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CONCLUSION

The objective of this study has been to analyze the problems faced by the students of B.A. (Hons.) at A.M.U. and the study set out to find a suitable solution to the learning problem of these students. The focus was on the development of a suitable approach that would enable them to develop both their literary skills and language skills.

The initial part of the study focused on establishing the nature of literature and literary texts and examined the relation between literature and language. By working on the hypothesis that literature is the product of culture, language, and various other factors, the study tried to foreground the problems faced by the teachers engaged in language and literature teaching in an ESL classroom. Working on a premise that the language of literature is the cultural artifact that represents a particular tradition-historical or social, the study tried to establish the correlation between literature and language. By establishing the differences between literary and non-literary language, the study was able to arrive at what may be briefly described as the ‘multidimensionality of meaning’. It refers to the fact that in a literary discourse words may not mean what they say and that there takes a process called the ‘meaning making process’ which was analysed in detail in later chapters. From there the
study moved on to identifying the way in which the literary text acquired multidimensionality of meaning, namely by denotation and connotation. After establishing the literary tools like imagery and metaphors that are employed by writers to create meaning, the study focused on non-literary language. It was found that non literary language generally follows a direct pattern to deliver its ideas unlike literary language.

From the notion that literature modifies and arranges the very language we use in daily life in peculiar ways the study arrived at the notion that the language used by a literary writer may deviate from the normal communicative resources of language but the meaning of the text depends upon the norms of that particular language. From this hypothesis we may conclude that the facts we find in literary texts are, therefore, linguistic in nature. Thus, it would be safe to conclude that the study of literature and particularly of poetry is closely connected with language skills that are essential for a study of English literature. Approaches form an integral part of the teaching of literature. It is necessary for the teacher of literature to be familiar with these approaches. Some of the approaches discussed in the study in chapter two of the work are biographical, archetypal, moralistic and sociological.

After the analysis the study concluded that reading of literature is not entirely subjective and that the meaning and value of a text is to some extent universal. In spite of the fact that every individual reader has a
particular responses to a particular text, some degree of unanimity of response is always possible. For arriving at the common value ascribed to a literary text, the study turned to linguistics. It has been used to describe grammar in terms of its social usage and also to describe the functions of these sentence constructions. For the sake of convenience the study concerned itself with the meaning conveyed through the work. For carrying out an interpretation of the literary work, the study concentrated upon the tools used to explain poetry. Register, Deviation, Foregrounding, and Collocation were found to be the tools employed in order to make meaning of poetry. For a more detailed understanding of the nature of poetic texts the study looked at the elements that constituted poetry. Metre or rhythm was one of the elements used to develop a figurative language with an objective of achieving specific results in poetry. In addition to the above mentioned tools various other types of figures of speech are also employed for evoking the desired response in the reader by the writer, which include Simile, Metaphor, Personification, Apostrophe, Hyperbole, Metonymy, Synecdoche, Oxymoron, and Antithesis. It is also found that in literature many deviations from normal language used to give an impression of novelty and refresh the reader’s perception. These deviations may be lexical, grammatical, phonological, semantic, and dialectal in nature. Other features include foregrounding and register.
It is found that one of the major problems faced by the students is that they lack the critical tools for literary analysis. The reason found is that English literature which is a part of the western tradition has been largely critical however the study of Indian literature on the other hand has been largely non-critical. As a result of which both teachers and students are found to be lacking in the area of critical tradition and attitude. In the Indian context the learners are not encouraged to ask questions but to respect conventions and customs. During their entire training in the Indian literary tradition they focus on abstract evaluations and summing up, with is not always quite pertinent in the context of English literature. The end result of this approach is that this effectively stops the formation of any subjective response to the text in question. It may be observed that new literary pieces are rejected on the grounds that there are no critical readings available about them. Since the Indian tradition rarely call for an evaluation of text on the basis of subjective analysis, even old and familiar texts fail to get a subjective response provoke from either the learner or the teacher.

The important conjunction which is the active process that takes place when the reader comes into contact with the text at his/her own terms never happens. Thus the reader fails to make an honest evaluation of the text on the basis of one’s own critical perceptions. The ‘individualistic opinion’ which is one of the main aims of a study of the
English literature is sadly left out of the learning process. The study suggests that the individual learner can often respond to literature as a result of guidance.

Studying literature means that the student should be able to interpret the text by themselves and also should be able to describe and prove the validity of their responses. Teachers in the literature classrooms should not hand over pre-fabricated meaning to students if the idea behind the course is that the student must know how to read and interpret texts on their own. Teachers should not force them to accept predetermined judgments on certain authors and their works without analyzing the text themselves.

The study suggests that students should not be taught to think and feel about certain writers and their works in a predetermined way rather they should be encouraged to become sensitive reader who can think and feel for themselves with the help of the textual facts. This leads to the assumption that the basic activity to achieve this objective is the linguistic study of literature – the self conscious linguistic reading and interpretation of texts.

The study cautions that teachers should not force students to undertake reading as a private activity but to make it a more general activity so that the process of criticism become more democratic in nature. The idea behind this suggestion being that the student should be able to relate their subjective impression with that of the objective text.