

Comparative Analysis of the Rasa Theory of Bharata and the Reception Theory of Jauss

Raj singh,

Research Scholar Maharishi University of Information Technology Lucknow

Dr Pratima

Associate Professor Deptt of English RBS College Agra

Abstract:

This paper looks at Bharata's Rasa Theory and Jauss's Reception Theory and how they are similar and different. The comparison is based on an analysis of both theories, which was done in earlier chapters. The comparison only looks at things from a theoretical point of view.

The word "compare" can mean more than one thing. "To compare" is a verb that means to look at two or more things, ideas, people, etc. to find out what they have in common and what makes them different. Comparative is an object that means "of or about comparison." It can also mean "based on," "going by," or "using comparison as a way to study." It comes from the Latin word "comparativus," which means "to compare." It was first used in late Middle English (1400–1500). Based on what we've talked about so far, the process of comparing or contrasting includes:

- It is a way to look at two or more things, ideas, or people by comparing them.
- The point of comparing things, ideas, or people is to see how they are alike and how they are different.
- Comparative theory is a way to learn about different areas of knowledge.

Keywords: Rasa Theory, Bharata and the Reception Theory of Jauss etc

Comparative Literature (Theory):

Comparative literature is a hard term to explain. It compares two or more things, ideas, or pieces of literature at the same time. Comparative literature looks at many different things about different societies, such as their languages, cultures, religions, economies, societies, and histories. Taking these things into account makes it harder to compare things.

To fully understand comparative literature, you have to look at the language used to talk about it. From a historical point of view, comparative literature is any literary work or works that are compared to other literary works or works. So, comparative literature is the study of how two or more important literary works or literatures connect to each other. (www.shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in, 1) When comparing two or more works, the person doing the comparison has to think about the sources, themes, myths, forms, artistic strategies, social and religious movements, and trends. At the same time, it is important that when comparing two or more literary theories, the origin, sources, background, period, approach, method, principle, characteristics, assumptions, practise, and trends must be taken into account. Comparing things well depends on how fair the person doing the comparing is. With his critical approach and investigation, the comparer will find the similarities and differences between the different theories (works) he is comparing. His approach must be fair and unbiased in order to get to the truth. His sincere and honest approach is the only way to get to the bare truth or natural results, which is the whole point of comparative study.

The term "comparative literature" or "theory of comparative literature" means a wide range of things. It looks at the whole of human experience and tries to understand how people in different parts of the world relate to each other through its critical method and approach to literature or theory under comparative study. Comparative literature is an important part of building relationships between people and between countries. It makes national and international borders less important, and in their place, the universality of human relationships becomes clear. So, the term "comparative literature" includes the study of different types of literature from all over the world. But there are a lot of terms that are used interchangeably in these areas, like universal literature, general literature, international literature, and world literature.

Again, comparative literature looks at how people act and what they go through in their lives as a whole. The works of Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, Emerson, Thoreau, Valmik, and Vyas are all part of what is called "world literature."

Human expression in all kinds of literature from all countries has deep similarities and affinities because people are the same everywhere on a psychological level. So, one can find close similarities between the great works of literature from different places and times. There's no doubt that people are complicated, and this shows up in their writing as well. This makes comparative study as complicated as people themselves. The only difference between a

comparative study and a critical approach to literature is that in comparative studies, a comparator looks at two or more objects next to each other. It makes the subject matter big and broad. Comparative literature needs to be made bigger so that it can include all of human life and all of its experiences.

Bijay Kumar Das has given a simple explanation of comparative literature. He says that the easiest way to explain comparative literature is to say that it is a comparison of two works of literature. Comparative literature looks at the similarities, differences, and connections between two pieces of writing. It also looks at the themes, styles, conventions, and ways that folk tales and myths are used in at least two different kinds of writing. (Das, 1)

The great Indian poet Rabindranath Tagor, who won the Nobel Prize for his book of poems called "Gitanjali" and is known as "Vishvasahitya," came up with the word "Vishvasahitya" to describe the study of different kinds of literature. He broadens the scope of comparative literature and urges critics and comparers to get out of their narrow provincialism and see each writer's work as part of the universal creativity of man.

Comparative literature has been around since the 19th century. It was created as a reaction to the biased nationalism of literary scholarship in England. From the start of the Christian era, comparing literary works was a popular thing to do, even if it was only done occasionally. The Romans were the first people to study things side by side. They were smarter than the Greeks when it came to making comparisons. The Romans follow the tradition of comparing the works of great Greek and Roman writers and poets and find that there are a lot of similarities between the works they study. Quintillion was the first person to think about this, but Longinus tries to make comparative study a systematic field of study. If Quintillion came before him, he would have been the first person to do this. He brings up the names of Homer, Plato, and other people. In the Indian comparative method, the first Sanskrit critics appear in the sixth century AD. The commentaries on Kalidas's Meghdoot and Abhijanasakutala make it clear. After that, critics like Kuntak and Abhinavgupta made the way for modern comparators with their focus on quality. In a letter from 1848, Mathew Arnold writes that every critic should try to read at least one great piece of literature that is not his own, and the more different it is from his own, the better.

Arnold is thought to be the first person in England to use comparative criticism. He also gave other literary scholars ideas for how to use this new method.

As was already said, comparative literary theory and comparative literature are not two completely different types of literary studies. Instead, they are related in the same way that literary theory and literary criticism are. This chapter looks at Bharata's Rasa theory and Jauss's Reception theory side by side. The comparison is based on some theoretical parameters, such as the theory's origin, its source, background, assumptions, approach, methods, principles, characteristics, limitations, and practises.

Origins of the Rasa and Reception Theories:

The rasa theory came from India in the past. It is written down in the sixth chapter of the *Natyashastra* by Bharata. It is Bharata's first attempt to study literature in a serious way. The Bharata, whether he really wrote it, and when it was published are all unanswered questions in the literary theoretical circle. *Natyashastra* came from a story that says Bharata was asked by Lord Indra, the god of gods, to put on a play with his hundred sons to celebrate Indra's victory over the demons. Bharata agrees to take on the challenge, and he writes the text *Natyashastra* to help his actors and characters on stage perform well and follow his directions. Since *Natyashastra* came out, the theory of rasa has shown up in many other Indian philosophical traditions. Different philosophers and literary scholars will look at the theory of rasa in different ways over the next few hundred years. Indian thought is not piecemeal; it is continuous, builds on itself, and includes everything. They write about different parts of people's lives and experiences, but most of what they wrote has been lost or destroyed. Texts that can be read in full or in parts cover a wide range of topics, including philosophy, grammar, medicine, literary theories, political thought, logic, military science, sociology, agriculture, and so on. Bharata is a philosopher of *kavyashastra*, which is the study of literature. His *Natyashastra* is considered to be one of the most important texts of Indian *kavyashastra*.

In Indian philosophy, knowledge is seen as a way to reach *moksha* (salvation), not as an end in itself. True knowledge always leads to self-mastery, which is what *moksha* means. They think that diversity comes from the outside, but that there is only oneness, or *atma*. The shapes are all different, but the core is the same. For example, there are many different kinds of jewellery, but most of them are made of gold. Rasa school, *Alankara* school, *Riti* school, *Dhvani* school, and *Vakrokti* school are the most important schools of Indian literary theory.

Hans Robert Jauss, a German scholar, came up with the idea for the reception theory. He is a German theorist, and he is most well-known for creating the aesthetic of reception. Together

with his friend Wolfgang Iser, he starts the Konstanz School at the German Konstanz University. The Konstanz school has had a big effect on Anglo-American criticism. On the Russian Front, Jauss saw the Second World War. After World War II is over, he is locked up for a while. His time in the army keeps him from going to school and studying. In 1957, he finishes his post-graduate work with a paper about Marcel Proust. He has a job in Munster and Giessen between 1959 and 1966. He has been asked to join the newly opened University of Konstanz to set up the literary studies field. In the middle of the 1960s, the Konstanz School of literary studies came up with reception aesthetic as a way to deal with a similar literary divide. The Konstanz school says that literary studies were mostly about making a history of the best literary works, which contributed to the idea of national identity and turned the relationship between literature and history, at the expense of literature's role as art, into a function of copying or commenting. On the other hand, the authors of the Konstanz school tried to figure out how creation and interpretation fit together.

Source of the theories of Rasa and Reception:

Rasa theory is found in many other works by Indian theorists like Abhinavgupta, Tholkappiyar, etc., but Bharata's *Natyashastra* is the first and most important source for rasa theory. It is an important step in the development of theories and laws about poetry and drama. When *Natyashastra* is written, drama and poetry are thought to be the same thing. Indian poetry is mostly about drama, and poetry was always a part of drama. Poetry is used to tell stories and talk in early English drama, Greek drama, and Sanskrit drama.

Natyashastra is the first book in the Indian literary and philosophical tradition to talk about dramaturgy. It is a collection of different ideas and rules about drama as an art form. Abhinavgupta's *abhinavabharati* has been putting the study of *Natyashastra* in the spotlight for a long time. *Natyashastra* is a scientific look at drama and how it is put on stage. Some of the things that the *Natyashastra* talks about are the nature of drama, where it came from and what its goals are, language structure, technique, characters, types, and writing dialogue for drama. Representation is about how a theatre or stage is built, as well as its structure and style.

Natyashastra also talks about *Aharya*, *Angika*, *Wachik*, and *Sattvik*, which are four ways to act. These four goals have to do with the actors, the choice of characters, the director, the hero, the panel of judges, and the order of the performances. The way the *Natyashastra* is put together shows that Bharata has talked about almost every part of dramaturgy. Through his text, he tries

to change the way people think about drama. His ideas are very basic and first, and he thinks about every part of the drama. Satya Dev Chaudhary says that the large amount of information in Bharata's natyashastra shows that this work is the result of a long history of dramatic art in this country before him. After Bharata, this practise seems to have stopped for good. The most likely reason for this is that the different ideas about poetic art were so deep, broad, and changing that the acaryas lost interest in putting together the rules for dramaturgy. (Satya D Chaudhary, 5-4)

Hans Robert Jauss is a thinker from Germany. He is a professor at the University of Konstanz, where he is an associate professor. He writes a book called "Rezeptionasthetik" in 1982. It is written in a language called Germanic. The professor at the University of Minnesota, Timothy Bahty, translates "rezeptionasthetik" into English as "Toward an Aesthetic of Reception." Paul de Man gives an introduction to the book. There are five chapters in the text. In the first chapter of the text, Jauss's main points about reception aesthetic are talked about. It is called Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory. The second chapter is about the history of art and the theory of pragmatics. The third chapter of the text talks about literary genres and mediaeval writing. The fourth chapter is an applied study of Goethe's and Valery's Faust: on the hermeneutics of question and answer. In the fifth chapter, Jauss talks about "Spleen II" by Baudelaire as an example of a poetic text that can be read from different perspectives. It is generally agreed that Timothy Bahti's translation of Jauss's "Rezeptionasthetik" is the most slandered translation of that work. This book is the first time that the founder of the aesthetic of reception's most important writings have been translated into English. In this section, Jauss tries to come up with categories that will help turn traditional literary history into a history of aesthetic experience. The essays in the volume look at how art history relates to social history, what genres were like in the Middle Ages, and give examples of how to compare and contrast different works of literature. (www.upress.umn.edu) The Journal of Religious says that this book plants the seeds of an exciting new hermeneutical programme that puts a lot of emphasis on history and social scientific inquiry. Journal of Film and Video says that the question of aesthetic praxis, which has been at the heart of all art as a creative, receptive, and communicative activity, is still not clear and should be asked again. This book answers questions about aesthetic praxis and the way that aesthetic experience and other areas of meaning in everyday life spread to each other. Journal of Aesthetic and Art Criticism calls Jauss one of those brave pioneers who not only tries to figure out what aesthetic experience is and how it has changed over time, but also

asks with great intensity and sincerity how we can be interested in art today and how aesthetic communication is still possible in our modern consumer society.

Context of the Rasa and Reception Theories:

Even though the history of the rasa theory is not very clear, it can be understood by looking at the things that are talked about in detail in Natyashastra. It looks like Bharata wants to write a book about how to write a play or poem. People also think that the god Brahma asks Bharata to write the Natyaved along with the other Vedas. Bharata is also asked to write a play for him and his hundred sons to act out on stage. In his Natyashastra, he talks about drama, theatre, rasa theory, dance, the way things are shown, the structure of a play, acting and performance, the genders of different characters, the qualities of directors and audience members, music, and musical instruments. Other than the Veda, there is no other scholarly work from which Bharata could start. Between the Vedas and the Natyashastra, there is a pretty long gap. Even Natyashastra's language, Sanskrit, is different from the language of the Vedas. By the time Natyashastra was written, the Vedic tradition was probably so strong that every new treatise tried to link itself to it. What do you think are the most important parts of any piece of writing or art? A work of art must be appealing so that it draws attention to itself. In other words, it shouldn't just be shocking because a lot of things are trendy for a while and then fall out of style. Things like that might catch our attention right away. But they don't keep us going for long. After the first shock, they might not have anything else that makes us feel. So, a piece of art can only be good if it has appeal. Bharata says that there can be no appeal without rasa. So, a work of art isn't complete or fulfilled without rasa. It should be interesting to the viewer, and to be interesting, the topic must have. Only through communication can rasa be made in the mind of a viewer. So rasa is an important part of every work of art. Second, it must be present in a work of art that is successful. Third, it needs to be communicated; otherwise, how can anyone know that rasa is in the work? Lastly, its purpose is to make a work interesting. This is the same as saying that only rasa can bring success to a work. (Patnaik, 23-24) When Bharata says that there is no meaning without rasa, he is making a broad statement. Any work of art should make you feel good about how it looks. If it doesn't, it has no point. So, aesthetic pleasure, or rasa, is what makes a piece of art appealing. In its original meaning, the word "appeal" means to come out, show up, start, etc. In the Upanishad and the Mahabharata, it means "circulated," "set out," "comes from," or "issues forth." In Sanskrit, the word for "appeal" is "pravartate," which means that rasa is the source,

origin, or cause. Bharata says that nothing can come out without rasa. It's because this special thing that affects a work or is a big part of it is the only thing that can give the work meaning or make it interesting. Only when the rasa is communicated through a work of art can we talk about how appealing literature is. Rasa takes the reader into an art piece. Using the "stimulus and response" formula, one can see that Bharata's argument is true. Bharata talks about the audience while talking about the play. When rasa is relished or tasted, it means that someone takes in something and reacts to it. This could be the reader or a viewer. Since the emergence or issuing forth of rasa is being talked about, for whom does rasa emerge? Who can see it coming out or feel it? So, the observer or even the poet is in a relationship of response or reaction to a stimulus. Part of the stimulus is or the stimulus (text or drama) has a presence or essence that can be called rasa. This is successfully transmitted to the audience, making the response more satisfying and complete. (Patnaik, 24-25) He bases his argument on how people reacted to him when he was on stage. His words also show that he has read a lot and knows a lot about how people think and feel. Bharata has talked about how a play is made, how it is acted out, and how the audience reacts to it and how it is received. This is meant to tell the playwrights how to write the play and make it work. Through his rasa theory, he explained the role of the audience in how they respond to what happens on stage. He also focused on the most basic psychological states of people, which play a big role in how poetic pleasure is shown.

Reception theory is a way that reader response theory has been used in the past. In modern literary criticism, reader response criticism is a group of critics and philosophers who try to know and understand the literature. It focuses on the reader as an individual and how their gender, nationality, ethnicity, religion, class, age, etc. affects how they understand and experience a text. Reader response criticism tries to explain how different people react to the same piece of writing in different ways. It also wants to find out how people react to works of literature. Reader Response Criticism is based on the idea that the reader is an active participant in figuring out what the text means. The reader completes the text and makes it real. They see literature as a performance art, and they think that every reader gives a performance related to the text. Reader Response Critics don't agree with new critics who say that the reader has no part in recreating a literary work and only look at the text as a whole, fixed thing. They also disagree with the formalist view, which says that a text's form is the only thing that makes meaning. Critics of this school say that the reader is just as important as the writer of the text, and that the text is not pure

or neutral, as formalists believe, because every work is made or read differently. Reader response criticism's focus on how a text is put together comes from phenomenology, a branch of philosophy that tries to understand how things look. Some of the most important people who helped start the school were Norman Holland, Stanley Fish, Wolfgang Iser, and Hans Robert Jauss. People also think of Louise Rosenblatt as the first person to start this school. Her works *Literature as Exploration* and *Towards a Transactional Theory of Reading*, both published in 1938, explain some parts of Reader-Response Theory.

During the 1960s, Germany went through a number of big changes that help explain how and why Jauss' reception theory came to be. Dissatisfaction in the academic world has grown along with dissatisfaction with the economy. The "Memorandum for the Reform of the Study of Language and Literature," written by Jauss, Iser, and other philosophers, is a good example of this. It argues for changes in the way universities teach and how they run. German literary studies have reached a crisis point because of the way it is being taught now. The methods and values of teaching literary context are being questioned. The problem with the historical critical and aesthetic formalist approaches was that they tried to hide the reader's role. ... So, Jauss tried to find a theory that did justice to the dynamic process of writing and how it is received by the author, the work, and the public. He thought this would help move the study of literature away from the dead ends of literary history, which were rooted in positivism. (www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk, 127)

In the 1960s, there was a new interest in studying literary hermeneutics. Jauss's interest in Gadmer's work in this area made him think about this question. The idea in question is that of horizon, which, as a historical masker and a necessary condition for the possibility of experimental knowledge, makes up all meaning structures related to human action and the most basic ways of understanding the word. (www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk, p. 128) Jauss is studied mediaeval literature. His studies led him to be interested in how people respond to art. His study of mediaeval literature made him think about issues like how the original setting of a text affects how it is understood and how background information can help you think about history. In his lecture "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary History," Jauss tried to point out the flaws in literary theories and explain how he came to the conclusion he did. In an interview, Jauss said, "I tried to imagine a new literary history, one that opened the closed circuit of author and work toward the receiver and was meant to make this receiver, whether a reader or the public, the

middleman between the past and the present, the work and its effects." Such a history would have to stand up to the old, discredited literary history's idea of objectivity and the exactness demands of sociologists and structuralists who laughed at historical understanding.

Methodology of Rasa and Reception Theories:

Everyone knows what rasa means. It is used in all kinds of art, plain and simple. When we call a work of art "interesting" or a receiver "interesting" or "boar," we're assuming that rasa has something to do with how art and aesthetics interact. There is a lot of confusion about what the word rasa means. The understanding of rasa is so vague that no one wants to ask more questions about it. When someone talks about a good experience they had after watching a good tragedy, they get more confused and wonder if they are selfish because they are happy when other people are sad. Why do they like to watch the tragedy again if it's not right? Why does it make them sad to see the characters in the tragedy suffer again? It means that the roots of how a good play or drama makes you feel are different from how it makes you feel good. To get to the bottom of these questions, it is best to understand the word rasa and the theory of rasa at a deep level.

When we read a good piece of writing or watch a play on stage, we get pleasure from it. The pleasure is called "Rasa" by Bharata. In fact, the word "rasa" means "essence" or "sap." In his book, professor Satya Dev Chaudhary translates the word "rasa" into English as "poetic pleasure, poetic relish, poetic delight, poetic detection, aesthetic pleasure, aesthetic enjoyment, aesthetic bliss, etc." He also used the word "rasa" in a technical way to mean "sentiment." (Chaudhary, 67) But Bharata, who is a great artist, has tried to explain how this poetic delight happens. He explained his theory of rasa in one "sutra," or saying:

Hans Robert Jauss is the middle ground in his text. He doesn't like Socialism and doesn't agree with the Formalist view. Jauss says, "My attempt to bridge the gap between literature and history, between historical and aesthetic approaches, begins where both schools stop." Their methods look at literary facts in terms of a system of production and representation that works in a circle. By doing this, they take away a part of literature that is essential to both its aesthetic value and its social function: how it is received and how it affects people. In both literary theories, the reader, listener, or viewer—in short, the audience—has a very small part to play. (Jauss & Benzinger, 7) He talks about "an act of reading" instead of "individual reception." Reading takes place in a certain situation, and the reader doesn't understand the meaning of the text the same way as when it was first written. Jauss says that a reader uses different criteria,

which he calls "Horizon and Expectation," at different times to decide if a text or genre is literary or not. He said, "No work is universal." What appeals to our generation at a certain time may not be interesting to readers at other times. A literary work is not a thing that stands on its own and shows the same face to every reader at every time or has an eternal core.

Jauss's theory looks at literature "from the reader's or consumer's point of view" and sees it as "a dialectical process of production and reception." In his 1969 article "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," Jauss wrote, "The relationship of work to work must now be brought into this interaction between work and people, and the historical coherence of works among themselves must be seen in the interrelations of production and reception." In other words, literature and art only have a history that looks like a process when the flow of works is mediated not only by the person who makes them but also by the person who reads them. This happens when the author and the public interact. (Jauss, 15)

This suggests that Reception Theory defines literature as the process of how the reader and the text interact with each other. This was a revolutionary way to look at the history of literature and literary criticism. Reception Theory, on the other hand, limits the role of the reader to this process, and the reader's "power" does not take the lead when they read the text. "Reception Theory makes it clear that the reader needs to be involved in the history of literature. This drastic and revolutionary change was not too surprising, given that Albert Einstein's influential writings on the "theory of relativity" and Thomas S. Kuhn's concept of "paradigm shift" both raise questions about how one should think about "truth" and "facts," which shows how important interpretation is (Kinoshita, 4). Also, these two authors laid the groundwork for Reception Theory, which says that the process of reading literature must include the idea of interpretation.

The word "hermeneutic" has its own place in the theory of reception. The theory of interpretation is what the word means. It is a way to study how understanding works. According to the "Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory," hermeneutics is the search for and interpretation of spiritual truth in the Bible in Christian theology. In a broader sense, hermeneutics has become more and more interested in interpreting and understanding how people act, especially how they act through what sociologists call institutions, such as political, cultural, economic, and kinship institutions. In terms of literature, it has to do with how the meaning of a text is communicated. (Cuddon, 377)

When Jauss talks about hermeneutics, he puts a lot of emphasis on how important history is. He also uses the philosophical hermeneutics of Hans-Gadmer, who says that all interpretations of past literature come from a dialogue between the past and the present. How we try to understand a work will depend on the questions that our own cultural background lets us ask... Our view of the present is always affected by what happened in the past, but we can only understand the past through the limited view of the present. ...a hermeneutical idea of "understanding" doesn't separate the knower from the object in the way that empirical science does. Instead, it sees understanding as a "fusion" of the past and the present. (Kinoshita, 4)

How does hermeneutics fit into the Reception Theory? Jauss says that "literary hermeneutics plays the role of concretizing the meaning of literary works, which happens historically within the framework of a certain "logic," creating and changing "the aesthetic canon." (Jauss, 147) So, the idea of hermeneutics is a key part of Reception Theory, since how a reader interprets something is now a part of the literary process.

Horizon of Expectation is defined in the Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory as "the criteria that readers use to judge literary texts in any given time period." It is a key part of Jauss's aesthetics of reception, and the term refers to the set of assumptions that every generation of readers has in common. (Dictionary, page 387) Jauss explains how the Horizon of Expectation is built in the text: "A literary work, even when it seems to be new, does not present itself as something completely new in an informational vacuum. Instead, it prepares its audience for a very specific kind of reception by announcements, overt and covert signals, familiar characteristics, or implicit allusions. It reminds the reader of what he or she has already read, makes the reader feel a certain way, and sets up expectations for the "middle and end," which can be kept the same, changed, redirected, or even ironically fulfilled as the reader reads, depending on the rules of the genre or type of text. (Jauss, 23)

Horizons of expectation change. The criteria help readers decide what they think about, say, a poem in a way that is not just based on their own opinions. The poetry of a certain time is judged, valued, and interpreted by the people of that time, but the views of the time don't always set the meaning and value of the poetry for good. The Horizon of Expectations of each generation will change, so neither the meaning nor the value of something is set in stone. Jauss says that a piece of writing is not a thing that can stand on its own and show the same face to every reader at every time. It's not a monument that tells its story in a single sentence. Each age

reinterprets poetry in light of its own knowledge, experience, and cultural environment. The value of a piece of writing is based on its "aesthetic distance," or how far it is from what its first readers expected it to be. (Dictionary, page 387) Here, Jauss makes a connection between literature and general history. This is seen as a major contribution to the theory of literature. Jauss says that the task of literary history is "completed" when "literary production is not only represented synchronically and diachronically in the succession of its systems, but also seen as "special history" in its own unique relationship to "general history." (Jauss, 39) Jauss says that the reader's life experiences, customs, and understanding of the world shape the reader's horizon of expectations, which in turn affects the reader's social behaviour.

In this way, history becomes an important part of the horizon of expectations. This is what makes Jauss's approach to Reception Theory different from Iser's. Jauss also says that the horizon of expectations is a key part of how literature and society are connected. Jauss says, "The social function of literature shows itself in its truest form only when the reader's literary experience enters into the horizon of expectation." (Jauss, 39)

It's clear that Jauss's theory cares about how involved the reader is and understands how important the reader's expectations are. Reception Theory is a new way of thinking about how a reader's role relates to ideas of interpretation. It is one of the most important things to happen in the history of literature, and it gives us a new way of looking at literary experiences. It gave writers and theorists a new way to look at things. Even though it's hard to fully understand how powerful and groundbreaking this model shift was at the time, it's easy to see that the ideas that came out of Reception Theory are now a big part of how we try to understand literature, art, and the world. The theory frees the work of art from ideas like "text is a strictly articulated form" or "text is a specific thing of a certain historical period" and puts it back in the hands of the reader and his or her expectations.

Jauss also explains the importance of the aesthetic of reception by saying that it is a bridge between passive reception and active understanding, between norm-setting experience and new production. If the history of literature is seen in this way, as a conversation between the work and the public, the difference between how it looks and how it happened is always being worked out. So, the thread between how a work looked in the past and how it is experienced now is tied back together. (Jauss and Benzinger, 8)

Jauss says that the relationship between a book and its reader has both aesthetic and historical effects. He said, "The aesthetic implication is seen in the fact that when a reader first encounters a work, he or she compares its aesthetic value to that of other works they have already read." The obvious historical implication of this is that the first reader's appreciation will continue and grow as the work is "received" by new generations. This is how the historical importance of a work and its aesthetic value can be found. In this process of history reception, which a literary historian can only avoid by ignoring his own rules for understanding and judging, past works are reclaimed at the same time that past and present art, as well as traditional evaluation and new literary attempts, are constantly mediated. ... The aesthetic of reception makes it clear what the criteria are for making such a canon and why literary history must always be told again. When we move from the history of how each work was received to the history of literature, we have to be able to see and explain the historical order of works in a way that shows how they shape and explain our current literary experience. (Jauss and Benzinger, 9) Based on these points, Jauss says that literary history can be rewritten.

Assumptions underlying the Rasa and Reception theories:

Rasa theory is predicated on the following assumptions:

A literary work makes the person who reads it feel something and gives them aesthetic pleasure (literary experience). Rasa is what a person who enjoys a work of art or a play feels when they enjoy it or learn from it. Every person has sthayibhav, which is a constant emotion based on three unitary principles like vibhav, anubhav, and sancharibhav. People have always wanted to use art to show how they feel, what they think, and what they are thinking. A poet or playwright has the ability to show how they feel, think, or what they are thinking in a beautiful way. A piece of literature has things like imagination, depth, and a creative way of expressing itself. There is a link between the artists' subject matter and the language they use. When vibhav, anubhav, sancharibhav, and sthayibhav come together in a piece of writing, the rasa is shown. All human minds always have a dormant stage of stayibhav, which is a permanent emotion. Sancharibhav are also known as feelings that come and go. They are different from permanent emotions because they are neither natural nor permanent. Instead, they are created by emotions. There are two kinds of vibhav: Alambana vibhav (which causes a lot of excitement) and Uddipana vibhav (enhancer excitant). Anubhav means the result of any emotion. The poetic word has the power to imply, and this implication becomes an inevitable and necessary way to make the reader feel

poetic pleasure through the text. Bharata calls a person who sees things as they are "sahardya," which means that they have a poetic sense and are kind.

Some assumptions have been used to build reception theory, such as,

Literary history can be a challenge to literary theory, which hasn't been able to settle the disagreement between the Marxist school and the formalist school. The aesthetic of production, the aesthetic of representation, the aesthetic of reception, and the aesthetic of social function are all ways to look at literature. In these systems, the author, the text, and the reader are all very important. A text isn't written so that a philologist or historian can read it and figure out what it means. Instead, it's written for the reader, whose role is the same for both aesthetic and historical appreciation. Critics who judge new works, writers who write based on what worked and what didn't work in other works, and historians who classify the work in its tradition and explain its historical context all have to read it first before they can respond to it in a productive way. The historical life of a text can only be thought of if the reader is actively involved in the process of communication. The work reaches the horizon of experience in a continuity in which there is a constant change from simple reception to critical understanding, from passive reception to active reception, and from a known aesthetic norm to a new production that goes beyond it. Literature's historical nature and its ability to communicate require a relationship between the work, the reader, and the new work. This relationship takes the form of a dialogue and process, which can be understood in terms of questions and answers, problems and solutions. The problem of understanding the historical order of literary works as a continuity of literary history can be solved in new ways by expanding the method of literary criticism to include the aesthetics of reception and its effects. The perspective of the theory acts as a bridge between passive reception and active understanding, between experiences that set norms and those that lead to new ideas. The history of literature should be seen as a conversation between the work and the public, so that the differences between how it looks and how it was made can be smoothed out. So, the thread that historicism had broken between how a work looked in the past and how it is seen now is tied back together. The relationship between a piece of writing and its reader has both artistic and historical effects. The aesthetic meaning comes from the fact that when a reader first sees a work, he or she compares it to other works they have already read to see how it looks. The appreciation of the first reader will continue and grow as the work is "received" by new generations. This is how the historical importance of a work and its aesthetic value will become

clear. In order to do literary history, a literary historian must go against his own understanding and judging rules. History of literature is a process of aesthetic reception and production that happens when literary texts are brought to life by an open-minded reader, a critical thinker, and an author who keeps coming up with new ideas. (Jauss & Benzinger, 7-10).

Methodologies of Rasa and Reception Theories:

Since rasa theory wasn't made as a way to judge a literary work of art, it was made as a guide for new playwrights to understand the different points of view of the audience. Keeping this in mind, we can sum up the methods of rasa theory as follows:

Rasa theory says that the goal of any literary work of art must be to appeal to the mind of the person who sees it and to give that person pleasure. Rasa is the idea that a piece of written art should give the person who reads it pleasure. For the goal of aesthetic pleasure, a literary work of art should be presented in relation to the emotions that people always feel. A permanent emotion (sthayibhav) should be at the centre of a literary work of art, and different parts of sthayibhav should be included in the different parts of the literary work of art. Sthayibhav is made up of the three parts Vibhav, Anubhav, and Sancharibhav. These are the basic rules of emotion that don't change (sthayibhav). A literary work of art should be able to make the person who reads it feel something. The ability can only be reached if the literary work of art is well planned, structured, and tells the story of the different bhava, emotions, and related principles. The poet or playwright should make the whole world fall in love with those words and their meanings, which we all use every day, by putting them in the right and most beautiful order. A piece of literature is a written or spoken account of an event that uses language and diction appropriate to the situation and is told in a creative way based on the author's imagination and depth of thought. An artist should be able to describe any event, soaring on the wings of his imagination and putting it into words in a way that fits the subject matter. Indian poetry calls this kind of pleasure "rasa." When we enjoy a piece of creative writing (which can come in many different forms), we call ourselves "perceivers." According to Bharata, rasa happens when the sthayibhav, or the emotion of a reader or viewer, is linked to three things in a piece of creative literature: the Vibhav (excitement), the Anubhav (reaction), and the Sancharibhav (temporary feeling). All three of these things should be brought together as one. Permanent emotions, called sthayibhav, are always there in a dormant state in all human minds as basic instincts, and they are fed by a number of smaller emotions called transitory feelings. We are born with feelings that stick with us. These things

can't be learned or taught, and they don't come from feelings or emotions either. Bharata calls a common person a *sahadya*, which means they have a poetic sense and are kind. When a person is in this state of mind, he or she is no longer tied to any of the characters, whether they are real or made up. As a result, the person's mind becomes as clean and clear as a mirror.

Historical objectivism, which is based on the aesthetics of production and representation, must give way to an aesthetic of reception and influence in literary history. Because a piece of writing is not a thing that can stand on its own and show the same face to every reader and every time. If literary history is to be brought back to life, the biases of historical objectivism need to be set aside, and the old way of looking at literature needs to be replaced with an aesthetic of reception and impact. "The historical importance of literature isn't based on how the works are put together after the fact, nor is it based on what the reader already knows about the works. This relationship creates a conversation, which is the first step in making a literary history. For the literary historian must first become a reader again before he can understand and categorise a work, or before he can justify his own evaluation based on where he stands in the history of readers. (Jauss, 20)

The aesthetic of reception avoids psychological threats by looking at how a work affected people at the time it came out, how well people knew the genre it was in, and how similar its themes were to those in other works. A text doesn't just appear out of nowhere; it uses signs, genres, and other things that people already know. "The study of the literary experience of the reader can avoid the scary downsides of psychology if it defines the reception and effect of a work in terms of an objective system of expectation, belief, or that arises for each work in the historical moment of its presence, from a prior understanding of the genre, from the form and themes of already familiar works, and from the contrast between poetic and practical language." (Jauss, 22)

The way a text makes the reader feel can be used to figure out what kind of art it is. The aesthetic distance between the text and its audience, which can be seen in how the reader responds to the text and how critics judge it, is what causes the text to open up new perspectives or change the reader's view of the familiar. When the horizon of expectations is remade in this way, it lets you figure out its creative appeal based on the kind and amount of effect it has on an assumed audience. Jauss says, "If one defines aesthetic distance as the difference between the given horizon of expectations and the appearance of a new work, whose reception can result in a "change of horizon" by negating familiar experiences or by bringing newly articulated

experiences to the level of consciousness, then this aesthetic distance can be measured historically along the spectrum of the audience's reactions and criticism's judgments (spontaneous judgments)." (Jauss, 25)

The reconstruction of the original horizon of expectations lets us compare how things were understood in the past and how they are understood now. It also makes us aware of the history of how the text has been read, which sits between the two horizons. " When you restore the expectations that a work was made and received in the past, you can ask questions that the text answers and learn how a modern reader might have seen and understood the work. This method corrects the mostly unnoticed flaws of a "classicist" or "modernising" view of art and avoids the circular use of the "spirit of the age." It shows the difference between how a work was understood in the past and how it is understood now. It also brings to mind the history of the work's reception, which sits between the two points of view. This calls into question as a Platonizing dogma of philological metaphysics the seemingly self-evident claims that literature is always present in the literary text and that its objective meaning, decided once and for all, is always easily accessible. (Jauss, 28) A literary historian must see the literary fact in relation to the change in horizons that the text brings about by negating the familiar or opening up new perspectives. This is because of the aesthetic distance between the text and its audience, which can be measured by the reader's reaction and the critic's judgments.

To understand the historical importance of a piece of literature, you have to look at it in the context of the other works in the same genre. The literary work solves formal and moral problems that the last work left behind, and it also brings up new problems. Jauss sees literary history as a constant conversation between the writing of the past and the writing of the present. Jauss says, "The theory of the aesthetics of reception not only lets us think about the meaning and form of a literary work in terms of how it has been understood over time. It also requires that the individual work be placed in its "literary series" to understand its historical place and importance in the context of literary experiences. In the transition from a history of how works were received to a history of events in literature, the latter shows itself as a process in which authors do the passive receiving. In other words, the next work can solve formal and moral problems left over from the previous one, and it can also bring up new problems. (Jauss, 32) A literary work comes out with certain answers that meet the reader's expectations, but it also raises new questions that change the reader's expectations. If a literary historian can find the historical

tradition or literary series that the text is part of, they can also find the historical importance of the text.

Because of changes in linguistics, the diachronic method is no longer the only way to study literary history. The synchronic method couldn't tell how good a piece of literature was when it first came out. The method only looks at it as a fact at a certain time in literary history. It doesn't compare it to other works of art from that time, which could help define the objective value of the work of art. Jauss says, "The accomplishment is...." When changing aesthetic tastes are taken into account, the history of reception always comes up against the functional connections between how new works are understood and what they mean, so it must also be possible to take a synchronic cross-section of a moment in the development, arrange the different works of the same time in a way that is equal, opposite, and hierarchical, and find an overarching theme. From this, the principle of representing new literary history could be built, if more cross-sections from before and after could be put together in a way that shows how literary structures changed at a turning point in history. (Jauss, 36) Synchronic study lets us see how different texts that look like they were written around the same time show how different values and structures play out.

Literary history is not just history in general. It is a special kind of history that serves a social purpose. It fits into history in a way that isn't like anything else. The social function of literature is when a reader's literary experience enters into the expectations of his lived praxis, shapes his understanding of the world, and has an effect on how he acts in social situations. Jauss says, "The task of literary history is therefore only finished when literary production is not only represented synchronically and diachronically in the order of its systems, but also seen as "special history" in its own unique relationship to general history." This relationship doesn't end with the fact that "a typified, idealised, satirical, or utopian image of the social function of literature manifests itself in its real possibility only where the literary experience of the reader enters into the horizon of expectations of his lived praxis, shapes his understanding of the world, and has an effect on his social behaviour." (Jauss, 39) So, a literary historian must look at a piece of literature not only from a historical point of view, but also in terms of how it works in the present. Literature has a social purpose. It takes the reader to a new aesthetic form that both fulfils their expectations and breaks them by presenting them with new challenges and questions. Through the process of a reader's expectations being met or changed, or through the question-

and-answer process, literature affects the reader's understanding of the world and his or her social behaviour and morals.

Fundamentals of Rasa and Reception Theories:

The following are the rasa theory's guiding principles:

- Rasa theory says that the goal of any piece of literary art is to make the person who sees it happy by appealing to his or her emotions.
- Rasa is the word for the pleasure that a literary work gives to the person who sees it.
- Sthayibhav is an emotion that lasts all the time. It has three parts: Vibhav, Anubhav, and Sancharibhav. These are the core emotions that never change (sthayibhav).
- When a literary work of art is well planned, structured, and tells the story of the different bhava, emotions, and related principles, it can appeal to the emotions of the person who sees it.
- Poets and playwrights make the whole world fall in love with these words and their meanings, which we use every day, just by putting them in the right and most beautiful order.
- Humans are hardwired to want to share their feelings, thoughts, and expressions with others.
- A piece of literature is a written or spoken account of an event that uses language and diction appropriate to the situation and is told in a creative way based on the author's imagination and depth of thought.
- A poet is someone who writes about real or imagined events in a way that shows off his or her imagination and uses beautiful language and diction that fits the subject matter.
- Indian poetry calls this kind of pleasure "rasa." When we enjoy a piece of creative writing (which can come in many different forms), we call ourselves "perceivers."
- In English, rasa means "aesthetic pleasure," "aesthetic enjoyment," "aesthetic bliss," "poetic pleasure," "poetic relish," "poetic delight," "poetic dictation," and many other things.
- Rasa shows up when the sthayibhav, or the emotion of a reader or viewer, is linked to three things in a piece of creative writing: the excitation, the response, and the fleeting feeling. All three of these things should come together as one.

- Permanent emotions, called sthayibhav, are always there in a dormant state in all human minds as basic instincts, and they are fed by a number of smaller emotions called transitory feelings.
- The short-term feelings (sancharibhav) are different from the long-term feelings. Thirty-three of these have been named, but more could be added. These are not like emotions because they are neither natural nor permanent. Instead, they come from the emotions themselves. For example, the depression caused by sadness.
- When a piece of creative writing shows what makes a basic emotion (vibhav) happen in the real world, this is called an excitant. There are two types: Alambana vibhav (a strong stimulant) and Uddipana vibhav (enhancer excitant).
- Anubhav is the effect of any emotion. For example, a person's physical reactions to a lion in the jungle, such as trembling, sweating, hiccuping, fainting, etc., are all examples of ensuing responses.
- The poetic word has the power to imply, and this implication becomes an inevitable and necessary way to make the reader feel poetic pleasure through the text.
- The human mind has three modes, called Gunas: Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas. These are the qualities of (i) goodness or magnanimity, (ii) passion, energy, or luxury, and (iii) ignorance or illusion. When someone is enjoying the pleasure of poetry, their mind is said to be dominated by the mode of magnanimity and unaffected by the other two modes.
- Bharata calls a common person a sahardya, which means they have a poetic sense and are kind. When a person is in this state of mind, he or she is no longer tied to any of the characters, whether they are real or made up. As a result, the person's mind becomes as clean and clear as a mirror.
- Perceiver enjoys the feeling of the character that is the original person only when he is not a specific person for the perceiver, when he is just a regular person and not a specific one. (Sadharanikaran)
- When a person understands the meaning of a text, all three of the above-mentioned phenomena—vibhav (excitement), anubhav (response), and sancharibhav (transient feeling)—become generalised, which means that the characters and all the situations that involve them lose their sense of time and place. The character loses what makes them unique.

- The rasa is temporary, which means that the people who read the poetry or watch the dramas with sad themes can't wait to read or watch them and get pleasure from them. A reader moves from his or her own emotional ground to a common ground. This means that his or her grief or fear is no longer tied to a specific place, time, or person.
- Advanced psychology says that vibhav, anubhav, and sancharibhav are most important for permanent emotions to show up (sthayibhav).

The ideas behind rasa theory are very stable, so they are not limited by time, place, culture, etc. Rasa is independent and universal, and you can see traces of it in the way western poetry is written.

CONCLUSION:

In light of what has been said so far, we can say the following about the difference between Rasa theory and Reception theory:

- Both rasa theory and reception have put the reader at the centre of literary discussion. Both theories agree that meaning is only possible when the reader or viewer is there.
- Both theories agree on the idea of "literary experience." Rasa means an experience of aesthetic pleasure, and the theory of aesthetic reception is the experience of reading.
- Both theories say that literature is an art form that appeals to the bhava (inner state of mind) and expectations of the person reading it. The quality of the writing is what takes the reader from the real world to the world of literature.
- There is a conversation between literature and the person who reads or watches it. Both theories insist that the reader or viewer is an important part of the process. In the rasa theory, the correlation of bhava to each other makes a person feel the same way a character feels during an event that is played out on stage. In the same way, in reception theory, a reader is involved in the process of reading by talking back and forth with the text and trying to meet his own expectations.
- Both theories take into account the psychological side of people. In the rasa theory, Bharata says that a person's sthayibhav, or permanent emotion, is linked to the other three unitary bhava, such as vibhav, anubhav, and sancharibhav, in a way that makes rasa happen. In the same way, Jauss came up with the term "Horizon of expectations," which refers to the standards that readers use to judge literary works in any given time.

- Literature can change the lives of people who read or watch it. In rasa theory, the viewer reaches his lived practise through the Sadharanikaran principle and is freed from his or her own real-life problems through new literary experiences. In reception theory, the social role of literature has been talked about. It shows up in its truest form only when the literary experience of the reader enters into the horizon of expectation of his lived praxis, changes how he sees the world, and has an effect on how he acts in social situations.
- In both theories, the whole process of writing is taken into account. Bharata came up with the rasa theory to give new playwrights a solid foundation on which they can build successful plays. He has talked about all the parts of the process of writing, such as creation, representation, and reception. In reception theory, the role of the author is not fully explained, but Jauss has said that the author must first be a reader before his response to literature can be useful again.
- Both theories agree that different people have different personalities. Bharata has described the different types of perceivers based on which of the three guna they have the most of. The three guna are sattva, rajas, and tamas. In reception theory, Jauss says that how a work is received depends on the reader's own values, principles, artistic taste, social, cultural, and economic background.
- Both the fusion of horizon of expectation and the manifestation of rasa lead to a new literary experience. In rasa theory, a person can feel the rasa when vibhav, anubhav, and sancharibhav are related to Sthayibhav through an act on the stage, and they can then enter a new literary experience. In reception theory, the reader's expectations blend with the text through a constant conversation between the reader and the text. The reader's expectations are either met or he is faced with new challenges (expectation).
- In both theories, the reader or observer is thought to have certain traits. In Bharata's rasa theory, the person who perceives is called "sahardya," which means a person with a poetic sense or a generous person. Jauss says that every reader has his or her own set of rules, ideas about what art is worth, and taste based on what they have learned, read, and done in the past. When a person reads a text, they do so with certain expectations and values that they have already learned.

- Origin: The rasa theory and the reception theory are different in how they got started. Rasa theory began in India around 2000 BC, and Bharata wrote about it in a book called Natyashastra.
- Both theories have the same subject, which is the role of the reader or viewer in how aesthetic pleasure is perceived, but they have different goals. Rasa theory tries to give new playwrights the tools they need to write plays that do well. Reception theory is an attempt to rewrite literary history based on how works were received and how they affected people. It also aims to create a new literary canon based on the aesthetics of reception.
- Background: Bharata came up with rasa theory without a lot of scholarly or literary evidence to back it up. There are no signs that can be used to say what Bharata's background is. Reception theory is based on a very strong body of academic research. Jauss starts with the theory of how a reader responds to a text and moves on to the aesthetics of reception. He then tries to figure out what a text means in its historical tradition or in its literary series.
- Rasa theory is made up on its own and is not meant to find the answer to a question that another theory either brought up or made. Reception theory was made on purpose to solve the problem of writing literary history and to move away from traditional socialist Marxism, which put the text in the background, and structural formalism, which didn't pay attention to the author or society behind the text.
- Role of the reader or observer: The role of the perceiver is important, but the two theories have different ideas about how the process of literary experience works. Rasa theory looks at the deepest psychological parts of the person watching (sthayibhav, vibhav, anubhav, and sancharibhav) as the foundations of rasa. Reception theory, on the other hand, doesn't usually deal with the reader's mind, but it does look at things like the reader's expectations and literary background.
- Bharata came up with ideas like sthayibhav, vibhav, anubhav, and sancharibhav, which are built into the human mind and become active when stimulated from the outside. But the idea of horizon of expectation isn't built into the human mind. Instead, it comes from what a reader already knows, what they've read, what they've done with literature, and their own values and principles.

- In both theories, the term "literary experience" is used, but the process of having a literary experience is different in each. Rasa can only happen when the vibhav, anubhav, and sancharibhav of the performer match up with the sthayibhav of the audience in the right way (representation). In reception theory, on the other hand, a reader gets to know a piece of writing by talking back and forth with it and trying to meet his or her expectations or challenges.
- Even though it applies to most types of writing, rasa theory only talks about drama because it doesn't talk about other types of writing anywhere. It also only looks at how the viewer feels inside and doesn't take into account things like the reader's background or other things that affect how they see things. Jauss has talked about these things, but he hasn't talked about the psychological factors that affect how we see things. But Jauss adds the text's historical importance to its literary series, which makes reception theory a cosmic idea.
- In his rasa theory, Bharata hasn't said much about how literature works in society. In his last thesis, Jauss went into detail about what literature is for. He says that a reader's literary experience shapes his understanding of the world and how he acts in social situations.
- Rasa theory can only be understood in terms of the psychological state of the viewer, and only that. Reception theory, on the other hand, can be understood in terms of the reader's psychological state, background, the text's historical significance in its literary tradition, etc.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory Classes, Nations, Literature*. Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2002.
- [2] Aloki, Tatsaya. *Study of Nagarjun Theory of Emptiness*, P. 58.
- [3] Amacher, Richard. Victor Lange. (Ed.). *New perspective in German Literary Criticism*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2009.
- [4] Apt, V S. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 2005.

- [5] Baldick, Chris. *A Concise Dictionary of Literary terms*. 2nd Ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014.
- [6] Barfield, Thomas. *The Dictionary of Anthropology*. Blackwell. Oxford.
- [7] Bennett, Susan. Ed. *Theatre Audience: a Theory of Production and Reception*. Rutledge, New York, 2000.
- [8] Bharata, *Natyashastra*, with “*Abhinavabharati*” by Abhinavgupta, (Ed.). With Sanskrit Commentary “*Madhsudani*” and Hindi Trans. by Madhusudan Shastri, 3 Vol. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University, 2001-2011.
- [9] Bharatrhari. *The Vakyapadiya*. Trans. K. Raghavan Pillai. Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, 2001.
- [10] Brooker, Peter. *A Glossary of Cultural Theory*. 2nd Ed. Arnold, London, 2012.
- [11] Chandra, Joseph. K S. Antony Sammy. *Classical To Contemporary Literary Theory: A Demystified Approach*. Atlantic Publication. New Delhi, 2015.
- [12] Chari, V K. *Rasa as an Aesthetic Concept: Some Comments from the Point of View of Western Criticism*. Unpublished Papers. International Sanskrit Conference, March 2012, New Delhi.
- [13] Chari, V K. *Sanskrit Criticism*. Motilal Banarasidass, New Delhi, 2003.
- [14] Childs, Peter. Ed. *The Rutledge Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Rutledge, London, 2015.
- [15] Chomsky, N. *Language and Mind*. Harcourt, Brace and World Inc, New York, 2008.
- [16] Coward, H. *Sphota Theory of Language*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 2000.
- [17] Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*, Cornell University Press, Ethaca, N. W.; 2002.
- [18] Das, Bijay Kumar. *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism*. Atlantic Publishers, New Delhi, 2017.

[19] Dasgupta, S A. *History of Indian Philosophy*. (Vol. 1) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[20] De, S K. *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. (2Vol.). Firma K. L. Mukhopdhyay, Kolkata, 2000.