

using his own method.

In Russian and American formalism, a reader had very little role and the text was important and since there were as many different interpretations as readers, literary criticism was losing its importance. A text is a kind of 'langue' that should be internalized by the reader. Structuralism played a great role in transferring attention from the text to the reader. In reader-response criticism, Hans Robert Jauss by relying on Gadamer's theories opposes the views of the formalists and the Marxists. The first group of critics do not pay attention to historical matters and the second group of critics do not pay attention to anything but history. Hans Robert Jauss believes that there is a relationship between past interests and experiences and the present ones. In other words a text is written in reference to interests that were prevalent in its time and a present reader, reads it because of his personal interests; therefore, it is the task of criticism to maintain this relationship. Wolfgang Iser believes that a reader, by reading a text concretizes it and reading is a process in which the text and the reader are confronted. Consequently, the function of criticism is to reveal mysteries that a reader finds in a text. In his opinion and also in the opinion of Roman Ingarden, a text is a designed structure which must be concretized by the reader. Such phenomenon, in Iser's opinion is the existence of gaps in a text that must be filled up by the reader. For Iser, reading is a dynamic process in which the gaps activate the human mind.

The conclusion of this discussion is that literature and literary criticism in the eastern hemisphere is lagging behind in several ways and what has happened to literature and literary criticism, especially in the past forty years leads us to believe that there have been drastic upheavals in the west which the east should understand and try to emulate. Until now, Iran has not contributed anything in the area of world criticism; our fiction, with the exception of *The Blind Owl* has not contributed to the bulk of world fiction either. We are expecting to have writers whose works could be comparable to those of Kafka, Joyce and Faulkner. In some western books of criticism, I have seen that certain chapters or entries have been devoted to literary criticism in the Arab world, India and Japan, but there has been no citation or devotion of a chapter to Iran's contribution to the world. I believe we have been consumers of western thought and now it is time to be producers. In the post revolutionary poetry, Iran has a dearth of good poets whose works are not amenable to criticism. All in all, we hope to have our own theories of literary criticism, profound poetry and fiction in the years to come.

Literary criticism is a triangle consisted of the writer, the text and the reader. Of course reader-response theory is still a controversial method. A good reader is the one who shares the dream of a writer, but can we conclude that good writers are capable of creating a relationship with all texts? Derrida says a 'reader' does not exist and it is the literary text which creates the reader. He says a good reader needs training. A reader's level of education, his keen interest in literature and his awareness of critical methods are of prime importance. The reader's exposure to the cultural milieu in which a work was created is crucial also. It is obvious that all these processes start from reading a text, therefore, linguistic and literary competencies of a reader must be taken into account.

If a text had finite meaning, there would have been left nothing for a reader to produce and fill the gap. As already stated, a text will have an identity of its own when read by a reader. But what is the cause of different responses to one particular text? If meaning resides in the text why is it so difficult to find it and why does meaning differ or is deferred? How can we explain the relationship between a text and the reader?

The first step is to demonstrate characteristic features which make a literary text different from other texts. The second step is the analysis of elements which cause a reaction to the text. Regarding the first step in the analysis of a text, one should not forget that a literary text may not reflect reality; in other words literary texts do not refer to the external world. Although a literary text borrows its content from the external world, the writer internalizes it. What is the cause of indeterminacy in a text? In order to respond to this question, one should clarify if a text does not refer to the external reality, what constitutes its corpus. The response to this question would be a galaxy of perspectives constitute a literary text, and in each perspective one characteristic of the text will be revealed. In order to achieve a more clarified perspective, different points of view should be taken into consideration but the problem is that each point of view represents just one aspect of the text. That is why we believe a good text has no definite or finite meaning. There exists indeterminacy or gaps in a good literary text that have got to be filled by the reader. These gaps should not be considered a drawback for a text, but, on the contrary, they are factors which force the reader to participate actively in the analysis of the text. Of course, a reader is not aware of such gaps, but in the process of reading, he fills them, and that is why a good literary text should be read and re-read. We should always bear in mind that indeterminacy activates the reader's imagination so that he would use his personal ideas to complete the meaning of the text; or to use Wolfgang Iser's theory, each reader may freely interpret the text

best scientific text is the one which conveys meaning in the simplest way. So, the language of science is a means of reportage, and that is why the readers of the eastern hemisphere favour such language. The writers of the eastern hemisphere have forgotten that such language was predominantly used in the nineteenth century and presently its period is over. In the twentieth century, literature in the western hemisphere, is no longer keen on demonstrating reality, and therefore, it does not report anything but renders. This is particularly true of poetry in the western hemisphere where poetry is paradoxical, ambiguous and full of literary devices. If one reads a poem once and understands it, that poem is not considered good poetry. Polysemic poetry is thought of as good poetry in the western hemisphere. Cleanth Brooks considers the language of poetry paradoxical. Polysemy is the sign of good poetry. The best example is T.S. Eliot's "The Wasteland". Polysemy in poetry causes it to have an indirect language. We do not consider didactic poetry, a good one, like the poetry of Parvīn E'tešāmī. In a statement like the following "In spring the trees lived in lamentation for the buds" what is paradoxical is the relation between the word 'lamentation' and "the buds in spring". Consequently, no poem with one single interpretation can be called a good poem. Since poetry does not convey truth, whatever makes it good poetry is the use of language, a paradoxical language which presents it like a puzzle to the reader. Therefore, no poem with a single interpretation can be considered a good poem. Paradox, for the expression of Irony, gives good poetry an opportunity to involve a dynamic mind in functioning in a broader perspective and since good poetry does not convey truth, what is of prime importance for it is the language; a language which is heavily paradoxical. Poetry is just an event in language.

One of the philosophical tendencies in reading poetry, is the role of the reader in creating meaning. The origin of this thought comes from Edmund Husserl's 'phenomenology'. In phenomenology, the human mind is at the center and basis of all meaning. Hans Robert Jauss gives the reader-response theory a historical perspective. He believes that the interpretation of poetry differs from one period to the other. Now we should ask ourselves whose interpretation is the right one; A reader who was a contemporary of the poet, or a present one. Hans George Gadamer believes that the interpretation of the poetry of the past is feasible only through a dialogue between the present time and the past. Stanley Fish believes that in the interpretation of poetry, the reader should have linguistic and literary competencies. Michael Riffatire emphasizes literary competence. What is important is the fact that a reader should internalize poetry and add its content to his personal experiences.

words, there is no fixed meaning in a work of art and it is arbitrary and conventional. Meaning is both postponed and differs every time we read a text. Therefore, by combining 'difference' and 'postponement' in a text, Derrida coined the term 'différance'. This new idea rejected *One* interpretation of the text and considered it quite useless. The term 'binary opposition' was widely used in literary criticism of the western hemisphere. According to this theory, what an author says about his work should not be taken seriously. For instance, John Milton on the first page of *Paradise Lost* said, he had composed his long poem to justify the ways of God to man, but a serious reader, after finishing this long poem, will realize that Milton has justified Satan. Derrida believes in reversing hierarchies through binary oppositions. He says western philosophy, since Plato preferred one to the other in a binary opposition while it is quite easy to reverse them. We can not find a fixed signified for a signifier; whatever we have is the continuous postponement of the process of signification. Therefore, in Derrida's opinion there is no 'fixed' or 'unique' meaning in language. This idea has led to the negation of 'Metaphysics of Presence' which means the presence of the signified in an utterance. For Derrida the signified is absent in a modern literary work. Since hierarchies in all binary oppositions are easily reversable, the claim of structuralists in believing that binary oppositions should be taken into serious consideration is rejected by Derrida because he believes such binary oppositions as nature/nurture, man/ woman or God/satan can easily be reversed. The consequence of this philosophy indicates how mankind is caught in a web of vicious circles. For instance, in the binary opposition like nature/culture, man's brain immediately reverses the hierarchy and changes love or nature into an institution called marriage.

The literature of the western hemisphere is 'paradoxical' while the literature of eastern hemisphere is not so. A paradoxical statement may seem nonsensical, but its interpretation depends on discovering the nature of paradox in the statement. But if paradox is treated as a tool for the expression of an idea behind words, the statement will no longer be considered an absurd one. How successful a reader is in deciphering the meaning of a paradoxical statement, depends on his profound reception of language. Therefore, what is of prime importance is the fact that paradox is an element in language for the transference of meaning. The language of literature, especially poetry, is different from the language of science. In a scientific treatise, both the writer and the reader are seeking truth. For them, language is a means of communication and they try to use the simplest language to convey meaning. Therefore, the

creation of truth by these discourses. A 'discourse' is not a document to inform us of something, but it is like a historical monument which has its own meaning. Therefore, Foucault has chosen the word 'archeology'. Foucault says we can never understand the archives of our time; we understand our past archives because we have personally changed and we differ from the past. Also, there is a distance between us, and like Nietzsche, he says we can never attain an objective knowledge of history. Each period has its special 'episteme' which limits understanding of reality in that period and the aim of archeology of knowledge is to study the impact of discourse on the lives of people.

I cannot conclude my discussion without reference to Samuel Taylor Coleridge whose critical views had a profound impact on the literature of western hemisphere. He was the one who coined the expression 'Willing Suspension of Disbelief'. He believed literature had to create something unreal. Also, he said the purpose or aim of literature was not the expression of truth. In his opinion, literature differs from science or philosophy because both science and philosophy are concerned with the expression of truth. The domain of literature is imagination and the domain of other disciplines is reality. True beauty is a concept that may not exist in the external world, but in literature, one can create sublime beauty. The example he gives is the tiger in the real world and the tiger in painting. Every observer enjoys a painting of a tiger in art form, but the same observer is frightened by confrontation with a real tiger in the external world and has no time to enjoy its beauty. In his opinion, imagination is necessary in creating something which does not exist in the real world. According to Coleridge imagination is creative, while fancy is not. Therefore, imagination is superior to fancy. In other words, a poet or a writer distorts reality in order to convey his ideas; a modern example of what Coleridge said is the first sentence of Kafka's *Metamorphoses* in which Gregor Samsa wakes up one morning, finding himself transformed into a gigantic insect. Now, if the reader is after external reality in this work by Franz Kafka, he would immediately put the book aside, because he finds it contrary to truth or reality, but a sophisticated reader, who knows the function of literature is not to convey truth or reality, enjoys reading the text. Consequently, the 'disbelief of the reader is suspended' by Kafka while reading his work. Therefore, Kafka has consciously made such 'impossible' happening 'possible' with the help of his imagination.

At the end of 1960's deconstructionists, under the direction of Jacques Derrida, after studying the works of Ferdinand de Saussure, realized that there was no logical correlation between the signifier and the signified. In other

other groups or individuals and this transference of power causes transformation in the accepted truths of society. The essence of what he is saying is that in 'new historicism' we are confronted with lack of decisiveness and absolute truth. Therefore, 'power' determines the different forms of discourse. The duty of intellectuals is to oppose the hegemony of 'power' in society and prevent the powerful from 'distorting' truth. *Archeology of Knowledge* is the title of one of Foucault's books. In this book, he has tried to explain the nature and function of discourse because in his opinion history is a series of disconnected and different discourses each of which is a collection of laws and regulations which rule over thought and writing in a special period of time. These rules and regulations function through inclusions and exclusions and consist the 'archives' or the historical documents of a nation. In this book Foucault has dealt with such discourses, their rules and internal structures, their relationship, continuation and disappearance. Indeed it is the collection of discourses in each period which constitute the 'episteme' of that particular period. Therefore, the role and function of archeology of knowledge is the study and analysis of the discourse of each period, in order to reach the 'episteme' of that period. In other words, in order to reach the 'episteme' of each period, Foucault has utilized certain methods which are used in archeology. He says like an archeologist who digs different layers of the earth in order to reach the heritage left from the past, a historian should put together the layers of 'discourse' in each period and compare and contrast them in order to reach the 'episteme' of that particular period. As Foucault states, archeology is an attempt to abandon things which do not exist and to reveal something which exists. Whatever exists is the 'discourse' and the task of the critic is to find unities in 'discourse'; interpretation is the way of imposing unities on language.

In *Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault studies different historical periods to demonstrate which thoughts and opinions in a special time are true and meaningful and which laws should be excluded. Foucault is interested in the historical dimension of 'discourse'; how it changes and is eventually excluded. He says, whatever determines laws and regulations which are normal and rational successfully suppresses whatever has got to be excluded. Those who work in different fields of discourse can not think or speak without obeying the 'archives' of laws. The collection of laws which represent thoughts which were formed in past periods are called 'archives'. Therefore, 'discourses' are piled up like sediments and affect our present thoughts. 'Discourses' are neither right nor wrong; they simply exist. What is of prime importance is the

or a true picture of the past events and the world view of the people who lived in the past. They say 'history' is just a discourse among other discourses such as sociology or politics; they have the same value in the interpretation of a text. In other words it challenges the 'objectivity' of history and in reconstructing the meaning of a text, considers prejudices and the personal opinions which have influenced criticism.

In Foucault's opinion, the language and thought of each period are directly influenced by the 'epistemes' of that particular period. It is the 'episteme' of each period which affects the reception of a literary or artistic work. There is a delicate and complex correlation between a literary production and society but one can evaluate literature without recourse to the society and culture which produced it. Therefore, in the literary analysis of a work, the author, historical periods and cultural elements which have influenced the work are of prime importance. It is the 'episteme' of each period which determines which discourse is socially acceptable and which discourse is not. In Foucault's opinion, it is the 'episteme' of each period which determines the reception of 'truth' in that period. Foucault questions the 'objectivity' and 'truth' of history. In close reading of a literary text, three factors should be considered: 1) the biography of an author, 2) laws and social relations reflected in the work 3) historical situations which were influential in the creation of the work and are reflected in it. In order to avoid the errors of 'old historicists' a critic should not draw general conclusions and instead should pay attention to apparently insignificant factors in order to observe all elements influential in the formation of a text.

In conclusion, Foucault believes that 'history' is not a reliable source to evaluate happenings. In classical criticism 'history' was considered to be an authentic source for the study of literature. In their world view, literature and history were two inseparable factors. Foucault says history was written by those who had 'power' and consequently, the interests of the socially powerful were influential in the compilation of history. Therefore, 'reality' was absolutely ignored in historical documents and was dictated by the powerful members of society. Foucault says 'truth' was distorted by historians; society accepts those world views which are accepted by the 'powerful'. In his opinion, man is the slave of the mechanism of the laws of 'power' in society which determine the accepted 'discourse' of the same society. When a certain group of people impose their 'hegemony' on the rest of the members of society, a network of relations is created so that both the 'powerful' and the 'oppressed' have to obey it.

Foucault says 'power' is always transferred from a group or persons to

New historicism, was a school of thought which appeared in late seventy's and early eighty's. Michel Foucault had a great influence in the formation of this school of thought. From the view point of old historicists, history plays the role of background for literary texts, but new historicists claim that historians can not reveal a true picture of a country or historical periods. They believe that history has a subjective quality and no one can find its truth. New historicists say history can not serve as a background for literature because it is only one method of viewing the world and all human activities should be taken into consideration in the interpretation of a text. In Foucault's view, history is a complicated correlation among different discourses. By discourse, he means the background of any institution which determines what should be said in any period. For him, history is a form of power. Discourse is a means of revealing certain patterns in different historical periods, patterns which reflect political ideologies, social activities and literary or artistic productions. Therefore, the meaning of a text is derived from the discourses about the author, the text itself, and the reader, all of which are inter-related.

New historicists in the United States and the United Kingdom are cultural materialists who studied the society and literature of the Renaissance. Among them one can mention Stephen Greenblatt, Jonathan Goldberg and other critics who believe that the Renaissance literary texts reflected the interests of the government and the powerful discourses of that period. British cultural materialists who were influenced by Althusser and Michael Bakhtin believed that in the course of history, there has always been resistance to the ruling powers. They utilize Bakhtin's 'carnival' to demonstrate that 'the carnival and carnivalesque' used to be in conflict with the official culture of the time. New historicism is a kind of literary outlook which is still evolving. In the opinion of new historicists, literature is full of 'lies', behind which is 'truth'. History, on the contrary, is full of 'truth', behind which are 'lies'. They say a literary text is a historical document. Old historicists, on the contrary, say 'history' is a document for the study of literature and art. In 'new historicism', a text is an artistic work which reflects social behaviour and is considered a kind of 'active' history. In traditional view of history, it serves as a background for literature and has an objective reality. Therefore, it helps the critic to know more about literature and art because historians are able to render a true insight about the people of a particular period. But 'new historicism' does not believe in such things and says all history is subjective and mixed up with the subjectivity of people whose treatment of the past was influenced by their prejudices and their personal beliefs. Therefore, history can never reflect truth

is a figment of our imagination. Nietzsche played a great role in the advent of postmodernism. He did not believe in objectivity and said whatever we have is just an interpretation of objectivity expressed through different perspectives. No interpretation is definite and 'truth' is nothing but a useful lie. We impose an order on the world through our rational concepts in order to be able to survive, but this is actually a distortion of truth. The impact of such philosophy was the emergence of nihilism. Therefore, postmodernism is the opposite of idealism and does not have faith in finite meaning and value.

Postmodernism was a cultural, artistic, and social event that occurred in the western hemisphere after the Second World War, although certain critics believe that postmodernism does not belong to a particular period and even existed prior to World War II. It is commonly believed that postmodernism came after modernism and therefore it is a continuation of modernism. The main feature of both movements is their rejection of realism as an artistic movement, while in the eastern hemisphere, realism is still accepted as an artistic phenomenon, although we still see traces of the imitation of reality in modernist art. It should be noted that the kind of reality practised in modernist art is different from what we have seen in the nineteenth century definition of realism. What the modernist artists expressed in their work was a kind of reality which could be perceived only with a profound insight. On the other hand, postmodern artists believed that there was no reality to be reflected or imitated.

Postmodernists, in believing that there is no absolute truth and the universe has no center and consequently coherence and meaning do not exist, neither in the world, nor in a text, are closer in their tastes to poststructuralists and deconstructionists. Of course, difference in outlook, has caused other differences in modern and postmodern art. The modernist artists have a pessimistic view of the world and consider the technological age, a period of alienation and lack of communication. The modernist artists feel such shortcomings and try to amend them and transform anarchy into order. Postmodernists, on the other hand, although believe in alienation and lack of communication in the modern world, contrary to modernists, they are not frightened by them. It seems as if they have accepted such conditions. Also, postmodern artists do not believe in any kind of resolution for the ills of society. Another crucial feature of postmodernists is that they try to bridge the gap between the intellectuals and the masses. They do not ridicule popular art and even deal with detective fiction. Therefore, postmodern art is social and anarchist, the subject of which is not 'reality', but itself.

such as the works of Rabelais or Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, our 'belief' is suspended, otherwise how can a sane person believe that a human being has metamorphosed into a cockroach (in Kafka's *Metamorphosis*). Therefore, fantastic literature and 'verisimilitude' are intertwined. Fantastic literature creates illusion, doubt and hesitation in the reader's mind and 'verisimilitude' forces the reader to believe strange, metaphysical and impossible happenings reflected in a literary creation.

As Copernicus, the Polish astronomer who promulgated the now accepted theory that the earth and the planets move about the sun, and by making this statement decentered the universe, the same revolution occurred in the twentieth century criticism. Copernican Revolution in literature deals with the death of the author. An author is no longer the source of information and authority in modern criticism. Both Barthes and Foucault believe that when a literary text is written, it no longer belongs to the author, but it is the property of the reader. Death of the author conveys the liberation of a literary work so that we should no longer believe in the metaphysics of presence, or the presence of the author. A text, therefore, is written for production; it is the text that can be read in different ways by a competent reader. According to Roland Barthes, attributing a writer to a text imposes limitation on that text. In such texts, meaning is indeterminate and evaporates every minute. Therefore, we should not look for a fixed meaning in a literary text and the writer should not provide the reader with a meaning that is ready to be consumed. In a text which meaning is produced by the reader, the reader has an active role in the process of interpretation; a text should be 'scriptible' or writerly, instead of being 'lesible' or readerly; or applying Copernican theory, it is the observer or reader who is constantly moving or changing and the interpretation of the text depends on the situation of the observer. The meaning is not already 'fixed' in a text; it exists in the mind of the observer. Consequently, different readers, in different times and places will have different interpretations of the same text. In Foucault's opinion changing 'epistemes' cause changing values in society and lead to changing interpretations of the same text. Thus, Copernican Revolution has decentered meaning.

The postmodernist artists in the western hemisphere reject concepts such as 'absolute truth', 'coherence' and 'unity' which existed even in modernist texts. The postmodern philosophers were the first in discovering 'false consciousness'. In other words they did not believe that the mind was capable of reflecting truth. Therefore, in their opinion 'consciousness' not only does not reflect 'truth' but it distorts it too. Consequently, they believe that 'truth'

and believes that a skilful poet or writer creates literature in a way that only a reader who has linguistic and literary competence can grasp its meaning.

Positivistic literature and criticism date back to the nineteenth century and consequently both positivistic literature and criticism are produced in the eastern hemisphere of the globe. A positivistic writer or critic is objective and denies any force outside of reality. Therefore, philosophical positivism seeks a scientific approach in the study of literature. For instance, Marxist criticism is positivistic in its nature because it forces the reader to consider literature in its social context and says literature should be in the service of the communist party, society and the proletariat. On the contrary, writers and poets of the western hemisphere believe that a poet and writer should have no restrictions and they are free to discuss any issue in their works.

In the western hemisphere we have Tezvetan Todorov, although he is originally Bulgarian. Todorov, in his well known book, *An Introduction to Fantastic Literature*, discusses 'verisimilitude'. In his opinion one of the main features of fantastic literature is 'verisimilitude'. As Aristotle said: "impossible probability is superior to improbable possibility". Therefore, a writer should create the illusion of reality in his work. Todorov says in verisimilitude, we have reality and dream. His main purpose in making this statement is that a literary work must not be a reflection of reality. According to Todorov, reality and dream make a synthesis both of which create the illusion of reality and then confront the reader with hesitation, doubt, uncertainty, and ambiguity. For Todorov, ambiguous literature is good literature, a phenomenon on which we seldom experience in the literature of the eastern hemisphere. Ambiguous language and consequently ambiguity in a literary work can cause polysemy and multiplicity of meaning and, like Wolfgang Iser, he does not believe that a literary work should have a definite or finite meaning. It is the reader, as a critic, that has the ability to construe a work of art. Therefore, we can vividly notice the variety of taste in the eastern and western hemispheres. The adherents of positivism in the eastern hemisphere rely on objective reality and are keen on discovering the finite meaning of a literary work. Consequently, great works of literature, like the works of Franz Kafka and T.S. Eliot had never been translated in the communist Russia. Before Todorov brought up the issue of 'verisimilitude', we had Coleridge in England who introduced the concept of 'willing suspension of disbelief'. In his opinion, a writer should have the ability to suspend our disbelief while reading literature. If a writer has been successful in his artistic creation, the reader will find the work of art acceptable. Therefore, in literary works which delay or postpone our 'belief'

who provided a model for communist leaders, but that was nineteenth century and what I am mainly concerned with is the twentieth century criticism.

Literary works produced in the eastern hemisphere of the globe are not amenable to criticism because one can not find artistic devices such as symbolism, irony, allusions, metaphor and mytonomy in them. They mainly reflect social problems in a plain and simple language and a critic cannot find anything in them rendered by implication. Although 'social realism' was predominant in the nineteenth century, writers of the eastern hemisphere still stick to it because consciously or unconsciously they are forced to demonstrate social problems in their works.

By 'western hemisphere' I mean Europe and the United States. In 1914 a drastic upheaval in all areas of art occurred in western Europe. Writers like James Joyce, Marcel Proust and Dorothy Richardson suddenly changed the art of fiction in western Europe and transformed it from 'objective' into 'subjective'. This was not only true of fiction but all genres of literature, including poetry, drama and art in general like painting. The communists, who considered 'subjectivity' in art 'decadent', forced the Russian formalists to leave their country, but because of the cold war, American universities wholeheartedly welcomed people like Jakobson to come and teach at their institutions. This tragic event occurred in late 1920's and consequently the Linguistic Circle of Prague provided them with a shelter prior to their immigration to the United States.

One of the main characteristics of literature and art of the western hemisphere is ambiguity. The writer deliberately avoids communication with the reader. He believes by creating ambiguity he can help his reader overcome the apathy which is predominant in the modern world. Modern literature is replete with complicated symbols and metaphors and therefore criticism plays a major role in the analysis of such literature. Therefore, it is not surprising that in modern and contemporary criticism, ambiguity is a predominant feature. A perfect example of ambiguity in modern and postmodern literature is the works created by Franz Kafka. It is quite obvious that I.A. Richards' theory of 'nervous balance' which paved the way for reader-response criticism could be of paramount importance. Empson's *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, Iser's theory of reader-centered criticism and the gaps provided in a literary text that have got to be filled by the reader and consequently what Derrida and DeMan have contributed to this issue can be utilized in the analysis of a text. In William Empson's opinion 'ambiguity' is the sign of skill in artistic creations. Philip Wheelwright, another critic, discusses the polysemic nature of literature

می آوردند. آنها دنباله‌رو ارسطو بودند و در ادبیات به صناعات ادبی توجه زیادی ابراز می‌کردند. این نوع آثار، مانند آثار جویس، کافکا، فاکنر، و الیوت، که ارتباط با خواننده برقرار نمی‌کردند، از سوی منتقدان نیمکره شرقی «منحط» اعلام شد و در روسیه شوروی و اقمار آن تا زمانی که کمونیست‌ها روی کار بودند از ترجمه و چاپ آنها جلوگیری می‌شد.

Abstract

If we divide the globe into two halves, the western and eastern hemispheres, we will notice that the majority of literary works produced in the eastern hemisphere are not amenable to criticism. There are exceptions, of course, but by the works created in the eastern hemisphere I mean literary works produced in the Communist Russia, the Middle East, Africa and the majority of developing countries. The major cause of this phenomenon is that the rulers, poets and writers of the eastern hemisphere were followers of Plato who believed that art should have utility – the rulers of the Soviet Union used to dictate that their writers had to create a kind of art which was at the service of the Communist Party and propagated communist ideas among the proletariat. In countries like Iran, intellectuals often favoured communism and although no one dictated to them how they had to write, under the influence of communism, they wrote novels in the fashion of Social Realism. Most countries in the eastern hemisphere had social problems and their writers were dedicated artists who wanted to enlighten the people through the medium of writing so that they would revolt against capitalism.

On the contrary, in the western hemisphere and especially beginning with the First World War, fiction in particular and literature in general went through a drastic upheaval and writers began to pay especial attention to "subjective" issues. They became the followers of Aristotle and loved to manipulate language by literary devices. Such writers like Kafka, Joyce, Faulkner, and Eliot deliberately refused to communicate with their readers and consequently were called "decadent" by the critics of the eastern hemisphere. As long as the communists were in power, their works were banned and were never translated into Russian.

There are two types of literary or artistic works; those which are amenable and those which are not amenable to criticism. If we divide the globe into two halves: the western and eastern hemispheres, we will notice that the majority of literary works produced in the eastern hemisphere, are not amenable to criticism. There are exceptions, of course, but by the works created in the eastern hemisphere, I mean literary works produced in the communist Russia, the Middle East, Africa and the majority of developing countries. In the Soviet Union, people like Stalin and Zhadanov advocated 'social realism' which was a photographic depiction of social issues. Of course we had Charles Dickens who did the same thing with fiction in the western hemisphere and

Technical Competence, Theoretical Literacy, and Historical Information: Necessary Tools for a Critic*

Bahrām Meqhdādi

Professor of the Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Tehran

چکیده

اگر کره زمین را به دو قسمت تقسیم کنیم، به طوری که اروپا و امریکا در نیمکره غربی و شوروی سابق، خاورمیانه و افریقا در نیمکره شرقی قرار بگیرند، ملاحظه می‌کنیم که در نیمکره شرقی به ندرت ادبیاتی که قابل نقد کردن باشد وجود دارد. دلیل اصلی این پدیده این است که نویسندگان و شاعران و حتی حکام نیمکره شرقی پیرو افلاطون بودند و تحت تأثیر او می‌گفتند ادبیات باید فایده داشته باشد — به‌ویژه سردمداران شوروی سابق که به نویسندگان دیکته می‌کردند که ادبیاتی خلق کنند که در خدمت حزب کمونیست باشد و عقاید کمونیستی را در میان توده‌های کارگر اشاعه دهد. در کشورهایی مانند ایران، روشنفکران اغلب نظر به همسایه شمالی داشتند و اگرچه کسی به آنها حکم نمی‌کرد که چگونه بنویسند، تحت تأثیر کمونیسم رمان‌هایی به سبک رئالیسم اجتماعی می‌نوشتند. اکثر کشورهای نیمکره شرقی از مسائل اجتماعی رنج می‌بردند و نویسندگان این نیمکره می‌خواستند از راه نوشتن مردم را آگاه کنند تا زمینه برای انقلاب فراهم شود.

بر عکس، در نیمکره غربی، از سال ۱۹۱۴ رمان و کل ادبیات ناگهان متحول گردید، به طوری که هنرمندان و نویسندگان این خطه کاری به مسائل اجتماعی نداشتند، بلکه درون‌گرا بودند و مسائل فردی و خصوصی انسان را به روی کاغذ

* متن سخنرانی دکتر بهرام مقدادی در دانشگاه لندن به تاریخ نوزدهم ماه مه ۲۰۰۱ م (۱۳۸۰/۲/۲۹ ه.ش).