

International Journal of Scientific Research and Reviews

Theorizing Multidimensional Interaction Approach on Literary Criticism: Unemployed to Non-labor

AchyutAryal

Mewar University (MU), Gangrar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India.

ABSTRACT

This research article is an introduction about a new approach on literary criticism, its background, nature, process, elements and models which introduce a new way of criticism. It constructs the claim unemployed persons are being treated with prejudice in texts by scholars or writers with inferior framework like before with women, blacks, minority and poor. It is happening from within as well as beyond literary discipline, which makes criticism with new approach possible. This paper explains that such new approach has broader horizon; it means it begins from unemployed and goes upwards to non-labor, from sub-structure to super-structure. How author behaves to non-labor is its ultimate quest. For example how a novel author behaves with bad computer, weak internet network, viruses', cell phone and old house; as after they stop working proper. And the new approaches on criticism explains such behaviors of authors(senders) as well as readers(receivers) from the judgment of used words, phrase, symbols, metaphors, sentences, characterizations, persona, setting, placement, structure etc. This will reveal new kind of discrimination through criticism. Moreover it will say about how a text interacts with complexity and survives as it can. Furthermore it asks for further depth research in the field with experimentation.

KEY WORDS: New Approach, Literary Criticism, Unemployed, Non-labor.

Corresponding Author

AchyutAryal

Mewar University (MU),

Gangrar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India.

Email: aryala4dk@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

Literary criticism is the practice of interpreting and writing about literature as the latter, in turn, strives to make sense of the world. Literary theory is the study of the principles which inform how critics go about making sense of literary works. There are at least five main ways of, or approaches to, interpreting literature.¹

The most obvious, commonsensical way to think of literature is as a verbal representation of the real world. Literary works, especially prose fiction, are thought to be realistic if they hold a mirror up to 'life.' The realism of particular characters, their fidelity to actual human beings, is often at the crux of such concerns. In technical terms, this is called the 'mimetic' approach to criticism. Hence, questions of the sort: "'Lamming's gift for the depiction of the West Indian laborer is unparalleled.' Discuss with reference to *In the Castle of my Skin*."²

Another obvious way of thinking about literature is to read it for what it reveals about the author and, by extension, the place and time (the social and historical context) in which s/he lived. Literature, from this point of view, is a form of self-expression and literary works (especially lyric poems) are seen as windows into the soul of their writers. In technical terms, this is called the 'expressive' approach to criticism. Hence, questions of the sort: "A close examination of Shakespeare's sonnets reveal the presence of a beautiful soul.' Would you agree?" or "Wordsworth's poetry reveals much not only about the man but about the world in which he lived." Discuss with reference to his *Lyrical Ballads*."³

Some critics are concerned with the impact, especially of moral kind, which literature has upon the audience. For example, can literature (and, by extension, other cultural practices like music) have a bad effect upon those who are exposed to it? Can literature make you adopt deplorable attitudes and even do bad things? Does literature accordingly need to be censored? On the other hand, can literature also have a good impact on the reader? Concerns of this sort are often grouped under what is sometimes called the 'pragmatic' approach to criticism. Hence, questions of the sort: "'Aeschylus' plays are a hotbed of vice and murder.' Do you think they should be banned? If so, why?" It should be noted that, in recent years, some critics are concerned less with the impact which literature has on the reader than the other way around, that is, with the impact which the reader has on the work. In other words, are readers passive absorbers of the meaning waiting to be found in a given work or do they necessarily impose their subjective point of view, their preferences, their biases and what not on the work in question? To

put this another way, some theorists argue that literary criticism is not an impersonal, objective affair but a necessarily subjective and perspectival undertaking, that is, we always criticize literary works from a particular angle.⁴

Other critics attempt to describe the verbal form or structure of the work, in other words, how a given work is put together and, importantly, to what end. The focus of such critics is on one or more of the following elements: the genre: poetry, prose fiction or drama together with the various sub-categories (e.g. a tragedy as opposed to a comic play, or lyric as opposed to epic poetry); the development of the work from beginning to end: the plot-structure of a play, the narrative structure of a short story or novel and the point of view from which the story is narrated, etc.; and the diction of the work, especially its figurative language (metaphors, similes, etc.). This is called the ‘objective’ approach to criticism. Hence, questions of the sort: “‘A mixture of pity and fear is inevitably inspired in the audience.’ How exactly does the plot structure of King Lear produce these emotions?”⁵

The final critical approach, for which there is no fancy name per se, attempts to situate each writer and his or her works in relation to what is sometimes termed ‘literary history’ and, in some cases, the so-called ‘canon.’ Literature has a history (in the sense that Chaucer precedes Shakespeare who precedes Wordsworth, and so on) and each writer works during a particular period of that history. Critics interested in literature from this angle try to historically categorize authors (e.g. Shakespeare is normally classified as a Renaissance writer while Wordsworth is deemed a Romantic) and to study whether the literature produced during a given period shares certain characteristics (e.g. what must the poetry of a Shakespeare and a Milton have in common for it to be classified as Renaissance literature?). Such critics are also interested in exploring the relationships of influence (and rejection) linking earlier and later writers (e.g. was Wordsworth influenced by Milton? If so, how exactly?). Some also explore whether particular writers should belong to what is often called the ‘canon,’ that small number of core writers and their works who are thought to be inherently more valuable and thus worth studying above all others. Hence, questions such as: “‘What exactly is ‘Romantic’ about Wordsworth’s poetry?” or “‘How do Post-colonial Caribbean writers resist the influence of canonical writers like Shakespeare?’”⁶

It should be noted that these approaches are not mutually exclusive and often overlap with one another. For example, to discuss *what* a literary work represents (a particular place and time and the people who inhabit them) almost inevitably necessitates an examination of *how*

exactly it does so (narrative structure, use of figurative language, and so on). In other words, a mimetic approach to criticism is often inevitably deployed in conjunction with the objective approach. By the same token, a discussion of what a literary work reveals about its writer and/or his or her world is most often inextricably linked to an examination of the precise features of the language used by the writer. In this case, then, the expressive approach goes hand in hand with the objective.⁷

WORLD (MIMETIC) WRITER (EXPRESSIVE) → TEXT → READER (PRAGMATIC) LANGUAGE
(OBJECTIVE)¹

In this way literary criticism is a unique sector of human knowledge. It is rich and big enough to do. Equally it is important to know how literary criticism up to now has developed. Where was literary criticism in the beginning? In which form it was? In which for it is now? In which form it will be? How it is working now? What are other possibilities in the field? Is there any new approach which has been ignored by scholars? If yes, what it is? How it works?

LITERARY CRITICISM: UP TO NOW

A formalistic approach to literature, once called New Criticism, involves a close reading of the text. Formalistic critics believe that all information essential to the interpretation of a work must be found within the work itself; there is no need to bring in outside information about the history, politics, or society of the time, or about the author's life. Formalistic critics (presumably) do not view works through the lens of feminism, psychology, mythology, or any other such standpoint, and they are not interested in the work's effect on the reader. Formalistic critics spend much time analyzing irony, paradox, imagery, and metaphor. They are also interested in the work's setting, characters, symbols, and point of view. Terms used in New Criticism:

- *Tension - the integral unity of the poem which results from the resolution of opposites, often in irony of paradox*

¹ For a useful overview of the main approaches to literary criticism, please see the opening chapter entitled "Introduction: Orientation of Critical Theories" of M. H. Abrams' *The Mirror and the Lamp*.

- *Intentional fallacy* - the belief that the meaning or value of a work may be determined by the author's intention
- *Affective fallacy* - the belief that the meaning or value of a work may be determined by its effect on the reader
- *External form* - rhyme scheme, meter, stanza form, etc.
- *Objective correlative* - originated by T.S. Eliot, this term refers to a collection of objects, situations, or events that instantly evoke a particular emotion.⁸

This approach can be performed without much research, and it emphasizes the value of literature apart from its context (in effect makes literature timeless). Virtually all critical approaches must begin here. The text is seen in isolation. Formalism ignores the context of the work. It cannot account for allusions. It tends to reduce literature to little more than a collection of rhetorical devices.⁹

A formalistic approach to John Milton's *Paradise Lost* would take into account the physical description of the Garden of Eden and its prescribed location, the symbols of hands, seed, and flower, the characters of Adam, Eve, Satan, and God, the epic similes and metaphors, and the point of view from which the tale is being told (whether it be the narrator's, God's, or Satan's). But such an approach would not discuss the work in terms of Milton's own blindness, or in terms of his Puritan beliefs. Therefore when the narrator says "what in me is dark / Illumine," a formalistic critic could not interpret that in light of Milton's blindness. He would have to find its meaning in the text itself, and therefore would have to overlook the potential double-meaning.¹⁰

A formalistic approach to the short story "Silence of the Llano" by Rudolfo Anaya might force us to see the incestuous relationship that is established at the end of the story as a positive alternative to loneliness. If we were to take into account external things, such as morality, we could not help but be horrified at such a conclusion. But in studying the symbols, setting, and structure of "The Silence of the Llano," we get an opposite picture. The setting of the llano, its isolation and desolation, make its loneliness the primary evil of the story, in contrast to the town where people can escape the loneliness, where Rafael can find love, and where men can talk. The only way to survive the llano is to make it more like the town--to fill it with love and words and anything to escape the loneliness. "Words" are positively contrasted to "silence," as is "winter" to

"spring" and "growth" to "death." The silence of the llano is constantly referred to, and Rafael's parents die in winter. But when Rafael marries, his wife makes a garden to grow in the desolate llano, and he can hear her voice. When Rafael establishes the incestuous relationship at the close of the story, he finally speaks to his daughter, and words break the long silence. He tells her that the "spring is the time for the garden. I will turn the earth for you. The seeds will grow." (182). Growth, spring, and words--the primary symbols which are positively contrasted to death, winter, and silence--are all combined in the close. The disadvantage of this formalistic approach is that it does not allow us to account for most readers' natural (and appropriate) response of disgust to the incestuous relationship or to examine how that affects the ability of the author to communicate his story. Some would argue that an understanding of the text is where criticism should begin, and not where it ends. We should also relate the text to life, ideas, and morality.¹¹

Reader response criticism analyzes the reader's role in the production of meaning. It lies at the opposite end of the spectrum from formalistic criticism. In reader response criticism, the text itself has no meaning until it is read by a reader. The reader creates the meaning. This criticism can take into account the strategies employed by the author to elicit a certain response from readers. It denies the possibility that works are universal (i.e. that they will always mean more or less the same thing to readers everywhere). Norman Holland argues that "each reader will impose his or her 'identity theme' on the text, to a large extent recreating that text in the reader's image." Therefore, we can understand someone's reading as a function of personal identity.¹²

It recognizes that different people view works differently, and that people's interpretations change over time. Reader Response criticism tends to make interpretation too subjective. It does not provide adequate criteria for evaluating one reading in comparison to another. For instance, in reading the parable of the prodigal son in the New Testament, different readers are likely to have different responses. Someone who has lived a fairly straight and narrow life and who does not feel like he has been rewarded for it is likely to associate with the older brother of the parable and sympathize with his opposition to the celebration over the prodigal son's return. Someone with a more checkered past would probably approach the parable with more sympathy for the younger brother. A parent who had had difficulties with a rebellious child would probably focus on the father, and, depending on his or her experience, might see the father's unconditional acceptance of the prodigal as either good and merciful or as unwise and

overindulgent. While the parable might disturb some, it could elicit a feeling of relief from others, which, presumably, is what Christ intended it to do, and a more skillful critic might be able to analyze the strategies Christ employed to elicit those responses.¹³

A mythological / archetypal approach to literature assumes that there is a collection of symbols, images, characters, and motifs (i.e. archetypes) that evokes basically the same response in all people. According to the psychologist Carl Jung, mankind possesses a "collective unconscious" that contains these archetypes and that is common to all of humanity. Myth critics identify these archetypal patterns and discuss how they function in the works. They believe that these archetypes are the source of much of literature's power. Some Archetypes:

- *Archetypal women - the Good Mother, the Terrible Mother, and the Soul Mate (such as the Virgin Mary)*
- *Water - creation, birth-death-resurrection, purification, redemption, fertility, growth*
- *Garden - paradise (Eden), innocence, fertility*
- *Desert - spiritual emptiness, death, hopelessness*
- *Red - blood, sacrifice, passion, disorder*
- *Green - growth, fertility*
- *Black - chaos, death, evil*
- *Serpent - evil, sensuality, mystery, wisdom, destruction*
- *Seven - perfection*
- *Shadow, persona, and anima (see psychological criticism)*
- *Hero archetype - The hero is involved in a quest (in which he overcomes obstacles). He experiences initiation (involving a separation, transformation, and return), and finally he serves as a scapegoat, that is, he dies to atone.¹⁴*

Provides a universalistic approach to literature and identifies a reason why certain literature may survive the test of time. It works well with works that are highly symbolic. Literature may become little more than a vehicle for archetypes, and this approach may ignore the "art" of literature. In *Go Down, Moses* by William Faulkner, for example, we might view Isaac McCaslin's repudiation of the land as an attempt to deny the existence of his archetypal shadow--that dark part of him that maintains some degree of complicity in slavery. When he sees the granddaughter of Jim, and can barely tell she is black, his horrified reaction to the

miscegenation of the races may be indicative of his shadow's (his deeply racist dark side's) emergence.¹⁵

In Herman Melville's *Moby Dick*, Fedallah can be seen as Ahab's shadow, his defiant pagan side wholly unrestrained. Numerous archetypes appear in *Moby Dick*. The sea is associated both with spiritual mystery (Ahab is ultimately on a spiritual quest to defy God because evil exists) and with death and rebirth (all but Ishmael die at sea, but Ahab's death as if crucified is suggestive of rebirth). Three is symbolic of spiritual awareness; thus we see numerous triads in *Moby Dick*, including Ahab's three mysterious crew members and the three harpooners.¹⁶

In "The Silence of the Llano" by Rudolfo Anaya, a mythological / archetypal approach would allow us to examine the archetypes that illicit similar reactions in most readers. We can see how Anaya is drawing on the archetype of water to imply purification (when Rita bathes after her period) and fertility and growth (when Rita washes before the incestuous relationship is established). The red blood Rita washes away calls up visions of violent passions, which will be evidenced in the rape. The garden conjures up images of innocence, unspoiled beauty, and fertility. Thus, the reader can sense in the end that a state of innocence has been regained and that growth will ensue. This approach, however, is limited in that by assuming it, the critic may begin to view the story not as a work within itself, but merely as a vessel for transmitting these archetypes. He may also overlook the possibility that some symbols are not associated with their archetype; for instance, the sun, which normally implies the passage of time, seems in its intensity in the llano to actually suggest a slowing down of time, a near static state in the llano.¹⁷

Historical / Biographical critics see works as the reflection of an author's life and times (or of the characters' life and times). They believe it is necessary to know about the author and the political, economical, and sociological context of his times in order to truly understand his works.¹⁸

This approach works well for some works--like those of Alexander Pope, John Dryden, and Milton--which are obviously political in nature. One must know Milton was blind, for instance, for "On His Blindness" to have any meaning. And one must know something about the Exclusion Bill Crisis to appreciate John Dryden's "Absalom and Achitophel." It also is necessary to take a historical approach in order to place allusions in their proper classical, political, or biblical background. New Critics refer to the historical / biographical critic's belief that the meaning or value of a work may be determined by the author's intention as "the intentional

fallacy." They believe that this approach tends to reduce art to the level of biography and make it relative (to the times) rather than universal.¹⁹

Moral / philosophical critics believe that the larger purpose of literature is to teach morality and to probe philosophical issues. Practitioners:

- *Matthew Arnold -- argued works must have "high seriousness"*
- *Plato -- insisted literature must exhibit moralism and utilitarianism*
- *Horace - felt literature should be "delightful and instructive"²⁰*

This approach is useful for such works as Alexander Pope's "An Essay on Man," which does present an obvious moral philosophy. It is also useful when considering the themes of works (for example, man's inhumanity to man in Mark twain's Huckelberry Finn). Finally, it does not view literature merely as "art" isolated from all moral implications; it recognizes that literature can affect readers, whether subtly or directly, and that the message of a work--and not just the decorous vehicle for that message--is important. Detractors argue that such an approach can be too "judgmental." Some believe literature should be judged primarily (if not solely) on its artistic merits, not its moral or philosophical content.²¹

Psychological critics view works through the lens of psychology. They look either at the psychological motivations of the characters or of the authors themselves, although the former is generally considered a more respectable approach. Most frequently, psychological critics apply Freudian psychology to works, but other approaches (such as a Jungian approach) also exist. A Freudian approach often includes pinpointing the influences of a character's id (the instinctual, pleasure seeking part of the mind), superego (the part of themind that represses the id's impulses) and the ego (the part of the mind thatcontrols but does not repress the id's impulses, releasing them in a healthy way).²²

Freudian critics like to point out the sexual implications of symbols and imagery, since Freud's believed that all human behavior is motivated by sexuality. They tend to see concave images, such as ponds, flowers, cups, and caves as female symbols; whereas objects that are longer than they are wide are usually seen as phallic symbols. Dancing, riding, and flying are associated with sexual pleasure. Water is usually associated with birth, the female principle, the maternal, the womb, and the death wish. Freudian critics occasionally discern the presence of an Oedipus complex (a boy's unconscious rivalry with his father for the love of his mother) in the

male characters of certain works, such as Hamlet. They may also refer to Freud's psychology of child development, which includes the oralstage, the anal stage, and the genital stage.²³

Jung is also an influential force in myth (archetypal) criticism. Psychological critics are generally concerned with his concept of the process of individuation (the process of discovering what makes one different from everyone else). Jung labeled three parts of the self: the shadow, or the darker, unconscious self (usually the villain in literature); the persona, or a man's social personality (usually the hero); and the anima, or a man's "soul image" (usually the heroine).²⁴

A neurosis occurs when someone fails to assimilate one of these unconscious components into his conscious and projects it on someone else. The persona must be flexible and be able to balance the components of the psyche.²⁵

It can be a useful tool for understanding some works, such as Henry James *The Turn of the Screw*, in which characters obviously have psychological issues. Like the biographical approach, knowing something about a writer's psychological makeup can give us insight into his work. Psychological criticism can turn a work into little more than a psychological case study, neglecting to view it as a piece of art. Critics sometimes attempt to diagnose long dead authors based on their works, which is perhaps not the best evidence of their psychology. Critics tend to see sex in everything, exaggerating this aspect of literature. Finally, some works do not lend themselves readily to this approach.²⁶

A psychological approach to John Milton's *Samson Agonisties* might suggest that the shorning of Samson's locks is symbolic of his castration at the hands of Dalila and that the fighting words he exchanges with Harapha constitute a reassertion of his manhood. Psychological critics might see Samson's bondage as a symbol of his sexual impotency, and his destruction of the Philistine temple and the killing of himself and many others as a final orgasmic event (since death and sex are often closely associated in Freudian psychology). The total absence of Samson's mother in *Samson Agonisties* would make it difficult to argue anything regarding the Oedipus complex, but Samson's refusal to be cared for by his father and his remorse over failing to rule Dalila may be seen as indicative of his own fears regarding his sexuality. A psychological approach to "The Silence of the Llano" would allow us to look into the motivations of Rafael--it would allow us to examine the effects of isolation and loneliness on his character and provide some reasoning for why he might chose to establish an incestuous relationship with his daughter. A specifically Freudian approach will tune us in to the relevant

symbolism which will enable us to better understand the conclusion. For instance, with such a mind frame, we can immediately recognize that Rafael's statement to his daughter "I will turn the earth for you. The seeds will grow" is the establishment of a sexual relationship that will result in children. We can see the water in which she bathes as symbolic of that birth that is to come.²⁷

Feminist criticism is concerned with the impact of gender on writing and reading. It usually begins with a critique of patriarchal culture. It is concerned with the place of female writers in the canon. Finally, it includes a search for a feminine theory or approach to texts. Feminist criticism is political and often revisionist. Feminists often argue that male fears are portrayed through female characters. They may argue that gender determines everything, or just the opposite: that all gender differences are imposed by society, and gender determines nothing.²⁸

In *A Literature of Their Own*, Elaine Showalter argued that literary subcultures all go through three major phases of development. For literature by or about women, she labels these stages the Feminine, Feminist, and Female:

- (1) Feminine Stage - involves "imitation of the prevailing modes of the dominant tradition" and "internalization of its standards."*
- (2) Feminist Stage - involves "protest against these standards and values and advocacy of minority rights...."*
- (3) Female Stage - this is the "phase of self-discovery, a turning inwards freed from some of the dependency of opposition, a search for identity."²⁹*

Women have been somewhat underrepresented in the traditional canon, and a feminist approach to literature redresses this problem. Feminist turn literary criticism into a political battlefield and overlook the merits of works they consider "patriarchal." When arguing for a distinct feminine writing style, they tend to relegate women's literature to a ghetto status; this in turn prevents female literature from being naturally included in the literary canon. The feminist approach is often too theoretical.³⁰

Showalter's three stages of feminine, feminist, and female are identifiable in the life of Cleófilas in Sandra Cisneros's "Woman Hollering Creek." Cleófilas begins to internalize the paternalistic values of the society in which she lives at least as early as the ice house scene. She

"accompanies her husband," as is expected of her. Since women should be seen and not heard in a paternalistic society, she "sits mute beside their conversation". She goes through all of the motions that are expected of her, laughing "at the appropriate moments". She submits, if unhappily, to the rule of her husband, "this man, this father, this rival, this keeper, this lord, this master, this husband till kingdom come". Yet Cleófilas gradually begins to emerge from the feminine stage into the feminist stage, where she begins to revolt and advocate for her own rights. It begins with "[a] doubt. Slender as a hair". When she returns from the hospital with her new son, something seems different. "No. Her imagination. The house was the same as always. Nothing". This is true because the house is not different; it is Cleófilas who has begun to change. Perhaps giving birth to a child has made her aware of the power and importance women possess. She begins to think of returning home, but is not ready for the possibility yet. It would be "a disgrace". She begins to internally protest against the society, thinking about the town "with its silly pride for a bronze pecan" and the fact that there is "nothing, nothing, nothing of interest". The patriarchal society, with its ice house, city hall, liquor stores, and bail bonds is of no interest to her. She is upset that the town is built so that "you have to depend on husbands". Though her husband says she is "exaggerating," she seems to be becoming convinced that her society is a bad one, where men kill their wives with impunity. "It seemed the newspapers were full of such stories. This woman found on the side of the interstate. This one pushed from a moving car . . .". Although she does nothing when he throws a book at her, Cleófilas does (if only meekly) insist that he take her to the doctor. And there she solidifies her internal rebellion with actions: she leaves her husband with Felice to return to Mexico. Felice is actually more representative of the third, female, stage than Cleófilas, but the fact that Cleófilas enjoys her company suggests that when she returns to Mexico, she *may* seek to enter that third stage herself. Felice is not phalocentric-- she is not interested in revolting against men, she simply does not need them. She doesn't have a husband and she owns her own car. "The pickup was hers. She herself had chosen it. She herself was paying for it". Felice is most likely a part of a community of women; she is certainly friends with the nurse Graciela. Cleófilas is attracted to Felice, who "was like no woman she'd ever met". At home, in Mexico, Cleófilas recounts the story of Felice's yelling when they crossed the creek. "Just like that. Who would've thought?". Cleófilas seems to have enjoyed her company and has kept the experience in her mind. Felice's laughter, "gurgling out of her own throat, a long ribbon of laughter, like water" suggests that Felice had completed the self-

discovery stage. (Water is often symbolic of rebirth.) Cleófilas has witnessed the third stage in Felice, and it is up to her whether she will enter it or regress to the feminine stage and internalize the paternalistic values of her father and brothers with whom she is now living.³¹

Mimetic Approach can be closely related to the moral / philosophical approach, but is somewhat broader. Mimetic critics ask how well the work of literature accords with the real world. Is it accurate? Is it correct? Is it moral? Does it show how people really act? As such, mimetic criticism can include some forms of moral / philosophical criticism, psychological criticism, and feminist criticism.³²

Structuralisms view literature as a system of signs. They try to make plain the organizational codes that they believe regulate all literature. The most famous practitioner is Michael Foucault.³³

Deconstruction approach assumes that language does not refer to any external reality. It can assert several, contradictory interpretations of one text. Deconstructionists make interpretations based on the political or social implications of language rather than examining an author's intention. Jacques Derrida was the founder of this school of criticism.³⁴

From this long review of literary criticism up to now I've arrived in conclusion that something big is missing. That is too big, a half existence and more. It is practical and applicable one. All criticism up to now has focused only on employed and labor sectors. No one has given attention towards non-labor or unemployed in literary criticism. This research paper is significant to fulfill this gap and to raise or introduce new approach.³⁵

A NEW APPROACH

Here I've given a new approach in literary criticism genre. This approach is justifiable because no one ever have spoken about it. There are around 40% unemployed live in Europe, if we talk about Asia and Africa it is about double. The reality is that 50% existence (not existed!) we have to say is in non-labor now. This class has been growing in number day by Day. So the use of words and behave of author over them takes meaning. To do criticism under my approach we have to consider some aspects:

- Unemployed: Those characters in text who do have no job. They do not do income. There are many categories under it-partially unemployed, half employed/unemployed, full unemployed.

- Non-labor: This is broad approach. It is more than human centric notion. All existential material things which are not in active state fall under such category. There are some categories under it- now non-labor, before non-labor, future non-labor.³⁶

How an author behaves over these two groups is main concern of my approach. Conceptually I've made a conclusion that all authors up to now have done discrimination for these groups. They are not balance on treating with labor and non-labor materially as well as employed and unemployed in their texts or works. All authors up to now are in favor of labor or active material as well as workers or employed. They have raised their backside for non-labor and unemployed. It is unfair and unjust over half of the existence.³⁷ During textual treatment they are unjust on:

- Language
- Style
- Words
- Directions
- Setting
- Framing
- Priming
- Meaning
- Characterizing
- Conceptualizing
- Treatment
- Priority
- Placement
- Justification
- Selection etc.

SOME EVIDENCES: NOVELS, FILMS and DRAMA²

Even less sexy to fiction than the topic of work is the topic of losing work. Being fired, losing homes to foreclosure, searching for a new job in middle age — these are the grim situations so many readers today are facing. The good news is that a few standout recent novels have ingeniously decided to tackle unemployment head-on.³⁸

Stewart O'Nan's great 2007 novella, *Last Night at the Lobster*, is about the last shift at a closing seafood restaurant in a crummy New England mall. Now, O'Nan has just published a powerful new novella about the unemployed called *The Odds*.³⁹

O'Nan's main characters, Marion and Art Fowler, are out of work and just about out of options. On the eve of their 30th anniversary, they're getting ready to divorce to protect what little assets remain. But, first, they've booked a deluxe suite at one of the honeymoon hotels in Niagara Falls. What a perfect setting to dramatize the ultimate middle-class nightmare: the fear of falling. Art's plan to turn things around, wanly agreed to by Marion, and is to gamble their remaining cash on the roulette wheel at the hotel casino. If that scheme sounds improbable, it's nowhere near as bizarre as the quick demise of Art's 20-year career as an insurance agent. Here's how the end arrived:

"[Art] relied on his seniority to protect him. It seemed to through the early round of cuts. The new head of Human Resources ... had come for friends on both sides of his office, a brawny security guard trailing behind like a bouncer. ... The drill was simple: hand over your badge and take your personal possessions. No farewell lunch, no sheet cake, no gag gifts...

He made it to July...

They came for him in the morning, before coffee break."⁴⁰

It sounds like a scene out of Edgar Allan Poe, doesn't it? And that's O'Nan's brilliance in this novella, revealing the unemployment story to be the tale of everyday terror it really is.³

²All these contents are made out from Google search(www.google.com)

Ross Raisin reminds us in his new novel, *Waterline*, the "Great Recession" isn't just an American horror story. Raisin is a phenom in Great Britain, having won awards aplenty for his debut novel *Out, Backward*. In *Waterline* he tells the evocative story of Mick Little, who has just lost his wife, Cathy, to cancer. The cancer may have been caused by the asbestos Mick tracked into their little house every evening after his shift ended at the Glasgow shipyards. The shipyards are dead now, too, being renovated into an "industrial heritage" theme park. *Waterline* follows Mick as he searches for a second act in life, scrubbing dishes in a hotel kitchen, sleeping in homeless shelters. There's a lot of wisecracking working-class humor in *Waterline* and strong echoes of George Orwell's classic, *Down and Out in London and Paris*.⁴¹

One American literary subgenre where hard-luck characters have always taken refuge is crime noir, those hard-boiled tales of men and women driven to the shadow side to make a buck. Crime noir was a product of the 1930s; in fact, James M. Cain, the king of crime noir, said that his classic, *Double Indemnity*, was a story of the Great Depression. Another Cain masterpiece, *Mildred Pierce*, is set in 1931, and the novel, unlike the movie versions, focuses obsessively on Mildred's struggles to make a living. A contemporary crime noir writer who walks in Cain's down-at-the-heel footsteps is Dave Zeltserman; his novels, *Small Crimes* and *Pariah*, are about as nasty and clever as noir can get. Zeltserman, who was a software engineer in his previous life, has written out a dark gem of a story called *Outsourced* about four computer geeks who are laid off and decide to take advantage of a glitch in a security program that one of them had installed in a bank to rob it. Zeltserman's pulp sensitivity to panic makes this novel a macabre delight to read. Before they hit on the robbery scheme, his characters spend down their 401(k)s and frantically shave years off their resumes. The bank heist plan is about as nutty as the Fowlers' gamble on that roulette wheel in Niagara Falls, but in desperate times, these unemployment novels tell us, all bets are off.⁴²

The Wind-Up Bird Chronicle is a novel published in 1994–1995 by Japanese author Haruki Murakami. The first published translation was by Alfred Birnbaum. The American translation and its British adaptation, dubbed the "only official translations" (English) are by Jay Rubin and were first published in 1997. For this novel, Murakami received the Yomiuri Literary Award, which was awarded to him by one of his harshest former critics, Kenzaburō Ōe.⁴

³<http://www.npr.org/2012/02/02/146279441/fired-and-foreclosed-unemployment-lit>

⁴Murakami, Haruki. *The Wind-Up Bird Chronicle*. translated by Jay Rubin. ISBN 1-86046-581-1.

The novel is about a low-key unemployed man, Toru Okada, whose cat runs away. A chain of event follows that prove that his seemingly mundane life is much more complicated than it appears. Toru Okada: The narrator and protagonist, Toru is a passive and often apathetic young man living in suburban Japan. He is Kumiko's husband and continually follows the orders or wishes of others. Currently unemployed, he is the embodiment of passivity.⁵

The Group, 1963, is the best known novel by American writer Mary McCarthy. It made the New York Times Best Seller list in 1963 and remained there for almost two years.⁶

The novel caused such a scandal that it was banned in Australia. When an editor suggested to Candace Bushnell that she write "the modern-day version of *The Group*", she wrote *Sex and the City*, a collection of revealing essays that became the popular TV series and film. As Bushnell summarizes; "*The Group reminds us that not much has really changed.*" Except that today, most of these topics are not as taboo.

In 1933, eight young female friends graduate from Vassar College. The book describes these women's lives post-graduation, beginning with the marriage of one of the friends, Kay Strong, and ending with her funeral in 1940. Each character struggles with different issues, including sexism in the work place, child-raising, financial difficulties, family crises, and sexual relationships. Nearly all the women's issues involve the men in their lives: fathers, employers, lovers, or husbands. As highly educated women from affluent backgrounds, they must strive for autonomy and independence in a time when a woman's role is still largely restricted to marriage and childbirth. The plot is influenced by the political and economic atmosphere of the time. Over the course of the book, the reader learns about the women's views on contraception, love, sex, socialism, and psychoanalysis.⁷

Kay Strong: Marries Harald Petersen, who is involved in theater management and stage directing. Kay calls him a "Yale man," even though he did only graduate work there; this mildly offends the analytical Lakey. Harald writes plays that aren't produced and is frequently unemployed. Kay has "a ruthless hatred of poor people," and is frustrated by their financial situation. She supports them by working at Macy's and cares greatly about her material

⁵Murakami, Haruki. *The Wind-Up Bird Chronicle*. translated by Jay Rubin. ISBN 0-679-77543-9.

⁶*The Guardian's review of The Group*. Elizabeth Day *The Observer*, Saturday, 28 November 2009

⁷"*The Group (1966)*". *Internet Movie Database*. Retrieved 9 March 2011.

surroundings. Her husband has multiple extramarital affairs. Their fights and his drinking escalate; finally he hits her until she threatens him with a bread knife. The next morning, he commits her to a psychiatric hospital, where Polly is working as a nurse. Kay is later released from the hospital; she divorces Harald. Her death at the end of the book is mysterious; no one knows whether she fell from the window on the twentieth floor of the Vassar Club, while airplane spotting, or whether she jumped. Her friends reunite at the end of the novel at her funeral, where they shun Harald.⁸

Mildred Pierce is a 1941 hardboiled novel by James M. Cain. It was made into an Academy Award-winning 1945 film of the same name, starring Joan Crawford and a 2011 Emmy Award-winning miniseries of the same name, starring Kate Winslet.⁴³

Set in Glendale, California, in the 1930s, the book is the story of middle-class housewife Mildred Pierce's attempts to maintain her family's social position during the Great Depression.

Mildred separates from her unemployed husband and sets out to support herself and her children. After a difficult search she finds a job as a waitress, but she worries that it is beneath her middle-class station. More than that, she worries that her ambitious and increasingly pretentious elder daughter, Veda, will think her new job demeaning. Mildred encounters both success and failure as she opens three successful restaurants, operates a pie-selling business and copes with the death of her younger daughter, Ray. Veda enjoys her mother's newfound financial success but increasingly turns ungrateful, demanding more and more from her hard-working mother while openly condemning her and anyone who must work for a living.⁴⁴

When Mildred discovers her daughter's plot to blackmail a wealthy family with a fake pregnancy, she kicks her out of their house. Veda, who has been training to become an opera singer, goes on to a great deal of fame as Mildred convinces her new boyfriend Monty (a young man who, like Mildred, lost his family's wealth at the start of the Great Depression) to help reconcile them. Unfortunately for Mildred, this means buying Monty's family estate and using her earnings to pay for Veda's extravagances. Mildred and Monty marry, but things go sour for her: Wally, her partner in the restaurant business, has discovered that her living like a rich person

⁸Day, Elizabeth (29 November 2009). "The Group by Mary McCarthy". *The Guardian*. Retrieved 29 November 2009.

has dramatically affected the company's profits. He threatens a coup to force her out of the company. This causes her to confess to her ex-husband Bert that she has been embezzling money from her company in order to buy Veda's love.⁴⁵

Gaz, Dave, Lomper, Gerald, Horse and Guy--The Chaps from The Full Monty (1997). After the local steel mill shuts down, many of the men in Sheffield (in Northern England) are on the dole in a town where there's not much work to be found. After seeing how many women crammed into a local club to see the buff Chippendales boys "waving their tackles," the crafty Gaz gathers together some of his not-at-all-buff job club mates to earn money stripping. When asked why any ladies would go see them when the Chippendales had visited just a few days ago, Gaz quickly responds, "Well... This lot go all the way." (That means the thongs come off.)

In addition to being hilarious, *The Full Monty* is heartwarming. Gaz--a role that turned Robert Carlyle into an unlikely sex symbol--is eagerly trying to salvage a relationship with his young son, despite being unable to pay child support. Dave (Mark Addy) suffers from body issues and low self-esteem that are hurting his marriage. Gerald (Tom Wilkinson) is struggling to extricate himself from a Web of lies and a pile of debt. Lomper (Steve Huisin) is awkward, lonesome and depressed. *(A lovely six-second scene that tells the viewer everything they need to know about the relationship between Lomper and his elderly mother is an exquisite example of the value of economy in writing--something I could learn about myself.)*

This clip shows the boys waiting in line to pick up their unemployment checks... and unconsciously rehearsing their act while Donna Summers' "Hot Stuff" plays on the radio. This is by no means the best scene of the movie, but I chose it because it espouses the Happy in Hooverville attitude. *(FYI, this clip has been translated into Spanish for some reason, but it doesn't really matter.)* Please see this movie. It's also a wonderful education in British slang. *(Just guess what a "lunchbox" is.)*

The Little Tramp, as played by Charlie Chaplin. Charlie Chaplin's brilliant physical comedy is the stuff of legend. He turns prat falls into poetry. However The Tramp--who appeared in many of Chaplin's films--wasn't his most beloved character just because of his acrobatic clowning and wobbling shuffle. One of the qualities that makes the tramp so entertaining is that his homelessness never interferes with his princely, fastidious maintenance of

his appearance; among the very few belongings he always has at hand are a nail file and a brush for dusting himself off after he inevitably falls into the dirt or is whacked in the face with a 30-pound bag of flour.⁴⁶

The tramp is also lovable because of his somewhat reluctant and sometimes accidental sweetness. A chivalrous fellow, he hands a grateful lady the cash that has just been lifted from her person by a wily pickpocket...

'Course he was also the pickpocket.

Bill "D-Fens" Foster, from Falling Down (1993). In this 1993 film, Michael Douglas plays a classic anti-hero. In the opening scene of the movie, D-Fens--downsized, divorced and distressed--sits in bumper-to-bumper Los Angeles traffic on a sweltering day, surrounded by obnoxious horn-honkers and a real jerk of a fly buzzing around his head and landing on his sweaty neck. Pushed past the limits of his patience, he grabs his briefcase, leaves his car behind and begins to walk home.

Trouble is, "home" is a place he's no longer welcome. His ex-wife has a restraining order standing against him. He won't be allowed to attend his little girl's birthday party that afternoon. He lost his job over a month ago but still impotently wears a tie and carries an empty briefcase. All he wants is to walk home and return to a time that he remembers being happy... but the world conspires against him.

Over the course of one short day, he goes from "regular guy" to "criminal target of a police manhunt," simply for doing all the things that most of us dream about doing. The true villains of the movie are the everyday assholes that drive him insane--the bigots, the highway robbers, the impatient, rude, miserable, cruel, selfish, soulless sacks of human trash. It's hard not to root for him, even as he becomes more crazed and more ruthless.

In the climactic show-down with a detective--perhaps the only other sympathetic character in the film, played by the ever-awesome Robert Duvall--Douglas delivers two lines that will brutally reverberate in your mind for days after watching the movie: "I'm the bad guy? How did I become the bad guy?"

Michael Bolton and Samir Nagheenanajar, Office Space (1999). *Office Space* is a film anthem for anyone who's ever suffered the very worst of the worst office jobs--those who have toiled under flickering fluorescent lights in gray cubicles surrounded by vapid bean counters and pencil pushers. (See this movie. It's a creation of the great Mike Judge, also responsible for *King of the Hill* and *Beavis and Butt-head*, and features *Stephen Root, Gary Cole, Jennifer Aniston* and *Diedrich Bader*.)

Long John Willoughby, AKA John Doe in Meet John Doe (1941). In this wonderful Frank Capra movie, Gary Cooper plays Willoughby, a former baseball player whose career ended after he incurred an arm injury he couldn't afford to get properly treated. Willoughby therefore becomes a rail-riding, harmonica-playing tramp.

Meanwhile, Ann Mitchell (Barbara Stanwyck) is fighting to save her own job as a newspaper columnist now that the paper has been bought up by a corporate bigwig. As a parting shot Ann writes a fake letter to the paper from "John Doe," stating he's so depressed by the world's inequities that he will jump off a building to his death on Christmas Eve. The letter sparks an enormous public outcry from people desperate to convince John Doe not to take his own life. Ann confesses to her former editor that John Doe was simply a character she created. When he plans to write a retraction of the letter, Ann convinces him instead to find a real man to play the part of John Doe and capitalize on the public attention. When she finds the handsome, down-on-his-luck Willoughby, she hires him to play the role.

At first being John Doe is a slightly uncomfortable lark for Willoughby; a simple money-making enterprise. However his speeches spark a huge John Doe political movement. Common people are inspired to band together in John Doe Clubs across the country, devoted to looking out for each other, looking out for the common good, defending themselves against the sometimes selfish aims of the powerful. As the movement grows, it ceases to be just a job to Willoughby. He becomes a true believer in the John Does' pure principles. Willoughby himself also becomes a celebrity... and a political asset. Bigwig publisher D.B. Norton invests generously in the John Doe clubs because (unbeknownst to Willoughby) he wishes to leverage the John Doe movement to support his own political aspirations.

When Willoughby learns of Norton's plot (and Ann's involvement in it) he tells Norton and his cronies that he'll expose them. In this clip, Norton in turn reminds Willoughby that by exposing them, he'll also expose himself as a fraud. He reminds him that the entire John Doe movement was built on Willoughby's own lies.

A true hero, a true every-man, Willoughby is willing to sacrifice himself. However before he can deliver the speech exposing Norton, Norton and his media machine beat Willoughby to the punch, discrediting him and labeling him as a fraud. Just as Norton predicts, the movement starts to crumble, the John Does turn on Willoughby. Time passes, and he sinks lower than he's ever been.

As Willoughby sees it, the only way to restore the public's belief in the original ideals of the John Doe movement, is to follow the whole thing through... by jumping off the building to his death on Christmas Eve.

The Full Monty is a 1997 British comedy-drama film directed by Peter Cattaneo, starring Robert Carlyle, Mark Addy, William Snape, Steve Huison, Tom Wilkinson, Paul Barber, and Hugo Speer. The screenplay was written by Simon Beaufoy. The film is set in Sheffield, England, and it tells the story of six unemployed men, four of them former steel workers, who decide to form a male striptease act (à la Chippendale dancers) in order to gather enough money to get somewhere else and for main character, Gaz, to be able to see his son. Gaz declares that their show will be better than the Chippendales dancers because they will go "the full monty" — strip all the way — hence the film's title. Despite being a comedy, the film also touches on serious subjects such as unemployment, fathers' rights, depression, impotence, homosexuality, obesity, working class culture and suicide. The film was rated a 15 in Britain for "frequent strong language".

The Full Monty was a major critical success upon release and an unexpected international commercial success, grossing over \$250 million from a budget of only \$3.5 million. It was the highest grossing film in the UK until it was outsold by *Titanic*. It was ultimately nominated for Academy Awards for Best Picture, Best Director, Best Original Screenplay and Best Original Music Score, winning the latter.

The once-successful steel mills of Sheffield, South Yorkshire, have shut down and most of the employees have been laid off. Former steel workers Gary "Gaz" Schofield and Dave Horsefall

(who worked at their steel mills, called Harrison's, for ten years) have resorted to stealing scrap metal from the abandoned mills to sell. Gaz is facing trouble from his ex-wife, Mandy and her boyfriend Barry over child support payments that he's failed to make since losing his job. Gaz's son, Nathan, loves his father but wishes they could do more "normal stuff" in their time together.

One day, Gaz spots a crowd of women lined up outside a local club to see a Chippendale's striptease act. He gets the idea to form his own strip tease group using local men in hopes of making enough money to pay off his child support obligations. The first to join the group is Lomper, a security guard at Harrison's, the steel mill where Dave and Gaz once worked. Severely depressed, Lomper attempts to commit suicide, but is rescued by Dave who convinces him to join the group. Next they recruit Gerald Cooper, a former manager at the plant, who has been hiding from his wife the fact that he's been laid off. Gaz and Dave see Gerald and his wife, Linda (Deidre Costello), at a dance class and recruit him to teach them some actual dance moves.

Moreover if we view more from job and unemployed approach there is higher ground of criticism and it is my main aim to show using unemployed first. And the higher ground, which had been left up to now by so called scholars in criticism field is- the non-labor approach of the criticism. So my effort here is to present two categorical aspects:

- Unemployed Treatment
- Non-labor Treatment

Unemployed treatment is more human centric notion in criticism from practical approach it is sound. But non-labor approach is broader. It includes:

- Animal world
- Plant world
- Marine world
- Insects world
- Matter
- Time
- Space

In this approach criticism has been done under some thematic base. And the thematic bases are very logical. There are two thematic bases:

- How a writer or author has behaved on non-labor?
- How work or text is being survived?

Second theme is very much complex to understand. I try my best to explain it here. How work or text is being survived? This is a great question. Under this question there are more sub questions- where was text before? How it came in existence? How interaction took place with author or writer? Why those parts of the texts only survive? Where are other texts which were in author's mind? How long those texts will survive? After survival where does it goes? Etc.

In this way this approach focused its direction in complex-interactive behavior of work or text with:

- Author
- Time/age
- Society
- Culture
- Economy
- Development
- Science
- Religion
- Law
- Ethics
- Morality
- Consciousness
- Education
- Environment
- Politics etc

What happens of a text after such complex interaction with different sector? It is clear work or text become weak. If it transform it will survive otherwise it dies. It is happening up to now. That text which has not participated on complex interactional task has gone on death. This is non-labor. By any form they can come again in labor or in existence again. And now existential can go to non-labor, inactive again. This is universal. Here again about work or text, some concepts are:

- Works or text comes from non-labor
- It does interaction till survival, which is complex
- After it left interaction it returns to non-labor

Here again during interaction any work or text involve in interaction with:

- Own-labor field
- Except labor field

First one is of literature field and its different genre or branches. Any text interacts with its field for modification. Correction, improvement, discourses, revision, reprint, editions etc are those terms we use for it. Except labor field it interacts with societal aspects and phenomenon mentioned above.

CONCLUSION

After presenting history of literary criticism and new approach of mine I am with a conclusion that: This new approach is the outcome of complex interactional behavior of literary criticism. It is also a part of the process. Some literary criticism may die. It is natural and some may come in life or existence. Once all aspects/ approaches were in non-labor now some are in labor condition. So many scholars use it for criticism. And may they go again back in non-labor. Is it not unique? Yes, my approach for literary criticism focuses on this true nature of the coming and going of approaches even further of texts, works or authors. There are all texts and works that are not in favor of non-labor. My claim is they are biased on it, whether they belongs to most powerful scholars of the pasts. They have not done justice over unemployed, moreover non-labor. I recommend serious and experimental researches in this direction further.

REFERENCES

1. Attridge D., *Poetic Rhythm*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1992. Audi R., ed. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, 2nd edn, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
2. Austin JL., *Performative Utterances in Philosophical Papers. 2nd ed.* Oxford University Press: Oxford; 1970.
3. *An Introduction to Literature: Criticism and Theory. 3rd ed.*, Andrew Bennett and Nicholas Royle Pearson Education Ltd. UK; ISBN 0 582 82295 5
4. Barker H., *Arguments for a Theatre*, London: John Calder, 1989.
5. Baudrillard J., *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place*, trans. Paul Patton. Sydney: Power Publications, 1995.
6. Chatman S.; *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
7. Chomsky N.; *Syntactic Structures*. S-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957.
8. Cixous H., The Character of "Character", *New Literary History*, 1974; 5: 383–402.
9. Cohen T., *Anti-Mimesis from Plato to Hitchcock*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
10. Day G., *Re-Reading F.R. Leavis: Culture and Literary Criticism*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996.
11. Dean C. J., *The Self and Its Pleasures: Bataille, Lacan, and the History of the Decentered Subject*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
12. Eagleton T., *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
13. Foucault M., The Subject and Power, in *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, eds. Hubert L. D. and Paul R., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
14. Foucault M., *The Use of Pleasure (The History of Sexuality, vol. 2)*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
15. Fowler R., *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
16. Gates H. L., Jr, ed. 'Race', *Writing, and Difference*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
17. Gates H. L. Jr, *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of Afro-American Literary Criticism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

18. Guerin W. L., et al. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.
19. Halperin D., *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
20. Harrison N., *Postcolonial Criticism: History, Theory and the Work of Fiction*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002.
21. Irwin W. *Intentionalist Interpretation: A Philosophical Explanation and Defense*, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1999.
22. Irwin W., ed., *The Death and Resurrection of the Author?* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2002.
23. Jacobus M., *Reading Woman: Essays in Feminist Criticism*. London: Methuen, 1986.
24. Jakobson R., Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics, in *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas A. S., Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, 1990.
25. Krieger M., *Ekphrasis: The Illusion of the Natural Sign*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
26. Kristeva J. Word, Dialogue and Novel, in *The Kristeva R.*, ed. Toril Moi, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
27. Lane C., *The Ruling Passion: British Colonial Allegory and the Paradox of Homosexual Desire*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.
28. Mulhern F., ed., *Contemporary Marxist Literary Criticism*. London: Longman, 1992.
29. Munt S., ed., *New Lesbian Criticism: Literary and Cultural Readings*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.
30. Murphet J. and Lydia R., Introduction', *Literature and Visual Technologies: Writing After Cinema*, eds. Murphet and Rainford B.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
31. Nancy J.L., Wild Laughter in the Throat of Death, in *Modern Language Notes*, 1987; vol. 102, no. 4: 719–36.
32. Orr M., *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Oxford: Polity, 2003.
33. Partridge E., *Shakespeare's Bawdy*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.
34. Quinn A., *Figures of Speech: 60 ways to turn a phrase*. California: Hermagoras Press, 1993.
35. Rabaté J.M., *The Ghosts of Modernity*, Gainesville: Florida University Press, 1996.
36. Richard L. W. Clarke LITS2306 Notes 01C 1, Approaches to Interpreting Literature

37. Rabaté J.M., *Jacques Lacan*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
38. Smith G., *Dickens and the Dream of Cinema*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
39. Spargo T., ed., *Reading the Past: Literature and History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000.
40. Thieme J., *Postcolonial Con-texts: Writing Back to the Canon*, London: Continuum, 2001.
41. Wittgenstein L., *Philosophical Investigations*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1984.
42. Wolfreys J., *Victorian Hauntings: Spectrality, Gothic, the Uncanny and Literature*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.
43. Wood M., *Slavery, Empathy and Pornography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
44. Young R., Poems That Read Themselves, *Tropismes* 5, 1991: 233–61.
45. Young R. Freud's Secret: *The Interpretation of Dreams* was a gothic novel, in *Sigmund Freud's The Interpretation of Dreams: New interdisciplinary essays*, ed. Laura Marcus. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
46. Barthes, R., Theory of the Text, in *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, ed. Robert Young. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.