NEWER THAN NEW: STYLISTICS, STRUCTURALISM, DECONSTRUCTION, MARXIST CRITICISM, PSYCHO-ANALYTIC CRITICISM, READER-RESPONSE THEORY, FEMINIST CRITICISM, NEW HISTORICISM

STYLISTICS

New Criticism was always an unfortunate label, like that of the Modernism from which, in some respects, it grew; there would soon be a time when it was no longer new or modern. In the past thirty years there have been many number of attempts to break out of the apparent *impasse* of the New Critical fixation with the text. One example, which has no general label but is easily identifiable in the development of university departments of Theatre Arts and Theare Studies, is the insistence that plays are not 'dramatic poems' but can best be understood (some would say 'only be understood') as texts for performance—in the context of the history and theory of the theatre. This has not only enriched our understanding of the classical canon of drama (see, for example, the American critic, Marvin Rosenberg's (b. 1912) studies of the major Shakespearean tragedies), but has greatly expanded concepts of what constitutes legitimate drama—finding value, for instance, in street, fringe, tribal and folk theatre, mime and the musical, all of them significant in their own right, but also helping to illuminate the great stage classics. The best-known figure in this general movement is the British theatre director, Peter Brook (b. 1925); (see his *The Empty Space,* 1968.) The current unresolved question is whether the development of 'theatre studies' takes the study of drama out of literary criticism, where it has been since Aristotle, altogether, to form a separate

discipline, or whether literary criticism can respond to the challenge by absorbing something from the new approach or asserting equally valid approaches of its own.

These developments in respect of drama are symptomatic of other advances in critical theory, many of which are associated with what we may broadly call communications theory, an amalgam of insights from linguistics, sociology and psychology. We can identify in stylistics and structuralism two approaches that have proved fruitful, though it is not always easy to say where one ends and the other begins.

'Style' has been widely used as a term in criticism for centuries, often in a rather impressionistic way, in attempts to draw attention to the characteristic or peculiar use of language in a particular text, author or period. Modern 'stylistics' is an attempt to approach the question of style on stricter, more methodical lines; it is not so much a discipline in itself as a cross-over point between linguistics, for which literary texts are only item of interest in the broad study of language and literary criticism. It starts from the proposition that any idea or concept may be expressed in one of a number of different ways, and that an author exercises a choice (conscious or unconscious; dictated by personal taste or the demands of the reader, genre or whatever) in determining the precise form of words to be used. Such a proposition is, incidentally anathema to New Criticism, which refuses to distinguish between the form and content of literature; what is written is written.

Literary stylistic poses for itself the task of assessing and classifying the range of linguistic choice available to authors, identifying the ways in which features of the linguistic 'surface' of a text may call attention to themselves; they may, for example, deviate from some accepted norm in their manner of expression, or in other ways be 'foregrounded' (a key term in literary stylistics). These classifications may then be applied to a particular text, or number of texts, in such way as to highlight their peculiar verbal characteristics. Such a procedure may be put to a variety of uses; for example, building up evidence to confirm or deny our impressionistic sense that certain features of style are characteristic of certain forms or periods in literature (see, for example, the American philologist and critic Josephine Miles (b. 1911), *Eras and Modes in English Poetry* 1957, 1964). More controversially, it may even be used in an attempt to isolate a particular author's 'literary finger prints,' perhaps with a view to determining the authorship of anonymous or disputed texts. But this procedure is most directly useful to literary criticism when it is applied to

between—examples of what stylistics calls 'discourse.' The mode of discourse adopted by the author for his text will largely determine the way in which it is apprehended by a reader; and so the more closely we can explain and quantify that mode the closer we are to explaining, or demonstrating, how that text 'works.'

Stylistics does not offer to replace literary criticism as it has been known in the past, but it does offer some refinements to it. Most exponents of literary stylistics are prepared to acknowledge that the texts which they choose to submit to their characteristic method of analysis are interesting or valuable firstly for any number of reasons that may barely be touched upon by that analysis; stylistics helps merely to describe the distinctively linguistic dimension of that interest or value. A New Critic who, shall we say, offered a cogent reading of some long-neglected poem might hope thereby to make his readers re-evaluate it; a critic employing stylistic methodology could only really hope to make them see it afresh by getting them to focus on its constituent linguistic features. The final business of appreciating literature remains when stylistics has had its say.

So stylistics may be of most use to the critic in offering him a vocabulary to describe precisely details of verbal nuance and presentation—without submitting to the artificial constraints of New Criticism (far from putting the text in a vaccum, stylistics compares it with as many other uses of language as possible) and without favouring certain kinds of verbal richness—such as ambiguity, irony, paradox and so on—over others. Stylistics does, however, have one drawback in common with New Criticism:

> linguistic techniques are more readily adapted to the miniature exegesis of a lyric poem, than the examination of a full-scale novel. In prose, the problem of how to select—what sample passages, what features to study—is more acute, and the incompleteness of even the most detailed analysis is more apparent.

One other feature of stylistics regretted by more traditional critics is its recourse to a special vocabulary, most of it imported from linguistics; it has been likened to the vocabulary of the old classical rhetoric, with which stylistics has much in common. It is regrettable because it tends to form a barrier between critics who choose to use this special terminology and those who do not; in a wider context, it definitely creates a barrier between criticism and the general reading public. The private language of stylistics announces it to be a quasi-science, distinctively a university discipline, and scarcely the concern of the general reader, much less the average writer; to many people this seems as unfortunate price to have to pay for the real benefits that stylistics can offer criticism.

If stylistics has, for these reasons, been greeted with some circumspection, particularly in English, how much more is this true of *structuralism*. This is a phenomenon on which it is difficult to divorce, in its application to literary criticism, from *semiotics* or *semiology*, which is the science of signs. The former term is generally preferred in the United States, in deference to its originator, the American physicist and logician C.S Pierce (1839-1941); the latter in Europe, following the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913). Structuralism is the name given to a twentieth-century body of thinking which fundamentally challenges everyday Western European concepts of 'reality;' it starts from the proposition (intelligible enough in the wake of the fundamental assaults on our understanding of man, society and the universe made by Darwin, Marx, Freud and Einstein) that the world is not made up of independent objects that are knowable and classifiable in absolute terms. Things only really exist in as much as we perceive them, and the act of perception is governed by innumerable factors which make objectivity impossible; so, to some significant extent, we create what we perceive. It follows that all we can really know is the relationship between the observer and the thing observed; this is the stuff of 'reality.' It further follows that nothing or experience is inherently significant, but only so when it is comprehended in the set of relationships, the structure, of which it forms a part.

In this view of things, the process of signification, that is making signs which imply meaning, is much more widespread than is commonly supposed; all human social behaviour—eating, sport, wearing clothes or perfume, politics, telling stories, whatever—is a process of making signs about our relationship with the world. Much 'structuralist' thinking, such as that of the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss, is devoted to uncovering the underlying 'rules' by which this process of sign-making in society is able to operate. Oral and written languages are only particular ways in which such signs are made; and literature is only one way of using languages.

The signs we make, including literature, are thus not intelligible because they refer to some objective reality, which is non-existent or at least non-discernible, but because they correspond to the process of discerning relationships ('structuring') by which we, as it were, create the reality we inhabit. This process presumably derives from the operation of the brain itself, about which little is known for certain. The key assumption is that we build up our sense of structures from an observation of benary oppositions, that is, very basic contrasting relationships, between things—red and green, for example, or circles and squares. These mean nothing

meaning will only be intelligible to the culture or society which has assented to that particular structure. We can observe this in the operation of language itself; words, at least in Western European languages, do not normally *represent* the phenomena they discuss. There is nothing either in the sounds or the shape of the word 'house' in English (or *maison* in French, or *domus* in Latin) which means a building of bricks, stone or timber for living in; the words only acquire that meaning when employed within the intelligible structures, the languages, of which they form a part.

Saussure tried to explain how this operates in practice by distinguishing between *langue* and *parole*. The former, in English, means approximately 'language,' as we might use it in the phrase, 'the English language;' it is an abstract set of rules or conventions about the way we communicate within our society. *Parole* means 'speech,' everyday examples of the use of words. Looked at in isolation, individual examples of *parole* seem chaotic or formless; they only take on meaning, and so communicate, because they subscribe to the rules of the *langue* of the particular community or society. Saussure cites the analogy of a game of chess; any particular game only makes sense in relation to the mutually accepted rules and conventions, ineffect the structure governing all such games; the analogy would hold true for any recognised sport. A major preoccupation of linguistics in this century has been an attempt to work through *parole* to a definition of the universal temrs of *langue*.

In respect of literature, it may loosely be said that the central activity of structuralist critics has been to discern a *langue* of literature, to which individual texts stand as examples of *parole*. This is some times described as a search for a 'poetics' of literature. This goes back to Aristotle's term; it is not confined, of course, to literature in verse. To this extent, structuralist criticism may be seen as an extension of the approach to literature via genre, an attempt to come to terms with the way in which it communicates through its sheer 'literariness.' Noarthrop Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957) is a key work in this context. But a central tenet of many of those searching for a 'poetics' of literature, particularly of those writing in French, is that no text, no instance of *literary parole,* can be 'pure' or 'innocent' in its relation to the 'poetics' or literary *langue* by which it acquires meaning. Literature, like any other sign-system, is a way of registering perceptual relationships (and not, in any simplistic sense, 'reality'); but it is one that aims at undestanding and so controlling the version of truth revealed in that process of registration. In so doing, it necessarily reveals its own capacity for changing the truth or reality it registers. For many structuralists, this is the most important feature of art, and of literature in particular; every choice of words and forms which would have 'created' alternative realities. (It

texts can be very similar to that employed in stylistics—the detailed exegesis of linguistic features of the text in relation to other possible formulations; but the rationale behind it is implicitly very different.) In this capacity to imply alternative realities, all literature may be said to be revolutionary in its impact, however conservative its 'content' may appear to be; in the process of understanding its 'signs,' the reader is made increasingly aware of the arbitrary way in which they operate, of the fact that they have no fixed connotation but may take on successive, theoretically infinite meanings, depending on our appreciation of the total structure. Thus they challenge us to construct our own new 'reality'. This helps to explain a general preference apparent in much structuralist criticism for the sort of writing—such as Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* and the Irish—authors James Joyce (1882-1941) and Samuel Beckett (b. 1906)- which draws attention to the sheer arbitrariness of its own sign-system; such writing is implicitly more 'honest' than quasi-realistic literature. It also explains, however, why one of the major works of structuralist criticism so far—*S/Z*, by the French critic, Roland Barthes (Paris, 1970; English translation, 1974)—is single-mindedly dedicated to exposing what it sees as the imposure of 'realistic' novels, which it attempts in an exhaustive analysis of one short story, 'Sarrasine,' by the notoriously 'realist' author, Balzac.

The implications of structuralism are far-reaching in many fields not only linguistics and literature but anthropology, sociology, psychology, economics, even physics. There can be little doubt that the sheer extent of its claims (a key to all connections?) has been one factor in making many English and American critics sceptical about it; like Marxism, it seductively pretends to have answers to all questions, but it is difficult to accept some of these answers without accepting them all. This is tied up with the fact that the difficult concepts with which structuralism attempts to deal have led to the adoption of extremely specialist jargon, some, but not all of it, overlapping with that employed in stylistics, often redefined by successive theorists to suit particular purposes. The suspicion is abroad that too much of structuralism is concerned with theoretical attempts to explain and define itself, at the expense of such items as the literary texts it offers to explicate. This suspicion is only reinforced by the existence of a variety of critical approaches such as formalism, phenomenology and deconstructionism which are clearly related to mainstream structuralism—if there is such a thing—but which lay claim to particular refinements and advantages.

A further problem has certainly been that, while in general terms structuralism seems to offer ways of examining literature dispassionately

subvert the supposedly corrupt society which produced them. Where this political dimension has not been evident, a further implication has arisen, equally intimidating to some people, which is that literature is not about anything at all, except itself; that what matters about a text is the way its form and style come together to register a type of communication; that the author and his chosen subject-matter are only incidentals in an impersonal world where everything man-made may be said to communicate *something*. This may be a logically defensible argument, but common sense suggests that it is a long way removed from the reasons why most people bother to write or read literature. Most Anglo-Saxon critics have so far proved too empiricist in outlook to swallow the argument whole.

For all that, structuralism can clearly be useful in underlining the fact that literature is only one means of communication among many and in making us self-conscious about literature as a medium. In terms of the status they have been given in schools and in society as a whole, printed books have been the most influential means of communication and the most privileged medium in the Western World since the Renaissance: to what extent has this shaped our thinking about the world, indeed created our whole concept of 'reality'? We may remember that our history of literary criticism began with Plato, one of whose objections to books and the written word was that they were inherently less truthful than the form of open-ended dialogue and debate which he had learned from his teacher, Socrates. Structuralism may yet offer us the best perspective for observing the struggle as film and television increasingly challenge the primacy of the written word and the printed page.

(ADAPTED FROM *AN INTRODUCTION TO LITERARY CRITICISM* BY RICHARD DUTTON)

DECONSTRUCTION

After New Criticism and Structuralism, the latest development in the technique of literary criticism is Deconstruction which provided a promising alternative of Freudian, Marxist and others. It was conceived by the French philosopher and critic, Jacques Derrida, who expressed his own deconstruction mainly in *Of Grammotology*. In practice, deconstruction is exemplified primarily in the critical readings, made by Jacques Derrida, of a series of texts in the history of western philosophy, from Plato to Descartes, Rousseau and Hegel to Husserl and Heidegger, and of a series of more recent texts in the history of structuralism and post-structuralism form Saussure to Levi-Strauss, Lacan and Foucault. Taking as an example Derrida's analysis of Husseri, Jonathan Culler describes it like this:

> Deconstruction thus undertakes a double reading, describing the ways in which lines of argument in the texts it is analysing, call their premises into question, and using the system of concepts within which a text works to produce constructs, such as *difference and supplement,* which challenge the consistency of that system.

Josue Harari picks on Derrida's analogy between deconstruction and de-sedimentation to explain deconstruction

> as the tracing of a path among textual strata in order to stir up and expose forgotten and dormant sediments of meaning which have accumulated and settled into the text's fabric...Thus, deconstruction is really a technique of de-sedimenting the text in order to allow what was always already inscribed in its texture to resurface.

The deconstructive reader exposes the grammatological structure of the text by locating the moment in the text which harbours the unbalancing of the equation, the sleight of hand at the limit of a text which cannot be dismissed as a contradiction.

M.H. Abrams argues that the most distinctive part of Derridian theory is that "..he shifts his inquiry from language to ecriture, the written or printed text; and the second that he conceives the text as an extraordinarily limited fashion." Abram's statement implies that for Derrida "writing" is the printed or the written text and the text is extraordinarily limited. Another commentator on Derrida is Newton Garver, who argues that Derrida is one of the philosophers of language who emphasizes the superiority of rhetoric over logic. Garver's arguments that Derrida shifts the importance from logic to rhetoric finds support from J. Hillis Miller, who states that "Deconstruction is an investigation of what is implied by this inheritance of figure, concept, and narative in one another. Deconstruction is therefore a rhetorical discipline." Murray Krieger believes that Derrida is a "critical structuralist who outdoes structuralism, and perhaps undoes as well, and that his assault is a newer form of that oldest attack on the poet as myth-maker by Plato."

Let us now try to explain the basic terms that Derrida shakes to demolish in traditional criticism and facilitate the act of deconstruction. First of all, "writing" and "speech" are the pivotal words in *Of Grammatology.* Metaphysics and theology assigned to the written word a secondary place and to the spoken word primary place. Derrida argues that the traditional concepts of speech and writing are "logocentric" which means that the concepts of speech and writing have been shaped, conditioned, and governed by metaphysics.

Language is a system of signs, and of the relation between language and reality is a relation between a set of signifiers and a corresponding set of signifier. A signified, within language, refers and

meaning of the poet, and that is why criticism is an endless pursuit. It is a movement forward and backward from the text. Thus to understand or to criticise a poem by W.B. Yeats, the critic has to have a knowledge of the author's other works that influenced Yeats and the authors and works that have thrown light on Yeats. So criticism becomes a participation in the movements of the signs under erasure. The business of the critic is to deconstruct an existing construct and then to reconstruct it so as to liberate it from the concepts of metaphysics.

MARXIST CRITICISM

The Marxists claim that since the publication of Marx's *Communist Manifesto* in 1848, there have been revolutionary changes in human thought. The traditional values and established institutions were weighed in the balance and found wanting. Marx and his close associate Frederick Engels assimilated the intellectual currents prevailing at the time. They imbibed the thoughts and ideas of the French materialistic philosophers like Diderot, Helvetius, D. Alembert, and Halbach, and came to believe that material facts were far more important than metaphysical abstractions. At the second stage Marx and Engels were the avowed disciples of Hegel, who evolved the dialectic method. We have reasons to believe that Marx and Engles read the utopian social theories of Saint Simon, Owen, Fourier, and Cabet, and felt that they were pursuing a wrong course. Not mere theorists, they got in touch with the League of the Just, a Trade-Union Organisation, whose slogans were—"All men are brothers," and "Proletarians of all countries unite." It was under the auspices of the League that the *Communist Manifesto* was published. Henceforth, Marx and Engels wrote a series of books and pamphlets, which dealt as much with the current political events as a systematic economic thought. Marx's works include *Revolution and Counter Revolution, The Class Struggle in France, The Civil War in France, A Contribution to the Critique in Political Economy, Theories of Surplus Value,* and the last but not least, *The Capital*. The Marxian economic and social theory has been elaborately stated in *The Capital* in which there is the beautiful illustration of his dialectic method. Marx presents a paradox that the interests of capitalists and wage-earners as individuals and those of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as classes are at the same time mutually dependent and diametrically opposed.

Marx maintains that the different sections of people are to be regarded not as individuals but as classes. In the feudal society there was the bitter conflict between the lords and the serfs. Even on the extinction of the

opponents. It was an uphill task to meet force with force and reduce the feudal barriers to the dust.

It is the struggle between the contending classes at the different stages of civilization that proved to be the driving force of history. Marx, Engels, and their camp-followers are of the opinion that whenever there have been major changes in the forms and means of production, the institutions and ideas, values and patterns of thought undergo radical changes. What is good for one age becomes repelling and immoral in another. The ideas do not grow in a vacuum. They emanate from material conditions. This is known as historical materialism. The Marxists do not believe in determinism. They are fully aware that man can control the material world by producing the necessaries of life. The methods of production change, which bring about changes in the social organisation as well as ideas.

During the feudal ages the lords owned the means of production, and the serfs worked for them. As capitalism became the rage of the day, the workers produced things, known as commodities, for sale in the market. The value of the commodities is determined by the labour-time spent on them. The question is—Whose labour-time? It is, as Marx points out, the "average socially necessary labour-time." This needs a little clarification. A labourer works for ten hours a day—four hours are spent for earning his wages, and the rest for producing the 'surplus value' which is enjoyed by the capitalist employer.

It is against this background that we shall have to study the role of Marxism in art and literature. The Marxian theory of literature is related to the Marxian theory of historical materialism. The three historical phases in human development, namely the slave phase, the feudal phase, and the capitalist phase and different modes of production, which necessitated different types of literary expressions. Class-struggle is the basic concept of Marxism. In all the three phases of history there have been class exploitation, but the inexorable forces of history will bring about an exploitation of man by man. Class struggle calls forth class literature. If the feudal lords are in power, the literature of the age reflects the sentiments of feudalism. The longing and aspirations, the laughter and tears are the sentiments of feudalism. The longing and aspirations, the laughter and tears of the feudal lords and their wives and mistresses alone find an eloquent expression in literature. The untold sufferings of the untold millions are left unrecorded. The serfs and slaves are unwept, unhonoured, and unsung. In the capitalistic age, the industrialists are lionised, while the workers are uncared for. True, the workers often record their protest against the heartless exploitation of the industrial magnates. But in most cases it is crying in the wilderness.

Marxism sees literature as an ideology that reflects the struggle

man's intellectual and social evolution. Marxist criticism leads to social realism, the doctrine that literature ought to express social realities as perceived from a Marxist point of view. Much Marxist criticism endeavours to show the relationship between literary values and the social, cultural and economic context which gave rise to them. For Marxist criticism, the definition of the nature of Realism and the Mimetic function of literature usually remain the fundamental critical concerns. Plekhanov in his famous essay "The Aesthetic Theory" gives a detailed account of the dominant role of Marxism in literature. "The true Marxist function of literary criticism," says Plekhanov, "is social analysis. Art is not a driving force, but the expression of a class view-point. To understand an artist is to discover the social milieu or class which he represents and to analyse the nuances of interest and attitude within that class which may be reflected in his writing. Objectivity in historical analysis is the merit of a literary critic."

Marx and Engels had the time and opportunity to formulate a systematic theory of art and literature. From the relevant titbits of their writings and *obiter dicta*, however, their approaches to literature are discernible. There was nothing pontifical about Marx, and he never spoke *ex-cathedra*. A widely-read person, Marx had classically orthodox, literary tastes. He read Aeschylus, Shakespeare, Dickens, and Balzac with profit with particular interest, and his monumental work *The Capital* abounds in numerous quotations from the plays of Shakespeare. He did not ignore Shakespeare, because the latter was the chronicler of an age of monarchy and feudalism. All that he emphasised was that art and literature were the products of socio-economic forces. Bourgeois literature is the reflection of the bourgeois ideology, philosophy, and outlook. Literature became the handmaid of the ruling class, be it feudal or capitalist.

The Marxist critic believes that text has to be read in the light of an all-informing philosophy. It has to be seen in relation to a Marxist view of history, in which the idea of class struggle is central: the connections between literature and the economic structure of society in which it was written must be made evident. This does not, however, produce a uniform critical response. Marxist criticism is lively and varied, and despite the collapse of communism throughout Eastern Europe, is still evolving. A crude Marxist might simply dismiss all literature as a bourgeois luxury in which middle-class authors write about their middle-class problems. Such a response, however, has not been widely expressed since the 1930s. Indeed, Marxist critics have often revealed a reverence for art, feeling that, through literature,

Not surprisingly, Marxists, such as the best-known Marxist critic, George Lukacs, have always been most interested in the realistic novel, which presents a suitably full picture of society. There is, in fact, nothing particularly contentious about much Marxist criticism. F.R. Leavis and the American New Critics focused more on the text than anything else, but there has always been a form of criticism in which the text is seen in context. Traditional Marxist criticism is simply one way of relating the text to a view of the social reality of the time in which it was written. A very accessible and influential example of such criticism is Raymond Williams's *The English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence* (1970).

At the same time we should recognise that, although the essence of Marxist criticism is a concern with material living conditions, the Marxist critic must consider more theoretical questions about the ideology of texts and the function of art in society. Such concerns have been sharpened with the advent of structuralism. Whereas traditional criticism—even traditional Marxist criticism—has always stressed the fullness and coherence of literary texts, structuralism draws attention to the constructed nature of the literary text; and more recent Marxist criticism has inevitably taken account of structuralism. The two critics who have been most influential in developing theoretical Marxist thinking about literature have been Louis Althusser and Pierre Macherey. Macherey stresses the gaps in a text, arguing that the reader can see what the text is hiding from itself. Althusser sees texts as incomplete and contradictory as their ideology (the ideas, values and political beliefs inherent in a text) runs into difficulties. Both critics are essentially saying that the issues raised in a text are too complex for the author—or the ideological code of the period in which the text was written—to control and contain. A critical approach thus can lead to is one in which the Marxist critic looks searchingly at the contradictions and problems inherent in bourgeois culture, exploring the text to see the way in which ideological values prove inadequate or incomplete or disruptive. This might appear a dismissive approach to literature, and handled crudely it might well be, but it can also prove a rewarding way of exploring both literature and history, making a connection between the text and the world.

One of the obvious strengths of such criticism is that it gets away from the idea that literary texts convey timeless and universal truths about life and human nature. Marxist criticism sees how a text belongs to a certain period, and expresses how people at that time organised and made sense of their world. In the hands of the committed and sophisticated Marxist (in England, critics such as Christopher Caudwell, Raymond Williams and Terry Eagleton, and in America, Frederic Jameson) this is, of course, tied to a radical political agenda, in which the critic hopes to

bring about changes in the way society currently conducts itself, but many non-Marxists practise a Marxist-influenced approach to literature in that they are committed to a questioning re-reading of the past that has much in common with feminism, and is often combined with feminism (and New Historicism) as in Nancy Armstrong's book, *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (1987), or Mary Poovey's *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England* (1989).

There is much that is valuable in Marxist criticism. What we object to is the dogmatism of certain Marxists who make a fetish of it. Let us not make ourselves exclusive and narrow-minded, and shut ourselves from the creative works—the classics of the past, which are a priceless legacy of man. Marx and Lenin have the catholicity to read and appreciate the classics, which posterity will not willingly let die. They have not rejected the literature that is non-socialist. They have not rejected the contributions of the Feudal Lords and the capitalists as those of the serfs and the labourers. Their contributions are also a social reality. We cannot afford to scratch the accumulated treasures of human culture. Appraising the Marxian theory of literature the editorial of *The Times Literary Supplement*, August 14, 1937, observes:

> There is much that is valuable in the attitude characteristic of Marxist criticism. It links on to and continues the distinguished tradition of the historical critics of the late nineteenth century; and for the newer elements to their work it must be allowed that there is a promising field for investigation. Of this, Ralph Fox's *The Novel and the People* is an attractive and a gallant example; it contains much sound sense along with a good deal that is polemical.

PSYCHO-ANALYTIC CRITICISM

Literary critics in the Romantic era frequently regarded a literary work as an expression of the author's psychology, but it was not until the late nineteenth century that a scheme for analyzing psychic phenomena emerged in the writings of Signund Freud. In 1896, he carried the term psychoanalysis to characterize the "talking care," a therapeutic method of recovering repressed material from the unconscious. He made use of the terms ego, superego, id, and Oedipus complex in his attempts at psychoanalysis. Freud's views of the dream house provided particularly useful concepts for the analysis of literature. Literature and the other arts, like dreams and neurotic symptoms, consist of the imagined, or fantasied, fulfilment of wishes that

individual of the standards of society) into the unconscious realm of artist's mind, but are permitted by the censor to achieve a fantasied satisfaction in distorted forms which serve to disguise their real motives and objects from the conscious mind. Freud set forth his ideas in his books such as *Introduction to Psychoanalysis* (1920), *Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (1933), and *An Outline of Psychoanalysis* (1939).

Freud's coment on the workings of the artist's imagination at the end of the twenty-third lecture of his *Introduction to Psychoanalysis* (1920) set forth the theoretical framework of what is sometimes called "classical" psychoanalytical criticism, where the work is read as a sympton of the author who produced it, or as analogous to the relationship between the dreamer and his or her dream, as if the work is a symptomatic reproduction of the author's infantile and forbidden wishes. Freudean psychoanalysis has regarded a literary work as an author's sublimation of unacceptable desires in short, a substitute gratification. The views of Freud found expression in literary criticism. Some of these famous works are Ernest Jones' *Hamlet and Oedipus* (1949), Marie Bonaparte's *The Life and Works of Edgar Allen Poe* (1949), Leon Edel's *Henry James* (5 vols. 1953–72), and Justin Kaplan's *Mark Twain and His World* (1974).

The relationship between psychology and literature is so intimate and well–defined that we can hardly think of any serious criticism since Aristotle which does not in some measure make use of psychological insights and impressions. From the theories of *nemesis* and *catharsis* down to I.A. Richards' neuro-motor concept of poetry, Edmud Wilson's treatment of symbolism, the New Critic's view of irony and ambiguity, and Northrop Frye's archetypal genres, psychology has had something to do with the achieved critical formulations. If psychology is the study of mind and its processes, then criticism, which is but an effort to reconstruct the inner dynamics of a work of art cannot but be psychological in its primal or nuclear aspect. It may be several things more—study of meaning, form, rhetoric, style, image, symbol, milieu, ethos etc.—yet, it will, in some manner, inevitably return to the psychology of thing. Lionel Trilling's perceptive statement that "poetry is indigenous to the very condition of the mind" supports the view that the very structure of aeshtetic experience involves psychologizing, or effective and chromatic categories. If so, psychology has a built-in purchase on criticism. In any reckoning, it will have to be taken of the writings of Freud, Jung, Adler, Mc Dogall, Watson Pavlov and Rank. A number of American critics have made use of the discoveries of the Freudians and Neo-Freudians to literary works. A few assumptions of Freudian metapsychology are: (i) the unconscious is the seat of explosive energies as well as of inspiration and epiphanies, (ii) hysterical symptoms are

caused by early trauma and are expressions of repressed sexual energy; (iii) criticism ought to be a history of man's ideas and imaginings in the setting of the conditions which have shaped them, (iv) free association technique and dream interpretation help in the discovery of repressed experiences; (v) psychoanalysis is an emanation of the Romantic spirit with its apotheosis of the self, and its belief in subjectivity, freedom and fulfilment; (vi) Poetry exhibits the psychic tension, synthesis, and order of the poet. The two forces which make the tension are "ego" and "id." The Freudian notion of art and neurosis, psychic determinism and sublimation of art is evident in biographical works and in the writings of such American critics as Edmund Wilson, Lionel Trilling, Kenneth Burke, Leon Edel, Harry Levin, Maxwell Geismar, Harold Bloom and Leslie A. Fiedler.

Recent psychological critics, who have placed more emphasis on the writer's control in structuring an aesthetic object, have been principally inspired by Ernst Kris's *Psychoanalytic Explorations in Art* (1952), which contends that the artist regresses in the service of the ego, an indication that ego functioning is central to the creative process and that "primary process" (that which, regulates the unconscious) is subject to "secondary process" (the cognitive, rational capacity of the ego). Thus, for psychoanalytic critics, "ego–psychology" has substantially replaced the earlier "id-psychology" (with its focus on instinctual drives). The effect has been to regard the artist's creative capacity—as opposed to his personality—as "healthy" rather than neurotic. Another development of psychoanalytical criticism is 'ego-psychology,' expounded by Norman Holland in *The Dynamics of Literary Response* (1968), and *Five Readers Reading* (1975). The theory is concerned with reader-text psychology and thus concentrates on the relationship between reader and text. As Elizabeth Wright puts it: "Holland sees it as the scene of a collusion between author and reader, upon which he founds an aeshetics of response." He analyses how readers respond to a given text and suggests that readers use a text to satisfy unconscious wishes. Holland says that it is the reader who does the work, ***not*** the text. The reader re-creates identity.

Erik Erikson is largely responsible for pioneeing what is now named psychobiography, which is concerned with the subject's psychological even, psychosexual, development. It makes a search for and discovery of a writer's intentions and motives. This approach is exemplified in Livingstone Lowes's study of Coleridge in *The Road to Xanadu* (1927).

Harold Bloom has devised a highly original theory based on the Oedipus Complex in his book *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973). He advocates the idea that every poet (especially since Milton) is, in a sense, 'belated'