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( a ) IMAGERY : ITS MEANING

A man cannot be satisfied with the recollection of the old and traditional trend of thought. It is fruitless to do so. There is the eternal pastime or eternal spirit for something new. So there is an attempt to appeal to the mind of man anew with all the energies and spirit asara required for the newer or modern society. Ancient poetry was beautified like the fine arts with all the qualities of a fine and lucid poem. Lucidity and pleasure were the main aim of such poetry with no care to feel the keen edge of life, to have freshness in vision or zest and savour in the senses. But the new and modern poetry has such freshness of vision and zest in life. Simile, metaphor, myth and symbol etc. extensively woven up with the full embodiment of the figures of speech and meaning, could be found in classical poems but the moderns need more than that. It is imagery, for the new technique of the language and the use of the old figures in a new way to communicate the thoughts. Thoughts cannot be easily communicated as the emotions and passions can be. And the complexity of the modern life has its various aspects to be depicted in poetry or any branch of literature, which is the image of the contemporary period. We therefore get the new form of poetry and image. The poetic image is Arthachitra. It is nearer to the concept of the Western 'image poetry'. Our Chitrakavya has such thing as
Anadavardhana explained. But C.D. Lewis thinks it as a broader concept and of wider field. In the simplest term we may call it a Manas-Pratima, Vak-Pratima, Chitra-Kalpa, Kalpachitra, as the words denote a picture of the mind. It is mental image depicted in a poem or art. It may relate to a Manasi, Manas Pratima, Man-as Sundari, Jivan Devata, Beautiful Lady, the ideal beauty that acts as the sole impulse to a poet or artist.

Imagery is a topic that belongs both to psychology and literature. In psychology the word 'image' means mental reproduction, a memory, of a past sensational or perceptual experience not visual. According to Coleridge images become proofs of original genius only so far as they are modified by a predominant passion. And Dryden said that image is the very height and life of poetry. The primary pigment of poetry is the image. Thus image whether it is virtual or real in science cannot satisfy a poet for his wonderful conceptions visualised in his poems. It may be of different hues like those of a rainbow to dance in the mental eye, that is the real visionary power for a creative mind. Or it may be a kaleidoscopic view to the genius of a poet. So a poem written according to the principles of abstract art is devoid of all thought-content, sentiment and understandable imagery, and it ceases to be poetry. The images, whatever their source, are transformed by a vision and an accent which belong to a plane above the mind. It is
invested with a rhythm of higher spheres. There is the communion with the very spirit, impulse, the Ray that cannot be seen by ordinary eye. The higher the mind is, the more powerful the vision be, the more significant and powerful the images are. It is evident in the great works of the masterminds in the literature. It is like Arjun's tremendous cosmic vision in the Gita (Ch. XI), Dante's final effulgent vision in his Divine Comedy or a good number of ecstatic passages in the Bible. And that visualisation is the power of a genius like Dante. Our concern here is that of the visionary world it may be cosmic or mental, social or political, historical or mythological, archetype or myths, symbolic or metaphorical as the subject matter of the poetry requires.

In modern Indian criticism, the word Bimba has stood for image. It is expressive of reflection through which the standard of similitude is reflected in the object compared. Through it an image is effected. Modern western literary critics have associated this image with almost all the varieties of poetic expressions. They have no suggestion, sentiment or figures of speech as being delimited and so that form of image has only a slight resemblance in the Arthachitra, of Indian poetics. In this situation the Chitratva denotes Vichitratva or picturesqueness, imagery etc. In the Upamana, the thing compared the standard of similitude, Upamans is mirrored or focussed and the image is produced. In the figure
metaphor, which in Aristotle's view idea of image is very
nearer and place can be occupied by the simile in Indian
poetics. Then again in Indian literature, symbols are taken
to be the old images, but in the western literature these
symbols have developed into images and so they constitute
the first phase of the development of thought into imagery.
Symbols that are also images are a primary, contemporary
concern. The beauty of the poetic image consists in the
synthetisation and concretisation of abstract thoughts in
poetry. But with the condensation of ideas there is always
the danger of the language lacking the strength to carry mean­
ing. This may result in ambiguity too. Finally, we can say
that an image is a different thing outside the limitations of
any particular figure of speech as a separate entity, and is
the real test of a poet, being more difficult to use or evoke
than any of the beautiful figures. What is needed in order
to achieve this feat of creative power is a surcharging of
the imagery emotionally and with feelings. Therefore, to be
genuinely evocative, the images must be emotive. And emotions,
like an oily substance at the best, can see a fringe along
with the contours of the images. Arthachitra constituting
these images, to be the highest type of poetry, must emerge
from the depth of heart.

The riddles, poetic tricks etc. which constitute the
sub-variety of the figure of sound and sense cannot be
included in higher poetry. In *Arthachitra* with images of
deeper meaning, even the highest type of poetry can be reali-
zed. This has direct appeal to the visual sense. It depends
for its existence on the figures of sense, mostly those having
*Bimbapratibimba* or *Vastuprativastu* relation, giving the pecu-
liar poetic gift of the particular poet. Naturally the image-
creation generally goes with the figures of similitude. Yet
true images cannot emerge from a comparison of two or more
distant realities. In fact no image is produced by comparing
two disproportionate realities. On the contrary, a striking
image is a new one to the mind. It is evoked, by bringing into
relation that which the inner spirit alone has seized or can
seize, as Shelley held the view that the image is created when
the "film of familiarity" is purged from our inward sight.
So image is a pure creation of the spirit.

In imagism, concentration is the keynote and should
form the very essence of poetry. The poetry which is endowed
with occult, ambiguous, mystic and dark meanings is the repre-
sentative of the decadent symbolism. On the other hand, the
imagist poetry is characterised by clear, definite and artis-
tic expressions. Lewis also understands various poetic images
or impressions as the impressions of a hundred sorts, sensuous,
lively, lovely and many-hued forming the image in the ring-
after ring fashion. Sanskrit poetry has no unexpressed sense
to be darkly gathered. But it is wrapped up in such a way that
it is possible only for those who are initiated in the poetic hieroglyphics, to comprehend it in its subtlety. There lies the status of poetry which is pictorial, which does not use suggestion, but incarnates feeling. That is the final result.

Actually image is a particular idea dawned in the mind of a poet in a moment overwhelmed with the highest bliss, pleasure or pain. Unknowingly as in a trance he expresses his mind and the very image follows at its bidding then. So George Moore said that ideas are those pests and parasites of artistic work. Ideas expressed in so flowery a way by the creator, can please him and convey such pleasure to others. How are those beautiful parasites blooming large on the very tree - the poem's body, like all the selected and beautiful ornaments we can supply for the beautiful maiden once more to beautify her beauty. And so Michael Angelo said that one paints not with the hands but with the brain. And lofty genius is so active to invent something more precious.

The process of aesthetic production can be symbolized in four stages e.g.,

(a) Impressions
(b) Expression or spiritual aesthetic synthesis.
(c) hedonistic accompaniment or pleasure of the beautiful (aesthetic pleasure) and
(d) translation of the aesthetic fact into physical phenomena like sounds, tones, movements, combination of lines
and colours etc. And that is why we have the sense of touch, sense of smell, sense of taste and sense of beauty.

And what do we understand by the word genius? It means his bent of mind and it was contrasted with 'talent' though they were used as synonyms, Genius means to bring into being. Genius acquired accretion from 'Djinn' not far different from the Greek 'Daimon'.

And genius is closely connected with Pratibha or imagination. According to I.A. Richards as he dealt with in the Principles of Literary Criticism (Ch. XXXII) imagination can be used in various senses e.g.,

(i) Producing visual images

(ii) Figurative language

(iii) Sympathetic reproduction of another's emotional states

(iv) Inventiveness

(v) Scientific imagination

and (vi) Coleridge's, that which reconciles opposites and unites disparate things.

Pratibha etymologically means 'Shines to.' This is what Patanjali called Mahajnana, the wish-yielding Chintamani. It is inherent in every sentient being in some degree or other. It is mind's eye and enables poets to describe places he has never seen as in Wordsworth's 'Yarrow Unvisited.'
According to Edward Young, a genius differs from a good understanding, as a magician from a good architect, ........

........ Hence genius has ever been supposed to partake of something divine. His essay entitled "Conjectures upon Original Composition" is a vigorous recommendation of a sustained celebration of the 'pleasures of the pen', the 'Sweet refuge' of original composition. 'How independent of the world is he, who can daily find new acquaintance ............ in the little world', the minute but fruitful creation, of his own mind?

Thus imagination is an active, self-realizing, self-forming system. The word is derived from the original Greek word 'Phantasia' and we get phantasy, fantasy, fancy. It is a wild lawless faculty of the mind as Hobbe's psychology considered. Create means to create something out of nothing. The creative imagination or Pratibha in the Romantic period of English literature became the repetition of the eternal act of creation. John Locke was the target of Blake and Coleridge as the theories of Locke dominated English Philosophy. He did assume that in perception the mind is wholly passive, a mere recorder of impressions. Blake says that this world of imagination is the world of Eternity; it is the divine bosom into which we shall go after death of the vegetated body. This world of Imagination is Infinite and Eternal,

1. Conjectures, p. 43, Edited by Edith Morley (Manchester 1918).

2. Ibid, pp. 4-5.
whereas the world of Generation, or Vegetation, is Finite and Temporal ............ All things are comprehended in their Eternal Forms in the divine body of the Saviour, the True Vine of Eternity, the Human Imagination. \(^1\) Both Blake and Coleridge had the same idea of it. And Coleridge's view on Imagination at that time was not very different from Blake's. He wrote that if the mind was not passive, if it was indeed made in God's image, and that, too, in the sublimest sense, the Image of the Creator, there was ground for the suspicion that any system built on the passiveness of the mind must be false as a system. And he wanted to prove the living power while he defined Imagination thus: "The primary Imagination I hold to be the living Power and prime Agent of all human Perception, and as a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM." \(^2\).

Thus imagination presupposes a sense of harmony and spirit. Coleridge's theory of Imagination is similar to that of the German Idealist philosopher Schelling, who in his 'System of Transcendental Idealism' accords to the faculty of imagination a high function as the organ of artistic and philosophical truth. The power that unifies and creates experience and constitutes the essential principle of unification in human consciousness is the Esemplastic Power accor--

\(^1\) The Romantic Imagination, p. 3, C.M. Bora, Oxford University Press, 1964.

Primary and Secondary Imagination:

He considered imagination as primary and secondary. "The secondary imagination is the echo of the former, co-existing with the conscious will, yet still as identical with the primary in the kind of its agency, and differs only in degree, and in the mode of its operation. It dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to recreate; or where this process is rendered impossible, yet still at all events it struggles to idealize and to unify. It is essentially vital, even as all objects (as objects) are essentially fixed and dead."

And, "Fancy, on the contrary, has no other counters to play with, but fixities and definites . . . . . . But equally with the ordinary memory the Fancy must receive all its materials ready made from the law of association."¹

Indeed imagination and insight are in fact inseparable and form for all practical purposes a single faculty. They are complementary. According to Kant, Imagination is a universal human faculty which reconstructs experience. And John Locke's 'Association of Ideas' reminds us of the past life and its experiences. Joseph Addison had put in his Spectator No. 417

---

similar views that any single circumstance of what we had formerly seen often raises up a whole scene of imagery, and awakens numberless ideas that before slept in the imagination; such a particular smell or colour is able to fill the mind, on a sudden, with the picture of the fields or gardens, where we first met with it, and to bring up into view all the variety of images that once attended it. Our imagination takes the hint, and leads us unexpectedly into cities or theatres, plains or meadows.

Such is the happy power of association. This is like a cluster of images no doubt. The fruits of an individual's past experience constitute his readiness or power of associational response. This response acts as the ultimate organ of inward vision which rises to the brain like an Aurora Borealis and there disporting the past and present in various shapes it images out. Adam Ferguson, a moral philosopher said, that 'imagination which conceives a thing with all its qualities and circumstances ......... in respect to all their relations of similitude, analogy, or opposition; whereas, in abstractions, we should consider subjects, or parts of subjects, in some limited point of view, to which our reasoning or thought in that instant is directed.'

Vividness (Enargeia) appears in classical treatises as a quasi-cognitive figure, a rhetorical merit which tends to be

definable best in terms of the imaginative excitement which it is said to induce in an audience. In the treatise of Longinus, the conception is treated under the head of images (phantasia).

At the present day the word (phantasia) is predominantly used in cases where, carried away by enthusiasm and passion, you think you see what you describe, and you place it before the eyes of your hearers. — XV.

Aristotle (Rhetoric, iii, xi) had suggested that vividness is likely to appear along with such, more definable figure as metaphor, antithesis, and parallel.¹

Anandavardhana illustrated the power of imagination thus: sarve nava iva bhanti madhuma iva drumah (As the trees in the spring season all are alive). Spring creates life under the ribs of death. And Prof. Lowes says that the touch of genius is like the miracle of spring. It is so bright with colour and life. The creative imagination shapes words in literature, sculptures stone, handles brush for painting, flows into melody of song or orders life itself. Abhinavagupta defined imagination as the power to create something original or new ("Aparba vastu nirmana kshanaprajna pratibha").

(b) Nature of Imagery:

By nature, imagery is a separate language as poetry is

to Paul Valery. Robert Frost is right in his opinion about the nature of imagery in poetry to say that it is saying one thing and meaning another. It is not a direct and straightest way of expression through which an image is created by a poet. With his own experience and feeling, a poet imposes a special colour or picture on a particular object of the subject or subject-matter of his poetry, in order to form images in his suitable design. Simile and metaphors serve the most essential parts in forming imagery. So there is every possibility of mistaking a simile or metaphor to be the very image. The technique is to apply simile or metaphor in a proper way to create an image but there must be the suggestiveness, the variety of the lucidity and sentiment. That suggestion leads the matter of the poem to the audience or to the very heart of a reader. The more delicate the suggestiveness the more deeper the imagery becomes and vice-versa. The image is significant or striking when the selected colour or picture imposed upon the very object is a matter of personal experience and of keen observation or vision. The point of attraction is not the very feeling in the poet, it depends on his sharp delicate perception and also intellect. To understand and enjoy it the senses-eyes, and the mind are to be sympathetic along with his intellect in a reader. It is like the same attitude to enjoy a painting with his eyes, mind and intellect.
The Imagination is the outcome of the emotions and therefore, regardless of logic, makes our expression powerful, profound, colourful and lucid. The imagery, in fact, is like a small word-picture which the poet uses for the exposition of his thoughts and emotions in order to endow them with clarity and intelligibility. In the absence of such imaginative word-pictures, the emotions become invalid. On the other hand figures of sense or meaning are inseparable from the imagination which is the carrier of the figures, or of thought. It is the concrete form of the abstract. It is the language of the inner psychology. It works like a medium. As a consequence of the inevitability this medium takes up various designs and colours like a rainbow. It is the inexhaustible treasure for poetry. So the new images are organised or arranged by imagination where the expression is free from the orthodox ideas. Thus we get the novel and beautiful world in images. There is the concretisation of the sensuous feelings. It is not like the imagination of a painter as poet's images are ocular and the auricular but painter's is ocular.

The nature of a noble image may be analysed to see its many qualities and characteristics, the depth, the extensive and vast region, the evernew expressive quality for the new vistas of the imaginations. So it is not possible to create images with the only one static technique specially the striking images need many coloured hue. The Noble poetry is always
unique, unsurpassable, unprecedent and this singularity of the poetry depends upon the nature of the image. So each noble and great work is without a second one to be compared with for its wonderful creation in all aspects as we see the epics by those ancient poets. It is eternal and everlasting. In most of them we see the simile, metaphor and other figures of sense bearing the images for all time to come. A striking contrast in these great works is the subjective element not valued and that makes them universal in character. Purely objective in nature the living images, the similes and metaphors there, are evernew. In other types of literary works we have the images that are more individual and more expressive than the abstract worlds whose place they take. The images here give a sufficiently definite outline of the states of the mind which are perfectly vivid to the poet. But they tell not only what a poet means intellectually but all that he feels the complex of thought and emotion in him. To the modern poets and writers the complex and strange situations in our day-to-day life help them create strange and at the same time complex images and thoughts can be so well inspired by the society at large. And behind the conscious gift that creates coherent image-patterns there lies the deep power to organize experience. And a modern mind has his thousands of varied experiences collected from every walk of life. And Rilke was right to opine that in order to write a single verse, one must see
many cities, and men and things; one must get to know animals and flight of birds and the gestures that the little flowers make when they open out to the morning.

Study of imagery is a modern topic in Western Critical literature but it was originated in modern semantics, psychology, anthropology, the original form of the mythological imagination in a society and their discussion. We can see that the visual imagination which is marked by the word 'Image', consequently assumes that the speaking or expressive form of the impressions or feelings in poetry is merely picturesque. And the language that is the medium of poetic imagination, the expressions - can assimilate all the sensuous feelings and thoughts. By the language of such craftsmanship we can be enlightened or enkindled with all the experiences of senses. The only ability or capability of language is to create some image or picture with it as the true medium. And a poet is capable of creating some other miracles too. If we assume an image to be only a picture, then the idea of image and its nature of complexities and expansiveness will be limited and passive. In other words we get the similar idea in Pratim, Pratima, Pratiman as the Latin word Image means (go).

The methods of considering imagery may be of different types. According to the need of artistic creation, the application of an imagery and its necessity (value) may be changed. We know that no literary criticism is based on something airy
nothing, non-entity or some isolated act of mind. They are not abstract reasonings. Rather we base on literary criticism and literary types for such criticisms. Yet we may find out probable paths to study the problem of imagery and its nature. Let us call it a bird's-eye-view .......

First we are to see which of the senses in us be enlightened or illusioned by the image created in expressions. Though we see nothing, hear nothing, touch nothing, or smell nothing with the very augmenting suggestions of the words conveying the sense of vision, smell, touch or sound, yet we feel of the sensuous experience. So the feeling we have is indirect - that is the image of the feeling. But to which sense of experience does it fall? Or with which kind of experience the sensuous experience it can be identified - an image of picture, an image of sound, smell, taste or touch? Whether it belongs to the sense organ eyes, ears, tongue, nose or skin? We may thus classify the images with the corresponding sensibility of the senses and with the help of this analysis of this kind, we can easily ascertain the creative - impulse of the poet and to which region or specific field of imagination it belongs.

Another characteristic of imagery is the absence of feeling and the subject-matter. Here we may get the cluster of images.

Original live imagery can psychologically expose the inner self of the poet. So many experiences, thoughts, feelings,
innumerable free passions dance in the sensitive mind of the poet since his being conscious of that up to the present moment and so many experiences submerged to the bottom of the subconscious state. But the most mysterious power of the creative faculty can revive once more those lost and forgotten emotions and thoughts in the form of image. Therefore we can come closer to the inner self of the poet with the help of those images. We do not see most of the trifling facts of the man in the society as most of them are not useful to art but those emotions and passions revived from the memory of the poet - as they are the most intimately connected true informations of the soul of the poet. In his imagery, the poet is upheld so. We can see the inner mind of a poet in images. But Coleridge says that images, however beautiful they may be, do not of themselves characterise the poet. They become proofs of original genius only as far as they are modified by a predominant passion; or by associated thoughts or images awakened by that passion. In this connection Day Lewis said in 'The Poetic Image': "Now that is a very valuable statement. It is a counterpoise, but not a contradiction, of Aristotle's dictum that command of metaphor is the mark of poetic genius. Its chief value for us to-day lies in its insistence on the modifying and interrelating of images by passion."

Again, "The poetic myth was created by a collective consciousness; the poetic image returns to that consciousness

for its sanction. It is not merely that, time and again, we
find in the images of modern poetry forms and impulses derived
from the myths, but the very nature of the image - of poetry
in its metaphorical aspect - invokes that consciousness, as
though man, even at his most individual, still seeks emotional
reassurance from the sense of community, not community with
his fellow beings alone, but with whatever is living in the
Universe, and with the dead."¹

And Virginia Woolf wrote that every secret of a writer's
soul, every experience of his life, every quality of his mind,
is written large in his works, yet we require critics to expl­
ain the one and biographers to expound the other.²

The senses in the writer, the attitude and propensities,
tastes and interests in the society or nature - all are respon­
sible for the imaginative works by him. So the nature and atti­
tude of the poet can be embodied in his work. Senses in a poet
are so sensitive that we cannot imagine it. As for example the
sense of smell may work in so many different ways that his
organ is very keen to experience them. It may smell the sweet
scent of a fragrant flower, the smell of a body, crop, pond,
food and drink etc. The degree of smell may be pungent, mild,
sweet. And this type of image, i.e., the image of smell may
not be self-made. It tries to be subordinate to some other
image or vanish that way. We may cite such example from those

using cosmetics that may entice us as if the very limbs smell like scents.

And the eye, with all the natural power to see things, we have. Mind is the real eye. Eye of all eyes. The retina of the mind is so sensitive that even the very delicate nerve connected with the very organ eye in our own body, fails to see it being fully and distinctly reflected or refracted in it the very object we have or may have before it. But the mind's eye can. It can reflect or refract so vividly and so much colourful a way that even a technicolour film will not do that to please us. It is so flowery. So bright. And so dependable for a creative mind. The Kaleidoscopic view is not so pleasant as the natural scene in the Highest Mountain ranges or sky only for the ever changing brightest colourful images of light and shade. And the images in the mind are more brighter than those real and natural riot of colours in the Kanchanjungha reflecting the sun-rise every morning. But the most painful thing is that the ever changing images are hardly recorded even if we possess any up-to-date sensitive camera working automatically and the true picture of the mind in its full bright colour at the moment of its feeling and concerning such images and ideas, is absolutely impossible to depict even by the earnest efforts. Such is the wonder of wonderful mind. Like the wonderful creation of the Creator the creation of mind is so vast and colourful in depicting an imaginary world.
So we can see the nature of images that tell us in the poetry of one, the similar attitude, mood, feeling, passions and emotions being duly depicted by his craftsmanship - either in simile, metaphor, symbol or such other alamkāras or rasas or style, a masterpiece is thus the time picture of a mastermind great creator.

And in his Letters 3rd Series, Sri Aurovindo mentions, with some explanations and illustrations, the various distinctive sources of poetic imagination and vision, particularly those of the Psychic, the inner Mind, the Higher Mind, the Illumined Mind, the Intuitive Mind, and, above all, the Over Mind.1

'...The higher thought has a strong tread with bare unsandalied feet and moves in a clear-cut light, a divine power; measure, dignity is its most frequent character. The out flow of the illumined mind comes in a flood brilliant with revealing words or a light of crowding images, sometimes surcharged with its burden of revelations, sometimes, with a luminous sweep. The intuition is usually a lighting flash showing up a single spot or plot of ground or scene with an entire and miraculous completeness of vision to the surprised ecstasy of the inner eye; its rhythm has a decisive, inevitable sound which leaves nothing essential unheard, but very commonly is embodied in a single stroke. 2 And as to the Over mind, he says

that it 'thinks in a mass' and 'its thought, feeling, vision
is high or deep or wide or all these things together ..... it
goes past on its way to bring the divine riches, and it has
a corresponding language and rhythm'.

So we see images created by those different kinds of
minds in a poet. And the nature of the images created by such
minds are also different. The higher the mind the higher the
imagery. We have in the Vedas such images, or in the Bhagawata
or in the great epics of the world in ancient languages, the
rich literatures of those great people.

The countries of the mind and the exquisite images in
such literatures created by such minds are really the touch
stone to the next genre of literature. They are classics,
And we have the Iliad by Homer who was believed to be blind?
And Beethoven was deaf! Imaginary world is boundless as
imagination can fly like an everfree bird in the sky and enjoy
the visible world with all its variegated colourful scenes
from the distance. And the distance or the region to which
the mind's eye can fly is so unimaginable!

C.D. Lewis says, that the moderns look for in imagery,
freshness, intensity and evocative power. Freshness and poten-
tiality of an image through the novelty of its diction, its
material, or both, to reveal something we had not realized
before. And in modern verse, metaphor holds the field over

1. Ibid.,
simile; intensity is achieved not only in separate image, but through the closeness of the pattern within which a poem's images are related. Evocativeness is the power of an image to evoke for us a response to the poetic passion.

But we are to consider the trends and the social norm in different periods. Actually the trends come with some possible novelty and potentiality. It may be something new though not the total change of the old faiths and traditions. Overall changes in a social or cultural life can't be expected though they are metamorphical in character. So modern critics are not satisfied with the age-old poetics only for its deep-rooted practice in similes and metaphors. Ancients believed imagery simply as ornate something or only as Alamkaras. But imagery is not Alamkara only. And it is not metre alone. To be frank the innermost things for a poem are metre and imagery. Simple tone or idea is not a poem, metre and beauty or form are also not making a poem. It should be the union of the music (tone) and metre, union of idea and beauty or form. And then and then only it is a poem. It is the theory of art to see the union of the sweet sounds of a Cuckoo and that of the pea-cock in a single moment, for ideas to be expressed as it may come to the mind. That which is full of Alamkaras, may not be the best poem as Alamkara also may not be the soul of a poem. We see some of the great poems so plain and simple containing the least Alamkara or without the profusion of any
figure of speech. So Mallarme suggested once to painter Degas to write poems with words only. Ideas may not make poems. We want expressions or words for a poem. And sound or suggestion and beauty of words not only have their own intrinsic meaning but are live energies to specific beauty and pleasure in poetry.

According to modern criticism it is really the imagery that is the soul of poetry. In discussing about the imagery in a poem we enter into the technique of the poet and his Kingdom of ideas as well. But in this new mode of criticism there may be some untraceable dust particles hidden unnoticed and so the approach may be fruitless and thereof the value as well. Avoiding those obstacles, we may discover the creative faculty of the poet in studying his imagery. In its last approach this very creative faculty of a poet is a mysterious thing. We cannot know it through the pages of a biography of the poet or even from his autobiography as well. Each image is the very road to the imagination. Every image, specially the unique one, is the very restrained illumination of the moment of creation.

Metre and the beauty of expression are the two specialities of poetry. Imagery or the application of the technique of expression in a unique and unanalyzable or unexplainable way in poetry, distinguishes it from painting or dance, a novel or drama. And it is the only technique that is found in poetry.
alone, and we may admire other arts as poetical if such a technique be found in them.

(c) **Different kinds of Imagery**

The commonest type of image is a visual one; and many more images, which may seem unsensuous, have still in fact some faint visual association adhering to them. But obviously an image may derive from an appeal to other senses than that of sight. And Lewis says that every image - even the most purely emotional or intellectual, has some trace of the sensuous in it.

Imagery is of many kinds. Some of them are conventional or traditional. It can be experimental or scientific. The sensuous imagery is related to one another or to one or the other of the five senses. They are mainly gustatory, olfactory. It may be archetype or primordial.

'We may introduce the theory of Dr. Jung's account of poetry's psychological effect, as summarized by Miss Maud Bodkin: The special emotional significance possessed by certain poems - a significance going beyond any definite meaning conveyed - he attributes to the stirring in the reader's mind, within or beneath his conscious response, of unconscious forces which he terms 'primordial images', or archetypes. The archetypes he describes as 'psychic residua' of numberless experiences of the same type', experiences which have happened
not to the individual but to his ancestors, and of which the results are inherited in the structure of the brain, a priori determinants of the individual experience.¹

We may classify the images with the corresponding sensibility of the senses. But classifications of psychologists and aestheticians are numerous. There are not only gustatory, olfactory images but we have thermal images and pressure images in the forms of Kinaesthetic, haptic, empathic. There are different groups like static and kinetic imagery as in electricity. And the sensuous images are transforming from one sense to another. And synaesthetic imagery is of such character. In this connection Austin Warren wrote:

"Synaesthetic imagery (whether the result of the poet's abnormal psychological constitution or of literary convention) translates from one sense into another, e.g., sound into colour. Finally, there is the distinction, useful for the reader of poetry, between 'tied' and 'free' imagery: the former, auditory and muscular imagery, necessarily aroused even though one reads to one and approximately the same for all adequate readers; the later visual and else, varying much from person to person or type to type."

I.A. Richard's general conclusions, as given in his Principles of 1924, still seem sound: that too much importance has always been attached to the sensory qualities of images.

¹ G.D. Lewis: The Poetic Image, p. 141.
What gives an image efficacy is less its vividness as an image than its character as a mental event peculiarly connected with sensation.'

Its efficacy comes from its being 'a reflect' and 'a representation' of sensation.

From images in the vestigial representatives of sensations we move with instructive ease to the second line which runs through our whole area - that of analogy and comparison.\(^1\)

Again, 'the visual image is a sensation or a perception, but it also 'stands for', refers to, something invisible, something inner. The image may exist as 'description or as 'metaphor'. But may the images not offered as metaphor, seen by the 'mind's eye' also be symbolic? Is not every perception selective?

So Middleton Murry thinks of 'simile' and 'metaphor' as associated with the formal 'classification' of rhetoric, advises the use of 'images as a term to include both, but warns that we must 'resolutely exclude from our minds the suggestion that the image is solely or even predominantly visual. The image 'may be visual, may be auditory', or 'may be wholly psychological.'

In some poems we get a central image and the poem moves round, springs from it, or constantly refers back to it. At

\(^{1}\) Austin Warren: Theory of Literature, p. 186, Ch.XV.
the centre of such poem there is only one image. But in some poems we get at the centre of it not a single image but a host of images.

In purer poetry of today there is a danger from the centrifugal force of its images. And poetry is an essence which we have to dilute with grosser elements to make it viable or practicable. A poem that is pure imagery would be like a statue of crystal - something too cold and transparent for our animal senses according to Herbet Read. The grosser elements are emotion, sensuousness etc.

Pure imagery is the essence of poetry. H. Read and Raleigh are not, however, talking about quite the same thing. Raleigh was speaking of the pure lyric. But the images are not pure as they are mixed with grosser elements. The sensuous images in a poem pitch the poem at a certain emotional key and mood. The images of the impassioned poetry may be forced images as they spring from artificiality or fertilized soil, sensibility. They are luxuriant but transitory and freakish.

In 1924, Henry Wells published a study of Poetic Imagery which attempts to construct a typology, the types inducted from and chiefly illustrated by Elizabethan literature. Rich in perceptive insights and suggestive generalisations, the book is less successful at systematic construction ......
basis of his investigation is said to be arrangement of groups of figures 'as they appear on an ascending scale from the lowest, or most nearly literal, to the most imaginative, or impressionistic', but the scale that of the 'character and degree of imaginative activity', is asserted to have no direct bearing on the evaluation of them. His seven types of imagery, arranged in his own order are: the Decorative, the Sunken, the Violent (or Fustian), the Radical, the Intensive, the Expansive and the Exuberant. They may advantageously be arranged according to historical and evaluative hints offered by Wells.

The crudest forms, aesthetically, are the Violent and the Decorative or the 'metaphor of the masses' and the metaphor of artifice. The Decorative image, abundant in Sydney's Arcadia, is judged 'typically Elizabethan'. The Violent image, illustrated out of Kyd and other early Elizabethans, is characteristic of an early period of culture; but since most men stay at a sub-literary level it belongs, in sub-literary forms, to any period'; sociologically, 'Fustian constitutes a large and socially important body of metaphor.' The evaluative judgement of both types is that they are 'deficient in the requisite subjective element,' that they too often link one physical image to another (as in Catachresis) instead of relating 'the outer world of nature to the inner world of man.' Again in both Decorative and Violent metaphors, the terms of
the relationships remain disjunct, fixed, uninvaded by each other. But in the highest forms of metaphor, Wells believes, each term acts upon, alters, the other, so that a third term, a new apprehension is created by the relationship.¹

Next as we go up the scale, come the Exuberant image and the Intensive, the former a subtler vision of the Violent, the later a subtler vision of the Decorative. We have left behind obvious forms of display, whether of energy or ingenuity. In the Exuberant image, we have, historically, reached Marlowe ........

Wells's Intensive image is neatly visualizable image of the sort associated with illuminated manuscripts and pageants of the Middle Ages. In poetry it is the image of Dante and, especially in English poetry, of Spenser. The image is not only clear but - what perhaps follows - diminutive, diagrammatic; ....

The three highest categories are the Sunken, the Radical and the Expansive (taken, one would think, in ascending order). Briefly, the Sunken is the image of classical poetry; the Radical, the image of the Metaphysicals, pre-eminently of Donne, and the Expansive, the image predominantly of Shakespeare as well as of Bacon and Browne and Burke. The common denominations of the three, their marks of shared attitude are their specifically literary character (their recalcitrance to

¹ Austin Warren : Theory of Literature, p. 186, Ch. XV.
pictorial visualization), their internality (metaphoric thinking), the interpretation of the terms (their fruitful, procreative marriage)". 1

The Sunken image, not to be confounded with the faded or trite, keeps 'below full visibility', suggests the sensuous concrete without definitely projecting and clearing it. Its lack of overtones suits it to contemplative writing ...

The Radical image - so-called perhaps because its terms meet only at their roots, at an invisible logical ground, like final cause, rather than by juxtaposed obvious surfaces - is the image of the minor term of which seems 'unpoetic', either because too homely and utilitarian or because too technical, scientific, learned. The Radical image, that is, takes as metaphorlic vehicle something which has no obvious emotive associations which belongs to prose discourse, abstract or practical ...........

Lastly there is the Expansive image, its name is linking it by contrariety, to the Intensive. - If the Intensive is the medieval and ecclesiastical figure, the Expansive is that of prophetic and progressive thought, of 'strong passion and original meditation', culminative in the comprehensive metaphors of philosophy and religion represented in Burke, in Bacon, in Browne and pre-dominantly in Shakespeare. By definition, the Expansive image is one in which each term opens a

wide vista to the imagination and each term strongly modifies the other: the 'interaction' and 'interpretation' which according to modern poetic theory are central forms of poetic action occur most richly in the 'Expansive metaphor.'

The complex world of modern age can be depicted by a poet in complex images. But they may be strewn in shreds sometimes inconsistent, incongruent. Whether images are too strong for their context and, quarrelling among themselves tear it into shreds; or whether they are so purified of human associations that our common, earthbound imagination cannot warn them in either case, the result is the same - a poem brilliant perhaps in the detail perceiving deep perhaps with its momentary intuitions, but unsatisfying in the round; an incomplete poem: a heap of broken images, Day Lewis remarks so.

**Romantic Image:**

And there is the Romantic Image. Day Lewis wrote that the greatness of the Romantics was to discover - or rediscover - and to explore the nature of poetic thought. To-day, however, when this term 'poetic thought' is sometimes palmed off on us by path as an excuse for not thinking at all, we do well to remind ourselves how far was the Romantic conception of poetry from that of an image - pattern related merely by the nature of the images on the strength of the feeling behind them.

---

And he defined the Romantic image thus: "The Romantic image is a mode of exploring reality, by which the poet is in effect asking imagery to reveal him to the meaning of his own experience. With the Romantic poet, the image-seeking faculty is unleashed and wanders at large, whereas with the classical it is tethered to a thought, a meaning a poetic purpose already clarified, and its radius of action is thus far limited."¹

The wide-expansive complexities of imagery may be classified in the following different names. It may be traditional, passive, obsolete or dead, light i.e. not serious or deep, original, live or new. And there is the poetic Gestalt according to Herbert Read.

The romantic poets employed, to establish the transcendent order, a vocabulary of assertion, of value-words representing concepts or feeling universally regarded as valuable, such as beauty, truth, liberty: words representative of the highest kind of bond between human beings, such as love, sympathy, harmony; words endowed by religious associations with a special sanctity, such as grace and ministry; or greatest of human endeavour and aspiration, such as power, might, awful, sublime. These words were used in images of impression. This vocabulary provided a context of values for the images, which take on a special character in terms of the value-words. This vocabulary helps to establish the images in a system of

symbols', and the images fortify the value-words and give strength to them. Images of impression such as those of light, the sun, the moon or the city or the desert are relatively static symbols. They sufficed for a lyric. The larger romantic poems are given a shape which is governed by a structural image, an action or theme which provides a frame-work integrating image. The most important are the image of life as a journey in time, and the image of love between two individuals as a type of a higher union. And it is out of these elements images of impressions including structural images and the vocabulary of assertion, that the romantic vision is built.

So Coleridge is right to say that it is a distinction resulting from the poetic genius itself, which sustains and modifies the images, thoughts and emotions of the poet's own mind. We have symbolic imagery too. The poet may write some picture or symbol which recurs again and again in the form of simile or metaphor. The predominant passion may be marked characteristic in the imagery.

We may have character images, topical images or similes, Images may be connected with our heritage and jewels, love, silence or stillness and noise, death, life etc. And all these are the affairs of human world. The changeless eternal subjects of poetry are love, death and nature. Imagery is connected with all these subjects of poetry. Difference in imagery indicates the difference in mood and temper of the writer. The method
of working by way of suggestion, springing from a succession of vivid pictures and concrete details, is of course, of the very essence of 'romantic art'. So we get the Romantic Image. And the romantic image is the image of wonder. It is the Yeatsian symbol which is flowering, reconciling opposites of action and contemplation according to Frank Kermode. And Coleridge called this unifying power Esemplastic. The word is Greek and means to shape into one, because having to convey a new sense he used it to prevent its being confounded with the usual import of the word Imagination. Wordsworth merely distinguished between fancy and imagination as an inferior and as a superior mode of imaging, while both are inventive, fancy was an inferior and arbitrary way of imaging, and imagination was a superior faculty. But Coleridge made a distinction between three types of mental faculties i.e. the fancy, the primary imagination, and the secondary. According to his view fancy is a mode of memory which may receive materials from the law of association. Primary imagination is a universal faculty and a source of human perception. The secondary is the poetical faculty, the special gift of the creative power. Yet their theories can not be separate as they are the two great minds producing romantic movement. Romantics certainly created worlds of their own and they persuaded others that their creations were not absurd or fanciful. The romantic imagination differs from some of the German contemporaries.
So we have different types of the romantic images—English and German. The latter had the respect for unsatisfied longing as an end in itself or the belief in hallucination or nihilistic delight in being detached from life. So Novalis wrote to Caroline Schlegel:

"I know that imagination is most attracted by what is most immoral, most animal, but I know how like a dream all imagination is, how it loves, meaninglessness and solitude." ¹

According to Blake romantic imagination is divine vision. And it is so because of the fact that that very vision carried them beyond it into a transcendental order of things.

And we have particular image, myth, dream, metaphor, simile, Symbol for poets in different parts of the world in their own literature and language. Some of them are influenced by the very land in which they are born and brought up. Those struggling for existence with the vast oceans like the 'Old man' of Hemingway, those Greek and Romans in the great epics, have the particular imagery of the sea or ocean. In our land we have the Himalayas, the Ganges, the Yamuna and some of them are used as objective correlatives. The Yamuna is the eternal love symbolised by Indian writers for all the ages. Indians got the origin of symbols in the Vedas.

As for particular imagery one may handle a simile in such a way that others cannot be a master in that as in our Sanskrit

literature 'Upama Kalidasagya' indicates. Some is rich in meaning or lucidity of words but hardly we can expect a Maasha who was gifted with the power of simile, meaning and the lucid style in his works. So it may be said a particular poet is the master of a particular imagery and may differ in a distinctive craftsmanship. The magical quality is the cause of wonder among surrealist writers. Baudelaire believed that the symbolical images of his poems accosted the ineffable, and the images from the eternal world corresponded to his own inner life. And his poems were portraits of himself. So he symbolised himself.

As there is dissociation of sensibility, we have also the association of ideas. With one idea is joined another to be related somehow or other. Images of vision, description of scenes and sight, images of complex, assimilated with unsensuous form are there. And images produced in different ways — not in sensuous experiences rather in formless feelings or abstract achievements (experience) may be associated. Chain action in associated images or images thus combined can be seen. Senses in a poet are so sensitive and keen that we cannot imagine it. As for example the sense of smell may work in so many different way that his organ is very keen to feel and experience them. So we get sensuous images in the manner of the Rupa, Rasa, Gandha, Sparsha or the sense of sight, taste, smell and touch respectively.

Also we may classify imagery as simple, complex, abstract, combined, combined abstract, complex abstract, abstract complex,
immediate etc. A simple imagery is a word which arouses ideas of sensory perception e.g. cold, bright, tree, hard. A complex imagery is a word or group of words arousing sense of perception e.g. bee, loud, glade, golden daffodils, bitter rice etc. An abstract imagery is a word which arouses no idea of sensory perception e.g. truth, idea, justice. A combined imagery is a group of words arousing sense of perception e.g. cold as charity, accurate knife, red revolution. A combined abstract is a group of words arousing ideas e.g. noble truth, just mercy. A complex abstract is a group of words arousing some ideas e.g. sincere love, faithful charity. An abstract complex is a group of words arousing sense of perception e.g. cold/chaste charity. Immediate imagery is fundamentally concerned with arousing ideas of touch, sound, smell, light, taste e.g. yellow, loud, touch. Responsive imagery is concerned only with stimulating the senses or restricted in its appeal to no one sense e.g. meeting, parting, Desire, Vigour.

Other types are the images of dreams, reflections, shadows, and also the image of likeness by art ecstatic, exact in dimensions with colours and of semblances by art phantastic i.e. painting, sculpture and music.

Regarding dream-picture the following statement is mentionable: "The 'manifest' dream-picture is the dream itself, and contains the 'latent' meaning. If I find sugar in the urine, it is sugar, and not a facade that conceals albumen. When
Freud speaks of the 'dream-facade', he is really speaking, not of the dream itself, but of its obscurity...... We say that a dream has a false front only because we fail to see into it. We would do better to say that we are dealing with something like a text that is unintelligible, not because it is facade, but simply because we cannot read it. Some of the dreams are symbolic structures. Jung interpreted myth and dream and influenced literary criticism. He says that a great work of art is like a dream.

(d) Function of Imagery:

To the last point of criticism, the creative faculty of a poet is a mysterious thing. In every successful image, we see the shining glories of the moment of creation in a restraint. Every image leads us to the imagination of a poet. According to the modern criticism, the life of a poem lies in the application of imagery. In discussing the imagery of a poem, we get the craftsmanship of the poet and know about the world of imagination of his. Images appeal, first of all, to the senses - the eyes, the ears, the nose, the skin, the tongue. We also know the vastness of the experience of the poet, deep sense of life and its value in images. Is the only medium of expressing the lyrical feelings, compassionate mind and thought, sense of episodes and stories, noble experiences. In

the best images of a poet we see assimilation of the objects of this world with eternal something, real and eternal as the spirit to realise and attain the most unrealisable or unattainable. Even the power of criticism is so limited to explore the very region of a poet creating sublime images in which the imagination of the poet soars up beyond the mortal world for its transcendental power that can transform the matter into spirit, real into eternal. In such an image the loud laughter, the deepest cry or unexpressed sense of distress can spread all over the world but that laughter, cry or distress have no physical form in existence. That sound cannot be heard by our external ear, the eyes can’t see it nor can it be experienced by our sense of touch. It is heard, seen and touched by the innermost sense of no bodily form. So it is purely abstract in idea. R.N. Tagore expressed such idea in his fine stanza in the poem Patraputa:

Hridayer asangkhya adrishya patraputa
guchchhe guchchhe anguli male ache
amar charidike chirakal dhare,
viswabhuvaner samasta aishwaryer sange amar yog hayechhe
manoikhsher ei chhadiye pada
rasalolup patagulir samvedane. (Innumerable invisible packages of in clusters are pointing towards me for all the time around me, I have been united with all the treasures of the universe only for the sympathy to those thirsty leaves of the mind’s tree spread out.) The sensuous appeal of the imagination of the poet is vivid here. And we get
the true picture of his colourful mind, the inner-self, that is invisible to audience or reader of his poem. It is quite impossible to enter into that creative mind of the poet however our attempts be to raise us to that very plane of his. Thus an image may reveal the inner self of the poet, though we cannot approach it fully. Image also reveals the philosophy of the poet and thoughtful emotions, emotional feelings, intellect and emotion too. Imagination bodies forth the forms of things unknown, the poet's pen turns them to shape and gives to airy nothing a local colour, habitation and name. Its inhabitants are diverse e.g. psychologists, art critics, writers on aesthetics, epistemologists, moralists, teachers and plain men. The topics that interest these people are varied too: dreams, inspiration, invention, education, sympathy, problems of knowledge, taste and other matters. Images create things unseen and unheard, disfamiliarises the familiar, it is a shaping spirit and is rasavvanjaka or expressive of sentiments. Metaphysically and mystically, it is equivalent of the Absolute.

Images also endow shape and form to the nature of poetry, and in order to express the poignancy of a thing or idea, present its concrete form before us. Only if this image-creation depends on the allusion of some idea or emotions, and enhances beauty, sweetness, loveliness or brightness etc., will it be of use to poetry. If it relates only to the length, breadth, shape or colour etc. then it will be not only futile, but also
a positive handicap to the realisation of the poetic sentiment.

Therefore, the imagery of similitude, which awakens the emotions, is alone acceptable in a poem, not that which had generated some momentary beauty, becomes ineffective. So devoid of the ocular imagery, the imagination may create a charm, but it will be not capable of giving concrete shape to any idea or effect. Mere imagination cannot present a concretised idea of any class. Poets utilise this imaginative power of image-creation for the sublimation of sentiments, and not for any extraneous effect. The secret of originality in the evocation of a good attractive visual image is first of all, the perceptive eye, or the true perception of the poet's vision, and then the interpretative imagination. And with this visual images poetry is created to inspire and impress. In this field the simile and the metaphor, among the figures, serve striking purpose. Lewis also gives much importance to the similes and metaphors. In his opinion, to invest real beauty in the poetic composition, they must be both original and powerful. It is these figures which make imaginative word-pictures conform to the actual universe, making them more real. It also heightens the poetic effect of newly found imageries. It is really the metaphor which gives the idea of image a new face-lift. According to Bertrand Russel images act as symbols just as words do. This leads us to think that symbolisation is accomplished through
the medium of images. But the main function of imagery is served by metaphor, simile and the symbol. Mostly the simile and metaphor are of utmost help for the evolution of the Arthachitra or poetic picture connected with the figure of meaning. And simile is the source of all the figures of sense. But in the light of the western treatment of image, metaphor has been valued in place of simile. Lewis admits the metaphorical nature of image. Certain metaphors have the depth as an image but not all. It is true that among the figures of sense the metaphor is, probably, the closest to the concept of image. So the object focussed in the image, comes as a part of a series of relationships, as also part of the nature of metaphor. It acts in more than one way. Metaphor consists in assigning to a thing the name of something else. It is metaphor that gives perspicuity, pleasure, and a foreign air. It is like a riddle. It is like the universal amber and acts as the permanent and necessary element for poetry. It is to some extent the touch-stone and a small model of the craftsmanship of poetry.

Now about some particular relation of metaphor and image neatly worked out may be mentioned. In metaphor, the formal relation of identity subsisting between two things is important. But in an image the very experience is metaphorphosed into the visualisation of the object. Lewis has expressed his opinion thus that taking into account the profound relation of
image with experience, that image, instead of creating a thing or object, visualises it in the context of experience. Thus, the object, focussed in the image, comes as a part of a series of relationships, and as a part of the nature of metaphor. It is contrary to the view of Indian theory of suggestion or dhyani that does not regard the visual element for the image-creation. Indians stressed on the element of enchantment or Ramanivata in poetry and have endowed Arthachitra or figure of sense, with this visual element. To some, the theory pronounced by Lewis is not so comprehensive and complete as the Indian theory of suggestion. But it is not our concern here.

Then we have to touch simile that serves the function of imagery. Metaphor may be the queen of figures but simile acts like an actress; in diverse roles dancing on the stage of poetic composition.

Simile is the most important figure of speech and to some extent it may mean all the figures of speech. We may compare the statements for this. First of all Upama or simile was born only to make the language ornate. In the primitive stage of mankind simile was used and it has been evolved or transformed into metaphor, Utpreksa etc. The complex figures of speech but the modern symbolical expressions are mostly the complex forms of simile e.g. the allegory, Utpreksa or lively fancy.
And Prof. J. Gonda remarked on this way: "That similes are not late phenomena in the history of human language, we learn from the fact that we are accustomed to look upon abstract ideas as similar to things we perceive with our sense organs, and that it is the first place people who have no trained way of thinking that are accustomed to do. Naive and 'Primitive' men who are scarcely able to abstract, are inclined to name new things after the familiar and to compare things unknown to well known. By means of 'simile' they bring the unknown within the sphere of the known. A primitive measure of time is e.g. Malay - sepetranak nasi lamanja, 'as long as it takes rice to boil' ........ also in Sanskrit, Kros'a - 'shout, yell; in a measure of distance; Ch. Up. 3, 14, 3 esa maa aatmauntar hrdayeves naa vaad voo .

Then we have in Panini, Bharata's Natvasastra, and different forms of it. According to Sanskrit poetics the figures of meaning include simile, metaphor, climax, anticlimax, personification, allegory, symbolism, pathetic fallacy, irony and the figures of speech have litotes, pun, euphemism, metonymy, synchdoche, stichomythia, epigram, antithesis, paradox, hyperbole, parody. The first group is called Arthalamkara and the secons sabdalamkara. 1

natural speech is so. And all Vakrokti is full of varieties of striking utterances. They may be classified as Varna-Vinyasa Vakrata: all figures of speech; Padapurvadha-Vakrata: the beauty of grammatical affixes, terminations, Vakya-Vakrata: all figures of meaning, styles, gunas and rasadi; Prakarana-Vakrata: all beauty of plot and description, innovations, Characterisation and propriety of rasa, sandhis andSandhyan gas and Prabandha-Vakrata: beauty of the whole work and the dominant rasa. According to Ruyyaka figures of meaning are numerous and he enlisted them in the following heads —

1) Where both the difference and identity between things are compared is simile.
2) Where identity between the two is super-imposed it is metaphor.
3) Where likeness is just suggested through words as in dipaka or through the sentence as a whole as in Prativastupama.
4) Where beauty is due to the suggestive element of epithets as in Samasokti.
5) Where the difference is prominent as in Vyatireka.
6) Where contrast is the principle of beauty as in Virodha or Asangati.
7) (a) Where poetic fancy is prominent e.g. Utpreksa.
   (b) Where poetic fancy involves exclusive mention of the imagined object e.g. Atisovokti (hyperbole)
8) Where common experience is poetically utilised e.g. Vakrokti.

9) Where beauty is due to the suggestive element of puns e.g. Shlesha.

10) Where serial arrangement is striking e.g. Sura, ekavati.

11) Where the logical mode of reasoning is poetically utilised e.g. Kavyalinga.

12) Where the rules of Syntax are poetically utilised: e.g. Yathasamkhya.

The imagery is mostly accountable as being associated with various figures of speech and meaning. Some of them are vivid in their picturesqueness. Mental image is emotional in its expression. We may say that imagery may serve four-fold function. It can have a sensuous, an imaginative, an archetypal and a spiritual appeal. It is at the archetypal level that imagery ascends to the level of Symbolism. Personification may hit similarly. Coleridge said that symbols were natural objects acting as the conductors of truth. Coleridge remarked that the imagination, incorporating reason in images of the sense, and organising (as it were) the flux of the senses by the permanence and self-circling energies of the reason, gave birth to a system of symbols, harmonious in themselves and consubstantial with the truths, of which they were the conductors.
In truth, greater than such symbols are the symbolic personalities created in aid of their creations by great poets of the world. We have Rama and Sita, Hamlet and Falstaff etc. and they are eternal, real as human beings.

The important landmark of Kant's aesthetic entitled the Critique of Judgment, 1790, is in making art in three-fold divisions corresponding to their character as the base. The first is arts of speech and its communication is word i.e. poetry and rhetoric. The second is arts of shaping e.g. architecture, sculpture, painting. Its communication is gesture and the third is arts of beautiful sensory pattern i.e. music and colour. Its communication is tone. "The modern activity of classifying the arts has been an attempt to put certain traditionally distinguished arts into more or less neatly bounded areas in a pattern having two basic dimensions. These dimensions are, unavoidably: (1) the dimension of physical medium under the aspects of time and space; and (2) the dimension of intellectual reference - positive and negative, that is, symbolic and non-symbolic.

Relation among image, metaphor, symbol and myth:

"Semantically, the terms (image, metaphor, symbol and myth) overlap; they clearly point to the same area of interest. Perhaps our sequence - image, metaphor, symbol and myth - may be said to represent the convergence of two lines, both import-
ant for the theory of poetry. One is sensuous particularly, or the sensuous and aesthetic continuum, which connects poetry with music and painting, and disconnects it from philosophy and science, the other is 'figuration' or 'tropology' the 'oblique' discourse which speaks in metonyms and metaphors, partially comparing worlds, precising its themes by giving them translations into our idioms.¹

Again, "The image may exist as 'description' or as 'metaphor'. But may the images not offered as metaphor, as seen by the 'mind's eye', also be symbolic? Is not every perception selective?

So Middleton Murry, who thinks of 'simile' and 'metaphor' as associated with the 'formal classification' of rhetoric, advises the use of 'images' as a term to include both, but warns that we must 'resolutely exclude from our minds the suggestion that the image is solely or even predominantly visual. The image 'may be visual, may be auditory, or 'may be wholly psychological.'

Like 'image' symbol has given its name to a specific literary movement. Like image, again, it continues to appear in widely different contexts and very different purposes. It appears as a term in logic, in mathematics, in semantics and semiotics and epistemology; it has also had a long history in the worlds of theology ('Symbol' is one synonym for 'Creed'),

of liturgy, of the fine arts, and of poetry. The shared element in all these current uses is probably that of something standing for, re-presenting, something else. But the Greek verb, which means to throw together, to compare, suggests that the idea of analogy between sign and signified was originally present.1

It is a problem now to see any difference and important sense of symbol, image and metaphor. To such a question they say: "Primarily, we think in the recurrence and persistence of the symbol. An image may be invoked once as a metaphor, but if it persistently recurs, both as presentation and representation, it becomes a symbol, may even become part of a symbolic (or mythic) system."2

So image, metaphor, symbol and myth are closely related. It is not possible to see them distinctly different something as the creation is by the same mind and idea. It is the mental attitude and mood so accurately depicted by the strong and mighty pen which is the inner mind of the creator and that is why the vision is divine.

And the myth 'a favourite term of modern criticism, points to, hovers over, an important area of meaning, shared by religion, folk-lore, anthropology, sociology, psycho-analysis, and the fine arts. In some of its habitual oppositions, it is contraposed to history, or to science, or to philosophy or to

1. Op.cit., p. 188
allegory, or to 'truth'.

In the XVIIth and the XVIIIth Centuries, the age of the Enlightenment the term had commonly a pejorative connotation: a myth was a fiction - scientifically or historically untrue. But already in the Scienza nuova of Vico, the emphasis has shifted to what, since the German Romanticists, Coleridge, Emerson, and Nietzsche, has become gradually dominant - the conception of myth as, like poetry, a kind of truth or equivalent of truth, not a competitor to history or scientific truth but a supplement.

Historically, myth follows and is correlative to ritual; it is 'the spoken part of ritual; the story which the ritual enacts.' For literary theory, the important motifs are probably the image or picture, the social, the supernatural (or non-naturalist or irrational), the narrative or story, the archetypal or universal, the symbolic representation as events in time of our timeless ideals the programmatic or eschatological, the mystic. In contemporary thought, appeal to myth may centre on any one of these, with a spread to other.

So it is clear that the four terms viz. image, metaphor, symbol and myth are prevalent in old literary study to treat the subject-matter both externally and superficially. They bridge and bind together old divisive components, 'form' and 'matter'. We may see such activities in poets thinking by means of metaphors, thinking in poetic narrative or vision.

They are only decorations, rhetorical ornaments. Modern analysis working after Freud sees all images as revelatory of the unconscious.

Figures:

Figures are subdivided and there are nearly two hundred and fifty sub-divisions but mainly they are of two or three categories. There is 'Schemes' or 'Tropes' as one kind and then the rhyme and alliteration under phonetic schemes. There are sound figures and sense figures, figures of speech or verbal figures and the figures of thought, figures of contiguity, figures of similarity and most of them are traditional. Supporting such view we may cite again, "Each period style has its own characteristic figures, expressive of its Weltanschauung; in the case of basic figures like metaphor, such period has its characteristic kind of metaphoric method. New-Classical poetry, for example, is characterised by the simile, periphrasis, the ornamental epithet, epigram, balance, antithesis." So figures could not be left out by poets.

Relation between myth, archetype, symbol and dream:

Regarding the myth, archetype, symbol and dream we now have some recent criticisms and theories or new meanings. The philosopher of our day who has pushed furthest the concern for

the origin of language and the laws governing the primitive ritual and myth is Ernst Cassirer. He thinks that language and myth are 'two diverse shoots from the same parent stem'. They spring from the same impulse of symbolic formulation. He calls this impulse "a concentration and heightening of simple sensory experience". He holds that symbols are shaped by man's needs and purposes. The symbol is not an aspect of reality: it is reality and in the symbol there is a thoroughgoing identification between subject and object.

And Richard Chase says that the term 'myth' is a value term. A poem is mythic if it is vibrant and alive and vice-versa. He identifies poetry and myth and says that myth is only art. For Leslie Fiedler the myth leads to the study of the message and consequently that of the biography of the poet. He says:

"In the Mask of the poet's life and the manifold masks of his work, the poet expresses for a whole society the ritual meaning of its inarticulate selves; the artist goes forth not to 'recreate the conscience of his race,' but to redeem its unconscious. We cannot get back into the primal Garden of the unfallen Archetypes, but we can yield ourselves to the dreams and images that mean paradise regained." ¹

Miss Maud Bodkin's conception of archetypes implies that images endowed with such universal significance—images
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rooted so deep in the human psyche have influence on the poet and the readers. Mythological patterns are the primordial images that occur in poetry.

But all these criticism owes to Carl Jung who thinks that the activity of the unconscious mind is capable of assuming an intelligence and purposiveness which are superior to actual conscious insight. The activity of the unconscious in dream and myth is not merely a symptom of psychic disorder but 'at times' at least is intelligent and purposive ordering. So all myths and dreams are not alike. Some are more purposive and significant than others. This implies a cognitive criticism and significant interpretation of myth and dream. They are knowledge-giving and dreams give us knowledge of ourselves he says.

Rhythm, Metre, Rhyme:

We know that the relationships of literature with fine arts and music are highly complex. Sometimes poetry has drawn inspiration from paintings or sculpture or music. Sometimes it has attempted to achieve the effects of painting to be word painting or to achieve the efforts of music - to turn to music. In this connection we have the useful statement —

"Musicality in verse, closely analysed, turns out to be something entirely different from 'melody' in music: it means an arrangement of phonetic patterns, an avoidance of accumulation
of consonants, or simply the presence of certain rhythmical effects.¹

And they stressed on the sound stratum, euphony, rhythm and metre to examine the methods used in describing and analysing the various strata of the work of art. We should follow now what the modern linguists have analysed the potential sounds as phonemes, and they have analysed morphemes and syntagmas too. But we require most effects of sound. Every work of art is a series of sounds and out of that arises the meaning. So we get sound - figures in some poetry.

And metre is the abstract pattern that obtains when rhythm is formally organized. It imposes a verse a regular recurrence of durations, stresses, or syllables that is intended to parcel a line into equal divisions of time. That is periodicity. Each of the temporal periods into which the line is divided is called a foot. But it is now untenable, by metrical schemes we get the regularity so marked. Metres have been based on diverse principles in different regions and in different ages. Some organized verse on the principles of stress, or intensity of emphasis, and alliteration. They may be logical or sense stresses. Accent is another word for stress. It is the basis of sprung rhythm. Accentual - syllabic verse replaces long and short syllables that compose a line.

They are termed as stressed and unstressed syllables. It is like musical notation. The analogy between the bar and the foot in musical notation is a measure. The feet in verse are Iamb, Trochee, Anapaest, Dactyl. The first two are dissyllabic. The latter two contain three syllables and is called trisyllabic. Other feet we spondees, Pyrrhic, Amphibrach, Cretic and Tribrach. Metres of verse composed of iambs, trochees, anapests, dactyls or spondees are said to be iambic, trochaic, anapestic, dactylic or spondaic respectively. Moreover metrical verse is appropriately described by the number of measures in a line. They may be a monometer, dimeter, trimeter, tetrameter, pentameter, hexameter, heptameter accordingly. And there is free verse or vers libre in which we see no rule of metrical verse being followed.

But the Russian formalists have tried to put metrics on entirely new basis. The term 'foot' seems to them meaningless since there are some verse without 'feet'. So the fundamental unity of rhythm is, then, not the foot but the whole line. It is a conclusion which follows from the general Gestalt theory. Feet exist only in relation to the whole verse.

In the background of every art there lies the deeper knowledge of the form. No successful art is possible without that. An artist paints after studying the lines and colours and their wonderful manner with much labour. So a musician does to acquire the melody and rhythm of so complex character.
But in poetry it is not so necessary as the creation is intuitive or instinctive. And thus the poet can create something full of suggestion and imagery that can easily touch any soul. But only the alamkara and idea cannot be suggestive - there must be the sense of the delicate thing 'form'. Though it is not possible to explain the technique of metre adopted by a noble poet for their wonderful suggestive qualities, in a scientific way yet we hear something pleasing in metrical sequences. And it is futile to examine the emotions and passions of the heart, the noblest and the most unique expressions of consciousness with the power of brain. And because of the fact that poetry is not the work of a brain through modern critics do not agree with the view that 'good poetry can be recognized by the thrill down our spine', it is so.