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CONCLUSION

Tradition and Orthodoxy have to exist together if a morally stable literature is to emerge. Eliot's and Tholkāppiar's persistent concern for their art genius and their essentiality on religion were virtually the main forces that led them to the sphere of the 'auditory imagination'. "Language and literature are fundamentally one, Speech gives rise to writing, granted. But once writing has come into being, it stabilizes, mould it, give it a more pleasing form, endow it with a richer vocabulary" (Pei 265). Being conscious of this fact, T.S. Eliot and Tholkāppiyar have written their works as ever monumental, which deals with science of literature.

From the studies of words based on the texts of Tholkāppiyam, we know the state of language during the age of Tholkāppiyar. Tholkāppiyam itself as a whole may be considered as a literature though it deals with the Science of Language and the Science of Literature.

Its divisions into three books, each containing nine chapters, make it a perfect work of art, with an exquisite symmetry of pattern. The verse, Tholkāppiyar has chosen, is the blank one which resembles Āsiriyam is one of the four main divisions of poetry. It is not the 'Sūtra' (formulae) form of Sanskrit. There are rhymes and alliterations in almost all the verses. When we go through the verses the rhythmical order captivates our mind, and makes us forget that we are studying a book of grammar.
Tholkāppiyar has a new technique in communicating ideas. He expects the reader to have what he has read in the previous pages in his memory. So, when he enjoins a rule and he repeats what he has said already. He says that it is quiet natural in his verses 222, 265, 275 in ‘Eluththu’. This brevity is one of the chief characteristics of poetry, which enlivens the reader. If literature is to deal with the experience of the author, Tholkāppiyam may be considered as one which deals with the experience of Tholkāppiyar. The subject matter of Tholkāppiyam is nothing but his experience of Tamil language and literature and the life of Tamils. It is an intellectual experience. So, Tholkāppiyam is to be considered as a work of literature-Pure and applied.

Ancient Tamils held the view that the study of the Tamil language must result in the study of literature which would in turn guide the people to the life of pleasure. So they called the literature as ‘Poru’ means - which cared for in life and the subject of life.

Literature is the finest flower of language and most enjoyable form of art loved by the learned. “No literature; no life” seems to be the motto of the ancient philosophers of Tamil Nadu. To them the final aim of language study is the study of literature and to know life through literature, for literature is the initiation of life. Therefore Tholkāppiyar has dealt with the science of literature in the third book as a corollary to the study of language.

We have found that Tholkāppiyar has dealt with (i) form, and (ii) content. We have examined this with illustrations, the details of the kinds of literature Aham and
*Puṭam.* Now we deduce the following principles of literature from the detailed analysis that all literatures fall into two major divisions—*Aḥam* and *Puṭam*.

*Aḥam* and *Puṭam* have seven kinds of divisions each. It is said to be those works which deal with love and marriage and *Puṭam* to be those which deal with all matters other than love. The subject matter of a poem will be concerned with *muthal*, *karu* and *uri*. *Muthal* is time and space. The origin of time and space is not easily found out. So they are called the first. *Karu* is said to be those which belong to a particular region. Fourteen things including God and food are mentioned in verse 18 which belongs to *karu*. *Uri* is said to be those actions which evolve love affairs. So literature is concerned with the people and their life with reference to their surrounding. Nobody is to be mentioned by the proper name in Aḥam literature. There are two kinds of similes—*Uḷḷuṭai* and *Enai*—employed in the literature. In *Puṭam*, words are allowed to be used to denote the meanings other than those which they ordinarily denote. Beasts, birds, trees and the inanimate objects may be said to have spoken and acted as human beings in verse 196 of *Porul*.

The function of literature is to create feeling in the hearts of reader of hearers. Such feelings are grouped into eight, each having four sorts in the verses from 251 to 259 which Eliot calls it an ‘auditory imagination’. The lover and the lady-love are main characters in *Aḥam* literature. They are portrayed to be equal in nativity, family trait, strength, age, and the means of enjoying love, chastity, graciousness, understanding, and wealth. They must not be portrayed of having jealousy, crookedness, wondering, slander, harsh word, and carelessness in duty, laziness,
thinking highly of their family, indulgence in pleasure ignorance, forgetfulness and mentality of comparison. When describing the course of secret love, pärppan, pāngan, thōli, sevili, husband and wife are the characters to be employed to make speeches. When describing the course of wedded-love, pānar, kūthhar, vifali, paraththai, arivar, kandör and those of secret love are the persons to make utterances.

The literature is expected to aim at the achievement of three main objects in life: aram (virtue), porul (wealth) and inbam (Pleasure) and it alone stands as the main principles of literature to be followed by the poets in the making of literature.

Literature is termed as ‘Seyyul’ in Tholkāppiyam. Seyyul means that which is composed. Now it denotes poetry only. In the view of Abercrombie, the word poetry, is understood that it may very well stands for whole. For poetry is the essence of literature; in poetry, what whole business of literature the communication of pure experience in language, is concentrated to its utmost intensity. Whatever is true, on general grounds, of poetry, will be true of literature as a whole and whenever our theory speaks of poetry, it will be of poetry as the type of the art of literature. This statement holds good for Tamil Seyyul also. So, Seyyul in Tamil came to denote poetry alone in the Post-Tholkāppiyar age. Seyyul seems to be the equivalent of the English word composition. Tholkāppiyar says that the constituents of composition are thirty four (313(223). From his statement it is clear that the composition appears to have these thirty four constituents even before his time. So the form of literature had been well-developed and had reached its perfection as an art only by Tholkāppiyar.
Those who made these compositions were called the poets of great fame. They were neither bards nor wandering ministers. The word ‘Pulavar’ meant the person who was a scholar in the art of composition and in any branch of science which was useful to humanity.

Tholkāppiyar uses another word ‘Yāppu’ to denote the composition in verse 390 in Porul. ‘Yāppu’ means that which is built or made. This word denotes exactly the form of literature. He says that the forms of literature are of seven kinds which are ‘pāṭtu’ (poem), ‘urai’ (prose), ‘nūl’ (the systematic treatise), ‘vāymōli’ (the book of morals), ‘pisi’ (the book of riddles), ‘angatham’ (the book of satire) and ‘muthusoV’ (the book of proverbs) in Porul 391.

Tholkāppiyar has given an elaborate description of these forms in the chapter ‘Seyyul’. It is mentioned as ten kinds of rhymes and their nature in the chapter on Composition, he points out that the scholars says that there are thirteen thousand seven hindered and eight rhymes in accordance with the traditional grammar in his verse 413 of Porul.

Among the seven forms of literature ‘pāṭtu’ denotes metrical forms of limited lines. By metrical form, it is divided into four kinds which are ‘vēnba’, ‘āsiriyappā’, ‘kallippā’ and ‘vanjippā’, each having different melody. ‘Pura nilai’, ‘vāyurai’ and ‘seviyārivuru’ which are name by the content they express, have the metrical form of ‘venba’ and ‘asiriyam’ in verse 473 of Porul. ‘Kaikkilai’ is known by the content and ‘paripādal’ by its form of verse (Porul501).
Content of literature also falls into *Aham* and *Puṭam* divisions. The life of the people in their various activities will be the content of the literature. The themes of poems are named on the basis of the content. In *Aham* literature, the names of the poems are only five which are *Kuṭinji, Pālai, Mullai, Maṟutham* and *Neythal*, each will have a different theme. Theme is called ‘*thūrai*’ in Tamil. The expression made by any of the characters who are mentioned to have the right of speech-making is called ‘*kilavi*’. Tholkāppiyar has mentioned the places of making expressions which belong to *Aham* in the chapters, *Ahaththinai, Kalavu* and *karpu*; and those which belong to *Puṭam* in the chapter *Puṭathinai*. The verses numbers are, 36,39,40,41,43,44,50,100,101,102,103,107,111,113,114,115,146,147,148,149,150,151,152,153,154,155,157,168,170,172 and 177, point out the occasions and the persons to make expressions (Kilavi) which form the themes of literature of *Aham*. The verses 58, 60, 64,67,68,72,76,79,90 and 91 describe the themes for composing the poems of *Puṭam* literature. All literature is to be secular in their content and to be pleasing in forms. Thus the forms of literature appear to be manifold and they are known either by their form or by their content. All literature is to be secular in their content and to be pleasing in forms.

Tholkāppiyar has allotted a full chapter called ‘*Uvama Iyal*’ which is a chapter on ‘*simile*’ to explain the use of simile in literature. He gives the descriptions of animal and vegetable kingdoms in *Maṟapu Iyal* as he expects all poets to be fully conversant with their surroundings.
Besides, it is the most important from Tholkāppiyar’s poetry; the poems consist of dramatic monologues. Tholkāppiyar enumerates certain illustrative contexts in the various aspects of ‘aham’ and ‘puram’ poetry where the character could speak and reveal a dramatic moment. It makes clear that in this particular period, no narrative poetry or epic but only a series of dramatic monologues. This is one of the most important aspects of the literary theory of Tholkāppiyam. At the seventh century, Dandin realized the importance of this literary theory about poetic anthologies and therefore spoke only of two kinds of poetry, the poetry of anthologies and the epic poems. As in the words of T.P.Meenakshi sundaram, "Many a gem of purest ray serene may be hidden in the sea of experience, and many are the hidden ways of the subtle artists, working on these valuable gems. Many like the epic poets are great in weaving beautiful patterns, immortalized in the pearl necklace of a queen or in the diamond diadem of a king - the varying dispositions of the many faceted gems satisfying the varying tastes and vanities of the rich. Some like the Cankam poets are great in carving out glistening and living forms of the Divine Dance [Ratna Sabhapati] or the Female Beauty, in each individual gem, infusing and vivifying the dead stone, with their life breath and mystical vision, making it, in short, the Absolute. How can this Absolute be reduced to the relative in a pattern?" (63). Tholkāppiyar has mentioned Vanappu as the last of the organs of a literary composition contemplates some narrative poetry or literature. Literature is composed in the ordinary dialect of the common man and it has common verse and prose. The other kinds do not contemplate any continuous narrative (Tholkāppiyar, sutras). Vanappu comes at the end as a vague remembrance of a forgotten tradition of an earlier age.
An important aspect of literature is an attempt by the poet to capture the poetic essence of the dramatic moment in the form of living phrases and poetic metaphors and similes which function as the life of the verse. It is what compressed in poetry. This paves way to become the names of such verses and often takes the immortal names of the poets themselves. This idea is depicted in ‘Netunōkai’ and ‘Pāttuppātu’, the dramatic and poetic compression is felt. This provides a great place being given to suggestion. Figures of Speech consist of various kinds of metaphors and similes. There is ‘ullurai’ ‘uvamam’ which is an implied metaphor (Porul 526-546,547-554 (246-248). Apart from it, other kinds of suggestions were not only of the meaning but also of emotions and ideals. ‘iraicci’ is a general name given to this suggestion.(229 (209)

The emphasis of Tholkāppiyar lays on poetic sentiments or meyppātu or Rasa in Sanskrit and what Eliot calls ‘auditory imagination’ is to be understood. He speaks of eight rasas- nakai (hasya), uvakai (happiness), suffering (soka), vira (heroism) physical, moral, intellectual and spiritual, ilivaral (jugupsa) or a kind of shuddering at meanness; knodha (anger), bhaya (fear) and adbhuta (wonder) (Sutras 1197). Tholkāppiyar clearly points out the various emotions which play an important part in the various dramatic moments of Aham poetry (Sutras 1207-1214).

Tholkāppiyar focuses on this ‘rasa’ or ‘meyppātu’, thus showing the importance of these poetic sentiments by a description at the appropriate time and place of the context. When we happen to understand such dramatic monologues, it becomes familiar with the conventions of such poetry. For interpreting such a verse, it
is necessary, as emphasized by Tholkāppiyar to know “who the speaker is, to whom it is spoken, its dramatic context in aham or puram; the time implied therein as a looking back or as a looking forward and the various strata of meaning and rich suggestion because such poetry believing as it does in compression should have recourse to an elaborate theory of suggestion and meyppādu or rasā or poetic sentiment”. (1441 etc., 1445 etc., 1452 etc., 1457 etc., 1460, 1462 etc.)

The theory of poetry in Tholkāppiyam deals with the sounds and the meanings together form one united whole in the aspects of form and content. It seems to be vague since it is connected to criticism but a careful analysis and understanding reveals the great organic theory of poetry as conceived by Tholkāppiyar.

We conceive an idea of Eliot's what he calls ‘auditory imagination’. “The other organs of the verse like the meaning made clear by the context, the elaborate ramifications by allusions and suggestions glowing into life, by sweet remembrances as described at length by Prof. Richards, the lexical traditions of words and their significance, the elliptical construction or the yearning for the predicate after every pause in the continuous flow of the sense making the whole a continuity, and the retrospective and prospective constructions as looking backward and forward to bring about a well known organized unity, are but ordinary grammatical themes. Various ways of the reader's understanding of a poem and an usual grasp of the meaning are utilized for swaying the mind, “thereby heaving up with the crest of the poetic wave and ebbing away with its trough, and his hypnotized intellect, reasoning
with the music and meaning of the poem, and thereby, becoming one with the theme" (Meenakshisundaram 55).

The other components of the verse are its “speaker, the persons addressed, the time and place, the effect, the sentiment, the generality, the particularity and the universality of the poem, the last head reminding us of Jung's archetypes and the unconscious racial and individual memories”(57). All these are under the head of meaning and subject matter. These form the poetic theme in “concrete and specific reality, vivified by its glowing emotion, appealing to every heart by its universality or archetype, becoming of momentous value, as the expression of a fundamental mode of intrinsically ennobling human behaviour; its value carrying with itself the imprimatur of personal experience” (59).

The value of a work of art consists not merely in the progressive organization of impulses for freedom and fullness of life according to Richards, but also of the open recognition of amoral sanction which is, in the old phraseology, revealed to the artist. The eight-fold facades and the import of the parts are attempts at telescoping these various strata of poetry, viz. the sound, the music, the significance, its sweep and development, the emotion and the final experience. Everything, thus, appears to be of great importance in the final make up of the poetic personality of the verse, reflecting the personality of the poet.

Hence, Tholkāppiyar seems to be aware of the ephemeral nature of the world on the basis of which he preaches morals to the world (78,79 Porul 170). There is no
mention of any religion or sect in Tholkāppiyam. Therefore, it is to be concluded that the religion found in Tholkāppiyam is the religion of the poets, humanism, and that the philosophy is the philosophy of living well, being useful to others. It is clear that the ancient Tamils way of life as revealed in Tholkāppiyam is “Have faith in God and serve others”. Thus it is clear that Tholkāppiyar has the concept of having not only ‘form and content’ but ‘the way of life’ as religion in his mind in making of literature always great in the Tamil literature.

Thus, in the sphere of the poetic drama, as Tholkāppiyar, Eliot has advocacy for permanent values in life; his adherence to the sense of tradition in literature; and his awareness of an artist’s moral obligations to society did not permit him to indulge in any aristocracy in art. Eliot’s contribution to the drama is marked by his distinct achievements. In the first place, he has expounded the dramatic theories, which give an insight into his own understanding of the subject. Secondly, he has written plays, in which we find his theories in operation. In the words of H.L.Sharma,

His preoccupation with a playwright’s endeavours to use the drama as an instrument of socio-religious communication; his regard for the classical methods as practiced by the great dramatists of the past; his enthusiasm for the creation of a suitable form of verse for the drama, and his concern for integrating drama and poetry together into the organic web of the rituals are some of the basic tenets. (62)

Eliot’s plays have not only restore the lost link between religion and drama, but have also become instrumental in making the drama an integral part of the contemporary tradition in art and literature.(162)
The dramatic theories of Eliot are influenced by his personal attitude towards life and problems. He is aware of the moral uncertainty of the world and as a writer; he is ever-conscious of his duties and responsibilities to his people. And so, Eliot upholds his view on moral and spiritual values. At the religious level, he accepts the Anglo-Catholic faith and at the literary level, he advocates strict adherences to the sense of tradition.

Eliot's whole approach to the drama is conditioned by his belief that man's present predicament is the direct outcome of a gradual process of spiritual devitalization and he wants to make efforts for his spiritual salvation. Such efforts, however, demand from man and unflinching sense of discipline, which religion alone has the power to cultivate. In this sense, the plays Eliot has written are legitimate products of his abiding faith in religion as a means of redeeming man's spiritual glory. These plays, though religious in every sense of the world, never teach religion in the form of a dogma. At their best, they may be regarded as genuine shifts into spiritual awareness in as far as their themes uphold the basic truth, which sustains Eliot's world-view, the primacy of the supernatural order over the natural world. And thus Eliot conveys the 'reality' of the Christian explanation of the world and the validity of Christian values for society.

The Murder in the Cathedral deals with the martyrdom of Becket. The play is divided into two parts which are connected by the 'interlude' of the Archbishop's sermon in the morning. Even in the sermon itself, Thomas points out the special significance of the Christian Mass. He conveys that it is both the celebration of the joy of Christ's birth and the sorrow of His death. Thomas differentiates God's peace
from the peace as the world knows it and draws the analogy between Christ and the martyr. He closes the sermon with his newly won insight into martyrdom—which the martyr is not made by his own design but is by God’s decision. And the situation continues when Thomas is threatened by the Knights; he answers that he is ready for martyrdom. And the events in Murder in the Cathedral are presented as ‘neither tragic nor comic, but Christian’ (Smith 102) achieves glory as he suffers martyrdom.

Christ sheds his blood “for the remission of human sin and the martyr, in return, sheds his blood both in repayment for and in re-enactment of Christ’s sacrifice”(109). Blood is a multiple symbol in the play and the women of the Canterbury view it differently—as a symbol of good and evil, guilt and glory. And thus Eliot makes Becket a martyr by making him submit his will to the will of God, which inspires even the ordinary men and women of Canterbury. Even though the play The Family Reunion deals with the contemporary world, the goal ultimately attained is the same. The normality of the play is continuously disrupted. In the surface action, the family (and audience) is gathered in expectation of one kind of reunion, but finds another kind of union portrayed.

characters such as the aunts and uncles, who begin by speaking the most ordinary prose sentiments, break into choral chants; scenes, such as that between Mary and Harry, which begin in the expectation of romance or ‘love interest’, end in rejection of human love in favour of the love of God (117).
The total effect was intended to be the presentation of a modern counterpart to the universal experience of religious purgation. The demands of Harry's reunion story disrupt the reality of their world. His reunion is a family reunion, not only in the sense that 'he is helped to understanding by Agatha and Mary' (125) but also as he is taught that 'he must acknowledge the truth about his parents and become reunited with his past as a means to self-knowledge and ultimate union with God (122). He is made to realize that part of his burden of sin and guilt is a family heritage. Eliot portrays Harry as a sick-souled person who is ready to take up the cross and who willingly surrenders his will to His will. Eliot projects Harry as leaving behind all his work and will and becoming a martyr to achieve the ultimate end. Agatha is presented as a representative of the spiritual world and Celia in *The Cocktail Party*, we have one more spiritually evolved person. Except Sir Henry Harcourt-Reilly the other characters in *The Cocktail Party* are in grip of triangular love. As the play moves on, Alex and Celia are in league with the doctor and have arranged appointments for Edward and Lavinia and for Celia.

Celia is convinced in her consultation with the doctor that her real love affair is with God. She is sent to Sir Henry's "Sanatorium" for which he found Edward and Lavinia unfit. Then the action takes place two years later just before another cocktail party given by the Chamberlayness. Everyone is presented this time except Celia who achieves martyrdom while serving the natives of Kankanja. As a representative of the Negative way of Christian sainthood and martyrdom,

Celia also suffers spiritual death and rebirth,

But in reversed terms. In the discovery that
She had loved an imagined creation of her
Own making, she suffers the death of her
Hopes for a life in the world, but in her
Acceptance of the Negative Way she is reborn in (128)

In her martyrdom she suffers physical death but achieves eternal life, just as she achieves another kind of Christian marriage in the union of the saint with God.

Thus Celia’s death acts as a spiritual catalyst to all those present that lives had been involved with hers. Through Sir Henry’s vision of the ‘triumph’ of her death, Edward and Lavinia gain a new insight into the other path which they are not equipped to follow. Peter has a glimmering perception that he might some day share her path.

Thus Eliot’s plays Murder in the Cathedral, The Family Reunion and The Cocktail Party dramatize the theme of martyrdom, not as a privileged prerogative of a few superior souls like the archbishop of Canterbury but as the birthright of every individual, especially of this century, in which there has been a disintegration of spiritual values and man feels torn inside and thoroughly alienated. Again martyrdom, as dramatized by Eliot in these three plays, is not achieved merely through renunciation as in the case of Celia. Eliot’s idea seems to be that man need not leave hearth and home but must face life where he is, as Beckett faced the knights, surrendering his will and the noise of reason so that His will might be done. Each man carries the sin of humanity as Harry carries the sin of his father and the only way to expiate sin is to give up the past (guilt) and the future (dreams and fears) and live the present under His will. Thus each person is a potential martyr. We see Beckett,
Agatha and Reilly playing the roles of the Guru guiding the tortured souls to salvation. Beckett teaches by example the Women of Canterbury en masse, Agatha guides Harry, and Reilly initiates Celia and the Edwards to the life eternal. Celia, Lavinia, Edward and even Amy definitely get a grasp of the message and are shown as prophets in the making. Thus Eliot has thrown open the door of martyrdom to all alike. Eliot’s concept of martyrdom makes him truly eclectic and deeply humanistic.

The seeming Contradiction:

Honest criticism and sensitive appreciation are directed not upon the poet but upon the poetry. (SE 49)

T.S.Eliot in his “Religion and Literature” has said “The greatness’ of literature cannot be determined by literary standards though we must remember that whether it is literature or not can be determined only by literary standards. Austin Warren feels “the work of literature is an aesthetic object capable of arousing aesthetic experience” (Wellek 241) and asks “Can evaluate a literary work entirely upon aesthetic criteria or do we need, as T.S.Eliot suggests, to judge the greatness of literature by extra aesthetic criteria? (241).

Eliot’s statement seems unbecoming of “a major figure in the development of formalistic criticism” (Scott 179). Eliot takes in the question of the judgement of a literary work. Eliot came under the influence of Pound and Hulme and “announced the high place of art as art, rather than as expression of social religious, ethical or political ideas and advocated the close study of the texts of the works themselves” (179). He applied his view of poetry as an “independent organism” (179) in many of his critical essays. He drew the attention in Blackmur’s words “to the facts in the
work under consideration as they are relevant to literature as such" (179). His historical pronouncement in Tradition and the Individual Talent that the poet escapes into the poem from emotion and personality took the critics away from biographical examinations into scrutiny of the craft of the poem. "He was in short concerned to formulate a kind of criticism that would be free of the pursuit of extrinsically historic moral psychological and sociological interpretations and free to concentrate on the aesthetic quality of the work" (180).

From what we have seen so far we understand Eliot a staunch supporter of formalism pays much attention to the aesthetic part of literature. According to Eliot's formalistic principles the judgement of art should be intrinsic, not extrinsic. That is to say that no eternal measurement is necessary to evaluate a work of art.

The second part of Eliot's evaluatory prescription is in full agreement with his art-oriented formalism. But it is the first part that provokes a controversy. It is about the question of greatness. Such question of greatness brings us to standards and norms and leads people to see a contradiction in Eliot. The critic who said, "Honest criticism and sensitive appreciation is directed not upon the poet but upon the poetry" (SE 73). In his epoch making "Tradition and the Individual Talent" with a thorough objectivity has also, to the shock of his own followers uttered several statements in his critical essay "Religion and Literature". Eliot believes that great literature is judged great by "explicit ethical and theological standards" (Scott 43). Elsewhere he says "our religion imposes our ethics, our judgement and criticism of ourselves, and our behaviour towards our fellowmen" (47). Yet in another place he says, "What I believe to be incumbent upon all Christians is the duty of maintaining consciously certain
standards and criteria of criticism over and above those applied by the rest of the world …” (53). While speaking about maintaining the standards Eliot exhorts us this way: “we must tirelessly criticize it (literature the best of its kind) according to our own principles”(54).

All these are statements going against Eliot stood for in criticism. We know his views on impersonality of poetry and the poetic process. Poetry according to him is not inspiration but organization. It means the greatness of organization decides the greatness of the poem itself. In other words the greatness of a poem does not depend upon the type of pleasure it gives or the quality of moral development it effects, but on the order and unity it imposes on the chaotic and desperate experiences of the poet. It only reiterates the point that a good poem or a great poem is perfect organization and organization is everything. If so why should Eliot bring in extra-aesthetic criteria like “religion” to be applied to literature to make it “great” is the question the pro-intrinsic evaluators would like to ask? They may argue that it is a clear contradiction. Eliot who said “the progress of an artist is a continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of personality” (SE 73) seems to contradict himself by recovering personality from surrendering itself and denying a continual extinction of it by asserting that religion ought to be applied to literature to make it great. What becomes clear, in this analysis, is that religion here is equated to personality.

But a closer look at Eliot’s statement will reveal that the contradiction is not a real one but only a seeming one. It is a contradiction to those who fall to look at the fact that Eliot has proposed a dichotomy in his statement for the cake of analytical convenience. It was necessitated by the lack of a criterion to distinguish the ‘ordinary’
from the ‘great’ in literature. As a responsible critic it was his moral obligation to state what he felt in serving excellence and truth, now it must be seen that Eliot by such a statement wants us to understand that norms of literature found within literature is simply criticism and norms found outside literature to decide whether it is great or not is theory of criticism. Thus one is intrinsic and the other extrinsic. Without these two, criticism cannot survive to maintain definitions and standards.

To those who argue that where is a dichotomy in Eliot, it is clear, religion is personality and therefore this is a clear contradiction for, formalism or structuralism proposes to emphasize reader art relationship and the assessment of work thereby. The work of art itself is the only source available to a critic to evaluate it. No extra-aesthetic criteria could be made the yardstick. As Elder Olsen puts it, “The form is the end of everything else in the poem would be found explicable in terms of it” (217-18).

It must be observed that those who accept the indispensability of Eliot’s “historical sense” (SE 71) also see that what Eliot means by tradition has much to do with religion as religion is the great part of tradition. It is a vital thing too. And we know what Eliot means by tradition it is not the dead past but the living past. Now what is the living past? It is the past that is relieved as part of the present as it cannot be separated from the present. Having defined what tradition is, we have the next searching question of what it is made of. Tradition which is the living past is a composition of all human experiences. Now, when we speak of literature, we speak of the best of the human past and human experiences that are evidently those about religion which has passed into the present as a major influence and archetype. 224
Such an awareness will enable the literal formalists to see that Eliot has used the word "religion" in a wider sense. Religion is not, as some believe something vague, a set of mystifying arbitrary principles, or a separate entity altogether and that it has no impact on one's character and that one can easily do without it. Again it must be added that it is not an orthodox bulk meant for unthinking people.

According to Eliot 'religion' is lived experience, and therefore it has inevitably become an archetype in literature. Those who see the dichotomy have difficulty in correlating impersonality theory to outside world. But, for Eliot and the like religion as said above is a 'lived experience' and therefore passes into 'artistic experience.' Religious emotions' become really 'art emotions' because this protagonist 'lives' his religion; it is his lived experience. Only those who look upon religion as something alien to human sensibilities see religious emotions are life emotions and these emotions are not part of one's aesthetic sensibilities.

Therefore, according to this understanding, there can be no art without this life experience passed on to it. Eliot's "Journey of the Magi" is a superb example to illustrate this point. It describes the difficult journey of the three wise men from the east on their way to see child Jesus. It is symbolic of the hesitation that people show to undergo hardships for the sake of higher things in life like religious experience. The difficulties of the Magi experienced during the journey, realistically illustrate that religious experience is nothing but life experience and the spiritual experience, as some imagine, does not belong to a world of one's making.

The winter and the cold, the sore-footed camels and the rowdiest act of the camel drivers the hunger and the temptations to give up the journey and return to the
world of summer girls bringing sherbet are experiences coming out of real life situations.

Life looks meaningless and void and existence purposeless. We are tempted to give up life and wish for escape or death. Such real life, situational hopelessness is illustrated in the poem: the art.

> With the voice singing in our ears, saying
> That this was all folly (SP,11(19-20).

The Magi journeyed all the way to have vision of the blesses birth of the Lord, but Where we led all the way for Birth or death? There was a Birth, Certainly, We had evidence and no doubt. I had seen birth and death But had thought they were different this Birth was Hard and bitter agony for us, like Death, our death. (11(35-39)

The bitter tragic shock is "Birth" is their "Death". Thus, we see the fact that religious experience grows only out of life experience, and the aesthetic experience is very well governed by or formulated by life's aesthetic experience in the poem. Almost all the images that bring out the religious hardships are the poetic image. The revival of life for the Magi, which represents the life-death proposition, is beautifully structured in the images of the running brook, the wine, the horse and the men-at-dicing. Thus religious-aesthetic nearness is brought out admirably. The religious message that this life is our death is brought out in the images that are very well structured in the Fryean paradigm, namely, the mineral, vegetative, the animal and the human. No one can deny this truth that is witnesses in the great poem

226
which is not a mere religious poem but a poem of life. It makes the point clear that
religion is nothing but life, and that religion is used by Eliot in this wider 'life-sense'.

When one becomes aware of religion in this wider sense there should be no
difficulty in correlating the impersonality theory to the outside world. The second
difficulty of who's which see the dichotomy is a perfect misunderstanding of what
formalism is. According to them, formalism has nothing to do with the 'idea' –
content' 'world'. It is wrong because formalism does not mean literary structure in the
vague. It has to bring into form certain material. It actually sees the closeness of
'matter' 'content' 'subject' which constitutes 'world' that is 'form'. As Warren sees
it, "instead of dichotomizing 'form-content', we should think of matter and then of
'form' that which aesthetically organizes its matters" (241). This is a point for us for a
close study. What follows is of great value to us as we are trying to annihilate the
supposed exclusive nature between matter and form. It is to be observed that a
successful work of art, materials is completely assimilated into the forms what the
world has become "language" (241). This goes to illustrate that there is no 'form'
without matter. This draws our attention now to the phenomenon of complete
assimilation. It can be recognized only by an intelligent pursuer. Those who fail to
have a perfect understanding of formalism (they are the charlatans rush to
conclusions) take language final in a literary work which, they do not see, cannot
exist without the perfect assimilation of matter and language. This literary process or,
creative process, may be explained for a better understanding in terms of the biblical
phrase the word was made flesh" (John 1.14). Here the language 'word has become
world' proves a perfect assimilation of possible truth. This truth must be accepted by all when we speak of such delicate distinctions.

Now we clearly see that mere language or form is inferior in statue as there can be no form without matter. Again we may maintain that the nature, intensity and complexity and greatness of form depend upon the 'highness' or 'greatness' or the 'most valuableness of the matter. If the perfect assimilation is between inferior world or matter and language or form we have an inferior type of literary piece produced. On the other hand, if the assimilation is between superior matter and language great literature is produced.

Now having cleared the misunderstanding of what actually formalism is, let us go on to establish what role religion can play in making the content belong to the highest order of existing matter.

Warren in his chapter "Evaluation" in Theory of Literature defines what matter is in a literary work of art. He says 'The materials 'of a literary work of art are on one level, words on another level, human behavior experience, and on another, human ideas and attitudes"(241)

This definition enables us to count on certain tangible factors to take us a good way into relating different levels of life to material of art. And these different levels are as Warren puts it doubtlessly, 'human behaviour experience', 'human ideas' and 'attitudes'. Now the question is, are these integral components of a work of art or extra aesthetic criteria? In other words, are they intrinsic or extrinsic factors in a literary work? We must say they are both. Any literary work of art ought to have these simultaneous components. But what is to be borne in mind is that their very
nature decided the rank or degree of excellence of the work. If the human behavior experience, human ideas and attitudes are of a higher quality so is the status of the literature with which it is produced. If they are low, the work suffers from mediocrity simultaneously the question is what is great literature or what makes literature great? As envisaged earlier, the high quality of 'human experience,’ ‘human ideas,’ and ‘attitudes’ make literature great. At this moment the crucial question is what gives greatness to these. It is convincingly RELIGION.

Religion looking at it in the broadest possible way is the sum-total of all great human experience and reflections drawn from all quarters of human behaviour, ideas and attitudes that promote the well being and happiness of man in the highest measure. Having thus identified religion we must pass on to responding to the next vital question of why religion is given the highest place in the order of excellence? The answer is one that is quite commonsensical. It is quite commonsensical because it is the every day experience of every one. The day-to-day realization of man is that of all things in this world only religious values stand high in fulfilling the human needs in a way that make man whole and hold him together as preordained by the super principle (most of us wish to call it ‘God’) or ‘Life Force that governs the whole universe from the dawn of creation.’

This is fairly an answer to the pressing question why Eliot who advocates formalistic principles to judge work of art seems to contradict himself by prescribing an extra aesthetic criterion like religion to make literature great. This is supported by Blackmur also in his Enabling Act of Criticism where “like Eliot he admits that non literary standards aid in determining the greatness of literature”(Pritchard 259).
Another reason for Eliot's stand is one of saving literature from spiritually and socially damaging influences. It is needless to say the primary and most ennobling task of a true critic is to set up high standards for the works of art and perpetuate them so that mankind does not degenerate. It is his moral responsibility to act as the guardian of the highest values which mankind has cherished and save them from any degenerating influence. Here we are not all concerned about the professional critics who do not make serious efforts to dedicate themselves to such high ideals.

It is not difficult for us to realize from our common experience that religion is a pure principle which saves life and literature from the degenerating pleasure principle which contaminates mankind making taking it to chaos and sorrow. Literature is a powerful weapon capable of arousing intense feelings in us because of its aesthetic content and powerful organization. The "autonomous realm of art" or "the aesthetic experience" (Wellek 239) is a realm and experience capable of positive or negative effects depending upon the quality of its art material. Therefore it is dangerous to love the autonomous realm of art, existing on its own without the standard check. It reminded of Plato who wanted to banish the poets who, according to him, were 'divinely mad' possessing the pleasure (purely aesthetic) principle. He had realized such an unchecked principle would be a destroyer of all cherished values. He had the learning principle which means that the literature produced must have the light to guide mankind to higher levels of life.

As Plato had rightly said, the whole world must rise against a principle (like the pleasure principle), which besides being a potential value destroyer is an agent of all misery and sorrow. The world of chaos and sorrow is not anybody, even Eliot
himself was against it. He is a staunch oppose of all that is low and substandard. He mercilessly rules out its presence in literature lest it should be a destroyer of values.

This proves Eliot’s complete realization of the enormous power of aesthetic values and their impact. With such a realization he is fully justified in saying that literature should rest in the care of religion to create a sound and sensible world. Eliot is further justified when we look at his view in the right of Aristotle’s observation that man must be “trained in ordinate of affections” or ‘just sentiments’ and that he must taught to “like and dislike what he ought”. According to Eliot, this in an ‘ordinate affections and just sentiments’ and the rights on likes and dislikes have traditionally been undertaken only by the religion.

Thus using religion as the central principle in judging the greatness of a work of art can be fully justified. Religion is, thus not an extra aesthetic criterion in the broadest and high-serious sense and what illuminate true of it is that it is being used in the service of literature.

For those who take religion in a narrow sense it is discipline which, with its grave watchful taskmaster’s eye monitors life. To them discipline always means ‘beating’ a kind of a negative entity. We must know what discipline in the real sense means. It means help service have to accept emotionally and imaginatively the service religion does.

Now, it is clear that those argue literature is a substitute to religion has made it a profession. T.S.Eliot attacks Matthew Arnold’s impulsive view on poetry which according to him will enjoy supremacy over all systems of value and philosophy.
Another claim is that of Wordsworth's paganism which instructs men to go to Nature and to consider it as god. As soon a little earlier the professional attitude to literature that it is self-sufficient and that there is nothing worth our seeking outside it is a gross error, the error in this view is self evident as literature which is born of religion as we have earlier proved cannot claim autonomy.

Next a word must be said of the contemplation of the pure being and beauty. The contemplation of the pure being is the ultimate aim of all human beings according to John Dewey. Aristotle and the scholastic philosophers St. Augustine and St Thomas Auginas have earlier insisted on this. It is not merely a religious attitude; the aesthetic attitude is also the same. This can be explained in terms of beauty. Beauty is not a palpable object whose dimensions can be mathematically measured. It is in the eye of the onlooker as Wordsworth in his poem “Straight and Crooked” says that ugliness and beauty are not in things themselves, but in the way one looks at them. Beauty neither is in the matter colour form etc., but in the way one contemplates it. Aristotle's idea of beauty centre on 'accidence' and 'substance' which includes shapes colour taste feel of touch etc., beyond the accidence there is something which makes the thing itself. Beauty is the substance not accidence this can be better explained in the theory of 'transubstantiation' Aesthetic attitude also is the contemplation of pure being. Such a contemplation has led St Thomas Aquinas observe Beauty 'Quod Placet' that which pleases.

All these pronouncements are effects to go outside the limits of human beings. Apart from Eliot and C.S.Lewis, Christopher Dawson also insisted that great values are outside man. In such a context pope’s secular dictum, 'Man is the measure of
everything' proves absurd and false. At the same time the extreme views as 'you should not tell a man I love you because you are child of god' of Forsters, Virginia Woolf and Clive Bell of the Bloomsberry Group of British Humanism may be reconsidered.

To conclude, any work of art possesses a quality. Eliot and Tholkääppiyar, on common people’s belief in God emphasize the indispensability of extra-aesthetic criteria in a work of art to decide its greatness. This verdict is seen in relation to the demands of formalistic principles of literary criticism, which takes the discussion on to 'form-content' definitions and distinctions and their closeness in literature. Supposing the work suffers from mediocrity, the question arises on what would make literature great? This leads to the universal thought that the high quality of 'human experience' ‘human ideas’ and ‘attitudes’ which means altogether ‘the way of life’ makes literature great. At this moment the crucial question is what gives greatness to these? It is convincingly RELIGION which is THE WAY OF LIFE.

Thus religion as the central principle in the selected works of Eliot and Tholkääppiyar is fully justified either in creating and criticizing a work of art. This religious spirit of T. S. Eliot and life spirit of Tholkääppiyar inspire and move the literary world towards religion, which consistently evolve themselves to be the central principle in the creation of literature. Further the central principle sets itself as an example for value and evaluation in elevating their work of art to the level of achieving Greatness.