



MYTHIC FICTION AS A WIDGET FOIL TO TRUTH

NEHA KUMARI

Research Scholar,
Department of English
V. B. U. , Hazaribag,
(JH) INDIA

DR. RAJESH KUMAR

Research Adviser
Associate Professor
Department of English
V. B. U., Hazaribag, (MS) INDIA

ABSTRACT

Whether the inherent nature of truth is “a truth” or merely an abstract is an interesting question to be explored. It is probable that even the universal truth –when it ascends from the level of a subjective “a truth” to an objective “the truth” - changes. It cannot be expected for truth to be absolutely unchangeable and perspective bound. Even the most accepted universal truth owes its canonicity to temporal circumstances. Two famous Indian mythologists, Devdutt Patnaik and Amish Tripathi, have claimed in this regard, in their interview and fiction respectively, that there is no universal truth at all but that there are different truths for different people. Thus, there must be a certain criterion or paradigms that affect the nature of truth. These paradigms are social agenda, political propaganda, ethnic, cultural and traditional beliefs, individualistic interest, et cetera. Though, the nature of these paradigms may differ yet the nucleus through where it germinates is one i.e., human psychology. Notably, the relationship between truth and these paradigms is circular where curvatures so intricately complement each other that no certain preliminary point can be agreed upon. For example, one believes in a certain ethics because he or she believes it to be the truth and this certain ethic is the truth for him because he believes in it. Truth and paradigm are reciprocal. As paradigms that influence the dynamics of the truth are circumstantial, truth too is varied. One vital nutrition upon which the truth feeds is fact. The nature of fact influences truth. The storehouse of concrete fact is historical records and that of abstract fact is literature. Both are biased as the former is victor based record and the latter is an author’s perspective. The nature of mythology is ‘beyond truth’, i.e. exempt from concrete proof. The paradigms that affect the truth also influence mythology. Thus, both truth and myth are swayed by

NEHA KUMARI

DR. RAJESH KUMAR

1 Page



paradigms which in return complement one another. This paper presents the mercurial nature of mythology as a widget foil influencing truth and truth influencing paradigms.

Keywords: Truth, mythology, Paradigms, subjectivity vs. Objectivity,

INTRODUCTION

To ascertain the nature of post-truth, it becomes obligatory to determine what the absolute truth is or whether there is an absolute truth. Comprehension of the subversion of the truth and the correlation between truth and post truth relies upon the understanding of the nature of the truth.

Truth is not linear but multidimensional. One of the quintessential examples to illustrate the precarious nature of truth is the proceedings of a legal case in the courtroom. The judge allows both plaintiff and defendant or respondent to present their cases, to present their side of truth and yet the third dimension remains left to be investigated into by the police. Nevertheless, the probed truth in the verdict of the judge out of the three dimensional truth - plaintiff, defendant and investigating officer- cannot be credited as an absolute. It is because the judgement has to be in accordance to the constitution. As the constitutional laws are prone to amendments, the constitution and the ideal truth it upholds are transitory. Besides every country has their own set of belief that they enforce to develop their constitution.

Truth is not static but an ever evolving process. Even the most acclaimed universal truth precepts are situation bound or circumstantial and have exceptions. For example,

Precept 1: one ought to speak the truth.

Situation: A member of a secretive defence system is captured by enemy and the secretive information is demanded.

Precept Subversion: Either hide the truth or tell a lie to save the impending calamity.

Precept 2: Murder is sin or crime.

Situation: soldier of country X kills the soldier of an enemy country Y in an armed conflict.

Precept Subversion: murder is an act of chivalry when done by soldier war. Etc.

The concept of truth at a certain period of time for the certain place evolves to another truth befitting another period of time and space. This can better be comprehended in the terms of scientific inventions. Historical records claim that until the first half of the 17th century, it was the general belief that the human voice can only be transmitted naturally and not through

NEHA KUMARI

DR. RAJESH KUMAR

2 Page



machines. In the latter part of 17th century, when string telephone or acoustic telephone was invented by Robert Hooke, the truth evolved that human voice can be transmitted mechanically but to a short distance. Since then, the invention has been developing leading to Bell's electromagnetic telephone that transmitted voices to longer distances but through wires to present day compact wireless mobile phones, contracting to the size of digital watch¹. Each stage of development evolved from the previous one and so the concept of truth correlated to it. Even the term *invention* itself does not have autonomy as it is the result of an idea that had already been present in the universe and the idea itself evolved from the previously perceived idea. Here, the point to note is that being in 20th century, one can't claim the truth related to telephones in 17th century as false, backward, outdated or wrong. Any idea evolved in any respective age is as innovative and unique for the period of time as contemporary innovation for us. The same concept of truth also applies in humanities, social sciences and other branches driving human lives. Thus, truth can never be same for all ages but is prone to transform to align with the swing of time. More than ever nature of truth is examined in contemporary narratives where authors try to make it's subjective nature acceptable.

“There is your truth and there is my truth. As for the universal truth, it does not exist.”² Quotes Amish Tripathi in his work *The Oath of Vayuputra* (2013), third book of *Shiva Trilogy* Series.

“Those who truly understand their faith, understand the stories are metaphorical³.” Quotes Dan Brown in his fiction *The Vinci Code* published in 2003.

“There is my truth. There is your truth. And there is their truth. The absolute truth is with God⁴.” Quote by Psyche Roxas-Mendoza.

Truth in its evolving process leaves behind some misunderstandings and misinterpretations which breeds something which is referred to as falsehood or evil. If the idea is found productive, the notion of truth automatically associates itself with it and if it is found to be detrimental, it inherits the notion of falsehood or evil. The same deduction passes to the next generation. Though, there are certain hurdle that makes this process extremely complex. First, an idea good for an age may or may not conform to the progress of the next age and trying to hold any society always with same idea is an indirect attempt to hold the time which is absurd. Second, idea may or may not remain static by is the time its true nature is institutionalised. Third, the idea may add on and update itself to be profitable or may make itself more disadvantageous. Fourth, as every idea, irrespective of its being good or bad, is always profitable to certain group of people. Problem emerges if this class would easily let go of the idea and their personal advantages attached to it and if they wouldn't do their best to legitimize the idea, especially if the class holds power. Fifth, if there is any concrete methodology to alter the idea already housed in psyche of the society. Sixth, if the

NEHA KUMARI

DR. RAJESH KUMAR

3 Page



transformed idea will remain unadulterated by the time it is established. The period of time between the emergence of an idea and the establishment of its true nature is when the truth evolves and whatever comes in contrast with it becomes a falsehood. Literature is the major tool to fructify its function.

The reservoir of the example of this progress is literature-religious, or scientific, factual or fictional- and what precepts it exemplifies is used as a touchstone. Many a time it poses as an upholder of truth in society. Whenever human want to justify any of his action, he resorts to literature. For example, perfect ecosystem demands that there must not be unnecessary killing be it of plants, birds or animals but human forgets the moral obligation and considers these all their property and this authority comes from literature as Genesis 1:26 says,

“Then God said, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth⁵.””

This literature bred authority when conceived in fragment without any notion of responsibility is enough for a man to be dictator of the earth. Referring to sixth commandment "thou shalt not kill." Leo Tolstoy explains that it not only include the murder of humans only but also to the murder of any living being. He asserts that this Commandment was inscribed in the heart of man long before it was proclaimed from Sinai⁶. He also quoted, “As long as there are slaughterhouses, there will be battlefields.⁷” Those with the personal inclination towards vegetarianism would side by this mythic precept and its interpretation and create retellings based on it while other would find their resort in non vegetarianism would justify their act with mythic precept of Genesis 1.26 above mentioned. It is not only religious myth but social myth that creates authority. For example: to counter, Tolstoy’s stance, one may their greatest claim in Hitler who had been a vegetarian and yet responsible of the murder of millions of Jews. Hitler had become vegetarian after the death of his niece, Geli. A psychological profile of Hitler prepared by the United States Office of Strategic Services, during the war describe him “In Clinical practice, one almost invariably finds compulsive vegetarianism setting in after the death of his beloved object⁸.”

One important question to inquire into why there is crying need of the truth. It is probably to bring stability, human needs conformity in lives and it needs discipline and in order to enforce it, authority of the truth is mandatory. This is one of the primary reasons why there has always remained the greatest quest to discover truth. Yet it is queer that though people welcome and embrace the change in scientific truth enthusiastically, there is reluctance to accept the change in social truth.



In the evolving process of scientific development, the prime concern is its feasibility or utility at present, its effect on present ecosystem, universe and lives related to it. Same as it must be, if not is, the concern of social scientists and especially, literature genitors to minutely look after the impact of their work on the society. It is because the examples presented through literature exemplifying the precept of social scientist houses more in human imagination than the mere precept. Rationalization rather than intuition bred work is more likely to achieve this end.

Though literature mirrors society yet it does not mirrors the society as a whole but the fragment of it. These fragments are often collected into a whole to understand and derive a conclusion. Though this process is unanimously tooled yet it has a major setback especially when the whole body of literature of an age, is not available or, is not thoroughly examined to come to a conclusion. For example, if a westerner, say, a Ukrainian lady who knows nothing of India, reads all the novels written by Anita Desai. The image that she must get of Indian lady would be of a helpless puppet, ignored, oppressed, sexually objectified and a constant sufferer. The fact is that these are the marginalised cases but when encoded in literature without the parallel contrasting images, it begins to stand for the image of masses. This is the faculty of space that blurs the truth. Literature as the upholder of the truth has few major flaws. First, it usually represents marginalised either the superior or the downtrodden but it is between them the real society lies. Second, it is perspective bound. Third, the victor's influences as before industrial revolution, author depended on patrons, their influence is most obvious. Fourth, it has nature to presenting only a fragment. Mythic literature along with inheriting all these flaws assimilates one major flaw. It provides an easy lending to interpolations which make it a widget foil to truth.

Literature as asserted by Sir Philip Sydney in his *Apology for Poetry*, doesn't claim to present any truth and so it can't be held responsible to be "mother of lies"⁹. It was a charge levied upon poetry by his contemporary Stephen Gossoon through his work *The School for Abuse*. Sir Philip Sydney assertion had been a response to his criticism. The nature of one branch of literature, namely mythology is of beyond truth. The larger part of religious texts also includes mythology. Here, the mythology has been taken as a term to represent whole of mythological literature. The nature of myth is enigmatic as it houses in the most sensitive compartment of the sensibility of the majority of human beings. The inherent nature of the mythology is neither of fact nor of falsehood but of a helpless parasite that depends on the perceiver judgment. Perceiver's race, ethnicity, religion, nation and individual perspective influences this judgement. For example, a Hindu may believe on Hinduistic myth but he may or may not find Islamic or Arabic mythology as true and vice versa. Or, a Christian may believe in biblical mythology but he may or may not find Judaist mythology as truth and vice versa. Moreover, its interpretation depends on individuals' perspective. For example, one of the most debated lines that appears in Sundar Kāṇḍ of *Ramcharitmanas* is:

NEHA KUMARI

DR. RAJESH KUMAR

5 Page



“ढोल गवॉर शूद्र पशु नारी।
सकल ताड़ना के अधिकारी॥¹⁰”

It has two translation varying on the meaning of the central word “ताड़ना” which means “beating” in Hindi language and “observing or understanding” in Avadhi language in which the *Ramcharitmanas* has been written.

The first translates as using Hindi term would be thus: “A Drum (ढोल), an Illiterate (गवॉर), an outcast or pariah (शूद्र) , animals (पशु) and Women (नारी) all require a beating to get the best out of them.

The second translation as using the Avadhi term and alternating expiation is as thus: “A drum (because of its helplessness of being hollow, may have been here used as a metaphor or those empty inside), an illiterate (because his lacking insight), the term शूद्र doesn’t stand here for outcaste but working class (means of education being limited in the 16th century, working class were usually uneducated thus lacked knowledge), animals (as being unable to speak for themselves), and women (for being a silent companion) needs to be understood.

First translation or interpretation makes, Tulsidas a misogynist and second may be said to uphold him as even feminist, the one voicing to understand female’s sensitivity. It would not be surprising if a modern pseudo feminist whose sole purpose is to somehow present female as a unfailing victim and male as a mere dictator, may come to such a theory as why Tulsidas demanded men to understand women and not vice versa. Besides, each interpretation turns itself into an authority, a dictum to be followed and an image of an age. Different people perceive and interpret the same things in different way. It is said that the world is the reflection of our inner self. It may be the reason for the differences in perception.

There are many paradigms that influences perception and interpretation like; social agenda, political propaganda, ethnic, cultural and traditional beliefs, individualistic interest. This is illustrated through following example: the Yuddah khand of *Ramayana* written by Maharishi (great Sage) Valmiki, recounts the event when Lord Ram battles Ravana of Sri Lanka to rescue Lady Sita who had kidnapped her but after killing Ravana, he disowns her, demanding to prove her chastity. This incident has long remained a touchstone for male behaviourism that he can question women. Along with it, the same episode is used to ridicule Lord Rama as misogynist, selfish, arrogant and so on. As this episode and certain Sarga or couple repeated or rather exploited so many times that people don’t bother about the rest. For example: Sarga 114, shloka (couplet) 28 of **Ramayana**:



व्यसनेषु न कृच्छ्रेषु न युद्धे न स्वयं वरे |

न क्रतौ नो विवाहे च दर्शनं दुष्यते स्त्रियः ||¹¹ ६-११४-२८

It translates thus: "A woman becoming visible to public in times of a calamity is not condemned in difficult situations, nor in battles, nor in self-choosing of a husband by a princess at a public assembly of suitors, nor in sacrificial ceremonies nor in marriage-functions."

When Sita is brought with due respect to Rama by Vibhishana, all gathered assembly begin to disperse at Vibhishana's hest. They believed Rama would have secret audience with Sita. Rama reproaches Vibhishana for driving the warriors like cattle. Fearing for the impending scandal that may create on Sita's character if the matter is not cleared in public, he proclaims that a woman who faces public in calamity is never again condemned. The very previous shloka has an interesting message:

न गृहाणि न वस्त्राणि न प्राकारास्तिरस्क्रियाः |

नेदृशा राजसत्कारा वृत्तमावरणं स्त्रियः ||¹² ६-११४-२७

It translates thus: "An apartment is not a thing that protects a woman, nor robes, nor compound-walls, nor concealments nor such royal honours. Her character is her shield."

It is interesting that interpreters so concerned with shlokas of disownments, ignores a shloka where women's character is placed beyond confinements. Sita while wondering in forest neither had a apartment, robes, compound walls, concealments or royal honour yet her being was perfect and unquestioned. Even in present modernistic time, these criteria are believed to be obligatory shield to a lady's honour.

The conversation between Rama and Sita is also interesting to study. Rama accuses her with all the blames that others could levy upon her and when accused, Sita berates Rama to behaving like a common man. At last, Sita proposes a fire ordeal by invoking lord of Fire, Agnidev, return unharmed and all the immortals of three world come to witness this and remind Rama that he is the supreme god incarnate to kill the demonic king Ravana and liberate human beings from his tyranny and Sita too is a goddess incarnate and Rama's behaviour towards Sita is unjust. Here, the fiction ascends into mythology when the supernatural beings make an association in human affair and mortal and immortal realms are made to combine by the author. The fantastic incidents are inexplicable and so the approach towards it. Human being for long has always tried to justify the ways of god towards men and ended up in accepting the way of god towards men without any uproar. So belief remained somewhere between justification and acceptance. Here, god is the unseen force driving life.

Fantasy incidents of mythology must be treated as such. When Rama questioned by Gods for his treatment to Sita in sarga 118, Shloka 15, he replies:

अनन्यहृदयां भक्तां मत्तत्परिवर्तिनीम् |

अहमप्यवगच्छामि मैथिलीं जनकात्मजाम् ||¹³ ६-११८-१५

It translates thus: I also know that Seetha, the daughter of Janaka, who ever revolves in my mind, is undivided in her affection to me." So if he knows, why such uproar and accusation. The next shloka answers this:

प्रत्ययार्थं तु लोकानां त्रयाणाम् सत्यसंश्रयः |

उपेक्षे चापि वैदेहीं प्रविशन्तीं हुताशनम् ||¹⁴ ६-११८-१७

I translate thus: "In order to convince the three worlds, I, whose refuge is truth, ignored Seetha while she was entering the fire."

Rama's stance is this that nobody hereafter should accuse or question Sita and so he wants to end up the matter for once and all through extreme measures. This stance is reconfirmed when Ram along with Sita and Laxman accompany Gods to heaven to meet his earthly father Dashrath. He advises Sita :

“कर्तव्यो न तु वैदेहि मन्युस्त्यागमिमं प्रति |

रामेण त्वद्विशुद्ध्यर्थं कृतमेतद्विद्विषाणा ||¹⁵ ६-११९-३५”

It translates thus: "No wrath indeed should be rendered by you towards Rama, for having repudiated you. This has been done by him, wishing for your welfare and in order to demonstrate your purity." (Yuddah khand, sarga 119)

Rama returns his home town Ayodhya along with Sita and Laxman and a family reunion takes place. Rama is crowned as King and as Sarga 128, Shloka 96, says ruled for ten thousand years, a rather hyperbolic term.

Later on different authors of different age came with various retellings. One important notice is Ramcharitmanas by Tulsidas who did a most imaginative interpretation, though rather derogatory. He is the poet of 16th century when India was under foreign rule of Arabs. By this time due to several socio-political reasons women's status had lowered in the society. This lowering was given a concrete authority by Tulsidas' interpolation. His Ramcharitmanas is the retelling of the Ramayana. His text furthers Ram's story in which he makes Ram to renounce Sita even when she was pregnant. Ram had to do so because a



washer man of his kingdom questioned Sita's chastity. Worst of it is that this action is justified. One can notice the nature of the accusation in both the texts. One is to save a lady's reputation from other's accusation and second is to confirm that accusation whether justified or not, if imposed on a lady, must be seriously looked after. This is the way how paradigms influence myth and then paradigm induced myth influence paradigm with no apparent knowledge which precedes which to give it a concrete form.

In India, 21st century is the era of mythic revival. The modernist phrase of Ezra Pound "Make it New" has perfectly fitted in mythic literature. Few bestselling examples are; *The Pregnant King*(2008), *Jaya: An Illustrated Retelling of the Mahabharata* (2010), *Sita: An Illustrated Retelling of the Ramayana* (2013) by Devdutt Pattanaik, *The Palace of Illusions* (2008) by Chitra Banerjee Divakaruni, *Yajnaseni: The Story of Draupadi* by Pratibha Ray, *The Karna's Wife: The Outcast's Queen* (2013), *Sita's Sister* (2014), *Menaka's Choice* (2015), *Lanka's Princess* (2016) by Kavita Kane, *The Winds of Hastinapur*(2013)by Sharath Komarraju, *Arjuna: Saga of a Pandava Warrior-Prince* (2012)by Anuja Chandramouli, *Adi Parva – Churning of the Ocean*(2012) by Amruta Patil, *Asura : The Tale of Vanquished*, *Ajaya : The Roll of Dice* and its sequel *Ajaya: The Rise of Kali* by Anand Neelkhanthan, *Scion Of Ikshvaku*(2015), *Chanakya's Chant* (2010), *The Krishna Key* (2012) by Ashwin Sanghi, *The Mahabharata's Secret* (2013), *The Mahabharata Quest: The Alexander Secret* (2014) and *The Secret of the Druids* (2017) by Christopher C. Doyle, *The Emperor's Riddles* (2014) by Satyarth Nayak.

All these narratives are mythic retellings, a mythic tales including subjectivity and contemporaneity. As myth when created focuses on the exploits of its protagonist, there remain certain unexplored marginalised characters. In making it new process, these characters are taken, turned into protagonists and their exploits are presented. The plot is analysed through a completely new standpoint. Epic narrative of third person is often changed to first person narrative. For Example, In Kavita Kane's novel *Sita's Sister*, Kaikayi sends *Ram* into Exile not because she has been instigated by Manthara as is the reason in the mythology but as the act of sacrifice. She takes blame on herself by becoming the cause of Ram's Exile, because Ram's exile is pre-destined. Even Ram Knows it and is thankful to her for her aid and sacrifice. In another example, in Amish's fiction *Scion of Ikshvaku*, Kaikayi demand Ram's exile but the real reason is that Rama used Daivi Astra (Divine Weapon) called Asuraastra, a gas missile the unauthorised use of which was banned by Lord *Rudra*, the previous *Mahadev* and those who break the law would be punished with banishment for fourteen years.

Aanand Neelkhanthan's fictional works. His fiction *Asur: The Tale of Vanquished* is the retelling of the epic the *Ramayana* but from Ravana's perspective. Through the novel, he has valorised *Ravana*, justified his deeds and has presented Lord Ram in a dark light as a helpless

NEHA KUMARI

DR. RAJESH KUMAR

9 Page



hypocrite. His mythological fiction *Ajaya: The Roll of Dice* and its sequel *Ajaya: The Rise of Kali* is a retelling of Mahabharata but from Duryodhan's point of view. In both these versions of the Ramayana and the Mahabharata, all traditional heroic characters are presented as either helpless or hypocrite. For example, in this version, Karna and Pandavas are helpless puppets, impotent in the hands of fate and Brahmanism and Lord Krishna is a hypocrite. The society is a darksome world where evil rules and conquers and the virtuous whimper helplessly. Surprisingly, all these three books are on bestseller list. Along with the author's artistic capacity, the reason is also the human tendency to tattle, the propensity to find fault with the winner and stand with the defeated as most of the persons identify themselves with the vanquished rather than the victor.

These tales imitate and steal only those parts from the mythology that supports their opinion and leave the rest. For example Neelkanthan's retellings of Mahabharata centers around a myth that the name antagonist of the mahabharta Duryodhan was Suyodhan. Usually prefix, su stands for good and Dur for bad. He asserts that when Pandav won they changed the name of their opponent from 'Su' to 'Dur'. Though the reality is that in Sanskrit it literally means the one with whom the fight is extremely hard as the prefix "Dur" stands for= Extremely hard and Yodhana means Yudh/Fight. For a reader of these fictions, the ideal presented in these become a traditional ideal and it blurs the already blurred truth.

To its core, Mythology may or may not be grounded on factuality still its actuality rarely hinders its veracity. There are few factors to sway it. Though its authenticity is uncertain yet it is definite that it inculcates the essence or idea of the age it is created. Famous Finnish folklorist *Lauri Honko* widely stated article entitled *The Problem of Defining Myth* published in *Sacred Narrative: Readings in the Theory of Myth* edited by Alan Dundes refers to myth as an instrument that, "expresses and confirms society's religious values and norms... provides(ing) a pattern of behavior to be imitated, testifies (ying) to the efficacy of ritual with its practical ends and establishes the sanctity of cult¹⁶" Through oral and written transmissions, it keeps on exaggerating or billeting its previous form. Where other branches of literature limits itself in the presentation of particular age or a period of time, myth presents both past, the past of past, the great grand past and present at same time. It blurs the distinctive boundary of the ages so much that past of past gets remoter by and by and gets so much entangled that nobody can ascertain which is which and if that which is a fact or fiction. It is something that appeals to the people's imagination. Moreover, myth abounds in symbol, metaphors and allusions both literal and oral, the misinterpretation or misunderstanding of which when seeps into a retelling, any truth, if be, is foiled. Thus the process of the deduction of interpretation from misinterpretation and then finding logic in it becomes a common phenomenon. This illogical logic reign human psychology until a new shift in the process takes place.



One of the reasons why myth reins the mind is its repetitiveness. The scale of the acceptance of myth depends on the number of times it is repeated. As Hitler said, “people will believe a big lie sooner than a little one; and if you repeat it frequently enough people will sooner or later believe it.¹⁷” Usually, Mythology is repeated zillion times in one’s life and it fit into human psychology so deeply that it become an essential part of our belief system, its ideal reign our value system, its archetypes turns ideal and thus, mythology remain alive in our belief. The faculty of repetition may have been a tool through which Hitler imposed a legalise image of Jewish holocaust in Christian German populace.

Myth sustains on its faculty of subversion. Sometimes attempts are made to turn myth into fact most especially in religious perspective. *Lauri Honko* defines myth as; “a story of the gods, a religious account of the beginning of the world, the creation, fundamental events, the exemplary deeds of the gods as a result of which the world, nature and culture were created together with all parts thereof and given their order, which still obtains.¹⁸” Since science is still unable to provide the complete logical or concrete theory of the account of the beginning of the world, the creation, fundamental events, mythology does this task with the help of the tool of the God. In myth, good is a tool to justify the ultra realistic assumptions. When such a myth tries to be the upholder of truth and doesn’t allow transformation and association with the respective age, it stops pleading human imagination and become obsolete.

Many a time, a suggestion surfaces to deal with the mercurial nature of myth. It is to reject it all together so that what remains is fact. This suggestion has a major setback already explored by Charles Dickens in his fiction *Hard Times*. In fiction, he presents how installing only fact and extracting all imagination from a human, make one bereft of the understanding of emotion, a faculty on which humanity survives. The power of imagination has also been greatly emphasised and explored by Shelley in his *A Defence of Poetry* where Shelley refers fact or reason as a logical though but the perception of which requires imagination. As mythology appeals to human psychology more than any other branch of literature for its having a nature of “beyond truth”, its exclusion may not be fruitful.

There seems to be two probable state through which the perception thrives. First, atheistic point of view. It asserts that there is no omnipotent unifying nuclei or in general the God that coalesce the world together. It rejects the idea of ‘action and reaction’ and ‘poetic justice’ and claims that all occurrences in the world is random without cause and effect. It doesn’t mean that atheistic worldview is unethical and immoral. It just rejects the idea of whole world as a unifying whole ruled by the omnipresent ruler.

Second is the theistic point of view that accepts the universal authority of the almighty. As William Shakespeare says in his drama *As You Like It* through the monologue of the melancholic character Jaques in Act II Scene VII Line 138.

NEHA KUMARI**DR. RAJESH KUMAR**

11 Page



*“All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players”*

If Shakespeare's statement is taken into consideration and the whole world is referred to as a cosmic play by the almighty, it is absurd for anyone to pass judgement or even attempt the meaning of the happenings around being in just a pigmy part of the universe and existing in the mega microscopic time and universe as contrasted to the earth's history of million years. The only fruitful thing is to utilize the idea to evolve it as myth does.

REFERENCES:

1. *History of the telephone* . Wikipedia.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_telephone
2. Tripathi, Amish. *The Oath of the Vayuputras*. Westland, New Delhi. 2013. Print.
3. Brown, Dan. *The Da Vinci Code*. Doubleday (US) Transworld & Bantam Books (UK). 2003. Print.
4. Quote by Psyche Roxas-Mendoza. <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/7325804-there-is-my-truth-there-is-your-truth-and-there>
5. Genesis 1:26 - Biblia.com. <https://biblia.com/bible/Gen1.26>
6. <https://thevegandatabase.com/30-quotes-leo-tolstoy-animal-rights>
7. Peace to All Beings: Peace Quotes. http://www.peacetoallbeings.com/p/blog-page_27.html
8. "OSS Psychological Profile of Hitler,
<https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP78-02646R000600240001-5>.
(PDF). Retrieved 17 December 2018.
9. Sydney, Sir Philip. *Apology for poetry*. Pg. 132-133. <http://www.kleal.com/Sidney%20-%20An%20Apology%20For%20Poetry.pdf>
10. Tulsidas. *Ramcharitmanas*. Chapter Sunder Kand.
<https://www.scribd.com/doc/310050886/Sunderkand-in-Hindi-Pdf-Gitapress-Gorakhpur>



11. Vyas, Ved. *Ramayana*. Yuddah Khand 114. Shloka 28.
https://www.valmikiramayana.net/utf8/yuddha/sarga114/yuddha_114_frame.htm.
12. -----*Ramcharitmanas*. Yuddah khand , shloka 27.
https://www.valmikiramayana.net/utf8/yuddha/sarga114/yuddha_114_frame.htm.
13. -----*Ramcharitmanas*. Yuddah khand , sarga 118, Shloka 15.
https://www.valmikiramayana.net/utf8/yuddha/sarga118/yuddha_118_frame.htm.
14. -----*Ramcharitmanas*. Yuddah khand , sarga 118, Shloka 17.
https://www.valmikiramayana.net/utf8/yuddha/sarga118/yuddha_118_frame.htm)
15. -----*Ramcharitmanas*. Yuddah khand, sarga 119, Shloka 35.
https://www.valmikiramayana.net/utf8/yuddha/sarga119/yuddha_119_frame.htm)
16. Honko, Lauri (1984). "The Problem of Defining Myth". In Dundes, Alan. *Sacred Narrative: Readings in the Theory of Myth*. University of California Press. p. 49.
https://books.google.co.in/books?id=l5Om2ALAFbEC&lpg=PP1&pg=PA49&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
17. "OSS Psychological Profile of Hitler, page 46" (PDF). *cia.gov*. Retrieved 17 June 2018.
<https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP78-02646R000600240001-5.pdf>
18. Honko, Lauri (1984). "The Problem of Defining Myth". In Dundes, Alan. *Sacred Narrative: Readings in the Theory of Myth*. University of California Press. p. 49.
https://books.google.co.in/books?id=l5Om2ALAFbEC&lpg=PP1&pg=PA49&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false