Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The present study covers the ideas and theories introduced by some major Indian theorists. Their theories and ideas could help the readers to get clear picture of the literary work. This study focuses the team work of all theorists in strengthening the Indian literary criticism.

A) Objectives:

The present study, in its various facets:

1. be subjected to the most severe scrutiny of five theorists’ theories from different perspectives,

2. strengths and weaknesses of their theories be identified,

3. the sources of their theories be revealed,

4. the significance of their theories be identified,

5. their contribution in Indian literary criticism be studied.

B) Research skills, methods & methodology:

The present researcher has used following research skills, methods and methodologies to carry out the study. Here, the research skills (techniques for handling material) such as: search skills in libraries, editorial skills, bibliographic skills, dissertation skills (such as how to structure a book—length, piece of writing), IT skills, period-specific skills, and professional skills such as how to present before scrutiny committee and open defence are used.
Research methods are concerned with the way of carrying out the research. The present researcher has used several research methods for instance, Autobiography, Discourse analysis, Textual analysis. Whilst research methods are concerned with how you conduct a given piece of research, methodologies are concerned with the perspectives you bring to bear on your work such as a feminist, or as a post-colonialist one, for example. However, research skills, methods and methodologies are interdependent, and are equally necessary to the successful completion of a research. These three determine the focus and outcome of a research.

In the present study I have practiced the said skill set, extensively. Along with these research skills. I have used the following research methods:

1) Autobiography,

2) Discourse analysis,

3) Textual analysis.

Moreover the methods have been informed by background research into the context of the cultural artifact under scrutiny, the context of its production, its content and its consumption. In this process I have consulted, mainly, original sources for the purpose. Lastly the methods are relied on Nativistic perspective or methodology. Thus, in the light of nativistic theory, a study of nativism has been carried out in the subsequent sections and chapters.

C) Significance of the Study:

The critical analysis of theorists’ work and their career will be significant to give a kind of honour to their work in the field of literary criticism. Their theories and ideas are very useful to understand clearly the Indian literary work. It is also expected that no misunderstanding be there in applying their
theories and ideas. The study is significant as it presents strengths and weaknesses of their theories that may help students to take what they need while studying literature. It is also significant as it presents critically how their theories are helpful to read and get clarity in out understanding. This study is also significant as it highlights their faiths in our own and foreign models of theories.

D)Scope and Limitations:

The study covers the theoretical and critical ideas of five dominant Indian literary theorists: Gayatri Spivak, Homi Bhabha, Ania loomba, Gauri Viswanathan and Ganesh Devy. It includes only their critical thinking. This study may be helpful for new research students. There are some limitations of this study as it only tries to cover the theories and ideas of selected theorists. Their books covering such theories are refered on priority ground keeping each and every rhing they have written or presented. In this process, researcher has consulted, mainly, original sources for the purpose. All literary and critical work of each theorist is not studied to minimize deviation in the study.

E) Brief Survey of Indian literary Theory:

A fascinating and extremely varied blend of unity and diversity is the noteworthy feature of Indian society and culture. Indians speak many more languages. We have also a literary tradition of several centuries. The Literary tradition in the major languages has many common features. Yet this apparent unity conceals a great deal of diversity. Indian Literature is one literature written in many languages. Many tried to perceive and portray about the Indian culture in their literary work.

Indian culture is not one tree with many branches, it is not even a grove of trees, it is a vast sprawling forest, in which there is a great variety of vegetation and topography. (Rajadhaksha (ed.), 2002)
This variety could contribute for great variety of literature possible in India.

Literary men have a strong tendency to form opinions about their craft and use these opinions as part of the message of their work. So we are likely to find literary theory as far back as we can find literary work. Literary criticism means the literature about literature. Criticism is basically a form of cultural practice and culture at any point of time in any society. It is not a monolith but a live field of opposing currents of thought and battling intellectual formations. It is a study of literature that covers the following streams of thought: i) what is literature? ii) Types of literature, their definitions iii) what is value judgment? iv) literary canons v) literature and society, vi) methods of value judgment vii) literature and interdisciplinary relevance viii) what is literary history? ix) Historiography x) what is literary criticism or literary theory? It also includes the relative relationship between the three major elements: Writer–Literary Work–Reader/Audience. The literary criticism is broadly divided into two: Practical criticism and Theoretical criticism. Both of them appear after the birth of literary work. The literary criticism is very important not only because it enriches literary work but also it gives proper direction to it. Criticism gives needed direction to literature, keeps a good balance in literary production, and provides devices to the reader to understand it properly. So the critical work is an equal important as creative work.

P. K. Rajan rightly points out that the Literary Criticism, as theoretical discourse and critical practice, is a recognizable category with an enormous body of output in all Indian languages. India has no common language. And we have no critical tradition based on common language. The typical Indian characteristic is our multilingualism and multiculturalism. Naturally, our literary history has had unique diversities and multidirectional negotiations. Our critical engagements too have been varied and diverse. Yet, we realize, there is some kind of a unity visible in the midst of all this variety and plurality. We observe some
cultural orientations and civilizational moorings that tend to weave some kind of a texture of unity. Here, we can refer Aijaz Ahmad’s remark, “The characteristic of loose and diverse unities”. (1992:256) A good critical theory has its own kind of validity. The criterion is not the scientific verifiability of its single propositions, but the scope, precision and coherence of the insights that it yields into the properties of single works of art and the adequacy with which it accounts for diverse kinds of art. Such a criterion will, of course, justify not one, but a number of valid theories, all in their several ways self-consistent, applicable, and relatively adequate to the range of aesthetic phenomena. The very fact that any well-grounded critical theory in some degree alters the aesthetic perceptions it purports to discover, is a source of its value to the amateur of art, for it may open his senses to aspects of a work which other theories, with a different focus and different categories of discrimination, have the principle overlooked, under-estimated or obscured.

The theorist is expected to consider four major elements in his theories which aim to be comprehensive. These four elements are: the work (the artistic product), the artist, the universe and the reader/audience. But the study of majority of theories proves that no critic gives an equal justice to all these four elements. He unknowingly tends to derive from one of these elements, his principal categories, for defining, classifying and analyzing a work of art so no theory or critical work is perfect in all sense. Keeping this in mind, it is tried here to put a brief survey of Indian literary theory.

The crisis of identity is the major feature of every history of literary theory. Historically speaking the crisis in criticism can be traced back to the beginning of the last millennium, to those pre-colonial centuries when modern Indian languages were emerging as languages of literary expression. In those new languages, and in literature written in them, there was a richness of creative expression but practically no critical writing and articulation. The colonial experience is responsible to create the awareness about this crisis. The importance
of literary criticism increases when literary education becomes institutionalized and literature becomes a subject in schools and universities. This shift results in importation of critical concepts, tools and perspectives from foreign. It also results in the spread of revivalist tendencies. To get clear picture of the history of literary criticism, the study of our original state becomes an obligatory part. The present study includes a brief history of our Indian critical tradition and the theories developed by our critics.

In the Indian context, our multilingual multicultural situation makes our critical activity extremely complex and uniquely diverse. The Indian critical scene presents a very wide spectrum of enterprises. The survey covers the period from 200 A.D. to the present century. It includes the dominant theorists and their theories in short. In the period 200 A.D. to 200, Bharatmuni was the dominant critic. His work, ‘Natyasastra’ has great importance in the history of Indian literary thought. It is a kind of encyclopedia on dramaturgy, histrionics dance, music etc. and its concern with poetry is a limited one. Yet, it gives us almost all the pivotal concepts of Sanskrit criticism which were to engage the attention of some of the best poet-critics and scholars of Indian for well over sixteen centuries. It focuses on rasa-bhava, acuity, quna dasa, alamkara, vriti, and also on literary genres. It gives an extra focus on drama with its norms regarding plot, characters, sentiments and style. It is a concise and comprehensive account of performed drama, music, dance, and arts. It proved to be a great wealth in Indian literary tradition that guides to study above arts in multiple facets. It helps to define and analyze the art with minute details. It was used through the fifteen hundred years of Sanskrit literary thought as the bedrock of literary theory.

The next generation: Abhinavgupta, Mammata etc. followed Bharata’s formulations as the polar star of Indian aesthetics. His fascinating insight in the psychology of aesthetic reception was a phenomenal during the last two hundred years; Bharata has been the maker of the rasa theory. Natya-sastra is
a detailed treatise and handbook on dramatic art that deals with all aspects of the classical Sanskrit theatre. Many chapters of it contain detailed treatment of all the diverse arts that are embodied in the classical Indian concept of the drama, including dance, poetics, music and general aesthetics. Its primary importance lies in its justification of Indian drama as a vehicle of religious enlightenment. *Natyashastra* is the greatest literary contribution in the literary tradition regarding the field of drama. It presents in depth about drama tradition and performance value of drama in the life of common people. It provides a thinking line of drama to the coming generations.

In the 5th and 6th century, Bhamaha, the promoter of *alamkara* tradition introduced his theory. He expressed his views focusing the need of beauty in the poetry writing. The poetry will be beautiful and attractive when the poet presents his ideas in the figurative language. According to him, “A woman cannot be beautiful and attractive without use of ornaments like the same the poem without figures of speeches” (Bhamaha, 1927). He proves that *Alamkaras* are the main sources of the beauty of the poetry. He dominantly states that *vakroti* (double entendre) is the main figure of speech which helps to beautify the poetry. Bhamaha strongly rejects the sound effects that add melody to the poetry. He states that poetry is not music. Bhamaha mentioned following major literary *genera of kavya*-forms: i) art epic (*mahakavya*) ii) drama (*abhinayartha*) iii) prose-chronicle (*akhyayika*) iv) romantic tale (*katha*) and v) smaller verse units or single contained verses (*anibaddha*).

Panini has already been universally recognized as a phenomenon in the history and development of linguistics. In the post-*Panini* tradition, Bhartṛhari’s contribution was the most memorable one. His, ‘*Vākyapādiya*’ is the earliest scientific work on syntax. Anandavardhana’s entire theory, concept of poetry was based on Bhartṛhari’s interpretation of the concept of meaning. He expressed his views on the terms: *sphota* and *dhvani*. The *sphota* is that which is
produced by the union and disunion of the speech organs like the vocal cords. Dhvanis are sounds born of this sphota. The measure of the word does not change on whether the speech sound is short or long. He states that the subsequent sound, i.e. the modified speech sound, which arises out of the primary speech sounds, can be expanded or contracted in its form.

In vakyapadiya, Bhartrhari clearly develops the three fold doctrine of Sphota related to letters of phonemes, words and sentences. He further described sphota as partless and indivisible. He divided sphota in two categories: pada-sphota (sphota identified as a word or meaning bearing unit) and vakyasphota (sphota in the form of sentence). Then he also deals with various definitions of the sentences concluding a sentence is a sequenceless, partless, and whole. In other words, a sphota that gets expressed or manifested is a sequential and temporary utterance. He also speaks about sphota-nada distinction of language stating Nada manifests sphota and sphota conveys meaning. Bhartrhari posited three stages of language or speech: pasyanti stage (non-verbal), intermediate stage (pre-verbal) and vaikhari stage (verbal). He also states that the comprehension of the sphota does not require the comprehension of sounds or nada as a condition. According to him, the sounds are perceived directly by our sense of hearing. Further he regards sphota as an impermanent unity, produced by the initial sounds resulting from the contacts and separation of the vocal organs. (Devy, 2004:19-25)

In the 7th century, Dandin was the leading theorist, whom Edwin Gerow argues in his Critique of Sanskrit poetics as the pioneer of Sanskrit literary theory. (Gerow, 1977) His Kavyadarsa is an excellent text that exposes very clearly the idea of Alamkara. His text provides detailed catalogue of the linguistic virtues of poetry, giving fine illustrations of each type and sub type of Alamkara. His major contributions, the concept of marga-riti (regional variations of poetic language) and the description of the Gauda and Vaidarbha varieties of literary
diction are noteworthy. He also contributed the definition of epic poetry. Apart from his comments on the subjects matter and the hero of epic comments on structural principles of the genre is his unique achievement in the literary field. “His *Kavyadarasa* is a work of literary criticism that defines the ideals of style and sentiment appropriate to each genre of *kavya*”. (Dandin, 1970)

During the 8th century, Udbhata and Wamana were slightly less popular theorists who gave their views on Alamkaras. Udbhata got popularity with his book, ‘*Kavyalamkarsangraha*’. In this book he presents his detailed expression on 41 Alamkaras. His work gives frequent references of Anandavardhan’s *dhavnyalamkar*. Wamana, a Sanskrit literary critic, wrote ‘*Kavyalamkarsutra*’. According to him, special practice/manner/style is needed for a true poetry. He states his theory in following words: *Riti* (Manner) is the soul of the poem and *Riti* needs the structure of special valued words. He was known as the promoter of *ritiscience*. In his book, *Kavyalamkarsutras* he has described all theories of Alamkaras in the style of formula. The book included 319 formulae divided into five paragraphs. (Wamana, 1953)

In the 9th & 10th century, Anandavardhana, Kuntaka, Dhananjaya and Abhinavagupta were the dominant and leading literary theorists. Anandavardhana’s *Dhvanyaloka* is the most central theory of literature in Indian tradition. In this book he presents a concise and comprehensive account of poetry and poetic styles, which refers to numerous views, scholars and poetic texts, mostly by way of illustration. His theory was known by the name *Dhvani*, which means the suggestive quality of poetic language. His contribution, the semantics of poetic language in Sanskrit poetics is noteworthy. Similarly, his contribution in terms of turning the focus of critical discussion from the outward linguistic style and poetic embellishment to the more complex issue of linguistic structure in poetry is very much significant. In Anandavardhana’s view it is the structure, which is the total effect of the suggestive quality of language that distinguishes
poetry from the ordinary usage of language. He states that, “The poetry, where in the (conventional) meaning renders its secondary and suggests the (intended or) implied meaning, is designated by the learned as dhvani—suggestive poetry”. (Anandavardhana, 1974)

Kuntaka is known as the originator of the Vakrokti School of Sanskrit literary theory. Historically, he occupies a place between Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta. Kuntaka lived at a period when literary criticism in India was acquiring a great sophistication. Among his contemporaries, his critical persuasions acquire a special significance. Vakrokti is a theory of poetry which perceives poetry essentially in terms of the language of its expression. He took vakrokti concept/ (term) from Bhahamaha and made it broader than him. He states that vakrokti is of six types. Vakrokti sees the poetic language as language of metaphor and suggestive communication. He developed his theory of vakrokti deriving inspiration from the dhvani theory. His theory helps greatly to practical criticism as an important aid. According to him the broadest principle which can do justice to all the categories of literary theory including dhvani is only vakrokti which might admit of innumerable varieties. He states that a poem may be beautiful for more reasons than one; and it should be the task of the critic to be on the lookout for all the diverse elements that contribute to the poem’s beauty as a whole. According to him the sahitya or mutual coherence between word and meaning in respect of beauty is nothing but a unique poetic usage. He expects the exact form of word and meaning to make the whole beautiful. He argues that classicality is the product of great artistic skill neither tender nor harsh and it wins the heart and for winning heart two styles – elegant (with its natural beauty) and brilliant (with its decorative effect) both come to be blended. Kuntanka’s work on beauty of the poem is noteworthy. He widely described different types of figures of speech that are used in decorating the poem. He also highlights the uniqueness of the poet. When great poets compose different
literary works based on an identical theme, they are each seen to possess infinite individual beauty, each of it possessing distinctiveness from the others. (Kuntaka, 1977)

The next theorist, Dhananjaya has received less attention than he deserves from students of literary theory in India. Dhananjaya is important as the most notable opponent of Abhinavagupta’s concept of Santarasa and Anandvardhana’s dhvani theory. He argues that aesthetic experience is a function of its reception (as like Bharata) and not of the art – structure (as like Anandavardhana). The ruling passion of Dhananjaya’s theoretical work was to return to Bharata as much as to return to his contemporary literary practices. His work, Dasarupa discusses the ten types of drama known in his times. He accomplished the plan of Bharata stated in Natyasastra (ten types of dramas) and presented an exhaustive catalogue of drama. He was mere partial towards the Natak-drama and Prakaran-drama. Dasarupa is the only critical text in complete Indian tradition devoted entirely to drama. The details offered by him while building the network of definitions and descriptions in his compendium of drama presuppose a rich fund of critical and historical comment.

Dhananjaya classified drama according to subject-matter, hero and sentiment. He also declared the five elements of the plot as – Germ (bija), expansion (bindu) episode (pataka), episodical incident (prakari) and the denouement (karya). He mentioned five stages of the Action that strive after a desired result. These stages are – Beginning (arambha), Effort (yatna- prayatna), prospect of success (praptysasa), certainty of success (niyatapti) and Attainment of the Result (Phalagama-phalayoga). While talking about a Hero he mentioned a number of traits that an ideal hero should possess to prove himself as a demandable figure. Dhananjaya expected him to have – well-bred, charming, liberal, clever, affable, popular, upright, eloquent, of exalted lineage, resolute and young. He also should have the qualities like – intelligence, energy, memory,
wisdom, skills in the arts and pride heroic, mighty, vigorous, familiar with the
codes, and a just observer of laws. He also discussed four types of hero as – light–
hearted (lalita), Calm, (santa), exalted (udatta), or vehement (uddhata). In short
his Dasarupa is a good reference to be used to know drama in its minute details.
(Dhananjaya, 1969)

Abhinavagupta, as like Bharatamuni and Anandavardhana, is the
greatest in Indian aesthetics. P.V. Kane remarks about Abhinavagupta as that he
was one of “the most remarkable personalities of medieval India. He was a man of
very acute intellect and was an encyclopedic scholar. He had taken all knowledge
for his province” (Kane, 1956). Historically speaking too, He stands at one of the
most crucial moments of Indian history. The concept of Santarasa posited by him,
and defended with an extraordinary logical rigor, reflects his visionary poetics. He
argues: “the eight rasas are like eight Gods, and the santa is like their highest
centre, Siva” (Abhinavagupta, 1940). This insistence on transcendence as the
highest value in literary aesthetics also reflects his realization of the need to
modify Bharata’s formulation to suit the changing cultural ethos. Abhinavagupta
called Santarasa as an aesthetic equipoise and to understand its real nature we must
follow the reading nava rasah (Nine rasas) instead of astau rasas (eight rasas). He
tries to make clear the misconception of santa rasa in connection with sama,
vibhavas and anubhavas. He rejects nirveda as the sthayibhava of Santa. He
differentiates sama from santa highlighting the synonymity that is only apparent
and not real. He further focuses the real difference between santa (the rasa) and
sama (the sthayibhava) saying sama is siddha ( an accomplished fact ) where as
santa is sadhya (something to be accomplished); sama is laukika (worldly) while
Santa is alaukika (other-worldly); Sama is Sadharana (ordinary), while santa is
asadharana (extraordinary). Therefore he says nirveda cannot be the sthayibhava
of Santa.
Abhinavagupta states that countless santarasas are possible if it depends upon the approaches of the person concerned. But it is also said that there would be only one santarasa and not infinite, because of its being the cause of one single result, namely moksa. In reply to the question – What is the sthayibhava of Santa? He states that if knowledge of the truth alone is the means of attaining moksa and so it would be proper to regard that alone as the sthayibhava of moksa and so of santa. He also states that santa rasa is to be known as the centre of all rasas reflecting in the form of supreme God with other eight Gods. This rasa is to be known as that which arises from a desire to secure the liberation of the self, which leads to a knowledge of Truth, and is connected with the property of highest happiness. It is also declared that santarasa is the source of all other rasas. (Abhinavagupta, 1940)

Jnanesvara, a Marathi poet is considered by common consent to be the greatest poet, stylist and thinker in the seven–hundred years’ tradition of Marathi poetry. His life and work is very short but seems to be a kind of miracle. He is believed to have willed death at the age of twenty after completing his great work, the Bhavarthadipika, popularly known as the Jnanesvari. It is an elaborate commentary on the Bhagavadgita. It is the first Marathi poem that founded the tradition of Marathi poetry. In the course of time, it also acquired the status of the central canonical work in the varkari movement in Maharashtra. It was an important shot in the battle against the cultural hegemony of Sanskrit and high caste Hinduism waged by the Bhakti poets all over India.

The deep study of his work reveals the poet’s philosophy of language, poetry style, and readership in his invocations parts of the poem. His abundance imagery proves the wealth of his imaginations. Jnanesvari deserves the credit of being the first critical text in modern Indian languages. Due to all features reflected in the poem, the tale is the very queen amongst the great epics. It is the source of grandeur of all literary works and it secures the sweetness of the
Navarasas including romance. The glory of word beauty has been rendered pure and refined through this tale and the tenderness of the highest wisdom of realization of the self has been enhanced, are two more special features of this work.

Jnanesvara composed his work in the Ovi form of verses. In his ovis he has interwoven letters smelling the essence of Supreme Brahman, in a way that would make all including even children understand it. His inborn poetic genius has become the very abode of rest with the result that mere hearing conquers constant study and meditation. We see the greatness of mind when he gives credit of his production to the glory of his brother Sri Nivrttinath. Jnanesvasa states that there are no other things (in the world) that can bear comparison to this work, which is meritorious achievement all saints have caused to be created in the three worlds through his agency. In the epilogue, he demands boom (prasaya) in the name of pasayadan from the supreme power for well-being, of all people or the living beings of the universe.

In the 13th century, Amir Khusrau, a Persian, Hindi poet and scholar has presented his critical view on India and Indians. He believed that literature is to be a matter of creation in languages that are spoken and understood. His brief comments on India’s multilingualism, learning and cultural excellence reveal a profound catholicity of taste. That also shows his respect for bilingual literary practices and literary translations. He expressed his opinion about India, stating India has multilingual literary culture. Talking about Brahmans of India, he says, they have greater wealth of philosophical thought. He also regrets that it is unfortunate that people outside India are not aware of its arts and sciences. He focused two significant points about India & Indians – i) There is inestimable learning in every nook and corner of India. ii) The people of India speak different languages, but the people outside India cannot speak in Indian dialects. He also
states that, Indians have an ability to master over the languages of the world and can speak them very fluently and effectively.

Khusrau points out that, scholars from all over the world came to India to learn its arts and sciences; but the Brahman never went out of India to acquire knowledge. He appreciated the marvelous and meaningful Indian work – Dimna – Khalila (Panchtantra) that was the better book of wisdom, accepted and translated by the world. The scholars of the world derive inspiration from it.

Khusrau expressed his views on Indian music as – Indian music is overwhelmingly moving in which we put our fire of heart and some in it. Many foreigners visited India to learn Indian music and also contributed to it, but no added anything to the basic principles of Indian music. Talking about beauty of Indian languages he says, in every corner of India, there is a different language with its own system and technique. Sanskrit, the language of Brahman, though common people do not understand it, is a pearl among pearls.

In the early 16th century, Rupa Goswami achieved an excellence, presenting his work the ‘Bhaktirasamartasindhuh’, an important critical document on Bhakti poetry. He was not trying to explain Bhakti poetry in terms of the rasa theory but the rasa theory in terms of Bhakti poetry. In his account, Bhakti is presented as the highest rasa because it brings to the rasika an aesthetic experience superior to bramhananda. His work achieves both: bhaktirasa and rasas tasks; so it is an important landmark in Indian literary theory. Primarily he was interested in describing Bhakti and its psychology. Besides, for him, Bhakti in real life itself is a rasa, which is indistinct from the rasa in poetry.

In the 16th century, Keshavadasa, a Hindi poet, was succeeded in providing a scholarly benefit to scholars by his work, Rasikapriya. It offers a catalogue of poetic conventions and aesthetic assumptions. This book follows a certain methodological discipline which has its roots in the Bhakti tradition of
poetry and philosophy. According to him, all nayakas are forms of Krisna and all nayikas, forms of Radha. He also treats all Sringara as an expression of love between krisna and Radha, a kind of cosmic affair (Banarsidass, 1977). In medieval Indian aesthetics Bhakti rasa was believed to be a new theoretical category of rasa theory. But his text explains that it is not an additional rasa. According to him, Bhakti rasa is a category of literary convention, loaded with metaphysics and folklore which overlaps with all other aesthetic sentiments, rasas.

It is a general belief that we learnt the discourse of literary history from Western criticism. This is wrong as it was practiced in medieval India and several histories of literature were written in Persian from the 14th to 18th century. Badaoni’s Tawarikh, a history of Persian poetry, is the most accurate in factual details and most readable in style. His achievement indicates that he was clear about the aims of history; consistent in methodology employed to analyze poets and poems and his standards of evaluation were uniform throughout the massive work.

In the early 19th century, Mirza Ghalib, a Persian and Urdu poet was a legend in his own lifetime. He stands out as the symbol of India’s creativity during the period of cultural decline in the 19th century. His comments, like John Keats’ on poets and poetry came to us through his letters. His letters reveal the social background to literature, expected healthy attitude to creativity and literature. The desolation of the social scene leads him to believe the faith in poetry as a way of life, and poetry as ultimate freedom.

Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941), the first-rate writer, a painter, a composer and an educationist, belongs to world literature and Indian literature, in general and to Bengali literature in particular. He, being the only Indian recipient of the Nobel Prize for Literature (1913, Gitanjali), is a charismatic nationalist and world known figure. His educational philosophy and his literary philosophy had an
integral link, namely, his theory of personality. He believed that art is created out of a surplus of emotions.

Tagore introduced new prose and verse forms and the use of colloquial language into Bengali Literature, thereby freeing it from traditional models based on classical Sanskrit. He was highly influential in introducing the best of Indian culture to the west and vice versa, and he is generally regarded as the outstanding creative artist of modern India. He came in close contact with village folk and expressed sympathy for their poverty and backwardness that became the key note of much of his later writing. In his short stories, humble lives and small miseries of poor people are well examined.

Tagore, accepting Sanskrit poetics (rhetoricians) says, in poetry we have to use words which have got their proper taste, which do not merely talk, but conjure up pictures and sing. The things which arouse our emotions arouse our own self feeling. Tagore presented his theoretical views on what is Art? In following words:

Art is creating its stars,-stars that are definite in their forms but infinite in their personality. Art is calling us the “children of the immortal” and proclaiming our right to dwell in the heavenly worlds. (1917)

Here he points out that we all are children of heavenly entity. According to him, in Arts the person in us is sending its answers to the Supreme Person, who reveals Himself to us in a world of endless beauty across the lightless world of facts.

In the 19th century, Sri Aurobindo, a poet, philosopher, mystic, political activist and nationalist played a very significant role in contributing Indian literary tradition. The knowledge of so many languages, and his untiring zeal for reading, gave him familiarity with a vast body of world literature. He has developed an extremely receptive attitude to literary forms and experiments, and acquired a catholicity of literary taste. His curious critical masterpiece, *Future*
Poetry is resulted from his good literary background, anti-British political programme and his visionary mysticism. It is a serious book of literary criticism. Sri Aurobindo was always involved in writing a highly experimental kind of poetry. He did not derive the ideas in it either from the west or from ancient India but are of his own creation. The ideas in his criticism represent the romantic mood in Indian literature of the early 20th century (Aurobindo, 1972).

Sri Aurobindo originated the philosophy of cosmic salvation through spiritual evolution. According to him (about cosmic salvation) the paths to union with Brahman are two-way streets, or channels: enlightenment comes from above (thesis) which the spiritual mind (supermind) strives through yogic illumination to reach upward from below (anti-thesis). He says, when these two forces blend, agnostic individual is created (synthesis). This yogic illumination transcends both reason and intuition and eventually leads to the freeing of the individual from the bonds of individuality, and by extension, all mankind will eventually achieve moksha (liberation). So his dialectic mode of salvation is noteworthy contribution.

Sri Aurobindo states while speaking about the sources of poetry as:

The waters of poetry flow in a current or a torrent; where there is a pause or a denial, it is a sign of obstruction in the stream or of imperfection in the mind which the waters have chosen for their bed and continent. (Aurobindo, 1972).

Aurobindo also values the original creation (Poetry) stating – poetry written from the reasoning (intellect) is apt to be full of ingenious conceits, logic argumentation, rhetorical turns, ornamental fancies, echoes learned and imitative rather than uplifted and transformed. He gives priority to satanic or luminous inspiration in the production of poetry as he calls it as a noble, rich and vigorous. It keeps an eye only on the right thing to be said with a right way. According to
him, satanic as well as rajasic poetry may be written from the uninspired intellect, but the sensational mind never gives birth to satanic poetry.

Sri Aurobindo also expressed his views on the qualities needed for a good poet. He says he need not be a reflective critic; he need not have the reasoning and analyzing intellect and dissect his own poetry. He expects four major faculties to be achieved by every good and ideal poet. They are – revelation or prophecy, inspiration, intuitive judgment and intuitive reason. He believes that these four perfect equipments can help the genius to do the work of interpretation or creative work. He also expressed his views on the essence of poetry. He expects that a good poem is nothing but an aesthetic pleasure of imagination. Anything pretty, pleasant and melodious with a beautiful idea in it would serve the aim of a poem. A good poem tries to strive after a more accurate, subtle, flexible and satisfying expression that the rough method of ordinary speech care to compass. Beyond the adequacy of speech, it may also aim at a greater forcefulness and effectiveness by various rhetorical means for heightening it force of intellectual appeal. It also prefers a more emphatic rhythm, to stimulate directly and powerfully the emotion and appeal to a more vivid aesthetic sense. It makes use of free and rich images to decorate for their effective value.

B. S. Mardhekar’s (1909-1951) contribution to the fields of aesthetics and literary criticism gives him a lot reputation. His criticism is in both languages: Marathi and English. His critical works or criticism reflects his keen interest in philosophy, logic and linguistics. The leading Western thinkers: Croce, Collingwood and I. A. Richards influenced B. S. Mardhekar very much. He contributed his original views and theories on: rhythm, contrast and balance. His views on aesthetics (law of beauty) proved to be a good guideline for Marathi thinkers. Mardhekar is, thus India’s first ‘modernizing’ critic. Hence his writing is important historically too.
B. S. Mardhekar’s aesthetic theory of poetry is significant. He states that poetry deals in words as carriers of emotional meanings. According to him the intimate apprehension of emotional meaning is a biological necessity. The prompt apprehension and quick proper reaction to meanings help to maintain its existence in constant struggle and to succeed in perpetuating its species. The medium of poetry – as a work of art is words, words and words only. He further states that the artistic aim of all the arts, including poetry, is the revelation of the beauty of their several mediums. He further examines the nature of the medium of poetry: that is of words and says that a work has primarily two aspects: i) Sensational and ii) Intentional. The sensational aspect is made possible by the phenomenon of sound – a group of vowels and consonants. The intentional aspect is the sole justification of the existence of that particular combination of vowels and consonants. The sensation or sound aspect of a word is symbolical of the intentional.

B. S. Mardhekar further analyzed intentional aspects of words into two aspects. Meaning as a fact of mental life, has the two facets: i) cognitive and ii) Affective or in other words: intellectual and emotional. Then he further subdivided affective aspects into two categories of emotions: a) pure or absolute and b) contingent or in other words: aesthetic and poetic. He gives less importance to sound effect saying it has no place in poetry at all. Sounds have only symbolic value in poetry, as carriers of emotional meanings, and not intrinsic value as in music. He also believes that there is no inherent necessity that a particular combination of sounds must express a particular meaning. According to him, the readers of poetry only hunt after emotional meanings and neglect towards musical side of it. (Mardhekar, 1960)

Krisna Raya has developed a theory of literature by putting to use ancient Sanskrit poets. He has been exploring the possibility of ‘modernizing’ Sanskrit poetics, in particular the dhvani theory. He presented all his explorations in his critical works. He strongly asserts that literature is distinguished from other
forms of linguistic discourses because of its complexity of literary language which arises from the ability of literature to be suggestive. He believes in Alamkara school of Sanskrit poetics and Anandvardhana’s stylistics. He is keen that his observations should have an applied value and so his works come in the form of practical criticism. His works reflect the clear influence of new critics.

Krisna Rayan presented his theory on what is literariness? He presented his point of view with illustrative method. According to him, suggested meaning is the defining characteristic of the best of truest poetry. He believes the statements of De Man and Beardsley that the figurality and pregnancy (discourse based on impliedness of meaning) are the very characteristics of literary discourse. He states that a literary text therefore i) is pervasively image based and ii) generates plural meaning through such strategies of implication as gaps, minimalism and a subtext. According to him, the response to a literary text is a predominantly affective one and so the reader’s emotional response is in fact the meaning of the text. The answer of what is literariness? can be answered as the emergence of emotion, meaning from its verbal structures. He says further that the meaning of the text emerges from figuratively pregnant language. (Rayan, 1991:7-16)

Suresh Joshi, a modern Gujarati writer, brought modernism to Gujarati literature as like B. S. Mardhekar to Marathi. His contribution to short fiction, literary prose and literary criticism is remarkable. He gave acute self-awareness to Gujarati literature. His critical writing highlights the processes of aesthetic transformation in literary transactions. He introduced a theory of fiction in Gujarati known as – ‘Ghatanavilop’ which insisted on minimizing the plot element and enriching the suggestive potential of language. His collection of critical essays – Chintayami Mansa (1983) received a Sahitya Akademi Award.
According to Suresh Joshi, interpretation is an analysis of the aesthetic process and the obstacles in its realization. In short, interpretation is the analysis of the structure of a literary work and it postulates the thematic as well as the semantic premises about a literary text. He also states that “whatever a critic does to a literary text is interpretation.” Sometimes it is also told, digging process; accepting the stated meaning and trying to explore the implied meaning is interpretation.

According to Suresh Joshi, the poetry is creation and not imitation and so interpretation may cause the loss of spontaneity of a response and as a result give rise to anti – art intellectualism. He further states that in the name of interpretation, the desired immediacy in aesthetic experience is generally displaced. He says that mediocrity dominates the business of interpretation and so instead of humble empathy with art, it shows an arrogant dissatisfaction. (Joshi, 1983)

The author of the novel, Kosala (1963) Bhalchandra Nemade has exerted an influence on Marathi fiction, prose style and literary culture to an extent as like B. S. Mardhekar. His large numbers of critical essays were published under the title – Tikaswayamvara (1991). His critical position is popularly known as ‘Nativism’. According to him, “Nativism” insists to treat literature as a sub-system of the native culture and it represents the social reality. It also proposes realism and ‘a writerly morality’ as criteria of critical judgment. He has been a controversial critic. His views produced opposition as well as sympathy.

According to Nemade, there are three basic trends in the development of Marathi novel after 1960 that are deeply rooted in our literary culture. This method of dividing the work gives us an awareness of our tradition, and helps us in putting together its missing links. These trends are – The Yamuna paryatan, the Muktamala and the Mochangad. The 19th century gave rise to the
feeling that the native culture was being smothered by a cultural encounter of a victor – victim character. According to Anthropologists, this phenomenon is Nativism which articulates itself either through a sudden irrational explosion or else gradually through reason. The second trend Muktamala is deeply rooted in literary convention rather than in life and it produces inactive, affected and entertaining mode in literary work. The third trend, the Mochanged creates with illustration a non-existence reality – imaginistic only. The first phase reflects the influence of English and the decadent Sanskrit works. The second is a combined product of the romantically, the nativistic revivalism and the Marathi Tradition of stylized. The third trend reflects the artificiality. The Realism could not grow strong in Marathi due to this trend. According to Nemade, no trends other than Pratikriti (illusionistic), riti (entertaining) and kriti (activist) could even emerge in Marathi that is closely related to the basic life instinct of Marathi society. He further expects that every novelist as an artist must perform the cultural function of preserving, cultivating and enlarging cultural values. He feels happy for the most valuable gain of the Marathi novel that has come to be native.

The next significant contributor in the literary theory is Gayatri Chakravorty spivak. She has presented many theoretical views on – deconstruction, Marxism, feminism, etc. She is deeply engaged in concerns related to her Third World Identity. Her Subaltern Studies provided a new historiographical perspective. I am presenting her contribution in detail in the next chapter.

The author of the book, *In theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*, Aijaz Ahmad proved to be a major critic in the area of post-colonial theory. He speaks on the current theories of colonial literatures in a post-colonial Indian Marxist’s perspective. He as like Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Spivak, writes for international audiences. But he feels much more at ease with Indian literature and Indian languages.
Since there have been no native movements or schools of criticism in India, we cannot really speak in terms of a representative anthology. We may have the course of intellectual developments in India in the present century. To practicing critics of India torn between the conflicting demands of Sanskrit Poetics and Western critical theory, the study will provide an initial outline of a modern tradition of theory. The modern Indian intellectual tradition in critical theory is represented by some major figures. The discussion included here may reflect the peculiar character and tensions of intellectual enterprise in modern India, the drive towards the revival of the Sanskrit heritage within the present context, the tendency to nativize Western critical theory, and also the native Subversions of these powerful cultural influences. In my research work, I highlighted the work of five dominant literary theorists in Indian critical scene. There are many more contemporary literary theorists who have contributed in the tradition of Indian literary criticism. I tried to present a relative significance of their contribution in the Indian literary tradition.

SUMMING UP:

The above brief survey of Indian literary theories indicates that Indian critics have produced a rich literary criticism. Our Sanskrit writers and critics played a very significant role in formulating some literary theories. The treatises of Bhamaha, Dandian, Vamana, Udbhata and Rudrata named Kavyalaukara or Kavyalaksana are noteworthy. Kriyakalpa and Kriyavidhi (the rules of the poetic art) proved to be the great contribution by Indian theorists. The term ‘Sahityavidya’ (theory of literature) emphases the perfect concord of sound and sense was our idea in literary theory. At present the term Alamkara-sastra (science of beauty) used in poetics was also studied minutely by Indian scholars.
Anandvardhana’s aesthetic theory of dhvani (implied and suggested meaning) proved to be a great help for practical criticism. The systematized classics of Kuntaka, Mammata, Vidyanatha, Visvanatha and Jagannatha were very famous and read and studied throughout India. The Rasa and Bhava, key terms in Sanskrit literary criticism attract the attention of all scholars. This survey proves to be an attempt to represent the significant work of every Indian critic who tried to establish a school of thought or a literary trend. Bharatmuni formulated his Rasa theory a great contribution in practical sense. The Riti theory of Dandin, Dhvani theory of Anandvardhana, Vakrokti theory of Kuntaka are notable one, that play as a great treasure of Indian literary criticism. Abhinavgupta’s original interpretation of the Rasa theory is a good guideline for critics and readers. Jnanesvara, an able spokesman for Bhakti poetics played a very significant position in founding Marathi tradition of poetry. The contribution of Al Badaoni in the literary historiography, Sri Aurobindo’s idealistic approach in Indian romanticism, B. S. Mardhekar’s theory on pure aesthetics is noteworthy. Aijaz Ahamd presented his theory on how to put in use the Marxism in Indian literary history and criticism. Nemade’s Nativism and Suresh Joshi’s Formalism are new innovative concepts in Indian literary tradition.

Today, Indian literary criticism seems to have been facing a profound crisis of identity. The awareness of this crisis in criticism is perhaps a gift of the colonial experience. The modern Indian literary critics and theorists can be divided into two groups of which the first group wishes to modernize and Westernize criticism, whereas the second group wishes to purify and revive the mainstream (Sanskrit) native tradition of criticism. These conflicting tendencies failed to present any significant contribution to upkeep the contemporary creative literature in Indian languages. The contemporary Indians seem to be afflicted by a sense of amnesia in relation to literary history. Modern India has lost touch with the Sanskrit language and so with Sanskrit literature and criticism. There is a
problem of availability of good translations of critical materials. The translators committed to specialized activity as literary criticism may help lot to get the exposure of different literary theories and criticism published in many languages in India. The easy access to India’s critical tradition can be useful to Indian students who could contribute more in the tradition. So the publication of the series of volumes may come to help for getting the access of important Indian critical text from the past to be put to use in the present.

In short, Indians must study our own tradition first and try to understand its useful theories to enrich literary angle as well as literary creations. We should also study the Western or foreign literary criticism and try to accept whatever is useful as per our culture pattern. The literary creation is designed and systemized by the social situation, culture of the particular country. All countries have their unique culture and social condition. So importing concepts, theories or ideas from any other countries may not be suitable or appropriate. It can be allowed to import some similar ideas or theories that can fit with our own country. In other words, we should not fall a victim to any foreign theories, critical concepts blindly to prove our slavery. We should have our own trends, critical concepts, theories to indicate our own supreme ability. For this we should take help of our past tradition and try at greater level its revival in a real sense.