CHAPTER I

COMPARATIVE STUDY : A CASE FOR PANUGANTI

SECTION A

The Aim and Scope of the Study:

A multilingual country like India offers the best scope for comparative literary studies. With its rich and varied literary heritage, many schools and centres have been flourishing over the ages. However Sisir Kumar Das, the doyen among Indian comparatists, observes,

Any student of any single Indian literature not to speak of the Indian comparatist, is obliged to go beyond his own literature, and quite often to study his own literature in relation to a literature belonging to a different civilization. ("Why Comparative Indian Literature"? 101)

Because of historico-political reasons, the impact of English literature has however, been most pronounced of all non-native influences, which variously shaped the sensibility and the work of Indian writers, since the early modern times. Foreign rule or political domination of a country by a foreign nation may gradually and consciously or unconsciously
nurture an inclination towards foreign things. The English impact on India in the nineteenth-century may have motivated the native writers to adopt voluntarily and purposefully the Western culture which was already developed in one direction. This impact later allowed or provided paradoxically more chances for the fostering of originality, because of the pressure or the presence of the domestic conditions in which a writer worked. It must have also kindled the impulse to safeguard one's own ethical values, especially in the cultural and literary spheres, as in these spheres the Western impact was more profound and lasting. In such contexts literary history becomes an integral part of the political and cultural history of a period. This phenomenon is unique to those literatures that grow under such political pressures.

The British rule brought in the English language and literature in India. This led to the introduction of new literary genres in the Indian languages, such as the novel, short-story, essay and biography. It also saw some Indian classics being translated into European languages, although such an attempt was already made by early Christian missionaries. The acquaintance of the Europeans with Indian Classics and in turn the acquaintance of Indians with European classics, ushered in a new trend in the field of comparative literature. Proliferation of comparative literary
studies at the present time in our country is partly due to the interaction with English language and literature, and through it with the languages and literatures of other countries of the West, though admittedly not so prolific.

Swapan Majumdar points out that "Interactions with Western education elicited... no less than three consecutive designs and counterdesigns (approval - rejection - adjustment), one overlapping another at certain points" ("The Divine Vapour and the Holy Rapes: Problems of Influence Studies in a Colonial Context" 153). The history and development of the literary genres follow a general pattern almost in all Indian languages.

In the context of Indian literature, comparative study involves a study of literature, classical and modern, against the entire Indian background. Literary works often reveal similarities in points of style, structure or idea; the works also share certain common conventions which are followed by a large number of works of similar nature. The similarity may be traced to the historical fact of a common bond. A significant point is that here in India, very often a pioneering product would be a work inspired by a certain model and other works would be consequentially influenced by it.

Sanskrit scholars in India had realized the significance of the comparative approach at least by the
sixth century A.D. Tamil scholars hold that Tholkappiam was a pioneering text of comparative grammar in ancient Dravidian literature. In some sense comparative studies are not new in India. Any piece of writing was studied under many of the aspects of comparative literature, such as textual criticism, reference to parallels, discussions on the rasas, on the form and style of the work. But one main drawback in Indian studies was the lack of a wider historical perspective relating to other cultural and literary traditions which ought to be the base for comparative literary studies proper. The traditional method of studying should be complemented with modern critical concepts, so that Indian comparative studies may be solidly founded on internationally recognized principles.

During the late nineteenth-century, there was a development in modern oriental literatures, for it was during this period that the foreign impact proved stronger than in the previous decades. This impact was felt more in the literary field, as it permeated deeply into the strata of the form and content of literary works. It is not therefore surprising that in the area of themes, forms and literary movements, comparative studies in India have flourished. Mythology formed a common subject for most writers. Social and political movements have undoubtedly influenced literature since the time of the National movement for freedom.
The first person who pleaded for a comparative study of literature as an academic discipline in India was probably Rabindranath Tagore. In 1906 the leaders of the newly established "National Council of Education" or "Jatiyasiksa Parishad" invited Tagore to speak on comparative literature. The title of Tagore's lecture in Bengali was "Visva-Sahitya" meaning "World Literature". The Indian comparatist Naresh Guha tracing the development of the JadHAVpur University from the National Council for Education, recalls Tagore's statement on this occasion: "I have been called upon to discuss a subject to which you have given the English name of Comparative Literature. Let me call it Visva-Sahitya in Bengali" ("Comparative Literature: Meaning and Scope" 27). Tagore went on to project the concept as an antidote to insularity in literary studies:

From... narrow provincialism we must free ourselves; we must strive to see the work of each author as a whole, that whole as a part of man's universal creativity and that universal spirit in its manifestations through World Literature. Now is the time to do so. (Ibid. 28)

As noted earlier, the historical reality of the British rule (for good or bad) brought in English literature, and it had a tremendous impact on all Indian literatures. The
various English literary forms were experimented with in most of the developed Indian languages, with varying degrees of success. Their relationship with the English language permitted Indian literature to develop a new outlook. This relationship extended its influence in all fields of life. It is interesting to note the extension of it to Telugu literature. One such instance is seen in the influence of The Spectator papers of Addison and Steele on Sakshi essays of Panuganti.

In England, the early eighteenth-century produced two great essayists, namely, Joseph Addison (1672-1719) and Richard Steele (1672-1729). The two writers, forming an ideal literary partnership, together produced in The Spectator a new literary form called the 'periodical essay'. The Spectator was an independent journal which appeared everyday from March, 1711 till December, 1712. The essays were a sort of editorial write-up and not newspapers as such. The writers, along with three others, established an imaginary club, called 'The Spectator Club'. The members sat every night to discuss the problems of the day, and to publish them in the next day's paper. The aim of The Spectator was to bring "Philosophy out of the Closets and Libraries, Schools and Colleges... at Tea-Tables and in Coffee-houses" (1.10:32).
When we turn to the area of Telugu literature, in the early twentieth-century during the British colonial rule, Panuganti Lakshmi Narasimha Rao (1865-1940) wrote his Sakshi essays, framing them as a Telugu counterpart of The Spectator essays. The term 'Sakshi' is a Telugu translation of the English word "Spectator", but the Sakshi essays are not translations of The Spectator essays. One can note a conscious and deliberate imitation of the style and method.

As Marian Galik points out, "At the genesis of modern literature and during its initial development, the highest place came to be occupied by fiction and the essay" ("East-West Inter-literariness: A Theoretical Sketch and a Historical Overview" 122). It may be added that the modification of a given form in a given cultural context sometimes produces a hybrid form. For example, from the narrating of the classics /epics to the rural audience, the 'Upanyasa' or 'religious discourse' form came up. The lectures when written down, formed essays. The 'English essay' was grafted on to the native 'lecture form'. At the genesis of modern English literature, the place was initially occupied by the 'essay' which later developed gradually into 'the novel'. From mid nineteenth-century, prose took the place of verse in Telugu literature, as in some other literatures too, as a result of the Western literary influence. Panuganti was perhaps interested in experimenting
with the new 'prose' form in Telugu through his Sakshi essays, since prose came to occupy a place in literature next only to poetry.

The respective aims of the English and the Telugu essayists, were the same - to reform the society. They adopted a narrative technique laced with humour and satire to achieve their goals.

For all the vicissitudes societies undergo over long periods of evolution, to the majority of people, human nature and behaviour seem more or less the same all over the world. This explains the remarkable similarities in the targets of attack in the authors studied here and their essays. However, the comparison is also bound to be partly determined by sociological factors which are relative. The writings were products of a particular time and culture. Hence any study of them should take into account the genetic context which is a variable.

The written mode of The Spectator essays reflects the development of an impersonal, urbane tradition in English. On the other hand the lecture form of Sakshi essays reflects the folk-tradition of India, where, as mentioned earlier, it is common to listen to popular discourses called 'Upanyasas' or 'katha kalakshepa'. Criticism here was thus articulated through folk and oral forms of exposition. In this mode,
there is an immediate sense of contact with the reader/audience. There is also more of the art of dramatization seen than in the English essays.

A survey of Telugu literary and critical history reveals that there is hardly any systematic study and documentation of this connection, except for a rather sketchy discussion in a doctoral dissertation on Panuganti in Telugu by M.R. Venkataramana. The conscious imitation and assimilation of a genre by a writer from an alien tradition calls for a more formal study than the one attempted in the Telugu thesis.

In comparing these two works, the intention is not to prove Panuganti's debt to Addison and Steele, for after all it is obvious. My work concerns not only examining signs of influence, but also the more suggestive link of shared motifs, and the process of 'hybridization' and 'assimilation' on the part of Panuganti. The significance of the similarities in these two works rests in a common pattern. Sakshi is, in fact, the result of a cultural osmosis. The comparison is caused at several levels owing to the British rule lasting in India for over 150 years. Hence a case is made out here for a study of these two works which goes beyond the academic, theoretical and thematic levels. A deeper account of the works will surely orient the reader (even if unfamiliar with them) to grasp the pattern.
One may look upon comparisons based on 'influence' or 'genres', as a common occurrence. But in this case, there is a total hybridization i.e., the Telugu writer has not just taken the English work as a 'model' slavishly to be copied, but transformed it into an original work, a new form, namely 'Upānyasa' or 'the lecture form', in a vernacular tongue. Thus Sakshi essays form the hybrid product. We may show this process by way of a diagram:

```
A1 --------- B ---------- B1
```

A  -  Addison & Steele (Authors)
A1  -  Work (The Spectator)
B  -  Panuganti (Author)
B1  -  Work (Sakshi)

Claudio Guillen's theory on influence studies which would be discussed later in this chapter will make the point more clear. The English model has been, no doubt, imitated, and there is a conscious influence as is evident in the Telugu work, but the degree of imitation is only partial, unlike in some cases of influence or imitation of works, where the writers imbibe the model as a whole, its form, content, method and medium.

The theories and concepts to be examined in the next section have enabled me to define the scope of my study.
which is based on the concept of 'influence'. According to the theory of Claudio Guillen influence is 'psychological', i.e., an impact upon the mind, and according to the theory of Ulrich Weisstein influence is 'literary', i.e., an impact upon the work. This study partly follows Guillen's theory and partly Weisstein's. Although the influence upon Panuganti may be said to be through the essays of Addison and Steele, we must not forget that the way the sensibility has been shaped, if not determined, is a mental process. The organization and form of the essays in Telugu reflect the process. In this process, the work is no doubt available in its physical form, but it is an index to the mind which combines the native stock of thoughts and precepts with those which attracted attention in the non-native tradition. We may note that unless the student of comparative studies knows more about the original author or the model, that which triggered him to produce the work, and the process of the production, he cannot understand, leave alone evaluate, the work fully. The theories and concepts that support my argument, and the general theories are therefore set forth briefly in the next section, in the context of the needs of this thesis.
SECTION 8

Comparative Literature, Theory and Methodology:

A proper comparative study of the two works under consideration involves our placing them in the theoretical context wherein certain issues -- eg. influence, imitation, reception, assimilation, survival, methodology -- are discussed. Although comparative literature is a relatively new area, in the last fifty years substantial theoretical discussions have established the legitimacy of the discipline. I wish to consider here, although briefly, some of these issues as they have a direct bearing on my subject.

I have divided my discussion of the various theoretical concerns under the following heads: European comparative literary studies and their history; Comparative Literature, definition and concepts; Methodology; relevance of comparative literary studies for the Indian literary context. As this study is based on the aspect of 'influence' (direct), I will be discussing this aspect elaborately taking into view the theories of well-known contemporary Western comparatists such as René Wellek, Henry Remak, Claudio Guillet, Ulrich Welsstein and Joseph Shaw, as well as the Indian comparatists like S.K. Das, Naresh Guha, S. Majumdar, R.N. Srivastava and others.
European Comparative Literary Studies:

The term 'comparative', says René Wellek, occurs in Middle English, and must have been derived from Latin 'comparativus'. From Wellek's article "The Name and Nature of Comparative Literature", the origin of the term can be traced to some extent. In 1598 Francis Meres used the term in his essay entitled "A Comparative Discourse of Our English Poets with the Greek, Latin and Italian Poets". Wellek notes that in 1602 William Fulbecke published A Comparative Discourse of the Laws. Thomas Warton in his preface to the first volume of his History of English Poetry announced that he would present "a comparative survey of the poetry of other nations" (Discriminations 2). But the combination 'comparative literature' perhaps occurred for the first time in a letter by Matthew Arnold in 1848, in which he attacks the English for not learning other languages, namely Greek, Latin, French, etc. But Wellek points out that the decisive use of the term in English was made by Hutcheson Macaulay Posnett in 1886. Wellek attributes the lateness of the English term to the change in the original meaning of the term 'literature' as 'knowledge or study of literature' to 'literary production in general'.

In France, in the early nineteenth-century the combination of 'litterature comparée' was used. It was
Abel-Francois Villemain, who however gave currency to the term. In Germany, in the early twentieth-century a new term 'Literaturwissenschaft' was coined for what was known by "Literary Criticism" or "theory of literature". Goethe in 1795 wrote "Erster Entwurf einer allgemeinen Einleitung in die vergleichende Anatomie". Here 'vergleichende' meant 'comparative' (Wellek, Discriminations 11).

Although the terminology was late in arriving in literary circles, the practice of comparative criticism, no doubt in rudimentary forms, was much older. It is a well-known fact that the Romans were highly conscious of their dependence on the Greeks. Their tradition was largely derivative. This gave ground to the writers who worked out elaborate parallels. It is said that Quintilian first took the lead in this regard. In Quintilian's Institutio a whole sketch of the history of Greek and Roman literature is provided, which concentrates on the Romans and their Greek models. But there is another view that the Greek critic Longinus attempted to apply the comparative method somewhat systematically. As T.R. Sharma states, "Longinus (3rd century A.D.) in many respects is the first to introduce the comparative literature" ("Introducing Comparative Literature" 3). In his fragmentary treatise "On the Sublime" Longinus searched for certain universal features in literature and made one of them his angle of study. Longinus established a
typological affinity, a similarity arising out of the inherent affinity in the creative process and expression of humanity in general.

Claudio Guillen mentions the place of Hippolyte Taine in historical criticism. Taine was preoccupied with the relationship between an artistic work and the people or the conditions that produced it; there is thus a cause and a product. Taine's theory may be summed up as follows:

(a) Every work of art is determined by a cause and should be explained by it;
(b) reorganization of certain elements into different structured products is a biological process;
(c) art imitates nature directly, and art only indirectly.
(d) Causes, historical conditions, nativity or the "soul" of the nations invite scrutiny as well as
(e) dependence of one writer on another (Guillen, Literature as System 24-25).

From this we can affirm that any work of art is to be traced back to the age which produced it. Age → Art (psycho→national) relationship always exists. There is a mutual dependence between these two factors, and it may extend in some cases to writers.
In "The Aesthetics of Literary Influence" Guillen goes on to examine Joseph Texte's idea on the 'biological analogy' which supported the subject of international influences. Guillen marks that "each single literature was regarded as a sort of subspecies, and comparative literature as the study of the cross-fertilizations and contacts between these subspecies, and of their evolution and mutations" (28). Texte implied that this biological and evolutionary process amounts to "creation". Guillen argues that Texte is in reality interested in the psychological aspect of the concept of influence. And Guillen would rather label it as the "concept of transfer" than as a 'creation' of a psycho-biological entity.

After a brief glance at the origin of the terminology and the pioneers in the field of comparative literature, I now move onto the 'history' of its more definitive phase. The German Man of Letters, Goethe believed that the spiritual need of all nations could be satisfied through a knowledge of a universal world literature, a common heritage represented by the efforts of the best writers of all nations directed towards the universal in humanity. Such a need has been met by the formal discipline of comparative literature.

It is common knowledge that from the beginning, cultures and literary works of one language and country have influenced those that came after, of other countries even.
Perhaps comparative literature originated thus. It was in the nineteenth-century that European literary scholarship assumed a new dimension which led to the emergence of comparative literature as a new discipline. With the Renaissance started the revival of classical literary scholarship on a broad scale. Towards the end of the eighteenth-century English literary scholarship assumed a new dimension. In Literature as System Claudio Guillen gives an account of the early comparatists of the modern period. Fernand Baldensperger (1921), after First World War, inaugurated the 'Renvue de Literature Comparee'--for fostering a new humanism based on the comparatist's search for universals beyond change and national differences, in order to find commonalities or universals. During the nineteenth-century when the concept of 'World Literature' was evolved from the European point of view, what was included within the limits of that concept was the literature produced in Europe from the ancient time, and since the advent of Christianity. These studies were Euro-centric, i.e. they involved studies of only Western languages and literatures.

The process of studying literary genres, aesthetic theories, critical principles, literary movements, or even a close and textual study of two or more authors or texts from different languages eventually resulted in evolving the concept of comparative literature. René Wellek and Austin Warren in Chapter 5 "General, Comparative, and National
Literature" of their Theory of Literature emphasize this fact. In a spirit of cosmopolitanism they hold that "it is important to think of literature as a totality and to trace the growth and development of literature without regard to linguistic distinctions" (49). The classical French comparatist Van Tieghem viewed comparative literature as the study of mutual relations between the literatures of two countries. However, being a literary historian as well as a historian of criticism Rene Wellek felt impelled to disagree with Van Tieghem's view. The reason is, in a given case, relations need not necessarily be mutual. There is often more of influence and less of mutual relation for the simple reason that factors of time and space are involved.

Wellek shows in "The Name and Nature of Comparative Literature" that

With the decline of evolutionism and the criticism launched against its mechanistic application by Bergson, Croce and others, and with the predominance of the late nineteenth-century aestheticism and impressionism, which stressed again the individual creator, the unique work of art, and highly sophisticated literature, these concepts of comparative literature were either abandoned or were pushed to the margin of literary studies. (Discriminations 34-35)
In his controversial paper presented at the International Comparative Literature Association Conference held at Chapel Hill, USA in September 1958 "The Crisis of Comparative Literature", Wellek attacked the French school for its failure to delineate a subject matter and a specific methodology. Wellek pointed out that out of the nineteenth century 'positivistic factualism' emerged the French school of comparative literature with its own narrow, rigid rules. Arguing against Van Tiele's stand, Wellek contended that "Comparative literature would be, in subject matter, an incoherent group of unrelated fragments: a net work of relations which are constantly interrupted and broken off from meaningful wholes" (Concepts of Criticism 283). In "The Name and Nature of Comparative Literature" he complains that "the whole concept of literature in these researches is external and often vitiated by narrow nationalism ..." (Discriminations 35). Wellek's paper "The Crisis of Comparative Literature" produced a snowballing controversy, making some of the European scholars regard Wellek as being influenced by the spirit of the country where he moved (namely the U.S.). They alleged that he tended to devalue the worth of scholarship under the influence of the New Criticism. Wellek however later explained that he was not against a nation, but against 'a method'. Some critics, as Wellek himself points out in the Chapter "Comparative Literature Today,"
while admitting the justice of some criticisms against the established theories, misunderstood my position as being inimical to all literary history and deplored the fact that Renato Poggioli, Claudio Guillen, and myself, though Europeans by birth, had ceased to be interested in the relations between the rival European nations which the old cosmopolitanism tried to revive after the war. (Discriminations 44)

The critics of the French school of comparative literary scholars are interested in such topics as the comparative arts, but do not regard them as being within the sphere of comparative literature. This school with its strict laws does not consider any study as comparative literature study, unless it involves comparison of literature with literature. Any other study involving comparison of literature with other spheres of activity, or other arts is only viewed as "a comparative study" and not as "comparative literary study". This school strongly feels that comparative literature must set up its own inflexible laws, a link between organically related but physically separated areas of human creativeness. There is less scope for other areas of interest to come under this school due to its formalistic principles.
Another leading modern American comparatist, Henry Remak, points out that the French school is interested in presenting historical documents and while doing this it tends to minimize the value of literary criticism in the sphere of comparative literature. This is one of the tendencies that are repeatedly criticised. Wellek and Remak strongly fought against the positivistic roots of the French school. Remak observes that the fact-finding or documentation process has no end and will not make a fruitful study. Despite the rigidities, the French school of comparative literature continued to occupy a 'distinct and distinguished' place in French universities, "precisely because it combined a wider coverage of literature with a prudent restriction to literature" (Remak, "Comparative Literature, Definition and Function" 7).

On the contrary, the American school holds more liberal views. It allows inquiries into the relationship between literature and other fields. While the French school concentrated on 'modes' and 'transmission', 'reception', 'sources', 'influences' and 'images' of a country from its literature to the literature of another country, the American school has introduced literary criticism as a valid sphere of interest, while keeping the general structure of literary history as the base of such studies. This school encourages comparative study of analogies, motifs, stylistics, genres,
movements and traditions. Such a study will enable one, as Remak says, to have a clear overview of both the works, their quality and strength. Remak outlines the actual method required for comparison as follows: "Comparative literature requires that a work, author, trend or theme be actually compared with a work, author, trend or theme of another country or sphere" (11). However, one can note Remak's partiality for the American school when he says, "We conceive of comparative literature less as an independent subject which must at all costs set up its own inflexible laws, than as a badly needed auxiliary discipline ... extending the investigation of literature both geographically and generically" (Ibid. 9-10). The task of the scholar, according to Remak, is to understand literature as a whole, bearing in mind the factors mentioned above.

Wellek holds in "Comparative Literature Today" that it would be a mistake if comparative literature studies are based on the method of the French school "of the multiplication of newly accessible documents and unexplored inter-relationships" (Discriminations 53). Studies should be more 'intrinsic'. The neighbouring disciplines such as other arts, psychology, philosophy, sociology, etc., contribute to enriching one's knowledge of literature. He thus concludes that "we have to keep a balance between expansion and concentration, nationalism and cosmopolitanism, the study of
literature as art and the study of literature in history and society" (Ibid.).

Comparative Literature: Terminology:

Now we may consider Remak's three dimensional view: the study of literature 'within walls' as National literature; 'across walls' as Comparative literature; and 'above walls' as General literature (18). These are some of the areas or terms that overlap with Comparative literature taking World literature also into account. We shall presently see why these cannot be treated as strict synonyms. A clear grasp of the meanings of the other terms is very useful for delimiting comparative literature terms. Even as there are rival terms for 'literature', we have some terms overlapping with the term comparative literature, like Universal, General, National etc. "Universal literature" is an eighteenth-century term, widely used in German. "General literature" exists in English, used by James Montgomery who gave 'Lectures on General Literature, Poetry' etc. (1833). Wellek calls "General literature" as "theory of literature" or "principles of criticism". The term "National literature" involves our dealing with significant differences in language, nationality or tradition. To put it plainly, it is based on research involving studies of literatures of one nation. The term "World literature" was used by Goethe in 1827 in commenting
on a translation of his drama Tasso into French. Goethe was probably thinking of a "single unified world literature", as Wellek says, when using the term. However Wellek points out that World literature today means all literature, or "a canon of excellent works from many languages, ..." (Discriminations 14-15). In Remak's view "World literature also suggests an element of time" (12). But as it is obvious, time factor is not as important in comparative literature as it is in World literature. World literature deals therefore with what we may call classics. We must consider Wellek's view that the use of the term "World literature" is still debatable. Wellek observes:

'Comparative literature' is now an established and comprehensible term, while 'General literature' is not. 'General literature' used to mean poetics, theory of literature, and Van Tieghem has tried to give it a new and special sense. Neither meaning is well established today ... 'Comparative' and 'general' literature merge inevitably. ("The Concept of Comparative Literature" 5)

Ulrich Weisstein discussing the three terms, agrees with Matthew Arnold while speaking on World literature for it includes "the best that is known and thought in the world" (Comparative Literature and Literary Theory 20). Remak observes that "Comparative Literature (geographically
speaking) involves, like world literature, an element of space, but frequently, though not necessarily, a more restricted one". Remak goes on to say, "Comparative literature often deals with the relationship of only two countries, or two authors of different nationality, or one author and another country" (12). But we must also note that there are instances of comparative studies of one country and two languages or two authors within it. Weisstein holds that studies involving more than two authors point to World literature. In "The Name and Nature of Comparative Literature" Wellek approves of Van Tieghem's view that 'comparative literature' includes 'general literature'. Van Tieghem however "confines 'comparative literature' to 'binary' relations, between two elements, while 'general literature' concerns research into 'the facts common to several literatures'" (Discriminations 17).

Definition:

Is it possible to arrive at a comprehensive definition of comparative literature? Let us briefly glance at the attempts made by reputed comparatists to define the nature and scope of the discipline. Anna Balakian regards Comparative literature as a "new indefinite, hybrid field... still in its experimental stage and prone to trial and error". However she believes, it "has a high potential and challenging, limitless vistas" ("The Objective of Comparative
Literature" 235). It has turned out to be an effective technique of exploration of individual excellences. In Owen Aldridge's view.

Comparative literature provides a method of broadening one's perspective in the approach to single works of literature -- a way of looking beyond the narrow boundaries of national frontiers in order to discern trends and movements in various national cultures and to see the relationship between literature and other spheres of human activity. (Comparative Literature: Matter and Method 1)

Ulrich Weisstein gives the famous French comparatist Jean Marie Carre's definition as quoted in Guyard's 'La literature comparee' while opening his chapter on 'Definitions'. Carre's definition runs thus:

Comparative Literature is a branch of literary history: it is the study of international spiritual relations, of 'rapports de fait' between Byron and Pushkin, Goethe and Carlyle, Walter Scott and Alfred de Vigny, and between the works, the inspirations and even the lives of writers belonging to different literatures. (Comparative Literature 3)
Van Tieghem who belongs to the French school, held that "Comparative Literature aims primarily ... at studying the works of various literatures in their inter-relationship" (qtd. in Weisstein 5). Van Tieghem went on to define it further: "The object of comparative literature is essentially the study of diverse literature in their relations with one another" (qtd. in Wellek, "The Name and Nature of Comparative Literature" 15). Henry Remak has defined comparative literature as

the study of literature beyond the confines of one particular country, and the study of the relationships between literature on the one hand and other areas of knowledge and belief, such as the arts (eg., painting, sculpture, architecture, music), philosophy, history, the social sciences eg., (politics, economics, sociology), the sciences, religion, etc., on the other. In brief, it is the comparison of literature with another or others, and the comparison of literature with other spheres of human expression. (3)

In Anna Balakian's view, "the comparative approach to literature could indeed become an auxiliary to the history of ideas" (237). Weisstein partially agrees with Remak's call for generosity as against French stringency when he says: "I
admire Remak's enthusiasm but do not wish to desert the 'terra firma' of scholarly security without taking steps to prevent the sliding off into the bottomless pit of mere speculation" (7).

According to Abhai Maurya, the Indian comparatist, comparative literature should be studied "in the wider meaning of the universal literary process with a view to arriving at some conceptual generalisations about the evolution of world literature" (Confluence: Historico-Comparative and Other Literary Studies 37).

Going back to Wellek for a definition as given in "The Name and Nature of Comparative Literature" we have his view that...

Comparative literature§ can best be defended and defined by its perspective and spirit, rather than by any circumscribed partition within literature. It will study all literature from an international perspective, with a consciousness of the unity of all literary creation and expression. (Discriminations 19)

According to this concept, "Comparative literature is identical with the study of literature independent of linguistic, ethnic, and political boundaries" (Ibid.).
Wellek strongly holds that "Works of literature are monuments and not documents" (Ibid. 20). The three main branches of literary study, according to Wellek, are: literary history, literary theory and literary criticism. In their Chapter "Literary Theory, Criticism and History", Wellek and Austin Warren discuss the limitation of these branches thus:

Within our 'proper study', the distinctions between literary theory, criticism, and history are clearly the most important. There is first, the distinction between a view of literature as a simultaneous order and a view of literature which sees it primarily as a series of works arranged in a chronological order and as integral parts of the historical process.... It seems best to draw attention to these distinctions by describing as 'literary theory' the study of the principles of literature, its categories, criteria, and the like, and differentiating studies of concrete works of art as either 'literary criticism' (primarily static in approach) or 'literary history'. (Theory of Literature 39)

Thus in their view criticism cannot be separated from history.
Despite the importance of the temporal or historical context, comparative literature in the broad sense sees the unity of human consciousness and the unity underlying the different ways in which the human spirit has sought expression creatively, producing different cultural patterns. It has been a long held belief that the human mind is everywhere the same with the same capacities. Such a position has been labelled in recent critical discussion as the "Essentialist view" of man. It holds that there is an unchanging trans-historical core in human nature shared by a vast majority of the people across cultures although historically speaking cultures have evolved over long periods of time. This position has been strengthened since the 18th century, familiarly called as the "Age of Enlightenment", and characterized much of the European thinking for nearly two centuries. However, in the late 20th century the assumptions of 'Essentialism' have been vigorously questioned and its hegemony much enfeebled. This current trend may appear to weaken comparative studies. But in reality, comparative studies have gained fresh dimensions on account of this destabilizing of 'Essentialism'. Comparative studies are possibly enriched in all fields by the changing socio-cultural theories.

Any orthodox comparative study aims at finding out the 'universals' and the 'particular'. This will give the reader
the exact data on the contribution of every national culture to world culture, also enabling the scholar to determine the regularity of the development of national culture in various stages, under changing social conditions, thus promoting the progress of national cultures. There are two aspects of comparative literary studies. They are the study of influences and genealogy or the study of genres.

Ideally speaking, an inter-cultural research which involves a study of the difference in the concepts of literature in different climes and times, is an ambitious venture. Comparative literary studies, however, are more restricted, although they surely draw from such a research for fixing the background of a given project. In any case in a critical study involving a comparison of two texts taken from across national boundaries, the reader has the opportunity of having a bifocal perspective. We may call this the 'context'. Then comes the 'content' which is the direct target for the literary scholar. Such an approach inevitably entails a systematic study of the subject.

When a systematic study is undertaken of two writers, the scholar discovers how a later writer constructs his 'tradition'. It requires what T.S. Eliot called 'historical sense' which "involves a perception not only of the pastness of the past but of its presence;" Eliot went on to add, "the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his
own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of his country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order" (Selected Essays 14). Although comparatists may dub such a concept of tradition as more relevant for constituting the notion of World literature than comparative literature, Eliot's emphasis on the spatio-temporal aspect of literary study is useful for our purpose.

History or tradition or 'the past' occupies a prominent place in comparative literary studies. History is represented in a selective form in the 'work', as the author takes into account the events of the age in which he lives and reflects upon them in his work. On the other hand the record of events in the chronological order becomes history. It is generally believed that great writers owe some of their greatness to the times in which they live, and serious writers feel the need to address issues of substance of those times which are troubled. Social reformers belong to this group of writers. History involves focussing on the socio-cultural, politico-economic and literary conditions. A comparatist finds the historical knowledge helpful in constructing the framework of his study, partly if not wholly.
Moving into the literary study proper we may say that it will be a happy occurrence if the connecting link between two chosen works is overt and strong. The important task in the study of a comparison is to be able to apprehend each separate example of a writer's work as a whole, to recognize its individual tones, rhythms, genre and internal structure. Historical situations, however, play a vital role in comparative literature in enabling the scholar to go beyond restrictive boundaries such as the dichotomy of the East and the West. This facilitates the historico-comparative method of studying literature.

Thematic comparisons yield fruitful results. How does one identify the areas of comparison? The 'stoff' or subject matter is constituted by a variety of motifs, such as love, fate, death, nature, etc., which are shared by all the literatures of the world, by humanity in general. Comparative literature has had two historic motivations: "Universalism" and "Romanticism". Thematology accounts for Universalism. This has been already mentioned in the brief reference to Essentialism. Romanticism is the other approach which has an equally strong interest in the cultures of other people, but aims at finding out the particularity of each culture. This view is in line with Guillen's stand as stated in "The Aesthetics of Literary Influence".
the 'romantic aspiration', the cosmopolitan or inter-nationalist tendency, ... regards literature as a cause -- in more than one sense of the novel. It presupposes the vitality of nationalism and responds to a broader style of living, to the experiences of political or social man.

(22)

The comparative method begins in an acknowledgement of the data as independent works and from there proceeds to examine them under the assumption of a common purpose, bringing out the creative talents of individual writers. Comparison also serves to establish differences. There may be a gap of time and space between the original author, his work and the later author and his work. This is, of course, reflected in the works. This gap accounts for a change of subject, the style, and the form etc. The writers take the 'raw materials' that are available to them from the society in which they live. The different socio-cultural conditions answer to the changes if any in the subject-matter or the form. A study of such works enables the scholar to trace the differences. A comparative study thus serves to establish both similarities and differences.

Parallel treatment is yet another method of comparison. In this method the scholar takes the works for study and
accounts for the similarities and difference in two parallel
times. Such a study may often be a mere piling up or
accumulation of matter or information. It may not give
fruitful results, as it does not place the works for scrutiny
under one head, taking into account Wellek's stand on the
interconnections between 'literary history, literary theory
and literary criticism' (Discrimination 20). Parallel study
of literary history and literary theory to some extent
neglecting literary criticism, does not form an adequate and
full-fledged appraisal.

Concepts:

"Comparison is the systematic juxtaposition of
phenomena from two different literatures or disciplines for
whatever results it produces: analogy, contrast, reception,
influence" (Jozsef Kovacs, "Complex or Inter-disciplinary
Studies: New Boundaries of Comparative Literature in
Hungarian Literary Scholarship"). To this view we may add
that influence also involves imitation and assimilation.
Given all these aspects, comparative literature becomes a
recognizable discipline by itself.

Going deeper into the nature of comparative literary
studies, we may say that comparison is used in literary
studies to indicate "affinity, tradition and influence".
Affinity consists in resemblances in style, structure, mood or ideas between two works which may not have any connection. Tradition consists in resemblances between works which form part of a large group of similar works held together by a common historical, chronological or formal bond. The concept of influence is concerned with genetic study, source study, literary indebtedness etc. The study of influence of one writer on another has always been prominent in comparative literary studies. There are two aspects to this type of comparison: direct influence or conscious influence and indirect influence or unconscious influence.

Direct influences occur when certain themes and ideas of one writer of one nation are imbibed by another writer of that nation or another nation. Indirect influences occur when similar themes are focussed upon in different countries by different writers independent of each other. As Wellek stresses in the "Crisis of Comparative Literature", comparison should not stop with the collection of similarities in the area of the subject matter, but end in the process of interpretation of the works by the scholar. As he says, "Works of art, however, are not simply sums of sources and influences: they are wholes in which raw materials derived from elsewhere cease to be inert matter and are assimilated into a new structure" (Concepts of Criticism 285). The researcher should, accordingly, not
only show the influence of A and A₁ in the later work, but should also bring in the creative talents of B and his imagination mixed with artistic talents that are fused into the later work 'B₁', as a result of the process of influence, imitation, and assimilation. Causal explanation leads only to accumulation of source materials, as earlier mentioned. Here lies the task of the researcher. He has to find out, as Remak says, "what was retained and what was rejected, and why and how was the material absorbed and integrated, and with what success" (4). The tracing of the process of assimilation is more important and perhaps legitimate in comparative studies than mere thematic discussions based on influences.

"Some of the pre-requisites of comparative literary studies involve finding the objective of imitation or the effect of influence of the works or ideology, and the transformation of this influence into an altogether different work, with traces of similarities, of course. This forms the actual process of assimilation. The most revealing comparisons will be those that show obvious signs of direct influence which have been accepted by writers themselves. To imitate, according to Ben Jonson, is to write. Imitation is not copying, but transforming. The basic principle in all the imitative acts is clearly the combination of similarity and difference or unity amid variety. We may look into Swapan Majumdar's statement on 'Imitation':"
Imitation may be studied in a one to one correspondence; influence reveals simultaneous traces of absorption from multiple sources. While the one looks obvious, the other only reflects a distant glow. In summing up the differences between the two, I would reiterate... that these two do not cancel out each other, but are in fact successive, complementary stages of a gradual, cumulative process. Such influence relations begin with imitation, then proceed through reception on the course of either integration or differentiation, culminate in impact -- ... and are finally followed by survival in successful cases. (149)

This pattern is applicable to both intra-literary and inter-literary relations.5

There can be no influence without some degree of affinity and imitation. In a comparative approach, the researcher has to locate first aspects relating to affinity and influence. The importance of an influence in this case lies in its significance to the whole work. Owen Aldridge defines influence as "something which exists in the work of one author which could not have existed had he not read the work of a previous author". He, however, supports J.T. Shaw
while saying, "Influence is not something which reveals itself in a single, concrete manner, but it must be sought in many different manifestations" (144).

Influence is an aesthetic concept in relation to which the following terms, 'borrowings, sources, parallels or analogies and imitation' were formed. A comparative study of two writers belonging to different cultures separated by time and space and with no imaginable influence on each other can also be aesthetically studied, provided it is done in a systematic manner. But for the best results of any comparative study, the combination of influence and analogy is important. Swapan Majumdar's view regarding comparative literary studies in Indian literature is that

the pedagogy of the imperialists was instrumental to the ushering of two far-reaching moves within Indian literatures: while on the inter-literary plane it exerted a direct influence, intra-literary transactions in its wake brought about almost simultaneously an indirect influence, which again contributed to no mean extent to the cementation of bonds between modern Indian literatures. (153)

But this view is also applicable to those literatures that are produced in non-colonized countries.
In the spectrum of influence we have at one end literal translations, and at the other, an original piece of art. In between we have adaptations, restricted renderings etc., helping in the making of the new work. Ulrich Weisstein rightly states in "Influence and Imitation" that influence cannot be quantitatively measured. If one wishes to exhaust the range of possibilities opening up to the student of influences, one may conceive of a series of steps which, beginning with literal translation, proceeds in an ascending order through adaptation, imitation, and influence to the original work of art. [32]

It is generally accepted that the influence of one literary work upon another is more easily demonstrable and more aesthetically interesting than that of a writer upon another. For eg., if we denote it as:

A -- as the original author,
A₁ -- as his work,
B -- as the later author,
B₁ -- as his work,

then the paradigm,

\[ A₁ \rightarrow B₁ \]

is easy to trace.
Even if we were to trace the impact of influence of \( A_1 \) on \( B \), we can only infer the effect or the degree of influence in \( B_1 \). It is the work that shows the process of influence, imitation, reception, etc. The final stage of these processes may be called 'survival'. The work \( B_1 \) is the surviving product (the aspects of reception and survival will be discussed at the end of this section). The work becomes an index to the mind of the author. The literary aspect of influence studies proves to yield better results than the psychological aspect. However, without the transfer of ideologies, thoughts, motifs, etc., of \( A \) to \( B \), \( B \) cannot always produce \( B_1 \). To support this argument we may quote J.T. Shaw who says,

In contrast to imitation, influence shows the influenced author producing work which is essentially his own. Influence is not confined to individual details or images or borrowings or even sources -- though it may include them -- but is something pervasive, something organically involved in and presented through artistic works.

(65)

This is somewhat similar to Henry Remak's view that "a comparative literature study does not have to be comparative on every page nor even in every chapter, but the overall intent, emphasis and execution must be comparative" (15).
Literary influence with its different aspects has particular manifestations in comparative literature. Influence should be intrinsic, showing in style, images, themes, thought etc., presented by particular works. For a proper study of this case, J.T. Shaw states that "Influence has a social and often a meaningful political context, in addition to the literary one" (66). Claudio Guillen in "The Aesthetics of Literary influence" acknowledges that "any theory of influence implies an intuition..." (18). Guillen may be identified with those who subscribe to the doctrine of "Romanticism" discussed earlier in this chapter.

At this point we must consider whether the influence on a writer is 'literary' or 'psychological'. Guillen points out that the psychological critic would argue that "states of mind and works of art are not only indivisible, but two stages of an uninterrupted process of formal reorganization." He also observes that "The nineteenth-century idea of influence sprang from this notion of literature as the product of a direct reorganization of human experience into art" (27). He complains that literary scholars went about looking for literary causes instead of psychological ones. The fact is that literary works exhibit not only the substance of experience, but also transmit previous literary works. We may assume that the flow to $B_1$ is from $A$ and $A_1$. The flow of influence depending on an undisturbed passage of
the elementary substances from A & A₁ to B₁ may be represented as A & A₁ --- B₁.

The other aspect of influence is the formation of a new product, as a result of 'absolute creation'. The absolute or artistic creation involves the process of transfer and reorganization. In the aesthetic context, an influence is defined "as a recognizable and significant part of the genesis of a literary work of art", and influences, since they develop strictly on one level, are individual experiences of a particular nature, for a number of reasons: because they represent a kind of intrusion into the writer's being or a modification of it or the occasion for such a change; because their starting point is previously existing poetry;.....(Guillen, Literature as System 30)

And also because the alterations they bring about, no matter the degree, have an indispensable effect on the subsequent stages of the genesis of the work of art, the product of a displaced series of influence. These three views of Guillen help one to understand clearly the process of transfer and the results of an influence. Guillen cites Haskell Block's definition of an influence to support his argument: "An influence would be a part of the process by
which works are created, hence located in the mind of the writer rather than in his work" (31).

Guillen's stand on influences is clearly marked by a preference for giving weightage to the psychological process for the reason that the impact is felt on the writer primarily, even before the actual work begins to shape itself. However Guillen does not discuss the theoretical difficulties involved in the process of transfer of forms and themes, for he believes, "a form cannot be rearranged by anyone's logic,"; and themes "are conveniently misleading entities" (Ibid. 31). But he gives an account of the disadvantages of the 'concept of transfer'. They are as follows:

(1) It implies that an influence is an objective connection, a tangible affair, of which some material traces ought to remain after the work is finished:

(2) The idea of transfer ascribes to phenomena of influence, in many cases, a kind of importance, of necessity, of effectiveness as great and enviable as that of the artistic works themselves. As all influential elements are ultimately embodied in the finished poem, nothing is lost and all is well that ends well;
(3) The most remarkable consequence of this view is the persistent confusion between influences and textual similarities.

We may denote Guillen's stand on influences, while keeping in view his résumé of the disadvantages of the concept of transfer, as follows:

\[ A \rightarrow B \]

the transfer is from Author to Author and not

\[ A_1 \rightarrow B_1; \text{ i.e.,} \]

the transfer is not from work to work.

In every artist there will be a desire, an urgent need to express the creative impulse. Even before arriving at the 'subject', it is the need or the urge to write that predominates. This 'mood' enables the writer to pour his feelings and thoughts into his work, consciously or unconsciously. In this case 'content' is not primary, but the disposition of the mind is more important. The external support from another work of art to the mind and indirectly to the work may also be called as influence:

\[ A \rightarrow B, \text{ is now between A and B.} \]

There may be some works which have an impact on B resulting in B₁. We may show it thus.

\[ A \xrightarrow{X} B \rightarrow B_1. \]
X is the external support from another work of art, i.e. an influence. For this the subject (X) need not always necessarily be literary. There may not be a one to one relationship between the influential element(s) and the final text. Thus there can be parallelisms which need not be influences. Guillen goes to the extent of remarking that "textual comparisons yield scanty results" (37). The present study, on the other hand, concentrates as much on this factor as on the impact on the mind. This may be seen in the discussions of the essays in Chapter III. Guillen gives the following propositions in support of his argument.

1. Every study of influence is initially a study of the genesis of a work of art, and should be predicted on the knowledge and interpretation of the components of that genesis. In other words, by simply comparing A and B, we cannot arrive at the influence of A on B;

2. To ascertain an influence is to make a value judgement, not to measure a fact. Thus 'influence' and significant influence are practically synonymous.

3. An influence study, when pursued to the full, contains two very different phases, just as it bridges the gap between the origin of the creative process and the poem itself. The first step deals with the influence as such, or impact. The second step is textual and
comparative, but entirely dependent on the first for its existence and value. It deals with parallelisms or echoes. The genetic function controls the impact, and the textual function, the echo or the parallelism.

(4) The value of an influence is not aesthetic, but psychological. Its genetic function is valued here.

(5) The study of convention and techniques is not the same as influences. Such studies will enable one to distinguish between what is more conventional and what is centrally operative (Ibid. 38-41).

After setting these theoretical points, Guillen concludes that "Our first perspective embraces the genesis of the poem, and our second, the career of the book"; and points out that "Comparative literature is the systematic study of literature in international terms" (Ibid. 49). Thus far, we have seen Guillen's observations which show that he recognizes influences in the 'process' and not in its 'product'.

The views of Ulrich Weisstein on influence may be taken up for consideration for a complementary perspective. In his book Comparative Literature and Literary Theory he supports those aspects of influence which are based on 'literary theories'. His view counters Guillen's as he argues that
only when the interpenetration of *rapports exterieur* [externals] and *rapports interieurs* [internals] and the interrelation between specific influences and general conventions or traditions is fully considered, is it possible to reconstruct the chain $A \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow B \rightarrow B_1$ satisfactorily. (47)

According to Weisstein, the transfer of influence occurs from one work to another:

$$A_1 \rightarrow B_1$$

Weisstein has offered the most extensive critique of Guillen's position and as such complements our discussion of the concepts which figure in comparative theoretical discourse. As mentioned in Section 'A', I would draw theoretical support for my study, both from Guillen's stand and from Weisstein's as I base my study on the fusion of the psychological and literary theories on influence. There is therefore a link between

$$A \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow B \rightarrow B_1$$

$A$ -- is the psychological impact

$A_1$ -- is the literary impact upon

$B$ -- the author (latter) and

$B_1$ -- is his work.
Another important aspect of comparative studies is the use of translations. Literary translations function as a vehicle to convey the national or native literature to the world. Translations of important literary works from one language to another constitute a major avenue of literary influence. The substance or the essence of the work can be had in any known common language through translation. Translations are very useful as they help to modify the reader's understanding and evaluation of the original work. Translations come of use at this stage as they transcribe into a different cultural context the ideas, emotions and aesthetic sensibility of the original. "Thus", as J.T. Shaw points out, "translations belong not only to the study of the 'reception' of a foreign author in a particular literature, but to the study of the literature itself" (62). Translation as a means of making the work available to a wider world, takes us to yet another central concept in comparative literary studies, namely 'reception'.

The term 'reception' refers to that (literature) which receives something from another (literature or language), of the same country or of another country. As the word implies, one author 'receives' inspiration or motivation from another and thus produces a work. This is another aspect of influence studies. The text is at the centre around which research is done. Swapan Majumdar clearly marks how a reception study should be:
Reception studies should focus on the receptor, on what the age demands of him and of his literary ideas and ideals, on what elevates and enkindles his imagination...; they should try to discover a common thread running through his oeuvre, to decipher a pattern, to map out a psychology of inclination that contributes to the making of his creative personality. (150)

Weisstein says in "Reception and Survival" that "the study of literary reception, accordingly (with its relations between works, authors etc.) points in the direction of literary sociology or psychology" (48). Weisstein is of the view that the popularity or the fortune of a work is not necessarily a prerequisite for literary influence. The fusion of reception with the creative talents, sometimes also turns into an act of erudition, where the later writer draws the thoughts and memories from other works or writers, thus producing a work. In such a case, there is the fusion of erudition, influence, and originality, resulting in the product $A_1$. There are instances when certain writers become 'models' for other writers, contemporary or later. For e.g., we have in the West Goethe, Spenser, Milton etc., and in India Vyasa, Valmiki, Kalidasa, etc.

Weisstein rightly holds that "in contrast to the kind of psychologically 'tainted' appropriation, the reception of
a foreign work on the part of an author writing in a
different tongue is a methodologically safe object of study
for comparative literature, and that regardless of whether
such reception has direct, indirect, or questionable literary
results" (53). In this model the later writer (receiver) due
to his linguistic skill has direct access to the works of a
foreign literature. Here there is no need for intermediaries.
To support this view, we may take Fidelino De Figuerido's
article "On Comparative Criticism" in which he mentions
"Reconstruction of interrelations, direct or indirect, of two
literatures, in which one would function as the emitter, the
other as the receptor, with or without, the existence of a
third as an intermediary" (11). Neisstein remarks that "the
image of foreign authors and their works projected by the
writer-as-critic adds another dimension to the kind of
'reception', we are presently concerned with" (55). This
aspect of 'reception' results in 'survival' which is the last
stage in the process of the influence studies.

In Neisstein's scheme 'survival' is the result of the
transfer of elements from $A_1$ to $B_1$. Now the traces of $A_1$ in
in the later work $B_1$ reflect the process of survival. The
erlier work and the earlier author may be seen surviving
directly or indirectly in the later work. This presence of
the elements of $A_1$ in $B_1$ is referred to by the term
'survival' in Neisstein. For this, we may note there are no
spatio-temporal barriers. Even after a lapse of time and distance, traces of elements of one work of art can be seen in another work of art. When a work of art, crossing all barriers, still surfaces, it becomes a clear case of survival. In order to explain the term more explicitly Weisstein cites Escarpit:

Quantitatively, the decisive and most severe selection occurs in the first generation beyond the biographical zone. Every writer has a rendezvous with oblivion either ten, twenty or thirty years after his death. If he crosses that formidable threshold, he joins the literary population and is assured a virtually permanent survival -- at least as long as the collective memory of the civilization which witnessed his birth endures. (7)

This description is very much in line with the traditional notion of a 'classic' in all literary cultures, and is best understood in the context of World literature. The sense of a work or an author surviving the test of time is also important to some extent in comparative literary studies. The difference, however lies in the laying of the emphasis on the historical context of the relationship between two works or two authors as well as on how an earlier work is received and assimilated. The later work is not a
passive receptacle of the features of the original. The critical interest should be as much in the transformation as in the reception. Conducted in this manner, comparative literary methodology meets with the demands of both the historical and the critical camps in the discipline of comparative literature.

Methodology:

In 1958 René Wellek in his "Crisis of Comparative Literature" had complained that this new, young discipline of Comparative literature "has not been able to establish a distinct subject matter and a specific methodology" (282). He bemoaned that comparative literature does not have a method of its own, as it repeats the normal method of literary historiography and it only extends its investigation to a wider or broader area, crossing national boundaries in its search for external influences.

The variety of critical opinions on the scope, content and methodology of comparative literature is indicative of the difficulty of defining the discipline. Henry Gifford holds that "there are no bounds to this study" (Comparative Literature 58). Wellek felt that Comparative literature had become a stagnant water and when it came to defining its methodology, it stood still, undiscovered. Wellek concluded that continuing with an obsolete methodology, borrowed from
nineteenth-century factualism, scientism and historical relativism, the study of comparative literature relied upon motifs, themes, characters, situations and plots subjected to comparison, and the study opened parallels, similarities and differences consequently.

However, the methodology of comparative literature can be determined by the twin needs of bilateral or multilateral study of literary works and thereby it can acquire a deeper awareness of culture and civilization expressed in literature. At the surface level, the study should concentrate on those motifs of thought and emotion which recur in the writings of a particular area or period. If this recurrence takes a pattern, then the socio-economic structure of the parent society will have to be searched for its cause and motivations. The same method is followed to trace differences.

"Method" should therefore remain consistent with the "approach". This forms the first pre-requisite of the methodological operation that the field be determined and areas of research be classified and sub-classified through a defined point of view. R.N. Srivastava, an Indian comparatist, in his article "Some Methodological Prerequisites Of Comparative Literature" (96) has diagramatically represented the method in his as detailed below:
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According to this diagram, we have constantives at one end and variables at another end. These two are common for any comparative study. The finding out of these involves the two processes, namely, text oriented and theory oriented. The former relates to literary studies which involve examining certain specific texts or works. As shown in the diagram above, the study involves National literature, and so it could be intra-lingual. But for best results of a comparative study, the study should involve inter-lingual and trans-cultural relations of works. This is the other aspect of comparative methodology shown in this diagram. This study involves a scientific approach or a hypothetical method to find out the universals. Based on the theories, experiments are made to find out the required results. Inter-lingual studies are done in this method. These two aspects are connected with certain common factors. They are as in the diagram the stem part showing relational, synthetic and international aspects. We can put it this way: the tracing of commonalities and variables mainly entails a study of the subjects in a relational method for synthetic products which may involve international subjects. These are some of the basic prerequisites for a methodological approach for any comparative study.

The comparable objects should be viewed as a composite whole, as well as separate units, abstract and concrete.
variants. Such a method will enable one to establish a dynamic relationship between two or more literary objects with conjunctive and disjunctive assertions. In my attempt to compare The Spectator and Sakshi essays, I have tried to apply this methodology, although not fully, with the objective of finding out the commonalities and variables.

To conclude, comparative study of literature is a highly fascinating and challenging discipline. Comparative literary studies are capable of going a long way in promoting a fully comprehensive awareness of and susceptibility to literature. Comparative literature has a wide canvas which includes all essential disciplines of Humanities.

Comparative study with its different manifestations enables the reader to understand literature as one whole, just as the Brahman, the ultimate principle, assumes different forms in the Hindu religion. Comparative Literature will emerge as a study of a complete human civilization, and by emphasizing the basic human values, will lead to the cultivation of a true understanding, transcending the boundaries of time and space.
(1) Macaulay's famous "Minute on Education" (1831) is historically the most significant document responsible for introducing English education in India. Macaulay wrote, "Whether we look at the intrinsic value of our literature, or at the particular situation of this country, we shall see the strongest reason to think that, of all foreign tongues, the English tongue is that which would be the most useful to our native subjects" (qtd. in G.O.Trevelyan, The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay 1: 405).

(2) Rasa: In Sanskrit poetics, the term refers to essence, taste, aesthetic experience of an emotion (emotion resulting from contemplation of life-emotion). There are basically nine 'rasas' in arts.

(3) Telugu is one of the Indian languages. Telugu belongs to the Dravidian family. But we can see the dominance of Sanskrit at phonological, lexical and grammatical levels. Telugu grammarians classified Sanskrit words in Telugu as 'tatsama' (equivalent to) and 'tathavas' (originated from). In the modern period the influence of English on Telugu is seen at some levels. eg., Bus, train, hospital, collector, plaster are considered as Telugu words by the Telugus. This shows the dominance of English on Telugu and the composition of Telugu vocabulary. We can see the influence of English not only on Telugu language but also on Telugu literature as English continues to be the administrative language in India.

(4) Upanyasa is a combination of music, scholarly discourse and popular exposition marked by a note of moralizing which will be discussed at length in Chapters IV and V. It might remind the Western audience of the classical Horatian dictum dulce et utile -- to amuse and to instruct, which is the end of art.