



Saurashtra University

Re – Accredited Grade 'B' by NAAC
(CGPA 2.93)

Sagar, Sunil, 2010, *A Translation of Select Critical Essays of Suresh Joshi from Gujarati into English with a Critical Introduction*, thesis PhD, Saurashtra University

<http://etheses.saurashtrauniversity.edu/id/eprint/134>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Saurashtra University Theses Service
<http://etheses.saurashtrauniversity.edu>
repository@sauuni.ernet.in

**A Translation of
Select Critical Essays of Suresh Joshi
from Gujarati into English with a Critical Introduction**

**A
Thesis Submitted
to
Saurashtra University, Rajkot
for
the Degree of *Doctor of Philosophy* in English**

Supervisor:

Dr. Kamal Mehta,

Prof. & Head
Dept. of English & CLS,
Saurashtra University,
Rajkot.

Candidate:

Sunil Sagar

Lecturer
L. E. College,
Morbi.

APRIL 2010

Smt S H Gardi Institute of English &
Comparative Literary Studies, Saurashtra University,
Rajkot. (Gujarat)

Certificate

This is to certify that the work embodied in this thesis entitled, '**A Translation of Select Critical Essays of Suresh Joshi from Gujarati into English with a Critical Introduction**', has been carried out by the Candidate Mr. Sunil Sagar under my direct guidance and supervision for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Arts of Saurashtra University, Rajkot. I further declare that the work done and presented here is original and independent.

I further certify that the work has not been submitted either partly or fully to any other university or institute for the award of any degree.

Supervisor:

Dr Kamal Mehta

Prof & Head,
Dept of English & CLS,
Saurashtra University,
Rajkot.

Acknowledgements

For more than a decade, one name, Prof. Avadhesh Kumar Singh, has burned bright in my mind as a luminous flame of inspiration in the light of which I have seen the world, life and work. I have been fortunate enough to have been his student and can barely put into words for what I feel when I think of his contribution to my growth as an individual.

Dr. Kamal Mehta, Prof. & Head, Dept. of English & CLS, Saurashtra University, Rajkot, and my guide has been the mainstay of my strength and motivation ever since I have known him. His stature as a teacher is higher for the nobility he brings to this profession which inspires us to rise above our mundane ways and sublimate our work in this domain. His encouragement, support and cooperation as a guide can neither be matched nor be expressed into words. I shall remain indebted to him for teaching me all the right values and for being the incomparable human being as a teacher.

I extend my gratitude to Dr. Jaydeepsinh Dodiya, Dr. R. B. Zala, Dr. Sanjay Mukherjee, the teachers at the Department, who have been all very generous in their support and cooperation. For my research work, I have disturbed the peaceful life of a number of people like Rtd. Prof. Chhelbhai Vyas, Amreli, and Mr. Dipak Patel, Dept. of Gujarati, Saurashtra University, who had been there throughout for me to clear my doubts or queries. I sincerely thank them for their valuable contribution.

I thank all my colleague-friends at Christ College, Rajkot, and L. E. College, Morbi for their cooperation and support. But much of the credit for the pace with which I could complete my work goes to two of my colleague-friends, Ms. Kailas Kanani (Head, General Department) and Dr. Gaurang Ghodasara, Lecturers (Mathematics) at L. E. College, Morbi, who took pains to ensure that I get the time and space to work on my Ph. D. I submit my sincere sense of gratitude to both of them.

I dedicate my Ph. D. to the lifelong struggle and hard work of my parents. I shall never be able to lend words to their sacrifices. My wife, my sister and brother-in-law have been the inexhaustible source of support right throughout this journey. My friends have complained about my near disappearance during the course of the research work but lent their unconditional support, and their best wishes have worked like prayers for me.

I extend my sincere gratitude to all my teachers who taught me at Prataprai Arts College, Amreli. I also thank all students and all well-wishers who have contributed to my growth in ways innumerable. In the end, I thank the Almighty for the strength which he showered on me so that I keep inching closer to the hallowed destination of my life.

Date:

Sunil Sagar

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Chapter – I	Introduction	1
Chapter – II	Critical Introduction to Select Critical Essays of Suresh Joshi	12
Chapter – III	Translation of Select Critical Essays of Suresh Joshi	29
Chapter – IV	Conclusion	361
	Bibliography	

Chapter I Introduction

Chapter I Introduction

Suresh Joshi is rightly deemed to be the forerunner of the modernist and post modernist trends in the post independent period of Gujarati literature. His stature as a critic has grown manifold over the decades. He brought into Gujarati criticism the western methods of the critical evaluation of a work of art and scripted a new era in the history of literary criticism in Gujarat. Throwing light on the significance of his contribution as a critic, Rasik Shah says, "Almost unanimously, it will not be an exaggeration to say that Suresh Joshi is the most significant spokesperson of the distinctive role of the new poetics."(*Vivechan: Char Mudda*, page 7) Not only Rasik Shah but many other eminent voices like Ram Prasad Bakshi, Jayant Kothari, Kanti Patel, Radhe Shyam Sharma and Chandrakant Topiwala have passed the same value judgment on Suresh Joshi's achievements as a critic. Joshi unhesitatingly pointed out the shortcomings of the then Gujarati literature and criticism and he also showed the way out of the then literary scenario.

Like a New Critic, Suresh Joshi proclaims that a work of art is self sufficient and it doesn't need to and shouldn't become the vehicle of cultural values. He vehemently opposed the supremacy of the element of story in creative writing and strove to establish the form of a work of art as an equally significant part of the challenges of a writer. He exposed Gujarati criticism to the western critical theories like New

Criticism, Structuralism, and even Post Structuralism to a certain extent. He refers to the world literature when he wishes to give evidence for his arguments and provides distinctive insight into the various Western critical theories mentioned above. His critical writings mark a new epoch in the evolution of the modern literary criticism in Gujarat. He has left behind sufficient critical writings to inspire a lot of critical discourses on himself for many years to come. Translating his critical essays from Gujarati into English is of vital significance as that exceeds the barriers of language and nationality. It is the need of the day to place his work on the global horizon because that is where it is destined to belong by the sheer originality of its outlook and its sincere and unbiased evaluation of literature and criticism in Gujarat. As far as the method of translation is concerned, I have tried to adhere, as far as possible, to the expressions he has used as far as possible but my fundamental effort would be to do justice to the sense of what he has communicated to us.

In the light of all this, I have translated select critical essays of Suresh Joshi. The proposed doctoral work has the following design.

Life and Works of Suresh Joshi (1921-86)

Suresh Hariprasad Joshi who ushered in an experimental and formalistically oriented literary culture was born in Valod in Surat district of Gujarat. He acquired the Master's degree and Ph. D. from Bombay University and taught in Colleges. He also joined the

faculty of M S University, Baroda later. He edited *Phalguni* (1945-47), *Vani* (1947-51), *Maneesha* (1951-56), *Kshitij* (1961-67) and *Etad*, which through the decades, separately and together, helped develop a new generation of writers such as Sitanshu Yashaschandra, Gulam Mohammed Sheikh and other younger writers who eventually emerged as major voices of Gujarati literature.

Suresh Joshi's works include *Pratyancha Itara* (poetry, 1961), *Chhinnapatra* (novel), *Grihapravesha* (short stories, 1957), *Na Tatra Suryo Bhati* (short stories), *Janantike* (essays, 1965), *Gujarati Kavita No Asvad* (literary criticism) and *Chintayami Manasa* (Essays). A few years ago, Gujarat Sahitya Academi, Ahmedabad published two volumes of his critical writings entitled *Suresh Joshi nu Sahitya Vishwa*(2005). The awards and honours he received include Gujarat Government prizes, Soviet Land Nehru Award, Ranjitram Gold Medal, Narmad Gold Medal and Nanalal Memorial prize. He declined the Sahitya Akademi award (1983) for a collection of critical essays, *Chintayami Manasa*, because the Award / citation did not recognize his creative writing. He generated a profound modernist enthusiasm in the field and ushered in a new era in Gujarati literature. He was deeply read in Eastern and Western philosophy and literature and drew on a whole repertoire of artistic strategies. However, Joshi's more ambitious work has always defied classification. To fathom the nuances of his writings call for the finely honed skills one brings to the reading of Kafka, Joyce and Borges. The necessity

that drove his work was the aspiration to reach out to a community of minds beyond regional and national boundaries.

Suresh Joshi as a Critic

All that one can say about a great critic can be said about Suresh Joshi. He came on the critical scene in Gujarat as the harbinger of a novel outlook towards literature as well as towards the way a work of art should be interpreted. He was the chief proponent of a critical pursuit which didn't stop at thematic concerns of a text like many others; in fact, he went on to discuss the new ways of interpretations of the literary theory and criticism in the West, especially those which concerned themselves with the form of the text. Considering his views on form and his incisive way of evaluating literature, he can easily be termed a New Critic, but he was one who did not stop at New Criticism.

Formalist moorings and beyond

The Formalist moorings of Suresh Joshi are evident in his writings, and hence his dissatisfaction with the then critical scenario which did not move beyond the plot and characterization in the interpretation of a work or remained hostage to the moral message of a text. The insistence on the formal aspects of texts is an undercurrent that runs through his critical texts. While his other counterparts were busy reading the moral message of a text and its influence on the society, he was engaging himself on writing full-length articles on different dimensions such as how a writer employs his

symbols, how a poet has to reinvent expressions, words in order to convey his ideas, and how signs are at play in a text. He may be taking recourse to the Western literary theory and criticism but it must be borne in mind that he was equally conversant with literature of his times. It can be explained in this way: while he discusses the idea of symbol-forming which is Western, his examples are from Gujarati literature. Thus, he creates a dialogue between Western literary theory and Gujarati literature as well as literary theory.

His major achievement lies in the fact that he was not inclined to stick to one favourite literary theory and spend the rest of his life interpreting texts with the help of the same. He kept on moving with the currents of the literary theory and criticism of the world. He made it a point to raise some of the fundamental concerns of Gujarati criticism. Firstly, he questioned the sanity of those critics who simply refuse to look beyond Indian shore or worse borders of the state of Gujarat. He points out time and again that the critical world needed to change the way it perceived a text. Also, its critical analysis needed to be reconsidered keeping the world literature and literary theory and criticism in mind. He was very sad about the complete negligence being shown towards the form of a text in the Gujarati criticism of his times, to say the least of his predecessors. Perhaps, that is the reason why he took it upon himself to write full-fledged articles on each of the key questions troubling Gujarati criticism. For example, he raised the questions about the reasons for writing and reading poetry. He

engages in a discussion on the time-honoured question of the responsibility of a poet. He writes in this vein to expound some of the fundamental conclusions of his study and analysis.

He has been an iconic figure who fathomed the depths of the Western literary theory and criticism in an unprecedented manner. His discourse on literature is deeply rooted in the gamut of world literature. He had busied himself for years in a dialogue with the literary geniuses like Sartre, Camus, Kafka and Dostoevsky. He introduced the average Gujarati critic to the best which was being thought and discussed in the West. He does not end up writing reviews or reverential testimonies of the Western literary theory, but he goes on to critique each one of them and discusses its relevance and applicability to the Gujarati critical scenario. He also brought it to bear upon the analysis of the works of art in a practical way. He writes on the major schools of Western literary theory and criticism and also on the leading Western minds who transformed the world. He discusses all the forms as they prevailed at that time in India and in the West and looked at them in the light of the newest possible critical approach and illustrate, perhaps, how criticism as an exercise has to be performed.

His contribution to Indian literary theory in general and Gujarati criticism in particular, is manifold and multidimensional. He viewed, whether it is creative process of writing or the formalistic aspects or the relevance and effectiveness of creative

writing on the society, everything in a new light and with the unsparing rationality of a philosopher.

Towards a new ambience for criticism

Suresh Joshi's criticism emanated from the questions which germinated in his mind about Indian literature as well as world literature, because henceforth he went on to unearth the answers to those questions in his characteristic fashion. His questions had a lot to do with the then Gujarati critical wisdom and the Western approaches to a text. He studied the Western literary theory and viewed the Gujarati critical situation in its entirety, with its flaws and future. His ideas were fundamentally inclined towards moving away from what has been traditionally practiced in the Gujarati critical writings and move towards an entirely new ambience for criticism. With these ideas in mind, he addressed the essential issues concerning literature and criticism in Gujarat such as creativity, the accountability of a creative artist, and the intricacies of the various forms. He raises questions on the validity of the outdated modes of critical analysis. Also, he is critical of the general critical ambience which prevailed in his time. He also addresses the question of how criticism suffered not because of a particular generation of critics but because of the insular outlook and the limited trajectory of Gujarati critics from time immemorial. He firmly believed that the breed of university teachers and university, as a system, have generously contributed to the abysmal state

of affairs as regards Gujarati criticism. He critiques the state of literature teaching at university and the kind of syllabi, methods of teaching and the outlook of the teachers prevailed therein. He doesn't stop at criticising it, but links it to the present and future of literature and criticism in Gujarat and goes on to offer a wide array of suggestions to cleanse the system of the ills. He emphasises the need to create the suitable ambience for the growth of the students and teachers of literature, if Gujarat wished to see any change in the dire circumstances around it. In his life time, he strove to critique the old critical practices and wrest the Gujarati criticism free from self-defeatist way. He also devoted his life to ushering in new ideas from the West and applying them with proper discretion, so that the natives don't get carried away by the intoxicating Western ways, but employ them in our context and benefit as we should. His critical writings are vital for the insistence on abandoning the outdated and create a critical scenario which suits our literature and helps us meet the creative and critical challenges of our times.

Newer Horizons

Suresh Joshi has to be credited with the quest for the newer horizons. The implications of this are many; that he did not stop at what he found tempting as a critic as it happens in the case of many others who become converts to one or the other theory and remained permanently imprisoned in the vicious cycle of that theory; secondly he

sought to transcend every theory and every viewpoint and reach out to even newer and more challenging ideas and theories. He kept abreast of the best ideas that the West had to offer, not only in the domain of criticism alone. He was well-read in the world literature, philosophy, changing realities of the West and the worldview in existence at that time in the light of the growth of science and technology. He could have stopped at Formalism which was so dear to him but he would have ended up being an average Formalist which was not to be. He kept pushing the envelope as he studied modernism and modernity in great depth followed by a critique of the same and the resultant foray into postmodernism and postmodernity. He has to his credit the glory of defining the Western literary theories to us in an unparalleled way and of intensifying this insistence on the formalistic aspects of literature. His chief accomplishment as a critic can be defined when one realizes that all his life he ceaselessly continued to raise and address the fundamental questions pertaining to creativity and criticism. His relentless critical investigation and unadulterated longing for addressing the issues of the day which scripted a new era in the critical arena of Gujarat are alone sufficient to testify to the characteristic ingenuity and ever increasing significance of Suresh Joshi as critic.

Objectives of the Translation

The objectives behind translating Suresh Joshi's critical writings are diverse. They range from a deep fascination for his writings to the desire to make a foray into the world of literary theory and criticism. I have taken up this task keeping the following objectives in view:

- This work aims at bringing to the fore the contribution of Suresh Joshi to Gujarati literary criticism.
- This work proposes to make Suresh Joshi available to non-Gujarati critics, scholars and readers.
- This work forms an exposition to the contribution and critical stature of Suresh Joshi but also to Gujarati literary criticism.
- This work aims at analyzing the place Suresh Joshi in the context of Indian critical tradition in general and Gujarati critical tradition in particular.
- It aims at encouraging a re-reading of Suresh Joshi with reference to his contribution to Gujarati literary criticism.
- This will also serve to draw national as well international attention to Suresh Joshi's critical insights.

It is high time that Suresh Joshi's writings travelled beyond all the linguistic barriers and reached out to the scholars and the litterateurs across the globe.

Chapter II

Critical Introduction to the Critical Essays of Suresh Joshi

I have translated the two collections of essays entitled *Kinchit* (Something) and *Chintayami Mansa* (*Thinking Deeply*) from the two volumes published by Gujarati Sahitya Academi, entitled *Suresh Joshi nu Sahitya Vishwa: Vivechan 1 & 2* (The World of Suresh Joshi: Criticism Vol. 1 & 2) respectively. These two collections contain some groundbreaking ideas in Gujarati criticism. With Suresh Joshi's contribution, Gujarati criticism made a distinct departure from the traditional methods of critical evaluation. He looked at the process of creative writing in the light of Formalistic approach.

Kinchit

The first essay in the collection of essays titled *Kinchit, Kavya no Aaswad* (Relish of Poetry) takes us to the key issues of how we simplistically interpret poetry, looking for 'the philosophy' of the poet or trying to understand its meter in total isolation with its impact on the poem. He refers to the statement by American poet MacLeish that the professors who teach poetry are the biggest enemy of poetry. He takes a few lines from Gujarati poetry and examines them in the light of the meter used and the way meaning is to be gleaned from those lines.

He insists that if criticism and poetry interact in a fruitful way, it will be beneficial to both. He stressed the need to make an effort to find out how much we have perfected the style of our poetry and the competence of our writing. He is hopeful that if we make efforts in this direction, the poets following the beaten track for ages will venture

into the direction of the newer expressions, and our teaching of literature will improve. Once the hurdles are out of the way of relishing poetry, the possibility of an active and lively interaction between the writer and the reader will arise and the sensibilities of an entire society will be enriched

Pratikrachana (Symbol Forming) is an extensive discussion on the use of symbols. He also opines that the poet should take language beyond the beaten paths and keep exploring new horizons. He takes recourse to examples from writers like Vishnuprasad Trivedi to Baudelaire and expounds the significance of using symbols for conveying a certain sense. He also underscores the idea that symbols don't have any fixed meaning as such. A creative artist must keep exploring new meanings from symbols and that is precisely what an artist is supposed to do. He gives examples of symbols like 'cross' and 'lotus' which have touched larger masses of people. He points out that some poets are content to restrict their achievements to creation of three-four symbols whereas a poet is supposed to work ceaselessly towards creating newer symbols and newer shades of meaning. This essay is rich in the way he explains the creative process of symbol-forming and the artist's attitude to symbols. It becomes evident that he is quite clear about the fact that an artist should be extremely conscious of the intricacies as well as opportunities inherent in a symbol.

Vidyapithman Sahitya nu Shikshan (Teaching of Literature in University) is an analysis of the prevalent scenario of literature teaching at university and its ills. He stresses the fact that literature teaching is in a dire state, given the kind of syllabi in place and the teaching method are employed. He also brings out the unfair treatment given to criticism as examination-oriented reading takes place of the selected texts of the syllabi and sometimes even that is sacrificed. He critiques the whole ambience of literature teaching pointing out various issues related to teachers and students and how they eventually reflect upon the state of affairs in literature and criticism. His essay is also remarkable, for it is a critique of the whole institution called university. Nevertheless, it is not a mere cynical outburst against the system as it happens in the case of many other critics; he gives out clear and actionable ideas to transform university culture in general and literature teaching in particular.

In *Kinchit*, Suresh Joshi takes his readers back to the fundamental critical concerns by asking the question, 'what is the objective of a work of art?' It is not that it is an entirely new question to ask. He emphasises that whenever we ask these basic issues and face it with an open mind, the nature and import of the question crystallize. He points out the age old response readers give after reading a story; the reader or the critic asks a question: what does the author want to say through this story? He gives his own example and opines that he himself is never in a position to say what he wants to say through his stories. He clarifies through his own experiences as a creative writer that

there is no deep mystery but one can't put a finger on something and say that 'this is what I want to say'. These are some of his observations and insight about the elusive nature of meaning and the intricacies of interpretation inherent due to that. The caveat he voices is that we should not be in a hurry to end the discussion on a text and certainly not end up by simplistic interpretation, resulting into a single meaning. He also discusses the way simple and ordinary things around us have the possibilities lying in them, waiting for an artist to explore them. He goes on to give an example of a chair and how who sits on the chair makes the whole difference to our perception of the image of a person sitting on the chair. Then he relates it to Van Gogh's painting 'Yellow Chair' and recalls the response Paul Gauguin had given about it, saying, 'No one ever painted a chair like that before!' (as quoted by Suresh Joshi in Suresh Joshi nu Sahitya Vishwa, Vol 5, page 55)

He has no two opinions about how a writer should go about using language. He firmly believed that the writer has to free the language from its traditional context and give it a distinctly new form. He avers that the issue of how the writer should use the medium itself deserves rigorous contemplation. He aptly remarks that we have come a long way from the dictum, "Literature is the reflection of life". He explains that literature helps us exceed beyond our ordinary existence and witness the human experience in its entirety. To be able to acquaint ourselves with those experiences through writing is the

privileged delight of art. He puts it in simple but unambiguous terms that the function of art is not to give out the grammar of values.

Kavi ane Rangbhumi (The Poet and the Theatre) is a foray into examining the constructs of drama and theatre. He traces the trajectory of drama since the times of Kalidas and takes us to the poetic dramas of his day. He analyzes the prevalent dramatic scenario and stresses the need for better poetic plays. He strives to draw our attention towards whether a poet can be useful in the process of reviving the theatre. He points out that the literary plays and theatre are too far away in the Gujarati literary and critical scenario. In the end, he says that a poetic play in the true sense is yet to be written in Gujarati.

In *Kavya no Anuvad* (Translation of Poetry), he also addresses the issues pertaining to the translation of poetry and its scope. He begins the discussion with the key question of whether poetry can be translated and points out that some people firmly believe that it cannot be accomplished. He also explains that words in a language aren't just linguistic objects but they are made up of the poet's consciousness and hence to transfer them to a different language and consequently a different ambience is fraught with dangers. He emphasises that by merely translating word by word, one cannot transfer the experience to another language. Hence, translation for him calls for a very deep understanding of the poet's consciousness and the two languages in question. He

insists that one should try to realize the possibilities of the language in which one is translating. He is categorical in stating that translations of poetry have been carried out till date and would go on but there should be no two opinions about the nature of the complexities involved in translation. This essay is significant from the point of view of translation as a construct and the issues concerning the same. He deftly uses the issue of translation of poetry as a trope to break open the whole issue of translation and the state of translation in Gujarat. He aptly sums up by saying that every poet should take up translation of great poetry as a part of the process of his development as a poet.

In *Gujarati Bhasha Sahitya* (Gujarati Language and Literature), he gives his characteristic perspective on the relationship of Gujarati with Sanskrit and Gujarati literature in general. This essay seeks to give his insights on the legendary poets and writers like Narmad, Kant, Manilal etc. He also discusses the influence of English and the influence of Gandhiji and Ravindranath Tagore on the Gujarati literature. This essay is significant because he gives us the whole trajectory of Gujarati literature and criticism in Gujarat in one essay. He traces the influence of Sanskrit in the themes and language of early Gujarati writers. He also brings to the fore how the influence of English is also noticeable in Gujarati writers and poets. He rounds it off with a word on the state of criticism in Gujarat by pointing out that critics have yet to develop the critical acumen required in the face of the challenges which face us. Research also does not escape his attention as he points out that we have not yet gone beyond analysing the classics and

that too in the same old fashion. In all, this essay is significant as it offers the history with their critical evaluation and future directions of and for Gujarati literature and criticism.

Yojakstra Durlabh (The Creative Artist Eludes Us) is an essay on the state of decline of novel in Gujarati literature and its possible reasons. He clearly states that Gujarati novel is lifeless and writers have to now take stock of the situation and change the approach to novel writing. He is critical of the attitude on the part of the writer which focuses on mere storytelling and limits novel to storytelling in the end. He is of the opinion that the story is just a trope around which the novelist has to create his universe.

He has little respect for novelists who blindly imitated Govardhanram, the Gujarati novelist, and this imitation went on for ages. Hence he remarks that all protagonists of Gujarati novels have inherited the passivity of Govardhanram's Saraswatichandra, the protagonist of the novel, '*Saraswatichandra*'. He criticizes the critics for the state of affairs as regards Gujarati novel. He states emphatically that every new text by a good writer has a new universe in it. This novelty is the key to good writing. He sums up by saying that every age requires a new talent who can lend a new direction to the age and we are waiting for such a talent to dawn on the Gujarati literary skyscape.

Kavita no Prachar (Expanse of Poetry) opens with a reference to a 'Read Poetry' campaign in Calcutta. He states that the idea of propaganda for reading poetry might sound ridiculous at first but it brings to the fore that tragic reality that poetry and literature are in dire need of some desperate measures in a world which is hell bent on chasing materialistic goals. He quotes a number of critics, poets and thinkers like Herbert Read, Erich Heller, and Vladimir Wield to name a few, to bring out the state of poetry in the context of his times. He also discusses the various components of poetry and points out how poetry also needs to change. He also attributes some part of indifference to poetry to the circumstances and ambience in which we are living. He also points out that good readers have a role to play as they should not let wrong standards become the order of the day and should always be on the lookout for great poetry.

In *Kala ni Bhavak pase Apeksha* (Expectations of Art towards Relisher), Suresh Joshi critiques the whole process of receiving a text. He begins the discussion by referring to the kind of readers who read in order to find the justification or support for their ideas. He points out that some readers merely tally their ideas with the ideas of a writer and see whether the writer upholds his ideas or not. He is critical of the tendency on the part of readers/society which puts pressure on a writer to give out a moral message and subscribe to a certain moral line. This is a limiting factor for the creativity of the writer. Not only that, but it distracts so many writers who dish out writings as the

society or ideologies demand. Hence, writings have assumed political nature and deviated from artistic benchmarks. The poet is a spokesman of one ideology or another and has lost his identity as a poet. This is an essay which makes us contemplate upon our expectation from a text and a writer. Suresh Joshi attributes a lot of this to the state of criticism as it has allowed such tendencies to grow and turn into a reality of the day.

Pather Panchali Vishe (About Pather Panchali) is a remarkable essay on the comparative study of the text and the adaptation. Suresh Joshi brings to light how one art can be complimentary to another art. It is a foray into how visual medium can be rewarding in terms of relishing a work which we have already read.

Chintayami Mansa (Thinking Deeply)

The first essay in *Chintayami Mansa, Arthghatan* (Interpretation) begins with the question whether interpretation is the appropriate term. It is an analysis of interpretation with an inquiry into symbols and metaphors. Interpretation is decidedly complex as the individual who writes the text is nothing less than a scientist of words; he experiments with words by combining them differently and employing them unusually. He revives many words by endowing them with new shades. Hence, the process of interpretation is highly demanding in the light of the creative exercise which goes into writing a text. It is a coded world and thus interpretation is an exercise into

decoding it. He also points out that inventing new words or language is an inevitable need of writing because a writer cannot work with the words which are used in the day to day life. He is also against the intellectualising the process of reading poetry. He also doesn't care for those who write commentaries on poetry; they simply indulge in a discovery of 'what does the poet want to say?' and remain indifferent to what the poet has done in the poem. Hence, he asserts that only mediocre minds go about interpreting poetry. He voices a caveat that interpretation should not render relishing poetry secondary in the whole process.

Sahitya ane Philsufi (Literature and Philosophy) opens with a statement that poetry is the mother of philosophy and delves into the relationship between literature and philosophy with the emphasis on exploring its ancient roots dating back to the days of Socrates and Plato. Suresh Joshi explains the relationship by quoting Merlo Ponte who said that literature and philosophy cannot remain separate or on two different ends from each other. He alludes to the fact that critics have never forgiven Plato for banishing poetry from his Republic. He also notes how certain poets and writers are great poets but poor philosophers. He does say that poets are not philosophers who are supposed to give out divine commandments. Literature creates a new sense about life in us, but for that, it does not have to become didactic. This essay is a study of the timeless debate on the relationship of literature and philosophy. It is rich in references

to philosophy and offers a fresh perspective on how literature should be read, with or without philosophy.

Kasmai Devay Havisha Vidhema? (To Which Deity Shall We Make the Offering?) is a study of the role of literature and creative writers in the society. He is sceptical whether poetry can sustain its standards if it becomes a vehicle of propaganda. He argues that earlier poets were controlled by some muse or divine frenzy but now they are governed by the forces of society. He asserts that many writers get carried away by the temptation of social change which is to be brought about, thinking they are the only ones who can do that. He also points out that it is not that writers should not write about relevant social issues but the writer should not become the spokesperson of any ideology. The essay ends in the reconciliation that the social issues and literature cannot be antithetical to each other.

The collection contains a separate discussion on Sartre entitled *Sartre: Aaj na Sandarbhma* (Sartre: In Today's Context). Suresh Joshi discusses Sartre in the context of the decay of values and ideas which we once held high and the emergence of a new reality of our lives and science. He discusses the relevance or the lack of any great thinker in times when today's thinker is one who writes the editorial of a newspaper and critiques the phenomena of his times as philosophers used to do. He raises a valid question as to if this erosion or trivialisation of philosophy continues, shall we have a

tradition of philosophy in future or will it become extinct? He also criticizes the tendency to stay afloat in the intellectual space by clinging on the latest trend in thinking and goes on to say that existentialism came in Gujarati literary and critical stratosphere much as the new intellectual fetish. He very distinctly pinpoints the uniqueness of existentialism of which Sartre was an able exponent; existentialism differs in that it drops the entire struggle to wrest some meaning out of the universe or the tendency to prove somehow that the world is a meaningful construct. This essay is a foray into the changing paradigms of life and hence of philosophy, the role of thinkers like Sartre and the relevance of the philosophy in the world.

Sarjak, Sarjan ane Vivechan (Writer, Writing and Criticism) is a detailed analysis of the nature and functions of all three: writer, literature, and criticism. Suresh Joshi brings to the fore the way a work of art has always been perceived as 'intentional' product of the artist. He recalls that Roman Ingard had presented the idea in a philosophers' meet in 1956 that while we lay down the characteristics of aesthetics, it should all begin with the 'encounter' between the artist and the work of art. But the basic premise of the essay is that it rests on the artist's creative talents as to how he gives form to the experience. It is Formalist statement on how an artefact is constructed.

Vivechan no Chaitanyavadi Abhigam (The Critical Approach of the Critics of Consciousness) is an expository account of school of Critics of Consciousness and the

valuable observations on its fruitful application in literary criticism in the context of his times. Suresh Joshi explains the position of the critics of consciousness and states that a critic or reader has to understand the consciousness of the artist who has created the work. He also places all the major critics of consciousness namely Marcel Remo, Albert Bengui, George Pule, in terms of their contribution to the theory they expounded.

Kavya Vivechan no Ek Navo Abhigam? (A New Approach to Criticism of Poetry?) critiques the influence that the criticism has on us as he points out that we are all products of literature. To explain this, he recalls the sensation one feels as a youth when he comes in direct contact of the world of literature. This sensation is lost somewhere on the way to maturity, for which Suresh Joshi attributes the entire blame to criticism. He also goes on to say that criticism is fine as it gives interpretations and so on and so forth but if it takes away the joy of reading, it would better be abandoned.

Octavio Paz ni Kavyavibhavana (Octavio Paz's Concept of Poetry) opens with the idea that a poet's ideas which emerge during his struggle to clothe his ideas and emotions with words are quite significant. For this, he gives examples of T S Eliot, Ezra Pound and Garia who significantly contributed in this regard. Octavio Paz is another such name in the same tradition who believed that poetry is a shaped product. It is shaped by the language, the obsessions and beliefs of the people. In the process, Suresh Joshi touches upon the issues concerning modernity and avante-guard.

While *Sanketvigyan ni Saiddhantik Bhumika* (The Theoretical Position of Semiology) expounds, as the title suggests, the basic theoretical position of Semiology, *Sanket Vigyan* (Semilogy) is a full-fledged foray into Semiology. Suresh Joshi goes on to expound for us the basic premises and constructs of Semiology. He discusses the territories which Semiology should focus on and the way a number of branches can be studied with Semiological approach.

Navya Vivechan vishe Thodu (A Bit about New Criticism) is an expository essay on how New Criticism emerged and developed as a school of literary criticism. He takes the opportunity to discuss the ramifications of oversight and false notions on the part of criticism. On the other hand, he also emphasises that one should also know the tradition in totality and unless that happens, he would question the understanding of that individual. Besides, he traces how it was developed by the leading exponents of New Criticism like J. C. Ransom, Allan Tate, Blackmar, Kenneth Burke and Winters and later on by Clinth Brooks, Robert Penn Warren and William Wimsatt. In all, *Navyavivechan vishe Thodu* traces the evolution of New Criticism and discusses its relevance in the then literary context.

Sahitya Vivechan ane Bhasha Vigyan (Literary Criticism and Linguistics) scrutinizes the way we approach linguistics and literary criticism. He firstly relates how some of the notions are getting exposed like the idea that prevails that the linguist observes the

details and notes them down and hands them over to the critic for interpretation. This is clearly the case of division of labour in Joshi's view. This essay is a site of arguments presented by linguists and critics against one another as regards the way they approach a text. Suresh Joshi sums up by urging them to strike a fine balance and remain objective in their respective endeavours.

Arvachinata ane Anuarvachinata (Modernity and Postmodernity) is a foray into Modernity and Postmodernity and the relationship of the two. In the course of this discussion, he explores all the Modern and Post Modern schools of literary theory and criticism. He refers a great deal to the existing work on the two and the driving force of the same. This essay brings to the fore the Suresh Joshi who is extremely well read into the Western literary theory and criticism and concerns himself extensively on the implications of the same on Gujarati literature.

His critical writings stand out in a myriad ways – for the scholarly inquiry into the hitherto unexplored spheres of Gujarati criticism, and for the path breaking conclusions he reaches in the process of addressing the fundamental critical issues of criticism. These critical texts should be read and appreciated in the literary and critical situation of his times because he was addressing writers and critics who were busy repeating themselves in the way the culture of literature had set in. these essays are the exposition of the Western theories as well as their application and implications on the

Gujarati literature and criticism. He should be credited with raising the questions which have been the most fundamental and central question of literature and criticism.

Chapter III

Translation of the Select Critical Essays of Suresh Joshi

Kinchit (Something)

Kavyano Aswad (Relish of Poetry)

American poet MacLeish once said that the professors who teach poetry are the biggest enemies of poetry. If we recall our experiences in school or college, we would get quite a few instances which substantiate the previous statement. The poem, which we used to savour outside classroom, used to become so dull and lifeless when the teacher discussed it in the class! It was different for those who were lucky to get good teachers, but mostly the poem was treated as if it was made of a chaos of words and an effort used to be made to restore the order of grammar and put the parts of speech in the place they belong. But by the time we used to bring the poem under some kind of law and order, it used to slip out of our reach beyond our knowledge. At times, an effort used to be made to discover the central idea of the poem, and on other occasions, we used to courageously attempt the discovery of *rasas* of the poem. Even this used to take place in the classical fashion. We used to arrest *vibhav* (emotion), *anubhav* (external manifestation of emotion), *sthayi* (stable state) and *sanchari* (transient emotion) and finally conclude the discussion on *rasa* (aesthetic relish). When none of the *rasas* fitted into our scheme of things, we attribute the *shant* (tranquillity) *rasa* to it, which as it suggests peace, was quite fittingly our last resort. The simple language cannot be the language of poetry, so we need embellishment, peppering it with metaphors and

metrical intricacies. But the poem allowed some scope for minute appraisal and analysis. Which kind of metaphor is this? Is this a metaphor? – we used to create a situation leading to such judgments. And, as if poetry is a dish made of social situation, the philosophy of the poet, the Russian Communism, Gandhi's national movements etc, we used to elaborate upon these various ingredients. Very much like the message of the criminal being taken away to be killed, we used to take cognizance of the message of the poem. The poem used to be dissected in various ways in the process of classification. One can find numerous instances of such a rape on poetry in our literary criticism.

Act of writing poetry is meant for the readers and they wish to relish the poem. Does one relish a poem after he is able to understand it or vice versa? They are not different states; in fact it would be more appropriate to say that both are blended into each other.

If we try to describe the chair lying in front of me, there can be near unanimity in the statements we make. The structure of the object called 'chair' is very clear. There cannot be much of difference of opinion about its four legs, its back, the two arms and the colour of the varnish. But can there be such a unanimity about the object called 'poetry'? Its structure is distinctly different from that of the chair. The intricate structure of a machine we can understand with the help of the guideline given by the expert. There can be some difference of opinion due to our ignorance of the structure of the machine,

but once we understand every detail, there is no scope of any difference of opinion. Hence, we need to mark the difference between the structure of a chair or a machine and that of poetry. Although we may know the meter, the meaning of words, the grammar and the subject matter of a poem, still at times it is not possible to have unanimity about it. What it means is that there is something in a poem that we cannot grasp even if we know the meter, the meaning of words or the subject matter of a poem. We should examine what this mysterious element of poetry is and whether it would always remain out of our reach.

Let us for a moment forget the terminology used in poetics. We use them to describe a poem. They help us bring as much of unanimity in our interpretation as possible. There cannot be two opinions about the meter or the figure of speech of a certain poem. But there would be difference of opinion regarding what role the meter or figure of speech plays in the poetic nature of the poem. There would also be different opinions as regards where the essence of a poem lies. The more a poem has the richness and substance, the more there may be scope of difference of opinion. An apparently simple poem, on a further investigation of its structure, may reveal some riches hidden behind this simplicity. We cannot discover this beauty of the poem by finding out what meter or figure of speech has been used by the poet. It doesn't make a difference even if we find out that the poet has used such-and-such symbol. The use of such terms salvages us from the labour of relishing poetry. But without bringing these terms in order to

relish poetry, we need to understand what happens in a poem and what the function of a poet is. Just so that we can understand the poem, we should not narrow it down to meter or figures of speech. What is better than that is that we broaden our perspective along with the poem. To let go the idea of relishing a poem for classical interpretation and to tally it with our emotions, to find out which rules of poetry have been followed or violated or to pass a judgment on a poet with the effect that so-and-so is the first among the equals is the business which may satisfy our ego, but we should admit the fact that for relishing poetry, it is relevant.

The poet uses the same language that we do. He is one of us so his joy and pain, attachment and disillusionment are like ours; yet when we read the poem, we feel that he seems to be using it in a different way. The familiar emotions seem to assume a different form in poetry. If we can understand how it happens, we can perhaps understand the trick that the poet employs.

Most of our dealings are done in prose, so it dominates over us and we try to place what is poetic into prosaic. But the mould of the prose of our dealings and the mould of the dealings of our inner world, which emanates in the poetry, are different. Let's take a line from a poem:

“sat at the swing, moved around all places- the terrace and the room.”

This is the first line of B. K. Thakore's poem called '*Junu Piyughar*' (Beloved's Old Home). Anybody, having some knowledge of meters, can say that this line is written in a metre called *mandakranta* (a metre in which each foot contains 17 syllables). At the first glance, the words used in the line seem to be like the ones we use in our day-to-day dealings. It is not difficult to turn into prose: (She) sat on the swing and reached out to the terrace, the room- to everything. But we are not satisfied with only this. Soon we realize that something is left outside our reach. Let's look at the line once again:

"sat at the swing, moved around all places - the terrace and the room."

We come across one thing: the poet begins with "sat at the swing", and immediately he makes her go around everywhere. Here, an image of restlessness and impatience is shaped in front of us. The context of the poem is something like this: the heroine, after a long stay with the husband, has come back to her parental home for the delivery of a child. Her parental home seems old to her now since she has just returned home after having a new experience of life. The poet brings out the ever new experience of married life by with the use of the word 'old'. She won't usually sit like that on the swing at her husband's place whereas she has the privilege to enjoy such comfort at her parents' place; that is why the poem begins with claiming the privilege. But right after sitting on the swing, she becomes acutely aware of the fact that she is alone. The absence of the person, who has immersed inextricably with every reality of her life, pierced her heart

and she stood up as soon as she sat down on the swing. Not only did she stand up, but she moved around in the house. Habituated with the constant presence of her beloved husband, and thinking that his absence is an illusion, restlessly she moves around to find him assuming he must be somewhere in the house- on the terrace, or in the room. The poet brings out the rhythm of restlessness with the able use of metre. The first four *guru* (measuring two matras) of mandakranta bring to the fore the sense of ease of the female protagonist sitting down on the swing. Once she realizes he is not there, she stands up and moves around. The poet depicts the suddenness, the rash pace by first four *guru* followed by the five *laghu* (short vowel). The portrayal of the inner world of emotions and the image of the female protagonist as it comes to us with the help of that, we can't find in prose. Taking the analysis forward, we can say that if we consider the state of mind of a female protagonist going to her parental home for the first child birth as the theme of the poem, there is no novelty in it. But the way the poet has woven the words, the meter and the context of emotions around that theme brings out the skill of a poet's work.

The way a poet weaves words, meter and other devices together gives a poem its poetic attribute. Such different structuring is indispensable for poetry. It is impossible to express the emotions as we feel. If somebody is feeling lonely and says that 'I am feeling lonely', it doesn't communicate that feeling of loneliness very effectively and this feeling doesn't assume any kind of concrete shape. Our perception is based on our

senses. It is only when it becomes tangible to our senses, that it becomes real in the true sense. The intensity of loneliness itself helps me come out of the state and depict it through stray images hidden in the mind over a period of time. The lonely darkness of a deserted temple untouched by the luminous glow of the lamp, the sound of bells of the evening prayer getting dissolved into the tranquillity of the evening, the stray beam of sunlight falling on the water of an old abandoned well,-when such disparate images unite together, they concretize my sense of loneliness. This experience of loneliness can be made more aptly depicted by the sound resonating from the bell in that kind of a backdrop. Having acquired a concrete form and having gone through such process of writing like this, my loneliness ceases to be my state of mind only, and becomes a work of art fit to be relished forever timelessly and universally. At times, we are not quite conscious of certain sounds or the memory of a touch embedded deep into the mind and we fail to observe the way a writer combines these ingredients together in order to concretize his feelings. Let's take a famous line by Tennyson:

'Between the loud stream and the trembling stars'

We may not be able to discern at first glance that the poet has woven letters l, s, t, n, m, as if to build a bridge between the vastness of the two entities-the stream on earth and the twinkling stars in the sky, but on second perusal, it will definitely attract our attention.

The real work of a poet is to help us relish what is beyond the powers of language and thus unrelishable; it should remove the temporality from it. He keeps immense scope of possibilities in terms of depiction in the form that poet imparts to the feeling although keeping well within the boundaries of the form. Reality is not just what we perceive in the sequence of cause and effect. Coming into contact every moment with many things, it is a complex and constantly changing construct. The sentence structure in language follows the cause and effect sequence. The poet takes up the task of depicting the complex reality using this kind of language as a medium. It becomes interesting to see how a poet succeeds in creating that miracle. That is the real material for our aesthetic relish. For this, he uses the sound of words, changes the dimension of our senses- he turns the sounds into something tangible or visible. At first glance, this structuring may not be noticeable. But once we can see that, it becomes interesting to see the way various component parts of a poem supplement and complement one another. It is not that we want to see whether or not, the sequence of the component parts is appropriate. But we need to see that these component parts acquire different liveliness in the distinct atmosphere of the context created by the poet and at every moment of our interpretation, they keep increasingly complementing the poem. How does a poet create this context and the distinct atmosphere? Let's take an example to understand this. Suppose I am sitting in a narrow 8x10 room. The reality of the room rushes up to my being and suffocates me. By then, I happen to see a portrait on the wall. There are

webs of thin lines, as if drawn by a child, on the small space in the portrait. I can see only this much in one way. A few lines drawn in a certain way on a piece of paper. And soon I can see something else in the portrait and seems to be more true. I can see a deserted garden for a long time in the portrait. Looking at the vast and chaotic expanse of the garden in the portrait, I experience a different sense of the dimension of place in my narrow 8x10 room. Thus, the new reality of the chaotic space of the abandoned garden was created in the narrow space of my room. It doesn't stop at that. Looking at that, I realized the chaotic expanse of my heart in a new way and having passed that state, I continued to relish the concrete form of the abandoned anarchy. We can create similar virtual expanse or virtual contraction, virtual density or lightness, virtual tautness or looseness in poetry with the help of words like that of the portrait. It can be created not with words, nor can it be created with figures of speech, and or with symbols but it results from the context created by the combination of all these. In music, we realize the flow of time. In painting, architecture, or sculpture, the dimension of space is restated. Poetry does both the things together. There is such an echo in one line of a poem that after we recite it, there is a vacuum all around. At times, words are organized in such a way that they crush everything that comes between them by their mutual interaction. On other occasions, words dazzle us with images so rapidly that all we remain conscious about is the consistency of images mingling with one another and getting transformed in the process. These are just a few possibilities of expression.

However, the possibilities are endless. We know the definition of the figure of speech called *rupak* (metaphor) or *utpreksha* (parable). But there are countless possibilities of applying resemblance of one on the other. Just saying that 'the face is compared with the moon' is not enough for the interpretation of a poem. We should also know what the poet's work is and how consequently it helps the essential poetic attribute of a poem.

The poet feels something (it doesn't have to be intense, unique or miraculous) and because of which he is drawn to do something. While he was doing it or after having completed it, when he looks at that feeling in an unbiased way, he finds a new form of that feeling as he looks at it in that unattached manner and creates that abstraction. That feeling becomes the aesthetic monad. When it explodes in one's consciousness, it releases a different kind of energy. It blasts, not in five, but in thousand parts; it draws to itself so many emotions, of the same kind or converse, or conflicting-lying passively in the hazy terrain of consciousness. In this form, this feeling assumes a different contour. There is expanse, density, apparent impression, contradiction, dialogue, and conflict as well in this contour. He has to create the kind of competence in his language to realize all this. How a poet creates this competence in his language is a part of relishing a poem. At times, he concretizes these seemingly contradictory distractions, creates a concrete image and organizes it in the poem in such a way that it continues to flow in every vein of the poem. At other times, he utilizes the poem as just a dot to

makes us plunge into a universal expanse. In that case, the entirety of the poem serves as a gateway and helps enter the expanse. The experience of this expanse takes us into the world of forms created in the subconscious mind of the prehistoric man and, on that broad plane, helps connect with our consciousness. We call them as image, symbol and myth. The experience of expanse yet depth, plasticity yet mobility- can be realized only in art. The 'reality' of our experience cannot come out completely without the way art imparts a new dimension to our experience.

The transformation of the raw material of our feelings gives us something unique and unheard of. For this reason, questions of literary criticism like "what does the poet want to say in the poem?" and "what is the subject matter of the poem?" don't do justice to the poet or the poem. The poet doesn't want to say something, he wants to accomplish something, reinvent language, and the unique use of language is his work. What we call the subject matter of the poem is merely a reason for the poet to write, it's not the main part of the poem. In order to measure the knowledge of the student, we make the poem go through the torture of fitting into the frame of measurements like, "give the summary of such-and-such poem", "explain the philosophy of a certain poem by a certain poet", "illustrate how the poetry of a certain poet reflects the contemporary social situation". Such questions symbolize the limitations of the person who asks them and MacLeish's complaint against the teachers of poetry proves to be true. To find out whether or not the student possesses the knowledge of meter, he is instructed: "Identify

the metres of the lines given below." We don't ask him to examine the way the metre helps the poem to communicate its message. In the same way, the student is asked to just "identify" the figures of speech.

The same is the problem with the "meaning" of the poem. Till date, we expect the poet to place simple and obvious message in the poem. The meaning of the poem is equivalent to the poem itself, it's not in some part of the poem but everywhere in it. The form devours the poem and the shape, the unique structure, created by the poet, is the real meaning of the poem. That meaning is rich, so unanimity is not possible. But the lack of unanimity is not because of the ambiguity but because of its endlessness.

So how can we set the standards of the hierarchy of poetry? Every true poem, in its own way, is unique. We tend to compare it with another poem in order to be able to give it a rank in the competition, but to relish it, it's not needed to compare it with any other poem. Still, the sublime theme or vast canvass of a poem is considered to be such a standard. Such quantitative standards are not essential. A true poet expands the dimension of our experience in one line. One who accomplishes everything with the help of bare minimum ingredients is the superior poet. One who realizes the possibilities of his medium to the optimum is the superior poet. The superior poet is one who accepts the challenge of giving clear form to what is impossible to be conceived in form. Even two lines of such a poet are like an epic because there is the

adventure of discovering a new continent within ourselves. The cobweb of lengthy storyline, its complex arrangement and its various branches and sub-branches would become a long poem but it does not inevitably become an epic.

We should find out whether the critic tries to unearth the poetry out of a poem or he tries to analyze a poem with the yardstick of certain preconceived notions. These days, there is a lot of emphasis on the tools of criticism. "Show your tools" is the dictum. But the most effective tool of the critic is the deep interest of the critic nourished by the analysis of so many works. The knowledge of all the other rules becomes immaterial without that interest. Criticism also aims at relishing the poem. Instead of this, if a critic brings out the moral values from the poem, or he attaches the burden of the tradition of the past with the poem, or he associates the poem with the life of the poet, or if he analyzes the poem in the context of social factors and deems the poet as progressive or reactionary, the scholarship, the cleverness, or the cunning of the critic amazes us, but we still are away from relishing the poem!

Some would say, 'Emphasis only on relishing the poem? Then who will be able to stop you from becoming self-willed in the name of relishing poetry? How to save ourselves from the dishonesty of discovering something which the poet hadn't even thought in his dreams and establishing it with misuse of logic? Who will stop the rule of self-willed behaviour under the disguise of relishing poetry?' Yes, such questions would arise. We

must take note of such serious issues. There is only answer to this. Poetry itself will stop the self willed behaviour because poetry is not uncontrolled anarchy, but actually the poetic sentiment in the poetry is carved out of this anarchy. The positive force of the poetry itself will disapprove of the self willed interpretations. It is pertinent to let poetry itself become the decisive factor.

Thus, if criticism and poetry come face to face this way, this auspicious occurrence will be beneficial to both. We need to make an effort to find out how much we have perfected the style of our poetry and the competence of our writing. In the same way, we also need to analyze the way we employ the figures of speech. Along with this, the poets, who are following the beaten track, will venture into the direction of the newer expressions, and our teaching of literature will improve. Once the hurdles are out of the way of relishing poetry, the possibility of an active and lively interaction between the writer and the reader will arise and the sensibilities of an entire society will achieve subtlety, depth and expanse.

***Pratikrachna* (Symbol Forming)**

Vishnuprasad Trivedi describes the following incident in his essay titled *Vivechan ni Pratishta* (Establishing Criticism): "A potter's wife goes to railway station to see off his

daughter and son-in-law. Both of them somehow find some place to sit. A distant relative climbs up the berth and lies down. So the potter's wife says, 'Dalpat Oza, you are sleeping as if you are sleeping on a bed at home!'" Here, the narrow bench of the train compartment became a bed! None of the passengers, fighting with the lack of space, must have objected to this, saying, 'This is a bench, and not a bed.' A wooden bench is a bench but it was described as a bed, and in this distinct situation, the listeners found the description right.

Here, there is not much difference between a bench and a bed. The anger of the potter woman is not so intense that it would transform that into something extraordinary and unusual. When an experience is not taken within the personal, well-defined limits but on a wide stage, it shows its effectiveness, and this effectiveness expects a new shape. The transformation of one thing into another, its relationship with what it is usually not related; the new existence, new shape achieved in relation to this reference—we are astonished by all this while perceiving all this at the time of relishing the poem. A lot keeps on happening in our day to day life. We take note of whatever is immediately important to us; the rest keeps accumulating in the subconscious. The board of a shop, from which a nail has come out, noisily swinging, seen swinging noisily in the air; the cat living in our home rubbing itself with our body for warmth—a lot of such things are lying here and there in our consciousness. The same is the experience sometimes while listening to the Western music: one note after another, we can't establish the connection

of one note with another, but at the end all of a sudden, we hear such a note that we stop. Having listened to that note, all the disorganized notes which came before become harmonious and a pattern of notes emerges that amazes us. In the same way, with one unique experience, the disorganized experiences lying in our mind get bound by a hitherto unidentified bond, create a new shape and astonish us.

When this happens, a poet like Baudelaire connects the board swinging noisily to a prostitute lying down, panting and tired after an intercourse; the warm sunlight of an early winter morning coming down to touch us with its warmth reminds us of that cat, rubbing itself with our body. These connections keep materializing at different levels, in different roles and different ways in our consciousness, and thus by creating such new references, they keep providing new shapes to our experiences.

It proves quite interesting to examine the process in the poet's mind by which the relationship among objects and emotions, come to the fore, the new contexts therein arise, and as a result new form of our experiences come to life. Among these processes, let's try to understand one process- creation of symbols.

Our understanding of ourselves becomes clear only in relation to others. The complex web of manifold relationships continues to be woven every moment. If we divorce ourselves from it, we can't understand any object or emotion as it is. Our one emotion can wander in all directions and in many dimensions. But the movement of our

grammar-bound language is like the straight line of trigonometry. It accepts only things established by rules; it regards any violation of time a flaw. But the relationship of various emotions is quite different in the world of our consciousness. Moreover, the isolated meaning bereft of context offered by the word in dictionary is not of much use to the poet. The poet can move forward only by transcending it and by re-creating it in the context created by him. All of us know the dictionary meaning of the word 'tree', but when the Upanishdik poet used the image of a lone 'tree' standing in an open ground, in order to describe God, the word 'tree' got enriched by the new meaning in this context. The word in the dictionary is merely a sign. Its relationship to the thing of which it is a sign is like that of an equation in Arithmetic. In the equation $A=B$, A is neither smaller nor bigger than B, but it is equal to B. This kind of unambiguity of relationships is essential in our worldly affairs. Everything is certain there. To realize definite objectives, we need to employ definite, unambiguous means. To drink water when thirsty is a very obvious projection of the definite form. To realize it, we use a sentence like 'give me water' as a means. There is nothing ambiguous in it, because all the words in it are in the form of signs. Right after their articulation, the impact is over. Nothing is left of these words. But take a word like 'lotus', immediately its meanings will begin to expand. The beauty of lotus coming out of mud, its purity and many such layers of meaning would arise in our mind. In the same way, take the word 'cross', the symbol of Christianity: its shape is like a human being, it suggests the two ways parting

after meeting, two lines cut cross each other and it suggests the pain of being cut across. In this way, the waves of its meaning keep expanding. Like religion, art also arises from the necessity to fulfil the deepest expectations lying into the depths of human consciousness. Hence, it doesn't restrict itself to the external reality; it reaches the various levels of consciousness. To impart expression to the insights that one discovers while doing this, creation of symbols is inevitable.

Then, how does a poet employ symbols? There cannot be any specific method for that. If it were so, it would have been very easy to create the science of symbol formation. But we understand symbols only in poetry, and we can internalize its true nature only by poetry. We see certain strangeness or uniqueness in some people. Every human being is strange in one way or the other. Many a time, this apparent strangeness remains symbolic of his entire personality. A child, suffering from the fears arising out of insecurity, always holds on to the button of his coat. Here, the button is a symbol of the assurance for his mind, and since such behaviour suggests the main characteristic of his personality, it is deemed 'symbolic behaviour'. A small act like this can prove to be suggestive. Taking us on to the surface of reality in order to crystallize the vastness, the complexity of the experience, the poet, too, employs words in such a way that by standing on the point of these words, the enormity and complexity of the experience becomes clear within a moment. To put it in another way, the poet turns the concrete

word into a springboard. The moment we climb on it, it catapults us into the infinite space of experience.

Thus, words with self-evident and unambiguous meanings can't be of any use to a poet. Language is used at different levels in our dealings. Like the atmosphere embracing the sky, the heartbeats of the people using it surround the language. In that atmosphere, there are possibilities of hitherto unrealized variations of meaning. To cover each word, the poet fathoms this atmosphere, and revives various meanings of the word from its nebula. Thus, a poet doesn't employ new words but he internalizes the background and environment of the language that people have been using and realizes the possibilities of creating new meanings out of that. To keep realizing such new possibilities is the real work of a poet.

It is not that symbol formation is the invention of certain poets of a particular age. With this conscious objective of writing poetry using symbols alone, we don't need to establish an 'ism' for it either. Since time immemorial, human mind has been striving to fathom the mystery of infinity around him. For this, the tools of rationality alone have not sufficed. There is so much around us which is mind-boggling. We have been able to organize very little of that in the structure of rational constructs. We have not been able to understand everything with the help of cause and effect theory. Apart from all this, a lot which remains outside the structure of our constructs, amazes and confounds us.

Like the pre-historic man, our mind still puts a foot forward on its way to adventure in this amazing universe. The sun perplexes our eyes by laying bare a host of forms in front of us, the expanse of smell takes to the border of the unknown by arousing our memory, the innumerable sensations of touch make us speechless. To escape from this, the pre-historic man invented symbols. One word, one articulation, one line, one ritual- in all this, he extracted the essence of this complex expanse, as if with some magic. This is connected with the collective unconscious with umbilical cord. Therefore, even today, when our mind dives to the depth of the systematic world created by our intelligence (and it is the nature of human mind to do so!) and transcends the milestones of definite concepts, and reaches the world of anarchy in which there still is the unchallenged sovereign rule of wonder, at that time reaching the depth of consciousness, it is inspired to understand the world with the help of the language of symbols created by the collective unconscious.

Poetry-the true poetry- always indicates at that ancient world of ours. There are layers and layers of dullness brought by the mechanical responses on our emotions, experience, and sensations; we are not able to experience all this in their unadulterated form, barriers like rationality-driven thinking, limitations brought upon us by our worldly dealings, the tendency to avoid adventure and seek safety come in our way. But for a poet, in his adventure is his emancipation. The whisper of leaves, the whiling waters of river, moonlight covered by haze, the meaningless but sweet words of a child,

the implication in the eyes of the beloved, the thrill arising out of a sudden touch- all this transports him to that world. If we try to study an insignificant emotion of ours, it will lead us to that world. In it, the methods of knowledge acquisition devised by our rationality do not help. Fathoming the collective unconscious in it, our mind looks for symbols. Symbol is such a magical thing that it opens all the doors of the unknown and the mysterious. We come home to a totally new, refreshing and mysterious world. It is like a breath of fresh air in our consciousness. At the end of this experience, we are thrilled as if we are coming face to face with this familiar world for the first time.

If the poet wishes to give full shape to the experience, he needs to acquire an insight into the different rhythms in which human mind moves. How beautiful is the rhythm of human mind in dreams! In the world of dreams, pictures come instead of words; uncontrolled by the rationality, the relationship of picture is truly novel. But the text coming into existence by the pictures and their relationship is not untouched by the world that our conscious mind knows. That world is transformed in this. But if we wish to understand the world fully, we can't afford to overlook this transformation taking place in the world of dreams. The poet has to identify the changing rhythm of the motion of human mind. Moreover, remaining on the border of subconscious and conscious in a trance, the poet should see the transformation of the familiar reality. He should put a sensation in various forms in order to bring it out in a proper form. One should sometimes set out to travel on the path on which he had travelled, holding the

hand of imagination and riding on fear and wonder. Discarding the mechanical responses like that of a robot, we should let loose our senses anew in the quest of the adventure for new responses; and we should lead the assault on the innumerable, the unknown and the mysterious borders.

For poetry which is a mere translation of those familiar sensations already used before, and which travels without any adventure on the path charted not by poet's consciousness but by rationality, and considers the repetition of the emotions and ideology lauded by the contemporaries as the summit of achievement, wouldn't sense the need for symbols. It would manage by borrowing symbols from older poets.

One can say at the peril of exaggeration that the suggestion of the invisible by what is visible is the characteristic of a symbol. In order to represent the invisible by the visible, a certain kind of relationship is expected between the two. There are infinite possibilities of this relationship. We mention the basis of a figure of speech while giving the definition of a figure of speech. This basis is just a step for the relationship between the visible and the invisible. We begin the discussion on the simile with the object of simile and reach up to the negation and contrast. Resemblance is expressed in numerous ways. The resemblance due to the similarity of the nature, resemblance created by the reflection of one by the other, resemblance coming to the fore due the dissimilarities-thus, resemblance is realized in many ways in figures of speech. To

ascribe and to devour is also a kind of relationship between the visible and invisible. If we examine the creation of figures of speech, the definition 'figure of speech means the ornamentation or embellishment of poetry' would not seem appropriate. When the poet has endeavoured to expand the meaning by taking language as far as possible, and feels that 'now it's enough, and one can't go beyond this, I have internalized all the possibilities of language', he rests by saying *alam*. Because of this, one can't put an end to the possibilities by employing a few symbols. Hence, the effort of a grammarian like Mammat for doing so seems artificial to us.

The English word 'symbol' was derived from 'cymbola'. In olden times, when there used to be any deal or business agreement or agreement on some conditions between two parties in Greece, they used to make two parts of a coin, and each party used to keep one, this one half of a coin was called 'cymbola'. This one half would keep reminding of the other. Let's try to understand the larger meaning behind this concept. The way the coin was one in actuality, what wish to realize in various ways and in various contexts is also something one and unfractured. But our language is not competent enough to put it in that same form. So in order to capture it, we discover a means. Where the objective is well-defined, there is no question of bringing out what is one and unfractured due to its definite limitation. Hence, there is no ambiguity here; and it would be a flaw if ambiguity remains. But the territory of poetry is the world of our emotions. There is no limitation to its nebula. Therefore, we try to capture, what is

abstract and mysterious and hence beyond our reach but felt by us, by some concrete means. We try to know what is abstract and beyond our grasp by some concrete and tangible which means we employ something concrete and tangible known to us in place of abstract and out of reach. Thus, in the creation of symbols and figures of speech, to place one for the other (substitution) is an important process. It is not necessary that the object used as the substitute should be extraordinary or unique. Every object has the possibility to become a symbol, lying it and this possibility crystallizes in the context employed by the poet. How Mallarme transformed 'window' into a competent symbol in his poem!

Apart from this, some other interpretations are associated with the 'symbol' and they reveal its other characteristics. The seemingly coincidental coexistence of two objects, the clash of two objects, the centralisation of two objects and consequently some new element coming into being- these are interpretations which can be identified. Looking at it this way, the motion and purpose of each word of language would seem to be resulting into a symbol. Being set as a symbol, it becomes poet-bound and its ability to expand by revealing new variations diminishes gradually and ultimately it comes down to the level of an ordinary word. This cyclical process continues to take place. To impart new voice to a word and to expand newer vibrations of meaning from it are of paramount significance to a poet. Due to this, a language sustains its lively nature. We expect this liveliness in poetry. When one can strike such liveliness in language, even

the words of day to day routine transcend the limitations set by dictionary and enter the vast orbit of our consciousness.

How does a poet achieve this? First of all, he removes the obstacles coming in the way of signs. The biggest limitation is the definite-ness or unambiguity caused by the use in routine life. A poet places the word way away from the common situations in which it is used and the way it creates meaning in relation to certain things. By doing this, the word is freed from the rigid web of sign. Such a liberated word qualifies to be a foundation for many new relationships.

But here a question would arise: would the uncertainty and ambiguity of signs not result into a kind of chaotic absurdity? Once freed from the set structure of meaning, would a word sustain its independent existence as a particular word? And if it loses its independent existence, would it not also lose what is essential to be the vehicle or medium for emotion?

Let's give an answer to this by a simple example: when we look into the mirror, we can see our reflection very clearly; it satisfies our desire to see ourselves clearly. The mirror can't do anything more. But, when we are looking out of the window, we don't see our reflection; we see the vast expanse outside. This expanse, in spite of being, so has a characteristic shape, it has a definite shape. Its definite shape is derived from the window from where we are looking at it. The window is situated at such a point that

the moment we open it, our gaze is focused on certain expanse. We look at that area from the structure of the window. Like this, the poet also opens a word like a window. He shows us the wide expanse of our consciousness from the open window. But the poet doesn't let the boundaries disappear; he lets only its rigidity disappear. There is always such a sign in the creation of a symbol. The surroundings of the symbol, and its relationship with other words- the poet constructs the space with the help of all this, because of this the word doesn't lose itself in meaninglessness after being freed from the rigid system of signs. While looking out of the window, we receive the tree standing on the hill in a new form. The tree related to the surrounding land, the sky above, and the quietness all around becomes a new object for our consciousness. In this same way, a word used as a symbol brings out the new force of our inner world.

For accomplishing this, to open the window of rigid signs, the poet must use the word in such a way that it shouldn't be easy to interpret it. He should create such a situation that it should prevent us from interpreting the word, used in day to day routine, in a traditional way. The traditional meaning should not seem fitting in the context created by the poet. So that we leave it and get inspired to move in a new direction. In doing so, the relation formed by the poet would prove useful. However, this new relationship wouldn't be such that we get confined to a new definite and unambiguous meaning. We should be able to wander freely in the kind of expanse that opens with the window. Nonetheless, this wandering freely is not fully unbridled. The context used by the poet

mayn't seem like a check on us but there is a check nonetheless. Due to such an arrangement, we get liberated from the rigidity of the meanings and are saved from the uncertain, absurd anarchy as well.

Some poets are content to restrict their achievements to three to four symbols. There is no complex web of symbols in the poetry of Mallarme or Rilke. They have justified the use of the few symbols that they have employed. It seems to us that they expand the horizons of these symbols to such an extent that these symbols have just stopped short of becoming transparent.

Thus, by removing the traditional meaning from the word, the poet who creates the symbol inspires us to add new richness of meaning to words. We receive this richness by reading the text as it has been created by the poet. For this, the poet takes to the depths of our hearts unknown to us; and there we stand there among the vast collection of innate qualities, experiences and memories. The symbol employed by the poet inspires us to choose relevant material from the vast expanse of our consciousness, fitting and helpful for the context of the poem. Thus, the freshly collected material becomes our substance. This substance is comparatively more or less rich for every individual on the basis of what's lying in the depths of his consciousness. Therefore, the mechanical responses are out of the way, and the boundaries of the possibilities of responses remain clear. Thus, by emptying the word, a new life is given to it in the

process of creating symbols. The unique thing about such a word is that its echo continues to expand even afterwards. The poet time and again keeps bringing out its expanse in various ways. Such a symbol becomes, not only a part of the text but the centre of the poet's entire creation. Every competent poet freely offers such symbols. Rather than slipping into abstractions, the poet's texts and characteristic experiences acquire proper shape because of the magnetism of the symbol lying at the centre. Until the poet discovers such symbols, his works are rendered in imperfect shape, fragmented and loose.

There can't be any definite methods as to how the magnetism of symbols moulds the strange inner world of our consciousness. However, the introduction to poetic literature gives us some general sense of certain methods. The discussion on the potentiality of the word is mainly an effort at studying this method systematically.

Sometimes, a symbol exposes not only one but many shades of meanings. These different meanings do not merge with one another, but sustain their individual existence, and thus by maintaining the dividing line between them, they make the poetry rich with mystery. Rather than being alternatives to one another and remaining separate, sometimes these different meanings house themselves into one another and form a design like a bouquet. In this kind of a design, there are multiple centres, in place of one, to regulate different designs like bouquets. Yet, these centres are not

completely disconnected from one another. Each one makes a certain contribution to the richness of ambiguity arising in the text. Due to this, a complex structure of meanings becomes possible. Different meanings connect with other meanings. The meanings A, B, C, D come together sometimes as A C, some other time as A D, and at other occasion as B C and keep giving rise to newer forms of ambiguity. Thus, in different combinations, different aspects of meaning keep emerging in the context of newer relationships. This can prove to be an efficacious instrument in bringing out the ambivalent attitudes. In this way, we grasp the two meanings in irony, connected with each other in antithetical relationship without disregarding any one. Sometimes, the different meanings in a text come together in a way so as to be the different parts of the larger meaning gradually emerging out of it. Here, one after another petal of meaning keeps blossoming and a bouquet is created in the end. On some other occasion, one meaning comes as a stimulant for another one, and that other meaning in turn leads to another meaning – thus it creates a whole series like this and it leaves an impression in the end that this series has kept going on and on. While throwing light on writing poetry, British poet Dylan Thomas offers a very different process; combining itself with the impressions in the consciousness, a deep experience creates an image, right along with it, as if from the same image, there arises another antithetical image, and a third image emerges from the clash of the two-in this continuous clash of images, on one auspicious moment one combination of these images-one that takes all the contradictions in-emerges. Poetry is

created in this momentary peace amid this war of images that rages on. Perhaps with the same meaning in mind, Robert Penn Warren says in his essay titled, 'Pure and Impure Poetry', 'A poem to be good must earn itself'¹

A symbol is a comprehensive sign. Various processes of writing poetry known in different ways have always been included in it. That is why, there seems to be some lack of clarity prevalent in our criticism as to how to employ this sign. There is difference between a symbol and an image. In a symbol, there is an effort to expand meanings and decentre the centre, whereas in an image, the artist brings all the expanding meanings in one centre in a visual or sensual image, and hence the intended emotions take shape in the centre after being attracted to it. But this shape does not have rigid boundaries; in fact, this shape is a creation of the amalgamation of various complex images, and when it takes that shape, this complexity does not disappear but grows into richness. In this way, the creation of images is an activity that leads us to the centre. This image becomes the focal point in the poem. The meanings branch out from it, the symbol moves in the periphery and the image remains rooted at the centre.

There is some difference between metaphor and symbol as well. When we ascribe an object to the thing resembling with it, it becomes a metaphor, but even after this, it does

¹ Explaining this statement, David Daiches says: '...it must not simply state its author's emotional convictions in easy generalities but must come to terms with all alternatives that threaten those convictions by including them in some way in the poetic statement.' *Critical Approaches to Literature*, pp 160

not change its form, and there is no interaction between the two; both sustain themselves as individual constructs, whereas in a symbol, a word brings about the ever expanding web of complex relationships.² Allegory is also different. It is allegory when a poet personifies an abstract emotion or idea, and clarifies in doing so the relationship between the images and the emotion or idea. Here, the poet's objective is to depict the emotion or idea and the text is a means to do it. The relationship between the two is also definite and static. It is quite useful in religious discourses, but there is no scope for ambiguity in it which becomes a flaw in that.³ Moreover, conceit, which is created by connecting two objects in an unexpected way, also needs to be differentiated from symbol. What Eliot calls 'objective correlative' resembles a symbol but that too is quite different from it. Eliot explains it this way that, '(It is) the image that sets up an inward focus of emotion in poetry and at the same time substitutes itself for an idea.' In the Western literary criticism, phrases like 'heraldic symbol' or 'central emblematic image' are also used in the similar sense. While discussing these phrases in his book, '*Anatomy of Criticism*', Northrop Frye considers the white whale in Melville's *Moby Dick* and the lighthouse in Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* the illustrations of that. Carlyle

² Compare: 'A metaphor is a way of describing an experience or an object, but a symbol is a way of recreation or recasting or even deepening a significant experience.' Wallace Fowlie

³ Compare: 'Allegory is fine. Since one has carried the traits from the personification to the quality personified. The process is complete, whereas once one has reached the concept symbolized one is left with the contemplation of it; and besides it in turn may be made the symbol of something further...There is something transparent about symbols, and something opaque about allegory.' Elder Olson

categorized symbols into two types and incorporated the rest in these two. These two types are intrinsic and extrinsic symbols.

With the development of science, the reign of intellect in our lives grew more and more. Due to this, a mechanical order came into being. Literature also experienced its impact and it resulted in scientific realism in France. Writers like Zola and others initiated realism full of details in literature. Symbol was established as a reaction to this. By liberating imagination from the control of logic, and language from the rigid system of signs, Rimbaud endeavoured to discover the traces of the unknown. The dividing line between the imaginative and the real in the works of Nerval seemed to be erased and our sensations began to wander freely in the marvellous world. Liberating our vision that which gets caught into the realities of the world, Mallarmé directed it towards the unknown and the mysterious that which can't be expressed by language. Coming out of the conventional boundaries of reality, it attempted to enter, by the means of words, the infinite space of the unknown.

The importance of science is growing. Hence, there has come an order in our thoughts, but the world of our emotions has not come under the control of any such system. The distance between the two is increasing. Symbol alone can become the bridge that connects the two. But these symbols should be created by the poet whose vision of life is comprehensive and deep, and which reaches the level of consciousness beyond there

where the concepts arise. Others don't sense the need to do this, and, the symbols created in the routine process of writing without feeling this need are nothing but a trick of the mind. The poem should be such that it should be able to carry the weight of the symbol; it should have the emotional richness to assume the symbolic density. It should reflect the competence to justify the unexpected combination of two objects. The body of the poem freezes where this competence to bring about this combination is not found and the movement of emotion is hampered. For creating symbols, even the language needs to undergo some change; we have to change the direction of the language, habituated to move in straight line; to bring out the interaction of many emotions in the symbols, we need to divert the language with the help of the rhythm of meter. We shall not be able to avoid the artificiality in the creation of symbols as long as there is a tendency to mould poetry into a structure of thought created by rationality; only the poet who touches the world with his whole consciousness can create symbols.

***Vidyapithma Sahityanu Shikshan* (Teaching of Literature in University)**

The dominance of both politics and what has come to be its means-science is more evident in our age. On account of that, a lot of issues, which should not have arisen, have become a reality. The relationship of these issues with our lives is one of distinctive proximity. The contemplation on these issues is inevitable in order to sustain

life. This situation has not only disturbed our value system but it has also deeply affected the consciousness necessary for cultivating values. Hence, people are heard saying that the contemplation on the values is a waste of time or an intellectual luxury. The accomplishments of science are so tangible and so manifestly result oriented, that it is natural that scientific method as regards acquiring knowledge may seem more reliable. There is a growing insistence on employing the scientific method in other spheres of life. At times, we forget the limitations inherent in this method. It is relevant to think whether or not this method, devoting itself to laboratory analysis, and dividing things and looking at them separately in parts, will be uniformly effective everywhere.

Let's examine this unique situation which has arisen in our age. In the Middle Ages, no clash occurred between religion and poetry. Religion was also a product of emotional make up, and so poetry accepted it; there was no clash between art and religion as well. Such a relationship could not be established between science and poetry. Our emotional make up has remained untouched by science. Therefore, there is an impression that there is conflict between the two. It seems the value of the definite role that human consciousness has played in the creation of literature or art is diminishing. Art had taken exile from Plato's republic. It appears a similar scenario is in place once again today. Poetry or art creates something imaginary in place of something real and concrete. What is the objective of this creation? Why is it needed? Wouldn't it take us

away from life? Such questions are raised. The devotees of science don't deem studying and teaching literature necessary.

It resulted in the situation in which our intellectual life and emotional life (if one can use such a term) go on to become two different things. Our intellectual development does take place but as far as the total development of life is concerned, nurturing of emotions is as essential as development of our intellect. As there is indifference towards nurturing emotions, and as we don't take note of what literature can do for it, there is growing disarray and anarchy in our emotional life. This dissonance in our lives is quite fundamental.

There are some other ramifications as well. There is a growing tendency to resort to the scientific methods to examine literature. What the rhetoricians call the power of suggestion, this discipline tends to consider it the cause for the indefiniteness of meaning or ambiguity. Any kind of ambiguity or obscurity is an evil for them. If a word provides 'proper' knowledge of an object it intends to describe, it is enough. If the personal experience of a person is mixed in describing it, the meaning becomes vague. Semantics approves of only one equation, that of the word and the object described by the word. This discipline looks skeptically at the competence of a symbol to incorporate myriad shades of meaning and continue to expand the circle of the echoes of meaning. It believes that the root of all the problems is in the imprecision of the usage of words.

When we put the issue this way, it assumes an extremely serious contour. The individual perspective of a person which enriches the meaning of a word is deemed unnecessary and confusing. Kenneth Burke, noted American critic, has challenged the autocracy of Semantics. He has phrased the clash between poetry and Semantics in the following words: 'Poetic ideal is aesthetic, the semantic ideal is analgesic.' He considers the positivistic sciences responsible for this. As he states further, 'Positivistic sciences transfer a physicalist perspective to human events by way of antithesis to the primitive magic which transferred animistic perspective to the charting of physical events.' How can this discipline accept the way words are employed in poetry given the way this discipline behaves with the tendency of either/or towards words? For it, that which is not right is wrong, but in poetry, the dimensions of meaning continue to expand. Of course, there is a suggestion which remains central in all this. A bigger circle doesn't nullify a smaller circle; in fact both can be true and moving at the same time. This discipline disregards this 'progressives encompassment' inherent in the meaning of a poem. It believes that once we give proper name and address to everything, the complexity is over. While poetry employs symbols, this discipline prepares a map. We shall discuss later on the effect this tendency has had on critical appreciation of poetry.

But when Plato exiled art, Aristotle found out reasons to give it its place back. Eliot, eminent English poet, has said that Hamlet could not find objective correlative for his tragic end and thus he got entangled in the whirlpool of his own emotions. Literature

creates such objective correlative. It acquaints us with the way of looking at experiences of others and of our own with dispassionate oneness. Such objectivity creates a new dimension to our awareness. Let me use Eliot's words again, 'It imposes a pattern on our experiences'. The manner of observing and relishing experience this way is itself one of the human values. Poetry instinctively evokes a sense of values in us. We can go further and say that 'fact' and 'value' become indivisible only in poetry. But this value is not the act of tallying the personal experience with the reality based on visible evidence; it's not the process of conceptual verification. As it is a proclivity of human mind to understand the world by fusing cause and effect by analysis, it is also an old tendency on our part to feel the world in terms of employing symbols and using this process of creating symbols. There is no escape from accepting the sovereign status of this myth-making or symbol-forming tendency. From the infancy of races, this tendency has run through ages. The unique characteristic of this is that instead of dividing things into parts like intellect which frames the conceptual moulds, it joins elements deemed contradictory into an all-pervasive embrace. Active role of this tendency is necessary for the holistic development of our lives. If we accept this viewpoint, we will have to change the signification of what science deems 'real' on the basis of tangible evidence. The meeting point of the finite and the infinite is the domain of reality in art.

Language is one of the important means for the dealings of human beings. A creative writer employs this language in a distinctive manner. Its grammatical correctness is not

the only measure of precision; the relationship between both the emotion one wants to express and the language which expresses that emotion is very important for the creative writer. To always remain watchful of the accuracy of language as a means that expresses the interiority of human mind and to expand the possibilities of this language is the work of a creative writer and it is a very important work. Discussing the same point, Ezra Pound, an eminent poet, has said that when somebody who is to provide medicine or the instruments of surgery indulges in malpractice, the lives of so many people get endangered and we condemn such a person and subject him to rigorous punishment; in the same way, we should punish the one who corrupts the medium called language or endangers its potentiality. But then who can take care of that except a writer? That's why Ezra Pound says, 'When their very medium, the very essence of their work, the application of word to thing goes rotten, i.e. becomes slushy and inexact of excessive or bloated, the whole machinery of social and individual thoughts and order goes to pot.' To express feeble feelings in grandiloquent language and create its false worth or to employ poor, lacklustre and weak language for a lofty thought and hide its real worth are serious offences. To scrutinize these flaws is the responsibility of a true critic. To overcome the flaws, and expand the possibilities of the medium is the work of a true creative writer.

Thinking from this perspective, the question of teaching literature is, at this juncture, worth discussing. Issues like the definite role played by human consciousness in

creative writing, its place as one of the important values for the refinement of a human being, the examination of the process of creating and relishing it, demand fresh deliberation. Today, when violence and destruction weigh increasingly heavy, there has arisen a distinctive need to save and nurture this noble activity of creating and re-creating from the funeral pyre of destruction. In today's context, the responsibility of creative writing, literary criticism and profession of teaching has increased manifold.

Keeping in view the above-stated responsibility, if we examine the present scenario of teaching literature, it will be found inadequate to shoulder the responsibility. We should take note of evils like rigidity of the system of education, flaws in the recruitment procedure of teachers, obscurity as regards what kind of a student we are to create at the end of education, obstacles concerning the study material of a student, an examination system rife with ills and detrimental to the objective of the study of literature, formation of syllabus in such a way that it fits into this examination system, rigidity in place of the readiness to modify the system in order to keep pace with the developments in different domains, and more than anything, the lack of incisive understanding necessary for teaching literature.

We create a system to enhance our ability to work. In fact, it is a means of our efficiency. But the nature of the system seems to be such that it becomes more and more complex and intricate. If we get too interested in the system, then there would be a reversal of

the means and the end, the end becomes the means and the means becomes the end. If the person in charge of the system doesn't have an ever-watchful, progressive and meticulous insight, it becomes impossible to avoid the evil results. The system has its own limitations. The people who work in it are set in a hierarchy; power is distributed according to the place and designation of the people in the hierarchy. The desire for power remains a big temptation in every walk of life. Above the human relationships, the false values of the relationships established by the system come into being. In the name of efficiency, these values begin to enjoy sovereign power and at the end, man is reduced to a cog in the machine. It is possible to avoid such dominance of the system in the domain of education. We should consider efficiency, the only one standard, important in the domain of education. Even if we have to maintain a hierarchy, the experience of the teacher and his contribution to the field of education should be kept at the foundation, once that is done, no situation should arise in which there is a discrimination in the name of upper cast and untouchables. In place of such caste distinction, we should nurture a spirit of cooperation for a hallowed task. Enthusiastic and assiduous involvement to accomplish the goal should be given importance instead of being devoted to glorification of an individual. We should create such a favourable ambience in which even the man standing on the lowest rung of the hierarchy also employs whatever unique ability he has with a lot of enthusiasm. We should accept the fact that everyone has some unique ability. Rather than exposing somebody's inability

or trying to humiliate somebody by giving him work that is below his dignity, we should encourage the tendency to accept whatever is his contribution. As regards the workers of an organization, we should reward the ability of a person to adjust with one another with warm cooperation, in place of harbouring grudge and doubt.

The mould of the system itself becomes the shield protecting the laziness of the administrators of an organization. We should always avoid such a situation. No convention should be so strong that it doesn't let new possibilities sprout. How slow our pace is in uprooting the evils inherent in the system of education and examination! Even a small little change, as if it is a huge revolution, shocks our system devoted to traditions. At times, the true servants of an organization, the common people who have fervour for education and spend their energy for the cause of education, have the vision to make some good changes, but because of the complex web of constitution and standards, we cannot make use of their perspective. It is perhaps easy to feel consolation and satisfaction of having accepted the system of democracy based on voting, but it is equally necessary to have the readiness to give way to whatever is good. Old organizations are more conservative, but it can stake a claim on survival because the tradition they are sticking to has been able to yield some good results. New institutions have the added responsibility of establishing a new tradition, but on the other hand, they also have the convenience of not being tied to the old custom. Rather than being known by the aura of one person, it is desirable that the institution should be

a symbol of the collective hard work of both its illustrious and ordinary employees. Only such a scenario can create attachment in the employees for the institution; this attachment liberates an employee from the slavery and stimulates his efficiency.

A true teacher never ceases to be a student. The sphere of knowledge keeps expanding, so we cannot depend on the old treasure of knowledge. The first clause of the qualification of a teacher is that he should be a true devotee of literature. To respect the significance of literature as discussed earlier, to point towards the possibilities of its future growth with the help of his insight, and to employ his teaching in such a way that it proves useful for creating the favourable atmosphere for realizing those possibilities, are the precepts which he should consider his religion. His effort should not be to establish new benchmark of quality by creating artificial difference between different parts of literature. If one is knowledgeable about one particular thing, he should consider other people, who are knowledgeable about some other things, his equals, although they may be inferior in terms of position. Instead of bringing together people expert at one and the same aspect of literature, colleagues who can complement one another should be brought together. We should not let a sense of partiality arise towards people knowledgeable about our favourite subject, and competition or envy for people working on other areas. We should take care of whether all the branches of study, useful to literature, are developing equally well or not. They should make a conscious endeavour to remain acquainted with the contemporary trends and

tendencies, the newer thoughts emerging from the theoretical criticism, not only from their own language, but the works deemed unique and epoch-making in other languages of the country and the world. A teacher should always be careful that the students don't become the victims of the limitations of his personal likes and dislikes and that his personality should not be so dominant to the extent of being a hindrance in their independent development. The students should not be used as the dustbin for the opinions collected from here and there. By presenting many possible contradictory opinions, he should encourage a fundamental examination of a subject. He should take special care that the vision of the students doesn't become flawed because of his laziness or a natural limitation on his part. Rather than thinking that he is teaching the students, to think that all are trying to learn something together proves useful to the teacher, because he doesn't have to lose what he learns from his students. If a teacher possesses the right vision of the values of literature, the true insight into the responsibility of criticism, the proper understanding of the barriers in the way of creating literature of the highest kind, his teaching itself can be the source of inspiration for good literature. He should be cautious so that his inclination, fostered by the study of many profound works, doesn't get trapped. Rather than asking the students to revere the traditions, he should establish the significance of original thinking in them. He should see to it that the true fervour for literature and research remains firm against the

efforts for promotion at job or the trivial tendency to achieve superiority over others.

The true teacher of literature never underestimates the value of creative writing.

What do we expect to see in students at the end of the prescribed syllabus? We still don't seem to seriously ponder over this issue. We need to scrutinize today's situation taking into consideration the facts like the dearth of good scholars, the anarchy prevalent in the domain of criticism, the lack of litterateurs who can serve as the link between literature and common people. An individual graduating with literature not only gets acquainted with the significance of literature for his growth, but shaping his taste by the perusal of the literary works of a higher kind, he can also create new standards of criticism. And with the help of these standards, he can confidently examine the contemporary literature being written and pronounce his opinion on the same. If a person holding a bachelor's degree in literature can do this much, his study of literature can be deemed satisfactory. Does this happen? If not, then we should examine its causes.

The scrutiny of these causes leads us to the evils of the education system of the day. The excessive significance attached to textbooks, dependence on only lecture method, the lack of direct contact between the student and the written material, the tendency of forming the syllabus in a way that it fits into the examination system, the lack of a scenario in which the student doesn't thoughtlessly accept the principles of criticism

from the books or teachers but endeavours to reach these principles by examining the method of relishing a work, how to use and how much to use the available study material for his study, the lack of right guidance as regards how to collect this study material from the library, and in the end, the fundamentally wrong examination system in place, only to test the power of retention of the students, are the chief evils of today's examination system.

The use of jargon of our syllabus is worth examining. Let's take a look at how textbooks are placed in the syllabus. After deciding upon a certain time period, the students are instructed to study the 'representative' works of the period in the context of the 'factors' of that time period. Then, along with the 'representative', another adjective 'classic' is also forcefully attached to it at some places. Will it be possible to establish the acceptable characteristics regarding whether to consider a certain work a classic or not, and regarding our judgment by which we consider a certain work 'representative' and others not so? The right way is that a student should estimate the literary activities of that time period, not only on the basis of those works, but also by studying some other seminal works of that era. Moreover, the arrangement of these time periods or ages is not always satisfactory; at times the students remain unaware of certain literary forms. On some other occasions, the students have to spend a lot of time on historically important but literarily inferior works. There are some repetitions also. The objective of studying the principles of criticism seems highly ambitious but ultimately the students

have to memorize the material from one or two 'recommended' books. While we take up the task of studying the progress and the tendencies of the 'ancient' and the 'modern' in the field of criticism, it happens that the books which have become old now and after that a lot of milestones have been crossed which are not taken note of. Therefore, it would be more useful for the students if we give them the systematic list of the fundamental issues of criticism and give them some suggestions regarding the books in which these issues are competently discussed. Abercrombie's book on the principles of criticism defines literature in this way: 'Literature is the communication of a significant experience.' Thus, he emphasizes the process of transition. But afterwards, that issue was cross examined and today that argument is not deemed significant enough to be included as a definition of literature. But the students, who accept only one book as textbook, will memorize the same definition of literature even today. Thus, in prescribing textbooks for the syllabus, it is like unnecessarily accepting some artificial limitations, detrimental for the real study of literature. But textbooks simplify the process of examination. In this way, the method of examination remains the decisive component in syllabus formation. At times, there is a lack of harmony in the vision for choosing the textbooks for the syllabus. The same book is in the syllabus of the First Year in one university, in that of the Final Year in another university, and in the post graduate syllabus of some other university also. At times, the angle of the profit-loss and sales figures of books is working behind all this. The number of students is more in

the First Year compared to the Final Year! Some experts work in the Board of Studies of various universities and yet, it is sad that we have not been able to uproot this evil. At times, it is also argued that 'This book will be tough for the students'. Can such an argument survive in the field of science, technology or medicine? Here, the lethargy of the teachers should be held responsible instead of the inability of the students. One more fact needs to be noted here. The teachers are not able to avoid the temptation of earning money preparing textbooks and compilations. Due to that, how poor textbooks are prepared! We don't have compilations of prose or poetry, prepared with a view to giving an idea regarding the sequential progress and achievements of that form. Nobody has the time to carefully study and prepare such compilations. Universities should take up the task of preparing the compilations so that this undesirable competition comes to an end. Compilations like these can be extremely useful in the first two years of higher education. The study of any one writer can be barely carried out at that level. So it is good that the students get acquainted with the richness and the diversity of a form and relish it. Science and commerce students have to study Gujarati Literature in their First Year so it is necessary that there are such compilations for them, only then they can get acquainted with the richness and the diversity of literature in that one year. Because of the system of prescribing certain textbooks in syllabus, the student of Gujarati Literature studying up to M. A. ends up acquiring more knowledge about the literature of the past rather than the contemporary writing. The tendency of

making the students accumulators of information is responsible for this. If the student makes the choice of books to read, irrespective of time and based on the quality and substance of the works, and if the teacher helps him in making the choice and gives him necessary guidance, and after studying such works systematically, then he can create standards of his own as regards criticism and later on he can mend the flaws coming into it, with the help of the principles.*

We can make some practical suggestions in this respect like rather than prescribing a certain number of texts, the terms of the year should be divided in units. We can allot certain texts or parts of the texts chosen for every unit from a certain perspective, and a 'creative' re-reading should take place of the same. The text should be discussed from all perspectives giving rise to some fundamental questions, and these questions should be analysed. In this way, after preparing the primary orientation for criticism, students should be given two weeks' time and the list of books for further reading and they should be briefed as regards what kind of discussion is expected of them after the time given to them. After the two weeks' time period, based on the reading material, they should be asked relevant questions, to answer which they have to use their critical

* Discussing this point, Seymour Betskey says: 'The problem is that of placing first thing first. While at the same time avoiding the development in the student of habits in reading which will leave incapacitated for the kind of alert, flexible, sensitive, 're-creative' reading without no social training or knowledge is worth the bother...If a taste for literature is to be encouraged and development...then the student must be given the kind of training that will leave him with a love for literature intact, but made responsible, precise and cumulative.'-'The Teaching of Literature', The Sewanee Review, Autumn, 1949 pp. 629

acumen; they should write the answers after giving it a good thought with the help of the reading material sitting in a library. After checking these answers, the teacher should discuss the limitations or flaws in the answers and give details missing in it. After we divide the time period of the year in units, if we can arrange this sequential reading for each unit, it will be useful for the objective of studying literature, creating true love for literature and acquiring the critical acumen required for analysing literature. The notable characteristic of this method is that studying a known text helps in honing the skills of discussing and examining an unknown text. And in this method, we can go beyond the rigid structure of textbooks and use books that can be useful to the fundamental objective of the study. We can avoid wasting a year on a lifeless text with the help of this method. In this method, textbook does not become the goal; it just becomes the means of creating the critical acumen.* And then, there is a flexibility to incorporate works of different time periods and different languages.

If we want to implement any such experiment, it will become imperative to make changes in the education system prevalent today. The ills of the lecture method have now become extremely evident. The biggest flaw of the lecture method is that it does not take into consideration the most brilliant and promising students of the class. Hence, due to this method, there is no scope for the special efforts the teacher should

* The successful experiment of this method was carried out at Chicago University. See, 'The Idea and Practice of General Education', Chicago University.

make for these students. That brilliant student has to go by the pace of an ordinary student of the class. The number of students in the undergraduate or post graduate class is limited. So, the teacher can have a personal interaction with each one and understand his\her requirements. Lecture method is not able to take the benefit of this provision. There are discussions, to some extent, but on such an occasion, the teacher should slip into the background and just take care that the discussion does not get diverted to something else or the important points should not be left out. Mostly in such gatherings, students collect information on a text or a subject from here and there and read out. The discreet organization of the content, a new perspective useful to the topic under discussion, and the inclination to take the study one step forward are seen missing from these discussions. Only after the real penchant for the literary studies is stirred in the student, such enthusiasm for one's study would arise, and only then, the student, after coming in touch with the subject of his study, can begin to think on his own. An education system, conducive to create such a scenario, should be put in place. A teacher collects some information on the textbook, dictates notes based on the information collected, useful for the examination, and students, without bothering their brains, mug up and vomit the same in the examination. We have to accept that this is what happens more often than not. If a student comes in direct contact with the textbook or the subject of his study, his mind would embark on thinking about it, questions would arise and the contemplation of these thoughts will gradually develop

his critical acumen. In the growth of a student, it is apt that educators should, where necessary, use their insight which is an outcome of the long period of literary studies and efforts made in that direction and it should be used in a way that it is useful to the student. Are appropriate questions arising in the mind of a student, or is he repeating the borrowed questions of the traditional discussion? Is his thinking on the subject of his study progressing in the right direction? A teacher has to take special care of these things regarding each student. Right questions arising in the mind is the base of intellectual vigilance. It stimulates zest in him and he may go way ahead of the teacher. He may ask questions which never occurred to the teacher and it may happen that he goes on to challenge the givens of his teacher. Only when such a situation arises that two watchful and keen minds will come into contact with each other to enhance their knowledge. A method should be employed to facilitate such an interaction.*

The first expectation of such a method is that the teacher should remain watchful. If he has to teach a text by some modern poet, the teacher should study it once again. Just by providing available information to the students, he should not think that his responsibility is over. If the study of literature is done this way, the works, which can stand deeper scrutiny, will offer newer evaluation and ultimately be useful for the

* F. R. Leavis says about this: 'The training to be one in sensitive and scrupulous use of intelligence; to that end, such help as can be given the student will not be in the nature of initiations into technical procedures, and there is no apparatus to be handed over- a show of such analytic work will most likely turn out to be a substitute for the use of intelligence upon the text.'

insight into literature which is evolving and to literary criticism and creative writing. But has such a situation been created here? The works of Govardhanram, Nanalal and B. K. Thakore can stand some more analysis. But don't we keep repeating the same things about them which have been said before? We are still to make an effort to evaluate Govardhanram as a novelist. We are yet to make a true estimate of the poet's poet, B. K. Thakore's concept of poetry and his poems placed in reference to his concept of poetry. There will now be a fresh study of the uniqueness and limitation of Nanalal's talents. And still, these works have been taught for, at least, last twenty years. We have to concede that this education system did not create the base for the exchange of ideas between the vigilant minds of the students and teachers of the last twenty years.

Let's delve deeper to examine why it has not been possible. Our understanding of literature is not moulded only by the study of the literature of our own language. One who reads *Prachina* also reads *Murder in the Cathedral*. The points to be discussed while examining the poetry made of images arise from the blessed reminiscences of relishing works of the same kind written across the world. What is the form of the dramatic element in a poem? Does it not seem that by placing the arguments as dialogues regarding the dramatic incident once it has happened, creates a fallacy of the dramatic element? Has the plasticity which precarious balancing found in the drama as a form been achieved in the metre that can express it properly? Can a poet employ sounds and stanzas fitting to the turn of emotions? Can the sculpture of poetry be made on the

foundation of empathy? At last, the question that Eliot has asked: Did this kind of speech (the poet tries to make us aware of the uniqueness of that speech in the poem) inevitably call for the medium of poetry? A well developed insight into the form of drama and poetry is expected on the part of one who discusses the above stated issue. Otherwise we can be satisfied by making a comparison, employing the historical method, with the experiments done in Gujarati prior to this, Kant's khandkavyas (a poem containing several metres), and these poems and in case if we know a bit of Bengali, by making a comparison with Ravindranath's 'Karnakunti', 'Gandharir Avedan'. This historical method saves a critic from a lot of hard work. For example, take the story of Nala and Damyanti, well first give the list of works written on Nala and Damyanti in Gujarati. Then examine what its origins are and what changes that the writer has made in his work. Then you need to trace how much he is indebted to his predecessors. By the time you reach here, your treatise, swinging scholarly footnotes, has become fairly lengthy. Then, nothing else is left to be done! The discussion has taken place by the classical method! This method has come to be seen everywhere. Give the lists; collect the details by rummaging various reference books but stay way away from the genuinely challenging work. Now, we need to diagnose the causes of this overdose of historicism.

Ezra Pound, expressing his acute dissatisfaction with the method of functioning of the universities during his times as a student, dubbed the universities as 'learnaries', the

storehouse of information. Even today, the tendency to burden students with huge quota of information is gaining force over here also. Take a look at some of the question papers of B. A. or M. A. examination. These question papers also have the characteristic artificial language. Some questions are definite and such that call for immense amount of information, possible to be evaluated in terms of marks. This whole examination procedure rests on this specific content-response. But how can such standards survive in a field like literature? Some questions are framed in such a way that they, way in advance, place a limitation before the real discussion on the subject. Due to the limitations created by the questions, the bright students, at times, do not know how to present the essence of his learning. The easiest way of asking questions is to quote a critical statement on the text and ask the students to discuss it. At times, the statement does not even rise up to the level of criticism. The student, at times, is instructed in the question itself to justify the opinion expressed in the question. For example, "There is a unique blend of intellect, imagination and subtle emotion in the poetry of a certain poet.'-Justify this statement by giving examples from text." These questions remain the evidence of the limitations of the understanding the person setting the paper. Students have to take into consideration some other 'practical' things as well. For example, a student would think "A certain examiner (The students somehow do acquire the information as to who is the examiner and who is not!) is a devotee of Nanalal, so I

should not discuss his limitations in my answer. A certain other examiner likes a certain viewpoint, thus let me write in that way." We should take note of this fact too.

These are issues lying on the surface. The real issues come up here. Examine the teaching of poetry on the basis of these question papers. Take a look also at the kind of criticism of poetry takes place. What does the relisher consider an element that one should relish poetry? If we can incorporate in prose what has been said in poem, then the poem is deemed intelligible otherwise unintelligible. There has been a pest of reflective writing after B. K. Thakore; poetic essays began to pile up. A wrong understanding of the musical element in poetry arose. The sticklers for the reflective writing forgot the first condition, which was to make reflection poetic. But if the poet wants to express his thoughts, why should he not do so in prose having the grandeur fit for such lofty thoughts? We should express the excess, the thrill in our mind caused by the thought, rather than expressing the thought itself. No poet needs to be enlightened about this. But our literary criticism sidelined the poetic and glorified the thought. What else could be the reason for the excessive appreciation of a work like 'Darshanika'? Don't you think that we have forgotten the dictum that the poet should clothe his ideas in sensation? Hence, up to the M. A. level, we indulge into 'scholarly' discussions on a lot of details irrelevant for relishing poetry, and also make students go through the same. But, do we get hold of what is poetic by doing this? But the poetic attribute is a difficult term, and it is true that it cannot be defined, but, the subconscious

understanding for relishing poetry-that which is shaped by the study of unadulterated, lofty poetry- is always at work at the time of relishing poetry. Yet, we have to admit that there will be difference of opinion as regards what is poetic attribute. It is obvious that this difference of opinion will bear some results in the teaching of poetry. At times, having become rigid, this difference of opinion is also reduced to the disgrace of turning into prejudices. Having studied under teachers having different opinions, and facing the test of an examiner, different from the rest, students try to match with the poetic sense of the examiner.

Let's examine the issue of teaching poetry in a bit detail. Our literary criticism has deemed these aspects important: the emotion expressed in the poem, the factors responsible for moulding the poet's vision of life, and 'social content'. But don't you think some of the fundamental issues regarding poetry seem unexplored? Let's take an instance. What is the uniqueness of the language that is used as medium in poetry? We cannot explain the competence of words by classifying them into *abhidha* (literal meaning), *lakshana* (connotated meaning) and *vyanjana* (suggested meaning)*. As a medium of daily dealings of our lives, language dies after accomplishing the task, but a poet finds out some endless element from the same language. This is how we get acquainted to what Valery calls 'Language in language'. What is the form of this style?

* We should compare the constructs of *vyanjana* or *dhwani* with the discussion of 'Aesthetic Ambiguity' by Ernst Kris and Abraham Kaplan.

How is it created? Literary criticism should make an effort to understand this process of creation. But generally, we take a poem and sit down to discover its 'meaning'. We should ponder over questions such as what the thing called 'meaning' is, how it is created in poetry, and whether we can make a transition from that.

The first thing is that in literature, we first get the form of the emotion rather than the emotion itself.⁴ Savouring the way this form is what makes a poem fit to be relished. The creation of form is the distinguishing quality of a poet's work. If we do not try to understand this and be satisfied by just stating that the poet has expressed a noble, grand and auspicious emotion, we do not value the distinguishing quality of a poet's work. Then how can we make a transition from that in poetry? Of whether the emotion or the thought? Can we know the emotion or the thought the way the poet felt them? What has not happened before cannot happen again.⁵ Every one of its new occurrence will be a new creation. There is not much in novelty in the feelings and thoughts, but the sensation that it creates in the poet's mind, the echo that is created in his consciousness, the way the unique rhythm of that re-creation of language, and thus it assumes shape as a distinctive form,-this process is what is really worth relishing;⁶ and

⁴ For a detailed discussion, see Susanne Langer's 'Feeling and Form'.

⁵ '...The reader feels the impact of that form...but can never have the poet's own experience.'-Vale'ry.

⁶ See Vale'ry's statement on this: 'I am inclined, personally, to pay much more attention to the formulation and composition of a work of art than to the work itself, and it is my ambit, which amounts to a mania, to appreciate such works only in terms of the activity that produces them.'

criticism of poetry expects a foundation of that sort. How is this distinctive form created by this poet? Take a look at the arrangement of words in prose employed in our daily dealings, and take a look at the distinctive arrangement of words employed in the language of poetry. The manner of the arrangement of both-what takes place on the sensory level and what takes place on conceptual level is obviously different. The form of different components like subject, object and verb undergoes change here. We cannot bridge the components by reasoning. The relationship that a poet creates between the symbols and the imaginative images is not the relationship of grammar or reasoning. Only the true emotions can bridge them; that is why the same words signify different things in different forms, different contexts and ambience created by the poet. If we try to, guided by logic, find 'meaning' that we understand usually, it would be like negating the distinguishing quality of a poet's work. A good poem resurrects itself at the end of each interpretation and enriches its signification, and that is why it is not possible to arrest it in the definition of exact meaning.⁷ We have to study how the poet succeeds in creating the wealth of ever progressive signs, and really, this activity grows to be extremely relishable. The poet's method of employing his experience, the uniqueness of his architecture, his ability to create metrical rhythm according to the ever expanding the resonance of emotions, his vision behind the way he employs the

⁷ 'A poem is designed expressly to be reborn from its ashes to become once more and indefinitely what it has just succeeded in being. The distinguishing mark of poetry lies in its inherent property of being able to reproduce itself within the form of its structure. It stimulates us to reconstitute its identity.' – Valéry.

figures of speech and the forms of the figures of speech-we should familiarise the students with all these aspects. What beauty arises from the suitable, slight change in the construction of the metre, effected as per the emotion, the form of the sentiment becomes so extraordinary! Recall the line by Sundaram: 'Oh, but, what has happened to this heart of late?'

The poet shakes us a bit by employing the guru in place of the third letter which should be *laghu* (short vowel) in *Prithvi* (a metre in which each foot contains 7 syllables). But the sudden stab of pain and the shock it gives to the heart due to its suddenness, and the way we pause keeping one hand to the heart,-how this emotion acquires a clear shape in this line! How it incorporates in it the complexity of such a situation! The exclamation 'oh' that comes out with the sudden feeling of pain, the shock dealt to the illusion of happiness upheld so far by the manifestation of pain, the rebuke conveyed to the heart for its deceptive ways-when a poet's consciousness touches the rigid structure of metre, he can accomplish something unique by violating the metre. One can create this grandeur from the employing rhyme in a certain way and a pleasing arrangement of sounds as distinguished from this meaning like *Yamak* (alliteration). Wave after wave keeps coming, the second wave bigger than the first wave, the third one even bigger-the poet can create this effect by the arrangement of rhyme. Rhyme that is not noticeable at first, and then the gradual expanse of meaning from the different words of a sentences, the expectation formed, this arrangement is broken in order to bring about a sudden

change of emotion, and this shock makes an impact on the reader,-thus, if poetry is conceptualized on the basis of empathy, how relishable it can be!* The poet can try to make changes in the way metre plays out in the poem, the use of harmonious sound in place of harsh cords, appropriate arrangement of sounds as per their classification, and arrangement of words according to their spellings. If the poet has an understanding of the core of the metre, he can use take a lot of work from it. The clouds are in the sky, the scorching heat, everybody longs for rains, there are signs of rains coming, and the poet's mind is filled with bliss. In this thrill of joy, there is a cadence, the word is also pushed by the delight, and we know that when a child is delighted and tries to describe that, he speaks as many words as possible in one breath. And the poet should employ a metre befitting the emotion, and Narmad used *Malini* (a meter in which each foot contains 15 syllables). 'Every now and then, sunlight and shade replace each other.' The first six laghu come together, how we can feel the intensity permeated due to the bliss. One should examine Kant's '*Sagar ane Shashi*' (The Sea and the Moon) in the same way. A poet can innovate a lot, within the rigid limitations of metre. Try to recall the famous poem of B. K. Thakore's '*Prem no Divas*' (The Day of Love)-the series of sonnets. In it, lovers crave to see each other. The lovely female protagonist is looking into the mirror to make the parting of her hair and paste a *bindi* (a red spot marked as an ornament

* The way a poem from Hopkins, Wordsworth, Rilke and Vale'ry is taken and minutely analyzed in a book titled, 'The Unmediated Vision' is worth referring to.

between two eyebrows) and chants his name with both her lips. Just at that moment, the man who inspired this emotion in her enters the door bending lower in order not to be seen in the mirror she is looking into, and touches her suddenly in order to astonish her. See what all happened in one moment with this one mere touch- how many pictures moving in a rapid procession, the poet has to draw here! Look at what the poet did here- with the mere touch; 'quivered, trembled, bent, and her ornamentation went awry'

First, there is a quiver; the poet is not saying that the female protagonist shivered because there are two shades of meaning in this 'quiver'-at first the feminine fear and ultimately the joy after recognizing the touch of her lover. The two actions after that are like two parts of one action. Keeping the consistency of letter 'l' between 'doli lachi', he has suggested the gliding motion. To swing expresses the extreme delight, to bend down suggests the weight of richness (Does it not depict the tree bending down with the weight its fruits?). The last part of the action is still left; with a word like 'scatter', the poet suggests change. Eventually, he combines all these actions with 'beauty'. The poet used the same 'ee' sound to suggest all these sudden actions; hence, the stream of the actions flows unobstructed. At last employing two 'ae', he keeps the stream in control. Such changes as per the emotions in the movement can be seen elsewhere as well. In a poem titled 'One Broken Branch' by B. K. Thakore, the protagonist of the poem leaves for the battlefield accepting the challenge for the battle, he is on the horse,

and about to leave-at this juncture, the action takes a different turn-a suggestion for the change in the slow pace of the memories and the poet at once makes a change suitable to the fast rhythm.

Dancing at the acceptance,
Showing the joy,
not expressing her pain
went the horse in that manner

How the poet has skilfully presented the small but sudden part between the female protagonist placing the garland around his neck, and the horse taking the rider to the battlefield!

When the poet has such structural sense, he delights the reader to perfection, and the medium of expression is perfected in the true sense, then there is no need to ask a question like 'What meaning did you express in it?' Where does the weakness of frail poetry lie? If a subtle sense of propriety as regards the structure of the poem is not there, it deforms the structure of the poem. We can see some noble emotions expressed in some misshapen works. The poems surrendering to rhyme, the ineffective use of the figures of speech, loose structure of the work, the lack of intelligent insight which is expected while employing the symbols-all these reasons of the ineffectuality of poetry should be examined. Every time we tumble upon a novel trick, there is a tendency that,

to present it with ornamentation, to create symbols which may be new for our readers even if the symbols aren't suitable for the work. Has poet created the atmosphere conducive for the 'virtual space' for the symbols to be concretized in poetry and grow gradually? The effort to classify poems into lyrics, *khandkavyas*, patriotic poetry, Bhakti poetry, Dalit poetry, realist poetry, love poetry, and accordingly derive the characteristics, ultimately slips into artificiality. The efforts to evaluate poetry in this way mostly take away the central poetic attribute from the poetry.

If we gradually and systematically introduce the students to the benchmark poems that satisfy our expectations of evaluation, and strive to enhance their understanding out of this exercise (not by merely reciting the dogmas readily borrowed from books) and then acquaint them with the poetry which they are expected to study, they will be able to study it in true sense. Education should interfere only as much as to provide necessary guidance at all these levels of development. By doing this, a student would know what to expect in a poem-a good poem, his standards would be high, as the creative writing will be place on the anvil of this high standard, there will be a decline in the production of substandard works, the true creative writer will realize the need to keep developing his work,-and lastly this tendency will be, undoubtedly, useful to our creative writing and literary criticism. The foundation for this can be laid only in universities. But as the American poet MacLeish has said, the teachers of poetry are themselves big enemies of poetry. It is through that poetry spreads into students, but if they don't properly

understand this new experiment and shout about the difficulty of the texts, grow intolerant and try to force it in the old mould instead of preparing the foundation of the new venture of poetry, an irreparable damage will be done to the study of poetry. Having the finesse to express their dislikes in a scholarly and seemingly glorious language, they may impress the students whose discretion is not yet developed, but by that, they will commit the crime of giving credence to wrong values in literature. Poetry should achieve the transition of emotions; the lecturers are the class of people who scream loudly that the meaning of a poem should not be extremely obscure.¹ Actually, a false insight of poetry is responsible for this. They have an idea in their minds that poetry means the process of putting a certain thought or emotion in embellished form with the help of figures of speech. If a transition takes place due to poetry, how does it happen and of what? To come in contact with the cork of art is to surrender to the truth behind the formation of the work, to the discipline that works in its backdrop. A good work of art redefines the writer and the reader. Transition in poetry does not mean that the meaning is generously handed over to the reader by the writer. What is expected is that the reader should become one with the state of mind of the writer at the time of

¹ 'The most hard-bitten and vindictive of all adherents of the (communication) theory is a man to whom the phrase 'the theory of communication' may seem novel and unfamiliar: I mean the average English professor. In one form or another, when in a conception which makes poetry a romantic raid on the absolute or in a conception of more didactic persuasion which makes the poetry an instrument of edification, some form of the theory of communication is to be found deeply embedded in the average teacher's doctrine of poetry' -Cleanth Brooks.

creation.² Writing poetry is the continuous endeavour of the poet to give shape to his experience; hence, it does not come to an end in a certain work. He has to take the help of symbols which keep giving out echoes in order to ensure that the meaning expands outside the work also. At the end of relishing a poem, one should be led to feel the ever expanding resonance of meaning, and the consciousness of this expansion of meaning is what inspires reading after reading of the poem.³ What is transcended by a poem is so minute, vast and rich that it cannot be dealt with in any medium other than poetry. A poet is a creator, not a medium. He invents new forms, and creates references that create relationship among them. At the end of it, the distinct character of a poem comes into being. He does not create a replica of a certain experience that he had, but he creates the shape from the cluster of his experiences and perceptions. If one wishes to grasp that form, he has to leave the shore of certainty and venture into the wild of the consciousness. The people, who emphasise the transition, place the whole responsibility on the poet.⁴ It is an adventure to relish a true work of art. That is why, Isabel C. Hungerland says in her article titled, 'The interpretation of Poetry': "The best way to

² George Whalley says in his book, 'Poetic Process': '(communication is) getting into touch with; a mental identification rather than the transfer of meanings.'

³ Somewhere between the excitement of discovery and the discouragement of 'trying to use words', between the sudden brilliance of vision and the successive desolations of striving to render the vision-somewhere in the middle land of ordered and accidental communication the words rest when the pen is set aside.'-George Whalley.

⁴ 'The theory of communication throws the burden of proof upon the poet, overwhelmingly, and at once. The reader says to the poet, Here I am. It is your job to 'get it across to me' when he ought to be assuming burden of proof himself.' 'What does poetry communicate?'-Cleanth Brooks.

avoid frustration and bafflement in the presence of art is to actively look for a variety of aspects and structures and their interrelation" (The Journal of Aesthetics & Art Criticism, March 1955).

What has been said as regards teaching poetry and criticism of poetry has to be thought about regarding writing fiction as well. The novel does not become remarkable or acquire distinct literary quality just because the novelist has discussed some contemporary issue, or has made use of novel as a tool to sing the glory of the past, or has tried to depict the life of a certain community of people of a certain region. The undue significance of 'story' is the biggest limitation of our literary criticism of novel as a form. The novelist decides upon the story in advance and places the pre-decided story in a frame prepared for it.⁵ Therefore, a close relationship between the story and form does not become possible. At times, the criticism of a work becomes secondary, instead of that, the viewpoint of the author reflected in the novel or the story, the portrayal of the contemporary society, and the discussion of other such 'factors' acquire importance. On account of this limitation inherent in our literary criticism and the lack of watchfulness in the study of literary forms, we have failed to guide our novels and dramas in the right direction. Consequently, compared to the growth of these forms elsewhere, they are lagging behind in our literature. Literary criticism can not only just

⁵ '...the events told in a novel are parts of the content, while the way in which are arranged into a 'plot' is part of the form. Dissociated from this way of arrangement, they have no artistic effect whatsoever.' 'Theory of literature': Wellek & Warren, pp. 140

point towards the numerous possibilities of the literary forms but it can also control the production of weak and cheap works by raising the standards of the interest of the readers as regards the expectations from a literary work. The efforts to revive the old theatre are due to the abysmal quality of the modern theatre. We need to analyse the scenario responsible for the strange mismatch between the competent actors and lifeless dramas. These days, even the competent and promising writer also has to sit in line with the commercial writers and hence, the pure literary writing is getting dull and lifeless.

To eradicate such an evil situation, we need to make the study of literary forms more watchful. The real readers are prepared in the universities. Later on, they become the connecting link between link and the layman and the creative writer. Literature reaches wide audience with their efforts. Literature is one of the important activities in the cultural activities but the common people are getting distanced from it because the foundation could not be laid which should have been laid by the readers for the meeting of the lay man and the creative writer. It is necessary that the prefaces that enable us to relish good works should be analysed. With the help of this, the common reader is guided in the right direction as regards relishing the work. The art of watching and relishing a painting is the subject of certain experts, so is the case with sculpture and music. As a result of this, the people are being exiled from the realm of creative-cultural activities. It is necessary that there is a marked increase in the class of the real

devotees of literature and art which serve as the bridge between the work and the readers. It is needed that such true devoted students take up the task of going among the people and helping them relish the good literary works. Such an activity should be deemed a part of the syllabus. Consequently, the values that literature inspires will expand up to all the layers of society.

It is the responsibility of the university that such students are placed in the appropriate roles. As regards the literary forms, only certain prose forms are taught at the M A level and that too from the point of view of chronological growth. Our prose forms like novel, drama, and essay developed under the influence of the western literary forms. Hence, while studying such literary forms, it is necessary that the students study the works of these forms which are considered landmark and unique and which explore new possibilities of that particular form. It is needed that those who study novel as a literary form come in direct contact with and know about the works of Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, James Joyce, Kafka or Thomas Man. Efforts are made to avoid this kind of study because it cannot be incorporated in the rigid examination system. To a certain extent, the lethargy of the lecturers towards such study also should be considered responsible. This work actually becomes easier at the colleges and the universities. Seeking the cooperation of the lecturers of English, the students can be made to benefit of their knowledge. But we have extinguished the foundation of such cooperation in the name of experts and specialisation. We should never forget the fact that a student of

literature is a student of literature first, and afterwards, a student of the literature of a certain language. If we can make the exchange of the results of literary studies possible, based on the cooperation of the students and lecturers of the literature of various languages, we can avoid the narrow-mindedness in the name of specialisations. The institutions, in which a number of languages are studied, have all the facilities for this exchange. False pride based on the knowledge of a language, class distinction, and competition, in the place of cooperation, are the some of the elements that work as the hindrance. If we decide, we can create a scenario in the university that can remove the enmity arising out of language. Why shouldn't a student, who is going to study the literature of a foreign country, study the literature of the different languages of his country? If we can reduce the burden of the study of texts from the syllabus, and avoid certain repetitions, we can allocate a place in the syllabus to the introduction to the study of the literature of other languages of the country. Hindi is taught as it the National Language. Therefore, the student gets the opportunity to acquaint himself with the Hindi literature. It should be deemed necessary for the student, who selects literature as a choice, to obtain the knowledge of at least one language other than Hindi and English such as Bengali, Marathi, Tamil or Kannad and its literature. Marathi is the language of a neighbouring region. Marathi is taught at the institutions, otherwise there are lecturers teaching other subjects whose mother tongue is Marathi. The institutions should make use of their knowledge. The number of people knowing Bengali is

increasing in Gujarat. By an acquaintance with that language, the students attain the knowledge of the rich literary reservoir of our country and the propensity to enter comparative literary studies can be inculcated in them. The argument that this kind of study is time consuming is wrong. A foreign student studying at a university in France has to obtain the knowledge of French language and it is considered necessary to prepare a dissertation on a French writer. If it is carried out in a scientific manner, it is possible to train students for that language in a short span of three months.*

Man's creative instinct is expressed in many ways through different media. Its diversity, the distinguished quality of the varied media, the process of creation and the relishing of the same-all these can be beneficial to the student of literature. If we understand the process of creation and criticism of the Fine Arts, we can understand the process of creation and literary criticism of literature in its uniqueness. We need to examine the form of transformation that the creative writer effects after taking the raw material from the world. We should remove the limitation created inherent in the one-dimensional study of literature by engaging in the close study of other arts and thereby broaden our view. For this, not only the literary criticism but the art criticism should also be studied, aesthetics has not yet been given a place in the universities. Although it is a part of Axiology, a branch of philosophy, even the students of philosophy do not

* Anyone who wishes to acquire the knowledge of second language should see two books-Naidal's 'The Teaching of English as a Foreign Language' and Dr. Hoenigswald's book on Hindi.

study it. In institutions where Fine Arts are taught, students are, now, given an introductory insight into aesthetics in order to facilitate the understanding of the history and the chronologically evolved values of art criticism. It becomes convenient to bring students of literature face-to-face to Fine Arts in the institutions in which both literature and Fine Arts are taught. But to date, it has not come to my notice that it has been made use of. Struggling to make way through the sections and sub-sections of the norms, students have not been able to reach the close study and criticism of art. If not anything else, students of literature, who are offered options like Sociology and psychology, should be given, at least, this facility to study this subject as one of the options.

Literary criticism enters the syllabus right at the B A level as a subject and does not reach beyond that level to M A. The standards of contemporary literary criticism, the theoretical foundation for that, re-examining what our rhetoricians have said in today's context-these things are yet to be done. Our study at B A goes as far up to '*Kavyadarsh*', '*Kavyaprakash*' or '*Sahityadarpan*' only and there too, we impose analysis on the students regarding the figures of speech and meaning exuded by figures of speech. '*Dhvnayalok*', '*Vakroktijivit*' or '*Srigarprakash*' have not found a place in it. This method is fundamentally wrong. Instead of that, the teacher should introduce the departures accomplished by the rhetoricians and the comparative and critical introduction of the same without making use of a certain textbook. If we make a deep study of what Abhinavgupta has said from a subtle and in-depth view, we can employ a lot of that in

today's context. Like the West, we have also had good discourses on the objectives of poetry in India. Thus, such issues, which are common to the students of any literature, should be outlined in the syllabus and detailed material should be provided to them for it. For example, a student who is studying *Dhvani* theory should, at least, study Tillyard's principle of Oblique Poetry, William Empson's Seven Types of Ambiguity or the Principle of Aesthetic Ambiguity by Kris and Kaplan. On the basis of this study, he can say something regarding the form of a figurative expression and the process of creating the same. With this view in mind, the syllabus of literary criticism should be framed. Instead of prescribing certain two or three volumes for the study of the Western literary criticism, students should be given a list of important basic points and the details of the reading material for the same. It may happen that only certain points are discussed well in a certain volume. At times, to make a comparative analysis of some points, we may need to refer to two or three books. Hence, in this regard, to insist upon one book is like accepting all its limitations. We haven't been able to go beyond Hudson, Worsfold, Abercrombie or Scott-James. We should remember that the acceptance of such a limit makes our study also limited. In this respect, certain enthusiastic teachers try to provide a textbook useful to the students but such an attempt is nothing else except mostly a translation of a book written in English. In it, a student also becomes a victim of the ignorance and half-baked ideas of a teacher. We should avoid this situation. If we examine our critical essays illustrating the theoretical

criticism, this limitation will become very evident. We can see the examination and re-examination of the same points, the effort to present one's confusion into a very scholarly but artificial language, and the tendency to prove everything on the basis of Bhamah, Dandi or Vaman. That is why we can only occasionally see the conceptual insight or values derived from the close study of the Classics, behind the literary criticism which is taking place for the namesake. If we want to avoid this undesirable situation, we need to remove, at the earliest, the limitation that we have accepted voluntarily.

We have not studied the history of literature keeping 'literature' always at the centre. Mainly, we engage in a long discussion on the periods of literary history, a scholarly effort to determine the precursor to the works, works with uncertain authorship, and the portrayal of the society as it occurs in the work. But we need to also deliberate upon the literary merit of a work, the literary taste of that era illustrated through a work, the writer's insight into that particular form expressed in the work and at the end of it all, a glimpse of the literary values of that particular age. If we examine the evaluations of Premanand as a poet, three or four points are reiterated throughout. Even if we concede that in bringing about Rasa, he is unparalleled, but does he place together two rasas that he does keeping their propriety of relishing rasa in mind? Do we come across any standards from Premanand's poems themselves to examine them? We cannot do justice to the literary works by glorifying the past and examining them from other than literary

points of view (the grammar, sociology, religious value etc.).¹ Examining the literature of a certain language, a student draws a precise picture of the changes that took place in the literary tastes of the people who speak that particular language. The literary history can also enlighten us on the traditions in vogue in the literature of that language, the factors and tendencies responsible for the tradition and the contribution of that tradition towards developing new traditions. The student of literature should not feel contented just by engaging in a scholarly discussion on 'sources' and 'influences'. If we approach someone who is deemed an 'authority' on the literary history of a certain time period for a discussion on the works of the same, we are bound to get disheartened.² At times, scholars are found to be quite indifferent to contemporary literature. They do not prefer to consider it fit for literary analysis. It is evident that this tendency will prove detrimental to literature and the student of literature.

In this context, let's also consider what the form of research should be in the study of literature. Generally, there are two stages; the first one is not research, but collecting the material as the preparation for it. But we expect from him that he knows the objective with which it is collected. A work does not become fit for research simply because it

¹ 'One's very interpretation of writers of the past decades for its relevance and cogency, even if only by way of contrast upon living awareness of one's contemporaries.'-Seymour Betskey, *Sewanee Review*, Autumn, 1949.

² 'We are all educated men who love literature, who know the best writers, and who will teach that love and fundamental knowledge, as well as a technique for reading to others. We are not after all 'authorities' on Milton or Shakespeare, stomach specialists of the use of the caesura.'-Seymour Betskey, *Sewanee Review*, August, 1949.

belongs to the past. It is worth both the hard work of proper editing and publication expense only if the work in question is significant from the point of view of the study of the literary insight or taste of that era, or as a study of an important tradition or if it seems to contain some literary value. But it is regrettable that most of the old works, the critical editions of which are made available by the scholars, are not of commendable merit. Information regarding the stage of development of the language of that particular period, grammar, the social scenario should be gleaned from such works. But its publication should not be deemed unavoidable. If the objective is to study the development of language on the basis of old works, one should take extreme care to ensure that any imprecision or inadequacy does not creep in because of the personal limitation of the editor. With this objective in mind, it should be considered necessary to get it examined by as many experts as possible. It is not significant who receives the credit but what is important is that the work should be carried out in a scientific manner. The research we have today is of the first stage. The material obtained has not yet been optimally utilised.

To ensure that research proves to be of high quality, scientific and visionary, students having a natural inclination towards research should be given research work on a small scale at the M A level and they should be trained for this under a qualified research scholar. If students closely observe the research work being carried out by the research scholar, examine its various stages and try to be useful in it, it will be very useful for the

future research but research is not in narrow sense of only 'antiquarianism' or preparing edited readers of old works.* Lecturers should not insist upon only that kind of research that fits into the mould of their own research. Obviously enough, a lot of questions arise in the minds of the good students of literature in the course of their student-life. It would be proper to discuss only one question in detail. There is one more important area of research and it has close relationship with the study of literature. In this area, we have yet to think about the process of relishing a literary work, the distinct scope and possibility of the media of art and literature, creative process, the form of aesthetic relish, the foundation of the intellectual arguments as well as the limitation of our evaluation of literature or a literary work, the fundamental difference between the aesthetic values and ethical values. Even a primary foundation has not yet been laid in our universities for a discussion on this. This is the outcome of the single track that our research has followed. Those interested in further discussion should go through the 13th Chapter of F L Whitney's *The Elements of Research*.

Some practical suggestions can be made to address this situation; firstly, interactive method should gradually replace lecture method as a method of teaching. Rather than conducting exam annually or biannually on a schedule, the year should be divided into phases and a student should be evaluated on the basis of the independent insight he

* The isolation of research becomes an evil and assumes the dominant tendency to judge others' research by one's criteria. This is what Seymour calls, 'The constricting hold of philological and antiquarian study'.

developed during that particular phase and the ability to find out the standards of relishing a work. To accomplish this, it is appropriate that he makes use of library. He should not end up being the compiler of information; the questions should be set in a way to test whether he is able to employ the knowledge of literary criticism he has for a particular literary issue. Instead of relying only on lectures, students should expand their reading as per their discretion which can be useful for the literary studies. 'Vidyavistar Lecturer Series' is organised at the universities. In such a lecture series, rather than inviting someone not just because he is respected all around, we should keep in mind what will be useful for the fundamental needs of the students. For instance, we should take help of experts of other languages to introduce students to the contemporary trends of the literature of other regions. Qualified expert should be invited to acquaint students with the achievements of the West. In this way, the lecture series can be complementary to the work done in the university and widen the perspective of the students.

Besides, an atmosphere for independent thinking should be created at the universities. With students discussing one question after another, a close relationship of a unique kind between the lecturer and students can be formed. It is extremely important that the talent of an unusual student should be developed. Many things are yet to be done for the development of Gujarati literature. A lecturer should continue his individual progress too. The university should organise training classes to support the process of

updating their knowledge. In such training classes, there should be a provision for the exchange of ideas among the inquisitive lecturers. If discussions continue to take place on the academic issues of their profession, they may find a way out. During holidays, classes should be organised to facilitate the minute study of a certain subject.

We have yet to do a lot of work in the domain of Philology and grammar. To date, we do not have the grammar of the Spoken Gujarati language. Hence, the rigidity of a very formal and artificial Gujarati language continues to increase, and that creates hindrances in the way of creative writing. In Philology, we hardly do anything except giving the origin of words. We should not hesitate in making use of the progress made in the domain of Philology in countries like America and the scientific methods that they have developed. With the help of this method, we should begin the study of the syntax of our language and the distinct sign that is created by its tonal quality in the pronunciation of the language. We should examine the constitution of our language using Structural Analysis, a method that is developed by the West and employed in Descriptive Linguistics. Instead of narrowing the science of language to the introduction of the meaning of words from the historical viewpoint, we should study some of the fundamental issues related to the meaning of words, symbolism, hindrances in the way of the expression of emotions etc. A scientific study should be made of the distinguishing characteristics of the different forms of the spoken language by making use of a tape recorder and using the symbols given in the International

Phonetic Chart. If we transcribe the language spoken by the tribal people living around us, there is no doubt about the fact that we shall be able to obtain a lot of information on the way they use syntax to convey a certain meaning, the symbols they employ and the amount of tone they use. It is necessary that universities take up this task at the earliest. On the basis of the scientific study of Phonetics and the study of the constitution of language with this method, we shall be able to prepare flawless scientific readers of the old manuscripts of medieval period.

Provision should be made for the exchange of ideas between the universities as well. We should ensure that books should be used freely and rules should not create cause inconvenience in this regard. With a view to ensuring encouragement for creative writing and literary criticism, the university should maintain contact with the people of the society through its lecturers and students. We should not believe that scholarship is limited to a certain domain. We do not have a single noteworthy journal of literary criticism. University can take an initiative in this regard. The vision behind publication should be that of the development of literature. There should be no delay in creating a situation in which the real devotee of literature does not have to go back disappointed from the university anymore.

Kinchit (Something)

What is the objective of a work of art? It's not a new question. However, the nature of the question becomes clearer, when we come in direct contact with that question. At times after reading a story, the reader or the critic asks a question: But what do you want to say through this story? Whenever somebody asks such a question regarding some of my stories out of these twenty one, I have not been able to answer it. There is nothing esoteric about it, there is no deep mystery and still I honestly say that one can't put a finger on something and say that 'this is what I want to say'.

In narrative literature, as and when there is some story, and as it naturally takes place in the dimension of time and place; while critically evaluating it, it is quite natural that questions will be asked pertaining to the story, its creator and its time and place. At times, such criticism is offered that the story isn't realistic; it doesn't appear that that situations have been cohesively woven, the character portrayal isn't convincing, and the story doesn't offer any positive value for life. While thinking about what is relevant and what is irrelevant in this, we come back the same question again: What is the objective of a work of art?

But my mind gives only one answer: *Lila* (play). Then somebody may ask: Tell us, what is this thing called *Lila*? It is tough to answer but let me try. I recently went to see a photography exhibition. There were three glasses arranged in such a way that the reflection of the sunbeam passing through it, appeared like a butterfly with its wings

spread. It was a photograph but it didn't just offer a reflection of an object. With the help of this arrangement, it created a new reality usually not found in photographs. And there was no objective behind this creation. Nor was it any instrument for any other objective. That was a self sufficient creation.

Then *Lila* means the activity of purposeless creation. Here it looked like the wing of a butterfly. But at times it is not possible to understand, what has been created, even with the help of what is usually a familiar object, incident or memory. A sculptor carves out a form that which doesn't remind us of any familiar form, yet we like to see it. Here what is worth relishing is the creation of that form. How did the artist get inspired to create it? What shall we say as an answer to that? What else can we say except that his mind felt the desire to have a free play?

One feels wonder to see the *Lila*. There are eight or nine *sthayi bhavas* (stable states) but wonder has inevitably been present in all of them. This wonder is what expands our being. This wonder is the chief source of Rasa itself. Call it a miracle or the expanse of consciousness that is the objective of a work of art. To nurture our inner being which is moulded by the eight rasas, to widen the periphery of our being is the fundamental objective of all the objectives. The reality which I can concretize for myself is not the only reality. There is an infinite expanse of possibilities beyond those objectives; motivations comes from there every moment, it stirs the soul. The impatience breaks the

boundary of the complex objectives. On the path of that unknown and unalloyed, there are no footsteps, no tracks; the zest for adventure is the only thing to be taken on this path.

Even if we think of the simple things, we reach so afar! How we feel surprised! It was drizzling. Standing by the window, I was watching the world beyond the semitransparent veil through the glass of the window. The all-too-familiar details of the familiar world turned ethereal! And I felt: what if I see this *lila* from the viewpoint of a handicapped person? The gliding of this water drop, this light blowing of the breeze, the tossing of this plant, and specially the unwarranted tremor of the mind which has suddenly become restless! Now, if we contrast it with the motionless state of the handicapped? We feel wonder. And see, the inanimate rock turned into a star and started flying in the sky. Now, this whole thing went beyond our reach. My mind felt joyous and satisfied. You might say that we liked that story because it narrates the mental agony. So be it, I don't want to fight about it.

But while writing these stories, I realized something. When we go away from what we want to narrate and then narrate it, we relish it all the more. In a game, we enjoy it vis-a-vis the skill of the opponent. Kafka says at one place: Our strength flows from our adversaries. Thomas Mann says the same thing in a different way in Tonio Kroger's story: The real artist never talks about the main thing. Psychologists have opined that

this is an age old human tendency. They call it Entantioromia: the tendency to reach out for the opposite. Has Kalidas also not described the restlessness of the first day of the month of *ashadha* between the restlessness of the helpless *yaksh* (deity) on the Ramagiri and the helpless *yakshakanta* (the deity's wife) in the midst of the glory and opulence of Alkanagari? If a lovelorn beloved directly says that today her heart is sad as the lover is not around, then it will not have any impact on us; but if she buries her grief in her heart and says that today the flowers have not bloomed in her courtyard, then we fully realize the sad state of her mind. If we assess it rightly, a figure of speech has only this objective: to remove or abandon the object of description as much as possible. Starting with a sentence like 'This face is like the moon', we blatantly and unashamedly negated the object. We said: this is not a face, but the moon. Even going beyond that and sidelining the object of description, we said that this is the moon. What is the comparison between the moon and the face! It is just an example, an excuse for the similarity. Did you see how our mind plays?

The removal and abandoning are two important words in literature. Now we should say that in art, the object should not be the part of art but it should be dissolved in it. Let me try to explain why I am saying this. What is the status of a drop in the stream? How shall we describe this? Every moment, since it is a drop, it exceeds the state of motionlessness, and it cannot become a drop. The same is true for art. I do not look at the petal, but I look at the journey of the petal towards becoming a flower. That is why

Paul Klee says: The work of art...is experiencing primarily as a process of formation, never as a product. When we try to look at art as the stable state of having reached a culmination, there arises a difficulty. Hence, we cannot say that art becomes a concrete objects with boundaries; we have to create its artificial boundaries, if we insist upon boundaries. This artificially created boundary is the act of injustice in art, because for art, it proves dangerous.

We can regard an incident pertaining to our familiar reality in countless ways. Take for instance an inanimate object like a chair! It assumes a different personality in dim light. When a familiar person is sitting on the chair and especially when that person is close to us, the chair dissolves itself completely and immerses itself into the power of that person. But when someone who invokes dislike in us is sitting on the chair, it brings its shape ahead of that person repetitively and creates the clash of images. Looking at Van Gogh's 'Yellow Chair', the painter Gauguin exclaimed with joy: No one ever painted a chair like that before! That inanimate chair came alive, ceased to be product. It exceeded its just being a chair. Formlessness to form and form to formlessness- completing the full circle, it is deemed to be complete creation. Rilke heard the note of the yearning of being deconstructed after being created and said: "Earth, is it not just this that you want: to arise invisibly in us? Is not your dream to be one invisibly? Earth! Invisible! What is your urgent command, if not transformation?"

And Rabindranath also sang:

The world of forms drops and hope is there of the formless

So the devouring of the subject of comparison, its de-realization, is a significant part of the creative writing. The question arose: Why is it like this? It is something like this: when an incident takes place, it begins at a point of time and place. We cannot definitely say that it began at a certain juncture. While we exceed a few threads of the incident, and think that the incident is over, actually the threads of the narrative extend beyond all that. When we try to see a unit separating it from the whole, we do feel the presence of the many surrounding threads. The form of the narrative is shaped with reference to some objective. Hence, although we cannot believe that it is permanently out of the way, but at least for the moment. But beyond our knowledge, that association takes shape and by the time we recall it, it has been influenced by a number of factors and chemical reaction in this mysterious known of the consciousness. What comes out as a result seems to be different from the original raw material. Therefore, instead of saying that the reflection of reality is conveyed in art, it would be better to say that what happens is its 'intuitive actualization'. Perhaps this is the way of realizing truth in art. The artist has to create a new context in place of the context in which the phenomenon has taken place. In this context, the phenomenon loses its attachment to time and space and transcends the inevitability to be the link of 'spatio-temporal continuum'.

Then what does the Truth in Art mean? The answer to that is actually included in what I have discussed above: truth means the pure state of existing. Until this takes place, the cobweb of the means and the goal seems intricate. Logic decreed that A cannot be anything else but it gets emancipated in art. It regained its birthright on different possibilities. Then what about coherence? How do I get a sense about myself? We do need to keep some point stable, rooted only then the motion is possible but this point should be such that 'concentric' circles keep expanding from there, it becomes the base for that expanse and not the impediment. This is what seems to be the expectation of art.

That is why the question of time is becoming more unsettling. The dimension of time has changed so much in Proust! So many things happen in between turning sides on the bed. That is why somebody has said about Proust: "He has created a new distance between ourselves and the world". For Virginia Woolf, the word 'The Moment' remained a very significant word. Hemingway seems to like the convergence in the centre of time. He places his characters on the smallest possible point of the "precarious present". On the frontiers of war, in the middle of a disease like Gangrene, in the dual with the bulls- the past and the present converge on that point. Time comes to a standstill in Kafka's writings. There is an unalloyed expanse felt in his writings. We also experience the same thing at times. At times, time races ahead of us and on some other times we leave the time behind.

I live in my house with consciousness of the self. I consider myself the centre of the house. But for a moment if I cease to be the centre and let the consciousness live-let's see what happens? The interaction between our consciousness and the inanimate objects, unknowingly though, continues. But as long as we keep ourselves in the centre, it remains one-way traffic, and seems flat. Sometimes, we should observe the whole situation from the other end as well. When we try to do that all will protest that it is imaginary, fantastic. That is alright. The other end of truth is fantasy. Thus, for a moment, if we discard the notion that man is at the centre of creation and if we look at it from the other end, then we again come to fantasy. If you are not convinced, then look at the way a child plays. In their world, the chair gets angry and the stick turns into a horse. A child's consciousness is so very consumed by the flow of life force that it animates even the inanimate objects and equates them with the living beings. The stick, the chair, the nail and the doll- everything begins to breathe with life. A child very generously dishes out life to everyone. An artist is also generous in the same way. The American philosopher George Santayana has rightly compared an artist with a child.

So in the comprehensive expanse of truth, even fantasy and absurdity are also included. This is the state of whatever remained outside the terrain of truth. Some valuable dimensions of truth have remained buried in this fantasy and absurdity. Apart from an artist, who will take up the challenge of unearthing that? Rabindranath Tagore has

talked about two types of truth in 'Galpsalp': truth and super-truth. The artist works in this sphere of super-truth.

Then what about the harmony, the credibility etc.? The artist doesn't dispense with all that. But he lets the work of art create all that. We belong to the earth. We breathe in the hemisphere of this earth. The air of a different planet like moon is unsuitable for us. Chitra in NalaDamyanti doesn't live by the oxygen of Sociology, Economics or ethics. If we try to force the interpretation, we would have the ashes of the narrative in our hands. When a child plays, it forms the rules of the game for the sake of the existence of the game. An artist should also be conscious of the harmony and credibility. What is a rule in one season will have to naturally change in another season. When even the winds change directions in different seasons, how can we afford to stick to our stance forever?

Even if we wish, we cannot remain adamant on our stance. What we see in our conscious state, how all that changes in the terrains of our sleep! But the sleep and the dreams also emanate from our consciousness. Our sleep and the dreams are not outside us. Then what's wrong if we utilize them in the depiction of truth. But the *intuitive* method of realizing the world has not been adequately appreciated in our age. We approve what is logical and what can be tabulated. That is why there is order in the world of knowledge. But with this kind of mindset, there is a tendency that we accept

only those things that are acceptable in the world of knowledge. The order has changed. We test things on the anvil of logic and knowledge. We accept things which we not only feel but also are able to establish in the world of knowledge. On the other hand, we dispense with our intuitions which we don't find logical. Whatever is based on knowledge is there, quite tangible; there is no special objective of art in bringing it to the fore. The real objective of art is in this form and re-creation. The critics should realize the need to emphasize on form.

For this form, continuous shifting of perspectives is quite necessary. As a part of it, we should resort to multiple focus, simultaneity, transparency, movement etc. in place of distortion unified focus. There is hardly any scope to get into the details of all this. I will talk about only that is relevant here. We believe that we feel a certain emotion as a response to a particular incident whereas what we feel are a score of emotions. How can we disregard this ambivalence of emotions? For example, one of the closest friends commits suicide and his grief stricken wife comes to me and breaks into my arms looking for support. What I feel from the physical contact is not only her agony in her tragedy but also the current of pleasure out of touching a female body. But if I express only the pain and hide the other emotions I felt, then is it not a misrepresentation of truth? So it becomes inevitable to depict the many emotions at one and the same time. Love has very deep roots in our psyche. When it is excited, some other deep emotions lying at the core also come to the fore. What if we can have an ambivalence of love and

pathos? The intense expression of emotion contains a different form in itself and to be honest, which emotion can we relish if it not be intense? For the truth, it seems inevitable also.

One more difficulty arises regarding language. It is used in day to day life as well as in literature. It becomes a little intricate due to its dual function. The writer has to transform the language as well. The writer has to free the language from its traditional context and give it a distinctly new form. How to use the medium is itself an issue worth rigorous contemplation. A sculptor carves out a certain shape from the stone. It is not that he uses the stone to carve out a certain shape but he uses the stone as a tool to effectively bring out the intrinsic character of the stone. This point of view deserves some deliberation. I have seen a wooden sculpture of Jesus Christ on the Cross without in which the skin of the wooden structure is deliberately not removed. In this sculpture, we don't lose the consciousness of the skin of the wood and our vision of Jesus also remains clear. This kind of use of the medium can erase the difference between the means and the objective. As we keep working on the language, its meaning is likely to expand. We cannot stubbornly expect it to communicate only a certain kind of meaning. Then, as we have to make the glass opaque from one side, we will have to set the limit of the meaning.

We have come a long way from the dictum, "Literature is the reflection of life". Literature places us on a vantage point so that we can exceed beyond our ordinary existence and witness the human experience in its entirety. The delight of familiarising ourselves with those experiences through writing is the privileged delight of Art. The function of art is neither to give out the grammar of values nor to create memories governed by code of conduct and still it is art itself that provides, not overtly but covertly, the first mould towards creating our values not directly but indirectly. It is art which gives the sign of change in the form of our values.

I see a lot of possibilities of the form as regards novella. Keeping this discretion in view, diving deep into the different recesses of human sensitivity, we can present diverse forms of what we call the reality on the expanse of this art form. Our prose writings have not yet matured. As it is expressed in Brihadaranyak Upanishad, the world was created when God exhaled. The world acquired its form by God's exhale. We have not yet exhaled well in our prose. It limps with the stick of the grammar-governed rules of sentence structure. It has still not been able to give expression to the various complexities emerging out of anger, jealousy, shyness, denunciation etc. Observe the free play of colour. To depict conflict or clash, he will place two acutely contrasting colours together. It would like as if both the colours are desperately struggling to run away from each other and a new force would seem to be arising out of this. This expression should become possible in writing also. And then, there are fewer verbs in

our language. The pace of our language seems to be slow. We should introspect as to why there are too many adjectives and too less verbs in our language.

My endeavour is to accomplish the task of turning the attention away from the story. The form of the story is what is significant to me. As per the requirements of the mould, I have used human emotions and then very eagerly discarded once the form is complete.

I have just jotted down my experiments. It just carries a hint of where I am trying to reach. I may not be able to reach the desired destination. My efforts may fall short. But some other more competent writer may benefit from all this. I don't desire to accomplish anything more by writing all this and there is no pretence of humility as well.

Kavi ane Rangbhumi (The Poet and the Theatre)

'A poet can reach where even the Sun cannot' is a well-known saying about poets. Poetry enjoys significant importance in literature. If you bring poetic elements in a novel, it becomes interesting, but if you bring elements of essay in a novel, it would irritate critics and readers will turn those pages without reading.

Novella and poetry also at times come close. Poetry is there in drama too, but that hardly needs to be stated to someone who has enjoyed the legacy of Kalidas and Bhavbhuti. Our Sanskrit drama means audio-visual poetry. Thus, drama used to be

considered a part of poetry. In Sanskrit, drama has not yet distanced itself from the shelter of poetry. It can be found in the manner of conversation as such, and in the prose of the mischievous clown. The king uses poetry to describe the beauty of the female protagonist, and she writes the letters to the king in poetry, and the Vaitalik employs poetry in the description attempting to invoke the consciousness of time. You step a little forward and poetry registers its presence at once.

Poetry entered our old theatre by way of music. But it didn't have the depth to earn literary status. There used to come some pseudo-poetry to accompany the comic that was part of the main theme, the pain of separation of the female protagonist also finds expression in poetry, sometimes ridicule also goes on. But all this can't earn a place in the court of literary poetry. Therefore, as if a new kind of the poet of drama and the poetry of drama emerged. It is mostly reliant on music. It is quite static, and follows the theme of the drama. Its one eye is focused on the spectator.

'Kanta' and *'Rai no Parvat'* which can be called literary dramas contain poetry that follows the tradition of Sanskrit drama, but it is an imitation of the tradition. Poetry did not used seem artificial in the atmosphere of Sanskrit dramas, but it doesn't seem that poetry in these two dramas has any fundamental relationship with the development of the theme of drama. Most of the times, it is like an object of embellishment.

But at that stage, our concept of drama was still crystallizing. Part of our focus was on *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* and the other part was on '*Shakuntal*' and '*Uttarramcharit*'. The idea of pure poetic drama had not arisen as yet. Today, our concept of drama has a little clearer, and hence, there is a need to rethink the relationship between the poet and the theatre or drama and poetry.

How can the poet prove useful to the theatre? We will have to think over this question from different perspectives. The worth of a drama is in its realization as a drama. It may not deem fit always that it becomes a poetic drama. According to one opinion, drama is the most objective form of literature. When a poet's genius blooms to the fullest, he turns more and more towards objective forms, and ultimately reaches up to drama. Shakespeare was one such poet. Eliot, an English poet, also turned towards poetic dramas in the last phase of his creative endeavours. Terms like Poetic allegory and poetic drama are now heard nowadays in our literature as well.

Then, what is this poetic allegory or poetic drama. The most acceptable thing to everybody is that the allegory or drama must be there in this first place; the characteristics found in the allegory or drama must be there. Then comes poetry. Here, we need to make an important clarification. This drama is written in poetry, poetry is its vehicle. It may become poetic to an extent. But we should not think that it is a poetic drama through and through.

Let's make note of one more thing. It may happen that the theme of a drama may be poetic but it would be in prose. Some of the dramas of Rabindranath, Maeterlinck and Chekhov are its illustrations. Hence, a drama is to be written, but its vehicle can be poetry or prose. The simple rule in this regard is that as long as prose can do the job, one should not resort to poetry. If we thrust poetry on prose or resort to poetry here and there as embellishment, we would cause problems in both.

The individual we find as the combination of the spectator and the relisher of poetry is the truly worthy of poetic drama. But is such a combination possible? The first and reasonable expectation of the spectator is that what he gets to view on the stage is nothing else but a drama. Poetry should not be such that it stands apart from the drama on its own and attracts our attention. It should completely dissolve itself in the drama. Poetry should accept this condition while entering drama. We should not forget that poetry employed in drama is a means, not the end in itself.

Then, why does dramatist need poetry? Poetry is perhaps more elastic than prose, or to put it in another way, the prose doesn't have the competence to clearly depict the fluctuation of emotions and certain impulses of actions. In such a situation, prose seems somewhat fragile; not only that, when the conflict of certain old human instincts is being portrayed in drama, poetry is more competent to capture its undercurrent. To the

contrary, prose is more comfortable with incident, so when the emotion or action hasn't reached the intensity, it is not proper to resort to poetry in place of prose.

A dramatist like Shakespeare ambidextrously employs both prose and poetry with finesse, but whoever is to do this, should possess Shakespeare-like insight into drama. In order to shock the audience knowingly, when prose itself takes us naturally to the boundary of poetry, the use of poetry is desirable. Moreover, the prose of our dramas is as such different from the prose of our day to day life. The various components employed in it are of different kind. Its manner of employing is also different.

The spectator is used to accept this much difference. But when there is an exaggeration of this, he expresses his displeasure by saying, 'This is too dramatic'. When you take him to poetry, you need to create suitable ambience for it, else the hard work to match the rhythm itself will sound discordant to him and he would be tired before he reaches the heart of the drama.

Whether a continuous poetic drama is possible or not, is not the question but whether the poet and the spectator can create and relish poetry all throughout the drama or not is the real question. If one wishes to employ poetry in a drama dealing with contemporary themes, poetry should be brought to the level of dealings of day to day life. The elasticity of poetry would be useful to dramatist but there shouldn't be undue insistence on making everything poetic. By dragging the level of emotion related to the

action to poetry, certain artificiality will enter into the action and dialogues of the characters and consequently the drama will have to suffer.

One can see such an effort to drag each one of the incidents to poetry in Nanalal's dramas. Therefore, the action of the drama slows down, the difference in the level of linguistic ability is not maintained in different characters, what we get is shadowy poetic form, known and understood only by the poet.

On the other hand, as a part of Umashankar Joshi's '*Prachina*' takes recourse to dialogue mode, it creates an illusion of poetic drama. But dialogues don't make a drama. The theme develops in '*Prachina*' not as drama but as poetry, and if it is necessary, then the drama can resort to prose. There used to be dialogues in certain poems of 'Kant'. Hence, we can't say that the drama benefited from the poet and poetic drama came into being.

When there is atmosphere of like that of a fairytale, and the writer desires to depict the real on the basis of the imaginary, the spectator would not be shocked to listen to poetry from the characters. The different styling and costumes of the characters transport the spectators to a different time period. Therefore, he does not feel like questioning the propriety of poetry there.

We are yet to erase the distance between literary dramas and theatre. Hence, our poet is quite far away from the theatre. There is still some time before we see the true poetic drama. The writer of poetic drama will have to employ poetry as a competent medium

without sacrificing the drama, and while doing so, he will have to remain free from the temptation of writing poetry.

***Kavya no Anuvad* (Translation of Poetry)**

Is translation of a poem possible? Can one translate a poem? Some reply in negative to this. If take the word 'translation', can one translate a poem in one's language written by the other in another language? Can one faithfully transfer a poem in a language different from the one in which it was written? We will not enter into the discussion on what poetry is. We would accept one thing and that is language is employed in a distinctive way in poetry. Valerie had said to Mallarme that poetry means the invention of the new powers of language. This uniqueness of language is realized by poet in various ways. There are no rules for it. Every true poet has to walk on a new path. He moves forward after internalizing all the qualities of writing poetry. Thus, the difference of language becomes an important thing in poetry. A poet doesn't employ new words, but as if revives the words in the garb of his emotional makeup but creates new contexts for them. The language, which has definite and unambiguous signs, and is employed to achieve the worldly objectives, and organizes itself in the structure of subject, verb and object, this structure, and this relationship are of no use to a poet. The relationship among the lines in a poem is not ruled by grammar. It is realized by the mysterious rules of the consciousness of a poet. The coexistence of words is not enough;

the missing links are joined not by the right sentence components, but by the inner feeling of heart on the part of every reader by putting himself in the poet's emotional state with the help of empathy. However, it doesn't happen that way that the reader understands it what and the way the poet had wished to express. It is the nature of poetry that such an equation between the reader and the poet and in that lies the richness of poetry. It is safe to be suspicious of the poem about which we tend to think that we have completely understood it. Do you remember the incident related to the devil imprisoned in 'Arabian Nights'? We can take the bottle in our hands as long as the devil is inside the bottle, but the form it takes the moment you open the bottle, it leads you to think, how would the devil have gone inside that bottle? Same is the case with translation. When we try to unlock a poem from the bottle of one language and place it in another, it will assume such a shape that it will amaze you greatly.

Translations of poetry have been done and will be done, but it is a very arduous task. As there is atmosphere around earth, there is always atmosphere around a language, made of the sentiments of the people who use it. The moment you separate the language from that atmosphere, it will die. The translator of a poem must fathom what goes on in the creative process in the poet's consciousness; along with it, he should place himself in the atmosphere of the source language. Having realized this, he should find out similar emotional state in his own language, and translate the poem in its mould. Thus the translator should be ambidextrous enough to understand the culture

of two different languages and employ them accordingly. But that is not enough. The translator has to be a mere vehicle for that. He should be vigilant about the fact that the poem should not deviate from its course because of the limitation or distinctiveness of his personality.

Let's remind ourselves of what Govardhanram had to say regarding Navalram's translation of '*Meghdut*': 'Translation doesn't happen by removing Sanskrit attire from it and putting Gujarati clothes on it, but if one can imagine as to had Kalidas been a Gujarati and had he written in Gujarati, how would he have written, and writes as well as Kalidas, then that translation earns the status of an original work, and that is real translation. Lying in the different expressions, country, time period, way of life, colours of life and in events, reflection of the original image should be true to the original. The raving and ranting of people who wear saffron for the country doesn't become the voice of Hindus.'

This is an ideal. Like Ezra Pound, some believe in free creative translation. But, it requires high kind of creative genius. How free should that free translation be? This decision should be left to the competence of the translator.

At the end, let me note the spot of danger lying in the translation of poetry. Translator should invoke the rhythm that follows the source poem in his own language. For this, he should examine all the possibilities in his language. It is a misconception that if we

translate the musical work of Rabindranath in the rhythm of the work of Bhoja Bhagat, people would find it more familiar. The consciousness in both the works is different. Our attachment with the rhythms of Bhoja Bhagat is different. The translations of some of the songs of Rabindranath's '*Gitanjali*' in the style of popular *bhajans* (devotional songs) lead to some disagreements.

The limitations of translations are also obvious. In it, perhaps there is emphasis on the doctrine of adhering to the original. But rather than thinking about how an examiner would feel if he happens to examine the translation, one should think as to how much a reader, not exposed to Sanskrit, would be able to relish. The poetic nature, not the mechanical adherence, is significant. Where we fail to take care of this, it would be like ushering in a new clumsy, hybrid language.

Comparatively, there are fewer translations of poetry in our language. Every poet should consider translation of the works of the great poets as an important part of his poetic quest.

Gujarati Bhasha-Sahitya (Gujarati Language and Literature)

'Let those who wish to divide, do so, but the litterateurs keep themselves busy in striking harmony.'

Umashankar Joshi

The Gujarat that we eulogize by singing, 'Gujarat, you are mine', is a place where we had settled as outsiders. The territory today known as Gujarat was, till 940 A D, a part of the empire of the Gurjjar kings of Kanyakubj. Later on, the territory came under the reign of the Parmar kings of Dhara, but some part of Abu was then known as Gurjjar territory. The terms like Gujarat or Gurjaratra were until then used for the territories of contemporary Jodhpur and Jaipur, and Narana which belongs to contemporary Jaipur was its capital. Later after the Parmar empire was destroyed, Bhimdev Chalukya of Sarswat Mandal brought some of parts of contemporary Gujarat under one rule and created Gurjjarbhumi or Gurjjardesh as a political entity. In 1120 A D, Siddhraj Jaisinh made Anhillwad the capital of Gujarat, the state enriched by Rajputana and Marwad. Mulraj had added 'Gurjareswar' to his name. He was the heir of Gurjjar pratihar and his father was the Samant of the Gurjjaratra-due to either of these reasons, it is believed that he used that addition to his name. In Siddraj's time, the consciousness of distinctiveness as people of this region became clearer and literature complimentary to this was also written during this time. After coming under the Muslim rule, the contact of Gujarat with Rajput and Malva was cut off, hence, the literary and cultural traditions of Gujarati people became well-defined; the character of Gujarati, grew differently from what was a common Marugurjjar language of Rajputat and Malva.

The origin of Gujarati as a language is believed to be connected with the last level of the medium stage of what is called Indo-Aryan language family. According to one opinion,

the dialects of Abhir and other people residing in Sindh, Marwad, Malva, Aanart, Lat, Saurashtra and Kutchh were employed in literature and became known as derivative language. The dictionary and pronunciation of this derivative are of one kind and its grammar, of another kind. Thus, it is a composite language. As regards pronunciation and dictionary, it doesn't differ much from the language of day to day life. Visual words keep accumulating in derivative. Derivative ceases to be a synthetic language and becomes analytic kind of language. Its components changed over a period of time. Right in 11th century, Bhoj makes a mention of an derivative for Gurjjars, but its characteristics are not found noted anywhere. The samples of derivative given by Hemchandra contain some characteristics of Gujarati.

With the increase in the use of elementary Gujarati as literary language, the tendency to employ Sanskrit words in place of words from derivative is becoming prominent. Around 1350, the use of 'chhai' as auxiliary verb is well-known and then onwards, we have learnt how to employ auxiliary verbs. Due to the influence of derivative, words convenient for rhyme have also been employed in poetry. By 1500 A D, Patan ceased to be the centre of literary and political activities. Thus, by 1650, the form of Gujarati, as it is known to us now, was structured. Sanskrit writing continued but later on, to make an exhibition of grammatical rules and to please the patrons, works full of artificial brilliance were also written. Long works like that of Sanskrit epic continued till the era of derivative. Its structure became exceedingly rigid. The sparks of new talent were not

seen in the lifeless writings, same old narrative style, and increasingly religious-centric works. In the end, the relationship with that tradition became as good as nonexistent. Bhalan's attention was drawn towards the story of 'Kadambari', and he translated that tale by Baan in poetry so that those who are not conversant with Sanskrit can also relish it. He added knot in it, and also brought about the ease of wandering in the wilderness of Baan. But why wasn't Bhalan's attention drawn towards the dramatic works of Bhas, Kalidas, Bhavbhuti, Shudrak or Harsh? Why did drama as a form become extinct in medieval literature after Ramchandra's work? Anybody writing the history of literature is bound to come to this question? Muslim rulers were against idol worship, so they might not have found it religiously appropriate to present characters in human form in the theatre (historical, mythological or imaginary). Thus, one can safely assume that due to the lack of state patronage, theatre ceased to remain functional. However, people must not become completely averse to festivities in these times of political anarchy and instability. Fairs must have been there even at that time, and the various forms of dramas containing music, dance and enactment. We are well aware that before Narsinh, Asait had written of 360 appearances. But how long did the tradition of Asait last? Such texts which were at the level of folk literature didn't reach us as proper literary works.

It is assumed that the Ras and Garba came into being from hallik ras mentioned by Bhas and Lasya, learnt by Usha from Parvati. In ras, there was dance in a circle, accompanied by music. Rasda was derived from ras. The ras created by Jainas were long works of

single section. Tirthankaras, the monks possessing ideal character, are their theme. In the preceding forms of such aakhyan, 'kadva' and 'bhasha' were the parts of such a long work. Later on, other poets developed it as aakhyan.

Medieval literature is religio-centric; it gives us an impression that religion is the end and poetry is merely a means for it. In the Jain works, the sovereignty of religion is evident, but one can't say that the worldly pleasures are totally overthrown from there. Attachment comes first as abstinence is possible after attachment. Before attaining emancipation, as a part of the state of being, one has to pass through the worldly emotions, and on that note, there comes the reference to worldly emotions. In aakhyan, religion is not so dominant; however, it seems that the characters and the theme are also rooted in religious sentiments. Bhakti ras is the predominant ras, and so it relies on god and devotees. This much structure is set. But one can't deny the fact that these poets enjoyed the worldly pleasures in the garb of religion. The interesting tale of love-struck men and women has not been exiled from it; the female protagonist orchestrating the abduction of his lover with the help of his friend is also found there. Just that one needs to establish its relationship with god so that nobody can accuse him of anything, and the ways of god are mysterious, who has ever understood its mystery?

In the faguo (a form of poetry) of Jainas and the poetry pertaining to seasons and barmasio (a flower), our attention is drawn towards the beauty of nature. Neminath and

Rajul have proved quite useful to Jainas. They prove to be the reason for the full-fledged sensuality resulting in culmination. In 'Sirithulibadra Fagu', we are quite assured by the prostitute Kosha, the representative of the world, and description of rains, the stimulant for the invocation of sensuality. Let religious-minded be led to upasham. Without referring to religion, poets other than Jainas boldly describes spring in the tradition of 'Rutusamhar'. The intimacy of lovers is unhesitatingly shown to us. If any god is remembered therein, it is Cupid, the God of love. There is combined portrayal of sex and full-fledged sensuality. The figures of speech used in it are also suitable for the theme.

Moreover, there are tales eulogizing the brave exploits of historical characters as well. This exploit is deemed religious attainment in the tales of Jaina. But in 'Kanhadade', Padmanabh eulogizes the brave act of Kanhadade. As regards history, it weaves the love-tale of Piroja and Viram de. The marvellous is inserted in it by employing miracles. Moved by patriotism, the poet asks Lord Shiva, 'Padmnabh asks you, lord Shiva, where did your weapon go?

Apart from this, without indulging in religion or any such other thing, plenty of narrative literature is found which satisfies our desire for good literature. Some aspect interesting to people used to be mostly the theme of these stories. One story leads to the other, the other leading to another, and this is how the katha used to expand, and at its

centre remained a character like Vikram- this kind of a series of stories was more popular. The beautiful and the miraculous were the crowning rasas in these stories. The sensual leading to the marvellous is unique in terms of relish it offers. In the world, there are stories many births; *parakayapravesh* (spirit of one entering the body of the other) is also the natural aspect. Clues related to mystery are found in dreams, birds and animals also play a part in the realization of love, and there is sufficient scope for wit and valour. Ghosts or demons also enter this world. There is invitation to adventure at every step. Suffocated by the rigidity of their times, the people must have undoubtedly enjoyed the free atmosphere of this world of stories. Long winding descriptions and uninhibited exaggeration do figure but if we gauge this world with the narrow measurement of our likings, we are likely to find it exaggerated. But as we encompass the whole world on a map assuming the distances, if we can gauge the reality prevalent in this world of stories, the question of exaggeration would not arise.

Whether in katha or aakhyan, there is a face to face interface. Its relisher was not invisible or away but in front of him. Hence, the poet was not placed on such a high pedestal. The poet had to create the reservoir of knowledge also in his work. Hence, the worldly cycle is seen to be gliding right along the saga of love in 'Madhavanal Kamkandalprabandh'. Nothing is left out, including the characteristics of different castes of the times, food habits, customs related to marriage and other things, plants, vegetables, clothes. With the audience being in front of him, the writer had to combine

material instrumental to their upliftment. Hence, he uses the face to face narration, employs various ragas in order to make it melodious, and the note of musical instrument is also added to it. Moreover, as per his finesse, he adds the element of dialogue in it and bring out the dramatic hue embedded in it. Thus, due to all these reasons, aakhyan is not merely a poetic novel but becomes something more than a novel.

This was a discussion pertaining to ras, prabandh, aakhyan, katha and other longer narratives. Moreover, a number of lyric poetry was also written. In those times, writing poetry was not something you assume like clothes. A host of our poets and poetesses were saints and devotees. Poetry that was the direct expression of devotion inspired by love and the sect of god beyond the characteristics based on knowledge has become immortal by finding its way on the tip of the tongue of people across all time periods. The *bhajans* (devotional songs) of Narsinh, Mira's Padas, chhappas (a form of satirical stanzas developed by Akho) of Akho, Dhira's Kafi, Bhoja's chabkha (the satirical form made of stanzas), and Babu Saheb's Rajiya are some of examples. Upanishadik depth as a result of the honesty of experience and intensity in Narsinh, the craving of Mira to reach her lord, the satirical statements against the then society in the writings of Akho, the padas (songs) of Bhalan depicting the childhood of Krishna, the delectable garbis (religious songs addressed to Hindu goddess) of Dayaram- these are the wealth of our eternity. The poet inspired by knowledge tradition sang the message of Vedanta with

elation, as their experience. At times, it all may appear dry on the surface, but deep down it is rich with oasis of pure water. Beginning with Ved era, and going up to Upanishad, Bhagavad Gita, Bouddh–Sahajyan-Vajrayan Tantra, Vaishnav Sahajiya, Jaina pahud doha, the worship of Siddh and Nath, Sufi tradition and due which the North Indian Saint tradition that developed, the knowledge tradition has evolved in these stages. If the experience depicted in the poem is poet's first hand realization, it imparts the poem a new relish. The experience of the realization of the self finds expression in various symbols and allegories like horio and barmasi. There was an effort of depicting this experience in the form of the physical pleasure of the man-woman intimacy. A sympathetic satire on the weaknesses of the people living a worldly life invokes genuine humour. Literature written in this line still awaits recognition. All these poets have written works in Vraj-Oudhi mixed Hindi. Besides these two traditions, the saint poets of Swami Narayan sect have also contributed to the enrichment of poetry.

There was water in the beginning, and then earth emerged from it. In the same way, poetry appears first in the world of literature, prose comes later. It is not that prose didn't exist then. Prose works like 'Aradhana', 'Balshiksha' are found even way back in 13th century. Those works are mostly in the form of moral message. Within the limitations, Tarunprabhusuri brings out the literary qualities in the parables devised to impart the religious message. Manikyasundarsuri's 'Prithvichandracharitra' is a

detailed prose narrative. Although prose had newly found its individual existence from poetry, it couldn't leave the rhythm of poetry. Like a child who walks with anklet in his feet, the prose in 'Prithvichandracharitra' moves with the echo of the rhyme and rhythm of poetry. Narrative material appropriate for epic is also there in it. Like other works of its times, the author seems to have intended to make it a properly structured work. Apart from these two notable works, there have also been summary account or prose translations from narrative literature of 'Simhasanbatrisi', 'Sudabahoteri', 'Vaitalpachisi' etc. In prose literature other than narrative literature, the summary of 'Bhagavat' and 'Yogvasishth', translations of 'Gitgovind', paraphrases of 'Bhagavadgita' and 'Chanakyaniti', the prose commentary on Dayaram's 'Satsaiya', prose form of 'Vachanamrut', prose works informing about astrology and medicine, and works like 'Kalpasutra', 'Uttraddhyayan', 'Navatatva' and the balavbodho on Bhartuhari's three shatakas (volumes) are worth noting.

During the times of Dayaram, Peshavas were in decadence, Gayakwads ruled only a small part of Gujarat, but apart from that, the roots of British rule became stronger. Rammohan Roy was Dayaram's contemporary, Durgaram Mehta's Manavdharmasabha was established during the last decade of Dayaram's life, Dalpatram's Bapanipar was also written during Dayaram's life (1845). It is believed that Dayaram had also gone to Mumbai in 1850 and after one year of that, a young Narmad had read his first prose article titled 'Mandali Malvathi Thata Labh' in the Buddhivardhaksabha in Mumbai. In

spite of all this, Dayaram remained the last representative of his era, he remained nearly untouched by the new age.

Let's remember our ancestors, the devotee of literature, with veneration: Premanand, who resolved and realized his goal of elevating the Gujarati language, fallen to lower ranks, by means of his competence as a writer; Narmad, who devoted himself to writing; Govardhanram, the writer of Sarswatichandra, who abandoned thumping business by free will and retired to serve literature: these devotees of literature will always remain the source of inspiration for the new generations of Gujarati litterateurs.

After the British rule was established, due to the advent of education system, the link with Sanskrit tradition was revived. The window opened for the introduction to the English literature. As a result, first of all poetry grew. According to the old tradition, Narmad and Dalpat are inspired to write works like 'Rukaminiharan', 'Vajesangh ane Chandba' and 'Vencharitra', but abandon I on finding it inconvenient. Vraj makes an influence on Dalpat, so he is drawn towards the technicalities of writing that kind of poetry. Narmad has more leaning towards modernity. He was keen to write epic and he carried out that experiment in '*Hinduo ni Padti*' (Downfall of Hindus) but he was also aware of his limitations. Such a vigilant critical approach (however flawed) towards his writings was one of the unique qualities of Narmad. Different from Sanskrit writings and influenced by English poetry, he gave poems full of nature description. In the

backdrop of nature description, we can see the poet's sensibility taking shape. The insight and competence of these two poets had not reached the level of internalizing the true richness of Sanskrit and English writings. Moreover, the work of commenting upon social reform and the then social issues and enlightening people was also the responsibility of poetry at that time.

The work of prose still used to be carried out by poetry. The understanding which underlined prose as 'the inner delight' and poetry as 'the force of emotions' was a limiting factor in Narmad. In Dalpatram, inner force or intense emotion was not the foundation of creative effusions. Hence, most of the poems remain limited in their appeal. When the intention is to entertain the people, they indulge in superficial play of words or wit. The indirect message in them is the real source of poetic beauty, which is absent in Narmad. Yet, the historical fact remains that it was these two poets who gave shape to the edifice of modern poetry.

English Poetry didn't affect the style of composition the way it influenced the themes. At this stage, Gujarati poetry is not competent enough to realize the richness of Sanskrit tradition. However, Dalpatram keeps appearing and reappearing in newer ways up to the modern day poetry. The poetry of Navalram, the contemporary of Dalpat and Narmad, seem to be more neat, neither there is any inclination in him towards play of words. He did write some humorous poems to preach the society. Navalram translated

Kalidas' *'Meghdut'*. Our contemporary Bengali, Marathi and Hindi poetry have, till today, not accepted the Sanskrit elements.

In the later period, there seems to be the influence of Sanskrit, English as well as Farsi on the poetry of Balashankar, Manilal Dwivedi, and 'Kalapi'. Balashankar began writing poetry in the style of Dalpat, and later while translating '*Saundaryalahari*', came under Sanskrit influence and went through the phase of Farsi influence along with Manilal and 'Kalapi'. In addition to this, English influence was also there. For this reason, Sudaram calls him the precursor of modern poetry. The Farsi influence disappears and reappears only in 'Patil'. The ability to employ the Sanskrit elements shows in Balashankar. The sagacity of Kant is also seen here. There are qualities of '*Saundaryalahari*' in 'Kalantkavi'. However, the poem expressing deep feelings towards beloved, poetry, and goddess 'Jagadamba' is a significant landmark in our literature. Manilal gave us the thought-provoking poems on the spiritual concerns and our poetry acquired the depth to express the seriousness and profundity.

There was intensity of emotion and truthfulness in 'Kalapi' but he didn't have the patience to carve out a proper shape for his poems. His innocent disposition is the real charm of his poems. 'Kalapi' also appears in our poetry at times.

In 'Kant', we find the realization of the tangible form of emotions. We inherited from him one of the finest lyric poems of our language. He was successful in identifying the

Sanskrit elements and realizing them as per the requirement. He had the ability to create appropriate context for the emotion and invoke enough sagacity by presenting an object in relation to various senses.

Under the influence of English nature poems, Narsimhrav gave us some simple nature poems. True qualities of poetry are lying in the nivapanjalis (homage) in '*Smaransamhita*'. But the influence of the style of poetic composition is not felt in them.

Nanalal also found meter unnecessary and he employed 'Dolanshaili' (a style of writing), but in doing so, he couldn't keep the flaws like pomp, unidimensional exposition and pointless descriptions. He had the richness of imagination but it gets dispersed in a kind of formlessness. The expression of the illusory grandeur of emotions does not make an impact on readers. At times, what is expected to take an extraordinary shape by the means of poetic composition doesn't do so, hence, in spite of all the hue and cry by the poet, it ultimately remains ordinary. But whenever he could keep from the flaws, he has given our poetry what no other poet has been able to do. His lively, delicate songs depicting warmth of relationships, and poems in which he has employed the pleasant feel and finesse of colloquial language and the familiar rhythm of folk songs are our true wealth.

Due to the excesses of unnecessary musicality, shallow and weak emotions and idealistic sentiments, there was negative influence on poetry, hence, as a reaction to all

this, B K Thakore recommended unsingable poetry full of depth and thoughtfulness. In the unsingable poem, he commendably employed the meter, '*Prithvi*' in a poem titled, '*Aarohan*' (Ascent). Depth and density emerged in his poetry. Where his poetry doesn't enforce him in it, poems like '*Premno Divas*', '*Virah*' (Pain of Separation) and '*Mitraprem*' (Love of a Friend) bring out exemplary fruition of this style of composition. Wherever he consciously used drab style of composition, complex or odd grammatical forms, and disconnected and joined words at a whim, and could not do justice to the relevance of the theme of poetry, poetry as a whole suffered. His sonnets have greatly contributed to popularizing sonnet as a form. After Narmad and Dalpat, the second phase of development of poetic composition began with B K Thakore. At times, he also penned some poems resembling empty structures, emphasizing depth of thought but devoid of any extraordinary beauty of composition. For poets after 1930s, he was deemed the head of the poet-family.

Apart from these four poets, some relatively lesser poets like 'Khabardar' also contributed, within their own limitations, to our poetic literature.

Due to the interaction with the western culture and since the times of Durgaram Mehta, an endeavour had begun to bring clarity regarding our timeless cultural values, and re-examine them by placing them in new context. As a result of the same, Narmad's prose, as we know it today, came into being. Reformist and preservation activities went on

parallel to each other. The change that occurred in the thinking of Narmad regarding reformation in the later part of his life is well-known to everyone, and it is highly suggestive that he called the composed, stoic and philosophical Manilal Dwivedi as his successor. The not-so-mature prose of Narmad acquires the competence of giving expression to the profound issues. Anandshankar took this development forward and as a result, we inherit from him rich essays as fruition of contemplation on oriental and western traditions. These thinkers not only provided the context of values for the life as it was, but they also prepared suitable foundation for the value system.

In this way, the ground was prepared for the creation of '*Saraswatichandra*'. In it, we saw for the first time the human dealings at different stages with the inner world of characters possessing different mindsets. Due to the fundamental contemplation on the new context, one could see the thinking of the author regarding life working in the background. This author didn't benefit from the findings of Freud but he did dare to enter the world of the dreams beyond their consciousness. The ideal world of the author presents itself in the dreams of characters. Like some many-headed deity of ancient age, this text strives to pronounce the mystery of life in many ways. The impressions inherent on the psyche of its well-oriented author were also made use of in the text. Transcending the limited boundary of the future of its characters, we find the vision of not only of the future of India, but of the whole world. We can see the glimpse of

Sevagram in Kalyangram. More than its artistic value, this text would remain respectable for the deep contemplation over life on the part of the author.

During this time, Vivekanand travels across the country. He had met Manilal, the author of Rajyog in Nadiad. In the meantime, the British Empire acquired surer footing and people began to experience the state of slavery. What followed was an outburst of patriotism. Efforts were on to channelize this force in the proper direction.

Around this time, Gandhiji returned to India after carrying out the experiment of satyagraha in South Africa. He remained a positive force for the whole nation. In the context of real situation, he pondered over the fundamental issues of the country. There was close tie between this thinking and the implementation. Practiced in the day to day life, dharma was realized. The message of '*Gita*' to have warmth even for the demons and the teachings of Buddha to develop, not bitterness, but love for one's enemy were seen to have been realized in Gandhi's life. Values like wholehearted sympathy crossing the narrow boundaries, compassion, non-violence, sincerity and selfless work-these made and impact on the life of people. Gandhi himself put all these values in front of people in his unpretentious but powerful prose. Till today, as a source of inspiration moulding our vision of life, these values have ceaselessly influenced us. Its deep impact on literature written afterwards is of extraordinary significance.

There was another impact of this. A lot of writings emerged which had borrowed those Gandhian values without the inner conflict of reaching those values and proffered their repeated pronouncements. Gandhi had emphasized on restraint but its excess resulted in a lot of needless exactitude. The leaning towards goodness resulted in incompetent niceties; rigidity of principles also became evident in some or the other fields. In spite of these limitations, the thinker who contemplated over Gandhian teachings reached some fine value judgments, and as all this was not divorced from the reality around them, it continued to have its impact as a positive force on the life of the people in a very subtle way. In a new form, this thinking has continued by the ideas of Vinoba and the interpretations of the same.

As a complimentary force to Gandhian thought, the influence of Rabindranath has also contributed. The constant contact with nature, the vision to look at rural life not just as a social activist but also as a devotee of beauty, the acceptance of happiness as a fundamental value, the appreciation of the way of life which emphasizes that living well itself can turn into an art, the education system that nurtures the creativity in people, and hence the higher priority to fine arts such as music, dance, painting, architecture etc-these are the components which saved us from the unnecessary narrow-mindedness which could have crept into our thinking.

The impact of Sri Aurobindo's vision of life is not felt so much. Three poets-Sundaram, Pujalal and Prajaram came under his direct influence. We can find the interpretation to this effect from the works of Ambalal Purani and the tri-monthly, '*Dakshina*'.

Due to the advent of Communism, the compassion for the Dalits took a new turn. But its philosophical implications didn't go to the depths of literary works; hence, there were works which touched only the surface of the reality. Then, at times, there was excess of insistence on communicating the vision, and at times, the theme became merely a pretext and by that pretext, a poetic essay of ideas was conveyed. However, there were also memorable works like, '*Atma na Khander*', '*Ann Brahm*', '*Virat Pranay*', '*Kavyapranash*' and '*Dhruvpad Kyanhi*' which offered a proper combination of emotions and thoughts.

The influence of Freud's psychological insights also began to be felt in poetry and novels. Poets began to freely discuss physical intimacy of lovers in the subjective poems. Human body, which was the foundation of happiness in Sanskrit literature, again came to the fore in the poetry of poets like Sundaram. But a number of poems in the name love poetry also sang the glory of weak, unhealthy and shallow human emotions and antics.

The new generation of poets that came after the Second World War moved way away from the world of Govardhan Ram and Nanlal, enamored by emotions. All the values

got lost in the heap of debris of created by the war. Hence, disorientation and dejection arose but in place of helplessness or directionlessness, what we could see was sharp satire and angry ridicule. This tendency is seen in the works of Nirranjan Bhagat and Hasmukh Pathak ('Prawal Dwip' and 'Nameli Sanj'). Coming out of the romantic orbit of emotion and avoiding the artificial style of writing poetry, these texts employ the rhythm of prose in the structure of poetry. These new writers use figures of speech not just to embellish but to sharpen the edge of the satire and to communicate the experience they wish to in an effective manner. New insight of musicality of poetry, ability to create the rhythm appropriate for the meaning, insistence on creating difficult images, tendency to concretize the abstractions and symbolism can be considered some of the other characteristics of this generation. However, some of the poems depicting the clash of the relevant and the irrelevant or poems which were written under the spell of modernity, full clever wordplay didn't prove always useful. Symbols also arrest our attention by being excessively blown out, instead of being employed as the inseparable part of the whole poem. At times, poets fail to create the structure of the poem which can carry the weight of a symbol. Writing poetry in the style of writing prose has now come to the point of becoming clichéd. It high time that some new adventurous mind made a departure from this set structure.

There began a reaction against the insistence on making poetry singable. Poets like Rajendra Shah, Balmukund Dave, Venibhai Purohit, Priyakant Maniyar and Harindra

Dave wrote a good number of singable poems. To employ the phrases similar to that of the folk songs, the manner of using old symbols in the new context and at times, the use of Rajasthani, Marwadi, or Hindi style of writing are some of the characteristics of these poems. It is difficult to sustain the poetic loftiness in such poems.

Very few poets like Harishchandra Bhatt or Patil could write without losing the individuality as a poet. It seems that the tendency to completely blend with the flow remains in vogue due to average kind of creativity.

Along with all this, ghazal and muktaks (a single stanza of four lines) which make an impact in the shows and poet meets were also written. But it doesn't seem that the foundation for the best creations of this kind has yet been put in place.

By the study of the Western narrative literature, our narratives developed considerably. Making its way through detective mystery and history etc, novel reached up to '*Sarawatichandra*'. After that, its impact was such that even K M Munshi found it difficult to write social novels. Hence, some of our novelists kept exploiting the historical novel as a genre. How rich our history is! Saraswatichandra experiences all this, but he is not at the centre of action anywhere; as a disinterested witness to things, he observes whatever happens around him. This passivity of the protagonist was resolved in Munshi's novels. The distinctive character of Gujarat itself is at the place of the female protagonist. In this world full of dynamic and ambitious characters, he also

made use of the sensuous, the marvellous and the vulgar to a good extent, but even Munshi's creative genius was not able to avert the unidimensional nature of his novels. Chunilal V Shah wrote novels with more faithfulness towards history. But the element of art is inadequate in them. Dhumketu's historical novels rely more on the emotions.

Ramanlal V Desai wrote the novel (*'Divyachakshu'* (Divine Eyes)) reflecting the sentiments of Gandhian era. Even at the expense of the unity of time, he portrayed the emotions in *'Pralay'* (Doom) and *'Bharelo Agni'* (Hidden Fire). After Govardhanram, the legacy of social novel continued in Ramanlal. He also wrote humorous novels like *'Bansari'* and *'Patralalasa'*, and a story like *'Purnima'* on a subject which was not hitherto explored. He, too, could not achieve anything significant in terms of the development of novel. Some of the novels of Gunvantraai Acharya are noteworthy in so far as they introduce our literature to the new world of the adventures of sea. Pannalal Patel and Ishwar Petlikar gave us janpadi novel. Pannalal Patel's *'Valamana'*, *'Malela Jiv'*, *'Manavini Bhavai'* and *'Bhangya na Bheru'* are some of the significant contributions to this genre. But he also couldn't keep from the flaw of repeating himself. The social reformer in Pitamber and Petlikar crushed the artist and moved forward and therefore, his art of writing novels couldn't make considerable progress. Meghani depicted the life of Saurashtra in his novels. In his distinctive style, he introduces us to that world in *'Liludi Dharti'*. In spite of the enthusiasm to experiment, his novels fail to cross the threshold of the old tradition of writing novels. Even, *'Darshak'*'s writing invites a few flaws because

of getting carried away in emotions. The sensibility inspired by the Gandhian thought is the driving force behind his characters. Like Saraswatichandra, his Satyakam lives life like a disinterested observer. He becomes the witness to the things that have happened around him. Shivkumar Joshi and Chandrakant Bakshi pay more attention towards writing modernist works rather than maintaining the literariness in the works. Novel is a popular form of literature. Hence, some find it difficult to transcend the boundaries of entertainment. To meet the demand, piles of novels are being written but looking at the possibilities that this form has thrown open in the west, I feel like saying that we have considerably lagged behind.

One can say that our novella began, in the true sense, with Dhumketu's '*Tankha*'. Characters from the lower ranks, whimsical artists, and extraordinary men and women were seen in his novellas. On some occasions, he could create the impact of atmosphere too. But too much leaning towards the tragic, sentimentality and the dilemma of the tragic characters proved to be the downside of it. At times, this emotion proved to be the outer layer of the writer's personal prejudice, and we are fed up of parade of characters intoxicated with this thinking. After this, by joining together the two links- the tendencies of the characters and situations arising out of them- Ramnarayan Pathak unraveled the mystery of writing an incident. In the story of '*Mukundrai*', we got acquainted with what is truly tragic. He used different narrative techniques. He also portrayed the criminal mindset. Gulabdas Broker tried to bring out the mystery of the

life of apparently simple middle class with artistic restraint. As per his competence, he too tried to make it all worth the relish by presenting the conflict of contradictory inclinations of a character. Due to reasons like the uniform straight narrative style, the little scope for suggestion and the lack of variety in theme and style of writing, his novellas didn't go beyond two volumes. Sundaram and Umashankar also gave some of the best novellas.

Writers like Bhavanishankar Vyas, Bakulesh and Jayant Khatri also gave some beautiful works of this form. And just because they differ from the common minimum denominator, they shouldn't be ignored. Jayanti Dalal gave some novellas, containing, at times, sharp sensibility, taking recourse to satire and at times, bringing out new possibilities with deep sense of humanism.

As there are numerous magazines publishing stories, there is a flood of short stories. But many of them prove to be short-lived. At such a juncture, some writers are carrying out notable experiments with seriousness and artistic sense. The contribution of Madia in this field is noteworthy. Now, efforts are on to ensure that the incident depicted in the story remains symbolic, artistic restraint, broadness and depth. There are novellas written now, depicting one of the pictures of mental processes. Newer styles of our prose are coming to the fore in our novellas.

In the sphere of drama, literature and theatre have not been able to come close to each other beyond a point. Dramas beginning with the mixed impact of Sanskrit and English turned towards Nalalal's emotional dramatic style. Being restricted in the theatre's set structure of entertainment, they couldn't attain any literary value on the other hand. In this sphere, Chandravadan Mehta made some noteworthy experiments. He even tried to develop the possibilities of *Bhavai*, the folk drama, into a modern context. The effort to rescue the old theatre has not been able to come out of the sentimentality. We don't have as yet the finesse to translate the reality of life in dramatic form. That is why, many struggles, disharmony and dilemmas have not been dramatized well.

In the sphere of *ekanki* (one-act play), the experiments of Umashankar Joshi and Jayanti Dalal are noteworthy. '*Saap na Bhara*' has become a memorable contribution to our *ekanki* literature. We should now at least do away with the illusion that when we make changes in a short story, it takes the form of *ekanki*.

Contemplation-Criticism-Research

Essays don't seem to develop as a form as much as Pandit era. In spite of enriched by the wealth of Sanskrit writings, Kakasaheb's prose doesn't get crushed by the weight of the Sanskrit edifice. The reason for that is the child-like wonder in him. Some of the Gandhian thinkers have given us prose that may be without any ornamentation but establishes thoughts on a high pedestal. Swami Anand's prose exhibits a different kind

of colloquial elegance. In addition to this, enriched with undercurrents and indulging in witticism, Jyotindra Dave's prose also sometimes spellbinds the readers.

In the field of criticism, the scholarliness, sincerity, and watchfulness of Sakshar era are not seen any more. In place of that, a kind of lifeless friendliness to all and practicality are found everywhere. Not such niceness or arrogance, which is the other end of it, but only fearless loyalty to truth can prove useful to criticism. The facility to obtain the orientation into the western literary criticism has become better, but we have not yet developed the insight required to employ the acquired knowledge in the contemporary context in an efficient manner. We are not yet able to raise the right questions and even when they do arise, and if there is even slight hue and cry, they hide themselves behind our good-natured silence. Our magazines have not been able to sustain the tradition of 'Vasant' and 'Kaumudi'. When we are not able to carry out unbiased scrutiny of literature, whatever fashion is in vogue becomes the real value in terms of interpretation.

Research has yet not come out of the primary level, the trend of classical reading of old texts. We have yet to ponder over some of the fundamental questions of the process of relishing and writing a work, moulding the culture of reading, and the social context. The contemporary literature is still not attaining as much as nurturing as it should from folk literature. The interpretation of folk literature has now begun to be done in a more

methodical fashion. But we have yet to acquaint ourselves with the life style and literature of the people residing in our surrounding forests. When that happens, their exile shall come to an end, and our literature shall acquire more competence.

***Yojakstatra Durlabh* (The Creative Artist Eludes Us)**

We need to discuss two issues here. Is today's novel turning lifeless because it has become story-less? Is the lack of novelty the other reason for this lifelessness?

I do think that our novels are becoming lifeless, but for a different reason. I don't believe that its story-less state is the reason for its lifeless. In fact, I think that our novels are too reliant on story and hence, we have not been able to create a new ambience for the realization of the new possibilities of this form. Has Anandvardhan also not opined the same way, saying, without a clear objective, what will you gain? The mere ritual of writing would become very easy. But we need to discriminate between the wonder for the ritual and the relish of a literary work. Banbhatt must have named his narrative *Kadambari*, keeping the character Kadambari figuring in it. Most of the people expect this intoxicating element in the novel. As such delight equivalent to realization of god is the fundamental objective of poetry, but there is considerable distance between this intoxication and delight equivalent to realization of god.

It is easy to narrate a story. But a truly good novelist utilizes the story as a trope and creates something else. Story is merely a support for the real edifice of the novel. But there is a trouble with the novel. Like drama, it becomes the source of entertainment of people with different tastes. Hence, it is categorized in two types-literary and non-literary. A novel, published periodically or sold on railway stalls, is read by masses and yet it is devoid of literary elements. The tragic situation today is such that in order to meet the demand of the masses, the writers of literary novelists are also diverting towards the non-literary kind. There is nothing else except story in this kind of novels. This novel is not such that gives you the trouble to make you transcend the threshold of your world. Their characters are of that type whom you might cross on the roads. Along with this, a little good sentiment here and there is all that is needed. If you take away the crutches of story from these novelists, they wouldn't be able to walk one step more. But as a true writer has the ambition to realize newer possibilities of the form, the reader also wishes to gain a lot from one page of a novel.

The context of the novel should be such that it doesn't limit the world of the novel but it should be able to give new circles emanating from the centre. The real story is created by the actions of the characters. This action brings out the tendencies of the characters. Through these tendencies, we get a glimpse of the complex infinity of human nature. Here, we need to think of one thing: can I write a novel simply by relying on my quota of experience and understanding and teasing people with all that, and by wrapping

everything in bright colours? I don't find any truth in it. In arranging the stockpile of my experience and beautify it with good language deducts the element of creativity from the process of writing. If one has acquired command over writing, it wouldn't take time in writing a stunning number of books. But something more than this is needed and this element is missing from our novels and hence, our novels are turning lifeless.

Then, what is this element? It would be difficult to give it a proper name but let's make an effort. We experience a lot of things or we can imagine. But that is raw material. We need to process it in order to transform it into a literary work. I would say, this process is that of structure. There is no doubt in what is one and unique, but there is no relish in it either. But the moment the many emerge out of the one, the question arises as regards the interrelationship of the various parts of the whole. The value or mystery of the relationship that comes out is because of the way a writer processes it. What James Joyce has communicated in *Ulysses* would not have been possible if he had not communicated it the way he did. There are numerous possibilities in this structuring and that is the reason how this new structure keeps revealing new mystery. I feel that the creative endeavours to conceptualize newer contexts based on the happenings of the world or the experiences of day-to-day life and represent them in newer ways are missing from our novels because the novelist himself is absent in the novel. He hands over the whole process of writing to one of the characters who comes across as common minimum denominator of the reader's tastes. That is why we haven't grown tired of

borrowing narratives from history. We have written stories, have given voice to the life and times of a certain community or race with the noble intention of social service, or we managed by borrowing some sentiments from saints but the true deity has remained elusive till date.

The protagonists of our novels inherited the passivity of Govardhanram's *Saraswatichandra*. We haven't known how to create the character of the protagonist according to the kind of emotions he invokes. Hence, we managed half of it by 'glorious' descriptions and half of it by senseless repetitions of emotions, happening in the subconscious or the unconscious state. As much possible, we relied on repetitive raw material. We inserted a lot of things in the novel from the outside world but we could extract very little from it. For this reason, only historical characters could carry out the work because history had already taken the work from them. Even their work could not take us to the depth of their consciousness; at times it all couldn't move beyond the level of running around and anarchy. Social novels also reduced themselves to the historical account of our social life. After 250 years, of course if it survives that long, it would help some fake researcher in terms of providing information on our social life. We became sentimental since Pandit era. Instead of emotions taking shape in a novel, the protagonist of the novel takes the flag of emotions and leads the other characters as if in the procession. Since we accepted emotions before writing, conflict was used only as a trick. Its driving force was not seen in the world of novel. The

writers couldn't even create the profundity so that the seriousness of characters can be created. The gravity pulls us and we manage to keep the balance. Therefore, we remain consciousness of our weight. In the world of novel, the writer couldn't create anything of that sort, and tried to make it up by the excesses of emotions. Our ethical prejudices limited the boundaries of our sensitivity and because we forgot that the true relish of a work is not of emotions but of the new forms arising out of emotions, we employed the wrong standards of judging a work such as judging the good or poor quality of a work by the good or poor emotions it portrays.

Now let's discuss novelty factor. Every one of the texts by a good writer is new because he knows that imitation of other or self proves destructive. If nothing new is created, why should he indulge in the childish act of repetition of that work? But for us, novelty means the novelty of subject, not of literary form or structure. Hence, when some writer depicts the smuggling on any port and such crimes or when somebody writes on the extramarital affair with his friend's wife and provokes sexual impulses, our critics are eager to pat the shoulder of that writer. Portrayal of rural life was a new subject once upon a time but now there is no novelty in it. There is no artistic sense in this kind of desperate efforts so they don't bring any result in terms of the development of novel as a form. If only novelty of subject were to be considered important, Shakespeare would have breathed his last before long!

Our novel is lifeless because the novelist is absent from it as a creator. The critics of narrative literature don't yet seem to have had an intense realization of this fact. Criticism is not as much partial to narrative literature as it is to poetry. The lack of this consciousness has also hampered the development of novel. Even literary criticism of '*Saraswatichandra*', at least for the sake of it, is still not found till date. And our lecturers have been teaching that text for years to the graduates and post graduates!

In the course of development of any literary form, one stage comes when one begins to feel that a new creative genius should rise to realize the new possibilities of this form. The only difference is that when literary criticism of the age is not watchful enough, this is felt a little late. The individual who takes the first few steps in this direction has to move forward by giving a jolt to the popular notions of the characteristics of this literary form. At such a juncture, the puritans would denounce it saying, 'This is not a novel'. The language of this veneration is ready, we are just waiting for the rise of the new creative genius.

Kavita no Prachar? (Expanse of Poetry)

Before around three years, young poets of Kolkata had carried out the 'Read Poetry' campaign. At first, this would sound ridiculous to many. Can there be a publicity of poetry. But in reality, that campaign is not so ridiculous. If we accept the significance of the vision to see and enjoy the world that poetry, art-the creative activities give us, we would not deem the insistence on relishing literature and art ridiculous. If we don't place the vision of looking at life with wonder, cheer and serenity against the rising rigidity and disappointment in people, the cultural dimension of people's lives would become increasingly inferior. Society should make optimum utilization of individual possessing the vision of relishing literature and art. By the study of literature, our tastes and the ability to take in an experience would be cultivated. Due to this, the tensions prevalent in the relationships of people and enthusiasm will replace indifference.

It is truly a tragic incident that we have to defend poetry by explaining its utility. The litterateurs and thinkers of the country and abroad are getting apprehensive about the future of poetry: before three months, Herbert Read described in 'Encounter' the modern phase of English poetry as 'the age of twittering machines'; in his book 'Hazard of Modern Poetry', Erich Heller minutely diagnosed the contemporary condition of poetry. In his annual lecture, 'The Poet's Task', C. Day Lewis has discussed what could be the responsibility of a poet in the contemporary situation of poetry. It would suffice if we state that humanity is living right by the side of death. It may seem that worrying over the future of poetry at a juncture when it is a life and death situation for humanity

is like worthless indulgence in oratory. But nonetheless, we feel that one should seriously think about this. Nowadays, we are witnessing a good output of poetry. A good number of poems by new poets have been published in indefinite '*Kavita*' and '*Sanskriti*'. Looking at that, some thoughts cross my mind as regards the path that poetry would take.

Gujarati poetry is not obscure in the way the poetry of Eliot or Dylan Thomas is. So-called 'thought-provoking' poetry also has not created any new mode of consciousness. It doesn't seem that the situation has arisen that the poet has to inevitably create a new mode of expression for what he wishes to communicate. Our poet has not yet achieved the finesse to enter some mysterious world of experiences and spin an exciting yarn of adventure. Hence, he manages with the help of moribund symbols. Looking at it in one way, poetry is the activity of discovering and realizing new possibilities. The real poet is one for whom the true objective is to discover a distinct medium of expression from the traditional system of language. Even if we examine today's poetry, we would feel that very few poets have felt the necessity for such an endeavour. The main reason for this is that our poets have not taken up the adventure of exploring the unknown and the mysterious. Poetry, too, is ultimately an adventure. While writing a poem, all the contours of a poet's consciousness are changed. At the end of each creation, the poet reinvents himself. In this sense, J B Leishman, Rilke's competent translator, calls Rilke 'the perpetual beginner'. The effect of change makes an impact on the reader as well.

Thought-provoking poetry also proves competent, not by its logical meaning, meaning but the substance underlying the whole poem. We should not get disturbed by the unknown and the mysterious referred to above. This is a reference to the mysterious to express which one has to create new possibilities in words. Our poetry is not able to offer any new dimension or firmament of experience. It seems that we are paying attention only to some of the details, considered the characteristics of modernity. Our poet has lost his individual and distinctive style. His emotions prove to be didactic bias alone. When he talks about frustration, he seems to be comfortably rolling in the shadow of Eliot's 'Wasteland'. Our poet is oscillating between the two extremes: on the one hand, the facile despair and on the other hand, the cheap, borrowed sentimentality as an echo of something. He at times consciously tries to bring superficial contemporaneity as well. Without understanding the essence of meter, some modern poets take undue liberty with it and make poetry worse by the tyranny of inappropriate rhyme. Sufficient examples are found in 'Kavita'. One poet calls his heart *nani narghi* (a tiny entity) and consequently, the beloved or the female protagonist in the poem has to bear with a title like *pola inda mukti marghi* (a hen giving fragile eggs), and to hatch the eggs the protagonist of the poet is not ready. It doesn't become poetic simply by writing something shocking. Driven by rhyme, poetry as such also reaches the boundaries of impropriety. Wladimir Weilde has carried out a good diagnosis of it in 'The Dilemmas of Arts': 'As soon as the intensity of personal creation becomes enfeebled, art plunges

into banality of arbitrariness-two extremes which are equally hostile to it.' Modern poets are still in search of a suitable meter for what they have to say, because it is a fashion to continue to be in quest. Nowadays, it seems *paramparit harigit* (traditional devotional songs), *zulana* (folk songs) and *gulbanki*, are more frequently used. No competent poet has brought out the possibilities of these meters. On the contrary, things like prosaic rhythm, unsuitable descriptions, exhibition of logic, play of words, calligraphic tricks, and effort to strike novelty by the use of brackets seem to be increasingly practiced. We don't get to see compressed metaphors or an image that would be engraved in our memory.

Keats pronounced a simple yet great truth about poetry: 'That which is creative must create itself'. Poetry should come as naturally as Nature creates water or fruit. A mechanical whole is created by putting together the disparate parts but poetry cannot be created by carving out a few things smartly around borrowed or traditional experience. This experience should come as one of the extraordinary events of the poet's consciousness. The difference between construction and creation should remain clear in the poet's mind. When a poet's whole consciousness is not involved in an act of creation, the poem wouldn't be able to touch the whole existence of its readers. Hence, 'participation of total man' is an inescapable condition of creation. Insincerity at that is unacceptable.

And obscurity! I came across one obscure poem in '*Kavita*'. One can understand the meaning in this way-remove the heap of luggage from the room and then ask why there is no echo possible. But the poet doesn't throw light on what he intends to suggest by this and what the context of the conversation is. There is a world of difference between the obscurity of this poem and Rilke's

Rose, oh pure
contradiction, delight
of being nobody's sleep
under so many lids.

We may not be able to put into words the essence that Rilke's lines express as a result of the passive attention but we can understand it in the heart of our hearts. To be honest, the question of obscurity doesn't arise in our poetry. Obscurity arises by weaving together subtle thoughts that we can't understand easily or sometimes by the use of symbols other than what we are used to see or by striking a new meaning in the words which are used in a set fashion. The obscurity arising due to these three reasons doesn't become an obstacle in the way of relishing poetry. If we realize that the poet had to resort to these three modes, we should not blame the poet. But if the poet brings about obscurity knowingly in order to pretend to offer something extraordinary, it would prove to be unbearable. If the thoughts in a poem don't become one with the poem, and seems to hold the exercise of thinking, but it doesn't have 'the sensation of thinking', this mode of writing affected by thinking becomes an obstacle in the way of relishing a

poem. Before using poetry rather than prose, the poet should think whether prose truly lacks the competence to express what he has to say. A lot of poetry-clad essays, lacking the touch of the beauty of a poet's consciousness and resorting to substandard symbols, would be found in our poetry. In the desperate effort to avoid the musical element, we did lose the delicate nature of poetry, and we could not offer anything in the name of ruminations except platitude. When a critic brings a fashion and the poet desirous of fame follows it, such a situation arises. When a poet, instead of accomplishing a way of expression carved with his individuality, creates mannerism which would eventually prove to be an obsession, and this poetry is published, its limitations come to the fore quite clearly.

It is truly astonishing situation that we still appreciate pseudo-poems, equating them with true poetry. The reason why we are getting used to limitations like this and others is that we are consciously cultivating a wrong sense of satisfaction. At this juncture, criticism of poetry has reached its lowest level. Due to the growing obsession for the picturesque use of language in criticism, the smartness to connive at the ground reality is being cultivated. We are not able to find a satisfactory analysis of the work of a writer whose contribution is deemed noteworthy. Coating with theatrical words the opinions that the previous generation of critics had made us memorize, we pronounce our opinions. As a result of this, we are further delaying the time of true evaluation of the poetry of poets like B K Thakore. At times, drawing attention to the other ancillary and

subsidiary aspects, instead of the true nature of poetry, it seems that at times, literary criticism avoids the main responsibility.

In the editorial note to '*Sanskriti*' of the last May, Umashankar Joshi raised a question, 'Why doesn't anyone desire to critically evaluate the poetry or say the whole literature of the time period of twenty-five years from 1930 to 1955?' The common people as such are getting averse and indifferent to poetry, now there is no way but to accept the deplorable fact that even the authentic scholars have also been avoiding the criticism of poetry! Now, Gujarat has two universities of its own. If they decide so, they can encourage such an extensive study. But we still don't have the equipment for that. The contemporary poetry of other regions, the comparative study of the tendencies and factors in English, French and German poetry, the true concept emerging after the study of the best poetry of the world- all this is needed for the above-stated study. The modern poetry is sidelined in a corner, what to say of the study of the poetry of other region or country! At this juncture, the question of teaching literature in university also calls for serious contemplation. If we will not place emphasis on relishing literature and the true values of literary criticism, the world would be researchers and scholars alone. Rabindranath has somewhere discussed two classes: kamalvanvasi and vetreanvasi. Today, compared to vetreanvasi, kamalvanvasi is more needed.

Lest anybody should believe that this is an effort to run down the poetry by some critical soul. This is the cry of one who appreciates every time there is a new way of writing poetry, and who believes that relishing and writing poetry has an important place in the life of people. There is no intention to state that there is nothing in Gujarati poetry that inspires hope. The line that Vernon Watkins placed on the lips of Yeats, one among the nine Welsh poets, is worth thinking over:

'The young poets', he murmured,
'Toil too much'. There lay
something on table,
and dissect and wear it away,
till nothing but the grit is left;
but all song is gay'

But why don't we hear the musical call of the fountainhead of poetry? At that time, I am reminded of Mayakovski's confession:

I mastered myself
and trod
on the throat
of my very own song.

A number of reasons are given for the indifference of common people towards poetry. Not poetry alone, common people are going away from any cultural activity of higher kind. We sense the lack of a force to keep the interest alive and alert. To ask the writer to come down to the level of people is equivalent to rebellion against the self. If the new

class of people serving as the link between people and writer-the devotees and scholars of literature, becomes enthusiastic about relishing poetry, the evil situation of today would come to an end. This work can't be accomplished by only the meet of poets on radio.

But the indifference to poetry is not our exclusive problem. The same is the case with even where there is expanse of education, where people enthusiastically participate in the life of their times. What is the reason for this? Why is there an increase in subjective poetry? Why does the poet employ symbols of his liking from the subconscious? Why does the poet have to torture the simple structure of sentences? Eliot also had to say:

So here I am, in the middle way,
having had twenty years-
Twenty years largely wasted,
the years of l'entre deux guerres-
trying to learn to use words,
and every attempt
is wholly new start, and a different kind of failure
because one has only learnt to
get better words
for the thing one no longer has to say
of the way in which
one is no longer disposed to say it.
And so each venture
Is a new beginning,
a raid on the inarticulate
with shabby equipment always
deteriorating
in the general mess of

imprecision of feeling
undisciplined squads of emotions...
(East Coker)

And Umashankar also said in '*Kavi no Anubhav*' (Poet's Experience):

Tries to fathom the depths
of human heart
that meter comes out and shakes
like a snake without a mani!
(*Sanskriti*, May 1945)

With the development of science, the vision of looking at the world continued to change. Only empirical knowledge was considered reliable and emphasis was laid on objectivity. Therefore, to know the happenings of the world as they appear to us in the series of cause and effect was deemed true knowledge. The knowledge different from that and internalized by emotions and instincts was not recognized. Hence, as if, human emotions and sentiments got exiled from the world of knowledge. Depicting this situation to a nicety, Erich Heller says:

'The human affections are the only instruments of recognizing and responding to values. By treating the affections as the rascals in the school of reason, and as the peace-breakers in the truthbound community, Reason-the rationalist's reason has set up a kind which leaves the human affections as idle as do, by general consent, the 'objective' methods that lead to its discovery. The workshops in which our truths are manufactured are surrounded by swarms of unemployed affections. Unemployment leads to riots, and riots there were and are.'

Because of this vision of life, our sense of values was also disturbed. A situation in which a poet can speak his heart, standing on a stage of values acceptable to all did not remain any more. It all became meaningless to say that poetry looks at the true stature of things and brings out their true significance, because we began to look at each of these words skeptically. Therefore, unanimity did not remain on our values. No foundation survived on which values can be firmly established. Hence, the study of poetry took an inward route and slipped into the consciousness and behind the curtain of personality, took shelter in 'a little cosmos of inwardness salvaged from the devaluation of world'; this 'discovery and colonization of inwardness' is one of the chief characteristics of modern poetry. Whoever is a poet in the true sense has felt the painful inevitability of finding such a shelter.

As Shelley has said, the religion of the poet is to make experienceable the threads of relationships, joining one object to the other and lying invisible in the world. If that relationship is such that it can be known by the rules of science, the poet should hand over this task to the scientist. But the true stature of things is not merely a coming together of atoms, moving and colliding with one another. Science gives us a method of knowing the world, and in the same way, poetry or art gives us another equally important method to know the world by way of emotions. Instead of considering both contradictory to each other, we should deem them mutually complimentary.

Hegel had got a sense of the assault of prose on poetry, so he had said: 'Art is and will remain a thing of the past because the mode of prose has absorbed all the concepts of the mind and impressed them with its prosaic stamp.' And hence, he has sounded this caveat to poetry of the future: 'Poetry will have to take on the business of so thorough recasting and remodeling of reality that, faced with the unyielding mass of the prosaic, it will find itself involved everywhere in manifold difficulties.'

How can the poet bring about the re-forming of what has happened. For this, he has to invent symbols and create new possibilities in language, otherwise he wouldn't be able to rescue poetry from the conceptual thinking. But today if we examine the way symbols are used in poetry, it will appear that these symbols are left as stray symbols lying here and there; they don't seem to become one with the poem. At times, they take the form of conceptual thinking. Because of this, the bridge that connects the poet's consciousness and reader's consciousness doesn't take shape. That which should become a bridge turns into a problem. Giving reason for this, Vladimir Wield has said: 'The cord which binds it to the whole being of him who speaks it disappears; it ceases to be anything but the automatic reflections of certain operations of the intellect. These operations could be creative but the sign itself now no longer shares in the creative work. The complete neutralization of the word will be the death of literary art.'

Examining the process of forming symbols, one more thing comes to the fore. The link between -the symbol and the object for which symbol has been used-became

increasingly obscure, hence, as if the world of symbol and reality got separated. Science assumed sovereign control over reality and symbols became sovereign in the world of poetry. The ambiguity that came in the voice of the poet as a result of this has stayed at the roots of poetry today; it has almost become an inevitable characteristic of poetry. Until we can change the situation responsible for this, we will not be able to remove the ambiguity as well. Erich Heller describes the situation in this way: 'As reality became more real. So the symbol became more symbolic an art more artistic. The artist ceased to be a humble crafts man, supplying goods for the common trade between heaven and earth. He set himself up as a dealer in very special specialities, with a heaven all to himself and an earth to look down upon.' As a result, 'Ambiguity and paradox are the manner of speaking when reality and symbol, man's mind and his soul are at cross-purposes.'

Kalani pase bhavak ni apeksha (Expectation of Art from Relisher)

With what expectations we go to a work of art is an important question in the contemplations over the process of relishing a work. At times, after reading a story, the reader proclaims: 'Did you see? Did I not say so? God doesn't spare anyone who behaves like this.' After reading Isaac Bibel's story titled, 'Isu nu Paap' (The Sin of Jesus), one friend said: 'What's new in this story that you wish to translate? That women face hardships, men are lascivious and drinking should be prohibited because

drinking is at the root of all this-this is all the writer wanted to convey, didn't he?' I feel that such readers merely wish to see that whether their moral beliefs borrowed from conventions tally with the one expressed by the writer (according to them) or not. The satisfaction behind this is something like this: 'My moral belief has been upheld by the writer as well, hence, there is substance in it, and I am right'

I feel such a tendency would serve as an obstacle in the way of relishing a work. Recently, there was a discussion on Earnest Hemingway's *'The Snows of Kilimanjaro'*. One creative writer, devotee of literature said: 'In this story, Hemingway has depicted one important truth. If a poet gets mesmerized by the early fame, and drops the hard work for better writing, surrenders to lethargy and temptations, he will meet his downfall.' He liked this text due to the presentation of this truth. Here, too, the tendency to tally one's moral belief would be seen to be at work.

If we wish to relish this text and do justice to Hemingway, we would look at this text in a different way. The truth that is presented in the form of information hardly has anything extraordinary in it. Human kind has been collecting such universal truth as the fruit of the long experience. A diamond is not important, but the skill which is used to place it on the gold is significant. In this story, the writer who is suffering from gangrene has come to surrender to death in the African forest. The writer wishes to say something about the whole of our culture. This statement doesn't remain limited to

only one individual; due to the deftness of writing, it expands to entire humanity. Take this most fundamental statement from it: 'In whose quest was the leopard at this height of this mountain peak?' The leopard has left only his skeleton as his remnant. And this throws light on the deep meaning: Will the human race leave behind only its skeleton in its rat race of ambition? Let's move forward. See, the experiences that he is reminded of. Don't these incidents seem to be representative of our culture? Love or glory, which used to nurture human life, is eating up the human existence like white ant. Why does this happen? And think about the gangrene, the disease, the writer is suffering from. It keeps getting worse. It feeds itself from his body and is killing it too. The writer has beautifully suggested it. Along with gangrene, the writer has also used two telescopic images as well: vulture and thirst. Both of them eat the remnants of what has been hunted down by others. The writer is also surviving on the past glory. This has also been powerfully conveyed. Looking at it this way, due to the unique arrangement by the writer in the story, he has given us a sense of epic tenor in a short story and there lies in it the worth of his existence.

While discussing this story, we should also not forget one more thing. The influence of Spain is heavy on Hemingway. He was extremely influenced by the famous work, 'Nada'-nothingness, by the Spanish painter Goya. In today's world, a human being is tormented in the whirlwind of nothingness. To survive for a moment or two, he creates an island for himself, and realizes later that that too was an illusion. Here, the snow-

covered peak of Kilimanjaro is also like the island amid the Nada-nothingness but due to technical faults, the aero plane cannot land on the peak, and that is how the illusion comes to an end. This influence of Nada can be brought out in other works of Hemingway as well. He has shown in many works that human beings desperately create newer illusions in order to save themselves.

Like Nada, 'Men without Women' is also one of Hemingway's notions about life. A woman proves to be an obstacle on the brotherhood of men. She blunts the manhood of man. This thought becomes clear in this story too. Every good reader will come across such way of writing in Hemingway's other stories like 'A Cat in the Rain' and 'Canary for One'. Let's take the story titled, 'Canary for One': One old woman who is deaf travels with a canary in the cage. With her, a couple is travelling to complete the last ritual for divorce. The old woman is talkative (As deaf people usually are!). Narrating the history in detail as to where and why she is carrying the canary, she says that her daughter wanted to marry a Swiss engineer but as she didn't like the idea of her marriage with a foreigner, she didn't allow her to get married. Therefore, her daughter is unhappy. This canary was deserted somewhere and lying all by itself. She is taking the canary for her daughter's entertainment. And then, the old woman says in between all this: 'Only Americans are ideal as husbands.' What a big illusion this is on the part of the old woman! But the old woman is deaf. The truth of the matter-lying close, as an antithesis to her belief- can't reach her because she is deaf. In this way, the writer

suggests that all of us cultivate this kind of protective deafness, knowingly or unknowingly. That canary also offers itself as a symbol. It embraces what it gets in place of what it desires. And canary of what kind? Deserted.

Hence, the question, here, is that if the writer had not employed this kind of symbol, placed American couple next to the deaf woman and brought canary in the midst of all this, could he have brought about such sharp expression to the story? We can put what is to be said in a simple sentence in the form of a statement of morality. But the arrangement of all the things requires the higher kind of creativity, otherwise our books of poetry would, in the end, become collections of memories.

Hence, the root of our interest in literature is in the play of our creativity. It seems, this important thing has been disregarded by our critics. Introducing Ushanas' 'Prasun', one of our professor-critic (!) called him the poet of Sarvodaya. I didn't feel any surprise in it. Instead of looking at the creativity of the poet's consciousness at work in the poem, this tendency to believe that a poet is a merchant of morality lessons and obtain suitable packets of morality lessons will paralyse the natural manner of relishing a work. If we consider the need for a mortal dependence and the desire for a natural way of relishing a work, there will be no point in creating a work of art or in its glory.

Therefore, our poor poet too has sat down to make packets, with labels of popular slogans. You need songs for a season on radio? Take it, please take it, our rate is

reasonable, everyone can afford. Do you need a song for bhumidan? Will surely give it. If Vinobaji calls, can I keep quiet? Take it, it will be quite useful to you. You would not find such a song anywhere else! What did you say? Depiction of seasons?-oh brother, are we poets or barber? If we don't feel sad for them, then who would?-we have good stock of poetry, depicting that sorrow.

Thus, our poor poet has forcibly become Sarvodayi-singing to the tune of everyone! If literary criticism were vigilant, this wouldn't happen.

Pather Panchali Vishe Thodu (A Bit about Pather Panchali)

When I think of all this, I feel like making a suggestion. We have many lecture series-supported by university, public organization, or organized on occasions. It would be quite fruitful if we assign a text to the speaker way in advance for a critical analysis. At times, the 'expert' speakers fail to speak anything original-as such to say anything original is difficult-or relevant. It is a waste of effort and money. It would be beneficial if we can assign these lectures to the right person and publish them. The contemplation over many a question seems necessary, particularly in the field of literary criticism. But we don't even have as yet the atmosphere necessary to give rise to such questions in the minds of researchers. There should be a number of seminars and workshops on this. Now it is being said from all quarters that literary criticism has strayed from its

responsibilities. If we have been able to cultivate the vision to recognize the situation as such and the honesty to state so, now we should resolve it too.

When I saw '*Pather Panchali*', I realized how one art, when used in a way that it proves useful to another art, can give a deep sense of satisfaction. I got introduced to the combination of arts, brought about by a creative genius.

I had read '*Pather Panchali*' many years ago. When I went to see the movie, I only had a faint memory of what I had read in the book. Even in that memory, I only remembered the village, placed at the lap of nature, in Bengal, the train passing by it, the natural surroundings of Bengal, the various phases of its life and the people living amid all this, their poverty, and their sorrows. I also had an impression that the reality was presented in such a way that there is nothing discordant, contradictory or obnoxious. The text remains melodious like the Bengali Palligit. This note is touched by someone standing knee-deep in the river, Machhi, or by a labourer, putting tobacco into the chelum. This note extends beyond the bank of the river on the other side, and wandering in the vast ground, knocks on the heart of a bride, sitting in a hut.

But '*Pather Panchali*', the movie is a new creation. The direction of Satyajit Ray, the cinematography of Suvrat Mitra and the background music (Ravishankar, the music director) made it an altogether new text. The saga of a poor family living a village that

ends tragically becomes a new text. This is a remarkable illustration of how one art can be useful to another.

We, all the friends, had gone together to watch '*Pather Panchali*'. Most of them didn't know Bengali but that didn't come in the way of relishing the movie because the director has made a very limited use of that in the movie. The scenes are full of life; even the mute animals and objects also communicate a lot. The music bringing out the essence of the incident or situation conveys effectively too. And the eye of the camera shows you the object from such a perspective that you we lose out on nothing; there is only a sense of realization of what you gained.

The first scene itself helps you enter the rural life. Durga, stealing a fruit or two from the landlord's farm, and passing on the road, marked by the sunlight and shade of typical rural ambience, is seen dancing, following the rhythm of the joy of achievement. Instead of getting carried away by the temptation to show the beautiful girl of the village, the director merely shows an ordinary girl, 10 or 11 years old. Durga's joy and its lucid rhythm are expressed effectively by the simple music. The depiction of Durga, dancing and jumping with joy, accompanied by music, has been employed to bring out the poetry of beautiful rural life. And then immediately we see Indir Thakuran! This Indir Thakuran, aged more than ninety, is an unforgettable character in '*Pather Panchali*'. She is embodiment of lust for life itself! The discussion about the stolen fruit between Durga

and Indir Thakkuran- the enthusiasm of an old lady towards the fag end of life for participation in the plot hatched by children has been shown in a touching manner. After spilling water in rice, the old woman sits down to eat. No other scene would have been able to express the way that scene expresses the lust for life. And there are dependents also in such a poor family. There is a dog sitting next to the old woman. She waters a plant as and when she passes by it. Thus, the extinguishing flame of life nurtures the new life.

The life of this poor family moves on like this. The story is quite feeble, although. But by employing symbols, such a narrow theme has given voice to some of the complex and elusive emotions of human life. Otherwise, at times, substandard symbols are used. (e. g. in some of the movies of Shantaram): to show a lamp getting extinguished at the time of death, to focus the camera on the petal blossoming into flower to suggest love- these are symbols which have been overused and hence, a spent force. In this movie, nothing is haphazard. In fact, I wish to draw special attention to the use of symbols in this movie. In the hut made of broken walls, the grin on the toothless face of frail Indir Thakuran, shattered by the onslaught of time and poverty, the flicker of child-like wonder in the her eyes, wrinkled, and covered with swelling of skin, and the fairytale flowing, like the simple and clear flow of a river, out of the same toothless mouth- so much is communicated by this paradoxical arrangement of symbols! There is not a single song in the movie but it is Indir Thakuran who hums a bhajan: '*Hari din te gelo*'

and touches the depths of our heart. I find one thing distinctive in the director: there is no insistence on extravagantly beautifying the beautiful, and he has shown what is un-beautiful as it is. He has not exaggerated it to invoke certain feelings in us. This restraint in art is truly essential. He has, as if, allowed the object, character or incident to reveal its essence itself. The director doesn't interfere anywhere.

None of the characters is beautiful. The skin of Indir Thakuran has become loose. Apuma Rajputra does not make an appearance at all. Durga is completely a village girl. Sarvjaya is seen, fighting sometimes, and carrying the painful load in the absence of her husband, on other occasions. And at that time, the idea of the beauty of characters doesn't arise in our minds. Sarvjaya's husband and Apudurga's father, Harihar is a poor village Brahmin. He is shown, coming into the house drying the sweat in the armpit with the end of his dhoti. When he sits down to eat, he bares his teeth in an ungentlemanly (!) manner and removing the nail from the fish. This scene doesn't seem obnoxious. Our life is made nothing else but such things! That is why a fine lake is shown close to the nearly broken hut of the poor family. And the insignificant worm of the lake struggling to survive depicts the life as it is. In winter, somebody, moved by mercy, brings a shawl for Indir Thakuran. Sarvjaya can't bear the fact that Indir Thakuran accepted the shawl, given to her out of mercy by someone. Hence, Sarvjaya fights with her and the old woman takes her things-her shawl and glass with which she drinks water-and goes away. The dog that always gets its share from the old woman's

food merely looks at her. While this scene is on here, Apu and Durga are relishing sugarcane on the farm. Indir Thakuran dies under the tree and her death is suggested by the glass rolling down on the ground and the notes of the bhajan the old woman used to sing resonate in the background. Apu and Durga come near the old woman's dead body. At that time, all three of them come running, with the musical sounds emanating from the bell tied to the neck of the calf; that weighs heavy on the stillness of death.

We were discussing the use of symbols. At first, Durga has satisfactorily wetted herself in the rain and enjoyed herself. She gives warmth by covering Apu, who is shivering with cold, in her clothes. At last, he is caught by fever, and there is torrential rain and storm the night he has high temperature. The closed doors of the house are opened up by this. The door of one side is out of the way now, there is only a torn cloth hanging instead. On one hand, the idol of Ganesha lying in a corner of the wall starts trembling. The trembling of the God who is said to remove our troubles and losing balance proves very suggestive in this situation. How is Durga's death depicted in the end? Not by extinguishing the lamp or any clumsy symbol. On the next morning, we see a dead frog, lying on its stomach in the puddle of water!

One more incident-Harihar was going to Calcutta to try his luck. Children don't even know much about it. In the village, the person who shows films has come! He shows

everything-Agra's Taj, Delhi's Kutubminar- in merely two paise. And when Harihar comes back, he wouldn't even get to see Durga! How suggestive is this yearning to see Delhi at the time of journey for Calcutta!

The director has depicted the tragic incident of Durga's death with exemplary restraint. Sarvjaya is dumbstruck by this incident. The pathos of her heart is expressed only through the notes of string sharnai (tar sharnai). Hence, music has been used very effectively here. In the same way, when Sarvjaya scolds Durga for stealing from the policeman's home, the use of dholak (a kind of drum which has two sides) throughout is impressive. Moreover, after Durga's death, scene in which, in Harihar's absence, the responsibility falls on Apu, he stands up throwing the shawl, is shown with the outburst of the strings of Sitar. The tragic seriousness of the situation in which Apu walks with lantern with the maturity of a responsible man, is also shown with the help of music. Behind the customary routine of daily life, Sarvjaya passes her days somehow, trying to rescue herself from the sorrow of her daughter's death. And her husband comes shouting from far off, 'Durga, Apu'. The word 'Durga' spreads into every corner of the gloomy house and returns. Harihar has brought an odhani (a kind of long strip of cloth, used to cover the head) for Durga. When he places the odhani before Sarvjaya, all her self-control gives way. There is indeed mist in our eyes when she clings to that odhani as if it is not odhani but her daughter herself who has gone away forever.

Looking at it in one way, the director has placed most of the burden of acting only on Durga and Indir Thakuran. The discretion as to what kind of work to be taken from whom exercised by the director is truly astonishing. At times, he has created the intensity of emotion with the help of very simple things. The landlord's daughter who is same age to Durga is getting married. On this occasion, Durga becomes conscious about herself. She has come back after taking a good look at her friend getting ready as a bride. Although she has not yet even imagined of this event in her life, she feels like looking into the mirror. She looks at her face in a broken mirror and she extends the kajal to the far end of her eyes and applies a bit of it on the forehead. She looks at her face again after this. This event becomes extremely touching in the context of her death.

This is how the story of this poor family of Nischindpur comes to an end. Harihar takes his belongings and prepares to leave. While he is putting together the pages of an old book, he tumbles upon the box of things Durga had collected. And the moment he opens it, the kidiya-for which she had been beaten-fall down. Leaving the broken and grounded home, the family goes away. After that, a snake is shown entering the house. It is one who protects Lakshmi. After the Lakshmi is gone, whom does it wish to protect?

This simple tale of rural life becomes tragic epic of humanity. The scenes from the movie remain constantly in front of the eyes. From the beginning of the day to the end

of the day with the whistle of train, the whole life between that is effectively depicted. The person who comes once a week, ringing bell to sell mouth sweeteners is also a note of the music of village life. Keeping their ears to the lamp post, how Apu and Durga listen to the music with wonderstruck eyes! How Sarvajaya, Apu's mother, runs after Apu with so much patience and affection, who is playing with bow and arrow, in order to feed him. When it is about to rain, the whole Nature is eagerly waiting; it shown by placing focus on all sides. But where does the first drop of rain fall? Not on the petals of roses but on the bald head of a man. The slow and fast rhythms of incidents have so well been interwoven that there is no sign of the fact that they are separate.

We, all friends, came out experiencing a sense of sublimity-some with the resolution to watch it again on next Sunday. This movie which can be understood by even those who are not conversant with Bengali was relished by some Gujaratis as well. Well, it is also true that the intensity of the incident in which in the helpless state of poverty, when Sarvjaya decides to sell the metal plate that was given to her at the time of her marriage with 'Be happy' engraved on it, may not be understood by one who does not know Bengali. But barring these few incidents, the lack of knowledge of Bengali would not prove so much of an obstacle.

I have written a lot. But there is no problem. While discussing such an experience, there is no need to exercise restraint. It would suffice if I have been able to present Indir

Thakuran, the old woman who is above ninety years old and Durga in front of your eyes.

***Chintayami Mansa* (Thinking Deeply)**

To my student-teachers

Discourse cheers us to companionable reflection. Such reflection neither parades polemical opinions nor does it tolerate complaisant agreement. The sail of thinking keeps trimmed hard to the wind of the matter.

From such companionship a few perhaps may rise to be journeymen in the craft of thinking, so that one of them, unforeseen, may become a master.

-Heidegger

Arthagatan (Interpretation)

The ambiguity arising out of certain words or phrases doesn't become so much of an obstacle in the way of relishing a poem. There can be even more subtle intricacies. Due to disharmony between the raw material and its form as poem or due to the flaws in the poetic composition can prove to be a hindrance in relishing a poem. It might happen that the context or incident lying at the depth of a poem might be elusive or obnoxious and hence, it might prove to be contradictory to our poetic sense; the intentions which we might find aesthetically or ethically inappropriate might have been mixed up in that. For this, we must have interpreted the poem. Only then we will be able to identify such obstacles and rest assured that we have not been carried away by some prejudice alone. Apart from this, other inadequacy can also arise; there could be disharmony between the state of emotions and the state of language. There could be disharmony in

poetry between performative means and native pulse. We cannot say that it is an evil by itself. It would seem relevant if there is any poetic design to it. What seems relevant or appropriate in other literary forms may not seem so in poetry.

It is one thing that we are able to rationally interpret a text and so feel the delight or disdain, but it might also happen that our response to a text may become negative only because we fail to grasp the true nature of the text. It might happen that even after gathering all the information necessary for a text, we fail to establish a dialogue with it. This doesn't happen only because of our personal likes and dislikes. But we keep feeling that our consciousness and that of the poet's wander in different spheres. We find it difficult to surrender to a text, considering it as a poetic entity. If there is a clash when we try to apply our sensibility on the sensibility of a text, there arises an obstacle in relishing a poem.

It is said about our culture that it is more keen on feeling than in knowing. The excesses of emotion will not be able to sustain its balance with intellect. Then we may not insist so much on discipline or structural components and we may be enthused to see things in relation to combinations and associations. One may feel diffident in resorting to any breach of conventions. We may not have the patience to form a response based on the deep knowledge rather than giving an immediate response. Therefore, our sense of

values will be disturbed. Due to such tendency, we have been indifferent to certain components of the domains of literature and art. Because of this, our prejudices are becoming intense and our interest is getting more and more shallow. Even this has also happened as a response to the situations prevalent before. After industrial revolution, the human sensitivity gradually became blunt. The significance of consumer goods and its business grew in the society made of consumers. Bureaucracy reduced human beings to pawns. Due to this, our relationship with artists and creative writers got broken. The intensity of the experience of separation also grew. There weren't many possibilities of rebellion against it so the writers pretended as if they were exiled. They opted to move out of the insensitive society. As a result, the tendency to cultivate 'semantic privacy' was encouraged. During the same period, the mass media began to have its impact. Due to its expanse, there remained nothing like the personal response to any situation. Newspapers, detective stories to be kept aside right after reading, erotic literature, comics-all this relegated poetry into background. The value of the uniqueness of individual experience diminished. Language lost its ability to impact. It became very cheap. As a result, poets began to search for words, uncorrupted by all this. There were manifestos for that. There was a desperate attempt to bring revolution in the language which had lost its orientation.

There are two dimensions to this response: somewhat unconsciously, there is a sense of rebellion against the good literature as well. Its significance lies in the attitude to

challenge the unchallengeable. It aspires to challenge the rigid tradition as well. Hence, by resorting to obscurity, he struggles to break the inheritance of tradition. The second endeavour supports Mallarme's attitude. In place of that which is linear, realistic and popular, he aspires to bring back the charm of the mysterious magic of ancient poetry. To put it in Heidegger's language, it is an attempt to experience 'hidden presences of Being in beings'. Due to loss of memory, we have our real sense of being. We have to bring it out from the level of the unconscious and the subconscious. Thus, the issue for the poet is to impressively and intensely bring out the language, fractured and eaten away due to misuse, and the human destiny. Polan Selan, a German poet, has said that it has become difficult to write poetry after the heinous, mass killings of Auschwitz. In addition, we have to employ the language of the same murderers because they were also German. The reason for this is that it is language that speaks in poetry, not the poet. Language lends voice to itself. That which expresses itself without any fuss is the true poetry. It is obvious that such poems are rare.

A poet wishes to enliven the language with the authenticity of his emotions and intensity. Due to this, it brings freshness and novelty, which are not short-lived, to his text. As a result, such an insight develops which proves penetrative and expressive. But the language which he has to deal with is the language of day-to-day dealings. Its similes and symbols are usually rendered ineffective by overuse. How can he employ that language for such a purpose? Hence, some people have gone on to believe that a

true poet cannot work with this obsolete language. Those words have lost their value, how can create new resonance from it? Hence, he should employ new words and sentence structures. Ezra Pound's instruction was also the same: 'Make it new'. The effort of Dada, Surrealists, and Russia's 'Futuro-Cubist' was also similar. Therefore, as what Beardsley has said that no interpretation of a poem can prove objectively unanimous, is right. 'Interpretation is not verdictive'. If the reader wishes to wander into the unknown world that is created by the poet, the reader has to learn the code in order to understand the experience of realization of the poet. Such mysterious code should not express it in such a way that its secret is given away. On the contrary, rather than revealing it, it should hide it with the help of language. Only some trained minds can enter the text. It cannot be for the masses or the commoners. If it happens so, the sublime brilliance of the extraordinary would be polluted!

Here, similes and allegories are referred to. There are possibilities of a number of relationships of colloquial and elevated or relevant and irrelevant. To identify and realize these relationships and make them relishable are a significant part of a poet's work. Therefore, how to interpret similes and allegories is an important question. Here, the point is not just to identify the relationships; we have to create new relationships as well. How can one establish the validity of these relationships? These figures of speech become creative not by employing new meanings of words, but by bringing out new form of the world. The one who uses figures of speech in a new way brings out a new

dimension of subject of narration. This new dimension is accomplished by the new way of using figures of speech. But one cannot claim to have changed the world merely by changing the point of view towards it. Figures of speech are the beacons, showing the direction of how to move in poetry. By doing so, our understanding of the world is enriched. In that sense, the world becomes, to an extent, new for us. These figures of speech lend a new direction to our sense of poetry or the sense of historical incident depicted in poetry. But does it happen so? We have to accept the fact that figures of speech prove decisive in the interpretation of poetry.

Borhes had said, 'Oppression is the mother of metaphor'. Where there is a reign of autocracy, there are limitations imposed on the creative writers. However, the poet's tenacity to truth and the sagacity of expression cannot be curbed. Hence, whatever is to be created, one should; whatever truth is to be brought out, one should, but in a way that incisive minds can understand. Insensitive rulers cannot fathom this. The poet has to accomplish the representation of the invisible as visible. Here, in place of becoming the beacons of the direction of poetry's real interpretation, figures of speech and metaphors skilfully keep it obscure. In such a situation, 'indirection' becomes the real work of suggestion. Interpretation becomes nothing else but a process of 'decoding'. In our recent history, reading works written during Emergency, which was truly literary, leads us through such a process. In such circumstances, people's ability to satirize gets sharpened. Whatever remains relevant reaches the level of becoming classic. It is not

that such a necessity arises only in unique political situation. When the ethical ambience of the society is adverse, either to rescue certain emotions from the puritans, or the poet deems obscurity appropriate so that the reader is not able understand the meaning easily, he creates obstacles in the way of interpretation. As George Steiner says, for the poet, it is not merely an endeavour to keep the identity of his beloved hidden. When there are elements of obscurity in love, it becomes more relishable. Love and overexpression are enemies. Such overexpression disturbs our sense of propriety. At times, lovers don't wish to reveal the true form of their emotions in front of each other. Such ambiguity becomes the reason of the intensity and wonder in love. The poet devises all this so that the reader does more 'digging' in the poem. He is seen, devising ways like-to knowingly create obstacles in the way of interpretation and hence delay it, not to create design that can be easily identified, to bring complexity in the arrangement of symbols and hence obscurity due to that, to cover the inherent unity with the apparent disharmony of language, figures of speech etc. If there is no scope of a dialogue between the poet and reader, how can interpretation be possible? Those who, in spite of this, believe that poetry is magic; it takes us in the situation of *vigalit-vaidhyantar*, consider this whole gimmick as a pointless intellectual exercise. Is it not enough to let the poem melt in our consciousness in its entirety, to remain eager for that? Nothing can substitute poetry.

Those people, who talk of interpretation and sense of poetry, ultimately end up giving the prose translation of the poem. It might serve the purpose of scholarship, but one can't say that it proves useful in relishing a poem. Not only poetics, but the contemplation over many poems opens the gates of the world of relish. The people giving commentary over poetry get lost into 'what has been said by the poet?'; they remain indifferent to 'what has been done by the poet?'. Culture acquires its worth by poetry because it is the summit of the growth of human consciousness. Instead, they consider it as the vehicle of the already existing cultural values. Due to this tendency of intellectuals, most of the people, believing that relishing poetry is the purview of experts, are becoming indifferent and hence, insensitive to relish.

Those who look at things from this point of view, call the poetry of poets like Eliot, which is truly scholarly, the barren patch of Muse. In it, there is not left even an iota of that magic. Poetry is not the imitation of anything; emphasis is laid on the fact that it is the creation of something new. Interpretations actually paralyze the naturalness of our sensitivity. In the name of interpretations, the adverse attitude of intellect to poetry finds expression. The immediacy that is expected in relishing a work is disregarded in the name of interpretation. The tendency to place the entirety of poetry in rational mould takes the life of our sensitivity. Only people with mediocre intelligence indulge in interpretation. In it, in place of being one with the text, the arrogant dissatisfaction is

voiced. The critic has barely anything to do except describing how things are organized in poetry.

These are statements made from an extreme. It rarely happens that a poem is internalized at the end by listening or reading once. But we should also accept the fact that it should not happen that interpretation renders relishing a text subordinate.

Sahitya ane Philsufi (Literature and Philosophy)

The poets have not forgiven Plato for the censorship he exercised against them. However, the outrage against Plato seems unreasonable. This issue should be looked at in the context of the Ideal Republic envisioned in 'Republic'. In such a state, the part that a ruler, philosopher, or poet has to play is different from the part they play in the real system of state. This difference depends on the difference of reality and ideal. Socrates compared philosopher with the insect extracting blood from the body. He doesn't let people live peacefully. It keeps pointing at whatever evil is there in society. To constantly examine the situation is his characteristic activity. It never claims to be possessing complete knowledge about anything. When he asked a question, he begins his intellectual quest. Socrates' confession of not having any knowledge is not false humility. He doesn't say that to ridicule the curious man either. There is an honest acceptance of the inevitable incompleteness of our knowledge in it. Only if we accept it,

we can remain in the quest for knowledge. We cannot unravel the secret of the construct of 'the good'. Socrates doesn't claim to know it completely. He merely knows the means of reaching there. Socrates is willing to learn of new dimensions from anyone who can help in this quest. Such a quest is begun from different points of view and everyone struggles to find out the solution to a new problem. Hence, every quest is significant in its own way. Then, why does Plato describe philosopher as enlightened soul in 'Republic'? This seems contradictory to what he has said in his other works. But we shouldn't forget that philosopher has been looked at like this only in 'Republic'. Ideal Republic was created in order to enlighten the most eminent and competent individuals. Such people, after realizing what is good, can make the state, the citizens and even themselves orderly. But only in an Ideal State, a philosopher can remain active. As Plato says in 'Apology', in our world, a philosopher has to live like a common man. Socrates had lived in that manner. In the Ideal State, the process of education envisioned in the Ideal Republic, creates favourable situation for acquiring the knowledge of what is right and what is wrong. If some outsider to this system claims this, he has to be considered ignorant and hypocritical.

In '*Crito*', the philosopher places emphasis on the fidelity of citizens towards the law of the State. There is a detailed discussion on forming laws and implementing them in this imaginary Ideal Republic in '*Laws*'. However, in '*Republic*', Socrates puts aside the question of which laws would be required to control the relationships of people and

that too by saying that if these human beings are trained properly as citizens, they themselves will be able to, without getting entangled into the complexities of any laws, maintain the relationships well. Therefore, should we think that Plato's attitude changed after 'Apology'? Did he go to the other extreme of his own view in 'Laws'? But this contradiction will be subsided if we shall consider it as the difference between Ideal Republic and prevalent system of the State. The perspectives of both are different. Ideal Republic is some heavenly imagination; there is no possibility of finding such an ideal system. Hence, the standards of the prevalent system of earth cannot be applied to it.

The definition of a poet's work in the Ideal Republic has also been conceptualized in the same way. In other contexts, Plato describes poets as driven by divine inspiration and worldly wise. After listening to the quotation from the work of an eminent poet, this is the question that Socrates raises: 'What does it mean?' Poets act on divine inspiration; God speaks through them. But like the divine voice, the poet's words also need to be interpreted. Here, Plato doesn't show disrespect for the poets. He doesn't question the wisdom of the deities; he raises questions regarding only the means by which deities express their wisdom, and its form and meaning. Deities or wise people cannot say foolish things.

If poets are acting on such divine inspiration, why does Plato banish them from the Ideal Republic? In fact, poets as such are not banished. Only certain kind of poetry has been banned. The poetry of Homer and Hesiod would not be tolerated. The beginning of education used to be with the mention of the work of deities and audacious men. From this viewpoint, all this may not be completely accurate but it wouldn't be wrong either. The descriptions of deities engaging in rape and misconduct are conjured up by poets because the deities are ethically infallible. In Plato's Ideal Republic, if the stories of spirituality and valour were to be useful in the citizen's education, the imaginary representation of deities and brave people should have been accordingly.

That is why Plato says that among poets, Homer has the best poetic sensibility; his is the first place among the writers of tragic works. But we have to get to the truth. In our republic, we can give place only to the poetry full of hymns of deities and singing the eulogies of good human beings. If we give place to poetry like lyric and epic, joy and sorrow would not serve as the governing principles of rules but rule the State. These things will have to pass the test of rationality at regular intervals.

Poetry should be useful in realizing the ideal of our Republic. Whatever is there in 'Republic' is there in order to mould the citizens so that they can carry out their responsibilities efficiently. Plato is aware of the complexities and difficulties inherent in the construct of education. It has to be thought of keeping the whole society in mind.

One disharmonious part of the society can break the whole republic. The spirit embedded in the poetry makes an impact on the character of students; the rhythm of poetry would also affect in the same way. Noble people are moulded by the noble spirit. Thus, poetry enjoys a significant place in the moulding and education of citizens, but poetry is not the end, it is the means. Whatever is good is the ultimate end, the rest is secondary. Censorship is a dirty word. Neither the poets nor the poets like it. It happens because we don't know what is right. We only have individualistic norms of what is to be avoided: e.g., a writer should not write admiringly about communism, or one should not give a vivid description of sexual relationship. Whom shall we blame in a society in which there are people with perverse mindset? Plato has clear standards but those are for the Ideal Republic. It would be erroneous to think that life was like that in actuality as Plato had imagined. Athens and Ideal Republic are different. Ideal Republic is in the minds of the people who desire for it, it is not a reality.

If we keep this in mind, we would not be doing any injustice to Plato. The role art plays in our real society is different. Not only does it help in making life bearable, but it also makes it relishable. It liberates us for a moment from the unbearable pressures of life; it gives us momentary peace in the face of inevitable failures and the resultant disquiet. It realizes the wholeness of experience which is impossible in the day-to-day life. This wholeness is of a certain aspect of life. The reader connects the artistic experience with

the experience of his life. This connection bestows some order for the moment. Art doesn't claim anything more than this.

Plato didn't imagine that all the citizens in Ideal Republic would become divine. Every citizen has his/her limitations but there was scope in it for everyone for achieving whatever was best and thus make progress according to one's own competence. The citizen of the Ideal State should obtain that kind of education that he should be able to identify the social significance of his work, and understand the fundamental relationship of his work with his existence. Hence, he can save himself from the frustration the common people have to undergo. It will not be necessary for him to artificially get rid of life's worries. Thus, education in Ideal State can cultivate knowledge, character, and sensitivity. Everyone can create harmonious relationship with self and, when possible, with others as well. As a result, outside his activities, we won't have to make an effort to achieve the fulfilment of those emotions that art evokes in our indifferent, chaotic life.

The difference between Socrates and Alcibiades brings clarity regarding the concept of beauty. Alcibiades was the handsomest man of Hellas. He has accepted the concept of the higher kind of beauty given by Socrates. The anarchic elements in the State have destroyed Alcibiades from within. Socrates is a happy coincidence. He has remarkable physical and mental strength. He is moulded by the best forces prevalent in Athens at

that time and he remains busy with the spirit of some divine mission. But, the requisite knowledge or education system was not at the disposal of Athens' politicians to consciously create such a good person. To develop the natural abilities, such an Ideal State and its well-governed institutions become necessary. We will not need to see the physical beauty of such people different from the beauty of character. In a well-developed system of state, it develops parallel in the individual with well-developed thinking. If all the people are capable of becoming philosophers, the beauty of such institutions would become secondary. But for this, we need to bring about revolution fit for ramrajya in the nature and circumstances of people. If we think that such a revolution possible in which man becomes divine, in comparison to this beauty, what we call philosophy would seem insignificant.

We have to, first, think of the ethical and political constitution of such an Ideal State in which not only philosophers but common human beings also live. We can measure our society by comparing it with the model that Plato presented before us. It is an ideal. Therefore, our society would certainly fall short of it; but the model sets up the goal for us. We can understand how far we have drifted away from the ideal and endeavour to learn of its reasons. It is not that Plato just runs down art, but he criticizes only that art which claims to be more than what it is. As Socrates has said in 'Apology', ignorance means the inability of knowing the limitations of the skill, opinion or inspiration; he has not criticized Ion's ability to recite poetry, but when Ion claims to know the meaning of

poetry, Plato criticizes this claim. If a poet also tries to claim more than his ability, or get it recognized as his achievement what he has not mastered, he becomes subject to criticism. Plato's quarrel with poets is only up to this. Poetry can be interpreted and it can be accepted or rejected by the standard that the learned have set.

Plato has always attacked the art that brings man's downfall. The empty oratory or Protagoras' repartee that Meno and Feadrus are enamored by doubt create beauty or knowledge because although there is a pretence of its having some relationship with the beauty of soul, it is interested in wealth, power or sensual pleasure. Thus, as art, it is a deception and corrupts the human mind. It attracts man to it that which realizes more harmony in life and makes him a noble being. Its goodness satisfies the best intentions of human beings and the force of truth inherent in it inspires the development of man's future. We look at art, ethics and science in isolation because we don't have the holistic vision like that of Plato's; we look at everything in parts. But artist doesn't need to be embarrassed because of this. All of us are trying to do certain things with ourselves and with others into this anarchic entanglement. We will be able to see what Plato is pointing at, only if our eyes are open. What Daniel Ruker has said is true that it will not work as a substitute to eyes. (*Journal of Aesthetics and Criticism'*-winter, 1966)

Some writers are such that they don't have the strength to survive on the printed pages. Those who can transcend time, defy death and remain alive are made of different stuff. Sentences written by them, even when they are not uttered, echo in our ears. The strong sound of their words makes an impact on us. Customs don't bind him and language behaves obediently with them. The reverse would happen if the writer comes under the control of language coming down from customs and tradition. At such a time, language uses the one using language. Aren't there a number of similar prose examples around us? In such a situation, language, like a woman, tries all its temptations and hypnotizes him. It is not that it is not beautiful or that it lacks the insight, but he doesn't know what price he has to pay for all this. If he has sharpness and brilliance, in place of the experiments of the previous generation, he would express authentic and unique experiences with the help of such a language; we would have known those experiences only as raw material. By the form that writer gives it, it brings forth unimaginable competence and it may happen that it would help us discover way to know ourselves better.

Voltaire Kaufman says that when this happens, not only the writer but the readers also have to pay the price- the price that will prove destructive for us. For the writer, living with peaceful satisfaction will not be possible because what he has learnt from life will not let him live him peace. This realization itself will endanger his mental stability. The element which makes his sensitivity more acute and makes it visible what is invisible to

others will eat him up from within. The real trouble is something else. Compared to that, all this would seem insignificant. The very thing for which he left his happiness and peace of mind, paid with his life and fought against many forces becomes the cause of his downfall. His own voice becomes the voice of his enemies. In such a situation, the writer will either forget the self in the intoxication or surrenders to death and get rid of this. At times, such a poet is a thinker too. He pierces the ignorance that we have inherited as a right with this sharp intelligence; he removes the webs of superstition and breath of fresh air and light in. He gives us the promise to redeem us from all this. During all this, he suddenly realizes the mesmerizing beauty of language and he feels like spending a lifetime in its cultivation. He employs language as per his objectives and he strives to create higher kind of art from it. How nice would it be, when such a rare competent man, who is able to take us to light and is deeply engrossed in accomplishing something extraordinary, decides to develop the beauty of language! He will try to win us with his language and take away our ignorance with its help; but in the process, if the language itself overpowers him and drags him in the ancient fantasies, the lines drawn with words melt into dreams, his own insights draw him into the mysterious world of legends, and the poet's world of childish nightmares becomes our reality? The writer had experienced it and transcended it as well, and later he adjusts in the world created by his intelligence. But now all that sometimes comes in a

stray dream or it delights what he has to say by engaging it in an allegory or parable, and not only that but turns a new leaf and becomes a part of the cultural history.

One feels the same while reading writers like Kafka or Dostoevsky. Don't we feel the same while reading Plato or Nietzsche? In them, there is unique intensity and depth and horizons after horizons keep unfolding; in them, the breadth is not in contradiction to the depth. Because of them, we acquire some subtle insight into things. Plato was engrossed into legends but was an advocate of rationality. Nietzsche too had the same reverence for rationality. Yet, both of them, perhaps unknowingly, betrayed it. In order to establish the significance of rationality, they humiliated poets and struggled against the language as a concept but ended up creating more powerful creations than that of their adversaries.

Plato deemed poet's vision 'dangerous'. He had apprehensions that it would blind the mind and evoke inappropriate thoughts and emotions. In this regard, he rated the impact of poetry higher than most of the thinkers. But we find something inhuman in his fear regarding the consequences of poetry. It is especially obvious in 'Republic' and 'Laws'. He had a particular objection against the ability of poetry to expand the boundary of our sensitivity to appreciate beauty. However, rarely somebody has used poetry to mesmerize the mind like Plato did. Plato was warning us against the poetry of poets like Horace etc, but today we don't feel the need to remain alert against such

poetry. We, in fact, like these poets; but we like it for the ability that poetry has of expanding the horizons. That poetry doesn't shake our convictions; it doesn't clash with what we call truth, the vision behind it doesn't compel our rationality to go to its shelter.

Contrary to this, Plato's vision ('we should banish poets from the Republic, otherwise the citizens will go the wrong way under their influence'), better than any tyrant, still rules the psyche of people even after Plato's times. In fact, Plato had begun his career by burning his poetry. He has also written a song on free inquiry in 'Apology'. Even afterwards, he respected Socrates very much. He had to ultimately accept death for his insistence on logical thinking. He was accused of corrupting the minds of the youth. However, Plato used the same Socrates in 'Republic' for the advocacy of such a society in which censorship was to be used to prevent unholy activities and stop the youth from coming in contact with philosophy. After this, he created the blueprint of accusations and full-fledged method of espionage and punishment. In it, capital punishment was included as punishment.

How far shall we consider the attachment for language or words in going away from what Socrates has said? There may be other reasons for this kind of change but a poet's temperament was indeed at work in this. What Plato saw as a poet was to win over language for this 'vision' and express it in appropriate prose. Plato accomplished things

like giving proper shape to minute details etc with the temperament of a poet. In creating the architecture of Ideal State, this artist became a rival to the poet. The ability that is lying behind the comprehensive vision, and dialogue is that of a poet. At times, he has left aside the rational analysis and resorted to the mythical imagery. Whether he took the imagery from the tradition of the past or he conjured it up at that moment with the help of his imagination, one thing is certain that the force behind this was neither rationality nor the intense craving for truth but it was the temperament of a poet. This is the chief difference between Plato and Socrates. Poet's temperament was not there in Socrates. Poetry was not his medium. He touched the personality of human beings and that too with his own personality. Due to this, Socrates influenced not only Plato, but Alcibiadis, Zenophone, Aristibus and Antisthenis also. He didn't have anything to write.

But Plato had to do everything by writing and he did that by creating amazing hypnotism of words. When we are getting carried away by the words, we enter a different world. A philosopher defines the truth but his words come from the dealings of the world in which words are used over and over again. A writer will not define truth. He knows that let the philosopher organize things in the structure of thoughts or constructs, that wouldn't be possible. That is why, writer experiences the world and concretizes the world with words. The whole world of rhythm, images, allegories and pratirup also comes along with words. The beauty of the world doesn't diminish due to

this but it, in fact, blossoms. We revere rationality because we have come to admire scientific attitude. The constructs created by the mind are 'distilled' from the world. There is no touch of the world in it. It cannot work as the substitute of the world. Hence, the writer gives priority to the experiential aspect. He continues to combine everything by employing associations, contrasts and sadrashyo. Experience doesn't deduct anything or follow any one particular equation. Expanding dimensions of consciousness is important. If we don't come to know the dimensions of the world, we will be crushed by the burden of our littleness.

Word takes us into different layers of consciousness. It is skeptical of the intuition or instinct but we are aware how many scientists reached the truth with the help of intuition. If we don't cultivate these mental abilities and privilege rationality alone, we are inviting stagnation.

Hence, both Plato and Socrates are good for us. The combination of the two may be an ideal situation, but we should keep our efforts on in that direction. Our so called intelligentsia has moved away from poetry and art. We cannot afford to let go a big part of our consciousness in the name of technocracy. Along with this, we should also accept the fact that to accumulate ignorance by remaining indifferent to what is happening today would also be dangerous.

As we have seen earlier, by placing undue emphasis on Plato's idea that rulers have the right to control all the aspects of men's life, and disregarding other aspects of this philosophy, we have done great injustice to him. We get introduced to Socrates' satire from no other place but Plato's dialogues. Even in 'Republic', he is seen, engaging his mind with newer issues. Although it doesn't match with his idea of education system, he doesn't seem to be refusing to see anything new. He inspired many to allow themselves to be driven wherever their curiosity and quest take them, defy censorship and discover the solutions.

Anyone tracing the history of philosophy will point out the contradictory influence of Socrates and the successors of Pythagoras. In 'Apology', only Socrates' influence is seen whereas in 'Republic' and 'Frido', the influence of the successors of Pythagoras is visible. Before he came under these influences, one can see the poet's temperament and rational approach-the two contradictory tendencies-in him. It doesn't seem that Plato was always satisfied by Socrates' rational, critical approach. This tendency was somewhat mysterious. In short, he had a poet's temperament.

Carl Poper has done great injustice to Plato by calling him Socrates' Judas. In spite of giving psychological explanations, it seems he underestimates the complexity of Plato's personality. We get an impression that although he had immense respect for Socrates yet he had betrayed Socrates due to some historical adversity. Plato's glory is immortal

because he immortalized the words of the one whom he had attacked first. He praised Socrates so much in 'Apology' that his critics became speechless. And the same Plato, without understanding the tragic seriousness of the irony behind it, retorted to Socrates which still continues to needle us.

Socrates wanted to awaken the reason in men. That is why he didn't let anybody breathe easy. But Plato lands the reason in trance by his enticing images. As a reaction to the Greek enlightenment, he encouraged the human imagination.

Plato's poetry is not the sugar coating on the bitter pill of philosophy. Lucretius has confessed of resorting to that so that it can be easily understood. True poetry cannot be relished so superficially like that. True poetry actually takes total hold of the human consciousness. Socrates had said in a pungent satire that poets themselves don't understand their poetry. But Plato, befittingly as the true disciple of Socrates, admired the poet's frenzy. His own experience has played a significant role in it. He was afraid of poetry because he was conversant with the powers of poetry. Yet, poetry deceived him. He thought that he would merely employ poetry as a means. He also believed that reason would censor it. He has said things to that effect in 'Republic' too. The poet, who governed by censorship uses his language, imagery and rhythm poetry as merely the coating over thought, ceases to be a poet. Poetry is the expression of one's love for language. When we use that which is dear to us as an instrument, love comes to an end.

When a poet uses language, language also uses him. Whatever he writes is expressed by his images, sounds, rhyme and rhythm. The work itself, which is taking shape gradually, becomes the source of information for him. He moves in the unexpected direction. Without the prior sanction or interference of reason, images and symbols get arranged. At times, the poet might follow the suggestions from the reasons and strive to express the hidden meaning of this combination. The philosophy is not suppressed by any reasons. It is not that Plato has told only interesting stories; and it is not that he discovered his vision at the extreme end of his reason.

Plato was a true poet and remained a true poet always. The ideal of Socrates was in front of him but the richness his vision and mythical imagery inspired him to write. But if the stories and parables, vision and mythical images were the predecessor of the context of his writing or dawned on him while writing, we have to say that Plato's principles, in their important phases, depended only on poetry. Not only Plato's, but at times other thinkers' philosophy too is contemplation over a piece of poetry. It effectively brings out the nuances and subtle meanings underlying the poem.

If sugar coating is what is foremost to him, we would have told him to keep his bitter pill with himself. If principles are merely the literal interpretation of the beautiful mythical images and symbols, why should they be imposed on us? The inspiration of poetry doesn't always come from the higher planes; a lot of that comes from our infancy

or the infancy of our civilization. We can take it from a station different from philosophy and we can relish it without looking for any principles. But if we wish to accept it from the position of philosophy, we need to, then, act as per the dictates of reason. Without any sentimentality, we should put it on the anvil with the unbiased approach of a philosopher.

But at any given point of time, such a viewpoint has never been known to be popular. It is not that Socrates became dear to the people of Athens because he criticized poets. On the contrary, the opposition against him increased and it resulted into his trial. This is the way he created many enemies. Why did it happen? The reason for this is that people have always searched for the shortcut to truth. Here, a number of objectives come together. Especially, the laziness and the desire for security play the major role in this. Large or small religions or smaller sects claim to show the safe and short way to spiritual bliss and therefore people get attracted to it. In addition, the temptation for the heaven and the fear of retribution are also used therein. Even those people who don't accept such a claim cannot give up the hope of knowing the truth in some scripture handy to them. Some turn to nature or sociology, while some others take recourse to thoughts like, 'Truth is beauty, beauty is truth' and eulogize the poetic imagination. But great scientists or poets don't entertain any such illusion.

German poet Goethe had said to Acraman, 'Lord Byron is great only as a poet; the moment he begins to think he becomes a child'. Plato has said this quite emphatically. In the domain of philosophy, nobody trusts a poet. It is foolish to think that a great poet is inevitably a great philosopher or thinker. It is impossible too. Rilke's friend has said about him, 'Rilke is great as a poet but his philosophy is sheer folly.'

It might be the case that Shakespeare's vision regarding the world and human destiny might be profounder than that of Descartes, Aquinas, Rinehold Nybuhar or John Duye, but the beauty of a line or stanza is no guarantee of the truth of what it claims. In deciding whether a viewpoint is right or wrong, the sense perception inherent in it should be deemed irrelevant. Shakespeare's poetry seems more profound and true where he doesn't indulge in philosophizing. Due to his disillusionment, the observations which he makes, without any recourse to philosophy, seem more true to us. The oratory of the philosophical poets doesn't have the competence to make such an impression on us. But to decide which of Shakespeare's statements are right, logical arguments and analytical thinking are required.

At times it happens in Shakespeare that his poetry becomes feeble where he seems to be supporting religious beliefs because it lacks the spontaneity. In stanzas where he rebels against the customs and where his own experience finds reflection, he takes us on a new height of thought.

Prospero's utterance is exceedingly poetic. It dismantles the boundaries of the context and transcends even the requirement of the narrative. ('The great globe itself will leave not a rack behind' or 'Our life is rounded with sleep'); Portia's sermon ('The quality of mercy-') is completely prosaic. The profound power and lucidity which one finds in the lines of *Macbeth* ('A tale told by an idiot-') are not there in it. Due to this, some may be led to believe that truth and beauty are not as inseparable as we think. To decide upon this, we have to critically think whether the line we find beautiful is true or not.

The philosopher who is a poet too doesn't strive to prove that philosophy and poetry are inseparable. While we are studying his philosophy, whether he is affected by the relationship he shares with poetry or not is a matter of consideration. Poetry is like a leopard. Our eyes like it but if you try to enslave it, it doesn't rest until it takes revenge.

Poets are not the philosophers who give vent to divine utterances. However, they have the ability not only to express one stray feeling or tendency but to create characters and help the reader experience emotions which are not possible in real life. Poetry expands our world; it makes our understanding broader and it also cultivates a deep sense of human realities. Poetry doesn't have to be didactic in order to accomplish this. A lyric awakens a desire in us, a novel creates sympathy in us for a character like Raskolnicov and in that way we can cultivate the true understanding about ourselves. Abandoning the effort to give mysterious truth, only when poetry combats with what reason can

never understand fully, it can become complimentary to philosophy. It can be expressed only if the infinite possibilities and numerous aspects of experience put the full promise of poetry to work. There are limitations to our abilities; we break down going beyond a point. But one rare soul can transcend it; the rest can find the shelter of mediocrity and remain safe. Some look at man as a well while some others as a water container to fetch water from a well. This contrast is merely for the sake of argument. In reality, many of us don't go deep, remain on the surface and obtain a few drops. To put it in true sense, man is a lake.

Kasme Devay Havisha Vidhem? (To Which Deity Shall We Make Offering?)

From Plato's times, the power of poet's word has been acclaimed. Various factors of the society keep trying to exploit this ability of a poet. A poet has been acclaimed as the forerunner of revolution. In every age, efforts have been made to bring the poet down to the society from his ivory tower. As a result of this, at times he ends up being the bard of a certain influential community of the society. And sometimes rather than singing that where there is dharma, there is victory, he is found singing the reverse as

well. He sings the songs of the war and is seen blowing the trumpet of propaganda. Now 'commitment' is the matter of discussion nowadays. A poet is indebted to the society, hence how can he, untouched by the good and evil of society, engage in writing poetry? Recently, British poet John Vein has raised this question in his article, 'Poetry and Social Criticism'

Matthew Arnold had insisted that poetry should be the criticism of life but later he added that poetry accomplishes this in its own distinct way. What is its distinct way then? Poetry doesn't insist on the unequivocal acceptance of a viewpoint. It accepts various approaches and possible viewpoints about one single truth. As a result of this, we can see life in totality and broader perspective. In the dealings of the world, we have to take the decision of making a choice from the alternatives available to us. At that time, we are flowing in the stream of life. Poetry provides us the objectivity. But this objectivity doesn't result from the indifference or lack of involvement with life. On the contrary, it makes it conducive for us to touch life more comprehensively.

As a part of society, the poet would certainly have his particular viewpoint. His pre-conceived notions and prejudices would also be there. It might not happen that he thinks everything logically. Don't we express some of our thoughts sentimentally? Is the poet's apparent uniqueness also not moulded in this way? Are his thoughts on the health and sickness of the society not expressed in his poetry? Eliot had said that the

social being and the poet should be differentiated. 'I' in the poem is a character; it is not the social being in the poet. Even if we accept this idea, it is still the imagination of an ideal, we cannot say that it can be fully realized.

If we look at the best poetry of our times, shall we come to think that criticism of life is the chief concern of the poet? Is it not merely one among the many concerns? Can we apply the objective criteria of judgment to the poetry which obviously expresses the views on society? Shall we not have to take a different position for evaluate it? We now have compilations such as 'Socialist Verse' and 'Committed Verse'. Looking at that, the question arises that can poetry preserve its poetic nature after donning the role of a vehicle of propaganda? Can propaganda be transformed into poetry?

When some political figure, or a leading citizen of society happens to make it to the Sahitya Parishad, advises us to write what will be seriously useful for living and for elevating life. The poet is asked, 'Don't you feel the ambition to make this world better?' How can one say 'no' in the reply? But if we don't give a reply in the simple language understandable to them, they will tend to think that poets are heartless, mere joy-seekers or cynics. They don't have the realization of the responsibility of one individual towards another. A poet can attract people's attention, and he can command their emotions. Poets possessing such powers should attack the evils prevalent in the society. What are these evils? For somebody who is in politics, the other party is such an evil.

An individual having a different viewpoint from mine is an evil to me. If I am a theist, an atheist is an evil to me. If I am a communist, a rich person is an evil to me. Thus, this evil has many faces. Who should I target? The new abuses added in our era among others like capitalist, imperialist, staunch believer in ethics, Fascist, and Reactionary hit our ears on a daily basis. Has 'Gandhism' not begun to be abusive and ridiculous? With the passage of time, being a human being stripped of all adjectives would also become an abuse.

Hence, the agonizing question for poetry is: which ideal should we pursue? The ready answer of this question is given to the poet. Here, nobody relies on the genius or talent of the poet. It seems that the conspiracy of the society has always been that of keeping the poet tied. Earlier, he was bound to the divine inspiration, now it is expected that he should behave according to the influential powers of the society.

There would be few ignorant beings who would be satisfied with the contemporary social situation. But it is one thing to shout slogans like, 'Change the Society' and to give it a new shape after proper analysis is another. In reality, society is afraid of immortality of poetry; the present generation is always tensed about what will the poetry of their times tell the new generation and what it means to the glory they have forged. Hence, the society is always making efforts to ensure that the poet does not remain to testify against society.

I too do not like a lot of things in the society. Such cruelty and barbarity are prevailing around. There is so much greed and tensions among people. How the so-called civilized high society is habituated to so much karmayata! So many so-called thinkers have become cynics. Who among us has not seen the beautiful picture of the earth taken from the moon? The moon looking beautiful from here is so ugly and lifeless in actuality. Mars also does not look so gorgeous. Hence, how mankind, which had the fortune to live on one of the most beautiful planet, has tarnished it with its misconduct, inhumanness and collective play of the destruction of war! We all act like spoiled brats. They wreck havoc by destroying the best of the things in the household. Yes, the world needs to be changed. But are imaginative creations the only most powerful instruments for accomplishing that? If you try to cut wood with a razor, you will not be able to do that and in addition, the razor will become useless in the end.

If art fails to be a competent instrument of social change, a certain section of society is always eager to exile art in Plato's style. Personal human relationships, art for no real purpose, natural beauty, or the enthusiasm for intellectual questioning-all these things seem unethical to that class of people. An artist seems to be a pygmy before the people who hold nobility of life as the only sacred thing. But if we look at it in another way, is such a mono-dimensional tendency not expression of serious limitation? There may be validity or unequivocality in it but it must have been possible by removing some important aspects. A tendency to disregard other aspects will prove dangerous to

mankind in the end. Thus, we can see two extremes: on one end, the active revolutionary who has knowingly limited his vision and on the other end, the creative artist who insists on totality, timelessness. But looking at the complexity of human experience, does it not seem natural that there would be these two extremes?

American poet Louis MacNeis has discussed some important things as regards poetry and propaganda. He says that the claim of propagandist poets is that they are realists. But this claim proves to be right when we accept that reality means practicality. Truth whether it emerges from poetry or science is not always simple or easy to understand. But the propagandist has to present things that would succeed in convincing the listeners and readers. In the true sense, realism accepts facts irrespective of the importance of its propaganda. Propagandists have their 'truth', but it is not the truth of a scientist or realist. It goes way away from the poetic truth. It is solely interested in changing the world. It uses the instruments needed to accomplish the end. Falsehood, perversion and tendency to simplify things complex are included in it. It can be justified in their own way but we cannot say that a poet will infallibly be able to write good poetry by accepting the truth of the propagandist. A poet does not need to be a propagandist. Even if he agrees to the objective of the propagandist, he should be sceptical about the possibility of realizing it by forcing it on poetry. Like Mathematics, poetry is a self-sufficient activity. If poor or Mathematics or poetry can be useful for

good purposes, those who are not mathematicians or poets, let them indulge in this misuse.

Many artists, at a certain stage of their career, get involved in some revolution. To struggle for some common collective ideal, to shoulder some responsibility along with some others, to develop the requisite discipline for that and to face fear standing by others-things are liked by us at a certain stage of life.

In our society, the artist has to go through the experience of loneliness. It is true that he can carry out his work satisfactorily without the interference of anyone but he has to lose the warmth and support which he can get by being with others. After years of creative activity, some get used to this loneliness but young writers find it difficult to face it. Hence, they form groups, come out with pamphlets, and keep mingling in the groups with enthusiasm. Their voice is louder than the necessary distance. Their hard work has the air of impudence. Many a time, it takes them to the battleground of politics. There, he begins to feel that he is someone important. 'We needed someone like you. You have god's gift. You will be able to communicate our viewpoint efficiently.'

In spite of excellent works an artist creates, society does not pay attention him. When there is some such limited to be accomplished, society pays heed to him. Young artists long for fame and recognition. Have we not seen the things that they do in order to

attain that? Only to satiate this longing, they join such groups and in order to remain faithful to the group, he is ready to sacrifice his unique self.

For some, this foolishness coming in the garb of deceptive seriousness seems more appropriate than the loneliness. Human experience is the subject of poetry. But that subject is so common that nobody finds it unique. And it is eternal. Hence, if there is something relevant, related to some social or political issue, people will be immediately drawn to it. In this, if he takes a position and speaks in the same way like those influential people, society places him on high pedestal: 'Our era needed this kind of an artist'. But later on realization takes place that it was all an illusion. That phase comes to an end and again indifference resumes. Ultimately, if the illusion is removed, he comes back on his path, otherwise he gets depressed and renders his powers useless.

Many are intrigued by the question, how much is the influence of a poet? In the court of law, the decree issued by a judge at the end of a trial is immediately carried out. But when an artist presents his work after years of hard work, what happens to it? Did many artists not remain unrecognized in their lifetime? But the idea regarding the influence of a poet is not always appropriate. A literary text does make an impact but it is more subtle and lasting. It makes a deep impact on the psyche of the people. Thus, such a comparison of influence will not be reasonable. Auden had said, paying tribute to Yeats, 'Nothing comes out of poetry'.

In our society, an obvious dislike for literary works is seen to be prevalent. Many consider it as waste of words and indulgence in whims and fancies. And there is a premium on engaging with some concrete work. Being active on the part of an artist is not of apparent nature. Hence, in their youth, writers are also seen to be hypnotized by the tendency to become active, joining some movement. Many of our time-honoured writers were 'progressive' writers in their younger days. They also used to give out declarations and shout slogans. The same has happened in the West too. Boudelaire used to believe that we are not going to be able to completely eradicate the evils of human situation; man-animal likes to wander in the wilderness of cruelty and violence, life's real beauty comes out in the petals of hell's flowers. Can we imagine somebody who thinks like this will ever join those clamouring for revolution? But in 1848, he was one of those activists who looted the arms shop and he was shouting slogans too. When Spanish people raised their head against Ferdinand VII, English poet Alfred Tennyson was one among those who expressed their sympathy for them and sent financial support to Spanish revolutionaries by collecting funds.

To join this or that revolution, to be devoted to a certain limited and concrete purpose, and the sincerity and warmth one feels and the public respect one gets, rids the artist of the loneliness. And in addition, he feels the illusion that his individual problems are

also taken care of at the moment. But if he is not able to face these issues, it must be said that he doesn't have what it takes to be an artist. After accepting the responsibility as an artist, he should learn to make use of the responses the contemporary political and social situation invoke in him and others as his raw material. For this, he should cultivate the necessary objective position. But as an artist the distinct personality he has developed and whatever he feels are most important. Hence, certain incident may be deemed to be political in nature alone, but by feeling it in the totality, it might happen that he might stumble upon some unexpected results. On the contrary, due to the limitations arising out of the involvement in the movement grow so insensitive that they fail to respond to an incident like an ordinary human being does. What response could the most of the artists give in Russia to the betrayal by Stalin to the Left wing people? For the whole of their life time, many remained imprisoned in the mould made of equations like, 'Stalin means Russia and Russia means revolution'. How did they respond when Russia made peace with Nazis in 1939? What was their response when right after the war, free elections were not allowed to be held in territories under the control of Germany's Soviet reign? What did they do when Russia constructed the empire of east Europe? What impact did they make in response to what happened in Hungary in 1965? The memory of what happened in Czechoslovakia is fresh in our minds. During this period, to what extent, the agony of withdrawing the faith placed in Stalin or the contemplation over that has been expressed in Soviet literature?

If a certain political event becomes the subject matter of poetry, it must be drastically transformed. Such poetry should be evaluated from this view point. We should not form the bias simply by the virtue of the fact that it is based on political theme. If we cultivate such a bias, it would be like removing a significant part of life from poetry. We merely need to see and relish how poetic expression has been accomplished in it. That it takes us away from our prejudices is the real ability of poetry.

The word, 'people' has a unique place in our times. To move away from people invokes a sense of guilt in us. If an art work becomes suitable for public taste, no excessive subtlety creeps in it, on the contrary if there is some roughness and rustic hue, we feel the sense of satisfaction of being close to people. Hence, to remain least conscious about the formalist features of a work, to create least intricacy in the work, to avoid obscurity- such tendencies keep expressing themselves in different terminology. It is expected that a word should be on par with folk literature. Today, again folk literature is in vogue. A certain class of people is ready to grab it as a competent instrument of propaganda.

The truth of the matter is that an artist is always relishing the inheritance of the tried and tested traditions of expression. He can make use of all the material regarding that. The advancement of art can never be adverse to the life of people at large.

Sartre Aaj na Sandarbh ma (Sartre: In Today's Context)

One of the young friends- a lecturer in French was going to France for further studies. When I told him, 'Do write to me if some writing expressing the views of the new generation towards Sartre is published', he told me, 'There is no influence of Sartre on the new generation. He has been forgotten long back.'

Sartre himself had said that he was writing for his contemporaries. He didn't claim that he had something to say about the new generation too. This is in sync with his philosophy. There cannot be permanent truths. With changing times, new consciousness is moulded, new questions arise and sense of values evolves. However, it is not that the experience becomes completely redundant. Hence, in many ways, Sartre's philosophy does not seem to be irrelevant even in today's context. But during this period, the literary climate has changed. Merlo Ponte had said that today if a philosopher wants to say something about his philosophy, he would need to tell a story. It is well-known that existential philosophy has been very well expounded by novels and dramas. A certain class may be delighted by the philosophical argumentation away from real life, but existentialists were not among them. Hence, what they aspired to do was to present the human context and realize philosophy by letting it evolve that way. Human character cannot be preordained otherwise it removes the scope of individuality in human transactions. Hence, existentialist literature privileges possibility over preordained nature of things.

The temperament of today's generation in France is different. It does not like to dig deep into philosophy-of course literature is out of the way. They are bored of discussion of principles, arguments and wrong debates. One can see widespread reaction to rational approaches. When the new edition of Alexander Dumas' novel was published, a writer of the new generation had said with a sense of relief, 'Finally, we found a writer to drag us to the depth of things!' During the 30s and 40s, the characters in a novel were not able to even drink water without making serious statement on life. Drinking vodka or whisky, they used offer definite statements on life, death, human destiny and the world. Many novelists were after challenging the existence of God and invoking the feeling of spiritual disillusionment. A young novelist was advised to incorporate all this in his novel. Hence, a writer called Roger Ikor had said, 'What tyranny! A novel is not a treatise.'

Clamouring and indulging in false notions, intellectuals used to create such a situation that they used to find it difficult to take this or that side. As a result of all this, there was growing dislike for the literature committed to a cause. Again there was a leaning towards writing novels with new formalistic features; new full-fledged experiments along this line began.

The novelists of Sartre's generation were playing the role of an inevitable witness to the agonizing era. They were struggling to incorporate a vast field of experience in the

sphere of thinking. Therefore, the image of an intellectual changed totally. The moment you say that, 'So-and-so is an intellectual', the image of a lifeless, narrow-minded, unpleasant, dumb kind of a being flashes on our minds. This new age does not deem fit that they dabble into active politics in a direct fashion. He has to construct cultural values and create an atmosphere in which they can be preserved. Renowned thinker Sioran had called intellectuals completely inefficient cultural filing clerks, frustrated people who are stuck up, between the tolerance and mechanical ways of life, leading an existence raptly keen on self-destruction. Some have begun to believe that our culture has lost the strength due to the devotion to intellectuality. It seems that it is paralyzed because of its self consciousness and its insistence on complexity. The faith in this or that political ideology has replaced the religious faith. Scepticism has taken away the enthusiasm and vigour of life. Insistence of morality has begun to be deemed irrelevant.

Firstly, deities were at the centre and then the Almighty took its place. Kings got the recognition as the representative of the people, feudalism came and went, a certain class enjoyed privileged position, and then the significance of an individual was established and individual also disappeared. Malro said that Nietzsche had declared the death of God and now we have to declare the new of the disappearance of a human being! Dostoevsky had described a human being as an animal residing in a hole. Kafka too showed him transforming into an insect in his novel. In a drama titled, 'Flies', Sartre also looks at human beings degraded to the level of insects. Then, it is well-known that

Allan Robb-Griye described human beings as an object and talked about 'thingification' and 'thusness'. He has ridiculed what goes in the name of serious thinking by calling it fantasies. Human beings crowding like insects have degraded themselves. Earlier, there was the question of creating a distinct image of a human being and now there are desperate efforts of erasing the human face. The illusory fantasy of progress moving in a straight line sounds like a cruel joke now.

Malthus had just pinpointed towards population explosion. But now there are more frightening things. Due to the advancement of technology, other, more intricate issues have arisen. As it is progressing rapidly, it seems humans will be left behind gradually. Up until the beginning of the 19th century, this pace was not more than the velocity of a fast running horse. At the end of a century after that, railways were properly established and it acquired pace. Cars and planes came in the 20th century. We still feel that Wright brothers have just been around, and now there are jumbo jets with the capacity of flying 400 people in it. These jumbo jets can fly up to the height of 30 thousand feet and cut the distance of 5000 miles without a halt. Parallel to this, there is progress in communication, production and warfare. Hence, people's expectations have also gone up. Now, expectations are that the whole world lives under one economy and discard the old-fashioned method of war to avoid conflicts. Keeping pace with the rapid pace of technology and issues arising out of it, thinkers too have to keep moving on. The information needed in order to resolve these issues can be obtained with the help of

computers, but they cannot help in the aspect of thinking. Thinkers themselves have to think. Thinkers like Cains, Whiner, and Sartre have tried to cope with this complexity. It is a question whether history shall reserve a place for them in the league of great thinkers. Right now, as the influence of their thinking is felt in our lives so we respect them as thinkers. Some of Cains thoughts have begun to sound old-fashioned. However, his influence is deep enough on the modern economist, and even those who call him old-fashioned do it by remaining in the mould of their thinking. Ricardo and Adam used to hold a place of high esteem but they did not have to face the complexity Cains had to deal with. Whiner is considered to be the pioneer of 'cybernetics'. It is considered to be one of the few great constructs of our times. Today, whatever is included is not Whiner's contribution but he was the one who opened up the realm of its possibilities. Afterwards, his able successors realized those possibilities. Thus, it was Whiner who realized the concept of cybernetics and placed it on firm footing. Sartre is one of the existentialists. It is not that he is the first existentialist. That esteem can be bestowed perhaps on Kierkegaard, and contemporary thinkers like Gabriel Marshall and Heidegger also have their influence on the contemporary thought. If look it historically, the names of St. Augustine, William James and Nietzsche should also be placed here. However, Sartre connected this thinking with the centre of four contemporary issues and due to that, existentialism emerged as such a potent force in our times.

It seems that all of a sudden economics has taken the place of religion and politics. Today, it has the deepest influence on the society. Their employment, standards of living, expectations and aspirations rely on the efficiency of their politicians towards economy. Economically backward countries have to depend on the efficiency of the other countries towards their economy. If those other countries will utilize this efficiency for mere selfish ends, the poor countries shall face dire circumstances. In our times, all competent thinkers will have to wreck their brains for facing the economic problems. Cains had understood this before everything else.

Cains made the economic dimensions arising out of Versailles pact to the economic reasons leading up to World War II as his subject of study. He presented many new concepts and structures for new concepts in his 'Treatise on Money'. It has been developed in his later texts, especially in a significant text, 'The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money'. Unemployment and recession were a severe reality of his times. Hence, he focused his thinking on these issues. He emphasised upon striking a balance of savings and its investment. If we can provide employment to people and if they become consumers, the investment in the world of industry will be promoted and employment opportunities may emerge too. He did not like the stagnant kind of balance. In his view, it was necessary that an imbalance also continues to play out. He was adept at understanding the process of complex, dynamic situations. If the duration between investment and savings keeps expanding, there will be surge, but if

the duration between savings and investment keeps expanding, investment will gradually lag behind and it usher in recession and unemployment.

Cains did not believe that we will be able to cope with this situation by increasing and decreasing the interest rates. According to him, 'liquid preferences' should be borne in mind. In his view, it is one of the crucial aspects in people's investment. It is related to the mental makeup of the people as well. The future economist will have to focus more on that.

No economist has the magic to resolve all the contemporary problems of his country. He can suggest the solution of a few issues, may try to explain the economic situation in a new way, but more than that, he can shape a tendency to cope with the complexities of the situation by analysing it efficaciously. Dogmatic economist would employ principles in a mechanical way in the present scenario and when he fails, he will take out his ire on the society.

In philosophy too, the method of breaking reality into pieces has been there since Greek philosophers' times. Its relationship with Mathematics is self-evident. By pointing out that simplicity lies beneath the complexity, we have been taking the route to end the complexity. People like Newton, Maxwell and Einstein have attained considerable success at it. The tendency is that the aspect in other fields which malleable should be taken into consideration, and disregards the rest. This tendency is found in Psychology

and Economics too. We have been less inclined towards examining an issue in its totality.

In Sartre and other existentialists, the defiance to face this complex situation is quite apparent. They abandoned the mould of rationality-based analysis which tried to explain that the world is meaningful. Instead of that, they wanted to identify the experience of the present moment in its totality. Compared to the abstract constructs conceptualized by a rational tendency, the reality of the experience of every moment is more important. A human being comes into his own only at the time of behaviour. At that time, transcending the mould of beliefs, he becomes balanced in the present moment. He does not shoulder the burden of history nor does he get bound in the chains of beliefs. They don't get lost in to the quest for an underlying truth beneath the external layer of reality. They are keen only on recognizing the truth of every moment. This truth is to be looked at in the context of a distinct individual. Therefore, it is concrete and distinct, and not of general kind.

When the existentialists faced the complexity, they faced it not by simplifying it or by planting meaning in the meaningless absurdity but by accepting it. Even if the complexity lying in a single moment is meaningless, we need to accept the reality as such. Meaning usually comes as the conclusion of something and it refers to a certain structure. But the charge against the existentialist is that in spite of the audacity to face

the complexity, he is somewhat lazy; he is in the habit of pampering himself. He has the courage as he expects the man to face the world without relying on any meaning. He believes that man can prove his humanness by decisions made by him. However, the charge against him is that he gives up the efforts to understand the world and keeps pampering the consciousness of the moment. It needs to be accepted that existentialism had a considerable influence upon the young generation and the values it wanted to create. The youth craves for self-expression. They accept the inevitability of rebellion. To take oneself seriously is a sacred responsibility to them. They pride celebrate the existing state of mind and reject any pre-conceived structure. Such philosophy or attitude will certainly appeal the youth but only as long as the rest of the structure of the society is strong and is able to lead towards the direction of rebellion relying on the material stability. There is a certain belief that existentialism as a philosophy cannot prove to be very effective for the whole society. It is useful in understanding the human experience and to that extent, it makes a favourable impact on the other prevalent philosophies. As an attitude, we need to accept its power to face complexity. To face it, as we have seen earlier, Cains had to make an effort to understand complexity.

Looking at it in one way, in the domain of ideas what is called Euclid age is over. Euclid had accepted that the world of our thoughts is triangular or rectangular and unadulterated. These were the givens behind his theories. The influence of Plato and Aristotle was deep at that time. Their followers too examined constructs as pure and

stable. They were in an illusion that they are examining the reality. Truly speaking, they were analysing the employment of language regarding the constructs. Mathematicians and scientists were also included in this. They were also examining the well-constructed world of Physics and the relationships which can be established therein. Now we are facing such complexity that there is no escape but to come out of the orderly world of logic. We will have to enter an intellectual world of different climate, leaving the constructs and preordained relationships. Human body is perhaps its most complex system. There are many layers in it.

Norbert Wiener has constructed the borders of this complex 'physiological world'. Its components are different: positive and negative feedback. The proportion of the change in sensitivity, self-established wealth institutions and independent methods etc are included in it, now there is nobody to create a method to control all this by remaining outside. This system creates itself and strengthens itself. Whatever happens is merely a change. Thus, different things continue to come into being. A well-expanded domain of concepts is about to emerge. It is not the world of Mathematics. It is the world of the creator of concepts. It is at the moment a matter of concern as to whether our constructs will develop enough to cope with the growing complexity, now we cannot work with the slow pace. What happened in the 20th century will have to be accomplished in a quarter of a century and its expansion will also have to be carried out at the same pace. Compared what Copernicus achieved, the revolution brought about by Wiener is more

fundamental. But except for a few Mathematicians and Methodists, nobody has paid attention to that.

Scholars get attracted to seemingly more profound and intricate constructs. It inflates their ego. But at times one can do the same things with the help of simple constructs. We miss to explain new constructs in the light of old constructs. Till date, it does not seem likely that intellectuals will leave the world created by Euclid all that easily. They still feel that the prestige and authenticity will be maintained in it. But Whiner is another Columbus of our age. We have to accept the fact that he has discovered a new continent. New thinking mostly emerges as a reaction to some of the old ideologies that were becoming irrelevant to the present context. History gives evidence to this. Communism came against capitalism. But Fascist tendencies have reared their head again and at a time when it is exuding in new forms in many countries, shall we have any new thinking as a reaction against it? The alternative to democracy as it has been employed does not seem to be successful. Perhaps this is not the era of comprehensive ideology encompassing all. It seems that this is an age in which there are different ideologies to address different contemporary issues. It also appears that only that ideology which can be useful in coping with the present situation will become more acceptable. Many believe that an era in which ideologies can remain acceptable for a long time and people can have faith in, has come to an end.

It may happen that certain ideologies may become fashionable. Among us, existentialism and void appeared more as a fashion. Simultaneously, many ideologies will seem to proliferate as fashion and each individual will accept different ideologies as per his requirement. As a result, there is a possibility that mysterious beliefs satisfying the individual whims will enter again as fashion. Experiences uncontrolled by logic and haywire will have to face things now. Due to the emphasis placed on the individual expression, a kind of sentimental Epicureanism will take the place of rationality-bred thinking. Whether it will open up new directions or it will go on to become a perversion of our intellectual inheritance, one can say only after some time. When there will be no thinking which will show us the direction, it may happen that directionless state would become our ideal and, we may create a structure of philosophy in order to justify it. Hence, the significance of the moment will be established instead of the continuity of time.

However, the fascination among the youth for a certain kind of idealism is a good sign. The youth still have the enthusiasm to organize study-circles, NGOs, and workshops. But the elders bring them under their control in the name of guiding them and make use of their organizations for their political, religious or worldly objectives. This is the reaction and hence there are acute differences between them. Only through some causeless violence, their impulses find an outlet. If there is no clarity regarding ethics of conduct, the structure of the society should be such that there should be no space for

such conduct. At one point of time, there was a regulation by the religious faith. We have not been able to establish anything in its place. As expounded earlier, we had established kind in the place of God. Dethroning him, we have reached up to the method of counting heads and establishing majority. There is not much of a difference between religious superstition and the belief that everything will be alright if count heads and act accordingly. We are bound to believe that since we elected them, they automatically become efficient and deserving. Then there is another notion prevalent that even they cannot afford to lose their efficiency. If that happens, their throne will be in danger at the time of next election. But now we know out of experience that this lack of efficiency is a more dangerous thing than the intentional misconduct. It is not that an inefficient politician has intentionally become inefficient because of an evil in him; his evil arises out of the tendency to cover up his inefficiency. Rather than covering politicians with our prejudices, we should think about the situation as well. Thinking does not arise from mere situation. It is an ability which has to be cultivated and there should be a provision for cultivating that in our educational institutions.

Now perhaps the era of politics, political parties and polarization of ideologies is over, and its place will have to be taken by an efficient system. Instead of faith and ideology, we will need to understand the complexity of human transactions and the intricacies arising out of it. We will have to focus more on the on the method and the objectives of economics. We will need to discard the terminology of the expansion of power and

accept the language of stability and firmness. Instead of the symbol of the party, now we will need to be loyal to the efficiency of the method of working.

Whoever busies himself with any of the knowledge domains will have to keep this reference of the intellectual world in mind. The support to the inflexible tendency of supporting what is stable will not sustain anymore. The tendency to keep the world away as much as possible with the help of constructs will also prove suicidal. We don't live in a pure world. If we will try to order the world in accordance by imagining some pure ultimate element and deem it indestructible, we are likely to get the whole sum wrong. The ostrichist tendency to call the complexity created by man as illusion will bring destruction.

After the intellectual like Sartre who pondered over contemporary scenario is no more, the question arises: does the world now need such intellectuals anymore? Today's thinker is one who writes editorials of newspapers. He concludes everything hastily. There has to be some comments as soon as an incident takes place. How will the thinkers of tomorrow be useful to the society? How will the process of thinking go on if we would no longer have great thinkers? Are new thinking and new intellectual approaches needed now? Or is it good to order and use whatever has been expounded by thinkers so far?

Intellectual values can be useful for the process of reaching some value judgment as the summation of what they suffer through and experience. This will provide the direction for the future human transactions. It is true that religion no longer holds any significance to us. However, the regulation of inherent human standards of morality has remained to a certain extent. The way existentialism came into being in order to understand the human context after World War II and the human destiny in the new perspective, will any thinking emerge which can grapple with the present condition? Even if such thinking emerges, will its evolutions still go on at a slow pace? Will it merely be a result of evolution or it would have the influence of certain thinkers?

Sarjak, Sarjan, Vivechan – Kriyashil ane Pranvan Sannikarsh (Writer, Writing and Criticism-Meaningful and Effective Dialogue)

Even in the West, the history of literary criticism has remained somewhat peculiar. It seems to be oscillating between two extremes: either there is emphasis on 'subjective' creative experience and behaviour, internalizing emotions, and the unpremeditated delight, or there is emphasis on certain 'objects' (mountains, natural scenery like sunset or man-made 'artefacts'). It is also seen that both viewpoints meet at a certain stage. But even then, the difference between the two is explained by privileging one over the other. The distinction between the two remains. There was a lot of hue and cry in the

19th and the 20th century over whether literary criticism should adopt a 'subjective' or 'objective' approach.

In 'Ion', Plato has exhibited his leaning towards 'subjective' viewpoint. In it, emphasis has been laid on creativity, creative experience and the creative pursuits of an artist, especially of a poet. In 'Phaedrus', he focuses on the literary texts. He discusses the issues related to the form of beauty but he has not explained what could be the relationship between the 'subjective' and 'objective' in this domain.

Aristotle has mostly discussed things keeping a work of art in view. His discussions are carried out, with little concern towards the creativity of the poet or the experience of relish on the part of the reader. Of course, there is exception in it: while defining tragedy, he forms rules based on the responses of the audience. It becomes a prime example of his inability to explain the form of tragedy in any other way. Lasing's discussion on 'Laokun' becomes the example of object-centric literary criticism. Bomgartan has discussed the other end. To him, literary criticism is a 'specific mode of cognition'. Kant discusses regarding the a priori form of effortless acquisition in '*Critique of Pure Reason*'. In '*Critique of Judgment*', we get to see a broader position on that. The dialogue of the reader with the work of art and beauty is also included in it. For him, whatever is approved by the trained mind is of considerable significance. He discusses the requisite conditions and finesse for that. He has discussed that in very few

paragraphs. There is not much new in it. His discussion on beauty and nobility is also of the same kind. Hegel has laid emphasis on the element of beauty in art. He does say that the artefact the artist creates in his distinct way is made in sync with the consciousness; however, he has not discussed the relationship between the 'objective' and 'subjective' nature of writing.

Visher has, as if, created the spiritual context of beauty and art but afterwards, he turns towards the issue of instruction a work of art offers and discusses 'empathy' especially.

In this way, he opens the door to psychology. Feckner's thinking is in contrast with Hegel's. Leaps certainly emphasizes the 'subjective' viewpoint. In the end, he turned the whole discussion towards one branch of psychology.

Valdemar Connad is the first to accept the Phenomenological approach to literary criticism; he has analyzed the works of various arts like literature, music, painting etc in a simple way. He has not said much about the creative experience of the artist or the process of relishing a work. He considers artefacts as 'ideal objects' and like Hegel, calls them timeless and immortal. Moritz Geiger discusses the subjective aspects. He is aware of the impact of experiences. There are some discrepancies in his discussion in order to define the issue of the relish of a work. He says in the preface to 'Approaches to Art' that our attitude to relishing a work depends on our experience as a reader. We can attend to the issue of relishing of work only after crystallizing our experience of

relishing a work. What should be the form of a work of art, what is the quality of aesthetic relish- these are questions that he considers to be the subject of appreciation of a work of art. He believes that the quality of aesthetic relish is an inherent element in a work of art. A rational approach to aesthetic relish is not able to exercise any power over that. Here again, he emphasizes the experience of a reader. In his discussions, there are frequent references to the psychological approach to aesthetic relish. Our relish is usually guided by some 'object'. By saying this, he points towards the possibility of 'object aesthetics'.

Thus, in the art criticism oscillating between two extremes, there is felt a lack of a connecting link between the two. In the domain of the issues concerning art criticism, phenomenology is an ontological inquiry. Max Dessoir (1907) and Enlilnitz has created that clamour for 'common sciences of arts'. They wanted to establish a parallel science to aesthetics. There are two different directions of such an investigation: one has to do with art and work of art. It strives to explain the structural elements and attributes of a work of art; whereas the second one is concerned merely with the experience of aesthetic relish. It is as if the connecting link between the two is lost.

'The common science of art' remained the cause of a lot of misunderstanding. In it, as if there was a resistance to accept aesthetics as a branch of philosophy. There was no clear understanding on the form of the common science. Was it going to become a science or

remain a branch of philosophy? Even if it is a science, it would not be so keenly interested in the history of its development; only that it can strive to bring some order in the ordinary domain of the principles of art. But it is certain that more and more terms like 'the common science of art' and 'principles of literature' began to come into being. In 1930, Ermalinger had used the term 'philosophy of art'.

What they meant by common in 'common science of art' is not clear to us. Would it mean the generalizations based on the experience of certain distinct works of art? What would be that experience? Was it that they wanted to prove it the way they did in the comparative literature? Or was there some other way of proving it? Did they want to prove it by analyzing it by way of taking the general content of certain distinct works of art?

In 1927, Roman Ingard wrote the first volume on this subject. His opinion was that the method of empirical generalization cannot be used in the aesthetics. Not the concepts regarding a work of art or of a certain distinct work of art, but there can be an 'eidetic analysis' of a universal work of art. It is a mistake to place the examination of the general form of a work of art and the experience of aesthetic relish against one another.

From the beginning, a work of art has been deemed to be the intentional result of creative pursuits of an artist. Along with that, the coherence arrangement of its elements was included in the structure of a work of art. A text will require its author, but along

with that, it also expects the experience of the reader which re-creates the text in a way and that is why because of the kind and nature of its existence, the text puts forward a completely different way of experience and subject as its condition of survival. It points towards the readers and listeners in the considerably long history of its existence. In another way one can also say that this experience should take place in such a way that it points towards only a certain object due to its particular form. It is not that the different experiences are needed for this object, for the text or its existence alone but it also requires the physical objects like a monument of marble, the canvass full of paints. These objects should be shaped by the artist himself. The readers should be able to relish it properly too. So that the text can unfold itself in this background and by not changing for a long time make all the readers feel the uniformity of experience. Thus, we include certain objects in the discussion as the material ontological foundation of a work of art. The creative work of an artist includes not only just the creative experience of the artist but it also includes certain material processes. To give a certain shape to certain objects, to take recourse to some processes so that the object, painting, sculpture or musical composition can serve as the ontological base. On the other hand, the reader has to complete the work of art and its well-knit coherence. Before he internalizes the object of aesthetic relish, he has to internalize the elements complimentary to the former. For this a trained reader is expected. He has to accomplish the distinct aesthetic relish. In this way, the relationship of the artist and the individual who relishes the

work is created. It enters the background of the work and presents itself as its ontological base. All these elements create a harmonious whole. Hence, this domain includes the work and the individual entering a dialogue with it and that is where we find unison of some sort. Therefore, we consider aesthetics a branch of Philosophy.

We will not be able to afford to disregard the issue of the value of aesthetic relish. We will need to search for a construct of aesthetics which will make the unity possible of encompassing the whole domain of all these issues.

In the conference of philosophers, these issues of aesthetics were discussed. In it, Roman Ingard presented one argument that while formulating the attributes of the aesthetics, it should begin with the fact of the encounter between the artist of the reader and the work. Due to this unique encounter, at times the work evolves, the object of aesthetic relish comes into being and an artist or a reader rich with aesthetic sense is also born.

We should not make the mistake of considering all the experiences and transactions because of which a work of art comes into being as active or contributory and we should not consider all the transactions and experiences resulting in the aesthetic relish of a work of art as passive and receptive. In both the situations, there are phases of passivity and reception, relish and acceptance, active participation and transcending

what has been given, and the evolution of something new. The new and unprecedented is the result of the honest endeavour of an artist or reader.

This process or transaction does not come to an end in the creative process of the artist. It continues in some material processes as well. By the end of which, the base of the material existence of a work of art is also laid. The form conducive to aesthetic relish is devised by the creative process. Gradually, its design begins to crystallize and it comes to the fore in the aesthetic relish. It seems that this experience is to be given a concrete shape in the work. The results which come due to this should be controlled by the artist. It is needed for realizing the objectives of an artist. Some of things come out as conclusion in this: there are certain phases of the material base at the time of creation of every work of art, and the structure of a work emerging in the mind of the artist gradually evolves in the process of constructing the base of its material existence. The efficacy comes into being at the time of shaping its physical base. The artist controls and examines them these results. These regulations work at the time of receiving a text and internalizing the attributes of a work. A painter should look at the result of the work of a particular period; he should examine what has been created on the canvass and its efficacy from the point of view of art. This is how an artist can carry on his work and this act of giving a material base to a work makes it possible to make requisite changes or completely transform it. On the other hand, the individual who relishes the work does not act as a passive recipient of the work. For the time being, at the time of

receiving the work, as he is in the process of re-creating it, he becomes not only active but the artist as well.

After the initial phase of the experience of the reception, the creative phase of the work, which has been internalized and re-created, begins. In this phase, the reader transcending the state of merely relishing a work engages himself in the creative process of completing the work. He makes value addition to the quality of aesthetic relish and in that way, establishes the value system of receiving a work. Of course, it is no necessary that it should happen every time. At times, without taking the cue from the work, the reader is attributes that particular nature to it. When this happens, the aesthetic relish does not depend entirely on the work as it is. Whether the quality is established objectively or not can be judged only after the position we get at the end of the observation of such various situations.

Such behavior or response of the reader can be considered creative. Not only should he be governed by what has been created in the work, but it is expected that the reader should take the initiative to fill the gaps with the aesthetic sense he has. He has to imagine with his intuitive insight how the work would seem when the hitherto unexplored elements of the work are realized. Mostly, the achievement of bringing the work in the purview of intuition becomes possible due to his active interaction with the work. If it does not happen, it all becomes tasteless and lifeless.

This process could be of both, active-passive or active-creative kind. It is not necessary to believe that it is a product of a conscious effort. A human being guided by the physical and mental powers does experience some changes in this process. The form of this change is based on the way the encounter takes place and the kind of shape the object of relish or work of art takes. If this process results into a true and honest work of art, this process and the newly discovered work leaves an indelible imprint of the image of the artist. Our encounter with a great work results into the creation of an object of relish possessing a very high quality. At that time, we pass through a lasting and important transformation.

Parallel to the various changes and processes taking place in the mind of the artist or the reader, changes take place in the object of relish as well. A work of art comes into being gradually and changes do keep occurring in the form and characteristics according to its phase of development during that time period. It is difficult to state about a work that comes into being and its governing principles work in what sort of limits. A work of art does not show any signs of its gradual evolution. There is no doubt about the changes it goes through. These changes follow the phase of its development.

When we are analyzing a work, there should be no shortcomings in it; it should be carried out properly. Its re-creation on the part of the reader should be done without doing injustice to the work. When this happens, we can consider the different phases of

interpretation as the investigation of its different parts and characteristics and the process of intuitive understanding. Thus, interwoven in this, two parallel processes go on: the analysis and evolution of the work and the intuitive understanding of the work. When these two come together, we call it an 'encounter' in the proper sense. The re-creation of a work would be rare and if it happens so, we can consider the work dead; from the perspective aesthetic relish it has become static and that is why it is not able to realize the objective of its creation. In addition to this, the purification of a work is also possible; it is possible to mend the flaws of the work. In that way, it may be like attributing the characteristics of aesthetic relish and values on the structure of a work. Until the reader re-creates by completing a work and his interaction with the work comes to a halt, the object of relish lies untouched in the work.

The process of evaluation of a work should be such that there should be no changes in the already existing work and there is no disturbance to it, only if this happens, we can avoid the possibility of ontological changes.

It may happen that the process of assuming shape and taking the form of an object of relish may be different in the case of work of art. The reason for this is that the experience shaping it and the circumstances in which it is created are different. As examples of a class and as individual works of art, they are different. Hence, when a reader is analyzing a work of art, there are different impressions on him and his

experience of relishing a work may also be different. In the individual relishing the work and the two parallel processes for relishing the work, there is a relativism and inevitability. One cannot study them by isolating them from one another. The task of expounding the fundamental realities that aesthetics takes upon itself and the point from where this has to begin is the end product of the interaction between the human being and an object lying outside to him and different and independent to him.

This object may be a thing, physical event, a fact of life, an experience of the reader, a note of music, a symphony, the contrast created by different colours placed together or a unique spiritual attribute. All this comes from outside and inspires the artist by pressing him for a realization of the same. This realization could be of the imaginative nature but it does take place. This object plays a part in making the artist active. It imparts a completely new temperament in place of the day-to-day, habitual haphazard tendencies.

This object should have the attribute to fascinate us because it creates very deep emotions in us and it also forms a mysterious atmosphere around it; this mysteriously incisive characteristic is called 'reizend' in German. This object should be such that the fascination for it should result into its relish in the end. By its mere presence, it should be able to satisfy the longing for a dialogue in the spectator or reader. By its merit if it is able to succeed at this, it would create an object of relish of an ancient kind.

This quality seemingly appears incomplete and seems to be giving a different meaning. But later on it almost dictates terms to the reader and leads him to realize the shortcomings. Sometimes, this shortcoming can be quite disharmonious. It may lead the reader to look for other qualities complimentary to the first one and as a result the whole thing comes to fruition. In this way, the disharmonious flaw is also taken care of. Thus, the reader may experience going through the process up to the point where he finds the complimentary qualities. This other quality will establish a relationship with the earlier one and will also create a new shape out of the combination of the two. This quest is the beginning point of creative pursuit. It not only discovers the shape but also creates the basis for the quality in which the shaper finds its 'ontological base'. It accomplishes its existence only through it.

This object may be the compilation of sounds, three-dimensional architecture, or a linguistic structure of sentences; it should be given proper shape so that it can become experienced by sense perceptions. This shape is what we call a work of art. If an aesthetically satisfying form is to be shaped, it is expected that there is a harmonious relationship between the shape and the attributes endowed upon the work. The end product which emerges from this is self-sufficient and aesthetically satisfying form is created on its own with it. It is also possible that the end product may lead us to some other quality about which we had intuitively thought. In spite of not being indifferent to it, he may not have paid attention to it so much. When this happens, the process of

shaping a work of art moves a step forward. This restless quest and creativity result in the relish and peace of heart in the end. That which accomplishes peace and creativity is valuable not simply because we were aspiring for it, but also because it is self-sufficient. The object created by imagination is already passed on to the work of art, if we wish to create a dialogue with it, we will need to enter the imaginative journey ourselves. There are important changes taking place in the object of relish. That is why there is an emphasis now laid that we should have a stable meaning of a work. That is why an artist tries to give shape to his creative experience in such a way that that shape can inspire certain mental and physical behavior due to which an object or transaction takes place which can serve as the material base of the existence of the work.

If that artist is a poet, he writes poetry. In doing so, he is at first inspired to attributes of a work seen in imagination. Sometimes, he is inspired by one of the parts of the whole. The poetry which is in the process of taking shape is seen only vaguely in the beginning and it has the competence to merely show a glimpse of an aesthetically valuable shape. After that, the poet fills in the necessary details.

If the artist or the individual who relishes the work has the right attitude, he can endow the work with the liveliness and depth that can inspire the emergence of aesthetic qualities.

If we think of the already created poem, it will be pleasing not only by mere reading. So we recite it. But too much of recital can also hamper the relishing of poem. In matters of this sort, it is enough that the qualities of a poem dawn on us on their own. Only then its subtle qualities will come out and touch us to the core but this is perhaps limited to literature alone. Can this be true of the unfinished poem or symphony?

When an artist is creating an ontological base for his work which he has shaped mentally but he has merely an idea by then that inspires him to move towards giving it the proper shape. It may happen that he may have an in-depth clarity as regards certain parts of the work. At times he realizes that this clarity regarding certain parts is coming in the way of shaping some fundamental traits of the work or is giving a different shape to the form of the work. Due to this, a work may become more effective because in such a situation he changes the structure of the work and makes it as much complete as possible. At times, when he is not able to do that, he is frustrated and drops the efforts of creating that work. But even when this happens, there is no need to discard the thought he was pursuing. It should not be that the shape that if it fails to take proper shape in the first attempt, it fails as an idea. On the contrary, if he is able to present his idea in the backdrop of the different shape, the work should be deemed successful. During the various changes and activities, it may happen that when the work is taking shape or the fundamental idea is evolving and other details of the work are fitting in the place, he may not be acting creatively all throughout. During quite a few phases of his

work, he may also be a witness to the shape of the work of art, the other parts, and the various details of the characteristics.

Works of art behave differently at the time of being structured and at the time of conveying the message. Both the processes create their problems which the artist has to transcend.

This process passes through many phases. During it, there goes on interaction and transaction between some object and a sensitive artist. This object is two, instead of one: the work being created and the material, fundamental object which continues to transform under the artist's influence. These two also go through mutual transformations. It is not the clash of two dead objects; it is an active and lively confluence.

***Vivechan no Chaitanyavadi Abhigam* (The Critical Approach of Critics of Consciousness)**

What does the criticism of a literary work ultimately place in front of itself as an objective? Some critics lay emphasis on establishing certain details beyond any doubt about the text. But it is well-known that it is not possible state things in that way about a literary work. Hence, at times, there is an effort to force a text into the mould of the

givens of a critic. Therefore, some important elements of a text are not considered. The one who explains the structure of a text does not offer his views on the nuances of the text. At times, while discussing the elements of symbol, images etc are interpreted in the old fashioned way. Hence, there is the satisfaction of giving a good logical interpretation. But does that satisfy our inclination for literature? We try to be concrete in the name of art. But taking it all in the domain of theory would bring us back to the abstract. Thus, the expectation of concreteness, immediacy and apparent nature from a text is not fulfilled. The rational tendency to summarize the complexity of a text is not as much insistent on relishing a text as it is on the order of things.

In our tradition, poetics have considered aesthetic relish as a miracle and miracle is the expansion of the consciousness. It would be the fundamental objective of any literary work. It is suggestive that even the French poet Valery has also mentioned 'increase of consciousness' as the objective of poetry. But it seems that today the 'affective cognitive aspect' of a critic is given more importance. Hence, the reader is not able to reach up to the consciousness of the poet. Criticism creates many hurdles in his way. Therefore, criticism should be such that places the reader in the dialogue with the consciousness of the artist.

The group of critics of consciousness believe that consciousness about the consciousness and literature about literature is what should be the form of literary criticism. There is

consensus about this one fundamental point but there are differences of opinion about the other matters. In a way, we can trace the roots of this movement in Walter Pater and Ruskin. In this way, it is also considered to be a new expression of Romanticism. Two critics out of the group namely Marshall Remo and George Pule are considerably influenced by the German critics Wilhelm Dilthey and Friedrich Gundolf.

Due to the attitude of literature for literature, the critics of this faction differ from their contemporary counterparts. French structuralists, Russian formalists or American new critics consider criticism a kind of objective science. According to them, it is a branch of human sciences. Hence, like Anthropology, History or Sociology, they try to fit the whole world into the mould of constructs with the help of analysis and narrative method. Contrary to that, critics of consciousness consider literary criticism a kind of literature. This kind of literary work does not take any natural objects or reality that other people or novelists write about; all this becomes a subject for them after a writer encompasses it in his work. Thus, in that way, literary criticism is a second stage of literature. It tries to reach the subject of literature by poetry, novel, drama, diary and letters. All this is written by others. To understand the subject of literature, a literary critic, like the way a scientist describes a flower or atom, does not have to describe a text from without. He has to expand the already existing subjects of literature, bring them to fruition and has to create them in new form. Hence, he uses language the way literature uses it and gives the same kind of expression to reality.

What it means is that in an indirect way, the literary critic embarks upon his own kind of adventure. This he does not by following his own experience but by the experiences of others. Thus, what he does is not unbiased or detached. As one of the critics of this sect, Albert Benguee says, subjective criticism is completely justifiable and worth appreciating. This kind of a critic continues his adventure in his creation. He makes his adventure concrete by inventing the language for it. The essays George Pule wrote regarding the texts of other critics of the school are suggestive in this context. Somebody may feel that if the criticism of the criticism of criticism goes on like this, there would be anarchy but it is not so. According to these critics, criticism is also a kind of literature so it should also undergo analysis. Hence, it should not be compared with other kind of criticism. This is the literature in the form of 'meditation reverie' of quest of consciousness. In Switzerland, there is a tradition of this kind of literature. It has been enriched by writers like Rousseau, Constant, Emiley and Ramuz.

If criticism is literature about literature, then what is literature itself? Whatever we will say in this regard, not only the subject of criticism but also the form of criticism will be determined. According the critics of this school, literature is a form of consciousness. This concept of literature differentiates them from other critics. Pule or Remo don't look at literature or novel as the structure of meaning, the statement of the artist through it or as the manifestation of the sign system of keeping the society together. To them, literature is a concrete form of a state of mind. Through the work of an artist, the

combination of a part of the consciousness and word bring about the expression of the inner reality. This combination brings out the consciousness as literature and makes it easier for others to follow.

Hence, before entering the critical analysis, the critic has to get rid of all these attributes so that it can be one with consciousness of the artist in the text. This kind of giving up of self is inevitable for the critic in the beginning. His critical pursuits would be a statement of being one with the text. Pule says that this kind of oneness is not possible if the writer's thought does not become the critic's thought as well. Only if the critic comes down to be one with whatever the writer experiences, thinks and imagines, he will be able to accomplish his goal. It is not proper to say that this is completely subjective. Because who has to reach is a 'subject' which means that it is an activity based on his consciousness. Until the critic establishes it, re-creates it and goes through the experience the writer has gone through, it is not possible.

Thus, according to the critics of this school, criticism means our consciousness towards other's consciousness, or to put it differently, criticism means placing the world of the artist's consciousness into the critic's mindscape. Therefore, these critics are indifferent towards the external elements of a work. Mostly, they begin the critical analysis by taking into account all the works of an artist. In this, they take the artist's notes, diaries, incomplete works, bits and pieces of writings into consideration. Such incomplete

writings give us a better sense of what goes on in the mind of an artist and the characteristic quality of his writing. Pule says that looking at it this way, there is nothing 'formal' in literature. The truth of an idea is different and that is an important thing. A mind that is lively is an infinite source. It can never express itself in an objective form. The unique attribute of a literary work is that it creates its own structure and transcends it, not only that but destroys it. Hence, an artist's work means the coordination of all that he creates. But in that, the works keep undoing the works created earlier and thus carry out the gradual procedure of liberating themselves. Jacque Rousseau, a critic belonging to this school, also considers the structure of literature as the series of interrelationships whose work is to give expression to 'the world of consciousness'. This inner world has its own structure and the critics of this school don't totally disregard the structure of literature. On the contrary, in place of the consciousness of a particular work, they establish the consciousness emerging from the sum total of the artist's works.

There is unanimity about literature being a form of consciousness and there are differences of opinion on what is this consciousness among these critics. We are living in an age of contradictory constructs regarding literature, not only that but there are contrasting opinions regarding human beings as well. If objective of criticism is that the critic's consciousness feels one with the artist's consciousness, it will all depend on what our understanding of consciousness would be. Where do we reach when we reach the

consciousness of others? What is the meaning of saying that we move and in the consciousness of the artist's work and live his feelings through his work? To find an answer to this, we will need to examine the thoughts of some significant critics of this school.

Marshall Remo is one of the leading critics of this school. In one way, one can say that he is like the founder of the school. It was he who had said that criticism means the critic's consciousness about the artist's consciousness. The critic has to cultivate acute sense of receptivity; for this he needs to be sensitive. This is merely about the initial requirement. After this, he should try to one with the artist's inner world. Only such deep sense of empathy will enable him to accomplish his work. He would be, then, able to enter the consciousness of the artist, gain knowledge on work and will be able to revive the artist's experience embedded in the form of words. The work of the critic is to transform the states of existence into the states of consciousness. He has to re-create the work within him. But it is to be achieved by abiding by the work, not by unbridled flights of fancy. It is apt that the work takes birth again in him but in coordination with the artist, not by cutting away from him. Thus, in Remo's opinion, 'penetrating sympathy', 'creative participation' are highly significant. Remo divides knowledge into two. One kind of knowledge is reliant on the intellect, scientific or objective. In the process of this kind of knowledge acquisition, the object to be known is to be kept at a fair distance. It is to be observed keeping it separate from the mind and also from other

objects. In the second kind of knowledge, the mind and the object of analysis become one; in criticism, the consciousness of the critic and the consciousness as expressed in the work become one. This kind of knowledge is inner and intuitive; it is expected that the way the critic is able to go deep in his own consciousness, he should be able to explore the consciousness of the artist as well. Remo's uniqueness as a critic lies in this; he can re-create the consciousness of all the artists whose writings he has critically analysed. He has a great amount of that 'inner plasticity' in him. He can feel the work of every artist and authenticate it in his criticism. He can give it a concrete shape by re-creating in himself and by small quotes. He can immediately fathom the essence of an artist. There is no dilemma or hesitation in that. There is no place for unnecessary diversion in it. In this regard, his book 'From Baudelaire to Surrealism' is the best illustration of his style. In 1933, a new phase began in French criticism with that book. In it, he has discussed about the poets of different styles and kinds, in their characteristic qualities without any discrimination and yet he has brought out the uniformity of modern French poetry. In that way, he has ably distinguished between classical and romantic poets. The classical writers are eager for self-recognition. Hence they become introvert and bring their own observations to the level of 'discursive reasoning'. Romantic poets disregard knowledge as it is if it is not pleasurable and cannot be felt. They wish to experience the world as a concrete presence. To express his transformation which is going to take place, invigorating his imagination, he creates the

sculpture of metaphors and symbols. Remo points out two inevitable elements here for poetic justice and to make it authentic: 'self-experience and the imagination to experience the world as a visible presence'.

This is not the self-consciousness attained by detachment, nor a picture of many objects or ideas. It is a timeless experience regarding existence. In it, the state of looking at things in isolation has not come; we cannot even say that this state is of certain consciousness. Remo describes it this way: 'It is the feeling of existence in what it can have that is most elementary and least differentiated'. It is like a galaxy which is irrational and opaque and which has remained beyond the knowledge obtained by intellect. Only such a mental state clears the hurdles created by rational consciousness between the mind and the world and helps the critic experience the world in its totality through the medium of words. Any true poetry always strives for attaining this state. In this, self-consciousness and world-consciousness become one. As Remo says, there is a place for a magical world in it wherein a human being can see himself as one with other objects. We find the evidence of attaining this oneness from poetry.

Albert Benguee is the next leading critic of this school. He is the disciple of Marshall Remo. Like Remo, he too believes that criticism becomes possible only when the critic is able to establish himself in the world created by the artist. He talks about creating oneness with the artist' pursuits but he does not accept Remo's insistence on dissolving

oneself. In his opinion, the critic has to embark on a continuous quest under the guidance of the poets or participating in the work of these poets. These poets and artists realize a material and mental reality which otherwise would not have come into being. He doesn't have much sympathy with those who are not of any help in his quest. He doesn't have empathy for Mallarme's construct of ideal poet or dry subjectivity. He is interested only if a poet's consciousness is the kind that transcends things.

He is interested in re-establishing the wonder and the objects. These are important to him. In his opinion, a poet transcends the layer of familiarity by his acute sensitivity towards memories or material objects. This layer covers the reality. Once it is removed, we re-gain the innocence of childhood. In Benguee's critical pursuits, the reference to childhood keeps coming frequently. This childhood is not merely of a person but the childhood of people as a whole. This interest in this becomes decisive for his attitude towards the romantics. According to him, in every human being, amid the pollution and complexities somewhere, the uncorrupted innocence of a child is our real existence; that is our real soul. If he can realize this for a moment, he can connect again with the timeless. He can act freely with the natural world and with other human beings.

According to Benguee, such a free state of mind is the distinct characteristic of a child; it can immediately recognize the existence of the material objects. Benguee says that after returning from the world of dreams, human beings feel the wonder which is felt at the

experience of new objects. As if I am born again by experiencing them that way; they emerge in front of me for the first time. The kind of exchange which takes place in the first few moments of existence is established between us. Due to this wonder, this world again begins to seem like the world of fairy tale.

What Remo calls the galaxy-like 'ir-rational opaqueness' can be contrasted with this concrete presence. Remo recommends the unclear sense of things in which the objects and people seem to be blending in one another, whereas Benguee finds the state of deep wonder more appropriate. In such a state, every object presents itself to the consciousness in an apt manner. We feel its particular weight and its true nature. It becomes more concrete in the poet's language. That is why, we feel the acute sense of existence in the language of a poet like Claudel. There is a fragrance of material objects in their competent language. Even when they are expressed through language, they maintain the impact of their presence. We can feel the density of the whole thing. The impact of its presence (which can be felt firsthand by a child and an artist) in front of our senses in their material existence and in the presence of the artist can also be felt. He has made himself concrete by so many objects in the world. Thus, 'presence' is at the centre of Benguee's criticism. It points towards its possibility of being touched and the artist's presence in it too. This sense of 'incarnation' is at the core of his construct of poetry. In his view, the consciousness of the material presence makes it concrete. Therefore he says: 'Poetry must touch in the concrete presence of the visible'.

In poetry, an object brings out the divine nature without losing its existence. 'Resonance at a distance' is heard in this glimpse of the heaven. The divine, the natural and the human-al three-resonate musically in it. Apart from this, he talks of the other two presences. Of these, language is the first. It is the instrument of the emergence of poetry. It is the medium of the poet's existence. Poet's words are at the centre of the poet's consciousness, the creator of the world and the material of the universe. Only the poet can identify things in their correct names and address them in secret names. His language brings out the creator inherent in every object.

George Pule is deemed to be a leading critic of this school. According to him too, the consciousness of the critics becomes one with the consciousness of the artist in the process of criticism. There should be transparency between the souls of the two. Other critics employ this transparency as a means of achieving something else, but for Pule this transparency is what is to be achieved. Criticism attaining oneness doesn't become the means to anything else. As he doesn't expect anything apart from the consciousness about consciousness, he can look at the writers of many ages and many kinds with same sympathy. Pule relishes it if some unique attribute of inner experience can be ably expressed. In his own way, he tries to re-create the main tone of all the writings of a writer.

For Pule, on the moment when the consciousness of the writer expresses itself from others is a significant moment. The other things are accidental and insignificant. The 'affective qualities' in the artist's consciousness become the fountainhead of everything. This is a thing lying in all the things that consciousness is cognisant of. This self-consciousness is the inevitable starting-point of looking at the human existence. The objective of criticism is to look at the consciousness of the artist, distancing it from everything. He has to internalize it in the moment of exuberance of his ability. To him, 'it exists in a heavy virginal state not yet invaded and as it were masked by the thick mass of its objective content'. Pule tries to move towards the point from where every imaginative world unfolds. For Pule, this individual uniqueness of the inner being of an artist is very significant. Hence, he gives so much importance to Emithel's diary. From it, he listens to the echoes of the most fundamental and ultimate pursuit of human consciousness. In it, consciousness is consciously contemplating over itself. It brings out the 'interior distance' lying inside human mind. It is the space of the pure void. Its bright expanse presents the domain of thinking in front of it. All the critics of this school seem to be following Husserl's construct of consciousness whereas for Pule, consciousness is the live source of literature. For Husserl and others, consciousness is about something else. Hence, for them there is no such moment of creativity when the mind does not possess any other cognizance without the characteristic 'affective tone'. Pule accepts the primary nature of consciousness and considers it the power of creating

literature. When mind is cluttered with objects or mesmerized, it is not the best state of consciousness. There is another state of consciousness which expresses itself, remaining distant from the object. It remains away from any object which moulds it from outside. This consciousness of being is disparate from the knowledge resulting from the relationship with the world. This consciousness is critic's oneness with artist's consciousness. Describing this state, Pule says, '...this double consciousness appears less in its multiplicity of sensuous relations with things than prior to and separate from any object, a self consciousness of pure consciousness'. In Pule's opinion, there is not much significance of the presence of a material object/s; the significance is that of the consciousness which narrates it. Even if something external is entering the literature, it is not coming from outside, it must be from the depth of human mind. This depth of human consciousness is such that nobody can see its end or the extreme. Even in what is called 'transcendence of centre', there is no need of going out of artist's consciousness. Pule like the term 'convergence' instead of 'transcendence'.

The consciousness of all artists moves toward such meeting point which is merely the external centre of consciousness. Accepting this viewpoint, Pule re-creates the consciousness of not only a certain writer but of the consciousness of the whole era. Collective human consciousness is a whole for him. Hence, according to him, the history of literature means the history of consciousness. For artists like Pascal and Nerwal, artist is the quest of an aim which cannot be attained. Therefore, 'transcendence

presence' remains outside the realm of possibility of attainment. Hence, Pule says, 'I am above all attracted by those for whom literature by definition a spiritual activity which must be gone beyond its own depths or which, in failing to be gone beyond in being condemned to the awareness nontranscendence, affirms itself as the experience and verification of a fundamental defect'. Order and transcendence are two aspects of Pule's criticism. This transparency can be attained by seeing through the creative pursuits. Here, the attribute of consciousness can be brought out by placing it in the light of warm intellect. Pule relishes the semi-transparent consciousness because it becomes the challenge to the power claiming to explain all. Whenever he talks of anything obscure, he tries to explain it too. He points out the relationship of the entire material of consciousness and makes it one by drawing upon the 'reciprocal interchange'. In this way, he tries to bring out an order in it. Pule is in a way interested in some of the elements of the world realized in the artist's work. However, his chief objective is to look at consciousness, distancing it from the rest of the material. He is concerned more with the inner space of the artist's consciousness. Pule has shown with the commendable finesse the way human consciousness attains knowledge about the indescribable 'intimacy' to the self.*

*based on John Hillis Miller's article 'The Geneva Critics'

Kavya Vivechanno Navo Abhigam? (A New Approach of Criticism to Poetry?)

M. H. Abrahams, one of the incisive critics of Romanticism, had said in his well-known work 'The Mirror and the Lamp' about four main points for the discussion of the complete context of a work of art. The work of art, the artist, the world and the reader are the four points. Among the relationship of the four, the attitude with which anyone is stressed upon will be decisive. In this way, the method of criticism can be categorised.

The method, in which the form of the text, its analysis and the criteria are derived by stressing the relationship of the artist with the work, is an expressive approach. The method, in which the relationship of the text with the reader is emphasised, the ability of the text to touch the reader's heart, to instruct and delight him is taken into consideration is the pragmatic approach. The method, which places emphasis upon the relationship between the text and its subject, 'the world' meaning wherein there is analysis of the relationship of the text with Nature, human nature and man-made objects is mimetic approach. The method which deals with a text as an autonomous object and discusses the relationship of its elements disregarding anything outside it is objective approach. This was in 1959. After this, there is one more element added to this whole context, or we can say that new relationships have been conceptualised between the elements enumerated above. Before this even 1957 too, Northrope Frye had laid the position of one more approach in 'Anatomy of Criticism'. In it, the relationship of the text with other texts instead of the artist, the reader or the world was taken into consideration. Has T. S. Eliot not said something similar? The works of the past remain

an ideal sequence. When a new work enters there, it is defined by the standards of the older works. Those old texts form a new sequence and order themselves around the new text. If poems, dramas and novels were not written earlier, they would not have been written now? The credit for the way new texts appear to us today rests with the earlier texts. In the same way, the way old texts appear to us the way they do depends on the new texts. This reordering goes on. In this successors become predecessors. Boherse had said once that the chief influence on Hawthorne is that of Kafka's.

The criticism which Terence Deas Press had offered regarding the prevalent situation in the domain in 'Partisan Review' (1975) (2) is worth remembering here.

Harold Bloom has said, 'The meaning of a poem could be another poem'. He is in favour of the romantic poets. Hence, he arranges poems in the way it shows that the influence of romantic poets even in today's poetry. In leading modern poets, he does not include Ezra Pound, Eliot, Auden, Williams or Yeats after 1900. He does not even include Wallace Stevens. He likes to keep away from the 'ugly' story told regarding criticism in the times of Eliot. He believes that that kind of criticism has proven to be full of moral bias, trying to take what is conducive to it. They should avoid such a situation. All these methods of criticism look at poetry into different parts like images, ideas, givens or echoes. Criticism with a moral, philosophical or psychological leaning finds constructs from the text, not the experience. Bloom firmly believes that if there is

something which needs to remain chief part, it is the poem itself. He suggestively calls the critical approach which he presented as a protest against all this 'antithetical'.

Let's try to understand this viewpoint. The poet wastes his time in writing the poetry of his predecessors again. This activity is fundamentally perverse because there is an attempt to get rid of the burden of the earlier poets. For this, he employs the tricks of misunderstanding, wrong interpretations and wrong relationships. The presence of the earlier poets turns into his own absence. The fact that they preceded him suffocates him. Thus, we have been, as if, the witness to the 'end of poetry'. The layers of past keep piling up. Very few poets can hope to breathe freely in this atmosphere. In our tradition, poetry will be killed by poetry itself; it seems that the powers created in the past will prove to be the cause of its death. The art of poetry is thus a peculiar thing. We experience its life in our death. Our critics are the experts at communication with the ghosts.

Ibab Hasan has also said something of similar nature. Literature is a suicidal activity. Within a short period of time, it will commit suicide and emancipate us into silence. Now, 'serious' literature has been destroyed. Now we can move towards vulgarity. In the same context, there is a discussion of renunciation too. The writers who have had too much are now full of desire for renunciation. Wordsworth and Matthew Arnold used to visualise literature in the place of religion and see emancipation in it. Now all

noble thoughts sound hollow. Now we are troubled by questions like: Now what else is left worth reading? Now is anything else left worth telling, writing or teaching? What should we understand now by what Ezra Pound had said 'Make it new'?

Is all this right? Neither literature dies, nor the world-there have been talks of doomsday many times but on the contrary today there is a lot of scope, variety and density in literature. Then what did these prophets of doom have in mind? They frequently cry out in agony. Would they be suffering from some genuine pain?

How thrilling it is when we enter literature at the young age! Does it not seem to be the world of amazing truths? We keep moving forward pulled by the delight of reading poetry and prose, one thing after another. Thus, we keep getting acquainted with various domains. Our tastes for different disciplines develop. We keep internalizing various methods of narration and criticism. But at the end we realize that our fundamental relationship with literature has changed. The long texts running in thousands of pages are left behind. The innocent joy is no more then. That mysterious terrain disappears. There is no alternative path seen leading us to something which can transcend all this. We feel jealous of those standing at the threshold of youth. Literature does not cease to be; our innocent response seems to be gone. We don't seem to be having the free mind and the ability to feel the wonder. Then what remains are monuments of the past, lifeless monuments! This terrain of literature begins to appear

like a graveyard or a museum to store old things. Somebody would rarely call this a happy state!

Who is responsible for this? Shall we consider the critic himself as the villain? That seems to be the only way of ending this problem. Some of us will have the occasion to relish and be more satisfied in future than now. Earlier we used to relish reading the texts but now we begin to feel worth living by the critical analysis of a text. The domain of criticism begins to seem more interesting than literature. It is not that there are no exceptions in this. We are more interested in new publications, new findings and the areas of literature which involve us deeply. The classic texts giving attributes of tradition are different. We discuss such texts in the class. We write research articles about them in critical journals, we keep writing about all these texts in order to keep our jobs, and this way, we maintain our professorly reputation too. But our attitude towards these texts is not the same full of innocent delight like that of our younger days. Later, we don't read 'Saraswatichandra' or 'Jayajayant' but we read the critical writings on them. We don't read new poetry but we participate in the hue and cry about that.

Spinoza had said that philosophy is our intellect-filled love for God. It is an intellectual approach to understand reality which does not ever come to an end. Lionel Trilling has used this definition for criticism: 'Criticism is the intellectual fascination for literature'.

Hence, the approach we adopt is the important thing. This approach shows us our method. It is the movement of an energetic mind. It is the movement towards what he knows but does not own. It is a movement towards a far away perfection which is beyond his reach.

The subjects of our relish create media of their own. The existence of works of art comes to fruition in this world. The consciousness of the individual seeing and relishing the work makes it complete. Then, it is surrounded by many constructs regarding that. Similar sense prevails regarding the definition of a work of art given by Wellek and Warren. The total meaning of a work is compounded by the interpretations given by its various readers at different points of time.

Hegel had tried to contemplate over the problem of the relationship of art and its criticism. The critical pursuits were going on as such; but the recognition of criticism as a discipline and methodology has acquired a definite shape in the last two centuries. To engage in criticism means to accept a systematic response in place of the immediate response; to examine the limitations of the method.

Kant's argument was that the domain of consciousness is narrower than we imagine. Our mind can give us a sense of the surface but does not give us an in-depth understanding. As a result, the surface and the depth are divided and the sovereign powers of the world slip into the background. Then, it has to be believed in by mere

faith. Have God, liberty and the base for the self always been there or are they the result of the division? The division described by Kant was not limited to spirituality. To be frank, the bond with the core of existence had come to be cut. It seemed impossible to perceive things in their depth. Many reasons are given for why this happened: loss of faith, rise of rationality, growing insensitivity, revolt, urbanization etc.

The sense of void and catastrophe took the place of the joy of being complete. What we used to call the substance dissolved in all this. As a result, the sense of hollowness or absence grew more intense. As if, it became the universal characteristic of the consciousness. Our most profound thoughts got directionless by this destruction and void. This sense remained the decisive factor for the creative expressions.

Modern painting can give us an illustration for this. Gradually, the perspective seems to have been lost. The significance of the surface and its own self seems to be getting established instead. The possibility of any world other than presented in it is squashed. Emphasis is laid on symbolism and use of language in modern literature.

Paul de Man had said that literature being an imaginary creation of self-consciousness expresses absence. Literary works emanate from the presence of void. The language of poetry getting impressed by all this keeps bringing our void in new names. Ultimately, everything that the symbols and metaphors are signs of represent its absence. Any text

is an image of that which is not there. Supporting this view, Valery also says that art reflects the absence of things.

Paul de Man says, 'Human consciousness has experienced the void here and it establishes it as void that which it seeks to fill with void. Earlier, literature was the intense reflection of truths and absence which cannot be erased. Now, it gives shape to the void of the world. As is seen in Beckett's works, now only word has remained intact and it now engages itself in un-existence.'

Then, what have we lost? We have perhaps lost the ability to engage ourselves immediately with surface as the depth. Kant had focused on this situation. But the work of finding a solution he left on Hegel and Hegel carried it out too. As the essential substance had lost the immediacy or systematic nature, there was felt a need to restate that. To structure what was structureless, we had to resort to structure. We have to fill in the gap of the object and the one who visualises it with hard work. He had accepted the idea that the response to the depth of things can be re-established with the help of the structure of intellectual constructs.

Myth is a myth and fantasy is a fantasy. Now, it is not possible to feel their influence by blindly believing in them or considering the surface reality as truth. We wish to fathom the depths beneath the surfaces and remain close to the meaning. We call these efforts criticism. Of course, there are other things included in it too. History, biography, social

context, style and analysis of linguistic structure, the interpretation of the text and the value judgment regarding it-these are things included in it. Epistemology also has a place in it. Apart from this or may be while doing this, criticism accomplishes something deeper. It becomes the medium for helping us enter great works. We are able to grasp the beauty of a text through it. We can be a part of its life and live in its presence.

It is not that criticism is merely a post-text exercise. As Matthew Arnold had said, it makes a considerable contribution towards creating conducive ambience for writing and preparing the reader for relishing a text. It is also a parallel exercise to writing. The discretion of a writer helps him take the decision. When we relish a text with trained taste, the process of criticism proves complimentary to it. We can reach the essence of a text through it. Then we keep engaging with it unknowingly too and it becomes our propensity as well. That is why Eliot has considered criticism as inevitable as breathing. Frye too accepts that today it is no possible for a reader to look at a text with fascination. Self-consciousness is always there in the response.

It would be unjust to say that our critical bent of mind has crushed unalloyed responses to a text. Instead we should say that it is the criticism which helps us enter the area of influence of a text. As Roland Barthes says, criticism is not the instrument which gives the balance-sheet of a text after we finish reading it. It is our intellectual exercise and it

is connected with the growth of the individual as well as his individual uniqueness and that critical pursuits are growing is a sign of the change in our culture. Its roots lie in our times and situation.

Rolland Barthes calls criticism 'meta-language'. It discusses the first layer language (language-object). Due to the encounter of the two, the attributes of criticism keep forming. The process in it is to penetrate the first layer language with the second layer language. The first layer language is concrete and sensitive; the second layer language is based on constructs. The relationship of the two is the one of the multi-dimensional space with mathematics.

In one way, we are all products of criticism. We are engaging in the hard work of transcending criticism with criticism. But this criticism should not be such that uses literature as illustration of some theory or fits a text in a particular conceptual framework. It should bring out the significance of the text. But what is the 'significance'? We have lost the immediate and indirect experience of symbols without any rituals. It is proper that criticism should re-establish that. In that way, we can be a part of the sensitivity and depth of meaning with the help of this device of symbols.

We welcome this kind of fascination in place of untrained reception of a text. In it, the responses become complete with the help of criticism. In all our intellectual pursuits, we lose something forever. We lose our spontaneous experience and faith. We may

have lost faith in the mysterious symbols and experience but at least we can relish the interpretation of the text. Criticism has one more professional position; it is a profession like any other. It exhibits the desire to establish itself among the kind of tensions keep floating in the academic world and the selfish interests keep clashing. Hence, criticism is seen wasting itself on the second, third or tenth rate insignificant texts. Wherever it endeavours to be a part of the significance of human existence and its wonder, it is engaging in the hard work to take us towards the fountainhead from where we draw our strength.

Today's criticism has not purified language or sensitivity. It has not established any standards nor has it placed any quality high enough. Matthew Arnold had said that the most important thing in the presence of a talented writer is to relish and experience a text in as much depth as possible. Has today's criticism inspired a student to do that?

The joy of literature emanates when we lose ourselves in it; when we become one with it. We can accomplish this with the help of criticism. We need to re-establish the direct relationship with the fundamental element of a text. Literature has the power to preserve and nurture the essence of culture. It is a big evil that an individual remains unconnected and uninvolved with his own work. It is necessary that he experiences the self through the text and experience the deep relationship with the self by nurturing the relishing of a text.

Octavio Paz ni Kavya Vibhavana (Octavio Paz's Concept of Poetry)

The contemplation of a poet taking place in the process of writing poetry has its own significance. It is not merely an exercise of logic. Precisely for this reason, the thoughts of poets like T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound or Garshia Lorca are deemed significant. The advantage of the rise of translation was that we began to get acquainted with the hitherto unknown poetry and criticism of other countries. We should recall here the compilation of Mexican poetry by Samuel Beckett. Many felt that our relationship with the South America became deeper with this.

One cannot give any extreme definition of poetry. The limitations of Mammat's definition of poetry are well-known to the researcher of rhetorics. Yet, no critic of poetry can be silent on giving the characteristics of poetry in his view. However, when a poet like Robert Frost says, 'Poetry, like butter, moves on its own melting', it gets eternally stored in our memory.

Octavio Paz says that poetry is, in a way, a structured object. It is shaped from the language, rhythm and the poet's obsessions and beliefs. We live in our present. Hence, gradually our life keeps filling up the data in history. Poetry is a trick played by human beings which creates anti-history. In fact, one does not mean to say that this is the objective of poetry or it is a conscious intention of the poet. But the process of writing

poetry creates a new dimension of time and transforms the idea of time familiar to us. Poetry does not freeze time. It transcends time and changes it completely. Our chief revolt is against time. It swallows us as death. To win over time is man's foremost endeavour. The poet tries to win over time with the help of words. But it would be erroneous to believe that to be immortal is to win over time. The poet's ambition is to take charge of time and change its nature and dimensions.

At times, the society whose blood is frozen fails to understand the poet's revolt against time. It takes its attention away by calling it a romantic attitude. Is it not that echoing the discord between the society and poetry and creating its acute consciousness become the mostly secret, but central thing in poetry?

The poet reveals the link between two incidents, experiences, or images. That is why Aristotle had said, 'Metaphor is the argument of the poet'. The poet's work is to create developing, expanding series of such images. As Baudelaire had said, the poet looks at the world as 'a system of correspondence'. The language is the other half of the world. Iron turns what we see upside down. In our 20th century, the irony turns into laughter whether it is black, green or purple!

Along with rationalism and surge for progress, the poet has to combat the apparent and the ironical. In today's poetry, there goes on a dialogue of resistance. One can see both the favour and revolt of modern revolution- in it. The dialogue between the apparent

and the ironical goes on in poetry or every poem. Thus, modern poetry becomes a graph of the attraction and resistance of contradictory relationships blended with one another.

1

Modernity cannot remain only modern. There is a dimension of contemporaneity in it. Novelty is not its sole characteristic. Contemporaneity too is there. It is of liberal kind. The various aspects of the past are also included in it. But the present cannot stand the past; modern would not wish to be a progeny of present. The art and poetry wish to survive merely on the basis of modernity and hence perish. Today a new poetics of wonder is being created! The marvellous is an aesthetic relish which comes along with others. But it is erroneous to believe that novelty and wonder are synonymous with each other. Whatever happens unplanned is new. It has nothing to do with change. But in today's poetry, one can see a hybrid product of negation and wonder. Thus, modernity keeps critiquing itself. It is a complex state. It reaches its own negation in the end. Hence, modernity is a self-destructive creative process.

As such, the poet engaging himself in constructing monuments on the land on which the demolition is brought about by the critics. The recent past is always disdained and criticised. If the pace remains constant, we get hypnotized. Hence, we have to keep interfering in order to break the constancy. The new fascinates us in its expanse. This

wide expanse lies in its own negation. In fact, it is something negligible or insignificant which divides time into 'post' and 'pre'. That which is very ancient is not the past but the beginning. Our mind is always busy, nurturing the contradictions. It is our tendency which gives support to division and makes it strong and rest not till it becomes contemporary. Modern art and literature mould themselves by exploring the ancient and the far away in terms of time and reach. For the old, today is a mere repetition of yesterday but for the modern, today is in clash with yesterday. We don't believe that time keep repeating the same moments or centuries. To us, every moment is different, disparate and unique.

The ground of modern era is so washed away as if it appears to have been lost. By making compartments, we have placed the ancient and the real, the new and the traditional against one another. Human mind cannot rest till it accomplishes something like this. As a result, we create unnecessary questions and sometimes we oversimplify that which is truly complex in order to fit the mould.

Our age has glorified the youth and its values that it has become a sect, if not a religion. In this desperate rat race to remain modern and the acute consciousness to save ourselves from history, texts written in new style begin to seem old prematurely. Before the newly invented style gets entrenched, there is a crowd of followers and that particular style goes to pieces. This rapid pace is mind-boggling. That which took place

just before some time begins to seem old whereas the older than the old seems close to us in terms of time. How do we explain our behaviour with time? In between, the poets abandoned the idea of immortality and focused on the momentary. The trend of believing in the momentary also went on; we kept saying that whatever is momentary may not necessarily be insignificant. We got interested in this intricacy of time. Our era is peculiarly interested in quickening the pace of history. It is not that years, months and days pass more quickly now but numerous incidents take place in that duration. Many events happen parallel, not in the chronological sequence. Hence, one event seems to be melting with the other, not only that but all the space and time streaming in flow seem to merge with 'here' and 'now'.

Is all this an illusion? Surrealists came. Frederick Schlegel and Andre Breton came. There was an astonishing combination of sex, fantasizing and the peculiar laughter of the Surrealists. We wish to see a difference in all this but we forget one thing: there is uniformity among cultures or among different phases of the same culture-that is a human being. Can one writer bring change in history and culture? A human being as the thread of all this brings change and variety. That is why one can find variety in culture, history and art. At times, these apparent changes touch only the surface. They don't seem to gain any real existence. Should we employ a contradictory word like 'modern tradition'? This term points towards the dramatic phase of our culture: at this juncture, we don't seek the base of culture in the past or something ethereal but in the

changes. The image of time has changed. The consciousness that we are rooted in a tradition itself becomes the base of criticism. Those who are orthodox would lead a happy existence lost in the present without any questions or scepticism. From the moment we realize that we are a part of a tradition, we also keep realizing the fact of being different from it. Hence, sooner or later, we raise questions regarding the tradition, and are inspired to analysis, and at times, we refuse to accept its existence. Time continues to unfold in history. Modern tradition is an expression of our consciousness of history. In every culture, there is a different relationship among the past, the present and the future. For the ancient human species, the past is beyond memory, beyond the past and comes before all beginnings. In fact, it becomes the rhythmic repetition of the timeless past. At certain stages, it is felt by subjecting it to some rituals. Not what has happened but what has always happened is their past; it escapes from the unexpected nature and simultaneous presence. It erases the difference between what has happened before and what is happening.

To us, time is the essence of change. We have imagined a state where time will make peace with itself, remaining in its confines. It is not that when time will find its rhythm, we will reach that state, but we have to follow it as it is. History is a flaw in the timeless flow of time, its trivialization. There is no sign of the revolution of time in it. Many a time, it destroys the dimensions of time. Sometimes, the essence of time is lost from it. At times, human beings get perplexed by the changes and fail to capture the rhythm of

the changes. Hence, it wants to tackle change with another change. To accept that we have rhythm of our own is another way. The past is there at the end of every revolution. Then the question arises, is there no way out of escaping the periphery of time? Religion and philosophy at times take change as a delusion or maya. Many a time, history becomes the reason and catalyst of our rebellion.

2

Why to go to such trouble to be deemed modern? If modernity is a consequence of flow of time, would it not be that we would lose modernity as soon we get hold of it? That is why great writers tolerate the younger generation with compassionate empathy. We cannot afford to wail over the youth which has passed. At times, the old take the consolation that the frustration which was there in the youth is now longer there and they have been able to make some progress. However pleasant is the delusion that to keep moving ahead in time mean progress does make us pitiable in the view of the younger generation. Those surviving on the basis of such a delusion come in the way of intellectual progress and reform.

The modern generation calls itself revolutionary. It has changed the sequence of meaning. It has turned the old system upside down and tries to establish a new order. They believe that the new system will be more rational and just.

We should recollect the truth Baudelaire had accepted very honestly. We do talk about the complete vision and complete criticism but that is an ideal state and we are not going to be able to attain that. The text itself is complex. We are not able to touch all the dimensions of our age; our taste and limitations also play a significant role in our criticism. Taking all this into consideration, we should honestly differentiate things but also accept the fact that what we do is meagre, not complete. Following the imitation, we must not try to make a part sound like a whole.

The modern era is a product of negative criticism. It seems to be governed by the principle of change. Another peculiar situation is seen. Modern literature deeply despises this era. Did Dostoevsky not call his times 'the negative age'? This literature criticises itself as much as it does the object of criticism. It lashes out at the bourgeoisie society and the values it has accepted. It criticises literature by looking at it as an object. It critiques language and its meaning. In these dual ways, it negates itself and establishes and celebrates itself as well.

There was a momentous occasion in the 18th century which erased a lot of rational ground. The transparency of the word came into question. At the beginning of modernity, it became clear that our sensitivity is detached from the periodization of time and chronology. Romantics turned the sensitivity into intense emotions. Sensitivity became the sign of our bond with Nature. Our intense emotions transcended the social

system. It began to give vent to itself in a language made of dreams, symbols and metaphors. A strange confluence was established between the sacred and the insignificant, the liberal and the vulgar.

One more fundamental contradiction is seen in modernity. Inevitability and individuality are juxtaposed in it. Before the advent of religion and its later revolutions, poetry was there as the language of the people.

3

The degradation of the sacred and criticism of God, the fondness for the peculiar and the mysterious, the insistence on establishing the relationship between the routine things of day-to-day life and the supernatural, love for irony- these are some of the achievements of the Romantics. One can see the love for contradictions in them. Quest for the bottom of the terrain of dreams, the impulses on the unconscious mind and the nurturing of the sensual instincts are also found in them. They transform the tendency of wailing for the past into an interesting situation and political movement.

Now we have begun to see through the reality rather than focusing upon the reality itself. As if, the domains of poetry and revolution are inseparable. By uprooting the time of history, both wish to establish the present beyond history. But here there is an issue. The sense of time which revolutionaries have is different from the poet's. It is neither the Utopia of the future or the stale past constructed by the critical intellect. The time in

poetry is some time span before the beginning of time. It shows its glimpse sometimes in the timeless gaze of an infant.

Every poet has to create his own world of mythical images. This world is made of a blend of diverse beliefs, reinvented myths and individual obsessions. There are two aspects of Romantic themes: by irony, it negates mere subjectivity and by melancholy, it shows the hollowness of existence even in its perfection. Irony brings out the ruptures in what was deemed to be complete and indivisible; it shows the variety in what seems apparently same. It also shows the other side of rationality to us. Melancholy shows the hollowness of existence. It makes us realize that life itself is death, heaven is a painful desert and religion is a delusion of our construction.

By the declaration of the death of God, the chaotic and the lack of rationality prosper. Irony, parody, intellectual contradictions, poetic contradictions and images are the chief components of modern poetry. It leans more towards the incredible, the fearsome, the peculiar, the noble and the marvellous. It is in favour of contradiction as the cause of relish. The poet himself is becoming the peculiar blend of the Satan and the joker. The poet's consciousness keeps oscillating between two extremes of laughter and tears, prose and poetry and doubt and faith. The religious attitude of the Romantics is potent enough to take it to the other extreme. Melancholy is included in it. If we have to

visualize the concrete image of the Romantic spirit, the image of a huge human being in nudity, bathing in the ocean of sensual pleasures would rush to the mind's eye.

Romantics like the illusion more than the truth. Did Aristotle not say that the work before art is not to create the truth but to create its effective image? They are not satisfied with the dimension of consciousness, but they wish to join the border of dreams with it. We keep getting carried away in the 'dark night' of the dream. It seems that somebody has abandoned us in the territory full of indifference or animosity. Guilty without the guilt and innocent without innocence, we look at ourselves in wonder filled with pain.

The declaration of the death of God provokes our creative powers. Creating a new world of mythical images, we get busy in establishing a new order of gods. We fell enthused to tell stories about them. We feel the need of a new geography and universe. Once again we enter the rugged routine of time. But poetry considers only the inconsequential time of sensitivity authentic. That time does not rely on the mythical entity; it is a kind of rebellious time.

The first utterance of human faith was in the form of poetry. But since the beginning of time, religion has been in the habit of appropriating for its own purposes. The fascination for myths is not in the religious element but it lies in the way narrative style which is able to transform the world and its reality. The image of 'Eurizen' makes us

think. He is a god who is the god of rationality and is deemed to be the upholding the ethics. But he places human beings in the structure of conditions. Not only does he creates conflict by pitting one against the other, but he gives rise to such conflict which disintegrates the personality of a human being. Eurizen means the intellect without wings and physical status. It imprisons a human being.

The idea of the apparent arises from the faith that words are the reflection of our existence. It is the source of strength for the poet. Its work is dual: it turns the world into poetry. It not only helps poetry pass through many adverse things but makes a disparate world of poetry for itself. We read the world of poetry and start living in it. It is not that order can be brought about and harmony can be established only through intellect. The harmony which comes in poetry is not rational but rhythmic. The moment also comes in poetry when this harmony is broken. We call it irony in poetry. We call it 'death' in the language of life. There is an acute consciousness of this broken harmony in the modern poetry. It works within the order of things of the apparent.

4

There came a time in between when an effort was made to bring together poetry and prose and create a dialogue between the two. In the same way, an effort was made to enliven poetry by stuffing it with the language of day-to-day life. Prose was to be elevated with the help of images rather than logic. As prose and poetry reached deep

into each other's territory, as a result, the new form of prosaic poetry came into being in the 19th and 20th century. New strength came by the infusion of the colloquial elements into the language of poetry.

New poetry is symbolic of the new way of receiving an experience and living. Our ideas regarding art have changed somewhat now. Art is not merely a concrete representation of reality or an interesting delineation of it. It is also an interference in reality. If one wishes to say that art reflects the world in it as a mirror, he will have to add that this mirror is magical; it changes the world. The criticism of subtlety and correctness emphasised on the clear distinction of life and art. Romantics laid stress on the priority of inspiration, intense state of mind and ability to feel and erased the wide line between art and life. A dream saves life from the fearsome feeling arising out of the sameness of day-to-day routine.

Poetry is regaining of the old, uncorrupted state of being. What is the reason that the creation of the apparent becomes possible? There is a rhythm of relationships among all the things in the world which continues to resonate. We not only create a stanza but the metre itself too. One can read the world like a script; it is a kind of system of signs. These signs are governed by a deep rhythm. This rhythm itself makes the ordering of the obvious and possible and inevitable.

Roman Jakobson also looks at poetry as a system of measured units. Rhythm and sounds also play a part in it. In fact, they are the representatives of what is there. Charles Currier had said that human desires are invigorated mathematics. Novalis had said that whoever touches a woman's body touch the sky. Among all sciences, the first one is the science explaining the principle of attraction. The principles of attraction between the physical objects or between the human beings arising out of intense emotions are not different. We don't have differences of opinion with Newton or Leibnitz regarding this. There is uniformity in the movement of the physical world and the world of consciousness.

Modernity is said to have begun with Baudelaire. To him, 'correspondence' is an important term. The creation of the world of images is at the centre of his poetics. But it is not necessary to believe that this centre is fixed. Swayed by rhythm, it is always in motion. Moreover, the consciousness of death and the idea of sin also keep haunting him. In Upanishads, the world is described as the exhale of the Brahma. Baudelaire also believes that the God had articulated the world. Initially, criticism indulges in aggression, assault and satire but later on learns to look at the world as the order of the things. What we call objects are actually words, a mountain is a word, so is a river and the spectacle of the landscape created by them is a sentence. There is hollowness at the core of this apparent world. The reality of the world and the meaning of the language rush together in the void and disappear. Baudelaire had no strength to look at this void

eye to eye. Mallarme could make it possible. Transforming this act of seeing, he realized the object of poetry. If the world is a void, a sign language, is the poet not the translator? Poetry is the other half of the world. It is a space littered with signs. Writing poetry, the poet does decode the signs but he translates them into new signs. This goes on repeating itself. This is eternal.

The poetics which keeps the world of images in the centre looks at literature as translation. These translations are many and a number of contradictions lie at the base. Those who undertake to decode them do it in numerous ways. However, it is not that one particular way is right and the other one wrong. There is substance in each one and it can be of use to us. Neither the poet nor the reader is the real writer of the poetry, it is the language which does this work. But it is not intended to mean that it uproots the significance of the reality of the poet and the reader. On the contrary, it includes them in it and transcends it. The poet and the reader are two moments on a poem in the process of assuming existence. It is not the only fact that language employs them for its purposes. But it is equally true that language speaks through them. How to create poetics on the basis of this point?

The apparent sustains itself on the basis of distinction or contrasts. A is not B. There is distance between the two but that is the reason why one can construct a bridge between the two. This bridge becomes possible by attributing things as it happens in words or

metaphor; the bridge neither destroys the distance nor uproots the distinction. It establishes relationship between the apparently different terms. The world as it is in front of us is such a state of mind in which different objects appear to be one. Distinction presents itself deceptively. Due to the world as it is, it establishes some order to this situation of diversity, full of anarchy and it all becomes intelligible. It makes the difference relishable without negating it. It is poetry's way of facing the external.

The beauty of modern poetry is of peculiar kind. It is new, unique and irregular. It also has the regret of the acceptance of not being infinite. Obscure, peculiar, extravagant, original, unique, matchless-such terms are used in the romantic and symbolist critical analysis. All these terms point towards one single thing in their own way-death. Irony is at the center of that which is obscure, extravagant and matchless. Wounded by the irony, the apparent world succumbs to death gradually. The word of poetry results in outcry or silence. We have lost the mystery of global language. It is the key to understanding the apparent. Mallarme had tried to avoid the difference between the apparent and the suggestive. He accepted the existence of void. Difference and irony are ultimately the products of the void. But along with that, he also accepted the apparent and the reality of the poet's work. The emancipation of the apparent is in silence.

5

Josse Marty has said that the world is more articulate than the human being. Now there are efforts to form the aesthetics of whatever is handy, minimum and familiar. Now as if we have discovered the secret of the colloquial speech of the day-to-day life. There is also an effort sometimes to turn poetry into a psychological equation. It also sometimes seems to be a mysterious monologue. Contemplation and lyrical elements, song and irony, poetry and prose are blended together in it. They become different and as soon as look at one another, become inseparable again. The harmony of a song is shattered; it ends up being a monologue or confession which has been interrupted in between. Melody is broken in between with empty space and silence. Now there is severe criticism of the same customs and tendencies and obsolete terms. There is disgust for the obsolete language and artificially purified language' not much enthusiasm is left for the symbols. The talk of pure or original poetry is ridiculed now.

6

Romantic movement and the movement which is known as avante guard are both products of the youth. Both are the revolt against rationalism. It is a rebellion against the conspiracy of the mind and the values it creates. These people have, as if, revived the body. They welcome its desires and experiences. Hence, their leanings are towards sexual impulses, dreams, inspiration. They wish to destroy the apparent world as it is

and establish some divine, magical, supernatural reality. They wish that it should be something more than the real.

The character called 'T' enters in this poem. It strives to save itself from the world and tries to take revenge by ironical or bitter laughter. These weapons at times kill the one using them. Romantics are themselves the Romantic attitude! Their effort is to maintain the consistency by denial or contempt. Their ambition is to ensure that art and life remain inseparable. If poetry is the deep religion of modernity, politics is its obvious religion. Modern era has accepted linear time whereas poetry accepts rhythmical construct of time. Modern literature skilfully negates the modern era.

The sense of time takes concrete shape in different forms in poetry. On the one hand, there is the linear time of history and development; on the other hand, there is the immediacy and presence of time lying in the sexual experience. Along with it, we also feel the cyclical sense of time residing in the apparent in front of us. We have to place it the sense of hollow time felt by the consciousness and see them as they are.

Due to this reason, it is difficult to formulate the characteristics of the 20th century poetry. It is a time of displacement, change, the renunciation of what was accepted very seriously, the wreck of faith, atheism and charting a new track. All this, as some unsympathetic, unkind critics believe, does not happen for the sake of competition or fashion. At times, the consciousness of a poet is going through some intolerable and

rapid situations. Nobody likes to go the other way by will; nor there is senseless or angry reaction alone behind this. It is a misadventure like Rebon's 'Drunken Boat'. In it, poets put the whole life at stake, abandoning all joys and sorrows. It is an exercise of involving oneself seriously and not merely a one-off or experiment.

As a result of this itself, some poets had to suffer and face tyranny at the hands of morally orthodox society; so many of them have gone through exile and spent their life in asylums and some who could not tolerate took the way to suicide. Diagnosed dangerous, some have been imprisoned by the State. Let alone fame and prosperity, some poets had to face sheer humiliation. Many poets have, hence, been pushed into solitude. Even after tolerating all the agony, has that which they strove to accomplish become a part of culture? That is why someone has said that the work of poet in this age is like an artist walking on the tightrope. He has to maintain balance, shiver not in the fear of falling in the abyss, keep smiling so that the crowds of spectators derive entertainment. The poet is either a joker or a bard, indulging in high praises. If his imaginary flights take us into the heaven of fantasy, they would like it, but if he presents the essence of reality without sparing words, how we can tolerate!

It is not fair to expect that when a poet looks at the world, he should look at it only objectively. How is it possible to be detached, indifferent to what we see? If we wish to re-create what we see, how can one accomplish that without getting involved? Hence,

we simply cannot demand that he should remain a detached observer. However, as he does not look at the world with pre-meditated vision or perspective, so he is indeed detached in that sense. It is also not that he should lose himself in the process of seeing. He transcends that which he sees by dint of the process of seeing. This transcendence is an important part of the creative process.

By irony, the poet dissolves the object but there is never any intention to cause anarchy in values. It in fact links which we consider as extremes and gives us the ethical and aesthetic solution. Some people say that we cannot change life, hence we change poetry. But there would be people who would change poetry to bring about change in life. Perhaps, only poetry can bring true revolution. Only through it, we can avoid the conflict between history and the sense we have as human beings.

In a way, we consider brahma pure and infinite but poetry is his propensity. There is such a celebration of language that poetry finds its emancipation. Thus, we don't turn towards void but we embark upon the quest for the discovery of the relationship with the world. The poet does not conquer the state of duality. There has been a conflict between seeing and longing. To see is to meditate but to desire is to achieve physical pleasure. Some say that such contrast has remained between art and life. Mallarme has said that the moment of being a poet is the moment on which the unbiased and the relative, the unalloyed and subject to change cross each other.

It is true that avante guard gives newer pathways but artists and poets are moving ahead on them at such pace that they reach the other end quite immediately and collide with the wall, and making a hole in the wall, jump into an unknown abyss. Every crossing over creates new hurdle and every hurdle is to be crossed by jumping over it. Thus, avante guard movement gets stuck up between two extremes and therefore, it cements the aesthetic position of change initiated by the Romantics and it also leads to the expansion of literary space. If we look at it this way, we cannot call crossing over as it is. It is merely the return in timeless time. Surrealists believe in the astonishing powers of desire to uproot things and the revolutionary power of sexual experience. They gave grave significance to dream and philosophy but did not accept the difference between the two. Both come from the unconscious and hence both give us the glimpse of the abyss. This abyss is the hitherto unknown side of man and reality. It is foolish to say that only some part of life is important. Each and every point is important. Every poet is different, unique and inevitable. One cannot measure poetry. It is neither trivial nor great; it is just one single thing: poetry.

Modern era is an age of tables and suppression of the self, meaning the age of criticism. It considers itself the form of change and considers change different from criticism, and for it, change and criticism is real progress. It has happened for some time now that its

tendency to abandon everything has remained a repetitive ritual, revolt ends up being a precise ritual and criticism is turning into a style of oratory. Transcendence is turning into a customary exercise.

There is inverse relationship between faith in the powers of the natural and the contempt for what is systematically created. The scepticism for the heaven of tomorrow is becoming widespread. Now the body is not the battleground of conflict between the angels and Satans. It is a means for the work we wish to accomplish. It has been degraded as the means of pleasure. Our attitude to detachment has changed. It is no longer considered to be the means of reaching heaven. It is merely a way of carrying out the work. Pleasure is waste of time and succumbing to sensual desires creates illusions in the mind. To criticise pleasure is to criticise imagination because the body is not only the source of desires but imagination also.

We have lost the sense of religion and immortality. We don't consider it logical. It is merely a statement made of empty words. Today, future itself looks as unreal as immortality. There is a need felt for creating a new aesthetics.

We no longer believe that politics creates the future. Now its task is to render the present tolerable. To distinguish some difference between yesterday and today, we need some sense of the pace of time.

Some French structuralists claim to give the definition of poetics. If it is a discipline, it will be a discipline describing many things, which means it will not be focused on one thing. Every list of the ideal method prepared by it will be proven wrong by new literary works. Structure is unmindful of beyond but a text will have history, it will have its givens. Poetry resides between the past hampered with many events and future, not inhibited by anyone. Its existence is like disappearing after coming to light, like a heartbeat.

***Sanket Vigyan ni Saidhantik Bhumika* (The Theoretical Position of Semiology)**

Whoever has read a little regarding semiology would not find the name of Umberto Eco unfamiliar. He is the professor of symbolism at the Baulo University. He is also the editor of a journal called 'La'strutura assente'. He has recently written a book expounding the principles of semiology. His mother tongue is Italian. He has also thought about writing in other language in terms of semiology position. He says that to write in another language is like thinking about a subject all over again. The interesting question is this: how does the mind translate the sensory material into meaningful signs? How do the visual and verbal reconcile with each other. Is something lost when linguistic expression is translated in some other language? How does the mind relate one with the other by way of metaphors and symbols?

Due to social custom, one sign can be used for another. What goes on in the mind at the time of translation, is it a matter of psychology? Does the question how these social customs are established belong to sociology?

His book is into five parts. John Walker has carried out an important discussion on it in 'Leonardo'. (page 10-14) Firstly, he has tried to chalk out the boundaries of Semiology in the preface. He has tried to discuss the border above and beneath it and its relationship with other branches of knowledge. He has clarified the difference between the use of signs and exchange of meaning. His objective is to differentiate between the natural signs (for instance, clouds are the sign of rain) and the signs used in the day-to-day life for human transactions. There is no conscious intention behind the natural signs. But in the human transactions involving language, there is always an intention of expressing something with the help of something and convey it to somebody.

After this, he has tried to establish the mechanics of relationship between 'code' and 'sign'. For this, he has also analysed some of the basic constructs of Peirce, Saussure, Barthes, Jakobson, Metz etc regarding Semiology. In it, he has discussed expression and the material for expression, suggestion and sign, oration and the study for it. He argues that there is nothing like sign in reality, there is only one thing-the function of sign. Using sign to convey something is fulfilled once the relationship of expression and the material for expression is established properly. This can be conveyed in other ways too,

hence, the signs are a result of establishing a relationship between two elements at that time. He does not accept that the signified objects are the meaning of the signs. He establishes cultural units in their place. These units can be different in every culture.

He has discussed the work done in the arrangement of signs in detail. In it, he has analysed the classification, the construct of icon, rhetoric, essays and aesthetic expectations.

He has also pondered over what should be the place of the one who is involved in the transaction of signs, but that cannot come into the purview of Semiology.

We are interested in what he has said about the texts which inspire aesthetic expectations; these texts also convey something (means there is an intention behind them hence cannot be place in the natural category). The analysis of the process that goes in the creation of signs is important. He doesn't accept that artists can create a work, at will, from nothing. His description of the new is intriguing. How do new signs come into being? How do the readers understand these signs? If their understanding of signs is based on social custom, the custom regarding the signs used in the text is not established as yet. A text with aesthetic expectations is a means for a 'message'. The organization of signs as the vehicle of message is of crucial significance. He emphasises the following details regarding this: (1) Ambiguity (a way of violating the norms of the 'code')-it provokes the readers for interpretation. (2) Concentrating on the self-it draws

the readers' attention towards the form. (3) The remnant of the expression and its material so that the impression one has is that a text turns everything into signs hence, does not communicate anything. He calls a work of art a first rate work of organisation of signs. It is controlled by 'derivative matrix'. Hence, it becomes inevitable to re-create the 'code'. That is how the possibilities of new signification can be realised. If it becomes acceptable, it will enrich the daily transactions. But the notions of society remain significant. Eco says 'for even to prophets to prove themselves right, society's acceptance is necessary. If it doesn't give its acceptance, they would prove to be wrong'. But when we say the acceptance of society, whose acceptance do we mean? When can one attain it? For what objective? – these questions remain unanswered.

Works of art transcend the boundaries of Semiology because if you change the system of literal meaning, you have to change the way culture looks at the world. A work with aesthetic expectation which has no bondage of truth and falsehood raises the doubt in our mind, would the confluence between the real situation of the world and the material of the text be the best interpretation exercise? One can give the attributes of the world by some other means also. A Semiotologist examines the system of signs in order to understand how the signs operate whereas the artist works on them to change them, to create new nuances out of them.

Whatever he has said about painting or other aesthetic forms is of general nature. There is a dearth of examples which can substantiate his statements. His statement on them is incomplete. It is not that once the details related to a work are given, the clarification on its art is over. Fine arts should also be contemplated as the part of social system. These fine arts sustain themselves on some of the instruments of the State (e. g. the art training schools, the committee taking stock of arts, the organisations taking care of exhibition). Moreover, the subject experts also contribute to it to an extent. The weight of their words is considerable while deciding upon what is art, what are the characteristics of good art? They also formulate the attributes of the higher and the lower layers of cultures. They also play an important role in establishing arts other than what the masses deem to be arts.

They call 'impressionism' a different way of looking at the world. Earlier, it was rejected as obscure but later on it was accepted. The possibility of acceptance is always there in the case of a number of artistic exercises. By combating the popular media, it proves the worth of its existence. Thinkers like Adorno have considered this as a positive value. The works of an 'abstract impressionist' do not act as per norms which can be predicted. But what they have to say is that there is an objective even in the events when the system of signs goes awry. It can be useful in proving that the absence of system of signs is relevant. In this sense, 'informal arts' can be compared with the

silence, giving expression to the desire to state nothing. Don't we call it 'rhetoric of silence'?

A different kind of system of signs is at work in the works of artists like Mondrea who is not depicting any familiar object or form. In it, objects act according to certain rules but nothing is imposed on them. One can relate them to some content. But as there are so many possibilities of such relationships, the reader has to take the challenge of interpretation of in this situation.

In this viewpoint, the objective of these works seems to be disregarded. Mondrea does have its own meaning. Why is that painting known by the term called 'neo-plasticism'? The 'cultural elements' in them create the base for accepting it as an artefact. Some of those values keep evolving.

What shall we say about an artist like John Heartfield who dedicated his works to politics? He says, 'in order to reach more and more number of people, I shall have to employ signs which they can understand, but the fundamental signs in my culture have been created by the rulers. Hence, I have to re-create the signs of the society which I wish to re-create. If the re-formulation of signs is of extreme kind, people will not be able to understand.' Here there is a fundamental contradiction. The artist who is to bring revolution has to work with mediocre signs.

The explanation given by Eco about the artistic inventions seems unconvincing. There are contradictions in his statements too. Who is responsible for the signs? The artist or the one who relishes the art? Arts are supposed to dictate the way signs signify and they also say that signification should not govern the artists but until the relationship between the expression and the material is not accepted, it is not understandable to readers, these signs will remain 'personal language'. Hence, we have to believe that system of signs is a combined effort of the artist and the one who receives it. A new culture takes shape right next to the old one. It doesn't come into being, totally detached from the old one. The one who strives to establish new signs in the extreme sense is taking the risk at his own will. Hence, the activity of establishing new signs fails too.

When does a Semilologist's interpretation of a work become useful to the artist engaging in the art? Only when they want to satisfy themselves to analysing the already existing samples and creating something new out of them! This analysis is of no great significance to an artist who establishes a relationship between signs which were not related so far. Semilologist analyses the system of signs only after it is established.

Semiology is expected to act as if it is beyond history. As if it is completely valuable! Science evolves detached from certain culture or intellectual situation and if Semiology is to be called a science, it will also have to do so!

May 1978

Sanket Vigyan (Semiology)

In between, we had a wave of 'structuralism'. But now it seems to have receded. Now we hear a bit here and there about Semiology. University or literary organisations should get authentic books prepared by the scholars on these new areas. Our syllabi keep safely away from these areas.

In 'The Times Higher Education Supplement' dated 24th Sept, 1974, renowned literary critic and linguist has given the account of the first conference on Semiology and raised some fundamental questions. To recall this would be useful to us.

As the term 'Semiology' suggests, it is a branch of knowledge studying the signs. In English, 'Semiology' and 'Semiotics'-these two terms are used. It is natural that the introduction of a subject like this seems incomplete this way. We need to include most of the domain of human knowledge in it. If we just say that whatever carries meaning is a sign, we shall invite the folly of exaggeration. All man-made objects (whether they are books, paintings, songs, sculpture or objects of daily use) do carry some meaning. In the same way, social science, psychology, history or the science which studies human behaviour also need to be included in this.

If we consider man-made objects and actions the vehicles of meaning, the domain of Semiology will expand considerably. In addition to this, we shall have to include the natural objects in this too because they also act as signs. Certain kinds of clouds are signs of rain; certain kind of constitution of land can be the sign of natural oil for some Geologist.

If Semiology has to study all that is signified, many branches of knowledge would be included in it. Every one of these branches of knowledge has its distinct subjects and methodologies. There was an eclectic mix of people in this first conference on Semiology in Milan. Papers were read on literature, music, film, painting, sculpture, organizations, the communication among the animals, non-verbal communication, psychological treatment etc.

This is like imperialism dawned in the domain of knowledge! How to justify this? Why should we bring all this under Semiology? What is there in Semiology which makes it study that is already studies by other branches of knowledge?

Let's recall Saussure here. He is deemed to be the exponent of modern linguistics. In his 'General Course of Linguistics' in 1917, he had argued for a separate branch of knowledge to study the system of signs. It should analyse 'what is a sign and which norms do these signs adhere to?' Saussure did not take it upon himself the task of its definite form. He just gave the assurance that its place is sure in the domain of

knowledge in future. The students of language will need to think about signs. 'It is not as clear as it should be that language is a system of signs. But sooner or later we will have to take recourse to the science of signs.' Studying the signs other than those in the domain of language, the linguist will be able to acquire knowledge of the similarity of other signs and their unique individuality. 'With this method, not only will we classify the problems of language better but if study our customs, rituals etc well, we will attain a new way of looking at things. We will need to include all that and study them as per the rules of the science of signs.'

In this perspective, very simply, emphasis is laid on the mutual exchange of our transactions. The significance of objects which man makes and the objects around us is brought out in this. All our actions have something to convey. It says something about us to others, it also says something about the society, its norms and our relationship with it.

It is not a given in Semiology that certain transaction or action will have a definite meaning forever. But our actions are linked to the system of signs created by the culture. Thus, they remain a part of the exchange of meaning. Long overcoats are also suggestive of certain professions. But it is not that a labourer cannot wear a long overcoat. He can also say, 'I am a share broker'.

There are complex intentions behind the verbal as well as non-verbal transactions and its implications can be various. To clarify the human transactions is not in the real work of Semiology. The behaviour of an individual can be peculiar, haphazard, natural or long winding. Semiology studies the reservoir created by the culture due to which human transactions acquire a certain meaning. The insight that there is a certain system behind the meaning which human transactions and objects assume is the foundation of Semiology. The meaning of a sentence acquires in relation to other sentences. The difference between the two rests on the mode of expression of a language.

A Semiotologist is concerned with human transactions and objects having certain meaning in the system of signs of a culture. What details should one note while studying the attire of a society? Today, women wear moghul style of clothes, collegiate girls wear jeans, but no girl would wear salwar kameez as the wedding dress. Would boys wear English style trousers and shirts as their wedding attire! What is the meaning of this? This study can be useful in understanding how the human behaviour and code of conduct are constituted in a society. What kind of fabric is used in making the clothes is not important. One can also come to know how we can identify the different classes of people on the basis of difference in clothes.

In this kind of a study, Semiology brings out in clear light what has remained hidden or suggestive in human behaviour. At times, we know certain things at the level of

subconscious. Due to that reason, we are able to understand the behaviour of people in the society. Certain behaviour would be deemed proper in a society whereas it would be an offence in certain other society. A particular kind of attire would be dignified in the Western society but that would be sheer shamelessness in our society. Wherever there is knowledge, dominance of information, a certain method is always there which can be explained. The meaning implanted in human behaviour and objects is not endowed by will, hence there should be some system behind it and we should be able to explain it methodologically.

A number of events can be studied in this way. One can study the elements which derive meaning from a particular economic system. Here, there is a question: if there are different kinds of signs, should there not be different Semiologies?

There are three types of signs: icon, index and sign; the relationship of signifier and signified among them is of different kinds.

In icon, the apparent image of the signifier and the signified is relied upon: the oil painting of a person signifies that very person. In it, it is the apparent image which is the base, not the custom.

The relationship of the signifier and the signified in 'index' is one of cause and effect. 'Where there is smoke, there will be fire' is the example in Sanskrit nyay. Here, smoke

and fire is the sign. The footprints of an animal are the sign of the fact that it has passed from here.

In 'sign', the relationship of the signifier and the signified is voluntary and tradition-ordained. To fold hands politely when we meet is a custom. It becomes a sign of respect. In the West, there is a custom of eating cheese at the end of a meal.

What is the significance of these three from the Semiology's viewpoint? Does it mean anything by these three categories? Main objective is to establish the sign at the centre because there is no cause and effect relationship between the signifier and the signified. It is like the essence of a larger system of signs. The discussion on the apparent image is a matter of philosophical inquiry. How does the drawing of a horse present the horse, what is the truth in it etc is for the philosophy to think. It is not the subject of Semiology, created on the basis of Linguistics. Thus, icon is not included in the purview of Semiology.

If a Semiologist undertakes the study of 'index', he would run the risk of making all human knowledge his subject because whatever re-establishes the cause and effect relationship can be seen as the subsidiary of Semiology. The symptoms of a disease suggest a certain disease. There is a cause and effect relationship between the two. But it does not mean that 'index' should be kept out of the study of signs because every 'index' can be employed as customary sign. Once the relationship between signified

and signifier is accepted to be of cause and effect, the signified goes on signifying the signified even if the relationship of cause and effect may not have remained, and may have become custom-ordained. Smoke can be used on the stage to suggest fire, albeit that smoke does not have the cause and effect relationship.

The Semiologist would be interested in the custom-ordained kind of 'index' because the 'social mythology' takes shape through it. What we call status symbol is its best example. It is not that it has cause and effect relationship; it has ended up being custom-ordained index. The custom prevalent in society gives it the status of symbol and through that, it means more than what the 'index' suggests. Television, motor car, air conditioner etc have become status symbols. In the West, to own a Rolls Royce becomes a sign of status. It can be considered 'index' because only those extremely rich can buy that car.

How far can we allow the imperialism of Semiology to expand? Many subjects can be discussed from Semiological approach but they may not be the subjects of Semiology alone. In order to draw the boundaries of Semiology, we should enlist the examples it deals with.

Only custom-ordained signs are useful in all these methods. They are pure examples of sign system but these examples are so simple, it becomes easy to explain the principle on the basis of which they are made. Hence, it doesn't interest us so much.

Apart from this obvious signs, there is also a system of signs in which there is an intention of interaction but it is not easy to establish its science. It is quite ambiguous. Literature has this kind of system of signs. To read and understand literary texts, one needs to understand something more than the language. But it becomes difficult to decide what more the readers should know. It is obvious that we are not talking about knowledge which we can place in the list. But the study of the expression based on this kind of aesthetic position.

We can find the 'notation' of the first kind of ambiguous thoughts. But we don't have the definition of the expression resting on these ideas lead us towards the notions and complexity. The way literary texts employ the system of signs is the reason why they seem fascinating from the Semiological viewpoint.

After this let's discuss the social transaction which does not consider expression or exchange of information to be essential but because of which a difference is felt and it means a lot to the people of a certain society. The manners or etiquette, the rituals related to eating, the attitude towards clothes, and objects related to business-in short everything for which society uses a sign is included in it. When a Semiologist is studying it, he brings the method of classification which works behind it indirectly or secretly to the fore.

At the end, we have to think of 'index'. It discusses the cause and effect relationships discovered or established by social science and natural science.

It doesn't mean anything if we state that all these are subsidiary branches of Semiology, because all these knowledge exercises will keep fathoming the difference of social and natural ritual and continue to establish cause and effect relationship. It may happen that it not be a part of Semiology but that does not mean that the Semiologist should not pay heed to it.

The Semiologist would certainly be interested in all these branches of knowledge which establish cause and effect relationship; firstly because it has to explain how 'index' continues to become a sign. Moreover, these branches of knowledge need to be studied from the Semilological approach too and it is a very difficult task. For a subject like Astrology which is not given the status of a discipline, the study is clear. We don't have faith about the cause and effect relationship between the planets and human life. Hence, it becomes a custom. We can form its rules so that we can explain the things in Astrology. A Semilologist can give an account of these customs. In it, he can analyse the method of an astrologist from the Semilologist perspective. It doesn't matter whether it is meaningful or not. He would look at it only as a method of narration in which there are some rules and norms for interpretation. If Semiology is not concerned with the veracity or the lack of it as regards Astrology, why can it not study other more active sciences?

The analysis can be done of the custom which prevails to order meaning on the objects and actions in those sciences.

Branches of knowledge such as Medical Science, Geology, Psychology, Economics and Astrology can be studied in the Semiological way. In fact, any branch of knowledge or thinking can be studied in this way because each one of them has its own language and its norms. It expresses a part of this world.

What should be our conclusion out of all this? The way Semiology is engaging itself we need to stress two points: Semiology should limit its ambition and even if it does not claim to call other branches of knowledge its subsidiaries, it will tend to be a kind of 'meta-discipline'. It will take it upon itself the task of examining how other branches of knowledge treat their signs and interpret them.

The work, that is going on the philosophical questions arising in the domains of history and science, which centres on the element which governs the work going on at that stage. Semiology stresses the point that different branches of knowledge are not merely experimentative methods; the process of interpretation goes on in them too.

As Semiology studies the components of expression, if it focuses on its method of classification, it will prove to be destructive. Because it is all very problematic. If we differentiate the classes, the dividing lines will begin to get erased. As seen earlier, once the cause and effect relationship is lost, 'index' becomes custom-ordained sign, and sign

becomes 'index'. The moment we identify something as a certain sign, it will, by virtue of the process of interpretation, become another kind of sign too. These examples of signs going from one class to another will become routine and would no longer remain exceptions.

The work of defining its components is an ever continuous process for Semiology because it strives to define the basis and subtlety of one of the most elusive process-the process of endowing something with meaning.

April 1978

Navya Vivechan Vishe Thodu (A Bit About New Criticism)

In the domain of criticism, some givens enjoy considerable influence in a particular period of time. This influence expands so much that it seems that it determines the future directions of the literary writings as well. Literature written during this period is also looked at by fitting it into that mould. But the excess of this influence invites the reaction against. It begins with a literary text. It will not fit into that mould.

When great works are not written, one can say that criticism is dominating the scene. Ultimately, the discussion or debates revolve around two points. One point is that of looking at literature as imitation (mimesis). The other is about examining literature from

the point of view of the competence of language. One doesn't mean to say that these two work separately from each other but it seems that the kind of emphasis laid on these two determines the attitude toward literature.

In Pandit era, Anandshankar and others were inspired to define poetry in the language which was a combination of the ideas of Plato and Vedant. One cannot say that its influence is completely over. This point of view is tempted to treat the aesthetic relish in which there is a deep sense of joy as the divine happiness. Hence, it is obvious that they would be more interested in discussing the resulting experience rather than the text itself. The world created by God is maya and hence, not worthwhile chasing it, to say that only brahm is the truth, and one should sing the glory of God with an understanding of the system created by him-in all of this, is it not more natural that the poet, believing that to know is to relish, rather than considering the world worthless, look at his own work with more inquisitiveness and wonder?

It is true that literature cannot prevail in isolation, away from life but if we accept that true literature, whatever it does, does it in its characteristically distinct way, we should try to understand it because that proves to be the decisive factor in the case of literature. To believe that the process of transformation has not happened and focus on the material of life in it and analyse it from the viewpoint of sociology, psychology, philosophy etc would amount to disregarding the exercise of interpretation. Due to its

distinct way, literature preserves its immediacy and concrete nature. In that sense, it seems possible that its relationship with life is deeper.

The idea of Formalism has been there since the times of Aristotle. In our criticism, we have celebrated only the ability of a text to transport us rather than the content of the text; if that were not so, the vulgar which has disgust as the basic emotion would not be rejected. But if we wish to disregard any viewpoint, we follow the trick of taking it to the extreme and making it seem ridiculous. We are not prepared to accept what the in-depth balanced analysis tells us. Around 1965, without much logical base, some modernists began to talk about 'formlessness'. It appeared as if this is all done due to the attachment with life. A young poet-friend had said in a tone of threat: 'Now all this talk of yours about 'form' will not last, just wait, we will create a good number-10 to 12-books on it within a year or two.' I consider such a situation desirable in the interest of literature. I would not claim that I have chanced upon some timeless truth. I do believe that there would always be an opportunity to reconsider it.

Against the New Criticism of Chicago in America, Charles Olson and Robert Crilly presented the concept of 'projective verse' and created a challenge in the domain of creative writing. This effort began in Black Mountain College. Pamphlets written in aggressive language began to come out. In our backdrop, we wish that some institution

accepts the task of cultivating such an approach and create the foundation for acquiring the requisite insight on the part of young writers.

One more expectation is there: the critics deemed to belong to old generation but who were otherwise incisive should, without taking any side, have taken the good points from both the sides. But the previous generation, either due to intellectual flaw or the evil of supporting the popular, didn't seem to be interested in any other thing. There is no hue and cry in the field of literature occurring; even if it does, it is taken on the individual level rather than on the intellectual level. Instead of the brilliance of intellect, anger, like burning fire, is what we get. One has to admit it sadly that the society which tolerates this situation –on the one hand, there are nearly rigid and impassive but smart people and on the other hand, the youth that makes a spark seem like an atom bomb-is intellectually quite immature.

It is not so in the West. Competent critics like Rene Wellek still remain eager to examine the situation. What had come to be known as 'New Criticism' is not only now a matter of past but there are many who say that it is fundamentally wrong. Those who say this have these four points: New Criticism is not interested in the human context and it sings the glory of art for art's sake; there are some gibberish utterances about the spiritual depth of aesthetic relish etc; it disregards the effect of literature on society and its responsibility towards society. This criticism is insistent on form. Now, the term

'Formalism' seems like an abuse. Secondly, New Criticism is anti-history; it looks at a text in isolation from its history and context. Thirdly, it aims at becoming a discipline. At the end it is said that New Criticism is merely a trick of the teachers; it may be needed in educational institutions but to insist that all readers should accept it is autocratic.

Rene Wellek gives a response to all the four counts. (Critical Inquiry: 4-4) He says that those hurling these accusations against New Criticism have not read the core texts in New Criticism which have laid its foundation. The tendency of the critics of previous generation is also similar. A lot of things which New Criticism recommends are of substance and as long as people will keep thinking about the function and form of literature with a balanced mind. It will continue to be of substance.

What is the theoretical position of New Criticism? The Schelegal brothers had used the term 'New Criticism' in the 19th century. Even Crotche also uses the term 'New Critic' in place of 'I' while referring to himself. Spingarn had taken this term from Crotche. He had written the book explaining the principles of Crotche in 1911. It was titled 'The New Criticism'. After that, this term got firmly entrenched although there was no oath in the book to establish New Criticism. John Crowe Ransom began 'Canyon Review'. Ransom analyses the criticism of Richards, Eliot and Winters. Angered by it, Winters countered it in 'Anatomy of Nonsense'. By 1941, the approaches and methods of New

Criticism were established. They had also come into being initially as the reaction to the contemporary criticism. At that time, there was the influence of Walter Pater and Remo de Gormo. Hence, there was criticism focused on aesthetic relish. The other influence was that of Humanists. Irving Babbit was its chief exponent. The third tendency was of the nature of opposing the business culture of America. It popularized the 'Naturalist Novel' of Draiser. Mengan and Ven Wine Brooks were its exponents. Apart from this, Marxism was another powerful factor. When recession hit America, the influence of Marxism grew. Edmund Wilson was the chief proponent and critic. None of them are included in New Criticism.

The sign of this new trend is seen in the writings of Ransom, Tate, Blackmar, Canath Burke and Winters. Later on, this thread was taken forward by Clinth Brooks, Robert Penn Warren and William K Wimsatt. The influence of T S Eliot cannot be disregarded. The influence of Richards was added to it. Looking at these names, we can see there was no group of like-minded people. One can quote many statements from these names opposing one another. At times, Ransom's viewpoint seems to be in contradiction to the ideas of his disciples like Allan Tate, Clinth Brooks, and Robert Penn Warren. Burke and Blackmar had later on severely criticised the approach of New Criticism. In 'History of Modern Criticism', Rene Wellek has discussed the distinct contribution of each critical thought, not the sect called New Criticism.

However, there has been something common in all of them. The critique of the old or contemporary criticism connects them together. They are not ready to accept the criticism carried out in ornamental language. They have, particularly Tate, Blackmar, Winters and Burke, protested against inserting a Humanist approach in it as well. They don't approve of the Marxist tendency too. They criticised the method, principles and viewpoint prevalent in English critics at that time. These English scholars were emphasising upon etymology and historical research. Wellek has noted that when he went to Priston before 50 years or so, American literature or modern literature was not in the syllabi. Even now, modern literature and modern approaches of criticism have no place in some of our universities. No professor had interest in aesthetics, barring an exception. In such an ambience, the professors who were the proponents of New Criticism had to make their way forward. Over here, the same situation still prevails.

Sahitya Vivechan ane Bhasha Vigyan (Literary Criticism and Linguistics)

Can the other branches of knowledge be useful in the study of literature? On one extreme, it is believed that criticism, like poetry, is self-sufficient, whereas some people, on the other extreme, believe that the study of other branches of knowledge is useful in understanding and relishing literature better. There is one more fear that by putting literature into the mould of constructs we destroy the substance and uniqueness which

literature makes concrete and relishable. It is also said that every branch of knowledge has its distinct terminology. Will the critic not be lost in the horde of different terminologies? Suppose he internalizes the terminologies of these branches of knowledge by putting in hard work, by that time, due to the gradual evolution of the domain, some of the terms, the basic concepts related to them may have changed. What should the literary critic do in this situation? No discipline is immune to time. The world does not behave according to the discipline; the discipline strives to understand the world. Even in the literary domain, we cannot a truth which stands forever. We have to keep critiquing every fundamental construct in relation to the creative situation. There is one more charge that the futile obscurity of terminology creates the exercise for our minds. Unnecessary terms and pseudo-intellectuality are not always symbolic of the obscurity. Hence, at times, it is like taking false pride also.

These questions related to literary criticism have begun to be discussed in our backdrop too. Linguistics and Semiology are expanding their influence. How much useful can the method of linguistic analysis be in the literary criticism? Would the terms used in it not create futile questions instead of clarifying the haze and systematic?

Nowadays, there are growing debates on this aspect. As a result, some misleading thoughts are also getting exposed. One of the ideas is: the linguist notes the details about the text and hands them over to the critic for interpretation. This is like the left

hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing. It is proper that John Ellis considers this situation absurd. If it happens so, neither the linguist nor the critic can accomplish anything. One who notes details, observes the facts, would not do it without any objective. On what basis, would he decide which details he should note? Would a clearly articulated or vague idea not be working behind that? He can decide the direction for his pursuits only if such an idea is there. Can he remain unbiased about noting the details? There can be many different viewpoints regarding how and where to look for the details. There can be different methods of beginning it. When we compile some details and classify them in a certain way, it means that we adopted a particular approach to towards the interpretation of the text. Thus, a linguist analyzing the text by observation does interpret it as well. He cannot remain unbiased in that. What would be the outcome if the linguist and the critic act on the principle of division of labour? Then, the critic would act in compliance with the approach for interpretation that the linguist has adopted. But that would be a highly uncharacteristic phenomenon.

Interpretation is that of the one who began the observation of the text from the linguistic viewpoint, not of the critic. At times, the critic sees the need to go beyond where the linguist has reached, or finds his approach insufficient or wrong; he may find some contradictions as well. In such a situation, the critic would adopt a new approach and make suitable observations in this regard, but if we accept the principle of division of labour, the moment the critic sees a contradiction or flaw, he will have to go back to

the linguist. We have never seen this happen. If it happens so, this whole method would seem awkward because nobody observes without an approach of one's own and without the preparedness to observe in one's own way, he cannot have his own approach. This is the reason why the efforts of linguistic to examine literary works from the viewpoint of style fall short. It knows only the act of presentation of facts and we cannot do anything about those facts; the facts are invincible and create a sense of helplessness. These facts are not seen as a small part of the whole process of critical observation. After fact, the phase of interpretation comes. After the interpretation, we cross-examine these facts; thus the process of examining, modifying the other goes on. To arrive at interpretation from facts and come to the decision is like jumping in the void again. The peculiarity of the situation is that firstly the critic creates the space between the facts and the interpretation and then complains that the facts are not helping in filling this space!

Even in the process of interpretation, there are problems due to the division of labour. Such interpretations are of obvious kind; its definition is not given by the linguist studying literature. When a linguist points a finger towards the relationship among the stanzas and their structure, has he not interpreted that it is an important part of the poem? But if they avoid the acceptance of this fact, how would it be possible to later improve or modify the initial interpretation? Then, the whole process of observation

would come to a halt and interpretation would also not be able to move forward. Thus, rather than helping it, the method of division of labour would hamper the process.

Interpretation means the primary statement on the organization of the component parts and the structure of a text. An interpretation which can encompass all the components would be more effective. Later on, it needs to be examined as to the general perception regarding this combination, and the importance of each component part in the whole that a text is and how and how much it is realized. The idea formed in the beginning keeps changing in relation to the definite details. New details have to be observed as per the changing perception. The reason for the impression that the interpretation of the details doesn't take place is that the process of examining one by the other does not go on continuously. It stops somewhere at the wrong time. Hence, there arises the distance between the linguist's precision about seemingly insignificant details and the critic's reliance on his own subjective judgment. Uncontrolled observations stop at the insignificant details and the lack of hard work to nurture the interpretation with the help of details would result in unscientific self-centredness.

Looking at it this way, when the linguist is describing the linguistic details, it cannot be isolated from the possibility of a primary interpretation. In fact, these two terms are part of this process. In the same way, to consider examination different from interpretation of a text is also a fundamental mistake. Whatever would be logical would be of

consequence to interpretation. Thus, it would also not be appropriate to clash the objectivity of science and the subjective approach of criticism.

At times, the arguments the linguists put forward seem to be appropriate but the context in which I have said things, these arguments need to be re-examined. Linguists argue that the linguistic or other details which literary critics bring forth are usually in favour of some pre-conceived viewpoint, not for the objective analysis. Hence, they merely pretend to take the support of linguistic details. Their minds have already made the decision and later just look for the supporting evidence. Linguist should also maintain objectivity in their observation. They should not be carried away by the pre-conceived notion about facts.

We should say that such an argument is misleading to some extent. If the linguist believes that it is possible to examine a text without any prior notion about it, it is his mistake. This is a clever effort to contradict their method with that of literary critic's. If you wish to raise objections against the method of literary critic, it should be done differently. Critics act arbitrarily in relation to facts, and don't do the work of establishing its relationship logically which would be suitable for the linguistic analysis. Due to the overinsistence on using only some details, they are not able to develop their interpretations by cleansing them properly. Looking at it scientifically, one can say that

to do this is insufficient and dishonest. But simply because the critic has adopted a position and that is why it is wrong is not reasonable.

November, 1978

Arvachinata ane Anuarvachinata (Modernity and Postmodernity)

A professor-friend said hesitatingly but with anger, 'Are we still not revolving round Aristotle?' Is there anything like progress in criticism? Or is it that we keep moving the circular motion?' With more aggression, some completely rule out the necessity for criticism. Somebody says literature is a mirror; we can see the reflection of life in it. Somebody else said that it is a lamp; it makes visible what was hitherto unseen, in a corner. Lionel Trilling places 'sincerity' at the centre; but now is it not that its place has been taken up by 'irony'? Have there not been efforts to define, like a scientist, the theoretical position of literature? But that is where we are headed in the wrong direction. Instead of unanimity, there is 'pluralism' of opinions. Hence, anarchy seems to be prevailing in place of order. To some, Formalism is out of date now; at the most, we give it a homage we pay to a loved one, now dead. It is not that the tendency to look at a text in the context of the literary tradition. In the meantime, structuralism came and now we have begun to hear about 'post-structuralism' from Europe. Before we can differentiate between modernism and modernity, discussions have begun on post-modernity and a poetics of its own.

The confusion of the professor-friend inspires sympathy in us. By the time we follow the latest fashion in criticism, it becomes out of date. For us, the problem is altogether different: we don't have such creative works which would make the re-examination of the givens inevitable. Our literary context itself becomes a hurdle in our pursuits. Albeit, I don't think that we should religiously confine ourselves in the boundaries. The questions which arise in my mind arise due to the reading of world literature. Therefore, some frown and say, 'Why do we have to insert all this here?' Their geographical sincerity does not awaken any sense of respect for them in me.

Some time back, we also used to have pamphlets; discussions were going on to change things fundamentally. But was it merely a reaction against the rigidity of the contemporary situation or the efforts for creating a foundation for new ways? Today, the way the teaching and criticism of literature goes on, the situation seems bleak. Apart from the ones who are indulging in complacency to the extent of becoming rigid, anybody would find the situation perplexing. We need to examine the givens on the basis of which the teaching of criticism goes on today. How does a lecturer treat literature in the class room, what insights go into our syllabi formation, do the departments which work in the area of literature teaching contribute anything unique at the end of a year, which viewpoint works behind the new compilations, how are the rigorous debates going in the literary journals- all these points should be examined. It is worth pondering over how most of the people follow the 'official creed' set in motion

by some prestige or some renowned person. Lecturers seem to act in compliance with the beliefs of government and semi-government organizations, trustees and students of literature. Where is the tendency to rise above all this and respect the honesty and the love for literature? Some outrageous rebels keep shouting safely at regular intervals; they keep growling in proportion in order to keep their position and feel satisfied at their revolt. The only thing is that the fundamental honesty is damaged, that is all. By dint of all this, not even the foundation of this old edifice shakes. The reason for the anomaly in our treatment of literature is because we don't examine the implications of our principles; we remain unaware of implications of our critical pursuits.

We should break the mould and come out when that which we used to call modern grows outdated. This has become inevitable in many spheres of life. Now even the trend to run away from the city life has also begun but rural life is not its alternative. That is why it is open for the rich. In the same way, we show off that we are in the quest of an alternative education system; there are discussions on changing the methods of agriculture; in the sphere of medical science, the honest doctors are drawing our attention to how the people in their profession are robbing the masses and aggravating the health issues rather than resolving them. Work is going on about popularising new ideas about nutritious food. In the education field, the protest against 'positivism' is seen in psychology, sociology, philosophy and other branches of knowledge. Tendencies like to defy the tradition, abandon coherence, rationality and titles are seen

in literature. Efforts are made to transcend Formalism; only 'rhetorical criticism'. Among the new approaches of criticism, Jacques Derrida's deconstructionist approach related to language and text has created quite uproar. 'Formalistic poetics' seems to be insufficient given the kind of texts are being written in the West. The way a reader responds to a text has also created some new expectations in the domain of criticism.

In this broad literary context, we need to look at revolt against what we have called modern in literature. We also need to take into consideration the change in the perception towards the world. In the context, we should examine what postmodernity is. Postmodernity is a movement, a flow, a way of thinking. It denotes many kinds of activities and gives a sign of the times to come. Now movements don't live long, at the most a decade or two but what we call postmodernity may last two hundred years.

Some say that it began in 1480. Some others are very eager to state that so-and-so movement is now dead. The modern came, primitive also came but now they are no longer appealing. But we cannot say that about postmodernity. We will not be able to state all of a sudden that it has come to an end. It denotes the renaissance of Europe.

Modernism originated in France. It was a movement in the field of literature and art. Later on, it spread in Spain, England and America. Now let's discuss about preparing to enter the postmodern era and mould our consciousness accordingly.

Aesthetics (and now aestheticism also) of the earlier period seems stagnant now. Some have pointed out its limitation by calling it 'logocentric'. Now, the need to make a departure in that direction has begun to be felt. But its beginning cannot reject humanism in that way. We are habituated to look at the world with man at its centre, which is not under the control of rationality and mere anarchy prevails over it and man is striving to establish order amid all this. Nature has begun to seem different and alien to the humans now. Existentialist thinkers do keep complaining about the indifference of the natural world towards the human destiny. Hence, it is considered a little too much to raise questions on the inheritance of intellectual humanism. Thus, when American critic Richard Palmer says that we are ready for postmodernism but not for postmodernity, it is true.

To challenge these values and inheritance would be like raise doubts about the art, science and cultural richness and its achievements of that period. We would need quite revolting ideology for this which will examine everything from the very roots. The cross-examination of the foundation of modernist thinking also needs to be carried out in it. We have to examine everything-its critique of the world, its focus of the self, the insistence of drawing everything into boundaries. (Galileo's famous statement: To measure everything measurable and to measure what is not yet measurable) Apart from this, is it right the way modernism has established two contradictory tendencies as duality? One the one hand, consciousness of wandering analyst and on the other hand

(mainly made of material objects) the world made of objects. But now we are becoming sceptical about the trust which was prevalent during the renaissance that rational scientific methods will accomplish infinite development. We are also trying to estimate the lack of perspective about the nature of modern psyche. This tendency about the consciousness, like the inner vision observing the consciousness, establishes it at some point and shows it as active in the dimension of 'extension'. Hence, we understand objects and even time in the dimension of space. It influences our thinking too – 'we spatialize modes of thought'. This tendency tries to justify our viewpoint. Now we are sceptical about the tendency to dominate lying at the heart of technology and subjectivism (Heidegger's term). Along with this, we are aware of the how much these forces are at work to mould modernist thinking.

It is one thing to join hands in the latest tokenisms of criticising modernity which intellectual living in cities like Mumbai and Calcutta indulge in, and to challenge the elements of humanism, and tradition humanist intellectuality is another. What we call reality is different from the point of view of a tribal. Vedanta or Zen Buddhists will see it differently. The one whose personality is dominated by dilemma will see even more differently. If we think of all this, the foundation of our so-called rationality will be shaken up. Even when litterateurs talk about reality, they add their own adjective to it. Dostoevsky uses a word like 'magic realism' whereas a German novelist calls whatever he portrays 'ghostly reality'. The experience after consumption of hallucinatory

medicine which Carlos Castaneda describes is an altogether reality. Religion calls reality *maya*. Apart from this, aren't there many poets who subscribe to the idea of concrete, harsh, ugly reality? Unemployment, pollution, inflation, population, electricity issues-these are all part of reality. Humanists say that the solution of these problems would not be found by taking recourse to orientalism, romanticism or schizophrenia.

Hence, this clarifies one thing, to be sceptical about modernism is one thing and to take the adventure to transcend it is another. Simply because somebody establishes a postmodernist principle or supports it, it doesn't make a difference to the liberal or rational behaviour of that person. But if you are adopting postmodernity, you have to challenge the advantages of 'modernization'. We have to be sceptical about the solutions which the liberal are resolving. An individual seeking to establish postmodernist principles would raise questions suitably about language, philosophy and social phenomena, but not on order to bring revolution –neither in society nor in education.

William Irvin Thomason believes that we are standing at the brink of history. Some say that this is a transition phase and we are awaiting the dawn of a new era. Now even our understanding has also changed. Thus, the discussion of transcending modernity has begun in different spheres of life. It is not that this is the position of the different thinkers of different domains. There is no consistency characteristic of a movement.

Therefore, we are not able to form its philosophy too. It is obvious that it will have impact on our thinking.

The picture of modern man that the philosophy draws was inherited from the 17th century. It is not in harmony with the thinking going on in science. Scientists standing on the brink of thinking now don't make use of rational thinking. However, the changed image of man has not been carved out well in the domain of modern thinking.

In his book 'Human Understanding' Stephen Toulmin has emphasised that philosophical analysis should attain harmony with the progress science has made. He pays homage to Descartes for the effort he made for laying a firm foundation for knowledge but he stresses the need to make the efforts to render what Descartes did useful and relevant for our age. Toulmin has shown in the examination of the philosophy based on the science that some of basic givens of the modern thinking whose roots lie in Descartes cannot last anymore. Moreover, Urgan Haibermass has shown in his book 'Knowledge and Human interests' that the aims of knowledge acquisition which are based on science would always determine the form of that knowledge. Nietzsche had said it earlier that some of our vested interests determine the form and direction of knowledge. Hence, philosophy should watchfully keep examining the relationship between the form and the aim of knowledge. The question regarding one-dimensional objective knowledge and how misleading the viewpoints about man are arises out of the process of thinking in the scientific method.

In the domain of philosophy, there have been efforts from Descartes and Bacon, especially from Locke and Hume, to save philosophical thinking from materialism. It is a kind of superstition; one has to take precaution so that the intellect should be lost in it. In a dream, Descartes had seen the realization of the foundation of all domains of knowledge. An effective method for realizing it was left to be invented. Hume, Kant and Nietzsche continued this revolt against metaphysics. In Palmer's opinion, only the acutely deconstructive Nietzsche among all of these reaches the roots of modern thinking and opens up the gates for us to enter postmodernity. Later, Heidegger enters from there and gives us results unimagined by Nietzsche even in his dreams. Was there anything Nietzsche did not attack? He rejected Christian religion and severely criticised it, calling it idealism of Plato oversimplified for the masses. Descartes, Kant, Schopenhauer, scientific objectivity, romanticism, Wagner, the rigid notion of morality, contemporary art, German people—he subjected everything to severe criticism. Nietzsche, as if, moulded philosophy with a hammer. Modern thinking was cleansed by the outburst of his anger. If we study his thinking sincerely, a lot of our misconceptions about the 20th century would be uprooted.

Nietzsche revolted against his times. He felt that that era was a victim of the destructive poison of Socrates' thinking. It used to engage in abstractions and discussion of theories. He had the readiness to sacrifice his life for the conclusions he had derived. Thus, in Nietzsche's opinion, modernity was turning into the combination of the self-

centred trivialness of Alexandra and ugliness of the abstract thinking of Socrates. Nietzsche opposed the viewpoint that man is a thinking object. Man is not a psychic element entrenched in a rigid object. Gilbert Rile has said the same thing in a different way. In his book, 'Concept of Mind', he has quoted man being referred to as 'ghost in a machine'. The duality of body and mind has been discussed since the times of Descartes. Nietzsche had doubts about the idea that what we call the consciousness is the centre and essence of our subjectivity. He had suggested that there are many elements or centres for interpretation in a human being. Our consciousness is just one of the many centres who are in a state of 'tension'. It is not that it has dominance or control over other centres. Nietzsche had definitively rejected the idea that there is a paramaterial reality beyond the world of senses and its reality. Such a paramaterial reality revives the ghost of Plato amid us once again.

The idea that to know the truth lying behind which is before us imparts knowledge is not right in Nietzsche's view. Knowledge is guided by our intentions and objectives. In this decade, Habermas has called it 'interest-guided'. Objective scientific knowledge cannot explain to us the form of the way things are in existence. It is just that it serves our purpose of conquering the Nature that our mind smartly concludes things. If our objective or intention were different, our knowledge would assume a different form. Hence, Habermas following the two intentions of science, sensory and analytical, discriminate between kinds of knowledge. These two types of knowledge differ from

'critical science'. This kind of knowledge is not technical or practical but what Haibermass calls 'emancipatory'. Psychological analysis is its illustration. Haibermass considers this kind of knowledge quite important because through it, one can liberate oneself from many illusions. The knowledge resulting due to this kind of thinking is futile if the thinker cannot liberate himself. Thus, this kind of knowledge turns the process of thinking towards the thinker. Due to this reason, he transcends mere interpretive knowledge and liberates man from the internal and external series of thinking.

Therefore we can say that after Nietzsche, Haibermass (Marx and Freud too) bring forth the ideological characteristics of human knowledge. They shatter as the foundation of the knowledge the divine element. Nietzsche does not stop at the attack on paramaterialism. He says that we cannot consider knowledge, which is the result of the cleverness of our understanding guided by intentions, as 'truth' according to rational viewpoint and what is there is not 'truth' but different forms of 'fiction'. Hence, Nietzsche has said that what we call truth are merely those useful 'fictions' with the help of which we can live life.

Science and technology are considered the main characteristic of modernity. Before 1840, the calculating intelligence of man was deemed to be one of his powers; it was kept in its boundary. Later, man's intellect regarding perspective blossomed. Hence, it

developed in the direction of 'spatialization' and 'mathematization'. Man's powers to control nature increased manifold. As a result, the one watching the world got separated from it. Due to looking at object from the viewpoint of 'extension' and 'mass', Descartes discriminated between the im-material consciousness and the world made of material objects. Thus, Galilio's statement 'To measure everything measurable and to measure what is not yet measurable' became the main slogan of modern age. Efforts were made to understand even time in the context of space. The viewpoint-the ability to see began to govern the modern thinking in a subtle way. To be means to exist in space, that is the meaning which began to float. Time became limited; its movement began to be thought as linear. Thus, a world of abstract limitations, slogans and conceptual thinking continued to provide the scope to control it even more.

In this way, the significance of 'perspective' is more than what it seems in the first assessment. It constructs the foundation of the spatialized thinking which has attained considerable significance in the modern age, and the credit for the evolution of the mathematical trigonometry goes to it as well. The credit for creating the essential foundation for the issue of the relationship of mind and body, the dual of objective and subjective and the un-intellectual and sensory approaches also goes to it. The expectation is that quest for the knowledge which can be authenticated expects to remain central. It should have some method or the definition which gives clear characteristics that impart meaning to the world. The egocentric, humanist, rational

slant of modern thinking rests on 'perspective model'. There is a woodcut of Durer in which a painter is drawing the picture of a woman on the other side of iron fence on a paper full of trigonometric squares. He trying fit the woman who is in front of him, alive, into the mould of trigonometry. This woodcut is symbolic of what is happening in the modern era. The process of summarising, the method of including in the squares, the idea of keeping the viewer separate from the object so that the object appear as 'extension'-all this is included in the woodcut. Protagoras had said that man is the measure of everything but it depends on his dimension. If you give the definition of man from psychological viewpoint, we will find a different standard for the measure. Once perspective became important, measure or extension becomes the only standard for the estimate of an object.

William Blake, Wordsworth and other romantic poets raised a voice of dissent against this-they were the first to grasp the relationship of modernity, objectivity and technology. Wordsworth longs for the state which was there before rationality and morality isolated man from nature. There is innocence of childhood in it. In spite of recommending the richness of nature, imagination and sense perceptions, we have not been able to avoid the discoveries and the tendency to take advantage. In fact, it seems that the protest started by romantics have lost the way. In the view of the growing mechanizing economic system, romantic literature and the literature that followed and art became a sort of relief or the compensation for it. Theodore Rozak has severely

criticized modern technology. In 'The making of a Counter Culture', he has criticised rationalism and scientific rationalism relying on technology. He points out the blind worship of object-centricity and its limitations coming to the fore. In of course, there is explanation of the phenomenon that has already occurred. He explains the theoretical position of the counter culture. He challenges the popular cultural premises. His effort along this line continues in 'Where the Wasteland Ends Unfinished Animal'.

Philip Slater and Herbert Markus have attacked technology from the philosophical position. Slater criticises the capitalist approach in America to achieve success on the individual basis. Technology is the best instrument for realising such an ideal but it brings about its own failure. Slater says that due to the shortage of things, lack of security, the limitations imposed on behaviour, we feel that we are living in an unkind and unsatisfied world without love. In Slater's view, the solution is that we should abandon 'masculine virtue' and adopt 'feminine virtue'. Mostly, women are suppressed in all the cultures of the world. The values associated with women are not nurtured much: these values are wholeness, consistency, harmony, humane approach, emotions, care of the body, involvement. Herbert Markus has said that in our times all our dimensions have been lost and they are all becoming mono-dimensional. His principle seems to have been formed from his premises derived from the philosophical position of Hegel, Marx and Freud. He feels the need to recognize the structure of prevalent thought. We should also take cognizance of the cultural needs arising due to these

structures. It is necessary to cultivate a new understanding of these needs. Hence, Herbert Markus criticises the prevalent cultural scenario.

Markus accepts the Freudian approach towards the protest against rationality and the criticism of culture. His argument is that we can face today's situation only through rationality. This rationality would be different from the rationality guided by technology. Man will liberate himself from the nature with the help of nature and create culture. Only through rationality, man will be able to realize his potential in the true sense in the context of history. With the help of the power of rationality as regards knowledge and ability to bring about change, culture will be able to salvage nature from the inhuman bondages. But in order to fulfil these expectations, rationality will have to transcend the limitations set by technology. The limitation of such rationality is that we believe that technology itself serves as instrument of the solution. Markus does not consider intellect as merely calculative. It is 'mind' or 'consciousness'. Analysing desire and cultural suppression from the Freudian perspective, Markus re-introduces us to emancipation. For him, emancipation requires such a situation where people are freed from the suppression of desire, not only that but there is liberation from the artificial desire created by the mono-dimensional intellect. He did not feel the need for the romantic protest for this. He doesn't talk about what Rozak calls 'rhapsodized intellect'. He does not see the need to establish any 'visionary reality'. We don't need to take recourse to revolt against rationality or some mysterious stuff in order to overcome

the limitations created in the intellect by technology. We need rationality which will maintain control over the technology, keeping view the aim of emancipation and does not necessitate suppression. The satiation of desire should be possible without getting into cultural dimension.

Nietzsche, Heidegger and Hans-George Gadamar have also criticised technology and object-centricity. Nietzsche sees the ambition of conquering the nature in this object-centric approach. This desire for dominance of nature is at the essence of technology. Heidegger doesn't reject such an ambition. He says that one should go back one step from what comes across as an alternative for something. He should separate himself from whatever has been created from the structure of modern thinking. Why should we linger in that age for indefinite period from which deities and divinity have left long back? We will have to once again form the definition of what does it mean to exist. We will have to understand the meaning of 'to exist' once again. Being a disciple of Heidegger, Gadamar has challenged the construct of consciousness given by Descartes and Kant. He has also challenged Husserl's 'transcendental subjectivity'. He means to say that aesthetics has become more subjective after Kant. He has felt the need to establish it on a new plane. The leaning towards subjectivity in modern thinking represents a perverse view of the language and the dialogue carried out through it. As a result, it also misrepresents our understanding. Neither does he mould philosophical thinking with a hammer like Nietzsche did, or as Heidegger did later, he did not say

that we should isolate ourselves from thinking which represents something else. Gadamar has brought about such a change in the basic concept based on which interpretation exercise goes on in modern times, we tend to think that he has transcended the horizon of modern thinking.

The fear of technology that we see in Heidegger, Slater and Rozak is not the universal characteristic of postmodernity. It is, in fact, good because we are going to live for long in the world controlled by technology and electronic equipments. Is there any perspective available to us in which we are no afraid of technology, nor enamoured blind love for by it? Ihab Hassan, one of the important thinkers on Postmodernism believes that it is possible.

The growing insistence of the mind to understand the reality without method and the tendency to keep channelizing the consciousness more and more, so that it itself becomes our reality, consciousness becomes sovereign and objects melt and gain a rhythm of their own-a perspective of this sort has been presented by Hassan. This dense world is gradually becoming dematerialized in front of us; it remains to be merely an interpretation. What they call 'syntropic force' re-creates the world in every which way. The terrain in which the dance and music etc arts of the culture imagined by those who are on the one extreme of the scare of technology and the utopia imagined by those who celebrate technology meet at a point in the totality of the consciousness. Two sides of

reality-earth and sky, myth and technology-are like a magic which can transcend all the structures. Like myth, technology suggests that man is creating such a universal consciousness which will render all the actions and objects things of the past. The spirit which you find in Americans should be there in the one who holds this viewpoint.

In Hassan's opinion, philosophical and scientific thinking at their highest level begins to possess mysterious nature. It doesn't take us into the abyss of barbarism or triviality but it elevates us to participate in the universal spirit in a mysterious way. That is the beginning and end of consciousness. It is the domain of dream and creativity. A dreaming being while floating between the inner and outer world continues to weave the web of consciousness, language, culture and technology. Creativity had begun in a depth.

This is, as shown earlier, a different form of postmodernity. It can become mysterious without any inhibitions. It wishes to fathom the creativity from the depth and channelize it. It possesses the richness of dream and fantasy. In it, the possibility of a less adverse relationship between postmodern thinking and technology has been pointed out.

In some people's opinion, the way of transcending modernity lies outside the Western thought. The oriental and African modes of thought, deemed to be ancient, present views of reality. The efforts for their modernization have begun. The government

controlled states, urbanization of rural areas, secularism, the weakening of family system-these are its characteristics. In his book titled, 'The Modernization of Japan Russia', C E Back has shown how this is happening in Japan and other Asian countries. The non-Western viewpoints have entered the West. Zen Buddhist thought of Japan, Yoga and spirituality of India, Maharshi Raman's Transcendental Meditation, Rajanish's entry in America-these are all examples of the same. Due to the influence of secularism and rationalism in modern viewpoint, the people of the West have more faith in spiritual creeds like Zen which are not God-centric. The faith in God-centric religions is on the decline in the West. Efforts are also being made to loosen the grip of logic on our minds.

Carlos Castaneda has written four books describing his experiences of consuming 'hallucinogenic drugs' similar to Mesckeline, which he had after he subscribed to spiritual discourse from Yanki. It has had considerable influence on the West. We cannot disregard that which he sees and experiences as merely an illusion. It is in fact a layer of reality, hitherto not experienced by us. Castaneda is a scientifically trained analyst. The way we experience the world, and distinguish between the real and the imaginary is merely a result of the habit of looking at the world in that way. This is not a universal reality. It is merely one of the many realities and there are definite boundaries of that. Castaneda finds the code of conduct adopted by Don Juan more concrete and lasting. There are questions raised on what has been accepted as reality in

the West and its lifestyle. There is a spiritual void in that lifestyle. To put it briefly, the foundation of what had been established by modernity has been shaken.

There have been suggestions from non-Western languages to move out of the Greek and other Indo-European languages. However, the tendency prevalent today is to consider them as 'other structures of registering experience' and to keep away from them. The basic premise behind that is that experience is universal. Thus, other languages don't pose any threat before the reality accepted by the West. As the Westernization of the mankind continued, the hope for universal structures based on European models was nurtured. Edmund Husserl also thought along the same lines. The expectations were that science and technology of Europe were attaining acceptance everywhere. If we move along the same lines, we have to imagine a global language in which the human experience can find expression. Such an approach exposes the partiality towards the definitions of language, man and reality given from the Western perspective. But if somebody takes into consideration the philosophical position behind a language like Bantoo, he would realize that it is not just a question of comparative structures of languages; we also need to take note of the viewpoint which gives life to the African word. Bantoo people hold a belief that a word brings an object into existence. But the West believes that words are just 'vehicle' of the information and human 'experience'. There is a deep implication of this. The philosophical position about man and his place are inherent in the linguistic philosophical premises. The way

man uses language brings out his philosophical position; if you study 'Hopy', the American Indian language, we not only get acquainted with a new way of understanding the world or field of sensory perceptions; it is also not that we would get synonymous form of the Western reality alone. If we study an Indian language or a language of an Eastern country, we would realize that the bent of mind behind modernity is just a part of the linguistic reality of the West.

The re-establishment of the myth and the study of the world from the 'mythic' point of view take us outside the Western and modern reality. It begins to get clearer to us how by relating to the myth of the world and all this, our perception of our place get dimmed and the dominance of science grows more and more. The cultural centres have proved useful in the efforts to attain scientific and technological dominance over the natural world. The growth of machines has made man unfamiliar to the cycle of seasons. He doesn't feel his bond with nature so much now. Arndt Cassirer considers the scientific and mythic viewpoints contradictory to each other. It is not just that we have lost the direct contact with the world. Mythic and scientific are two method of establishing the characteristics of what is real. Hence, we lose a whole dimension of reality. Earlier we used to call nature our mother, now it is a means for us. Earlier man used to politely stand before the Nature now it has to act under man's control. Now Nature and religion are removed because now man lives in a secular world. Now the Nature doesn't 'say' anything to us. Deities have all run away, one after another.

Modern man, as Holderline had said, lives in a world of needs. Heidegger and William Beret have noted the same thing later.

Ghosts, astrology, the tricks to make gold, mysticism -interest in all these is increasing. It suggests that the rational, humanist viewpoint of the West is not as relevant as it was. Due to the dissatisfaction towards the hollowness of understanding of reality in the modern thinking, it is now believed that there can be alternatives to it. Whatever are the flaws in astrology, mysticism, etc, the study of myths create a sense in us that there could be other lifestyles which can make us one with the forces of the world. It is true that we can objectively study these myths. If we do so, there may not be any questions regarding our viewpoint. But the efforts to regain what is lost would also continue to be made. This is the only way of transcending the prevalent modern viewpoint without taking recourse to mysticism.

The key to any mode of thinking lies in learning about its premises. The premise of the contemporary scientific viewpoint is that the natural material world is self-sufficient and it remains detached from consciousness (human, animal or higher than its own). One justification given for this is that a disease like cancer or arthritis has nothing to do with the mental situation of the patient. Mind merely makes aware of pain and conveys various messages; it receives the responses from the world. It cannot win over the

disease or receive the messages coming from the other person's mind without the help of a medium.

This viewpoint may be significant for finding our reasons of natural phenomena. But it doesn't make any great impact on the attitude towards human relationships, religion and objects. Because of a premise that there is nothing a-physical in this world, our sense of reality end up being something which can be explained by cause and effect relationship and nothing more. This premise cannot explain telepathy or miracle cure. Materialists go to the extent of being ridiculous in order to reject such things.

However, we will not be able to disregard the evidence which our sense present to us. We have been getting signs that we have to believe now that our mind is not as limited as the materialists believe. Regarding this, we should throw some light on the challenges offered to materialism in some of the texts. Liol Watson's book 'Super Nature', Joseph Chiltern Pears' 'The Crack in the Cosmic Egg' and 'Exploring the Crack in the Cosmic Egg' mention phenomena which challenge the basic premises of materialism. In his book, 'The Healing Mind', Dr Irving Loyal has, based on his experience as a doctor, presented evidence of the role mind plays in healing the illness. This is true not only for psychosomatic diseases but also for the dangerous diseases too. Edgar Cais has forced us to think again about telepathy as a method of treatment. In his

book, 'The Centre of Cyclone', John Lyly talks about the other side of reality about which materialism fails to throw light.

Philosopher Martin Buber has pointed out the limitations of materialist approach in his renowned work 'I and Thou'. In his view, materialism limits itself in the boundary of 'I-it' relationship. Hence, the domain of the relationship with 'you' is taken out of consideration. The meaning of life has sustained on the basis of this relationship. The deep meaning which this relationship brings out is not available to the one who has adopted the materialist approach. Therefore, it becomes necessary to get rid of the hypnotism of materialism.

To transcend modernity, a new approach is required. One end of which touches what we call fantasy. Now, journey to other planets is on the verge of becoming a possibility. This phenomenon will change our experience of the time and space. It may happen that there may be a change in the constitution of our consciousness. Louis Powels and Zach Bargier have taken note of such changes in the past. Our consciousness is higher than the monkey, by the same logic, the consciousness higher than our own can also be possible. In his novel, 'The Philosopher's Stone', Collin Wilson has imagined the consciousness going to the roots of time to fathom its starting point. Swiss writer Jean Gebser who has written history of art has said in his book 'Origin and Present' that we are witnessing the dawn of a new consciousness which is different from the one which

dominated the West since renaissance. José Argüelles says that this era would come to an end in 1987. His imagination has nothing to do with our calculation of ages. After collecting data from different branches of knowledge and observing it, Gebser has said that the egocentric and mono-dimensional pace of contemporary thinking is slowing down. The idea of 'perspective' has dissolved in the modern art. Picasso's figure of woman presents many dimensions of that. Artists are also trying to transcend the mono-dimensional time.

Picasso's Formalist and Cubicist vision aspires to see an object in its inner form and in a harmony as a whole in all its dimensions. The signs of a new consciousness lie in this. This consciousness wishes to transcend today's concept of time and space. The signs of this consciousness are also felt in mathematics, natural and social sciences, literature and art. It may be that Gebser had stretched his conclusions too far, or his evidence may not be completely satisfactory but the main point remains the same: Are we not going through the fundamental change in the consciousness? Is the higher consciousness not coming to the horizon?

Is it that our leaning towards the fantastic is due to our 'wishful thinking' in order to escape from the worries of our times? These efforts from different directions to transcend modernity are a result of Taunmil's serious thinking over the same. It is not about creating new branches of knowledge but it is pointer to the idea that new results

will continue to pour in. Moreover, we can point towards the signs of this in the domains of psychology, philosophical position of language, and literary theory.

Positivism is that philosophical principle which places all knowledge in the level of scientific knowledge. It does not take para-physical knowledge into consideration. Modern psychology is very critical of the illusion which this principle has created. Due to the recent deliberations in this branch of knowledge, some psychologists have begun to believe that some parts of reality which cannot be explained objectively have been ignored. In the psychological treatment, they are becoming acutely conscious of the distance between the material objectively gleaned in the laboratory and the state from which their patients go through.

Herbert Smileberg has written a book elaborately discussing 'phenomenological psychology'. Apart from this, Anthony Barton's 'Three Worlds of Therapy' is another important book. In it, he has described the experience of an imaginary patient taking the treatment of methods devised by Freud, Rogers and Jung. Three different kinds of analysis come out. He has presented the contradictions among these in a ridiculous form. In Barton's view, only phenomenology can create the position to understand the patient's viewpoint. Describing what Abraham Maslow calls 'third force psychology', he has given guidelines for not the study of the sick consciousness but the excellent kind of psychological study.

Moreover, the influence of the treatises of Erickson, Rogers and Rolo May is also felt in the domains of literature, art and philosophy. R D Leing discusses the spiritual and religious dimensions of split personality. He has criticized the endless competition, exploitation and terrorism going on in our world. In his book, 'Pathways to Madness', Jule Henny has raised questions on what we call healthy intellect. Michelle Foucault has discussed the same questions in 'Madness and Civilization'. Now we are also moving towards what is known as 'transpersonal psychology'. We can see that it includes even some of those experiences which psychology does not discuss. It also fathoms the unusual kind of reality. It takes into consideration the states of 'heightened consciousness' also. Traditional psychology does not take any such thing into consideration. The branch of interpretation in psychology has evolved considerably. The new method of study created by Robert Sardelo under the influence of Phenomenology and Hermeneutics takes up, as if, the work of redefining psychology. Jacques Lacan drags psychology to a new extreme. Under the influence of Hegel, Heidegger, Sartre as well as Saussure, Jacobson and structuralist anthropologists, Lacan adds a new dimension. Any word uttered during the psychological treatment is always addressed to someone or the other. When the analyst hears this word, he draws his attention to the linguistic side inherent in the situation. Here, we should also mention what James Hillman calls 'Polytheistic Psychology'. He raises questions on modernity more systematically than all the psychologists mentioned above. Monotheism,

egocentric psychology, 'apolonianism'-all this is as per the negative and materialist life style in 'modernity'. Hillman is Jung's disciple. He believes that we should re-establish the deities, and rediscover problematized or disintegrated 'soul'. He shook the foundation of 'modernity' by attacking its roots.

As Paul Ricoeur has said, the problem of language has remained at the centre of contemporary European thought. Everyone who works in the field of linguistic issue should take note of the intellectual disruption which took the place in 1960 and growth of structuralism. It has emerged from linguistics and anthropology. It is not a philosophical sect but a method. The intellectuals got considerably intoxicated by it. Roland Barthes received the influence of structuralism most fruitfully. However, Structuralism was just one of the rivulets of the schools of thought such as Marxist Literary Theory, Phenomenology, and existentialism, prevalent at that time. Moreover, thinkers whom we cannot associate with only one of them like Foucault and Derrida also shared the intellectual space at that time. Though these two, French thinking seems to take the direction of transcending modern thought. Foucault emphatically says that man's values are dead because man himself as a construct is dead. Now, we have to discuss something more interesting and definite thing instead of studying man. Foucault did make such an effort in 'The Order of Things'. In it, he has discussed the methods of presentation and counter argumentation. For that, he has examined language, economics and biology. We need to take into consideration only the profound

changes which took place in those domains. The decisions which politicians take on the stage of history are not of much significance. Levis Strauss and other anthropologists discover structures which can help in gleaning some material into a certain unit with the help of structuralist technique. But with that, they have not come to the conclusion 'man is dead'. On the contrary, their structuralism has facilitated such means and method with the help of which they can turn the objects of analysis into certain signs. Even after the efforts to decode the hidden signs and mythology, and discovering successful methods, structuralism has not gone beyond the premises accepted today. A thinker like Foucault can transcend the limitation of the method and establish a universal principle; in that way, he can take modern thinking in his stride and transcend it. In French philosophy, one can see postmodern trend in Jacques Derrida. He has the ability to enter the centre of philosophy and think from within. Therefore, beginning with his criticism of Husserl's trigonometry, he makes a successful effort to understand all the points of modernity. His thinking about language and human existence is fundamental and he has gone way beyond the modern philosophical thought-even beyond phenomenology and structuralism. Moreover, Sollers, Kriesteva, Gremiere, Genette and others have also thought about language. They have thought about language, human existence and time.

Postmodern literary thought is looked at as the revolt against Formalism. It challenges the branch of American criticism called 'New Criticism'. It challenges the modern

aesthetics and French symbolism lying in the foundation of New Criticism. It can be said to have begun with Northrope Frye's 'Anatomy of Criticism'. But Frye is neo-Aristotelian hence postmodern revolt is not seen to be complete in him. Thinking of literature in the social context also cannot serve as its substitute. Even, 'Geneva Critics', who are critics of consciousness, don't find philosophical base for its theory from phenomenology. He has gone beyond the objective premises of modern criticism. In his book, 'Critics of Consciousness', Sarah Lowell has given a good explanation of the critical pursuits of the said school. American critic J Hillis Miller is also included in it. Geophre and Paul de Man also feature in it. It is hoped that the contribution of the three would prove fruitful in the domain of postmodern criticism. Derrida has had considerable influence on this group. It is evident in journals like 'Diacritic' and 'New Literary History'. Joseph Ridel's book 'The Invertedble' is worth noting in this context. This book has contributed to in the formation of postmodern literary theory. Ridel uses the basic principles of Derrida and Heidegger in his criticism of William Carlos Williams' text 'Veterson'. Ibab Hassan's contribution is of similar nature. His two books 'Dismemberment of Orpheus' and 'Paracriticism' are books which established literary theories. Defying the tradition, literary experiments have been celebrated. He has considered literature of silence, disharmony, void and imposed non-literariness as characteristics of postmodernity. He has discussed the texts of The Saad, Hemingway, Kafka, Jennet and Beckett. He has also included discussion on science fiction in one of

his other books. Thus, he has widened the boundaries of literature. William V. Spanos has also thought in depth about interpretation; its base has been brought out in Heidegger's 'Being and Time'. Heidegger has given new definition in terms of the sign of the time as regards human existence. Moreover, some of Heidegger's distinct constructs (are, anxiety, guilty) have been used to give the definitions. All this extends the horizons of postmodernist literature and limit them too. It challenges the thought-centric tendency and the importance which space enjoyed compared to time. This viewpoint is expresses in Spanos' *'Icon and Time'*. Moreover, we should also mention Edward Said' *'Beginnings'*. Poststructuralist French thought can also be discerned from it. He has employed it in examining literary texts and literary theories. Thus, these postmodern activities are going on in various domains. It is not that the counter theory to this will not come into being but if we wish to acquire consciousness in the domain of thought, this kind of interaction and reaction should go on.*

* I have gratefully used the material from an article by Richard Palmer on this subject.

Chapter IV Conclusion

Conclusion

To assert that translation offers a veritable vortex of challenges and future directions would be stating the obvious. However, it is always necessary to revisit our well-entrenched ideas and critique them from time to time. Especially, when the question is of translation from regional languages into English, the way we approach our translation will prove to be decisive. Translation assumes a more serious character when it is critical texts that one has to translate, because they differ considerably from translating literary texts. Moreover, the significance of translation of critical texts requires to be underscored. The challenges and opportunities translation of critical texts by somebody like Suresh Joshi presents have always remained understated. In terms of challenges, the critical thought rooted in the tradition of its own (e. g. Gujarati, in this case) also experiences the encounter with other traditions and imbibes ideas from them. Hence, it is imperative on the part of a translator to be conversant with the critical thought of not only one language from which he wishes to translate but also the other traditions which influenced it.

A translation such as one from Gujarati or any Indian language for that matter into English will also proffer various opportunities as regards widening the horizons of critical thought by contributing to the existing reservoir of critical knowledge. A

translator requires a unique blend of abilities to focus on the translation of critical texts, the difficulties inherent in them, and strategies for overcoming them.

Gujarati literature and literary criticism underwent a drastic transformation with the advent of Suresh Joshi. His writings are the raw material with which this transformation took shape. Translating his writings is fraught with multiple dangers. We are likely to get carried away by the stature of Suresh Joshi. Moreover, we may be drawn to think that his writings are mere paraphrase of the Western literary theory and criticism. Critical texts of Suresh Joshi are rooted in many premises, branching out to various traditions and hence, as a translator one has to know a lot about his deep knowledge of the Sanskrit literature and poetics to begin with, extending it up to the in-depth insight into the various schools of literary theory and criticism in the West prevalent in the 20th century. His critical texts are challenging to translate for many diverse reasons. Firstly, he refers to a number of theories in one single essay. He takes us to the days of Govardhanram and prior to that, which unless one has some sort of understanding of, it would be extremely difficult to translate. In addition, he quotes at length at times from Gujarati poetry, translating which is again a task no less difficult.

Of course, by far the most agonizing part as a translator is his use of terms. He freely translates the terms of Western literary theory and criticism into Gujarati and uses them freely in his writings. Acquainted with the Western tradition, one can understand them

in English but it is difficult to read their translation into Gujarati and place them back into English. These terms were used in Gujarati criticism for the first time perhaps and to translate them back into English is never an easy task. Some of the terms which he uses don't have their equivalents in English and hence, a translator can be stuck up at a word for days.

Suresh Joshi's writings form a coded world which is made of these various theories and terms from the Western and Indian traditions. The knowledge of the theories is one thing and to read their critique in Suresh Joshi's writings is altogether another thing as they are so well-blended in his ideas that he contextualises and indigenises them when he writes. Besides, he writes in response to many other things happening around him on the Gujarati literary and critical scene, so his writings have to be read in the context of the ambience in which he was responding to the creative and critical follies of his times. He believed that the function of criticism was to create an intellectual climate in which different kinds of literature should flourish and his writings always stressed the idea of creating such a climate. For example in his essay, *Vidyapith ma Sahitya nu Shikshan*, he explained how literature teaching was turning into a mindless ritual at the university and the university as a space for intellectual questioning and critiquing had lost its relevance and validity. Hence, he asserts that if literary criticism and reading of literature have to survive, university as a system, teaching as a profession will have to undergo some drastic changes.

If the nature and functions of literature are the mainstay of criticism, Suresh Joshi explores its intellectual space thoroughly. He accomplishes this with the help of a wide variety of theories. He clamours against those who wish to use the art for purposes other than literary. For example, he criticises those poets who get carried away by the zeal of social change through literature. He time and again comes to the discussion on the fundamental questions like, 'Why do we write literature?' in his opinion, literature stands for itself, not for any ideology or any campaign. A similar aspect to some writers' writing is that they try to make it palatable to the masses for popularity. In his view writers should toil hard to transform what they wish to present into a form which does not allow easy relish.

This takes us to the question of the function of language and the poet. Suresh Joshi engages in a rigorous discussion on how a writer should not use the language of day to day life, but instead he should explore the possibilities inherent in the language and strive to realise them by employing a language which is refreshingly new. He insists that the writer will have to use metaphor, image, myth etc in order to 'make it new'. He furthers this line of thinking when he discusses the use of symbols by a writer. He writes at length on how symbols communicate the idea so powerfully when the right symbols are used and also that a good writer continues to explore newer symbols and reinvent the old symbols by using them differently, unlike many other writers who are content to limit their glory to the use of three to four symbols. He criticises those who

try to discourage the experimentation in terms of use of language or symbols because he believed that the artist who invents a new way of using language creates a universe of his own in his text which is the true function of literature. It is a world with its own intrinsic values and ideals. The one who wishes to enter it should shed his pre-conceived notions and enter it.

Suresh Joshi's critical writings are an exposition of the nature, function and form of literature which are the most ancient and yet unarguably the most relevant concerns of all the times. Gujarati literary scenario and the critical theories were in dire need of a dose of new ideas and new ways of reading, writing and perceiving literature and criticism. Suresh Joshi's critical texts should be read as the critique of the literary practices of his times and should be read for anybody who wishes to trace the history of Gujarati literature and criticism. These critical essays provide us with an opportunity to enter into a dialogue with the best which was being thought and discussed in the West at that time because what he accomplishes in them is that he takes up a fundamental critical concern and examines it through various theories at his disposal from the West and critiques the literary and critical scenario of his times and also critiques the theory he uses, if need be.

Translating some of Suresh Joshi's critical essays is merely an endeavour to understand the world in which Suresh Joshi lived and thought. It is also an exercise to revisit some

of the Western constructs and re-examine their validity or relevance to our context in times when theory seems to rule our academic and intellectual existence. His writings offer a space to contemplate upon a phase of literature and criticism in Gujarat when new ideas were most desperately needed to be ushered in. Translation, hence, becomes a very enriching site for the questioning and re-examining our own ideas as well. I hope, this translation becomes a humble but significant beginning for translations of the other critical writings of Suresh Joshi so that we place him in the Indian and Western traditions of literary theory and criticism, and thus open up the world of Suresh Joshi to all.

Select Bibliography:

Primary sources:

Joshi, Suresh, *Suresh Joshinu Sahitya Vishwa: Criticism*, Vol 1 & 2, Gujarat Sahitya Academi, Gandhinagar, 2005

Secondary sources:

Bassnett, S. (1993), *Comparative Literature—A Critical Introduction*, Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass, USA: Blackwell.

Bassnett, S. (2000), “From Comparative Literature to Translatology”, in Chen Dehong, Zhang

Belloc, Hilaire, *On Translation*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1931

Jhaveri, Mansukhlal, *History of Gujarati Literature*, Sahitya Academi, New Delhi, 1978

Lefevere, Andre (ed.), *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther Rosenzweig*, Amsterdam and Assen: Van Gorcum, 1977

Shah, Suman, *Suresh Joshi thi Suresh Joshi*, Parshva Publication, Ahmedabad, 1978

Venuti, L. (2000), “Rethinking Translation—Preface to A Western Translation Theory Reader”, in Chen Dehong, Zhang Nanfeng (eds) *A Western Translation Theory Reader*, Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.