

LANGUAGE IN INDIA
Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow
Volume 11 : 3 March 2011
ISSN 1930-2940

Managing Editor: M. S. Thirumalai, Ph.D.
Editors: B. Mallikarjun, Ph.D.
Sam Mohanlal, Ph.D.
B. A. Sharada, Ph.D.
A. R. Fatihi, Ph.D.
Lakhan Gusain, Ph.D.
Jennifer Marie Bayer, Ph.D.
S. M. Ravichandran, Ph.D.
G. Baskaran, Ph.D.
L. Ramamoorthy, Ph.D.

Literary Criticism as a Shared Set of Measurement

Naseem Achakzai, M.Phil.

=====

Abstract

When I started working on Shakespeare's use of five senses, on Ph.D. level I felt as though I was nothing but an agent that merely activated the purpose of the author. Particularly, of that author who once had put a purpose in his works as a performing quality of a device. I stand nowhere in front of this giant of all times, called William Shakespeare, though I am merely an admirer of his text. I am just a worshipping soul of an 'intension' in the shade of his basic meanings. His fundamental implication had the command of poetry that grew to be the authority of each modern time in movement.

How far it is accurate, but I devotedly tried to re-articulate what I felt being existed in Shakespearean works in form of a reader and it was not easy to overcome the cultural and social distance I had with Shakespeare.

Above all, to interpret him in his historical, political and social montages, the only device that could enable me to come nearer to his signs was the universality he still holds in his works and his works would always synchronize or make a point of rendezvous of all social, political and cultural variations of the world. This is the reason that I did not feel any social or moral distance in working between the creative lines of his five tragedies and my single question. This task was full of pleasure.

I had to survive critics' opinions, showering terms and their shades of past and present, but the only skill that equipped me well was the 'scientific theory' I applied on Shakespeare, which gave a birth to this present research paper.

Introduction

A scholar is not as free as he was hundred years ago. He has to follow a few testified rules to justify his work in a specifically designed frame. A scholar has to attempt his single question with the help of a selected theory and methodology. It is not fashion but is the dress up of the discourse of community of knowledge to follow the etiquettes what Matthew Arnold and T. S. Eliot set up to value literature with.

This study in Shakespearean poetics will turn reader's concentration into a single word 'sign'. Sign, not only from its mythological attachment but from a technical viewpoint, will be dealt in this task. Its Linguistic legitimacy will also be promoted, which provides a source of arrangement to trace out the meaning of writing art in its theoretical bent of configurations: to find an ocean, though with its 'shifting' bent in a drop of *sign* what 'language' or 'word' in Linguistics means.

It sounds as though a scholar has to break an atom into pieces to find out the answer of a single inquiry: *Does Shakespearean poetics, in its practical and cognitive dimensions, generate the value of thought through sensory perceptions?* So, this systematic task will find scientific way around the riddle that a single question all over Shakespearean poetics¹ creates.

A single grain or gravel of solitary inquiry makes hundreds of circles of myth, history, linguistics, philosophy, mental space theory, social phenomena and social mannerism.

Workings of Language and Developed Theories

A specific scientific mechanism in this undertaken task will also classify and analyze each communicating sense from *Vision* to *Touch* and *Taste* in its procedure from latent potentiality of *sensory perceptions* into patent signs of meanings, in *Romeo and Juliet*, *Othello*, *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*.

This responsibility will build up a bridge of values with the help of the studies and findings of the seniors in this specific field to move technically and transparently safe with the methodology of 'qualitative research'.

I'll try to cross the maze of philosophy, myth, linguistics and other methods to achieve the mode of expansive signs (with their meanings) of human manners, feelings and emotions within the frames of the means of perceptual ability. This whole tuning will be tested with a selected theory of *cognitive poetics*, showing how Shakespearean art synchronizes with the operative value and cognitive strength of thought in its concreteness and its link to the senses.

Even after his physical death 400 years ago, Shakespeare's feelings and emotions in dramatic form are available to us through his sign-composition and sensory perceptions in kaleidoscopic designs of

communication. Human senses, in Shakespearean writing, are combined in the sequences of social actions and reactions. These sequences promote physical and cultural performances of language in main current.

This kaleidoscopic design of communication, while retaining the diachronic or historical dimensions, will never resist the embrace of the scientific and modern dimensions in the space and time of social activities we live in. We, in present time, have to deal with Shakespearean world/reality on all available commands of sign-using capability on all binary levels from black to white and vice to virtue. Shakespeare's force of intelligibility directly stems up from his sensory content of five senses that holds back the microscopic visibility of constructional web from all binary relations from parallels to oppositions. To follow its scientific and physical cognition from de Saussure to his followers, I'll try to incorporate all aspects of 'sign'. This proximity will provide us with the studies of post-structuralist and post-modernist views and shades in Shakespearean perceptual involvements.

Playing the Game between Literature and Linguistics – Re-tooling

To play a game between Literature and Linguistics is as tricky as they themselves are. Our modern readers need to have the background of philosophy, mythology, ethnography, mysticism and a broader view of literature to accomplish the journey of sign-tracking errand from de Saussure's Structuralism to Derrida's 'essence of construction' to grasp the meaning of essence from its matter, like word 'one' from the only 'One' to its 'Oneness'. To work on Shakespeare, in modern time, technically and simultaneously needs to work out on many channels. Our work on Shakespeare in present time and space certainly requires the equipment of measurement that changes with the alteration of time and space. As a matter of scientific fact, the criticism of our forward-looking time in literature has turned into a theoretical bent to align, as well as, to confirm the reality we try to trace out in Shakespeare. We cannot reject the current system² of our space and time. We have to meet the prerequisites in same rhythm that Shakespeare followed in his time and space. In our present moves we have more responsibility because we have more access to information that activates not only the bygone rules of management, but also cross the deconstructive image of even post-structuralism. This present image demands that we add to our equipment of measurement sharper, modern, authentic and valid features. This sharp equipment gives us confidence to meet the requirements of the energy of nearby age and speed.

But to track down the sensory perceptions of Shakespearean poetics in his five tragedies requires that we have a view of past that starts from scientific approach to define language and its word in the form of *sign*: the systematic and scientific definition of linguistics provides us a lab to deal with the literary discourse, which also lends us a technical assistance to have twenty kilos of milk (literary matter) in 20 grams of condensed form. It is not only a loaded matrix but it is a matrix, reloaded now, in a re-array of numbers and elements that rule and constitute the structural format of literature in present mood and taste of style.

The Role of Communication

A key to success in understanding Shakespearean poetics is good communication. The mechanism of cognitive poetics provides us with one of the keys we need to grasp a new approach to reading Shakespearean tragedies. This task will certainly be re-loaded and will be linear as well as spatial in kaleidoscopic presentation, whether that will be demonstrated in formula of a *signifier* or *signified*, or if that will be a show of pattern of an addresser *within*, or towards the addressees *without*. Each time will have its course of action whether that is a concept in linear variety or it is the purity of *literariness*. We have to keep it in our shifting bent that the quality of messaging system is improved in cognitive version in between sound pattern and concept. We can have more variety as well as closeness in *reading* literature, now, on the very edge of the 21st century.

A Historical Perspective on Literary Authenticity

Our main current investigative literary approach is rather different and improved from the skill-tools and methods what literature or literary topics were dealt with in past centuries. Principally, from 16th to 19th centuries a literary authenticity and its implications were in the hands of a poet, dramatist, prose writer and a critic in which a personal view was regarded final. Their time differed from their past as a figure. Our time diverges from our history as a shape. Shakespeare, as a figure will always remain a fresh challenge for each coming history. Now, after scientific confirmation a diachronic approach to literature is altered. Our present scientific system of a research work has utterly been turned into a synchronic/theoretical treatment. This synchronic manner needs an effective communicative action in form and function of a *figure ground reality*.

Cognitive Poetics

A language that survives the function of structured system will serve the purpose of background in this undertaken task. It will link opinions on a defining ground of linguistic terms what make a verbal message a work of art. This work will totally be based on *cognitive poetics* from *Structuralism*. This *cognitive design* has also become one of the most significant theories of myth on the scene of the twentieth century called Levi-Strauss's Structuralism. Therefore this research work will systematically demonstrate the values of the 21st century. It will try to support the practicability of Jakobson's '*cognitive poetics*' (followed and improved by Peter Stockwell's *Cognitive Poetics: an introduction*, Routledge, London: 2002), a theory showing that how Shakespearean art of writing in a dramatic outline synchronizes the operative value and cognitive force of thought in its concreteness and immediate link to the senses of human mind.

The meaning of purpose laid down in the microscopic woven frame of 'shuttering'³ or a Genre, in this task, will become part of a selected theory and methodology. The purpose of a single action of a selected theory and qualitative/methodology (biography will principally be used in a methodological value in this work to show the author's growth of mind in modern pattern of biography. It will present the inner development of the author in sequence of the visibility or the outer surface events with a number of influences that would have had relations to the shaping of author's *thoughts* and art.) will be guided by its type of synchronic description: a description of language that functions at a particular time. A synchronic description of elements do not take into account the historical change only, but rather concentrates on the meaning they have for the speakers at particular moment. The essence of this

particular moment will be protected by a selected Genre, which will catch the line of research to accomplish the purpose of this undertaken task in Shakespeare's force and skill of communicating sensory perception in his five tragedies.

'Many of the approaches within cognitive poetics have developed within other disciplines such as linguistics, affecting strokes, computer design and programming, and anthropology, and then adapted for the literary context. As cognitive poetics emerges as a discipline in its own right, of course, it will develop its own frameworks and useful terms that are particular to literary concerns. Furthermore, and in keeping with the principle that there is a continuum of cognition across literary and everyday language, as the field matures insights attained in literary exploration can contribute to and illuminate general aspects of human communication and thought.' (*Cognitive Poetics: an Introduction*, London: 2002, 121)

This research work will systematically get done the quality what Stockwell considers as a *literary reading* to connect and add the possibility of cognition, which is embodied and experiential.

In this respect cognitive science has paid sufficient attention to the social and literary roots of shared human conditions and experiences. It is mostly paying its (cognitive science) attention to the focus of its origins in sentiments. It discovers another dimension of an individual with his or her figure ground reality. Though, as a matter of present figure ground reality the 21st century shows be diverted to cover the world of social and economic area of human life to discover the territory of human mind in its vastness. On the other hand a qualitative research will contain and depict the spirit, source, strength and scientific mechanism of a theory (theory/silhouetted research methodology) that is indirectly put like a seed in this undertaken assignment.

Literary Criticism

A valuable literary and critical winding up is currently made on the understructure of a shared set of measurement. As far as the approximated value of Shakespeare's art is concerned, its impact can certainly be enhanced with the comparative study of our modern scientific approach to human feelings and emotions. His art of writing can be captured within the frame of our modern scientific calculation to literature.

The scheme of this estimate needs to be equipped with a selected theory and methodology.

There can be an effort to evaluate what Shakespeare 'did' or participated as an 'actant' in the outcome of our modern theoretical approach to human language in its scientific reality. This approximation can make the canvas of our perception more broaden and can add more matter of authenticity to the work of an artist who was called Shakespeare in the end of the sixteenth century to keep his work and its value up to date. It is a matter of fact that each coming age inserts more additions. Each methodical advance provides more genuineness of consideration in re-framing a piece of bygone art in the mode of current time's language. It expands the meaning and shades of various terminologies. It digs out the source of human feelings they were perceived to be created for and on stage to be witnessed by an audience, since they themselves were the actual parts and productions of their very five senses in their

time and space – that becomes part of the value for our phase, but in a dimension that is rather different from the time Shakespeare wrote or expressed himself in *word* that is now totally changed and is called a ‘*sign*’.

Change in the Climate of Modern Criticism

The climate of modern criticism is changed since T. S. Eliot’s efforts that ‘the poet must be very conscious of the main current, which does not at all flow invariably through the most distinguished reputation . . . He must be aware that the mind of Europe – the mind of his own country – a mind of which he learns in time to be much more important than his own private mind – is a mind which changes’⁴—this piece of contemporary loom to art and literature changed criticism from classical into modern criticism. This is why, after each decade, the time shows its rapid alterations and advancement.

Not Necessary for Another Interpretation, But There are Significant Changes

To have grip on the flux of modern critical consciousness in Jonathan Culler’s opinion, does not mean to have ‘another interpretation of *King Lear* but to advance one’s understanding of the conventions and operations of institution, a mode of discourse.’⁵

Each epoch and its improved study gives us an attitude⁶ of another advanced mode of discourse what Shakespeare meant us to know and comprehend. How to see the world he saw. Can we see what he saw? How to listen to the sounds or voices he listened to and how to smell, touch and taste the life he and his fellow artists and characters had to act when they themselves were humans?

If Shakespeare maintains the record of all feelings what his viewers and listeners could view and listen on stage with their very states of their private minds they learned in, which need to be proved within the boundary of specific theory in our modern studies of literature—that has an architectural possibility as well as reality with a collective set of measurement.

This architectural performance opens a vision. We become keener to our senses of delight and appreciation. The system, devices, facilities and the composition of our present art and creation is rather dissimilar from the design of signification the Elizabethan age had, or practiced. The bodies of our ideas are more accessible so far as the ideas or the matter of implication is concerned, they were also trying to signify their own meaning of life what we are trying to follow today. They had the same feelings of exploring life in the art of drama what we do in our present time in Hollywood, Bollywood and Lollywood.

Hard Times Faced by Literature

In the movements of all times, literature, playing the role of one of the most central mediums of human expression, has historically been through hard times in its attachment to a critical and analytical treatment. Each century has proved its own rules and regulations, but the scientific approach of scientific theory⁷ of language puts a new boundary line of linguistics for literature to observe another

chain of respected scientific rule. New systematic regulations from theoretical point of view are becoming part of our present critical values in Shakespearean thoughts.

A language that once had been the language of literature only, fell down on the dissection table of the modern scientific inquiry. Language is to be understood in time as well as in its demand and quality of the instance. A 'diachronic' study of language that once was based on historical changes and development in phonology and semantics transformed into a 'synchronic'⁸ system.

Linguistics and Literature

This scientific method gave birth to linguistics in which a literary, and predominantly a critical investigation, has to adjust itself to the requirements of existing time and its situation. The addition of the study of linguistics, in a positive sense, should never be accepted in the form of a mere requirement, but must be used in its power to achieve the standard of an advanced mechanism of a device. The instrument now available should openly approach the zones of human acceptance with the help of a scientific system mainly with those areas of human mind and creation, which are not revealed according the meaning and the veracity of our 'tranquil place'⁹ in time yet.

Structural Attachment

Now, with a *cognitive pointer* the theoretical advance of linguistics in literature opened another synchronic field of critical discussion to revise the modes and characters of the bygone doctrines and events, which were treated in a 'diachronic' way from Aristotle to 19th century criticism when the Poetics of Aristotle changed into the global science of verbal structure.

This structural attachment in our present time gives us another meaning in which 'poetics' is regarded as an integral part of Linguistics. So in this regard Linguistics deals with the science of language that literature has to carry it out with itself. It has to play the role of a matter of fact of its current main stream to give opportunity to the readers to follow Shakespearean piece of creation in a strongly built or trained ear and its manner with its exclusively tuned mind. It must deal Shakespearean time and matter with a valid literary criticism in time, which had once created an atmosphere of appreciation on stage in 16th century. This critical opportunity in Shakespearean drama will enable the minds of the world 'what' and 'how' other people think with the mind of that explicit language in which the Shakespearean readers learn in. Therefore, a specific scientific tool, applying to Shakespearean art of writing will certainly synchronize that precise tuned and private mind with European, African, Arabian, American, Russian or Asian mind, which is always subject to change.

Theoretical Responsibility of Main Current

Meaning, in our current treatment, is a strong-minded activity we achieve in the function of a result from theoretical occupation in Shakespearean poetics. How to act on Shakespearean poetics in the scientifically well equipped studios of modern film industries of present with its scientific devices? It's the specialization of main current to be skilled in how to read and reproduce Shakespearean discourse, both in film production and literary classrooms. Or, how Shakespearean dramas are dealt within the

command, skill and practices of post-structuralist atmosphere of time that has taken start from 20th century's Formalism, or New Criticism and Structuralism, while *form* in our present stroke of time means 'content' and *structure* gives us an entry into the world of *meanings*?

If we want to follow the conceptual meanings of Shakespeare's sensory perceptions he wrote through in the role of a playwright within the frames of his five senses, then we have to follow the mode of 'meaning' in its strongly built interface. We have to look at, what and how our present cognitive poetics deals with, where structural design is characterized into two angles that relate to our social universe – the universe that is found arbitrary. This arbitrariness can positively be called man-made, created and is practiced in a social atmosphere and that really stays, sounds, seems, is heard, smelled touched and can be tasted to the same degree in differently tempered and maintained temperature of different qualities of atmosphere and human body with its mind.

Constructions are Intrinsic

Therefore, 'Men do not simply create arrangement for their own purpose. Constructions are intrinsic and manage 'allied processes'.¹⁰ This associated treatment, or procedure of construction can be well thought-out with the help of one of the most important practical scientific theories from the ear-perceived articulated syllables to the same extent, where auditory impressions accomplish their process in mind. The results are produced from vocal organs turning into an instrument of thought, if we apply it to Shakespeare's art of writing.

Physical and Psychological Journey

We have to journey in Shakespearean art in physical as well as in psychological performances that establish an unrestrained and shaping joint with its system between mind and body. This instrument of thought that is either called word or *sign* shoots up in the air from an individual to individual. It flies from groups to groups. It conveys its message like a loaded code, not within the frames of a specific social groups or society only, but now in the 21st century from showering satellite channels from society to society on a worldwide atmospheric society all over the world. This code is like one of the companions of our modern world we all breathe with. The individual part of the language in Shakespeare's art of writing cannot be understood without its social aspect, nor can social side be grasped without its individualistic cognitive role.

If we look at Shakespearean poetics from current modern scientific closeness, then our latest advancement indicates that the nearer we come to Shakespearean poetics the higher his creative skill grows up into a huge mountain in the continuity of four hundred years – because the equipments of measurement change with the alteration of time and space. We have to make the competence of his (Shakespeare) language to the instance to know how and in what atmospheric condition and temperature in current sense of education, mood and mode of life we get the meanings of Shakespearean poetics being a whole once was created.

The equipment of our current capability demands to investigate Shakespearean poetics in a reader-author-context level, if we want to grasp the meanings what Shakespeare produced in shape of a

literary discourse. This act can, to a greater extent, be accomplished with the help of a linguistic configuration. A linguistic management provides a system to contribute and add in the material, contemplative and relational processes of Shakespearean language with satisfactorily grasping quality that a scientific approach defines in a profile of a self-contained whole and a principle of classification¹¹ that can give us a secured way of observing Shakespearean art with the help of cognitive psychological research.

This very mechanism of consciousness in human brain provides the background and foreground of a connected function that creates a literary space of higher degree and value to signify and examine cognitive poetics in the storage system of its schemas. It strikes clear now that very different and new 'notions of the ways in which literature might be settled can hardly be avoided'.¹²

Social, Individual and Sequential

These ways enable us to manifest between what is social or is individual from what is sequential more or less accidental.

On the other hand to follow the strings of a speech that how it springs out of a 'combination through which the speaker uses the code provided by the language in order of expressing his own thought and secondly the psycho-physical mechanism which facilitates him to externalize these combinations'.¹³ These mechanisms slowly and gradually transform into a proper conceptual framework¹⁴ of our modern criticism.¹⁵ Our world of meanings in Shakespearean literature remains vague unless we have a 'general science of signs'¹⁶ that will promote a systematic poetics to understand Shakespearean art of *combinations* and *selections* in his writings.

Above and Beyond the Norm of Racial Distinctiveness

A literary criticism, while applying a modern theoretical slant to Shakespearean art is above and beyond the norm of racial distinctiveness. If we put Shakespearean poetics on the pivot of a *pattern* and constitute his poetics on a critical *property* we have to weigh him linguistically in between two axis of horizontal and vertical poles for a practical literary criticism of current standard in literature. We can use linguistics rather electrically to enlist its language and methodology for the purpose of specific scientific goal in Shakespearean text. This kind of scientific literary function organizes the inner fabric of Shakespearean poetics: author-reader-context in its acquired meanings.

Scientific World and Shakespearean Skill

A theoretical slant and treatment will enable us to pay our tribute to Shakespearean skill from the current scale of arrangement of scientific world. It can also combine the ingredients of cognitive apparatus with cognitive linguistics in sequences. If we select Shakespearean works on the land of cognitive poetics then it renovates into a 'mold' in which like Mr. Jakobson explains about the elements of poetry, 'similar in some ways, whether in sound or sense some other characteristics, are combined in sequence.'¹⁷ The same poetical result that Jakobson talks about poetry can be achieved in

Shakespearean poetics, projected paradigmatically on the horizontal pole of human senses. This kind of treatment can promote a modern angle of Shakespearean world of cognitive feelings and emotions.

A *silhouette* on the Canvas of Sign

A piece of art as a *silhouette* on the canvas of 'sign', is another nature a writer creates in its strongly made linear. A properly managed scientific theory assists us to trace out Shakespeare's visionary contact as a 'design'. A design, that portrays human perception of reality, either it is normal, or is improved, or is extraordinary, or if it is mismanaged. Afterward, it refuses to allow the received sensation to be realized paradigmatically by the analytical mind the individual contains.

During its visionary process Shakespeare depicts all kinds of states of mind that represents its certainty in shape of colour. It identifies an object that the mechanism of a theory can guide us to come closer to. We come closer to the judgment and formation of human consciousness, which is shown in its degrees before, or after an object is depicted. In Shakespearean writing we can have approach to the system of colour perception.

We can look at the mechanism before the consciousness is able to see the object to find out either Shakespeare gives the same account of a degree of human mind what it dictates when colours either become stronger, bright or less brilliant that the laws of cognitive device shows. Or, if they (colours) appear entirely absent. It currently and medically is observed that this varying degree of identification of objects has not been recognized on the level of a psychic factor. But variations in colours, light and shades have nebulously been assumed to be some sort of a condition of the mind when it is noticed.

Harmony of Form and Order

We can check the creative task of an experienced artist who transforms it into the harmony of form and order – or how does this harmony strike in Shakespearean writings or *how* and *where* it appears when there is inequality, or is an opposite force that rules in the unity of diversity. If the opposite forces are mixed in the circumference of human life that twists the balance of life into a devastation, then the harmony of healing force of Shakespearean creation injects itself to strengthen human mind to have peace, justice and health.

Does his eyesight search harmony everywhere to use it on the degree of a healing force? Doesn't this healing energy, (like a musical chord which is one of the streams of universal and cosmic expressions a sound connects human body with its ancestral source, in the stroke of same case an artist's creative harmony ties human mind and body up, with its healthy and positive messages) create a sort of method of an equipment of measurement to balance its measurable space and time in Shakespearean art? Or does it not only compose an alternative that equates the testing existence that is curved into the test or question for the given moment?

These kinds of questions we can put in the lab of a specific theory to keep Shakespearean compositions up-to-date.

When Jacques Derrida¹⁸ treats Structuralism on the floor of a theory he relates it with a 'sign' in the background and in the foreground he looks at it with the degree of a 'play', which in a horizontal pole marks the sequences of the moments post-structuralism stands at. It gives the worth of a movement, if we apply it to Shakespearean art of writing. We have to supply a specific theoretical basis for a satisfactory rejoinder to the build of Shakespearean works in the complexity of its demands¹⁹ in current moves. On the same makeup if we attach Shakespearean cognitive poetics with a scientific loom, then we can certainly have the exact tone of five senses in its cognitive dimensions. The same work Mr. Lévi-Strauss artistically and creatively did for myth, where cognitive poetics attain a secret soil, or a 'centre' or 'transcendental signified' transparency it engenders.²⁰

Therefore, this transcendental 'signified' or supposition of a 'purpose' enables current research to 'configure' or compose Shakespearean excellence in a new construct. It allows us to re-direct the specific manufacture of Shakespearean materials with new directions – that not only from social and political theories viewpoint to transfer a "text" response 'towards "context" has increasingly been the concern of the critics and scholars since the Second World War'²¹ but this *transfer* in Shakespearean art will also uphold the linguistics-cosmos of our main current. In Gérard Genette's opinion at the 'cost of a double operations of analysis or of synthesis'²² we can put Shakespearean art into poetics. The same cognitive linguistics analysis in Shakespearean text can be examined from the results of cognitive functional mechanism of current scientific reality of human senses.

Fundamental Mode of Knowledge

The Shakespearean world itself, even in Shakespearean language and in sense of theory, consists of stories where a narrative develops the *region* of fundamental mode of knowledge. The abstract property of literature is considered to the same degree of a metaphysical, or metaphorical in modern theoretical base. It is constituted with its singularity of objectiveness of a literary mechanism: literariness,²³ that can produce the possibility of literature with a binary activity of possible realization with a specific constitutional linear where a general constituted capability of Shakespearean text can be developed into a vividly synchronized manifestation of meanings.

Simply, an, application of a properly defined theory in Shakespearean creation can give us the standard of poetics, if we compositionally dive into the properties of Shakespearean discourse. It really gives us a literary criticism of its typicality of nature within the scientific outline of two dimensional explanation in which language is a compositional system of an active stage of actualization. It is genuineness in a particular section speech circuit, functioning in sound patterns which are associated with concepts in the social movements of day to day participations of an individual with a group. It also gives an explanation of the style of Shakespearean language when Shakespeare in the mental state of a playwright produced his language for the social group of the people he lived in his life cycle. It revolves into the social part of Shakespearean poetics, either within the frame, or functions of sound and concept when Shakespeare being an individual was exposed to.

But Shakespeare was not a linguist. It is confirmed that he was not trained in the performance of an individual who had an apprenticeship in order to acquaint himself with the working of a language on

scientific and theoretical pedestal, where language is treated as form of a system of signs – both *solid* and *psychological* in parts and participations that is certainly linear.

Observing Shakespearean Language

Either time stands still, or passes backward or forward, but a theoretical responsibility in Shakespearean writings is improved step by step. It moves on with the passage of time. Whatever angle the time contains, though the methods of dealing Shakespearean life and objects are vividly changed from a lantern-light into an atomic energy. We have another method to weigh and measure speed and distance rather different what language meant in 16th or 17th centuries.

Now, we observe Shakespearean language from another angle that is the sound pattern with concept. Our modern approach create two axis called horizontal and vertical. Shakespearean writing in these axis, is considered as the clear pattern of their (axis) tangible form. It represents constant Shakespearean visual images.

The images of these realities are localized in the countryside of Shakespearean readers' mind.²⁴ These localized realities dominantly work with different orders of facts, expressing ideas according to a theoretical system.

Nature of Shakespearean Sign

An order of facts in our current treatment has created 'a tendency, which has perhaps reached its climax in more recent movements such as "New Historicism" or "Cultural Materialism".²⁵

A Shakespearean sign in this system, creates another transcendental 'interior'. An inner ground awards us the study of *signs* which projects a part of social life: a governing law that maintains the nature of sign²⁶ in the capacity of social communicative tool. It is considered as an assigned field of linguistics we can study in what Shakespearean literature really, in this scientific clarification is.

Therefore, an exact selected theory in time can grant us a particular support to categorize in between Shakespearean language and its meaning. It also grants us a certain function for a common mind, as well as, for an academic mind what scientific, social and psychological dimensions distinguish in Shakespearean world.

This kind of distinction can provide us with the apparatus of the sign in linguistics, cognitive linguistics, cognitive logo and cognitive poetics to explore Shakespeare's use of five senses in his five tragedies. It can also present us a clue in between the participations with a hypothetical midpoint, or with a foundation of cognitive poetics. In fact, a scientific theory acquires to study 'sign' in the faculty of a social and individual phenomenon. A scientific theory can easily lead us to the very sensual features we do expect to find in Shakespearean 'text'.²⁷

If, on the other hand, 'sign' opens the field of semiology²⁸ and we change its land and transform it into a thoughtful structure. Then we can have the world of literariness and poetics in Shakespearean

writings. Otherwise, if we move or modify the position of the identical sign with the equivalent organizational method and situate it on the soil of *sensations* then the same sign and its role rotates into a cognitive mode of Shakespearean language. It indeed denotes the inner utility of *sign* in human sensory *perception* that chase the same laws of cognitive reposition in its definitive choices. Therefore, a specific theory can guide us directly into the core of the situation of narration in Shakespearean dialogues.

Make Improvements in the Standard of Current Modern Criticism

This attempt will not only permit us to link literature with linguistics in cognitive poetics and cognitive linguistics, but will give us a scientific tool to advance the standard of current modern criticism. Mostly, the literary criticism that is getting shape of a new introducing, or re-shaping ‘design’, which is certainly forming a newly constructed ‘inside’ of cognitive appliance in the minds of Shakespearean patients. It also provides us one of the backgrounds of this shaping *silhouette* that distinguishes itself formally from other kinds of criticism.

Since, literary criticism uses the same theoretical material in language. It applies the same theoretical utensil to the other portions of art and creation as one of its objects. A scientific theoretical approach can allow us to explore Shakespeare’s level of thought²⁹ in its scientific function. It relates in Gérard Genette’s opinion to the academic level of knowledge, and thoughtfulness within the frame of the materiality of the text sources in exciting, or historical origins.³⁰ It can also facilitate us to put Shakespearean works into the make up of public and common mind. A critical literary ability is universal like music. It is like a rhythm or an event of active aptitude of extended reasoning that can certainly help us to catch the spinning inner self of cognitive realities in Shakespearean art.

Reports of Reality

Literary criticism is reports of reality Shakespeare tried to record with sound effects Shakespeare had gone through in sign of being human. Mr. Jakobson’s poetics primarily deals with a mechanism that makes a verbal message a work of literature in which Shakespeare as a playwright remained busy. This verbal message in modern criticism becomes *sign* of investigation and application to use it in mode of an equipment of measurement in the structural activities of Shakespearean art and literature. Predominantly, to encompass Shakespeare’s verbal composition as a Shakespearean language.

One of the modern literary critics Gérard Genette³¹ weaves linguistics into literature and builds poetics possible and puts it onto the level of an integral part of linguistics in his essay ‘*Structuralism and Literary Criticism*. The scientific explanation of sign, taken start from *sound pattern* and *concept* enters³² in the beginning of the 21st century, while crossing the experimental lab of Formalism, Structuralism and Post-structuralism.

It is now, encompassing psychoanalytical treatment and practices of Jacques Lacan,³³ that turned language into a signifying chain of importance in a literary discourse and its text to explore Shakespeare on modern support—that is shaping and securing the substance of its composing validity through time and thoughts that had a start from *Content* to *Structure* or from Shakespearean *Form* to

Shakespearean *Meaning*—that moved within the creative activity and acceptance of each overlapping main current investigative tactic of each merging century and turned into Lacan's *sliding*.

It is now, observing literary creation of time in a frame of a perpetual move of the *signified* under the *signifier* that creates another linear possibility of arbitrariness of a state that is captured by another denotation which is sustained by anything other than reference to another superimposing meaning of our modern time in Shakespearean compositions. Theorists in linguistics with modern literary critics contribute their efforts and scientific analysis to put literary criticism on to the *terrain* of the main current to improve and inform personal mind (reader) that can certainly be altered at anytime.

The Science of Verbal Structure in Shakespeare

The science of verbal structure in Shakespearean works, particularly on the basis of understanding in the 21st century provides a required block of literary systematic and scientific mechanism of measurement to let the pyramid of modern Shakespearean criticism be accomplished, accordingly. If we fix linguistics on the surface of a *principle* and take Shakespearean world and life (of Shakespearean writings) in literature on the facade of an '*illustration*' we certainly pick up another grid of structural value in the foreground and background of these two important outlines called life and literature. Linguistics in form of a crust gives variety and authenticity of their linear microscopic patterns,³⁴ where language is not only reflection of the images of our world, but is the main linkage of discernment in Shakespearean 'action'. It (language) is the centre of human activity.

An analytical and systematic loom of linguistics can enable us to have world-view of Shakespearean art on the plane of poetics and over all view of his literary creative field. Because we are at a time facing two worlds: the world we exist in and use language in state of a growing and expanding mechanism.

Shakespearean Literary Text

On the other hand we are connected to a Shakespearean literary text that keeps in check its remodeled world (textual-world). An actual Shakespearean text embodies its personal structural combination and selections from the cosmos of their (texts) forefronts and background. We must have a compositional authenticity of 'world-view' and 'critical-literary-view' in juxtaposition to comprehend each pole in its built up wholeness to explore Shakespeare on the floor of our main current. It will allow us a plan-like quality to classify what current equipment of depth demands us to weigh Shakespearean texts in various parts.

During the process of creating images for stage performance, Shakespeare sounds to be quite confident, having sense and art of positive responsibility to confirm his style an artist has to demonstrate to protect everything that relates to life. With this sense of protection via perception he also gives artistic and creative mold to the images he creates. He knows about the standard of art and literature that the impression he designs is thus always superior to the *thing* itself.³⁵ This is the creative web of Shakespeare's an artistic capability where art re-mixes life. In this process Shakespearean art communicates, reflects and generates life. This is the creative reality of an artistic movement and

realism where Shakespeare with an individual expression of a personality exhibits what he does, showing part of the conscious of human activity. He crafts a self-portrait to create his recreated action via his recreating reality.

Role of Unconscious Values

A self-conscious act of literary criticism must reconcile with two identified poles of unconscious values of re-presentations in their synchronic and social life with different *acts* and *events*. This harmonization that become comprehensible through linguistics is combined with an individual conscious creative literary and socially representative acts and recreated *events* and *scenes* that the methods or models of Structuralism³⁶ in form of a theory can cover it in Shakespearean details. The instrument of a selected theory can enable us to catch Shakespeare as an author with his social environment on the foreground of reader's consciousness and perceptual capability. Whatever problems Shakespeare touches in his art are confirmed in the field of his sensory signals. As before giving an artistic opinion or molding these lively senses into a dramatic form Shakespeare would have to go through an actuality that is transcended into the world³⁷ of art and creative mind.

Social and Cultural Context

A theory, while applying it to Shakespearean art, deals with what is narrated in its social and cultural context. Time and situations do not stand still, neither in linguistics, nor in literature. Now, in current moving days and nights a scientific loom to literature provides us cover of discussion to our modern researchers who find out cognitive poetics in development of a brain-research of the language Shakespeare used which 'is a predominantly sequential activity of a conspicuously logical character'³⁸ in its aesthetic purposes that Shakespearean writing contains in a poetic form.

In the first half of the 20th century terms *Formalism* and *Structuralism* had a great impact that would certainly offer creative frames in number of areas of the world. Above all, in Europe and America that the theory of 'sign' from sound pattern to concept helped to explore the scientific zones of *content* and *meanings*. Mainly, the extra-textual or extrinsic features of 19th century biographical literary criticism was changed into an intrinsic³⁹ and structural aspects of a literary work of 20th century.

The literary criticism, if we apply it to Shakespearean writing, changed its rout and shaped a new direction to find out *form* in mode of a *content* that would serve the function of a container like world itself or things in this existing world where shapeless things dump. In contrast those shapes received structure⁴⁰ through superimposed forms. Secondly, its content is presented in it. It was the *what* of the text of Formalism that was juxtaposed by the *how* of Structuralism to touch the exact note of Shakespearean meanings.

Application of Theory in Literature

The application of theory in literature did open a new discussion of scientific approximation to encompass Shakespearean literature in frames of Historicism, Materialism, Psychoanalysis,

Colonialism, Feminism and New Criticism. These treatments have to explore Shakespearean literary texts in current stream of exchange of ideas.

Putting Together the Pieces

Theory, through the consideration of this scientific mechanism, is in hundreds of pieces⁴¹ but its each piece fulfills our modern requirement of construction or de-construction to elaborate Shakespearean art and literature. So far as the pulse of cognitive poetics in current situations and Shakespearean topics with their texts are concerned, it takes its modern and scientific start from a scientific explanation of sound pattern, which is one of the most important poles of linguistic sign. In this scientific exploration sound pattern does not have a physical appearance only in the energy of a sound but its importance lies in a sound pattern that is on hearer's psychological impression that makes meaningful patterns or circles in the shifting ocean of his or her mind.

A Shakespearean sign is the real material of cognitive function. It serves the purpose of fixation, making illustrations with the *foreground* and *background*. It dominates the electronic messages of our sensory impressions that how we understand, or catch Shakespearean materials. There are other Shakespearean elements in a horizontal axis that represent concepts in its psychological nature, which actualizes sound pattern in discourse.⁴² On this stage a scientific approach in Shakespearean writing promotes meaning⁴³ or a word and investigates it in model of a 'sign' that presents *sign* in a plan of a combination of sound pattern and concept, whose signals and significations are arbitrary.⁴⁴

This scientific advance⁴⁵ allows us to track down the strings of Shakespearean-cognitive-poetics with the essential elements of science of language in Shakespearean structure. Structure as the mold of a scientific makeup in a theory is rather different. In the former sense, structure is scientific truth about reality and in the latter it is one of the skills in particular method of rules that deals to explore that truth or reality from Shakespearean *content* to Shakespearean *structure* or from Shakespearean *image* to Shakespearean *meaning*, if we apply it to Shakespeare's art of writing.

Each signal from the outer and external world is associated by its signified stage of the countryside of the mind (Shakespearean text) in which cognitive design and its function are the processes in analyzing its *signified* Shakespearean data. It (Shakespearean text from author to a reader) passes through hundreds of circuitous deviations and distortions. Shakespearean text also participates with the arbitrary nature of the sign when 'sign' changes its position from 'anatomy' or 'subject' into *cause* or *object* or from a 'domain' or object into a 'shape'. This function of changes in Shakespearean art also differentiates in its categories of imagery functions.

Art as Techniques

Mr. Victor Shklovsky in his *Art as techniques* relates images to the approximation of meanings we derive from variously composed signs from the author or reader's point of view. They (sign) create meanings if we relate or put them on a specific property of Shakespearean writings. This is why Mr. Shklovsky says that 'art is thinking in images'.⁴⁶

In his opinion much more important point is that a visual art passes more imperceptibility into non-visual art that generally in the category of readers we never differentiate between both of them. A suitable theory promotes our signification about the relationship of *who* speaks when he or she speaks to *whom* and with *what* authority this action is accomplished in Shakespearean signs.

There is the harmony of form and structure in Shakespearean art of writing. The necessary perfection of form gives us the under-hidden portion of a complete system of its arrangement. There is harmony of the world in size and order of poetic reality with its radiant ignition that conjures up in accordance with the laws of demands that Shakespeare as an author kept himself busy with. The play of Shakespeare's free forces, like perceptual curves on the foundation of his personal might have had another manifestation of his freedom in a poetics we presently deal with the help of our main scientific apparatus.

This is why, we feel that a Shakespearean poetics is valuable precisely in that it communicates the truth of life becoming a source of the sublime joy the appreciation of senses gives. The self-gratifying function of Shakespearean poetics is to delight the audience asserting the absolute value of human personality in its structural details, in a design-like role on a supposed specific *sphere* with objects and their vivid curves and portions. It would be in vain to look for areas that alone afford material for poetics, while the whole world in Shakespearean sign-composition is the object, not only of scientific, but of poetic exploration as well.

Quality of a Figure

Art of criticism in the quality of a figure on the *understructure* of architectural capability creates objects of new knowledge in the foreground. This quality also creates classical values of investigation in the background with an absolute horizon, when is applied to Shakespearean poetics. We are performing the roles of the participants of the 21st century's studio as figure on the *principle* of Shakespearean writing. Not getting every day new discoveries through discovery channels on Television and cables only, but structurally becoming involved in parts and particles of the discovery, which enable us to share current areas of interests being researchers and readers and being participants of the current situation in indulging life and its surroundings.

May be, Shakespeare was scientifically not aware of the unconscious participation of cognitive transport that worked out an implicit memory and was becoming part of his personality in the sketch of a performer, while this implicit mechanism might have molded him into a creativity. However, the mechanism of smell we use around our material world was the same system, what Shakespeare had. He was a molded human mind and particularly was an active and busy self a playwright went through. It is one of the main channels of the five senses of human body that develops contact of human mind. It is a machine working with the external world and its tactile reality that Shakespeare had to deal with, was the very crust of Shakespearean reality.

The Companionship of Senses

If Shakespeare was not aware of the companionship of sense of smell with his cognitive function, he certainly had full awareness about the individuality of sense of smell he possessed in form of one of the companionship and collaborations of his poetics. Shakespeare used his sense in a working mode that would perform a correlative energy with a piece of poetics in his dramatic art, which is a combined topic of taste and smell.

This instant portion of sense frequently directs the discussion of five senses in our main current. It is, because the nature of the stimulus in each case defines chemical terms while smell refers to those sensations that arise from the stimulation of the receptors that the upper portion of the nasal cavity receives. Both taste and smell participate in the regulation of feeding activities of animals, including man. The consistency of a situation in Shakespearean language offers the world like we ourselves. It arises from the way the state of affairs is organized from the nature of the condition we all feel with our five senses. Its molecules travel on the shoulder of air, making a difference between the atmosphere of a drawing room and dining room. This immediate sense of smelling also remains active in the grouping of one of the forces that shows changes between a 'bud' and its 'leaves' in Shakespearean art of depiction.

One of the reasons of its magnitude is that the relations of this scientific line of attack to Shakespearean studies is a particular object of research that practically and co-existentially works anywhere in the world. A world cannot be denied just for the sake of personal and traditional practices. We have to settle on the qualified substance of this system to achieve current Shakespearean critical purpose in relations to other International creative elements, which performs the task of a method and serves the current purpose what Ernest Cassirer entitles (Structuralism) as a 'general tendency of thought'.⁴⁷ It is the reality of time that the mechanism or structure of Structuralism can occur anywhere, when and wherever the foundation of any kind of construction on the *foot* of Shakespearean writing is laid down. It leads objects or available material or is applied for an acquired construction or deconstruction.

This mechanism of construction or in form of reconstruction survives and acts in the system of current Shakespearean connections and relations. It works in both categories, either objects in Shakespearean art of writing are conceived or perceived because structure is part of all cosmic system. A literariness in Shakespearean literature envelops all that makes a *whole* and is part of this cosmic build up, conveying meanings from signs of the stars to the sign of words we call language.

Re-establishing Our Modes

Our existing literary criticism needs a scientific manner to re-establish a Shakespearean discussion, expression, or *narrative* in a newly accepted form of quality⁴⁸ that language has shown and experimented. We come nearer in its proximity and intimacy to the repercussion of Shakespearean text what Mr. Jakobson places ancient rhetoric (in sense of paying his homage) at the heart of the structural method in the categories of their indications.

On the other hand, if Mr. Jakobson calls language scholars 'the technicians of communication' then on the other he awards the title of poetics to Shakespearean literary discourse in his *Linguistics and*

Poetics.⁴⁹ The analytical mechanism of Structuralism empowers a critic to have signification of literariness in Shakespearean language. A critic can have a properly managed interpretation of a Shakespearean poetical writing, which is called ‘figure of sound’.

In Valéry’s view of poetry is “hesitation between the sound and the sense”. And quoting Valéry’s view Gérard Genette appreciates that it is ‘much more realistic and scientific than any bias of phonic isolationism.’⁵⁰ It equips a critical view to make modern Shakespearean criticism potential to expose link that subsists among system of forms and meanings. Its theoretical application represents the study of literary morphology that embodies a whole, identifying poetics, stylistics and composition in Shakespeare’s world of signs.

Details in Linear

A theory in linear confirms to us the event of human spoken language, where a single question asked about Shakespeare in ‘what’ (text) is changed into the arrangement of functions and linear details of edifices. It will show a grammatical and linguistic identification of *how* this question of ‘what’ is solved through a systematic and scientific function of procedure in Shakespearean text cosmos. This systematic function (structuralism) enables researchers and scholars to have proper scientific meanings of an image. It also gives reasons to show the mechanism of the process occurs between an image and its existing meanings in Shakespearean texts.

Now, in the post-structural or post-modern era of 21st century the network of meaning has extended from poetics to cognitive poetics.

This cognitive welding enables current examiner to figure out the Gestalt and sensory part of Shakespearean art that can give us a clue that how the fossilized perceptions, once used by William Shakespeare in his time worked out the scientific fact of the country of mind. It can also provide us a picture with its entire lineage how and what kind of investigative approach Shakespeare had on social corruption and injustice in his comedies and tragedies. Or why was he called the man of communication? Was he able to portray life in its magnifying mode of time? Is he superior because the French classical were in rather higher position in thoughts and ideas of his time? Word that presents the drawing of a ‘sign’ had been worked out and has scientifically presented the sound pattern with its concept which has passed through two centuries like two waves of telegraphic message in parallel. It also crossed the research works in their literary findings of the Formalism and Structuralism now on the very moment when we enter into the approved and practiced mechanism of Shakespearean poetics or a literary discourse to investigate Shakespearean texts through the scientific approach of current linguistics.

Enduring Shakespearean Poetics

It is the tribute of our time we pay to Shakespearean poetics to have implication of what the requirement and quality of modern acceptance expect from us to award to an artist and playwright who looked at life from his perspectives of time. Now, a theoretical responsibility that stems out of linguistics stands to have importance in one of the scientific combinations our current minds approve

and accept on a worldwide academic level to see poetics (art and literary work) giving state of a figure on the *dais* of current learning. Shakespearean poetics, being an object might have existed for centuries to survive traditional and conventional views. It is argued not only to re-cognize and see Shakespearean works in a rough draft of an object but to re-perceive it, nor in a draft that once was created and still exists but to achieve it to be shown on the surface of scientific findings.

This systematic approach will facilitate us to re-find Shakespearean art what is ours, or why it belongs to our time in shape of an *object* we live with. This project can give us a scientific clue why or *what* do we *do* with the language Shakespeare meant, once upon a time that was part of the significance of fables. For the reason that we cannot see, nor feel about the significance of Shakespearean art unless we say something strong-minded about it. We are guided by words what Shakespeare did once. We have to re-move Shakespearean art from its already given *easel* to re-place or re-adjust it to be known, shown and re-signified to let it re-activate our perceptions. On the other hand, a theoretical treatment will allow us to extend our knowledge from Shakespearean poetics into the cognitive⁵¹ poetics of the country side of the mind Shakespeare himself was part of.

Order or Disorder?

To move Shakespearean poetics into a form of development, either in order or a disorder,⁵² from poetry to prose, from concrete to abstract⁵³ needs deeper understanding. The container that keeps Shakespearean sense of perceptions must be opened with a strong-smelling mechanism that lies yet, a hidden object to be examined on the *foundation* of gestalt principle. It will give us a tactic to re-fill the sensation of life it produced to re-move the veil off of habitualization. This will also give us what we have to re-value in Shakespeare from gestalt point of view of an association of a figure. It will give us its *sphere* to make the stone 'stony'. Whatever is known, from last 400 years, must be perceived.⁵⁴ It must be enjoyed like an old wine in a new bottle. This technique will prolong our sense of perception to appreciate Shakespearean art in a newly supposed *account* of cognitive discipline in cognitive linguistics.

Rediscovering Shakespeare – Blended Mental Space Effect

This theoretical treatment to re-discover Shakespeare will move us ahead from our day-to-day routine. On the contrary, this process will show us a path to an *actualization* between practical language and poetics language to have 'greatest amount of thought in the fewest words'.⁵⁵ This undertaken theoretical possibility will award us an idea that how images exist in the crust of figure a poet merely remembers and uses. Being a user an author he does not create them. These images journey from nations to nations, and from centuries to centuries. These are thought to be poetic, particularly the images that cross the aesthetic process of human perceptions and sensations. These kinds of images are called the blended mental space 'effect' of an expression.

The menu of current bent is to re-present Shakespeare how we perceive him now with the development of the re-sources of linguistics, to 'have' and to feel it 'changed'. A precise theory leads us into the capsules of issues of authorities, events and their significance. It directs us to re-find that there is a possible twist of human sense of smell in between the surface of stage⁵⁶ performance (in shape of text)

and audience (listeners and readers) on the *stay* of instinctive mechanism. If we shift this *settle* of instinctive mechanism into a communicative one, we certainly get human *body* as a *figure* on the one and human words and their literary performance (in foreground) on the other hand that suggest the figure-ground reality of sense of smell (in the background) in Shakespearean poetics.

Criticism within the Boundaries of Poetics

A Shakespearean literary criticism within the boundaries of poetics appears to strengthen the very foundation and character of serious and valuable academic work. A common reader or even authors are suggested to know or practice it in our current main stream. In studying a poetic speech can certainly be applied to any form of literary creation either in novel and drama in its phonetic and lexical arrangement and in its characteristic distribution of words and in the characteristic thought organizations encompass *everywhere the artistic trademark*.

It is in Shklovsky's⁵⁷ opinion that a work is created 'artistically' so that its perception is hindered in action or progress. And the greatest effect is produced through the slowness of perception that produces a sort of continuity in time and space of social environment. This is why a poetics touches, or its language gives satisfaction that in Aristotelian phrase 'must appear strange and wonderful'.

The next scientific mind in the science of language in the 20th century intellectual history is Roman Jakobson,⁵⁸ who has two powerful points in his contribution to modern theory that the 21st century has to appreciate: the identification of the rhetorical figures, metaphors and metonymy. His opinion represents models for two fundamental ways of organizing discourse that can be traced out in every kind of cultural production. The second is his attempt to *signify* the role of 'literariness'. His literariness defines in linguistics terms that what 'makes a verbal message a work of art' that not only welds linguistics or the science of language into modern literary criticism but also contributes procedure to give entry into scientific zone of 'cognitive poetics'. It had a great impact on the richness of the structuralist tradition of poetics. It gives importance to a textual analysis that originated in Eastern and Central Europe that tightens its roots in the very beginning of the 21st century, taking on text-and-context oriented approaches seriously.

This richness sheds broader views of Shakespearean context that encompasses both social and personal circumstances on the very edge of our present beats of time. It synchronically and systematically brings textual matter nearer to its contextual linear that is created and conceived from different readers of the world in different situations and circumstances. It allows other nations to perceive Shakespeare's *Othello* that is reproduced in Hindu Othello or Pashtoon Othello in Athal⁵⁹ Khan Ow Damano,⁶⁰ which produces a globalize-sense-of-acceptance of literariness with its science of verbal structure all over the world.

Shakespeare had a skill to be in control of accessing the most resourceful states⁶¹ of his characters' minds. These states showed themselves in their given actions or piece of experience to be performed to reproduce life that determines their perceptions of reality on stage. Or, in dialogue form that was written to be performed. Thus, their decision and behavior, whatever they feel and touch, is the outcome of the shape they remained in the characters of the participants in that specific scene and its

demand. They were part and body of scene that certainly portrays life in its given situation as a whole in their entire sensuous organic system.

In literature, if we deal Shakespearean poetics on the cues of modern structural criticism, have to change foreground and background of poetics from an objective investigation of a scientific explanation that acquires us to search out words on the level and category of signs from its sound pattern to thought to observe in a subjective approval or disapproval of a single thought only. And sign, whose quality remains hidden in a distance that in Gérard Genette's opinion is related to us 'by virtue of its very distance'.⁶²

If in the structural⁶³ treatment of Shakespearean poetics, by 'distancing' our speech⁶⁴ we fix sentence structure in the scale of two axis of definitive and straight dimensions that provide selections, choices and sequential combination of sound pattern and concept. This kind of mechanism in Shakespearean text is totally an objective structural work. The importance of a Shakespearean works can only be understood on the very foundation, collection and usage of a *sign* in the factory of social values and norms, as settings. This objective structural work even represents to allow a lot of matter to Shakespearean usage of anthropology and mythologies.

But the plastic function of a structural method and its theory in Shakespearean text give us an opportunity to move towards the centre of thought where the function of the method changes but theory which corresponds to a scientific method remains the same.

Application of Structuralism

If we apply Structuralism that would add a new signification to Shakespearean language from a cognitive background or angle and we would certainly have another 'meaning' of Shakespearean language. It will enable us to achieve the graph of knowledge in its critical subject particularly in literary criticism.

We have to put Shakespearean thought on a scale which would create a model or a *figure* from itself on the *well-defines edges* of cognitive mechanism: a presupposition that will certainly provide us a horizon to estimate about the distance we feel about Shakespearean poetics and its *literariness*. It will certainly be called a structurally designed criticism in current main stream of Shakespearean poetics. It will also be a sort of re-construction. It will certainly be intelligible, despite its force of being 'distant'. It is not a kind of superficial or artificial mechanism, but is a parallel force of an external system that penetrates in a radioscopic reality. It will systematically move inside the internal means of thought and comprehension of a literary value of Shakespearean text.

Tools that Assist Us

Theory, like a tool assists us to capture the instance of Shakespearean perceptual reality in the instance of Shakespearean discourse. Many changes have been taken place since Shakespeare was contributing in the role of a writer and was bringing a great amount of attributive processes in human temperament, like word 'soul' for example.

The meanings of word 'soul' moved from century to century from Aristotle to Will Durant. Surviving many isms from Reformation to Rationalism, Transcendentalism and then to the exploration of Space and now after 9/11 event we are still on the very edge of a new level of an other *signified* - what signs soul or life mean on the threshold of the 21st century. Defining *sign*, Lévi-Strauss saw that a range of sequential forecasts obscured a frequent performance of thoughtfulness, which condensed experiences to create a sort of makeup of an arrangement, to *mold* an event. 'From the unlikely starting-point of geology he had developed what was to be a basic principle of structuralist analysis: to understand phenomena is to reconstruct the system of which they are manifestations.'⁶⁵ These changes and thousands more witnessed and experienced influences of the improved mind of today, but these were unknown to the English man of the sixteenth century of Shakespearean Europe.

Age to Age, the Same – A Delusive Oversimplification

No doubt, however, if we know the meaning of the Elizabethan language used, from the origin of the culture of Elizabethan times, the fashions and opinions they had and something of the dramatic practices of the day they were used to, we may proceed to the enjoyment of Shakespeare's drama on modern screen. Our modern treatments show that human nature dictates the same signals from age to age, but now with more scientific additions, depth and many kinds of contributions we get more authenticity in Shakespearean language.

The poetic function of literary discourse props up the plainness of Shakespearean signs. This scientific occupation cannot be locked up only to poetry, nor to a poetic role only that Roman Jakobson calls as a 'delusive oversimplification.'⁶⁶ If we focus on a 'message' in Shakespearean dramatic art, the very same thing can certainly be studied in the general problems of language.

Dealing with poetics function, linguistics overlaps⁶⁷ the whole cosmos of literature from prose to criticism. It equips us from fiction to poetry and to Shakespearean poetics. On the contrary a cognitive poetics belongs to the perceptual and sensational activities we oversight in its background and foreground or never take notice of the importance of the makeup of feelings that overrules the atmosphere of *Romeo and Juliet*, *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *Othello*, and *King Lear*. These feelings remain part of our (readers, listeners and viewers) implicit memory what Shakespeare had also recorded in his writings. It undoubtedly is nutritive activity but remains one of the active parts of our minds' inner utility. This cognitive function is the foremost assignment of frequent messages. It is not only in poetics, but in linguistics that defines changes with unbroken, long-term and inert features, which can easily be studied in Shakespeare's synchronic features of poetics.

The Universal What and How

A theoretical business of linguistics in Shakespeare permits us to examine 'what' and 'how' the universe of social world is actualized through vocalization by a given discourse. It allocates us to monitor 'how' it is realized in between two dimensional axis.

Linguistics is expected to open up all possible problems of relation between discourses. It tries to solve questions between Shakespearean 'word' and the 'world' because many features belong not only to the

science of language but to the whole theory of signs. In this relationship the study of poetics is entitled to the leading place in current literary studies. It deals with problems of verbal structure, though linguistics is considered to be the global science of verbal structure and poetics is one of its fundamental parts. Current literary criticism of Shakespearean texts secures proper space for a cognitive signification of latest investigation through structuralism. It obtains a closest and familiar, but 'distancing' silhouette of Shakespearean speech mechanism. A specific scientific theory in Shakespearean world can serve the purpose of a tool to provide us the critical interpretation of the text as a landmark on the unified field of Shakespearean poetics.

If we use arrangement to detect signs or meanings in Shakespearean literary criticism we have to use thought that would give us the value of a *sign* to achieve current modern quality of literary value with same measure of independence of its own. Now, through Internet and Satellites we never produce for a specific language, nation, tribe or Television channels only, but do current recording to exhibit to show to the world in the frame of a whole. The present quality and production in the conduct and knowledge of literary criticism demands us to do that, which is acceptable to the whole world through current media's strongly built device in thought and intentions which have already twisted into the world of Shakespearean art and poetics. Presently and apparently, a strong made-arrangement to investigate Shakespearean art seems to be on its solid linear embodiment. It signifies Shakespeare as a critical and investigative 'support' when criticism in the background throws its spotlight, or fixes the scoop of a cognitive light for the searching state of continuation on the outside current perceptual purposes. Our literary modern criticism is on the very edge of a digital network that can show us the accuracy of the vibration of Shakespearean object in its entire detail from blood to pulses in the perceptual field of his sense-loaded text.

Criticism into a Figure

Criticism has an equal importance to the literature of current main stream, when it studies Shakespearean thoughts through the medium of language. Without criticism Shakespearean literature would have had no meaning. It brings the Shakespearean literary task into being. Criticism into a figure on constructed 'defined edges' of scientific approach encompasses literature with its author-text-context-reader frames. The implementation of a specific theory on Shakespearean critical base creates its detailed critical function like an object of resolved organism. The theoretical and methodological treatment of the 21st century demands us to explore the poetics of Shakespeare in its whole. Scientifically, the whole of a works in its different parts, elements and components may critically be linked in a synchronic method that on the contrary till the beginning of the 20th century literature and particularly literary criticism was dealt with a diachronic method.

A diachronic method was considered and proved to produce the interpretation of interpretation only.

Secondly, literary criticism should synchronically investigate Shakespeare as an author, who had dealt language in the means of developing portion called literariness. It certainly generates the value of thoughts in Shakespearean language. Thirdly, a modern estimate of criticism must cover reader-oriented approach in Shakespearean writings. A reader's level attitude investigates the minds of the

readers who take main part for whom literature in form of *Hamlet* or *Macbeth* was and is produced. This part was totally forgotten and was never ever explored.

In this sense, methods and systems alter with the passage of time in centuries. The author who really is the creator was totally focused from a diachronic critical angle. But those minds were entirely forgotten, or were over-sighted who would participate silently in the roles of the readers and observers. All these Shakespearean readers and viewers contain questions beneath their valuable and meaningful silence. This is why an author-reader-contextual investigation in Shakespeare can enable us in modern methodology and theory to find the history of human mind with an altered function for the achievement of our current targets.

Despite the fact that a system survives, its function can be changed to achieve our current bent and purpose in Shakespearean language that *speaks*. With this alteration (of a function) we can have the history of 'reading' in a scientific method. A scientific method of linguistics will certainly allow us to have a line of an intellectual, social and physical history of human kind in a critical and cultural mode Shakespeare portrayed his characters in. We can have Shakespearean works as a reference to weigh Shakespearean language on the scale of our current instruments. To give more importance to past (Shakespeare as a ground) we must show and act on ourselves more attentively to have command on our current theoretical skill, because the mannerism of our literary criticism is being changed gradually in current episodes of art and creation. We can have the exact note of our modern investigation in Shakespearean language if we put Shakespearean poetics in form of a *figure* of investigation on the *preceding surface* of social means and systems.

In the present given situation Shakespearean drama in *form* of a book is totally transferred into the background that exists like an echo in schools, colleges and universities.

In the centre we have modern cinematography through Television channels and electronic cables. Or we have direct link to the sounds and signs of Radio through hearing system or with a vision on net, which have turned a living screen and chat rooms into an existing critical book. Therefore, in the views of these present *foreground* and *background* of Shakespeare's works, a poetics changes its meanings. Literature and particularly literary criticism on Shakespeare has to survive the development of current media of information and communication technology. This is why in Gérard Genette's words a 'literary history becomes the history of a system'.

As a matter of present practice, we are switching on, in a literary criticism from diachronic to synchronic method of literary and critical treatment in Shakespearean art and literature. We have to accomplish our structural responsibility of current standard and demand. As Mr. Jakobson has remarked, the literary table of a period describes not only its time of creation, but also a presents its culture. Therefore, on the experienced form of a certain image of the past our current organizing investment can enable us to dissect the diachronic images of Shakespearean criticism in the lab of present synchronic system. A structural mechanism facilitates us to grasp the system and the usage of five senses in Shakespearean literature in its over all advancement with a synchronic equipment of dissection. In this synchronic way, we have to have and to show the *function* of an element in its coordination, if that is either social or Linguistic mechanism. A compositional treatment of synchronic

investigation in Shakespearean writings creates a stand to have an assessment of those active minds, which are being concerned in their silence. We have to capture those minds, which are called the 'readers' (who are also loaded and re-loaded of their five senses) of Shakespearean texts.

Reading and Silence

In this specific portion of 'silence' or 'reading' process we can prove the idea of *sound pattern* that being addresser pierces or travels or connects an addressee, silently, that is called 'concept'. On this explicit and detailed stay we can recognize language life from an 'object' or 'sign' that speaks in silence. Or we can definitely say that language speaks. A speaking language itself is 'a series of partially autonomous and unpredictable individual acts'.⁶⁸ This current synchronic countryside of structuralism in a cognitive poetics connects us to the field of cognitive actions that can make the *patterns* of understanding in reader's mind.

Extended Means of Investigation

A specific theory extends means of investigation in Shakespearean language from sensory forms to cognitive meanings. Scientific devices and their methods are now functional parts and partners of the current literary enterprise, in exploring Shakespeare's texts from freshly and newly developed angles.

We cannot prove, nor re-present our literary navigation without the companionship or application of literary theory our current means of resourceful writing continue through which an author (researchers or scholars) works out his attachment and findings in the country side (researcher as a reader of Shakespearean texts) of his mind. This is why, a theoretical treatment to literary findings has twisted into a worldwide academic demand a scientific procedure and machinery of Linguistics provides us.

The scientific regularity and means of Linguistics supply us a platform to deal with Shakespearean art, entitled the Shakespearean poetics. It awards the set of its scientific portion that is approved in its sequence. It promotes a part and value of message a sign or code of sound pattern corresponds to. It also encloses to generate the value of thought⁶⁹ pattern of Shakespearean concept.

This pointer turns into a cognitive pencil that is created with the help of cognitive linguistics and cognitive expertise in helping modern readers and viewers to get the meanings of Shakespearean poetics⁷⁰ on the ground of gestalt formula. It finds out the sources of memory and manner of the current field of creation that instructs us to protect and promote its scientific approval of Shakespearean literature. It will award us to keep on up-to-date human acts-data within newly findings and movements of Linguistics to enhance art factories and their business with literature.

Therefore, a poetic function, as Jakobson reported, is the code of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination⁷¹. So, this is the configuration-like mechanism that envelops Shakespearean poetics in its entire production. It allows us to investigate his creation on a scientific pedestal our current criterion and mood accept. The proficiency of theory that serves the purpose of a tool makes possible for us to explore the cosmos of Shakespearean poetics in a rhythmical figure of language. A poetics in the wider sense of word dealing with the rhythmical occupation superimposes

on the utility of language Shakespeare used 400 years ago in two dimensional axis of *selection* and *combination*.

Conclusion

Now, in our main current, a poetic function has enlarged itself like the digital devices in a microscopic activities and uses. It encompasses Shakespearean language from its figure/ground reality. It also provides us the facility of scientific-improvisation, x-rays and laser-and-atomic-treatment, ultra-sound in our current modern studios and labs.

Here scientific-device means the exact scientific appliance we use in Television and Cinema. Therefore, the application of cognitive poetics supplies us a ground to suppose a strongly built easel and background/foreground to widen and identify an object within Shakespearean texts. We can spin it from all sides for its shades of explanations to achieve various angles, positions, selections and combinations on the screen of human mind. This scientific function of supposed mental screen allows us to have Shakespearean used senses that superimpose, either to overlap, fade in, and fade out in the shape of scientific technical productive microfilms with a sort of skill of editing.

This technical editing in mind shows us a mechanism to analyze Shakespeare's use of five senses in his five tragedies. As a matter of fact the possibility in current waves of conception only depends on a fully grasped and well equipped application of a theory from the lab of linguistics. It will then, never let a linguist indifferent⁷² to a poetic function, nor will leave a literary scholar either careless or prejudice to the linguistics schemes and facilities of its time.

If we choose the same strongly built design from linguistics and change its utility diverting it from poetry to criticism, then it can certainly give us the critical foreground and background of Shakespeare as an author. We can have, whatever the influences or creative effects he had in his vertical and horizontal selections and combinations from the maturity of his mind and thoughts to the growth and ideas of social and cultural⁷³ sequences and episodes he (author) the human flesh and blood lived in all his accompanied sensory perceptions. We can have approach to the episode Shakespeare showed through his art of composing words, when the characters, however, only come to life because of the words they speak. He composed his words for his characters and used of language that has to be recognized as of 'central importance.'⁷⁴ We have to tag along and can apply strongly made task to Shakespearean poetics that in Jacques Derrida opinion, is a historical 'event' our current time approaches. Shakespearean creation in language opens another vastness of current field for scholars and critics of modern age to bring into light the coherence of the system. The centre of structure⁷⁵ creates a ground for us to 'play' on the elements of the inside of the total form of Shakespearean art. The purpose of theory is to discover the system of the Shakespearean text in its complex network.

Notes:

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

11 : 3 March 2011

Naseem Achakzai, M.Phil.

Literary Criticism as a Shared Set of Measurement

¹ Roman Jakobson's focused work on the fundamental workings of language and developed theories that specifically applied to literature, will guard the investigation of this research work.

² John Peck and Martin Coyle write in their General Editors' Preface to New Casebooks series on *Hamlet*, published in 1992 that 'The purpose of this new series of Casebooks is to reveal some of the ways in which contemporary criticism has changed our understanding of commonly studied texts and writers and, indeed, of the nature of criticism itself.' John Peck and Martin Coyle, *Hamlet*, p. ix.

³ John M. Swales *Research Genres*, p. 62.

⁴ Keith Green and Jill Lebihan, *Critical Theory & Practice: A COURSEBOOK*, p. 272.

⁵ Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs*, p. 6.

⁶ (Each New Casebook editor has been asked to select a sequence of essays which will introduce the reader to the new critical approaches to the text or texts being discussed in the volume and also illuminate the rich interchange between critical theory and critical practice that characterises so much current writing about literature.' John Peck and Martin Coyle, General Editors' Preface, *Hamlet*, p. ix.)

⁷ 'Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) was a Swiss linguist who studied in Germany and France before taking up a university chair in his native city of Geneva, which he occupied for the rest of his life.' (David Lodge, ed.) *Modern Criticism and Theory: Introduction to Ferdinand de Saussure*, p. 1.

⁸ 'Before Saussure, the study of language, or philology as it was usually called, had been essentially historical, tracing change and development in phonology and semantics within and between languages or groups of languages. Saussure argued that a scientific linguistics could never be based on such a 'diachronic' study but only by approaching language as a 'synchronic' system – that a system of which all the elements and rules are in theory simultaneously available to the user of the language.' *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁹ Sarah Werner, *Shakespeare and Feminism Performance*, General editor's preface, p. ix.

¹⁰ Keith Green and Jill Lebihan, *Critical Theory & Practice: A COURSEBOOK*, p. 59.

¹¹ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory: Saussure, On defining a language*, pp. 3, 4.

¹² Sarah Werner, *Shakespeare and Feminism Performance*, General editor's preface, p. x.

¹³ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory: Saussure, On defining a language*, pp. 5. 6. 7.

¹⁴ ‘My first case, in many ways the most significant, is that of Northrop Frye’s *Anatomy of Criticism*. Frye’s polemical introduction is, of course, a powerful indictment of contemporary criticism and an argument of a systematic poetics: criticism is in a state of ‘naïve induction,’ trying to study individual works of literature without a proper conceptual framework.’ Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs*, p. 7.

¹⁵ ‘. . . contemporary criticism has established new methods of analysing texts and who have reinvigorated the important debate about how we ‘read’ literature.’ John Peck and Martin Coyle, General Editors’ Preface, *Hamlet*, p. ix

¹⁶ Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh (eds), *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader* (4th Edition), p. 46.

¹⁷ Keith Green and Jill Lebihan, *Critical Theory & Practice: A COURSEBOOK*, Basic relations, p. 5.

¹⁸ ‘Jacques Derrida (b. 1930) is a French philosopher, who teaches philosophy at the Ecole Normale Supérieure in Paris. He has, however, arguably had more influence on literary studies than on philosophy, particularly in the universities of America, where a school of ‘deconstructive’ criticism, drawing much of its inspiration from Derrida, has been a major force in the 1970s and 80s, and where he himself is a frequent visitor.’ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, Introduction to Jacques Derrida, p. 107.

¹⁹ Sarah Werner, *Shakespeare and Feminist Performance*, General editor’s preface, p. ix.

²⁰ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, Introduction to Jacques Derrida, p. 107.

²¹ Sarah Werner, *Shakespeare and Feminist Performance*, General editor’s preface, p. ix.

²² David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, Gérard Genette: Structuralism and literary criticism, p. 63.

²³ Keith Green and Jill Lebihan, *Critical Theory & Practice: A COURSEBOOK*, p. 74.

²⁴ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory: Saussure, On defining a language*, p. 7. 8.

²⁵ Jean E. Howard and Scott Cutler Shershow, eds, *Marxist Shakespeare* General editor’s preface, p. xi.

²⁶ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory: Saussure, On defining a language*, p. 8.

²⁷ Nicholas Marsh, *Shakespeare The Tragedies*, General Editor’s Preface, p. x.

²⁸ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory: Saussure, On defining a language*, pp. 8, 9.

²⁹ ‘Above all, my aim was not to slow Shakespeare down with a commentator’s clumsily retrospective words but to try to keep up with him and register the very moment of his making thought come into being.’ Philip Davis, *Sudden Shakespeare: The Shaping of Shakespeare’s Creative Thought*, Introduction, p.1.

³⁰ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, Gérard Genette: Structuralism and literary criticism, pp. 63, 64.

³¹ ‘Gérard Genette (b. 1930) shows how Jakobson revised the more extreme doctrines of the Formalists to take into account the semantic dimension of literature, but in his observation that structuralism’s privileging of structure is an ideological stance, and he anticipated many poststructuralist critiques of structuralism.’ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, Gérard Genette, Structuralism and literary criticism, p. 62.

³² Nonetheless, driven by a necessary overdetermined set of institutional and intellectual purposes and pressures, sometimes in the 1970s, theory was transformed from a minor and arcane subspeciality into a compelling, if not completely coherent, subject in its own right, with imperial intellectual ambitions and substantial institutional prestige. David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare after Theory*, p. 26.

³³ ‘Jacques Lacan (1901-81) studied medicine in Paris and entered the Freudian psychoanalytical movement in 1936. His radical critique of orthodox psychoanalytical theory and practice led to his expulsion in 1959 from the International Psychoanalytical Association and the setting up of his own Ecole Freudienne in Paris in 1964.’ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, Introduction to Jacques Lacan, p. 79.

³⁴ (Keith Green and Jill Lebihan, *Critical Theory & Practice: A COURSEBOOK*, pp. 36, 37.

³⁵ Damian Grant, *Realism*, p. 57.

³⁶ Keith Green and Jill Lebihan, *Critical Theory & Practice: A COURSEBOOK*, p. 59.

³⁷ ‘In his dramas of creation, evolution and destruction, Shakespeare created a parallel world through which he could lock into the creative life-force itself.’ Philip Davis, *Sudden Shakespeare: The Shaping of Shakespeare’s Creative Thought*, Introduction, p.2.

³⁸ <http://www2.bc.edu/~richarad/fea/tsur/cogpoetics.html/27.4.06/11.00.am>.

³⁹ Mario Klarer, *An Introduction to Literary Studies*, p. 77.

⁴⁰ ‘. . . it is a structure that we learn, and which teaches us to order the world and reality.’ Martin Coyle, *Hamlet* Introduction, p.6.

⁴¹ Judith Butler, John Guillory, and Kendall Thomas. eds. *What’s Left of Theory?* p. xi.

⁴² David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory: Saussure, On defining a language*, pp. 10, 11.

⁴³ ‘If theory cannot, then, be accurately condemned as the potent destroyer of Western rationality or enthusiastically embraced as a significantly liberatory political practice, it has decisively rewritten our understanding of cultural signification, a rewriting with profound effects for literary studies.’ David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare after Theory*, p. 27.

⁴⁴ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory: Saussure, On defining a language*, p. 12.

⁴⁵ ‘Theory can complicate and contest the categories of analysis . . . ‘ David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare after Theory*, p. 28.

⁴⁶ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory Victor Shklovsky’s Art as technique*, pp. 16, 17.

⁴⁷ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory, Gérard Genette: Structuralism and literary criticism*, p. 68.

⁴⁸ Arguing against the effects of theory Mr. Kastan in *Shakespeare after Theory* demonstrates that ‘it is, however, only by turning to history from theory that this can be shown to be true and meaningful, that the particular forms and particular effects of a text’s “worldliness” can be discovered and demonstrated.’ p. 42.

⁴⁹ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory, Gérard Genette: Structuralism and literary criticism*, p. 67.

⁵⁰ Quotes Genette: Roman Jakobson, ‘Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics,’ in T. A. Sebeok, ed; *Style in Language* (Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T. Press, 1960), p. 367.

⁵¹ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory Victor Shklovsky’s Art as technique*, p. 20.

⁵² (‘This awareness of the inevitable disorder of experience is seen in its most development form in Shakespeare’s tragedies.’ John Peck and Martin Coyle, *Literary Terms and Criticism*, p.150.)

⁵³ ‘Art is a way of experiencing the artfulness of an object; the object is not important.’ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory, Victor Shklovsky’s Art as technique*, p. 20.

⁵⁴ ‘In literary study, the pressures toward interdisciplinary are, however, almost irresistible.’ David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare after Theory*, p. 47.

⁵⁵ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory Victor Shklovsky’s Art as technique*, p. 19.

⁵⁶ ‘Shakespeare keeps prompting our uncertainty by his choice of words and his requirements for stage movement.’ Peter Davison, *Hamlet, The Comedy of ‘Hamlet’*, p.42.

⁵⁷ ‘Victor Shklovsky (b. 1893) was a leading figure in the school of literary and linguistic theory known as Russian formalist which flourished in the immediately pre-and-post-revolutionary period in Russia. David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, p. 27.

⁵⁸ ‘Roman Jakobson (1896-1982) was one of the powerful minds in 20th century intellectual history.’ Ibid, p. 31.

⁵⁹ (The structural linear of Athal in ancient Pashto sheds the meaning of a ‘hero’ that synchronized Othello’s name and the character Shakespeare wanted to portray. Athal in ancient Pashto is the sign of bravery and chivalry, used by one of Pashtoon hero and poets Ameer Krore, an ancient Pashto tribal chief whose poem as the first part and period of Pashto literature in written form has been recorded in Pashtoon history and literature. He has written *wiarana*: a self appreciation, in about 140, BC). As a figure on the ground of history sign ‘Athal’ reflects a syntagmatic pole of the movement of a brave hero and as a figure on the plain of ‘quality’ its paradigmatic value awards the meaning of gallantry. On the other hand Damano is also a primeval name of a female beauty and heroine. Her name structures out the meaning of a female character from a desert. Daman, in Pashto means wild plains or a desert. Therefore, Athal Khan and Damano provide the perfection of structural value in Pashto language that assimilates Shakespearean art in Othello what Shakespeare supposed about the character of Othello to be.

⁶⁰ When I came across Hindoo Othello, in a literary research paper written by Sudipto Chatterjee and Jyotsna G. Singh in *Shakespeare and Appropriation*, I remembered our Pashtoon Othello which was entitled Athal Khan Ow Damano, translated by Dr Khudaidad Khan in Pashto for Radio Pakistan Quetta. I still have syntagmatic montages of those bygone moments, performance, scenes and emotions when I played the main role of Othello as Athal Khan in 1977. Othello was transferred into Athal Khan and Desdemona into Damano – even these names gave the social and traditional touch to the dramatic performance of Othello in Pashto. A typical English *Othello* was transferred into a typical Pashtoon hero as it is. It did not have any difference at all, and no cultural, or social difference could distract the listeners, because the universality of human feelings and emotions, and even the theme of drama was the same. It was my first and the youngest literary experience in the age of 17, making and creating me into a bent to translate Hamlet in Urdu for Radio Pakistan in 1984 – that was the second part of “Appropriation in Practice” I experienced as an artist, and writer in the early stages of my life.

⁶¹ ‘A state of partial separation and resulting inconveniency in what Shakespeare’s tragic protagonist must inhabit.’ Philip Davis, *Sudden Shakespeare: The Shaping of Shakespeare’s Creative Thought*, ‘Compounded of Many Simples’: Shakespeare’s Compositions p.66.

⁶² David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, Gérard Genette: Structuralism and literary criticism, pp. 71, 72.

⁶³ (‘ . . . modern criticism has been on the idea that language, far from being just a tool the writer uses to put forward his or her ideas, actually creates the content of a text. This is the emphasis of ‘New Criticism’, but some subsequent thinking, in a structuralist and poststructuralist vein has suggested that there is nothing outside language in a literary text.’ John Peck and Martin Coyle, *Literary Terms and Criticism*, p. 162.)

⁶⁴ Gérard Genette explains further in his footnote that ‘a new signification is not necessarily a new *meaning*. It is a new connection between form and meaning. If literature is an art of significations, it is renewed, and with it criticism, by modifying this connection, either through the meaning or through the form. It thus happens that modern criticism is rediscovering in ‘themes’ or ‘styles’ what classical criticism had already found in ‘ideas’ or ‘feelings.’ And old meaning comes back to us linked to a new form, and this ‘shift’ displaces a work.’ Gérard Genette. ‘Structuralism and literary criticism’, David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, p. 77.

⁶⁵ Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs*, p. 30.

⁶⁶ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory* Roman Jakobson, pp, 37. 38.

⁶⁷ ‘Shakespeare brings together words and clauses just as he brings together differing considerations, jostling for space, overlapping with the modifying each other’s meaning.’ Philip Davis, *Sudden Shakespeare: The Shaping of Shakespeare’s Creative Thought*, ‘Compounded of Many Simples’: *Shakespeare’s Compositions* p.78.

⁶⁸ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, Gérard Genette: Structuralism and literary criticism, pp. 73, 74.

⁶⁹ ‘In his famous subtilisation of the Romantic idea that Hamlet is unnecessarily and morbidly reflective. T. S. Eliot argued that Shakespeare himself failed in Hamlet to establish any clear correspondence between thought and action, idea and image. The play is ‘full of some stuff that the writer could not drag to light, contemplate, or manipulate into art’, Eliot suggested; and since nothing in the fictional occasion is sufficient to account for the protagonist’s great apprehension and disgust, his thoughts and feelings cannot be expressed by ‘a skilful accumulation of imagined sensory impressions’. The morbid corporeality of the imagined sensory impressions described in the first section of this essay may provide an answer to Eliot’s charge, in that they constitute something like an ‘objective correlative’ for Hamlet’s obsessive withdrawal from the world of action. The attitude toward corporeal existence inherent in the play’s imagery figures prominently in the protagonist’s thinking as well; it contributes to his inability to ‘act’ by challenging what he regards as the integrity of his being.’ Martin Coyle, (ed.) *Hamlet*, JOHN HUNT, ‘A Thing of Nothing: The Catastrophic Body in ‘Hamlet’, p.177.

⁷⁰ ‘Here the goal is to develop a poetics which would stand to literature as linguistics stands to language. Just as the task of linguists is not to tell us what individual sentences mean but to explain according to what rules their elements combine and contrast to produce the

meanings sentences have for speakers of a language, . . . ‘ Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs*, p. 42.

⁷¹ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory* Roman Jakobson’ Linguistics and poetics, p, 39.

⁷² Ibid, p. 55.

⁷³ ‘Increasingly, even in fields where scholarship was previously presumed to mean historical research, attention has turned to synchronic analyses. To understand social and cultural phenomena, whether they be congressional committees, neckties, or cross-country skiing, is not to trace their historical evolution but to grasp their place and function in various systems of activity and to identify the distinctions which give them significance.’ Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs*, p. 34.

⁷⁴ John Peck and Martin Coyle, *Literary Terms And Criticism*, p.102.

⁷⁵ David Lodge, ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory*, Structure, sign and play in the discourse of human sciences: Jacques Derrida, p. 109.

=====

References

Abrams, M.H. (1953) *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alexander, Peter. (1967) *Studies in Shakespeare*, Ely House, London: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, John R. (1990) *Cognitive Psychology And Its Implications*, United States of America: Freeman and Company.

Armstrong, Philip. (2001) *Shakespeare in Psychoanalysis*, London: Routledge.

Atkinson, Rital. (1981) *Introduction to Psychology* (Eighth Edition), NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Baddeley, A.D. and Weiskrantz, L. (eds) (1993) *Attention: Awareness, Selection, and Control*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, Harry. Ph.D. (1955) *Introduction to Exceptional Children*, New York: The Macmillan Company.

Barker, Francise. (1984) *The Tremulous Private Body*, London: Methuen.

Barnet, Sylvan. (1963) *Macbeth: By William Shakespeare*, England: The New English Library Limited.

Barthes, Roland (1977) *Image Music Text* (ed. S. Heath), London: Fontana.

Bartlett, F.C. (1932) *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology* (reprinted 1995), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beardslee, David C. and Wertheimer, Max (eds) (1958) *Readings in Perception*, Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Belsey, Catherine. (1985) *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama*, London: Methuen.

Berry, Margaret (1977) *Introduction to Systematic Linguistics* (2 vols), London: Batsford.

Betens, Hans. (2001) *Literary Theory*, London: Routledge.

Bex, Tony (1996) *Variety in Written English*, London: Routledge.

Blax, Max (1962) *Models and Metaphors*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Booth, Wayne C. (1961) *A Rhetoric of Fiction*, Chicago, II: University of Chicago Press.

Boring, Edwin (1950) *A History of Experimental Psychology* (second edition), New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Boruah, B.H. (1988) *Fiction and Emotion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bradley, R. and Swartz, N. (1979) *Possible Worlds: An Introduction to Logic and its Philosophy*, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Co.

Bradley, A. C. (1978) *Shakespearean Tragedy*, London: The Macmillan Press.

Bristol, Michael and McLuskie, Kathleen with Holmes, Christopher. (2001) *Shakespeare and Modern Theatre*, London: Routledge.

Bristol, Michael D. (1985) *Carnival and Theatre*, London: Methuen.
— (1996) *big-time Shakespeare*, London: Routledge.

Brook, Nicholas. (1968) *Shakespeare's Early Tragedies*, London: Methuen & Co.

Brown, Ivor. (1967) *Shakespeare IN His Time*. London and Edinburgh, UK: Thomas Nelson.

Brown, John Russell. (ed.) (1990) *Studying Shakespeare*, London: The Macmillan Press LTD.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen-Rosa and Coulthard, Malcolm (eds) (1996) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Routledge.

Callaghan, Dymphna. (2000) *Shakespeare Without Women*, London: Routledge.

Cameron, L. and Low, G. (eds) (1999) *Researching and Applying Metaphor*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carnegie, Dale. (1956) *How to Develop Self-Confidence & Influence People by Public Speaking*, New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Carnegie, Dale. (1986) *How to Enjoy Your Life and Your Job*, New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Carter, Ronald (1997) *Investigating English Discourse: Language, Literacy, Literature*, London: Routledge.

Carter, Ronald and Nash, Walter (1990) *Seeing Through Language: A Guide to Styles of English Writing*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Chadwick, Charles. (1978) *Symbolism*, London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

Charney, Maurice. (1971) *How to Read Shakespeare*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Chatman, Seymour (1978) *Story and Discourse*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Chilton, P. (ed.) (1985) *Language and the Nuclear Debate*, London: Pinter.

Clemen, W.H. (1966) *The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery*, London: University Paperbacks, Methuen & Co Ltd.

Cockcroft, Robert (2002) *Renaissance Rhetoric: Reconsidered Passion – The Interpretation of Affect in Early Modern Writing*, London: Palgrave.

Coles, R. (1989) *The Call of Stories*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Colman, E. A. M. 1974) *The dramatic use of Bawdy in Shakespeare*, London: Longman Group Limited.

Cook, Guy (1989) *Discourse*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corrigan, Paul. (1999) *Shakespeare on Management*, UK: Kogan Page Limited.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

11 : 3 March 2011

Naseem Achakzai, M.Phil.

Literary Criticism as a Shared Set of Measurement

-
- Coyle, Martin. (ed.) (1992) *Hamlet*, England: Macmillan Distribution Ltd.
- Craig, Hardin. (1965) *5 Plays of Shakespeare*, USA: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Culler, Jonathan (1975) *Structuralist Poetics*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
— (2002) *The Pursuit of Signs*, London: Routledge.
- Culpeper, Jonathan (2001) *Language and Characterisation*, London: Longman.
- Currie, G. (1990) *The Nature of Fiction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, Philip. (1996) *Sudden Shakespeare*, London: The Athlone Press.
- de Beaugrande, Robert (1980) *Text, Discourse and Process: Toward and Interdisciplinary Science of Texts*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- De Bono, Edward. (1979) *The Mechanism of Mind*, London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Desmet, Christy and Sawyer, Robert. (1999) *Shakespeare and Appropriation*, London: Routledge.
- Dewsbury, Donald A. (1939) *COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGY: A Modern Survey*, London: McGRAW-HILL KOGAKUSHA, LTD.
- Dillmore, Jonathan. (1984) *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology, and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Duchan, J.F.; Bruder, G.A. and Hewitt, L.E. (eds) (1995) *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dusinberre, Juliet. (1975) *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women*, London: Macmillan.
- Eagleton, Terry. (1986) *William Shakespeare*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eco, Umberto (1976) *A Theory of Semiotics*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Edwards, Derek (1997) *Discourse and Cognition*, London: Sage.
- Edwards, Philip. (1968) *SHAKESPEARE and the Confines of Art*, London: Methuen.
- Egan, Greg (1996) *Axiomatic*, London: Millennium.
- Elam, Keir. (1980) *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*, London: Methuen.
- Eliot, Simon, and Owens, W. R. (eds) (2003) *A Handbook to Literary Research*, London: Routledge.

Evans, Malcolm. (1986) *Signifying Nothing: Truth's True Contents in Shakespeare's Text*, Brighton: Harvester Press.

Eysenck, Michael W. (1990) *The Blackwell Dictionary of Cognitive Psychology*, Great Britain: Butler & Tanner Ltd.

Fellman, Eric. (1995) *The power Behind Positive Thinking*, NY: Harper Collins Publishers.

Fermor, Una Ellis. (1967) *The Frontiers of Drama*, London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

Fischlin, Daniel and Fortier, Mark. (2000) *Adaptations of Shakespeare*, London: Routledge.

Fleischman, S. (1982) *The Future in Thought and Language: Diachronic Evidence from Romance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fowler, Roger (1977) *Linguistics and the Novel*, London: Methuen.

Fraser, Russell. (1963) *The Tragedy of King Lear: By William Shakespeare*, London: The New English Library Limited.

French, Marilyn. (1982) *Shakespeare's Division of Experience*, London: Cape.

Galotti, Kathleen M. (1999) *Cognitive Psychology In and Out of the Laboratory*, London: An International Publishing Company.

Gardener, John. (1994) *On Writers and Writing*, New York: Addison-Wesley publishing Company.

Gavins, Joanna and Steen, Gerard (eds) (2000) *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*, London: Routledge.

Genette, Gérard (1980) *Narrative Discourse*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Gerrig, R.J. (1993) *Experiencing Narrative Worlds: On the Psychological Activities of Reading*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gibbs, R. (1974) *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibson, William and Sterling, Bruce (1990) *The Difference Engine*, London: Victor Gollancz.

Glatthron, Allan A, and Joyner, Randy L. (1998) *Writing the Winning Thesis or Dissertation*. (second edition) London: Sage Publications Ltd.

-
- Goatly, Andrew (1997) *The Language of Metaphors*, London: Routledge.
- Goldberg, Adel (ed.) (1996) *Conceptual Structure, Discourse, and Language*, Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Gollancz, Litt. D. (1932) *The Shakespeare Allusion Book*, London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press.
- Grady, Hugh. (1991) *The Modernist Shakespeare*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (2000) *Shakespeare and Modernity*, London: Routledge.
- Grant, Damian. (1978) *Realism*, London: Methuen & Co Ltd.
- Granville-Barker, Harley. (1963) *Preface to Shakespeare*, London: The hooiberg Printing Company.
- Green, Keith, and LeBIHAN. (2004) *Critical Theory and Practice: A Course Book*, London: Routledge.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. (1990) *Shakespearean Negotiations*, Great Britain: Biddles Ltd.
- Halliday, F. E. (1969) *A Shakespeare Companion*, England: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Harbage, Alfred. (1964) *Shakespeare's Audience*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Harber, Ralph and Hershenson, Maurice (1980) *The Psychology of Visual Perception* (second edition), New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Harrison, G. B. (1983) *Introducing Shakespeare*, England: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Harting, James Edmund, F. L. S., F. L. S. (1978) *The Ornithology of Shakespeare*, England: Gresham Books Unwin Brothers Limited.
- Hawkes, Terence. (1969) *Coleridge on Shakespeare*, London: Penguin Books.
- (1986) *That Shakespearean Rag: Essays on a Critical Process*, London: Methuen.
- (1996) *ALTERNATIVE SHAKESPEARES* Vol 2, London: Routledge.
- Hazlitt, William. (1966) *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*, London: Oxford University Press.

Hibbard, G. R. (1974) *The Elizabethan Theatre IV*, The United Kingdom: The Macmillan Press LTD.

Hidalgo Downing, Laura (2000) *Negation, Text Worlds, and Discourse: The Pragmatics of Fiction*, Stamford, CT: Albex.

Hinchliffe, Arnold P. (1977) *The Absurd*, London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

Hoban, Russell (1982) *Riddley Walker*, London: Picador.

Hodek, Brtislav. (1983) *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, London: The Hamlyn Publishing Group Limited.

Horowitz, David. (1968) *Shakespeare: An Existential View*, London: Butler & Tanner Ltd.

Horwood, F. C (ed.) (1968) *Othello: By William Shakespeare*, London: Oxford At The Clarendon Press.

Howard, Jean E and Shershow, Scott Cutler (eds) (2001) *Marxist Shakespeare*, London: Routledge.

Hubbard, L. Ron. (1986) *DIANETICS*, England: NEW ERA Publications.

Hubler, Edward (ed.) (1963) *Hamlet: By William Shakespeare. The Lectures of 1811-1812, Lecture X11*: Samuel Taylor Coleridge, England: The New English Library Limited.

Hutcheon, Linda (1985) *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*, New York: Methuen.

Iser, Wolfgang (1974) *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

— (1978) *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Jardine, Lisa. (1983) *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*, Brighton: Harvester.

— (1996) *Reading Shakespeare Historically*, London: Routledge.

Johnson, Mark (1987) *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson-Laird, P.N. (1983) *Mental Models: Towards a Cognitive Science of Language, Inference and Consciousness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— (1988) *The Computer and the Mind: An Introduction to Cognitive Science*, London: Fontana.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

11 : 3 March 2011

Naseem Achakzai, M.Phil.

Literary Criticism as a Shared Set of Measurement

-
- Joseph, B. L. (1964) *Elizabethan Acting*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Joughin, John J (ed.) (2000) *Philosophical Shakespeare*, London: Routledge.
- Just, Marcel A. and Carpenter, Patricia A. (1976) *Cognitive Processes in Comprehension*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kahn, Coppélia. (1981) *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare*, Berkley: University of California Press.
- (1997) *Roman Shakespeare*, London: Routledge.
- Kastan, David Scott. (1999) *Shakespeare after Theory*, London: Routledge.
- Keeton, George W. (1967) *Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background*, London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons LTD.
- Kintsch, Walter (1977) *Memory and Cognition*, New York: Wiley.
- (1998) *Comprehension: A Paradigm for Cognition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kittay, Eva (1987) *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Klarer, Mstio. (2004) *An Introduction to Literary Studies*, New York: Routledge.
- Knight, G. Wilson. (1972) *The Imperial Theme*, London: Methuen & Co, LTD.
- (2002) *The Wheel of Fire*, London: Routledge.
- Kövecses, Z. (1986) *Metaphors of Anger, Pride and Love*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (1988) *The Language of Love*, Lewsburg, PA: Associated University Press.
- (1990) *Emotion Concepts*, New York: Springer.
- Lakoff, George (1987) *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, Ronald (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald (1991) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. 11: Descriptive Application*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lankshear, Colin, and Knobel, Michele. (2004) *A Handbook for Teacher: from design to implementation*, England: Open University Press.

Lawlor, John. (1969) *The Tragic Sense in Shakespeare*, London: Chatto & Windus.

LeDoux, J. (1999) *The Emotional Brain*, London: Phoenix.

Leech, Geoffrey (1981) *Semantics* (second edition), Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Lenz, Carolyn Ruth Swift and Neely, Carol Thomas (eds.) (1980) *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Levinson, S.C. (1983) *Pragmatics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, D. (1973) *Counterfactuals*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lodge, David. (1998) *Modern Criticism and Theory*, England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Logouis, Emile. (1971) *A Short History of English Literature*, Great Britain: Clarendon Press.

Loomba, Ania and Orkin, Martin. (1998) *POST-COLONIAL SHAKESPEARE*, London: Routledge.

Lyons, John (1977) *Semantics*, Vols 1 and 11, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maclean, M. (1988) *Narrative as Performance*, London: Routledge.

Maitre, D. (1983) *Literature and Possible worlds*, London: Middlesex University Press.

Mandler, J.M. (1984) *Scripts, Stories and Scenes: Aspects of a Schema Theory*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Marsh, Nicholas. (1998) *Shakespeare The Tragedies*, N. Y. 10010: PALGRAVE.

Martindale, C. (ed.) (1988) *Psychological Approaches to the Study of Literary Narratives*, Hamburg: Buske.

Matejka, L. and Pomorska, K. (eds) (1971) *Reading in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*, Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

McCarthy, Michael and Carter, Ronald (1994) *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*, London: Longman.

McEvoy, Sean. (2000) *Shakespeare: The Basics*, London: Routledge.

McLuskie, Kathleen. (1985) 'The Patriarchal Bard: Feminist Criticism and Shakespeare', in Dollimore, Jonathan and Sinfield, Alan (eds.) *Political Shakespeare*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Meletinsky, Eleazar M. (2000) *The Poetics of Myth*, London: Routledge.

Meutsch, D. and Viehoff, R. (1989) *Comprehension of Literary Discourse*, Berlin: de Gruyter.

Minsky, Marvin (1986) *The Society of Mind*, London: Heinemann.

Monica Davies, B. A., Dip. ED. (1969) *Shakespeare For The IXTH*, London: University Tutorial Press LTD.

Morgan, Charles. (1960) *The Writer And His World*, London: Macmillan & Co LTD.

Muijs, Daniel. (2004) *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*. SAGE, London: Publications Ltd.

Muir, Kenneth. (1972) *King Lear*, London: Methuen & Co LTD.

Müller, Beate (ed.) (1977) *Parody: Dimensions and Perspectives*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Murch, Gerald M. (1976) *Studies in Perception*, U.S.A: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
Nash, Walter (1985) *The Language of Humour*, London: Longman.

— (1992) *An Uncommon Tongue: The Uses and Resources of English*, London: Routledge.

Novitz D. (1987) *Knowledge, Fiction and Imagination*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Oatley, Keith (1992) *Best Laid Schemes: The Psychology of Emotions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ortony, Andrew (ed.) (1993) *Metaphor and Thought* (second edition), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ousby, Ian. ed, (1994) *Companion to Literature in English*, UK: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.

Parkin, Alan J. (2000) *Essential Cognitive Psychology*, UK: Psychology press Ltd.

Peck, John and Coyle, Martin. (2002) *Literary Terms and Criticism*, New York: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.

Posner, M.I. (ed.) (1989) *Foundations of Cognitive Science*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Prince, Gerald (1982) *Narratology: The Form and Function of Narrative*, Amsterdam: Mouton.

Prosser, Eleanor. (1981) *Shakespeare's Anonymous Editors*, USA: Stanford University Press.

Putnam, H. (1990) *Realism with a Human Face*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pylshyn, Z.W. (1984) *Computation and Cognition*, Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Quennell, Peter and Johnson, Hamish. (2002) *WHO'S WHO IN SHAKESPEARE*, India: Gopson Papers Ltd.

Ralli, Augustus. (1974) *History of Shakespearean Criticism*, U.S.A: Oxford University Press.

Rescher, N. (1975) *A Theory of Possibility*, Pittsburgh, PA: Pittsburgh University Press.

Rice, Philip and Waugh, Patricia. (2001) *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader. Fourth Edition*, London: Hodder Headline Group.

Richards, I.A. (1924) *Principles of Literary Criticism*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Ridley, M. R. (1971) *Othello*, London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

Righter, Anne. (1967) *Shakespeare And The Idea of The Play*, England: Penguin Books, In Association with Chatto & Windus.

Robbins, Anthony. (1992) *The Giant Within*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

— (1997) *Unlimited Power*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ronen, R. (1994) *Possible Worlds in Literary Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rutter, Carol Chillington. (2001) *enter the body*, London: Routledge.

Ryan, Kiernan. (1989) *Shakespeare*, London: Harvester Wheatheaf.

Saint-Exupery, Antoine de. (2000) *The Little Prince*, England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Scarry, Elaine (2001) *Dreaming by the Book*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Schwartz, Barry. W.W. (1978) *Psychology of Learning & Behaviour*, London: Norton & Company.

Shrivastava, R. N. (2004) *Literary Criticism in Theory and Practice*, India: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.

Simpson, Paul (1993) *Language, Ideology and Point of View*, London: Routledge.

Singh, Dr. Yogesh Kumar. (2005) *Research Methodology*, India: Kul Bhushan Nangia.

Sinha, M. P. (2004) *Research Methods In English*, India: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.

Smallwood, Robert. (ed.) (1998) *Players of Shakespeare 4*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Spurgeon, Caroline. F. E. (1966) *Keats's Shakespeare*, London: Oxford University Press.

Sternberg, Robert J. (1999) *Cognitive Psychology, second Edition*, United States of America: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Stockwell, Peter. (2002) *Cognitive Poetics*, London: Routledge.

Stoll, E. E. (1963) *Art And Artifice in Shakespeare*, London: University Paperbacks Methuen.

Swales, John M. (2004) *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications*, United Kingdom: Press Syndicate of the University Press of Cambridge.

Thompson, Ann. (1992) *Which Shakespeare?*, USA: Open University Press.

Underhill, Evelyn. (1993) *MYSTICISM*, England: One world Oxford, publications.

Watt, Homer A. (1970) *Out Lines of Shakespeare's Plays*, USA: Barnes & Noble, INC.

Weimann, Robert. (1978) *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Werner, Sarah. (2001) *Shakespeare and Feminist Performance*, London: Routledge.

Wilson, Edwin. (1969) *Shaw On Shakespeare*, England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Wilson, John Dover. (1967) *The Essential Shakespeare*, London: The Syndics Of The Cambridge University Press.

Wimsatt, W. K. (1969) *Dr. Johnson On Shakespeare*, England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Woods, Peter. (2006) *Successful Writing for Qualitative Researchers. Second Edition*, London: Routledge.

Youngs, R. E. S (ed.) (1972) *Romeo and Juliet*: By William Shakespeare. London: Collins Publishers.

=====

Naseem Achakzai, M.Phil.
Director, English Language Centre
University of Balochistan
Quetta
Pakistan
nasasak@gmail.com
asak.khan@yahoo.com