

---

## Essay

---

# Use of *Exempli Gratia* In Literary criticism

---

**Tarique Khan**

Assistant Professor

Govt. Degree College ,Gurez.

District Bandipora.

KASHMIR.

Examples have always helped in understanding concepts; but have done better and bad simultaneously. In understanding any new concept, old examples are always a great help. But the newness and novelty of the new concept is lost when understood with the help of the old example that exists previously. For instance

To understand T.S Eliot's "*Tradition and Individual Talent*" M. Arnold's *Touchstone* method is cited frequently...that tradition and individual talent is nothing but "Touchstone method" by M. Arnold.

The new concept is understood very clearly in the light of the old citation, but the old example (Touchstone method) cited here surpasses and shadows the novelty of the new concept.

If Eliot's concept was already there, existed previously in the form of touchstone method, why Eliot formulated this concept? Whether to understand the old (touchstone method) or the old did exist to grasp the new (Eliot's concept)? The question is when the old concept (Touchstone method) was comprehended without any prior example, why not then the new concept can be understood without citing the old example? If the initial concept (touchstone method) was understood having no clues and prior examples, cannot we grasp the new in its newness?

Saying (Tradition and Individual Talent) is the same as (Touchstone method), either means reinforcing the old and weakening the new, or understanding the understood (touchstone method)? That is, understanding the old concept again in the context of the new concept and devaluing the new, or does it mean that, the new concept is serving the old one or the new concept is mere an addition of a bit of

information to the already existing content (Touchstone method). Or formulated on the basis of the already existing concept. Or presented the new concept in a different and new way, when it is the same.

How examples are distorting figures?

Q-Who is more successful, Shakespeare or Agatha Christie?

Obviously, W. Shakespeare –the greatest of all, who wrote 37 plays, 154 sonnets and poems as well.

No, no, no .... it's Agatha Christie!

How?

She wrote 79 crime mysteries and collections, and saw her work translated into more languages than William Shakespeare.

But the question is the same, to do or not to do?

Although examples are suitable and good to follow and cite, if it is the same, but not, if it is, like the same or like that.

E.g. in any state or country, "zebra crossing" is termed as *tiger crossing*. This tiger crossing would be difficult to understand to that person who is not familiar with it, but, when cited the example of *Zebra crossing* it is understood easily and becomes obvious to the unknown person, that it is the same zebra crossing.

Instead, when the matter is of any concept which is new and the old concept is cited as an example, this creates chaos and confusion, as, why this example was cited? To make it (new concept) easy to understand or to turn over the old pages again to understand the new, or learning the old more clearly? Does not it happen that the new concept is losing its essence in the hands of the old?