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The present research is a modest attempt to study concepts of postmodernism as developed by the critics like Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard and Jean Baudrillard. Jacques Derrida rejects centralization of texts and emphasizes on decentralization of meaning. He coins the term ‘difference’ to point out difference in the meaning and the postponement of meanings in the text. Derrida writes, “there is nothing outside the text” (Derrida 1982, 11). In other words there is no reality outside the text, art of life is like a text and the text is nothing but a play of differences. Derrida decentres the idea of centre which is impossible, an illusion, and a hallucination of language. All language is a form of arch writing. It is noticeable by temporality which is a succession of signs in time, spacing between signs, differences, and absences, not presences. Meanings, illusion of stability is possible through trace. Deconstruction cancels the search or need for origin since there is no grounding origin for language or signs. Signs function only in a network, chains of signs, traces of differential connections in the network, differences and defferals. Difference is an attempt to adjoin the differing and deferring aspects contained in arche-writing. It plays upon the distinction between audible and the written. Michele Foucault has challenged the validity of Marxism and questioned the validity of its ancestry. He attacks Marxism for its undue importance given to Enlightenment. He coins the terms power and knowledge to bring out lack of centre, “there is no centre of power but a multiple network of diverse elements and from bodies of multiple mechanisms at the power levels, we hear the roar of battle” (Foucault 1977, 307-08). Foucault’s thought comprises an astonishing intellectual initiative, a minute and ongoing investigation of the nature of power in society. Foucault’s study
of power in society, schools, hospitals, factories, homes, families and other forms of organized society is taken into consideration. Lyotard is not happy with the contemporary view of narration. He rejects modern metanarratives and favours small narratives. In this connection Narahari Kaviraj writes, “In the new age, socialist utopias (metanarratives, according to Lyotard) have to be given up, because they do not accord with the spirit of the age. In the new age, capitalism has the power to constantly revitalize itself, it is energy incarnate, it is the new avatar, you have to accommodate to it, or you perish. In the circumstances, the postmodernists evolve their new strategy, they accommodate to the capitalist system, but on terms of their own” (Kaviraj Narhari 2005, 20).

According to Lyotard, the prospect of metanarratives is gone and the new mini narrative is the only alternative left. Hence, the importance of the marginal takes the place of importance of the centre. Jean Baudrillard was also not happy with the Marxist for its inability to provide a radical enough critique of the existing society. According to him reality does not exist. Instead simulacra and images have taken the place of reality. In his work Simulations (1982) he boldly asserts that there is the “end of power, history and ‘the real’ in general” (Jean Baudrillard 1982). He contends that in this postmodern world, individual flees from the desert of the real in order to get pleasure of hyper-reality and the experience of realm of computer, media and technology. According to him there is fragmentation and loss of subjectivities. Regarding his postmodern stand Featherstone writes, “The proliferation of signs and images has effaced the distinction between the real and the imaginary – art has triumphed over reality” (Mike, Featherstone 1991, 85). The terms like simulacra, simulation, and hyper-reality are coined by Baudrillard to reveal his dissatisfaction with the contemporary view of reality. Thus Derrida, Foucault, Lyotard and Baudrillard contribute postmodern concepts like
‘difference’, ‘power’ and ‘knowledge’, ‘metanarratives’ and ‘mininarratives’, and ‘simulacra’ and ‘hyperreality’ respectively. Postmodernism is a continuation of modernism. ‘Modernism’ is used to identify the new features in the forms and concepts of literature. The special feature of modernism is that it involves a deliberate and radical break with some of the traditional bases of Western art and culture. A prominent feature of modernism is avant-garde that is creation of new artistic forms. Modernism embraces a number of artistic movements including Symbolism, Imagism, Expressionism, Surrealism, Dadaism, Cubism etc.

The term ‘postmodernism’ resonates in at least three registers: Firstly, in terms of historical development, the term appears as ‘postmodernity’, designating the latest phase in the broad evolution to capitalist economics and culture, especially since the later part of the 20th century. This historical phenomenon has generated two further registers that of postmodern theory, literature and art.

In the second register the term ‘postmodern’ has been used for the works of numerous writers, such as Jacques Derrida, Julia Kristeva, and Michel Foucault, who have labelled as ‘Poststructuralist’. M.H. Abram’s in *Glossary of Literary Terms* (2006) says: “Postmodernism in literature and arts has parallel with the movement known as post-structuralism in linguistics and literary theory” (Abram’s, M.H. 2006). Finally, in the register of literature and art, the terms used by a number of critics, such as Ihab Hassan, to distinguish the experimental literature produced after the Second World War (1939-1945).

Postmodernism is a broader phenomenon, one of its manifestations is poststructuralism. The two terms might be viewed as two approach or perspective, rather than two phenomena, from which to view the history of modern literary and cultural criticism. The Perspectives of modernism
situate modern theory within the context of larger economic and cultural
tendencies, whereas that of poststructuralism sees such theory as both
emerging from and reacting against the structuralisms modes of analysis
that predominated in many fields, including literature and political theory,
during the 1950s. The major practitioners of postmodernism include
Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard and Jean
Baudrillard.

Postmodern philosophy is a philosophical direction which is
critical of the foundational assumptions and universalizing tendency of
Western philosophy. It emphasizes the importance of Power
relationships, personalization and discourse in the ‘construction’ of truth
and world views. Postmodern philosophy is often particularly skeptical
about simple binary opposition’s characteristic of structuralism,
emphasizing the problem of the philosopher cleanly distinguishing
knowledge from ignorance, social progress from reversion, dominance
from submission, and presence from absence. Postmodernism follow the
thoroughly modern trend of idealism, it is more an ultra modernism than
anything else. The Encyclopaedia of Contemporary Literary Theory gives
comprehensive definition of postmodernism: “Postmodernism is now
used to describe the visual arts, music, dance, film, theatre, philosophy,
criticism, historiography, theology, and anything up-to-date in culture in
general” (Best Steven, 1993). The development of Information
technology ever increasing cultural multiplicity needs new modes of
representation. This demand for new modes of representation is met by
number of academic thinkers, critics, and the result is the birth of
postmodernism. A postmodernism that lives up to its name, therefore,
must no longer confine itself to the premodern preoccupation with things
nor with the modern confinement to ‘ideas’, but must come to terms with
the way of signs embodied in the semiotic doctrines of such thinkers like
Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard and Jacques Derrida. Postmodern critics as mentioned above contributed the development of postmodernism in different ways. These writers are formally diverse and ideological varied plurality; what brings these writers together is their protest against modernist approach to the study of literature. There is an ongoing debate over what modernism is, whether postmodernism constitutes a decisive break with it, or a development within it. Nor there is an agreement concerning what are the defining features of postmodernism as a mode of culture. Modern theory follows Enlightenment models of science, representation, and totality and exposed to the postmodern critique. Some modern theory, however, anticipated elements of the postmodern critique of modern theory, as well as some of the postmodern perspectives on society. Postmodern discourses thus denote new artistic, cultural, or theoretical perspectives which give up modern discourses and practices.

In order to elaborate and examine postmodern concepts of the authors stated above, it is indispensable to dwell on the rise and development of critical theories from Plato to T. S. Eliot.

The term ‘Criticism’ is used generally for studies about defining, analyzing, interpreting and evaluating works of literature. Theoretical criticism speaks of literary theory. Criticism aims at establishing an appropriate text for a literary work. Aristotle, Longinus, Horace, Boileau, Sainte-Beuve, Goethe, Johnson, Coleridge, Arnold, Poe, Emerson, Richards, Burke and Frye are the major theoretical critics. Practical criticism or applied criticism concerns with particular works and writers. The literary essays of Dryden, Johnson, Coleridge, Hazlitt, Arnold, Richards, Eliot, Woolf, Levis, Trilling and Brooks are good examples of literary criticism. The traditional critical theories and applied criticism includes mimetic criticism, pragmatic criticism, expressive criticism,
objective criticism, and the like. Apart from the above, there are historical
criticism, biographical criticism, sociological criticism, psychological
criticism, and myth criticism.

Criticism is the expression of disapproval of someone or something
based on perceived faults or mistakes. Criticism is the analysis and
judgment of the merits and demerits of literary work of art or artifact.
There are various approaches or methods of criticism in well developed
literary theories. The scholarly investigation of literary historical texts
determines their origin or intended form.

Plato was one of the oldest critics who spoke of poetry. Plato
considered art as dangerous to man’s morals and his Athens needed
discipline and reason. It is said, “For morality and ethics, the citizen had
better go almost anywhere rather than to the poets” (Plato 3). For Greeks,
fiction seemed distracted. Plato banished the poet from his Republic. He
argued that Poetry is false; it is copy of copy having no reality. God
himself is imitated, so poetry did. Hence he banished poets from his
Republic.

Aristotle defends poetry from the charges of Plato, the doubts Plato
raised about poetry. Aristotle sees that epic poetry, tragedy, comedy,
dithyrambic poetry, and music imitated. They differ on the ground of
medium, objects, and manner of imitation. He says tragedy is superior
even to epic, and comedy. According to Aristotle poetry has two reasons
for continuation: first man is an imitative being and takes pleasure in it,
then harmony and rhythm. Aristotle defines tragedy as “a representation
of a serious, complete action which has magnitude, in embellished
speech, with each of its elements separately in the various parts of the
play, represented by people acting and not by narration; accomplishing by
means of pity and terror the catharsis of such emotions” (Aristotle 95).
Aristotle says that poetry is more universal than philosophy. Aristotle in his *Poetics* takes it for granted that a work of art, whether it be a picture or a poem, is a thing of beauty, and that it affords pleasure appropriate to its own kind. The gift of Aristotle’s artistic is like that of his philosophy as a whole. It is a distinctly classical one. In Aristotle’s view, imitation is the essential part of a fine art which distinguishes creative or fine art from all other products of the human mind. Poetics may be called a romantic, so that one can understand it with the help of other larger works.

Horace’s *Art of Poetry* is an encyclopaedia for aristocratic literature of good sense. He insists on aesthetics and the middle path. He speaks of the importance of literary traditions. He seems to say either sticks to tradition, or see that your inventions be consistent. Horace insists on the smooth functioning of literature by focusing on the craft of verse. He says, “People like to ask whether a good poem comes natural or is produced by craft. So far as I can see, neither book-learning without a lot of inspiration nor unimproved genius can get very far. The two things work together and need each other” (Horace 93).

In an essay *On the Beautiful* Plotinus’ writes: “The soul, ranking as she does with what is nobler in the order of realities, must needs by her very nature thrill with joy if she sees something even remotely akin to her own spirit, and will draw it to her, becoming aware alike of herself and of that which is her own” (Plotinus 73). Longinus’s writes of poetry in his *On the Sublime*: “It was no mean or low-born creature which Nature chose when she brought man into the mighty assemblage of life and all the order of the Universe, and ordained us to be spectators of the cosmic show and most eager competitors; from the first she poured into our souls a deathless longing for all that is great and diviner than ourselves” (Longinus 73). According to Plotinus ‘the body becomes beautiful, by
participating in the Reason that flows from the Divine,’ and Longinus’ judgment, that all the greatest writers are ‘above what is mortal…Sublimity lifts them near the great mindedness of God’ (Hall, Vernon 19). Longinus defines sublimity by showing that it consists of a certain distinction and excellence in expression, and that it is from no other source than this that the greatest poets and writers have derived their eminence and gained an immortality of renown. The effect of elevated language on audience is not influence but convey. The language aims at persuasion and gratification. Sublimity, flashing forth at the right moment flees everything before it like a thunderbolt, and at once displays the power of the orator in all its plentitude. For the craze and novelty he insists on tradition and experience. According to Longinus, sublimity is the echo of a great soul.

Longinus’s concern with the sublime might be seen in *Odyssey* and in *Iliad*. It is a call for spiritual reorientation, a movement away from rationality and mere technical skill, itself a reaction of materialist and pragmatic thinking towards an acknowledgment of a profounder and more authentic strain in human nature. Longinus concludes whether Greek literature’s democracy and freedom alone is able to foster intellectual genius and to fill it with high hopes.

Dante is known for his *Divine Comedy*. He calls it comedy because it begins horribly in hell and ends pleasingly with heaven. His *Comedy* fulfils the Horatian prescription to teach and delight. Dante speaks of an ideal language for literature by insisting on a formal language, rather than in dialects. The language should be illustrious, cardinal and courtly. Dante defines the vernacular as natural speech, acquired when we are children through the practice of imitation without following any rules. Dante defines grammar as a secondary speech, which arises from the first. Unlike the first, natural speech, grammar is acquired only by a few
persons through hard-working study and much expenditure of time. Dante observes that no human language can be lasting and continuous (Dante 27). Dante says literature may be written on love and virtue. He prefers lyric, when it comes to genre. Critics write that Dante was not well read in classical literature, but he was the first modern critic.

Boccaccio’s *Life of Dante* speaks of religion as poetry. He calls the Bible as a literature work. Since theology is the poetry of God, poetry is theology. His work *Geneology of the Gentile Gods* speaks of the ancient myths, upholding imaginative literature. Vernon Hall writes about his criticism “Poetry has strong enemies. First, of course, are the completely carnal men whose minds never rise above the pleasures of the table and the brothel. Second are those with a smattering of philosophy who, without ever having come nearer to learning than popular digests, fancy themselves great theologians and scorn the poets as being mere triflers. The third class is composed of the real philistines of this time, the lawyers. They have learning, to be sure, but their learning is entirely for the purpose of gaining money” (Hall, Vernon 29). The fourth class contains the most dangerous enemies of poetry, the narrow minded theologians. Among them are certain affairs and others who make a parade of learning to impress the masses. They contend that poems are false, obscure, lewd, and replete with absurd and silly tales of pagan gods. They shout that poets are nothing but seducers of men, prompters to crime. Boccaccio thinks that poetry is noble, and it cauterizes the common man. Good literature is inspiration plus learning. His most important point is the same one he made in his *Life of Dante*: “The ancient poets are teachers. The truths they write about are written in allegorical form in the same manner as the stories in the Bible. The world needs what the Greeks and Romans can teach” (Ibid. 29). Boccaccio anticipates many of the Romantics in stating that poet prefers lonely
haunts that are favourable to contemplation, especially contemplation of God.

Plato and Aristotle thought that so called imitation is imitation of persons and things in nature, while later writers, including the Renaissance writers, took it for imitation of other writers. The writers more imitated the Roman writers than the Greek because Rome provided them with sophistication. They studied form in literature as in life. Genres and styles were used according to the classes of people in society. Even the Greeks had told the functions of tragedy and comedy is of different social classes. Farce was meant for the low people. Renaissance writers argued about the use of language for different social classes. They believed in the pedagogical theory of art. For them literature would teach delightfully. The critics were classic in theory, but romantic in practice: “The great glory of the Renaissance critics’ remains. With all their faults they set the standards for their own age and the age that followed them. If their criticism was more restrictive than inspirational, it must be recognized that their contemporaries were more likely to err on the side of license than that of restraint. But regardless of whether their influence was good or bad they succeeded admirably in doing one thing. They established literary criticism as an independent form of literature. Henceforth the critic was given an honourable place as a citizen in the republic of letters” (Ibid. 48).

John Milton (1608-74) was puritan, also interested in criticism. Milton was a parliamentarian whose party closed the church, not because the drama was vulgar, but it was royalist in cause. He condemned libidinous and ignorant poetasters’ though advised that poetry was necessary to the spirit of man.

Davenant (1606-1668) and Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), both exiles with Charles II in France, wrote criticism from French prospective.
Their criticism marks a transition from Renaissance to Neoclassicism. Something had gone out of life. With all their rule-making the Renaissance critics never forgot that the poet is divine, that he is inspired. In Davenant and Hobbes the fire is gone. Inspiration is replaced by reason and imagination by fancy. Davenant begins his letter by praising the ancient epic poets. When he considers the moderns, however, he can find only two writers of heroic poems who are worthy of notice: Tasso and Spenser. In Hobbes’ reply to Davenant’s letter we discover the philosophical basis for the neoclassical attitude. For Hobbes all is simple, all is clear. The universe is divided into three regions: celestial, aerial and terrestrial; the world into three: court, city and country. Hence, there are divisions of poetry: heroic, satiric, and pastoral.

Boileau’s (1636-1711) *Art of Poetry* (1674) is a text of neoclassical literature. In his verse essay he writes: Whatever you write of pleasant or sublime, Always let sense accompany your rime; Falsely they seem each other to oppose, Rime must be made with reason’s laws to close; And when to conquer her you bend your force, The mind will triumph in the noble course; To reason’s yoke she quickly will incline, Which, far from hurting, renders her divine; But if neglected, will as easily stray, And master reason, which she should obey, Love reason then, and let whatever you write Borrow from her its beauty, force and light (Boileau 61).

Boileau thinks sublime a metaphysical affectation of nicety. Boileau’s main point in his classic *Preface* was that the sublime so well described by Longinus resided not in nicety of terms but in grandeur of conception—a grandeur which had to be expressed, not preciously, but strongly, and which was capable of being expressed in only a few simple words. Boileau asks for the study of (human) nature. He not only tells that ancient poets are the best to imitate, but gives rules for pastoral,
elegy, sonnet, epigram, ode, satire, and drama. The rules Bioleau gives remind us of the precept of the Renaissance critics. There is, however, a difference and it is an important one. The Renaissance critics said ‘do thus’ and so because common sense and reason demand it. Like Pope’s *Essay on Criticism*, Boileau’s *Art of Poetry* embodies some of the vast intellectual and political changes that were already beginning to sweep over Europe. Art, in the classic tradition, professed to render reality through a trick of presenting something either better or more significant than reality. But the trick obviously and quite often involved the unreal. Four antitheses: realism vs. fantasy, history vs. fiction, particular vs. universal, real vs. ideal, was subsumed in a medley of ways by the classic tradition under the basic antithesis nature vs. art” (Jr. Wimsatt and Brooks 334).

Dryden (1631-1700) is Boileau’s contemporary. His major critical work entitled *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* is in the form of a dialogue. The speakers are Neander (Dryden himself), Crites (Sir Robert Howard), Lisideius (Sir Charles Sedley), and Eugenius (Lord Buckhurst). By using the dialogue form Dryden presents the various critical points of view that agitated literary circles at this time. Eugenius contend that the plays of the last age were better than theirs, Crites, upheld the ancient drama; Lisideius argued that French playwrights were better than the English, and Neander defended the English. Dryden speaks of his *Defence of the Essay* thus: “Hitherto I have proceeded by demonstration;…having laid down, that Nature is to be imitated, and that proposition proving the next, that then there are means which conduce to the imitating of Nature, I dare proceed no further positively; but have only laid down some opinions of the Ancients and Moderns, and of my own…which I thought probable” (Dryden 193). Dryden critically appreciates the Elizabethan dramatists, and his great words ‘I admire Jonson, but I love Shakespeare’ sounds
pleasant. Dryden who imitated and used properly the French heroic rhyme with that rhyme is nearest to nature.

Alexander Pope’s *Essay on Criticism* published in 1711, the neoclassical movement had become firmly established in England. The great figure of Shakespeare had for the moment receded into the past, and Pope allows himself to be much more rigorously French and neoclassical than Dryden’s feeling for the poetry of the previous age had allowed him to be. He starts out with the statement that good taste is as necessary to the critic as genius is to the poet, but that both demand to be restrained: Nature to all things fixed the limits fit. And wisely curbed proud man’s pretending wit (Pope, Alexander 70).

By the word “judge”, Pope refers to the critic, drawing on the meaning of the ancient Greek word *krites*. Pope sees the endeavour of criticism as a noble one, provided it abides by Horace’s advice for the poet: “But you who seek to give and merit frame, And justly bear a Critic’s noble Name, Be sure yourself and your own Reach to know, How far your Genius, Taste, and Learning go; Launch not beyond your Depth...” (Pope, Alexander 293). According to Pope the rules of poetry are natural and reasonable. Excess enthusiasm in poetry must be restrained by the rules. Pope insists on following the tradition which is well organized. He thinks criticism and poetry are like physics. They need to be polite and polished. They need to be learned, well-bred and sincere.

“English neoclassical criticism has Dryden at the beginning, strictest Pope in the middle and Samuel Johnson at the end of the period are subject to influences which make the dogmatism of Pope’s *Essay on Criticism* less essay for them to embrace” (Vernon, Hall 74). Johnson was a Tory, and against new tastes. In his *Rasselas*, he says that the province of poetry is to describe nature and passion. He must distract himself of
the prejudices of his age and country; he must consider right and wrong in their abstracted and invariable states; he must disregard present laws and opinions, and rise to general and transcendental truths, which will always be the same.

His *Lives of the Poets* could not be bettered in the sections where he deals with Dryden and Pope, whose poetry is exactly what Johnson thinks poetry should be. Johnson would say ‘If Pope be not a poet, where is poetry to be found.’ Johnson is less happy in writing about poets whose view of poetry is different. Johnson can show an independent judgment that reminds us of Dryden. In Johnson’s Preface to *Shakespeare* we find his most liberal critical utterances, though admittedly they exist side by side with some of his narrowest criticism.

With Wordsworth’s collaborated *Preface to Lyrical Ballad*, a shift was given to Neo-classical Criticism and new type of Criticism took birth known as Romantic criticism If Johnson wrote of man in certain class of society, Wordsworth wrote of man as himself after the French Revolution. In *Preface to Lyrical Ballads* he writes, “The principal object, then, proposed in these poems was to choose incidents and situations from common life, and to relate or describe them, throughout, as far as was possible in a selection of language really used by men, and, at the same time, to throw over them a certain colouring of imagination, whereby ordinary things should be presented to the mind in an unusual aspect, and, further, and above all, to make these incidents and situations interesting by tracing in them, truly though no brazenly, the primary laws of our nature....” (Wordsworth 79).

For Wordsworth “poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings,’ he adds that poetry, ‘takes its origin from emotion recollected in tranquillity: the emotion is contemplated till, by a species of re-action, the tranquillity gradually disappears, and an emotion, kindred to that
which was before the subject of contemplation, is gradually produced, and does itself actually exist in the mind. In this mood successful composition generally begins” (Wordsworth 661). F.W. Bateson observes, ‘The issue of poetic diction had been growing upon the English literary consciousness steadily since about the time of Chaucer, that is, since the beginning of Renaissance English literature, and with special intensity since the time of Spenser. A new linguistic consciousness, the new linguistic expansiveness of the Renaissance nation, promoted the learned enrichment of vernacular expression and produced a plethora of words” (Bateson, F. W. 340). Dante insisted on the use of polished language, but Wordsworth used the common man’s language. He does not believe in the ways of the city folk. Man in nature is better than man in the city. Wordsworth puts stress on the individualism of the poet. Wordsworth writes that the only restriction the poet writes under is the ‘necessity of giving immediate pleasure to a human being possessed of that information which may be expected from him, not as a lawyer, a physician, a mariner, an astronomer, or a natural philosopher, but as a man’. Poetry is ‘the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge’; it is the impassioned expression which is in the countenance of all science.

Wordsworth’s friend and collaborator S.T. Coleridge tried to examine and correct Wordsworth’s views on language and meter in his *Biographia Literaria*. Coleridge acutely remarks that Wordsworth’s own theory of language is based on a selection of the language of rustics. Coleridge says if the provincial term of speech from a peasant’s language removes, there no longer has rustic language at all. Thus, he denies Wordsworth’s main assertion that a special virtue is in the speech of those in close communication with nature. However he is in complete agreement with him as to the falseness and artificiality of much of the verse of the preceding generation. Coleridge’s ideas about fancy and
imagination, and his criticism of Shakespeare are much useful for the study.

Coleridge classified his idea of Imagination as primary and secondary. The primary Imagination is 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 man. The secondary imagination is an echo of the former, co-existing with the conscious will, yet still as identical with the primary in the kind of its agency, and differing only in degree, and in the mode of its operation. It dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to re-create; or where this process is rendered impossible. It struggles to idealize and to unify in all events. It is essentially vital, even as all objects are essentially fixed and dead.

Fancy has “no other counters to play with but fixities and definite. The Fancy is indeed no other than a mode of Memory liberated from the order of time and space; and blended with, and modified by that experimental phenomenon of the will as to express the word choice. But equally with the ordinary memory must receive all its materials ready made from the laws of association” (Coleridge 676-677). The term ‘imagination’ had been likely to distinguish itself from ‘fancy’ and settle toward a meaning centred in the moderate sophistry of sense impressions and the survival of this in memory.

Victor Hugo, a Romantic poet and critic, in the Preface to his play *Cromwell* (1827), he thinks that Romantic view of life is much substantially meant for society’s welfare.

Goethe (1749-1832) began his literary career in the *Strum and Drang* (Storm and Stress) times, and spoke of romanticism. His poetry, fiction and drama speak of his critical theories. In *Conversations*, he thinks poetry is a universal possession. Goethe calls classic literature strong, fresh, joyous and healthy, while Romantic literature as weak,
morbid and sickly. Goethe is perhaps a little more inclined to emphasize the tenacity of the material in which an artist works. He never forgets that the artist has to deal with the hard facts of life, and that life is reluctant to lend itself to the plans of the poet. ‘Fact must give the motive,’ he says, ‘the points that require expression the particular kernel.’ Nonetheless, ‘to make a beautiful enlivened whole, that is the business of the poet’ (Goethe 232). ‘The plot is the first thing for Aristotle. Coleridge’s unity must be arising from a predominant passion. Goethe is as direct as the Greek. He speaks of ‘the great importance of motives, which no one will understand’.

Walt Whitman’s (1819-1892) Preface to Leaves of Grass (1855) is the American equivalent of Hugo’s preface to Cromwell. The same energy, the same sense of newness and freedom animate both. Yet, if anything, Whitman out-Hugo’s Hugo. If the poet is a world-shaking genius to Hugo, he is a god, or better than a god, to Whitman. Both Walt Whitman’s poetry and his criticism are filled with his sense of uniqueness. Whitman thinks the whole Europe lived an undemocratic life, and America is democratic. So the future belongs to America. America itself is a great poem. American poetry is all-embracing as America itself. The American poet, dealing with American subject matters in new, American forms, is fortunate because he has a fit language in which to write. All of these things, which will make the new poet and the new poetry, are born of freedom. No great poetry is possible without the idea of liberty. The poets are liberty’s own voice. For Whitman, acceptance is good, rejection is evil. Poetry should be inclusive, not exclusive. Whitman has the courage to use the license he demands for the poet. He uses a free-flowing rhythm that usually has neither rhyme nor meter in the old sense. Nor does he hesitate to use the diction that is spoken on the streets as well as that used in the courts” (Whitman 95).
Saint Beuve (1804-1869) was totally a different critic. He rejected any restraints in literature. So he offers us the science of genius. He thinks criticism is an art and criticism should be an artist. Literature and the production of literature are most complex matters. The critic make the author come to life. As he says in an article on Corneille, “It seems to me that, as regards the literary critic, there is not reading more recreative, more enjoyable and at the same time more fruitful in all kinds of information than well-made biographies of great men. To get inside one’s author, to establish oneself there, to exhibit him from all points of view; to make him live, move and speak as he must have done, to follow him as far as possible into his inner life and private manners; to tie him on all sides to this earth, this real existence, these daily habits which are as much a part of great men as the rest of us” (Saint Beuve 100-101).

Saint Beuve defines literature as comprising “all literature in a healthy and happily flourishing condition, literatures in full accord and in harmony with their period, with their social surroundings, with the principles and powers which direct society, satisfied with themselves…these literatures which are and feel themselves to be at home, in their proper road, not out of their proper class, not agitating, not having for their principle discomfort, which has never been a principle of beauty.” Romantic literature on the other hand springs from ages which are in “a perpetual instability of public affairs” (Saint Beuve 239). Since the writers of a romantic age find it difficult to believe in literary immorality, they permit themselves every license.

Hippolyte Adophe Taine, (1828-1893) in his introduction to his *History of English Literature* (1864), explains his new, scientific approach to literature. “It was perceived that a literary work is not a mere individual play of imagination, the isolated caprice of an excited brain, a certain kind of mind. It was concluded that we might recover, from the
monuments of literature, knowledge of the manner in which men thought and felt centuries ago. The attempt was made, and it succeeded” (Taine 104-5).

Mathew Arnold’s (1822-1888) one of the key words in his criticism is ‘disinterestedness,’ he does not mean by it as an art-for-art’s-sake. The critic must be disinterested, not because he has no social functions, but because he has one. He thinks true criticism must be independent of critics need to adopt an objective approach for appreciation of poetry. The battle for men’s minds that is being waged by science and religion will be won by neither. Religion and philosophy, the ‘shadows and dreams and false shows of knowledge,’ will be replaced by poetry. As Wordsworth said, “Poetry will be the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge” (Wordsworth 109). Scott James thinks that the function of Arnold’s criticism in the broadest sense of the term is to promote ‘culture’; his function as literary critic is to promote that part of culture which depends upon knowledge of letters. Wimsatt Jr and Cleanth Brooks believed that Arnold was not only a cultural critic but also a poet and an educator. Arnold defined poetry (in fact, all literature) as a criticism of life. Arnold’s didacticism reaches its mature and accurate formulation in the sentence so often quoted from the opening of the 1880 essay: “More and more mankind will discover that we have to turn to poetry to interpret life for us, to console us, to sustain us. Without poetry, our science will appear incomplete; and most of what now passes with us for religion and philosophy will be replaced by poetry” (Arnold 448).

Arnold loves the past and is a student of the classics; Howells is the encourager of the new, the defender of Hamlin Garland, Stephen Crane, and Frank Norris. Reality takes away from art, according to Arnold; reality is the test of art, according to Howells. Howells joins hands with his fellow countryman Whitman in rejecting much of the old literature
because it lacks a democratic spirit. Howells thinks the traditional literature does not depict democratic life. No critic is an authority. No author was ever an authority except in those moments when he held his ear close to nature’s lips and caught its very accent. The best art is the art which is most realistic. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Romanticism fought with effete classicism. At the end of the nineteenth century, realism is waging the same battle with effete Romanticism. Howells defines realism as “nothing more and nothing less than the truthful treatment of material…” (Howells, W.D. 114). Applying this standard to the English novelist, only Jane Austen measures up completely. The history of the English novel from Jane Austen through Scott, Dickens, Charlotte Bronte, and Thackeray is the history of a decline, a decline attributable to the false and perverted taste of English, a taste for which the critics have not little responsibility. In America the situation is different. America has been built upon the affirmation that all men are equal in their rights and their duties. The American novelists should be as Americans as they unconsciously can. Howells is a humanitarian and a socialist. Howells’ theory of realism is ‘democratic’ in several senses. As seen above, he takes from Burke the democratic notion that “all people have the potential for aesthetic judgment” (Howells 483). Though Henry James was an American novelist, he saw the word ‘American’ as embracing a certain cultural openness, or in his words, a fusion and synthesis of the various national tendencies of the world.

Charles Darwin influenced the 19th century literature. Tennyson felt dejected of Darwinism. Arnold thought Darwinism destroyed religion whereas Swinburne found a promise in this. Butler’s *The Way of All Flesh* was of note in another way, too. Darwinism in the later nineteenth century fused with cosmic pessimism to help produce the naturalistic
novel. One has only to read the novels of Thomas Hardy to see how Tennyson’s vision of the future has changed. The most long-lasting influence of Darwinism will be seen the realm of science fiction. In Europe the impact was less great. French rationalism and German Biblical scholarship had long since destroyed the kind of complacency that England still possessed in Darwin’s time. In America, on the other hand, the shock was as great as in England. However, most American literary men in spite of all evidence to the contrary remained determinedly optimistic.

Leo Tolstoy turned back on most of modern art but even denied own great novels. In the first pages of What is Art? Tolstoy expresses his shock at the immense sums of money and the enormous number of hours of labour spent for art, art which stunts human lives and transgresses against human love. Thousands upon thousands of people labour and pay taxes for the production of art from which they not only receive any benefit but which is usually harmful. “Art is activity that produces beauty,” says one aesthetician. Tolstoy defines art by deliberately omitting both ‘beauty’ and ‘pleasure’. Art is a human activity consisting in this, that one man consciously by means of certain external signs, hands on to others feelings he has lived through, so that others are infected by these feelings and also experience them”(Tolstoy 134).

Like Kant, Hegel sees art and beauty as a realm that belongs to sense, feeling intuition, imagination. Its sphere is essentially different from that of thought, and it is “precisely the freedom of production and configurations that we enjoy in the beauty of art…it seems as if we escape from every fetter of rule and regularity…the source of works of art is the free activity of fancy which in its imaginations is itself more free than nature is. He says, the concept of the beautiful, “must contain, reconciled within itself, both the extremes which have been mentioned,
because it unites metaphysical universality with the precision of real particularity. Hegel proceeds about art. He rejects the centuries-old notion that the aim of art is imitation, that art awakens or purifies one’s feelings and passions” (Hegel 400). Art, he says, synthesizes two elements into a reconciled totality: the content of art is the Idea, while its form is a ‘configuration of sensuous material.’ Given that the content of art is spiritual and the form is sensuous, the first requirement is that the content itself must be worthy of artistic representation.

Marxism, the world-shaking economic and social theories of Karl Marx could not help but influence literary criticism. Marx insisted that literature, like every other cultural phenomenon, was a reflection of the basic economic structure of society. An epic, a poem, and a play are produced by the same forces that produce social classes and cannot be fully understood without reference to these forces. Marx knew cultural forms developed unevenly. The rapid spread of Marxist politics throughout the world introduced Marx’s literary theories to all countries. Marxism helped to create a social perspective that influenced much literary scholarship. His colleague Frederick Engels wrote in a letter to an early proletarian novelist who asked for Engel’s help in popularizing his novel.

Marxism is the political and economic theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels developed Marxist theory with their followers to form the basis for the theory and practice of communism. Central to Marxist theory is social change in terms of economic factors, according to which the means of production provide the economic base, which influences or determines the political and ideological superstructure. Marx and Engels predicted revolutionary overthrow through of Capitalism by the proletariat and the eventual attainment of a classless communist society.
Bergson (1859-1941) offers a philosophy declaring that the artist, not the scientist, who penetrates to reality. The scientist is artificial. For Bergson life is a “continuous process indefinitely pursued, and indivisible process, on which each visible organism rides during the short interval of time given it to live” (Bergson 152-153). True reality is the style of the essence, the vital impulse that creates, that makes for continuous evolution. The very important style strives toward creativity and individuality against matter, which would drag it down to limpness, to death. The artist by his intuition is able to penetrate through matter to reality.

Croce (1866-1952) is the chief modern critic. In his article “Aesthetics” he speaks of art. Croce's theory grows out of an initial preoccupation with the historic-social thinking which intrinsic to one sort of 19th century didactic theory. It is pure intuition and is the first form of knowledge. It is distinguished from the second form of knowledge, which is logic. Art is always a form of self-expression and is always internal ideal activity.

Sigmund Freud’s interested in the allusion of psychoanalysis began to exercise influence over the entire domain of culture. He sought to apply psychoanalytic principles to study of art, religion, and primitive cultures. Freud viewed obsessional neurosis as a distorted private religion and religion itself as a universal obsessional neurosis. In *Totem and Taboo* (1912-1913) Freud explored taboos or exclusions in primitive cultures, and parallelized the various postulates of primitive beliefs with neurosis. In *Civilization and its Discontents* (1930) Freud suggested the extension of the analysis of neurosis in individuals to the examination of the imaginative and cultural creations of social groups and peoples. Sigmund Freud writes that writing is a form of psychological therapy. The most famous example of this is *Oedipus Rex* of Sophocles, so famous.
that Freud borrowed the name of Sophocles’ king for the fundamental complex of all men. In the Oedipus legend, the hero kills his father and sleeps with his mother but does this in ignorance of their true identities. According to Freud this was a poetic presentation of the fact that the adult is no longer conscious of his Oedipal experience. In the same fashion the prediction of the oracle that Oedipus will do what he does symbolized the inescapability of the fate which requires us all to live through this experience. Even the self-blinding of Oedipus can be considered as a poetic form of self-castration.

Freud says literature moves us by presenting in symbolic form our own most fundamental desires. As might be imagined, the various schools of psychoanalysis that comes after Freud have, in changing his doctrines, changed psychoanalytic literary criticism. The followers of Adler substituted the inferiority and superiority complexes as the key to literary character analysis. Carl Gustav Jung preferred to emphasize the collective unconsciousness of the race as revealed in the character, an unconscious which contained mystic elements. The tendency in more recent psychoanalytical criticism is to borrow concepts from all these schools. Psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan considers language as the mirror. In the modern age it is possible on the basis of modern knowledge to construct a psychological theory of value that will enable us to compare the worth of experiences, literary or otherwise.

Criticism is the art or practice of judging and commenting on the qualities and character of literary works. Modern critics tend to pass over the concerns of earlier centuries, such as formal categories or the place of moral or aesthetic value; some analyze texts as self-contended entities in isolation from external factors. Critical theory explores the ideas from a diverse range of disciplines; ‘theory’ encourages us to develop a deeper understanding of how we approach the written word. The section first of
the first chapter of the research work is about what is generally referred to as ‘critical theory’, highlighting through some of the most complex and fundamental concepts in the field, ranging from Aristotle up to T. S. Eliot. Critical theory can appear incomprehensible, complex, and complicate and even a distraction from what should be the real focus of one’s interest.

Although theoretical writing can often appear to be very complex and to employ vocabularies and ways of thinking that are different from those with which most of us might be familiar, it engages with questions, ideas and issues that are crucial to our experiences of identity, culture and society, and focuses precisely on the ways in which literature, art, the media, history and individuals communicate and interact in the world in which we live. Critical theory allows us to explore the cultural production and communication of meanings in precise and nuanced ways, and from a range of different perspectives. Since the 1920s, the concepts of meaning and authorship have been explored or questioned by New Criticism, Formalism, Structuralism, Poststructuralism, Postmodernism, and Deconstruction.

T. S. Eliot has described himself as a classicist in literature, a royalist in politics, and an Anglo-Catholic in religion. He understands that his beliefs in politics, religion and literature form a whole. He wrote his thoughts in his essay, Tradition and the Individual Talent, in 1917. It was written to contest the idea that a poet should be praised in proportion to his originality. No poet or artist of any sort can be understood solely in terms of himself.

Thus each new piece of work must inevitably be judged by the standards of the past. The artists must have the historical senses, which we may call nearly requisite to anyone who would continue to be a poet beyond his twenty-fifth year. There is a mind outside of his own, the
mind of Europe, of his own country. The conscious present is an awareness of the past.

Eliot speaks of impersonality theory, or objective correlativity. He thinks the progress of the artist is a continual self-sacrifice, a continual disappearance of personality. By contrast, Ezra Pound’s most vigorous and most influential criticism is informal and occasional. It has often taken the form of practical advice to other writers. The incredible prestige of Eliot as a poet gave such weight to his critical opinions that the appearance of his collection of critical essays *The Sacred Wood* (1920) started a trend in modern aesthetics now known as the New Criticism. T.S. Elliot, F.R. Leavis and I.A. Richards are considered as the precursors of New Criticism.

New Criticism is an influential movement in literary criticism in the mid 20th century that stressed the importance of focusing on the text itself rather than being concerned with external biographical or social considerations. Associated with the movement was John Crowe Ransom who first used the term in 1941. The term New Criticism was also used by J. E. Spingarn. Though Paul Valery had previously been polishing the same critical instruments in France; T. S. Eliot is undoubtedly considered the father of this new school, particularly since the major practitioners have been either American or English includes I. A. Richards, and Cleanth Brooks, William Empson. New critics like Cleanth Brooks, John Crowe Ransom, Robert Penn Warren, and W. K. Wimsatt focuses on the poetry, a genre well suited to New Critical practice. As a descriptive term, ‘New Criticism’ is completely meaningless, since all criticism is ‘new’ when it first appears. New critics think that literature is the most important of human activities. They speak of text as autonomous for appreciation. No vulgar biography is endorsed there. However, new criticism also focused on finding the truth in the text-poetry. The only
thing that distinguishes New Criticism from earlier or traditional Criticism is its exclusive emphasis on the text and not biographical or historical background of the text. But, the main concern of both traditional and New Criticism is to see the universal truth in the literary texts.

Formalism is, as the name implies, an interpretive approach that emphasized literary form and the study of literary devices within the text. Formalism sought to place the study of literature as a scientific basis through objective analysis of the motifs, devices, techniques, and other functions that comprise the literary work. The formalists placed great importance on the literariness of texts, those qualities that distinguished the literary form from other kinds of writing. Neither author nor context was essential for the formalists; it was the narrative that spoke.

Formalism is best known in Shklovsky’s concept of ‘defamiliarization’. In Structuralism, structure is more important than function. Until the 1960s this remained the intellectual agenda of U.S. anthropology, which largely ignored the emergence of both functionalism and structuralism in Europe. There was an immediate affinity between the two. Structuralism represented a revolt against the existentialist idea of the self. Originating in the Structural Linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure and extended into anthropology by Claude Lévi-Strauss, structuralism was adapted to a wide range of social and cultural studies, especially in the 1960s, by writers such as Roland Barthes, Louis Althusser, and Jacques Lacan.

Another trend developed in 20th century criticism is Reader-Response criticism. It does not designate any one critical theory. It focuses on the process of reading a literary text. Reader-response critics turn from the traditional conception of work as an achieved structure of meaning to the ongoing mental operations and responses of reader as
their eyes follow a text on the page before them by the shift of perspective, a literary work becomes an activity on the part of the reader. Reader-response critics agree that the meaning of a text is the ‘production’ or ‘creation’ of the individual reader. Hence, there is no one ‘correct’ meaning for all readers. Wolfgang Iser, Hans Robert Jauss and Stanley Fish are some of the prominent exponent of Reader-response criticism. In short all criticism including Traditional, New Criticism, Formalism, Structuralism, Reader-Response Criticism, Psychoanalytical Criticism are concerned with finding out the truth in the text though in a different ways. This thinking of a modern criticism receives a jolt with new kind of criticism offered by Roland Barthes, Lacan, Derrida and any others.

Poststructuralism is branch of linguistics deals with language as a system of interrelated structures especially the theories and methods of Lyonard Bloomfield. They emphasize the accurate identification of syntactic and lexical form as opposed to meaning and historical development. An extension and critique of Structuralism is used in critical textual analysis. It is emerged in French intellectual life in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Poststructuralism departed from the claims made by structuralism and objectivity and comprehensiveness emphasized instead plurality and deferral of meaning.

Poststructuralism rejects the fixed binary opposition of Structuralism and the validity of authorial authority. These two shifts are fundamentally related in that the structuralism focus on the function of Western epistemology that leads directly to post-structuralism’s ontological dominant. But if Marx, Freud, Nietzsche, Lacan, structuralism, post-structuralism and postmodernism have taught us anything, it is that the category of the individual cannot be treated as a given. It must be recognized that while relations between structuralism,
post-structuralism, and history became extremely complex, processes of disciplinary border crossing still took place.

Poststructuralism and deconstruction can be seen as the theoretical formulations of the postmodern condition. Poststructuralism was a product of that blend of euphoria and disillusionments, liberation and dissipation, carnival and catastrophe which took place in 1960s. Roland Barthes, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault and Jean Baudrillard are the major Poststructuralist. Postmodern theory emerged after the World War II. Its main aim was to oppose the Modernism. The perspective of Postmodernism situates Modern theory within the context of larger economic and cultural tendencies. Jean-Francois Lyotard, and Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Derrida are the major exponent of Postmodernism.

Deconstruction is skeptical approach to the possibility of coherent meaning in language. It is a very significant and controversial theory of literary criticism, initiated by the French Philosopher Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) in a series of works published in 1967, later translated as *Speech and Phenomena, Of Grammatology, and Writing and Difference*. According to Derrida no work of literature has been able to express what it wanted to say. And thus the critics’ business is to deconstruct and recreate them. Barbara Johnson explains the term: Deconstruction is not synonymous with the ‘destruction’, it is in fact much closer to the original meaning of the word ‘analysis’, which etymologically means to ‘undo’. The deconstruction of the text does not proceed by random doubt or arbitrary subversion, but by the careful teasing out of warring forces of signification within the text itself” (Barbara Johnson).

The method of Derrida’s deconstruction simply problematizes all habit of thought in any discipline by demonstrating how impossible it is to draw a clear cut line between reality and representation.
There are number of concerns, and certain terms, that can be said to characterize deconstruction. Derrida’s claim is that the dominant Western tradition of thought has attempted to establish grounds of certainty and truth of repressing the limitless instability of language. This ‘logocentric’ tradition sought some absolute source or guarantee of meaning (a ‘transcendental signified’) which could centre or stabilize the uncertainties of signification, through a set of ‘violent hierarchies’ privileging a central/marginal, nature/culture, male/female, and most importantly speech/writing.

The ‘phonocentric’ suspicion of writing as a parasite upon the authenticity of speech is a crucial target of Derrida’s subversive approach to Western philosophy, in which he invert and dissolves conceptual hierarchies to show that the repressed or marginalized terms are always contaminated the privileged or central term. Thus, drawing on Saussure’s theory of the sign, Derrida argues that the stable self-identity which attribute to speech as the authentic source of meaning is illusory. Since, language operates as a self-contained system of internal differences rather than of positive terms or presences. Writing distrusted in the Western ‘Metaphysics of presence’ because it displays the absence of any authenticating voice. In this sense writing is logically prior to speech.

Derrida’s central concept is presented in his coining of the term ‘difference’. It is a French Portmanteau word combining ‘difference’ with ‘deferral’ to suggest that the differential nature of meanings in language defers any determinate meanings: language is an endless chain or ‘play of difference’ which logo-centric discourses try to fix to some original term that can never be reached. Deconstructive readings track down within a text. The aporia or internal contradiction undermines its claims to coherent meanings; or they reveal how texts deconstruct themselves. Derrida’s difficult and paradoxical attitude to the metaphysical tradition
seeks to subvert it while claiming that there is no privileged vantage point from which to do this from outside the instabilities of language. Thus, Deconstruction undermines its own radical skepticism by admitting that it leaves everything as it was. It is a self-contradictory effort to think the ‘unthinkable’, often by recourse to strange neologisms, puns and other wordplay.

Jacques Derrida’s influence and practice of Deconstruction in America and Europe was unparalleled in the later 20th century. The writings of Paul de Man, Barbara Johnson, J. Hillis Miller and Geoffrey Hartman in the 1970s and 1980s applied an extended Derrida’s concepts to critical questions of interpretation, tending to challenge the status of the author’s intention or of the external world as a source of meaning in texts, and questioning the boundary between criticism and literature. This Yale School and other deconstructionists came under fierce attack for dogmatic nihilism and wilful obscurity.

According to Deconstructionist notion reading is a construction, truth is an interpretation, human subjectivity is not essentially fixed, and there are no ultimate transcendent foundations of thought and practice. But it is deconstruction that deconstructs the linear concept of time, meaning narrative and narrative history.

**The Origins of the Concept of Postmodernism:**

Postmodernism is generally understood to have emerged from a politics of the left. The names of intellectuals commonly associated with it are Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Jacques Derrida, and Fredric Jameson. Postmodernism has a traditional meaning. It was a reaction to political, cultural and artistic movements whose apparent boundaries were understood to be symptomatic of the cultural decline of the West.
The first reference to postmodernism is found in 1926 in the work of the catholic theologian Bernard Eddings Bell entitled ‘Postmodernism and Other Essays’. Bell believed that his postmodernism embodied ideas to be superior to those associated with the modern era. The moderns were in the power of reason to free the human spirit from bondage arising out of ignorance and prejudice. Postmodern ideas would overtake modern one. They characterised the era that follow from the modern age; they defined postmodern age.

According to Bell postmodernism referred to something that was both ideological and historical. It was a body of ideas and a new age. Bell considered postmodernism to be an intellectual alternative to the opponent ideologies that dominated Western societies in 1920s. He believed complete essentially modern thoughts. These were liberalism and totalitarianism. Bell believed that liberalism and totalitarianism shared a faith in mankind’s ability to discover the underlying principles that govern nature and societies that presented to promote wealth creation and increase national power. Bell believed that liberalism’s and totalitarianism’s faith in reason brought about the ruin. He attacked liberalism because he believed that it stressed the values of economy and material prosperity and intellectual acceptance. It is generated societies of intellectually and culturally mediocre and politically complacent. He attacked totalitarianism as an alternative to liberalism left them spiritually poor, and inferior. Bell also attacked values of the pseudo-moralities of science. The faith in scientific objectivity and progress left individuals spiritually weak and emptied.

Christ philosopher St. Augustine thought that the ancient philosophers Plato and Aristotle had mistaken to believe that we could obtain objective knowledge of ourselves and fashion communities were true to our natures. So Bell thought the same of modern philosophers.
Their faith in reason and human progress rested on a wrong belief of man’s ability to change the world around him. This was symptomatic of superiority toward God and his infinite and great wisdom. Just as Augustine refers that the ancient philosophies have led man to ignorance and spiritual isolation, Bell believed that modern ideas emptied man’s experience of the world of fear and wonder. Augustine believed that only through faith individuals could be returned to the path of salvation. Bell considered the characteristic of the postmodern individual was intellectually humble and spiritually hungry. The postmodern man drew his strength and solace not from within his own ego but from Heaven. He was an individual who longs to fall upon his knees and worship a comprehending Absolute.

The term postmodernism is originated in an ancient doubt about human’s ability to understand the workings of the universe, how the changes take place, within it. There was theological and traditional meaning at that time. Postmodernism focused the strange and unknowable nature of the world. The term stressed on the mankind’s weakness. Postmodernisms need to turn toward God for strength, relief and salvation. Bell’s use of the term postmodernism even though is one sided religious studies but on the other hand it included number of values which is based on reason of science and belief in the unsolved wonderful and mysterious nature of man and the universe.

Again the term postmodernism is used by Mexican literary critic Federico de Onis to denote both a historical and a literary movement. To him the postmodern covered a period between 1905 and 1914. It positioned between the modernist ages. Onis’s postmodernism connected to a genre of Spanish and Latin American poetry. The poetry reacted to the extremes of modernism, a conventional tendency within modernism postmodernism searched out to harness in modernism’s excesses.
Postmodernism believes in the rejection of the traditional narrative structure. It also rejects stream-of-consciousness and longings for the past. The characteristic of the postmodernism is to think of the truth, an advanced tone, simplicity of prose and ironic humour, highly deep in thought, directed towards introspection. According to Onis the postmodernism movement was transitory. It was outdated by ultra modernism i.e. avant-garde. It was returned to modernist ambitions but strengthen the search for poetic modernism and symbolic and formal representation. Postmodernism brings modernism’s radical influences and its avant-garde tendencies.

Arnold Toynbee’s work *A Study of History* highlights the history of West enclosed by two forces: Industrialism and Nationalism. It has positive force to determine Western civilization. After that, its contradictory time came to be in all useful modes. Industry enlarged its ways. It became international. Nationalism inwardly progressed a little and locates practical cultural groups. Arnold Toynbee ends up it as First World War was the outcome of the conflict between industrialism and nationalism. Hence, Toynbee thought that this was a particular sign of a new and post-modern age. According to Toynbee, the task of historian was to think on the new age, and set up the postmodern features.

Arnold Toynbee was negative, pessimistic about human nature and the changes in the contemporary age. Toynbee finally used the term ‘Post-modern’ to conform the period that began ‘at the turn of the 19th and the beginning of 20th centuries. It’s a negative approach toward ‘post-modern age’. Arnold Toynbee thought that modern era had been marked by the ideas and achievements of a bourgeoisie. His class’s rational strength, commercial and industrial collection and majority position made progressive and innovative class. Toynbee and Marx’s definition about the bourgeoisie was very similar. They thought it was a revolutionary
class and self-centred, self-satisfied and hubristic. Toynbee argues that a particular prosperous and comfortable Western middle class was taking it as a matter of course. The end of one age of one civilization’s history was the end of history itself and as far as their class was concerned, they were represented for their benefit. A sane, safe, satisfactory modern life had astonishingly come to stay as an eternal present.

**Beginning of ‘post-modern age’ and decline of modern:**

Here is the beginning of ‘post-modern age’ and decline of modern age. The class was challenged by industrial urban working class and nationalist intellectuals. Both are combined to unsafe the modernity from within and without.

By end of the II\textsuperscript{nd} World War, technology and man’s abilities to adapt the threat of a third and nuclear, conflict caused Toynbee to judge the concept of civilisation itself inappropriate. Western Civilization became universal on the point of its own total destruction.

American poet Charles Olson (1910-70) followed the industrial and imperial eras. He used the term post-modernism descriptively. Olson understood postmodernism as reaction against modernism. “And it’s defining attributes: the formal and symbolic representation of reality and experience as means to both deepen humanity’s self-knowledge and strengthen its ability to control the universe”. Like Heidegger Olson emphasised rationalisation of human experience back to Ancient Greek Socratic Philosophy. It had an important function in developing an alternative to the whole Greek system. Man caught himself between creature of nature and creation. According to Olson postmodern was a new form of poetic expression.

Ezra Pound and William Carlos William’s Imagism, were rejected the formal thought and symbolic representation. It was in favour of a clear and specific presentation of image.
Olson in his lectures talked about postmodern art as that emergence of image from an enormous condition of creation which we only thrust at. He continued to say that this postmodern aesthetic would give freedom to human potentialities. Here it had been exceeded by the intellectualisation of human experience. These potentialities proceed to a new form of human self-determination. It resorted on impoverished world to a vitality, wonderment and richness not experienced since the time of the pre-Socratics.

Olson led and inspired by William Spanos’s work appeared in journal 1972 *Boundary2: a Journal of Postmodern Literature and Culture*. The journal decided the role and humanity’s authenticity of the growth they employed an aesthetic of de-composition. This aesthetic, strikes Heidegger’s idea of Destruction and the method of ‘deconstruction’ employed by the French philosopher Jacques Derrida in his 1967 *Of Grammatology*. Derrida sought to provoke an experience of deracination in the reader. Spanos and his group believed that it could be associated with the experience of dread and despair.

Heidegger thought this brought transformation of both humanity and the world into objects. He finally writes, the Western philosophical tradition culminates in the objectification of reality, and this is at the heart of man’s alienation from himself and the world. According to Spanos, ‘postmodernism’s aesthetic of de-composition, the provoking of a stale of rootlessness, rendered powerless the concepts and categories of Western rationality and in a manner a kin to restoring our encounter with death restored conscious selfhood. The postmodern aesthetic is an aesthetic of direct or unmediated experience. Spanos and contributors of *Boundary 2* understood the postmodern aesthetic as an aesthetic of freedom, hope and infinite possibility’ (Spanos, William V. 156).
Philosophical writing is origin to the postmodern aesthetic. Postmodernism is used in a discipline as aesthetic consideration and theories of poetic expression that is architecture.

**Architectural Postmodernism:**

American architect Joseph Hudnut introduced postmodernism into architecture in his article in 1945 the Architectural record entitled *The Postmodern House*. He defined Postmodernism as a new historical category, referring to the atomic and computer age, and an aesthetic ideal, harnessing scientific and technical advances. The authentic human experiences could preserve. Hudnut’s postmodern ideal was diametrically opposed to the modern ideal. Modern ideals had mechanised and standardised contemporary life. His critique of architectural modernism and vision for postmodern architecture failed to attract wide range of area.

Earlier Robert Venturi admired modernism’s achievements for its aesthetic principles like universal, a historical and timeless. This style created a built environment that suppressed individual, expression and enforced social uniformity. In his *Complexity and Contradiction* Venturi argued that modern architecture could not accommodate modern life’s richness and complexity. The new form of architecture could take account of the diversity of the human experience and facilitate its expression through new ideas about design and planning. Venturi called this postmodern architecture “complex and contradictory” (Venturi, Robert, 1966, 22). Venturi explored ideas in his book; architecture’s communicative attributes stressing terms, such as symbolic meaning, rhetoric, and architectural language. Venturi claimed that modern architecture had lost its ability to communicate with a general population. Its language was self-assured, intimidating and elitist, and reinforced its tendency toward hermeticism, formalisation an undimensionality. The
result was that modern architecture looked to itself alone for inspiration and thereby lost all vitality in returning to the pre-Socratics for inspiration, Venturi turned to pre-modern architecture, such as Baroque, which drew on other traditions and disciplines for inspiration. These pre-modern architectures were exciting and expressed a natural vitality because they employed a tradition of iconology in which painting, sculpture and graphics were combined with architecture. Postmodern architecture returned to this pre-modern tradition of iconology. It looked to other disciplines for inspiration, integrated into its own medium different art forms, and mixed diverse pre-modern architectural traditions (Ibid. 89-90 and 101-3).

Postmodern architecture and urban planning commercial collapse of Las Vegas shocked too many. Postmodern architecture was all about awakening architects to the possibilities offered by ‘the commercial strip’ (Venturi, Robert, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour 85). Charles Jencks is ‘the acknowledged guru of Post-Modernism’ (Ada Louis Huxtable, 10). He points out Venturi’s criticism of architectural modernism is influential for a more specific theorisation of postmodern architecture.

In Charles Jencks’s essay The Rise of Post-Modernism Architecture endorsed Venturi’s critique of modern architecture in article ‘Architecture Association Quarterly’. He argued that and postmodern architecture looked to different disciplines for inspiration, traditions and styles. It is commercial capitalism’s positive effect in giving urban living vibrancy and diversity. It’s consumer-oriented architecture (Jencks, Charles 1975, 3-14). In ‘The Language of Post-Modern Architecture (1977), Jencks defined postmodernism architecture that was very similar to Venturi’s idea of postmodern architecture. These first appeared in the second edition of Jencks’s The Language of Post-Modern Architecture
Jencks substantially re-worked his ideas on postmodern architecture and gave a new definition of it that incorporated an elitist element repudiated in the earlier edition. Jencks’s elitism— a response to critics’ assertions that postmodern architecture was nothing more than ‘dumbed down’ architecture—stemmed from the idea that postmodern architecture should communicate to two groups of individuals: an international architectural elite which determined standards of beauty through a shared aesthetic sensibility and ‘the man in the street whose aesthetic was informed by a local culture, traditions and issues (Jencks, Charles 1978, 8). Postmodern architecture used forms and symbols that were meaningful to international elite and had relevance to a local population. This architecture was termed ‘double-coding’ which ensured postmodern architecture communicated both with architects and a concerned minority who care about specifically architectural meaning and the public at large or the local inhabitants who care about other issues concerned with comfort, traditional building and way of life (Jencks, Charles 1978, 6). In the third edition he redefines the definition that the double coding meant ‘an electric mix of traditional or local code with modern ones’ (Jencks, Charles 1981, 133). Postmodern architecture periodised in a three distinct phases-pluralistic, eclectic, classical, and concluded its culmination into ‘Free-Style Classicism,’ a kind of ‘world consensuses’ in art and architecture. The emergence of this consensus was a proof of postmodern architecture’s success in exposing the shortcomings of modern architecture and presenting itself as a better alternative. Postmodern architecture’s ability to fulfil the need for a universal language, a public language enabled it to supplant modernism as the universal idiom of architecture and art (Jencks, Charles 1987, 45-7). Yet this triumph seemed hollow as postmodern architecture now
accommodated virtually all idioms except purist modernism (Bertens, Hans 1995, 66). All real became common and conventional.

Venturi and Jencks failure to postmodern architecture did not give way to their own critique of architectural modernism was testimony to the depth and acuteness of ideas, drawn from the same sources in Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, and Heidegger. They nourished Olson’s and Spanos’s critique of modernism and their belief that postmodernism would restore an impoverished humanity to vitality. These ideas challenged the fundamental beliefs of modernity. Their ideas were incorporated in the works of philosophers like Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Jean Francois Lyotard and Jean Baudrillard who have explosive consequences for humanities, overtraining conventional wisdom, and established practices, changing forever the face of the human sciences.

**Postmodernism and Humanities:**

Architectural modernism and postmodern alternative was criticised as a failure of imagination because it was nothing more than an eclectic mixture of pre-modern forms. It was also attacked for failure of courage because it was unable to free itself from commercial imperatives and glossed over this short coming by redefining the social issues that lay at the heart of contemporary architecture as ‘questions of style’ (Jurgen Habermas, 19).

German Philosopher Jurgen Habermas identified his work and postmodernism in other disciplines. Habermas associated postmodernism with neo-conservatism. Habermas, Foucault, Derrida and Jean-Francois Lyotard’s were committed as public intellectuals. They were indentified with the left as well as revolutionary implication of their writings was universally acknowledged as breathtaking.
Postmodernism’s Philosophical Origins:

Modernism is a name for a period in the history of art around late 1880s in the West. The philosophical modernism begins with Emanuel Kant’s *Copernican revolution*. The object of knowledge must conform to our abilities of representation. The idea of God, freedom, immorality, the World first beginning and final have a regulative function for knowledge. These explain the experience of modernity and make sense of pictures of the self in question.

The emergence of bourgeoisie and decline of feudalism, discovery of new lands, religions reform movement and the advent of modern science are the factors for the coming out of the phenomenon of modernity. The modern age witnessed the sudden increase and release of huge amount of energies in various artistic, scientific, social, and spiritual, an intellectual field. The rapid changes and developments helped to create a flowing situation of Maxim’s thought that all that was solid melted into air.

Kant in his essay claim’s an answer to the Question: “What is Enlightenment?” that “Enlightenment is man’s emergence from his self-incurred immaturity” (Kant, Emanuel 54). According to Kant fear is man’s inability to make use of his understanding without guidance from another. They lacked the courage to think independently. ‘Sapere aude’ ‘have courage to use your own reason!’ that is motto of enlightenment. Kant was optimistic about the prospects of ‘each separate individual’ being able to ‘work his way out of ...immaturity’ (Ibid. 54).

Man’s use of his own critical reason gradually enabled him not only to improve his first order knowledge but also his second order knowledge. Modern man realized that knowledge is the product of his endless statement for understanding and explaining phenomena. Modern man gradually realizes that his ignorance is boundless. It is not
impossible to improve his knowledge by means of methodical investigation of various realms of reality. It is possible to achieve emancipation and spiritual freedom through knowledge.

The later 19th century is the age of modernity. Modernity achieved a reality. Science and technology, mass communication, transportation, reshape perceptions. There is no clear cut distinction between the natural and the artificial in experience. Kierkegaard describes modern society as a network of relations. Individuals are levelled into an abstract phantom known as “the public”. The modern public is a creation of the press in contradiction to ancient and medieval communities. The press is the means of holding together the mass of unreal individuals who never are and never can be united in an actual situation or organization.

According to Marx society has become a realization of conceptual thought, held together by an artificial and all-pervasive medium speaking for everyone and for no one. On the other hand, we have an analysis of craze/mania of commodities where the objects lose the solidity of their use value and become supernatural figures under the aspect of exchange value. Human subjects themselves experience this derealisation because commodities are products of their labour. Workers lose their life form in realizing themselves and this becomes a postmodern sensibility. The derealisation of being is the last breath of a vaporizing reality and remarks upon the ending of the distinction between the ‘real’ and the ‘apparent’ world. Nietzsche also traces the history of this distinction from Plato to his own time, where the true world becomes a useless and superfluous idea. Neither the real nor the apparent is left but the virtual reality of more recent time.

The idea of the real and the apparent is collapsed in Nietzsche’s first book *The Birth of Tragedy* (1967). Nietzsche presents Greek tragedy as a synthesis of natural art impulse represented by the god Apollo and
Dionysus. Apollo is the god of beautiful forms and images. Dionysus is the god of passion and intoxication. Tragic art is life-affirming in joining these two impulses of logic and science. This is built upon Apollonian representations that have become frozen and lifeless. Nietzsche believes only a return of the Dionysian art impulse that can save modern society from infertility and nihilism. This interpretation presage of postmodern concepts of art and representation anticipates postmodernist’s fascination with the prospect of a revolutionary moment arguing a new, anarchic sense of community.

Nietzsche is also a precursor for postmodernism as is seen in his genealogical analysis of fundamental concepts, “I”. Nietzsche’s genealogy of concepts in “On Truth and Lies in Non-moral Sense” is also an important reference. In connection with genealogy Nietzsche criticizes the historicism of the 19th century.

According to Nietzsche the life of an individual and a culture depend upon their ability to repeat an unhistorical moment, a kind of forgetfulness, along with their continuous development through time, and the study of history. Everyone repeats the moment. Nietzsche would agree with Charles Baudelaire who describes modernity as “the transient, the fleeting the contingent” that is repeated in all ages. Nietzsche presents this concept in the Gay Science and developed in the Spoke Zarathustra. The concept is to involve an endless, identical repetition of everything in the universe. Nothing occurs that has not already occurred to an infinite number of times before. Postmodern history is the repetition of an unhistorical moment that is always new. Therefore repetition is a matter of difference rather that identify. The eternal return is the loss of the distinction between reality and the apparent world. Heidegger argued that Nietzsche was right to focus on the central role of ‘value’ in Western metaphysics. Heidegger went on to argue that within the modern age
‘knowing’ is construed as ‘representing’. He argued that we understand ourselves in picturing the World, and understand the world as whatever can be pictured by us successfully. Being or existence was basically flawed with alter failures fully exposed in the modern age, ‘the age of consummate meaninglessness’ as he called it. This judgement on modernity differed little from Nietzsche’s account of nihilism as the crisis of modern thought. What makes Heidegger to depart from Nietzsche is in his assessment of what needs to be done, preparing the way for a whole new way of thinking. Heidegger’s argument was that individual is ‘already determined’ and that being reveals itself through our individual existences. Heidegger called this ‘the Being of beings’ (Heidegger, Martin, Nietzsche 1987, 178)

Heidegger went on to argue that Western thinking was dominated by a subjectivism or humanism in which individuals defined and manipulated reality according to their needs. He believed humanism to be a historically motivated and psychologically encouraging approach. He is associated with the modern age-science and technology.

Heidegger’s critique of humanism and his belief that individual existence were the expression of Being were easily incorporated in the structuralist activity of the dissolving the subject. His influence is seen on the structuralists Marxist Louis Althusser and M. Foucault. He tried to and up the conventional metaphysics with a new way of thinking gave a leading role to artists, poets, and thinkers, like Nietzsche. Nietzsche’s works were very influential to poets like Olson.

The crisis of humanism and the rise of Postmodernism:

Heidegger’s attack on humanism was most impressive example of the idea of an autonomous and coherent human subject. It could discern an overall pattern to human history to improve the past. This campaign gained ground in the 1950s under the guidance of the anthropologist
Claude Levi-Strauss and the philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty. They introduced philosophical discussions. Saussure’s structural linguistic and Claude-Levi Strauss’s structural anthropology is the effect of this philosophy. Louis Althusser revolutionised interpretations of Marx’s and thought on ideology.

In the fields of linguistics, literary criticism and cultural studies were radically altered by Roland Barthes. A new generation of intellectuals such as Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida began their attack on what Foucault called ‘totalising system’. Their own critique of the human sciences was strikingly different from the structuralist critique. It was called ‘poststructuralist that combines the structuralist style of objective, technical and even formal discourse about the human world with a rejection of the structuralist claim that there is any deep or final truth that such discourse can uncover. The poststructuralist project need not be self-contradictory, but it is inevitably ironic, since it sees its methods of analysis as both necessary and, given traditional goals, doomed to failure. The poststructuralist project was the beginning of the postmodern revolution in the human sciences. The precursor of the postmodern thought and works are discussed in the following passages.

Michel Foucault as a philosopher historian, public intellectual and political activist published number of books on the treatment of mental illness, in the birth of clinical medicine, the development of the human sciences, and the methodology of the history of ideas. The origins of the prison and the history of sexuality are primarily dealt with the history of human sciences especially on knowledge, power and discourse.

His work includes *The Order of Things, Archaeology of the human science*. He writes “a historical a priori in a given period, delimits in the totality of experience a field of knowledge, defines the mode of being of the objects that appear in that field, provides man’s everybody perception
with the course of powers, and defines the conditions in which he can sustain a discourse about things that is recognized to be true” (Foucault, Michel 1970 xxii). It was the conceptual strategies underpinning various field of knowledge in a given epoch with the episteme of one historical epoch being not only incompatible but also entirely incommensurable with those of another” (Merquior, G. 36).

The Nietzschean method of genealogy, its application to modern subjectivity is another element of philosophical postmodernism. Foucault’s application of genealogy is to formative moments in modern history and subjectivity place within the scope of postmodern discourse. Foucault’s essay Nietzsche, Genealogy, History (1971) dealt with his adaptation of the genealogical method in his historical studies. He argues, genealogy opposes itself to the search for Origins. Genealogy studies the accidents and contingencies that coverage at crucial moments, giving rise to new epochs, concepts, and institutions and its disparity. Foucault exposes history, conceived as the origin and development of an identical subject, for example modernity as a fiction discourses invent after the fact. History includes the discontinuities and interruptions that mark points of succession in historical time. Foucault’s doctoral thesis History of Madness and Civilization is about history of mental illness and historical beginning of modern reason as it comes to define itself against madness in the 17th century. He thinks that the mad is a transformation of the medieval practice of confining leprosy that was kept outhouses. They kept them to live long after the leprosies-disappeared. The modern concept of madness as a disease took snap.

The practice of confining the mad constitutes a break with the past. Foucault focuses on the moment of transition, as modern reason begins to take shape in a coming together of concepts, institutions, and practices, knowledge and power. Emerging reason is a power whose truth and
identity is also assigned by reason. Reason is allowed to speak. Foucault finds that madness is not allowed to speak for itself and is at the disposal of a power that dictates the terms of their relationship. Reason is found when madness comes to stand in the place of non-reason. The reason stands in opposition to madness and not identical to the reason. It inscribes their difference. It’s a kind of free-floating power without definite shape.

The use of episteme emerged from Foucault’s conviction that those engaged in intellectual enquiry confined themselves to the study of more appearances or ‘knowledge of things’ and failed to explore the foundations to human knowledge. Like Nietzsche Foucault saw the need for the new and critical orientation of thought. This critical approach involved investigating the fundamental structure of thought. Foucault described this approach as archaeological, a sifting through the layers of surface reality in order to penetrate to the deeper and hidden rules, the given the way individuals know and understand themselves. The archaeological method demonstrated the facility of the traditional human science which maintained the core condition in an autonomous and coherent human subject capable of discerning. An overall pattern to human history and thereby show how the past informed the present. It revealed how historical periods were incommensurable. Yet by 1960 when he had refined his ideas further in the Archaeology of Knowledge, Foucault was keen to stress an important timeless element. The concept of discourse bound up with his understanding of the past through the idea of archive. Archive is the law of the system that governs appearance of statements as unique events. It related to the play of rules which determines within culture the appearance and disappearance of statements and was the general system of formation and transformation of statements (Foucault, Michel 1969, 170-1). The introduction of discourse and
archive was Foucault’s response to his critics who challenged that his work was confined exclusively to the domain of theory and was unable to address the relation between knowledge and human practice.

Foucault’s *Archeology of Knowledge: Introduction of discourse and archive* reflected Foucault’s deep commitment with politics and the study of power. The writing of Foucault reflected the Nietzschean idea of the genealogy. Nietzsche was his intellectual and spiritual inspiration who also highlighted his preoccupation with the power/knowledge matrix that dominated modern societies. Foucault saw discourses in a complex relation with power whereby certain forms of knowledge or human practices were marginalised or repressed. Foucault was against the totalising discourses. By geneology he understood the ‘painstaking rediscovery of struggles’, the rediscovery of ‘fragmented subjugated, local and specific knowledge’, the knowledge of marginalised individuals or groups. Genealogy aims at to expose the workings of power, to illuminate a society’s will to truth: repressive and permissive procedures that determine how knowledge is valued, applied, distributed and rejected (Foucault, Michel, 1980, 80-5)

Genealogical history would tell the story of a constant struggle between different powers which try to impose their own will to truth. The same was the object of *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975). It is the history of prisons and punishment. In his early works *Madness and Civilization and The Birth of the Clinic* are on mental illness and psychiatry. These works revolutionised disciplines such as clinical psychiatry, psychology, philosophy, criminology, sociology, and political theory. Foucault’s archaeological method and genealogical approach made a significant contribution to the shattering of barriers between established academic disciplines and the new ones. A new generation historians Frank Ankersmith, Hans Kellner and Hayden White
turned to philosophy and literary criticism in theorising a postmodernist history.

Genealogy served as the foundation to the elaboration of a strategy of resistance particularly for those groups who suffered from institutionalised subjugation and social marginalisation: the clinically insane prison inmates, sexual deviants, social misfits. It was a way of releasing and bringing into play local discursivities and subjected knowledges (Foucault, 85). It was about giving voice to marginalised individuals or groups in their struggles to resist domination and transgress the boundaries of social propriety. It gave impetus to an anarchic impulse but did not guarantee liberation, as the exercise of power over other is built on the premise that the table can always be turned dissolved or reconstituted (Philip, Foucault 78). This was not a politics of ideological struggle; it was micropolitics of resistance that would be identified with the postmodern politics of Gilles Deleuze, Jean Francois Lyotard, and Jacques Derrida (Drolet, Michael 259-73).

Jacques Derrida is most penetrating poststructuralists among poststructuralists. His essay *Cogito and the History of Madness* was a brilliant early example of his Deconstruction. Deconstruction is the approach to apply and analyse literary work of art and artefact. Derrida agreed with Foucault that the traditional approach to human sciences was dead and not worth reviving. He believed that Foucault’s archaeology and genealogy still adhered to the assumption underpinning Western philosophical tradition that there was an objective body of knowledge or ultimate truth that could be discovered. Derrida aimed for a definitive rupture and result is the birth of poststructuralism. He uses strange terminology and his narrative thread is broken by numerous long digressions which are all designed to push language beyond the
boundaries of convention or as he says himself, to make his works frustratingly difficult to comprehend.

Derrida was impressed by Heidegger. Heidegger was the inspiration behind the composition of Derrida’s doctoral thesis *Of Grammatology* (1967). This work set out a new approach to philosophy known as deconstruction. Deconstruction endangered the established rules of the order.

Like Heidegger, Derrida believed that the world is dominated by the Western philosophical tradition. Derrida referred this as logocentrism. Heidegger calls this kind of metaphysics is humanism. This was misleading because it was anthropomorphic, equating man and being as the same, it was also flawed and ultimately destructive.

Derrida believed to abandon the anthropomorphic conception of being as something more than man. His early endorsement of structuralism paved the way to his acceptance of Heidegger’s philosophy. But later he concluded that Heidegger had gone far enough in his break from humanism. Derrida sets out to give his own deeper and more penetrating analysis of humanism and thereby achieve a final separation from it.

Derrida’s central concept in *Of Grammatology* is “difference” which means both difference and to defer, where meaning itself is forever postponed. Differance is central to his mode of philosophical questioning and his attack on humanism. He is not interesting in focusing on core ideas or arguments. He is not interested in offering a complete or definitive account of a work or philosopher’s thought. Rather he is concerned with modes of rhetorical devices. His intention is to show how a text fails to succeed in communicating its message or representing reality. Derrida challenges that we make sense of the world through
language and that there is no way of stepping outside of language to determine whether the world represented by it is consistent with it.

Derrida’s approach blurs the distinction between philosophy and other forms of writing such as literature. For this reason his work has been attacked by philosophers but embraced by literary theorists such as William Spanos who saw it both a new way of reading but also writing texts. The same approach has also attracted followers in other disciplines. By undermining the traditional boundaries between disciplines and by offering a rigorous critique of the modern conviction in progressive history governed by self-reflexive individuals who act according to an objectively discoverable set of universal ethical rules, Derrida has done to great effect in *Spectres of Marx* by deconstructing the idea of the end of history. Derrida’s whole approach to philosophy makes it not only poststructuralist but also quintessentially postmodern.

Like Derrida, Jean Francois Lyotard (1924-98) had a keen interest in the works of Nietzsche and Heidegger. His *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* was account of the condition of knowledge in the most highly developed societies. His study was original in the way it explored to the society the poststructuralist critique of philosophy. Lyotard believed that poststructuralism triumphed over humanism and that this altered the nature of knowledge, requiring it to adopt a new role in a postmodern world.

He studied the distinction between scientific knowledge and other forms of knowledge called ‘narrative’ knowledge. The apparent triumph of scientific knowledge over narrative knowledge had to do with its ability to appeal to more encompassing narrative or metanarrative. Metanarrative embodied the values that comprised the transcendent and universal truths which legitimated modern society, such as universal reason, the progressive course of history and the universal capacity for
individuals to act freely the value of humanism. The spread of secularism and the breakdown of political authority gave rise to “incredulity towards metanarratives”. It is postmodern condition that makes him very postmodernist and popular.

Like Derrida’s use of deconstruction and dissemination as a method and strategy of analysis, Lyotard drew on a different set of concepts. Language game, a concept adopted from the later work of the Cambridge based philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein, Lyotard believed that by using and pursuing the line of philosophical enquiry that went it, he could debunk the metaphysical pursuit of fundamental nature that had dominated philosophy since Plato. The idea of language game revealed the words obtained their meaning in the course of particular activities in which humans were engaged. A word is really plays in our usage of language. Wittgenstein believed that he could help philosophers out of muddles in which they had unwittingly ventured. This was no longer philosophy on grand or metaphysical scale rather it was a form of philosophical therapy.

Lyotard used the idea of language game for its purpose to dispel from philosophy the method of science. It was introduced to undermine the use of generalisation and the unifying treatment of different topics that had led to a disapproving attitude. And its introduction showed that philosophers quest to find metaphysical essences was the result of twisted thinking. It is used to stress the political dimension. Language characterised in terms of conflict. To speak is to fight-up any meaningful exchange of ideas between the two. Derrida’s Marxism is inconceivable to those who claim to have a fair knowledge of the authentic Marxist texts.

Jean Baudrillard a professor of Sociology at the University of Nanterre from 1966 to 1987, Baudrillard took the postmodern turn in the
mid-1970s. In 1960s Baudrillard used to describe himself as a Marxist and participated in the students uprising of May, 1968. Like many of the left, he was disappointed that the French Communist Party did not extend the assistance that the students’ movement deserved. He began to argue that Marxism did not provide a radical enough critique of the existing society. He concluded that the French Communist is failure to support the May 68 movement was rooted in part in a conservatism that had its origins in Marxism itself. In the following years Baudrillard’s writing matured into a full-fledged rejection of Marxist theory.

Baudrillard is best known for his proclamation that reality ‘no longer exists’. *Simulation* is his most widely cited work, which boldly proclaims: the end of power, history and ‘the real’ in general. The logic of production and class conflict disappear from Baudrillard’s story. Technology replaces capital; the proliferation turn is thus connected to a form of technological determinism and a rejection of political economy as a useful explanatory principle (Cuddon, J.A.1982).

In this postmodern world, individuals flee from ‘the desert of the real’ for the ecstasies of hyper-reality, the new realm of computer, media and technological experience. In this universe, subjectivities are fragmented and lost and a new terrain of experience appears that for Baudrillard renders previous social theories and politics obsolete and irrelevant.

Baudrillard draws attention to the key role of the electronic mass media in the late capitalist society. T.V. is all. T.V. produces a surfeit of images and information which threaten our sense of reality. In the postmodern world, he writes that the proliferation of signs and images has effaced the distinction between the real and the imaginary art has triumphed over reality.
According to some critics, in his latest works Baudrillard has taken an extreme posture. His post 1970s work raises the question whether he wanders away from the world of social theory and chooses the world of science fiction; whether his latest works should be read under the sign of truth or fiction.

Baudrillard is only the most hyperbolic version of a widespread concern with the disappearance of the real in postmodernism which is also demonstrated by the contemporary novel. The most characteristic formal practice in postmodern fiction is what is known is meta-fiction, fiction that in some way foregrounds its own status as a fictional construct. Meta-fiction is essentially an ironic form in that it demonstrates that we cannot accept the reality’ we are presented with in a novel at face value. The story is undermined by its form, by the way in which it is told. In fact this practice relates to one particular literary version of irony from a much earlier tradition, ‘romantic irony’.

Baudrillard’s views on postmodernism and the real regard as an attitude towards our culture; postmodernism refers to a heightened degree of self-consciousness indicating changed experience of the reality. Reality is no longer something we can take for granted but is something that we suspect is continually organised and constructed for us by the twin apparatuses of the mass media land the global capitalist economy. The changed experience of ‘the real’ is a future of more ambitious. Theoretical accounts of postmodern seeks to depict it as an evidence of a paradigm shift in society as whole, not just in terms of cultural style advanced by Daniel bell, Fredric Jameson, Jean-Francois Lyotard and David Harvey.

To live in postmodernity is to find one divorced from those aspects of life which are regarded as authentic, genuine, and real in postmodernity. We are no longer able to appreciate the particularity of
our historical location, we no longer create original works of art, and we live and work in virtual space rather than reality. Jean Baudrillard’s provocative conception of postmodern life takes place the logic of the changed status of the real. Baudrillard holds that the characteristic feature of contemporary society is its domination by systems which are capable of perfect duplication. Baudrillard called it the code.

Previously technology could produce copies of thing. For example, recorded music or artistic prints were clearly versions of the original and still recognizable as copy. Now, however science and technology have advanced to such a degree that copies can be made which are indistinguishable from the original: As with the cloning of animals, or the ability to ‘burn’ CD’s the difference between the original and the copy is eliminated. This is the process of Baudrillard simulating example big brothers, bombing of the world trade centre mass media as if Hollywood film. Bardrillard argues that a new definition of real appears in postmodernity: anything which can be copied absolutely which is to say in the age of the code, absolutely everything. Reality is no longer real any more, in fact, it is hyperreal.

In contemporary social science vocabulary, no discourse is complete without referring to postmodernity. Postmodernity and postmodern thinkers have become popular subjects of study. The entry of postmodernity in common usage is very recent articulate. In 1990 period a kit of concepts viz., discourse, metanarratives or grand narratives, simulacra, simulation, hyperreality, deconstruction, cyber people, poststructuralism, truth, reality, etc are developed. Some of the postmodern thinkers have also become popular figures in our day-to-day discourse in academic circle. Among them Jean Baudrillard, Jean Francois Lyotard, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Derrida are prominent postmodern thinkers.
Postmodern media rejects the idea. Any media product or text is of any greater value than another. All judgements are merely taste. Anything can be art, anything can deserve to reach an audience, and culture ‘eats itself’. There is no longer anything new to produce or distribute. The distinction between media and reality has collapsed. We now live in a ‘reality’ defined by images and represent a state of ‘simulacrum’. Images refer to each other and represent each other as reality rather than some ‘pure’ reality. This reality survives before the image represents. It is the state of ‘hyperreality’. All ideas of ‘the truth’ are just competing claims or discourses and what we believe to be the truth at any point is merely the ‘winning’ discourse.

Philosophers of the postmodern movements are Baudrillard and Lyotard. Derrida and Foucault offered different theories of postmodernism. Jean Baudrillard argues that there is nothing real in this world. Simulacra and simulation, hyperreality have taken the place of reality in the present world. Like Plato in his Republic argues Poetry is thrice removed from its Reality. It is a mere imitation; as Jacques Derrida shared a belief about the idea of truth needs to be ‘deconstructed’, Lyotard rejects the ‘grand narratives’ which challenge the dominant ideas of people, claim as truth (Marxism). The truth, institutions, the discipline and punishment as discourse area is called as knowledge and power relationship in Foucault’s postmodern perspective throughout work.

Postmodernism is a continuation of modernism. Both terms are concerned with the literary work of the recent times. ‘Modernism’ is used to identify the new features in the forms and concepts of literature. The special feature of modernism is that it involves a deliberate and radical break with some of the traditional bases of Western art and culture. A prominent feature of modernism is avant-garde that is creation of new artistic forms. Modernism embraces a number of artistic movements.
including Symbolism, Imagism, Expressionism, Surrealism, Dadaism, Cubism etc.

The term ‘postmodernism’ resonates in at least three registers: Firstly, in terms of historical development, the term appears as ‘postmodernity’, designating the latest phase in the broad evolution to capitalist economics and culture, especially since the later part of the 20th century. This historical phenomenon has generated two further registers that of postmodern theory, literature and art. The term ‘postmodern’ has been applied to the works of numerous writers, such as Jacques Derrida, Julia Kristeva, and Michel Foucault, who have also been labelled as ‘Poststructuralist’. M.H. Abram’s in *Glossary of Literary Terms* (2006) writes, “Postmodernism in literature and arts has parallel with the movement known as post-structuralism in linguistics and literary theory” (Abram’s, M. H. 2006). Finally, in the register of literature and art, the terms used by a number of critics, such as Ihab Hassan, to distinguish the experimental literature produced after the Second World War (1939-1945). Postmodernism is a broader phenomenon, one of its manifestations is poststructuralism. The two terms might be viewed as two approach or perspective, rather than two phenomena, from which we can view the history of modern literary and cultural criticism. The Perspectives of modernism situates modern theory within the context of larger economic and cultural tendencies, whereas that of poststructuralism sees such theory as both emerging from and reacting against the structuralists modes of analysis that predominated in many fields, including literature and political theory, during the 1950s.

The major practitioners of postmodernism include Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard, and Jean Baudrillard. The works of Georges Bataille belongs to an earlier phenomenological tradition but was revived in the usage of postmodernist and poststructuralist. The
opponents of postmodernism (who have also theorized about it) have included notably left-wing intellectuals such as Jurgen Habermas, Fredric Jameson, and Terry Eagleton.

The research study spotlights the postmodern theory, its approach, methods, objectives, assumptions, practices, critical responses and relevance. Postmodernism is an approach related to the opposition of the Modernism. The Postmodernism highlights the literary and cultural changes from Modernism which emerged after the World War II (1939-1945). The objective of Postmodernism is to foreground what might be called ‘intertextual element’ in literature, such as parody, pastiche, and illusion; there is a major degree of reference between one text and another, rather than between the text and a safely external reality. The Postmodernism is based on certain assumption; it refers to the aspects of a more general human condition in the late capitalist world, which have an all embracing effect on life, culture, ideology and art.

The practice of Postmodernism is started with Jean-Francois Lyotard. His book The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge (1979) is a precursor of this approach. It is essentially a strategic practice concerned with undermining the philosophical establishment and its commitment to foundationalist principles. The book stands prominently among a number of books which develops attacks on modernity, commissioned as a report on the state of modern knowledge. Jean Baudrillard might be regard as the high prophet of modernism. He is associated with what is known as ‘the loss of the real’, which is the view that in contemporary life that pervasive influence of images from film, TV, and advertising has led to a loss of the distinction between real and imagined, reality and illusion, surface and depth. His conception of Postmodernism is founded upon three principle ideas: ‘Simulation,’ ‘Implosion’, and ‘Hyperreality’.
Jurgen Habermas’s paper *Modernity an Incomplete Project* is a major movement in the history of Postmodernism. His writing is concerned with the Enlightenment project and aesthetic Modernity. Feminist is also emerged in Postmodernism. The argument of Postmodern Feminism is that gender is constructed through language. Judith Butler, Donna Haraway, Bell Hooks etc. are the major exponent of postmodern feminism. Postmodernism also has close relationship with Marxism. The Marxist critics Fredric Jameson and Terry Eagleton contributed within it.

The major critics and thinkers are concerned with the Project of Enlightenment, Narrative techniques, Humanism, Marxism, Poststructuralism and Feminism. The Project of Enlightenment is a major factor in postmodern approach. Many Postmodern critics like Habermas, Derrida, Foucault, Lyotard, Baudrillard, and Fredric Jameson give their contribution in developing the Project of Enlightenment. The Postmodern critic opposes the grand narrative of Modernism. Postmodernism has become the buzzword of contemporary society in the1990s. It offers clear and accessible study of literature. It encourages reader to study the basic philosophical and cultural ideas. Postmodernism helps reader to understand the areas of contemporary culture, philosophy and cultural theory; architecture and concepts of space; visual art sculpture and the design arts; popular culture and music; film, video and television culture, and the social sciences. Thus, it is clear that postmodernism plays very important role in current critical theories.

**‘Post’ in the Postmodern**

The term ‘post’ functions as chronological indicator, designating that which follows and comes after the modern. The discourse of the postmodern thus involves periodizing terms which describe a set of key changes in history, society, culture, and thought. The confusion involved in the discourse of the postmodern results from its usage in different
fields and disciplines and the fact that most theorists on postmodern discourse provide definitions and conceptualizations that are frequently odd with each other and usually sometimes inadequately conceived. Moreover, some theorists and commentators use the term postmodern descriptively to describe new phenomena, while others use it prescriptively urging the acceptance of new theoretical, cultural, and political discourses and practices.

An ambiguity is inherent in the prefix ‘post’ which is played out in various postmodern discourses. It has two types of meanings. First, ‘post’ describes ‘not’ modern, that can be read as an active term of negation which attempts to move beyond the modern era and its theoretical and cultural practices. Thus, postmodern discourses and practices are frequently characterized as anti-modern interventions which clearly break with modern ideologies, styles, and practices that many postmodernists see as oppressive. The prefix ‘post’, in this prescriptive sense, signifies an active break with earlier traditions. This rupture can be interpreted positively as liberation from old restriction and oppressive conditions and as an affirmation of new developments, a moving into new terrains, a forging of new discourses and ideas. In the earlier the postmodernism was interpreted negatively as an awful regression, as a loss of traditional values, certainties, and stabilities or as a surrender of those still valuable elements of modernity. On the former view, the ‘post’ in postmodern also signifies a dependence on, a continuity with, that which it follows, leading some critics to conceptualize the postmodern as merely an intensification of the modern, as a hypermodernity, a new ‘face of modernity’, or a ‘postmodern’ development within modernity.

Yet many postmodern theorists set up the term as it was introduced by historian Arnold Toynbee to characterize a dramatic rupture or break in Western history in 1940. The discourses of the postmodern therefore
presuppose a sense of an ending, the advent of something new, and the demand that we must develop new categories, theories, and methods to explore and conceptualize the term in social and cultural situation. Thus, there is an inherent sadness of the new discourses of the postmodern and its celebrants tend to position themselves as theoretical and political avant-gardes.

Therefore the term ‘postmodernism’ is used to describe the areas of the postmodern within the fields of philosophy, cultural theory, and social theory. A postmodernist describes and usually supports attributed breaks in knowledge, culture, and society. Postmodernists frequently attack the modern while identifying with what they present as new and ‘radical’ postmodern discourses and practices. A postmodernist thus calls for new categories modes of thought, writing, values and culture and politics to overcome the absence of modern discourses and practices. Some postmodern theorists, like Derrida, Foucault, Lyotard, Baudrillard, Jameson, and Haraway focus on developing alternative modes of knowledge and discourse emphasizing the forms of economy, society, culture, and experience. Within social theory, postmodernist claims that there are fundamental changes in society and history which require new theories and conceptions, and those modern theories are unable to illuminate these changes.

Jameson, however, utilizes modern (primarily Marxist) theory to analyze postmodern cultural and social forms, while Habermas and many of his associates criticize what they consider to be the ideological nature of postmodern theory as present work area. The capitalist class societies are exploring the possibilities of a “post-modern” society that is a historically new principle of organization and not a different name for the surprising vigour of an old capitalism. However, Habermas has never really undertaken an inquiry into what might follow modernity and has
generally treated postmodern theories as irrationalist ideologies. By contrast it uses postmodern critiques to go beyond Marxism and to reconstruct the development of radical democracy.

Deleuze and Guattari do not explicitly adopt the discourse of the postmodern, but they do present new models of theory, practice, and subjectivity which they counterpose and offer as alternatives to modern models. Baudrillard was at first reluctant to embrace the term postmodern to describe his work, but he now uses it to identify his own positions. Lyotard has expressed uncertainty toward the label before writing the report on the postmodern condition. Guattari has attacked the term while Laclau and Mouffe remain linked to many modern political values and Jameson continues to identify with Marxism.

The research study provides complete clarifications and critiques of postmodernism by exploring a variety of postmodern positions and perspectives. It excludes systematic discussion of such major poststructuralist theorists as Kristeva, Barthes, or Lacan who are often linked to postmodern theory and their work can be spoken with postmodernism. Ryan and Spivak have shown the main focus of most poststructuralists is on philosophy, cultural theory, or psychoanalysis. Poststructuralist theory comes within an account of postmodernism. Thus, the research study centres on theoretical work dealing with postmodern approaches and account of the ‘postmodern condition’. The task of researcher is to consider the point to which postmodern approaches contribute to the development of a critical theory and radical politics for the present age.

The study examines how these selected postmodernists characterize and criticize modernity and its discourses and suggest a break with modernism to produce alternative postmodernism for construction of postmodernism. It is for the development of
postmodernism sufficient towards the supposed postmodern situation. Further, the study intends to compare and contrast the evaluation of modernity, the characterizations of the basic trends of postmodern culture and the development of postmodernism in Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard, and Jean Baudrillard.

The research study outlines the theoretical perspectives as proceeds and elaborates our theoretical and political positions in more detail in the conclusion. The research study interprets and approaches to the conceptual study of postmodernism. Postmodernism is as a challenge to modernism. The study includes both promising new perspectives and problematical aspects. Sometimes the critics like Jean Francois Lyotard do not accept the postmodern claim of a radical rupture or break in history which requires totally new theories and modes of thought. So far the study identifies important changes in vast domains of society and culture which requires a reconstruction of social and cultural theory, and which sometimes authorize the term ‘postmodern’ in theory, philosophy, arts, literature.

**Background of Modernism for Postmodernism:**

Modernism is movement for a period in the history of art which emerged around late 1880s in Europe and America and lasted until the Second World War. Modernism includes a propensity to create culture shock by abandoning traditional conventions of social behaviour, aesthetic representation, and scientific verification, the celebration of elitist revolutionary aesthetic and ethical departures and in general the derogation of the premise of a coherent, empirically accessible external reality (such as Nature or Providence) and the substitution of at all devised structures or systems which are self-consciously arbitrary and transitory. Post modernity has come out of Enlightenment and modernity. For enlightenment philosophers the critical reason and science, the use of
modern era produced the liberation of humanity from poverty, ignorance, prejudice and the absence of enjoyment. Modernity brought the victorious struggle of reason against emotions, science against religion and magic, truth against prejudice, correct knowledge against superstition, and reflection against uncritical existence.

Postmodernism analogy of technological or cultural change is often used in combination with blank point or singularity. First, Copernicus demonstrated that the earth is not the centre of the universe; second, Darwin showed that humans are an evolutionary species of animal; and, third, Freud explained human behaviour as governed by biological drives and the unconscious. The changes in the various fields have brought us to the postmodern society. In the postmodern society we are not only uncertain about the present but also uncertain about the past; we live in the era of cable television, e-mail and the internet. It is difficult for anyone including those of us who are older to plan ourselves, leave a couple of generations. In 1950, we had no computers, and many families listened to the radio in the evening. Fifty years before there were no airplanes or cars, no factory assembly lines, no automation (machines running machines), and no movies, no communication was direct; it was slow; what is now called snail mail.

Besides these dominant theoretical orientations, there were a few dominant ideologies also which characterized the 19th century. It was this heritage that influenced the postmodern thinkers. All these theorists in one way or the other strengthened the modernist ideology of progress, democracy and capitalism. This means that there was economic progress all over the world. The idea of division of labour was also proposed by the theorists like Karl Marx. This resulted in institutions such as bureaucracy, professionalism and specializations in walks of life. The 19th
century is known for the popular theory of evolution. The theorists of this period had a fascination for the ideology of evolution.

In short, industrialist capital competition was seen as a good thing by the theorists of this period. They believed capitalism would lead to a better world. The optimism of this dominant ideology at the beginning of the 20th century was consistent with the western theories being used to explain social life and with the ‘goodness’ of western development.

All the thinkers of the 19th century supported the ideology of the growth of capitalism as a good thing. Karl Marx views capitalism from the standpoint of the workers. The theoretical argument included like the exploitative, oppressive nature of capitalism, the meaningless nature of work, the importance of economic classes in the world history, the expansion of capitalism to worldwide operation, or imperialism, the expected eventual revolution of the worlds working classes against the capitalist owners. The division of labour resulted in alienation. Ideologically, the first and second generation radical anti-capitalist argued that explanation and understanding must have changed their goal. They were optimist convinced that the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism was not only needed but inevitable.

The major characteristics of modernization democracy, capitalism, nation state and state power were issues of debate. There were various dramatic changes taken place after the Second World War. The successive struggle for independence of many colonies is one such major event.

The concept of postmodernism is very fluid. It carries wide open-endedness. All sorts’ of controversies and contradictions are attached to the meaning of this ism. It allows full social plurality to ethnic groups and at worse; it is nothing short of nihilism. The meaning of the term is certain that postmodernism is against ideas about depth and essence, the
total and universal. Again, despite controversies, postmodernism stands for superficial and provisional and fragmentation and difference. There is nothing real in the society, nor is there any truth. The precise meaning of postmodernism is changing day by day with new era and its new trend appearing on the media. Everyone is very familiar about media TV.

The first half of the 20th century was dominated by modernism movement. It rejected the legacy of past, the technological progress, and to create the world a new. Russian Revolution occurred. Postmodernity by the second half of the century, the dramatic, daring and innovative trend had become the cultural norms. The revolutionary influences had once stimulated policies. The Brave New World was in retreat. It is the beginning of postmodern society. It has started new moment that seeks to recover tradition. It prefers stability to change. This vacuum steps is of postmodernism. It tries to undo what modernism has done for the European and American societies.

There are several myths about postmodernism. The cultural paradigm is not concerned with economics and politics. The culture of postmodernism believes for good or evil. It is related in some way to the emergence of a new social epoch of postmodernism. Some of the related social developments and the loss of confidence are not only in revolutionary Marxism but also in social planning as characterized by post-war housing estates and tower block. The so-called economic changes occur from mass production to flexible specialization and from mass consumption patterns to life style puts in the marketplace. There were the consequent fragmentation of social classes, the perception of the modernist ideas of technological progress and economic growth. The cause of problems of pollution, waste and wars, rather than solutions, the decline of the politics of party, parliament and trade unions and the
growth of micro-politics marked by struggles at the institutional and local levels are the responsible factors for the rise of postmodernism.

Some of these changes are periodical. It is the one single cultural change that rocked the whole economic, political and social sphere. It is the astonishing growth and pervasiveness of the mass media. Communication is visual media of film, television and graphic design. In a postmodern age, most destructive characteristic is a loss of rational and social coherence in favour of cultural images. Social forms and identities are marked by fragmentation, multiplicity, plurality and in determination. It is a broken world.

**Modernity and Modernism:**

“Modernity” is slippery term as “postmodernity”. Some scholars date the “modern subject” as emerged early in the Renaissance. When some refer to the “modern period,” they mean the period from about 1898 to the Second World War. This is a time of wild experimentation in literature, music, art, and even politics. There is still a belief among many thinkers in concepts such as truth and progress. This is the period that saw such revolutionary political movements as fascism, nazism, communism, anarchism, and so on. The proposals about artistic form are just as widespread. There are different forms like surrealism, dadaism, cubism, futurism, expressionism, existentialism, primitivism, minimalism, etc.).

In general, Enlightenment values may be suspected by this radicalism. Modernists therefore question all the values of the Victorian period includes referentiality, religion, progress, bourgeois domesticity, capitalism, utilitarianism, decorum, empire, industry, etc are the characteristic feature of Modernism.

Self-reflexivity forms the attribute of modernism. It’s like woman working in the office, or Picasso’s woman in the Studio. Modernism explores psychological and subjective states in combination with a
rejection of realism or objective representation as in expressionism or stream-of-consciousness writing. It’s an alternative way of thinking about representation. For example: cubism, the same event or objects from multiple perspectives are the same time. Radical experimentation in form, including a breakdown in generic distinction in Virginia Woolf’s poetic prose features Modernism. Fragmentation in form and representation in T.S. Eliot’s Wasteland, extreme ambiguity and simultaneity in structure in William Faulkner’s The Sound and the Fury, some experimentation in the breakdown between high and low forms of T. S. Eliot and James Joyce’s folk and pop-cultural use, the use of parody and irony in artistic creation as in Joyce’s Ulysses are strange, satirical and paradoxical writing. As a matter of fact, Joyce’s Ulysses has become so much fragmented; in cohesive and broken.

The key idea about postmodernity is its stand against any depth and essence. It is vehemently opposed to total and universal. Postmodernism rejects grand theories of Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, Karl Marx, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, etc. These theories are simply totalizing. The major thrust of postmodernism is that everything in this society is superficial and conditional. The world or the society is fully fragmented in varying cultures, ethics.

There is theoretical and ideological background for the post modern thinkers to their contribution. There are various changes in the society. Post modern thinkers are the product of western social and historical condition. In the same way, the emergence of post modern conditions in India is also traced to its social, cultural and historical context. Post modernism in India can be traced to architecture, literature, media, and technology. The main reason of the roots of Indian post modern society is located in social and historical condition of the country.
The post modern thinkers in the west include Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Jean Baudrillard, and Fredric Jameson. All these post modern thinkers and academicians belong to the same French generation. Baudrillard was born in 1929, Foucault in 1926, Lyotard in 1929, Derrida in 1930 and Jameson 1935. All five belong to the first half of the 20th century. Their ideas were formed during the second half of the 20th century. They published the greater part of their work after the Second World War. They have taken pessimistic view of the forces of history. To all of them there is disillusionment against modernity. They contributed immensely and enjoy an established status in post modern theories. For them modern society is in crisis.

There are basically three ways that people use the term “postmodernism”. First, to describe a specific era at the end of World War II especially starting from 1970s; second, to describe a body of philosophical ideas and critical studies that late 1960s with such poststructuralist thinkers as Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Jean-Francois Lyotard, and Jean Baudrillard produced. Then 1970s and 1980s come to include a whole series of different analysis involving language and symbolic systems that develop some of the insights of these earlier poststructuralist thinkers. Though postmodernism as a body of thought is usually traced back to the late 1960s, there are a number of earlier philosophers whose ideas could easily be described as postmodernist, including the Friedrich Nietzsche, the American pragmatists William James and Charles Pierce, and to a lesser extent the German phenomenologist Martin Heidegger and Hans-George Gadamar. Finally, a whole body of different artistic works make reference to embody the ideas.

According to Daniel Bell postmodernism is often used as synonymous with “the post-industrial age” or “the late capitalist age” as
in Frederic Jameson’s words. It generally refers to a shift away from traditional factory production towards a more service-oriented economy; the growing importance of information technology and media; the explosion of consumer and advertising activity; and the appearance of nuclear power as an energy source and world threat.

In the second sense of the word critics generally try to draw back the development of the ideas and themes. Late capitalist era has two exceptions. Both Jean Baudrillard and Jean-Francois Lyotard are postmodern theorists theorised at the same time about the postmodern age. They gave their ideas of postmodernism in different way.

Postmodernism is not a single. It is huge body of ideas. Postmodernism means something a little different for every area of the arts or specific field of knowledge. There are some themes and ideas common to many of these areas that can serve as family characteristics (in Wittgenstein’s sense). Modernist critical theory concerns with forms of authority and injustice. It accompanied the evolution of industrial and corporate capitalism as a political-economic system. Postmodern critical theory politicizes social problems by situating them in historical and cultural contexts, to connect themselves in the process of collecting and analyzing data, and to relativize their findings. Meaning itself is seen as unstable due to the rapid transformation in social structures. As a result, the focus of research is centred on local manifestations, rather than broad generalizations.

Postmodern critical research is also characterized by the crisis of representation. Postmodernism rejects the idea that any effort is an objective representation of a stable other. Instead, many postmodern scholars have adopted alternatives that encourage reflection about the ‘politics and poetics’ of their work. In the postmodern description the personified, collaborative, dialogic, and improvisational aspects of
qualitative research are elucidated. The Compact Oxford English Dictionary refers to postmodernism as a style and concept in the arts characterized by a distrust of theories and ideologies and by the drawing of attention to conventions. Christopher Butler defines that Postmodernism as after the modernist period.

The movement of modernism and the postmodernism are defined by a set of perspectives. Postmodernism is used in critical theory to refer to a point of departure for works of literature, drama, architecture, cinema, and design in the late 20th century. Postmodernist’s claim that in a media-saturated world, where we are constantly occupied in media on the shift, at work, at home the distinction between reality and the media representation became blurred or even entirely invisible to us. In other words, we no longer have any sense of the difference between real things and images of them, or real experiences and simulations of them. Postmodernism is a historical development: the modern period came before it in which artists experimented with the representation of reality, and the postmodern comes next. This idea of representation gets remixed, played around with, through pastiche, parody and intertextual references. People create texts and deliberately expose their nature as constructed texts. They make no attempt to pretend that they are ‘realist’.

**Postmodernity and Postmodernism:**

One of the problems in dealing with postmodernism is in distinguishing it from modernism. Postmodern artists and theorists continue the sorts of experimentation as found in modernism such as use of self-consciousness, pastiche, parody, irony, fragmentation, generic mixing, ambiguity, simultaneity, and the breakdown between high and low forms of expression. Postmodern artistic forms can be seen as an extension of modernist experimentation. Others prefer to represent the shift into postmodernism as a more radical break. Postmodernism is a
result of new ways of representing the world including television, film and the computer. Many critics witnessed the rise of postmodern architecture from the 1960’s. Some critics prefer to see World War II as the radical break from modernity since the horrors of Nazism were made apparent and modernist revolutions like communism and Maoism were evident at the time. In fact, historian Arnold Toynbee coined the very term “postmodern” in the 1940.

According to some theorists, the 20th century can be divided into two distinct periods; one characterized by the modernism movement and the other by postmodernism. Some believe that postmodernism was a response to modernism and hence consider them as two aspects of the same movement. There are some major differences between modernism and postmodernism. These distinctions make clear, the basic difference in the ways of thinking that led to these movements. The difference between modernism and postmodernism highlights the difference in the approaches towards life. Modernism describes a collection of cultural movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. It consists of a series of reforming movements in art, architecture, literature, music and applied arts. Modernism was characterized by a dramatic change of thought, whereby human intellect sought to improve their environment. There was a trend of improving every aspect of life by involving science and technology into it. Modernism brought about a reform in all spheres of life including philosophy, commerce, art and literature, with the aid of technology and experimentation. It led to progress in all the aspects of life by changing the approach of mankind of looking at them. Postmodernism is a reaction to modernism. It was influenced by the disenchantment brought about by the Second World War. Postmodernism refers to the state that lacks a central hierarchy and one that is complex,
ambiguous and diverse, the development in society, the economy and the
culture of the 1960s were influenced by postmodernism and vice-versa.

**Difference between Modernism and Postmodernism:**

Modernism is associated with the period of the mid 20th century. It is related with constant change in search of progress, achievable through rationality and logic. In contrast postmodernism takes a less optimistic view where constant change becomes the stable and progress outdated. Modernism began in the 1890s and lasted till about 1945. Postmodernism began after the Second World War, especially after 1968. Modernism was based on using rational, logical means to gain knowledge while postmodernism denied the use of reasonable thinking. The thinking of postmodern era was based on irrational, unreasonable thought process, as a reaction to modernism. A hierarchical, prepared and recognized nature of knowledge is characterized by modernism. But postmodernism was based on a chaotic, non-totalized and indeterminate state of knowledge. Modernist approach was objective, theoretical and analytical while the postmodernism approach was based on subjectivity. It lacked the analytical nature and thoughts were self-important and completely based on belief. The fundamental difference between modernism and postmodernism is that modernism is about the search for a conceptual truth of life while postmodernism believes that there is no universal truth, conceptual or else.

Modernism attempts to construct a coherent world-view whereas postmodernism attempts to remove the difference between high and low. Modernist thinking asserts that mankind progresses by using science and reason while postmodernist thinking believes that progress is only an excuse to impose European domination on culture. Modernist thinking believes in learning from past experiences and trusts the texts that narrate the past. On the other hand postmodernist thinking challenges any truth
and narrating the past in the text. Modernist historians have a faith in depth. They believe in going deep into a subject to fully analyze it. This is not the case with postmodernist thinkers. They believe in going by the surface appearances. They believe in playing on surfaces and show no concern towards the strength of subjects. Modernism considers the original works as reality while postmodernist thinkers’ views are based on their hyperreality. They are highly influenced by objects reproduced through media.

Art and literary works were considered as outstanding creations of the artists during the modernist era. People were serious about the purpose of producing art and literary works. These works were believed to accept a full of meaning. The society was dominated with novels and books. The postmodern society is marked by beginning of use of computers. This postmodern era marked with the media and advancements in technology, television and computers. The digital media began to copy and preserve the art and literary works. People no longer believed in art and literary works bearing single meaning. They believed in getting their own meanings from work of art and literature. The media and Internet show the way to exchange of knowledge.

Pop music like Mozart was popular during modernism. This became less popular in the postmodern era. World music, DJs and remixes dominated in postmodernism. The previous architectural forms were popular during modernism. This architecture forms were changed and replaced with a mix of different architectural styles in the postmodern times.

The postmodern features consist of extreme self-reflexivity. Postmodernists tend to take this further than modernists. It tends to be more playful and even irreverent. In postmodern architecture self-reflexivity is achieved by its structure, building elements. Self-reflexivity
tended to be used also in difficult works of modernism. Irony and parody forms the tendency of postmodern artists, theorists, and culture. Postmodernists emphasize to the breakdown between high and low cultural forms. Some modernists experimented with the same breakdown. Modernists played with popular appearances like in James Joyce and T. S. Eliot. They tended to be extremely difficult to follow in their experimentations. In contrast Postmodernists used pop and high cultural objects in directly understandable ways though their goals are still often multiple. Postmodern work always includes the mixture of pastiche, baroque and parody. Postmodernist and postmodern culture tends to be fascinated with styles and fashions from the past. They will often use it completely out of their original context. For example, postmodern architects will juxtapose baroque, medieval, and modern elements in the same room or building. For Baudrillard and Jameson it is a sign of the failure of link with historical temporality.

Postmodernists reject Grand narratives. Lyotard sees the breakdown of the narratives. The narratives are formerly legitimized the stableness as an important aspect of the modern condition. Modernists also questioned such traditional concepts as law, religion, subjectivity, and nationhood. Postmodernity is questioning it and it is no longer particularly associated with an avant-garde intelligentsia. Postmodern artist’s employed pop and mass culture in their analysis. Pop culture itself tends to play with traditional concepts of temporality, religion, and subjectivity.

Postmodernity embraces visuality and the simulacrum vs. temporality. The popular visual media are TV, films, media advertising, the computer, and MTV video. Both postmodern art and postmodern culture are attracted towards visual forms. For example, the breakdown between ‘high’ and ‘low’ forms and a general breakdown in narrative
linearity and temporality are the results of these visual forms. As a result, Baudrillard and others have argued that we have lost all connection to reality or history. This theory may help to explain back to the idea that the line separating reality and representation has broken down.

Postmodernism features late capitalism because after the industrial age it’s the new era called late capitalism as in Jameson’s *Late Capitalism*. The world has been taken over by the values of capitalist acquisition subsequently the alternatives no longer exist. One symptom of this fear is the predominance of suspicious narratives in pop culture (Blade Runner, Matrix). This fear is of course helped by advancements in technology, especially observation technology. This technology creates the sense that we are always being watched.

In postmodernists work, thinking, and the events have uncertainty. MTV culture is also an example of postmodern architecture which attempts to disorient the subject entering its space. Another example of disorientation is the popularity of films that seek to doubt the viewer completely through the disbelief of a truth. The truth changes everything that came before (the Sixth Sense, the Others, Unbreakable, the Matrix).

In postmodern media society provides secondary orality. Postmodern society has seen a major problem in this tendency. The majority of people are now functionally uninformed, relying instead on an arrival of oral media sources like TV, film, radio, etc.. The culture still very much relies on print to create these media outlets. So the term secondary orality is emerged in professional, well-educated class that has access to full print-and computer literacy. An ever larger percentage of the population merely consumes orally the media that is being produced.

**Postmodernity and postmodern, postmodernism:**

Postmodernity and the postmodern have been ascribed an astonishing display of meanings. It differs from discipline to discipline.
The terms are often associated with philosophical writings, social and political theories. The theories are complex, solid, obscurely complicated with full terminology and incomprehensible prose and its readers. The terms often bother strong reactions including deep suspicion and or even complete opposition. These reactions are common. It’s a new thinking or fashionable recourse of using the terms to describe just about any phenomenon. That is old and new.

Postmodernism, postmodernity and the postmodern need not cause bewilderment or provoke such hostility. The terms can be defined clearly. In this study, the terms are defined and their importance is given. How these terms have evolved within and emerged from different artistic communities is also given in the academic pursuits of the humanities and social sciences. In this chapter the detailed introduction to postmodernism, postmodernity and the postmodern is given. These terms considered the social, political artistic, literary and above all, philosophical impact objectively and significantly. The introduction of this study will examine how these terms were first employed, questioned; in different disciplines and in different times. How their different usages were kept a collective and common tendency? This history of the concepts of postmodernism, postmodernity and the postmodern will focus on spiritual studies, literary criticism, history and essentially architecture.

The philosophical roots of postmodernism, postmodernity and the postmodern is cleared in the same chapter. The postmodernism can be seen as next with romantic sensibility and its critique of rationalism and system building. Therefore, postmodernism challenges the fundamental assumptions of the Enlightenment. As the philosopher and historian Michel Foucault in his essay *What is Enlightenment?* (1978) pointed out, to keep the Enlightenment’s push toward individual and social liberation: Postmodernity and the postmodern are the sociological or historical
expressions of postmodernism. These have like ‘romantic’ or the ‘romantic age’ are similar expressions of romanticism.

Postmodernism is defined as a set of quite different social science theories. Some are highly affirmative, looking at positive aspects of complexity, progress, and technologization of life and work. Others are more sceptical looking at the dark side of claims of progress since 16th century Enlightenment, and the impact of technology, such as in biotechnology, and cyberization. There are quite radical positions by Baudrillard (claiming all is simulacra), and Lyotard claiming incredulity to all modern narratives of science, progress, etc). Michel Foucault’s discourse, Power Knowledge relationship, and Derrida’s deconstructive approach make difference in writing as well as in the meaning. Postmodern approaches are less radical that combine with Critical Theory (Frankfurt School, before Habermas). Critical Postmodernism argues some modern narratives, such as ethics, Marxism, Capitalism. They need to be balanced with labor and environmental perspectives.

The term postmodernism was referred in the late 1950s. It applied to the work of Robert Rauschenberg and poets such as Charles Olson. They wanted to challenge received wisdom and established norms in their respective disciplines. At that time, the term was used in regulative. It was associated with movements of modernism.

The term, postmodernism became popular among artists, writers, poets, and some literary critics in the 1960s and 1970s. This term was adopted by a number of prominent architects such as Robert Venturi and Charles Jencks. Their intention of good architecture was to express meaning or message. It was open to new developments in linguistics especially in the writings of the late 20th C. Swiss linguistic philosopher Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913). In Literature, art and the latest works were adopted by sociologists of mass media Canadian Marshall McLuhan
(1911-80) and the French writer Roland Barthes (1915-80). In this way clear similarity have emerged between the ways the term was understood in art and literature and the way it used in architecture.

The different disciplines saw postmodernism as a movement whose conscious purpose was to turn over basic ideas to modernism especially on narrative and representation. Architects and artists understood as movement for change. The term was employed and used as a concept descriptively in 1970s. The expression ‘postmodern’ has been used since 1970.

In the coming of post-industrial society (1973) Bell equated postmodernism with a ‘new sensibility’. This breaks down all genres and denies that there is any distinction between art and life. Three years later in The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism (1976) he attacked postmodernism as the psychedelic, effort to expand consciousness without boundaries. He believed this new cultural mode was simply the decay of the self in a consequence to remove individual ego.

Structuralism rejected the idea of human subject as autonomous, coherent. It can discern an overall pattern to human history, and thereby improve on the past. For the French Structuralist anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss the human subject had become the spoilt brat of philosophy. Structuralism, therefore, sought not to form the subject, but soften it. Structuralism’s attempt to dissolve human subject were part of a deeper disappointment with a general and disciplines and political movements. The failure of liberal democracies to achieve genuine equality and promote social justice, and the collapse of political ideologies are of Marxism. Marxism was inspired by grand designs to liberate individuals and transform society to conform the reflections of intellectuals. The intellectuals emphasised the limits to human reason and the folly of schemes that sought to rationally engineers’ individual and social
liberation. This modern day consideration stressed the collapse of grand ideologies. It was the manifestation of a profound tendency, breakdown of rationality and of the Western Philosophical tradition itself. Within this general body of writing some writers were rigid, such as Michel Foucault, Lucy Irigaray. They asserted that forms of human liberation were possible, but that liberation could be thought about only within a new theoretical context of the central doctrine of the Western philosophical tradition.

Postmodernism is the most problematic concept of contemporary cultural criticism. The term has featured prominently in an unusually wide range of academic disciplines-literary study. The visual arts and architecture, philosophy, social theory, history, cultural studies are used in different ways, to designate apparently different things. The term has entered more general cultural discourse, cropping up regularly in broadsheet newspapers; style magazines, TV arts programmes and non-academic books, where the meaning of the term is even less clear. The object of Postmodernism is unstable, because it keeps changing according the context in which the concept is being discussed. Postmodernism has become more or less established critical discourse. The term refers to shift in what it means to be a subject in late twentieth century society and a design related attitude of self – reflexivity or ironic knowingness that permeates our culture. Postmodernism is understood through the contemporary novel like Amis, Rushdie, Morrison, Delillo, Pynchon, Carter, Fowels, Marquez, Cortazar, Robbe-Grillet, Grass, Calvine. Postmodernism is effectively regarded as our own cultural form as symptomatic of late twentieth and early twenty first cultural experiences.

The sociologist Jean Baudrillard and political philosopher Jean-Francois Lyotard also held same views on similar philosophical grounds. They claimed that the profound changes experienced by Western
industrial societies in the last four decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century were the consequence of the way Western thought shaped individuals and Societies’ direction toward them and the transformation of their natural and social worlds. Western societies were functioned and controlled in such a way as to make individual and human liberation impossible. The descriptive works arrived at a deeply pessimistic conclusion. But contrary to it, there was a group of descriptive works that was optimistic about the possibilities of human condition.

These writings pointed out the developments specific to contemporary society that were novel and without historical to represent. These changes were argued the characteristic of a postmodern age. Some like those of the Marxist political theorist Fredric Jameson argued that a postmodern age offered new possibilities for a revolutionary left. Others, like those of the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman challenged that in postmodern age traditional ideologies became meaningless and failed to have any moral or believable power over individuals. A new series of circumstances and social conventions required a total rethinking of a new form of individual and human liberation.

In the postmodern world, media texts make visible. It challenges ideas of truth and reality by removing the illusion of stories. Texts or images can ever accurately or neutrally reproduce reality or truth. There are always competing versions of the truth and reality. Postmodern media products will engage with this idea. It is important to understand that many people see Baudrillard and Lyotard’s views as offensive and hard to bring together with their belief systems. It can be seen as an unusual treat to question and play with the idea of truth. Everyday some people challenge basis for the existence of truth, justice and human rights. Some people also find the idea of rejecting their ‘grand narrative’. It goes against their whole religious beliefs and moral principles.