Chapter - II
METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Comparative study of literature has recently become a favourite area of research in the Indian Universities. This branch of literary research has found special favour with the scholars. Such studies really enable the people to understand the literature of languages other than their own. Different personalities, different eras and different movements can be taken up as the topics of the comparative study.

It has long been recognized that the term ‘comparative literature’, current in England since its casual use by Matthew Arnold in the 1840, is not altogether happy. Apparently analogous terms from the natural sciences are not open to the same objections: ‘comparative anatomy’ makes sense, for anatomy is a mode as well as an object of study, while ‘literature’ is nowadays an object only. One must stress this ‘nowadays’ for as Rene Wellek, who has gone into the history of this and related terms most thoroughly, recently demonstrated, the word ‘literature’ has in fact, narrowed its meaning. An Italian of considerable literature signified to Boswell, a man of learning and literary culture; this meaning survived into the nineteenth century, but is now obsolete. ‘Literature’ now means ‘literary productions as a whole’, ‘the writings of a country or period, or of the world in general’. The term ‘comparative literature’ therefore lays itself open to such charges as have been brought against it by Lane Cooper in the 1920, a ‘bogus term’ he called it, one that makes ‘neither sense nor syntax’.

‘Comparative Literature’ implies a study of literature which uses comparison as its main instrument. But, as Benedetti Croce never tired of pointing out in his vigorous attack on the nation that literature comparative could form a separate discipline, this is true of any study of literature: we can not fully appreciate the individuality of Wordsworth, his place in a tradition and modification of that tradition, without comparing his work, explicitly or implicitly, with that of Milton and James Thomson, that of Shelly and Keats. Comparative literature, then, makes its comparisons across national frontiers.

A distinction is often made between what is called Comparative and what is called General Literature. R. A. Sayce has furnished a succinct statement of the differences between the two: ‘General Literature’ he defines as ‘the study of literature without regard to linguistic
Comparative Literature is the study of national literatures in relation to each other. This is a useful distinction so long as we recognize that the concept of national literature is not without its problems, and that the two kinds of study must, inevitably, shade into one another. The lexical field of comparative literature includes besides the term General Literature, that of World Literature. This term, hollowed by its use in the later work of Goethe, has acquired many disparate meanings.

Welt literature, in Goethe’s sense, is clearly related to comparative literature and may lead comparatists to ask many of their most interesting questions. A search for the answer to many such questions must lead into social and political as well as cultural territory. No one reader, obviously, can keep in his mind a personal canon that includes the whole of world literature. Each must make his own selection, find his own path, and discover what authors, what works, have the deepest affinity with his own nature. It is also important to not invariably point out that the term ‘literature’, in our context, need refer to the best and highest that has been written—works that have entered, or are ever likely to enter, the canon of a nation’s than the early nineteenth century, where the French term came into use in emulation of Cuvier’s Anatomie Comparee; or into a history of literary classics. Like other scholars, comparatists will often be well advised to look beyond the classics, to examine more humble writings of entertainment and instruction.

Accounts of the history of comparative literature studies often resolve themselves into a history of the terms ‘Literature Compare’ and ‘Comparative Literature’—which goes back no further the subject as an academic discipline, which begins sporadically with a series of courses by Noel and Laplace at the Sorbonne and gathers momentum about the middle of the nineteenth century. But, in fact, literatures from various cultures and in various languages had been compared ever since the time when the Romans measured their own poetry and oratory against that of the Greeks; and reference to works in several languages came naturally to the leaders of taste who proposed a catholic view of Western literature in the Renaissance.

When Latin lost its position as a ‘universal’ language, and growing nationalisms divided Europe more and more, comparative literary studies assumed new functions; or that of enriching narrow native traditions by beneficial contacts with others. Increasingly, too, comparatists looked beyond the Western world; to the Indian classics at first, with the German Romantics; to Arab, Persian and even Chinese literature, with Goethe; and in our own time to other far Eastern as
well as to African literary and oral traditions. As new and subtler methods of analysis and classifications benefited literary studies of all kinds, comparisons across linguistic frontiers were used to shape a sense of native traditions to alter a general theory of literature. The work of August Wilhelm Schlegel illustrates the first of these, that of Matthew Arnold the second, and that of Friedrich Schlegel the third, and increasingly, as Sainte-Beuve observed on the Revue des deux mondes, comparative literary studies were pursued in a spirit of purely intellectual curiosity, which set them apart from the overtly interested polemics of Lessing or Voltaire.

The Nature of Comparative Literature:

The present century is pre-eminently suitable for studies in comparative literature. The purpose of such study is to discover the common areas among the various literatures. This is a kind of co-ordination which seeks resemblance in some respects. In fact all great writings look to their own times and also look forward and backward. The process of comparison is a natural function of the reason. Even in our everyday life, comparison is implicit in our response and behavior. It thus seems to be a normal and inevitable mental process. Hence the study and appreciation of literature in a sense is always comparative.

It is the study of literature using comparison as the main instrument. Here literature is studied not in isolation but in comparison. It would be comparison of two or more similar or even dissimilar forms or trends within the literature or in the same language. It would also cut across the national boundaries and compare themes, literary forms of authors from the various languages of the world to discover the underlying elements of unity in diversity for getting universal knowledge of literature. All these are comparative studies in the realm of literature.

But the term ‘comparative literature’ can be strictly used only when taken into consideration items from two or more literatures representing separate languages and different national traditions. Some critics distinguish comparative literature from general literature. It is not confined to any particular method. It is related to history as well as criticism. In such study not only comparison but other methods such as description, characterization, interpretation, narration, evaluation are employed. It is independent of linguistic or political boundaries. Of course the basis of comparative study was nationalism. “Schlegel” became a pioneer in the study of Sanskrit Literature. In comparative study one can draw parallels and similarities, but it is very difficult to show that work of art was caused by another work of art. It is pointed out by Renewellek that the concept of comparative study is very often vitiated by narrow nationalism. It
is his opinion that comparative literature must overcome national prejudices and at the same time should not ignore the existence of different national traditions.

In Europe, especially in England, need for comparative study was greatly felt. Since Latin was no longer a universal language and it was a necessary to restore the last unity and so contacts with other literatures were felt beneficial and so comparatists looked beyond the Western literature. Of course comparative literature studies are pursued in a spirit of intellectual curiosity.

**Motives of comparative study:**

The motives of the study of comparative literature can be various. However, it is done with a view to use it as the most useful technique of analyzing the work of art. One can recognize the qualities of a work more effectively by comparing it to other works in different languages. Secondly one can take a balanced view of literary merit. Thirdly, literature can not be a separate entity and so it must be studied in relation to other literatures. Comparative literary study aims at studying different national traditions. A set of characteristics may not be found in a single individual in that country and in the study of comparative literature such ideal types can be taken into consideration. Thus an attempt can be made to define the spirit of the nation reflected in the language and literature.

A comparative literary study considers the impact of translations. Renewellek has pointed out the work of art is never caused by another work of art. The study of influence implies the study of analogy and tradition. Analogy can be defined as resemblance in style, structure, mood or idea between works which have no other connection. Influence can be direct or indirect as well. In order to study the influence of one writer on another, one must start from clear references. Comparatists can deal with theematics or the thematology.

In different languages of different times, natural human phenomena have been the subject of literary works. In spite of common personages or situations, each work can be independent work of art. Thematic study implies the study of literary field of literary style. Genre, movements and periods are also equally important place in studies of comparative literature. The modern forms are more or less related to the aesthetic elements and comparative study seeks to find out the relations between these elements.

Comparative study leads rediscovery and revaluation of great literary figures of other cultures. The question of forms leads one to the important question of the relation between literature and society. Certain forms thrive in particular social conditions, social morals, social
ethics or social problems, philosophical convictions etc. Comparative literature takes note of all such aspects, because social and political movements undoubtedly influence literature. Widening of horizons, hopefulness and frustration, a certain purity and nobility of thought urge for a social revolution and reforms may be taken as the result.

**Importance and necessity of comparative study in modern period:**

In the modern period of multiculturalism comparative cultural studies play a vital role. In the background of globalization comparative studies help a lot and it has become an intellectual discipline. Comparative studies of a substantial help to the academic research language and literature. If you considered the initial efforts in this field in India and Abroad, two prominent names come to our mind. One is eminent European writer Goethe and the other is the Nobel Laureate and artist Ravindranath Tagore from India. In 1906, Tagore used the term ‘Viswa Sahitya’ for comparative literature Goethe initiated the idea when he coined the term ‘Walt Litaratur’ for the study of literatures of different countries together. 1

Comparative literature should include the open ended possibility to study literatures. Various aspects of literature like linguistic rigor and historical background of the literary texts are helpful for us to compare two or more literary works for comparison. So far Indian ethos is concerned, it is more conducive to practice comparative literature because according to the Indian philosophy, the individual and the particular is realized and is grounded in the universal. The essence of the individual is no more than the universal.

Comparative study of literatures is primarily a study of similarities and differences. All these studies of similarity and differences aim at creating a universal structure of oneness. Initially, the comparative literature was accepted as a universal category. However, many literary critics and historians opposed this notion of universal construct, how so ever formalistic study of literary works might keep corporatists away from history. Comparative literature crosses the border of the language and culture.

According to Spivak ‘Liberal Multiculturalism’ was on the agenda of comparative literature. Therefore, cultural studies are at rise. In many parts of the world the discipline of comparative literature is now defined as cultural studies and it indicates that its scope is broadening. The inclusiveness and expanded scope of comparative literature liberates us from cultural prison and helps us to develop a bigger perspective. The issue of multiculturalism is
related to the notion of global village. The acceptance of multiculturalism has become a strategic necessity.

Any literary work that compares can be called as comparative literature. The comparison could be in terms of structure, style, theme or the philosophic vision of the writers. A more comprehensive and adequate understanding of the works and their authors is the main motto of comparative literature. It is the study of literatures written in various countries and in various languages. In the modern period, the comparative literature is one of the most important academic and literary disciplines. In comparative literature, the East and the West are merging and are unifying the world into a single whole. If we try to find out the meaning of comparative literature, we can say that it is the study of any literary work that compares with the other literary work.

Though we think that comparative literature is of recent origin, literary comparison as a critical exercise has been in use for more than 2000 years in Europe. (Terence’s comedy ‘Phormio’ published in 161 B. C.)

Matthew Arnold used the term ‘Comparative Literature’ in one of his letters in 1848. He wrote, ‘How plain it is now, though an attention to the comparative literatures for the last 50 years might have instructed any one of it.’ When Matthew Arnold wrote about comparative literature he did not speak only of a single discipline but of many disciplines in terms of the plurality of comparative literatures. He placed England and the continent together not only for comparison but for contrast. It was Posnett who published the first work in English on comparison in 1886. According to George Saintsbury, it is Matthew Arnold who was the very first critic to emphasize the importance and the necessity of comparative criticism of different literatures in a systematic and impartial manner.

The view, the methods and aims of comparative literature have not yet been unanimously accepted by those who are working on the subject. This may perhaps seem the strange reason behind it that comparative literature has been recognized as a distinct discipline only in the recent times. It is still a growing field of research. The comparatists apply various approaches in their investigations; some of them give stress on differences and disparities and some on identities and similarities. Some other critics do the both. The aim of comparatist, in our opinion, should be to find out the implications and the underlying identities of both similarities and differences so that even the differences can be given their proper place in a deeper and more
comprehensive understanding of the artists. It should be borne in mind that there can not be any significant difference without any underlying identity.\(^3\) one should be earnest and sincere in his inquiry and desire for truth. The comparatist must have an open mind and he has to be self critical.

Any literary analysis should help to understand the text/work of literature. No work exists in isolation. Each text has a tradition. It is related to other texts. How so ever unique, each work of art can be traced back to its sources. Each work of art is related to the society, the history and there are various influences on the writer. It is the embodiment of the real world of the living organism. There is a great scope for the study of comparative literature within India where the cultural basis of the literary works in many languages is the same though there is marked differentiation owing to the genius of the regional language in which it is written.

Certain areas of Indian literary achievements can never be fruitfully studied by scholars of any one language alone. With the help of a broader canvas and a wider vision a comparatist can truly appreciate any literary work. The post-independence resurgence of the theatre in the Indian and English languages is one of the significant areas of literary studies in India as well as in Briton. It needs to be studies at all levels. Its emergence in almost all parts of the world with a uniquely renewed vigor and phenomenal vitality is a remarkable achievement. “It needs the efforts of a comparatist to asses, investigate and to locate the stimulus for this movement that includes such significant names from variety of languages; such as Mohan Rakesh, Om Chery, Vijay Tendulkar, P. L. Deshpande, Girish Karnad and Badal Sircar.”\(^4\)

Comparing literatures is one way of widening the critical awareness, correcting taste and perhaps arriving at proper judgement. It is often argued that Indian literature is one though written in many languages. To study inter-relationship between two or more literatures is of paramount importance in the Indian context. Comparative literature can be studied profitably in the Indian context under the following heads-themes, forms, sources, movements and trends and literature as an illustration of literary theory and criticism.

Comparative literature is an authentic discipline in literary criticism and in the country with multiplicity of languages and literatures and traditions like India, comparative literature methodology would serve better purpose than the traditional critical analytical method.

Comparative literature is a literary study across cultural national and regional barriers. For example, an enlargement of critical perspective is essential because our literatures have a
common Sanskritic heritage and have been affected to a great extent by Arabian and Persian influences. A comparatist looks at differences and affinities in different literatures. As far as the methodology is concerned, social realism in Indian and English literatures has been seen at all the times.

Matthew Arnold said, “Everywhere there is a connection, everywhere there is an illustration, no single event and no single literature is adequately comprehended except in relation to other events, to other literatures.” Recurrent and perennial motifs, situations, themes, character types occur in all literatures and lend themselves easily to a comparative analysis.

At the very outset of new millennium the Editorial Board of World Literature Today has published, “To 40 lists 1927-2001” the only Indian work included in the list is R.K.Narayan’s ‘The Guide’(1958) the novel much popularized by its Hindi film version. This shows that still the non-Indian people think that India is the land of saints and snakes, bears and elephants. One of the simplest ways of making Indian literature popular is to compare it with the world’s classics, because there are numerous classics in literature which are unknown to the world.

Dr. Anand Patil uses the term ‘literatures’ in plural, in order to reject the hegemonic representation of so called unity in diversity of languages and literatures.

Comparative Western literature is the study of different national literatures. Comparing literatures is one way of widening the critical awareness, correcting taste and perhaps arriving at proper judgements. One can compare any two literatures of the not with studying the language and cultural differences. It is an assessment of two literatures done by using various critical theories. In a multi-lingual and multi-cultural country like India, comparative literature helps us to assess the literary texts. Comparative literature studies interrelationship between two or more literatures. It is of paramount importance in India.

The comparators has at his disposal several technical terms to describe intersexual relationship between two texts of it is a source and product relationship, it can be termed imitation, influence adopting parody or subversion. The history and literature of a country in the current social and political scenario, remains incomplete if the country’s original heritage and culture get ignored in its waiting.

Comparative literature shows the relationship between the two texts or two authors in one country or in the different country in different languages. In future the comparative literary
studies will be named as a comparative cultural study because the literary studies are being turned into cultural studies.

The main objective of comparative literature is to study the interrelationship between different literatures. With the advancement of modern means of communication such as cell-phone, internet and multimedia the distinction between cultures has become the thing of the past. Today we live in the global village. The protection to a singular culture and deliberate obstruction to the influence of many cultures is not possible even by controlling of technology. Therefore Gayatri Chakraborty Spivek rightly considered liberal multiculturalism as agenda of comparative literature. While we pay attention to the contemporary theoreticians of comparative literature, we must not forget the major role played by great men of literature like Tagore and Goethe, in India and abroad who initiated the process of the study of the world literature around a country ago.

Comparative study of literature aims at the creation of a universal structure of oneness. It is a study of similarity and differences. Many literary critics and historians opposed this notion of universal construct. The formalistic study of literary works that aimed at a universal structure was not accepted by the corporatists, because they thought that it might keep them away from history. However it is true that comparative literature crosses the border of the language and culture.

According to Spivek liberal multiculturalism is on the agenda of comparative literature. This has given the boost to the cultural studies. As a consequence the discipline of comparative literature is defined as cultural studies in many parts of the world. One can say that there is the broadening of the scope in the study of this discipline. On account of the quality of inclusiveness of this discipline and because of the expanded scope of the comparative literature, there is liberation from cultured prison, because of this liberation there is a larger perspective in the study of comparative literature.

In the twenty-first century as culture has become hybrid there is the need of translation studies in the field of literature. In the world of globalization, the cultural barriers are breaking down. In the changed circumstance it is the translator who helps the writers of vernacular language to expose themselves to do well. These translations will help the students of comparative literature as the social realism used by P. k. Atre in his plays with the plays of other English playwrights such as G. B. Shaw, Noel Coward, Briyo, Ibsen, T. W. Robertson, Arthur
Pinero, Jones, Oscar Wilde and others who have used social realism in their plays. Even the plays of Atre may be compared with the plays of Tennessee Williams and Emil Zola.

The existence of comparative literature depends a lot on translation. The tremendous growth in translation studies is boosting the Comparative Literature. Though Comparative Literature was criticized at the beginning of its emergence, later it is accepted as one of the disciplines which help the students of literature to analyze the texts. In 1900 Ferdinand Brunetiere has observed “the history of Comparative Literature will sharpen in each one of us, French or English, or German the understanding of the most national characteristics of our great writers. We establish ourselves only in opposing; we are defined only by comparing ourselves to others; and we don’t know ourselves when we know only ourselves.”

Comparative Literature is a reaction against nationalism. It was Susan Basnett who pointed out that Comparative Literature seems to have emerged as an antidote in nationalism, even though its roots went deep into national cultures. In India, Comparative Literature is directly linked with the rise of modern Indian nationalism. It is an assertion of national as well as cultural identity in the Indian context. In the last two decades of 19th century, Comparative Literature began to be established to the international. In 1886, H.M. Posnett published a journal Comparative Literature and a full length study of the subject was introduced in Auckland, New Zealand entitled Comparative Literature. Comparative Literature is a study of intertextuality and translation brings intertextuality to our knowledge. And that intertextuality benighted core of Comparative Literature helps the students to compare the texts.

In recent times, there is a craze for translation in India. There are mainly two reasons. First the writers and critics of one literature want their literature to be translated into English or any other regional language of the country. If the regional literature is translated into English, it gets world-wide readers. And if it is translated into other regional language it is read by those regional language readers. Secondly, when the literature is translated into a target language, it immediately gets the scope of being compared with the literary texts written originally in the target language. The plays of Vijay Tendulkar are translated into regional languages like Bengali, into national language Hindi and into English also. His Ghashiram Kotwal is staged in many countries. The plays of Girish Karnad are also translated in many regional languages. All his plays except Wedding Album are translated into Marathi. Girish Karnad writes his plays in Kannada and later he translates his own plays into English.
In the post 1980 period, translation has been given a position equal to that of original e.g. Jaques Derrida, Walter Benjamin and Lambard. The deconstructionists are of the opinion that the original texts is also a work of translate of thoughts and ideas. And hence there is no vital difference between the original and translation. Edwin Gentzler writes in his passage “in translation, what is visible is language referring not to things, but to language itself. Thus the chain of signification is one of infinite regress-the translated text becomes a translation of another earlier translation and translated words, although viewed by deconstructionists as ‘material’ signifiers, represent nothing but other words representing nothing but still other words representing.”

The use of translation is invaluable in the study of Comparative Literature in the multilingual and multi-cultural context. In their book Translation, History and Culture, Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere state: ‘‘With the development of Translation studies as that draws on comparatists and cultural history, the time has come to think again. Translation has been a major shaping force in the development of world culture and no study of comparative literature can take place without regard to translation.’’

Comparative Indian Literature

Comparative western literature is the study of different national literatures. Comparative Indian literature helps us to study Indian literature as a whole. Comparing literatures is one way of widening the critical awareness, correcting taste and perhaps arriving at proper judgments. One can compare any two literatures of the world not with studying the language and cultural differences. It is an assessment of two literatures done by using various critical theories. In a multi-lingual and multi-cultural country like India comparative literature helps us to assess the literary texts. Comparative literature studies interrelationship between two or more literatures. It is of paramount importance in India. Intertextuality No source Source and product Analogy Parallelism Parody Subversion Imitation Influence Adaptation

The corporatist has at his disposal several technical terms to describe inter-textual relationship between two texts. If it is a source and product relationship, it can be termed Imitation, Influence, Adaptation, Parody or Subversion. The history and literature of a country, in the current social and political scenario, remains incomplete if the country’s aboriginal heritage and culture get ignored in its waiting. Comparative literature shows the relationship
between the two texts or two authors. In future the comparative literary studies will be named as comparative cultural studies because the literary studies are being turned into cultural studies.

The main objective of comparative literature is to study the inter-relationship in between different literatures. With the advancement of modern means of communication such as cell phones, internet and multimedia the distinction between cultures has become the thing of the past. Today we live in global village. The protection to a singular culture and deliberate obstruction to the confluence of many cultures is not possible even by controlling of technology or by coercion. Therefore Gayatry Chakroborty Spivak rightly considered liberal multiculturalism as agenda of comparative literature. While we pay attention to the cotemporary theoreticians of comparative literature we must not forget the major role played by great men of literature like Tagore and Goethe, in India and abroad who initiated the process of the study of world literature around a century ago. Tagore used the term ‘Vishwa Sahitya’ for the comparative literary studies in 1906. Goethe propagated the same idea for the study of literatures of the different countries, for the purpose he coined a term called ‘Walt litteratur’.

Comparative study of literature aims at the creation of a universal structure of oneness. It is a study of similarity and differences. Many literary critics and historians opposed this notion of universal construct. The formalistic study of literary works that aimed at a universal structure was not accepted by the corporatists, because they thought that it might keep them away from history. However it is true that comparative literature crosses the border of the language and culture. According to Spivak liberal multiculturalism is on the agenda of comparative literature. This has given the boost to the cultural studies. As a consequence the discipline of comparative literature is defined as cultural studies in many parts of the world. One can say that there is the broadening of the scope in the study of this discipline. On account of the quality of inclusiveness of this discipline and because of the expanded scope of comparative literature there is liberation from cultured prison. Because of this liberation there is a larger perspective in the study of literature. Any literary work is not a single whole.

**Methodology of the study**

The comparative approach with reference to what has been said into the introduction of this chapter so far the inclusive and expanding multicultural approach of comparative literature will be the approach of the present study. The comparison of the use of social realism in the selected plays of P. K. Atre and John Galsworthy is the main purpose of the study. Both the
playwrights use themes and plots of their respective plays to show the exploitation of the masses by those in the power. The present study will show what type of power and from which period and in which places the respective power mongers, coerce into the lives of the ordinary men and women. The juxtaposition of various incidents of injustice and attacks on individual liberty in all the selected plays will reveal the similarities and differences in the portrayal of social realism by both the playwrights.

“I do not want the emotion that arises out of thought, but thought that arises out of emotion,” says Arthur Hopkins. The theme might be defined as the playwrights’ point of view towards his material. Every play has a theme of some kind. There in one spot in the play where it can be discerned – the climax and the author reveals what interpretation he puts on the material. The experienced dramatist doesn’t begin with theme generally. He also does not fashion a story in order present a philosophical position. He lets the theme take care of itself. Any seasoned playwrights do not put in to mouth of his characters, statements that spell out the theme.

Primitive human being started feeling alienated from nature as they gradually grew conscious of their identity and for them Nature appeared gigantic and mysterious and they felt themselves powerless and inferior. Since then the human being are striving hard and trying to be superior and powerful. This alienation brought about various divisions in it and one class trying to be more powerful than the other make the society paramedical. We find in the society that some people are there at the top and they overpower the masses at the bottom. The people accept the hierarchy. “As the higher rungs are more privileged and more powerful than the lower rungs, people always struggle hard to scramble up the ladder of power. In rat race, some go up and some go down.”

Every human creature, even the primitive insists tried to have power and struggled for their own identity. The feeling of inferiority makes man troublesome. In order to have power one suppresses or oppresses the other and the oppressed is to face the sufferers. People can be oppressed through cruelty and power. The poor are victimized and it is said that; power corrupts (Galsworthy’s The Silver Box) and absolute power corrupts absolutely. The oppressor also thinks that he is superior to the victim and they are proud of their superiority. (Galsworthy’s ‘Strife’) A typical prosecutor opts for such a profession that enables him or her to play the role, so he or she becomes a strict officer, a police officer, a public prosecutor, a military officer, a jailor or a criminal also. Political power is a type of power held by a group in a society which allows
administration of some or all of public resources including labour and wealth. It is frequently defined as “the ability to influence the behaviour of others” – with or without resistance. I.C. MacMillan says, “Power is the capacity to restructure actual situations.” (I.C. MacMillan – Wikipedia) He also mentions, “Influence is the capacity to control and modify the perceptions of others.” One of the most famous references to power comes from the Chinese Communist leader Mao Zedong who believed that power was primarily obtained by force and fear. He said, “Political power grows from the barrel of a gun.” Who so ever gets the power gets the power of decision making and decision making is the main indicator of power.

The term like cultural hegemony has been flourished out of power. Political power is intimately related to information. It was Sir Francis Bacon who said that knowledge itself is power. Post – modernism has debated over how to define political power. Perhaps, the best known definition comes from Michael Foucault who has mentioned it in his Discipline and Punish as power is organic within society. This view holds that political power is more subtle and is part of a series of societal controls and normalizing influences through historical institutions and definitions of normal vs. abnormal. Foucault once characterized power as “an action over actions arguing that power was essentially a relation between several dots, in continuous transformation as in Fredrich Nietzsche’s philosophy. In his view the power in human society was part of training process in which everyone, from a prime minister to a homeless person, used power in their own relationships in society. Jorgen Habermas opposed himself to Foucault’s conception of discourse as a battlefield for power relations, arguing that it should be possible to achieve consensus on the fundamental rules of discourse, in order to establish a transparent and democratic dialogue. Thenceforth, he argued against Foucault and Louis Althusser that power was not imminent to discourse, and that philosophy could be completely distinguished from ideology.

In the initial stage when human beings were living in the forests the basic human instinct of violence used to be satisfied while securing food or protecting themselves from various dangers. The education and civilization have made them mild outwardly. But the basic instincts of violence and sexual urge remain as they were in the heart suppressed. Under certain pressures and inevitable conditions prevailing in the society, these two basic instincts of man - violence and sexual urge - come out from his heart violently. Naturally these two have become the important constituents in power-game.
Human Relationship

It is the family group of blood relationship that recognized in a sort of social aspect. Family forming the one group of co-operation is idealized. The sanctity and the traditions of family are very important. Each and every member of the family owns allegiance to the family. It is his bounden duty to respect and preserve the family traditions. A family is said to be ruined even if an individual member misbehaves. (P. K. Atre’s ‘Udyacha Sansar’) A man with no character burns away his family. Members of a family will have to run away if one of them loses character. With this attitude towards family it is no surprise if blood-relationship is held in high sanctity. Members of a family are always believed to be identical not only in conduct and character but even in the details of their physical features.

Family is the recognized social unit. It helps to determine the place of women in a society. A woman could destroy a family by her misconduct. A woman’s faults cost the good name of family. A woman’s capacity to destroy is greater than that of man. In her life time a woman would be a member of two families that of her present in the beginning and that of her husband later. Once married, the girl becomes the property of her husband. In addition to this general privilege of being treated as a chattel, a woman of aristocratic tradition enjoyed the right to live a sequestered or purdah life. The married woman however was compensated in some ways for the loss of human rights. Within the four walls of a family she wielded authority and commanded high respect as a mother. Where a married woman enjoyed such honorable position there was no place for some early and less refined practices like – the niyoga the “levirate” system. The only other social unit, bigger than the family and closely knit on the same ties as blood relationship heredity was caste. In his selected plays, P. K. Atre has presented the suffering and pathetic condition of the Indian women and the inhuman treatment given to the women by the men in the male dominating society.

The present study will compare and contrast the innumerable incidents of inhuman torture of the vulnerable members in the family, especially women in the hands of men (Nirmala in Gharabaher, Karuna in Udyacha Sansar and Ulka in Jag Kay Mhnel) and of some women who play in the hands of men and exploit other women. The control of wealth and the consequential confrontation among the family members is shown in quite a few plays of these playwrights. The comparative study will highlight these instances to show the tension in the Indian and British families. Family forms the basic ground where children are trained a typical
family. Father plays the role of a Persecutor, Mother plays the Rescuer and children play the victim. When father hurts children, mother rescues them. Father becomes her victim as she persecutes him for hurting children. Children rescue mother when father hurts her. The relationship in between the persecutor, the rescuer and victim goes on interchanging.

The traditional family system and the old customs in the Indian culture are strategically used by typical Indian males to enjoy all time superiority in the sexual relationship with women. The control and power have given the Indian men the upper hand and they treat women as their slaves (Atre’s Gharabaher, Udyacha Sansar & Jag Kay Mhanel). The only alternatives available for the women are the visible or invisible slavery of man and total floating of the traditional family system and either to leave the home or to commit suicide (Nirmala in ‘Gharabaher’ & Karuna in Udyacha Sansar & Ulka in Jag Kay Mhanel). The selected plays of Atre and Galsworthy are supreme examples of the rootless attack on this fundamental problem of the women and the poor in Indian and British families. The comparative study of all the women characters in the selected plays of both the dramatists will help the researcher to highlight this problem.

The tension and strain that exists in the Indian and British society is primarily because of the socio-cultural relationship. The portrayal of Indian and British society that is reflected in these plays is supposed to be the most authentic portrayal. The society is under the heavy burden of age old customs, traditions, superstitions and religious beliefs, on the one hand and it is invariably exposed to the Western ideas of freedom, individual liberty and equality on the other. The Indian and British culture is thus torn between tradition and modernity. The socio – cultural analysis of the human relationship shown in the selected plays and its comparative study will be undertaken in the present research work. The only other social unit bigger than the family and closely knit on the same ties as blood relationship and heredity is the caste. The Brahmins and the Kshatriyas are referred to as the higher and the more important classes. The Brahmin however has an undecided superiority over all others. The universally respected Bhishma himself says that Drona is superior since Drona is a Brahmin and he is a Kshatriya. Even Karna says that he would never go against a Brahmin. Circumstances too are such as to justify a Brahmin’s Superiority.

Techniques Used in the Plays of P. K. Atre and John Galsworthy

Plot
“The plot (Which Aristotle termed the mythos) in a dramatic or narrative work is constituted by its events and actions, as these are rendered and ordered toward achieving particular artistic emotional effects. This description is deceptively simple, because the actions (including verbal discourse as well as physical actions) are performed by particular characters in a work, and are the means by which they exhibit their moral and dispositional qualities. Plot and characters are therefore interdependent critical concepts as Henry James has said, “What is character but the illustration of character?” Notice also that as plot is distinguishable from the story – that is, a bare synopsis of the temporal order of what happens.

When we summarize the story in a literary work, we say that first this happens, then that, then that. It is only when we specify how this is related to that, by causes and, motivations, and in what ways all these matters are rendered, ordered, and organized so as to achieve their particular effects that a synopsis begin to be adequate to the plot.” (Abrahams 224) There is variety of plots. There are tragic plots, comic plots and some plots are designed to achieve Romance, Satire etc. The chief character in a plot, on which our interest centers, is called the protagonist and if the plot is such that he or she is pitted against an important opponent, that character is called antagonist. “As a plot evolves it arouses expectations in the audience or reader about the future course of events and actions and how characters will respond to them. A lack of certainty, on the part of a concerned reader, about what is going to happen, especially to characters with which the reader has established a bond of sympathy, is known as suspense. If the fact happens and ---violates any expectations we have formed, it is known as surprise. The interplay of suspense and surprise source of vitality in a traditional plot.

The most effective surprise, especially in realistic narratives, is one which turns out in retrospect, to have been grounded in what has gone before, even though we have hitherto made the wrong inference from the given facts of circumstance and character.” (Abrahams 225) The plots in the selected plays are the major means to communicate the story to the audience. They are of extreme variety so far as honest portrayal of Indian and British society is concerned. Both of the playwrights have given strong plots to transfer the dramatic content on the stage.

The comparative study of the plots of these plays will make it easy for the researcher to understand the play more effectively. Plot, however in the full sense of the term is ‘action’ and includes not only the circumstances and incidents which form the main part of ‘plot’ as popularly conceived but also ‘character’ in the full dramatic sense of character producing an ‘action’. The
term plot used by Aristotle requires to be interpreted in a comprehensive sense. It embraces not only the deeds, incidents and situations but also the mental processes and motives which underlie the outwards events or which result from them.\textsuperscript{14} In Drama proper the basic formula is that persons make decisions and act on them, which have consequences involving other persons, and complications and crisis follow. Some events and actions have always occurred before the start; the beginning of the play implies that a certain situation exists between groups of people, the play showing the further evolution. A past and a further are always implicit in the opening scenes. This may be said of any subsequent moment in the course of play it constitutes the essential feature of a plot in which all hangs together in tense relationship for a short space of time.

\textit{Action}

Drama is necessarily an action on the stage. Characters act out their respective roles. The comparative study of the ways in which the action takes place in the selected plays will enable the researcher to show the playwrights in their proper position as the playwrights who create most effective action on the stage. Aristotle defined tragedy as “an imitation of an action”. The word that Aristotle used is praxis derived from the Greek verb pressing which means to do. So broadly speaking action would mean doing; what men and women do in life, the way they act. Naturally the word would cover the whole of human activity. In the context of Greek philosophy praxis is often opposed to theory which means thinking or speculation. But scholars have also noted that Aristotle uses the word “action” in the singular and therefore he is clearly thinking of one large action which constitutes the whole play. He argues that the large action encompasses the whole play. Everything else that happens in the play, therefore, is organized so as to support and forward this large action. Situations or events, character relations and what they say and do, lead to an effective presentation of this large action. It does not mean that the dramatist has a clear idea of such a large action and when he writes the play. In order to communicate effectively what the dramatist has to say, he would break this large action into stages or phases. In a dramatic text, therefore, we have act and scene divisions which represent the various stages necessary to realize the large action. In ancient drama such divisions were not common, but the stages of development were powerfully suggested by the chorus. True dramatic action is what the characters do at once contrary as it were to expectation and yet because they have already done other things. No dramatist lets his audience know what is coming but neither should he
suffer his character to act without making his audience feel that those actions are in harmony with temperament.

Conflict

Conflict is the element that seems to be an essential ingredient of every forceful dramatic work. It may be taken as axiomatic to say that without conflict we are not going to have a play to which an audience will pay much heed. A play depicts a contest, in which the conscious will is employed to accomplish some specific goal, a goal that is hard to reach and whose accomplishment is actively resisted. The comparative study will highlight the conflict used by both the playwrights in their plays selected for the study.

It would not be wrong to assert that conflict is the soul of drama-its dynamic principle. There could, of course, be different levels of conflict. But the dramatic as such cannot be thought of without some kind of struggle or competition. If we pay attention to meaning of the word “play”, the presence of competition becomes obvious. This is, however, a matter of everyday experience in our life. Some lose their courage and submit, some fight it out and emerge victorious and some are defeated but dazzle us because they have fought with dignity.

Drama in its earliest expression had enacted the battle between good season and bad season or between life and death. In early Greek drama agon was a powerful element of its structure. Agon is conflict, struggle between two opposed principles. Perhaps battle between the good and evil, between right and wrong, between the ideal and the real or between the dreams we cherish and our inability to realize them make us aware of the complexities of our life. Drama by its very nature intensely and artistically expresses these conflicts. This is probably the most significant and straightforward kind of conflict we can imagine. Drama represents conflict in all its diversity and from a variety of perspectives.

The simplest possible conflict we see in drama relates to opposition between individuals, in traditional terms the hero and the villain or the protagonist and the antagonist, a clash of interests or conflict between their respective natures, approaches, views, or ideas. Dramatic comedy, for instance, often shows two men desiring to marry the same woman. The triangular situation can also show two women in love with one man. The plot structure of such plays evolves as a battle fought to win love. Desire of sexual satisfaction or marriage proper happens to be prime motivation that controls the conflict. Elements of custom, family or society in general enter into the primary relationships and complicate it. Related with sexual motivation but
on a different level or in a different area of human activity we have conflict generated by desire for power. History plays or tragedies dramatize political conflict and show us cunning and deception men adopt when they are involved in the game of politics. Sexual desire and desire for power seem to be the most universal sources of dramatic conflict.

One must remember, however, that dramatic conflict need not always be internal or psychological. A number of dramas treat the endless battle between individual and society. That individual is attuned situations for his unhindered growth seems to an ideal proposition. Conflict is very essential in a tragedy. The conflict may be between an individual and his fate and the gods; or it may be the conflict between hero and the villain in which the tragedy occurs due to some weakness in the hero’s character, or it may be a conflict between a weak individual and a strong social force. The tragedy inevitably results from this conflict. In the Greek tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides the conflict was between the hero and the Fate or the gods.

Characters

Characters are the persons represented in a dramatic or narrative work, who are interpreted by the reader as being endowed with particular moral, intellectual and emotional qualities by inferences from what the persons say and their distinctive ways of saying it the dialogue – and from what they do – the action. The grounds in the characters temperament, desires and moral nature for their speech and actions are called their motivation. A character may remain essentially “stable,” or unchanged in outlook and disposition, from beginning to end of a work. (Abrahams 32, 33) None of the above techniques is of any use without the study of characters and characterization in the selected plays.

The characters come from different stratas of the society. They give the guidance, the correct and complete picture of today’s society. The close scrutiny of all the major characters will make it possible for the researcher to compare and contrast the mental traits of the characters in the selected plays. Characters and the story of the play are inter-dependent and they are tied together with the help of objective. Objective of the play in the foundation on which the writer builds his characters and the course of events the characters are involved in attaining their goals. Many superficial traits help to depict the character, language, manner of speaking, dress, gesture, physical condition, mannerism and so on. Not only the protagonist of the play who has objective but at the same time other major characters have their own and conflicting desires. Personalities can be depicted on the foundation of such desires.
The protagonist of the play is usually the leading character. The chief characteristic of the protagonist is a desire, usually intense, to achieve a certain goal, and it is the interest of the audience in watching the play toward that objective that constitutes its absorption in the play. The playwright directs our attention strongly toward one of his characters. He does this principally by showing this person the protagonist, having some strong desire, some intense need, bent on a course of action, from which he is not to be deflected. The protagonist wants something – power, revenge, a lady’s hand, and bread, peace of mind, glory, and escape from a pursuer. Whatever it may be, some kind of intense desire is always present in the mind of the protagonist. He arouses some kind of emotional response from the audience. He can be sympathetic and can arouse our pity and important thing is that the audience must not be indifferent to him. We must care one way or other, whether he achieves his goal. A protagonist who does not know what he wants, or knows but doesn’t greatly care whether he gets it or not, is poor dramatic material. By characters Aristotle means certain qualities “Which we ascribe to the agents”.

Language

Language – “A species – specific communicative ability, restricted to humans, which involves the use of sounds, grammar and vocabulary, according to system of rules”\(^{15}\) Henry Sweet, an English phonetician and language scholar states – “Language is the expression of ideas by means of speech – sounds combined into words. Words are combined into sentences, this combination answering to that of ideas into thoughts.” The U.S. linguists Bernard Bloch and George Trager formulated the definition in their Out Line of Linguistic Analysis (1942) “A language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group cooperates.” Language interacts with every other aspect of human life in society and it can be understood only if it is considered in relation to society.

Dialogues

The major thrust of drama as literary form is its dialogues. Both the playwrights blend the ancient style of dialogues with the contemporary colloquial styles. These dialogues powerfully create the particular character in our mind. The comparative study of the dialogues in the selected plays will help the researcher to understand the style of this playwright. Speech takes many forms, since it exists wherever words are used for communication or expression and every kind of speech is accompanied by some degree of gesture. Not the words only, not the gestures
only, but both together show how angry or joyous, or ill tempered, or aggressive the character is at a particular moment. The sort of language that is spoken in the course of such a relation, altered under the influence of all varieties of feeling, emotion, passion and will power and in consequence a language that is always part of a physical mental excitement, is the characteristic speed of drama. It is the agent of the action and the plot and the tensions.

It is an activated language implying constant movement, development and changes in the feeling and the relations of persons. It is a language that makes explicit both the external action and the driving motives. Dramatic speech is the complete and adequate realization in dialogue of a tense situation between people. “Dramatic dialogue can afford to drop a lot of what would be necessary in something meant just to be read. The actors are there, and their tone of voice, their comportment towards each other, even their facial expressions can convey a lot which therefore does not need to be spelt out in words” John Russell Taylor.\(^{16}\)

Dialogue carries a tremendous burden. Consider all it must accomplish for the playwright - It must characterize the speaker, and perhaps the person addressed. It must reflect the relationship of the speaker to other characters. It must reflect the speakers’ mood, convey his emotion. It must be connective that is, grow out of a proceeding speech or action and lead into another. It must advance the action. It must be idiomatic, maintaining the individuality of the speaker, yet still bend into the style of the play as a whole. It must often reveal the speaker’s motivation. It must often carry information or exposition. It must often foreshadow what is to come. It must be clear and comprehensible to the audience. (In case of performance) In writing dialogue it is well to remember not only that activity is going to carry part of the burden, but the actors themselves, with their physical presence and their voices will also make an immense contribution. Even a single speech can be spoken in a score of ways – with indifference or with passion, with respect or suspicion, with hope or with anger, or any other possible interpretation.
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