

**AESTHETIC EFFECT IN SOME OF THE
REPRESENTATIVE POEMS OF
W.B. YEATS**

(2)

*Dissertation Submitted to the
Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfillment of the requirement of
the award of the degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

SONILA SAINI



**CENTRE OF LINGUISTICS AND ENGLISH,
SCHOOL OF LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND CULTURE STUDIES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI – 110067
2002**

(2)

**AESTHETIC EFFECT IN SOME OF THE
REPRESENTATIVE POEMS OF
W.B. YEATS**

LIBRARY'S COPY

*Dissertation Submitted to the
Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfillment of the requirement of
the award of the degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

SONILA SAINI



**CENTRE OF LINGUISTICS AND ENGLISH,
SCHOOL OF LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND CULTURE STUDIES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI – 110067
2002**

DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE

This Dissertation entitled, **Aesthetic Effect in Some of the Representative Poems of W.B Yeats**, submitted by me to the Centre of Linguistics and English, School of Language, Literature and Culture Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, for the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy, is an original work and has not been submitted, in part or full, for any other degree or diploma of any university.

Sonila Saini

SONILA SAINI

**Centre of Linguistics and English
School of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi - 110 067**



CENTRE OF LINGUISTICS & ENGLISH
SCHOOL OF LANGUAGE, LITERATURE & CULTURE STUDIES
जवाहरलाल नेहरू विश्वविद्यालय
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI-110067, INDIA

CERTIFICATE

Certified that this dissertation entitled **Aesthetic Effect in Some of the Representative Poems of W.B Yeats**, submitted by Miss Sonila Saini, Centre of Linguistics and English, School of Language, Literature & Culture Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, for the award of the degree of **Master of Philosophy**, is an original work and has not been submitted, in part or full, for any other degree or diploma of any university. This may, therefore, be placed before the Examiners for evaluation for the award of the degree of **Master of Philosophy**.

Kapil Kapoor

Prof. Kapil Kapoor
Supervisor

Vaishna Narang

Prof. Vaishna Narang
Chairperson

DEDICATED

TO

MY ĀḌARANĪYA GURU PROF. KAPIL KAPOOR,

MY BELOVED PARENTS,

AND MY DEAR FRIENDS.

CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	Acknowledgement	
	Introduction	1-2
I	What is Aesthetics, Aesthetic effect and the Model of Analysis ?	3-24
II	Western Aesthetics, Comparison of Eastern and Western Aesthetic attitudes, Yeats's Aesthetics and the background.	25-45
III	Analysis of the Poems in the Indian Model.	46-65
	Conclusion	66-67
	Bibliography	68-72

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This dissertation owes much to the valuable guidance and constant motivation of professor Kapil Kapoor who patiently went through the whole work. Without his unstinted support, constructive suggestions and incisive analysis this task would not have been possible. I express my heartfelt gratitude to him.

Equally, I am thankful to Dr. Rajnish Kumar Mishra for guiding and providing me with books and the required material.

I extend my special thanks to the library authorities of Jawaharlal Nehru University, the Sahitya Akademy, the British Council, who ungrudgingly helped me in finding the relevant material. I am also immensely thankful to Mr. Malik and Mr. Rawat for the assistance rendered by them.

I would also like to thank the members of the faculty of the Centre of Linguistics and English who allowed and encouraged me to work on this topic.

My dissertation work has been made pleasant and worthwhile by a group of friends – Huma, Asghar, Faiz, Zahid, Tulsi, Cheena, Anju and others who gave me immense moral courage in the course of my writing. They were always eager to know about the progress of my work till I completed.

Last but not the least, a note of gratitude must go to my friend Mr. Faiz Ashrafi, who assisted me in getting my dissertation typed and also in getting clearances for dissertation submission. I am really thankful to him for helping me in every possible way.

A deep concern and moral support of my parents and my brother Mannu inspired me to complete this task. It is they who stood by me in time of joys and sorrows. I am deeply indebted to them for this and everything.

Sonila Saini

INTRODUCTION

As the title suggests, this work is an attempt to analyse some representative poems of William Butler Yeats in the Indian aesthetic model, primarily or specifically, according to the *rasa* theory; and to bring out the various *bhāvas*, *rasas* or the aesthetic experiences which they (the poems) possess. Also, to bring together the Indian and Western aesthetic attitudes as there has been quite a lot differences (though also similarities) in the thinking of the East and West. As Yeats was deeply influenced by Indian Philosophy and had great affinity with the Indian thought, hence, it becomes a meaningful exercise to analyse Yeats's poems according to the Indian aesthetic framework. The focus of my study are the poems, *The Second Coming*, *Sailing to Byzantium*, *Easter 1916*, *A Prayer for My Daughter* and *Among School Children* which are the most popular poems of Yeats and which place him on a high pedestal (as a poet). The reason for taking up this topic for study is of my curiosity to know how the Indian theory matches our response to Yeats's poetry.

I have divided the study into three chapters and a conclusion. In the first chapter, first of all, I have tried to define Aesthetics and Aesthetic effect. Then, I have discussed the different theories of the Indian tradition with the major thinkers. Lastly, I have talked of *rasa* theory as a model of analysis. In the second chapter, Western Aesthetics, has been discussed. Also, the Indian and Western aesthetic views have been compared; and, finally, Yeats's poetry, aesthetics and the background of it have been dealt. The third chapter consists of the analysis of Yeats's poems in the Indian model and a bit on how analysis and aesthetic judgement is done (by different people). The conclusion consists of the three chapters and about the ultimate aim of all art and creative writings. The methodology undertaken is both empirical and interpretive. There is

application of Indian theory (*rasa*) on recent Western texts. Also, there is comparison between Indian and European thinking. I have tried to discuss some important issues in Indian and Western aesthetic thinking both from the point of ancient and modern thinkers. Concludingly, I would like to say that I have tried to explain the selected poems of W.B. Yeats from the point of view of the aesthetic effect that these poems have. As it is only a preliminary study, the analysis is more or less at a general level. There is need to follow it up with detailed, sophisticated studies.

CHAPTER 1

WHAT IS AESTHETICS, AESTHETIC
EFFECT AND THE MODEL OF ANALYSIS ?

AESTHETICS AND AESTHMETIC EFFECT:

The term 'Aesthetics' has various connotations. In simple words, Aesthetics is basically appreciation of art. It is a science of perceptible forms, things which we can see, e.g. painting, sculpture, drama, dance etc. It may also be described, as a science which defines what is art. Also, 'Aesthetics is that branch of knowledge which deals with the historically determined essence of human values, their creation, perception, appreciation and assimilation'.¹ In the context of Indian Aesthetics, the word 'Aesthetics' means 'science and philosophy of fine art'.² Fine arts include poetry, music, architecture, sculpture and painting. But Indian Aesthetics is primarily concerned with three arts, poetry, music and architecture. Aesthetics, therefore, as philosophy of fine art, has to deal with the philosophic views of these arts, known as *Rasa-Brahma Vāda* (aesthetics of drama), *Nāda Brahma Vāda* (philosophy of music), and *Vāstu Brahma Vāda* (philosophy of architecture). Similarly aesthetics as science of fine art has to concern itself with technique of each of them. Aesthetics as philosophy of fine art in India has been studied not with reference to music or plastic or pictorial representation, but mainly in the context of dramatic representation (drama being considered the highest of all forms of poetry and poetry being the highest of all arts). In the main, music and scenic representations have been regarded as auxiliaries to the drama. The reason is that the varied situations of life, which art depicts, find a more successful representation

¹ 'Aesthetics', Yuri Borev, Progress Publishers –Moscow, 1981. Translated from Russian to English by Natalia Belskaya and Yevgeny Phillippov. English Translation 1985. p. 13.

² 'Comparative Aesthetics' – Vol 1: Indian Aesthetics (second edition), Prof. Dr. Kanti Chandra Pandey, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office- Varanasi, 1959. p. 1.

in drama than in any other class of art. For, drama appeals to the eye and the ear, the senses, which are regarded pre-eminently aesthetic.

Aesthetic effect is the effect or experience which takes place in the mind of the reader/auditor as he reads a specimen of poetic art, he is delighted to see his own passions and actions in the attitude of the external world presented in the poems and as self of the experiences is delightfully savoured by his own self, he enjoys supernormal bliss. The effect that ensues from the experience of a particular feeling is ordinary, but when this is presented through the medium of poetry, it appears in the shape of an idea of unlimited possibility, and naturally causes delight to the reader /auditor. The ingredients of poetic experience being extra normal, poetic experience itself is something other than the ordinary experience, obtainable in the empirical plane. Thus, attainment of aesthetic experience constitutes the end of all poetic creation, which is intended to cause unalloyed (aesthetic) joy to the reader / auditor.

INDIAN AESTHETIC TRADITION:

In the Indian literary tradition, the major literary theories are those of *Rasa* (Aesthetic experience), *Alaṅkāra* (principle of figurativeness), *Rīti* (mode of expression), *Dhvani* (verbal symbolism), *Vakrokti* (principle of deviation) *Guṇa /Doṣa* (excellence/faults), *Aucitya* (propriety), *Mahāvākya* (narrative), Discourse Analysis (*yuktis*), Comprehensive Analysis (Rājaśekhara's Composite model, e.g. *Kāvyaṁīmāṁsā*), Interpretation.

Rasa theory (one of the Indian Aesthetic theory) is about *Rasa* or the aesthetic relish, pleasure or rapture on the part of the reader or perceiver which is derived from a work of art. *Nāṭya Śāstra* by Bharata

(written between first century B.C. and fourth century A.D.) can be considered the first extant work that deals with poetics in the Indian tradition. Though, *Nāṭya Śāstra* deals, primarily, with drama and its various elements, in the context of specific kind of drama (*vācika abhinaya*), it deals with poetry (in fact, what has been said of *rasa* in drama is applicable to all kinds of literature, especially to poetry).

Alaṅkāra is the earliest and the most sustained school; it studies literary language and assumes that the locus of literariness is in the figures of speech, in the mode of figurative expression, in the grammatical accuracy and pleasantness of sound. But meaning is also not ignored. The structural taxonomies of different figures of speech are models of how meaning is cognized and how it is to be extracted from the text. Bhāmaha is the first *alaṅkāra* poetician. In his book *Kāvyaālaṅkāra*, he talks of the pleasure of multiplicity of meaning inherent in certain *alaṅkāra* such as *arthāntaranyāsa*, *vibhāvanā* and *samāsokti*. In chapters two and three, he describes thirty five figures of speech. Others who continued the tradition are Daṇḍin, Udbhata, Rudraṭa and Vāmana. Finally, in Ānandvardhana, *alaṅkāra* was sought to be integrated with *dhvani* and *rasa*. There is a form of suggestion (*dhvani*) which is evoked by figures of speech and which thus contributes to aesthetic experience (*rasa*).

Rīti is a theory of language of literature. Though it is described for the first time in Bharata's *Nāṭya Śāstra* under the rubric of *vṛtti*, it is Vāmana who developed it into theory, as the theory of *viśiṣṭa padaracanā rīti* — formation of or arrangement of marked inflected constructions is *rīti*. Two other words used for *rīti* are *mārga* and *vṛtti*. *Rītis* correlate with themes, effect on hearers/viewers, and sentiment. Bharata has all the

three in mind in his discussion of *vṛttis* in *Nāṭya Śāstra*: *kaiśikī* for *sṛṅgāra*, *bhāratī* for all *rasas*, *sāttavatī* for *vīra*, *ārabhaṭī* for *raudra* and *bibhatsa*. Viśwanātha considers proper organisation of language as *rīti* -- words and phrases have to be properly selected and organised in poetry and this is necessary for *rasas* and *bhāvas*. *Rītis* (styles) are defined by *guṇas* (excellences) as well. *Rīti* may be called 'diction', particularly when *guṇa/doṣa* become part of discussion. But *rīti* is much more than just diction. Basically it is a theory that handles the psycho-phonetic fitness of language for speakers, themes and sentiments, and therefore becomes a study of craftsmanship and psychology of speech.

The *dhvani* theory of Ānandvardhana considers suggestion, the indirectly evoked meaning, as the characteristic property of literary discourse, the determinant that separates it from other rational discourses. As articulated in *Dhvanyāloka*, *dhvani* becomes an all-embracing principle that explains the structure and function of the other major elements of literature --- the aesthetic effect (*rasa*), the figural mode and devices (*alamkāra*), the stylistic values (*rīti*) and excellence and defects (*guṇa-doṣa*). All subsequent literary theorists in the tradition found the combination of *rasa* and *dhvani* theories both adequate and sufficient to analyse the constitution of meaning in literature. In *Dhvanyāloka*, Ānandvardhana has presented a structural analysis of indirect literary meaning. He has classified different kinds of suggestion and defined them by identifying the nature of suggestion in each. He integrates *rasa* theory with his *dhvani* theory. *Dhvani* is the method, the means, for achieving or evoking *rasa*, which is the effect of suggestion. Thus, *dhvani* theory is a theory of meaning, of symbolism, and this principle leads to the poetry of suggestion being accepted as the highest kind of poetry.

Vakrokti is also a theory of language of literature. It claims that the characteristic property of literary language is its 'markedness'. It deviates in identifiable ways from ordinary language in its form and in its constitution of meaning. Kuntaka made *vakrokti* a full-fledged theory of literariness. His definition of *vakrokti* as in *Vakroktijīvita* is — 'both words and meanings marked by artistic turn of speech.' *Vakrokti* literally means *vakra ukṭi*, deviant or marked expression, and can also mean special denotation. It may be properly translated as 'markedness'. Also, Kuntaka incorporates *rasa*, *alaṅkāra*, *rīti* and *guṇa* theories into his *vakrokti siddhānta*. The principle of *vakrokti* has affinities with modern formalist theories of literature which consider the language of literature as deviant language. In the clarity of its conception and categories, *vakrokti* theory is a useful framework for stylistic analysis of literature.

Guṇa/Doṣa theory examines literary compositions in terms of qualities (*guṇa*) and defects (*doṣa*) both of form and meaning. From Bharata downwards every theorist has, more or less concerned himself with this aspect of compositions. But it is Daṇḍin and, subsequently, Udbhata who make *guṇa/doṣa* the primary features, the locus of literariness. Bhāmaha, who was also a logician (*naiyāyika*), concerns himself only with defects. In the first and fourth chapters of *Kāvyaṅkāra*, he enumerates and discusses the general defects of expression and form and the defects springing from failure of logical thinking. Vāmana (*Kāvyaṅkārasūtra*) also concerns himself with ideal qualities of literary compositions and the shortcomings. But for Vāmana, the defects, *doṣa*, are restricted to the figures of speech. Daṇḍin takes a more wholistic view and assimilates the concepts of *rasa* in his conception of *guṇa* and *doṣa*. In this sense, in Daṇḍin, *guṇa* and *doṣa* are

primary attributes of literary compositions. After Daṇḍin, Udbhaṭa tried to correlate *guṇa/doṣa* with both *alaṅkāra* (figures of speech) and *rīti* (linguistic styles) and claimed that excellences and defects are not independent features which can be distinguished in isolation — in fact, *guṇa* and *doṣa* are properties of figural composition. The *guṇa/doṣa* concept always remained an important component of literary theory but it did not acquire the status of a major literary theory that could account for all the aspects of literary composition.

The theory of propriety or appropriateness (*aucitya*) claims that in all aspects of literary composition, there is the possibility of a perfect, the most appropriate choice — of subject, of ideas, of words, of devices. As such, it has affinities with Longinus's theory of the 'sublime' (*On the Sublime*). The concept of propriety with reference to custom, subject, character and sentiment recurs in almost all theorists and is often discussed in association with figures of speech, *guṇa/doṣa* and *rītis*. Ānadaṅvadhana relates this principle specifically to *rasa* in his *Dhvanāyāloka*. It has been used for propriety in delineating *bhāvas* according to characters, and in the choice of *mārgas* (for example, in the use of compounds, etc.) according to the speaker, content and type of literary composition. Kṣemendra made *aucitya* the central element of literariness. He defines *aucitya* in *Aucityavicāracarcā* as the property of an expression (signifier) being an exact and appropriate analogue of the expressed (signified). This theory also did not prevail as an independent literary theory, but remained with every subsequent theorist an important principle.

There is no model of narrative grammar as such in the tradition, but such a framework can be constructed from different sources – grammar,

philosophy and poetics. The concept of grammar of narrative is well established in modern, western literary theory as a model for analysing the structure of literary content, particularly of prose fiction, and is associated chiefly with the French theoretician Greimas (1971). The term 'grammar' is used here to mean the principles of organisation, the elements of structure and their arrangements. It was developed by extending and reinterpreting the categories of linguistic grammar. The Sanskrit poetics' concept of *mahāvākya* is theoretically a concept of narrative grammar, one that has originated in fact in philosophy. In the Indian tradition, while *pada*, the morphological structure, is the object of study in *vyākaraṇa* (science of grammar), *vākya* (sentence) is the subject-matter of *mīmāṃsā*, a philosophical system dealing with the interpretation of vedic injunctive sentences (*vidhi vākya*). It is understandable that in the course of analysing the meaning of sentences, the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā* should confront questions of larger-than-sentence units, that is, the concept of discourse. *Mīmāṃsā* was the first to use the term *mahāvākya* technically for longer-than-sentence discursal realities. Gradually, it came to be used for units ranging from a collection of a few sentences to the whole epic of *Rāmāyana*. Technically, *mahāvākya* is 'a group of sentences which are interconnected and serve a single purpose or idea'³. It was easy for the poetics to extend the concept of *mahāvākya* to refer to whole literary works, the *kāvya*, themselves. Thus, if the structure of a literary narrative is to be analysed in a grammatical framework, we need to have a grammatical model, and it is logical in the Indian context to

3. 'Mahāvākya Vicāracarcā' (in Sanskrit), K. Subramanyam, Published by the author – Visakhapatnam. 1986.

adopt the Paninean framework which will be a natural fit for Indian habits of thought (Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is a very elaborate grammar, extremely rich in its analytical categories).

The Indian intellectual tradition offers interesting, and to some extent unparalleled, identification of the methods of constituting a rational discourse. This is described literally as the method (*yukti*) of building up a system (*tantra*) of ideas. There is a major text devoted to this subject Neelamedha's *Tantrayuktivicāra*. Kauṭilya devotes the final chapter of his *Arthaśāstra* to describing how he has built up his text — he names thirty-two compositional devices and the list includes such devices as 'statement of reason', 'mention of a fact' 'rejoinder', 'analogy', 'conclusion', 'exception', 'illustration'. This is a system that can be borrowed by the literary analyst to show the compositional structure of a discourse. Like the other Indian theoretical frameworks, this one too is flexible and can be suitably expanded or adopted.

Scholarship in the classical Indian literary theory requires a scholar to belong to one of the 'schools' and to work within its traditions. But the competing schools are built around distinct principles of literariness and analyse literary compositions in the perspectives determined by the respective principles. Thus the *alaṅkāra* school, for example, examines the literary compositions strictly in terms of the figures of speech alone. This is why a need is felt for a composite analytical framework — quite contrary to the insistence in the tradition on a strict adherence to one theory alone. A practical analytical model should be strong enough to investigate all the major dimensions of a literary composition—language, meaning, formal organisation, etc. Such a model shall lean on more than one theory and draw its categories eclectically from as many theories as

need be. One such applicational model available in the tradition is the model of analysis presented by Rājaśekhara in his *Kāvyaśikṣā*. This model is not doctrinaire about the autonomy of a theory. In bare outline this framework covers: narrative–dramatic elements; types of lexis (*padas*, i.e., fully inflected morphological forms); types of sentences; nature of literary meaning; evaluation measure. Rājaśekhara even refers to literary / aesthetic experience that a reader / hearer has when he interacts with a literary composition in any of the various ways, and mentions *rasa* theory as an adequate structure to account for this. Again he eschews details, as *rasa śiddhānta* is the most widely discussed theory in Indian literary tradition. He assumes all its categories as part of his analytical framework.

Indian literary theories are constitutive analyses concerned with how meaning is constituted in a text — they are not interpretive, i.e. they are not concerned with interpretation, which, in the Indian tradition, is the concern of philosophy of language. However, in the context of modern literary concerns, interpretation is central. A powerful system of interpretation has developed in the tradition of philosophic thought and a large body of interpretive (commentary) literature is in existence and Śaṅkara and Śabara were the practicing exegetes. This *śāstra paddhati*, its framework, can be directly employed for literary interpretation. The whole exercise of interpretation resolves in *artha nirdhāraṇa*, the determination of meaning which involves: explication of a clearly worded statement, establishment of meanings of a seemingly clear or of an evidently multivalent statement, determination of the symbolical meaning of a transparent statement, assigning some meaning to opaque statements. The principles and methods of interpretation conceived and sharpened by the vedic exegetes became the foundation of all kinds of exegesis (*kāvya*,

smṛti, vedic) so that there is a common core of methodology to interpret texts of different disciplines. The term for this common core methodology is *śāstra paddhati* which employs ten instruments of interpretation: *śruti* (source text/texts), *smṛti* (philosophical texts), *itihāsa-purāṇa* (history, myth and legend), *sārvabhauma siddhānta* (meta-assumption of the discipline / interpreter), *saṅgati* (coherence—internal and external), *paribhāṣā/nyāya* (metarulas; principles of judgement), *laukikanyāya* (principles of common sense/life), *vyākaraṇa* (grammar), *nirvacana* (etymology), *śabdaśakti* (theory of meaning).

The major aestheticians and poets of this (Indian Aesthetic tradition) are Bharata, Daṇḍin, Ānandavardhana, Śaṅkuka, Bhaṭṭa Lollāṭa, Bhaṭṭa Tauta, Abhinavagupta, Mammaṭa, Viśwanātha Kavirāja, Paṇḍitrāja Jagannātha and others. Jagannātha's *Rasagaṅgādhara* (seventeenth century) can be considered the last important work in this tradition.

The following chart⁴ depicts the major schools, thinkers and the texts of the tradition:

Major schools, thinkers and texts

School	Thinker(s)	Text(s)
<i>Rasa</i>	Bharata Dhanika-Dhanañjaya	<i>Nāṭyaśāstra</i> (second century B.C.) <i>Daśarūpaka</i> (tenth century A.D.)
<i>Alaṅkāra</i>	Bhāmaha Daṇḍin Udbhata Rudraṭa	<i>Kāvyaḷaṅkāra</i> (sixth century A.D.) <i>Kāvyaḷadarśa</i> (seventh century A.D.) <i>Kāvyaḷaṅkārasārasaṅgraha</i> (ninth century A.D.) <i>Kāvyaḷaṅkāra</i> (ninth century A.D.)
<i>Rīti</i>	Vāmana	<i>Kāvyaḷaṅkārasūtra</i> (ninth century A.D.)
<i>Dhvani</i>	Ānandavardhana Abhinavagupta	<i>Dhvanyāloka</i> (ninth century A.D.) <i>Abhinavabhāratī</i> (also for <i>rasa</i> theory) (eleventh century A.D.) and <i>Locana</i> (commentary on <i>Dhvanyāloka</i>) (eleventh century A.D.)

	Mahimabhaṭṭa	<i>Vyaktiviveka</i> (eleventh century A.D.)
<i>Vakrokti</i>	Kuntaka	<i>Vakroktijīvitā</i> (eleventh century A.D.)
<i>Guna-Doṣa</i>	Daṇḍin Also Bhāmaha	<i>Kāvya-darśa</i> (listed above) <i>Kāvya-lamkāra</i> (listed above)
<i>Aucitya</i>	Kṣemendra	<i>Aucityavicāra-carcā</i> (eleventh century A.D.)

Major *saṁgraha* text

Thinker	Text(s)
Rājaśekhara	<i>Kāvya-mīmāṁsā</i> (ninth century A.D.)
Bhojarāja	<i>Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa</i> and <i>Śṛṅgāraprakāśa</i> (eleventh century A.D.)
Mammaṭa	<i>Kāvya-prakāśa</i> (eleventh century A.D.)
Viśwanātha	<i>Sāhityadarpaṇa</i> (fourteenth century A.D.)
Pt. Jagannātha	<i>Rasa-gaṅgādhara</i> (seventeenth century A.D.)

RASA THEORY AS A MODEL OF ANALYSIS:

The *rasa* theory deals with the various *rasas* and their relationship. But, first of all, it is necessary to know what is *rasa*? *Rasa* is a combination of various *bhāvas* like *sthāyībhāva*, *vyabhicārī* or *sañcāribhāva* and *sāttvikabhāva* (emotional states, e.g. permanent, transitory or fleeting); the *vibhāvas* (antecedents) and the *anubhāvas* (consequents). The word '*rasa*' has various connotations like flavour, taste, juice or fluid. It also means aesthetic relish or pleasure. It involves total identification of the perceiver with the work and also transcendence (distancing) from personal prejudices, anxieties etc. Thus, *rasa* according to Abhinavagupta, 'is simply and solely a mental state which is the matter of cognition on the part of a perceiver without obstacles and consisting in

4 'Literary Theory: Indian Conceptual Framework', Kapil Kapoor in collaboration with Nalini M Ratnam, Affiliated East-West Press Limited-Delhi, 1998. p. 14.

relish'⁵. Aesthetic experience or *rasa* involves emotions which are common to all mankind and also the entire literary process from its very conception in the mind of the artist to its final perception in the heart of the perceiver or reader. Also, in it the artist, the work of art or the text as well as the reader or the perceiver all are important, as it is the artist's genius (*pratibhā*) only that leads to an excellent text which has the capacity to transport the essence of aesthetic enjoyment — *rasa*, it is the text in which we see how emotions are suggested through words or actions, and finally, it is the reader who perceives, savours and enjoys. Hence, the ultimate goal of aesthetic experience is a state of bliss, it serves a moral function also by helping one to overcome one's worldly desires and achieve transcendence to a higher level.

There are eight *rasas* as depicted in *Nāṭya Śāstra*. But most scholars are of the view that there is a ninth *rasa* (*śānta rasa*) also which is a later addition. The *rasas* have been classified into two categories: primary and secondary. The primary *rasas* are those from which the secondary *rasas* are derived. Hence, the primary *rasas* are *śṛṅgāra* (erotic), *raudra* (furious), *vīra* (heroic) and *bībhatsa* (disgusting). The secondary *rasas* are *hāsya* (comic), *karuṇa* (compassionate), *adbhuta* (awesome) and *bhayānaka* (terrifying). The ninth *rasa*, i.e. *śānta rasa* is highlighted by Abhinavagupta who suggests that all the other eight *rasas* lead to it.

Śṛṅgāra (erotic) *rasa* focuses almost entirely upon manifestation of the love between man and woman. It ultimately leads to a physical union,

5. 'Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta,' Raniero Gnoli, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office -- Varanasi (India), 1968. p.62.

and also suggests a union that transcends the physical. This *rasa* has been divided into two categories: love-in-union and love-in-separation. These are in fact the two possible conditions in which love can not only be felt, but will also thrive for in the absence of the lover, one will realize how incomplete one's life is, and will also feel the anguish of separation and the desire for union. The first category depicts the intensification of love when the lover and the beloved are together. The second category depicts the reaction of the lover or the beloved in the absence of the loved object. Here, sadness, longing etc, are intermixed with the expectation of future union. Thus, the second category is close to *karuṇa rasa*. But while in *karuṇa rasa* there is no possibility of reunion in love in-separation this possibility is not only present but it is also emphasized.

Karuṇa (compassionate) *rasa* arises from the frustration of an attachment. *Karuṇa rasa* always occupies a secondary position wherever it is depicted in the Indian tradition while *śṛṅgāra rasa* is given maximum importance. The reason is that in the Indian tradition, there are two metaphysical possibilities that participate intensely in the lives of the common men: transmigration of the soul, and the consequences of one's *karma* or good/bad deeds. Thus, evil can never be rewarded. If not in this life, in the next life one will reap the consequences of one's evil acts. Similarly, good, if not now, will certainly be rewarded in the next life. It is thus that the very possibility of tragedy cannot be conceived here, for in a tragedy along with bad, good is also destroyed. So, here the scope for sorrow, horror, rage, etc. are minimal. In the epics, especially in the *Mahābhārata*, all the *rasas* are to be found. But, since the Indian world view is rather optimistic, the *rasas* such as *karuṇa*, *bībhatsa*, *bhayānaka* etc. are not very visible. Since *karuṇa rasa* involves a desire which is refuted, it is closely related to *śṛṅgāra* — for here the absence of the

object of desire is there. Thus, between the two of them *śṛṅgāra* and *karuṇa* exhaust almost all the aspects of love. As, in this refutation, denial or separation there is the possibility of both violence and violation, it is related to both *bībhatsa* and *bhayānaka* where there is a violation or distortion of order and harmony.

The comic or *hāsya rasa* presupposes a state of well-being. Unless one is happy or in a positive state of mind, one cannot appreciate laughter or see anything funny. Since the *rasas* that show the absence of well-being are the following: *raudra*, *bhayānaka* and *bībhatsa* — the comic element is usually absent there. Even so, there is the possibility of fusion of *karuṇa* and *hāsya rasa* — many examples of which can be seen in the west — that can lead to the ‘comedy of the grotesque’. In *bhayānaka* and *bībhatsa* fear and disgust dominate. Hence, comedy does not find any scope in them. But the very structure of these *rasas* is similar to that of *hāsya rasa*. In all three *rasas* there is incongruity: something which is out of ordinary, that is, unusual. Thus, all the three involve a break of harmony and order. But what determines the nature of the *rasas* is the nature of their response and their consequences. If they are harmless, it leads to *hāsya*. On the other hand, if they are such as destroy and deform permanently, the possibilities of *bhayānaka* and *bībhatsa rasas* arise.

Raudra or the furious *rasa* leads to damage and destruction. Thus, in its manifestation, it holds the potential of an intimate relation with *bhayānaka* and its consequences — destruction and devastation — hold the possibility of sorrow. *Raudra* is close to *bhayānaka rasa* as, in both cases, the result is fear. The difference lies in the fact that in the former, the emphasis is on the element of anger, while in the latter, it is the resultant fear or fearsome atmosphere that is the focus of attention.

Besides, *raudra* might have just reason, in which case it fights for good and against evil. But in *bhayānaka* the atmosphere is always negative.

Awesome (*adbhuta*) *rasa* is considered a consequence of the action of *vīra* or the heroic. Heroic actions lead to an admiration for them. Since they are difficult, almost unbelievable, they lead to the experience of the awesome or the wonderful. *Adbhuta rasa* indicates that which surprises in a delightful manner. But it also holds the possibility of seeing supernatural things that are almost frightening. In this way, the element of fear is also contained here. But as wonder dominates over fear it is a positive *rasa*. For this reason, *bhayānaka* and *bībhatsa*, where fear and disgust are central, cannot lead to *adbhuta*. All these three *rasas* have the element of surprise in common. In *adbhuta*, it is of a positive kind. In *bhayānaka* and *bībhatsa*, it is of a negative kind.

In Indian tradition, *vīra* (heroic) *rasa* has always been an important *rasa*. In both the epics (*Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata*), where we see a lot of war and heroic action, it is manifest. Besides, in many of the plays of the Sanskrit dramatist, Bhāsa (fourth century A.D.), they prevail. *Vīra rasa* is not a very complex *rasa*. Here, dynamic energy or *utsāha* is the most dominant emotion. *Raudra* or the furious *rasa* is in most cases an accompaniment of *vīra*. This is so since *vīra rasa* is usually generated against some injustice, where there is the possibility of anger. In this regard, *raudra* and *karuṇa* are very similar, as both can be the result of some deprivation. At a physical level, there can be the deprivation of a hand or a leg or even of life. At material level the deprivation of wealth and at an emotional level, the deprivation of love etc., can also lead to either of these *rasas*. Threatened deprivation and the trauma and insecurity following it can also lead to sorrow or rage. The difference is

that, in *karuṇa*, the result of the deprivation is loss of hope and resignation. In *raudra* it is fury. The former involves a process of acceptance, while the latter involves a fierce reaction of protest and rejection.

As stated in *Nāṭya Śāstra*, *bhayānaka* is the secondary *rasa* which has its source in *bībhatsa* or the disgusting *rasa*. In *bhayānaka* or the terrifying *rasa*, the immediate response is fear. But in *bībhatsa* there is the intermediary step. The first response here is a lack of comprehension, for like *hāsya* it also arises from the incongruous. But as this incongruity is of a negative kind, it is more of a displacement, a substitution of the normal by the abnormal. Thus, the basic difference between these two *rasas* is that in *bhayānaka* fear is what is dominant. But in *bībhatsa* in comprehension lurks everywhere. For example, a dead body gives rise to disgust since it is something we do not understand. At the edge of life it lies like a question mark. It is a distortion of life, and hence disgusting. But the possibility of fear comes from many sources. Apart from the fear of ghosts etc., the other reason for fear is insecurity. A dead body implies that one can die – and is, thus, an implicit threat to existence. Besides, a dead body close by also suggests that whatever caused its death can also threaten one's life. Thus, *bībhatsa* and *bhayānaka* are both life negating and have been neglected everywhere in the ancient literature. It is only with the two World Wars of the twentieth century, that *bībhatsa*, as a dominant force, emerged in literature.

There is a ninth *rasa* also known as *śānta rasa* which has been added later according to most of the scholars of the tradition (Indian). 'Śānta *rasa* has been taught as a means to the highest happiness (*niḥśreyasa*). It arises from a desire to secure the knowledge of the Self

and leads to knowledge of the Truth.⁶ It is a state where one feels the same towards all creatures, where there is no pain, no happiness, no hatred, and no envy. From what we have known about the other eight *rasas*, they are responses of either attraction or repulsion or both. In *śānta*, there is a cessation of all these forces. *Śānta* is, therefore, both similar and different from other eight *rasas*. Abhinavagupta says that all the eight *sthāyībhāvas* or permanent states hold the possibility of the 'perception of truth' (about the real nature of the world) and thus, the possibility of a transcendence. In other words, they lead to the *sthāyībhāva* of *śānta* — *śama* (a state of calm which is the result of the perception of truth). Hence, once the various causes that lead to the various other *rasas* are transcended (overcome or dissolved) a state of bliss is achieved which is *śānta*. In this sense, the experience of *śānta* can be equated to that stage of the *rasa* experience where the self is transcended. For both the creator and the perceiver, thus, *śānta* holds the possibility of *mokṣa* or enlightenment where all the emotions and their causes dissolve.

Before ending this discussion on *rasa*, one point needs to be highlighted: the response to the various *rasas* is two-fold — the response which is depicted inside the text and the response of the reader/perceiver.

In case of *śṛṅgāra*, there is an empathetic response in which the emotion of love is communicated to us. The sense of identification plays a very important role here. In case of *hāsya* the response of laughter is similar to what is being seen. But here, the cause is different. We are

6. 'Śānta Rasa and Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Aesthetics' - Series no-9, Bhandarkar Research Institute- Poona, 1969, p.93

able to laugh only because we are able to alienate or separate ourselves from the object which is the source of mirth. Thus, a certain distancing is involved. Even so, we are not completely alienated since we are also aware of the possibility of ourselves sometimes becoming the object of laughter.

Karuna usually elicits the response of sorrow and compassion in the reader or the perceiver. Yet it can lead to anger if the cause of sorrow can be located and it is evil. Here, both distancing and identification are involved. 'Pity' is an emotion which comes when one can distance oneself from the victim. But if there is feeling of identity, the sorrow will not only be felt but will also be shared by the reader.

In *vīra*, the response is that of *adbhuta*. In the audience or reader, there can be dual response of inspired courage and wonder. If the heroic acts are achievable they lead to a response of wonder. This is a response where distancing is involved. But if it is the heroism of a common man (someone with whom we can identify) then both sympathy and identity will operate. Thus, here is the possibility of inspired courage.

Raudra is a *rasa* which depicts fury — death and devastation. Here, the response inside the text and outside will be similar. If one is involved in the perception of fury, he will respond with bewilderment. But at the end of fury, courage (to avenge some injustice), fear, disgust or sorrow at the waste can arise. *Raudra rasa* can be seen from a position of distance. But if the cause of *raudra* is some injustice, then there will be a sympathetic response of anger.

Adbhuta is a *rasa* where amazing or surprisingly delightful events occur. Here, both inside the text and for the reader, it will be a response of amazement, awe or delight. There is always a space across which one inspects the object of amazement; for amazement is shown when one is incapable of doing the same.

It is similar in case of *bībhatsa rasa*. The disgust generated will or may be manifest both inside the text and in the reader. Since disgust comes from disorder, incomprehension etc., it can only come from a sense of alienation from what is disgusting.

But in *bhayānaka*, though the perception of the terrifying comes from alienation, the response need not be that of fear. In the reader, the response can be that of fear or sadness or even retribution, depending on the nature of the object that is subjected to fear. If one can alienate oneself from the victim of terror (say, a bad man), the response will not be that of fear or sorrow. But one can perceive the terrifying element. If the victim is a man with whom one can sympathize, the response will be that of sorrow and if one can identify oneself with the victim, then he might even feel fear himself.

Thus, the investigator's problem is two-fold: (i) to identify the nature of the aesthetic experience constituted in the text, and (ii) to explicate how the reader / auditor assimilates that experience, how the aesthetic effect gets transferred to the reader. In this context, the tradition points out that there are four epistemic modes of reader/auditor :

(1) *Pratyakṣa* (perception) (2) *Anumiti* (inference) (3) Linguistic theory of meaning (*abhidā*, *bhāvanā*, *bhogakṛtva* – the last responsible for *rasa* experienced). (4) *Śabda* (claimed to be a form of perception).



TH-10506

P2

0,111,1,165:9(RS)

DISS

Thus, regarding this following questions are raised — as to whether *rasa* or the aesthetic experience exists in the character being portrayed (*anukārya*) or the actor (*anukartā*)? Or, does it exist in the viewer/hearer/reader? These questions have been answered by four major commentators or thinkers of the tradition.

According to Lollaṭa Bhaṭṭa, the emotion that a viewer experiences, though primarily and really subsisting in the character (by reason of his having assumed that character and when thus recognized) is *rasa*.

In view of Śaṅkuka, *rasa* is imagined to be subsisting latently in the actor, and even though not really present in him, it is relished by the spectators through their predisposed tendencies.

In the opinion of Bhaṭṭanāyaka, *rasa* is not cognised (inferred), or generated or manifested. In fact, in poetry and drama, words are invested with a peculiar power or potency (*bhavanā*) — different from direct denotation (*abhidhā*) and indirect indication (*lakṣaṇā*) — which generates the *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *sañcārībhāvas*, and thereby presents to consciousness the ‘latent emotion’ (*bhāva*) which then comes to be relished (experienced) by a process of delectation abounding in enlightenment and bliss due to the plenitude of the quality of harmony (*sattva*).

Finally, Abhinavagupta’s position is that the *bhāva* is present in the mind of the spectator in the form of a predisposition. These *bhāvas* that exist in the human hearts in the form of *vāsanās* (*vāsanā*, that which permeates the self) are the *sthāyībhāvas* of literature. The *sthāyībhāvas*

are tendencies or dispositions — *cittavṛttis*. When we recognize these *bhāvas* by means of enlightened bliss in the self (*prakāśamaya ātmānanda*), the very same *bhāvas* are designated as *rasa*.

It would be easier to understand all these views (mentioned above) with the help of a chart:⁷

Rasātmaka bodha / rasa jñāna (literary cognition)

Thinker	Where does <i>rasa</i> exist ?	<i>Rasa jñāna</i> (form of knowledge)	Epistemology	Nature of knowledge	Influenced by which <i>darśana</i>
Lollāta Bhaṭṭa	In <i>anukārya</i> – in Rāma, for example Also through <i>āropa</i> , imposition, in <i>anukartā</i> , the actor	“This Rāma (actor) imbued with <i>rati</i> , love, related to Sītā”.	<i>Pratyakṣa</i> (perception)	Both <i>laukika</i> and <i>alaukika</i> (for absent Sītā)	<i>Mīmāṃsā</i>
Śāṅkuka	In <i>anukārya</i> – but its relish in the <i>sāmājika</i> by <i>anumiti</i> . So in <i>sāmājika</i> as well	“This is Rāma” (on seeing the <i>naṭa</i> , actor)	<i>Anumiti</i> (inference)	<i>Vilakṣaṇa jñāna</i>	<i>Nyāya</i>
Bhaṭṭanāyaka	In <i>sāmājika</i>	“This is <i>nāyaka</i> , this is <i>nāyika</i> ” (generalized cognition devoid of the specificity of <i>Rāmatva/Sītātva</i>)	Linguistic theory of meaning (<i>abhidhā</i> , <i>bhavanā</i> , <i>bhogakṛtva</i> -the last responsible for <i>rasa</i> experienced)	<i>Ātmasākṣātakāra rūpa</i>	<i>Sāṅkhya</i>
Abhinavagupta	In <i>sāmājika</i> ’s <i>cittavṛttis</i>		<i>Śabda</i> (claimed to be a form of perception)	<i>Ātmabodha</i>	(<i>Kashmir</i>) <i>Śaiva</i> (<i>Vedānta</i>)

7. ‘Literary Theory: Indian Conceptual Framework’, Kapil Kapoor in collaboration with Nalini M. Ratnam, Affiliated East-West Press Limited-Delhi, 1998. p. 112.

Thus, I am going to analyse the selected poems of W.B. Yeats in the Indian model, i.e., according to the *rasa* theory in all its detailed sophistication because, processes, assimilation of experience and the transformation of such experience effects in the self. I am using the theory to identify the general emotional response encoded in what the poet records in his poems. In this way, I will explain these poems to the readers from the point of view of the aesthetic effect that these poems have.

CHAPTER 2.
WESTERN AESTHETICS,
COMPARISON OF EASTERN AND
WESTERN AESTHETIC ATTITUDES,
YEATS'S AESTHETICS AND THE
BACKGROUND

WESTERN AESTHETICS:

The history of Aesthetics in the West is very long. It begins from the ancient period with thinkers like Socrates, Plato, Aristotle to the contemporary times consisting of George Lukacs, Lucien Goldmann, M.C. Beardsley, Immanuel Kant, Virgil C. Aldrich. Thus apart from these the other major thinkers of the Western Aesthetic tradition are Lord Shaftesbury (called the father of Modern Aesthetics), Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten, Friedrich Schiller, Thomas Reid, John Dewey, George Dickie, David Hume, Clive Bell etc. The word 'Aesthetics' is derived from the Greek word *Aisthesis* (sense perception) but it is traditionally regarded as a branch of philosophy concerned with the understanding of beauty and its manifestation in art and nature⁸. The importance of art and beauty in our life is due to the reactions created by beautiful and artistic objects on our states of consciousness as well as our emotions. In other words, the experience arising due to the contact between the mind and these objects have a special significance and value for us and it is art and beauty which carries utmost importance for the experience it produces.

This experience can be called 'aesthetic' as it can be distinguished from other experiences on account of some distinct features and characteristics it has. It is not beauty or art alone which can create reactions in the minds, but everything that exists and comes in contact with our mind is bound to give rise to some states of consciousness and feelings in the form of experience. Thus, aesthetic experience is not just

8. 'Aesthetic Theories of India':Vol. 1, Dr. Padma Sudhi, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute-Poona (India), 1983. p. (ii)

any reaction but a very vital experience having its own value and place in life. Something that is beautiful or artistic is a source of aesthetic experience and the gradation of artistically or aesthetically valuable object depends on the extent of the qualitative excellence of the experience itself. This experience can be seen as an impact of some stimuli varying in the degree of delight and excitement caused by the source of experience. The keen interest in the concept of 'aesthetic experience' and the theoretical formulation of the same is a recent phenomenon. But even the ancient Greek thinkers like Plato and Aristotle were aware of the impact of art on our emotions. While Plato held these emotional impacts of art as undesirable, Aristotle elevated them to a healthy cathartic influence and therefore very essential for human welfare. The modern theories about aesthetic experience analyse the concept and phenomenon from different points of view.

Taking into consideration the theories forwarded by different schools of thought in aesthetics from the ancient to the modern times, it can be safely concluded that most of the theories consider both beauty and art as the source of aesthetic experience. There is a tendency to treat the influence of art as almost similar to the influence of beauty and the main feature of aesthetic experience according to these thinkers is the 'disinterested pleasure' that qualifies this experience and makes it typical and different from other experiences. It is this element in aesthetic experience that makes us seek it as an absolute intrinsic value and an end in itself. However, a philosopher like Plato ushers in a dualism between the value of beauty and art and so the influence exerted by them on human minds. He recommends the experience of the sublime beauty as the most precious one and condemns the pleasure of being deceived by art as childish and unworthy. Aristotle does not treat art as 'imitation of

imitation' even though it is basically a mimetic activity. He invests in art the capacity to represent universal truths of life, and so also to bring about catharsis and purification of heart. The tragedy, a form of literary composition and also a stage performance is capable of producing profound emotional responses in the minds of the readers and spectators. The mediaeval philosophers treated beauty in nature as handiwork of God and valued only those arts as sources of aesthetic experience which could give a glimpse of natural beauty. According to this view the beauty of nature constitutes the essence of beauty of art also . The renaissance thinkers revived the Greek ideals of art which epitomise the excellence of form as the highest achievement of art. However, the foundation of modern theory of aesthetic experience was laid in the eighteenth century by Hutcheson in his book *The Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* (1725). This work reveals a shift of emphasis from the objective qualities to the subjective perception and identification of beauty with the understanding of aesthetic experience as 'disinterested pleasure'. The historians attribute this change to the rise of subjectivism in the eighteenth century. The focus of perception is seen to have undergone a transition and beauty is seen as an idea in the mind of a percipient as against the traditional view of treating it as an objective quality. This is responsible for the consequent interest in understanding experience, attitude and general human nature. Clive Bell, the well known art-critic and aesthetician of the nineteenth century asserted with emphasis that it is the 'significant form' of artistic creations which evoked an 'aesthetic emotion' in human minds. The aesthetic emotion which the majestic forms arouse in our mind are powerful and strong responses to the artistic forms distinct from the sensuous pleasure which the beautiful things evoke. Bell, therefore, treats art as the source of aesthetic experience and not beauty which he confines to natural objects

such as flowers, butterflies, birds, faces etc. What man realises in art is not beauty, but a 'significant form' which has the potentiality to overwhelm a spectator in an intense manner. In the present century, most of the aesthetic philosophers treat art as the important source of aesthetic experience. In fact, aesthetics according to them is basically a philosophy of art, and this is established by the authors like I.A. Richards, Beardsley, Stolnitz, Aldrich, Goodman, David Pole and many others. They discuss predominantly all the issues related to art and the experience it can arouse, the requisite attitude and capacity of perception, analysis of the language of aesthetic judgments, postulates and functions of art – criticism and many more problems related to art and aesthetics.

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE AESTHETIC VIEWS OF THE THINKERS OF THE EAST AND THE WEST:

According to Croce (a Western thinker), beauty is not a physical factor nor an intended object but a mental and spiritual activity because aesthetic joy exists in the human beings. He believes that the object of empirical sensations when contacted with the imagination of the artist, is transferred completely in a different form. That form becomes entirely separated from the form which is imitated, and the aspirant during aesthetic experience forgets the dualism in the outer or internal echoes. This transformed ideal or image of experiencing beauty belongs to spiritual concomitant rather than the physical world. Croce negates physical existence of aesthetic object completely. But he accepts the objectivity in experiencing beauty where interdependence of subject is shown. For him, natural beauty is simply a stimulus to aesthetic reproduction, which presupposes previous production without preceding aesthetic intuition of the imagination; nature cannot arouse at all. The

aesthetic fact, therefore, is nothing but form. Croce is very near to the Abhinavagupta's exposition of *rasa* in the Indian aesthetic tradition. Here 'form' is the spiritual activity enlivened by intuition. By the word 'form' it is meant, beauty is a mental fact like Indian views of sheaths of *anna*, *prāṇa* and *manas* which are the mental states of different levels of experiencing aesthetic state. The concept of beauty as described by Croce depends upon aesthetic knowledge and intuition while *rasa* theory is based on emotionalism, *bhūktireva rasa* (Bhaṭṭanāyaka). Croce gives antithesis against Indian views of aesthetic emotions. In spite of aesthetic knowledge, if for beauty, he accepts aesthetic emotions then emotions having two-fold aspects of happiness and sorrow cannot be of the form of aesthetic joy. It will then include the unhappy aesthetic state also. Circumscribing the opinion of Croce in favour of Indian emotional theory of aesthetics, Aristotle says that a tragedy effects a purgation of the feelings of piety and terror and lifts us freer of these emotions in our daily life. Croce describes the Indian factors of poetics where generalisation or impersonalization by suggestive power of word and sense is mentioned. The emotion is suggested, which is the source of relish, is also generalised; the love of Rāma and Sītā becomes love in general, and it is possible for the reader to relish the emotion in this generalized form, for its impression is already latent in his mind. The emotion (*bhāva*) is generalized into a sentiment (*rasa*) which can be relished by all persons of similar sensibility.

Poetical pathos arouses pain in the reader if emotions are considered in the opinion of Croce and even in Indian poetics *karuṇa* is termed as *rasa*. The relish of *rasa* is supposed to be an extraordinary bliss, dissociated from personal interest and not be likened to ordinary pleasure and pain in which personal or egoistic impulses predominate.

The mind is so entirely lost in its contemplation that even when the sentiment of grief or horror is relished in such a state pain is never felt, and even when felt it is a pleasurable pain. Jagannātha in this connection remarked that the shedding of tears and the like are due to the nature of the experience of particular pleasure, and not of pain, like tears of devotee on listening to a description of the deity, there is no feeling of pain. The poet Percy Bysshe Shelley was also of the view that sympathy in tragic fiction depends upon the principle that tragedy delights by affording a shadow of that pleasure which exists in pain. This is the source of melancholy which is inseparable from the sweetest melody. The pleasure that is in sorrow is sweeter than the pleasure of pleasure itself. Here the word 'pleasure' gives the idea of aesthetic hedonism rather than the Indian aesthetic spiritualism. Even sentiment of pathos or compassion gives aesthetic enjoyment as theorists of Indian poetics established which is not based upon hedonism. Actually sorrow and happiness both are the tendencies (*vṛttis*) where consciousness exists in both of them. While these two tendencies become aesthetic intuition as a latent impression of potential memory or *sthāyībhāva*, only then one can relish the spiritual state of aesthetic relishment. *Rasa* is not merely a highly pitched natural feeling or mood, it indicates pure intuition which is distinct from an empirical feeling. *Laukika vibhāva* which are the causes of pain in the world as subject feels, when they are represented in the dramatic piece of a writer, because of their extraordinary representation become *alaukika-vibhāvas*, and from them only pleasure ensues. Unlike *vibhāva*, which are founded by the grammarians as *sthāyībhāvas*, never reach the height of *rasa* as they always exist in their empirical state. It is only when aesthetic intuition is suggested then this suggestion of poet's creation creates *alaukika* sentiment in *sahṛdaya* through universal sympathy. The essence of *rasa*, therefore consists in

its *āsvāda* or *carvaṇā* which is *alaukika*, being inconceivable by the ordinary process of knowledge. Only the authority is one whose mind is capable of flawless imagination which can engross itself in total absorption in the poetic creation.

There are many Western thinkers who give importance to aesthetic intuition related to Pure Consciousness or God. Three epithets attributed to God or personal God which are *Sat*, *Cit* and *Ānanda*, are the counterparts of intuition, ethics and aesthetics. The last, that is, aesthetics deals with aesthetic intuition and ethical beauty also. German philosopher Immanuel Kant, great thinkers viz. Socrates, Plato, Tolstoy, Ruskin, Shaftesbury, Schiller, Thomas Reid, etc. expose light into the spiritual aesthetical intuition. Socrates spontaneously expresses, ‘pray thee God, that I may be beautiful within.’ Socrates prays to God for internal beauty. If he experiences the beauty within, he shall get into the beauty in whole creation like Vedic seers. But with the condition if internally he possesses aesthetic intuition mentioned by, Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Mammaṭa Viśwanātha, and Jagannātha as *sahṛdayatā*, *sacetasām*, *sāmājika* or *ratyādinā*.. etc., one has to become connoisseur to participate in the consensus of minds and has to perceive the natural appropriateness of what is represented. The mind of such person becomes lucidly receptive like a mirror through effort and constant practice of poetry. Again, where Socrates finds beauty in the subject itself in the form of inner beauty, Plato talks about objective beauty in morality or inner qualities of a man which are proportionate to the outer physical beauty of a person. His opinion is that the most natural beauty in the world is honesty and moral truth—true features make the beauty of the face; true proportions, the beauty of architecture; true measures, the beauty of harmony and music. The word ‘true’ or ‘truth’ implies the meaning of the

word *satyam* in the *Ṛgveda*. The truth is the universal to enjoy aesthetic intuition. To achieve aesthetic state one should be truthful which is an ethical quality. Truth always brings utility of purpose, perfect knowledge of the human heart. Ethical beauty has characteristics of harmony and proportions.

Anthony Ashley Cooper Shaftesbury takes one sided principle of beauty while he explores that the most natural beauty in the world is honesty and moral truth --- true features make the beauty of the face; true proportions, the beauty of architecture; true measures, the beauty of harmony (just like Plato). Also, Shaftesbury echoed the concept of propriety with Ānandavardhana and Kṣemendra in their thesis of the theory of *aucitya*. Kṣemendra took only rhetorical views while discussing *aucitya*, but Shaftesbury tried to direct his views for all the fine arts. Kṣemendra touches only external components such as the application of the principle of propriety to the various points in a poem such as a word, a sentence, the subject matter, the speaker, the time and place, the qualities, the poetic figures, the underlying sentiment, the employment of the verb, proposition, adjectives and particles, the use of case, number, and gender and so forth. His theory of *aucitya* is complimentary to the theory of *Dhvani* by Ānandavardhana. In his *Dhvanyāloka*, Ānandavardhana puts the question (as later on readdressed by Kṣemendra also) in the foundation of the essence of *Rasa* before himself that there is no other circumstance which leads to the violation of *Rasa* than impropriety. Ānandavardhana took *aucitya* with reference to the theory of *Rasa* and *Dhvani*, and he treated it with internal application in poetry. Like Ānandavardhana, Shaftesbury cared for harmony in beauty which only deals with the depth or internalization.

Like Vedantist, Hartmann believes in the transformation of body and soul, from consciousness to unconscious state. Becoming more and more conscious means to be away more and more from essence, and to be nearer to a materialistic life. Our instincts are rooted in the unconscious (or *Jīvātma* of Vedānta) which enjoys beauty of creation. This unconsciousness is the source of all material creation. This unconsciousness is the source of all material creation. It secures the least possible amount of evil and the greatest possible amount of good. Suffering in the form of evil arisen from our conscious state of the evolution of creation are the instrument of man's salvation. Through it, the unconscious expiates the crime of willing to exist (*videhamukti*). Then there is no more consciousness, no more pain, no more existence, and the unconscious enters once more into the bliss of attainment. Hartmann uses the sufferings of the world as a means for the attainment of experiencing the aesthetic bliss. An artist like an unconscious being enters into the material of art and uses it fullest in displaying the culmination of aesthetic bliss then again absorbs himself in which it dwelt before the foundation of the world. So the unconscious is the enjoyer of the material he has created while forming the world. This material if it is enjoyed by the unconscious being, brings more bliss and more aesthetic taste rather than the conscious state of the existence. The unconscious and the conscious in the form of material world are two inseparable things like *ātman* and *māyā*. But the unconscious is the enjoyer and the conscious is the enjoyed. That enjoyed has instincts which spring up in the form of happiness or sorrow. Thus Hartmann like an Indian philosopher takes into the account the *samādhi* state in the *alaukika* creation of artistic beauty.

Scott philosopher Thomas Reid (1710-1796) divided human nature into a rational half and a half composed of habits, appetites, desires and

affections. The reason decides what ends we ought to pursue, and should devise the means for securing them. Knowledge alone can tell us what is good. To know the good or beauty is to desire them. We have an intuition of right and wrong and this intuition is sufficient to motivate us toward right action. The emotion accompanying such intuition is one of sympathy and benevolence towards good men. The mind does not proceed to construct a world out of sense data by introducing relations among them; the world it first meets is an already constructed world, outfitted with relations and connections, towards which its primitive reaction is not one of perception but one of judgement about perceptions. He experiences the causal connection between two events just as directly he experiences them. The suggestions which thinking and perceiving carry with them, that there are a thinker and an external object thought about, are just as integral a part of experience as the sense-impressions from which these suggestions emanate. Mind according to Reid, the rational half constitutes knowledge and intuition while other half which is known as emotions of desire, appetite and affections is nothing more than the previous impressions in the form of *sthāyībhāva* in a person, and the suggestions are the integral part of a thinker who builds by his thinking and perception previously experienced. Already constructed world gives the power of suggestions as well as it conforms later experiences of a person as a guide to the emotional world. The intuition or the knowledge of these experience, takes us into the depth of experiencing, good or beauty. Reid is very close to the Vedantic concept of *samskāras* which according to him is the will of the *sahrdaya*.

In Western literature as in Classical Sanskrit literature also, poets defined the beautiful, then laid down the principles in their preface and originated the literature only after a preconceived system. Though

Sanskrit poets do not formulate the rules for it, they believe in the rules laid down by great poeticians who proceeded them with their respective individual modification. Bharata, as a founder of aesthetic rules and the latter rhetoricians who improvised and elaborated the task with the help of philosophical and logical systems, by them, metaphysics is absorbed in the literature in such a way that without it the concept of beauty is null and void. In Western literature, on the threshold, it had planted aesthetics while the ascendancy of metaphysics was much more visible only in the middle of its advent than on its threshold. It happened when German poet Goethe, the father and promoter of all lofty modern ideas at once sceptical pantheistic and mystic wrote in '*Faust*', the epic of the age and the history of the human mind. Coleridge is theologian and dreamy poet passed on his spiritual poetry to Wordsworth, Byron and Shelley.

To Wordsworth, objects move in themselves without dreaming of clothing them in a beautiful style, conventional language, and poetic diction, noble words and scholastic and courtly epithets and all the pomp of factitious splendour which the Classical Western writers thought themselves bound to assume and justified in imposing, were neglected by Wordsworth. According to him in poetry as elsewhere the grand question is, not ornament, but truth. It is the truth of sentiment not the dignity of folks which makes the beauty of a subject, it is the truth of sentiments not dignity of the words, which makes the beauty of poetry. Wordsworth classifies his poems according to the different faculties of men and the different stages of life, undertakes to lead us through all compartments and degree of inner education to the convictions and sentiments which he has himself attained. Wordsworth has philosophical mental-level with which his reader should co-ordinate. His images in the poetry do not admit the restriction of rules of poetics and rhetorics. He takes for himself

the aesthetic relish in his own compositions. He wants complete freedom and inner moral personality while he writes something. Wordsworth did not accept conventional or natural laws except his spiritual enjoyment as the output of his poetry. Dhanañjaya in his *Daśarūpaka* — clearly stated that nothing of the world is here which is not exposed to poetry. Everything can be composed of poetry but with the condition of aesthetic taste. Briefly, everything in this world can be transformed into aesthetic joy in a poetry. This is what is done by Wordsworth.

YEATS'S AESTHETICS AND THE BACKGROUND:

William Butler Yeats was a versatile writer, specifically, a poet of twentieth century. He wrote poems prose, plays, criticism (critical works) etc. Yeats belonged to Ireland. After a period of darkness Ireland saw what is called Celtic revival. He was a part of Irish revival. Irish revival was divided into two parts. Firstly, the revival of ancient culture, i.e. revival of folk art — folk music, dance, drama etc. Secondly, the revival of Irish culture as a whole, i.e. the way the people spoke and lived. He was interested in the revival of Celtic poetry and drama which were based on folk art. He used his poetry to revive Irish legends, folk lore, myths and tales of heroism; in this way to make Irish poets conscious of their past. He also believed that there can be no great nationality without great literature. His interest in Irish folk lore, its myths and legends was due to three prominent reasons. It was in reaction against both scientific rationalism which had all but destroyed the simple religion of the people and had left them on an unchartered sea of scepticism and moral vacuum or cynicism — also levelling down process (rather than levelling up) of democracy. In a way, he hated both science and democracy.

Just like T.S. Eliot, Yeats too was critical of scientific thought which had almost banished God from the world leaving human life fragmented, barren and impersonal. But while Eliot felt the need of some kind of spiritual discipline, especially, that of Roman Catholicism and to be more precise Anglo-Catholicism, Yeats looked back to feudalism. To him feudalism symbolised the unity of life which he calls the unity of being, i.e. total harmony between thought, word and deed. This we see in the choice of Byzantium civilization and culture. He was against democracy. Democracy in his view has been a process of levelling down, the king and the commoner have been put on the same pedestal. It had also destroyed the dignity, nobility and the aristocracy of the feudal society or life. Feudalism was upholding the purity and the grandeur of human life. In this respect, he was very much a conservative and a reactionary. The destruction of feudalism by the modern democratic and rationalistic civilization and culture would mean downgrading of high culture and high artistic values. He strongly believed in the landed gentry or Aristocracy. He had a temperamental distrust of scientific thought. Scientific thought had bred the idea of democracy as well as the idea of socialism as propounded by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in Germany and by J.S. Mill and Bentham in England. The humanitarian spirit was in the air. The sight of the suffering people had deeply moved and stirred the minds and hearts of the thinkers as well as the social reformers. The poor masses had to be uplifted. They should be given their rightful place in society. In this way, the biblical idea and the ideal of the dignity of man could be put into practice.

Scientific thought had also helped in the creation of the climate of scepticism. Serious doubts had been cast on the religious system of beliefs. In a way, Charles Darwin had thrown the first stone. His

researches and discoveries showed that man was not created by God about four thousand years ago. But man was a product of evolutionary forces or process of evolution. Thus, religion was under shadow.

Yeats had no faith in the denominational or institutionalized religion like Christianity. He did come under the influence of Hinduism through a paṇḍit. He studied Vedānta also. But then as G.S.Fraser says that he developed a system of magic which was a combination of primitive science and primitive magic (from the book *Modern Writer and the World*). But Yeats was fascinated by Catholicism because it involved many beautiful rituals and ceremonies. He sought the help of Cabalistic and Rosicrucian systems of magical rituals. His system of philosophy and thought of communicating with the dead. His wife had a knack of automatic writing. She also used to act as a 'medium'. The spirits of the dead entered her body and mind and dictated poems or their subject or a number of images. According to Jeffares, in fact, these images were culled from the folk art. Others believed that Yeats's own mind was filled with folk images. There was a third school which argues that the truth lies in between. Yeats shared the Jungian position that the Unconscious part of the mind had a reservoir of racial memories which the poet called the Great Memory or Jung called it the Collective Unconscious. These images that were supposed to have been dictated by the spirits had really come from the reservoir of the Collective Unconscious. During certain times a stirring takes place in the reservoir and these images are thrown up.

Yeats was a poet of symbols par excellence. He was influenced by symbolists like Mallarme, Baudelaire, William Blake (a symbolist and a mystic) and his reading of Blake encouraged his mystical interest. Yeats

mainly made use of personal symbols in his poetry. He used symbols like 'rose' or 'wind'. 'Rose', for example, can be both personal and traditional. Traditionally, rose stands for passion and love as well as for Virgin Mary. Rose also stands for Absolute Beauty and it evokes a sense of suffering, a nostalgia for something unattainable. Particular moods of the poet's consciousness are personified and given Irish names. Hanrahan, Robartes are used as symbols to express the poet's own love, pain and suffering. So also is wanderings of Oisín. Maud Gonne, for whom Yeats had a violent unrequited passion, stands often for Beauty that is unattainable. Byzantium stands for a world of timeless impersonal beauty of art to which the poet seeks to escape the rigours and futility of old age. The shadowy horses and the defeated Gaelic gods are creatures of imagination imbued with personal meaning and significance.

G.S. Fraser sums up Yeats's views of history, 'it is a fated and eternally recurrent pattern in which like actors we must again and again play the particular parts assigned to us. The great thing is that, however painful our part may be, we should play it with style: 'Hamlet' and 'Lear', said Yeats, are gay' (*Modern Writer and the World*). Yeats had a temperament of a passionate lust for life and another for the contemplative immortality of a pure withdrawn spirit. It was his occult philosophy of history that reconciled these two aspects. He saw death first as the road to another kind of life of contemplative wisdom, but ultimately as the road back, through returning wheel, to our own life here. He also referred to history, containing the rise and fall of civilizations. He believed the nature of civilization changes from time to time. To explain this he posited a system of gyres and cones. A civilization begins at a particular moment. It is a moment of revelation. The gyres turn and return, now narrowing, now broadening or as one broadens, another gyre or

gyre within gyre narrows. At first it is narrow like the top of a cone. Then it widens, dissipating its energy. Then an opposition revelation begins another civilization. He has carefully worked out the pattern of double interpenetrating gyres. All this is powerfully expounded in the poem 'The Second Coming'.

Walter Pater was a critic of later part of the eighteenth century and early part of the nineteenth century. According to Walter Pater the purpose of life is to burn with a gem like flame. In him, flowered what we might call the cult of Aestheticism. Walter Pater was an Aesthete. He laid emphasis on the form of literature rather than on the subject. Yeats was least concerned with the sufferings of humanity. Yeats was more or less confined to the world of Beauty. But he did not hear like Wordsworth 'the still sad music of humanity'. Unlike Keats he did not realise 'the misery of the world is misery' (Keats in *Hyperion*). Yeats was the last of Romantics but his Romanticism is very much limited like those of Walter Pater and his followers. Having ignored the humanity at large or at least being grandly aloof or even indifferent to the human suffering meant that Yeats as David Daiches and Peter Ure have remarked had ignored a large part of his own experience. Yeats also tried to escape from the world of reality (e.g. industrialization, democratization) and problems of life, especially, old age. Wordsworth said, 'Have I no reason to lament what man has made of man'. Keats said, 'Where but to think is to be full of sorrow' (*Ode to Nightingale*). Yeats hated realism. For Yeats, as for the Romantic poets he loved, there were two chief species of art: one mimetic and factual, the other subjective, luminous; one the mirror, the other the lamp.

Much of the advanced contemporary poetry of Yeats's youth (such as that of Oscar Wilde and Arthur Symons) was influenced by Whistler and by French impressionistic painting. Yeats, then, found himself in a world where art was smear or blur and politics and society were wax and he countered them by striving towards hardness, purity, definition. As a poet, Yeats hoped to subvert a language created for the description of the everyday world, in order to embody visions of the extraterrestrial. The mirror of his art must not merely reflect, but kindle, start to burn with images hitherto unseen. Yeats's poetry shows a lifelong search for such images which were not reflections but illuminations. He sought them in translations of old Irish myths. He sought them in fairy-tales told by Irish peasants — he heard many as a boy, when his family spent summers in Sligo, in the far west of Ireland, and later he made a systematic investigation of folk-beliefs. He sought them in seances, alchemical research, spiritualistic societies, telepathic experimentation, hashish-dreams, and meditations on symbols. When old, he sought them in philosophy, from Plato to Berkeley to the Indian Upanishads. As he contemplated these multifarious sources of transcendental images, he came to the conclusion that there was in fact one source a universal warehouse of images that he called the Anima Mundi, the Soul of the world. Each human soul could attune itself to revelation, to miracle, because each partook in the world's general soul. Most of us had blinded our spiritual eyes, in order to maintain our little privacies, in order to be disturbed by truths that violated logic and the evidence of the five senses; but the real principles that governed life. Yeats tried to discipline his imagination, to cultivate a detachment from the normal world, to smooth and to empty his mind until it could flame with images from the world beyond our own. He favoured images of extravagance. He assumed that the world of experience comprises puny, deformed, incomplete, perishing

things; whereas the world of imagination comprises things that are exclusive, immeasurable, autonomous and triumphant. The young Yeats thought that modern art had triumphed by a steady emptying of its contents. He believed that Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning had all erred by over inclusion — by trying to absorb into their work science, politics, philosophy, ethics, until their poems became hopelessly heavy, distended. By contrast Yeats announced (in 1898, in *The Autumn of the Body*) that he belonged to a movement, including D.G Rosseti and Mallarme, that worked towards disembodiment and purity. Yeats wanted to make his own art kinesthetic, carnal, and to esteem its bodily potency more than its beauty. Far from banishing the sensations of the flesh, his later work seems to appeal to the whole inner whorl of the body's nerves:

O body swayed to music, O brightening glance,
How can we know the dancer from the dance?

(Among School Children)

As Yeats grew older, he wanted to realize divinity less in hunted and moody landscapes than in himself — and in a few other select human images. His poetry has an unusually restricted cast of character. It is rich in dead people: dead poets (Lionel Johnson, Ernest Dowson, John Synge), dead relatives (George and Alfred Pollexfen), dead friends (Robert Gregory and MacGregor Mathers), dead warriors (those executed in the 1916 Easter rebellion), and beautiful dead women (Florence Farr, Eva Gore-Booth and Con Markiewicz) —as if in death the soul became fit for refashioning with a verbal body. Among the living, there are three people who predominate in Yeats's poetry : Maud Gonne, Iseult Gonne, Georgie Hyde-Lees.

Yeats as a man and as poet, was unusually afraid of incoherence, the sensation of being soft wax; and such images as the golden bird in this

famous poem *Sailing to Byzantium* (written in 1926) offer an aesthetic refuge from the shapelessness of commonplace life:

‘Once out of nature I shall never take
My bodily form from any natural thing,
But such a form as Grecian goldsmiths make
Of hammered gold and gold enamelling
To keep a drowsy Emperor awake...’

In 1906, Yeats described the evolution of his art as a turning-away from his ordinary self. It is important to note that, for Yeats, Art is not self expression — the self is too shifty, evanescent but a search for impersonal beauty. Also, Yeats’s double gyre shows the dynamic of human personality. In Western philosophy, most models of the psyche are dualistic-based on the conflict of two principles. In Freudian psychology, for example, the id (undifferentiated lust and greed) is hampered or channelled by the superego (conscience, internalized restriction of conduct). Yeats’s model is equally dualistic, and the two opposing principles that tug at us, vex us, almost tear us in two, he called the subjective (or antithetical), and the objective (or primary). Yeats’s simplest formulation of the opposition is as follows: ‘the primary is that which serves, the antithetical is that which creates’⁹.

Therefore the two basic drives of mankind are the urge to fantasize, to wish, to gratify wishes, and the urge to rest content in received reality. The balance between these competing urges describes the identity of each of us. It is noteworthy that Yeats defines both human identity and human history with terms derived from literary criticism and art criticism. The

9. ‘W.B.Yeats: The Poems’, ed. by Daniel Albright, J.M.Dent & sons Ltd.-London. 1990. p. (XXXIX).

terms subjective and objective seem to come from Browning's essay on Shelley (1852), which describes literary history as a cyclical pattern: heaves of creative energy from subjective artists (such as Shelley) overturn established concepts, seize the world's imagination, are particularized and elaborated by objective artists, finally decay into stock truths, until some new subjective visionary appears to refresh the world's image of itself.

Yeats believed that the artistic faculties were fundamental to mankind. His poetry continually strives to embody the processes through which the imagination receives images, as if a poem could be a funnel delivering symbols from Anima Mundi. Sometimes Yeats even tried to make his poems literal constrictions of the gyres — as in *A Dialogue of Self and Soul*, where the antithetical gains strength in exact measure as the primary grows feeble. It might even be said that Yeats managed to establish his household inside a gyre, for (as he shows in 'Blood and the Moon') the tower where he lived, Thoor Ballylee, had a winding staircase easy to see as a reification of the spiral motion that governs all things. Yeats wished to facilitate the transit of images to him, by all means available from philosophy, poetry, and domestic architecture.

Thus, all this depicts Yeats's views on art, philosophy and to some extent on aesthetics. Also, Yeatsian poetry shows a great change and development in his personality (both mental and spiritual). His earlier poetry was more passionate while the later poems were more mature, philosophic and dealt with the basic questions of life, death and existence. Yeats wanted to escape from an inadequate world — escape from nature, society, history and from his own self; in pursuit of Eternal Beauty that lies beyond, he immersed himself in dreams of supernatural splendour, he

drivelled in an austere and symbolical tower and tried to transmute himself to metal or stone, in order to assume a permanence equal to that of the beauty he sought; but in the end (as in *The Circus Animals Disertion*) he found that what he has painfully sought, what he has painstakingly constructed is nothing but an image of his own simple perishing face.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF THE POEMS IN THE

INDIAN MODEL

WHAT IS AESTHETIC ANALYSIS OR AESTHETIC JUDGEMENT? :

The world is full of things and objects, both natural and man-made, which attract our senses and mind. The reactions produced by these objects on our perceptual and emotional faculties are called aesthetic experiences. The linguistic expression of these experiences and the statements made about the objects of such experiences are called aesthetic judgements. These statements constitute certain type of language used in the context of beauty and art. Also, they (the statements) bring out the aesthetic effect or delight inherent in the work of art as well as provide aesthetic delight or *ānanda* to the readers/auditors. Aesthetic judgements are called aesthetic only because they are an expression of how the things appear to us, i.e. whether they have impressive perceptible qualities or not. In other words, whether they are beautiful, attractive, pretty, graceful, meaningful, grand, sublime etc. Also, whether they create certain *bhāvas* (emotions) or *rasas* (aesthetic experiences) like that of pity, horror, wonder, anger, etc. or not. The other statements unfolding information which is historical, geographical, sociological, religious, etc. are definitely important in their respective fields, but they have no relevance to the aesthetic aspects of the object. The aesthetic judgements, according to Hume are statements which express human tastes. So also Kant considers these statements as 'judgements of taste' implying thereby the feeling of pleasure and disinterested delight associated with the experience of the beautiful. The pleasure belongs to the feeling mind and not the object.

Now, it also becomes necessary to clarify how different people react to a piece of art (be it a poem or a painting) and analyse/give judgements in a different manner, for example, a layman, an art-critic or a

philosopher. A **common man** uses certain language to express his appreciation of beauty and art. This language is an expression of his praise and delight and so also other feelings evoked by art objects or beautiful things. He may express his feelings and emotions by using such words as pretty, marvellous, charming or simply great. He is least concerned about the controversy raised in this context, i.e. the question whether these terms are subjective and objective, what exactly is the difference between the subjective and objective language, whether he can define the meanings of the terms which he uses while praising an object and so on. He plays the role of a simple appreciator without involving himself in the battle of wits. Whichever terms and language are in usage suit his purpose for expressing his appreciation, and he does not burden his mind with the responsibility of analysing the meaning of the words which he uses. On the other hand, an **art-critic** claims himself to be an expert in the field of art which he undertakes to evaluate. Not only this, he is also capable of understanding the techniques used by particular artists. He describes and highlights the special features of the art-objects, and passes judgements on the success and failure of the artists in realising their intentions, and also the techniques and symbols they use to manifest their visions. His judgements are thus both descriptive statements trying to interpret the symbols and special features of the work of art and also evaluation of works of art in terms of the responses they evoke. He evaluates a work of art by taking into consideration his imaginative and creative power as manifested in the forms, contents and styles used by the artists. He also gives stress to the impacts the art-objects make on the sensibilities and emotions of the viewers. The **philosopher** is not directly concerned with particular works of art. His concern is with the method of criticism and evaluation of the artistic creations. In a way, the job of the critic is complementary, to the job of the philosopher. The philosopher

makes generalisations about art which makes it easy for the critic to identify works of art as distinct objects so also the criteria for determining the artistic values of the work. The critic himself does not define art nor the values on the basis of which he has to pass the judgements. It is only at the philosophical level that values can be determined. The language of the critic is also pruned and evaluated by the philosopher who is particularly interested in the linguistic approach to aesthetics. The art-critic is a person who is very closely connected with concrete works of arts and hence in a position to state with authority the facts concerning the creation of works of art and the specific effects these words can bring about on the sensibilities and feelings of the recipients. The conclusions of the art-critics can be useful in substantiating the general principles which the philosopher discovers. But the art-critic himself cannot ascertain the validity of the postulates implied in his job. Thus the metamorphosis of the philosophy of art takes in the form of the 'critique of criticism' at one stage of its development. This happens when the aesthetic judgements and the principles presupposed in passing these judgements by the art-critic become the subject-matter of philosophical discourse.

As far as I am concerned, I am going to analyse some selected poems of W.B. Yeats according to the *rasa* theory. I am going to study and analyse the properties of words and language not only to convey direct meanings but also the most complex of human emotions. Also, I am going to bring out the various *bhāvas* and *rasas* (as that of pity, fear, surprise, anger, disgust etc.) inherent in these poems. Thus, the ultimate aim will be to get aesthetic delight (*ānanda*) which these poems embody.

ANALYSIS OF THE POEMS IN THE INDIAN MODEL:

First of all, I am going to take up W.B. Yeats's one of the most celebrated poem *The Second Coming*. First published in 1920 in '*The Dial*' it is a terrible but richly evocative, prophetic poem. Yeats believed that the present day civilization inaugurated by the birth of Jesus was now coming to an end. Here Yeats refers to a system of double gyre, the apex of the one touching the base of the other. Each gyre is like a spool with thread wound round it. As one narrows, the other widens. Each cycle of these gyres contain in itself two smaller cycles of a thousand years, the total being two thousand years. The present cycle with Christ at its apex was tender, poetic, feminine tending towards self-realisation. The other would be marked by hardened sensibility, scientific, masculine and barbarous violence. 'Turning and turning' the repetition suggests inexorable movement and then its increasing uncontrollability. Things are already predetermined. Now the falcon cannot hear the falconer, the first symbolising Intellect and falconer the Soul, or may be the world and God. People in general have become atheistic or cynical. Thus the circumference is gradually widening, so even the centre cannot hold. It can mean body with its lust and sordid passion has lost touch with the guiding Soul. Forces of disorder and disruption are erupting. Yeats probably had in mind the Irish unrest and Bolshevik revolution. There is bloodshed everywhere. The ceremony of innocence is drowned. Yeats valued ceremony very highly. He refers to this word in *A Prayer for My Daughter* also. Ceremony is a part of time sanctified and part of life of aristocracy of old and noble values. Innocence alone opposes all the sexual and social violence symbolised by the blood-dimmed tide, says John Unterecker. Also, the best of men are without any firm faith or trust in any time-honoured truth or set of truths. They are wavering all the time

between one faith and another and sometimes no faith. But the worst kind of people are determined to achieve their aims and objectives, be they wicked and evil by all means, no matter how foul. Thus, surely the second coming is imminent. A barbarous, inhuman monster personified by the 'rough beast' is about to take over. Yeats uses terrible images to suggest it. Somewhere in the desert indicates something sinister and diabolic. The gaze of the beast is 'blank' as if death itself and is also 'pitiless'. It is slouching, back-bent, moving its slow 'thighs'. It is going towards Bethlehem where Christ was born --- this is a terrible irony. The birds are wheeling around it. They also have the ominous aspects of birds of prey. Thus, the new age would be the doom of the Christian era. As A.G. Stock says, 'the poem has the very force of prophecy'. C.H. Bowra sees it as an example of Yeats's expression of a vision.

The first stanza suggests disintegration, disorder and lack of harmony which is evident from the images of turning and widening gyre, things falling apart, centre not holding, etc. Also, the images, e.g. as that of 'blood-dimmed tide' depicts fear and horror. Thus, all these images together evoke the *bhayānaka* (terrifying) *rasa* as well as the *bībhatsa* or the disgusting *rasa*. *Bhayānaka* is the secondary *rasa* and has its source in the *bībhatsa rasa*. In the former, the immediate response is of terror, while in the latter the first response is of incongruity and lack of comprehension. But as this incongruity is of a negative kind, it is more of a displacement a substitution of the normal by the abnormal. These images give rise to disgust as they are unusual, abnormal and something which we do not understand. Also, they depict fear because they are a threat to our life, existence and security. Thus, they imply death and also that whatever is happening (e.g. bloodshed, violence, barbarity etc.) may

happen to us. Hence, both *bhayānaka* and *bībhatsa rasa* show distortion (of life) and are life negating.

In the second stanza, the images of the rough beast slouching towards Bethlehem, a shape with lion body with the head of a man as well as with a gaze blank and pitiless, indignant desert birds, etc. are all sinister and blood-curdling images; and so they give rise to fear and disgust (lack of comprehension). The images in this stanza also give rise to awe and wonder as the sight of these images are uncommon, unusual and unnatural. In fact, these can be considered as supernatural images which are frightening and surprising. Thus, once again the *bhayānaka*, *bībhatsa* and *adbhuta* (awesome) *rasas* are evoked. All these three *rasas* have the element of surprise in common. In *adbhuta*, it is of a positive kind as wonder dominates fear. In *bhayānaka* and *bībhatsa*, it is of negative kind. Also, the very title of the poem *The Second Coming* as well as the lines,

‘Surely some revelation is at hand;

Surely the Second Coming is at hand...’

suggest that something marvellous or wonderful is going to happen. Though, these lines may also indicate towards something very frightening, terrifying and evil. Thus, the poem basically consists of three *rasas*, i.e. the *bhayānaka*, *bībhatsa* and the *adbhuta*. On reading this poem, the readers are at once filled with the feelings or *bhāvas* of fear, surprise, perplexity.

Yeats’s other great poem is *Sailing to Byzantium* composed in 1928. It is the first poem in the volume entitled *The Tower*. The theme of the poem is the attempt to escape from old age and decay by escaping altogether from the world of biological change into the timeless world of

art, symbolised by Byzantium. Images of breeding growth, change and death give way in sailing to images of a world of artefacts 'Of hammered gold and gold enamelling'. But the sense of loss is there, the golden bough may be changeless but it is not real tree. One may compare it with Keats's Grecian urn. It is also timeless, after all, 'Cold Pastoral'. Art is after all nourished by the very world of growth and change. Byzantium itself is a legendary city or state. As Yeats himself has said that in early Byzantium, may be never before or since in recorded history, religious, aesthetic and practical life were one. The architect and artefacts, the painter, the mosaic worker, the worker in gold and silver, the illuminator of sacred books had created impersonal art. Thus, the ideal of Unity of Being was realised. Poets probably had no place, for language became instrument of controversy and had grown abstract. By contrast, modern life is fragmented and art has grown personal, too personal. Wilson says, Byzantium 'is a country of the mind', a city outside time and Nature, a retreat from the process of ageing and decaying. It marks a change from a mentality which values the pleasures of sexuality to one which values the things of the mind. The poem is based on contrasts and paradoxes — life and death, old age and youth, time and timelessness. The poem opens on a mixed though underlying note of nostalgia for young age with its sexual passion as well as its resulting impotent rage. Nor is Ireland, his motherland nor a habitable place. The poet no more enjoys the sensuous delights. Hence his pining for a utopia, a never never land. Everywhere passionate love-making is going on, and breeding. He glances at the 'dying generations' recalling Keats's *Ode to Nightingale*. Both the human world and animal kingdom are spawning progeny, the young in one another's arms, birds in the trees. Thus, the sensual music is all around. But there is the sad neglect of the world of intellect, philosophy and impersonal art. As an old man, 'a tattered coat upon a stick', he has no

use for romantic passion or sensual music. He must devote himself to the study of the 'monuments of unageing intellect'. But the recognition of the physical body perishing or dying is very much there. However, there is some compensation even at the late stage of life. Although a tattered coat, a scarecrow, and a paltry thing, the soul can still 'clap its hands and sing'. Of course, the soul's song is the opposite of sensual music. Monuments whether of intellect or of emotions are, after all, works of art. He has at last come to Byzantium. Fervent prayers are offered to the artists turned gods to seek spiritual guidance and help. These artist-gods are purged of worldly dross. The poet is still sick with desire, with physical passion. He too wants to be purged and purified. They may be his singing masters, presumably, art and artistic activity itself is purging as Shakesperean tragedy does, or may be it is indicative of the influence of Hindu thought. The point to note here is that Yeats has not still rejected music and opted for sculpture and architecture, implied in the word 'monuments'. Also, before Yeats is gathered into the artifice of eternity, he must acquire self-knowledge. In the last stanza, death sweeps over the poet, he is disembodied. He is so disillusioned with the world of transience, decay and death that he would not like to be incarnated. He would like to be a 'bird made of gold'. As a mystical bird he (his soul) would sing to the 'lords and ladies of Byzantium'. Gold is a Platonic symbol of immortality and perfection. Like Keats before him, Yeats has not got any closer to a final solution. In fact, there is none. The really 'immortal' is human. Mandha artist can be only partially immortal in a metaphysical sense. But the critic Cleanth Brooks has stated the truth, if only a partial one, the poet has come 'to terms with life and death'.

In the first two stanzas of the poem, we find the *bhayānaka* and the *bībhatsa rasas* suggested in the lines,

‘That is no country for old men....
-Those dying generations -....
Whatever is begotten, born, and dies.
Caught in that sensual music all neglect
Monuments of unageing intellect’.

The poet, here, wants to escape from the world of biological change into the timeless world of art and perfection, symbolised by Byzantium. He becomes nostalgic and yearns for youthful life. He is disgusted and frightened at his own state as well as because of the sad neglect of the world of intellect, philosophy and impersonal art. The lines,

‘An aged man is but a paltry thing,
A tattered coat upon a stick’,...

bring out the *hāsya rasa*. Here, the poet mocks at himself or at his old age by calling himself an insignificant, useless thing just like a torn coat upon a stick. But the ultimate impact on the *citta* of the reader is that of the *karuna rasa*. In the third stanza the image of gods coming out of holy fire and perning in a gyre arouse *adbhuta rasa*. The sight of this image is not only difficult to see but also unbelievable. So it surprises us in a delightful manner and hence leads us to the experience of the wonderful (*adbhuta*), for example:

‘O sages standing in God’s holy fire...
Come from the holy fire, perne in a gyre,....’

In the last stanza, the poet talks of self-realisation, knowledge of truth, realisation of god which is very essential and important for all human beings to achieve in this life. All his earlier emotions and their causes (regarding old age, decay etc.) dissolve, and he is enlightened. Thus, we find *śānta rasa*, here, in the lines:

‘Once out of nature I shall never take
My bodily form from any natural thing,
But such a form as Grecian goldsmiths make
Of hammered gold and gold enamelling
To keep a drowsy Emperor awake;
Or set upon a golden bough to sing
To lords and ladies of Byzantium
Of what is past, or passing, or to come’.

A Prayer for My Daughter was written in February June 1919 soon after the birth of Yeats’s eldest child, Annie Butler Yeats on February 26, 1919, and was published in the volume entitled *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (1921). In this poem, Yeats again expresses his feeling, his premonition of, even certainty, at the birth of a barbaric civilization. It is true that he is on guard against beauty, i.e. beautiful girls becoming arrogant and brutally seductive, thus destroying themselves as well as their lovers. He is apprehensive for his daughter. At the back of mind he has his own personal tragedy, Maud Gonne who spurned his passionate and true love. He does not forget the ceremony associated with the old world aristocracy in which the age-old moral, social and aesthetic values still survive. The poem opens with the howling of storm echoed by the storm within the poet’s heart. He is possessed by gloom and foreboding. The storm outside is symbolical. The other symbols are the ‘tree’, the singing linnets, symbolising great rooted traditions with its rituals, ceremonies and is opposed to the storm. There are significant allusions to Helen, Aphrodite and the inevitable Maud Gonne and the Horn of Plenty. The poet would like his daughter to be beautiful but not too much of murderously beautiful like Maud Gonne or Helen, lest she should reject another Yeats, a worthy suitor and marry a ‘worthless

drunkard' Macbride. She must have tenderness, courtesy, humility and innocence. She also should not have intellectual arrogance but must be like his own wife humble, wise, unselfish, unlike Maud Gonne who was a fiery Irish revolutionary. He wishes that her daughter's husband may take her to a home where life is traditional. Yeats was a great admirer and advocate of the big-house tradition. To him aristocracy was a repository of the highest spiritual values. Yeats has not set before him a religious ideal but only a non-Christian order whose keynote is man's sense of his own nobility and self-sufficiency. This poem is yet another expression of his artistic integrity.

The main *rasas* in the poem are *bhayānaka* and *raudra rasa*. Though, there are other *rasas* also. In this poem, Yeats expresses his fear at the birth of a barbaric civilization and rage towards beautiful girls becoming arrogant and seductive, thus destroying themselves and their lovers. It begins with the howling of storm echoed by the storm within the poet's heart. He is gloomy and sad. The storm outside marks the coming or the advent of a dark, cruel civilization. He feels that the future years were not going to be safe and pleasant. Thus, in the first two stanzas, fear, barbarity, darkness, gloom, insecurity are highlighted. Thus, we find here the *bhayānaka* or the terrifying *rasa*. This is depicted by the following lines,

‘Once more the storm is howling,...
That the future years had come,
Dancing to a frenzied drum,
Out of the murderous innocence of the sea.’

In the following stanzas, we find Yeats's apprehension for his daughter because of his own tragedy (his love being refuted by beautiful Maud Gonne). These stanzas bring out *karuṇa rasa* because of Yeats's

compassion towards his daughter and *raudra rasa* due to his anger towards beautiful women being haughty and cruel. The poet prays for his daughter to be beautiful but not extraordinarily and troublingly beautiful like Maud Gonne, Helen or Aphrodite. She must possess the qualities of his wife. She should also not have intellectual hatred, excessive pride like Maud Gonne and other beautiful women. Otherwise, she would reject a worthy person and marry an unworthy man like these beautiful women. Thus, *karuṇa* and *raudra rasa* is evident in the lines:

‘May she be granted beauty and yet not
Beauty to make a stranger’s eye distraught,...
Lose natural kindness and may be
The heart-revelling intimacy.
That choose right, and never find a friend’,...also
‘Helen being chosen found life flat and dull
And later had much trouble from a fool’, and
‘An intellectual hatred is the worst,
So let her think opinions are accursed...
For an old bellows full of angry wind?’

To speak the truth in spite of its artistic beauty the poem is not very rich in *bhāvas* and *rasas*.

Easter 1916 is one of those poems of Yeats which relate to the contemporary themes. The poem was written on September 25, 1916 and appeared in the volume *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (1921). The theme of the poem is Dublin uprising 1916. It refers to the Irish revolt against Britain’s imperialistic rule. The revolt confined to a few hundred people, elicited Yeats’s admiration as well as regret. The somnolent town and its fiery protestors, quite unexpectedly turned against England. Yeats, being a liberal intellectual, was in favour of a negotiating settlement. He

disliked violence. Nevertheless, he had all praise for the ordinary citizens turned martyrs. But both his like and dislike and his ambivalent view comes out in the poem. The poem opens on a casual note. In conversational rhythms, he describes his meeting with the citizens of the town. It was a routine life without any sparks. He used to meet men while they were returning after the day's work. He exchanged formal greetings with them or he cracked a joke or told a mocking tale to amuse a companion at the club. All of them were leading a comic kind of life. Suddenly these people turned rebellious even revolutionary and died as martyrs:

‘All changed, changed utterly
A terrible beauty is born.’

Then he describes them one by one. Earlier these were described as ‘motley’ symbol for a clown in the ‘casual comedy’. One was Gore Booth. She was passing her time in ‘ignorant good will’, pleasant conversation and was interested in hunting. Patrick Pearse was a poet, orator and owned a school in Dublin. Mac Donagh was a poet, dramatist and critic. The poet bitterly even abusively refers to Macbride, the drunkard bumpkin whom Maud Gonne married and led unhappy life with him. But for once he also turned revolutionary. A successful rival for the love of Maud Gonne, whom she later divorced, he too was put to death by the British. Thus, all of them turned revolutionary. The refrain ‘A terrible beauty is born’ acquires a new meaning, the rebellion, a new significance. Then Yeats refers to what happened to the rebels. Their hearts turned ‘stony’, that they remained firm in their revolutionary ardour but also became stone hearted. Stone stands in contrast to the living stream, for:

‘Too long a sacrifice
Can make a stone of the heart!’

‘The stone’ creates difficulties. Earlier, too, people were ‘stones’ in their town, Yeats, then, makes a neat, ironical reversal. Now, they are single-purposed aiming at the total liberation of Ireland. But they are impeding or troubling the ‘living stream’ by their fanaticism (the third sense of the ‘stone’). And in Yeats’s view it is not quite desirable. The living stream of life is described in terms of time and action: minute by minute, minute by minute, minute by minute things change, range, change, slide, splash, dive, call and finally live. The stone impedes this flow. It may refer to their possible immortality or their inflexibility as human beings. Perhaps they do not listen to the rational advice of the intellectuals like Yeats for a negotiated settlement with the British. Now, God alone can be the ultimate judge of their intentions and actions. All that we, i.e. the poet and other Irishmen and readers, too, can do is to lament their martyrdom or like mother who chant the names of their sleeping babies at nightfall, lament with fond love and sympathy. But they are not sleeping but are dead. ‘Was it needless death after all?’ asks Yeats showing his ambivalence. Richard Ellman says that the poet celebrates the martyrdom and revolt but also insists in pointing out its ‘folly’. Here is Yeats without a mask. Yet, it seems that the poet thinks one thing and feels another. Another thing to note is that the poet uses only speaking voice. Its tone does not suggest that he is celebrating heroism.

The significant *rasas* in this poem are *bhayānaka*, *bībhatsa*, *vīra*, *adbhuta* and *raudra*. The theme of the poem which is Irish revolt against the British rule itself suggests terror, disgust, rage amongst the people.

The lines,

‘All changed, changed utterly...

Transformed utterly...

Are changed, changed utterly...’

show that the people of the town (Dublin) who were not keen about the war and lead a very simple routine life suddenly changed completely. They not only participated actively in the revolt but also gave their lives for the cause of Irish independence. Thus, suddenly the town was filled with rage against the British imperialistic rule and turned violent. Hence, this depicts poet’s praise and surprise for the ordinary people turned martyrs. So, here we find *adbhuta rasa* as well as the *vīra rasa* as *adbhuta rasa* is considered a consequence of the action of *vīra* or the heroic. Heroic actions lead to an admiration for them. Since they are difficult, almost unbelievable, they lead to the experience of the awesome or the wonderful. *Adbhuta rasa* indicates that which surprises in a delightful manner. Also, the anger of people show *raudra rasa*. The line, ‘A terrible beauty is born,’ bring out fear and disgust, i.e. *bhayānaka* and *bībhatsa rasas*. First of all, the term ‘terrible beauty’ itself is paradoxical as beauty (beautiful object) cannot be terrible. But here the heroic actions of the people have been admired but at the same time the poet finds this terrible and disgusting and so he shows his regret. Here, we find Yeats’s ambivalent view. Such a drastic, sudden and complete change in the town give way to incomprehension, incongruity and lies like a question mark. So, *bhayānaka*, *bībhatsa rasas* are highlighted here. Also, we find *vīra* and *adbhuta rasas*. The lines,

‘Hearts with one purpose alone
Through summer and winter seen
Enchanted to a stone
To trouble the living stream’...

bring out *vīra* and *raudra rasas* as, here, dynamic energy or *utsāha* is the most significant emotion. *Raudra* or the furious *rasa* is in most cases an accompaniment of *vīra*. This is so since *vīra rasa* is here generated

against some injustice, where there is the possibility of anger. Here, these *rasas* are the result of some deprivation, i.e. deprivation of rights (e.g. deprivation of the fundamental right of the people which is freedom). Threatened deprivation, trauma and insecurity following it leads to rage and fury involving a fierce reaction of protest and rejection (as seen in the lines above or in the whole poem). Also,

‘Was it needless death after all?’

show *bībhatsa* and *bhayānaka rasas* as here we see death and distortion of life. Death of the citizens also bring out terror and insecurity and an implicit threat to existence. Thus, we find here both life negating *rasas*, i.e. *bhayānaka* and *bībhatsa*. Hence, the poem is full of *bhayānaka*, *bībhatsa*, *vīra* and *raudra rasas*.

The poem *Among School Children* was written in 1926 and it appeared in the volume entitled *The Tower*. The poem is complex and fascinating. It is built around a series of parallels: the three selves of Yeats, the public man, the aged lover and the intellectual contemplating; the three stages common to all men: the child, the lover, the old man. This poem, too like others, is based on a series of contrasts: the past and the present, between youth and the old age, the ideal and the actual or real, man’s nobility and absurdity, the common and the uncommon. Without these pairs of contrasts there can be no life. But over all there is the Unity of Being which is the final ideal, that is beyond both life and philosophy. The poet, as a senator, visits a school. An old nun conducts him around. He looks at little children, girls and boys. While looking at girls he is suddenly reminded of Maud Gonne who haunts his unhappy heart. He is reminded of her own unhappiness when she was once rebuked by her teacher. The day ended in a tragedy. He deeply empathized with her, as if their souls had been blended and fused together, two bodies with one soul.

He wondered if any girl looked like her, for even the common girls share some of the features of the beautiful ones. So suddenly he is thrown into a frenzy:

‘And thereupon my heart is driven wild.’

Then, suddenly another contrast enters his mind. He imagines Maud Gonne as now an old woman, hollow of cheek and as who had ‘a mess of shadows for its meat’? Time flies. Advancing age takes its toll. It overtook the beauty of Maud Gonne. As much it effected Yeats. He feels nostalgic but not narcissistic. He never was a Zeus to Gonne’s Leda, never a Swan. He is now a scarecrow though a tolerable, comfortable kind. This is Yeatsian kind of self-mockery, even gentle humour. He thinks of all the mothers, who, if they were to see their darling children grown hollow of cheek, even ugly would never have undergone their birth pangs: grown old, their young ones had betrayed ‘the honey of generation’. He also speaks of old age that one cannot wrestle with the wrinkles and rigours of old age. One cannot fight the inevitable, howsoever hard one tries. The poet is equally harsh on the great philosophers like Plato, Aristotle and Pythagoras. Plato thought that the world is a weird world of phantoms. Aristotle taught Alexander wisdom by playing taws on his bottoms. Pythagoras noted the numerical relation between the length of strings and music notes when vibrating. But none of them could find a solution to the problem of old age. One cannot fight. One can only come to terms with it and make the best of a bargain. Thus, great philosophers do not impress Yeats. They all labour under delusions and try to escape reality. Passionate lovers, affectionate mothers and pious nuns harbour illusions, even love to live by them. They fail to confront reality and are often deluded. But these icons and ideals themselves poke fun at men attempting to realise them, Yeats wants us to strike a meaningful balance between human activities, attitudes and various beliefs. It is no use

denying the body's claims and torturing it to please the soul. A scholar's poring over his books must not make him 'bleary eyed'. Nor man must ignore his soul which is his most precious possession. Then, comes a deeply enchanting thought couched in glorious language. Yeats posits the chestnut true 'Are you the leaf, the blossom or the bole?' It is none but all of them. Similarly, the dancer is inseparable from the bewitching glance and swaying and gyration of the dancer. After all, Yeats profoundly believed in the unity of all life as he did in the unity of being.

As far as the *rasas* are concerned which the poem embodies, there are plenty in the poem. In the first stanza, the lines,

- the children's eyes
In momentary wonder stare upon
A sixty-year-old smiling public man'.

reflect *adbhuta* and *bībhatsa rasas* as the children in the school look at old Yeats with surprise and wonder. Surprised may be in a delightful manner to see such a nice, smiling old man. Or, may be surprised in a frightening manner to see such a old, lean and unpleasing (wrinkled) Yeats. Old age of Yeats also shows distortion of life and so *bībhatsa rasa*. In the second stanza and the third stanza, the poet becomes nostalgic and remembers a childhood incident when Maud Gonne was scolded by her teacher. He felt sad at that event. Yeats was passionately in love with Maud Gonne who refuted his love. So, his life had been full of grief and tragedy. Thus, here we see both *karuṇa* and *ṣṛṅgāra* (love-in-separation) *rasa*. In the absence of the loved object (Maud Gonne) Yeats is feeling anguish of separation, nostalgic and also miserable. There is desire for union but there is no possibility for future union. It also brings out *karuṇa rasa*. Yeats was so obsessed by Maud Gonne that he wondered if any girl (in the schoolroom he visited) looked like her (Maud Gonne). This

also shows his sorrowful state. Thus, again here we find *vipralambha sṛṅgāra* (love-in-separation) and *karuṇa rasa* as there is both misery and pain at the absence of the beloved as well as there is frustration of an attachment because there is no possibility of his love being fulfilled. For example,

‘I dream of a Ledaean body, bent
Above a sinking fire, a tale that she
Told of a harsh reproof, or trivial event
That changed some childish day to tragedy-,’ and
‘And thinking of that fit of grief or rage
I look upon one child or t’ other there
And wonder if she stood so art that age’-...

these lines depict the above mentioned *rasas*. The fourth and the fifth stanzas depict *bībhatsa* and *bhayānaka rasas* as here rigours of old age and also ugliness (wrinkles) which accompany old age are shown. Time runs and old age takes its toll. It snatched away the beauty of Maud Gonne as much it effected Yeats. He imagines her as now an old woman hollow-cheeked, very lean and thin who ‘took mess of shadows for its meat?’ He also thinks of mothers that if they were to see their children growing old and weak they would not have undergone the pangs of birth. So, here we find fear, insecurity, distortion of life. Thus, both *bhayānaka* and *bībhatsa rasas* are very much evident here, e.g.

‘What youthful mother, a shape upon her lap
Honey of generation had betrayed,
A compensation for the pang of his birth,’ also the lines
And I though never of a Ledaean kind
Had pretty plumage once—enough of that,
Better to smile on all that smile, and show
There is a comfortable kind of old scarecrow’.

bring out *hāsya rasa*. Here, Yeats indulges in self-mockery and gentle humour. He says that though he was not very good-looking like Maud Gonne but he was not bad also. Now also he may be a scarecrow (old) but of a tolerable, comfortable kind. In the sixth stanza, the poet expresses anger or rage. So, he becomes harsh on great philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Pythagoras and others who did great things but could not find solution to the problem of old age. They all lived under delusions and tried to escape reality. He is also angry at his own old, miserable state deprived of all youthful charms, his love etc. In the eighth or the last stanza, we are led towards *śānta rasa* — *śama* (a state of calm which is the result of the perception of truth)¹⁰. Here, the self is transcended. For both the creator and the perceiver, *śānta* holds the possibility of enlightenment or state of bliss where all the emotions and their causes dissolve. Yeats in this stanza says that man must not ignore his soul which is his most precious possession and should realise his self. In the last four lines, he posits the chestnut tree, ‘Are you the leaf, the blossom or the bole? It is none but all of them. Similarly, the dancer is inseparable from the dance. Thus, everything is dissolved and becomes one. Here, the poet is at calm unlike the earlier stanzas. Thus, the poem consists of a range of (varied) *rasas*.

10. cf. *Abhinavabharati* on *Natya Sastra*, ch.6. (*Santa rasa*).

CONCLUSION

The terms like 'Beauty', 'Art', 'Aesthetics', etc. have been of great concern not only in the Indian but also in the Western tradition since times immemorial. Thinkers and Philosophers have always tried to get a deep insight into the nature of things (e.g. nature of above mentioned terms, etc.). As far as poetry is concerned, a keen interest was shown in studying and analysing the properties of words and language that empowered it not only to convey direct meanings but also very complex and subtle human emotions. For, poetry has a profound potentiality to evoke a wide range of emotions, and on an examination, words are found to be very powerful instruments to move a reader emotionally. That is why we have a tradition of schools of poetics in both Indian and Western tradition. As I have analysed W.B. Yeats's poems in the general model of *rasa* theory, I would like to mention that the theory of *rasa* was not confined to dramaturgy alone though it was initiated by Bharata in the context of *nāṭya* or drama, but the entire thrust of discussion of this theory was shifted to poetry, since it was discovered that poetry was a very powerful source of expressing emotions and evoking *rasas*. The main purpose of such an analysis was to enjoy and appreciate the beauty as well as experience the emotions which Yeats's poetry embody; and also to explain the (selected) poems of Yeats from the point of view of the aesthetic effect (*rasas*) that they have. Thus, the aesthetic function of art as the Indian poet Kālidāsa (fifth century) says is to arouse the admiration of the gods; to create images borrowing the material from the world around the artist and the life of man; to be a source of many sublime joys through aesthetic sensations (*rasas*): the comic, love, compassion, fear, horror, etc; to be a source of everyone's pleasure, joy, happiness, and all beauty. Quoting this excerpt, the contemporary Indian scholar V. Bahadur noted that the chief purpose of art is to ennoble man's

inner life and that in order to inspire, purify and ennoble, art must be beautiful¹¹.

11. 'Aesthetics', Yuri Borev, Progress Publishers – Moscow, 1981. Translated from Russian to English by Natalia Belskaya and Yevgeny Phillipov, 1985. p. 122.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, Daniel (ed), *W.B. Yeats.- The Poems*, London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1990.
- Amaladass, Anand, *Introduction to Aesthetics*, Chennai : Satya Nilayam Publications, 2000.
- Bagchi, Amalendu, *Aesthetics In Modern Psychology*, Calcutta: The Principal Sanskrit College, 1966.
- Borev, Yuri, 'Aesthetics' (Translated from Russian to English by Natalia Belskaya and Yevgeny Phillippov), Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1981. (English translation, 1985).
- Bosanquet, Bernard, *History of Aesthetic*, London: George Allen and Unwrn Ltd., 1892.
- Carritt, E.F., *The Theory of Beauty*, London: Methun & Co Ltd. 1949 (Fifth edition revised). First published in 1914.
- Chakrabarti, Tarapada Dr., *Indian Aesthetics and Science of Language*, Calcutta : Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1971.
- Chatterji, P.C., *Fundamental Questions in Aesthetics*, Simla: Indian Institute of Advance Study, 1968.
- Cohen and Ernest Nagel, '*An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method.*', New York: Hariourt Brace and Co., 1934.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K., *Figures of Speech or Figures of Thought*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1981.
- _____, *The Dance of Shiva*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1991.
- Cooper, E. David (ed.), '*Aesthetics: The Classic Readings*', Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.
- Cross, K.G.W. and R.J Dunlop, *A Bibliography of Yeats Criticism 1887-1965*, London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1971.

Cullingford, Elizabeth, 'Yeats: Poems 1919-1935', London : The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1984.

Ghosh, Manomohan, '*The Nāṭya Śāstra: A Treatise on Ancient Indian Dramaturgy and Histrionics – ascribed to Bharatamuni*', Calcutta : Granthalaya Private Limited, 1967

Gnoli, Raniero, '*The Aesthetic experience according to Abhinavagupta*', Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1985.

Gupta, Shyamla, '*Art Beauty and Creativity*' - *Indian and Western Aesthetics*, New Delhi: D.K. Printworld (P) Ltd, 1999.

Jeffares, A Norman., *Yeats Selected Criticism*, London: Macmillan and Company Limited, 1964.

Jha, Ganganatha Mahamahopadhyaya, '*Kavyaprakasha of Mammata*', Allahabad: The Indian Press Ltd, 1925.

Jhanji, Rekha , '*The Sensuous in Art :Reflections on Indian Aesthetics*', Simla : Indian Institute of Advanced study (in association with Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas), 1989.

Jhanji, Rekha, *Aesthetic Meaning: Some Recent Theories*, Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1980.

Jochum, K.P.S., *W.B. Yeats: A Classified Bibliography of Criticism*, The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, 1978.

Kapoor, Kapil (in collaboration with Ratnam M Nalini), '*Literary Theory: Indian Conceptual Framework*', Delhi : Affiliated East – West Press Limited, 1998.

_____, "Sylvia Plath's Daddy in the Other Tradition : An Example Analysis in Rajasekhara's Model" *International Journal for Literature and Philosophy*.

_____ and Kapoor Ranga, '*Cononical Texts of English Literary Criticism*, (with selections from Classical Poeticians), Delhi : Academic Foundation, 1995.

Kermode, Frank, '*Modern Essays*', Glasgow : Collins Fontana Books, 1971.

Khapchinko, Mikhail, '*Artistic Creativity , Reality and Man* (translated by Ben Ekolf), Moscow: Raduga Publishers, 1986.

Krishnamoorthy K. Dr, '*Indian Literary Theories: A Reappraisal*', New Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas Publications , , 1985.

Masson, J.L. and M.V. Patwardhan (tr.), '*Santa Rasa and Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Aesthetic* – Series no. 9, Poona : Bhandarkar Research Institute, 1969.

_____, '*Aesthetic Rapture : The Rasādhyāya of the Natya Śāstra*' (in two volumes : Vol. 1:Text), – Poona: Deccan College, Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1970

Osborne, Harold, '*Aesthetics And Art Theory*' – *An Historical Introduction*, Longman, Green & Co. Ltd; 1968.

Pandey, Dr. Prof Kanti Chandra , '*Comparative Aesthetics : Indian Aesthetics* (Second Edition), Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1959.

Pandit, Sneh, '*An Approach to the Indian Theory of Art and Aesthetics*, New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1997.

Parashar, Sadhana, '*Kāvyamīmāṃsā of Rājaśekhara* : (Original text in Sanskrit and Translation with Explanatory Notes). New Delhi: D.K. Printworld Pvt. Ltd, 2000.

Patnaik, Priyadarshi, *Rasa in Aesthetics: An Application of Rasa Theory to Modern Western Literature*, New Delhi: D.K. Printworld Pvt. Ltd, 1997.

Pritchard, M William, *W.B. Yeats: A Critical Anthology*, London: Penguin Books, 1972.

Punekar, Mokashi Shanker, *Interpretations of the Later Poems of W.B. Yeats*, Dharwar: Karnataka University, 1973.

Ross, Malcon, *The Aesthetic Impulse*, Oxford. New York, Pergamon Press, 1984.

Seturaman, V.S.(ed.), *Contemporary Criticism : An Anthology*, Delhi: Macmillan India Limited , 1989.

_____, *Indian Aesthetics: An Introduction*, Delhi: Macmillan India Limited, 1992.

Shanker, Laxmi, Dr. S. Hamid Husain., *Researches in English Literature*, Bhopal: Publication Division - Council of Oriental Research, 1979.

Singer, Alan and Allen Dunn (ed.), *Literary Aesthetics: A Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Snukal, Robert, *High Talk: The Philosophical poetry of W.B. Yeats*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Stallworthy, Jon, *Between the Lines: Yeats's Poetry in the Making*, London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Subramanyam, K., *Mahavakya Vicaracarca* (in Sanskrit), Visakhapatnam : Published by the author, 1986.

Sudhi, Padma Dr., *Aesthetic Theories of India*, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, , 1983.

_____, *Aesthetic Theories of India – Vol. III*, New Delhi: .Intellectual Publishing House, 1990.

Taneja G.R., *W.B. Yeats: An Anthology of Recent Criticism*, Delhi: Pencraft International, 1995.

The Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharatamuni, (A Board of Scholars), Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

Turiyānanda, Svāmī (Tr.) and Brahmaṣrāna Pravrajika (ed) *'Vivekacūḍamaṇi of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya'*, Chennai: Sri Ramakrishna Math, 1991.

Unterecker, John, *A Reader's Guide to William Butler Yeats*, Guildford and London: Billing and Sons Ltd , 1959.

Ure, Peter, *Yeats*, Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1963.

Wimsatt, K. William and Cleanth Brooks, *Literary Criticism – A Short History*, New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co., 1957.