thrissur