The Goan cultural discourse is to be looked at as a set of signs which signify contextually. In an intersubjective space, particularly that which is occupied in an oral tradition, the reference is fixed, and coded, because it is desired to be so. Whereas, in a far more distanced space, induced by the merits of writing, there exists, possibilities of newer codes and indeterminate references. We do not state these observations as absolute, but only relate this inherent property of language as a sign-system, to the cultural discourse of a certain section in Goan society. We do this, by observing the texts on the basis of their formal properties in any of the three modes- poetic, narrative and dramatic, and how all these have internal organisations of their own. Secondly, in trying to understand what these texts signify, or where
is the 'centre' of these texts, we raise further issues, like that of the performance of these texts. The discourse of these groups, which we will describe in the next chapter, we believe finds its final significant moment in the performed rituals. The centre of these texts could lie in an essentially ontological frame of reference like a 'dharma' or in the ritual, which provides the pragmatic support to the text.

The sign, by itself produces more than referent, as we have been told from Bharthari and Panini onwards to more recent modern linguistic theory in the west. It is said to be governed by the social circumstances under which, it acquires fixed meanings. The Prague school, particularly Roman Jakobson, gave language studies, two very crucial concepts, that of metaphor and metonymy. The use of either of these prominently, determines the nature of discourse according to Jakobson. Hence, he put forth the theory that poetic discourse (which for the most part contains the dominant use of metaphors), was by far the superior form of language. Much later, under the influence of psychoanalytic theory, the metonymic displacements of language were thought to be a major clue to the basic discoursal motivations in a given society.

Combining the two concepts is one of the major aims of this thesis. In order to produce a metaphoric, essentially symbolic form of discourse, the Goan society has chosen to foreground certain details and displace others. But in an altogether non-symbolic discourse (with a growth in literacy and general awareness), the displaced details are sought and the referent becomes far more dispersed. The discourse, in
such a situation, is interpreted for its referent rather than for a fixed meaning. In doing so, we are placing a cultural discourse well within concrete social relations. A text cannot be said to have a fixed centre at all different points of time. It shifts as interpretations and perceptions shift.

A sign to us, in keeping with the theories in India and in the west, is anything (from language to concrete objects) which participates in a communication process. It means something to someone at a given moment. The sign, it is believed here is governed by a structure where a set of signs, like in a linguistic text, relate to one another. But once an utterance takes place it is interpreted in two ways: 1. By a collective convention which allows for active imagination towards decoding the text in accordance with a given code. 2. By individual interpretation which ultimately, either converges in a collective code or remains independent in a mobile semiotic system, thus moving out of a symbolic code. These insights developed with the new interest in the actual performance of the text which has a meaning in many ways, independent of the text itself. This is why, we take recourse to the phenomenological moment, where the ritual conveys a meaning, which is actually as stated earlier, 'pre-text' and ontological, to the formal structuring of the text.

Using these tools, we try to understand the Goan folk narratives for: a. The structure; b. the nature of the discourse-poetic, narrative and dramatic. This endeavour is of crucial relevance to the description of the symbolic discourse in the oral tradition which re-
lies on poetic metaphors with an underlying narrative lifescrpt. The
dramatic discourse, seen in the ritual performances, is relevant for un-
derstanding the 'I-thou' relationship in an intersubjective space of the
oral tradition.C. Performance. Every text, in keeping with the perfor-
mance theories, is 'performed', both linguistically and with the help
of non-verbal signs.

The theories and issues which will be discussed in this chapter are
essentially consumed by these concepts underlying the thesis. They
are:- 1. Narrative: we explore the extent to which theories in In-
dia and in the West have dealt with this mode. 2. Structure: This
concept is explored on the basis of the argument that meaning is irre-
trievable, except in a 'form' which we, as interpretants and creators,
impose upon our perceptions of reality. Secondly, we also highlight
the structuralist explanation of a system. So, the text, Zagor for
example, has a ritual structure, through which people comprehend
certain cultural and social realities. 3. Performance: This concept
opens up the performer-audience relationship.

The Goan cultural texts are not created in a void. They are ad-
dressed to a particular audience who respond with the help of a cre-
ative imagination. The realm of experience in this situation goes
beyond the symbolic and is in that of the imaginary. And this is the
most powerful aspect of the Goan cultural performances. The perfor-
mance theories in the West capture the effect of the stylised discourse
on the addressee, like rhythm, meter, rhyme, parallelism etc. The
Indian theory of performance has its origins in the Natyasastra, with
its powerful theory of rasa. We try to capture the performance aesthetics of the Goan performances using these concepts. The other model of experience that will be utilized for this purpose is that of phenomenology. The strangeness of even a known text during its performance requires seeing it along with others and as they see it. In essence, then, we trace the Goan cultural discourse as a symbol, a sign and a phenomenon. The statement is that at a given point of time, in an ever-changing present, the text can be anything – we need to capture the sensibilities of the users.

The chapter traces the theories more or less chronologically, highlighting the basic tenets of each. We have also given the application of some of these theories in order to facilitate a proper comprehension of the model. The discussion assumes our earlier observations on identity and modes of presentation in performance.

Preoccupations with theories on language and discourse can be viewed in the ancient philosophies in India, China, Greece and the Roman civilizations. A fascinating precursor to Language as part of a semiotic system can be found in these philosophical treatises, particularly in India. Language was considered to be crucial in order to understand reality. One of the assumptions has always been that man communicates in totality and hence the relationship between language, reality and logic can be conceivable. In India a general epistemology was worked out with language in the centre. Srivastava and Kapoor (forthcoming) point out that the Indian scholars had developed six ancillary components of Vedic study (the Veda:-ngas),
Siksa: (phonetics), Kalpa (ritual), Vya:karna (grammar), Nirukta (etymology), Chanda (metrics), and Jyotisa (astronomy). Vya:karna later developed into an independent science and also became a meta-discipline. The reason being the importance given to the power of the word on which all kinds of meanings were supposed to depend. It was Bhartrhari who arguing for the relationship between human consciousness and language regarded it as the primary epistemology and emphasized that the theoretical indivisibility of the sentence reflects the individuality of thought and reality.

The nature of the linguistic sign was discussed as early as in Bhartrhari’s Vakyapadika in the ancient Indian philosophy on language. Bhartrhari, stressing on the arrangement of words says that meaning belongs to structure. In the case of a sentence, he says, individual words have particular meanings only when uttered in a sequence, and the meaning of the sequence – the sentence is something different from the meanings of individual words (II, 55). This sentence meaning is inalienable and cannot be located in the individual words in isolation. Further, Bhartrhari elaborates on the nature of cognition and the word, which he believes lacks certainty. There is no absoluteness or identity of experience. “Just as our senses perceive the same object in different ways, in the same way, an object is understood from words in different ways.” (II. 134). “The meanings of words intended by the speakers to be one thing is understood by different listeners
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1Brough (1951, 1972); Matilal (1985); cited in Gargesh (1990).
according to their background". (II. 135). However, Bharthari adds, in understanding the comparison of the holistic sentential meaning, a specific faculty is involved – *Pratibha*; all living beings are said to possess it. *Pratibha* creates intuitions about meaning. As man's experience is enriched, his intuitions grow deeper and more mature and the process is inherent in man. As our intuitions about life deepen, the meaning we grasp become more and more rich.

Verbal communication, according to Bharthari, does not relate to all, or total, reality – it relates only to a part of an aspect of reality, or to the determination of the intended object by an external factor, or to a reversal of reality, or to an absence of it (III. 3. 52). "Describe not the object itself" wrote Mallarme (1956), but the effect it produces. Therefore a verse must yield to sensation. In theoretical discourse, says Chaitanya, the word is merely a sign of the expressive content, it only names it, the verbal designation merely referring to it without being able to express it adequately. Sanskrit poetics is said to have always resisted the attempts by grammarians to annex poetic evocation as a form of the denotative power (*abidha*) of words. Expressive meaning has to do with the embodying of a psychic process which took place at a certain time.

The underlying property of language is always rule-governed, The sensation yielded by the language of verse, narrative or prose either conforms to the rules or breaks them. Thus, we either have rule-governed verse, or free-verse, which alludes to another law. The power of reception lies in being able to identify either. The dynamic nature
of language lies in the endless possibilities of combinations among the elements. In the recent theories in the West, the attempt has been to allude to the dynamics of language, where the traditional concepts like the subject-object division is broken and language is given a position in the social mobility of the word. The linguistic sign interacts with its own verbal sign and non-verbal signs in a world of endless signification. Further, the conscious and the unconscious process before and after the production of a structure have deepened the understanding of the space occupied by any sign system in society which is inevitably subject to social laws, and at the same time break them if it desires so.

A theoretical break such as this places the sign squarely in the domain of social theory. It allows one to grasp not just the inability of the sign to remain denotative, as Bharthari warned us, but also that it has an inherent law which it must either obey or transgress. This kind of study, to explain in Eco’s words, “can be conceived of either as a unified theoretical approach to the great variety of systems of significations and communication and in this sense it constitutes a metalinguistic discourse dealing with any of its objects by means of homogeneous categories, or it can be conceived as a description of those various systems insisting on their mutual differences, their special structural properties, their idiosyncracies from verbal language to gestures, from visual images to body positions, from musical sounds to fashion. It shows a wide range of ‘languages’ ruled by different conventions and laws. It can investigate these various domains either at
the elementary level of their consecutive units (such as words, colour spots, physical formants of sounds, geometrical or topological shapes) or at the more complex level of texts and discourses – that is narrative structures, figures of speech and so on” (Eco, 1977: 108-117).

The interpretive theories of language have undergone changes. Tracing these changes on the most basic and complex forms of language, we try and arrive at some sort of some sort of eclectic understanding of the function of the discourse in society. By discourse/text, we understand a continuous stretch of language, larger than a sentence built on the foundations of the basic linguistic structure. It operates in a given context. As Harris (1952: 357) says, “language does not occur in stray words or sentences, but in connected discourse”. There are three types of discourses – Poetic, Narrative and Dramatic, referring essentially to the kinds of situations in language use. On the lines of Benveniste’s (1971) distinction between Narrative and Discourse, then, we derive that Discourse is the ‘how’ of language and the types, the ‘what’ of language use. Discourse is the stylised use of language.

This broad division into types is not as distinct as it seems to be. There is considerable overlapping between the three and thus we find instances of all three in each other. A quick look at the basic characteristics will help locate the differences for a clearer picture to emerge. The Poetic discourse is essentially monologic in nature and uses predominantly the ‘first person’. The representation of reality
in a poem according to Riffatere (1973)² "is a verbal construct in which meaning is achieved by reference from words to words, not to things. The poetic discourse then functions through the signification of linguistic items and not through the referential meanings. Learner (1985:239)³ suggests that in poetry language is being used for its own sake and it generates its own meanings. It does this through repetitions in the signifier rather than the signified. Further, poetry as Easthope (1983:23)⁴ says is subject to the laws of its own materiality, i.e., in being composed in lines. The Prague school considered it to be its main constitutive principle. Finally, the poetic expressions allow a use of language appropriate to the discourse in order to create the required aesthetic experience.

Dramatic discourse is governed by a fictive function in a dialogic mode of presentation – the 'I-thou'. According to Elam (1980) the fictive context of dramatic discourse is based mainly on two components: the 'situation' created and the 'context of utterance'. The 'situation' is related to the co-ordinates of a given exchange that takes place, i.e., the set of persons and objects present, their physical circumstances, the supposed time and place of their encounter etc. The 'context of utterance' involves the communicative context proper, comprising the relationship set up between speaker, listener and discourse in the im-

³ibid
⁴ibid
mediate 'here and now' (Elam, 1980: 138). In the theatre\textsuperscript{5} meaning depends upon the deixis which Jakobson terms as 'shifters' (empty verbal index). Thus, anaphoric and cataphoric referencing comes into play. Also, the use of supra-segmental features in language are necessitated to produce effective communication. Finally, the non-verbal communication like body movements, shape and dimension of stage, use of space, etc. function as a range of connotative units of theatre. All this constitutes what Elam (1980) calls 'performance text'.

We finally come to narrative discourse. It has been observed, that despite the seeming oppositions of logic and textual, or narrative, at the most fundamental level, efforts have been made to understand the narrative in terms of a structure that parallels language. Narrative, it is said, is the other extreme of expressivity. Where there is language, there is narrative and vice-versa\textsuperscript{6}. The essential feature, that differentiates narrative discourse from others is the factor of narration. The structure of narrative events (or story), characterization, temporal dimension, point of view (focalization), and narration are the salient features of narrative. Just as the interest in language studies has been to find out "how an infinite number of sentences can be generated from a finite set of rules, similarly in narrative studies the aim has been

\textsuperscript{5}Theatre, Elam (1980) says, is taken to refer here to the complex of phenomena associated with the performer-audience transaction. Production and communication of meaning in the performance itself and the systems underlying it. 'Drama' is that mode of fiction designed for stage representation.

\textsuperscript{6}Manjali (unpublished monograph).
to discover how infinite variety of stories may be generated from a limited number of basic structures (Rimmon Kenan). This enthused interest in the narrative mode stems from its varied existence, as we human beings feel a compulsive need to narrate.

2.1 The Indian Intellectual Tradition

A basic distinction was drawn between narrative and non-narrative discourse by the early Indian philosophers. *Katha*, story-telling, was a very important mode of expression. Kapoor represents the discoursal divisions in the Indian traditions thus

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Discourse (Vang-Maye)} \\
/ \\
\text{Temporal} \\
/ \\
\text{Non-Temporal} \\
/ \\
\text{(Narrative)} \\
/ \\
\text{(Non-Narrative)} \\
/ \\
\text{Krta} \\
/ \\
\text{Smrti} \\
/ \\
\text{(Description)} \\
/ \\
\text{(Argument or theory)} \\
/ \\
\text{(created or fictional)} \\
/ \\
\text{(recalled)} \\
/ \\
\text{Historical} \\
/ \\
\text{Myth} \\
/ \\
\text{Marvellous Romance} \\
/ \\
\text{legend}
\end{array}
\]

7Kapoor, K (forthcoming).

8Kapoor, K (forthcoming).
The Narrative mode was employed in the sacred Hindu texts. These texts have been divided into two types, *Smrti* and *Shruti*. *Shruti* says Narayan (1992) is 'what is heard'. It is a core of texts which contain the fundamental tenets of Hinduism. These texts include the *Vedas*, the *Brahmanas*, and the *Upanishads*, and they are believed to have emerged from direct spiritual revelations. The latest extant major Upanishad (and there are minor ones) dates from roughly the fifth century B.C. This cluster of texts contain narratives that range from accounts of creation to stories backing rituals and parables told by religious teachers to their students. *Upanishad* means 'sitting beneath', and indeed, most of the Upasnishads relate to the teaching gleaned at the feet of the various teachers. Mookerji⁹, describing the *Upanishads* in his "Ancient Indian Education" observes: "In these discourses are found utilized all the familiar devices of oral teaching such as apt illustrations. . .stories. . .and parables." *Smrti* texts on the other hand are open-ended. Texts grouped under *Smrti* include the *Ramayana* and *Mahabharat* epics, eighteen main *Puranas*, and many subsidiary ones, and law books like the *Dharma Shastras*. Since *Smrti* can be added to and elaborated upon, various sectarian traditions have their own interpretations of what constitutes *Smrti*

---
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Scripture. Stories are important in this group as well. The narratives in the Mahabharat (300 B.C. to 300 A.D.) and the Mahabharat have powerfully shaped the Indian imagination. They are told, performed, rewritten, parodied in narratives that often branch off into other stories as well as metaphysical musings (the Bhagvad Gita, part of the Mahabharat, is a celebrated example of an excursion into philosophy at a gripping moment). Clearly then, the use of storytelling as a medium for religious instruction extends far back into the history of Indian civilization (Narayan, ibid.).

One distinguishing property of the narrative is its open-endedness and as a result, the variations. The variants in story-telling have been accounted for in the Indian tradition, based on several parameters—language, meter, subject matter, narrator, goal, type of protagonist, the span of time, etc. Kapoor (ibid.) lists five kinds of narrative—(i) Fictional Now, (ii) Fictional Now-How, (iii) Romance, (iv) Myth or legend (viz. Puranas), and (v) Historical. Of course they interact and new types emerge, depending on the context of the narration. The Mahabharat, for example, says Kapoor is dominantly an itihasa, but has intermingling of at least three narrative categories—the Fictional Now-How, Myth/Legend, and History. Again, he further claims subsidiary narrative (Upakhayana) within a narrative may belong to any of the five kinds of narratives resulting in a rich texture of story-telling. The one defining property of all narratives is their temporality. In the world of a narrative there is overwhelming instability, constant change and flux. Every moment one thing becomes another. Also secondly
all narrative is a form of biography – retelling of someone's or some experience – which is what makes the narrative an appropriate illuminating analogy or explanation for the reader/recipient's particular experience. Hence its value. Retelling of a narrative is possible precisely because of this timelessness and non-specificity of its ability to transform into wider generalizations.

The result of narrative variants according to varying contexts gives rise to various genres, because stories emerge in particular contexts to make particular points and were shaped by the interaction between the teller and the audience. One is here reminded of Narayan's (ibid.) Swamiji who uses the words *katha, kahani, drishtant, upama*. Despite the conventional differences between them, Swamiji used *katha* and *kahani* interchangeably. The explanation he gives is, "They're the same thing". This statement indicates that from his perspective both kinds of stories can be used to illuminate religious principles acting in the world. Whether or not a story is light entertainment in other contexts, it can be transformed in retelling to convey religious teaching. It is also possible that in his view both kinds of narratives are grouped together as fictions of illusions (*maya*) since the highest reality cannot be represented through arrangements of words.

The other two divisions of *drishtant* and *upama* he explains as being futuristic or a vision and a parable respectively. The narrative in India had the distinction according to Warder (1983) "to combine two conflicting elements: realism and criticism of social evils on the one hand and the growth of fantasy, of the acquisition of superhuman
powers in connection with extraordinary adventures on the other”. The questions raised are – the range, the potentiality and the reality of human nature; the generalised structure of human experience; the concept of an essential ethical order; and the nature of dharma, both individual and collective; the conflict between man’s dharmas in different orders and the necessity of making a choice; the need to do karma and the nature of action, inaction and non-action (Kapoor, ibid.). The meaning of a text has a reference outside it:

“Hindu culture – constructs meaning not through the logic of the narrative but through over-arching symbolic equations which function as structural invariants. The centre of the text – because the centre is void – must be found elsewhere in ritual (which is a carrier of meaning in its own right) or in the individual and essentially ontological frames of reference-limit- situations- exemplified by karma and dharma, and especially dharma” (Mishra, 1989)

The ancient Indian dialectic of Maya and lila approximates the contradictions in a narrative. And the inexplicability of the narrative makes ‘form’ the means of resolving contradictions. It has been said that all forms are kalpana (imagination), because kalpana is manasa-janitha (mind-construct). Hence forms, they say are transpositional. The endless variations of the narratives serve to recapture one’s original state of being. Narrating a story to someone else becomes often the mode of release even from a divine curse10. Sivaramakrishna (1986) il-
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10For further illustrations on this point, see Karnad (1990)– “Naga-Mandala” and O’Flaherty, W (1985).
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Illustrates from *Brihatkatha* wherein the impropriety of hearing a story brings on Pushpadanta a curse from which he can absolve himself only by narrating it to another. An analogue of this is evident, he further illustrates, in religious texts where injunction is often given that whoever narrates or hears the story/text is absolved from the contingent universe.

Telling and retelling says Sivaramakrishna (ibid.) involves formal variations and also reincarnations of the same character, like the Buddha in the *Jataka-katha*. Thus we have spirals rather than cycles of stories and their recycling is a counterpart in narrative of the continuity of man's misconceptions stemming from the maya-ridden universe. These spirals are *karma*-driven and a furtherance of the complex of Maya. The moral of the narrative is therefore to transcend, both form and narrative. One narrative leads to another like in the *Vetal* tales. There is simultaneous existence of valid but limited perceptions ultimately. A 'manifestation (i.e. a form)' is all we ever get: the archetype itself is beyond the reach of reason (Sivaramakrishna, ibid.).

The Structure of Literary Experience

The purpose of poetics of a literary form in the Indian tradition has been considered to be that of *Ananda* or delight, says Kapoor\(^{11}\). But *Ananda* he explains does not mean laughter or gross pleasure – for *Ananda* arises from a narrative grief as well. It is that entertain-

\(^{11}\)Kapoor, K (forthcoming).
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ment, delight or pleasure which comes from acquiring a certain kind of knowledge of human experience. The experiences codified in a literary text leave on our self or, as some theorists say that 'reconstitute' our self. We recreate those states of mind in ourselves and the knowledge of a text in us is the knowledge of the emotional essence of experience. Vṛtti or style of language blends with the other aesthetic experience. The whole aesthetic experience in the Indian tradition constitutes the Rasa theory – a structure of states of being. We will return to the Rasa theory in a later section.

The style of language here is related to the emotional effect on the receiver. Bharata in his Natyasastra speaks about the dimensions of a poem as a sign, i.e., Sabda (expression) and artha (content) which together signify the meaning of the expression (Sabda:ṛtha). However, he is said to have made a distinction between the pragmatic use and the aesthetic use of the verbal sign while the text-reader dynamics resulting from the pragmatic rules of the verbal sign is centred around what he calls Kapithpa:k, the aesthetic dimension employs the Sahrdayapa:k. The former refers to the non-affective and the latter to the affective state of the listener/reader. This distinction is carried all through the Indian poetics cutting across the viewpoints of different schools and culminating ultimately in the theory of devotion as propounded by Kuntaka through his construct of Vakrokti and the theory of suggested meaning i.e., dhvani as propounded by Anandvardhana. Vakrokti is an analogue of the theory of poetic deviation and its principles are essentially linguistic.
The role or place of *kavya* in our cultural community says Kapoor has been essentially one of delight – *Ananda*. *Ananda* here is used to mean laughter or gross pleasure and narrative deep grief as well. It is that entertainment, delight or pleasure which comes from acquiring a certain kind of knowledge of human experience. This knowledge comes through impressions or *Samskaras* that the experiences codified in a literary text leave on our self, or, as some theorists say, that ‘reconstitute’ our self. We recreate those states of mind in ourselves and the ‘knowledge’ of a text in us is the knowledge of the emotional essence of experience.

Experience in a literary composition, therefore, is a *Rasa-Bhava* structure – a structure of states of being. The argument is that *Being* is a configuration of the *Samskaras*, traces, impressions, left by events (involving necessary persons) in the form of emotional conditions/responses. *Bhava* says Kapoor (ibid.) is a carefully worked out category – *bhu* = ‘to be’ and *bhava* = ‘that which brings about Being’. *Bhava* is a category in philosophy as well as means *Being* or existence, and also the ultimate meaning. Secondly, he says, *Bhava* is not in opposition to intellection but a stage in total intellection. Kapoor further claims that the *Rasa* theory is more than a theory of experience and behaviour and it is based in particular conceptions of experience, being, knowledge and cognitive mechanisms of *mania-buddhi, citta, karana* as various forms of *vrttis* (movements and actions), the *Samskaras*, the traces of experience, constitute and shape our Being.
Extending the sentential logic to the larger level of discourse, Kapil Kapoor and Ranga Kapoor (1993) present the method in the Indian Grammatical Theory. They begin by stating that the need to analyze discourse was one of the major concerns in the *Mimansa*, a philosophical system dealing with the interpretation of vedic sentences. It was during the course of the analysis of the meaning of sentences that the confrontation of discoursal realities took place and this led to the *Mahavakya* technically 'longer-than-sentence'. The use of such terms gradually extended to whole epics. Technically, *Mahavakya* is a group of sentences which are interconnected and serve a single purpose or idea. . . ' (Subramanyam, 1986). This discoursal entity, says Kapoor, is identified on the basis of two-fold unity. . . of syntax (*Ekavakyata*) and of sense and purpose (*Arthaiktva* or *Ekarthibhava*) and these two requirements are said to be constant. So just as *Varna* 'sounds' together constitute a new entity, 'the word', and the words together constitute the entity known as the sentence.

The sentences together constitute *Mahavakya* provided they fulfil the requirements of sequence (*karma*) mutual expectancy (*akanksa*), compatibility (*yogyata*) and spatio-temporal contiguity (*samnidhi*) besides the syntactic unity, a kind of textual unity expressed through linguistic items, and a unity of sense and purpose directed towards communicating a single overall meaning or bhava. It was easy, according to Kapoor, for the poeticians to extend the thus defined concept of *Mahavakya* to refer to whole literary works, the *Kavya*.
themselves. Bhoja in the eighth chapter of the Srngaraprakasa calls Ramayana a 'Mahavakya', treating as it does the character, and the conduct of Rama, which is its ekarthibhava. The unity of literary texts, Prabandaikya, this article says, is recognized as early as Bharata who talks of both the aesthetic unity and the narrative unity. And Sahityadarpana explains its definition of Kavya literary composition as a Mahavakya that has a unified aesthetic experience.

Capturing the implications of a concept like the Mahavakya, Kapoor goes on to establish an internal grammar of discourse. This grammar is essentially an extension of the sentential grammar. The claim is founded upon the major assumption of the Indian Grammarians that 'grammar' is a system of conceptualization, an abstract framework in terms of which we make sense of, and structure all experience, not just the universe of language (see Srivastava and Kapoor, 1988a). In an earlier such exercise Kapoor has discussed such an epistemological framework in the Paninean grammar (Kapoor, 1988b:1989). In this experiment, he extends the Paninean model to analyse the structure of a literary narrative. The model that is proposed does not claim an exhaustiveness of the original model, but is only an abbreviated model designed to suggest further possibilities of applying finer and deeper categories and sub-categories.

Panini's grammar, says Kapoor, is that of process of movement. It takes abstract elements such as the Pratipadika (nominal base) and transforms it into a living referential reality by subjecting it to various catalytic elements (Pratyaya 'affixes') and processes (derivation,
agreement etc. . ) The whole process is called in the tradition, Sid-
dhi which literally means ‘to make real by investing with a particular
form.’ Secondly, it has a pyramidal structure that ends in a single
construct, sabsa an ekarthibhava (to apply the term metaphorically).
The immense variety and multiplicity of phenomena is organized and
arranged to create in the minds the cognition of a well-coordinated
entity. Both these characteristics enable a global framework that ac-
counts for a dynamic arrangement of texts and events, like in the
literary narrative, and also evokes a single bhava, according to this
essay.

Analyzing R. K. Narayan’s ‘The Astrologer’s Day’, Kapoor at-
ttempts to link the central theme of the story to the grammatical struc-
ture in Panini’s model. He is reinterpreting the categories of grammar
to account for the semantic properties of narrative discourse. But first,
a look at the general grammatical outline as adapted by Kapoor. The
central theme of Narayan’s story is identified as a restoration of the
disrupted harmony by a new order of co-existence. In the Paninean
model, says Kapoor, the given Pratipadika (the nominal status corre-
sponding to dhatu (the verbal roots, corresponding to acts and ac-
tions) during which the objects contract relationships (such as Agent
and Object), and this results in a surface structure, a ‘sentence’ which
represents a new order of co-existing objects a new harmony.

He identifies the corresponding categories in the characters in ‘The
Astrologer’s Day’. The new harmony according to him is of the dis-
engaged Agent and Object. . . . the astrologer and Guru Nayak
come together, interact and then disengage, i.e. get out of the Agent-Object nexus, and co-exist again dependent through transformed objects, each at peace with his respective self. The final grammar of 'The Astrologer's Day' is thus, in fact a dissolution of the arrangement – the 'nouns' become 'intransitive', beings rid of their case-markers (Karaka-Vibhaktis). This insight into the world-view, or 'philosophy' implicit in the story, is to be gained and validated, by looking at it through the framework of grammar.

The discoursal perspective which Kapoor talks of is a 'content'-based category. Thus, he says, that a 'noun' formally takes postpositions in Hindi is a fact of grammar but that it potentially refers to some entity, is the substantial fact that pertains to discourse. The category of 'tense' similarly, has formal grammatical properties but it is also the discoursal perspective on the actual time of the events. The transformational 'permutation' finds its discoursal analogue in the significant spatial relocations of characters. 'Case' has some grammatical attributes but by virtue of its semantic contents, it becomes a very appropriate principle to identify the relationship or function of different characters in a story. Thus this model shows how a narrative organizes within its own lexis, the delicate relations maintained within it between the requirements of narrative and the needs of discourse. The grammar then deals with the Morphology, pada-sidhi, the elements and their arrangements in the text and the syntax (here, the use of the Karaka structure) the relations between these elements and operations.
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This model, Kapoor says, enables one to describe the structure of a narrative in terms of characters (objects) and events both in their typological and their particular identities. It describes patterns of coherence of these characters and of the characters and events. It describes the 'themes' of each character. It also describes the general themes (by a typological analysis of the meanings of all the verbs). It also describes the overall movement of the narrative.

2.2 The Western Intellectual Tradition

We now turn to the Western theories of language which heralded a point of departure from the traditional prescriptive approach. The major developments which proved highly influential in giving language a scientific status, and also triggered directions in the psychic structure which prefigure and result in either the presence or absence of a form on the immanent level of discourse. We begin with Structuralism which put forth the theory of language as a system of signs. The relationship of the signs gives way to the structural unity which is supposed to govern language. With the publication of Saussure's Course in General Linguistics, modern linguistic theory took a giant step forward. Prior to Saussure meanings were privileged, language as a medium was not. He alerted the Western world to the fact that the resemblance between word and things was an illusion, the relationship between the signifier and the signified was an arbitrary one. The explorations in language brought the discovery that the meaning of a
sign rests not on the fact that it represents something in the external world, but in the manner in which this representation is affected. Linguistic theory sought to expose its structural constituents and reveal the formal aspects.

According to Saussure, the value of the linguistic sign is determined in relation (contrast and difference) to other signs. Meaning is perceived to be a system of differences. Identity is defined negatively: "Instead of pre-existing ideas then, we find . . . values emanating from the system. When they are said to correspond to concepts, it is understood that the concepts are purely differential and defined not by their positive content but negatively by their relations with the other terms of the system. Their most precise characteristic is in being what the others are not" (Saussure, 1966: 117).

Saussure's (1966) account of the system of language asserts that the object of study is 'social' and not individual. He does not try to give an explanation of human utterances (parole) but rather of 'language' (langue), the system which underlies human speech (parole). Applied to language this would mean that we study not individual poems and plays (paroles) but the system which produces them. In order to isolate a linguistic system, it is necessary to cut a 'synchronic' slice from the 'diachronic' flow of language.

Language is to Saussure one among many semiotic (sign) systems. This 'sign' is not, what other linguistic theories called a 'symbol'. The latter is a linguistic item corresponding to a 'referent' (tree = ). The signifier is a graphic or acoustic image and the signified is the concept.
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In their relationship Saussure implied two important notions – the arbitrary relationship and the possibility of more than one referent. But in a particular unambiguous context, there is a unity and the process of signification is a stable and systematic process (Saussure, 1966).

The concept central to most Structuralist theory is that of the binary opposition. In linguistic theory, one phoneme, the lowest level linguistic unit is distinguished from another by its 'difference'. The difference between the two sibilants /s/ and /z/ is expressed in terms of a binary opposition – 'voiced' and 'unvoiced'. The whole phonetic system is a system of such differences. All sign systems are similarly identified in terms of binary patterns (on-off, presence-absence, sweet-sour, cooked- raw, etc.)\(^{12}\). On the basis of this binary opposition, one particular, that of metaphor and metonymy has proved to be a milestone in linguistic theory. A sentence according to Jakobson can be viewed from either perspective: (i) each element is 'selected' on the basis of 'similarity' from a set of possible elements (vertical or paradigmatic); (ii) the elements are 'combined' in a particular sequence (horizontal, or syntagmatic).

All discourse according to Jakobson tends to go towards one pole or other. This is expressed by the distinction between metaphor (which involves selection) and metonymy (which involves deletion from the sequence)\(^{13}\).

---


\(^{13}\)Lodge (1977) has added refinements to Jakobson's account. He has shown that
Narratology

Structuralism provides immense input to the study of narratives, taking language (langue) as its model. The structure of a sentence is seen as the model of structure in Narrative. The age-old division of 'subject' and 'predicate' was used first by Propp (1928) in his study of the Russian fairy tales. In keeping with the general Structuralist practise, the 'Narrative' was abstracted from its 'discourse' (telling). This division had its roots in Plato's Republic, where a very important distinction between 'mimesis' and 'diegesis' is made. In recent times, this tradition has come down in the form of another distinction: 'showing' versus 'telling'. Genette (1976) in his "Narrative Discourse" schematizes the distinction thus:

```
  Lexis
  / \      
 / \      
Diegesis  Mimesis
  / \      
 / \      
Description Narration
  / \      
/ \      
Narrative Discourse
```

context is all important: what is metaphoric in one context may be metonymic in another.
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'Narrative' here corresponds to the abstracted 'langue' which can be studied for its own sake, its formal properties. It is according to Genette, a sort of 'pure telling' in which no one speaks, while 'discourse' draws attention to the 'speaking subject'. This abstracted ideal in the narrative structure opened up new ways of looking at non-literary traditions like folklore. Some of the major exponents of this highly influential era were Propp, Levi-Strauss and A. J. Greimas. In order to gather the workings of the model we will highlight the main features of each of these. The models of Propp and Greimas have often been called 'theatrical' models as the "metalinguistic signs are those which represent pointing, showing, displaying, acting, speaking, framing, decor and mise-en-scene" (Maclean, 1988: 54).

Vladimir Propp (1928)

The real beginnings to the study of narratology is said to have appeared in 1928 with V. J. Propp's "Morphology of the Folktale". Propp was a staunch Russian Formalist, and being aware of the 'historical' (diachronic) theories in the European circles, he realized the need to stress on a synchronic and structural analysis. Stressing the need to 'describe', a given folkloric phenomenon, he says - "One can speak about the origin of that phenomenon only after the phenomenon has been described" (Propp, 1968: 4, 5). This thinking in itself it is said, was a great theoretical advancement from atomistic thinking to descriptive approach and a point of departure from the 'devolutionary' promise in folklore theory.

Not believing in exercises like finding the origins of these similar-
ities and also in indexing and classifying arbitrarily, he worked out an analytical approach which we call 'Morphological' and by which he means a "description of the [Russian Fairy] tale according to its component parts and the relation of these parts to each other and the whole" (Propp, 1968:19).

By component parts Propp means such elements of fairy tales or 'marchen' which remain same everywhere and do not change and are therefore constants and not variables or elements which change from one tale to another tale. During his analysis he found that it was not characters or dramatis personae but their constant actions of 'functions' that formed the basic elements or the component parts of tales. He further emphasized that these actions qualify for functions or constant elements only when these have implication for the advancement of the tale plots. Therefore, he developed a methodology by which one could study the tale according to the functions of the dramatis personae. Thus 'function' became the basic classificatory and analytical unit. He studied Afanasyev's celebrated collection of '100 Russian Fairy Tales' and found 31 functions that can account for the totality of the data of 100 tales or the entire genre of fairy tales. He arranged these 31 morphological elements in the "chronological order of the linear sequences . . . Thus, if a tale consists of elements A . . . Z, the structure of the tale is delineated in terms of this same sequence" (Dundes, 1968:xi) and therefore sometimes called "syntagmatic" or "given" analytic schema.

Irrespective of their specific contents, the fairy tales contain con-
stant elements, for example, a person of authority gives an object of value to another (deserving) person who is able to draw benefits from this object such as spatial translocation required for achieving a task. Propp noticed that statements constituting the tale can be reduced to a set of constant values and certain variable values. The constant values which do not change (unlike for instance, the names of dramatic personae) are the functions of the characters. Propp identified these functions of personages as the constitutive elements (comparable with the linguistic 'parts of speech') of the folktale. The functions are thus defined in terms of actions of the characters, i.e., what they do (Manjali, 1993). However, we are told that 'the action is not to be defined outside its situation in the course of the narrative. One must account for the significance of the given function in the unfolding of the intrigue of the story.' (Propp, 1970: 30)

Levi-Strauss

Levi Strauss began by criticizing Formalism of the Proppian kind which divorced form from content, and considered the latter a residue of the former. Structure according to Levi Strauss 'has no distinct content; it is content itself, apprehended in a logical organization as a property of the real.' (Levi Strauss, 1973: 115). For him it is the vocabulary that conveys specific structural content, both in relation to historical and ethnographic information and in terms of the relevant oppositions that are significant within the context of a given folktale (Manjali, ibid.). 'Form and content are of the same nature, susceptible to the same analysis- content draws its reality from its structure and
what is called form is the structural formation of the local structure forming the content’ (Levi Strauss, ibid. : 131)

Levi Strauss stresses on the values that are relative to a social context. Proppian functions according to him are constant because they do not have a value in the tale-context. For example, a plum tree and an apple tree have different values, since the former is recognized for its 'fecundity' while the latter is famous for its 'strength and depth of its roots.' As a consequence, instead of viewing the characters that make up a function as arbitrary, they have to be seen in their specific value defined positively (e.g., fecundity) or negatively (e.g., earth-sky transition in the case of the apple tree) (Manjali ibid.). Thus Levi Strauss notes that a 'universe of this tale' will be progressively defined analyzable in pairs of oppositions diversely combined within each character. .. who, far from constituting a single entity. is a bundle of differential elements in a manner of that phoneme as conceived by Roman Jakobson. (Levi Strauss, ibid. P. 135). Thus for Levi Strauss, the specific culturally rooted connotations of words employed in a narrative reveal the structural content of the myths and tales.

A. J. Greimas (1966)

Greimas developed a proper semiotics of the narrative extending on Levi Strauss's concern with the signification. Manjali (ibid, P. 7) says that it was the principle of difference introduced by Saussure, and which was put to analytical use by the Prague school of Phonologists (Roman Jakobson and Trubetzkoy) and subsequently by Levi Strauss,
which proved to be the orientation in Greimas's model. This was in keeping with Saussure's anti-positivist stand. He had noted that 'in language there are only differences, without positive terms.' (Course, P. 20) In his 'Structural Semantics' (1966), Greimas proceeded from an 'immanent' semiotic analysis of the natural world towards an examination and subsequent explanation of how the 'immanent' becomes manifest as the content of discourses thus further emphasizing the relevance of content. Greimas's work, says Manjali (ibid.) owes greatly to the methodological ideas put forward by the major structural linguists of that period, namely Louis Hjemslev and Lucien Tesniere. From Hjemslev, he borrows three key notions: 1. the opposition between 'system' and 'process' which were partial modifications of Saussure's 'langue' and 'parole'; 2. the idea of form of content according to which the content plane could be (autonomously) submitted to a pre-empirical analysis; and 3. the application of semantic distinctive features, which was the extension of the feature theory into semantics. From Tesniere Greimas adopts the notion of 'actant' which for the former was a unit of structural analysis of syntax occupying an important place in his understanding of the structure of grammatical cases. Greimas constructs his own 'actantial' model of narrative analysis by substituting Propp's list of seven 'spheres of action' by the six actants each of which has a place in the narrative utterance that constitutes a tale. (Manjali ibid.)

The notion of actant is central to the Greimasian approach to the narrative. The motivation for the introduction of the 'actant' is
George Dumezil's description of mythologies as per which the gods in question are presented as actants having their own 'sphere of activity'. The technical use of 'actant' is derived from Tesniere for whom 'actants are beings or things which in some capacity and in whatever manner, even in the capacity of mere onlookers and in the most passive manner participates in a process' (Tesniere, 1959: 102). In Tesniere's syntactic analysis, the logical categories such as the subject and object disappear in favour of the non-heterogeneous category of the actant. In the little drama that every sentence is supposed to represent, there can be a maximum of three actants which are dependent on the main predicate or the verb. Additionally, there can be the circumstances which are indicators (adverbs of place, time and manner). Tesniere had introduced such linguistic categories as actant connection and valence, in order to do away with the prevalent logical conception of syntax and instead to initiate a 'theatrical' or narrative-like organicist, and vitalist conception. (Manjali, ibid.).

**Performance Theories**

One of the major criticisms against abstracted formal logic of texts of the Structuralist era was the fact that it left no room for the actual 'telling' of the narrative. Later theorists, drawing from socio-linguistic theories believed that the 'performance' of texts is an equally important part of the overall life of the text. Apart from creating a redundant expectancy in their audience, texts are received for their 'telling'. Thus, the resolution is not as important as the journey towards the resolution.
The focus on performance represents a new movement in studies on folklore. It focuses on what is actually performed and the context in which it is performed. The text (when there is one) is not an idealized one, not a generalized one, not the traditional one, but the one actually presented on some occasion. The main contribution of the performance theory is in the delineation of the scope of study. Most performance studies are on verbal traditions (oral traditions), but verbal traditions in action. They study an event and all that is related to that event: the setting, the social context, the performer and the audience. If the verbal tradition entails musical or theatrical or any other kind of performance media, that too, and the interaction between verbal and other media become part of the study.

A performance is a live presentation which is never repeated identically. It has a fleeting existence and is the product of a performer, an individual in the society. We are used to dealing with conceptualizations of folklore as fixed, idealized phenomena. Performance studies does away with these concepts and looks at the context which, it is presumed is changed. The text here is not a written text, but the verbal one presented on a given occasion, a given performance event. This is not the traditional text, but the actual, tape recorded text. The texture of the text is the major component of performance. Blackburn (1986:168) suggests a crucial distinction between performance and context, as they are often used interchangeably.

Context, he says, is the sum total of factors from both the cultural and the most immediate situations that impinge upon an oral
presentation. Performance, on the other hand, is the delivery and stylization of a story within a context; it tells not 'what' but 'how'. Though different, context and performance methodologies are supplementary. Contextual data are necessary, but not sufficient for a performance analysis, since the latter encompasses both context and text. Performance in other words, is what happens to a text in a context. The center of focus for the analysis must be performance. The ethnography of context cannot be added after the fact.

While performance theories have opened up a whole new field of theory, they however are still inadequate to answer questions regarding the culture in question. These theories, using linguistic models, have focused on hitherto unoccupied territories of presentational or performance style, which has contextual reasons behind it. Ramanujan's (1986) excellent array into the 'public' (puram) and 'domestic' (akam) tales is an example of this kind of study.

One of the factors that this approach does not set out to analyse is, that of the 'response' to this 'feeling'. Content with explorations of the textual strategies, it assumes (in order to remain within its working limits, and not as a belief) a certain passivity in the reader/listener. It was Post-Structuralism that first brought this limitation to the fore.

**Reader-Response Theories:**

The criticism levelled against earlier, formal approaches were mainly two – (i) It assumed an overly passive recipient of narrative meanings. (ii) In focusing on the formal properties of the text, it ignored the cultural context within which the meaning takes place (See Davis, 1986).
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One of the major exponents of this era was Roland Barthes, who began as a Structuralist, but in his later writings displayed a strong post-structuralist leaning. Barthes completely demystified the Reader as someone who follows the path of the narrative in accordance with its structure. Starting from the realisation that 'classic' criticism has never paid any attention to the reader; for it, the writer is the only person in literature. Barthes argues that it is at the point of consumption that meaning is formulated. In *The Pleasure of the Text* he claims that the "pleasure is not the pleasure of the corporeal striptease or of narrative suspense. In these cases, there is no tear, no edges: a gradual unveiling. . . ."

Barthes' reflections can best be summed up in this passage - "Yet the most classical narrative (a novel by Zola or Balzac or Dickens or Tolstoy) bears within it a sort of diluted tumesis: we do not read everything with same intensity of reading; a rhythm is established, casual unconcerned with the integrity of the text; our very avidity for knowledge impels us to skim or skip certain passages (anticipated as 'boring') in order to get more quickly to the warmer parts of the anecdote (which are always its articulations; whatever furthers the solution to the riddle, the revelation of fate): we boldly skip (no-one is watching) descriptions, explanations, analyses, conversations; doing so, we resemble a spectator in a nightclub who climbs onto the stage and speeds up the dancer's striptease, tearing off her clothing, but in 'the same order', that is: on the one hand respecting and on the other hastening the episodes of the ritual (like a priest gulping down
his Mass). Tumesis, source or figure of pleasure, here confronts two prosaic edges with one another; it sets what is useless to a knowledge of the secret against what is useless to such knowledge; tumesis is a seam or flow resulting from a simple principle of functionality; it does not occur at the level of the structure of languages but only at the moment of their conception: the author cannot predict tumesis: he cannot choose to write what will not be read. And yet, it is the very rhythm of what is read and what is not read that creates the pleasure of great narratives: has anyone ever read Proust, Balzac, "War and Peace", word for word? (Proust's good fortune: from one reading to the next, we never skip the same passages. ) Thus what I enjoy in a narrative is not directly its content or even its structure, but rather the abrasions I impose upon the surface: I read on, I skip, I look up, I dip in again” (Cited in Ashley, 1984).

A final boost to the Reader-Response theory was given by the psychoanalytical theories, of which Deconstruction was a major influence. A very crucial aspect of the binary opposition introduced by the Structuralists, that of Metonymy (interpreted as fostering equivalence relations in Jakobson's model in favour of metaphor), was highlighted in all post-structuralist thought. Developing on the theatrical model developed by the Structuralists, it sought to stress that metonymy is also the main constituent figure of the theatre and of performance in general. This was the case with the necessarily partial (synecdochic) representation of words or actions, apart from actual objects of decor. Metonymy is the figure which shows on stage what for various rea-
sons cannot be shown, the Courete present standing for a real absent present which is much greater: the stage object thus indicates the place of the unrepresentable (Ubersfeld, 1981:158).

In narrative, as on stage, one action must represent a whole series of actions, the words spoken stand for words unspoken, what we are allowed to see becomes metonymic of the unseen. The use of space is translated, as Barthes perceived, into questions of narrative forms and perspective: "The theatre is precisely that practise which calculates the place of things 'as they are observed': if I set the spectacle here, the spectator will see this; if I put it elsewhere, he will not, and I can avail myself of this masking effect and play on the illusion it provides. . . The scene, the picture, the shot, the cut-out rectangle, here we have the very condition that allows us to conceive theatre, painting, cinema, literature. . ." (Barthes, 1977:69-70).

Gerard Genette (1972) and Mieke Bal (1977) in the analysis of 'focalization' reminded us of the relayed power of selection implicit in both the focused gaze and in lighting. The focus highlights certain aspects (the focalized) and leaves others in the shade, but that focus and the focalizer are relaying the selective principles at work in the text, just as the spot moves in accordance with the skill of the technician and the plan of the director. The metonymic model sought the unconscious or the 'unspoken' behind every text. For the belief was that in order to say something, something else must be left unsaid. And if one has to grasp the significance of the enunciated, then, one will have to seek the 'hidden', the 'silent' aspect of the text. This was
captured powerfully by the two schools of psychoanalytical thought mainly comprising the Tel Quel Group in France (Kristeva, Barthes, Todorov, etc.) and the Phenomenologists (Wolfgang Iser, Poulet, etc., who were influenced by Heidegger).

The Tel Quel Group:

Drawing heavily on Freudian psychoanalysis, this group, whose major exponent was Julia Kristeva who "redefined the text as a dynamic working" [Travail] of language through the desires of speaking subject as he or she responds to the concrete socioeconomic forces of history. In 'Semeotike' Kristeva delivers a thorough critique of Structuralism, especially its static notion of the sign and its bracketing of the so-called extralinguistic factors of history and psychology. A long era of psychoanalytical thinking has attributed a pre-representational motility to a sign which is generated (is a process) in order to attain to a signifying position that represents something. The sign is connected to a precise modality in the so-called 'primary processes' in the Freudian psychoanalysis. Discrete quantities of energy move through the body of the subject who is not yet constituted as such and, in the course of his development, they are arranged according to the various constraints imposed on this body — always already involved in a semiotic process — by family and social structures. We may therefore posit that social organization always already symbolic, imprints its constraints in a mediated form which organizes the 'chora' (primary processes) not according to a law (a term we reserve for the symbolic) but through an ordering". (1974:4)
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This primary process according to this thinking is replete with ambiguous drives which are both assimilating and destructive. These drives involve energy discharges which connect and orient the body to its mediator (here, the mother). The mediation helps in controlling the destructive drive of the subject, who is both generated and negated leading to a disruption of his unity. Checked by the constraints of biological and social structures, the drive charge thus undergoes states and marks 'discontinuities' such as displacement and condensation, absorption and repulsion, rejection and statis, all of which function as innate preconditions 'memorisable' by the species for language acquisition" (Kristeva 1974, in Moul (ed) 1986: 110)

Discourse, just like behaviour (which is governed by drives and is a pre-condition to it) has the ability to conform and reject any form of law. Thus the possibilities of transgressions is an inherent quality of language as illustrated by Jakobson. But the 'sign' is an infinite even before the symbolic which essentially is composed of rules - socio-historical. Hence, when a discourse obeys a law, imposed by society it refuses to transgress it. But since the sign has an infinite capability, the law can also be transgressed and take on an 'a-social', a-theological possession as in the Bakhtinian carnival. It however obeys another law. The subject is in-process and not fixed. The symbolic is unstable and this is the power of the sign. The infinite signifying process, can be locked up by society which imposes fixed, determinate meanings till the basic drives which are made up of double motivations decide to intervene and subvert it. The systematic discourse of Jakobson which
though refracts indeterminate meanings, only pre-figures possibilities of transgression. Thus it is easier to talk of a ‘system’ as a unified construct.

*The Phenomenologists:*

A phenomenologist defines literary experience holistically, with a minimal sense of separation between the text and its reception - or rather, with a recognition of the inseparability of the two. This kind of thinking attributes a “willing suspension of disbelief” to the reader/listener. The latter, when encounters strange, or new information and experiences that are not his own, he soon begins ‘thinking the thoughts of another’. These ‘alien’ thoughts elicit a kind of alternative consciousness of another. This alien consciousness in turn, as Poulet reasons, must be thought by someone, a subject. Therefore, “this thought which is alien to me, and yet is me, must also have in ‘me’, a ‘subject’ which is alien to me. This process of discovering ‘otherness’ in reading culminates in a direct confrontation with a kind of transcendental subjectivity or ‘being’.

An application of this model in the Indian context has been done by Anuradha Ka. pur (1990) on the Ramlila at Ramnagar. Drawing inspiration from the classical rasa theory she has attempted to capture the interactive, intersubjective relationship between spectator, actor and the social milieu which gives rise to social and phenomenological meanings.

*Implications for Orality and Literacy:*

The oral tradition was for a long time ignored for its textual value,
and it was with the advent of the Structuralist narrative theories and earlier Propp, that it was brought out of its dormant status. The tradition, as we had outlined earlier, was looked at, from various viewpoints – the style, the social implications among others. But perhaps the greatest service was by the post-Structuralists, particular the Deconstructionists, who dissolved the rigid distinction between oral and written discourse, and made it more a case of inter-textuality, thus leading researchers to discover traces of oral narratives in their written counterparts. It gave oral traditions the much needed respect. The rest of course is history as the research on oral traditions evidences¹⁴. There was an increase in interest in the merits of writing itself and in its contrast with the oral traditions. These theories gave both orality and literacy an independent, systematic, and formal status.

Goa like any other colonized society has been undergoing socio-cultural transition for a long time now. Coping with a new experience has not been easy and quite destabilising each time. Forming and re-forming identities, particularly for the marginal groups has required tremendous motivations. Away from the benefits of literacy, these groups have had to fall back upon indigenous symbolic systems which essentially held them together. But oral traditions are in themselves a well-organised means of communication and these groups carved out a formal system which was a cohesive means of relating to one another.

But in the process, they also gained new identities. Hence the facts to be accounted are – (1) Unambiguous, determinate meanings at fixed moments, (2) ‘Intertextual’ experiences – Hindu-Christian-Hindu, (3) The inherent instability of the symbols, (4) At a given point of fixed vocality, the intersubjectivity of communication, (5) In the process of constructing new identities, what is ‘foregrounded’ in order to suppress another set of details, (6) The journey – Are they moving away or towards their origins?

In an effort to account for these questions, we spread over the theories detailed so far, in an eclectic manner. The aim is to capture the essence of the field under the study and not judge any particular theory for its merits. Inevitable to this attempt has also been a reading of anthropological accounts by Victor Turner and Clifford Geertz, among others. A lot of vocabulary has been presupposed. For example, Jakobson and Bakhtin, are solid foundations over which much of later linguistic theory in the West was expanded. We take this as presupposed and have not discussed their works in the present chapter.

The discussion on the Indian linguistic theories is not meant to be exhaustive, but more by way of creating an awareness of overlapping interests between the two traditions. But the recourse to the theory of Rasa is an attempt to illustrate its ability to adapt to any context, and increase further possibilities of research on the theory, which may be best suited to account for performance in the Indian context.

The intertextuality of cultural forms does lead to new modes of ex-
periencing life, but one has to agree with Jakobson when he says that a poetry can be transformed into a painting, but something survives in this process. We attribute this survival to a basic 'structure', an organization of details. The move from theatrical forms like Zagor to Tiatr in Goa (discussed in the next chapter) has not been able to do away with the basic ritualistic structure. For, the centre of the texts lies in the ritual. Ritual is closely linked to myths and it dramatizes the latter. The narrative life script is closely related to the ritual.