Social Function of Poetry
From View of New Criticism

Mohammad Khosravishakib
Department of Persian Language and Literature, Human Science Faculty, Lorestan University, I. R. Iran
E-mail: M.khosravishakib@gmail.com

Received: 06-09-2016 Accepted: 11-11-2016 Advance Access Published: January 2017
Published: 01-03-2017 doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.2p.14 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.2p.14

Abstract
The standards, morality and function of poetry lie in its correctness and truthfulness to the state of mind it is trade with, not in its themes. The matter of decency and correctness in poetry and poems is a controversial one. Commonly seen as a fictional category which have a tendency to toward subjectiveness and perception, it is frequently tough to conclude whether the moral sense of poetry is to be found in its content, its method, in the feelings transported, or in the linking of these features. Here this subject is scrutinized as it appears in the supposed of faultfinders linked to the so titled New Criticism school. Prominent during the mid-20th Century, this school was recognized for its emphasizing on the reading of interior and formal possessions of the literary manuscript. On the other hand, the authors related to it had sumptuous philosophies on morality in poetry and poem. Here some of these concepts are conversed.
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1. Introduction
These inquiries will be surveyed in this paper, in kith and kin to one exact art, I mean poetry and poem. Poetry is frequently perceived as a more mental and ambiguous type in literature. Its subjects are often individual or abstract, its compositional developments are puzzling, mostly in contemporary poetry and the concepts it delivers are seen as secretive. Many knowledgeable literature readers mention that they do not know how to assess the value and worth of a verse or even that there is simply no way to estimate it, that poetry is not meant to be assumed or assessed, only imprecisely “sensed.” It is understandable that so ambiguous an art would scarcely endure during the centuries in accurately all human cultures. Poetry has confidently, equally additional arts, played a part in human culture, even if this part is not every time strong. Insisted by these problems, poets and criticizers such as T. S. Eliot, I. A. Richards and Ezra Pound and Nima Yooshig in Persian contemporary poetry fixed to provide more compact and objective examines of the poetic occurrence, procreating a group of criticizers questionably and somehow capriciously named “the new critics.” The works of this group were perhaps the best poetry criticism written in the 20th Century. While these writers became known for their highlighting on the study of poetic works’ interior structure, a great deal of echo on the moral and communal duty and contribution of poets was provided by them. This article aims to provide a short-lived and general view of their reflections on these topics. The topic of decency and morality in art and literature has permanently been very tough in the ground of aesthetics. All the same, it remnants an unclear and ambivalent topic. There is slight hesitation about the decent and moral worth and accountability of the researcher. On the other hand, the artist’s, is murky and debatable. Where does ethics and morality give the impression in art? In its subjects? In its procedure and structure? In the artist's opinion on his or her matters?

2. Discussion
2.1 Communal Concern of Poetry
Requesting of the poet’s concern is forthrightly put in a 1952 paper by Allen Tate (1998) previously in the heading: To whom is the poet responsible? Asks the poet and faultfinder. He put answer to this fundamental question by himself as below conception:

"The total complex of sensibility and thought, of belief and experience, in the society from which the poetry emerges, is the prime limiting factor that the poet must first of all be aware of; otherwise, his language will lack primary reality, the connection of thing and word. (Tate, 1999. p. 27)

The response he stretches, though not so straightforward as the question, is nevertheless self-assured and strong: the poet is in charge with his own morality, for his personal poetry. Tate exposes us that the poet as other writers was held responsible for much of the confusion that quivered the 20th Century in the form of conflicts and hostilities and tyrannical governments. It was said that this road taken by poetry in contemporaneousness, had led to unfriendly spiritual behaviors, to a flouting of awareness leading to those instabilities. Tate, on the other hand, repeating us that “the human condition must be faced and embodied in language before men in any age can envisage the possibility of