Chapter One

Introduction
The art of comparison is as old as humanity itself. It has a prominent and paramount part to play in the modern world comparison in every field has become a trend, fashion or even a dire necessity. The word ‘Comparative Literature’ was used in English for the first time by Mathew Arnold in 1848, when he was translating the French writer’s words, ‘Historie Camparative’. In his Inaugural Lecture at Oxford in 1857, he said:

Everywhere there is connection, everywhere there is illustration. No single event, no single literature is adequately comprehended except in relation to other literature. (1)

Languages are different, cultures are different, but when the reader reads the great works of the writers, all the differences vanish and the art of the artist becomes a tool for the world unity which is spread by Comparative Literature. The regional literature becomes the world literature. Rabindranath Tagore has rightly said for the term Comparative Literature, which he translated in Bangla, as ‘VishwaSahitya” means World Literature.

When Tagore wrote this, comparative literature as an academic discipline was still in its infancy in Europe and America and its introduction in universities was vehemently opposed by many scholars of eminence. An Indian writer, Buddhadeva Bose, has written an essay on comparative literature which is reproduced here in an abridged summary:

If we want to understand man as revealed in action, his motivation and his aims, then we must pursue his intensions through the whole of history. To take isolated instances, such as the reign of Akbar or Queen Elizabeth, is merely to satisfy curiosity. He who knows that Akbar and Elizabeth are only pretexts or occasions; the man, throughout the whole of history incessantly at work to fulfill his deepest
purposes, and to unite himself with the All-it is he, I say who will strive to see in history not the local and the individual, but the eternal and universal man. His pilgrimage will not end in observing other pilgrims, for he will behold the god whom all pilgrims are seeking.

What I am trying to say amounts to this. Just as this earth is not the sum of patches of land belonging to different people, and to know the earth as such is sheer rusticity, so literature is not the mere total of works composed by different hands. Most of us, however, think of literature in what I have called the manner of the rustic. From this narrow provincialism we must free ourselves; we must strive to see the work off one another 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. (243-44)

Nowadays, the comparative literature forms the part of the curricula of so many universities of the world. In India it is popular since last fifty-five years. The first department of Comparative Literature came into existence fifty years later, in 1956, at the Jadavpur University. It is a pleasant coincidence that National Council of Education, where Tagore delivered his lecture on Comparative Literature, is the ancestor of Jadavpur University. In the year 1974, Delhi University started the syllabus for M.A. English in Indian Literature, for modern Indian languages, a department, named ‘Comparative Indian Literature’ was started. Then after the word Comparative Literature became popular in various universities of India. Ganesh Devy suggests that comparative literature in India is directly linked to the rise of modern Indian nationalism, noting that comparative literature has been used to assert the national cultural identity.
Comparative study of any two or more things in any field is a natural phenomenon. Comparative Study of literatures is a systematic reading of literatures in the light of each other. Comparative study in literature, confines to the study of relationship between two or more literatures. It is the study of literature beyond the confines of one particular country. It is the comparison of one literature with another or others, and with other spheres of human expression as well. Susan Bassnett writes in *Comparative Literature*,

Benedetto Croce argued that comparative literature was a non-subject, contemptuously dismissing the suggestion that it might be seen as a separate discipline. He discussed the definition of comparative literature as the exploration of ‘the vicissitudes, alterations, developments and reciprocal differences’ of themes and literary ideas across literatures, and concluded that ‘there is no study more arid than researches of this sort’. This kind of work, Croce maintained, is to be classified ‘in the category of erudition purely and simply’. (2)

But Charles Mills Gayley, one of the founders of North American comparative literature, proclaimed in the same year as Croce’s attack that the working premise of the student of comparative literature was:

Literature as a distinct and integral medium of thought, a common institutional expression of humanity; differentiated, to be sure, by the social conditions of the individual, by racial, historical, cultural and linguistic influences, opportunities, and restrictions, but, irrespective of age or guise, prompted by the common needs and aspirations of man, sprung from common faculties, psychological and physiological, and obeying common laws of material and mode, of the individual and social humanity. (3)
S.S. Prawer writes in the *Comparative Literary Studies*, that comparative literature implies a study of literature which uses comparison as its main instrument. Remak Henry defines the term broadly,

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

The discipline of comparative literature is a method in the study of literature in at least two ways. He further writes,

First, Comparative literature means the knowledge of more than one national language and literature, and/or it means the knowledge and application of other disciplines in and for the study of literature and second, Comparative literature has an ideology of inclusion of the other, be that a marginal literature in its several meanings of marginality, a genre, various text types, etc. Comparative literature has intrinsically a content and form, which facilitates the cross-cultural and interdisciplinary study of literature and it has a history that substantiated this content and form. (1)

Thus, Comparative literature is an academic field dealing with the literature of two or more different linguistic, cultural or national groups.
Comparative study of literature may also be performed on works of the same as well as different languages, nations or cultures. We can say that comparison is a method used by all criticism and sciences of course it does not describe the specific procedure of literary study. Comparative study is the study of oral literature, relationships between two or more literatures and literature in its totality with "world literature". According to Sussan Bassnett,

Comparative literature involves the study of texts across cultures, that it is interdisciplinary and that it is concerned with patterns of connection in literatures across both time and space. (1)

Human aspirations are common and so are their frustrations. A creative writer looks at the society, understands it and portrays it with noble intentions of improving it. He also tries to discover in a specific event some universal pattern of human behaviour and social happening. By abstracting and then constructing such a universal happening, he educates with entertainment or aesthetic pleasure the mankind with what mankind can do to have a better quality of life on earth. This has been usually found with the authors who subscribe to the principle of art for life's sake. Both the British author George Orwell and the Indian writer in Hindi Shrawan Kumar Goswami have followed the principle of art for life's sake in their long career as creative writers.

Both the writers belong to the 20th century. However both of them belong to two different halves of the 20th century. Secondly, they belong to two different countries and in that way two different cultures and ways of life, i.e. the west and the east. Moreover, they also appear to be belonging to two different political ideologies. However, both of them very sincerely believe in the same value system, strongly supported by humanism. Both of them are to a very great extent unhappy with the society in general and the ruling class in particular. Both of them feel that the common man is made an easy prey by their leaders of different sorts and exploited for their personal gains and power. Unfortunately, the common man is also partly responsible for his
unprivileged place in the society. Both of them have strong sympathy for the common man and aspire to liberate him from the exploitation in different names. The result is obviously these two and several other dystopian novels by these writers. Both of them aspire to bring into reality a society which is classless and without hierarchy of any kind.

The research work has been undertaken by the researcher with the following hypotheses:

- Both the novels are thematically very close to each other.
- Both the authors employ stylistic device of a fable and allegory.
- Both the authors present a complex vision of life.
- Both the authors have a few dissimilarities due to their cultures.
- Both the authors have different authorial intentions for the novels.
- Both the novels reveal different visions of life.

This research has been undertaken with the following objectives:

1. Close study of *Animal Farm* by George Orwell
2. Close study of *Jungletantram* by Shrawan Kumar Goswami
3. To compare and contrast the novels written by two different writers of different background.
4. To compare the thematic concerns in these novels.
5. To compare the forms of the novels and the craftsmanship employed by the novelists.
6. To promote the vision of one world by appreciation of literature beyond national frontiers, and in pursuance thereof to rise above separate identities of single national literatures, and thus realize Tagore’s all embracing concept of *Viswa-Sahitya* and Goethe’s *Weltliteratur*
7. To encourage more researchers to do interdisciplinary studies in literature and other arts.
Second chapter presents a brief biography of George Orwell and Shrawan Kumar Goswami. At the same time, it also presents a brief description of their novels. Third chapter gives the complete picture of the novels *Animal Farm* written by George Orwell and *Jungletantram* written by Shrawan Kumar Goswami. In the fourth chapter the comparative study of these two novels is presented in detail by giving sub titles presenting similarities and dissimilarities between two works and approach of these two writers. The last chapter presents the conclusion of the whole thesis followed by the bibliography.
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