CHAPTER V

Conclusion

Some of the most purely inductive parts in the treatise are discussed here. Very little of their material is derived from any kind of synthesis of ideas already presented in other critical commentaries. The findings here form the offshoots of observing and discovering a prolonged confrontation between the primary materials and the authors with reference to their works. However, some critical works can be cited as relevant, corroborative or supplementary. They are acknowledged. The validity of the initial hypothetical propositions made at the outset of this study is also being examined in this chapter. Besides, from the analyses of the three previous chapters narrative techniques are detected. In the process some comparative literature strategies also are noticed and recorded.

(i)

The conception of a narrative triangle is presented in "Introduction." Amidst many things, sectional analysis of a narrative is taken up to identify basic units. As the analyses of Paradise Lost and Adhyatma Ramayana attempted here are fruitful, the narrative theory based on triangulation of narrative has been found acceptable. They even lead to a viable narrative conception covering the magnitudinal aspect of the narrative. The triangles emerging from the cross-sectional analyses are placed in apposition, one after another. All of them together give us a narrative prism. Using this prism, the formation of varying concepts of a narrative ranging from a tiny short story to a long
epic is not a tall order. This forms one of the most basic conclusions of this treatise.

(ii)

Chapter II provides analyses of the surface level of narration. It relates how the narrator, Milton or Ezhuthachan, got the fabula changed into a sujet. The relation between narrator and sujet has been noted and the whole chapter turns out to be an attempt to measure the relation between them. In the process how the narrator has employed "description", "diegesis" and "mimesis" as powerful techniques of externalization could be found.

Expansion and condensation are two techniques in both Paradise Lost and Adhyatma Ramayanam. Paradise Lost is found as a work that underwent expansion ranging from about eighty lines in the presentation of the story in Genesis to ten thousand five hundred and sixty five lines in its re-presentation in Paradise Lost. Adhyatma Ramayanam is the resultant product of the twin processes of condensation and expansion. When it is compared to Valmiki's Ramayana, it is much condensed. When it is studied with Adhyatma Ramayana, it is condensed in certain parts and expanded in certain others. The hymnody and homiletics discussed in Chapter II substantiate the technique of expansion. It is observed that Valmiki's Ramayana does not contain most of the hymns and homilies in Adhyatma Ramayanam. Verbal expansion or condensation comes under "description". Adding more events or dropping events is observed in "diegesis". Adding or dropping of dialogues or monologues comes in "mimesis".
The stance of the narrator in the fabula is measured in Chapter III. The second part of the Chapter centres round the exemplification of the concept of mediacy. This latter part is a mine of narrative techniques employed by both Milton and Ezhuthachan. The mediacy complex in either work discovered slowly unravels the mystery of the faculty of story telling. This may lead to further study. The Chapter is no doubt an eye opener for narratological investigations.

To borrow the phrase, the 'notion of ostranenie' or defamiliarisation, used by Shklovsky, the technique employed by 1 both Milton and Ezhuthachan is "defamiliarisation". Genesis story of Adam and Eve had been prevalent and hence quite familiar. Ramayana story also had been in use. In the works of both Milton and Ezhuthachan, literature becomes a means of renewing perception by exposing and revealing the habitual and the conventional. This leads Shklovsky to the second main concept 2 in his theory, that of "laying bare the device" in order to achieve defamiliarization. In Paradise Lost, in the process of "making strange" implies a literary dynamism. This dynamism is evoked in the rationalizing process of Milton in re-presenting the story of Adam and Eve. In Adhyatma Ramayana the literary dynamism is due to the religious revival that demands such a re-presentation.

The study further steers it to the theory of self-conscious fiction or metafiction. The composition of Paradise Lost is the culmination of a long process starting with Milton's proposition
to write a play on the same theme. The study of the process of composition of the poem constitutes a fiction about fiction. That is, it includes within itself a commentary on its own narrative or linguistic identity. At the beginning of the poem Milton explores a theory of fiction which he translates into the poem through the practice of fiction. It concerns itself with particular conventions of fiction to display the process of their construction. Only this term "metafiction" is new, the practice had started long back and it is as old as fiction itself. Usually it gives the representational nature of all fiction. If it provides the representational nature of the literary history of the genre it is also clear in the poem that Milton was aware of the theoretical issues involved in constructing this poem. To cross over these theoretical issues he sought the assistance of Urania, the Muse. Regarding Adhyatma Ramayanan, the theory of self-conscious fiction is more meaningful. The Indian epic tradition has been following this conception since its very inception in Valmiki's Ramayana. In the first part of Valmiki's Ramayana the "making of a poet" is represented. The formation of Valmiki the sage into Valmiki the poet is part of an explanation of metafiction. So also, the poem provides the making of the poem. The knowledge of the fabula of the poem is given by Narada, the emotive content (rasa) by Nature through an episode, and the self-confidence by Brahma, one of the Trinity (Creator). Similarly in Adhyatma Ramayanan the theory of fiction effected through an introduction of mediacy has been explained. It is evident that Ezhuthachan has a full picture of Ramayana and its prospective externalization before the actual composition.
As a part of metafiction a special feature is noted in different parts of these poems, called "duality". In Milton it is due to the tension between Christian and Classical in *Paradise Lost*: that between external and internal, inner and outer. The epic, as it should be, is characteristically concerned with the public, the external. Christian literature revolves round the individual soul's encounter with God. What has been noted in *Paradise Lost* is an intertwining of the Classical and the Biblical. It relates the displacement of Satan as the point of interest. The shift constitutes an increased Biblicising of the episode and the tension is felt in the course of the shift. It is relieved in the end of the poem. In the process Milton suffers a kind of agony in the dual state of narrator. It is quite natural too.

In *Adhyatma Ramayanam*, Ezhuthachan's tension is due to the representation of the narrative. Rama is a man. He is godhead too. Sita is a woman. She is the incarnation of Leksmi too. Characters like Narada know what happens and what is yet to happen in the narrative. Ezhuthachan's self-conscious representation does not hide this duality in the characters and their actions.

(iv)

Milton says in the argument of the first book that "the whole subject" of the poem is "Man's disobedience, and the loss thereupon of Paradise where in he was plac'd". This reminds us of Horace's Latin phrase "in medias res". It is explicit when he says that in passing over the angels' revolt the poem "hastens into the midst of things." But he obviously means only one thing:
he is rushing into the middle of the story. And precisely because he does so, he has to give the antecedents of the action of the epic. The introduction gives an answer to the question concerning the Fall of Man, that the Fall was brought about by the crafty, envious and vindictive Satan after he had been worsted in his revolt against God and thereon into Hell. Of course this is only an assertion, but that is enough for Milton.

In *Adhyatma Ramayanan* the technique is, of course, different. The narration is chronological. Rushing in medias res as a valuable narrative technique creating an effect of dramatic fashion, securing the immediate interest of the listener has been employed in the embeddings and digressions only. This retrospective narration of earlier events in both the works presents the story by anticipation. It may be more effective than surprise in many cases. The readers know the beginning, middle and end of these works. But the difference in externalization of these two known stories provides some narratological peculiarities. Raphael recounts the war in heaven. Siva relates Rama's story. Indian epics are chronologically narrated and western epics generally are narrated in medias res.

The events intended and organised in a plot in a chronological sequence ensure organic unity. Chronological narration of selected events is the time-honoured method of Indian epics.

After all, the poet's choice of technique is determined by the tradition, and more importantly by the needs of the poem. The traditional linear progression of events is not followed in *Adhyatma Ramayanan*. Milton uses his traditional methodology in
Adhyatma Ramayanan is, in no sense, a true translation: the general plan and management of the incidents are necessarily much the same, but details have been touched and changed considerably. It may be called a refaccimento, a close adaptation of the Sanskrit original, Adhyatma Ramayana. Though the work here directly refers to such a treatment, it may be of interest to show a little more at length the divergence between the two poems. Regarding the relation between Valmiki and Ezhuthachan, it may be said that whatever Valmiki has condensed, Ezhuthachan has expanded, and on whatever the elder poet has lingered longest, his successor has hastened on most rapidly. It will be seen that the two agree only in the broadest outline. The episodes so freely introduced by both poets are entirely dissimilar. Even in the main narrative some of the most important incidents, such as the breaking of the bow, and the contention with Parasurama, are differently placed and assume a very altered complexion.

In Ezhuthachan the reader gets the tone and tenor of a Valmiki and the anonymous author of the Adhyatma Ramayana in him as Milton gets the tone and tenor of a Homer and Virgil in him. This is regarding the treatment of the story in each of them.

Paradise Lost is a poem which deals with "things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme", the writer apprises. The poem Adhyatma Ramayanan relates things very often attempted in rhyme, the writer admits.

The musical qualities in Adhyatma Ramayanan are so powerful
that its readability and musicality induce in the readers an enthusiasm to read it daily. In *Paradise Lost* the music is strong, but, Milton's narrative finds pride in man's narration of lord's story. In Ezhuthachan there is a difference to note. The poet thinks it an arduous task to sing a song in praise of Rama the avatar of the almighty. So he brings in a narrator Siva to execute the narration. This poem finds a narrator in Siva. He tells the story of Rama who is human. Here God tells man's story compared to the situation in *Paradise Lost* where man tells God's story. Man employs an angel as an agent narrator in the description of war in heaven. God narrates the war on earth. The fabula of the narrative existed from the time of Moses to Milton in *Paradise Lost*. In the *Adhyatma Ramayanam*, the narrator's role spreads from Brahma to Ezhuthachan.

(vi)

As a dominant theme in theology and literature for nearly two thousand years, of commentaries by christian and jewesh thinkers, of poems and plays and of pictures by artists, the fall of Adam and Eve has lured the imagination of Western Man. In a similar fashion, Rama's story has been the theme for literature and religion for a similar span or even more. Puranas and epics find it a splendid theme for treatment. The recursiveness of the themes in either case is due to the human significance in each of them. The most potent of the reasons is the nature of this narrative as a myth. It is a myth not in the strictly anthropological sense of the term, but in the vague poetic sense defined by C.S Lewis as a narrative sequence having "a value in itself - a value
independent of its embodiment in any literary work." In the presence of such a story, we are transported into a numinous world. Although the characters may be remote and the events preternatural, we feel "as if something of great moment had been communicated to us." It is the urge to formulate this "something" in the Fall of Man that has prompted each new generation of readers to reinterpret the first three chapters of Genesis in terms of its own particular values and experiences. The enduring vitality of Ramayana is due to the very myth of Rama's story. The narrative instance of Valmiki's Ramayana speaks volumes on the theory of Vico's "sapienza poetica" (poetic wisdom). The later retellers of Ramayana did not purposefully lose the much acclaimed sapienza poetica from the work. The study of "something" prompting a reinterpretation of the fall story around the cultural, religious, political, and other similar factors of the Renaissance England is not included in this work. Similarly the "something" that demands a retelling of Ramayana is not part of this work. Anyhow this "something" in either case is vital in a value judgment.

(vii)

The work is an earnest effort in comparative literature study and observation. It has gone into preventing the wrong value judgments, into distinguishing different techniques each of which has its justification. Some of the most valuable comparisons of this kind juxtapose two contemporary or near contemporary writers, working in different countries, in order to sharpen awareness of the different forms, which one and the same literary or cultural movement could take in the countries concerned. The
study of influence and assimilation across national and linguistic boundaries is also part of this study. The study of tradition and innovation in two epic narrative traditions, and mutual "placing" through comparison and contrast could also be seen in this treatment. It is another type of comparative literature as an ideal "analogy" study. Aldridge defined "analogy" or affinity as resemblance in style, structure, mood or idea between works which have no other connection. The study of image or image complexes in the works which had no contact with one another provides examples. In Chapter II, the comparative "hymnody" in section (ii) discussing hymns addressed to light in Book III of Paradise Lost and "yudha kanda" in Adhyatma Ramayanam can be an analogy study. Another area of analogy study refers to how Eve in Paradise Lost and Ahalya in Adhyatma Ramayanam yield to temptations of lust. Both refer to common human experience. Use of disguise of Satan as a snake and Marica as a golden deer may provide another analogy study. All these can account for the attempts to mould the raw materials of life into the formal perfection of the lyric poet's art.

In typological studies what comparativists mean by "interplay" is applicable here. "Literary interplay" is noted in these works. At the fag end of the development of the epic genre in the West Paradise Lost finds a place. Adhyatma Ramayanam has a similar place in the Indian epic tradition. At certain stages of development a given genre may develop a dynamic of its own and lead to a similar development which then may not be strengthened by the direct contact with foreign models. This is the condition which attributes interplay in these two works. Their
psychological interplay too is noted as both the works represent the human mind with certain ways of responding to common experience.

Philip Hobsbaum uses a concept in his survey of recent 10 Milton criticism called "availability". The concept is applicable to both the works under consideration here. Both *Paradise Lost* and *Adhyatma Ramayanam* are long works. "The longer the work the less chance there is of its being flawless". What Milton does may be explained as follows. Milton accepts the fall story for the theme of his poem. He discovers many flaws in the story. He wants to find connections which were not there among parts of the Genesis story. In order to keep the work in his mind as anything more than detached fragments, he has made some efforts at interpretation. Hobsbaum explains this concept in the reader: just as all of his experience is not available even to the most gifted creative writer, so all of the writer’s work is not available to even the most interested reader. The techniques employed by Milton are suited to those of a critic. As the atmosphere of *Paradise Lost* is less available to the reader, the interpreter in Milton keeps greater consistency in his techniques. The lack of availability has hence helped Milton to compensate for that lack by interpolation of habitual and extraneous standards. The controversy in Milton’s presentation in *Paradise Lost* is due to the fact that he is not providing any uniform meaning of the text. A uniform meaning is not really formulated by the text. It is the reader’s projection. It is not the hidden meaning made available by the reader. "The many different consistencies that have been established would seem to
prove that the interpretations have not risen from classical norms, but use these norms as a justification, for all these consistencies serve to make the epic available as a whole, even, or indeed especially, where apparent inconsistencies resist the process of harmonization." The lack of availability conditions consistency-building throughout both the writing and the reading process. But regarding Adhyatma Ramayanan the "availability" factor is just the opposite. The events being narrated are all known to the reader. The reader is slightly hampered by the already existing materials in their minds of Rama and his life. To sum up, the contrast in techniques in these epics is due to the "availability" factor. Consistency-building is a basis for involvement in text as an event.

The narrative in Paradise Lost and Adhyatma Ramayanan is each a compilation of exilic experience which serves as an enabling experience in either of them. The imperial insulation earlier of Satan and later of Adam and Eve in the former epic, and the imperial isolation of Rama and Sita from the throne to the forest for exilic experiences in the latter form the theme of these epics. The techniques in both of them have been devised to execute this.

Paradise Lost represents a biblical narrative. The events of the Fall story are exaggerated in the poem in such a way that the story teller uses ingenuity in explaining the impossible. Erich Auerbach establishes Homeric and Hebraic methods of narration as models of two quite different modes: one primarily realistic and the other symbolic. Homeric narrative represents phenomena "in a fully externalized form, visible and palpable in all their parts
and completely fixed in their spatial and temporal relations." Each detail as it is narrated carries its own weight: all is in foreground and immediate presence in the sequential parade of the things themselves. Scriptural narration, on the other hand, "has no present", and its details point to things that they cannot fully manifest. Both motives and surroundings are left partly to inference. The prime mover of Abraham's story is God who for obvious reasons cannot be fully externalised. He must remain a mysterious voice from an invisible background. Principles of style and technique such as syntax, dialogue, and characterization are influenced by the abrupt intrusion of such hidden plot strands and motive forces.

Auerbach notices the idea of the hidden cause in mind in the Homeric narrative. Even a comparatively realistic mode has similar forces at work upon it, not mysterious and personal, perhaps but nonetheless imperative. Every narrative work has a method. It has goals and patterns that require transcendence of immediate detail also. At every point of reading, a reader must look into what has happened. He has to anticipate what is about to happen, constantly comparing, predicting and assessing. These buried aspects of the story form the background to the present and define its purpose and direction. The plan-of-the-whole is a "prime mover" quite as dictatorial a voice that Abraham hears. Whether or not a story withholding its principle of order until a sudden deus ex machina comes forth to declare it, then, something is always invisible until the plot is completed, and all relationships among all parts bear upon the meaning of each particular part. As Auerbach through his analysis has proved that
As far as art is concerned, "reality is representation", the analysis of both the epics becomes meaningful when it proves that reality is representation in either of them.

The fabula is externalized through the mediation of some "prism". It is otherwise termed "perspective" or "angle of vision". This mediation is "focalization". Focalization is different from a more common expression, "point of view". Focalization includes besides its common meaning "vision", cognitive, emotive and ideological orientation. Though in epics what is desired is objective narration, the epics here are the products of focalization also. The externalization will yield the focalization which amounts to subjectivization of narration.

As the Fall story in Paradise Lost has undergone transformation from what is in the Genesis, and as the Rama's story in Adhyatma Ramayanam too has undergone a similar transformation from Adhyatma Ramayana, the techniques used by Milton and Ezhuthachan in the two works are the techniques of transformation of narrative.