The term "formalism" in modern criticism refers to the certain principles of Russian Formalism, Czech theorists and Anglo-American New Criticism. Therefore, the American New Criticism is, in fact, an offshoot of the new organic formalism which is one of the most influential approaches in modern criticism. It is also termed as aesthetic criticism, analytical criticism, formalistic criticism, textual criticism or ontological criticism. Some of the practitioners of the New Criticism are: I.C. Ransom, Allen Tate, Yvor Winters, Cleanth Brooks, Robert Penn Warren, W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., R. P Blackmur, Eliseo Vivas and others who dominated not only the American scene of 30s-50s but also other parts of the world with their creative-evaluative tradition and taught the whole generation how to read.

There are naturally some parallels between Russian Formalists and the New Critics as both advocated 'intrinsic' criticism characterized by an impersonal concern for literary work as an independent object and were opposed to 'extrinsic' critical approaches banking upon authorial intention and historical, moral or political consideration and so on. Their approach was objective as they popularized close reading of the text and both were 'Kantians' engaged in re-evaluating the canons of great works.

There is, however, a marked contrast between the ideas of the Russian Formalism and those of the New Criticism. The New Critics maintained the humanistic, aesthetic tradition of Europe as opposing the scientific progress, while the Russian Formalists were in favour of scientific advancement. The Russian Formalists were busy with theorising, whereas the New critics engaged themselves in Practical judicial criticism of individual texts. While Russian Formalists accepted "deviation" as a standard, the New Critics committed themselves to unified structure and unified sensibility.

In fact, the New Critics are more interested in practical criticism and organic unity of the text than the Russian formalists, however both the schools of criticism aim at to explore what is especially Literary in texts rejecting the limp spirituality of late Romantic poetics in favour of a detailed and empirical approach to reading. The New Critics regarded literature as a form of human understanding, the formalists thought of it as a special use of language.

With publication of J. C. Ransom's book *The New Criticism* in 1941, the term 'New Criticism' came into its current use. Ransom studied the critical method of I. A. Richards, T. S.
Eliot, Yvor Winters and others. The last chapter of the book is significantly entitled as "Wanted: An Ontological Critic." Ransom did not define the world 'New Criticism' but he cautioned the New Critics against two specific errors:

The New Criticism is damaged by at least two specific errors of theory, which are widespread. One is the idea of using the psychologically affective vocabulary in the hope of making literary judgements in terms of feelings, emotions, and attitudes of poem instead of the terms of their objects. The other is plain moralism, which in the New Criticism would indicate that it has not anticipated itself from the Old Critics. I should like to see critics unburdened of these drags (ix).

Defining the term 'New Criticism' Harold Beaver writes that "it denotes such criticism which concentrates on semantics, meter, imagery, metaphor and symbol, placing emphasis always on the isolated text (usually a poem) dissociated from biography and historical tradition and background; and applying extra-linguistic techniques whether from logic, sociology or psychology in literature." (xi).

The New Criticism is, in fact, Post-War I school critical theory that insisted on the intrinsic value of a work of art and focused attention on the individual work alone as an independent unit of meaning. It was opposed to a critical practice of bringing historical or biographical data to bear on the interpretation of a work. It was a reaction against the then prevalent trends of American Criticism, namely impressionistic, humanistic and Marxist. The Dictionary of Literary Biography (67) outlines the nature and scope of the New Criticism in the following terms:

The New Criticism was a reaction against historical philology and aesthetic impressionism of the nineteenth century, its tactics represent the recurring desire of its practitioners to isolate the text and stay close on its language. This focus on the strictly "literary" aspects of a text has come to be known as "close reading." New Criticism views the text as an Organic unity or self contained verbal medium held together by a unifying principle dictated by the text itself. The New Critic ignores the author's intentions, the reader's experience, or historical contingencies. In short, he respects the text as a "verbal icon" and explicates its internal tensions, images, and rhetoric, its irony, metaphors, and paradoxes (295).

It is very difficult to define "The New Criticism" precisely. Nevertheless, it may be
remarked that the New Criticism aims at intrinsic and aesthetic study, analysis and evaluation of an autonomous work of art with application of formal critical tools ignoring all the extra-literary features like biography, sociology, history and so on. In its method of analysis, the critic concentrates on semantics, meter, imagery, metaphor and symbol and deals with the tone, texture, and tension to explicate a fused form and content in a piece of writing rather than dealing with the relation of that piece to an age, a tradition or an author's whole body of writing.

But the question still persists i.e., how 'new' is 'the New Criticism?' The New Criticism is new in the sense that it centres the attention of reader from the poet to the poem excluding all the non-literary or extrinsic considerations and reinforces the equation of life and literature. The New Critics examined the aesthetic relevance of a work of art studying the text itself and not beyond it. It also focused attention on the contemporary consciousness as it is reflected in modern literature.

The New Critics developed a new method and query into "the work-itsel" as an artifact with recognizable structural characteristic (Leary, 45-59) and so is objective in its approach and analysis while the old criticism was subjective. The New Critics have obvious and specific job to query. As Hawkes states:

A poem consists, less of a series of referential and verifiable statements about the 'real' world beyond it, than of the presentation and sophisticated organization of a set of complex experiences in a verbal form. The critics' query is that complexity (152).

So the New Criticism is a term that stresses the work itself and its complexity. But this phrase has been a subject of controversy since its inception. Brooks comments on the inappropriateness of the term 'New Criticism' and he feels the lack of a better one. For him 'it's a mythical animal' created by Spingarn and used by J.C. Ransom inadvertently. Brooks asserts that even to use the term formalist does not do much good because People will assume that the critic is interested in empty form. Brook's has tried to use the word 'contextualist' because attention to the work as a total context is important. A significant aspect of any item of the poem, say, is, not merely its reference outward, to elements of the world of reality, but what the item in question contributes to the whole context and how in turn its meaning is modified by the rest of the context. Brooks has sometimes used the term 'formalist-contextualist' but that hasn't proved very satisfactory. If the New Criticism is not new, still it has features which are fresh as it involves us in talking' about the basic structure of poetry which has been anticipated long ago by Aristotle in his
The New Critics also made a fresh approach towards knowledge. For them poetic knowledge is different from scientific knowledge. It is for the first time that these cardinal issues were discussed and debated extensively amongst New Critics. With the publication of Richards's *Science and Poetry* in 1926 a pseudo-statement came to be treated as 'poetically true' within the poetic structure of a poem on the model of general coherence theory. For the Southern Critics, "Poem is not merely emotive language but a particular kind of representational knowledge." (Wellek, 1961: 114)

The New Criticism, therefore, is 'new' in its method, tone and taste and is distinct from the earlier criticism in its analytical and intrinsic characteristics. Cowan observes: "Literary Criticism takes on a role larger than meditation becoming in a manner a co-constructor of the work of art: it makes, explicit the knowledge that poetry is an active mode of understanding to the well being of society" (vii). The New Criticism emerged as a revolt against liberalism and romanticism and its way of rewarding Poetic knowledge has proved viable.

The aesthetics of New Criticism provides an alternative to understand the poem's formal structure, considering it as the organization of man's experience into an autonomous whole. There were a number of influences on the New Critics in rejecting romantic subjectivism for formal objectivity. T.E.Hulme, Ezra Pound, T.S. Eliot, I.A. Richards and William, Empson were the important figures who provided the necessary theoretical foundation to the New Critics.

Although the New Critics developed anti-romantic attitude, the romantic blood was still running in their veins as they considered poetry as knowledge of higher kind and borrowed Coleridge's theory of imagination. Indeed, "the criticism of today, may be said (to be) in direct descent from Coleridge." (Eliot, 1956:113-31) And S.E. Hyman has affirmed that Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* (1817) can be said to be the Bible of Modern Criticism." (13) His theory of imagination had perhaps the widest influence on the men who were to found the New Criticism as well as on the later generations of the New Critics. Coleridge in his *Biographia* Chapter XIII differentiates Primary imagination from Secondary Imagination.
According to him, the Primary Imagination is an act of perception and is the fundamental awareness of ourselves. It is "a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in infinite I am" (Cross, 202). The Secondary Imagination is more conscious and creative and in this way an echo of the Primary Imagination. The imaginative faculty dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to recreate" (202). The difference between the two is not of kind but of degree and Operation. 'Fancy' is another faculty which Coleridge distinguishes from 'Imagination' stating:

Fancy, on the contrary is no other counters to play with, but fixities and definities. The Fancy is indeed no other than a mode of Memory emancipated from the order of time and space: while it is blended; with, and modified by the empirical phenomenon of the will, which we express by word of CHOICE. But equally with the ordinary memory the fancy must receive all its materials ready-made from the law of association (202).

So the American New Critics were greatly indebted to Coleridge for their philosophical and theoretical foundations which are undoubtedly indispensable and unforgettable. Yet Hulme, Pound, Richards, Eliot and others were highly influential in shaping their critical sensibilities and enriching their critical theories. However, it was Richards's close reading on the basis of imagery, metaphor and irony that served as a model for Empson's *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. It is through these influences and techniques of verbal analysis that the New Critics produced several volumes of textbooks and host of other critical works which made them worth reading in modern age. These works of the American New Critics really opened new vistas for literary interpretation and evaluation. There are, of course, some common assumptions underlying in the critical visions of most of the New Critics, which can be summarized as follows:

1. The poem *Qua poem* is an autonomous object in itself. "A 'close reading' through analysis of poems is the hallmark of the New Criticism." (Brooks. 1984: 44) The critic's concern is to adapt the 'formal analysis' and to analyse interpret and evaluate the work of art. The poem is an aesthetic object and it must be considered so. The New Criticism ignores that the work of literature is an expression of historical and sociological trends. It considers the poem as distinct from the poet and his social milieu and therefore, generally does not consider the moral, social and biographical aspects as important, for these aspects divert the attention from the work of art. The New Criticism is a return to text and most of "the New Critics themselves by forties had begun to shift their emphasis from the 'poem' as a thing-in-itself to poetry or art as a formal constituent of the human community." (Foster 1962: 31).
2. The New Critics did not believe in genre distinction. But they were supposed to favour a highly organized and complicated poetry that is intellectual, allusive, crotchety, packed; a poetry whose quality of (being) ingenious of obscure coherence was named by such new critical tags as 'irony', 'ambiguity' and 'metaphysical' (Foster, 1962: 15). They were primarily interested in the rhetorical structure of the text.

3. Poetry is a means of communication through language and therefore, the New Critics believed in Communication of the whole experience with totality of thoughts and emotions with its minute linguistic details and in the organic nature of poetry in which form and content intermingle and parts cannot be separated from the whole. Cleanth Brooks considers a poem not as a mechanical combination but as an organic whole like a plant:

   Certainly it [a poem] is not to be thought of as a group of mechanically combined elements-meter, rhyme, figurative language, idea, and so on-put together to make a wall. The relationship among the elements in a poem is what is all important, it is not a mechanical relationship but one which is far more intimate and fundamental. If we must compare a poem to make-up of some physical object it ought not to be a wall but something organic like a plant (1938: 16).

4. The New Critics revalue the works of poets of past as well as present. Their concern is the work of art as an artifact distinguished by imagery and order and they try to explore what goes on in a work of art, how language functions, how imagery is used, and what totality of meaning is conveyed. For this most of them devise master-metaphors. Each critic views the poem in terms of his own metaphors: Eliot has his objective-correlative, Richards his emotive and referential meaning, Empson his ambiguity, Ransom his structure and texture, Cleanth Brooks his Paradox, Tate his tension and Blackmur his gesture. These terms are novelty in the critical world which resemble those of applied science and technology or other social sciences.

5. The earlier New Criticism was primarily interested in lyric poetry and regarded it most highly forms of poetry in which irony, tension, paradox and ambiguity inter-act with semantics of language. In such a way, they believed as to render poetic meaning unique and unparaphrasable. They claimed, however that poetry could impart knowledge but a form of knowledge radically different from knowledge in the scientific sense. They particularly admired metaphysical poetry because the New
Criticism argued that poetic language is semantically different from non-poetic language since it does not refer beyond itself but only functions contextually within the structure of a poem, it is sometimes called 'contextualism.'

In such a way, the New Criticism believed in "the organic nature and autonomy of art and its unique power to give meaning to our experience," (Krieger, 1956: 5) concentrating on close textual study with the formal tools diverting the critical attention from content to language vindicating literature in the science-dominated world of the twentieth century.

The New Critics, however, had their disagreements. Some times their views are divergent and contradictory, "Burke and Blackmur, for instance, rejected the New Criticism in strong terms and Winters too was never happy associating himself with the New Criticism as they included historical, sociological and ethical matters in their works." (Wellek, 1965: 146) But there were a group of people called 'Southern Critics' who held similar views. The group comprised John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate, Robert Penn Warren and Andrew Little. They were also called 'Fugitives' as they published a magazine entitled, The Fugitives (1922-25 ) in the early 1920s which contained poetry, criticism, fiction, biography, history, reviews and pedagogy, etc. The Fugitives were the natives of the south and helped in each other's development. Later, in 1930, they published a book entitled I'll Take My Stand. Thus they acquired another name 'The Agrarians' and voiced for rural social order against the contemporary industrial commercialism. They projected the images of 'Old South' in their literature and arts. For them literature was both an escape from modern life and an ideal realm of humanity. The group is also associated with the publication of American Review (1933-37). Besides, Ransom accepted editorship of The Kenyon Review, Allen Tate edited the Sewanee Review and Cleanth Brooks and Warren edited Southern Review (1935-42). When Ransom called for a programme that would be aristocratic in manner, ritualistic in religion and traditionalist in art, he was in a manner following "Eliot's description of himself as a classicist in literature, Royalist in politics, and Anglo- catholic in religion" (Sutten 1965: 182).
It is believed that the greatness of literature lies in its criticism and Brooks's significant contribution depends on faithful analysis of literary texts through close reading. He focused on individual texts through close reading. He concentrated on individual texts one after another and tried to provide a concrete criticism of a particular text by way of unifying 'likes with the unlikes.' Thus he succeeded in installing the pillars of practical criticism in the twentieth century based on the New Critical approach which is variously called formalism or the intrinsic approach. He developed a battery of analytical weapons drawing judiciously from T. S. Eliot, I. A. Richards, William Empson, J. C. Ransome, Allen Tate and gave them currency: ambiguity, irony, tension, paradox, complexity etc. All these terms imply a double or dialectical principle by which two elements are juxtaposed or interwoven or embedded within each other. Brooks's favourite poets are John Donne, John Keats, T. S. Eliot and W. B. Yeats. He examined poems in themselves, as far as possible, not looking for extraneous props. His method does not give primacy to considerations of genre or external structure - that a poem is a lyric or an elegy or mock-heroic-but to the emerging dramatic structure in each poem. The paper is an assessment of Brooks's Studies of Yeats's "Sailing to Byzantium." In fact, Brooks tries to relate Yeats to the tradition of modern poetry which is characterised by metaphysical traits and symbolist practices.

W. B. Yeats is another great representative poet of the twentieth century, whose "tone of voice is that of time." (Alvarez, 42) He was a myth-maker and his myths made his poetry coherent and traditional. His multi-faceted interest in history, politics, folk-loric and mythology helped him attain a permanent poetical status for himself. Undoubtedly, he is of the greatest English poets and he learned how to create fragments of actual not only for his own time but also for all time. (Blackmur, 81)

Brooks's natural affinity with the Southern writers is a well-known fact. Yeats, too, like Southern writers had "joined the mainstream of Western literature" and concerned himself "with the plight of modern man." (Simpson, 118-19) According to Brooks, he had "a base in backward looking, traditional society which had hardly yet, as a culture, entered the modern world." (Ibid) We can easily discern the obvious reason behind Brooks's interest in the poetry of Yeats from a conversation that took place between Robert Penn Warren and Cleanth Brooks. During the course of conversation, Brooks stated that Yeats's position was very much like that of the Southern writers as they, provided common terms like "passion as against
Brooks was constantly interested in the poetry of Yeats and does not fail to reckon him in every volume, including *The Well Wrought Urn, The Hidden God and A Shaping Joy*. The term tradition is all important for modern writers like T.S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, W.B. Yeats and even Cleanth Brooks. To Yeats, "the traditionalism is based upon a wide reading in and a rich knowledge of, Plato and Platinus, Berkeley and Vico, and the modern cultural historians." (1963a: 44-45) Actually Brooks tried to relate Yeats to the stream of the modern poetry and its tradition. According to Brooks, it is the Symbolist technique and Metaphysical strains which characterize modern poetry. He minutely traces the sense of 'tradition' in W.B. Yeats as in the case of T.S. Eliot. His views are enshrined in his essays on "Yeats: The Poet as Myth-Maker" and "Symbolist Poetry and the Ivory Tower," which were published in *Modern Poetry and the Tradition*. Apart from these two essays, Brooks studied the poetry of T.S. Eliot; Robert Frost, McLeish, W.H. Auden and others in terms of metaphor, wit, irony and paradox. He searched for a sense of "tradition" in their poetry and related them to the metaphysical and symbolist poetic tradition. (1939, vii-xxvi, 1-243)

Brooks studied Yeats's *A Vision* which appeared in 1925. It contained Yeats's mystical and metaphysical system. Brooks observes that Yeats replaces "the abstract, meaningless, valueless system of science . . . to substitute a concrete, meaningful system, substituting symbol for concept." (1939: 175) A close examination of *A Vision* gives an impression that Yeats is creating a myth, a system which is a factor for 'unification of sensibility' and it is not an escape from reality but an effort to encapsulate coherence, a unification of natural and supernatural powers and a complete knowledge of the world. Brooks says that Yeats like I.A. Richards, kept science and poetry separately as in watertight compartments but "has preferred to reunite these elements in something of the manner in which they are fused in religion. His system has for him, consequently, the authority and meaning of a religion, combining intellect and emotion as they were combined before the great, analytic and abstracting process of modern science broke them apart." (1939: 176)

For Yeats "Arts is special kind of knowledge, a revelation" and his conception of poetry is closely linked to his conception of Reality. (1971c: 105-8) Brooks also affirms that literature gives a special kind of knowledge, a complete knowledge which is distinct from scientific knowledge. Poetry, for him, is a 'simulacrum of
reality.' In fact, Yeats adopted magic as a system to grasp reality. R.P. Blackmur comments on this aspect of Yeats's poetry: "What is important is that the nexus of reality and magic is not by paradox, but is logical and represent for Yeats in his poetry, a full use of intelligence. Magic performs for Yeats the same fructifying function that Christianity does for Eliot, or that ironic fatalism did for Thomas Hardy: it makes a connection between the poem and its subject matter and provides an adequate mechanics of meaning and value." (80)

Yeats has been a representative symbolist poet and a true disciple of the French symbolists in English world. He tried to realize and actualize the experience in more ways than one: "On the one hand, implementing magic with a consistent symbolism and on the other, the greatly multiplied expense of restoring through the craft of poetry." (83) It is the function of the poet's mind and his craft which unifies the symbol of the outer world with the symbol of the inner world. But in Yeats's case, this unification is "the forms of knowledge, being magical, do not fit naturally with the forms of knowledge, it ordinarily occupies us. But it is possible, that I hope to show it, that the difficulty is in a sense, superficial and may be overcome with familiarity, and that the mode of magic itself, once familiar will even seem rational for the purpose of poetry-although it will not thereby seem inevitable." (83)

About the symbols used by Yeats, Brooks opines that they are:

Nothing, nothing but concrete and meaningful images in forms of which the play of the mind may exhibit itself that play being, not rigidly conceptual and bare, but enriched with all sorts of associations. Yeats's later poetry, like the poetry of Donne, reveals the "mind at the fingertips." (1939: 62).

Yeats has called his system magical, which can be divided into three parts: a portrayal of history, an account of human psychology and a presentation of the life of the soul after death. The theory of history uses a symbolism drawn from the twenty--eight phases of moon, which are based on the cycle of human civilization.

Commenting on Yeats's system of psychology, Brooks remarks that four faculties which can be grouped into two sets: will and mask (image ...), and creative mind and body of fate. According to Yeats's system these four faculties are based on the interplay of tensions or the conflict of opposites. Yeats's ideas are interpreted by Brooks in the following manner:
[Yeats's] psychology is founded on the conflict of opposites. The basic form of the whole system is gyre, the one end of which widens concomitantly as other narrows. Will and Mask are fixed in such a relation in one gyre: Creative Mind and Body of Fate, in another. "All things are from antithesis." Yeats observes, "all things dying each others life, living each others' death". Will and Mask desire and the thing desired, among the other elements of Yeats's system bear such a relationship. (1939: 185)

In Yeats's psychological system, we can pass from the conscious stage to the subconscious one. The mind of the man may display the conscious stage while Daimon or the ultimate self of the man the subconscious one. Both of them are related to each other as "the narrow and wide ends a gyre." Brooks, discussing Yeats's psychological system, writes:

But man not only is influenced by his Daimon; he may also be influenced by the dead, and partake in the Anima Mundi, the great collective memory of the world. Here one comes upon the third division of Yeats's system, that which deals with the life after death... and it goes through certain cycles in which it relieves its earthly life, is freed from pleasure and pain, is freed from good and evil, and finally reach a state of beatitude, unless it has finished the cycle of its human rebirths, it then receives the cup of Lethe, and having forgotten all its former life, is reborn in a human body. (1939: 188-89)

The Soul is permanent even after death and it may take various forms and shapes. It may communicate through living thing in dreams. Yeats's automatism through the mediums of his is a kind of communication of a spirit. Yeats has drawn his metaphors, symbols, myth, magic and occultism through the vision of his wife with a view to maintaining 'tradition' against modern problems.

Yeats's idea of an account of the relationship between the artist and soul finds its exposition in the poem "Sailing to Byzantium" (1927). It is an example of Yeats's later writing, which is a product of reality while his earlier writing was romantic, escapist, fleeting and defealist. "Sailing to Byzantium" is the first poem in the volume entitled The Tower. The poem celebrated the intellectual beauty and if we juxtapose another poem written in the same year acid called 'Among School Children," we find that this poem celebrated the natural beauty.
'Byzantium' in this poem stands for a symbolic city of the unity of Being, the kingdom of artistic imagination of 'unaging intellect' beyond 'time' and 'nature,' a Utopia, a retreat from the process of aging and decaying. The poet is an old man and he notices that in his country fish flesh and fowl—all are busy in procreation and are neglecting the monuments of 'unaging intellect.' Commenting on the poem Brooks says:

The poem can be taken on a number of levels: as the transition from sensual art: as the poet's new and brilliant insight into the nature of the Byzantine imagination as the poet's coming to terms with age and death. The foregoing account of the development of the symbols in the poet's personal experience will not in itself explain the fineness of the poem, or even indicate its aesthetic structure: it will not indicate, for example, the quality of self irony in his characterization of himself as a "movement of unageing intellect" or as "a tattered coat upon a stick" or the play of wit achieved in such phrase as "the artifice of eternity"... it [the poem] may indicate the source of the authority which dictates the tone of the poem.

The real importance of the symbolic system is that it allows the poet a tremendous richness and coherency (1939: 192).

Brooks's analysis of "Sailing to Byzantium" exemplifies his perceptive interest in Yeats's poetry, which possesses the qualities of irony, realistic diction and wit, the common characteristics of the symbolist and the Metaphysical poet. The poem has the 'syllogistic' framework typical of the Metaphysical poetry: "The poet reasons as follows: His country is a land off natural beauty, beauty of the body. But his own body is old. The soul must, therefore, sing the louder to compensate for the old and dying flesh." (1939: 62)

The poet goes to Eyzantium where artists do not follow the forms of nature but intellectual forms and ideal pattern. The poet further appeals to "Consume my heart away: sick desire/ And fastened to a dying animal" and to severe him "the dying world of the body and render into the artifice of eternity." (1939: 63). The poem is full of imagery, symbols and complexity. It also has certain other qualities:

Yeats has brought a scarecrow and the "lords and ladies of Byzantium" into close and successful fusion. There is irony and wit-serious wit-in a phrase like "the artifice of eternity." Indeed, the fantasy and extravagance of the poem would cause one to call it in Wordsworth's terms, a poem of the fancy as opposed to the imagination, except that it has a tragic seriousness which has nothing to do with the
playful fancy of Wordsworth (1939: 64).

It is thus quite evident that Cleanth Brooks applies his critical terms such as metaphor, symbol, wit, irony and complexity in analysis of Yeats's poetry. He emerges most often as a true formalist. In Yeats's case, the Symbolist Poetry get, coalesced into the Metaphysical poetry and satisfies Brooks's sense of tradition.'

To Blackmur, "Byzantium is a heaven of man's imagination," (1939: 189) the nature of which Yeats described in *A Vision*.

Donne's poems are dramatic in their essence and they are the poetry of wit in which the unity is complex, founded on the resolution of the incongruous and discordant. Modern poets like Eliot, Yeats, Ransom, of course, readily yield instances of highly dramatic poetry. Another significant relationship between the modernist poets and seventeenth century poets of wit lies in their common conception of the use of metaphor. Thirdly, in case of the poetry of Donne and his followers the difference between imagination and fancy in view of poetry of wit is very narrow and this is true in case of modernist poets as anticipated by critics like T.E. Hulme.

A close examination of Brooks's criticism of W.B. Yeats's "Sailing to Byzantium" gives the impression that he is an astute critic who uses the critical vocabulary of New Criticism such as metaphor, symbol, wit, irony, paradox and so on Brooks's views on the poetry of John Donne, T.S. Eliot and W.B. Yeats have drawn a lot of attention in recent years. The popularity of Donne, Eliot and Yeats was enhanced by the criticism of New Critics like Cleanth Brooks. Brooks's criticism of other writers is equally, objective, exhaustive and perceptive. It is here in his practical criticism Cleanth Brooks has earned the reputation of 'Critic of Critics.'