

**CRITICISM IN INDONESIAN LITERATURE: A REVIEW OF  
INTERNATIONAL EVIDENCE**

DR. Julie and DR. Aguirrezaba

Department of literature Aarhus University

**Abstract**

The English literary-critical tradition finds its origins in a specific bi-lingual sensibility that dominated the literary critical scene after the arrival of the British. The Renaissance period for the development and advancement of such a tradition was the eighteenth century. The main products of this bi-lingual sensibility were conveyed by the preachers themselves, who were mostly British, and were used in the administration of the East India Company as translations into English of sacred writings and other sacred writings. This also included verifiable and religious records. A brief introduction to the history of criticism will be provided at the outset. The sign of the word "Literary Criticism" alongside the beginning and progression of Literary Criticism must then be examined. There are numerous ways in which criticism can be classified. There are several major critical hypotheses, such as mimetic, pragmatic, expressive, and objective. Aristotelian versus Non-romantic is a common polarity in criticism. Aristotelian criticism implies a legal, intelligent, formal criticism that will generally discover the estimations of a work either within the work itself or indistinguishably related to the work, whereas Platonic criticism implies a moralistic criticism. This research paper discusses Criticism in English Literature.

**Keywords:** Literary Criticism, English Literature, Traditional Literature

**Introduction**



## **CRITICISM IN INDONESIAN....**

The term Literary Criticism, like ' Literature in English,' requires explanation. Before proceeding, it would be useful to characterise the significance and scope of literary criticism. One commonly understood significance of literary criticism is that it is the control of assessing the structure and status of specific works within a writing tradition. In his book, *The Adventure of Criticism*, K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar quotes a well-known definition of criticism: "Criticism is the art or demonstration of evaluating the nature of literary or artistic work by an examination of its benefits and deformities." T. S. Eliot is quoted as saying, "Criticism... should consistently declare an end in view, which generally gives the impression of being the clarification of works of art and the remedy of taste" (1985: 3). A broad definition of literary criticism is the control of assessing the structure and status of specific works within a writing tradition. It is, in a sense, the path toward gathering points of reference, recognising or legitimising them as standards or benchmarks of execution, and estimating nearby work using these standards. The criteria by which a critic evaluates a work of art are not always fundamentally and simply literary; they are adapted and controlled by his social legacy as well as the literary tradition in which he belongs. If this is what is meant by the process of criticism, then literary criticism in India should be rooted in her past culture and philosophy, and its regional characteristics should reflect accentuations of philosophy and feel throughout the process. However, the Western influence on the I personality has rendered it impossible for any critic today to work solely within the antiquated - Sanskrit tradition of criticism. In this way, an critic is compelled to combine his own tradition with the Western tradition.

Art (as literature) is doomed to superficiality and artificiality from various interpretative perspectives unless it is grounded in the native soil and links. The Alps and Thames of European tradition, as well as the Himalaya and Ganges of heritage, weigh heavily on the shoulders of writers. "...in if they) are compelled to

an alternative to waiting in their own mother tongue, let it be Indo-Anglian, in spirit, in thought, in emotion, in imagery, and English only in words... let their ideals be the expression of themselves, but they must be quite sure that it is their self," James H. Cousins writes in 1918. David McCutcheon examines the concept of "" objectively and thoroughly. He tries to figure out if there is a theory of lacuna and loop hope. For him, it is a long-standing tradition passed down through several generations: "Now time has passed. The professor of English Today is invited to lecture or conduct research at British and American universities by the British Council and the USIS. However, it is unavoidable that poems written in English will be heavily influenced by English sensibility, a tradition of daffodils rather than, Criticism of Literature

Literary Criticism is the investigation, study, and evaluation of individual works of art or literature as well as the plan of general methodological or tasteful standards for the examination of such works. Literary Criticism also refers to the plan of general methodology or tasteful standards for the examination of such works. Criticism has been an important facet of literary theory and practise for a significant portion of literary history's most punctual and extended time periods. It is beneficial to take a look back at the historical context of criticism in light of the numerous speculations. Aristotle is widely regarded as the most influential proponent of the mimetic theory, which was prevalent in the criticism of the old style age. Horace delighted in presenting the possibility of guidance, and the effect it had on the congregated audience in the centre was critical to his understanding of how art should be viewed. In spite of the fact that neoclassic critics resuscitated a genuine enthusiasm for impersonation, the down to business theory was prevalent from Horace through the majority of the eighteenth century. This was the case despite the fact that Horace's theory was prevalent. In the meantime, the evidence demonstrates that the concept of art as imitation was unquestionably accepted by critics throughout the eighteenth century. It is

## **CRITICISM IN INDONESIAN....**

possible to argue that the expressive theory is the most natural fit for sentimental mindsets, and it emerged simultaneously with the beginnings of sentimentalism. When Wordsworth describes poetry as "the unrestrained flood of incredible inclination," it is a sign that the artist has moved inward. At this time, the imaginative mind of a poet is another power on the planet and a source of remarkable learning, and the ability to articulate oneself is the true power that art possesses. According to Poe, the "ballad essentially... composed exclusively for the poem's purpose" began to gain popularity in the nineteenth century and continued to do so throughout the twentieth century. This trend began in the nineteenth century. Structure and structure, along with various examples of symbolism and images, have become the focal point of the critics' concern because the work of art is seen as existing in a separate universe. In any case, the developing enthusiasm for brain research has kept the contemporary critic additionally mindful of the way that the crowd capacities in the work of art, and perspectives on the legend ebb and flow today will in general take the artist back to a focal position while at the same time to an incentive regarding the group of spectator's reality the artist talks through his or her prototype examples and pictures from the racial obviousness. With these various perspectives on criticism at our disposal, we will be able to outline the history of criticism.

Since the seventeenth century, the term "criticism" has been linked to the depiction, investigation, or evaluation of works of art. Criticism can also be considered an activity. There are a lot of different categories that can be used to classify criticism. Some of the more common groupings, such as mimetic, logical, expressive, and objective, are presented in this section. These groupings were found to be helpful in M. H. Abrams's attempt to differentiate between the major critical hypotheses. The Aristotelian and Non-romantic schools of criticism are two fundamental schools of thought in the field of criticism. In this sense, Aristotelian criticism suggests a legal, consistent, formal criticism that will in

general discover the valuations of a work either inside the work itself or indistinguishably connected to the work. Dispassionate criticism, on the other hand, infers a moralistic, utilitarian perspective on art, where the valuations of a work are to be found in the convenience of art for other and nonartistic purposes. Both of these perspectives are based on the idea that the values of a However, those who hold such a perspective on dispassionate criticism point to the omission of the writer from Plato's Republic as evidence that their viewpoint is valid, despite the fact that it is limited and partially off base. The Aristotelian-Platonic polarity, in its most fundamental sense, suggests the existence of a natural extraneous partition. It is also common practise to differentiate between relativistic criticism and absolutist criticism. The relativistic critic makes use of any and all frameworks that will assist in arriving at and explaining the concept of a work of art, whereas the absolutist critic maintains that there is only one appropriate critical strategy or set of standards, and no others should be connected to the critical undertaking.

### **Conclusion**

English Literature is able to flourish thanks to the dedication and manifestations of such a large number of literary stalwarts, including an increasing number of authors writing in shifted structures such as the novel, poetry, story, exposition, drama, and so on. In spite of this, there is yet another sub-genre of literature written in English whose primary objective is to weigh the benefits and drawbacks of a proposed solution against a predetermined set of criteria in order to reach a conclusion about whether or not it should be implemented. Taking a deep dive into both the positive and negative aspects of the people who are engaged with this field and undertaking a critical examination of the literature in question. The activity in question is referred to as literary criticism, and those who engage in the practise are referred to as critics. He makes a concentrated effort to think about the entire scope of English poetry, from its beginnings up to the year

## **CRITICISM IN INDONESIAN....**

2000. His focus is on poetry written in both and English. It includes a general study of periods and schools, an evaluation of notable periods, an investigation of remarkable lyrics, both long and short, and thought on significant issues, such as alienation and in relation to English poetry.

The compilations of critical expositions that have been produced by critics in India have done a great deal toward fostering an environment that is conducive to criticism. He has edited more than ten volumes of critical essays written by other people on a variety of literary works. One collection is devoted to The Image of India in Western Creative Literature, another to American fiction, and a third to poetry written in English. His arrangement of McCutcheon believes that if poetry written in English does not make an effort to "seriously fill up the lacuna of a tradition" and "in fact create its own tradition and ideas," then this type of writing is doomed to be "imitative" and "unimpressive." David McCutcheon writes in The New Poetry (Page 97, Ibid.) that there is "Nothing very typically s" in contemporary literature written in English. McCutcheon writes the following in his analysis of contemporary Indo-Anglian poetry: In the realm of professionalism, whether we believe Naipant's observation or not is a matter of belief and disbelief; a professional is someone who acts in a professional manner. criticism. Even after sixty years since India gained its independence, English criticism has not been recognised as canonical in the country. It is not taught or discussed. learned as a prominent mode of genre that possesses a 'corrective' measure of literacy corpus, but the method formation itself is still a mystery. The uneasiness the practise of criticism frequently degenerates into bias and degenerates into an imitational practise intended to please an author by investing adjectives by themselves. Herein is the genesis of the various relations between the symptoms and the cause of the psycho-literacy disease, which professor Meenakshi Mukherjee refers to as "anxiety of ness," also known as

"anxiety about being," is a disease that epidemically spreads among critics writing in English. However, it is challenging to fully subscribe to this viewpoint.

the argument made by professor Mukherjee at the beginning of the section titled "The Anxiety of ness," which can be found in *The Perishable Empire* (New Delhi, OUP, 2000, pages 166–186), "the anxiety of ness in Raja Rao, Anand, and Narayan came out of their own desire to be rooted." [Citation needed] Because they were dedicated to meeting the requirements of their textual environment, they undoubtedly desired to be "rooted," and they succeeded in doing so. This is abundantly clear. expressed by Raja Rao in his confessional declaration which can be found in the "Forward" section of his novel *Kantapura*. Anxiety regarding one's ability to communicate verbally concerns the poets who wrote in English. Anxiety about linguistic selection is something that Kamala Das expresses in her poem titled "An Introduction." Viewpoints" developed the corpus of English Literary Criticism. Volumes are given to poetry, fiction, drama and genuine composition. Naik's own basic paper in every volume exhibits an extensive study of the field. Naik's criticism is recognized by his careful grant, and his insight into Sanskrit literature and poetics. His introduction, with each reference painstakingly commented on, can go about as a helpful manual for any scientist who needs to catch up his examinations. Be that as it may, he wears his intelligence delicately. Naik has set up himself as one of the main critics on writing in English and included another 'measurement' to critical methodologies with every one of his critical works.

## **References**

1. B. K. Das (2007). *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.

## **CRITICISM IN INDONESIAN....**

2. 2. Belliappa K. C., "C. D. Narasimhaiah (2004). Towards a Common Poetic for Modern India" in Indian Literary

Criticism in English: Critics, Texts, Issues, edited by P. K. Rajan. New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 2004.

3. Das B. K. (2007). Twentieth Century Literary Criticism. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.

4. Day, Gary (2008). Literary Criticism a New History. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2008. Print.

5. E. V. Ramakrishnan (2004). "From Statement to Suggestion: The Relevance of Krishna Rayan as a Critic", in P. K. Rajan

(ed) Indian Literary Criticism in English: Critics, Texts, Issues, Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

6. Habib, Rafey (2008). Modern Literary Criticism and Theory: A History. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2008. Print.

7. Leitch, Vincent B. (2011). The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism. New York; Norton, 2001. Print. Bronner, Stephen

Eric. Critical Theory a Very Short Introduction. New York: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.

8. M, K. Naik (2006). Indian English Poetry: From the Beginnings Upto 2000. New Delhi: Pencraft International, 2006.

9. M. K. Naik and S. Mokashi-Punekar (eds.) 1997. Perspectives on Indian Drama in English. New Delhi: O.U.P.

10. M. K. Naik (1985). Dimensions of Indian English Literature. New Delhi: Sterling, p. 132.



11. M. K. Naik (2006). *Indian English Poetry: From the Beginnings Upto 2000*. New Delhi: Pencraft International, 2006, P. 180.
12. M. K. Naik (2006). *Indian Poetry in English: From the Beginnings Upto 2000*. New Delhi: Pencraft International.
13. M. S. Kushwaha (2008). "The Unheard Voice: An Apology for Indian Literary Criticism in English", in O. P. Budholia (ed.) *Seeds in Spring: Contemporary Indian English Poetry, Drama and Critics*. New Delhi: Adhyayan Publishers and Distributors.
14. Mohit K. Ray (2002). *Studies in Literary Criticism*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.
15. P.P. Raveendran (2010). "Toward a New Critical Paradigm: Meenakshi Mukherjee and the Indian English Critical Tradition", in P. K. Rajan (ed.) *Indian Literary Criticism in English: Critics, Texts, Issues*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
16. Rajnath (2004). "Literary Criticism in the New Millennium", in P. K. Rajan (ed.) *Indian Literary Criticism in English: Critics, Texts, Issues*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
17. Saintsbury, George: *A History of English Criticism*. Adinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons Ltd. Print.