Chapter: 4

Comparative Study of Bharata’s Rasa Theory and Jauss’ Reception Theory

The present chapter deals with the comparative study of Bharata’s Rasa Theory and Jauss’ Reception Theory. The comparison is made according to the analysis of both the theories that discussed in previous chapters. The comparison deals with the theoretical perspective only.

The word comparative has several meanings. Morphologically, ‘to compare’ is a verb which means to examine (two or more objects, ideals, people etc.) in order to note similarities and differences. The word comparative is an object which means: of or relating to comparison. It is also mean as proceeding by, founded on, or using comparison as a method of study. It has originated in late Middle English (1400-1500) and it is borrowed from Latin word ‘comparativuss’ which mean to compare. On the premises of above discussion the process of comparison or comparative includes:

a) It is an art of comparing for the examination of two or more objects, ideas and people.

b) The art of comparing is intended to note the similarities and differences between or among objects, ideas or people.

c) Comparative theory is one of the methods of study in different branches of knowledge.
**Comparative Literature (Theory):**

The term comparative literature is difficult to define. It develops two or more than two objects, theories, literature in comparison at the same time. The comparative literature has multi-dimensional aspects such as linguistic, cultural, religious, economic, social and historical facts of different societies. The task of comparison becomes more difficult when a comparator has to take into consideration such factors or aspects.

One has to analyze the terminology of comparative literature, in order to understand it in detail. Etymologically, the term comparative literature denotes any literary work or works when compared with any other literary work or works. Hence, comparative literature is the study of inter-relationship between any two or more than two significant literary works or literatures. (www.shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in, 1) While making comparative study of two or more than two works a comparator must take the sources, themes, myths, forms, artistic strategies, social, religious movements and trends into consideration. Simultaneously, it is essential that while making comparative study of two or more than two literary theories a comparator must take the origin, sources, background, period, approach, method, principle, characteristics, assumptions and practice and trends into consideration. The art of comparing and its justification lies in comparator’s impartial nature. *The comparator with his critical approach and investigation will find out the similarities and dissimilarities among various theories (works) that he has undertaken*.
for the purpose of comparison and justification lies in the fact that his approach must be unbiased and unprejudiced to reach the ultimate truth. It is only his earnest and sincere approach which will bring forth the naked truth or natural results and this really is the purpose of comparative study. (www.shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in, 1)

The term comparative literature or theory is a broad and comprehensive in its nature. It covers entire human experiences into its scope and it aims to realize all internal human relationship among various parts of the world, through its critical method and approach literature or theory under comparative study. The role of comparative literature is important in building relationship among the nations and human beings. It helps to vanishing narrow national and international boundaries, and in place of that universality of human relationship emerges out. Thus the term comparative literature includes comparative study of regional literatures, national literature universal literature. However these are many over-lapping terms in these concerns such as universal literature, general literature, international literature and world literature. (www.shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in, 1) It can be stated once again that comparative literature includes human behavior and experiences of human life as whole. The concept world literature counts the literature of Homer, Dante, Shakespeare Milton, Emerson, Thoreau, Valmik and Vyas as one in comparison.

Human expression in all kinds of literature of all nations has deep rooted similarities and affinities because psychological human nature is same all over the world. Hence, one can find a close resemblance among
the masterpieces of different literary works of different region and period. It is certain, that the human nature is complicated which percolates in its literary expressions as well and it makes the comparative study as complex as human nature. The comparative study is like as any critical approach to literature, the only thing, which differ it from critical approach, is that in comparative studies a comparator deals with two or more than two objects side by side. It makes the subject matter of the vast and wide. *Boundaries of comparative literature have to be extended to encompass the entirely of human life and experiences in one’s embrace.* (www.shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in, 2)

Bijay Kumar Das has explained the comparative literature in simple way he says; *the simple way to define comparative literature is to say that it is a comparison between the two literatures. Comparative literature analyzes the similarities and dissimilarities and parallels between two literary works. It further studies themes, modes, conventions and use of folk tales, myth in two different literatures or more.* (Das, 1)

Rabindranath Tagor, the great poet of India and who has got the Noble Prize for his anthology of poems ‘Gitanjali’ coined the term called ‘Vishvasahitya’ which refers to comparative literature also. He broads the scope of comparative literature and appeals to the critique and comparator that they must free ourselves from narrow provincialism, and must see the work of each writer as a part of man’s universal creativity.

The history of comparative literature goes back to 19th century and it is a reaction against the prejudiced nationalism of literary scholarship.
in England. Though it was an occasional tradition, the comparative study of literary works was in vogue, right from the beginning of the Christian era. Romans were the pioneer in the field of comparative study. They outdid the Greeks in the development of comparative study. The Romans work out on the tradition of comparing the works of great creators and poets of Greek and Roman and find out many similarities among their studies of literary works. No doubt, Quintillion is the pioneer in this concern, but Longinus endeavors to set the comparative study in systematized discipline. If he is preceded Quintillion he would have been the pioneer in this field. He brings forth the names of Homer and Plato etc. In Indian comparative approach the Sanskrit critics emerge out during the 6th century AD. It is clear from the commentaries on Kalidas’s *Meghdoot* and *Abhijanasakutala*. After that the critics like Kuntak and Abhinavgupta with their qualitative approach pave the way for modern comparators. Mathew Arnold makes meaningful argument in this concern, he writes in a letter in 1848, every critic should try and possess one great literature at least besides his own and more the unlike his own, the better. (www.shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in, 3) Therefore, Arnold is considered as the pioneer of comparative criticism in England. He also gave inspiration to other literary scholar to go with this new approach.

As stated earlier the comparative literary theory and comparative literature is not totally different branch of literary studies but they are interlinked in each other as strongly as literary theory and literary criticism. This chapter deals with comparative study of Bharata’s Rasa theory and Jauss’ Reception theory. The comparison is made on some theoretical parameters such as origin of the theory, its source,
background, assumption, approach, methods, principles, characteristics, limitations and practices as following.

**Origin of Rasa Theory and Reception Theory:**

The rasa theory is originated in ancient India. It is formulated in the 6th chapter of the Bharata’s *Natyashastra*. It is the first scholarly attempt on literature by Bharata. The Bharata, his authenticity of authorship and date of its publication all are unresolved questions on literary theoretical circle. There is tale behind the origin of *Natyashastra*, that, one day Bharata is asked to present a play with his hundred sons in a court of lord Indra the god of gods on occasion of Indras Victory over the demons. Bharata accepts the challenge and as a part of his endeavor for successful performance and directions for his actors/characters on the stage he writes the text *Natyashastra*. Since the publication of *Natyashastra* the theory of rasa is appeared in many of other Indian theoretical tradition. The theory of rasa is interpreted in various ways by different philosopher and literary scholars during next centuries. Indian thinking is not fragmentary but it is continuous, cumulative and inclusive. They write about different areas of human life and experience, the facts is that much of the written text are either lost or perished. The number of texts available either in full or bits form deal with different areas of thinking as philosophy, grammar, medicine, literary theories, political thought, logic military science, sociology, agriculture etc. Bharata is a philosopher of kavyashastra (literary science), his *Natyashastra* is regarded as major text of Indian kavyashastra.
Indian philosophy believes that knowledge is to attain \textit{moksha} (salvation) and not an end. True knowledge always leads to the conquest of oneself which is \textit{moksha}. They believe that diversity is external but there is oneness i.e. \textit{atma}. The forms are different but the basis of all is same. For example there are various kinds of ornament but their basic material is same that is gold. The major school of Indian literary theories are rasa school, Alankara School, Riti School, Dhvani School and Vakrokti School.

The reception theory is originated in Germany through the scholarly efforts of Hans Robert Jauss. He is German Theorist and best known for the establishment of the aesthetic of reception. He founds the Konstanz School in German Konstanz University with his colleague Wolfgang Iser. The Konstanz school has significant impact on Anglo-American Reader response Criticism. Jauss is witness of Second World War on Russian Front. He is imprisoned for some year, after world war second is end. His service in army delays his education and studies. He completes the post-graduation in 1957, with a dissertation on Marcel Proust. From 1959 to 1966, he works as an employee in Munster and Giessen. He is invited to join newly established university of Konstanz to set up the subject area of literary studies. Reception aesthetic is developed by the Konstanz School of literary studies in the mid 1960’s to confront a similar literary divide in literary studies. The Konstanz school determines that literary studies had been largely concerned with establishing a history of the best literary achievements that is contributed to the idea of national individuality on its way to itself and comprehended the relationship between literature and history, at the
expense of its character as art, into a function of mere copying or commentary. The authors of the Konstanz school on the other hand, strove to address the relationship between creation and interpretation.

(www.booksgoogle.co.in)

Source of Rasa Theory and Reception Theory:

Rasa theory is appeared in many others works of Indian theoreticians such as Abhinavagupta, Tholkappiyar etc. but the first and who is considered as most relevant source of rasa theory is Bharata’s *Natyashastra*. It is a milestone of theories and laws related to poetry and drama. During the period, when *Natyashastra* is written, drama and poetry are considered as similar. Indian poetics focuses on drama and poetry existed as an integral part of drama. In early English drama, Greek drama, and Sanskrit drama, poetry is found as a medium of narration and dialogue.

*Natyashastra* is the first treatise on dramaturgy in Indian literary philosophical tradition. It is an encyclopedia of various ideas and principles about drama as a form of art. The *abhinavabharati* of Abhinavagupta is foregrounding the learner of *Natyashastra* since long time. *Natyashastra* is scientific illustration of drama and its representation. The nature of drama, origin and objectives of drama, language structure, technique, characters, types and dialogue writing for drama are some points which include in the Natyashastra. Representation deals with theatre construction, stage construction, structure and style of performance.
Natyashastra also deals with fourfold acting i.e. Aharya, Angika, Wachik and Sattvik. These fourfold objective deals with actors, selection of characters, director, hero, the committee of judge and successive performance. The structure of the Natyashastra indicates that Bharata has dealt with almost all elements of the dramaturgy. He tries to evolve the theory about drama through his text. His thoughts are very fundamental primary, and take every elements of the drama in to consideration. Satya Dev Chaudhary says *the vast content of natyashastra by Bharata indicates that this work is the result of the tradition of the dramatic art prevalent in this country for the last many centuries prior to him. After Bharata, it seems this tradition ceased altogether. The probable reason might be that the various concepts about poetic art were so profound, extensive and progressive that the acaryas become disinclined towards the formation of the principles connected with dramaturgy.* (Satya D Chaudhary, 5-4)

Hans Robert Jauss is a Germanic Philosopher. He works as an associate professor in the University of Konstanz. In 1982 he writes a book entitled as “Rezeptionasthetik”. It is written in Germanic language. Timothy Bahty, the Professor in University of Minnesota translates the “rezeptionasthetik” into English entitled as *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception* and it is introduced by Paul de Man. The text is divided into five chapters. The first chapter of the text deals with Jauss main arguments on reception aesthetic. It is entitled as Literary History as Challenge to Literary Theory. The second chapter deals with History or art and Pragmatics theory. The third chapter of the text is related to the genres and medieval literature. The fourth chapter is an applied study
and Goethe’s and Valery’s Faust: on the Hermeneutics of question and answer. In the fifth chapter Jauss discusses the Poetic text within the change of horizons of readings with the example of Baudelaire’s “Spleen II”. The translation of Timothy Bahti is scholarly endeavor and it is accepted as most slandered translation of Jauss “Rezeptionasthetik”.

This volume presents for the first time into English the foundational writings of the leading proponent of the aesthetic of reception. Jauss here attempts to develop categories to channel conventional literary history into a history of aesthetic experience. The essays in the volume explore the relation of art history to social history, the nature of genres in the middle ages, and provide exemplary readings in the comparative analysis of literature. (www.upress.umn.edu) The Journal of Religious writes, this book sows the seeds of an exciting new hermeneutical program with a heavy emphasis on history and social scientific enquiry. According to journal of Film and Video: the question concerning aesthetic praxis which has underlain all art as productive, receptive and communicative activity remains no clarified and deserves to asked a new. This volume covers question about aesthetic praxis and about the contagious relationship between aesthetic experience and other provinces of meaning in the word of everyday reality. Journal of Aesthetic and Art criticism refers Jauss as one of those courageous pioneers who not only aspires to fathom the nature of aesthetic experience in its various historical manifestation, but also ask with great intensity and sincerely how we today can be interested in art at all how aesthetic communication is still possible in our present day consumer society.
Background of Rasa Theory and Reception Theory:

Though the background of the rasa theory is not fairly clear, it can be understood from the subjects that are discussed in Natyashastra in detail. It seems that Bharata is intended to write a book on art of writing a play and poetry. It is also believed that Bharata is asked to produce Natyaved in addition to other Vedas by the god Brahma. Bharata is also asked to produce a play to perform on the stage with his hundred sons. He discusses many topics in his Natyashastra such as drama, theatre, rasa theory, dance, manner of representation, structure of a play, acting and performance, male–female attribution, the temperament of various characters, qualities of directors and spectators, music and musical instrument. There is not any scholarly treatise available excepting Veda where Bharata could begin. One can find a fairly long gap between Vedas and Natyashastra. Even the language of Natyashastra that is Sanskrit is different from that of the Vedas. It is much likely that by the time Natyashastra is written the Vedic tradition had established itself so strongly that every new treatise tried to link itself to this tradition. What can be deemed over of the most important qualities of any literature, any work of art? That it attracts, draws attention to itself a work of art must appeal. In other words, it should not contain mere shock-value, a lot of things come into vogue and then they are forgotten such things might immediately catch our attention. But they fail to sustain us for long. After the initial impact they may not have anything that touches us. Thus a work of art is successful only when there is appeal. Without rasa, according to Bharata there can be no appeal. Hence without rasa a work of art is incomplete, unfulfilled. It should appeal to the spectator, and to
appeal the topic must have rasa can be created in the mind of spectator only through the act of communication. So rasa is indispensable to any work of art. Secondly it must reside in the successful work of art. Thirdly it is necessary communicated, how can one know that rasa resides in the work? Finally its function is to make a work appealing. This is equivalent to saying that only rasa can make a work successful. (Patnaik, 23-24) Bharata makes sweep statement when he says that there can be no meaning without rasa. The purpose of any work of art is to provide aesthetic delight, if it fails to provide it become meaningless. Thus the aesthetic delight i.e. rasa makes a work of art appealing. In its roots sense the word appeal implies coming forth, manifestation, origin etc. in Upanishad and Mahabharata it is used to mean, circulated, setting out, coming from or issuing forth.in Sanskrit appeal means ‘pravartate’ which implies that rasa is the root, the origin, the cause Bharata claims that without rasa nothing can issue forth. It is as this special something which influences a work or is a very integral part of it is such that only it can make the work meaningful or appealing. One can talk about the appealing quality of literature only when the rasa is communicated through work of art. Rasa involves the reader in a work of art. One can observe that, Bharata argument in the light of the formula called stimulus and response. While talking about the drama, Bharata states about the audience also. When rasa is relished or tasted it involves someone who takes in something and responds- the reader or spectator, since the issuing forth or the emergence of rasa is being discussed, for whom does the rasa issue? Who sees or feel it issuing forth? The perceiver or even the poet is hence involved in a relation of response are
a reaction to a stimulus. A part of the stimuli is or else the stimuli (text or drama) have some presence or essence which can be called rasa, this is successfully transmitted to the audience making the response more satisfying, more complete. (Patnaik, 24-25) He makes his argument on his experience of performing on stage and spectators response. His discourse also suggests that he is well read and learned of human psychology. Bharat has dealt with the production of a play, representation of the play and its reception by audience with their response. His is intended to direct the playwrights to write the play and its successful representation. Through his rasa theory, he explained the role of spectator in the reception of incident performed on the stage and also focused on the very basic psychological states of human being that plays crucial role in the manifestation of poetic pleasure.

Reception theory is an historical application of reader response theory. Reader response criticism is a group of critics and philosopher in modern literary criticism to know and understand the literature. It insists the role of reader in understanding, creating the meaning and experience of a text, their focus is on the reader as an individual and a reader belongs to particular categories, such as gender, nationality, ethnicity, religion, class, age etc. and their response to the literary work. Reader response criticism aims to explain the diversity and divergence of the readers and their response to literary work. It also aims to study how the audiences or readers response to literary work. The theorist of Reader Response Criticism considers reader as an active agent in the meaning creation of the text; he /she completes the text and bring it to the real existence. They view literature as performing art, where every reader
performs a text-related performance. Reader Response Critics do not agree with new critics who deny the readers role in recreating the literary work and focus only on text as complete and objective, fixed text. They also reject the formalist view that necessarily highlights only form of a text as an active element of meaning creation. The critics of this school consider reader as a quite important as the writer of the text and text is not pure or neutral as formalists think, because every work is created or read differently. Reader response criticism emphasis on the construction of a text originates in the branch of philosophy called phenomenology which deals with the understanding of how things appear. Norman Holland, Stanley fish, Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauss are some major pioneers of the school. Louise Rosenblatt is also regarded as first pioneer of this school, her Literature as Exploration and 1938 and an essay Towards a Transactional Theory of Reading gives some aspects of Reader-Response Theory.

The several major shifts take place in Germany during 1960s help to understand and explain the rise and background of Jauss’ reception theory. The discontentment in the academic realm is grown with the dissatisfaction with economic problems. A good example of this is that the “Memorandum for the reform at the study of linguistic and literature” written by Jauss, Iser and other Philosophers which argues for the methodological and institutional changes in the universities. The methods and values of teaching literary context are doubted by Germen literary studies come to the point of crises within the current paradigm by which it is being practiced. The problem with the historical critical and the aesthetic formalist approach was that they suppressed and
concealed the role of the reader...... As a result Jauss sought to find theory which did justice to the dynamic process of production and reception from author, work and public that would helpful to lead the study of literature out of the dead ends of literary history which bagged down in positivism. (www.ethesis.nottingham.ac.uk, 127)

During the 1960s there is a revival in the study of literary hermeneutics, the study of Gadmer in this area raised the question for Jauss. The concept in question is that of horizon insofar as it as historical masker and at the same time the necessary condition for the possibility of experimental knowledge-constitutes all structures of meaning related to human action and primary modes of comprehending the word. (www.ethesis.nottingham.ac.uk, 128) Jauss is studied medieval literature. His interest in the aesthetic reception of arose from his studies. His study of the medieval literature raised the problems for him relating the possibilities of direct aesthetic of understanding through the text itself the role which the original horizon of the text first played in the understanding and the possibilities of historical meditation through background information. Jauss delivered lecture “Literary History as a Challenge to Literary History” in an attempt to address the shortcomings in existing in literary theories and to introduce the conclusion he reached at. In an interview Jauss says: I tried to imagine a new literary history, once that opened the closed circuit of author and work in the direction of the receiver and was meant to make of this receiver, whether a reader or the public, the intermediary, between the past and the present, the work and its effects. Such history would have to stand up against the ideal of objectivity espoused by the old, discredited literary history, and also the
demands for exactness lay down by those sociologist and structuralist
who scoffed at historical understanding. (www.ethesis.nottingham.ac.uk, 128)

Approach of Rasa Theory and Reception Theory:

The word rasa is well known to all. It is being used in the context of all forms of arts simply. The relation of rasa with the interaction between aesthetic and work of art is assumed when we call a work of art as an interesting/ or a receiver as interesting or boar. The meaning of the word rasa creates lots of confusion. The understanding of the rasa is so hypothetical that nobody feels to make more enquiries, about that, one gets more confused while he or she explains about the good experience which they got after watching a good tragedy and feels that whether they belong selfish category that they feel happy in other grief. If it is not right then why they do like to watch the tragedy again? Why do they feel to watch again the grief of the characters in the tragedy? It means that the roots of the experiences of a good play or drama are different from the emotion or feelings of pleasure. It is better to understand the word rasa and the theory of rasa from its deep level to reach at the roots of these questions.

When we read a good piece of literature we get pleasure as a reader or when we watch a play on the stage, we derive a certain kind of pleasure from the scenes enacted on the stage. Bharata defines the pleasure as ‘Rasa’. The word ‘rasa’ actually means ‘essence’ or ‘sap’. In his text prof. Satya Dev Chaudhary translates the word ‘rasa’ into English as poetic pleasure, poetic relish, poetic delight, poetic detection,
aesthetic pleasure, aesthetic enjoyment, aesthetic bliss etc. Further he used the word ‘rasa’ technically, as ‘sentiment’ also. (Chaudhary, 67) However, Bharata the great aesthetician has tried to explain how this poetic delight takes place. He has given the theory of rasa in one ‘sutra’ (aphorism), he says:

“vibhav-anubhava-vyabhicha-rasa-nispattihi”

(Natyashastra, 6th chapter)

Prof. Ami Upadhay has explained the Sutra in his “The Indian Poetic”; he writes ‘rasa’ develops from the blending of vibhav, anubhav and vyabhichyari. It manifests itself when sthayibhav of the reader is correlated with the following three aspects presented in a piece of creative literature.

1) Vibhav - Excitant
2) Anubhav - Ensuing response
3) Vyabhichyaribhav - Transitory feeling

These three should be combined into one. In another way, ‘Rasa’ is the result of the combination of vibhav, anubhav and Vyabhichyaribhav correlated to reader or spectators sthayibhav.

While understanding the structure of ‘rasa’ in detail we must understand the above terms in some detail. Prof. Satya Dev Chaudhary has divided these terms into two groups:

1) A) Sthayibhav i.e. permanent emotion  
   B) Vyabhichyari i.e. transitory feeling
2) A) Vibhav i.e. excitant

    B) Anubhav i.e. ensuing response.

A) Sthayibhav or permanent emotions are always inherent, in dormant stage, in all the human minds as basic instincts and are fed by a number of minor feelings called transitory, auxiliary feelings. Permanent emotions in human being are inborn, and cannot be acquired through any experience, training or out of any emotions. Sthayibhav are eight in numbers, and those are manifested into following rasa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sthayibhav</th>
<th>Rasa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rati (Love)</td>
<td>Sringara (Erotic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hasa (Laughter)</td>
<td>Hasya (Comic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Soka (Grief)</td>
<td>Karuna (Compassionate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Krodh (Anger)</td>
<td>Rudra (Wrathful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Utsaha (Enthusiasm)</td>
<td>Vir (Heroic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bhaya (Fear)</td>
<td>Bhayanak (Terrifying)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jugupsa (Disgust)</td>
<td>Bibhista (Odious)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vismaya (Astonishment)</td>
<td>Adbhuta (Marvelous)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sthayibhav are comparatively stable and last longer. They are frequent and more powerful. Generally all human beings experience them now and then.

B) Vyabhichyaribhav or transitory feeling is contrary to the permanent emotions. These have been enumerated thirty three in numbers. These
are neither born, nor permanent, but born out of the emotions themselves. For example, the bashfulness is born of ‘Love’, the depression out of ‘sorrow’ etc. The transitory feelings are attached with more than one emotion. For example the feelings like unsteadiness, madness, remorse, dejection, sickness, agony, despair, nearing death etc. are attached with the emotions ‘Sorrow’, ‘Love’ and also with ‘Fear’

Now let’s have the second group – A) Excitant and

B) Ensuing response

A) Vibhav or excitant is the cause of any basic emotions in worldly affair when presented in any piece of creative literature. It helps in development of a feeling in sentiment. These vibhav are of two kinds: Alambana (supportive) and Uddipana (existent)

B) The effect or reaction of any emotion or vibhav is called ensuing response or anubhav. For example In the case of fear, the physical movements of a frightened person from a lion in the jungle like trembling trying to look for helps towards all direction, perspiration, fainting, horripilation etc. are called ensuing response.

When these three, transitory feeling, excitant and ensuing response are correlated with permanent emotions of spectator i.e. (sahardyaa) it is manifested, transformed, or say converted into poetic pleasure or ‘rasa’ the sentiment.

In his “Indian Poetic” Prof. Ami Upadhay has tried to explain the ‘rasa theory’ with an example as following, he takes an example of ‘Karuna Rasa’. The viewer of a play, for example experiences the
feeling of grief (Soka) as manifest in the performer. A number of vibhav are used in such cases such as death of some loved one, misfortunes, sufferings etc. They depend on visaya, asraya and uddipanna. The ‘Sthayibhav’ of ‘Soka’ takes different visible forms depending on the nature of the experiencer. ‘Abhinaya’ indicates the sthayibhav. Bharata uses the word ‘nispaththi’ (rendering) of rasa through bhava in ‘Sahardya’. In the sentiment of ‘Soka’ (grief), there may be anubhav like mourning (vilap), weeping (rudana), shedding of tears etc. ‘Sattivikbhavs’ would be indicated through tears, change of voice etc. In Abhinaya we find actions like weeping, paleness of face, change of voice, deep breathing, fainting, Immobility and loss of memory etc.

Hans Robert Jauss gives new direction to the Reader Response Criticism through his Reception aesthetic. His “Towards an Aesthetic of Reception” (1982) is a compromise between Formalism which neglected History and Socialism which marginalized the text. Formalism is literary theory which developed in Russia in the early 1920s practitioners or followers of the theory were called Formalist who emphasized on the study of poetic language or literary text as a form. Indeed the Formalist collapsed the distinction between Form and Content. Socialism were primarily concerned with Economic Political and Philosophical issues and worked out explanation of the capitalist theory and mode of production. They have not developed an aesthetic of culture or literature. The Socialist critic wrote from the definite standpoint of Marx’s philosophical ideas, and from his view of history in which the class struggle is fundamental, or in terms of socio-historical factors. They have been devoted to reconstruction of the part on the basic of historical
evidences in order to find out to what extent a text is truthful and an accurate representation of social reality at any given time.

In his text Hans Robert Jauss holds the place of compromiser; he does not admire the Socialism and not take the side of Formalist view. Jauss say’s; my attempt to bridge the gap between literature and history, between historical and aesthetic approaches, begins at the point at which both schools stops. Their methods understand the literary fact in terms of the circular aesthetic system of production and representation. In doing so, they deprive literature of a dimension which unalterably belongs to its aesthetic character as well as to its social function: its reception and impact. Reader, listener and spectator - in short, the audience - plays an extremely limited role in both literary theories........ (Jauss & Benzinger, 7) He explains on ‘an act of reading’ instead of ‘individual reception’, according to him; reading happens in particular situation, the reader does not percept the meaning of the text as same when text was published. Jauss argues that reader uses different criteria at different periods, which he calls ‘Horizon and Expectation’, to judge the nature of literariness in text or genre to which it belongs. What appeals to our generation at given period may not interest reader at some other periods; according to him ‘no work is universal’. A literary work is not an object which stands by itself and which offers a same face to each reader in each period or its timeless essence.

Jauss’ theory views literature “from the perspective of the reader or consumer” and treats literature “as a dialectical process of production and reception.” In his article “Literary History as a Challenge to
Jauss states “the relationship of work to work must now be brought into this interaction between work and mankind, and the historical coherence of works among themselves must be seen in the interrelations of production and reception. Put another way; literature and art only obtain a history that has the character of process when the succession of works is mediated not only through the producing subject but also through the consuming subject-through the interaction of author and public.” (Jauss, 15)

This suggests that Reception Theory defines literature as the process of how the reader and the text interact with each other, and it was a revolutionary way of looking at the history of literature and literary criticism. Reception Theory, however, confines the role of reader within this process, and the ‘power’ of the reader does not function as the dominant in the act of reading the text. “Reception Theory introduces the necessity of the reader’s involvement in the history of the literature, and this drastic and revolutionary development was rather natural considering the influential writings on the ‘theory of relativity’ by Albert Einstein and the concept of ‘paradigm shift’ by Thomas S. Kuhn, both raises questions as to how one should approach the notion of ‘truth’ and ‘fact’, thus suggesting the importance of interpretation” (kinoshita, 4). In addition, these two authors provided the foundation for Reception Theory, which requires the notion of interpretation to be included in the process of literary experiences.

In the theory of Reception the term ‘Hermeneutic’ has its own place. The term is defined as the theory of interpretation, in order to
study how the process of understanding works. According to ‘Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory’ *In Christian theology hermeneutics is the find and interpretation of the Spiritual truth in the Bible. In more general terms, more recently, hermeneutics has been concerned with the interpretation and understanding of human action and particularly, with human action through Sociologists refer to in particular sense as institutions i.e. Political, Cultural, Economic, and Kinship institution. As far as Literature is concerned it is to do with the way textual meaning is communicated. (Cuddon, 377)*

Jauss approaches the notions of hermeneutics with great emphasis on the importance of history and incorporates the philosophical hermeneutics of Hans-Gadmer, who states the following on the term hermeneutics, *all interpretations of past literature arise from a dialogue between past and present. Our attempts to understand a work will depend on the question which our own cultural environment allows us to raise...Our present perspective always involves a relationship to the past, but at the same time the past can only be grasped through the limited perspective of the present.... a hermeneutical notion of ‘understanding’ does not separate knower and object in the familiar fashion of empirical science; rather it views understanding as a ‘fusion’ of past and present. (Kinoshita, 4)*

What is role of hermeneutics in Reception Theory? Jauss argues that “literary hermeneutics plays the role in the concretization of the meaning of literary works, which develops historically within a framework of a certain ‘logic’ creating and transforming ‘the aesthetic
“cannon” (Jauss, 147). Therefore, the notion of hermeneutics functions as a key element in Reception Theory since the interpretations by the reader are now a part of literary process.

In the *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, the term Horizon of Expectation is defined as the “criteria which readers use to judge literary text in any given period. It is crucial aspect of Jauss’ aesthetics of reception and the term designates the shared set of assumption which can be attributed to any given generation of readers.” (Dictionary, 387) Jauss explains how the Horizon of Expectation is constructed in the text: “A literary work, even when it appears to be new, does not present itself as something absolutely new in an informational vacuum, but predisposes its audience to a very specific kind of reception by announcements, overt and covert signals, familiar characteristics, or implicit allusions. It awakens memories of that which is already read, bring the reader to a specific emotional attitude, and with its beginning arouses expectations for the ‘middle and end,’ which can be maintained intact or altered, reoriented, or even fulfilled ironically in the course of the reading according to specific rules of the genre of type of text.” (Jauss, 23)

The criteria help to constitute reader’s judgments of, say, a poem in a trans-subjective way. Horizons of expectation change. The poetry of one age is judged, valued and interpreted by its contemporaries, but the views of the age do not necessarily establish the meaning and value of the poetry definitively. Neither meaning nor value is permanently fixed, because the Horizon of Expectation of each generation will change. As
Jauss puts it: A literary work is not an object which stand by itself and which offers the same face to each reader in each period. It is not monument which reveals its timeless essence in a monologue. Each age reinterprets poetry in the light of its own knowledge and experience, its own cultural environment. Literary value is measured according to ‘aesthetic distance’ the degree to which a work departs from the Horizon of expectations of its first readers. (Dictionary, 387) Here Jauss makes a connection between literary and general history; this considered to be an important contribution to literary theory. Jauss argues that the task of literary history is “completed when literary production is not only represented synchronically and diachronically in the succession of its systems, but also seen as ‘special history’ in its own unique relationship to ‘general history.’” (Jauss, 39) Jauss explains that the horizon of expectations is formed through the reader’s life experience, customs and understanding of the world, which have an effect on the reader’s social behavior.

In this sense, the notion of history becomes fundamental to the horizon of expectations, and this is what differentiates Jauss’ approach to Reception Theory from one of Iser. Jauss also points out that the horizon of expectations is a crucial element in connecting literature and society. Jauss argues, “The social function of literature manifests itself in its genuine possibility only where the literary experience of the reader enters into the horizon of expectation.” (Jauss, 39)

It is clear that, Jauss theory is concerned with reader’s involvement and recognizes the importance of one’s horizon of
expectation. Reception Theory is revolutionary approach to the role of a reader in relationship to the notions of interpretation and one of the most important contributions to the history of literature and new perspective on the literary experiences. It established a new model for writers and theorists. Although it is difficult to fully understand how powerful and revolutionary this model shift was at that time, it is easy to see that the concepts which came out of Reception Theory are now part of how we try to understand literature, art and the world. The theory makes the work of art free from the constructed ideas like text is ‘strictly articulated form’ or ‘text is a particular entity of historical period’ and keeps it in the hands of reader and its horizon of expectations.

Further, Jauss explains the significance of the aesthetic of reception as following; the perspective of the aesthetic of reception mediates between passive reception and active understanding, norm setting experience and new production. If the history of literature is viewed in this way as a dialogue between work and public, the contrast between its aesthetic and its historical aspects is also continually mediated. Thus the thread from the past appearance to the present experience of a work, which historicism had cut, is tied together. (Jauss and Benzinger, 8)

Jauss insists that the relationship of literature and reader has aesthetic as well as historical implication. According to him; “the aesthetic implication is seen in the fact that the first reception of a work by the reader includes a test of its aesthetic value in comparison with works which he has already read. The obvious historical implication of
this is that the appreciation of the first reader will be continued and enriched through further “reception” from generation to generation; in this way historical significance of a work will be determined and its aesthetic value revealed. In this process of the history reception, which the literary historian can only escape at the price of ignoring his own principles of comprehension and judgment, the repossess of past works occurs simultaneously with the continual mediation of past and present art and of traditional evaluation and current literary attempts……The criterion for establishing such a canon and the ever necessary retelling of literary history is clearly set out by the aesthetic of reception. The step from the history of the reception of the individual work to the history of literature has to lead us to see and in turn to present the historical sequence of works in the way in which they determine and clarify our present literary experience.” (Jauss and Benzinger, 9) Jauss raises his argument that literary history can be rewritten on these premises.

**Assumptions of Rasa Theory and Reception Theory:**

Rasa theory is based on some assumptions as,

A literary work appeals to the emotions of perceiver and gives aesthetic pleasure (literary experience) to the perceiver. The perceiver of a work of art gains pleasure or the literary experience while watching a play is called as rasa. Every human being has sthayibhav i.e. permanent emotion with some three unitary principles such as vibhav, anubhav and sancharibhav. It is an inborn desire of human being to express the own feelings, emotions and thought through art. A poet or playwright has a
quality to represent its emotions, feelings or thought through the sublime way and in elegant order. Imagination, richness and expression with fanciful manner are some qualities of a piece of literature. There relation between subject and language used by the artists. The rasa is manifested through the combination of vibhav, anubhav and sancharibhav with sthayibhav in a piece of literature. Sthayibhav (permanent emotion) always inhere in dormant stage in all human minds. Sancharibhav are also called as transitory feelings are contrary to permanent emotion, they are neither inborn nor permanent but born out of emotions themselves. The vibhav are of two kind i.e. Alambana vibhav (substantial Excitant) and Uddipana Vibhav (enhancer excitant). The effect of any emotion is called as anubhav. The poetic word possesses the power to suggest and the suggestiveness becomes an inevitable and indispensable medium to stimulate the poetic pleasure into the mind of reader through the text. Bharata terms a common perceiver as sahardya that is a person of poetical sensibility, magnanimous person.

Reception theory has been developed on some assumption as,

    Literary history can be a challenge to literary theory to solve the unresolved dispute between Marxist and formalist school. The literary fact is to be understood in its various systems i.e. aesthetic of production, aesthetic of representation, aesthetic of reception and aesthetic of social function. Author, text and reader play extreme role in these systems. A text is not written for to read and interpret by philologically by philologist and historically by historian but it is primarily addressed to the reader whose role is unalterable for aesthetic as for historical
appreciation. The critic who judges new work, the writer who writes in the light of positive and negative norms of previous work, the historian who classifies the work in its tradition and explains it historically are also readers before their response relationship to literature can become productive again. The historical life of a text is thinkable only with the active participation of its reader through the process of communication; the work reaches the horizon of experience in a continuity in which the continual change occurs from simple reception to critical understanding, from passive to active reception, from recognized aesthetic norm to a new production which surpasses them. The historicity of literature and its communicative nature presupposes a relation of work, reader and new work; it takes the form of dialogue and process which can be understood in the relationship of questions and answer, problem and solution. The problem of understanding the historical sequence of literary works as a continuity of literary history can find new solution by widening the methodology of literary criticism to the aesthetic of reception and its impact. The perspective of the theory mediates between passive reception and active understanding, norm setting experience and new production. The history of literature should be viewed as a dialogue between work and public so that contrast between its aesthetic and historical aspects is also mediated. Thus the thread from the past appearance to the present experience of a work, which historicism had cut is tied together. The relationship of literature and reader has aesthetic and historical implications. The aesthetic implication is seen in the fact that the first reception of a work by the reader includes a test of its aesthetic value in comparison with works which he has already read. The
appreciation of the first reader will be continued and enriched through further ‘reception’ from generation to generation, in this way the historical significance of a work will be determined and its aesthetic value revealed. In the process of literary history a literary historian must ignore his own principles of comprehension and judgment. History of literature is a process of aesthetic of reception and production which take place in realization of literary texts on the part of the receptive reader, the reflective critic and the author in his continued creativity. (Jauss & Benzinger, 7-10)

Methods of Rasa Theory and Reception Theory:

Since rasa theory is not developed as literary theory of evaluating a literary work of art but it is formulated as a directive principle for new playwrights to understand the various perspectives of the spectators. By keeping the fact in mind, the methods of rasa theory can be summarized as following;

Rasa theory believes that the objective of any literary work of art must be to appeal the perceivers mind and to give pleasure to the perceiver. A literary work of art should contain the pleasure which is enjoyed by perceiver is called as rasa. A literary work of art should be presented in relation to the permanent emotion of human being for the completion of the objective of aesthetic pleasure. A permanent emotion (sthayibhav) should be the center of literary work of art and different parts of sthayibhav should be included in the various parts of the literary work of art. Vibhav, Anubhav and Sancharibhav are the parts of sthayibhav. These are unitary principles of permanent emotion
A literary work of art should have the capability of appealing the emotion of the perceiver. The capability can be achieved only when the literary work of art is well planned, structured, narrated the different bhava, emotion and related principles in the work of art. The poet or playwright should infatuate the whole world with the help of those very words and their senses- which we people use in our daily life just by arranging them in their suitable and elegant order. A person describing any event, uses the language and diction according to its context, and also narrates it not as a statement, but in a fanciful manner on the basic of his imagination and richness of thought, that verbal or written narration is called a piece of literature. An artist should describe any events, soaring on the flight of his imagination, expresses it in an adorned and embellished language and elegant diction according to its subject matter. A piece of creative literature (it may be in various forms) we enjoy it as perceiver (reader or spectator), this sort of pleasure according to Indian poetics is termed as rasa. According to Bharata, rasa manifests itself when the sthayibhav i.e. the emotion of a reader or a spectator is correlated with the following three aspects expressed in a piece of creative literature: Vibhav (excitant), Anubhav (ensuing response) and Sancharibhav (transitory feeling) all these should be accumulated as one. Sthayibhav (permanent emotion) always inhere in dormant stage in all human minds as basic instincts, and are fed by a number of minor feelings called transitory feelings. Permanent emotions in us are inborn. These are not acquired by any experience or training and also are not born out of any emotion or feeling. Bharata terms a common perceiver as sahardya that is a person of poetical sensibility,
magnanimous person. In this state of mind the spectator becomes quite free from all the strings of his prior attachment or detachment he has towards any character whether historical or mythical and thus his mind becomes cleans and clear like a mirror.

Literary history must move from historical objectivism which is based on the aesthetic of production and representation to an aesthetic of reception and influence. Because a literary work is not an object which stand by it and which offers the same face to each reader and each period. If literary history is to be revived, the biases of historical objectivism must be detached and the outdated approach to literature must be substituted by an aesthetic of reception and impact. “The historical relevance of literature is not based on an organization of literary works which is established post factum but not on the readers past experience of the literary data. This relationship creates a dialogue that is the first condition for a literary history. For the literary historian must first become a reader again himself before he can understand and classify a work, in other words, before he can justify his own evaluation in light of his present position in the in the historical progression of readers.” (Jauss, 20)

The aesthetic of reception avoids the psychological threats by looking at the influence of work in the period of its appearance, from pre-understanding of genre and from themes already familiar in other works. A text does not appear in a vacuum but makes use of signals, genres and other familiar characteristics. “The enquiry of literary experience of the reader escapes the frightening drawbacks of
psychology if it defines the reception and effect of a work within the
objectifiable system of expectation belief or that arises for each work in
the historical moment of its presence, from a pre-understanding of the
genre, from the form and themes of already familiar works, and from the
opposition between poetic and practical language.” (Jauss, 22)

The artistic character of a work can be determined by the effect of
the text on its reader. The change in horizons that the text brings about
through the negations of the familiar or opening up of new perspectives
is a result of the aesthetic distance between the text and its audience,
which can be objectified through the reader’s reaction and the critic’s
judgments. Recreated in this way, the horizon of expectations permits
one to define its inventive appeal by the kind and the degree of its
influence on an assumed audience. Jauss says; “If one characterizes as
aesthetic distance the disparity between the given horizon of
expectations and the appearance of a new work, whose reception can
result in a “change of horizon” through negation of familiar experiences
or through raising newly articulated experiences to the level of
consciousness, then this aesthetic distance can be objectified historically
along the spectrum of the audience’s reactions and criticism’s judgment
(spontaneous success, rejection or shock, scattered approval, gradual or
belated understanding).” (Jauss, 25)

The reconstruction of the original horizon of expectations allows
us to compare past and present understanding and forces us to become
aware of the text’s history of reception which mediates between the two
horizons. “The restoration of the horizon of expectations, in the face of
which a work was produced and acknowledged in the past, allows one on the other hand to pose question that the text gives an answer to, and thereby to discover how the contemporary reader could have viewed and understood the work. This approach corrects the mostly unrecognized of a classicist or modernizing understanding of art, and avoids the circular recourse to a general “spirit of the age.” It brings to view the hermeneutical difference between the former and current understanding of a work; it raises to consciousness the history of its reception, which mediates both positions; and thereby calls into questions as a Platonizing dogma of philological metaphysics the apparently self-evident claims that in the literary text, literature is eternally present, and that its objective meaning, determined once and for all, is at all times immediately accessible to the interpreter.” (Jauss, 28) A literary historian must see the literary fact in relation to the change in horizons that the text brings about through the negations of the familiar or opening up of new perspectives is a result of the aesthetic distance between the text and its audience, which can be objectified through the reader’s reaction and the critic’s judgments.

A literary work must be seen in its position in its literary series in order to recognize its historical significance. The literary work solves formal and moral problems left behind by the last work and presents new problems in turn. Jauss looks literary history as constant dialogue between past and present literature. Jauss says; “the theory of the aesthetics of reception not only allows one to conceive the meaning and form of a literary work in the historical unfolding of its understanding. It also demands that one insert the individual work into its “literary series”
to recognize its historical position and significance in the context of the experiences of literature. In the step from a history of reception of works to an eventful history of literature, the latter manifest itself as a process in which the passive reception is on the part of authors. Put another way, the next work can solve formal and moral problems left behind by the last work, and present new problems in turn.” (Jauss, 32) A literary work appears with certain answers which fulfills the expectations of the reader but at the same time it opens up new question which bring changes in the expectations of the reader, if literary historian can locate its historical tradition or its literary series, the historical significance of the text also can be located.

The advances in the field of linguistics allow us to overcome the dominance of diachronic method in literary history. Diachronic method could not judge the values of a literary work of art when it is appeared. The method studies it only as fact at a particular moment in the course of literary history but not sees it with its contemporary work of art which can help to define objective value of the work of art. Jauss says; “the achievement ……..If the perspective of the history of reception always bumps up against the functional connections between the understanding of new works and the significance of older ones when changes in aesthetic attitudes are considered, it must also be possible to take a synchronic cross-section of a moment in the development, to arrange the heterogeneous multiplicity of contemporaneous works in equivalent, opposing and hierarchical structure, and thereby to discover an overarching system of relationship in the literature of a historical moment. From this the principle of representation of new literary history
could be developed, if further cross-sections diachronically before and after were so arranged as to articulate historically the change in literary structures in its epoch-making moment.” (Jauss, 36) Synchronic study allows us to see how the competing values and structures are realized in different texts which appear contemporary with each other during such changes.

Literary history is not general history but it is special history which has a social function. It has a unique relationship with the general history. The social function of literature occurs when the literary experience of the reader enters into the horizon of expectations of his lived praxis, performs his understanding of the world and thereby also has an effect on his social behavior. Jauss says; “task of literary history is thus only completed when literary production is not only represented synchronically and diachronically in the succession of its systems, but also seen as “special history” in its own unique relationship to general history. This relationship does not end with the fact that a typified, idealized, satiric or utopian image of social function of literature manifests itself in its genuine possibility only where the literary experience of the reader enters into the horizon of expectations of his lived praxis, preforms his understanding of the world, and thereby also has an effect on his social behavior.” (Jauss, 39) Therefore a literary historian must see a literary work of art not only in diachronic perspective but in its synchronic system also. Literature has social function, literature takes a reader to an unfamiliar aesthetic form which completes its expectations and at the same time breaks its expectations by opening up new challenges and questions. Through the process of
completion of expectations or changes in expectations or the process of question and solution literature enters into reader’s life, readers understanding of the world and effects on his social behavior and morals. (www.ethesis.nottingham.ac.uk 125-154)

**Principles of Rasa Theory and Reception Theory:**

The principles of rasa theory are as following:

1. Rasa theory believes that the objective of any literary work of art is to give pleasure to the perceiver by appealing its emotions.

2. The pleasure contained in literary work of art and enjoyed by perceiver is called as rasa.

3. Sthayibhav is called as a permanent emotion; Vibhav, Anubhav and Sancharibhav are the parts of sthayibhav. These are unitary principles of permanent emotion (sthayibhav).

4. A literary work of art gets the capability of appealing the emotion of the perceiver when the literary work of art is well planned, structured, narrated the different bhava, emotion and related principles in the work of art.

5. The poet or playwrights infatuate the whole world with the help of those very words and their senses- which we people use in our daily life just by arranging them in their suitable and elegant order.

6. The desire to express our emotions feelings, expression and thought to other is an inborn instinct of the human being.
7. A person describing any event, uses the language and diction according to its context, and also narrates it not as a statement, but in a fanciful manner on the basis of his imagination and richness of thought, that verbal or written narration is called a piece of literature.

8. A person, who describes any events, soaring on the flight of his imagination, expresses it in an adorned and embellished language and elegant diction according to its subject matter is called a poet.

9. A piece of creative literature (it may be in various forms) we enjoy it as perceiver (reader or spectator), this sort of pleasure according to Indian poetics is termed as rasa.

10. In English language rasa is translated as aesthetic pleasure, aesthetic enjoyment, aesthetic bliss, poetic pleasure, poetic relish, poetic delight, poetic dictation etc.

11. Rasa manifests itself when the sthayibhav i.e. the emotion of a reader or a spectator is correlated with the following three aspects expressed in a piece of creative literature: Vibhav (excitant), Anubhav (ensuing response) and Sancharibhav (transitory feeling) all these should be accumulated as one.

12. Sthayibhav (permanent emotion) always inhere in dormant stage in all human minds as basic instincts, and are fed by a number of minor feelings called transitory feelings.

13. The transitory feelings (sancharibhav) are contrary to the permanent emotion. These have been enumerated thirty three in
number, yet more can be added. These unlike the emotion or neither inborn, nor permanent, but born out of the emotions themselves. For ex. the depression out of sorrow.

14. The cause of any basic emotion (vibhav) in worldly affair when presented in any piece of creative literature is called an excitant. It is of two kinds: Alambana vibhav (substantial excitant) and Uddipana vibhav (enhancer excitant).

15. The effect of any emotion is called Anubhav (ensuing response), for ex. in the case of fear the physical movements of frightened person from a lion in the jungle like trembling, perspiration, horripilation, fainting etc. are called ensuing response.

16. The poetic word possesses the power to suggest and the suggestiveness becomes an inevitable and indispensable medium to stimulate the poetic pleasure into the mind of reader through the text.

17. The human mind is attributed with three modes, called Gunas: Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas that is, the quality of (i) goodness or magnanimity (ii) passion, energy or luxuriousness and (iii) ignorance or illusion respectively. At the time of enjoying the poetic pleasure the mind of the reader or spectator becomes dominated by the mode of magnanimity and is said to be untouched of the other two modes.

18. Bharata terms a common perceiver as sahardya that is a person of poetical sensibility, magnanimous person. In this state of mind the
spectator becomes quite free from all the strings of his prior attachment or detachment he has towards any character whether historical or mythical and thus his mind becomes cleans and clear like a mirror.

19. Perceiver enjoys the sentiment of the character that is the original person only when he is in no way a specific individual for the perceiver, now a common person not a particular one. (Sadharanikaran)

20. Perceiver understands the meaning of the text, all the three above mentioned phenomena: vibhav (excitant), anubhav (ensuing response) and sancharibhav (transitory feeling) become generalized, that is the characters, and also all sorts of situations connected with them become devoid of time and space. The character loses their specific individuality.

21. The rasa is temporal, that the readers and the spectators long and look forward to read the poetry, or to watch the drama with the tragic themes with their desire to get pleasure out of them. A reader descends from the particular emotional ground to the common ground, that is his grief or fear does not remain bound to a particular space, time and individual person.

22. According to advanced psychology, the existence of vibhav, anubhav and sancharibhav are most necessary in the manifestation of permanent emotion (sthayibhav).
The principles of rasa theory are very much sustaining; therefore they are independent from all the boundaries of period, region and culture etc. Rasa is universal and independent in its nature; one can find its traces in western poetic aesthetic.

The principles of reception theory can be summarized as following:

1. Literary history must be seen as challenging literary theory to solve the unresolved dispute between Marxist and formalist school.

2. The literary fact must be understood in its various systems i.e. aesthetic of production, aesthetic of representation, aesthetic of reception and aesthetic of social function. Author, text and reader play extreme role in these systems.

3. A text is not written for to read and interpret by philologist and historically by historian but it is primarily addressed to the reader whose role is unalterable for aesthetic as for historical appreciation.

4. The critic who judges new work, the writer who writes in the light of positive and negative norms of previous work, the historian who classifies the work in its tradition and explains it historically are also readers before their response relationship to literature can become productive again.

5. The historical life of a text is thinkable only with the active participation of its reader through the process of communication; the work reaches the horizon of experience in a continuity in which the continual change occurs from simple reception to
critical understanding, from passive to active reception, from recognized aesthetic norm to a new production which surpasses them.

6. The historicity of literature and its communicative nature presupposes a relation of work, reader and new work; it takes the form of dialogue and process which can be understood in the relationship of question and answer, problem and solution.

7. The problem of understanding the historical sequence of literary works as a continuity of literary history can find new solution by widening the methodology of literary criticism to the aesthetic of reception and impact.

8. The perspective the theory mediates between passive reception and active understanding, norm setting experience and new production. The history of literature should be viewed as a dialogue between work and public so that contrast between its aesthetic and historical aspects is also mediated. Thus the thread from the past appearance to the present experience of a work, which historicism had cut is tied together.

9. The relationship of literature and reader has aesthetic and historical implications. The aesthetic implication is seen in the fact that the first reception of a work by the reader includes a test of its aesthetic value in comparison with works which he has already read. The appreciation of the first reader will be continued and enriched through further ‘reception’ from generation to generation, in this way the historical significance of a work will be determined and its aesthetic value revealed.
10. In the process of literary history a literary historian must ignore his own principles of comprehension and judgment.

11. History of literature is a process of aesthetic of reception and production which take place in realization of literary texts on the part of the receptive reader, the reflective critic and the author in his continued creativity. (Jauss & Benzinger, 7-10)

12. Literary history must move from historical objectivism which is based on the aesthetic of production and representation to an aesthetic of reception and influence. Because a literary work is not an object which stand by it and which offers the same face to each reader and each period.

13. The aesthetic of reception avoids the psychological threats by looking at the influence of work in the period of its appearance, from pre-understanding of genre and from themes already familiar in other works. A text does not appear in a vacuum but makes use of signals, genres and other familiar characteristics.

14. The artistic character of a work can be determined by the effect of the text on its reader. The change in horizons that the text brings about through the negations of the familiar or opening up of new perspectives is a result of the aesthetic distance between the text and its audience, which can be objectified through the reader’s reaction and the critic’s judgments.

15. The reconstruction of the original horizon of expectations allows us to compare past and present understanding and forces us to become aware of the text’s history of reception which mediates between the two horizons.
16. A literary work must be seen in its position in its literary series in order to recognize its historical significance. The literary work solves formal and moral problems left behind by the last work and presents new problems in turn.

17. The advances in the field of linguistics allow us to overcome the dominance of diachronic method in literary history. Synchronic study allows us to see how the competing values and structures are realized in different texts which appear contemporary with each other during such changes.

18. Literary history is not general history but it is special history which has a social function. It has a unique relationship with the general history. The social function of literature occurs when the literary experience of the reader enters into the horizon of expectations of his lived praxis, performs his understanding of the world and thereby also has an effect on his social behavior. (www. ethesis. nottingham. ac. uk 125-154)

Limitations of Rasa Theory and Reception Theory:

Rasa theory is not the theory of literary criticism, but it is theory that directs to write a play and about its performance. Since the objectivity and authenticity cannot be questioned as other literary theories directly. The discussion on rasa theory leads some points which show some area that Bharata has not overlooked.

a. Rasa theory deals with only the psychological aspects of spectator, it has not focused on the aspects like social, cultural, and
economical. Readers own expectation and previous experiences which influence on the reception process too.

b. Rasa theory is limited to only the literary genre called drama. Though at the time when rasa theory was formulated drama was major genre of literature, now days it has been replaced by other familiar genre.

c. The terms rasa theory used for to indicate the states of human mind are difficult to interpret, one has to rely on their translation such as nishpatthi, sanyogad, sthayibhav, vyabhicharibhav etc.

d. It is difficult to find the expression for one’s own emotion, imagination, if one thinks to write according to rasa aesthetic. There is chance of shaking the poetic license used by the poets and artist.

e. Rasa theory deals with the psychological aspects of spectator which plays important role in literary experiences but the fact cannot be neglected that every human being possess different psychological aspects therefore it is difficult write a play which will appeal a group of spectator simultaneously.

Though rasa theory has some limitation, the significance of rasa theory is immense in literary tradition. Rasa theory put the spectator at the center of the process of creation of a work of art. It has discussed about reader as creator of meaning and without whom the meaning of a text is not possible.

As stated earlier reception theory is a historical application of reader response theory. It is a dialogue with history for reconstruction of
new literary history depending upon the aesthetic of reception. The reception theory begins with the argument that it aims to bridge the gap between literature and history, between historical and aesthetic approach. The theorist also accuses Marxism and Formalism for their method understands the literary fact in terms of the circular aesthetic system of production and of representation and in doing so they deprive literature of a dimension which unalterably belongs to its aesthetic character as well as its social function: its reception and impact. (Jauss & Benzinger, 7) Jauss argues that the unresolved dispute between the Marxist and Formalist can be taken up one again by looking at literary history as challenging literary theory. Jauss theory of aesthetic of reception deals with the reader, its involvement in the literary experience, the horizon of expectation, historical significance of a literary work, synchronic perspective and objectifying the literary experiences, literary history as a unique history and social function of the literature. Though Jauss’ reception theory deals with more objective facts and principles and rests on the analysis of literary experiences according to the reader’s horizon of expectations it has some limitations as following:

a. The role of author or creator is absolutely important in a production of literary work of art. Author’s creativity and imagination which appeals readers has been not focused in the reception theory.

b. Any literary work is produced in certain situation; it has particular social, cultural background which is not much considered in reception theory. Literary work cannot be considered as an
authentic representation of authors imagination but it deals with some implications of authors own views, his own background may be social, cultural etc.

c. The text has its some artistic qualities of representations which determine the value of a text. The artistic representation of the art attracts the reader’s attention and at the same time reader can forget its own literary values and horizon of expectations. For. Ex. the poems written during the romantic period still holds the attention of readers because their language, themes and art of expression.

d. It is difficult to define the aesthetic impact of a literary text at particular point in the past and its synchronic relation to its contemporary literary texts. Every individual human being is different from each other on various tests; therefore it is not possible to determine the common reception of particular text.

e. Since it is not possible to determine the common reception of a text in a past, the question raises of locating the text in its literary series and also its historical significance.

Though Jauss’ reception theory has some limitation, they can be overcome by the sincere study of literary experiences, though all human being are not equal on various tests, there are many aspects which are found same in all human beings all over the world such as love, sympathy, sorrow. Patriotism, hate, aesthetic feelings, romance, greediness etc. on the basis of these aspects Jauss’ argument can be justified. Jauss has put reader in the center of literary discourses and dared to say that the literary history can rewrite not only by author’s
perspective, social perspective, and structural perspective but also aesthetic perspective.

**Conclusion:**

In the light of above discussion, one can summarize the comparison between Rasa theory and Reception theory as following:

a. Both rasa theory and reception have put reader at the center of literary discourse. Both the theories have agreed that the meaning is possible only in the presence of reader or spectator.

b. The aspect of ‘literary experience’ is common in both the theories. Rasa means an experience of aesthetic pleasure and aesthetic of reception is theory literary experience.

c. Both the theories have claimed that literature has an artistic quality which appeals the bhava (inner state of mind) and expectation of perceiver. It is the quality of literature which takes reader from real world to world of literary experience.

d. There is dialogue between literature and perceiver/reader/spectator where both the theories insist on the involvement of reader or spectator in the process. In the rasa theory a perceiver involves in an event performed on the stage through the correlation of bhava to each other and feels the same what character feels. Similarly, in reception theory a reader involves in the reading process through the constant dialogue with the text and tries to fulfill his own expectation.

e. Both the theories incorporate with the psychological aspects of human being. In rasa theory Bharata states the sthayibhav
(inborn/permanent emotion) of human being is correlated with other three unitary bhava such as vibhav, anubhav and sancharibhav in proper way which manifest into the realization of rasa. Similarly, Jauss coined the term Horizon of expectations which denotes the criteria which readers use to judge literary text in any given period.

f. Literature can bring the changes in readers or spectators life. In rasa theory the spectator reaches to his lived praxis through the principle of Sadharanikaran and gets freedom for its own problems of real life with the new literary experiences. The social function of literature has been discussed in reception theory. It manifests itself in its genuine possibility only where the literary experience of the reader enters into the horizon of expectation of his lived praxis performs his understanding of the world and thereby also on effect on his social behavior.

g. The entire literary process is taken into consideration in both the theories. Bharata has formulated rasa theory for to lay the foundation for new playwrights on which they can write successful play. He has explained all the elements that come under the literary process such as production, representation and reception. The role of author is not fully focused in reception theory but Jauss has explained that author is itself reader before his response relationship to literature can become productive again.

h. The principle of diversity in human nature has been accepted by both the theories. Bharata has mentioned the types of perceiver
according to the *guna* that the perceiver has most in quantity, the *guna* are *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. In reception theory Jauss argues that the reception may be varies according to the readers own principle, judgment, artistic value, social, cultural and economic background.

i. The fusion of horizon of expectation and manifestation of rasa are both similar processes which lead to the new literary experience. In rasa theory perceiver realize the rasa through the correlation of vibhav, anubhav and sancharibhav with Sthayibhav through the act performed on the stage and enter into the new literary experience. Similarly, in reception theory, reader’s horizon of expectation gets fused with the text through the continuous dialogue between reader and text and gets his expectation fulfilled or meets new challenges (expectation).

j. The reader or perceiver is assumed with certain qualities in both the literary theories. In rasa theory Bharata defined the perceiver as ‘sahardya’; a person who has poetic sensibility or generous person. Jauss argues that every reader has his own principles, artistic value and judgment according to his previous knowledge, reading and experiences. The reader reads the text with certain horizon of expectation and with certain values that he has come across previously.

k. Origin: there is difference between the rasa theory and reception theory on the ground of their origin. Rasa theory has been originated in India during the ancient period (2, BC) and it has formulated by Bharata in his treatise called Natyashastra.
l. Objective: both the theories go with the same subject that is reader or spectators role in perception of aesthetic pleasure but their objectives are different. Rasa theory aims to build a foundation for new playwrights to write successful plays. Reception theory is a historical application of reader response views or reception to rewrite the literary history according to reception and impact; it is also intended to establish a new literary canon based on aesthetic of reception.

m. Background: rasa theory is formulated by Bharata without much scholarly literary established background; there are no evidences to which one can define as the background of Bharata’s rasa theory. Reception theory is developed on very strong scholarly background. Jauss begins with the reader response theory to aesthetic of reception and tries to define the historical significance of a text in its historical tradition or in its literary series.

n. Rasa theory is formulated independently and not intended to find out the solution on the question that previous theories either raised of created. Reception theory is intentionally developed to overcome the problem of writing literary history and to get rid from the traditional socialist Marxism which marginalized the text and structural formalism which neglected the author and society behind the text.

o. Role of reader/spectator: though the role of perceiver is significant, the ground is different on which the process of literary experience is defined in both the theories. Rasa theory considers the spectators innermost psychological aspects (sthayibhav,
vibhav, anubhav and sancharibhav) as bedrocks in the manifestation of rasa. While, reception theory mostly not deals with the inner psychology of the reader but incorporates with the concepts like horizon of expectations and literary background of the reader.

**p.** Bharata has developed some concepts like sthayibhav, vibhav, anubhav and sancharibhav which are inborn in human psyche; they become active when they get appealed from external excitant. But, the concept horizon of expectation is not inborn in human psyche, it is developed by readers previous knowledge, reading, literary experiences, own principles and literary values.

**q.** The term literary experience is common in both the theories but the process of it is different in both, rasa theory and reception theory. Rasa is manifested only when the vibhav, anubhav and sancharibhav correlates with the sthayibhav of the spectator through proper way (representation). While, in reception theory, literary experience is gained by reader himself through engaging himself in the dialogue with text and tries to meet his expectations or challenges.

**r.** Scope: though it is applicable to most of the literary genres rasa theory is limited only to the drama because other genres are not discussed in anywhere in rasa theory. It is also limited to the spectator’s inner state of mind and not considers other aspects that affect the perception process too, such as reader’s background etc. Jauss has discussed about these elements but he has left the psychological aspects that affect the perception process. But, Jauss
incorporates with the historical significance of the text in its literary series which makes reception theory cosmic.

Bharata has not discussed the social function of literature comprehensively in his rasa theory. While, Jauss has elaborated the function of literature in detail in his last thesis. According to him, the literary experience of the reader enters into the horizon of expectation of his lived praxis performs his understanding of the world, and thereby also effect on his social behavior.

Rasa theory can be understood only in terms of psychological state of spectator and it is limited to this only but reception theory is comprehensive in its nature, it can be understood with psychological state of reader as well as reader’s background, historical significance of the text in its literary tradition etc.
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