Ayyappapanicker And The Theory Of Interiorization

Dr. Gangadevi M.
Asst. Professor, Dept. of Malayalam, KKTM Govt. College, Pullut, Thrissur.

Literature attains fulfillment in the parallelism of the creativity of the writer and the reader. The writer and the reader–both are endlessly bound to the literary work. The writer creates a literary work. The reader need not perceive the historical aspects or the hidden experiences of the writer. Interiorization is a new theory that helps to understand both these aspects (of the writer and the reader) equally, and to identify the interiorized inner work.

Literature is the language of creativity and power of imagination. The origin of inspiration of a literary work is the author's experiences and imaginations. Consciously or unconsciously, the identity of the writer is manifested in his work. This is quite natural. The writer creates in every word, an inner meaning of another word, in every description, another experience, in every life another life's signs. This is the fundamental identity of the writer. The aim of this work is to study the theory of interiorization as a literary device.

The Relevance of this Theory

One who goes in search of Indian poetic schemes can get familiar with many poetic schemes like *Rasa, Dhvani, Anumana, Vakrokti, Reethi, Alamkara* etc. The propounders of these theories argue that the soul of literary work is their own theories. What is the intention behind developing a theory namely interiorization for analyzing literature, while many theories exist? Mainly because, adopting new methods and dimensions for study of literary works has become popular. Secondly because, this

theory has been presented by a Malayalam poet – Dr. K. Ayyappapaniker. In this context, the study of interiorization becomes relevant for the Malayalam reader who depends on Western and Eastern theories for literary analysis.

The Malayalam term used for interiorization is *'Anthassannivesam'*. Here, '*Sannivesa'* means the fixation of one in another. *'Anthassannivesa'* is a method of incorporating *bhava-artha* and *rasa* either explicitly or obscurely by constructing linguistic units, sounds and sentences. It may be added that the concept of *sannivesa* will be relevant and useful, only to the extent that the process of the author intending or the reader divining the meaning—at the levels of sound, word, sentence—clears the way for comprehending the covert meaning and savouring the work.

Anthasannivesa is not a refutation or an opposite of *bahyasannivesa*. It is the play of imagination that we can discover when we read texts which hold back the *bhava-artha-rasa* within themselves. *Anthasannivesa* is a mode of textual exploration, which through a discovery procedure or hermeneutical process, enables us to effect entry into the interior of those literary works that, through word, sentence and material line, render palpable, the *bhava-artha-rasa* born of the imagination or real experience. It is at the point at which the author and the reader meet each other face to face the engage in discourse. *Anthassannivesa* succeeds when the reader turns away while the grammarians are demonstrating before, and blocking the entrance to the text, and directs his imagination into those areas of aesthetic experience which are thrown open by the text. In a sense, this is a joint enterprise, a bonding in spirit which reinforces the author reader relationship.

The Relationship and Differences With Indian Poetics

Most people are of the view that the theory of interiorization is not a new invention, but a new version of Indian poetic theories like *Rasa, Dhvani, Vakrokti* etc. Though it is not possible to say that this theory is not related to Indian theories, it is possible to establish that it has differences with them.

Interiorization and *Dhvani*

Dhvani, one amongst the *'Sabdavyaparas'* is a process which follows writing. Interiorization differs from *dhvani* in two or three ways. In the first place interiorization is not always a conscious production of meaning. It can originate in several cases without the author or reader

attending. If the work contains a *bhava-artha-ras*a which is different from the manifest meaning or opposed to it or embraces the whole work, then the effort to identify it leads to *anthassannivesa*. In contrast, where the dhvani principle cannot get through to the spiritual fore of the work, *anthasannivesa* can invoke and convey it. Merits-demerits, birth-death, day-night, white-black – like these twins, opposite twins for every literary work, there is another 'opposite work'.

Like *Dhvani, Anumana* also follows the creation of the text, whereas *anthassannivesa* inheres in it. The results that follows *anthassannivesa* include *dhvani, anumana* and whatever theories are based on them. With Kunthaka's *Vakrata, antassannivesa* has not many differences. If *anumana* and *dhvani* are the after results of interiorization, then the *vakrata* is a way or style for interiorization.

In examining how hard an author or artist strives to incorporate *Bhava-artha-rasa* in the inner reaches of the text by means of interiorization, and how well he succeeds, a particular approach may prove more useful than others to some. Then this study continues with Bharata's *rasa sidhantha* and *'ulluraiuvamai'* indicated in the *Tolkappiyam* or Tamil.

As part of the analysis, the meaning of the terms – trace, oblique, position are traced. Studying interiorization, relating it with popular Western critic theories such as deconstruction, binary opposites, narrative techniques, reader response theory etc. is continued in the next part.

Trace: The word 'Trace' is examined in several meanings as follows:

An indication that something has been present, a visible mark as a footprint left by the passage of a person or animal, etc. It can be seen to be related with the word meaning of Interiorization. Trace means a sample, the remains – the meaning left behind. That is, the full meaning is not conveyed. Other than the obvious meaning it gives an indication of something else. i.e, 'Trace' only expresses a part of the meaning. This can be a symbol or a sign. It does not mean mere remains, but is the symbol of a whole. For example, a photograph is a symbol of a person. But we get the signs required to get the full information about the person from it. Similarly a literary work also contains signs that are left behind either purposefully or otherwise by the writer. The hypothesis of 'Interiorization' is that the reader will be able to unveil another work through these signs.

Oblique: The word oblique bears similarity with 'Interiorization' with its meanings as 'indirect', 'curved' etc.

Position: The meaning of this word is internalization. It can be said that the meaning of Interiorization is contained by the English words – trace, oblique and position.

Binary Opposites

One of the interpretations of 'binary opposites' is the 'the disappearing writing subject'. This is a concept which is contradictory and at the same time intermingled. Landow quotes from Roland Barthes book saying that "the goal of literary work (of literature as work) is to make the reader no longer a consumer, but a producer of the text".

After detailed analysis of the terms Readerly text, Writerly text, Hypertext and inter-texuality Derridas assumption of binary opposites is examined. Derridian thoughts have widely accepted concepts about binary opposites. According to Derrida, people think in terms of opposites. All things are identified in part by what they are not. This idea can be traced back to Saussure. There are countless dichotomies such as beginning/end, tall/short, masculine/feminine, presence/absence and speech/writing. In addition to being dichotomies, these pairs are also hierarchies. The fact is that one of these does not exist without the other.

Just like Derrida, Tongien seeks to destroy binary opposites using a counter intuitive self contradiction. From this, it can be understood that, for anything there is an opposite, inner flow. The theory of interiorization also says thus. i.e., for any literary work, there is an 'opposite work'. This 'opposite work' will be it's binary opposite. More than the writer, it is the reader who should discover this interiorized 'internal work' – this is the importance of the theory of interiorization.

Deconstruction

Deconstruction is a scheme of thought centred on theory and based on philosophy. It's major area of research is language. It gives more importance to writing than speech. Derrida, the main propunder of this theory, gives much importance to reading and text than writer and work. The same thing is stated in the famous thesis = "The death of the author" by Roland Barthes. Derrida says "there is nothing outside text". What Derrida means is the physical and substantial importance of text. That is the un-importance of the author is the importance of the text developed by reading. Derrida also presents the opinion that the text also contains it's criticism. Deconstruction identifies and reconstructs every aspect of a literary work.

Narrative techniques

Narratology is a branch of Semeotics. The major characteristic of narration is sequence of events. To observe narration on the basis of events and to see every event as the result of ' vyavhara'. Is important is narratology. WilliamLabov says that narratology is a method of recapitulating past experience of matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events.

In narration, the writer has full freedom. It is the linguistic modifications or renewals that are brought about through events that make the narration of each writer distinct. It is quite natural that the narrator may adopt his/her own techniques to become distinct in this way. Interiorization can be said to be a technique used bythe writer as part of narration. It can be seen that the writer has interiorized many things in each work. The study of the theory of interiorization aims at making the reader aware of the real text and the interiorized text.

Reader response theory

The moremost among the propounders of the theory of acceptance is the German scholar Hans Robert Jaz, who argued that each reading responds to a literary work through the lens of certain systems, rules and horizon of expectations. Reader response theory is just another transcript of the acceptance theofy. Acceptance theory is one that gives importance to the reader than the writer as also the readers text, than the writers text. The meaning of the work are the responses of the reader. The text leads the reader to certain definite annotations. The reader makes them spread into the new the new readings. Reader response theory proclaims that each reading thus becomes a writing. In interiorization, the reader is not given so much importance. In Interiorization, the work, the writer and the reader have equal importance. The theory of Interiorization becomes relevant when the events interiorized by the writer becomes a new reading – a text. The reader's response, responsibility and the writer's responsibility are all combined to testify interiorization.

Even though many of the western theories can be considered further, such a entry is not possible here. This comparative was only aimed at finding the possibilities of interiorization. The core of interiorization is to enter into the inside of the work irrespective of the form of literature and to produce a new text by assimilating all the meanings intended by the writer.

Other than analyzing a work psyschologically and in the sense of humor, to find the things hidden in this way, it is also required to seach for the humor in the social and political planes.

Bibliography

1. Ayyappapaniker, Dr. – Interiorization (Tr. Krishna Rayan), international centre for Kerala studies, University of Kerala, Karyavattom, 2003.
2. Ayyappapaniker, Dr. – Antassannivesam – State Institute of Languages, Thiruvananthapuram, 2000.
3. Ayyappapaniker, Dr. – Indian Sahithya Sidhantham – Prasakthiyum Sadhyathayum – State Institute of Languages, Thiruvananthapuram 1999
4. Andre Milner Jeff Browitt – Contemporary cultural theory, Rawat Publications, Jaipur and New Delhi, 2003
5. Abhinava Gupta – Abhinava Bharathi Ed. Ramakrishna Kavi, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1956.
6. Achuthan M. – Paschatya Sahithyadarsanam, SPCS, Kottayam, 1977.
7. Bhaskaran T. – Bharatheeya Kavyasasthram, State Institute, of Languages, Thiruvananthapuram 1994.
8. Derrida Jacques – Writing and difference, Tr. Alan Bass Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1978.
9. Holub, Robert – Reception theory, An Introduction, Methuen, London, 1984.
10. Eco, Umberto – The Role of the Reader – Huthinson utg. Press, London, 1983.