

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

CRITICAL DISCUSSIONS OF FICTION

*Dr Mamoona Riaz¹, Dr Fatima Jalal², Dr Adnan Ahmed³, Farwa Ayesha⁴,
Dr Waseem Abbas Gul⁵*

¹Lecturer, Urdu University of Education Lahore, Faisalabad Campus

²Assistant professor, Urdu University of Education Lahore, Faisalabad Campus

³Assistant professor, Urdu, University of Jhang, Pakistan

⁴PhD Scholar, Government College University, Faisalabad

⁵ Lecturer Urdu, Ghazi university D.G. Khan

Corresponding Email: academyresearch43@gmail.com

Dr Mamoona Riaz, Dr Fatima Jalal, Dr Adnan Ahmed, Farwa Ayesha, Dr Waseem Abbas Gul. Critical Discussions of Fiction -- PalArch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 19(4), 1174-1182. ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Fiction, Critical, Literature, Urdu, Linguistic

ABSTRACT

It is not correct to neglect creation compared to criticism or to give priority to criticism over creation.

Whether criticism is subjective or objective, the critic and the creator go hand in hand. Criticism is seen behind every literature, every movement, and every trend in the world. Criticism has always played an active role in solving intellectual, social, linguistic, cultural, intellectual and psychological problems.

Every literature flourishes. Along with this, trends, movements are also developed, thanks to which, innovation, authenticity and realism also appear. Due to these situations, misunderstandings and misconceptions develop. In such a situation, there is a need for criticism to establish an atmosphere of balance. If we examine the criticism of Urdu fiction in the light of facts, the role of criticism in the understanding of fiction is seen to be prominent. Despite the fact that our critics have also given place to extremism. He also exercised the right of friendship. A quick mention of some important issues, did some go home in bargains, some tried to get cheap fame by imposing fatwas, class inequalities were also seen, prejudice and favoritism were kept in mind in most cases, yet this cannot be said. That criticism of Urdu fiction is disappointing or according to Intar Hussain that our criticism stands on one leg. Our

critics have continued the process of accountability in spite of excessive exaggeration and indiscretion.

INTRODUCTION

A tendency and a dimension in the literature were declared to be precursors of criticism. On the one hand, symbolic fiction and its critics tried to generalize the phenomenon through their writings, while on the other hand, psychology was turned.

Wahab Ashrafi says:

"Critics of new fiction often play up the trope, and the term serves as a noun under internal dramatization. I have yet to read an article that highlights the term and its performance. The frequency with which it has been used that it demanded that it should be carefully watched." [1]

The critic Hazrat often does this by taking a term and referring to some English books of explanation to make it an ornament of his book. are unable to do. Criticism is not a genre that allows for length or any kind of exaggeration.

Parveen Azhar Zodiac Signs are:

"Our criticism has been a victim of exaggeration and there is no regular work in Urdu related to this art which presents the limits and possibilities of this art in a systematic way." [2]

For the critic to meet the demands of the new age, he needs new styles, new themes, new visions to judge the abilities of fiction writers and their art.

DISCUSSION

Professor All Ahmad Sarwar writes:

"The circle of readers of good healthy and serious literature is very small. There is a short circle in every language, but it is not as short as it is here. Ideological dictatorship is very high. Those who believe in Marx are willing to believe Freud barely, they do not even recognize the increasing influence of existentialism. It is dangerous to turn a blind eye to the facts in life.

Our critics are also of many kinds. The first critic is the common reader who is in the prison of his prejudices and preferences, who has his own rules for judging art and is confined in the framework of his choice. The second is the critic who awakens after the passage of time and time, while the third critic is the creator himself, who is both the creator and the reader, he creates his art and also sees it. The critic cannot judge things from a distance unless he feels the whole game played on his soul and body.

Ejaz Rahi says:

"It is not possible for a writer to tell the story of the cool air of heaven while passing near hell." Every literature is a recognition of its era and a criticism of

its era. Each era brings its own scale of expression according to its requirements and problems.

Not as much has been written on the composition and structure of fiction as on the genres of novels and plays. In the West, Haitian problems of fiction were rarely seen before structural criticism by separating them from the subject and content. Despite the young age of Urdu fiction, whatever concepts are prevalent about Haiti in Urdu fiction are directly or indirectly derived from Western criticism. Shamsur Rahman Farooqi writes: "Criticism as a genre of literature is younger here than the novel and more or less the same age as the short story. Like the novel and short fiction, criticism as a genre also came here from the West and many allegations about the status of criticism. We also received here from the West. We absorbed these allegations into our critical and literary consciousness through the automatic or conscious process of imitation and influence.

Narrative Fiction

In the 20th century, Western creatives, including DH Lawrence, Franz Kafka, James Joyce, Jean-Paul Sartre, underwent a major shift, which disrupted the narrative of fiction, resulting in plot-driven rather than plot-driven fiction. Myths began to be created and characters were replaced by symbols, metaphors were given importance to expression rather than events. Thus the critics railed against morality and beauty and advocated the free exercise of human instincts. The Russian artists considered art as an organic unity and emphasized practical criticism. In fact, he was convinced of the literary nature of literature, due to which he also rejected the romantic approach. Criticism of Urdu fiction has also become a field of literature due to its use from the West.

As soon as the trend of progressive criticism became common, where the critics paid attention to the criticism of fiction, they also wrote critical articles on a number of selected fiction and fiction writers. Essays on issues cannot be counted at all. These essays did not discuss the structural elements of fiction and technical discussions.

Dr. Andalib Shadani is optimistic about:

"Whatever our fiction writers and their critics write, they usually write from the whims of nature, they are not built on the principles of art, because they are neither familiar with the principles of art, nor do they feel the need to be familiar with them. [6]

Urdu Fiction

The critic of fiction is also somewhat simplistic. Understanding and interpretation of Urdu fiction requires time, but our critics do not have that much time. The short fiction has gained popularity in our literature so quickly that it needs no introduction. We live only with the support of legends and comments and reviews are published on these legends every day, but unfortunately these comments fill the stomach of magazines but the reader's knowledge does not

increase significantly. Fictionalists as well as critics of fiction are prone to complacency. If good fiction writers can be counted on the fingers, the number of critics is like salt in flour. In the same way, among the good fiction writers, there are a few who have been blessed with critical acclaim, most of the fiction writers have been blessed with lasting fame but could not get acceptance in the critical circles. Anwar did writes about this:

"Criticism of fiction has generally been neglected. At one time, criticism of fiction was associated only with Sayyid al-Azeem." [7]

From the literary point of view, different types of criticism come to light. Civil, emotional, aesthetic, historical, psychological, romantic, Marxist, interpretative, stylistic, biological, structural and comparative etc. These types are reflected in every corner of Urdu literature in one way or another, but these rules and laws are not valid in the criticism of fiction. Except for a few names and theories, all other criticism is impressionistic.

Most of the critics are those who have advanced a point of view, but still they could not stick to what they said. Due to the lack of examples and arguments, they are often so trapped in their established assumptions that there is no other way to explain them, due to which they remain confined in their own circle.

From the experience of criticizing fiction, two things have come to light, one is groupism and the other is extremist behavior.

Artza Karim opines:

"...Instead of working on the rules and regulations of Urdu fiction, we have given more importance to the identity of fiction writers." [8]

The myth has been in need of criticism since its inception. Where there is a lack of theoretical work in the criticism of fiction, most of the critics have given importance to the expression in order to prolong the story, to the extent that most of the critics are seen discussing the personality and art of the fiction writer. There are many subjects which Critics have only observed.

Critical View from Critics

Salim Akhtar is the astrologer in this regard:

And the last basic thing is that there is still no basic methodology in the criticism of fiction, as it used to be in poetry, that is, only expression and style were taken into consideration or in contrast to style in progressive criticism. Content and subject matter are given special importance. So far the critics of fiction have not reached this method, the disadvantage of which is that until a critic who understands the trends comes to replace the fiction, the trend itself is debunked." [9]

There is a circle of our critics who have done mostly impressionistic work in the criticism of fiction, while there is much room for conceptual and practical

work on fiction criticism to support or refute any mythicist or myth's basic premise. And it can be judged on the principle and basis of criticism, for which new critical terms need to be clarified, new concepts can be defined through which this art can be defined.

Here is Waris Alavi's point of view:

A style. A critic who firmly believes in one technique and one method confines his own criticism in a black room and prevents it from visiting the vagaries of the world of fiction. What would be the result of considering the symbolic to be the universal, except that, apart from the repetition of a few names and the repetition of a few ideas, there is no coin in the criticism?" [10]

There has been very little practical criticism of fiction. Most of the critics in their critical books have either considered the summary of the fiction as criticism or have described the description of the characters as the main purpose of criticism. The critic of the modern era has come out of the art of fiction writing, Kurda, plot, detail writing, but he has not struggled with the problems of style and technique. There are mills.

Anees Nagi says:

"There are many concepts in modern criticism of fiction (the self-talk of consciousness, the binary use of language, the creation of meaning through story, etc.) that need to be imported into the criticism of fiction because without them the process of practical criticism is incomplete." [11]

Urdu fiction has been criticized from different angles. In the beginning, the rules of the art and construction of fiction were clarified that the events in fiction must be in accordance with the environment and society. The reality of fiction is not that it does or does not happen, but that it does or can happen in a given environment.

Critics of fiction give primary importance to the concentration of point of view. In this regard, he also used western fiction. Although there was no color in the criticism of fiction, the art and compositional elements of fiction were openly discussed. The importance of the plot was emphasized. The better the plot is constructed, the more successful the story will be.

Similarly, along with style and expression, most attention was paid to the presentation of aesthetics in literature. From the beginning, the critics of fiction emphasized the technical aspects. Technical discussions were discussed later. Through practical criticism, such analyzes were possible that could assess the structure and quality of fiction.

Mehdi Jafar Horoscope is:

"On the basis of the analysis and criticism of the body, we can determine the external structure and aesthetic quality of the fiction so that the quality of the

language style and texture can be evaluated and through this, it is possible to mark the conscious industrialization of the fiction writer." [12]

In the 20th century, Waqar Azim discussed the technical debates of the art of fiction writing and also made critical and analytical reviews of the works of contemporary fiction writers. Mumtaz Shereen is the eminent critic who first studied the forms and techniques of fiction on the criticism of fiction. It was a unique and novel experiment in fiction criticism that examined technique as well as narrative, imagery, characterisation, theme and content. Technique is the slave of the material, the material is not of the technique, summarizing this discussion, the artificial and whip hand has been declared necessary in the construction of fiction.

Syed Mazhar Jameel writes:

"Criticism of fiction has become a separate field of literature, but the vast body of criticism is actually an interpretation of fiction that examines the story as a complete work of art, looking at the interrelationship of content, theme, and structure. goes and thus the work of determining the value is done."] 13[

Later, critics of fiction turned to narrative and dealt with negative existential issues, followed by long essays on symbolism, abstraction, and the restrained modes of consciousness. Until the 20th century, if any critic, bound by criticism, narrative and symbolic pegs, did not try to find the foot of the myth, to determine its place and status by classifying it, rather our critics got involved in the same debate. It is seen that such and such fiction is narrative, such and such is symbolic, and so is abstract, the criticism of fiction must have changed different forms. Some preferred the purely vertical approach and some focused on the psychological and aesthetic aspects.

CONCLUSION

"Critics of fiction must determine that just as any word is meaningful only after it becomes a symbol of an object, situation, feeling, quality, or essence. Similarly, a myth does not deserve to be called a creation unless it becomes a symbol of a slightly higher level. A myth is not the truth of ordinary life, but a greater truth. The criticism of fiction also has the same role to discuss the other semantic and aesthetic pretense that escapes from the narrative of every fiction, that this is actually the creative area in which the incident, idea, observation or feeling is adapted to the story. If the story is lucky, it becomes a legend."] 14[

There are numerous ways to study the form, subject, and content of fiction. story, plot, character, allegory, symbols, mythology, technique, theme, image, metaphor, mime, imagery, scenery, location, atmosphere, atmosphere, appropriateness, tone, narrative, linguistic structure, point of view, aesthetic expression, satire , Elegance, Tragedy, Education, Psychological, Social, Ethical, Structural, etc. There are innumerable sub-discussions and points of these topics and the critic reserves the right to study the fiction from any angle he wants. There is absolutely no scope for the claim that Fiction should be judged on the criteria of narrative, verbal or linguistic structure. There can be many ways to uncover the art and meaning of fiction. Even in the criticism of fiction, the interpretation and interpretation method helps to understand the

external and internal merits and demerits, while it helps the critic to make multiple interpretations and interpretations of the work of art.

Nasir Abbas writes regarding the criticism of Nair fiction:

Criticism of Urdu fiction generally follows three lines. Subject, Style, Technique and Social Studies. Balance was not maintained in giving importance to these letters. Studies of the subject have shown comparatively greater activity, and stylistic, technical and social studies have not been conducted with the frequency with which Urdu fiction is studied in terms of its technical diversity and sociological implications." [15]

When our fiction deviates from its tradition, a new trend is born. When the parameters of its expression and style change, the rules of judging it will also change. The fiction writers of this period gave birth to figurative and abstract fiction, thus a continuous flow of works was seen, due to which prose criticism also changed its approach.

Mahmud Wajid writes about this:

"The study of our coined critics became very limited. To a small circle, the result is that they know nothing but a few names, even those with whom they have a personal relationship. Our critics do not have it, they only rely on what they have heard." [16]

Most of the critics are simplistic as well as afraid of the truth. The reason for this is the instability and prejudice of our democratic traditions. The main reason for this is that critics do not have the courage to speak the truth. Critics of fiction do not attempt this. The roots of art should be found and then linked to tradition. Often critics consider the praise or criticism of a fiction writer as a manifestation of critical insight. The function of criticism is to enlighten artists, not to mislead them. Every genre needs the crutches of criticism to learn to walk and stand on its feet in order to make its place in literature.

Our critics have certainly supported the myth but treated it like a stepmother from the very beginning, according to Muhammad Hasan Askari.

Mansoor Qaiser is astrologer about:

"The critics first sympathized with the legend as a loner and traveler, then took him to their beggar camp and tried to break the legs of the cross so that he could beg for it by paralyzing him and mounting him on the publisher's carriage. Such work should be done." [17]

Fiction is the source of life, it does not reflect life, but it shows life moving, talking, laughing, playing, crying. The end of fiction is revelation. A revelation that pierces the veil of reality is a very fundamental difference between fiction and criticism. Essay criticism is based on originality. One creator explained the difference by saying that essays are like transparent glass through which you can see everything, while fiction is like a mirror that reflects everything. You

can only see yourself. With the changes in social and cultural life, the point of view of man also changes. The effects of this change are also set on the genres of literature.

Rashid Majid says:

"Fiction is born from the womb of life, if the values of life change, then fiction will also change." Therefore, criticism should also change its principles along with the times.

Most critics are those who have accepted preconceived notions. He based his way of thinking on the critics before him and their critical capital, due to which he remained captive to negative attitudes like symbol for symbol, complete avoidance of abstraction for abstraction, breaking of tradition. He did not try to adapt his literature to the contemporary requirements due to which he seems to be living in a circle. Along with the times, societies also change and social roles too, then how can the old characters fit into the modern story. Now there is not even a chopal, where the story left by yesterday can be told the next day. Every story in the modern era has culminated in a moment. Zamir Mutkalam appears to be hanging on the cross of the traditional role of autobiography with all its colors and lights. But the reader or critic has to take off the centuries-old lens of tradition to see it.

REFERENCES

- Wahab Ashrafi, *Landscape of Awareness*, Delhi: Educational Publishing House, 1992, p. 188.
- Parveen Azhar, Dr., *Criticism of Short Fiction in Urdu*, Aligarh: Educational Publishing House, 2000, p.8
- All Ahmad Sarwar, *What is Fiction Why and Written*, Contents: Collection of Criticisms, Lahore: Al-Waqar Publications, 1996, p.598
- Ejaz Rahi, *A Dialogue with Dr. Jilani Kamran*, Contents: Arts, Lahore: Issue 37, 1992, p.37
- Shamsur Rahman Farooqui, *The Rate of Interpretation*, Karachi: Akademi Faqir, 204, p.68
- Andalib Shadani, Dr., *Investigations*, Bareilly: Jalil Academy, 1900, p.76
- Anwar Sadid, *Urdu Prose Ke Afaq*, Lahore: Maqbool Academy, 1995, p.208
- Artza Karim, *Criticism of Urdu Fiction*, Karachi: Fazli Book Supermarket, 1997, p.548
- Saleem Akhtar, Dr., *Dastan and Novel*, Lahore: Sang-e-Mail Publications, 1991, p.22
- Waris Alvi, *Critical Tragedy of Fiction*, Karachi: Educational Press, 2000, p.88
- Anees Nagi, *The Story of New Afsane*, Lahore: Hamaliat, 2008, p.30
- Mehdi Jafar, *The Story of New Fiction*, Contents: Dialogue, Path, Contemporary Urdu Fiction, Karachi: Akademi Faqir, p.189
- Syed Mazhar Jameel, *The Poetics of Fiction*, Contents: Dialogue, p. 349
- Hamid Shahid, *Criticism of Fiction and the Problem of Determining Value*, Contents: Dialogue (2), p. 671
- Nasir Abbas Nair, Dr., *Quest for a New Paradigm in Fictional Criticism*, Contents: Dialogue (1), p.596

- Mehmood Wajid, The Problem of Storytelling in Urdu Fiction, Contents: Papers, Lahore: November, December 1982, p. 289
- Mansoor Qaiser, The Cultural Journey of Fiction, Contents: Seep, Karachi: Issue No. 17, p. 272
- Rashid Amjad, New Horizons of Fiction, Contents: Papers, Lahore: Issue No. 2, p.66