Chapter: 5

Conclusion

The present chapter incorporates the précis conclusion of previous chapters. It also deals with some research findings and concluding note.

The first chapter of the thesis is divided into three sections. The section A deals with the concepts like theory, literary theory, criticism and relationship between literary theory and literary criticism. Section B includes some important Indian literary theories and related concepts. Section C is about the short introduction of western literary theories and related concepts.

The word ‘theory’ is generally used in various discipline of knowledge. It is always read with certain assumption such as, theory as a set of rules, a set of principles or a philosophical foundation of any practical work. Etymologically a theory advocates the process of speculation according to particular assumptions. Theory is contemplative and rational type of abstract or the result of such thinking. Depending on the context, for ex. the result might include a generalized explanation of how nature works. Jonathan Cullor (3-4) explains; a theory must be more than a hypothesis it cannot be obvious: it involves complex relations of a systematic kind among a number of factors, and it is easily confirmed or disproved. If we bear these factors in mind, it becomes easier to understand what goes by the name of theory. He continues: The main effect of theory is the disputing of “common sense” common sense views about meaning, writing, literature, experience. Theory enables
people to think differently about their way of life, activities of studying particular object.

So theory can be summarized as, it is interdisciplinary discourse with effects outside an original discipline. Theory is an analytical and speculative attempt to work out what is involved in what that we call language or writing or meaning or the subject. Theory is the critique of common sense of concepts taken as natural. Theory is reflexive thinking and enquiry into the categories we use in making sense of things in literature and in other discursive practice. (Jonathan Cullor, 14-15)

Literary theory is the process of understanding the nature of literature, the function of literature, the relation of text is to author, to reader, to language, to society and to history. According to Manoharlal Shah; (1) basically literary theory is the theory of the interpretation of literature and literary criticism. Its history begins with classical Greek poetics and rhetoric includes since the 18th century aesthetic and hermeneutics. In the 20th century, theory has become as umbrella term for a variety of scholarly approach to reading text, most of which are informed by various trends continental philosophy.

There are number of schools or types of literary theory, which take different approach to understanding text. Major schools of literary theory that have been historically important include New Criticism, Formalism, Structuralism, Post structuralism, Marxism, Feminism, New Historicism, Deconstruction, Reader-Response Criticism, and Psychoanalytical Criticism. Though different approaches hold their own separate tradition and histories, there are several ideas or principles
which are recurrent in all critical theories in practice at present time, they are a single entity with a set of understanding beliefs. For ex. theories are socially constructed that is they depend on social and political forces, thinking and investigation are always affected by the prior ideological commitment, language, meaning within a literary text never fixed and reliable and theorist distrust all ‘totalizing’ notions.

Literary criticism is a practice of judging a work of art to interpret, analyze and evaluate it. The chief objective of criticism is to provide particular judgment. Cuddon defined it as an art or science of literary criticism devoted to the comparison and analysis, to the interpretation and evaluation of literary work. (Cuddon, 196) There are three functions of criticism, to interpret, to evaluate, and to judge the literary text impartially. It should be disinterested practice to propagate the best that is known and thought in the world as Arnold calls it.

The relationship between literary theory and literary criticism is difficult to define because whether literary criticism is involved in theory or separate from theory is matter of debate. The object of criticism is to analyze, to interpret and to evaluate the work of art with best judgment. The literary theory plays a role of bedrock to analyze, to interpretation and to evaluation of work of art. Literary theory is a set directive principles of criticism which lead the practice of criticism to the final judgment about the text. Joseph Chandra (1-2) says: Whether literary criticism is a separate field of practice from literary theory is a matter of debate. Literary critics have not been always theorist. Literary criticism which is the study, interpretation and evaluation of literature considered
as a practical application of literary theory. Criticism deals directly with literary work from a theoretical framework. Contemporary literary criticism is often informed by literary theory which is the philosophical discussion of its methods and goals. The two activities are thus closely related to each other.

Literary theory has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome. It begins with Plato to Aristotle up to Present. Now, the practice of literary theory has become as a part of many professions. A good literary theory always incorporates some parameters such as; it should be valid, universal, objective, impartial, practical applicable, double potential, general applicability, and flexible enough to interpretation and newer needs. These parameters determine the relevance of a literary theory and at the same time they lead to the relevant judgment of a literary work.

Section B highlights some recurrent Indian Literary theories From Bharata to Spivak and Aijaz Ahmad. The brief introduction of Indian theoretical tradition shows that Indians have produced very rich and significant literary approach. At present Indian literary criticism is facing profound crises of identity because today Indian literary critics and philosophers are divided into groups. They have different disposition regarding insistence upon the purification and review of (Sanskrit) native tradition of criticism. These various and conflicting tendencies has failed to play important role to upkeep the creative literature in Indian languages. Today the common charge being made against Indian literary studies is that it has not practical application. There are two reasons, probably lack of written record of practical application and oral
commentary of Indian literary criticism. Modern Indian scholars have lost touch with the Sanskrit language and so with Sanskrit literature and criticism. There is a problem availability of good translation of critical texts. Those who know English has no interest in Indian Critical Theories, we must come out this tendency in order to make world aware of the great character in literary theory and criticisms. We should also stop falling a victim of any foreign theories and put our faith in our great past tradition and should show our supreme ability with own trends and theories.

Section C is about the short introduction of western literary theories. Western literary theory has rich and long tradition in the history. It begins with the Plato, Aristotle to the renaissance, neo-classical period to modern and postmodern literary theories. One can divide the tradition of western literary theory in four major parts according to period. The first phase, classical literary criticism includes the ancient philosopher like Plato, Aristotle, Longinus and Horace. This philosopher has discussed about author, poet and their qualities. They also determined the principles and merits of good poetry. The second phase, criticism of early centuries includes the philosopher and critics such as Thomas More, Ascham, Sir Philip Sydney and Ben Jonson. They talked about drama as separate form of art, values of poetry. Jonson criticized the Aristotle’s views on unity of time and chorus. The third phase, criticism of middle centuries includes the neo-classical theorists such as Dryden, Pope, Dr. Johnson, Wordsworth, Arnold and Walter Peter. These philosophers and critics put their views on nature of poetry, dramatic poetry, methodology and standards for criticism, merits of
literary composition, relation of nature and poetry, and poetic diction. They talk on theory of art, imagination, fancy, the ways of writing poetry and problems of criticism. Arnold advocates the touchstone method and Peter proclaimed art for art’s sake and aim of poetry is to give delight. The fourth phase, criticism of modern and postmodern period which begins from the Russian Formalism and it continues to the postmodern theories like eco-criticism and techno-criticism. Some postmodern theories found reader as the center part of interpretation and evaluation of a literary text. These theories have their specific ideology for instance Marxist’s Philosopher developed their views on society and economic structure, feminist conciders women as a center of discourse and reader response theorists interpret according to readers point of view. It is rightly said that, to decide the standard literary theory for the perfect judgment of literature is difficult but do we also don’t have the definition of perfect judgment. All these western literary theories try to reach at perfection to the logical judgment literature and their significance lies there.

The second chapter of the thesis deals with the Bharata’s rasa theory. Rasa theory has been originated in India, during the ancient period. Bharata, an Indian rhetorician is considered as founder of the rasa theory. He has written a text called *Natyashastra* which is conserved as fifth Veda of Vedic philosophy. Bharata has explained the theory of rasa in the sixth chapter of the *Natyashastra*. It is said that Bharata was asked to write a text which would be considered as fifth Veda for to direct the playwright to write the good play and its successful representation. There is no much theoretical background
available for the rasa theory; all that exist could be understand as mythic stories.

Rasa is roughly translated as aesthetic rapture, pleasure, or relish on the part of a perceiver or reader which is derived from a work of art. According to Bharata aesthetic pleasure rises from the combination of bhava (in the work). Bhava are translated as psycho-physiological states of human mind. These bhava are of three kinds- sthayibhav, sancharibhav (Vyabhichyaribhav) and Sattivikbhav. Sthayibhav are permanent or stable states and are those which dominate or persist throughout a literary work. They set the mood of literary work such as anger, sad, terrifying, etc. sancharibhav are short lived mental states which generated along with them (sthayibhav) for ex. panic, fear, anger, trembling, paralysis etc. Sattivikbhav are similar to sancharibhav, they are difficult to imitate in dramatic representation. There must be a cause or stimulus to generate these emotions which will give rise to an effect in the character or the subject. These causes or stimulus are known as vibhav; for instance; a tiger in the forest can be the cause of fear in a lonely traveller. In this case, the tiger and the man’s aloneness can be considered the vibhav which generate fear. And the consequences manifestation or effects of fear will be many like trembling, panic, horripilation, paralysis etc. these are known as anubhav. These states of mind may or may not be perceivable to our senses directly, for example anger in a subject cannot be communicated directly to another but it can be suggested through various manifestations. Patnaik says (8), thus whereas vibhav and anubhav can be seen or observed directly, the states
or bhava need not necessarily be directly perceivable. It is, in fact, to suggest the bhava or psychophysiological states.

Bharata uses the rasa theory in the context of drama, only. But in latter it has been applied to all kinds of literature and particularly to poetry. Rudrata used it in his *Kavyalankar* in the context of poetry. Anandvardhan and Abhinavgupta also used the rasa in relation to poetry in very significant manner. This is implied when Abhinavgupta explains in his commentary on *Natyashastra*, to the extent that poetry resembles drama; rasa is also to be founded in poetry. Our teacher said that rasa arises in a poem if we see things as if they are happening before our very eyes. (Patnaik, 8) So, rasa can be applied not only to drama and poetry but also to all the kinds of literature which completes the above conditions.

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.

**Observations:**

1. Rasa is self-manifested for ex. as to see the Sun no other lamp is needed similarity, aesthetic pleasure not requires other means to make it manifested, because the emotions, itself turn into such sort of pleasure.
2. Rasa is indivisible. It is a blend of all the three above said elements, excited etc. any one or two of these three cannot help in its manifestation.

3. Rasa is free from the touch of any other perception that is while enjoying it; we require an extreme type of concentration of mind.

4. Rasa is nothing but joy and is also, a pure state of consciousness. It indicates that this pleasure is not like sensual pleasure which we get out of sound sleep or from any intoxication in the state of unconsciousness.

5. Rasa is also known as joy that elevates one to the supreme joy. It can be compared with the sublime joy or ecstasy that Longinus refers to in his views on the sublime. Rasa indicates that though this pleasure is not the same as is the spiritual pleasure, yet it is similar to it.

6. Rasa includes hyper-physical wonder or surprise means a kind of expansion of mind by the virtue of which a spectator or a reader becomes liberal and such state of mind can never take place in other pleasure of sensuous nature.

7. The role of an aesthete is very much significant in the rasa theory, where an ordinary person attains to the position of being a sahardya (an aesthete) i.e. when there is an exaltation of magnanimity in his mind.
8. Rasa theory has the basis of psychological principles like emotion, sentiments, expression and reception which leads it to the nature of universal and sublime category.

9. Poet is not as an ordinary person, but he is an artist with certain qualities, through which he makes us partake the various experiences and emotions that we may not have experienced in our individual lives.

10. A literary work of art is not a statement, but it is fanciful expression on the basis of artist’s imagination and richness of thought. It is verbal or written narration through the poet’s imagination, expressed in adorned and embellished language and elegant diction according to its subject matter.

11. Rasa is like the spiritual experience that makes a perceiver to identify the spirit divine which is one and un-fragmented whole. The perceiver experiences the feeling of oneness through the experience of rasa.

12. Rasa considerate the entire literary process from its very conception in the mind of the artist to its final perception in heart of the perceiver or reader. No one is left out.

Third chapter of the thesis is about Jauss’ Reception Theory. The period of 1960s is considered as a period of social unrest and several shifts have been took place during the period. Jauss was the founder member of Konstanz School in Konstanz German University. Jauss and other philosopher brought memorandum for the reform in the study of
linguistic and literature, in which they argue for the methodological changes in the Universities. The methods and values of teaching literary contexts have been doubted by German literary studies and they come to the point of crises within the current paradigm by which it was being practiced. They also questioned the sociologically and formalist approach of literary history which suppressed and concealed the role of the reader while the reader is an indispensible element to any act of interpretation. Jauss published an essay entitled as “Literary History as Challenge to literary Theory” in which he gives a historical dimension to the reader oriented criticism. He tries to achieve a compromise between Russian Formalism which ignores history and social theories which ignores the text. Jauss says: my attempt to bridge the gap between literature and history, between historical and aesthetic approach, begins at the point at which both school stop. Their methods understand the literary fact in forms of the circular aesthetic system of a dimension which unalterably belongs to its aesthetic character as well as its social function: its reception and impact. Reader, listener and spectator- in short the audience play extremely limited role in both literary theories.

Jauss derives the term ‘paradigm’ from the viewpoint of science which refers to systematic basis of concepts and assumptions working in a particular period. Everyday science does its experimental work within the mental world of a particularly paradigm, until a new paradigm displaces the old one and throws up new problems and establishes new assumptions.
Jauss uses the term ‘horizon of expectations’ to describe the criteria which a reader uses to judge literary texts in any given period. These criteria will help the reader decide how to judge a poem. The original horizon of expectations only tells us how the work was valued and interpreted when it appeared, but does not establish its meaning i.e. fixed forever and open to all readers at any period: a literary work is not an object which stands by itself........not a monument which reveals its timeless essence in a monologue. This means that we will never be able to survey the successive horizons which flow from the time of a work down to the present day and then. So the questions rise whose authority are we to accept, that of first reader, or combined opinion of readers over time or present reader?

Jauss answers these questions from philosophical hermeneutics as Gadmer argues: all interpretations of the past literature arise from a dialogue between past and present. Our attempts to understand a work will depend on the present. Our attempts to understand a work will depend on the questions which our own cultural environment allows us to raise. At the same, we seek to discover the questions which the work itself was trying to answer in its own dialogue with history. 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. Put in this way, the task of establishing knowledge of the past seems hopeless. But 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: we cannot make our journey into the past without taking the present with us. The
‘fusion of horizons’ is not, it seems, a total merging of all the points of view which have arisen but only those which to the hermeneutical sense of the critic appear to be part of the gradually emerging totality of merging which make up the true unity of the text. (Raman Seldom, 60-62) Literary history should be rewritten on this premise, he suggests seven theses (discussed in chapter no 3) that provide a systematic approach to rewriting of literary history according to aesthetic of reception and its impact.

Observations:

1. Jauss looks at literary history as a challenge to the literary theory to solve the unresolved dispute between the Marxist and formalist approach to literary history.
2. Marxist philosopher studies literary history in the light of social and economic principles but they neglected the role of an author and the text in the creation of literary work of art.
3. Formalist philosopher looks literary history and literary work in the light of textual principles (form, content and language) only. They deprived the role of author and the socio-economical background behind the literary work of art.
4. Both the Marxist and formalist philosophers have not considered the role of a reader in the historical development of a literary work of art. Jauss has built his argument on this ground. He keeps the reader at the center of the discourse and tries to establish a premise on which literary history can be rewritten according to aesthetic perspective.
5. Jauss’ aesthetic of reception plays the role of mediator between literature and general history to determine the historical series of a work of art.

6. Jauss has tried to focus the deprived dimension of literature such as its aesthetic character, social function, through its reception and its impact on the reader.

7. Reader has been placed at the center of the discourse. The historical life of a work of art is unthinkable without reader’s active participation, literary work is primarily addressed to the reader, and the author, critic and literary historian are also reader before they become productive as their relationship.

8. Jauss insists on the communication process between literary work and reader, he looks literature as dialogue between work and public through which the literary work reaches the changing horizon of expectations.

9. There is a relationship between reader and literature and it has aesthetic and historical implications. The text includes its aesthetic value in comparison with the text reader has already read and the appreciation of the first reader is continued and enriched through the further reception from generation to generation which reveals the historical significance and aesthetic value of the text.

10. The role of literary historian is declined in reception theory. The aesthetic value of the text is revealed only at the price of ignoring his own principles, comprehension and judgment.
11. Jauss argues that the first condition of literary history is the relationship between literary work and reader’s past experience which creates a dialogue.

12. The literary text does not stand as an object or monument for years together but it is like a play among its reader of given time which frees the text from the substance of the works and makes it meaningful for the time. Therefore philological scholarship should be founded on the continuous re-reading of texts, not on mere fact.

13. The history of reception is based on the analysis of the literary experience of the reader. The analysis of literary experience avoids the pitfalls of psychology, if it describes the reception and the impact of a text within the objectifyable system of expectations. These objectifyable system of expectations arises from a pre-understanding of the genre, from the form and themes familiar of works.

14. These expectations can be objectified by three general means: first, by the familiar standards of the genre, second, by the implicit relationship to familiar works of the literary historical context. Third, by the contrast between the poetic and practical function of language this is realized while a reader reads the literary text.

15. The reconstruction of horizon of expectations in this way determines its artistic nature by the kind and the degree of its influence on a presupposed audience. The aesthetic distance between given horizon of expectations and change of horizons can be objectified historically along the spectrum of the audiences.
reactions and criticism’s judgment (spontaneous success, rejection or shock, scattered approval, gradual or belated understanding).

16. The text which does not brings any horizon change but fulfills the expectations, which are prescribed by a predominant taste, by satisfying the demands for the reproduction of familiar beauty and confirming familiar sentiments are culinary or light reading.

17. The theory aesthetic of reception allows one to conceive the meaning and form of literary work in the historical unfolding of its understanding. It also, allows to insert the individual text into its ‘literary series’ and recognizes its historical position and significance in the context of literary experience.

18. The advancement in linguistics can be an occasions for overcoming the diachronic perspective that previously practiced in literary history. One can take the synchronic cross-sections of a moment in the development, to opposing and hierarchical structures and thereby to discover and overarching system of relationship in the literature of historical moment. This can be the foundation of principles of representation of a new literary history.

19. A literary historian should see the literary history as special history and its relation to general history. The social function of literature manifests itself only where the literary experience of a 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 tries to set an approach for rewriting of literary history by keeping readers role at the center of the discourse and tries to develop
the principles of representing literary history according to its reception and impact.

The fourth chapter of the thesis is a comparative study of Bharata’s rasa theory and Jauss reception theory. In the beginning of the chapter researcher has attempted to define the comparative literature, its history, scope, limitation and art of comparison. The comparison between both the theories has been made upon certain elements such as origin of the theory, its source, background, approach, assumption, method, principles etc.

The process of comparison or comparative includes: an art of comparing for the examination of two or more objects, ideas and people. It is intended to note the similarities and differences between or among objects, ideas or people. Comparative theory is one of the methods of study in different branches of knowledge. Comparative study develops two or more than two objects, theories, literature in comparison at the same time. It 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.
Rasa Theory and Reception Theory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Bharat’s Rasa Theory</th>
<th>Jauss’ Reception Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Similarities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rasa theory puts perceiver at the center point of the discourse.</td>
<td>Reception theory puts reader at the center of entire discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Literary experience: rasa means experience of aesthetic pleasure.</td>
<td>Literary experience: the aesthetic of reception means a process of literary experience of a text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aesthetic quality of literature: rasa theory claims that literature has an aesthetic quality which appeals the perceiver’s bhava.</td>
<td>Literature has the aesthetic quality that takes reader to his live praxis, expectation and impacts on his social behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dialogue: rasa theory insists on the dialogic relationship between the incident performed on the stage and perceiver.</td>
<td>Reception theory also assumes that there is a dialogic relationship between reader and text which involves reader in the process of aesthetic of reception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Psychological aspects: rasa theory deals with the psychological aspects of human.</td>
<td>Reception theory also incorporates a psychological aspect of a reader that is horizon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
being such as Bhava (sthayibhav, Vibhav, Anubhav and Vyabhichyaribhav). Bharata states that the proper combination of sthayibhav with other three bhava through work of art leads to the manifestation of rasa. of expectations which denotes the criteria which the reader use to judge literary work of in any given period. These horizons of expectations are determined by the previous experience, literary value and artistic principles of a reader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Social function of literature: rasa theory assumes that literature has the capability to bring change in perceiver’s life. Perceiver enters into his daily life through the principle of Sadharanikaran (universalization or generalization) and finds the solution for his own difficulties from new experience.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Social function of literature manifests itself when the literary experience of a reader enters into his horizon of expectations of living life performs his understanding of the world and thereby also effect on his social behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process of literary creation: The entire process of literary creation from its conception to final perception by perceiver is taken into consideration in the rasa theory. Though reception theory deals with only the text and reader relationship, Jauss states that author is also reader before response relationship to literature become productive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rasa theory accepts the varieties of perceiver. According to Bharata perceiver are of different kinds for ex. they can be classified by the <em>guna</em> that they have most in quantity such as <em>sattva, rajas</em> and <em>tamas</em>.</th>
<th>Jauss also accepts the individuality of the reader according to his expectations determined by his previous literary knowledge, his socio-cultural, economical and historical background.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Combination/Fusion (literary experience): rasa is manifested thorough the proper combination of <em>sthayibhav</em> to <em>vibhav</em>, <em>anubhav</em> and <em>Vyabhichyaribhav</em> in an action performed on the stage.</td>
<td>Similarly in the reception theory reader communicates with text continuously and enters in his horizon of expectation where he finds the solution that what he expects (Fulfillment of expectation) simultaneously meets new challenges (change in expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Perceiver/reader: Bharata calls perceiver as ‘sahardya’ i.e. is the person with certain poetic sensibility or generous/magnanimous person.</td>
<td>Jauss assumes every reader as an individual reader with certain horizon of expectations with some artistic value that he has come across at his previous reading or experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissimilarities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Origin: rasa theory has been originated in ancient period of India in the work of Bharat’s ‘natyashastra’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Objectives: rasa theory is a part of natyashastra which is intended to prepare the essence of writing a good play. Rasa theory not investigates the whole play but studies the role of perceiver in its manifestation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Background: Bharata’s rasa theory has been formulated with lacking much scholarly established background on literary theory and criticism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rasa theory has been formulated independently and it is not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reception theory has been developed to overcome the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reception theory has been originated in Germany in the essay of Hans Robert Jauss entitled as “Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jauss wants bridge the gap between Marxist and formalist approach of writing literary history. He aims to design a model for rewriting literary history and to establish new literary canon according to reception of literary text and its impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jauss reception theory has a very strong background of reader response theory. In fact reception theory is considered as the historical application of reader response theory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intended to find out the solution on the question that previous theory has raised or created.</td>
<td>problem of rewriting literary history and to get rid from the traditional approach such as Marxism and formalism of writing literary history as they lack their relevance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The psychological aspects (sthayibhav, Vibhav, Anubhav and Vyabhicharyabhav) discussed in rasa theory are universal and commonly present in all human being. They are inborn and deeply rooted in human’s innermost psychology.</td>
<td>Jauss concepts ‘horizon of expectations’ which has some psychological implications, is depend upon the external aspects as readers previous literary knowledge, socio-economical background which is very much individual and not universal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The element of bhava is inborn in its nature and it lies in human unconsciousness permanently, it can be appealed by the vibhav intermingled in the action performed on the stage.</td>
<td>Jauss concept horizon of expectations is not inborn in its nature but it is determined by reader’s external aspects like previous knowledge etc. the continuous dialogue between text and reader leads to the readers expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>In rasa theory it is literary work</td>
<td>In reception theory reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rasa theory deals with the perceivers state of mind i.e. bhava and does not think about the other aspect of literary work such as authors background and history.</td>
<td>Reception theory signifies the role of reader in the reception with his expectation and also tries to determine the historical significance and place of literary work in its literary tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>that appeals to the perceiver’s sthayibhav and takes him to the realization of rasa i.e. aesthetic pleasure.</td>
<td>engages himself in a dialogue with a text and tries to meet his expectations and new challenges. (Literary experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The social function of literary work of art has not been discusses comprehensively in rasa theory.</td>
<td>Reception theory relates the social function of literary work with the literary experience of a reader which impact on the reader’s social behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rasa theory opens a passageway to writing good play according to perceiver’s psychological states.</td>
<td>Reception theory tries to establish a model to rewrite literary history according to the aesthetic of reception and impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion:

The rasa theory is one of the ancient literary theories India. Bharata has expounded it in *Natyashastra*; it deals with the entire discussion on dramaturgy and its essence of good writing. As Bharata argues, rasa theory deals with different kinds of emotions, their depiction, inclusion and transmission through a work of art. Rasa theory views literature as it is about life and emotions. The function of playwright is to observe these emotions in a work art and represent it successfully on the stage. The theory deals with the common element to all mankind at all times i.e. emotion. The validity of rasa theory lies there.

Rasa theory is impartial and objective in its nature. It deals with the bhava and states of mind i.e. common to all human being at all times. The bhava discussed in rasa theory re inborn and permanent lies in human mind. Critic has no scope to put its personal judgment and conclusion. Rasa theory helps to eradicate the subjectivity and partially from the process of criticism.

Rasa theory can be applied to any kind of literature as literary theory is about literature primarily. One can observe the various bhava or can experience them one own self. The theory considers the entire process of literary work from its very conception in the mind of an artist to its perception by perceiver or spectator. It leads to an excellent text which has capacity to transport the principle of aesthetic pleasure i.e. rasa. Rasa theory allows one to see how emotion suggested through the actions or words and finally the audience who perceives the pleasure.
The rasa theory acknowledges all the factors for their indispensability. The theory provides a total view which makes up this coherent theory. As P. Patnaik says (2) rasa theory has tremendous linguistic potential, for an emotion cannot be shown or communicated directly. It can only be suggested (dhvani) through the words or their equivalents. Rasa theory has double potential, it has provides a background for many other literary theories in later period and to newer philosophical speculation at the same time it can applied to any literary art.

Rasa theory is generally applicable to any literary work of art. The rasa i.e. aesthetic pleasure exists in music, dance, sculpture and painting because all these form of art capable to suggesting the bhava or psychophysiological states of mind. Rasa theory is flexible enough in is nature, it has developed over the centuries, more than thousand years, it has become authentic and more complete. The rasa such as shanta rasa and bhakti rasa have been contributed by later philosophers.

Reception theory is one the modern literary theories in western tradition. Jauss has formulated it in his essay entitled “Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory”. It includes the discussion on rewriting literary history according to aesthetic of reception and its impact. It deals with some thesis that creates an approach for rewriting an approach for literary history. It minimizes the role of literary historian by leaving his own literary value and judgment out of the process, and forces him to incorporate with the relationship between a literary work and a reader reception theory deals with the horizon of expectations of the reader which is built by reader previous literary experience, artistic
value. It is common in all reader that they possess some expectations before they begin to read a new text. The authentic, impartial and objective nature of reception theory is depend upon whether the literary historian able to determine the objectifieable horizon of expectations. Every reader differs from each other on the ground of previous knowledge and experience about the literary genre is going to read. Therefore it is difficult define authenticity of the reader and finally it becomes difficult to determine the historical significance and place of literary text in its literary series. Rewriting of literary history of any nation, language, culture etc. through this approach is possible only if the historian could catch the expectations of readers that succeeding the particular literary tradition.

Reception theory is intended to rewriting literary history and to establish new literary canons according aesthetic of reception and impact. Jauss theory is not as other literary theories but it is historical applications of reader response oriented theory. In take into consideration the process of a literary text from its publication to reception by the reader and its recognition of historical significance. Jauss not discusses about author, forms and content of a text in detail and insists only on reader’s role. Jauss aesthetic of reception is applicable to all forms of literature. But, its application to other forms of art is questionable because the objective expectations of the perceiver regarding the forms such as music, dance painting etc. are subjective again. It is not flexible enough as rasa theory. It has not rich tradition and full-fledged attention by other literary philosopher. It has historical
application and not much literary approach as it tries to bridge the gap between Marxist and Formalist approach of literary history.

Both these theories have some common elements such as suggestiveness of literature, role of perceiver, literary experience, reception and impact. They differ on the ground of their aims and objective. Rasa theory is a part of Natyashastra which is written as a guide book of writing a good play. The rasa theory originally developed as a study of human mind and its role in the literary experience not as literary theory. If one studies rasa theory separately from the Natyashastra it looks like a literary theory with all relevance. Reception theory is formulated on the background of Reader Response Theory. Jauss has tried to see literary history through the principles of reception of literary text and its impact on the reader. The reception theory also not developed for any kind of literary criticism but it is developed for the rewriting of literary history through the reader’s perspectives. At the same time it questions the traditional literary canons established according to socio-economical and textual perspectives. Jauss argues on this premise and ask to reestablish literary canons according to reception of the text and its impact.

**The relationship of the rasa theory and the reception theory can be summarized as two boats in the same river, loaded with same content, moving in the same direction but leading to different goals.**
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