

LITERARY CRITICISM

SKT4 E08

IV SEMESTER

Elective Course

M.A. SANSKRIT (GENERAL)



**UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT,
School of Distance Education,
Calicut University P.O.,
Malappuram - 673 635, Kerala.**

190216

University of Calicut

School of Distance Education,

Study Material

IV SEMESTER

Elective Course

M.A. SANSKRIT (GENERAL)

LITERARY CRITICISM

Prepared By:

Sumesh A.S,
Asst. Professor of Sanskrit,
SDE, University of Calicut.

Scrutinized By:

Dr. Geetha H,
Assistant Professor and Head,
Dept. of Sanskrit, Govt. College,
Chittur, Palakkad.

DISCLAIMER

“The author shall be solely responsible for the content and views expressed in this book”

CONTENTS

Unit I:

General introduction to Indian aesthetics and Sanskrit poetics (7Weightage) Bharata's Nyastra, Bhama, Vamana, Utbhanga, Rudra, Dandin, Nandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Mahimabha, Mukulabha, Jagannatha, Kuntaka, Bhoja, Hemachandra, Ksemendra, Rajasekhara (No questions shall be asked from Unit 1 for external examination. This unit may be covered through components of internal assessment.)

Unit II:

Indian Literary theory- concepts (8Weightage) Rasasutra, Alankaraschool, Riti and Gunas, Dhvani- theory and classification, rasadhvani- the soul of poetry, Mahimabha's objections against Nandavardhana, seminal doctrines of Pratybhijñadarana, sahdaya, rasavighnas, bhuktivada, citraturaganyaya, abhivyakti, Kuntaka's concept of marga

Unit III:

Western literary Theories (8Weightage) Personages: Plato, Aristotle, Longinus, Wordsworth, Eliot, I. A Richards, and William Empson.

Unit IV:

Western literary Theories II (7Weightage) Theories and concepts: Mimesis, tragedy, sublimity, romantic criticism, objective correlative, impersonal theory, ambiguity, Pragmatism, Idealism, Phenomenology, Psychoanalysis, Structuralism, Post Structuralism, Deconstruction, and Reader response theory

UNIT I

General introduction to Indian aesthetics and Sanskrit poetics

Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, *Bhāmaha*, *Vaṃśa*, *Uttara*, *Rudra*, *Dandin*, *Nandavardhana*, *Abhinavagupta*, *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, *Mukulabhaṭṭa*, *Jagannaṭha*, *Kuntaka*, *Bhoja*, *Hemacandra*, *Kemendra*, *Rajaekhara*.

Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* is a Sanskrit treatise on the performing arts. The text is attributed to sage Bharata Muni (1st century BCE–3rd century CE). *Nāṭyaśāstra* is a text that covers almost all aspects of performances and has also been vastly accepted beyond geographical boundaries. It consists of 36 chapters and six thousand verses and is the first available text in Sanskrit for Indian classical art forms including dance, music and theatre with vivid descriptions minutely laying out the intricacies involved in each subject. *Nāṭyaśāstra* begins with a conversation of several sages with Bharatamuni. The sages say that although all the Vedas consist of all knowledge that mankind needs for elevation, they are not easily accessible or understandable to all humanity. Therefore, there is a need for a comprehensible approach to gain spiritual knowledge and practice it to all socio-economic levels in the human population. In response to this question, Bharatamuni seeks the assistance of the creator – Brahma and composed the *Nāṭyaśāstra* by taking one feature from each of the Vedas. *Nāṭyaśāstra* came to be praised as the fifth Veda. It describes every facet of performing arts, it sheds light on stage, participants, body language, music, expression, movement of each body part and also tools used for theatrical arts. *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the first text that mentions *rasa*, amplifying it in all senses by describing

sthayibhavas (basis of expression), sancharis (elaboration of expression), dividing the rasas as ashta rasas, colours depicting the rasas and respective devatas of each rasa. Bharata mentions eight rasas and Shanta rasa was included by later stages. Natyasastra has numerous commentaries in contemporary times. The Abhinavabharati of Shri Abhinava Gupta is one of the most famous commentaries.

Bh maha

Bhamaha was the most prominent representative of the so-called alamkara school of Indian poetry, which considered the rhetorical figure (alamkara) to be the heart of the poetic work. Bh maha lived in the sixth century A.D. He was one of the top critics in the Sanskrit literature. His important work is 'K vy la k ra'. This is also called Bh mah la k ra by a few. There are six chapters in this. The first chapter deals with K vya ar ra, the second and third with Ala k ra, the fourth with K vyado a the fifth with Ny ya and the sixth with abda uddhi. As against Da , Bh maha separates 'Kath ' from ' khy yik '. According to him the requisites of a good K vya are sweetness, pleasantness and liveliness. Da prescribes ten attributes for a good K vya. Bh maha opines that Vakrokti is not a Ala k ra and in a wider sense it is 'ati ayokti' (exaggeration). But Bh maha admits it has a place in K vya.

V mana

Vamana is held in high esteem among the major scholars in the early Indian Poetics. Vamana was lived in latter half of the 8th century and early 9th century. Vamana's investigation into the nature of a K vya is known as theory of Riti. Vamana's Kavyalankarasutra is considered as the first attempt at evolving a philosophy of literary aesthetics. He regarded that riti

is the soul of Kavya or poetry. He presented his formulations in the form of Sutras. His Kavyalankara-sutra-vritti is a very significant work that comes up with original ideas and concepts. It is regarded as the earliest attempt at evolving a philosophy of literary aesthetics.

The Kavyalankara-sutra-vritti is divided into five Divisions or topics called Adhikarana, each of them consist two or three chapters (adhyaya).

:- The first Adhikarana (having three chapters: Prayojana pariksha; Adhikari chinta; and Kavya-kanti) deals with the need or prayojana of Kavya; characterises the nature of those who are fit for studying Alankaras, and declares that style is the soul of poetry.

:- The second Adhikarana (having two chapters: Pada Dosa and Vakya Dosa) is about the defects of words, sentences, propositions and their meanings.

:- The third Adhikarana (having two chapters : Guna-alankara-vivechana; and Sabda-Guna nirupana) discusses the aspects of Gunas ;

:- the fourth Adhikarana (having three chapters : Sabda-Alankarika vichara ; Upamani nirupana ; and Upama prapancha nirupana) deals with Yamaka , Anuprasa, Upama and such other Alamkaras.

:- The fifth Adhikarana (having two chapters: Kavya samaya; and Sabda shodhana) is devoted to poetical conventions, observance of the rules of sandhi, necessity of grammatical purity and the like. The last chapter also deals with the purity of words.

Udbhata

The scholars of the early period of Indian Poetics, somehow, seem to come in pairs. It was Bhamaha and Dandin followed by Udbhata and Vamana; and then came Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta.

Udbhata and Vamana were both said to be in the service of King Jayapida of Kashmir (Ca. 776-807 AD). Udbhata followed Bhamaha ; while Vamana followed Dandin. They developed and expounded the distinctive features of Dandin and Bhamaha; as also upon the differences that separate the two.

Udbhata is said to have written a commentary Bhamaha-vivarana on Bhamaha's Kavyalankara. It is believed that he also wrote a commentary on Bharata's *Natyasastra*. Both the works are now not available. He is also credited (by some) with a *Kavya: Kumarasambhava*. Udbhata's Bhamaha-vivarana, which is an explanation or commentary on Bhamaha's Kavyalankara, dealt mainly with Alankara. In his explanations, he generally followed Bhamaha and his definitions of certain Poetic principles. The Alankaras that Udbhata talks about in his *Kavya-alankara-sara-sangraha* are almost the same as those mentioned by Bhamaha in his Kavyalankara. Udbhata's work gained great fame; almost overshadowing the original work of Bhamaha, perhaps because he remained focused on Alankara and did not deviate into discussions on Guna / Dosa (grammatical purity) or such other elements of Kavya.

Rudrata

Rudrata was a Kashmiri poet lived in the first quarter of the ninth century. He wrote a work called the Kavyalankara. It is a notable work in the line of poeticians such as Bhamaha, Dandin and Anandavardhana. It is divided into 16

chapters and it comprises 734 verses, excluding 14 verses in the 12th chapter on eight types of Nayika, which are considered as the later interpolations. Most of the work was composed in the Arya metre with a few exceptions, particularly at the end of the chapters. The 13th chapter, comprising only 17 verses is the shortest one. The 7th and the 8th chapters, comprising 111 and 110 verses are the longest.

Da in

Dandin was the famous Sanskrit poet and lived in the sixth century. One of the most important contributions of Dandin to the field of aesthetics is his literature on poetry called Kavyadarsa. He is credited with two other works namely, Dasakumaracharitra and Avantisundarikatha respectively.

Kavyadarsa is divided into 3 paricchedas (chapters). In Kavyadarsa, Dandin argued that a poem's beauty derived from its use of rhetorical devices – of which he distinguished thirty-six types. He was the main proponent of gunaprasthana, the view that poetry needed qualities or virtues such as slesha (punning), prasaada (favour), samataa (sameness), maadhurya (beauty), arthavyakti (interpretation), and ojas (vigour). Poetry consisted in the presence of one of these qualities or a combination of them.

The Dasakumaracharitra contains descriptions of various pleasures of regal nature, wine, courts, gardens, courtesans etc. It also depicts a picture of the cities and citadels of the time of Dandin. It is the story of ten princes. The story pans out as a very descriptive prose of various events involving the royal court, forests, exiles and wars culminating in the court again. Dandin does not seek to teach morals, but rather achieves to entertain his readers.

nandavardhana

nandavardhana was a great critic of Sanskrit literature. He lived in the 9th century A.D. He expounded his theory of Dhvani by 120 K rik s. His own commentary of the K rik s is the book called Dhvany loka. He was a member of the royal council of Avantivarm who ruled Kashm r during the period 854-884 A.D. It is believed that he wrote Dhvany loka in 850 A.D. Many commentaries have been written of Dhvany loka of which the one written by Abhinavagupta is considered to be the best.

Dhvanyaloka is divided into four Udhyotas and written in three parts - the Karika, Vritti and examples. Often the prose explanation (Vritti) is at great length, and examples are taken from Prakrit texts and from earlier eminent poets. Abhinavagupta wrote an extensive commentary 'Locana' which is compared as eye to look into Dhvanyaloka. Contents of the text Dhvanyaloka: In the first Udhyota Anandavardhana establishes his theory that Dhvani - suggestion is the soul of poetry. He refers to three different views of those who are against the doctrine of Dhvani- (1) Dhvanyabhavavaadins likesome saying that Dhvani does not exist, (2) Bhaktavaadins_some regard that it is included in Lakshana, and . (3) Anirvachaniyatavaadins - others speak its essence as lying beyond the scope of words which is known only to the men of literary taste.

Abhinavagupta

Abhinavagupta a distinguished philosopher, aesthete and saint was one of the most outstanding Acharyas of the Monistic Saivism. His exact date of birth is not known but we learn from references about him in his works Tantraloka and Paratrimshika Vivarana that he lived in Kashmir about the end of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh century A.D. The earliest known

ancestor of Abhinavagupta was a famous Brahmin Attrigupta a great Saiva teacher and scholar of Kanauj, who had been invited to settle in Kashmir by King Lalitaditya. Abhinavagupta was born in a family which had a long tradition of scholarship and devoutness for Lord Siva. His father Narasimhagupta (Cukhulaka) and mother Vimalakala were great influence in his life and it is believed that they both underwent austerities to be bestowed with an extra ordinary son with spiritual powers.

There are two major works by Abhinavagupta on Poetics, Dhavnyalokalocana and Abhinava Bharati point towards his quest into the nature of aesthetic experience. In both these works Abhinava Gupta suggests that Aesthetic experience is something beyond worldly experience and he has used the word *alaukika* to distinguish the former feeling from the mundane latter ones. He subscribed to the theory of Rasa Dhvani and thus entered the ongoing aesthetic debate on nature of Aesthetic pleasure.

In his Dhvanyaloka Anandavardhana observes: In the province of poetry (creative literature) obviously standards of truth and falsity have no relevance. Any attempt to find out or discover whether a poem (or any literary composition) is true or false by employing means of valid cognition leads to ridicule alone Abhinavagupta comments on it: Such a person will be ridiculed as follows: He is not able or competent to appreciate aesthetic experience or his mind has become (truly) hard by indulging in dry logic.

Mahimabha a

Mahimabha a is a Sanskrit critic who lived in Kashmir in the 11th century A.D. His chief work was entitled "Vyaktiviveka", a treatise on "Ala k ra". The book is divided into three parts. He was a scholar in logic also. He was the author of another book

"Tattvoktika a". The anumana theory has been propounded by Mahimabhata in his illustrious work called Vyativiveka. He wrote a full length book called Vyaktiviveka to examine afresh the true nature of the Vyanga sense and found out that all the varieties of dhvani may duly be included in the scope of anumana (inference). In his first chapter of Vyaktiviveka, Mahima Bhatta wrote verse which clears the blind sense of Dhvani supporters and that verse leads to them to understand anumana theory. The definition of anumana for detail study is very vast. There are so many texts in which anumana comes as a major facts. Mahimabhata explains and recognises the phenomenon of suggestion (vyanjana) as poetic inference (Kavyanumiti). He explains that all the varieties of dhvani are the cases of Kavyanumiti. Mahimabhata says the permanent mental status of love, sorrow, etc. belonging to poetical characters are through the cognition of the Vibhava, Anubhava and the vyabharibhava, described in the Kavya.

Jagann tha

Jagann tha Pa ita was a famous poet and literary critic who lived in the 17th century. As a poet, he is known for writing the Bh min -vil sa ("The Sport of the Beautiful Lady (Bh min)"). He was a Telugu Brahmin from Khandrika (Upadrasta) family and a junior contemporary of Emperor Akbar. As a literary theorist or rhetorician, he is renowned for his Rasaga g dhara, a work on poetic theory. He was granted the title of Pa itar ja by the Mughal emperor Shah Jahan, at whose court he received patronage. Jagannatha Pandita Raja's contributions were, "Rasangadharam" (Alankara Sastram), Gangalahari, and Five Vilasams in Sanskrit language.

Kuntaka

Kuntaka is the originator of the Vakrokti school of Sanskrit literary theory. He came after Anandvardhan of 9th century and before Abhinavagupta of 10th century. His time was the time of high merit of Indian poetics. Dhananjaya and Rajashekhara were his contemporary theorists. The theorists appeared in the time of Kuntaka contributed a lot what is in different shape is considered as modern theories of literature and language. Kuntaka's contribution in poetic thought is not only the matter of poetry or literature but it is about understanding the language, language of poetry and its difference with the language of the common. Kuntaka's opinions on language of poetry and overall his study on language makes his position many steps further to the future. He is considered as one of the early language theorists in India.

Bhoja

Bhoja lived in the eleventh century A.D., is the author of a huge Alankara work called Sringaraprakasa. This work mainly deals with Rasas, considers sringara as the most important among Rasas. The sringara as defined and illustrated by Bhoja is not the mere erotic sentiment. It is something more sublime and subjective. Bhoja has also written another Alankara work called Saraswatheekandabharanam.

Hemachandra

Hemachandra was an Indian Jain scholar, poet, mathematician and polymath who wrote on grammar, philosophy, prosody, mathematics and contemporary history. Hemachandra lived the 12th century AD., Hemachandra was the author of an Alankara work called Kavyanusasanam.

K emendra

Ksemendra lived in the 11th century A.D., is the author of two Alankara works, Aucityavicara carca and Kavikandabaranam. In his Aucityavicaracarcha he has developed the theory of aucityam is an essential factor in the development of Rasas. After Ksemendra no new theory was expounded in the Alankarasastra.

R ja ekhara

Rajasekhara lived in 10th century A.D., is the author of a great Alankara work called Kavyamimamsa. He refers to various authors and his remarks on the merits of those authors are very apt and interesting. He has also quoted many traditional sayings about poets in his work.

Unit II:

Indian Literary theory- concepts (8Weightage) Rasas tra, ala k ra school, r ti and gu a, dhvani- theory and classification, rasadhvani- the soul of poetry, Mahimabha a's objections against nandavardhana, seminal doctrines of Pratybhijñ dar ana, sah daya, rasavighnas, bhuktiv da, citraturagany ya, abhivyakti, Kuntaka's concept of m rga

Indian Literary theory- concepts

Rasasutra (Vibhavas, Anubhavas and Vyabhicharibhavas)

Rasa is generally regarded as the corner stone of Indian Aesthetics. Rasa implies aesthetic emotion. The earliest work of Indian aesthetics is Bharatha's 'Natyasastra'. It consists of a few instructions to the actors about present plays. In the course of discussion, Bharatha remarks that the aim of presenting a play is to evoke Rasa. Rasa, according to him, is the product of the combination of the Vibhavas, Anubhavas and the Vyabhicharibhavas. (Vibhavanubhava vyabhichari samyogat rasanispatti) Vibhavas are the objective conditions producing an emotion, vibhavas are of two kinds-alamba vibhava i.e. the characters with respect to whom the emotions aroused, and uddipana vibhava i.e. the circumstances that inspire the emotion. In "Sankuntalam", for example, Sakuntala is the vibhava to excite sringara in Dushyanta and vice versa. The serenity of the atmosphere, the blooming flowers, the fragrant air, the furling Malini etc. are the uddipana vibhavas. The Anubhavas are the psycho-physical manifestation which a particular emotion makes upon characters. For example, the emotion of anger urges one to

rant and chafe and gnash one's teeth. The vyabhicari bhavas (Sancharibhavas) are the various fleeting or temporary emotions which lies upon the dormant emotion. For example, a woman waiting for her lover may experience a variety of emotions like jealousy, despair, anxiety and over fondness. Probably, Bharatha means that when certain Sthayibhavas are excited using appropriate Vibhavas, Anubhavas and Vyabhicaribhavas, the Sthayibhava is transmuted to its corresponding Rasa. Abhinavagupta, the 11th century aesthetician wrote an interpretation to Bharatha's "Natyasastra"- "Abhinava Bharati"

The key concept of Rasa theory

Rasa theory is built around some very significant key concepts. All these concepts represent vital elements of theatre contributing their own significant inputs to produce a natya aiming at realising rasa for refined spectators. A thorough understanding of these concepts will help us to understand the Rasa theory better. Some key concept of Rasa theories are-

Bhavas – Bhavas are called so because they become or bring into being (bhavyanti) and help convey the desired meaning. They enable the natya to realize its rasa to ensure that its poetic meaning has been conveyed. Bharata gives a lucid definition of Bhavas: "That which conveys the meaning intended by the poet through words, physical gestures and facial changes is a Bhava." Broadly speaking Bhavas refer to all the elements like vibhavas, anubhavas, vyabhicari bhavas and sattvika bhavas but in the Chapter VII on Bhavas. Bharata largely discusses sthayibhavas, vyabhicari bhavas and sattvika bhavas totally to 49 in all. In a broader sense Bhavas mean the originating cause of actualisation and evocation of rasa. Bharata made a clearcut distinction between real life emotions (Bhavas) and emotions depicted in

drama (natyabhavas). Natya being an imitation of life, real Bhavas can have their counterparts as natyabhavas as well.

Vibhavas and Anubhavas – Vibhavas are made of patterns of life and serve as cause or stimuli of emotions. Vibhava Bhava: The term Vibhava means knowledge. It is the expression of bhavas by the combination of Vachika, Angika and Sattvika abhinaya. It is the aspect that evokes Rasa in its complete form. The creation of Rasa in a peculiar way can be termed as Vibhava. In Vibhava, the characteristic feature of each individual is determined from the expression of feelings. It is of two types:

a). Alambana Vibhava: The evoking of emotion by the deed of an object or person can be termed as Alambana Vibhava. It can be an idea about the nature or the deed of the characters. The emotional experience Sita felt at the sight of Shri Rama is an example of Alambana Vibhava.

b). Uddipana Vibhava: The aesthetic feelings which arouse the emotional pleasure of an individual can be termed as uddipana. When Sita was left alone after seeing Rama, the feeling she had can be compared to Uddipana Vibhava. It is of four types- Guna, Alankara, Cheshtha and Tatasha.

Anubhavas are bhavas which ‘show up’ on characters after some stimuli (vibhavas) has had their impact. They include the bodily movements, attitudes and facial expression by which the feelings are expressed by the artist and made to be ‘felt’. To manifest a feeling of wonder, widely awake eyes, raised eye brows, constant gaze etc. are some of the anubhavas used by actors. Anubhavas are the outcome of vibhavas and make the spectators aware concerning the dominant emotions, theme of the play. They can be those behavioural patterns which represent the evocation of similar emotions in spectators. Anubhava is considered fact

constitute the real skill and art of the performers. Bharata talks of four types of Abhinayas (Histrionic representations) Angika (Bodily) Vacika (Verbal) a Sattvika (involuntary acting) and Aharya (Back stage inputs) Performers are directly involved with the first three types of Abhinays.

Sthayibhava (permanent emotions) – Human life has some fixed emotive patterns, universally present and integral to our life They are a set of eight permanent emotions, which are subtle in nature and depend on other elements for their representation. Etymologically sthayi stands of abiding and continuing and bhava means existent. These innate, enduring, assimilative and dispositional traits of human nature are dormant and when activated they develop into an expressive and distinct emotive pattern which get manifested through some minor transitory states, bodily movements and involuntary actions. The eight sthayibhavas are - 1. Rati (love), 2. Hasa (laughter), 3. Soka (sorrow), 4. Krodha (anger), 5. Utsaha (enthusiasm), 6. Bhaya (fear), 7. Jugupsa (disgust), 8. Vismaya (astonishment)

Being universally present the artists use them as objectifying principles to give their art work structural unity by unifying other elements of the work through them. Bharata did not give any specific reason why are sthayibhavas ? Giving the illustration of a king and the subject he explains one may each sthayi is a king because of its position and rest of the minor bhavas are its subject. In other words sthayibhavas being subtle, they cannot express themselves, they gets manifested through these vyabhicari bhavas only. It is very interesting to learn that like (8) sthayibhavas, Bharata enlists a limited 33 number of vyabhicari bhavas only. At times vyabhicari bhavas serve multiple sthayibhavas. King sthayibhavas do share their limited vybhcari subjects with other king sthayibhavas.

Vyabhicari Bhavas (also called Sancaribhavas) – Besides these limited number of sthayibhavas Bharata talks of 33 transient, ancillary, temporary, fleeting emotions which do not just accompany sthayibhavas but represent, reinforce and re-echo them. These emotions are minor, temporary and transitory, they emerge and fade and in the process portray the dominant emotions. Soka for instance could be expressed through some of the following vyabhicari bhavas - indifference, anxiety, delusion, weeping and change of colour (here sattvikabhavas are acting as vyabhicari bhavas) . Natya is a mirror of life, Bharata holds, through these well worked out recommendations of combination of different vyabhicari bhavas to evoke a particular sthayibhavas Bharata tells actors precisely how it can be done. But he cautions actors also that he is not formulating absolutely exhaustive and closed set of combinations of these vyabhicari bhavas, rather he accords some good creative freedom to the practitioners of these art form.

Bharata's Rasa theory

Literary theory in India is quite old as much as ancient India. Panini, an ancient Grammarian considered literary theory as the fourth category of discourse. Bharata is known as first pioneer of the literary theory in Indian literary tradition. Bharata is a philosopher of kavyashastra (literary science), his Natyashastra is regarded as major text of Indian kavyashastra. Bharata declares that Natya is an anukarana (imitation) of life. Natyashastra is aimed at instructing the practitioners to 'recreate' or 'reproduce' life by putting up a production through their enactment and several other theatrical elements. All this is aimed to create an aesthetically relishable unique experience called Rasa. Bharata opens his Rasadhyaya by asking these questions "what constitutes Rasa?" "What are the Rasas expert speak?" and a little while after he introduces a simile drawn from the word of cuisine to explain

what he means by Rasa, he explains, Rasa is said so because it is something to be relished. Like various condiment, spices, herbs and other food items are blended and cooked to prepare a delicacy which is ready for a relishable tasting, similarly performers produce rasa out of the union of vibhava, anubhava and vyabhicari bhavas. What comes out after this unifying, creative, assimilative and engaging enterprise is an aesthetical state for the spectators to be relished and known as Rasa. Bharata did not elaborate much on Rasa, like a good chef, he was more concerned with giving a good recipe for a good delicacy. Chefs do not talk of good flavour and good taste they are sure of it. So was Bharata of his Rasa. His recipe of allowing a prescribed union of vibhava, anubhava, vyabhicaris to arouse sthayi so well worked out that Rasa has to emerge to enchant the refined spectators. One can easily make out his rasa is a state of mind, nothing like any mundane state it, a state of intense absorption which is emotionally charged and an essentially delightful savouring experience.

Abhinava Gupta's views on Rasa.

The real discussion of Rasa was started by Abhinava Gupta in his commentary on Bharatha's maxim on Rasa. The discussion was based on two words: Samyoga (conjunction) and Rasa-nispatti (manifestation of Rasa). Rasa is based on the psychological theory that our personality is constituted of a few primary emotions which lie deep in the subconscious or unconscious level of our being. These primary emotions are the amorous, the ludicrous, the pathetic, the heroic, the passionate, the fearful, the nauseating, and the wondrous. Other aesthetic psychologists have in later times, added to them the peaceful or intellectual, the devotional and the filial. These emotions are there in all, and so these are called the dominant emotions or Sthayibhavas. Each emotion in its manifestation shows a composition of diverse

sentiments which produce the appearance of a permanent flame. The flames of diverse sentiments give expression to the permanent emotion of love or hate, heroism or anger. No emotion is called Rasa unless it is aesthetically excited. When a young man falls in love with a young woman and his whole frame is shaken, we cannot speak of him as being the subject of Sringara rasa. When his son is dead and he is weeping, we cannot say that he is in the Karuna rasa. Rasa is an emotion excited by artistic circumstances.

Mammata's views on Rasa.

According to Bharatha, Rasa is evoked when the Vibhavas, Anubhavas and Vyabharibhavas are combined. Unfortunately, he has not interpreted the theory in detail. Hence, many scholars have tried to explain this conspicuous concept. Bhatta Lollota pointed out that Rasa is a product made by efficient causes, i.e. Nimitta Karan of the Vibhavas, Anubhavas and Vyabharicari. Mammata rejects this view on the ground that "Rasa" cannot exist in the absence of the Vibhavas, Anubhavas and Vyabharicari. It is not a producer-product relationship that exists between the Bhavas and the Rasa. He concludes that they cannot be considered the efficient causes of Rasa but concomitant agencies contribution to the creation of Rasa.

Abhinavagupta's Commentary on Rasa Theory. (Sadharanikarana) Abhinavagupta points out that in the actual aesthetic experience; the mind of the spectators is liberated from the obstacles caused by the ego. Thus transported from the realm of the personal and egoistic to that of the general and universal, we are capable of experiencing Nirvana or blissfulness. In the aesthetic process, we are transported to a trans-personal level. This is a process of de-individualization or universalization. The Indian Aestheticians consider this process as Sadharanikarana

Ala k ra school

Alankaras can be compared to the Alankaras of damsels. Anandavardhana says that Alankaras are only the Sarira, the outer body, they can be made the Sariri, the soul, i.e. when Alankaras are not expressed but suggested. Alankaras are the external ornaments on the body but can sometimes be like the Kumkuma smeared for the beauty on the body, when they are organic and structural. When Alankara is suggested and not expressed, it attains great beauty and shares the nature of the soul. Bhoja classified Alankaras into those of 'Sabha'- i.e. Bahya; 'Artha'- i.e. Abhyantara and those of both 'Sabda' and 'Artha'- i.e. Bahyabhyantara. The first one consists of the most external, the verbal figure of speech i.e. the 'Sabdalankara'. Bhoja compared it to dressing, garlanding and wearing 'Kataka' etc. The third, he compared to bath, treating the hair with fragrant smoke, smearing the body with Kumkuma, Candana, etc., Beginning from outside, these are more intimate with the body. The second, he compared to cleaning the teeth, manicuring, dressing the hair etc. They are purely the Abhyanthara alankaras or the Artthalankaras. These are most intimate.

Auchitya (the appropriate)

Auchitya in poetry means appropriateness, harmony and proportion. It ensures the ultimate beauty in poetry. The Greek equivalent for the term 'Auchitya' is decorum which means propriety. It is the soul of poetry. If auchitya is lost, the alankaras becomes more ornaments on a dead body. Alankaras are then said to be abused. Kshemendra says: 'Auchitya is the life of the Rasa-ensouled Kavya. Auchitya means that Alankaras have their meaning, only if they keep to their places. Only an Alankara which is appropriate to Artha and through it, to Rasa, can be of any beauty.

Anandavardhana's rules for the proper employment of Alankaras: Anandavardhana has formulated rules for the proper employment of Alankara. Alankara is subordinated to Rasa. It has to aid the realization of Rasa. It shall suit the Bhava and come to the poet along with Rasa. It shall overpower neither the poet nor the reader. The following are the rules formulated by Anandavardhana:

- i Alankaras shall be intended to suggest Rasa.
- ii. It shall be born along with the poet's delineation of Rasa.
- iii It shall be naturally and easily introducible.
- iv. The poet shall not stop to take a fresh and extra effort to effect it. Such a figure is allowed as proper in Dhvani. Such Alankara is born almost of itself. When the figure is actually found, it is a wonder. This Alankara properly function to heighten Rasa.

Riti and Guna

Riti

The mode of expression or the style of a literary composition and is synonymous with the term marga (way or path). The concept of riti as an element of a literary composition dates back to Bharatas Natyasastra where he discusses it under the rubric of vrttis. Bharata identifies four vrttis namely, kaisiki, bharati, sattavati and arabhatti. He opines that the kaisiki vrtti should be employed in the srngara and hasya rasas, the sattavati in vira, raudra and adbhuta, the arabhattiya in bhayanaka, vibhatsa and raudra and the bharati in karuna and adbhuta rasas. Bhamaha does not include riti or marga in his discussion of poetic composition but distinguishes between vaidarbha and gaudas, two kinds of poetry. It was Dandin who deals with the concept of

poetic style in an elaborate manner for the first time in his monumental *Kavyadarsa*. Dandin does not use the term *riti* and instead prefers the term *marga* to refer to the style of a poetic composition. He classifies the various modes of composition broadly into *vaidarbhi* and *gaudiya* on the basis of the presence of *gunas* (excellences). The *vaidarbhi marga*, according to Dandin is superior because it possesses in a harmonious relationship to all the ten *gunas* that has already been enumerated by him in the first chapter. The *gaudiya* on the other hand is marked by the absence of these *gunas* except *arthavyakti*, *udarata* and *samadhi*. Although Dandin's treatment of poetic style is quite elaborate compared to earlier theorists he does not consider the *margas* an independent element because he considers the basis of the *margas*, the *gunas*, to be mere embellishments. He thus fails to distinguish between *alamkaras* and *gunas*, a distinction which Vamana constantly emphasizes to form the basis of his *riti* doctrine. The credit of making *riti* is an independent theoretical category can be attributed to Vamana for whom *riti* is the soul of poetry. At the outset of his *Kavyalamkarasutra* (9th century A.D.), he defines *riti* as *visishta padaracana* (arrangement of marked inflected constructions). He goes on to differentiate between *gunas* and *alankaras*, classifies *gunas* into *sabda guna* and *artha guna* and on the basis of the presence or absence of *gunas* classifies *riti* into *vaidarbhi*, *Gaudiya* and *pancali*. Like Dandin, he accords the highest status to the *vaidarbhi rit* as it possesses all the excellences but also associates the *gunas*, *ojas* and *kanti* with the *gaudiya rit* and *madhurya* and *sukumarata* with the *pancali rit*. Thus while the *Gaudiya* is marked by the grand, the glorious and the imposing the *pancali* is characterized by sweetness and softness. Vamana's chief contribution to Sanskrit Poetics lies in his elevating the concept of *riti* to the status of an independent school. His elaborate treatment and classification of *gunas* definitely marks a major advance on the *Alankara School*

which subsumed literary excellences under the rubric of embellishments. The theory of *riti* suffered a setback after Vamana and its general doctrines were criticized by the proponents of the Dhvani School. Anandavardhana, the most important figure associated with this school, did not admit *ritis* an important element of poetry but accepted another factor namely, *samghatana*. He classifies *samghatana* into *asamasa*, *madhyama samasa* and *dirgha samasa* on the basis the presence or absence of compounds. But the dhvani theorists accepted this concept in so far as it contributed to the evocation of *rasa-dhvani*. But those theorists who neither adhered to the *Riti* or the Dhvani School paid considerable attention to Vamanas principles and accepted them with major modifications. Rudrata, for instance, adds another *riti* to Vamanas classification namely the *latiya* but makes the basis of his classification the presence or absence of compound words. The Agnipurana similarly accepts the four *ritis* of Rudrata but the basis of classification is not only the length or shortness of sentences but also the qualities of softness and the prominence of metaphors. Kuntaka does not accept the classification as enumerated by Dandin and Vamana. He does not consider regional variations to be the basis of classification of literary modes of expression. Instead of these he identifies three *margas*—*sukumara*, *vicitra* and *madhyama*- on the basis of what he terms *kavisvabhava* or the power, nature and the practice of the poet. According to Kuntaka, the *sukumara marga*, is marked by natural grace and charm, the *vicitra* by decorativeness and the *madhyama* by a combination of elements of both the styles. Mammata does not admit *ritis* a separate element in poetic compositions. He discusses the concept of *riti* under the rubric of *vr̥tti*. Mammata gives the name of three *vr̥ttis* - *upanagarika*, *parusa* and *komala* or *gramya*—and says that these were referred to as *vaidarbhi*, *gaudiya* and *pancali* by earlier theorists. The *upanagarika* is characterized by letters suggestive of the

madhurya guna, the parusa by that of ojas and the komala by letters other than the above. But Mammata makes it clear that mere arrangements of the letters can never impart poetic charm until and unless they help in the manifestation of rasa. Similarly,

Viswanatha points out that ritiis just padasamghatana, the formal arrangements of words and letters that help in the manifestation of rasa and can thus never claim to be the soul of poetry. The theory of riti, despite its limitations, has been a major contribution to the study of literary compositions. This theory of language has close affinities with modern day stylistic studies of literature.

Gu a

All Alankarikas accept Guna as an essential quality of poetry, it cannot be said that it developed into a school (Padhathi). The reason most probably is its connection with Riti. There are different opinions as to their number, nature and relationship to other salient features of poetry.

Origin of the concept of Guna

It is in the Arthasastra (B.C.1 st Century). The epics *Ramayana and Mahabharatha* are other sources of this concept. Gunas like Laghu, Madhura, Chitra and Udara are seen in both of the epics.

Bharatha

Coming to Sanskrit poetics Bharatha is the first to insist that the sahitya's drama should have some qualities like mrdu, lalita. In the sixteenth chapter of Natyasastra, Bharata deals with the topics of Lakshanans, Alankaras, Gunas and Dhoshas. Bharatha does not define Guna or indicate its function and difference from

Lakshanas and Alankaras. He simply says that the ten Gunas related to Kavya.

Bhamaha

Bhamaha seems to have held that as Gunas and Alankaras are the features of poetic beauty, a distinction between them is unnecessary. He was aware of some theories based on Gunas. But according to him they are not essential qualities of any particular mood of writing and should belong to all good Kavyas generally. He mentions Madhurya and Prasada and refers to Ojas as accepted by some others. It is noted that these are the three Gunas which are later defined and accepted by Anandavardhana and his followers.

Dandin

Dandin is considered as the founder of Guna Theory. His Kavyadarsa is the first authentic work dealing with Gunas in connection with the Riti otherwise known as Marga. Dandin says that whatever enhances the poetic beauty is its Alankara and in this view gunas are not different from Alankaras. Dandin admits the ten Gunas accepted by Bharata. According to him there are two types of poetic composition Marga viz. Vaidharbha and Goudiya. Between the two Vaidarbhamarga is perfect with all the ten Gunas while Gaudiya is characterised by two Gunas, Ojas and Kanthi. Just after the enumeration of ten Gunas, Dandin declares the soul of Vaidarbha marga is ten Gunas. It is because of that Dandin, though a follower of Riti and Alankara School is taken as the founder of Guna School.

Vamana

Vamana theoretically follows his predecessors Bharatha and Dandin is the names of the Gunas. But he doubles the number by

spelling up each of the Gunas as relating to Sabda and Artha. This classification of Sabdagunas and Arthagunas was first made by Vamana, as it clear from his treatment. He held that a Guna is to be called a Sabdaguna or an arthaguna according as it belongs to the Sabda or to the Artha. But sometimes this seems to be mistaken. For example Arthavyakthi is taken as a Sabdaguna by Vamana. Vamana himself was perhaps conscious of the defective nature of some of his definitions. However Vamana's distinction and treatment of numerous Gunas were later contravened by Dhvani Vadins.

Kuntaka

Kuntaka is a writer of originality in the history of Gunas. He accepts two main sets of Gunas viz. Sadarana and Asadarana. The Sadarana Gunas which belongs to all kavyas in general are soubhagya and auchitya. The Gunas that distinguishes the various margas are called as Asadarana Gunas. They are Madurya, Prasada, Lavanya and Abhijathya. Among them, the first two are old ones and the latter two are new. In illustrating Guna Saubhagya, Kuntaka shows various kinds of Vakrata. Finally he says that Gunas also are Alankaras and Alankaras means Sobhakara Dharma of Vakrokthi.

Namisadhu

Namisadhu is an important name in the history of Gunas. He establishes a strange idea in his commentary on Rudrata. After discussing three Ritis, he says that these Ritis are not alankara, but they are Gunas of Sabda . Again in the chapter of Rasa he says that the Sabdalankaras and Arthalankaras are considered as artificial ornaments where as Rasas are the natural Gunas like Soudarya etc.

Bhoja

Bhoja in his *Saraswathikandhabharana* points out that like *Rasaviyoga* and *Gunayoga* is *nitya* in *Kavya* and *Alankarayoga* is *anitya*. Bhoja classifies *Gunas* into three classes-

1. *Bahya sabdagunas*
2. *Abhyanthararthagunas*
3. *Vaiseshikagunas* or *Dosas*

These *Dosa* and *gunas* are not always *Dosas*. Sometimes they become *Gunas* in certain cases like *Punarukta* in the case of *Utkandha*.

Prathiharenduraja

Prathiharenduraja, the commentator of *Udbhata* and a follower of *Vamana* defines *Kavya* as *Sabdarta* beautified by *Gunas*. In the number of *Gunas* and then nature he differs from *Vamana*. In their number he follows *Dhvanikara* and says that *Gunas* are only three viz. *Madurya*, *Oja* and *Prasada*. In the nature of *Guna* he differs from *Anandavardhana* and remarks the *Gunas* are not *Rasadharmas*, but they are the characteristics of *Sabda* and *Artha* and they are to help *Rasa*.

Anandavardhana and Abhinavaguptha

It was *Anandavardhana* who for the first time made a more scientific definition of *Gunas* and *Alnkaras*. According to him the *Vachya* and *Vachaka* is the body of poetry and the *Again* or the *Atma* is *Rasa*. Here the question about the position of *Gunas* and *Alankara* arises. Therefore *Gunas* are related to *Rasa*, whereas *Alankara* are related to the body that is *Sabda* and *Artha*. *Gunas*

of Kavya resembles gunas like bravery, courage, straight for wordless etc.

According to Abhinavagupta who states Anandavardhana's view more explicitly, the Gunas are of the form of realisation in the heart of the Sahrdaya. They are attributed to the Rasa conditioning the experience and through them to Artha and Sabda. Such Gunas are Maduraya, Ojas and Prasada.

Mammata and Others

The above view of Abhinavagupta is described by Mammata elaborately. Following the former and Dhvanikara, Mammata defines the three Gunas and refutes the ten described by Vamana. Here three ways are shown to eliminate the other gunas.

1. Certain Gunas can be included in the three Maduraya, Ojas etc.
2. Some of them are only the absence of certain dosas.
3. A few others are sometimes no Gunas at all; they became positive dosas which have to be avoided.

Jagannathapandita

Jagannathapanditha has a new idea to tell regarding the nature of Guna. To him Gunas are not related to Rasa, the soul of poetry. Atma of Kavya, like our Atma is Nirguna. There can be therefore no gunas at all. Sabdartha, Rachana and Rasa all produce Madurya and other Gunas which are the states of the mind. All of them go to produce that kind of Chittavrthi called Guna which is also equivalent to the Chittavrthi itself.

Dhvani theory and classification

The Dhvanyaloka of Anandvardhana (8th Century A.D.) is, with Bharata's Natyasastra, the most central theory of literature in Indian tradition. Dhvani Theory is basically a semantic theory and Rasa theory is an affective theory. Anandvardhana was the chief exponent of Dhvani Theory and Abhinavagupta had made significant contribution to it. Poetry is a verbal structure. There cannot be any poetry without words. The poetry invokes emotional response; and that is followed by the understanding of its emotive language and the appreciation by the reader of the true import of the poet. The success of a good kavya (poetry) involves three aspects: -

1. Pratibha (the poet's creative inspiration)
2. Body of the Kavya (its form by way of word and meaning)
3. Rasa (the aesthetic effect)

Bharata's in his Natyasastra mentions four alankaaras (figures of speech), ten Gunas (excellences), ten Dosas (defects) and thirty-six Laksanas (characteristics) of poetic composition. In Indian poetics, scholars had different viewpoints, so they formed different sampradayas (school of thought). Dhvani School of Poetry It is regarded as a "meaning school" which gives suggestion. That suggested sense is not apprehended by mere knowledge of grammar and dictionary. It is only apprehended by the knower of the poetic meaning, who knows how to recognize the essence of poetic meaning. The word dhvani is used for: -

- i Conventional symbol- the articulate sound.
- ii. Conventional meaning

- iii. The power of word to convey the suggestive meaning
- iv. The suggestive meaning
- v. Poetic work containing the suggestive element.

Dhvani school of poetry focus on the potential power of the word in a kavya. Here, the word together with its literal sense forms the body of kavya. Anandavardhana in Dhvanyaloka takes up three main types of implicit sense: - · Vastudhvani, alankaradhvani and Rasadhvani In Vastu dhvani some rare fact or idea is implied. In Alankaradhvani some alankara or figure of speech is suggested. In Rasadhvani rasa is evoked. Both Vastudhvani and Alankaradhvani can be expressed by direct meaning or ‘vacyaatha’, by suggestion or ‘vyangyaatha’. But the third variety of implicit sense of Rasa dhvani can never be expressed in the direct meaning of words. The primary meaning can be understood by all. But the suggested meaning is understood only by those who are gifted with some imagination and a sort of intuition. The mere knowledge of word is not enough to understand and enjoy the poetic import or the essence of the kavya. It needs ‘intuition’ or ‘pratibha’. Mammatacharya calls ‘pratibha’ as- “nava-navonmesha-shalini prajna”, means the ever inventive and resourceful intellect. Mammata seems to suggest that Anandavardhana graded the entire body of kavya into three classes: -

1. Dhvani kavya-The poetry that suggest as the true kavya, the best (uttam), where ‘dhvani’ the unspoken suggestive element is dominant.
2. Gunibhuta-vamgmayakavya- well-endowed descriptive poetry, as the middle where dhvani is secondary to alankaara, and serves as a decoration for the spoken or expressed meaning.

3. Chitrakavya- poetry that structured into various patterns or drawings. Some critics dispute Mammata's statement and point out that Anandavardhana did not say any such things. The Dhvanyaloka is divided into four chapters called Uddyotas. In the beginning of the first Uddyota Anandavardhana summarizes the purpose of writing his book: "Kavyasyatama dhvaniriti budhair yah samamnata- purvah." It means the soul of poetry has already been recognized, the theory of dhvani is the essence of poetry. Anandavardhana has borrowed the term "dhvani" from the field of grammar. Anandavardhana discusses all the factors connected to dhvani doctrine such as Alankara, Guna, Riti, etc. He assigns their true place in relation to rasa and dhvani. The technical term Sphota pertaining to dhvani of the grammarians has been employed by the rhetoricians in a slightly different sense. The supporters of Dhvani theory maintain that the situation, the context, the speaker, the words and their meanings all conjointly produce the suggestion. There are three powers of words or three aspects of Dhvani: . Abhidha (denotation) . Laksana (implication) . Vyanjana (suggestion), According to Anandavardhana a word is not only endowed with the two powers of denotation and implication but also that of suggestion. We arrive at the suggested sense either through abhidha or laksana. According to vaiyaakaranaas sphota is 'vyangya' or what is suggested. In verbal expression abhidha and laksana form the nature of the condition and 'vyanjana' or dhvani is of nature of contents. Abhidha and Laksana are ways and Vyanjana is the end. The Dhvani theory, in all its minute details has five thousand, three hundred and fifty-five subdivisions of suggestive poetry. Dhvani is what one overhears in good poetry, the meaning that echo after a statement has been made. It is basically a semantic theory. Abhinavagupta in Dhvanyaloka Locanam explains that 'sabdasaktimoola' (word) and 'arthasaktimoola' (meaning) have

a role to play. He further explains the word 'dhvani' in two different way: -

1. Dhvanat iti dhvani

2. Dhvanyate iti dhvani

The first is that which sounds or reverberates or implies is dhvani. The second is 'dhvanyate iti dhvani' or dhvani is what is sounded or reverberated or implied. All the three types of dhvani , Vastudhvani, Alankaaradhvani and Rasadhvani come under 'dhvanyate iti dhvani' or that which echoes. Abhinavagupta accepts the three types of dhvani as given by Anandavardhana. However, he adds some other explanation to it. Anandavardhana, who was an advocate of rasa, was also the greatest exponent of dhvani. He concluded that rasa was expressed only through dhvani. His commentator Abhinavagupta lays down that dhvani can be employed in the whole work or in just the meaning or only in a word.

Mahimabha a's objections against nandavardhana

Mahimabhata, in his treatise Vyaktiviveka, criticizes the doctrine of dhvani proposing that there is no need to accept a new potency of word i.e. vyañjan , because the suggested sense or vyañjan can be expressed through the process of inference or anum na. For instance, in the following verse, the suggested meaning can be understood through inference as well, so there is no need to introduce the concept of dhvani. "Ramble freely, pious man! That dog to-day is killed, By the fierce lion that dwells In Goda river dells." In the above lines, when the girl says that the lion has killed the dog, she gives the impression to the hearer that it is now safe for the pious man to wander about in the garden. These seemingly assuring words lead one to the inference of the true significance of the said words, and that is, the dog may have

been killed but the greater danger of the lion is still there. As the 'roaming of a fearful person' is invariably concomitant (vy pti) with the certainty of 'the absence of all sources of fear', and the source of fear i.e. the lion, is present on the banks of the Godavari river, therefore, the fearful person would not wander. In the example, pak a (minor term) is the bank of the Godavari River, hetu (middle term) is the lion and s dhya (major term) is prohibition to wander. Hence, the purpose of the girl i.e. 'to prohibit that man from wandering from their meeting place' is arrived at from the process of inference rather than dhvani.

The supporters of the dhvani School counter the argument of Anum nav dins. By arguing that in the above example, the logical inference is not appropriate because a fearful person may still go to the places of danger and may face the risk of the lion, if ordered by his employer or teacher, or if he is urged by his beloved. In this situation, such logical arguments do not hold. It is inferred that 'a fearful person wanders only in the places where there is the absence of all sources of fear'. When we say that 'avoids all places of fear', the reason or hetu is not fixed in one place but several, and so, here occurs the fallacy of the savyabhic ra hetu or discrepant reason. The savyabhic ra hetu or discrepant reason literally means that hetu which creates confusion in the concomitance of the li ga (smoke) and the s dhya (fire). The li ga coexists with the s dhya; for example, 'smoke' coexists with 'fire'. The fallacy occurs when the hetu sometimes coexists with the s dhya and sometimes with the absence of the s dhya. For example, the mountain is fiery because it is knowable, and this knowability is there even with the absence of fire on a lake. Moreover, here, the reason (hetu) of fear is contradictory (virudha). There is a possibility that a person who is brave may not like a dog or does not see any valor in killing a dog but may still wander about, in spite of the presence of the lion. So this does not prove that a person who is scared of a dog

would certainly be scared of a lion also. Here, the reason or hetu is contradictory. Contradictory reason is that which is pervaded by the negation of the thing proved; for example, sound is eternal because it is created. Credibility is covered by the negation of eternity or transitoriness.

Finally, the most important thing in inference is to determine pak adharman , which can roughly be defined as the presence of hetu on paksa. The linga or hetu must be found to be present in the subject (pak a) about which the inference is to be made, i.e., in which the existence of the s dhya is to be established. For example, to infer that there is fire on the hill, the li ga, namely, smoke, must be known to be actually present in the hill. If not, the inference would not be possible. It should be noted that smoke itself is considered as pak dharma, although there may be many other things on the mountain such as trees, stones, etc., these are not considered as pak adharma, because smoke alone leads to the inference of fire in the particular case. Just as all things on the mountain are not pak adharma, in the same way, all smoke in the world is not pak adharma. Only that particular smoke on the mountain is pak adharma, because the knowledge of that alone is capable of giving an inference of fire on the mountain. Unless smoke is seen on the hill, we cannot have the knowledge of fire. All our previous knowledge about the invariable concomitance of smoke and fire will be of no use if we do not perceive smoke on the mountain. That is why it is not merely hetu but par mar a is also defined as the knowledge of pak adharman . The process of inference is possible only when smoke is cognized as a dharma of the pak a.

Following from this, it is not certain that there is a lion on the bank of a river, as a stranger gives the information of the presence of the lion. This is the fallacy of asiddha hetu or unproved reason. We can thus conclude that inference is not logically a substitute

for dhvani because the relationship that exists between hetu and s dhya, or li ga and li gi, cannot exist between the primary sense and suggested sense. It cannot be said that the latter can be inferred from the former. Abhinavagupta maintains that word and its meaning are not two different entities, and hence, cannot have a similar relationship that exists between li ga and li gi or hetu and s dhya. When we say that suggested sense (vyañjan) is the subject of verbal operation (sabdvay p ravisayatvam) , here, verbal operation does not exist as two different processes just as the operation of a word and then its apprehension. Abhinavagupta maintains that the operation of a word and its apprehension is one and same thing. Therefore, it cannot be a matter of inference.

Seminal doctrines of Pratyabhijñ dar ana

Pratyabhijna is an idealistic monistic and theistic school of philosophy in Kashmir Shaivism, originating in the 9th century CE. The term Trika was used by Abhinavagupta to represent the entire Kashmir Shaivism or to designate the Pratyabhijna system. The name of the system is derived from its most famous work, vara-pratyabhijñ -k rik by Utpaladeva. Etymologically, Pratyabhijna is formed from prati- ("re-") + abhi (preposition meaning "closely") + *jñ ("to know"). So, the meaning is direct knowledge of one's self, "recognition". The central thesis of this philosophy is that everything is iva, absolute consciousness, and it is possible to re-cognize this fundamental reality and be freed from limitations, identified with iva and immersed in bliss.

The Sahrdaya

A poet can communicate effectively to a reader who possesses similar sensibility as the poet. So, in order to appreciate a work of art, the reader should be endowed with rasikatva (taste), and only this person can experience the aesthetic pleasure. Bharata uses the

term *prekshaka* for a spectator. He says that only a responsive and sympathetic spectator is one “who can watch the dramatic performance with all his senses undisturbed, is pure and honest, is expert in judging the pros and cons, who can ignore a fault and lovingly appreciate merit of the performance.” Bharata enumerates the qualifications of the spectator in the twenty-seventh chapter of *Natyashastra*. The spectator has the following attributes:

- intellectual background, including the knowledge of arts and literature in general and of the dramatic art in particular,
- knowledge of the various types of aesthetic configuration, of the accompanying psycho-physical states and of the subtle distinctions among them,
- knowledge of various languages, including the provincial dialects, which are used in drama,
- the capacity of concentration,
- the power of quick understanding,
- the capacity to maintain impartial attitude,
- character and breeding,
- interest in the presentation, and
- the capacity to identify with the human focus of the situation so as to have the identity of experience. Abhinavagupta uses the term *sahrdaya* for a sensitive spectator. The ideal reader or spectator should possess *rasikatva* (taste), *sahrdayatva* (aesthetic susceptibility), power of visualisation, intellectual background contemplative habit (*bhavana*), the required psychophysical

condition and the capacity to identify his own self with the aesthetic object. The sahrdaya experiences the delight of a poetic expression when the sthayibhava that is dormant in the mind in the form of an impression is awakened by the vibhava that appears without any specific connection. The generalisation that takes place is devoid of the individuality of the character and the reader or the spectator.

Rasavighnas

Abhinavagupta says that this level can be reached only if there are no impediments (vighna). He has mentioned seven impediments in the realization of rasa (rasa-vighna).

They are:-

1. sambhavanaviraha – impossibility of the presented;
2. svagataparagatatvaniyamena desakalavisesavesa – subjective and objective limitations of time and place;
3. nijasukhaduhkhadivivasibhava – influence of personal joys and sorrows;
4. pratityupayavaikalya – lack of clarity to grasp due to insufficient stimuli;
5. sphutatvabhava – lack of clarity in expression;
6. apradhanata – subordination of the principal theme;
7. samsayayoga – lack of obviousness in the presentation

Bhuktiv da

This theory has been promulgated by Bhatta-nayaka, according to whom rasa is enjoyed by the spectator as pure joy with self-

forgetful nature through the general character of the sthayibhava in the actual play or poem. If the emotion is of personal nature, then there cannot be uniform, but indifferent enjoyment to the emotion. Hence, he proposes this theory which clearly envisages that rasa or aesthetic enjoyment is possible only when the spectator or the reader keeps his mind calm and quiet without any practical interest. A mood of composure is essentially required and the situation must be idealised so that idealised emotion is shown through the actors. As far as the method of communication is concerned, Bhatta-nayaka has discovered a unique concept known bhava-katva, a special power in language that enables the reader or spectator to discover the presented emotion leading to delightful experience through the impact of generalization (sadharanikarana). This special power of language transcends space and time and produces idealised conditions of the emotions by exposing the circumstances as well as physical expressions. However, the introduction of the concept called bhavakatva seems to be arbitrary. Since none of the alankarikas have recognized nor re-considered it. On the other hand, even if admitted this concept will be applicable only to the art pertaining to language and literature. Further this concept is applicable only to the generalised situation and not to generalized emotion. Again aestheticians have not recognized the existence of a sthayibhava in the spectator similar to the one that is shown in the play. Since he is committed to Samkhya theory of duality in Indian philosophy he could not appropriately explain the nature of rasa. Since buddhi is predominant in purusa to associate with prakrti to produce pleasure and pain. But the sattva nature of buddhi plays a role in producing aesthetic enjoyment known as bhogakrtva which means, 'the power to create enjoyment.' As a rebuttal to this viewpoint Abhinavagupta gives an alternative theory from the vedantic perspective that the potentially inherent pure pleasure in the self manifests as rasa.

Citraturaganyaya

Indian scholars from the beginning looked at Aesthetics as philosophy and they have examined

the characteristics of art as ‘philosophy of fine arts in terms of Aesthetics experience’. As an

example to comprehend the Aesthetics experience, Shakuka has given as analogy of

“citraturaganyaya” (the picture of horse logic). He explains: one, who looks at the painting of a

horse, knows that it is not a real horse but still understands it as a horse and at the same time he

will not doubt whether it is a horse. When one looks at the horse painting it create delight and

pleasure. This relation of the creator and spectator is the Aesthetics sentiment. It is strongly

stressed in Indian Aesthetics that there need to be ‘Sahrdaya’ between creator and spectator.

Abhivyaktivada

This theory has been developed by the chief exponent of Indian aesthetics, Abhinavagupta. According to this theory, rasa is manifested or revealed the moment all defilements of the self are annihilated and the blissful state of existence is achieved which is latent in the self and not brought from outside. He agrees with Bhatta-Nayaka that the sthayibhava has been presented as the theme of the artistic creation in a general and idealised form. With reference to the nature of rasa, he argues that there is an identity

between the basic emotion of the artists and the fertile imagination of the appreciator. The artist suggests the emotion and the appreciator realises, apprehends and enjoys the same through his powerful imagination. Thus the manifestation of rasa is due to the total response from the qualified appreciator. The vibhavas, anubhavas and the vyabhicharibhavas that are shown in the stage through the characters of the actors become ideal in essence and he establishes an inseparable relation with the character affected by an emotion ideologically. Subsequently the spectator develops a kind of delightful emotional experience, which is not personal but impersonal marked by generalization. As the spectator is freed from his ego, he is free to appreciate the emotional presentation. When the sthayibhava of the audience rasa is emanated. As the exponent of Kashmir Saivism (pratyabhijna), Abhinavagupta was able to fulfill all the requirements of the theory of rasa. The method of communication is dhvani or suggestion. Hence this theory has been recognized as a standard ones.

Kuntaka's concept of Marga

According to Kuntaka 'Sukumara Marga' is essential condition of Kavya. Beside Sukumara Marga, he talks about vichitra Marga and he explains the characteristics in ten Karikas. There are another Marga which is created by the characteristics of both the above said Margas, and that is Ubhayatmak Marga. Kuntaka talks about four kinds of Guna. They are Madhurya, Prasada, Lavanya and Abhijatya. For example he took references from Kalidasa. Later he mentioned about two more Guna, Auchitya and Soubhagya and these Gunas are common to all the above three margas.

Unit III :

Western literary Theories I (8Weightage) Personages: Plato, Aristotle, Longinus, Wordsworth, Eliot, I. A. Richards, William Empson

Plato

Plato was the first scholastic philosopher who had given a systematic shape to criticism. He lived in the fourth century B.C. He was the most celebrated disciple of Socrates. By his time the glory of Athenian art and literature began to fade and was taken by philosophy and oratory. The great philosophers of the period discussed a great variety of matters including the value of literature of society and its nature and functions. The fourth century B.C. was an age of critical enquiry and analysis. Plato was not a professed critic of literature and there is no single work that contains his critical observations. His ideas are expressed in several books, chief among them being the “Dialogues” and the “Republic”

Plato’s Views of Art: Plato’s view of art is closely related to his theory of ideas. Ideas, he says are the ultimate reality and things are conceived as ideas before they take practical shape as things. The idea of everything is therefore its original pattern, and the thing itself its copy. As copy ever falls short of the original, it is once removed from reality. Art – literature, painting, sculpture-reproduces but things as mere pastime, the first in words, the next in colors and the last in stone. So it merely copies a copy; it is twice removed from reality. Art takes men away from reality. The productions of art helped neither to mold character nor to promote

the well-being of the state-. He was however not aware of its potentialities for good. Rightly pursued, it could inculcate a love for beauty and for whatever is noble in character and life.

Plato's Attack on Poetry

In Plato's opinion, poetry cannot shape the character of the individual not can it promote the well-being of the state. It is a copy of the copy. It is twice removed from reality. He condemns poetry on three grounds. 1. Poetic inspiration 2. The emotional appeal of poetry 3. Its non-moral character. Poetic inspiration The poet writes not because he has thought long over but because he is inspired. It is a spontaneous overflow or a sudden outpouring of the soul. No one can rely on such sudden outpourings. It might have certain profound truth, but it should be suspected to the test of reason. Then only it will be acceptable. Otherwise they are not safe guides. So they can't be substitutes to philosophy which is guided by the cool deliberation. Poetry, on the other hand, is created by the impulse of moment. So it cannot make a better citizen or a Nation. Its pictures of life are therefore misleading. Poetry is the product of inspiration. Hence it cannot be safe guide as reason. Plato illustrates this with reference to the tragic poetry. In tragedy, there is much weeping and wailing. This moves the heart of the spectators. It is harmful in its effect. If we let our own pity grow on watching the grief of others, it will not be easy to restrain it in the case of our own sufferings. Poetry feeds the passions and let them rule us. Its non-moral character Poetry lacks concern with morality. It treats both virtue and vice alike. Virtue often comes to grief in literature. Many evil characters are happy and many virtuous men are seen unhappy. It is seen that wickedness is profitable and that honest dealing is harmful to one's self. Their portraits of Gods and Heroes are also objectionable. Gods are presented as unjust or revengeful or

guilty and heroes are full of pride, anger, grief and so on. Such literature corrupted both the citizen and the state.

The Functions of Poetry: Plato says that although poetry pleases, mere pleasure is its object. Art cannot be separated from morals. Truth is the test of poetry. Pleasure ranks low in Plato's scale of values. A poet is a good artist in so far as he a good teacher. Poetic truth must be the ideal forms of justice, goodness and beauty.

His Comments on Drama

Plato's observation on poetry is equally applicable to drama. But he says a few more things about drama in particular. Its appeal to the Baser Instincts Drama is meant to be staged. Its success depends upon a heterogeneous multitude. In order to please them all, the dramatist often introduces what they like. This is likely to lead to the arousal of baser instincts. It may affect morality. Hence such plays should be banished. Effects of impersonation by constantly impersonating evil characters, the actors imbibe vices. This is harmful to their natural self. Acting, says Plato is not a healthy exercise. It represses individuality and leads to the weakness of character, However, Plato admits that if the actors impersonate virtuous characters, the same qualities are stimulated in them by the force of habit. These tragedies that represent the best and the noble are to be encouraged. Tragic and Comic pleasure Plato tries to answer what constitutes tragic pleasure. But his explanation is not scientific. He says that human nature is a mixture of all sorts of feelings such as anger, envy, fear, grief etc.; these feelings are painful by themselves. But they afford pleasure when indulged in excess. It pleases a man to be angry or to go on weeping, otherwise he would not do so. In comedy, the pleasure takes the form of laughter when we see a coward behaving like a brave man, a fool as a wise man, a cheat as an honest person and so on. The source of laughter is the incongruity between what he

is and what he pretends to be. Such a pleasure is malicious as it arises from the weakness of a fellow man. We derive pleasure from such a man only if we love him. If he were one whom we hate, he fails to arouse any laughter but contempt. Plato says: “no character is comic unless he is lovable”. Observations on Style. Plato lays down a few principles of good speech. They apply equally to good writing. The first essential of a speech is a thorough knowledge of the subject matter. The speaker should also know the art of speaking. The presentation must have an organic unity. i.e. it must have a beginning, middle and an end. The speaker must also have a thorough knowledge of human psychology. These principles are equally true in the case of written word. The value of Plato’s criticism Plato is a discerning critic in both poetry and drama. In his attack on poetry, he exhibits a thorough insight into their nature, function and method. He insists on truth as the test of poetry. He says that poetry is twice removed from reality. He disapproves of the non-moral character of poetry. He makes a distinction between the function of poetry and that of philosophy. He also derides the emotional appeal of poetry. He makes valuable observations on the source of comic and tragic pleasure. He was also, perhaps, the first to see that all art is imitation of mimesis. He divides poetry into the dithyrambic or the purely lyrical, the purely mimetic or imitative such as drama and the mixed kind such as the epic. He makes valuable observation on style of good speech and writing.

Aristotle

Aristotle lived from 384 B.C. to 322 B.C. He was the most distinguished disciple of Plato. Among his critical treatise, only two are extant- ‘Poetics’ and ‘Rhetoric’, the former deals with the art of poetry and the latter with the art of speaking.

The Plan of Poetics

Poetics contains twenty six small chapters. The first four chapters and the twentyfifth are devoted to poetry; the fifth in general way to comedy, epic, and tragedy; the following fourteen exclusively to tragedy; the next three to poetic diction; the next to epic poetry; and the last to a comparison of epic poetry and tragedy. Aristotle's main concern thus appears to be tragedy, which was considered the most developed form of poetry in his day. Poetry, comedy, and epic come in for consideration because a discussion of tragedy would be incomplete without some reference to its parent and sister forms.

Aristotle's Observation on Poetry

1. Its Nature.

Aristotle calls poet an imitator. The poet imitates things 'as they were or are', 'as they are said or thought to be' or 'as they ought to be'. In other words the poet imitates what is past or present, what is commonly believed, and what is ideal. He believes that there is a natural pleasure in imitation. This is an inborn natural instinct. There is also another inborn instinct i.e. the instinct for harmony and rhythm. This manifests itself in metrical composition. But unlike Plato, Aristotle does not consider the poet's imitations of life as twice removed from reality, but reveal universal truths. To prove this, Aristotle makes a comparison between poetry and history. The poet does not relate what has happened, but what may happen. The historian relates what has happened. Poetry therefore is more philosophical and higher than history. Poetry expresses the universal, history the particular. The pictures of poetry are truths based on facts on the laws of probability or necessity. Thus Aristotle answers Plato's severest charge against poetry.

2. Its functions.

Aristotle considers pleasure as the end of poetry. Poetry springs from the instincts of imitation and rhythm and harmony. They are indulged in for the pleasure they give. Poetry is pleasing both to the poet and to the reader. Aristotle now here states that the function of poetry is to teach. However, he considers teaching desirable, if it is incidental to the pleasure it gives. Such a pleasure is regarded as superior to all others, for, it has a dual purpose i.e. teaching as well as pleasing.

3. Its emotional appeal.

Poetry makes an immediate appeal to the emotions. For example, tragedy aroused the emotions of pity and fear- pity at the undeserved suffering and fear for the worst that may befall him. Plato considers them harmful to the healthy growth of mind. Aristotle has no such fear. According to him these emotions are aroused with a view to their purgation or catharsis. Everybody has occasions of fear and pity in life. If they go on accumulating they become harmful to the soul. But in tragedy, the sufferings we witness are not our own and these emotions find a free and full outlet. Thereby they relieve the soul of their excess. We are lifted of ourselves and emerge nobler than before. It is this that pleases in a tragic tale. Thus tragedy transmutes these disturbing emotions into “calm of mind”. So the emotional appeal of poetry is not harmful but health-giving.

Aristotle’s Observation on Tragedy

1. Its origin

Poetry can imitate two kinds of actions- the noble actions of good men or the mean actions of bad men. Tragedy was born from the former and comedy from the latter. Tragedy

has resemblances to epic and comedy to satire. Aristotle considers tragedy superior to epic. Tragedy has all the epic elements in a shorter compass.

2. Its characteristics.

Aristotle defines tragedy as “an imitation of an action that is serious, complete and of certain magnitude, in a language embellished in with each kinds of artistic ornaments, the several kinds being found in the separate part of the play, in the form of action, not of narrative, through pity and fear effecting the proper purgation of these emotions”. By a serious action Aristotle means a tale of suffering exciting the emotions of pity and fear. The action should be complete which means that it must have a proper beginning, middle and end. It should also be arranged sequentially also. In other words it should have an organic unity. The action must be of certain magnitude. i.e. It should have reasonable length. It should be neither too long nor too short. Then only it can be easily remembered. It should have a length enough to unfold the events naturally. By artistic ornament, Aristotle means rhythm, harmony and song. They are all designed to enrich the language of the play. The form of action in tragedy distinguishes it from narrative verse. In tragedy, the tale is told with the help of characters. Their speeches and actions make the tale. In the narrative the poet is free to speak in his own person. In tragedy, the dramatist is now here seen. All is done by his characters. It is meant to be acted as well as read. The narrative, on the other hand is meant to be read only.

3. Its constituent Parts.

Aristotle finds six constituent parts in tragedy. They are: Plot, character, thought, diction, song and spectacle. The Greek equivalents of these terms are: ethos, muthos, dianoia, lexis,

melos and opsis. By plot is meant the arrangement of the incidents in the play in a logical and coherent way. Aristotle considers plot as the chief part of the tragedy because tragedy is an imitation not of men but men in action. Aristotle says: “without action there cannot be a tragedy; there may be without character’. The actions themselves issue from characters. Character, he says, determines men’s qualities, but it is by their action that they are happy or sad. It is by their deeds that we know them. So it is these deeds that are woven into plot that matters. Character, is thus next only in importance to plot. Thought refers to what the character thinks or feels. It reveals itself in speech. As plot imitates action, character imitates men, so thought imitates men’s mental and emotional reactions to the circumstances in which they find themselves. All these three i.e. plot, character and thought constitutes the poet’s objects in imitation in tragedy. To accomplish them, he employs the medium diction. By diction is meant, words embellished with each kind of artistic ornament. Song is one of them. Spectacle, the last of the six parts, is in fact the work of the stage mechanic. But it constitutes the manner in which the tragedy is presented to the audience.

4. The Structure of the Plot.

The plot is the soul of the tragedy. It should have unity of action. It means that only those actions in the life of the hero which are intimately connected with one another and appear together as one whole forms the plot. If any one of them is displaced or removed, the whole will be disjoined. The events comprising the plot will concern only one man. Otherwise there will be no necessary connection between them. By unity of time, Aristotle means the conformity between the time taken by the events of the play and that taken in their representation on the stage. The unity of place means the conformity between the scene of tragic events and the time taken by them to happen. A good tragic plot arouses the

feelings of pity and fear in the audience- pity for the undeserved suffering of the hero and fear for the worst that may happen to him. The plot is divisible into two parts- complication and denouement. The former ties the events into a tangle knot, latter untie it. Complication includes all the actions from the beginning to the point where it takes a turn for good or ill. The denouement extends from the turning point to the end. The first is commonly called the rising action, and the second the falling action.

5. Simple and Complex Plot.

The plot may be simple or complex. In a simple plot there are no puzzling situations such as peripeteia and anagnorisis. Peripeteia is generally explained as 'reversal of the situation' and anagnorisis as 'recognition' or 'discovery'. By reversal of situation is meant reversal of intention (e.g. a move to kill an enemy turning on one's own head, or killing an enemy and later discovering him to be a friend.). The discovery of these false moves is anagnorisis. In other words it means a change from ignorance to knowledge. Both peripeteia and anagnorisis please because there is an element of surprise in them. A plot that makes use of them is complex. A perfect tragedy should be arranged not on the simple but on the complex plot.

6. Tragic Hero.

According to Aristotle, the ideal tragic hero should be good but neither too bad nor too perfect. He should be a man whose misfortune is brought about not by vice or depriving but by some error or frailty. This error is hamartia or the tragic flaw. For example, in 'Hamlet', it is his procrastination or inability to take action that leads to his down-fall. It is not a deliberate vice but flaw of characters and it makes the play tragic one.

7. Aristotle's opinion about Comedy.

Aristotle regards comedy as inferior to tragedy. He traces its roots to satire. Satiric verse originated in phallic songs sung in honour of Dionysus, the god of fertility, as epic originated from hymns to gods and praises of famous men. Consequently tragedy represents men as noble as they can be, and comedy taking its origin from satirical verse, represents men as worse than they are, but satire ridicules personality or rather the "sinner" while comedy ridicules sin or rather human vices. Unlike Plato, Aristotle does not consider the characters in comedy as vicious. According to him they are rendered ludicrous by some defect that is neither painful nor destructive. They are not contemptible also. Like poetry, comedy shows not what has happened, but what may happen. The characters are presented in particular situations in which every human being would have acted in the same way. Thus, general, not individual weakness is displayed in them.

8. Aristotle's opinion about epic.

The epic is earlier in origin than tragedy or comedy. In its nature it resembles tragedy, for it is an imitation of a serious action, whole, with a beginning, middle and an end. The structure also is like that of the tragedy, for the plot has a complication, and denouement, it can be complex, or simple, with or without peripeteia and anagnorisis. Its effect is the same, namely catharsis. But it lacks the song and spectacle found in tragedy. In its form it is different from tragedy, for it is narrative and is much longer than a tragedy. It is meant to be read or recited. While the tragedy presents only one main event, an epic contains several events which add to its variety and grandeur. Thirdly, an epic poet can introduce many improbable but marvelous incidents which presented on the stage may appear absurd, while they remain unnoticed when perceived by the imagination. They add to the

pleasure of the poem, and Aristotle recommended probable impossibilities though not improbable possibilities. The supernatural element in the epic is an example of it. Aristotle still considers tragedy superior to epic though the latter appeals to the cultured, refined people and has no need of theatrical aid to achieve its effect. But Aristotle finds that tragedy with its music produced greater pleasure and its limited length attains more unity.

9. Aristotle's observation on Style.

Aristotle lays down clearness and propriety as two essentials of good writing. According to him current words are the best. But writing should aim at dignity and charm. These are best attained by the use of archaic words, foreign words, dialect words and newly coined words. They have an element of surprise in them. Metaphorical use of words is to be preferred to the plain. Aristotle says that a perfect poetic style uses words of all kinds in a judicious combination. Compound words are the most suitable for the lyric, rare or unfamiliar words suit the epic form, and metaphorical use of language is best for drama. In the "Rhetoric" Aristotle comments that common, familiar words are best for prose that deals with everyday subjects. But metaphorical language may be employed to introduce an element of novelty and surprise. Multiplicity of clauses, parenthesis and ambiguity should be avoided in prose. Words may be arranged in two ways called loose style and periodic style. The former consists of a whole sentence with a beginning and an end. The periodic style is more intelligible and graceful 10. The Value of Aristotle's Criticism.

Aristotle's approach to literature is that of a scientist. Aristotle wanted literature to be an -art and not to do the work of morality. He points the difference between politics and poetry. Politics is a

socialscience, therefore it should be judged by the contribution it makes to social well-being. Poetry, on the other hand, should be judged by its capacity to please the audience. He judges literature by aesthetic standards alone. Unlike Plato, he does not regard poetry as twice removed from reality. Instead, he considers the representations in poetry as true to the facts of human life. He points out its capacity to see the permanent features of life. He suggests what kind of plot, character and style please men. He finds that *perepetia* and *anagnorisis*, please most in a tragic plot, *hamartia* in the tragic hero, and metaphor in style. Tragedy, comedy and epic are all, in this way, considered with reference to the effect on the minds and hearts of their spectators. Poetics deals with the art of poetry and many more problems of literature and has therefore attracted greater attention than any other works of criticism.

Longinus

Longinus is one of the greatest Greek critics. His position is only next to Aristotle. His 'On the Sublime' is an immortal critical document of great worth and significance. It deals with the principle of sublimity in the world of writing. Here Longinus discusses the meaning, the nature and the sources of sublime. He distinguishes the true sublime from the false sublime. He advises how to overcome the vices of sublime. His suggestions are of permanent and paramount value.

Wordsworth

William Wordsworth(1770 – 18500), one of the most famous of all Nature poets, set off the Romantic revolt in English with the publication of 'Lyrical Ballads' in collaboration with Samuel Taylor Coleridge in 1798. He published his masterpiece 'The Prelude' a long autobiographical poem in 1805. 'The Preface to

the Second Edition of *The Lyrical Ballads*, 1800' contains Wordsworth's philosophy of poetry. He argues that poetry should be written in the natural language of common speech. The themes of his poetry are inspired by 'humble and rustic life'. Wordsworth's "Preface to the Lyrical Ballads" with an Appendix on poetic diction is universally acclaimed as a manifesto of Romantic criticism. The principal object of *Lyrical Ballads* is to illustrate how good poetry can be written on common incidents in the lives of ordinary human beings in simple, natural language. Wordsworth has given a number of memorable definitions of poetry such as "a spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings which takes its origin from emotions recollected from tranquility" He says "Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge." Wordsworth emphasizes on the poet's freedom of expression and the free play of imagination. He denounces the poetic diction of the Neo- classical poets for their artificiality. He does not consider metre and rhyme as absolutely essential for good poetry, He realizes that metre when superadded can give pleasure. He asserts that there is essentially no difference between the language of poetry and that of prose. However with the exception of his early poems, Wordsworth did not adhere to his own principles.

Wordsworth's critical pronouncements are found in his Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads*. They constitute the romantic manifesto. In the Preface to the Second Edition of the *Lyrical Ballads*, 1800, states the object of writing the Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads*. He expresses his hesitation to defend his theory of poetry for a number of reasons: Firstly, the reader might get the impression that the poet was foolishly and selfishly hoping to persuade them to appreciate the new variety of poems he was placing before them. If his poems possessed a genuine quality, the reader would certainly receive it. He was not in favour of advertising his own poems. Secondly, the poet felt that a substantial and sound view of poetry cannot be condensed within

the limited framework of the Preface. If he were to do justice to the task, he would have to examine the prevalent public taste, the changes have occurred in social and literary trends as also the impact of language on the human mind. All this would require a lot of space. In spite of his initial reluctance, Wordsworth did not wish to abruptly present a totally unfamiliar kind of poetry. He found it his duty to prepare his readers for this new variety of poems. Wordsworth expected strong opposition to his volume. Therefore, he intended his Preface. Wordsworth's principal object of the Lyrical Ballads is to choose incidents and situations from common life, and to relate and describe them, as far as is possible, in a selection of language really used by men and at the same time, treat the subject imaginatively so that ordinary thing would appear unusual. Besides, he hoped to make such incidents and situations interesting by relating them to the primary laws of our nature, particularly the way we associate idea in a state of excitement. Humble and rustic life was generally chosen, since, in such a condition, human passions are less under control, more mature and can express themselves in a plainer and more emphatic language. Secondly, our basic emotions co-exist in a state of greater simplicity and so they may be reflected upon and communicated more effectively. Thirdly, the manners of rural life originate from these basic passions and lastly, in that condition such feelings blend with the beautiful and permanent forms of nature. Wordsworth took special pain to purge the rustic speech of all its defects, coarseness and faulty constructions before employing it in his poems because the simple country folk are constantly in touch with the best aspects of nature from which the best part of language evolves. Thirdly, as the rural population is restricted to the narrow circle, their manner of expression is more passionate, vivid and powerful. Fourthly, rustic speech is more precise and philosophical than the artificial diction of such poets who deliberately separate themselves from the language and

feeling of ordinary people. Thus the principal object of the Lyrical Ballads is to illustrate how good poetry can be written on simple themes of ordinary human beings in simple, natural language. Wordsworth asserts that the poems in the Lyrical Ballads have the moral purpose of enlightening the readers and purifying their affections. He had the habit of meditation and it so regulated and transformed his emotions that the sentiments he has expressed are bound to increase the comprehension of the readers as also to purify and reinforce their own emotions. He says: "For all good poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings which takes its origin from emotions recollected in tranquility" However, worthy and noble poems are produced only when the poet has thought long and deep on the subject matter. Wordsworth considers a poet as a man of more than usual organic sensibility, but also one who has "thought long and deeply", the poet's feelings are modified by his thoughts which represent all our past feelings; he becomes capable of connecting on thought with another, in this manner he is able to discover what is really important and worthwhile. By continued repetition such mental exercises, our feelings will be connected with important subjects so that such a noble perception of things will become habitual. Naturally, whenever he composes poems, such a poet will deal only with noble themes and lofty sentiments in a worthy manner. Such poems will have a desirable impact on the readers' sensibility too. Wordsworth implies that if a poet is always given to noble thoughts and worthy ideas he will never fail to compose poems of a noble note. In "Lyrical Ballads" Wordsworth adopts the simple language of common men. Personifications, figures of speech, antithesis and similar devices are rarely used. Wordsworth maintained and practiced in "Lyrical Ballads" his theory that there is hardly any difference between the language of prose and that of poetry. The language of large portion of every good poem differs from that of good prose only in the use of

metre. The choice of words and phrases is done with real feeling and taste. As the subjects of poems are chosen judiciously, they are expressed in a judiciously chosen dignified and variegated metaphors and figures. In the preface to the “Lyrical Ballads” published in 1798 Wordsworth tells the reading public that his poems were a kind of experiment to know how far the language of conversation in the middle and lower class society is successful in producing poetic pleasure. Wordsworth asserts that even in the best poetry, the truly significant passages follow an order of words which is similar to that found in a good prose composition. The sole difference between the two is that the language of poetry is arranged according to the law of metre. Wordsworth declares that “there neither is nor can be any essential difference between the language of prose and metrical composition” they are intimately related in their nature, function and appeal. According to the poet, poetry shed’s no tears such as Angels weep, but natural and human tears. That is to say, both prose and verse employ the same materials, spring from the same source, and appeal to the same faculties. Thus Wordsworth establishes that there is no essential difference between prose and metrical composition. Wordsworth points out that in the view of several critics the very use of rhyme and metre distinguishes the language of poetry from that of prose and that this in itself justifies the use of certain other artificial distinctions, which afford pleasure and so are willingly accepted by the readers. In other words, poetry, by its very nature, differs from prose. The use of poetic diction is as much a source of pleasure as rhyme and metre, and so it is equally justified. Wordsworth does not subscribe to these views; He insistently recommends the use of “a selection of language really used by men”. And if such a selection is made with true taste and feeling, the language of poetry would be free from the coarseness and vulgarity of ordinary life. Such diction is a sufficient distinction, and the addition of metre to it becomes a

further source of pleasure. He holds the view that metre and rhyme are not indispensable to poetry. There can exist genuine poetry even without metre. Wordsworth observes that the poet is basically a man speaking to men. He is a person who writes not for his own pleasure but primarily to express his own thoughts and emotions to his readers. He is a person endowed with a more lively sensibility, more enthusiasm and tenderness than ordinary people. He has a greater knowledge of human beings. He has a greater degree of imagination and so he can feel or react emotionally to events and incidents which he has not directly experienced. In addition, he has a disposition to be affected, more than other men, by absent things as if they were present. Having a more comprehensive soul, the poet can share the emotional experiences of others. He can identify himself emotionally with others and he can express the feelings and sentiments of others. He has greater amount of zeal and enthusiasm for life than ordinary people. He rejoices in the spirit of life, in the activities of mankind and in Nature at large and takes pleasure in communicating his own joy in life to others. Moreover he has greater readiness and power in expressing what he thinks and feels. Wordsworth agrees with Aristotle's concept that poetry is the most philosophic of all writing. The object of poetry is truth, no individual and local, but general and operative. Poetic truth is much higher than the truth of history or philosophy. In fact, poetry is more philosophical than philosophy itself. While history deals merely with particular facts and philosophy, with abstract truths, poetry alone deals both with the particular and the universal. Poetry aims at universal truths and also illustrates them through particular instances and illustrations. It is the mirror of human life and nature. Poetry is guided by sole consideration, namely, that of imparting pleasure to the readers while giving a faithful picture of nature and reality. On the other hand, the historian and the philosopher, labour under several obstacles. Poetry, says

Wordsworth is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings which takes its origin from emotions recollected from tranquility. This definition of poetry gives us an idea of Wordsworth's poetics. This definition highlights the spontaneity and emotionalism of poetry. He says: "Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge; it is the impassioned expression which is in the countenance of all sciences. This definition explains how poetry blends passions and knowledge. According to Wordsworth, poetic truth is superior to scientific truth, for it is based on universal facts of life and hence can be appreciated by all. While the scientist makes only a surface study, the poet probes into the inner reality and arrives at the soul of things. As he is a man of fine sensibility, the truth which he discovers is surcharged with his personal emotions. These emotions are recollected in tranquility and in a rare mood gush out as a spontaneous poetic outpouring. Wordsworth affixes an Appendix to his Preface to the Lyrical Ballads to express his views on Poetic diction. In poetic diction Wordsworth could not agree with his neo-classical fiends. He wanted poetry to be a medium for expressing the feelings and aspiration of common man in common language. Wordsworth wrote Lyrical Ballads to justify his theory and to see if he could produce pleasure by writing in the language of common man. In the preface in 1798, he told the readers that his poems were a kind of experiment too knows how far the language of conversation among the middle class and lower class in the society was suited for poetry. In the second and the third editions, he stated that his object was to choose incidents and situations from common life and describe them in a language used by men. He preferred the language of these men because they communicate with the best objects in nature and they express their emotions in simple and unelaborated expression. He maintained that there is hardly any difference between the language of prose and that of poetry. His poetic diction is therefore, devoid of personifications, phrases,

figures of speech, antithesis and similar devices. He emphasized the selection of language. Words and phrases should be chosen with true taste and feeling. But the selection and choice of words implies the neo-classical attitude of the poets. This accounts for the comment that Wordsworth actually ends in good neo-classicism. The whole trend of Wordsworth's writings, both poetic and critical, was towards the simplification of life. Even his theory of poetic diction is only another aspect of his general effort to pierce down through artificiality and conventions to nature and reality.

T. S. Eliot

Eliot made significant contributions to the field of literary criticism, and strongly influenced the school of New Criticism. He was somewhat self-deprecating and minimising of his work and once said his criticism was merely a "by-product" of his "private poetry-workshop". But the critic William Empson once said, "I do not know for certain how much of my own mind [Eliot] invented, let alone how much of it is a reaction against him or indeed a consequence of misreading him. He is a very penetrating influence, perhaps not unlike the east wind."

In his critical essay "Tradition and the Individual Talent", Eliot argues that art must be understood not in a vacuum, but in the context of previous pieces of art. "In a peculiar sense [an artist or poet] ... must inevitably be judged by the standards of the past." This essay was an important influence over the New Criticism by introducing the idea that the value of a work of art must be viewed in the context of the artist's previous works, a "simultaneous order" of works (i.e., "tradition"). Eliot himself employed this concept on many of his works, especially on his long-poem *The Waste Land*. Eliot's 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' begins the essay by pointing out that the word 'tradition'

is generally regarded as a word of censure. It is a word disagreeable to the English ears. When the English praise a poet, they praise him for those aspects of his work which are 'individual' and original. It is supposed that his chief merit lies in such parts. This undue stress on individuality shows that the English have an uncritical turn of mind. They praise the poet for the wrong thing. If they examine the matter critically with an unprejudiced mind, they will realize that the best and the most individual part of a poet's work is that which shows the maximum influence of the writers of the past. To quote his own words: "Whereas if we approach a poet without this prejudice, we shall often find that not only the best, but the most individual part of his work maybe those in which the dead poets, his ancestors, assert their immortality most vigorously.'

Tradition does not mean a blind adherence to the ways of the previous generation or generations. This would be mere slavish imitation, a mere repetition of what has already been achieved, and "novelty is better than repetition." Tradition in the sense of passive repetition is to be discouraged. For Eliot, Tradition is a matter of much wider significance. Tradition in the true sense of the term cannot be inherited, it can only be obtained by hard labour. This labour is the labour of knowing the past writers. It is the critical labour of sifting the good from the bad, and of knowing what is good and useful. Tradition can be obtained only by those who have the historical sense. The historical sense involves a perception, "not only of the pastness of the past, but also of its presence: One who has the historic sense feels that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer down to his own day, including the literature of his own country, forms one continuous literary tradition." He realizes that the past exists in the present, and that the past and the present form one simultaneous order. This historical sense is the sense of the timeless and the temporal, as well as of the timeless and the

temporal together. It is this historic sense which makes a writer traditional. A writer with the sense of tradition is fully conscious of his own generation, of his place in the present, but he is also acutely conscious of his relationship with the writers of the past. In brief, the sense of tradition implies (a) a recognition of the continuity of literature, (b) a critical judgment as to which of the writers of the past continue to be significant in the present, and (c) a knowledge of these significant writers obtained through painstaking effort. Tradition represents the accumulated wisdom and experience of ages, and so its knowledge is essential for really great and noble achievements.

Also important to New Criticism was the idea—as articulated in Eliot's essay "Hamlet and His Problems"—of an "objective correlative", which posits a connection among the words of the text and events, states of mind, and experiences. This notion concedes that a poem means what it says, but suggests that there can be a non-subjective judgment based on different readers' different—but perhaps corollary—interpretations of a work.

More generally, New Critics took a cue from Eliot in regard to his "'classical' ideals and his religious thought; his attention to the poetry and drama of the early seventeenth century; his deprecation of the Romantics, especially Shelley; his proposition that good poems constitute 'not a turning loose of emotion but an escape from emotion'; and his insistence that 'poets... at present must be difficult'."

Eliot's essays were a major factor in the revival of interest in the metaphysical poets. Eliot particularly praised the metaphysical poets' ability to show experience as both psychological and sensual, while at the same time infusing this portrayal with—in Eliot's view—wit and uniqueness. Eliot's essay "The Metaphysical Poets", along with giving new

significance and attention to metaphysical poetry, introduced his now well-known definition of "unified sensibility", which is considered by some to mean the same thing as the term "metaphysical".

His 1922 poem *The Waste Land* also can be better understood in light of his work as a critic. He had argued that a poet must write "programmatic criticism", that is, a poet should write to advance his own interests rather than to advance "historical scholarship". Viewed from Eliot's critical lens, *The Waste Land* likely shows his personal despair about World War I rather than an objective historical understanding of it.

Late in his career, Eliot focused much of his creative energy on writing for the theatre; some of his earlier critical writing, in essays such as "Poetry and Drama", "Hamlet and his Problems", and "The Possibility of a Poetic Drama", focused on the aesthetics of writing drama in verse.

I. A. Richards

I. A. Richards (1893-1979) was educated at Clifton College, Bristol, and Magdalene (pronounced Maudlin) College, Cambridge, where he studied philosophy. In 1919 he started teaching at the newly created School of English at Cambridge. In 1926, he was made a Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. For some time, he was teaching in China. In 1939 he moved to the United States of America, and taught at Harvard, where he was University Professor Emeritus. He published three volumes of poetry, but he is remembered primarily as a literary critic and teacher, not as a poet. Richards was a scholar of semantics, and along with C.K. Ogden, formulated Basic English. *The Meaning of Meaning* (1923) written with C.K. Ogden, is an important contribution to linguistics. *Principles of Literary Criticism*

published in 1924, was followed by *Science and Poetry* (1926), *Practical Criticism* (1929), and *Coleridge on Imagination* (1934). Richards believed that literary criticism should be objective. He was fascinated by the newly developing science of psychology, and wanted to evaluate art in terms of the state of mind induced by it. He promoted a psychological theory of value. This theory has become outdated due to later researches in psychology. But his comments on language, and on the practical analysis of poetry, are still valid, and have had an enormous influence on Anglo American literary criticism in the twentieth century.

Principles of Literary Criticism

In the *Principles of Literary Criticism*, I. A. Richards set out to establish a theoretical framework for criticism which would free it from subjectivity and emotionalism. His some isolated observations which could make profitable starting points for reflection. But they provide no answer to the central question of criticism: "What is the value of the arts, and what is their place in the system of human endeavours ?" Richards proposes a psychological theory of art; art is valuable because it helps to order our impulses. In the second chapter, "The Phantom Aesthetic State", he dismisses the concept of a special aesthetic state. Modern aesthetics, starting with Kant, rests on the assumption that there is a special kind of pleasure which is disinterested, universal, unintellectual and not to be confused with the pleasures of sense or ordinary emotions. They believed that art experience was a special kind of experience, in a class of its own, not to be compared with the experiences of ordinary life. Richards feels that there is no such special mode. The aesthetic experience is not a new or different kind of thing; it is similar to ordinary experiences. Richards uses a very graphic analogy to explain this point: "When we look at a picture, or read a poem, or listen to music, we are not doing something quite unlike what we

were doing on our way to the gallery or when we dressed in the morning ". Richards believes that aesthetic experiences are not *sui generis*, that is, they do not merely have intrinsic value. It is possible to analyze art experience, and examine its value in terms of ordinary life, because it is not a special state cut off from ordinary life. According to Richards, "The two pillars upon which a theory of criticism must rest are an account of value and an account of communication" . Richards believes that the human mind has developed because it is an instrument for communication. The arts are "the supreme form of the communicative activity" . Of course, the artist himself may not be conscious of this; he is not as a rule deliberately and consciously engaged in a communicative endeavour" . The artist is concerned with getting the work "right", regardless of its communicative aspect. Whether it is a poem or a play or a statue or a painting, the artist is wholly involved in making the work embody his experience. He cannot stop to consider the communicative aspect. It is always there at a subconscious level. The very process of getting the work "right" involves endowing it with great communicative power; "efficacy for communication" is a main part of the "rightness". . Criticism should not concern itself with the avowed or undeclared motives of the artist. Richards believes that the mental processes of the poet are not a very profitable field for investigation. It is dangerous to try to analyze the inner workings of the artist's mind by the evidence of his artistic work. It is not possible to verify what went on in the artist's mind, just as we cannot be sure what goes on in a dreamer's mind. Very often, the most plausible explanations of the artist's mental processes may be quite wrong. To prove this point, Richards takes up Coleridge's famous poem, *Kubla Khan*.

I am sure you would be familiar with the poem, and may have heard that Coleridge wrote it the influence of opium. Critics like Graves have presented a complex psychological explanation for

the sources of the imagery in the poem. Richards points out that the explanation is much simpler: Coleridge was influenced by Milton. Richards examines lines 223-283 from *Paradise Lost*, Book IV. He quotes many lines from Milton's poem to establish it as the source of the underground river, the fountain, and the Abyssinian maid "singing of Mount Abora" of Coleridge's poem. Richards brings up this example to show the difficulties of speculating about the poet's mental processes; he feels that it would be a wrong application of psychology. Richards believes that the arts can improve the quality of our lives by communicating valuable experiences. It is not easy to communicate complex experiences; Richards believes that the arts provide the only way of doing so. "In the arts we find the record in the only form in which these things can be recorded of the experiences which have seemed worth having to the most sensitive and discriminating persons". He believes that "The arts are our storehouse of recorded values". He gives a very high place to the artist. "He is the point at which the growth of the mind shows itself". I. A. Richards's literary criticism should concern itself with value: Richards believes that "Art for Art's sake" is wrong. He declares, that "critic is as closely occupied with the health of the mind as the doctor with the health of the body". He says that it is wrong to consider value a transcendental idea. Metaphysical or ethical considerations should be - New Criticism kept out of literary criticism. He proposes a psychological theory of value. Anything is valuable which satisfies the impulses or appetencies, as he calls them. These desires or aversions may be conscious, or they may operate at the subconscious level. Appetencies include both conscious and unconscious desires. because the more important appetencies may be ones which are not consciously felt. So Richards defines value thus: "Anything is valuable which will satisfy an appetency without involving the frustration of some equal or more important appetency". This naturally raises

the question, "Which are the important appetencies?" Richards believes that the importance of an appetency can be gauged by the extent to which other appetencies which will be disturbed by the thwarting of the impulse involved, that is, the importance of an impulse can be judged by the way it involves other impulses. States of mind are valuable in so far as they involve coordination of activities as opposed to curtailment of them. Richards says that the function of the arts is to organize our impulses; the effect of art is "the resolution, inter-animation, and balancing of impulses". In some respects, Richards's theory resembles Aristotle's catharsis, which suggested that the function of tragedy was to restore emotional balance. Richards has proposed a very simplistic process, and his psychological theories have become outmoded with the passage of time. Moreover, it is difficult to accept the high claims Richards makes for art as an ordering of the mind. Richards was one of the first to indicate the importance of the response of the audience. Beauty is "not inherent in physical objects, but a character of some of our responses to objects". His first book, *The Foundation of Aesthetics* (1922) was co-authored with two friends of his undergraduate days, C. K. Ogden and James Wood. He continued his collaboration with C. K. Ogden, the inventor of Basic English. Their book, *The Meaning of Meaning* (1923) created new technical terms for literary discussion; they drew attention to the "symbolic" use of language in science and its "emotive" use in poetry. Chapter Thirty-four of *Principles of Literary Criticism* is devoted to "The Two Uses of Language". Richards observes that the terms we use to discuss poetry are ambiguous and fail to record the correct distinctions. In this book, he has used words like causes, characters and consequences when analyzing mental activity, in place of thought, feeling, and will. Richards distinguishes between two kinds of causation for "mental events". The first kind is represented by the stimuli affecting the mind through the senses

immediately, and also combining with what survives from comparable stimuli in the past. The second kind of causation lies in the mind itself, its needs and its receptiveness. In the scientific field, the impulse should be derived from what is external ? The scientific use of language thus relies on reference undistorted by the receiving mind. By contrast there is an emotive use of language which is designed to arouse emotions. Richards says, "A statement may be used for the sake of reference, true or false, which it causes. This is the scientific use of language. But it may also be used for the sake of the effects in emotion and attitude produced by the reference. This is the emotive use of language. The distinction once clearly grasped is simple. We may use words for the sake of the references they promote, or we may use them for the sake of the attitudes and emotions which ensue" . These two uses of languages are analogous to the denotative and connotative functions of words; the scientific use should avoid ambiguity, it should have a fixed, single meaning. But the emotive use encourages multiple meanings; various connotations of the word are brought into play. The scientific and emotive use have different criteria for success. For science, the connections and relations of references to one another must be logical. The references should not contradict one another. But a logical arrangement is not necessary for emotive purposes. They can reject logic in favors of their own internal emotional connection; as long as they have a coherent organization, it does not matter even if they contradict each other. Richards goes on to illustrate his proposition by discussing the way the word "truth" is used. In the scientific sense, a reference is true "when the things to which it refers are actually together in the way it refers to them" . In criticism, the most usual sense is of acceptability. Truth may also be used in the sense of sincerity, when we are discussing art. In Science and Poetry, Richards uses the term "pseudo-statement" for poetical statements. Truth in a scientific statement is a matter

of laboratory verification; "a pseudo-statement is 'true' if it suits and serves some attitude or links together attitudes which on other grounds are desirable". Richards uses the word "simplistic" for the referential use of language, but there is a difference between his views of language and Saussure's. You would learn about Saussure in the next block, so it would be a good idea to come back to this unit after you are acquainted with semiotics. Like Saussure's *Course, The Meaning of Meaning* starts with the proposition that there is an essential disjunction between language and reality, that it is wrong to believe that "words are in some way parts of things" (to use the words of Ogden and Richards in *The Meaning of Meaning*). From this common starting point, their ideas develop in different directions. For Saussure, the meaning of words does not depend in any way on their relationship with things, it is wholly determined by the arbitrary and conventional structure of language. Ogden and Richards, in contrast, stress that words are used to "point to" things, and that their meaning does depend on the things they are used to point to, their referents. Language may be different from reality, but it reflects it. Their position is thus an empiricist one, in that it rests on the principle that knowledge is the product of experience.. Richards continues his discussion of language in *Practical Criticism*, when he analyses the "Four Kinds of Meaning". All articulate speech can be regarded from four points of view: I.A. Richards 1. Sense -- the state of affairs or the items presented for consideration. 2. Feeling -- By feeling he means the whole range of emotional attitudes, desire, pleasure etc. that the words evoke. Feeling does not enter into some types of discourse -- mathematics, for example. 3. Tone: the attitude of the speaker to the audience. 4. Intention -- the speaker's conscious or unconscious intention, the effect he is trying to promote.

William Empson

Empson, a student of I.A Richards, in (1930) promulgates a radically new approach to the language of poetry – to the multiple semantic possibilities of individual words, and to the frequent openness of English syntax to more than one construction. The purpose of the “seven types” taxonomy is clarity of thought and not rigidity of classification. Empson’s argument underlies the claim that “the mechanization’s of ambiguity are among its very roots.” The book treats poetry from Chaucer to T.S Eliot, but its most famous examples are from the 17th century: Shakespeare (Macbeth), Donne (A Valediction Forbidding Mourning) and Herbert (Sacrifice).

Empson’s taxonomy of ambiguity moved from simple ambiguity such as double meaning to outright contradictions. He begins with words that seem to mean several things at once due to similar sounds. In the second type, two meanings merge into one. In the third type, two seemingly unconnected words are given together. In the fourth, alternative meanings combine to confuse interpretation. In the fifth type, there is some confusion that the author has discovered as he went along, and is the result of the author not being able to “hold” the entire work in his head while composing. In the sixth, irrelevance constitutes the ambiguity and the reader has to make a choice. Finally outright contradictions and `antagonistic meanings are deployed by the author — which, Empson argues, via Freud, is an indication of a split in the author’s consciousness. Empson argues that words have meanings of many kinds beyond those their authors could conceptualize; meanings that embody drives contradicting the author’s conscious codes, meanings that express psychological and social forces that show up fully only in subsequent development. For his against the grain verbal analyses Empson is sometimes claimed as predecessor of deconstruction and notions of a free play of language.

Unit IV :

Western literary Theories II (7 Weightage) Theories and concepts:

Mimesis, tragedy, sublimity, romantic criticism, objective correlative, impersonal theory, ambiguity, Pragmatism, Idealism, Phenomenology, Psychoanalysis, Structuralism, Post Structuralism, De- construction, Reader response

Mimesis

Traditionally the English word 'imitation' is used, although inadequately, to translate the Greek word mimesis and the philosophical discussion of the behaviors denoted by mimesis is commonly called 'the theory of imitation'. The theory of mimesis was not, however, a well-articulated theory but was rather a fundamental outlook shared by most authors, philosophers and educated audiences in the classical period, in antiquity as a whole, and even later. Neither was there a clear-cut terminological usage. Several words were used more or less synonymously as, for instance, mime (imitation), eikon (image),. But behind this terminological cluster there was, I think, a basic conceptual consensus which will be sketched in this chapter. The theory of mimesis is now generally regarded as the oldest theory of art. But the theory of mimesis as we find it in ancient texts is not a theory of art in a modern sense; it is rather a theory of pictorial apprehension and representation. The basic distinction for the ancient theory of mimesis was that between mime and real things. For example, a house is a real thing whereas a painting or a sculpture representing a house is a mime, a thing which looks like a house but is not a house. And a piece of music which sounds

like sorrow is not a real or genuine (expression of) sorrow but just gives the impression of sorrow. The mime as a thing is a sort of vehicle for 'man-made dreams produced for those who are awake', as Plato suggestively formulates it. Neither the dream nor the mime is a real thing.

The ancient heritage with regard to the aesthetic field is first of all dependent on the basic distinction between what we know by means of the intellect and by means of the senses. The senses 'inform' us about the individual and contingent qualities of particular things whereas the intellect considers the abstracted and common properties of things: we see and hear the colors, sounds and shapes of things but we understand their common natures by the intellect. Further, within the field of the senses people have has a mimetic faculty which was understood as the ability to see and hear individual things where no such things are at hand; for instance, you see a house in a painting where there is, in fact, a flat surface painted in different colors. In order to see or hear such things the percipient must be aware of and know that the house seen is a picture and mime of a house and not a real house. If they do not see this they either see a Tradition and the Academy 26 flat surface with colors or they have an illusion of seeing a house where there is none. In order to see and hear mime the percipient must be acquainted with things of the kind represented. In order to see that the painting represents a house you must know what kind of things houses are. The mimetic faculty is twofold in nature: every human being has the ability to see or hear mime, for instance in shadows and reflections in water, but only some persons have learnt the skill and practice of producing mime, i.e. 'man-made dreams for those who are awake' in Plato's formulation. Finally, these man-made dreams can be used in many different ways, for many different purposes and under vastly different circumstances. They appear in religious contexts, they can be used in political propaganda, they serve as

entertainment, as educational tools and as pornography. To use them as works of art is a cultural tradition and behavior with its roots in antiquity and in the theory of mimesis but not developed as a social institution of its own until the eighteenth century.

Tragedy

Aristotle defines tragedy as ‘the imitation of an action that is serious, complete and of a certain magnitude, in language embellished with each kinds of artistic ornaments, the several kinds being found in the separate parts of the play, in the form of action and not narrative, through pity and fear effecting catharsis or the proper purgation of these emotions.’ Aristotle regarded tragedy as the highest form of poetry. He identified six elements of tragedy. They are plot, character, thought, diction, music and spectacle. Tragedy is a serious play that deals with the misfortunes and sufferings of man. The tragic hero is neither too virtuous nor too vicious but his misfortune or fall is brought about by some error or frailty. Aristotle called it hamartia which means tragic flaw. Tragedy excites pity and fear in the minds of the audience, thus resulting in the purgation of their emotions. Aristotle divides the plot of tragedies into two kinds: (i) simple and (ii) complex. Aristotle is quite emphatic that Plot is more important than character. He even says that there can be tragedy without character, but none without plot. The function of tragedy is the arousal of the feelings of pity and fear in the mind of the audience effecting catharsis or proper purgation of these emotions. As a result when the spectators leave the theatre, they attain a calm state of mind. This is the principle behind tragic pleasure. Marlow made significant contribution in the field of tragedy. His heroes are not kings or princes but humble individual. However, they have heroic qualities. Tamburlaine and Dr. Faustus are examples, the former is a shepherd, and the latter a poor scholar. Their insatiable ambition leads them to their

downfall. Marlow added to the English tragedy the element of struggle which was absent in the tragedy of the Middle Ages. A Shakespearean tragedy is the story of the downfall of a man from a high status. The story leads up to the death of the hero. At the end the stage is littered with dead bodies. Modern conception of tragedy differs from the Aristotelian, Medieval and Shakespearean conception. The hero of a modern tragedy is not a person of high rank and status. He is a person like us, who suffers terribly, for no fault of his own. The saying 'character is destiny' is not true of modern tragedy. For example, Thomas Hardy's concept of tragedy is capsuled in a quotation drawn from Shakespeare's "King Lear": 'As flies to wanton boys, Are we to God/ They kill us for their sport.'

Sublimity

Sublimity is a certain loftiness, distinction and consummation of excellence in language, expression and composition. It was the most influential rhetorical text through much of the period of the Second Sophistic, and has subsequently exerted a pronounced influence on literary criticism since the seventeenth century, somewhat against the grain of the classical heritage derived from Aristotle and Horace. It has fascinated critics of the modern period on account of its treatment of the sublime as a quality of the soul or spirit rather than as a matter of mere technique. In the later classical period and the Middle Ages, the treatise appeared to be little known.. In modern times the concept of the sublime owed its resurgence to a translation in 1674 by Nicolas Boileau, the most important figure of French neoclassicism. The sublime became an important element in the broad Romantic reaction in Europe against neoclassicism as well as in the newly rising domain of aesthetics in the work of thinkers such as Immanuel Kant.

The Sources of the Sublime: According to Longinus there are five principal sources of the sublime.

These sources are-

- Grandeur of thought
- Strong emotion
- The use of figures
- Noble diction-Dignified composition.

The 'grandeur of thought' and 'strong emotion' is inborn gifts of nature. The rest three sources are the gifts of art.

Grandeur of thought

Grandeur of thought is one of the principal sources of the sublime. It is largely the gift of nature. It is essential for a sublime work. Men with mean and servile ideas can't attain sublimity. In fact, great thoughts spring from great souls. In short, it is the echo of a great soul. In the words of Longinus 'their words are full of sublimity whose thoughts are fully majestic'. Sublimity demands skillful selection and organization of material. Details should be so chosen as to form an organic whole. The imitation is also one of the significant paths, which lead to sublimity.

Strong emotion

Strong and inspired passion is the second significant source of the sublime. The vigorous treatment of it is essential for acquiring sublimity. Strong emotion is an inborn gift of a genius. According to Longinus nothing makes so much for grandeur as true emotion in the right place. But the subject of emotion has not been dealt with in detail.

The use of figures

The use of figures is the third principal source of the sublime. It can be acquired by art. It helps in the creation of the sublime. Figures of speech should be used in a natural manner. They should be employed in the right place, on the right occasion, in the right manner and with a right motive. Only such use strengthens the sublime and the sublime supports it. The chief figures like the rhetorical questions; adjuration, asyndeton, hyperbaton, periphrasis, anaphora, contribute much to the sublime and add greatly to the beauty of language.

Noble diction

It is also a very important source of the sublime. It includes choice of proper words and the use of metaphors and ornamental language. The choice of proper and striking words is essential for producing sublimity. Longinus is of the view that beautiful words are the very light of lofty thought. Trivial subjects should not be treated in a grand manner. It means that inappropriate magnificence of diction should be avoided. The use of metaphors also contributes a great deal to the sublime.

Thus Longinus is one of the greatest masters of criticism. He is the pioneer in the field of literary appreciations. His 'On the sublime' is the first and a unique treaty on style. His prescriptions for sublimity are universal.

Romantic Criticism

Romanticism, as an artistic, literary, and intellectual movement, began in Europe toward the end of the 18th century and flourished in the first half of the 19th century in most places in Europe. Romanticism can be seen as a revolt against the aristocratic social and political norms of the Age of Enlightenment as well as a

reaction to the scientific rationalization of nature. Embodied most strongly in art, music, and literature, it had a tremendous impact on historiography, education, politics and the natural sciences. Romanticism legalized intense emotion as an authentic source of aesthetic experience, elevated folk art and ancient custom to noble status, made spontaneity a desirable characteristic. Romanticism reached beyond the rational and Classicist ideal models, embraced the exotic, the unfamiliar, and the distant. It also viewed the individual imagination as a critical authority. This unit offers you a brief introduction to Romantic criticism. Along with contextualizing the critical approach in the socio-cultural context of the literature of the time, attempt has been made to distinguish it from Neo classical criticism. However, it is always advisable to read the major critical texts of each critic in order to understand the characteristics of each critic and the period or school s/he represents.

History of Romantic Criticism

The Romantic period in English literature begins around the end of the 18th century and lasts till the 1830s. More specifically, from the point of view of the literary historian, Romantic period in English (and also in German) literature began in 1798, the year of the first edition of *Lyrical Ballads* by Wordsworth and Coleridge and of the composition of *Hymns to the Night* by Novalis, and ended in 1832, the year which marked the deaths of both Sir Walter Scott and Goethe. As an international movement of all the arts, Romanticism began at least in the 1770's and continued into the second half of the 19th century. This extended chronological spectrum (1770-1870) also permits recognition as Romantic the poetry of Robert Burns and William Blake in England, the early writings of Goethe and Schiller in Germany, and the great period of influence for Rousseau's writings throughout Europe. The early Romantic period thus coincides

with what is often called the ‘age of revolutions’—including the American (1776) and the French (1789) revolutions. Though there lays vast difference in the philosophy and treatment of subject matters among the writers of the Romantic era, it is noteworthy that almost everyone were responding to certain sociopolitical movements taking place in their time. It was a socially tumultuous period and the influx of different revolutionary ideas created chaos and conflict in the socio-cultural lives of people.

The definition of Romanticism has been a topic of debate in the field of literary history throughout the 20th century. They generally accepted view is that it was part of the reaction against the Age of Enlightenment, the classic Western traditions of rationality and the very idea of moral absolutes and agreed values. Most Romantics can be said to be broadly progressive in their views, but a considerable number always had, or developed, a wide range of conservative views, and nationalism was in many countries strongly associated with Romanticism. According to some scholars, Romanticism is essentially continuous with the present; for scholars like Robert Hughes it is the inaugural moment of modernity; and others like Chateaubriand, ‘Novalis’ and Samuel Taylor Coleridge believe that it is the beginning of a tradition of ‘Counter-Enlightenment’, – a resistance to Enlightenment rationalism, which is associated most closely with German Romanticism. Both the fictional and nonfictional writings of the Romantic period were highly influenced by the French Revolution, which inspired writers to address themes like democracy and human rights. The French Revolution, bringing a violent end to feudal powers and monarchy, asserted the right and supremacy of the individual free will. The new philosophy of the rights of all men was expressed in both politics and literature, which led to the ‘Liberalism in Literature.’ This literature was inspired by the ideals of equality, fraternity and liberty and

revolted against the tyranny of set formulas, rules and conventions. Their individual spirit has been dignified. This new form of philosophy became one of the main guidelines of a new school of Romantic poets, writers and philosophers. Romantic's search for fresh subject, their belief in nature, their emphasis upon spontaneity and their belief that everyone has a right to express his own idea are the features of individualism, which was the prime demand of French Revolution. In the beginning, the Revolution got huge support from the writers because of the opportunities it seemed to offer for political and social change. In later years, the poets used the spirit of the revolution to help characterize their poetic philosophies. The Industrial Revolution brought about a different and related reaction in literature that addressed the rights of the laboring classes and improved labor conditions. This revolutionary spirit prompted Romantic poets like Wordsworth, Coleridge and Shelley to posit new theories about the function and form of poetry.

Major Exponents of Romantic Criticism

Romantic Literary criticism in English literature is basically associated with and dominated by the writings of William Wordsworth in his 'Preface' to *Lyrical Ballads* (1800) and Samuel Taylor Coleridge in his *Biographia Literaria* (1817). Apart from them, poets like John Keats, PB Shelley as well as essayists like Hazlitt, De Quincey also contributed to the development of criticism in the Romantic period. Let us now discuss some of the major exponents of Romantic criticism in English literature. Wordsworth: Wordsworth is one of the most important Romantic exponents in English literature in the sense that he is the only romantic poet who made his poetic experiences the locus of his critical discourse. Instead of theorizing his idea of poetry, like his friend Coleridge, he was insisted on unraveling the workings of the mind of the poet. That is why; his literary

criticism ceases to be criticism in its most literal sense. Rather, his Preface to the second edition of *Lyrical Ballads*, an important document of Romantic literature in English can be seen as a poetic ‘manifesto,’ or ‘statement of revolutionary aims.’ The revolutionary idea that Wordsworth brought to English Romantic literature was the rejection of ‘the Pseudo Classical’ – Neoclassical – theory of poetic diction. As a poet, his aim was to deal with the rustic and humble life: ‘to choose incidents and situations from common life’ for which the appropriate language would be the language used by the common men in day-to-day simple situations: ‘a selection of language, really used by men’. The rustic language in its simplicity, for Wordsworth, is highly emotional and passionate. Charged with the natural emotions of the human heart, it comes from the heart, and thus goes direct to the heart. Therefore, such a language is highly expressive of the essential truths about human life and nature; it is more ‘philosophical’ than any other language. Apart from his take on ‘poetic diction’, Wordsworth’s definition of poetry is emblematic of the Romantic notion of poetry. As far as the nature of poetry is concerned, Wordsworth held the opinion that “poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings.” Poetry, having its origin in the internal feelings of the poet, is a matter of passion, mood and temperament. It cannot be produced by strictly adhering to the rules laid down by the Classicists. However, it has been clarified by him that good poetry is never an immediate expression of powerful emotions; it is the result of deep and long meditation: ‘poetry has its origin in emotions recollected in tranquility.’ There are four stages in the composition of poetry. The first stage is of observation or perception of objects, characters, or incidents, which infuses powerful emotions in the mind of the poet. The next stage is about the contemplation or recollection of that emotion in tranquility. At this stage, memory comes into play and brings out what had been lying in the

unconscious for days, months or years. The third stage is that of filtering wherein the poet is purged of nonessential elements and thus makes his experience communicable to all men. The fourth stage is where the actual task – the composition – begins. There have been a series of severe criticism of Wordsworth’s critical notions about poetry among his contemporaries. That his conception about the language of poetry was unsound is best exemplified by his own practice: most of his best poetry is written in language far removed from the language of ordinary people. Wordsworth’s status in the history of English criticism is not exceedingly high. Coleridge himself exposed the hollowness of Wordsworth’s notions in his *Biographia Literaria*. Coleridge: Coleridge was a far greater critic than Wordsworth because of the fact that he had depth of study and observation, a deeper understanding of the creative process. Besides, he was a pioneer in many respects. He gave a new conception of the very function of a critic: a critic should appreciate and interpret but not judge a work of art. According to his own conception of the poetic process where he claims that for the existence of truth there must be a knower and a known, a subject and an object, or the Self and Nature. Out of the interaction and fusion of the two arises a creative work. This work is neither Self nor Nature but a different entity altogether having laws of its own. Coleridge’s criticism of Shakespeare is based on this conception of the creative process. He reacted to the Neoclassical critics like Dr. Johnson, who considered Shakespeare to be a great dramatist on the ground that Shakespeare was ‘the poet of nature’ holding in his art ‘a faithful mirror of manners and of life.’ For Coleridge, to mirror nature is not the functions of a poet. Poetry is neither Nature nor Self but the outcome of the counteraction of the two, and, therefore, an independent entity with laws, which it is the function of a true critic to explore and explain. Thus, he develops the idea of ‘organic unity’. Coleridge is one of the earliest critics to

distinguish between fancy and imagination. While he confines fancy to 'fixities and definitives', imagination is defined as the chief creative force of an artist. The critical theories of Coleridge seem to be part of a larger system of aesthetics he might have wanted to develop in future. His criticism was also influenced by the metaphysics of the German Philosophers like Lessing, Schlegel and Kant. However, despite being a remarkable critic, he failed to develop his own 'school' of criticism. Most of his critical writings are concentrated in the only monument of his criticism: *Biographia Literaria*.

Objective correlative

The theory of the 'objective correlative' is one of the most important critical concepts of T.S. Eliot. It exerted a tremendous influence on the critical temper of the twentieth century. The term 'objective correlative' was first used by American painter Washington Allston in the 19th century and later it was revived by Eliot. In the concept of the 'objective correlative', Eliot's doctrine of poetic impersonality finds its most classic formulation. Eliot formulated his doctrine of the 'objective correlative' in his essay on "Hamlet and His Problems" (1919).

According to Eliot, the poet cannot communicate his emotions directly to the readers, he has to find some object suggestive of it, and only then he can evoke the same emotion in his readers. So this 'objective correlative' is "a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that particular emotion; such that when the external facts, which must terminate in sensory experience, are given, the emotion is immediately evoked." It is through the objective correlative that the transaction between author and reader necessarily takes place. For this object is the primary source of, and warrant for, the reader's response whatever that may be; and it is also the primary basis for whatever

inferences we may draw about what it is that the "author wanted to say." Briefly speaking, what Eliot means by his doctrine of the objective correlative is that a great work of art is nothing but a set of conceptual symbols or correlatives which endeavor to express the emotions of the poet, and these symbols constitute the total vision of the creative artist. Eliot cites an example to prove his doctrine from Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. In *Macbeth*, the dramatist has to convey the mental agony of Lady Macbeth and he does so in "the sleep-walking scene", not through the description, but an unconscious repetition of her past actions. Her mental agony has been made objective so that it can as well be seen by the eyes as felt by the heart. The external situation is adequate to convey the emotions, the agony of Lady Macbeth. Instead of communicating the emotions directly to the reader, the dramatist has embodied them in a situation or a chain of events, which suitably communicates the emotion to the reader.

Impersonal theory

In "Tradition and the Individual Talent" (1919), Eliot stated the position with almost shocking emphasis: the poet has, not a "personality" to express, but a particular medium, which is only a medium and not a personality, in which impressions and experiences combine in peculiar and unexpected ways.

A view of art so thoroughly organic as this implies as a corollary an impersonal art; that is, that the work grows in accordance with some inner principle of its own being, and is not merely the creature of the writer's ego, either as an expression of his feelings as a man or as an assertion of his opinions.

The relations among the parts that make up the art work become the important matter for critical investigation. That relationship is

conceived to be complex. Eliot even suggests that the work of art is to be regarded as an organism, alive with a life of its own.

Ambiguity

Ambiguity is a literary term put forward by William Empson in his work, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930). The book was influential as one of the foundations of the New Criticism. In *Seven Types of Ambiguity* Empson sought to enrich the reader's understanding of a poem by isolating the linguistic properties of the text. He suggested that words or references in poems are often ambiguous and, if presented coherently, carry multiple meanings that can enrich the reader's appreciation of the work. He argued that the complexities of cognitive and tonal meanings in poetry form the basis of the reader's emotional response. The seven types of ambiguities listed by Empson are:

1. When a detail is effective in several ways simultaneously.
2. When two or more alternative meanings are resolved into one.
3. When two apparently unconnected meanings are given simultaneously.
4. When alternative meanings combine to make clear a complicated state of mind in the author.
5. A kind of confusion when a writer discovers his idea while writing. In other words, he has not preconceived the idea but comes upon it during the act of creation.
6. Where something appears to contain a contradiction and the reader has to find interpretations.

7. A complete contradiction that shows that the author was unclear as to what he was saying.

Pragmatism

The word Pragmatism is of Greek origin but it is a typical American school of philosophy. It is intimately related with the American life and mind. It is the product of practical experiences of life.

It arises out of actual living. It does not believe in fixed and eternal values. It is dynamic and ever-changing. It is a revolt against Absolutism. Reality is still in the making. It is never complete.

Our judgment happens to be true if it gives satisfactory results in experience, i.e., by the way it works out. A judgment in itself is neither true nor false. There are no established systems of ideas which will be true for all times. It is humanistic in as much as it is concerned more with human life and things of human interest than with any established tenets. Therefore, it is called humanism.

Pragmatism means action, from which the words practical and practice have come. The idealist constructs a transcendental ideal, which cannot be realized by man. The pragmatist lays down standards which are attainable. Pragmatists are practical people.

They face problems and try to solve them from practical point of view. Unlike idealists they live in the world of realities, not in the world of ideals. Pragmatists view life as it is, while idealists view life as it should be. The central theme of pragmatism is activity.

Pragmatism has no obstructive dogmas. It accepts everything that has practical consequences. Even mystical experiences are accepted if they have practical results. Unlike idealists they

believe that philosophy emerges out of educational practices while the idealists say that “education is the dynamic side of philosophy”. The chief exponents of Pragmatism are William James (1842-1910), Schiller, and John Dewey (1859-1952).

Idealism

Idealism is the oldest system of philosophy known to man. Its origins go back to ancient India in the East, and to Plato in the West. Its basic viewpoint stresses the human spirit as the most important element in life. The universe is viewed as essentially nonmaterial in its ultimate nature. Although Idealist philosophers vary enormously on many specifics, they agree on the following two points; the human spirit is the most important element in life; and secondly the universe is essentially nonmaterial in its ultimate nature. Idealism should not be confused with the notion of high aspirations that is not what philosophers mean when they speak of Idealism. In the philosophic sense, Idealism is a system that emphasizes the pre-eminent importance of mind, soul, or spirit.

The word idealism is derived from two distinct sources—the idea and the ideal. Idea means true and testified knowledge. The word ideal stands for the perfected form of an idea or ideas. If we study the basic principles, Idealism puts forth the argument that reality, as we perceive it, is a mental construct. It means that experiences are result of sensory abilities of the human mind and not because reality exists in itself, as an independent entity. In the philosophical term this means that one cannot know the existence of things beyond the realm of the intellect. Plato describes “reality” in his Theory of Forms. For him the “Form” is actual substance of 'Things' which 'Formed' matter and perceptible reality. Plato wants convey the message that matter is real and can be experienced as a rational living entity; it is not a mere projection of consciousness.

According to Knight (1998), Augustine (354-430), Rene Descartes (1596-1650), George Berkeley and the German philosopher Immanuel Kant and George William Hegel are the prominent names who represent idealism. Berkeley and Kant have interpreted idealism in very different ways. Kant described idealism as transcendent, whereas Berkeley called it 'immaterialism' which is commonly termed as subjective materialism. George Berkeley says that the material world exists because there is a mind to perceive it and that things which are not within the conceptual framework of the human mind cannot be deemed real.

Berkeley admits that objects exist, but their presence in the physical realm is as long as there is a mind to perceive them. For this Berkeley has used a Latin phrase 'Esse est percipi' (to be perceived). On the other hand Kant is of the opinion that reality exists independently of human minds but its knowledge is inherently unknowable to man because of sensory filters in our consciousness. These filters slow down our ability to see the 'thing in itself'. Thus our ultimate perception of things is always through the mind's fixed frame of reference.

Phenomenology

Phenomenology is the study of structures of consciousness as experienced from the first person point of view. The central structure of an experience is its intentionality, its being directed toward something, as it is an experience of or about some object. An experience is directed toward an object by virtue of its content or meaning (which represents the object) together with appropriate enabling conditions. Phenomenology as a discipline is distinct from but related to other key disciplines in philosophy, such as ontology, epistemology, logic, and ethics. Phenomenology has been practiced in various guises for

centuries, but it came into its own in the early 20th century in the works of Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty and others.

Phenomenological issues of intentionality, consciousness, qualia, and first-person perspective have been prominent in recent philosophy of mind. Phenomenology is commonly understood in either of two ways: as a disciplinary field in philosophy, or as a movement in the history of philosophy. The discipline of phenomenology may be defined initially as the study of structures of experience, or consciousness. Literally, phenomenology is the study of “phenomena”: appearances of things, or things as they appear in our experience, or the ways we experience things, thus the meanings things have in our experience. Phenomenology studies conscious experience as experienced from the subjective or first person point of view. This field of philosophy is then to be distinguished from, and related to, the other main fields of philosophy: ontology (the study of being or what is), epistemology (the study of knowledge), logic (the study of valid reasoning), ethics (the study of right and wrong action), etc. The historical movement of phenomenology is the philosophical tradition launched in the first half of the 20th century by Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Jean-Paul Sartre, et al. In that movement, the discipline of phenomenology was prized as the proper foundation of all philosophy—as opposed, say, to ethics or metaphysics or epistemology. The methods and characterization of the discipline were widely debated by Husserl and his successors, and these debates continue to the present day. In recent philosophy of mind, the term “phenomenology” is often restricted to the characterization of sensory qualities of seeing, hearing, etc.: what it is like to have sensations of various kinds. However, our experience is normally much richer in content than mere sensation. Accordingly, in the phenomenological tradition, phenomenology is given a much wider range, addressing the meaning things have in our

experience, notably, the significance of objects, events, tools, the flow of time, the self, and others, as these things arise and are experienced in our “life-world”. Phenomenology as a discipline has been central to the tradition of continental European philosophy throughout the 20th century, while philosophy of mind has evolved in the Austro Anglo-American tradition of analytic philosophy that developed throughout the 20th century. Yet the fundamental character of our mental activity is pursued in overlapping ways within these two traditions. Accordingly, the perspective on phenomenology drawn in this article will accommodate both traditions. The main concern here will be to characterize the discipline of phenomenology, in a contemporary purview, while also highlighting the historical tradition that brought the discipline into its own. Basically, phenomenology studies the structure of various types of experience ranging from perception, thought, memory, imagination, emotion, desire, and volition to bodily awareness, embodied action, and social activity, including linguistic activity. The structure of these forms of experience typically involves what Husserl called “intentionality”, that is, the directedness of experience toward things in the world, the property of consciousness that it is a consciousness of or about something. According to classical Husserlian phenomenology, our experience is directed toward—represents or “intends”—things only through particular concepts, thoughts, ideas, images, etc. These make up the meaning or content of a given experience, and are distinct from the things they present or mean. The basic intentional structure of consciousness, we find in reflection or analysis, involves further forms of experience. Thus, phenomenology develops a complex account of temporal awareness (within the stream of consciousness), spatial awareness (notably in perception), attention (distinguishing focal and marginal or “horizontal” awareness), awareness of one’s own experience (self-

consciousness, in one sense), self-awareness (awareness-of-oneself), the self in different roles (as thinking, acting, etc.), embodied action (including kinesthetic awareness of one's movement), purpose or intention in action (more or less explicit), awareness of other persons (in empathy, inter subjectivity, collectivity), linguistic activity (involving meaning, communication, understanding others), social interaction (including collective action), and everyday activity in our surrounding life-world (in a particular culture). Furthermore, in a different dimension, we find various grounds or enabling conditions— conditions of the possibility—of intentionality, including embodiment, bodily skills, cultural context, language and other social practices, social background, and contextual aspects of intentional activities. Thus, phenomenology leads from conscious experience into conditions that help to give experience its intentionality. Traditional phenomenology has focused on subjective, practical, and social conditions of experience. Recent philosophy of mind, however, has focused especially on the neural substrate of experience, on how conscious experience and mental representation or intentionality are grounded in brain activity. It remains a difficult question how much of these grounds of experience fall within the province of phenomenology as a discipline. Cultural conditions thus seem closer to our experience and to our familiar self-understanding than do the electrochemical workings of our brain, much less our dependence on quantum-mechanical states of physical systems to which we may belong. The cautious thing to say is that phenomenology leads in some ways into at least some background conditions of our experience.

Psycho analysis

Psychoanalysis is one of the modern theories that are used in English literature. It is a theory that is regarded as a theory of

personality organization and the dynamics of personality that guides psychoanalysis. It is known that the closet connection between literature and psychoanalysis has always been deployed by the academic field of literary criticism or literary theory. Among the critical approaches to literature, the psychoanalysis has been one of the most controversial and for many readers the least appreciated. In spite of that it has been regarded one of the fascinating and rewarding approach in the application of interpretative analysis. This psychological interpretation has become one of the mechanisms to find out the hidden meaning of a literary text. It also helps to explore the innate conglomerate of the writer's personality as factors that contribute to his experience from birth to the period of writing a book. The goal of psychoanalysis was to show that behaviour which was caused by the interaction between unconscious and consciousness. The proposed work titled 'Psychoanalytic theory used in English Literature: A Descriptive Study' aims to explore where psychoanalysis has been used by the author's in his/her literary works in English literature.

The modern theory that is used in literature has two accepted meanings. Firstly, it means a method of treating mentally disordered people. Secondly, it also goes to mean the theories on human mind and its various complexities. Psychoanalytic theory was propounded by Sigmund Freud. Freud was originally a medical man who was engaged in the study and treatment of patients in his clinic. His long devotion to this sector makes him realize and he observed mental disease of his patients. Gradually he was more interested in the study of psychology and more particularly psychology of the unconscious mind. Freud suggested that our mind has three distinct regions. On the basis of his first discoveries concern the psychology of psychoneurosis, dreams, jokes and what he called the psychopathology of everyday life, such as slips of the tongue, of the pens. The second

is a system of pre-conscious and a third a system of conscious. His ideas were first presented in ‘The interpretation of Dreams (1900). It has often been assumed that the evidential basis for these theories came from his study of dreams. It is the mind in which all our pleasant and unpleasant experiences are accumulated, synthesized and organized.

Structuralism

Structuralism designates the practice on analyzing and evaluating a work of art on the explicit model of structural linguistics. It is based upon the concept that things cannot be fully understood in isolation. They have to see in the context of larger structures they are part of. Structural criticism views literature as a second-order signifying system that uses the first-order structural system of language as its medium. Structuralist critics often apply a variety of linguistic concepts to the analysis of a literary work, such as the distinction between phonemic and morphemic levels of organization, or between paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships. Some critics analyze the structure of a literary text on the model of the syntax in a well-formed sentence. Literary structuralism explains how it is that a competent reader is able to make sense of a particular literary text by specifying the underlying system of literary conventions and rules of combination that has been unconsciously mastered by such a reader.

Tenets of Structuralism

- i. A literary text is considered as a ‘text’ i.e. a mode of writing constituted by a play of component elements according to specifically literary conventions and codes. These factors may generate an illusion of reality, but have

no truth-value, nor any reference to a reality existing outside the literary system itself.

- ii. The individual author is not assigned any initiative, expressive intentions or design as the 'origin; or producer of a work. Instead the conscious 'self' is declared to be a 'space' within which the impersonal, the pre-existing system of literary language, conventions, codes and rules of combination gets precipitated into a particular text.
- iii. Structuralism replaces the author by the reader as the central agency in criticism; but the traditional reader, as a conscious, purposeful and feeling individual, is replaced by the impersonal activity of "reading" and what is read is not a work imbued with meanings, but 'écriture'. The focus of structuralist criticism is on the impersonal process of reading.

Post structuralism

Post-structuralism refers to the intellectual developments in continental philosophy and critical theory that were outcomes of twentieth-century French philosophy. The prefix "post" refers to the fact that many contributors such as Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Julia Kristeva were former structuralists who, after abandoning structuralism, became quite critical of it. In direct contrast to structuralism's claims of culturally independent meaning, post-structuralists typically view culture as inseparable from meaning.

Post-structuralism denotes a way of theorizing that emerged around the 1950s, predominantly in France, among otherwise extremely diverse intellectuals . Most thinkers termed post-structuralist, as well as the legitimating struggles and heated debates, were prominent until about the 1980s. Beyond this date,

the debates died down and many once radical post-structuralist ideas were subsequently absorbed into mainstream disciplines. As the name suggests, a post-structuralist way of thinking is rooted in structuralism, but it also represents a retrospective critique of certain structuralist commitments. Like structuralism, post-structuralism identifies a way of theorizing that belongs equally to literary theory, philosophy (especially the study of how thought works, insofar as thinking is carried out in language), and critical theory (emancipatory social science via discourse analysis and ideology critique). The starting points for a post-structural theoretical vision within this enormous terrain of interdisciplinary scholarship are language, signification, and semiotics. Most post-structuralist thinkers first sought to establish new concepts in this domain to describe their novel way of thinking. Most later turned their attention to philosophical and ethical themes and, consequently, to emancipatory social critique. Of the figures commonly named post-structuralist, some are more closely aligned than others with structuralism. Together, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Roland Barthes, Jacques Lacan, and Michel Foucault have been named structuralism's "Gang of Four." However, the latter three, across their diverse domains of concern, ultimately shifted from structuralist to post-structuralist thinking. Lacan, in particular, remains difficult to place since he published "work in progress" that was subject to revision over a span of fifty years, and his texts generate opposing structuralist and post-structuralist readings. The selection of more clearly post-structuralist figures (Umberto Eco, Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, and Julia Kristeva) follows the overall flow from concerns with signification, through philosophical and ethical issues, to social critique. A great deal of overlap is found, however, since this trend is also evident in the course of thinking specific to each figure. The "ethical turn" in post-structuralism is marked by an emphasis on subjectivity, authorship, and identity (particularly

feminine). This emphasis reflects both an important critique of structuralism (which threatens subjectivity) and the overall shift toward philosophical and ethical concerns that culminates in critical theory. Disagreements among post-structuralists, as well as criticisms of post-structuralism, concern the degree to which “chaos concepts” (such as instability, chance, and ambiguity) should be accommodated when considering issues of meaning, knowledge, subjectivity, and ethics. Although the border between post-structuralism and postmodernism is not clearly drawn, postmodernism can be characterized as an extremist response, which celebrates “chaos” as a replacement for structuralist rigidity. Such extremism has elicited strong criticism. A more rigorously post-structural approach is to resist extremes and adopt a theoretical attitude that accommodates complexity.

While post-structuralism is difficult to define or summarize, it can be broadly understood as a body of distinct reactions to structuralism. There are two main reasons for this difficulty. First, it rejects definitions that claim to have discovered absolute 'truths' or facts about the world. Second, very few people have willingly accepted the label 'post-structuralist'; rather, they have been labeled as such by others. Therefore no one has felt compelled to construct a 'manifesto' of post-structuralism. Thus the exact nature of post-structuralism and whether it can be considered a single philosophical movement is debated. It has been pointed out that the term is not widely used in Europe (where most supposedly "post-structuralist" theory originates) and that the concept of a post-structuralist theoretical paradigm is largely the invention of American academics and publishers.

Deconstruction.

It is a literary theory developed by Jacques Derrida. It regards language as inadequate to convey the meaning, for languages are

all based upon sound symbols. Communication is therefore made fuller with gestures, facial expression and so on. Since the same word may mean different thinkers, distortion is possible. Derrida challenges the conventional theory that language has the potential to refer to an extra-textual world or to express determinate signification.

Derrida, who coined the term deconstruction, argues that in Western culture, people tend to think and express their thoughts in terms of binary oppositions (white / black, masculine / feminine, cause /effect, conscious /unconscious, presence / absence, speech writing). Derrida suggests these oppositions are hierarchies in miniature, containing one term that Western culture views as positive or superior and another considered negative or inferior, even if only slightly so. Through deconstruction, Derrida aims to erase the boundary between binary oppositions—and to do so in such a way that the hierarchy implied by the oppositions is thrown into question.

Although its ultimate aim may be to criticize Western logic, deconstruction arose as a response to structuralism and formalism. Structuralists believed that all elements of human culture, including literature, may be understood as parts of a system of signs. Derrida did not believe that structuralists could explain the laws governing human signification and thus provide the key to understanding the form and meaning of everything from an African village to Greek myth to a literary text. He also rejected the structuralist belief that texts have identifiable “centers” of meaning—a belief structuralists shared with formalists.

Formalist critics, such as the New Critics, assume that a work of literature is a freestanding, self-contained object whose meaning can be found in the complex network of relations between its parts

(allusions, images, rhythms, sounds, etc.). Deconstructionists, by contrast, see works in terms of their undecidability. They reject the formalist view that a work of literature is demonstrably unified from beginning to end, in one certain way, or that it is organized around a single centre that ultimately can be identified. As a result, deconstructionists see texts as more radically heterogeneous than do formalists. Formalists ultimately make sense of the ambiguities they find in a given text, arguing that every ambiguity serves a definite, meaningful, and demonstrable literary function. Undecidability, by contrast, is never reduced, let alone mastered in deconstruction. Though a deconstructive reading can reveal the incompatible possibilities generated by the text, it is impossible for the reader to settle on any permanent meanings.

Deconstruction is a poststructuralist theory, based largely but not exclusively on the writings of Derrida. It is in the first instance a philosophical theory and a theory directed towards the (re)reading of philosophical writings. Its impact on literature, mediated in North America largely through the influences of theorists at Yale University, is based

- 1) on the fact that deconstruction sees all writing as a complex historical, cultural process rooted in the relations of texts to each other and in the institutions and conventions of writing, and
- 2) on the sophistication and intensity of its sense that human knowledge is not as controllable or as convincing as Western thought would have it and that language operates in subtle and often contradictory ways, so that certainty will always elude us.

Reader response theory

Reader Response, primarily a German and American offshoot of literary theory, emerged (prominent since 1960s) in the West

mainly as a reaction to the textual emphasis of New Criticism of the 1940s. New Criticism, the culmination of liberal humanist ideals, had stressed that only that which is within a text is part of the meaning of the text; that the text is “autotelic” entity (complete within itself). Hence, it neglected authorial biography, social conditions during the composition of a work of art and the reader’s psychology. Reader Response Criticism wholly repudiated all these notions; instead, it focuses on the systematic examination of the aspects of the text that arouse, shape, and guide a reader’s response (for instance, Aristotelian Catharsis/ Brechtian alienation effect“. It designates multiple critical approaches to reading a text. According to Reader Response criticism, the reader is a producer rather than a consumer of meanings (parallel to Barthes’s Birth of the Reader). In this sense, a reader is a hypothetical construct of norms and expectations that can be derived or projected or extrapolated from the work. Because expectations may be violated or fulfilled, satisfied or frustrated, and because reading is a temporal process involving memory, perception, and anticipation, the charting of reader-response is extremely difficult and perpetually subject to construction and reconstruction, vision and revision.

The philosophical origins of Reader Response criticism can be traced back to the doctrine of Phenomenology, whose foundations were laid by the German philosopher, Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), The term “phenomenon” means appearance, and Phenomenology shifts our attention of the external world to the ways in which these objects appear to the human subject, and the subjective contribution to this process of appearing. He proposed that consciousness is a unified “intentional” act; by ‘Intentional’ he does not mean that it is deliberately willed, but that it is always directed to an object.”

The hermeneutic conceptions of Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) have also been pivotal to the development of Reader Response theory, especially his explanation of Dasein as constituting a temporal structure of interpretative understanding, which is already engaged in the activity of interpretation. The Polish theorist Roman Ingarden (1893-1970), views that a literary work originates in the intentional acts of the consciousness of its author.

Reader Response criticism does not denote any specific theory. It can range from the phenomenological theories of Wolfgang Iser and Roman Ingarden (both were faculty members at the University of Constance, Germany) to the relativistic analysis of Stanley Fish, who argues that the interpretive strategy of the reader creates the text, there being no text except that which a reader or an interpretive community of readers creates. Being both a reception aesthetic and a reception history, Reader Response criticism examines how readers realize the potentials of a text and how readings change over the course of history; it believes that although the reader fills in the gaps, the author's intentional acts impose restrictions and conditions

One can sort Reader Response theorists into three groups: those who focus upon the individual reader's experience ("individualists"); those who conduct psychological experiments on a defined set of readers ("experimenters"); and those, who assume a fairly uniform response by all readers ("uniformists"). In a more general sense, one can break down Reader Response theorists into those who concern with the reader's experience and psychology, those who concentrate on the linguistic/rhetorical dynamic of audience, and those who deal with readers as cultural and historical ciphers.

Reader-response critics hold that, to understand the literary experience or the meaning of a text, one must look to the

processes readers use to create that meaning and experience. Traditional, text-oriented critics often think of reader-response criticism as an anarchic subjectivism, allowing readers to interpret a text any way they want. They accuse reader-response critics of observing that the text doesn't exist. Another objection to reader-response criticism is that it fails to account for the text being able to expand the reader's understanding. While readers can, and do put their own ideas and experiences into a work, they are at the same time gaining new understanding through the text. This is something that is generally overlooked in Reader Response Criticism.

References:

1. Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit, A. Sankaran, Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, New Delhi. 1996.
2. Comparative Aesthetics, (Vols-2), Pandey, K.C. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1956.
3. Principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit, Dvivedi. R.C, MLBD. New Delhi.
4. Literary Criticism-A short History, Wimset Jr. William K and Cleanth Brooks, Oxford and IBH, New Delhi.
5. Literary Theory an introduction, Terry Eagleton , Blackwell publishing, Malden, USA, 2008
6. A History of Modern Criticism (6 Vols.), Rene Wellock, Jonathan Bedford Square, London, 1970.
7. Modern Criticism and Theory : Reader Longman, London 1991.