

Two Epitomes of Susceptibility and Inaction: A Comparative Analysis on the Characters of Hamlet and Oblomov

Md. Abdul Awal¹

Abstract: The paper aims at exploring the affinity and difference between the characters of Shakespeare's Hamlet in *Hamlet* and Goncharov's Oblomov in *Oblomov*. Ivan Goncharov is a Russian novelist and William Shakespeare is a British playwright. Though the two different pieces of literature have probably no connection, both the writings are named after the male protagonists and both are character studies of susceptibility and inaction. There are reciprocal illuminations of the arts in their writings although they were born in different centuries and nations. On one hand, Hamlet represents intelligentsia and suffers from susceptibility to make definite decisions. On the other hand, Oblomov represents a kind of iconic indolent man who is so lazy and idle that in the first 50 pages of the novel the only movement that he makes is from his chair to his bed. Oblomov is also incapable of taking decisions and actions for what to do like Hamlet. The paper is of interest in many respects as this literary survey proves that both characters suffer from the inability to make rapid decisions and actions. A qualitative research method with an inductive approach and the secondary sources are parted in the development of various aspects of the paper for the virile comprehension and exact interpretation of the comparatist standpoint. The study intends to install a qualitative methodology escorted textual analysis from evaluative and analytical angles to clarify the comparanda of the fictional characters. Goncharov could have been famous for his literary works if his literary works had been introduced like Shakespeare across the globe. Hence, the focal point of the research is to exhibit some significant similarities and differences such as in style, structure, mood or idea between the two masterpieces of world literature.

Keywords: Affinity, Inaction, Interliterariness, Susceptibility, Tradition and Universality

Introduction

This study is by far one of the most inclusive character analyses of the most popular Russian novelist, Ivan Goncharov and William Shakespeare, the greatest dramatist in English literature. They have become famous writers of

¹ Associate Professor, Department of English, Prime University, Mirpur-1, Dhaka-1216, Bangladesh

the world forever. The researcher compares Goncharov's and Shakespeare's fictional characters of two embodiments of susceptibility and inaction. In this process, this study highlights the performances of Oblomov and Hamlet in the light of comparative literature. The discursive narratives of *Hamlet* and *Oblomov* offer an understanding of the comparison of the protagonists in the backdrop of historical interests, interliterariness, multiculturalism and globalization. The researcher has to go through other relevant literary works with a view to making a clear understanding of proper subjects of comparative literature. For example, Matthew Arnold in his inaugural lecture at Oxford University in his essay says: "Everywhere there is connection, everywhere there is illustration. No single event, no single literature is adequately comprehended except in relation to other events to other literatures" (1857). *Hamlet* and *Oblomov* echo cultural paradigms and outlooks of their respective eras concerning their protagonists, their positions, their roles and their expectations for "the essential human needs and concerns" (Adrams 225). Shakespeare presents intelligentsia in his characters in the Renaissance, the golden period in the history of English literature. Goncharov's contribution to the exploration of the infertility of the Russian culture and the superficiality of the modern Russians is immensely important. His achievement as a significant Russian novelist compares to Shakespeare for reality and universality as a great writer to "satisfy enduring human desires and needs" (Abrams 224) out of fictional characterizations. Characterizations are the essential elements for estheticism in literary works within the social formation in which are produced. Literature represents "the truthful reproduction of typical characters under typical circumstances (Marx et al. 401). Goncharov and Shakespeare possess the mastery of producing typicality in their writings. The traditional complacency of Russian writers regarding the excellence and flexibility of Russian literary works was shaken, and writers like Goncharov and Shakespeare at the time tried to synthesize the amorphous ideas in their consciousness through their characterizations as world-famous writers.

Comparative literature has recently offered the study of diverse fields and cultures due to translation studies. It is an academic field across linguistic, national and overseas boundaries as it is the cultural "relationship between different literatures" (Joesph Texte). Comparative literature is "the comparison of one literature with another of others and the comparison of literature with other spheres of human expressions" (Henry H. H. Remrk). The development of comparative studies has alos much to do with the assertion of national identity. The consistencies of comparative literature are

with a series of French anthologists entitled *Cours de Litterature Comparee* (*The Course of Comparative Literature*) (1816-1825). This was the beginning of comparative literature. There are many approaches to comparative literature; the French Approach that talks about cultural transfer, colonialism and domination. The German Approach is nationalistic but more about exploration. The 20th-century American Approach is pretentiously geopolitical. Here 1980s Postcolonial Approach is about resistance. There are some suggestions also given by the comparatists such as Susan Bassanet's *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction* which identifies some methodological problems, therefore, she suggests that comparative studies should be replaced translation studies. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's *Death of a Discipline* (2003) identifies eurocentricity. Therefore, she recommends that comparative analysis should be replaced by area studies. suggests that comparative literature should be replaced by translation studies. So, comparative study is inevitable and the most informative and thought-provoking expression of human characterizations and actions to present reality. These suggestive clues have inspired the researcher for attempting a comparative study between Hamlet and Oblomov who might be the centre for any kind of study in comparative literature.

Problem Statement

In describing human conditions all writers think alike to uphold the culture, creed, customs and tradition of their individuals but they are in different languages. Although a writer writes plenty of literary works, s/he is hardly well known to the world owing to individual identity. Though the writers have huge cultural contributions in media and literature in their own nations, they are hardly familiar with other nations owing to comparative studies. All writers have great artistic values but "no artist of any art, has complete meaning alone...You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison" (Eliot 122). Though there have been significant contributions and improvements in the field of translation studies over the past decades, much more attention has to be paid in comparative studies in the age multiculturalism and globalization.

Research Questions

- * How do Hamlet and Oblomov seem so close to each other?
- * What does a comparatist function?
- * How have susceptibility and inaction been focused on in *Hamlet* and *Oblomov*?

* And how does the research inspire the researchers and scholars for comparative study?

The Aims and Objectives

The purpose of the study is to show the similarities and differences between Hamlet and Oblomov by revisiting the fictional world of Shakespeare and Goncharov. The study portrays the susceptibility and inaction of the wonderful mentioned protagonists by themselves. It displays Shakespeare's and Goncharov's mastery of engineering artistic fictional characters in literature and media in literature and media. It manifests interliterariness, susceptibility, inactive, soliloquies, mythology, pessimism, imagination, universality and so on in the mentioned books. The researcher narrates the backgrounds of so-called Russian novelty and the superfluity and vogue of Renaissance materialism comparative literature. The paper analyzes the two epitomes, susceptibility and inaction in order to present the existing superfluity of the people of the present world. The researcher displays intertextuality in making these two masterpieces of world literature as the centre for comparative studies. Finally, the paper motivates researchers and scholars for comparative study.

Theoretical Framework

This study resorts to the comparatist theory as a core concept to analyze *Hamlet* and *Oblomov*. As the comparatist study emphasizes the interdisciplinary analysis in the cultural presentation of fictional characters, the related knowledge is useful to show how the comparison of Goncharov and Shakespeare comes into effect in the critical study. The researcher analyses and evaluates the susceptibility and inaction of the excellent fictional characters Hamlet and Oblomov in order to display the proper subjects of comparative study. This paper excavates the different national cultural backgrounds of Goncharov and Shakespeare to display their similarities and differences. It evaluates comparatively Russian and English cultures, creeds, customs, values, beliefs and traditions as reflected in Goncharov's and Shakespeare's literary works. The researcher presents comparatively how these two masterpieces of world literature are the fullest and finest expression of the universality of their same appeals and the same aesthetic rules of artistic production of literature as world-famous writers. Comparative. It has recently offered the study of diverse fields and cultures due to translation studies.

Literature Review

A large number of critics worldwide have studied Shakespeare and Goncharov keeping in view their comprehension of Hamlet and Oblomov in literature and media. Javed Akhter et al. in their scientific essay “Hamlet and Oblomov: A Comparative Study” analyze the characters from the Marxist perspective. The paper highlights the social and literary types for exploring socio-political norms in which Hamlet and Oblomov belong. In “The Comparative Nature in Comparative Literature: A Case-study of Some Major Bengali Literary Works in Conjunction of Other National Literatures” Abu Saleh Md. Rafi mentions: “The Russian novel *Oblomov* may be compared to *Hamlet* because each work is a character study of indecision and procrastination” (p 2). Numerous critics have critically criticized Shakespeare’s characterizations in the critical intellectual stadium. Georg Lukacs views Hamlet, one of the characters:

Of Shakespeare’s great tragedies is particularly instructive, because in them the specifically dramatic character of historical changes, of dramatic historicism, is clearly manifest. As a true dramatist, Shakespeare does not try to point a detailed picture of historical and social circumstances. He characterizes the period through his actors. That is, all the qualities of a character, from the ruling passion down to the smallest ‘intimate,’ yet dramatic, subtlety, are coloured by age. Not necessarily in a broad or epic historical sense, but certainly in the historical conditioning of the collision; its essence must derive from the specific determinants of the epoch (137).

Goncharov represents the Russian superficiality of the novelty of Oblomov. In his PhD Dissertation entitled “The Drama in Disguise: Dramatic Modes of Narration and Textual Structure in Mid-Nineteen-Century Russian Novel” Wiggins explores the most thought-provoking ideas about Oblomov and appeals to the same as literary character.

This is not to say that Oblomov is unique among the nineteenth-century Russian literary characters for his display of the Easternness of Russia. Rather, he and Andrey bear contradictory and paradoxical symbolic currency that was inherent to the cultural milieu. Instead of emerging as diametric opposites (Ehre 196).

Peace Richard points out, “All approaches of the contemporary critics of Ivan Goncharov to judge the character of Oblomov made absolute the social aspect of the character and ignored all the rest. Such type of critical interpretations is limited to diametric oppositions between the two

characters” (13). Though there have been plenty of studies on *Hamlet* and *Oblomov* related to theories, indecision, procrastination and historical context, there is hardly any specific discussion on the two epitomes of susceptibility and inaction by analyzing the characters. This paper is going to engage a holistic approach to comprehend how this masterpiece of world literature encounters the notion of susceptibility and inaction about Hamlet and Oblomov by analyzing their attitudes and actions to formulate a pattern of similitude in their responses to the same.

A Glimpse on Life and Works of Goncharov and Shakespeare

Before going to do a comparative study, the following facts about Goncharov and Shakespeare would facilitate the understanding of their wonderful and excellent literary works. Ivan Alexandrovich Goncharov (1812-1891) was one of the greatest Russian novelist. He was born in a noble family. He graduated in 1834 at Moscow State University from the Department of Literature. He served as a Governor Secretariat. In 1838 he joined the Russian Literary Society. Initially, Goncharov wrote romantic verses and novelettes. His first novel is *Obyknoyennaya Istoriya* 1847 (A Common Story). His first novel was, *Obyknovennaya Istoriya* (A Common Story). His *Oblomov* was published in 1859. This novel makes him a living classist. The novel has been hailed as one of the best tragedies.

William Shakespeare was born in 1564 and died in 1616 in London, England. He is considered one of the greatest dramatists of the world. He writes 154 sonnets, 37 plays with elaborate metaphors and rhetorical phrases and other literary works that are revolving several main and sub-genres such as histories, comedies, tragedies and tragicomedies. His *Hamlet* is one of the best tragedies. Parallel to the fragmentary allusions to the sources of experiences, writers like Goncharov and Shakespeare build multiple layers of human consciousness. The researcher attempts to recognize Goncharov as a living breathing novelist of the world like the greatest dramatist Shakespeare. The platform for biographies of Goncharov and Shakespeare is described as an agenda for having their excellent literary careers. They contribute significantly in the arena of literature. This present study is displaying the reasons in Hamlet and Oblomov tracing their susceptibility and inaction.

Findings

Hamlet of Shakespeare belongs to Renaissance, the golden age in the history of English literature and Goncharov's Oblomov is the production of Russian

superficiality or so called novelty. Though the two protagonists belong to different countries and ages, there are reciprocal illuminations sleeping in the titles, traditions, influences, and illusions and here the interliterariness, i.e. guiding and unifying principles of Goncharov and Shakespeare encompasses for exploring the bitter conditions of life out of their sentiment “which manifests itself is less what the language says and more what it does, i.e. words take on an energy in their contextual and intertextual life” (Gentzler 40). *Oblomov* is a well-known literary text. Oblomov is the main character. Goncharov explores the artificiality and superficiality of the Russian so called nobility through the activities of Oblomov. Ilya Ilyich Oblomov is a member of the upper middle class society. He is the son of Russian landed gentry. He conducts his daily business from his bed. He does not know what to do. Initially, he is found lying in his bed and the only movement that he makes is from his chair to his bed. The following evidence of Goncharov can be culled:

Nevertheless, his ability stopped short of a talent
for verbal exposition; and no sooner was
he called upon to transmit a theory into
action than his whole bearing underwent a
change, and in every case he discovered
practical difficulties in the way of what he
conceived to be the best course to take...

“I was just about to rise/” said Oblomov with a yawn.

(Goncharov 49-50)

Oblomov symbolizes laziness, inaction and stagnation of the entire feudal system of relations. He is infected with a fundamental contradiction between word and deed, reverie and practically worthless. The novel, *Oblomov* reveals the complex relationship between slavery and nobility. “It is clear that Oblomov is not a dull, apathetic nature,” writes Dobrolyubov. Anton Pavlovich Chekhov even considers this image negative, a judgment by the fact that Oblomov is too pleased with himself and thinks too well of himself. Through Oblomov, Goncharov embellishes contemporary attitudes of Russian nobility toward issues like frustration, loneliness, haughtiness, conscience, regicide, retribution, mourning, and spiritual barrenness in his literary works. Through his protagonist, Goncharov reveals moral degradation, dilemma and damage of his age. Oblomov’s distinguishing characteristic is depicted in order to make a change. A leading literary critic Vissarion Belinsky (1811-1848) strongly argues that literature should promote positivity for the overall development of the society. Through his

essay he tributes Goncharov's Oblomov as an effective diagnosis for eradicating Russian social disease. One of the essays of Dobrolyubov entitled "What is Oblomovism" traces artificiality and superficiality of so called Russian novelty through Stoltz and Olga as social ideals in contrasting to Oblomov. Goncharov makes Oblomov work like a superfluous man with a view to depicting the reality of the Russian nobility. A superfluous man is a man, who talks more, does a little and is lazy. Oblomov is the portrayal of moral dilemma and superfluity in his age.

Oblomov is different from Hamlet who forms a resolve to take revenge the murderer of his father. He is unable to take any steps for the action which he has been contemplating for long. "Hamlet's psychological crisis is precipitated by his inability to act against his uncle King Claudius and reconcile contradictory normative imperatives" (Pupavac 15). He has merely been brooding over the problem he is faced with, but he has not yet been able to come to any definite decisions. Shakespeare, although, represents intelligentsia, one can easily intuit Oblomov's echo in the soliloquy of Hamlet:

To be or not to be, that is the question;
 Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
 The slings of arrows of outrageous fortune,
 Or to take arms against a sea of troubles
 And by opposing end them. To die –to sleep,
 No more; and by a sleep to say we end
 The heart- ache and the thousand natural shocks
 That flesh is heir to; 'tis a consummation
 Devoutly to be wish'd. To die, to sleep;
 To sleep, perchance to dream –ay, there's the rub
 For in that sleep of death what dreams may come,
 When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
 Must give us pause- there's the respect
 That makes calamity of so long life.
 (Hamlet, III, Lines, 59-69)

These choices imply that the decision of whether or not to exist is a constant struggle for every man. Hamlet struggles to mediate out of his wisdom which implies that death is evaluated based on the perceived social value, as opposed to a universal ethical system. He is affected by suspension out of circumstances about the sudden death of his father and the marriage of his mother. At the outset of the play reveals that "Something is rotten in the state

of Denmark” (Shakespeare Act I). Hamlet is tragically doomed to reform the social norms. Terry Eagleton states, “Hamlet is a radically transitional figure, striking out between a traditional social order” (74). Hamlet’s realistic selfhood is vividly portrayed against the forms of society. He insists, “Together with all forms, moods, shows of grief, That can denote me truly (Shakespeare Act I). He honours and gripes his unique sense of self when he proclaims, “That ever I was born to set it right!” (Shakespeare Act I). Shakespeare presents him as an impeccable performer. He is much impressed with the effect of performances upon the performer:

Is it not monstrous that this player here,
But in a fiction, in a dream of passion,
Could force his soul so to his whole conceit
That from her working all his visage waned,
Tears in his eyes, distraction in’s aspect,
A broken voice and his whole function suiting
With forms to his concert?

(Hamlet, II, Lines, 553-559)

But for representing ephemeral slogans of England and Russia, Hamlet and Oblomov may vibrantly be alike. In spite of having their strong convictions of human dignity, nobility and ability as human beings, they do not perform their duties duly. Oblomov’s maxim “to be free or not to be free” is, in fact, the same as Hamlet’s axiom “to be or not to be”, (Patterson 6). Hamlet and Oblomov, in the socio-economic and political upheaval of their respective society, may verbalize the reality to the “mental process which enables the readers to perceive similarities and differences” (Aldrige, 1985). Hamlet is a very complex literary character of Shakespeare on the point “seemingly accomplished for the greatest actions...whose existence is nevertheless an outperforming dream” (John 31). Hamlet cannot make it implemented immediately due to his hesitation in him. William Hazlitt, S.T Coleridge, A. C Bradley and Sigmund Freud opine Hamlet’s hesitation as “only an excuse for his want of resolution” (Harold 513).

Similarly, Oblomov can barely leave his bedroom in the country. As he sleeps, a dream reveals Oblomov’s upbringing in Oblomovka. He is never required to work or perform household duties, and his parents constantly pull him from school for vacations and trips or for trivial reasons. Oblomov symbolically represents the inner hollowness and spiritual barrenness of the people especially the Russian gentry who do not have the courage to be quick doers like Hamlet who, although gets excellent opportunities to take

his revenge upon King Claudius, is unable to make the opportunity properly used:

That would be scann'd:
 A villain kills my father, and for that
 I, his sole son, do this same villain send
 To heaven
 Why, this is hire and salary, not revenge.
 (Hamlet, III, line 75)

Hamlet presents the contemporary infidelity and degrading customs of the particular social formation for envisioning a peaceful living world. "And indeed Hamlet dreams of a world which has been somehow made straight, a world of honest people, honest relationships, but he does not believe that such world will ever in fact become reality" (Lunacharsky 237). Shakespeare's portrayal of Hamlet has aroused a great amount of debate and critical commentary as a universal literary character in the Elizabethan era, which has become immortal in world literature. As Dollimore and Sinfield put it:

A play by Shakespeare is related to the context of its production economic and political system of Elizabethan and Jacobean England and particular institutions of cultural production (the church, patronage, theatre, education) ...culture is made continuously and Shakespeare's text is reconstructed, reappraised, reassigned all the time through diverse institutions in specific contexts. What the plays signify, how they signify, depends on the cultural field in which they are situated (Poularde 31).

Similarly, Russian works of literature have come out in the nineteenth century in English. Characters like Oblomov certainly reflect the social, economic and political phenomena in them. Isolation from the outside world, gentleness and cordiality, greater than in an alien external business world, humanity, and self-sufficiency are poetized by Goncharov, like Russia itself. The resulting characteristics of the so-called Russian nobility are; "weariness, boredom, indolence, self-orientation, self-pity and fear", (Patterson 3). Some critics argued that the superfluous man [such as Oblomov] emerged as a result of too much affluence, too much leisure, and too much idleness for the children of the privileged class in Tsarist Russian society, The book, *Oblomov* upholds a relationship between the character and the reality of the society. The following predicament of Oblomov is mentionable:

Full of strange phantoms was
 his mind, fear and grief had sunk deep
 (and, possibly, for ever) into his soul.
 Mournfully he gazed about him and saw
 that everything in life was changed with
 evil and misfortune
 (Goncharov 117)

Oblomov has two things; the first is a futile dream, and the second is a pragmatic, unspiritualised activity of the people of his age. He wastes his valuable time only thinking of making decisions but hardly goes for implementation. He wakes up early, around eight in the morning, when he thinks that he has to get up, it is already ten o'clock, but until eleven in the morning, he is not going to get up and even receives guests lying in bed. He is a young man who is not without positive qualities. Oblomov adores the old values and traditions of the past and abhors the new ones. He lives in the past dreaming for his past and childhood. He prays that the next day will be the same, as the previous (Gerschenkron 699). He obviously wants to do something but his spiritual barrenness makes him frustrated from execution. Oblomov cannot do anything out of fear. He is a kind, smart, innocent man. His main drawback is inertness and indecision soaked up with his mother's milk. His character is a direct consequence of the education of the so-called Russian nobility. One can compare Oblomov's indecisiveness to what Prufrock thinks in T.S. Eliot's poem, "*The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock*":

And indeed there will be time
 For the yellow smoke that slides along the street,
 Rubbing its back upon the window-panes;
 There will be time, there will be time
 To prepare a face to meet the faces that you meet;
 There will be time to murder and create,
 And time for all the works and days of hands
 That lift and drop a question on your plate;
 Time for you and time for me,
 And time yet for a hundred indecisions,
 And for a hundred visions and revisions, (Lines-22-32)

Prufrock, the lover in "*The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock*" is trapped in his own mind for making a love proposal. He is so full of hesitation and doubt that he is unable to act. Eliot makes Prufrock a portrayal of the paralyzing anxiety of the superfluous Russian men like Oblomov whose tendency is to

brood over the problems of life for the reason that he and Prufrock belong to the same community as Hamlet in terms of taking rapid decisions and actions. Like Prufrock, Hamlet also thinks that it is his urgent duty to take his revenge but he is in crisis. He keeps waiting. It so happens that while Hamlet is capable of impulsive action, he cannot act upon any premeditated plan. The following lines show the tendency to brood over the problems of Hamlet's life:

Rightly to be great
Is not to stir without great argument,
But greatly to find quarrel in a straw
When honour's at the stake. How to stand I then,
That have, a father killed, a mother stained,
Excitement of my reason and my blood,
And let all sleep, while to my shame I see
The imminent death of twenty thousand men
That, for a fantasy and trick of fame,
Go to their graves like beds, fight for a plot
Whereon the numbers cannot try thy cause,
Which is not tomb enough and continent
To hide the slain? O, from this time forth
My thoughts are bloody or nothing.
(Shakespeare, Lines 53-66)

On one hand, Hamlet realizes all the more keenly that he fails in his filial duty to take his revenge upon his uncle Claudius. He is perfectly conscious of his irresolution and his vacillating nature. He represents "a certain emancipator and messianic affirmation" (De Grazia 264) implying an absolute justice "beyond the logic of vengeance" existing as a non-linear "differed time" (265). On the other, Oblomov is required to do important work or to perform household duties; therefore his parents constantly pull him but he does not pay any heed to them. Goncharov makes Oblomov correspond exactly with the quiet inefficiency as a superfluous man. Scholar David Patterson (1995) describes: "The superfluous man is not just...another literary type but...a paradigm of a person who has lost a point, a place, a presence in life" before concluding that "the superfluous man is a homeless man" (2). Oblomov's indifferent indolence is again seen in the following:

Yet this crisis of emotion
seldom crystallized into the form of a definite
the idea is still less into that of a fixed resolve.
Almost always such emotion evaporated in

a sigh, and shaded off into a sort of apathetic
 lethargy...With Oblomov, lying in bed was neither a
 Necessity nor an accident
 always he was at home he would spend his
 Time is lying on his back
 (Goncharov 5)

Through Oblomov Goncharov describes contemporary attitudes toward issues such as frustration, lethargy, regicide, and mourning. Based on his strong convictions of human dignity and equality, Goncharov speaks against all social and political evils and tries to eradicate superfluity from Russian society. All approaches of the contemporary critics of Ivan Goncharov to judge the character of Oblomov made absolute the social aspect of the character and ignored all the rest. Such a type of critical interpretation is limited to diametric oppositions between the two characters. Goncharov's investigation reveals a number of convincing new reasons for viewing Oblomov as an irresolute young man with moral dilemmas and "deferred time" (De Grazia 265). Oblomov and Hamlet have the same realizations of incapacities for concrete action produce a very depressing effect on them when Hamlet says:

How all occasions do inform against me,
 And apur my dull revenge. What is a man
 If his chief good and market of his time
 Be but to sleep and feed? A beast, no more.
 Sure he made us with such a large discourse,
 Looking before and after, have us not
 That capability and godlike reason
 To rust in us unus'd. Now whether it be
 Bestial oblivion, or some craven scruple
 Of thinking too precisely on th'event-
 A thought which, quarter'd, hath but one part wisdom
 And ever three parts coward-I do not know
 Why yet I live to say this thing's to do,
 Sith I have cause, and will, and strength, and means...
 (Shakespeare, Lines 32-45)

It is seen how Hamlet's incapability for physical action produces a very depressing consequence for him. His conscience has been in him for his failure due to his dilemma as Caudwell Christopher rightly justifies:

In Hamlet the problem of conflict of unmeasured wills is posed in yet another form— here a man's will is divided against itself, and therefore even though nothing 'external' can oppose or reflect it, it can yet struggle with itself and be wrecked. This 'doubleness' of a single will is aptly symbolized by the poisoned swords and goblet in which one aim is as it were two-faced and secures opposite ends (87-88).

As a consequence of his personal strife and suspension, Hamlet fails to evaluate and demand diverts him from taking revenge in every complaint he appearances. He does not spend his time planning reforms. He is entrapped in confusion and indecision. He says:

Now might I do it pat, now a is a-praying?
 And now I'll d't. (Draws his sword)
 And so a goes to heaven
 No.
 Up, sword, and know thou a more horrid hent:
 When he is drunk asleep, or in his rage,
 Or in th'incestuous pleasure of his bed,
 At game a-swearing, or about some act
 That has no relish of salvation in't,
 Then trip him that his heels may kick at heaven
 And that his soul may be as damn'd and black
 As hell, whereto it goes
 (Shakespeare, Act III, Lines 73-95)

His disappointments and hopelessness are visualized when he says, "How weary, stale, flat and uncomfortable, Seems to me all the uses of this world"(Act I, Lines133-134). His final soliloquy expresses his frustration, "a little patch of ground, that hath in it no profit but the name" (Act IV lines 18-19). Finally, he ends his life by contemplating revenge against the murderer of his father. Similarly, Oblomov's incapability for physical action produces a very depressing consequence for him. Their consciences have been stabbing them for their anxieties in the matter. Ultimately, Oblomov ends up living in penury. He dies in his sleep fulfilling his wish to sleep forever.

Conclusion

In this article, the two characters Hamlet and Oblomov have critically been analyzed with keen attention and observation and displayed the similarities from various critical studies of William Shakespeare and Ivan Alexandrovich

Goncharov and there are plenty of themes that can be researched again and again on their literary deeds. Sources are surely available in Shakespeare's and Goncharov's writings in themselves which provide obviously a good number of ideas to explore constantly. Similarities are found in both literary works. Oblomov and Hamlet have the same expressions and realizations. The characters are male in gender. Both protagonists fulfill their missions and die in the end. Shakespeare's and Goncharov's writings uphold the value and universality of their fictional characters. This study may be a paradigm and propaganda in which interliterariness, susceptibility, inactive, soliloquies, mythology, pessimism, imagination, universality and so on are in the two books of Shakespeare and Goncharov manifested. These two comparanda, susceptibility and inaction in *Hamlet* and *Oblomov* respectively might be helpful for scholars in the field of comparative study.

References

- Abrams, Meyer Howard. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Bangalore: Prism Books Pvt. Lid..1993.
- Akhter, Javed, Shumaila Abdullah and Khair Muhammad "Hamlet and Oblomov: A Comparative Literature". *International Journal of Literature and Arts*, vol. 3, no. 5, 2015, pp. 108-119. www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/journal/502/archive/5020305. Accessed 15 January 2023.
- Arnold, Matthew. "On the Modern Element in Literature." (Inaugural Lecture delivered in the University of Oxford, 14 November 1857), Encyclopaedia Britannica, viewed on 04 July 2021. www.britannica.com/topic/On-the-Modern-Element-in-Literature. Accessed 20 January 2023.
- Bassinet, Susan. *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell, 1993.
- Chances, Ellen. *The Superfluous Man in Russian Literature*. 1st ed, Routledge. 2001.
- Christopher, Caudwell. *Illusion and Reality*. Macmillian, 1937.
- De Grazia, Margreta. "Teleology, Delay, and the Old Mole." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 50, no 3, 1999, pp. 251-267. www.jstor.org/stable/i345579. Accessed 17 January 2021.
- Diment, Galya. *Goncharov's Oblomov: A Critical Companion*. Northwestern UP, 1998. www.abebooks.com/Goncharovs-Oblomov-Critical-Companion-NorthwesternAatsell-Companions/11798806346/bd. Accessed 17 January 2023.
- Dobrolyubov, Nikolai. "What is Oblomovism?" *In Selected Philosophical Essays*. Moscow, 1956, pp. 343-356. www.amherst.edu/media/view/297815/original/Dobrolyubov.pdf. Accessed 16 January 2023.
- Dollimore, Jonathan.and Alan Sinfield. *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Manchester UP, 1985.
- Eagleton, Terry. *William Shakespeare*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Ehre, Milton. *Oblomov and His Creator: Life and Art of Ivan Goncharov*. Princeton, 1973.
- Eliot, Thomas Sterns. "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock." *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock and Other Poems*, Harriet Monroe, USA, 1915.

- Eliot, Thomas Sterns and Frank. (ed.) "The Perfect Critic", *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot*. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975.
- Gerschenkron, Alexander. "Time Horizon in Russian Literature." *The Slavic Review*, vol. 34, no. 4, 1975, pp.692-715. www.jstor.org/stable/i322534. Accessed 10 January 2023.
- Goncharov, Ivan Alexandrovich. *Oblomov*, Translated by C.J. Hogarth, GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD., London, 1958.
- Karl, Marx and Frederic Engels. *Selected Correspondence*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965
- Liukkonen, P. "Ivan Goncharov", *Books and Writers*. Kuusankoski Public Library, 2015
- Lukacs, Georg. *The Historical Novel*. Penguin Books, 1981
- Lunacharsky, Anatoly. "Bacon and the characters of Shakespeare's Plays." *Lunacharsky on Literature and Art*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1973.
- Patterson, David. *Exile: The Sense of Alienation in Modern Russian Letters*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995.
- Peace, Richard. *Oblomov: A Critical Examination of Goncharov's Novel*. United Kingdom: Birmingham Slavonic Monographs of Department of Russian Language and Literature, University of Birmingham, 1991.
- Rafi, A. S. M. 'The Comparative Nature in Comparative Literature: A Case-study of Some Major Bengali Literary Works in Conjunction of Other National Literatures', *Bangladesh Research Foundation Journal*. Vol 1, 2012. Accessed 18 January 2023.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*, Friends' Book Corner, Dhaka, 2007.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. George Bell & Sons, London, 1897.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Death of a Discipline*. Columbia UP, 2003.
- Wiggins, Kathleen Cameron. *The Drama in Disguise: Dramatic Modes of Narration and Textual Structure in Mid-Nineteen-Century Russian Novel*. PhD Diss. University of California, Berkeley, 2011. escholarship.org/uc/item/0g68t49h, Accessed 25 January 2023.