

**C H A P T E R - I**

**FANTASY IN LITERATURE**

### Fantasy : It's Nature and History :

Fantasy has always been an Integral part of literature since the beginning of times and it has had a broad appeal to people of all ages. It deals not only with the particular forms of fiction, but also it touches broad areas of folk-tales, myth, satire, allegory, Gothic fiction and science fiction.

'The word or term 'Fantasy' was derived from Greek word 'phantasia'. The meaning of this term is 'making visible, capacity for imaging.' Fancy was supposed to be an abbreviation of fantasy. Both terms are closely related to imagination.'<sup>1</sup> According to Tolkien fantasy is not part of traditional literature courses. But fantasy differs from all these aspects. It informs the spirit of all but a small part of western literature. 'Fantasy is the fantastic product of imagination'.<sup>2</sup> We are curiously blind to its presence because our traditional approaches to literature are based on mimetic assumptions. Even we are unable to be develop an analytic vocabulary for understanding fantasy. Up to this stage we can form ideas about it only with difficulty and find ourselves in struggle. The doctrine of mimesis was the foundation of the Greek aesthetics. 'Fantasy is a playful imagination'.<sup>3</sup>

### Critical Approaches to Fantasy :

There is no discussable relationship between literature

and reality but in practical terms most words in any normal narrative refer to the commonalities of human experience. Very few readers expected the correct meaning of a word in a text. They will put the book down rather than try to respond to words. Those words are being offered only as melodic sounds or even as infinite interplay of signifiers. We find that literature bears resemblance to reality. Most subsequent critics along with Plato and Aristotle have assumed mimetic representation to be the essential relationship between text and the real world.

If we think of Christianity, it unconcernedly perpetuated mimetic assumption, and at the same time it further muddled critical perceptions of fantasy. In classical literature we find fantastic creatures and deities of an alien faith. It is the seductive attractions. So early fathers and authority of the church developed a rhetoric of rejection that debarred these fantasies. According to many earnest Christians literary fantasy has seemed a species of lie. The enemies of poetry addressed by Boccaccio and Sir Philip Sidney evidently numbered such literary persons in their ranks. The Plymouth Brethren parents of Edmund Goose considered that all fiction whatever to be reprehensible lies. We find the secularization of this literal-mindedness, and its extension as a mingling of Protestant and scientific seriousness in Hard Times. In this fiction Dickens is sensitive to the issue of fact versus non-fact and he choreographs an elaborate battle in between these two issues.

However, more sophisticated Christians throughout the ages have <sup>been</sup> trying to dismiss popular fantasy as a frivolity. Therefore they never consider it seriously. But on the other hand Christianity didn't quickly give rise to a realistic literary tradition. Christian fantasy encouraged the nonreal but did not think about critical awareness because fantasy if it is served the cause of morality became "true" and therefore ethically distinct from the lies of fable. Christianity did nothing to correct the balance between fantasy and mimesis, although Christian poets made much use of fantasy in allegory and romance and pious tale. Up to this stage fantasy was seemed as worthless entertainment. It never received separate and positive status or identity.

Theorists along with Plato and Aristotle assume that the essential impulse behind literature is mimetic, and that fantasy is therefore a separable and secondary phenomenon. They think that fantasy is a pure phenomenon because it is delimited by some clear rules and that the result will be a genre or form which can be called fantasy. They frame their definitions in such a way as to exclude as many works as possible. The remaining part of the text according to them <sup>is to be</sup> declared to be fantasy. It is nothing but departure from reality and which fails to fit <sup>in</sup> the rules. The resulting definitions are unable to tell us much about the larger problem of departures from consensus reality, their nature, aims and effects.

In western civilization literature has served different functions in keeping with the shifting cultural patterns. There have been three fundamentally different kinds of literature. 'They follow the sequence A - B - A - B - C. The first is the kind of literature brought up by traditional societies which are unifying religion and morality. We find the examples of this form in the Homeric epics and much of the Old Testament and in the literature of the Middle Ages (A,A). The second develops after the religious myths have been challenged (B,B)'.<sup>4</sup> In late classical times; But afterwards this development was cut short by the rise of Christianity and a new traditional society. After Renaissance it is converted in to <sup>a</sup> new form of literature i.e. Realism. The third stage (C), encompasses modernism and post modernism. This literature has achieved a clear new function and feel that it can generally be recognized as a third distinct kind of literature.

In these three stages we find very different scope for the impulses of mimesis and fatasy. The characteristics of traditional societies have logical impression in their literature which help to explain how that literature gives a sense of meaning. It helps to define varied functions of fantasy. Literature insists on skeptical, philosophical and scientific stances and it affect the ways of conveying meaning.

Several theorists use a narrow definition of fantasy. They claim fantasy to be a post enlightenment phenomenon. Such

fantasy is different from traditional fantasy in many respect. The impulse to depart from consensus reality is present <sup>r</sup>for as long as we have had literature. It is based on a different logic and different concept of reality.

In the beginning we find the existence of fantasy in myths. It has certain value but that cannot be proved by science. Such stories are based on decided matters. Verification of these stories is impossible. Generally such stories are based on activities of God, the deeds of divine beings and culture heroes. Even we find tales of men. They are displaced from mythic level. They are based on enmity and enemies are necessary to define heroes. It means the fantasy serves to let them copy the mythic pattern. And by this way it strengthens meaning. Fantasy uphold morality in classical tragedies when angels or the Virgin enter medieval tales. Even fantasy serve satiric ends. What we do not find until the culture's myths have been seriously challenged is fantasy used to denigrate the ideal, satire without a high moral norm and black comedy. Those demand skeptical awareness as their first step. And so effect of skepticism on traditional literature and values plays important part in this connection.

#### The limits of realism :

Realism is closely related to literature. We find that our culture still values science and reason, objectivity and observation. All these aspects are found in realism. Realistic

novels are circulated on large scale but the sophisticated readers are not satisfied with its subject matters. Realism no longer imparts an adequate sense of meaning to our experience with reality.

But afterwards fantasy regained popularity at all levels of literature. Before this period fantasy was permanently discredited by science and realistic literature. Realistic fiction has several kinds of limitations. It is an inherent set of literary problems i.e. novelty and degree of details<sup>are</sup> included. Another set is external to literature. It involves the implications of advances in science and philosophy. If the objectivity of observation is called in question for science, this has ramifications for literature. Another type of limitation is, some one present from the outset which is not inevitable, is simply the ability of 19th century writers to impose a convincing sense of meaning on human experience. And their context is religious and social. The convincingness of what they were achieving was hidden throughout the century in the fantasy literature. We have to look at these various limitations. Even they misplace the values of realism and become obstacles for thinkers to implicit meaningless world.

The internal limitations are logical corollaries to the aims and functions of realistic literature, one being the central significance of novelty and originality. Readers never expect novelty if the mythic pattern is repeated as per the function

of literature. They want those unchanging patterns. If any novel is based on scientific observation and it serves the purpose of exploration and illumination of human behaviour, then only we find little virtue in repetition. Truly scientific knowledge is increasing by successive additions. Publication of rediscoveries is even harmful. Science wastes readers' time and distracts them from most genuinely new work. Each narrative can be viewed as filling in the blank areas of a large map. It becomes more difficult task to find out the new and true material. The proper form is in troublesome nature at this crucial point. Sometimes novelty of a recent story seems insufficient. That's why there is fear about the particular form. If the truth fails, it becomes more problematic to the existence of form. We dismiss the work as an artistic mistake or acknowledge the departures from reality to be fantasy. Everywhere in the world, we find that the taste of readers is going to change on large scale and far rapidly. So the effect of all these conditions found on the new fictional possibilities continue to come into existence. A nuclear war or famine etc. are the subjects of most of the effective realistic novels. The author try to portrait the whole impression about him and his work of art. Their realism would not be any shortcoming. It means they have certain boundaries about novelties.

If we find the development of any novel, we come to know that there is constantly pressure on author to present



original material of his own. And impact of this pressure is found in many dimensions in the development of novel e.g. As there was concern to upper middle class and middle class protagonists were exhausted. Writers moved lower down<sup>to</sup> the social scale for subjects. The nineteenth century saw Zola's brilliant studies of washermen and actresses and peasants. The twentieth century refers to the serious quest for novelty which has forced writers to examine the fantastic which is unique and which contributes at<sup>its</sup> best to our understanding of human nature. Without originality the novel loses some theoretical justification. But material too makes readers unwilling to give the story time or attention.

The other kind of internal literary limitation can be explained by analogy as a limitation of scale. As per the analogy suggestion, there is closer focus on human experience. It can cause evaporation of meaning. For instance, Stream of consciousness, as it is pushed towards greater loyalty can lead to such fragmentation that all message disappears. If it is multiplied in detail does not produce incomprehensibility, then it may evoke (call up) boredom. In everyday routine life we find<sup>that</sup> many of the sensations are repeatitive. An unedited presentation of breathing and heartbeats would provoke any reader who is healthy in mind, to close the book.

'Limitations external to realistic literature but influential upon it come from the advances and changes in philosophic and

scientific thought.'<sup>5</sup> They are from recognizing the limitations in those areas e.g. We now know the scientist, once who was assumed to be impartial and non-interfering. In art and microscopy humans see what they know about or think what they know. They are forced or they are compelled by their language to force data into imperfect classifications. It is as like as observer whose language admits sacred and secular modes of action when he tries to classify ceremonies in a culture with five or six modes of action. We no longer consider that the author is objective in his presentation of social classes. Many Marxist critics like David Punter and Rosemary Jackson make us aware of the many ways. According to them the author's own values are included in the stories and distort his presentation with strong unconscious biases.

Afterwards also we are doubtful about the reality of author which he shows to us by his writings. We are doubtful about its interpretation. Scientists have had to reconcile themselves to one kind of uncertainty. They can not fix both position and momentum of an electron up to that stage which they expect to study <sup>in</sup> its flight patterns. Science has also made it hard and difficult for us to ignore the illusory nature of our sense e.g. - data or art may help us to receive the experience of the stoniness of a stone. But that experience may seem meaningless, when we remember that the stoniness is an illusion. The stone consists of empty space, its small proportion is

occupied by atoms. In turn they are proved as form of energy. Physicists are aware that our exploration into the nature of the universe is based on mathematical projection. Psychologists remind us of the degree to which what we see in other people is really a projection of ourselves rather than any objective reality. Philosophers and linguisticians remind us that all we think we know is really only a set of arbitrary linguistic structures e.g. Barthes. He applied such observations to their logical conclusion, where he applies this logic to realistic literature and shows it to have little connection with reality. Its values refer to other linguistic and literary conventions. Upholding realism as a means of giving meaning to experience seems unsophisticated in the face of deconstruction of its established principles.

Our scientific and social thinking has also changed our responses to the aims of realism. Where once there was importance of the individual and of mankind and we felt it to focus on the individual but the situation changed, <sup>and</sup> we now live with a society and sciences in which individual is negligible. Even whole populations are only numbers on paper. Especially when we study the middle ages, we find <sup>that</sup> the secondary importance was given to the individual identity and subordinated as he was to the traditional group. He had very little personal freedom. He had very little importance as a man But as a soul, that same individual was second only to the angels. Science has made free

to man from one kind of insignificance. It is done only to precipitate him into a far more complete state of aimlessness. Man is aware of his own pitiful limitations when he acknowledged the immensity of the world and its complexity. Still we are willing a sense of meaningful relationship with the universe as our history of myth making testifies. But Science needs or properly traces on physical, biological and chemical relationships. It means science does not give people that sense of their own importance<sup>of</sup>, what they are willing. Through this lack of meaning causes depression and alienation and makes literary focus on the individual pointless. It becomes impossible that tragedy which is declare to be true on an individual's significance. Romance, heroism appears to be silly fairytale material. The affirmation of society offered by comedy seems absurd. Only irony can flourish under these circumstances and even irony must feel the weight of its own pointlessness.

When we turn to the limitations presented in nineteenth century realism, we come to know that contemporary reactions to these inadequacies in the peripheral literature of the day. These limitations are not necessarily inherent but reflect the blindness of the authors, their class outlooks, their moral assumptions, and other such individual and social characteristics. Realism which was in practice was very far from being objective. But mainstream authors repressed some of their darkest fears. Authors in the Gothic tradition

and the literary descendants of such writers possessed on these fears and magnified them. Many authors realized that mythology is not in existence in the world. What we call divine and demonic was not entirely true to human experiences. Much of what we feel in life can easily be represented in realistic terms. But some of the experiences that move us most derive from more different states of experience, which we have represented in literature through the use of fantasy.

Realism goes step by step towards nothingness. At first the great realistic novels impress wonderfully. The readers feel that they get correct experience of fictive explanations from such novels. 'Realistic literature gave its readers a sense of power and insight, an outlet for feelings and concreteness for social life.'<sup>6</sup> This richness and strength never proved its long life because of its fundamental dependence on novelty and on valid truth. With all these problems, we can see why realistic literature would fail to give much sense of meaning to sophisticated readers. No one form has replaced it with a generally accepted way of asserting value. 'Modern literature is in its way a literature of quest, a literature which first strikes the reader as being in search of its proper form, rather than already possessed of that form.'<sup>7</sup> This quest gives it the appearance of being transitional. But some fairly major mental changes took place in western consciousness. This searching for answers may be as honest and effective function as is possible for literature at present. The function of

traditional literature was to present mythic patterns and the function of realistic literature was observation. In this stage we find a quest for ways of giving a sense of meaning. The modern literature works from the acknowledgement that science does not allow us to assert mythic fantasies as real. And from the knowledge that man is ill-equipped psychologically to live without a sense of meaning. There are no easy answers. But contemporary authors are struggling sometimes very impressively to make friendly<sub>relations</sub> again with incompatible demands.

'According to contemporary theorists of modernism and post modernism, realistic literature assumed that the world was rational and describable.'<sup>8</sup> There was a correspondence between a description and reality. That even if there was a mystery at first you could separate threads of mystery. Modernism broke all such assumptions. In many of its manifestations modernism has proved to be a literature of reaction. It has provided data for the theory that fiction is about other fiction.

Contemporary fiction seems to be going in four directions-

(1) Writers ignore the emptiness and its implications. They retreat from the edge and try to write in essentially conventional, realistic style. Or they retreat even further to fantasy with strong traditional roots. Beautifully created or artistically created fiction is still possible in the realistic style e.g. Saul Bellow and John Updike's exemplify<sub>ing</sub> works<sub>are</sub> being done

of this kind. Among the writers of fantasy we find Tolkien and his ilk, and the political based conservative writers of science fiction, in whose works the adventures serve to uphold the status of technological group. We may stick to values that have worked in the past until something better comes along with it. We should cherish them.

(2) Writers continue to talk about authorities limitations, needless repetition of language and the referential nature of art and the other negative messages of modernism. All these forms acknowledge emptiness on large or less scale.

(3) Writers know much about the problems of readers. They are unable to give proper answers to such problems. But they go over and over the questions by checking possibilities of the readers. They look towards our fictional tools and techniques.

(4) Some writers are trying to draw a new kind of meaning, a new sense of conviction and involvement. They wish to make a new kind of relationship with the world. Sometimes even they create new mythology.

Since all the authors of these various kinds of contemporary fiction have somehow escaped from the silence. It is implied by the emptiness. All of them find some meaning in the act of writing and even in the action of their characters.

It is worth looking at their solutions. No any genre or any answer has yet merged except the quest itself is a kind of function. We can see what kinds of meaning are being sought and which are still valid. We can also see various new kinds of fantasy and note possible reasons for its re-entry into the mainstream literature.

Most of the writers <sup>are</sup> following realistic or fantastic reactionary paths. They are concerned to find ways of asserting the importance of the individual. They never take burden seriously which is led by Science and mass societies. This is their basic myth. According to them man is important. They never care the universe. Humanity seems to live rather poorly without some kind of belief in its importance. This is a defensible artistic stroke. If we grant that their established principles need not be proven, we can only ask how they are persuasive in positive thinking. Such type of systematic arguments we find in the later half of the nineteenth century.

There are some other ways which convey meaning. Some of them are already tried and <sup>the</sup> remaining are new. But among those which are being tried are based on some form of fantasy e.g. - In the cases of Calvino, Lessing, and Pynchon, the mythic elements are symbolic and metaphoric. In Barth, they are allegorical. If our mind wills <sup>for</sup> a sense of meaning, authors find that we must speak to it in its own language, which



is the language of symbol. Thats why<sup>there is</sup> the recurrence of fantasy as a serious literary technique.

Realism concentrates with quasi-scientific disinterest on what is there in the real world. It can not validly express value judgements, they are being human likes and dislikes. If the writers work in blindness, they are compelled to try fantasy. It is nothing but deliberate departure from consensus reality. We have never seen<sup>an</sup> absolute return to a new mythology.

#### UTOPIAN FANTASY :

Utopian fiction is an old form of literature which was not studied systematically upto the end of nineteenth century. It was taken into consideration when utopias were again recognized as a social influence. Afterwards political economists<sup>were</sup> attracted towards the proper study of utopian literature. They began to write history of utopian literature. Their history is nothing but summaries and criticisms of the utopian proposals of reform. Sociologists and Philosophers went on such reformatory search. They started defining the principles of utopian thought. The utopian's mental attitude became established as one of the most important forces in political reality. At the same time the literary fiction moved backward towards the background. Certain important utopias came in for individual literary criticism but only lately utopian fiction has been recognized and studied as

a proper literary genre. M. Dupont has studied monumental history of English utopian literature.

First of all Dupont lists all the reformatory details of utopian literature. Then he considers the literary devices of all available utopias. So his work is the best reference book for the specialist. According to him utopias are skilful descriptions of ideal societies which are meant to be taken as practical contributions to social reform. The utopian writer is an active social reformer producing constructive political propaganda. Therefore such imaginary voyages as Gulliver's Travels or Erewhon are not taken into consideration. Due to this Dupont's work is restricted to a special kind of utopian writing upto 1914.

The aim is not concerned with the practical details of social planning and only superficially with special literary devices. It tries to show that the several characteristics of utopian literature are the outcome of a comprehensive utopian imagination and view of life. If we want to know what this imaginative force is, we cannot set out with<sup>out</sup> certain definitions and typologies. Therefore various other kinds of imaginary and fantastical utopias are<sup>to be</sup> considered along with socially constructive utopias. By this way utopianism often appears in different manner from what it must be in a study based on 'classical' utopias.'<sup>9</sup> The material of the present study of it is modern. That's why other differences arise in such study. Present study is taken

from the twentieth century. In last fifty years we find great number of utopian writing in existence. Dupont deals only with few products. Other critics<sup>have</sup> rarely ever tried to penetrate beyond the work of Wells, Huxley and Orwell.

If we try to compare with continental utopias we will find English utopian literature has its minor national peculiarities. But in the main view it expresses the hopes, fears and dreams of all western civilization:

Life in the future haunts the utopian's mind in many different ways. It manages the subject matter for various kinds of speculation on human destiny. But it also gives rise to a new kind of grammatical statement. In a utopia, the narrator first jumps towards future in order to be able to look back at the present. Through this process the writer is able to use 'prophetic past'. He is not content with looking forward and speaking in the future tense, although from time to time such semi utopias as Judian Huxley's If I were dictator (1936) make their appearance. A total description of a non-existent social sytem in the future tense not only be rather difficult and dull, but the reader would also feel emptied to question the conclusions arrived. Such conditional statements seem to ask for proving to be wrong since their grammatical form points to the unreality of the conception in every sentence. Therefore the real utopian is not satisfied up to the stage that he can speak of future possible events<sup>as</sup> if they had really happened.

'Pretend that you believe this, and that following  
 is an authentic message from the Last Men ---  
 Otherwise I cannot give life to the great history  
 which it is my task to tell.'<sup>10</sup>

When we consider the translation of the evolutionary hypothesis in detail of the superman we see that the utopian writer works with the desire to transform abstract ideas into myths. Instead of arguments and discussions, he tries to work on the reader's imagination in a more powerful and direct way. When the mythical imagination of the evolutionary utopias tends towards the grand scale, then the more numerous social utopias <sup>seen</sup> are <sub>A</sub> mainly concerned with practical details. Their didactic intention may be obvious. It is not their function to provide a religious view to support man in his universe. The socially constructive utopias try their level best to convince us how all of us are happy under utopian condition. It is nothing but the rich presentation of a man. The reader feels satisfied when he knows much about mankind of universe by reading an optimistic evolutionary utopia. On the other hand if he reads authors like More, Morris, or Wells immediately he is dissatisfied with the present state of society.

In the alluring utopian picture we find a considerable quantity of details. But the details of the utopian writer are not the details of the scientific economist. The utopian writer

does not attempt to prove his thesis by long calculations and statistical estimates. In theory his ideas are rather sweeping but his utopia is worked out concretely in suggestive detail. His imaginary society seems to be alive. We are made to feel what it would be like to live in such a utopia. This ability to visualize actual non-existent conditions also forms the starting point for anti-utopian writing. It may prove that certain plans are not desirable when they are put into practice.

'The good utopian writer's aim is not limited to the creation of single, disconnected details. Generally he is more interested in working out a fundamental hypothesis.'<sup>11</sup> At first he is giving imaginative reality and then following it through all its branches. The pleasure of seeing a hypothesis realized in all its significant imaginative details is more important to the utopian writer. It is one of the most characteristic aspects of the utopian imagination that it is limited. It is started from ideas, created its own world and extending its view till it is lost in infinity. On the other hand it keeps narrowing its view until it arrives at a minute fact. This tendency is clearly expressed in 'Utopia' itself. Its communist working society is opposed to capitalism. One of the most obvious reasons of this demand consists of the less valuation of gold and finery. This idea is worked out in detail when the foreign ambassadors arrive in Utopia. It finds its perfect and fantastic fitting. This line

is further continued in the clothes of the priests which should be rare and fine -

"theire vestimentes be neither embrauded with old, nor set with precious stones. But they be wrought so fynely and conningelye with divers fethers of foules, that the estimation of no costely stuffe is hable to countervaille the price of the worke."

The utopian writers get pleasure in ingenuity. Sometimes they indulge in laughter.

"I laughed when writing both it (Mr. Blettsworthy on Rampole Island) and Men Like Gods and The Autocracy of Mr. Parham."

A utopian writer need not be confined to didacticism. He is not careful about constructing his new universe, because he has come to the conclusion that the best way to reach the audience or readers is to write a utopian tale. He is not restricted to play with puzzling plausibilities. Even a utopian writer may be moved by a sudden imaginative flash. This is not very surprising in a writer of utopian allegorical fantasies, but even in a minor writer of a scientific utopia the same forces may be at work.

"At that time I did not care a great deal for the early scientific novels of H.G.Wells. I was primarily interested in people and in human problems, and not particularly in physical and chemical romance of the Jules Verne school -- I had not read any of the scientific romances; neither The Time Machine nor When the Sleeper Awakes nor The Country of the Blind . So it is rather curious that when the idea for my first novel came to me, it should have been a pseudo-scientific utopian one. It occurred to me to wonder what would be the effect on society if the human race could determine in advance the sex of its children. I remember still with complete clarity the time and place where this notion impinged upon my imagination. It gave me an almost physical shock of excitement and pleasure, one of those mysterious shocks experienced by the creative artist at the first moment of impact of an 'inspiration'."

The desire for the concretion and individualization of a general social idea is the most important factor. It never relates to whatever the origin of utopia or whatever the exact mixture of its amusing, puzzling or didactic components. The reader's attention is fixed on the utopian narrative. They accept the

events and facts though they are surprizing. If the reader refuses this suspension of disbelief he cannot enjoy the story. But the writer has to help the reader towards such a state of disbelief. Presenting the non-existent as it is really existed in grammatical form does not do away with all difficulties. The question of reality enters by another way.

In principle the creation of an imaginary state may be considered the same as the creation of a fictitious character. It is the same in scale and degree. There is no any doubtful comment from the readers about invention of persons those who are never existed. He is not in the position to prove that they actually do not exist, since it would be extremely difficult for him to check their identities individually. The facts are not materially altered. So it is not surprising that many unsophisticated readers hardly distinguish between fictitious and real people. But sometimes we find the statement in most novels that all the characters are fictitious. They are generally such as might easily exist according to our common knowledge. Documentary evidence does not play an important role in such cases. There is no question of what is real but of what corresponds to our notions of reality and what is natural in the context of word. The case is different with the creation of an imaginary state. We find here that, there is rarely any danger of confusing the real and fictitious. By the invention of a non-existent state the



author deviates from well known facts. Even sometimes he departs from natural laws. He enters in a new area with special aspects and different interests. It means in the realms of the fantastic.

"What does fantasy ask of us ? It asks us to pay something extra. It compels us to an additional adjustment. The other novelists say 'Here is something that might occur in your lives', the fantasist. 'Here is something that could not occur'. "

But even in such utopian fantasy there are degrees, and the utopian device, which is included among the time-honoured fantastic means by Mr. Forster, sometimes merge with the more usual novel. Fictitious<sup>ci</sup> names of countries and towns do not in the least interfere with realism. Inventing a new name for a country does not make a novel utopian or fantastic, though the country does not exist on map. But by such invention of new names realism begins to move back. Such countries as Ruritania, Balkania, Azania represent typical abstracted local colour. They are vaguely situated in the Balkans in Africa, or among the South American republics. Such countries are specially adapted to this purpose. Because they belong to a group of similar ones. Like Evelyn Waugh's Black Mischief, novels making use of such states are slightly irresponsible. They are operative products rather

than wildly fantastic ones. Names of particular well defined states like the U.S.A., England or Russia are hardly changed that way. Sometimes the newly created romantic countries may be used e.g. Lilliput and Erewhon, to satirize a country which does not belong to the group originally designated. So the small pseudo German kingdom in Laurence Housman's Jingo stories satirizes English institutions and stands somewhere between Ruritania and Erewhon. By this way we find so many possible variations in it. Geographically non-existent country is also considered by the readers by the nature of that country. It conforms to reader's notion of what kind of country is that by comparison. So its existence can be accepted by the reader as a matter of course. But if these conditions are not fulfilled, as soon as the nature of the country, its inhabitants and civilization contradict the reader's prejudices. It becomes fantastic. A white tribe in the middle of the African continent or highly advanced society on an island in the Pacific are fantastic, possibly utopian, if social criticism is involved. The utopian creation take care of to be fantastic because their civilizations are so unheard of that they cannot be placed anywhere on earth without being wildly incongruous. While as soon as they<sup>are</sup> placed among the stars or in the future, they become even more fantastic, because they are out of our knowledge. 'Only academic utopias<sup>are</sup> stressing the return to nature. They idealize images in the eyes of western man.'<sup>12</sup> At first the utopian hypothesis is in the air. Then it becomes more solid

when realized in the description of the utopian state. But still the utopian state itself remains in the air.

The attempt to connect such fantastic states with reality may be explained as the final aim in some of the utopian's desire to create the illusion of reality. That desire is not for greater impression on readers mind but then it moves the author. The existence of the utopian state also changes his ingenuity, his imagination which cannot be stopped, to puzzle out of connection between the hypothesis and everyday reality. It would never do to place hard and factful state in some vague world for the utopian.

We find the reflection of impact of a strange society with greater force on the utopian traveller's mind by his reactions. Such reactions may lead to a dramatic conflict. Both the desire for greater verisimilitude and for greater dramatization make the utopian journey a useful and well established device.

If we take a historical rather than a deductive view, we have to consider that the genre of the imaginary journey is even older than the utopian genre. 'Every imaginary journey contains of a utopian romance. A utopia could be regarded as a development of such imaginary journeys.'<sup>13</sup> In fact, the two join forces, on the one hand the desire for a realistic utopia naturally take care of the creation of a utopian journey. On the other hand the existence of imaginary journeys make utopias more easily

possible. In certain cases the first circumstance predominates and in others the second circumstance predominates. In More's case the creation of utopia preceded the journey and the geographical setting. In cases like Godwin's Man in the Moon (1638) and many modern scientific romances it is the utopian element which is the by product. The varied literary traditions which can be at work in a single piece of utopian writing have been traced and analysed through Gulliver's Travels in Eddy's critical study. This work shows us a firm proof that the origins of utopian writing are multiple and they can not be reduced to a single element.

The original technique of introducing utopia is exemplified in Plato's Critias, More's Utopia, Bacon's New Atlantis, Swift's Gullivers Travels, Butler's Erewhon, Well's Time Machine and many others. In these cases we find the similar reaction from the readers. Such as it is drawn out from the listeners in 'New Atlantis : for indeed we were all astonished to hear so strange things so probably told.' The method employed may be called the technique of fantastic realism.

All utopian voyages are fantastic or extra-ordinary. There are certain attempts to classify such imaginary voyages as realistic on the one hand, and fantastic on the other hand. It is essentially confusing. After having defined a realistic voyage as one 'to an existing country, or one that might easily exist,

in which the mode of travel and the adventures are restricted to the possibilities of an actual voyage', Eddy continues :

"In determining the 'possibilities of an actual voyage' the knowledge possessed by the author's contemporaries must be taken into account. A Seventeenth century voyage describing unicorns and hermaphrodites does not on that account fail to be a Realistic Voyage however prodigious such features may seem to the modern scientist."

The question arises before us that, if description of words like unicorns and hermaphrodites are realistic, then why they are not extended upto get<sup>ting</sup> meaning ? If it is dealing with seventeenth century then why the references of supernatural and magical elements are disappear ? The subject matter, the plain facts emerged in a summary of such journey is credible, fantastic or realistic.

According to Eddy all journeys to the moon would have to be classed as fantastic. Most of the discoveries on earth would be realistic. Such a definition might possibly be accepted for the sixteenth, seventeenth, and even the eighteenth century. But since in considering such journeys one has to take into account the nature of travelling and the nature of the imaginary country. This distinction breaks down when <sup>it is</sup> applied under modern conditions. A journey into the African interior may be appearing reasonable.

But because of its reasonableness and ordinariness the discovery of an unknown utopian country in regions which have been explored is extraordinary and fantastic. Acceptable modern utopia will have to be placed in unknown regions outside the earthly sphere. But in such a case the mode of travel presents greater difficulties. So the utopian creations are all tend<sup>ed</sup> to be fantastic in a factual sense. Once the transition to the unknown country has been achieved, the creatures inhabiting those parts may take all kinds of shapes and adopt customs.

The distinction between realistic and fantastic utopian journeys according to the mode of travel and the nature of the destination is not satisfactory. Total impression of a utopian journey is fantastic. Along with this narrative treatment, another important aspect is more interesting and illuminating. From the point of view of the narrative method a journey to the moon can be realistic or fantastic. The subject matter itself being fantastic as one may easily distinguish between realistic and plain fantasy. According to Herbert Read the two necessary attributes of plain or pure fantasy are objectivity and arbitrariness. On both counts he raises objections against utopias:-

'A 'Utopia', or description of a fantastical country and its civilization, might well exhibit all the characteristics of pure Fantasy, but rarely does so because the writer has some ulterior satirical

or moral aim, which aim distorts his composition, fixes it in space and time, gives it a basis of subjective intolerance. Such objections apply to Utopia itself, to News from Nowhere and The Dream of John Ball, to Erewhon and A Crystal Age. They do not apply to some of the fantasies of H.G.Wells, who comes as near as any modern writer to a sense of pure fantasy. He errs, as in The Time Machine, by imparting to his fantasies a pseudoscientific logicity; it is as though having conceived an arbitrary fantasy he were compelled by the habits of his scientific training to work out the consequences of this fantasy. Real fantasy is bolder than this; it dispenses with all logic and habit, and relies on the force of wonder alone.'<sup>14</sup>

It is not surprising that a utopia cannot be pure fantasy because there is lack of objectivity and arbitrariness. An objective utopia, i.e. an imaginary country whose institutions are not related to its time and which has no moral significance that is by definition not a utopia, but it is only a fantastical country. Lack of arbitrariness is not a condition of utopian writing. In Wells's fantasies this arbitrariness is said to be impaired by a 'pseudo-scientific logicity'. This tendency makes Wells' fantasies realistic fantasies, his method is fantastic realism. Herbert Read

does not consider the other utopias with regard to arbitrariness, but some of them exhibit the same pseudo-scientific logicity. This is not a matter of scientific training, but of the utopian type of mind which takes pleasure in working things out logically. They are proceeding from hypothetical premises to detailed concrete conclusions. The utopian does not even aim at arbitrariness. On the contrary he tries to avoid it, striving to construct a coherent pseudo-logical reality. The irony implied in the use of such a device corresponds to the utopian's consciousness of the gap between appearance and reality. In purely fantastic writing reality simply recedes. The fairy tale simply starts like 'Once upon a time.... ' and the reader can take it or leave it. There are no any claims made. The unsophisticated attitude is truly expressed. In utopian writings there is always a double level, the implication being : "Here in this really existing utopia things are like this; they could also be like this in our known reality, but of course they are not, and perhaps, after all, they could not really be so, for we know, don't we, that this utopia does not really exist." The fantastic realist protests that he deals with realities, but he does so with his tongue in his cheek; he is highly sophisticated and self-conscious; he is acutely aware that there are statements which do not correspond to events, that the word and the thing are not the same, and that there is the possibility of fiction, of 'saying the thing which is not'.



# R E F E R E N C E S

- 1) Alex Preminger, ed., Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics.  
(Princeton; Princeton University Press, 1965), P. 270.
- 2) Hornby, Gatenby, Wakefield, ed., The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English  
(London; Oxford Univ. Press, 1963), p. 358.
- 3) Owen Weston, ed., Longman Modern English Dictionary  
(London;; Longman, 1976), p. 375.
- 4) Kathryn Hume; Fantasy and Mimesis  
(New York; Methuen and Co.Ltd., 1984), P.29.
- 5) Ibid., p.41
- 6) Ibid., p.43
- 7) Ibid., p.43
- 8) Ibid., p. 44
- 9) Richard Gerber, Utopian Fantasy  
(London; Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965), p.11
- 10) Ibid., p. 81.
- 11) Ibid., p.82
- 12) Ibid., p.86
- 13) Ibid., p.87
- 14) Ibid., p. 89

\*\*\*