

Postcoloniality of Indian Poetics: A Critical Analysis

Dr. Janmejy Kumar Tiwari

Assistant Professor, KS Saket PG College, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

Postcolonial literature is the literature by people from formerly colonized countries. It exists on all continents except Antarctica. Postcolonial literature often addresses the problems and consequences of the decolonization of a country, especially questions relating to the political and cultural independence of formerly subjugated people, and themes such as racialism and colonialism. A range of literary theory has evolved around the subject. It addresses the role of literature in perpetuating and challenging what postcolonial critic Edward Said refers to as cultural imperialism. Migrant literature and postcolonial literature show some considerable overlap. However, not all migration takes place in a colonial setting, and not all postcolonial literature deals with migration. A question of current debate is the extent to which postcolonial theory also speaks to migration literature in non-colonial settings. One of the key issues is the superiority/inferiority of Indian Writing in English (IWE) as opposed to the literary production in the various languages of India. Key polar concepts bandied in this context are superficial/authentic, imitative/creative, shallow/deep, critical/uncritical, elitist/parochial and so on. The views of Salman Rushdie and Amit Chaudhuri expressed through their books *The Vintage Book of Indian Writing* and *The Picador Book of Modern Indian Literature* respectively essentialise this battle. Rushdie's statement in his book – "the ironic proposition that India's best writing since independence may have been done in the language of the departed imperialists is simply too much for some folks to bear" – created a lot of resentment among many writers, including writers in English. In his book, Amit Chaudhuri questions – "Can it be true that Indian writing, that endlessly rich, complex and problematic entity, is to be represented by a handful of writers who write in English, who live in England or America and whom one might have met at a party."

How to cite this paper: Dr. Janmejy Kumar Tiwari "Postcoloniality of Indian Poetics: A Critical Analysis" Published in International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), ISSN: 2456-6470, Volume-6 | Issue-6, October 2022, pp.164-170, URL: www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd51841.pdf



Copyright © 2022 by author(s) and International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development Journal. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)



KEYWORDS: *postcoloniality, Indian, poetics, critical, analysis, writers, English, arguments, experiences, literature*

INTRODUCTION

Chaudhuri feels that after Rushdie, Indian writing in English started employing magical realism, bagginess, non-linear narrative and hybrid language to sustain themes seen as microcosms of India and supposedly reflecting Indian conditions. He contrasts this with the works of earlier writers such as R. K. Narayan where the use of English is pure, but the deciphering of meaning needs cultural familiarity. He also feels that Indian is a theme constructed only in IWE and does not articulate itself in the vernacular literature. He further adds "the post-colonial novel, becomes a trope for an ideal hybrid by which the West celebrates not so much Indian, whatever that infinitely complex thing is, but its own historical quest, its reinterpretation of itself".[1,2]

Some of these arguments form an integral part of what is called postcolonial theory. The very categorisation of IWE – as IWE or under post-colonial literature – is seen by some as limiting. Amitav Ghosh made his views on this very clear by refusing to accept the Eurasian Commonwealth Writers Prize for his book *The Glass Palace* in 2001 and withdrawing it from the subsequent stage.

The renowned writer V. S. Naipaul, a third generation Indian from Trinidad and Tobago and a Nobel Prize laureate, is a person who belongs to the world and usually not classified under IWE. Naipaul evokes ideas of homeland, rootlessness and his own personal feelings towards India in many of his books.

Indian authors like Amitav Ghosh, Anita Desai, Hanif Kureishi, Rohinton Mistry, Meena Alexander, Arundhati Roy and Kiran Desai have written about their postcolonial experiences.

Water is a natural element that has been universally and religiously recognized as a purifying natural symbol. In India this element acquires special significance from a literary perspective, from poetry to narrative. In a current world that appears to be devoid of spiritual values, where technological modernity is an integral part of our daily experience, it seems necessary to rediscover and recover old sacred values that acquire significant meaning as explained under the eye of an eco-spiritual approach to several examples taken from the corpus of Indian writing in English. In the midst of a world that has turned into a globalised village with hardly any cultural differences, proud as we are of our age of information and communication, it seems necessary to bring forward forgotten values essential to human beings. In Indian writing they can be identified by the symbol of water and the image of the river.[3,4]

Poetry first seemed to represent the difficult confrontation with a dislocated cultural, political and social field or with a conscience torn between contradictory tensions. Today, the anxiety of poets who write in English seems to have been overcome, their voice is freed from the trauma or the guilt of a so-called alienated postcolonial conscience, from the need to justify themselves in front of an Indian or a Western audience. The poetry of estrangement born from the feelings of dislocation and disquieting otherness of the self and of reality seems to have given way to a poetics of strangeness as revelation and regeneration of the world.

Both, like many Indian poets of their generation, have been influenced by various inspirations, ranging from the immediate impact of Western modernity, extreme modernism and surrealism, to the heritage of the most classical Indian texts and myths, to the varied often heterodox voices of folk literature and living oral traditions, to elements of mass culture and a range of ideological discourses, in particular Marxism. They ask for “[the] right to claim everything that comes from [their] roots and everything that comes from elsewhere and put the two together in one defiant all-inclusive category”. But if poets may today claim rather than suffer from plural belongings and identities, the second half of the twentieth century—which indeed represented, as the poet Dilip Chitre asserts, a “fantastic conglomeration of clashing realities,” with a “tremendous variety of cross-influences” -was not only a period of excitement and

angelical hybridization but of chaos and disarray as well.[5,6]

In the sixties and the seventies, Indian poetry both in English and in the vernacular languages was often shaped by rebellion or defiance, which expressed itself either by a reactive and realistic discourse, or by restless formal experimentalism, the two modes sometimes combining. Poetry represented a kind of struggle at a time when—as V. S. Naipaul suggestively portrays in two of his books on the tumultuous seventies and eighties (India: a Million Mutinies Now and India: A Wounded civilization)—India rediscovered the multiple fissures of the national fabric and the violence (against untouchables, women, minorities etc) which had been eclipsed for a time by the independence movement. If Independence had come to India like a revolution, now there were many revolutions within that revolution, the writer argues.

“I feel external reality bearing down on me from all sides with a pressure strong enough to tear the eardrums,” also writes the poet Keki Daruwalla. And poetry seemed indeed to struggle with the outside world and with the extreme pressure of outside events: the Maoist naxalite insurgency at the end of the 60s, the state of Emergency declared by Indira Gandhi from 1975 to 1977, or the widespread disillusionment (“moh-bhang” in Hindi) born from the betrayed promises of Independence. Poetry was also struggling with language itself, with English, which is often seen as the sign of a continuing colonial bondage, and with the Sanskritized standardized versions of the other main languages as well: “Hindi is India’s national language (sic), but part of the contemporary writer’s importance lies in the fact that he works against his language”[7,8]

Discussion

The postcolonial discourse in India has attempted to appropriate Tagore within its fold. But he cannot be appropriated by a single discourse, let alone by postcolonialism. His works, when keenly examined, transcend postcolonial thinking. The re-examination of Tagore’s views and ideas, on the other hand, hold immense value for the current political discourse of nationalism and democracy in India.

There are striking similarities between the topics covered by Rabindranath Tagore’s works and the postcolonial literature. Tagore has been portrayed as a unique postcolonial scholar who approached issues from a unique vantage point. Even Edward Said has accorded Tagore the identity of a postcolonial thinker.[9,10]

The postcolonial discourse in India has made many attempts to appropriate Tagore within its fold, and it is not that its arguments are weak. We can take two of Tagore's famous novels *The Home and the World* (1916) and *Four Chapters* (1934), which are set against the backdrop of political upheavals, for the purpose of examining this point. The protagonists from both the novels—represented by Nikhil, Bimala, Sandip (from *The Home and the World*) and Indranath, Ela, and Atin (from *Four Chapters*)—embody the happenings that took place during their subjugation by the British colonisers, amidst the Indian freedom struggle. The main focus in both the novels is on the discourse encompassing cultural, political, social, and economic issues which reflect the mindset of the people during those times. The novels clearly depict the British colonisation of India, the bold rejection of subjugation by the protagonists, and the reasons for doing so. Thus, the need for self-identity and recognition was beginning to take root in the heart and soul of the people of India at that time. Tagore's initiative to instil self-worth into a colonised people is portrayed through his novels. [11]

But, surely, Tagore cannot be appropriated by a single discourse, let alone by postcolonialism. His works, when keenly examined, transcend postcolonial thinking. Michael Collins in his 2011 book, *Empire, Nationalism and the Postcolonial World: Rabindranath Tagore's Writings on History, Politics and Society*, argues that postcolonial historiography has not accorded Tagore the intellectual standing he deserves. His book strives to explain, on the one hand, why "Tagore has been consistently misunderstood, misrepresented, sometimes ignored, and in many respects diminished as a writer and thinker". On the other hand, it attempts to locate more precisely Tagore's importance for historians, political scientists, and theorists of modernity, postmodernity, and postcolonialism alike. It does so by laying out Tagore's "distinctively universalist philosophy," presented as a critique of certain aspects of modernity, and as an alternative to both empire and nation. On the other hand, Collins claims that "Tagore can help us better understand some of the failures of postcolonial theory." Tagore does not engage in an outright denunciation of the West, but acknowledges its good aspects (Tagore and Dasgupta 2009). He does not indulge in mirrored reactions; that is to denigrate the Western culture in return for their denigration of ours, the non-Western. Apparently, this appears to be a trend of postcolonialism in its attempt to reassert the self (the East). In contrast, Tagore attempts to draw an overarching bridge between the East and the West. He engages in an attempt to find harmony and unity in its true essence, a call to be one

with "the infinite." We can observe this in his novel *The Home and the World*. His conception of internationalism—located in the interactions between colonial and postcolonial, East and West, tradition and modernity—contains the seeds of cosmopolitanism, as he perceives colonialism as a two-way process.

Taking the context of British colonialism in India, he observes that colonialism steers nationalism into becoming imperialistic. He was concerned about anti-colonial resistance in India which morphed into chauvinistic nationalism, which has been the characteristic of Western nationalism. For instance, referring to the burning of "foreign" goods by Indian nationalist leaders, during the freedom struggle, he said such acts were not only self-defeating, but also a mere imitation of Western nationalism. [12,13]

However, on the other hand, Tagore believed that colonialism presented a chance through which the West came to be experienced by India, and thereby, introduced a channel of learning and exchange. Tagore argues that certain extreme forms of nationalism, espoused and used in India's struggle for independence, are ultimately self-defeating, and perceives nationalism as a purely Western construct, warning against the extreme frenzy of nationalism. For him, independence lay both in denunciation of imperialism and the retention of the channel of learning and exchange. It is in Tagore's ability to accommodate such contrasting viewpoints does one find the roots of cosmopolitanism. Surely, this cosmopolitanism is beyond the coverage of postcolonial discourse.

Postcolonial theory is a body of thought primarily concerned with accounting for the political, aesthetic, economic, historical, and social impact of European colonial rule around the world in the 18th through the 20th century. Postcolonial theory takes many different shapes and interventions, but all share a fundamental claim: that the world we inhabit is impossible to understand except in relationship to the history of imperialism and colonial rule. This means that it is impossible to conceive of "European philosophy," "European literature," or "European history" as existing in the absence of Europe's colonial encounters and oppression around the world. It also suggests that colonized world stands at the forgotten center of global modernity. The prefix "post" of "postcolonial theory" has been rigorously debated, but it has never implied that colonialism has ended; indeed, much of postcolonial theory is concerned with the lingering forms of colonial authority after the formal end of Empire. Other forms of postcolonial theory are openly endeavoring to

imagine a world after colonialism, but one which has yet to come into existence. Postcolonial theory emerged in the US and UK academies in the 1980s as part of a larger wave of new and politicized fields of humanistic inquiry, most notably feminism and critical race theory. As it is generally constituted, postcolonial theory emerges from and is deeply indebted to anticolonial thought from South Asia and Africa in the first half of the 20th century. In the US and UK academies, this has historically meant that its focus has been these regions, often at the expense of theory emerging from Latin and South America. Over the course of the past thirty years, it has remained simultaneously tethered to the fact of colonial rule in the first half of the 20th century and committed to politics and justice in the contemporary moment. This has meant that it has taken multiple forms: it has been concerned with forms of political and aesthetic representation; it has been committed to accounting for globalization and global modernity; it has been invested in reimagining politics and ethics from underneath imperial power, an effort that remains committed to those who continue to suffer its effects; and it has been interested in perpetually discovering and theorizing new forms of human injustice, from environmentalism to human rights. Postcolonial theory has influenced the way we read texts, the way we understand national and transnational histories, and the way we understand the political implications of our own knowledge as scholars. Despite frequent critiques from outside the field (as well as from within it), postcolonial theory remains one of the key forms of critical humanistic interrogation in both academia and in the world.[14,15]

Results

The Western tradition of literary theory and criticism essentially derives from the Greeks, and there is a sense in which Plato, Aristotle, and Longinus mark out positions and debates that are still being played out today. At a moment when we are questioning the sufficiency of such Western critical methods to make sense of the plethora of literatures produced by the world's cultures, it may be useful to remind ourselves that other equally ancient classical critical traditions exist. There is an unbroken line of literary theory and criticism in Indian culture that goes back at least as far as the Western tradition. Indian criticism constitutes an important and largely untapped resource for literary theorists, as the Indian tradition in important respects assigns a more central role to literature than the Greek tradition does.

While explicit literary theory in India can be traced as far back as the fourth century b.c.e., placing Indian critical theory at the same time as Aristotle and Plato,

there is much discussion of poetic and literary practice in the Vedas, which developed over the period 1500 BCE-500 BCE. In India, literary theory and criticism was never isolated simply as an area of philosophy; the practice and appreciation of literature was deeply woven into religion and daily life. While Plato argued in *The Republic* that the social role of the poet was not beneficial, Ayurveda, the science of Indian medicine, believed that a perfectly structured couplet by its rhythms could literally clean the air and heal the sick. We know this perfect couplet today as the mantra, literally “verse.” Sanskrit poetry has to be in the precise meter of the sloka, comparable to the heroic couplet, to be able to speak to the hearer. The Vedic Aryans therefore worshipped Vach, the goddess of speech or holy word. Like the Greeks, Indian critics developed a formalistic system of rules of grammar and structure that were meant to shape literary works, but great emphasis was also laid on the meaning and essence of words. This became the literary- critical tenet of *rasadhvani*. In contrast to Plato's desire to expel poets and poetry from his republic, poetry in India was meant to lead individuals to live their lives according to religious and didactic purposes, creating not just an Aristotelian [15,16] “purgation of emotions” and liberation for an individual but a wider, political liberation for all of society. Society would then be freed from bad *ama*, or “ill will” and “feelings that generate bad karma,” causing individuals to live in greater harmony with each other. This essay outlines the various systems that aimed at creating and defining this liberatory purpose in literature through either form or content.[13]

The three major critical texts that form the basis of Sanskrit critical theory are Bharata's *Natyasastra* (second century C.E.), Anandavardhana's *Dhvanyaloka*, which was the foundation of the *dhvani* school of criticism, and Bhartrhari's theory of *rasa* in the *Satakas*, the last two dating to about c.E. 800. We shall discuss these works in the order in which the three genres—poetry, drama, and literary criticism—developed. Interestingly, these works asked questions that sound surprisingly contemporary. For example, a major question concerned whether “authority” rested with the poet or with the critic, that is, in the text or in the interpretation. In his major critical treatise, *Dhvanyaloka*, Anandavardhana concluded that “in the infinite world of literature, the poet is the creator, and the world changes itself so as to conform to the standard of his pleasure”. According to Anandavardhana, *kavirao* (“poet”) is equated with *Prajapati* (“Creator”). The poet creates the world the reader sees or experiences. Thus, Anandavardhana also jostled with the issue of the role of the poet, his

social responsibility, and whether social problems are an appropriate subject for literature. For Anandavardhana, “life imitated art”; hence the role of the poet is not just that of the “unacknowledged legislator of the world”—as P. B. Shelley stated—not just that of someone who speaks for the world, but that of someone who shapes social values and morality. The idea of *sahridaya* (“proper critic”), “one who is in sympathy with the poet’s heart,” is a concept that Western critics from I. A. Richards through F. R. Leavis to Stanley Fish have struggled with. In the Indian tradition, a critic is the sympathetic interpreter of the poet’s works.

But why interpretation? Why does a community that reads the works of its own writers need interpretation? How does the reader read, and what is the role of criticism? Indian philosophers and priests attempted to answer these questions in terms of the didactic purpose of literature as liberation. As we shall see, *rasadhvani* approximated closely to the Indian view of life, detachment from emotions that would cause bad karma, purgation of harmful emotions, and the subsequent road to moksha, “liberation.” Twentieth-century critics such as K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar and Kuppaswami Sastriar (both South Indians, the latter being the major Tamil interpreter of Sanskrit literary criticism) have brought about a revival of the *rasadhvani* schools of criticism. Similarly, Bengali writers such as Rabindranath Tagore were greatly influenced by the didactic purpose of literature that *rasadhvani* critics advocated.[14,15]

To understand how these critical theories developed, we need to look briefly at the development of Indian literature. The Rig Veda is considered the earliest extant poem in the Indo-European language family and is dated anywhere between 2500 b. c. e. and 600 B.C.E. It does, however, make reference to *kavya*, “stanzaic forms,” or poetry, that existed before the Rig Veda itself. The word *gatha*, referring to Zoroastrian religious verses that are sung, also occurs frequently in the Rig Veda. Valmiki, the author of the Ramayana, is considered the first poet, but as we shall see, Valmiki is also considered the first exponent of poetic form. The period between 600-500 B.C.E. and c.E. 200 is labeled the epic period by Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan (the first president of the postcolonial Republic of India and the most prolific scholar of Indian philosophy and critical theory) because it saw the development of the great epics, the Ramayana and the Mahabharata. According to Radhakrishnan, the Bhagavad Gita, which is a part of the Mahabharata, ranks as the most authoritative text in Indian philosophical literature because it is considered to

have been divinely revealed and because it apparently was noted down as it was revealed and therefore was not merely transmitted orally. In the Gita, Krishna and Arjuna philosophize about the role of the poet. The responsibility of maintaining order in the world is on the shoulders of the poet-sage, such as Janaka, for ordinary mortals tend to imitate the role model as portrayed by Janaka. Thus it is the poets who set the standards for the world to follow.

Conclusions

The period of Indian philosophy that spans more than a millennium from the early Christian centuries until the seventeenth century C.E. is considered the sutra period, or the period of treatises upon the religious and literary texts. It was this period that saw the rise of the many schools of literary criticism and interpretation. Radhakrishnan calls this the scholastic period of Indian philosophy, and it was in this period that interpretation became important. Sanskrit is the language in which the Vedas are written, and because the Vedas are the basis of the all-Indian Hindu tradition, all of India’s religious, philosophical, literary, and critical literature was written in Sanskrit. Sanskrit served as a lingua franca across regional boundaries but predominantly for the learned, upper classes and the Brahmins, who made up the priestly class. The Brahmins then interpreted the religious, literary, and critical texts for local individuals by using the indigenous languages.

While Sanskrit remained the language of religion in the south, local versions of the religious literature began to emerge in order to meet the needs of the South Indian people, who spoke predominantly Tamil or Telugu. It was not until the breakup of the Brahminical tradition in about the seventh century c.E. that literary religious hymns emerged in Tamil. The Indian- English writer R. K. Narayan’s version of the Ramayana is based on the Tamil version by the poet Kampan in the eleventh century. Tamil literary criticism remained rooted in the classical Sanskrit critical tenets, however, as is evidenced by the continuance (even in the 1900s) of Dhvanyaloka criticism by Kuppaswami Sastri in Madras.[16,17]

Early Indian criticism was “ritual interpretation” of the Vedas, which were the religious texts. Such ritual interpretation consisted in the analysis of philosophical and grammatical categories, such as the use of the simile, which was expounded upon in the Nirutka of Yasaka, or in applying to a text the grammatical categories of Panini’s grammar. This critical method, which consisted in the analysis of grammar, style, and stanzaic regularity, was called a *sastra*, or “science.” Panini’s *Sabdanusasana* [Science of *sabda*, or “words”] and the *Astadhyayi* [Eight

chapters of grammatical rules] are perhaps the oldest extant grammars, dated by various scholars to about the beginning of the Christian era. Alankara sastra is “critical science,” which emanated from Panini’s grammar and was dogmatic and rule-governed about figures of speech in poetry. The word alankara means “ornament” ,and as in Western rhetorical theory, this critical science consisted of rules for figurative speech, for example, for rupaka (“simile”), utpreksa (“metaphor”), atisya (“hyperbole”), and kavya (“stanzaic forms”). As Edwin Gerow has noted in his chapter “Poetics of Stanzaic Poetry,” in *The Literature of India*

Alankara criticism passes over almost without comment the entire range of issues that center around the origin of the individual poem, its context, its appreciation, and its authorship. It does not aim at judgement of individual literary works or at a theory of their origin. (Dimock 126)

The idea of criticism as a science is rooted in the centuries- old Indian belief that vyakarana, “grammar,” is the basis of all education and science. Rules were to be learned by rote, as were declensions and conjugations, as a means of developing discipline of the mind.

Patanjali, whose work is ascribed to the second century b. c. e., believed that a child must study grammar for the first twelve years; in fact, before studying any science, one must prepare for it by studying grammar for twelve years. Since grammar lay the foundation of all other study, a series of rule-governed disciplines arose, each of which had categories and classifications to be learned by heart. These disciplines were arthasastra, a grammar of government or political science; rasa-sastra, the science of meaning or interpretation specifically for poetry, that is, literary criticism; natyasastra, the science of drama or dramaturgy; and sangitasastra, the science of music or musicology. Each was further broken down; for instance, musicology was divided into jatilaksana (“theory”), atodya (the “study of musical instruments”), susira (“song”), tala (“measure”), and dhruva (“rhythm”).[18,19]

Poetry was most governed by the alankara, the rules of critical science; but since poetry existed before criticism, it in itself was generative of that criticism. Critics in the last few centuries b. c. e. believed that any association of word and memory having a special quality generates kavya. The creation of mnemonic rhymes was considered essential to poetry. Poetry was considered as having two qualities: alankara, here loosely translated to mean “formal qualities”; and guna, or “meaning” and “essence.”

According to the Alankara sastra, form has as much to do with creating the sphota, the “feeling evoked by a poem,” as the sphota has to do with creating meaning. Tradition has it that Valmiki, the sage wandering in the forest, heard a pair of Kaunca birds mating. When the male of that pair was shot down by a hunter, Valmiki heard the grieving of the female bird, which was metrically so perfect that Valmiki himself expressed her grief in the form of a perfect couplet. Ever since then Valmiki is considered the father of Sanskrit poetry as well as of poetic criticism. The appropriate vibhav, “cause,” in this case grief, gives rise to the anubhav, “effect,” which in turn gives rise to perfect rhythmic expression. Valmiki, the author of the Ramayana, which is contemporaneous with the Mahabharata and belongs to the epic period, thus became the first poet to proclaim a critical tenet. [20,21]

Drama developed later in India than in Greece. Bharata’s Natyasastra [Science of drama], written about the second century C.E., not only lay down rules governing the creation of drama but also prepared the way for developing the theories of rasa, “meaning” or “essence.” Lee Siegel provides the following explanation in his important book on comedy in Indian drama:

Playing upon the literal meaning of rasa, “flavor” or “taste,” [Bharata] used the gastronomic metaphor to explain the dynamics of the aesthetic experiences. Just as the basic ingredient in a dish, when seasoned with secondary ingredients and spices, yields a particular flavor which the gourmet can savor with pleasure, so the basic emotion in a play, story, or poem, when seasoned with secondary emotions, rhetorical spices, verbal herbs, and tropological condiments, yields a sentiment which the connoisseur can appreciate in enjoyment. Love yields the amorous sentiment, courage the heroic mode.

Thus Bharata provided formulas for producing the corresponding sentiments in the audience—recipes similar to Aristotle’s definition of “tragedy” and “comedy” but corresponding mostly with the means to produce homeostasis or balance in an audience by having the audience identify with certain rasas.

It is in the idea that literature is meant to cause a purgation of emotions and create a homeostasis in the audience that Indian criticism most approximates Aristotle’s theory of tragedy. This idea, though, is drawn from Indian philosophy and religious emphasis on liberation and freedom from bad karma. All literature is supposed to generate the feeling of moksha (“liberation”). Literature, more particularly drama or tragedy, must cause the purgation of the

emotions of satva (“happiness”), rajas (“anger”), and tamas (“ignorance” or “laziness”) so as to free the soul from the body.[22,23]

Bharata divided up the *Natyasastra* into *hasya-rasa* (“comedy”) and *karuna-rasa* (“tragedy”). The effect of drama can be obtained through, first, *vibhava*, the conditions provoking a specific emotion in the audience, which are controlled by *alambana-vibhava*, or identification with a person, as in Aristotle’s dictum of identification with the fall of a great man, and *uddipana-vibhava*, the circumstances causing the emotion to be evoked, as in the role of fate, pride, ambition, and so on; second, *anubhava*, or the technicalities of dramaturgy, gesture, expression, and so on; and third, *vyabhicari*, the buildup toward the dominant emotion, or as Aristotle would put it, the climax and subsequent catharsis. S. N. Dasgupta says that the theory of *rasa* is based on a particular view of psychology which holds that our personality is constituted, both towards its motivation and intellection, of a few primary emotions which lie deep in the subconscious or unconscious strata of our being. These primary emotions are the amorous, the ludicrous, the pathetic, the heroic, the passionate, the fearful, the nauseating, the wondrous.

Each of these, however, can be classified under the three primary emotions—*satva*, *rajas*, *tamas*. In freeing the audiences of these emotions, dramaturgy functions rather like *karma yoga*, or the “yoga of good deeds.”[24]

References

- [1] Buell, L. 2005. *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- [2] Callicott, J. B. and R. T. Ames, eds. 1991 (1989). “A Metaphysical Grounding for Natural Reverence: East-West”. *Nature in Asian Traditions of Thought: Essays in Environmental Philosophy*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- [3] DeLoughrey, E. and G. B. Handley, eds. 2011. “Cultivating Community: Counterlandscaping in Kiran’s Desai’s *The Inheritance of Loss*”. *Postcolonial Ecologies: Literatures of the Environment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [4] Desai, K. 2006. *The Inheritance of Loss*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- [5] Eagleton, T. 1999. “Postcolonialism and ‘Postcolonialism’”. *Interventions* 1 (1).
- [6] Eck, D. L. 2012. *India: A Sacred Geography*. Harmony Books: Kindle Edition.
- [7] Goodbody, A. and K. Rigby. 2011. *Ecocritical Theory: New European Approaches*. Virginia: University of Virginia Press.
- [8] Heise, U. K. 2008. *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [9] Held, V. 2006. *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, Global*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [10] Huggan, G. and H. Tiffin. 2010. *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environment*. London: Routledge.
- [11] Kennedy, D. 1996. *The Magic Mountains: Hill Stations and the British Raj*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [12] Love, G. A. 2003. *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology and the Environment*. Virginia: University of Virginia Press.
- [13] Murphy, P. D. 2009. *Ecocritical explorations in Literary and Cultural Studies*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- [14] Oppermann, S., Ufuk, O., Ozkan, N. and S. Slovic. 2011. *The Future of Ecocriticism*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- [15] Quayson, A. 2000. *Postcolonialism: Theory, Practice or Process?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [16] Rao, R. 1960. *The Serpent and the Rope*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- [17] Roy, P. “Teesta river runs dry as India and Bangladesh fail to resolve disputes”. . (Accessed January 2015)
- [18] Schama, S. 1995. *Landscape and Memory*. New York: Knoff.
- [19] Sivaramakrishnan, M. 2010. *The East-Facing Shop and Other Poems*. Kolkata: Monkafera Books.
- [20] Sivaramakrishnam, M. and C. Lourdes, eds. 2012. “Echoing Eco-Spiritual Values for a New World”. *Inter-Readings: Text, Context, Significance*. Chennai: Versa Books.
- [21] Spock, M. 1989. *Water: The Element of Life*. Hudson, New York: Anthropomorphic Press. 125.
- [22] Swanson, P. 2001. *Water: The Drop of Life*. Minnesota: NorthWord Press.
- [23] Wardi, A. J. 2011. *Water and African American memory: An Ecocritical Perspective*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- [24] Zinsser, W., ed. 1987. *Inventing the Truth: The Art and Craft of Memoir*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.