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ASCETICISM vs EROTICISM--A MATTER OF MORAL CHOICE: SAMSKARA

Here was a man who both lived and wondered aloud, and with equal intensity and depth, about a multiformity of inclinations which other men hide and bury in strenuous consistency. At the end great confusion can be a mark of greatness, too, especially if it results from the inescapable conflicts of existence.


It is the privilege of every age to consider its predicament unique, and it is its hope that the predicament may prove the most crucial history has ever known. Such illusions need not be always baseless, for they are the stuff of which men make the record of their lived experience. Reinhardt rightly comments: "Human existence has always been a problem for man, the rational animal, who in virtue of his faculty of rational reflection, could not help looking searchingly and critically at his own life and at life in general, and comparing his mode of being with that of other creatures."¹ Thus, Existentialism as a mode of assessing human existence and particularly in its contemporary form
concentrates on this critical reflection on the individual human self. Placed in such a situation, it confronts the individual human existence with those collective claims and forces which threaten to submerge or pulverize individuality and personality in abstract, ideal essences or in such absolutes as "the nation", "the race", "the tribe" etc. Existential thinkers in general have observed that in view of this danger, man passionately reasserts himself as an individualum, as an indivisible unity or substance, conscious of the fact that no valid substitution can ever be made for a human personality. To cite Reinhardt again: "Existentialism has risen in modern Europe because the steadily increasing pressures of collectivism and abstract idealism have forced the individual to a resolute and radical self-affirmation."  

The rise of Existentialism is thus one of the symptoms of a specifically European crisis, but in its broader ramifications it is indicative of the modern crisis of human existence as such. History offers ample evidence that as long as human life and culture are healthy and normally integrated, the individual and universal elements balance each other. In times of severe stress and strain, however, when the foundations of human life and of the established system of values have been shaken, when man experiences more acutely the insecurity of life, one or the other of these
elements tends to assert itself disproportionately. In such cases, in the Existentialist view "what makes man go is not a set of innate drives or biological needs but free and fully conscious choices. Man is not driven by animal exigencies; he makes himself by his own choices" (emphasis added). Thus, one of the principal existentialist arguments relevant for our study is that, whether abstract ideas exist or not they are uninteresting and insignificant to the existing individual who has to make concrete decisions.

Hence, to a very large extent all humans are partakers of a universal quest, symbolized in different cultures by contrary modes of living and diverse systems of belief. Yet this is essentially a solitary quest, each one constantly embarking upon a never-ending journey, which is sometimes mundane, often painful and always fascinating. Each individual journey is unique, and for most of us the well-travelled paths offer the greatest safety. However, in each generation of travellers there are those who strike out on their own, who swim against the tide, who are not afraid of being challenged by a truth deeper than that which the world provides.

With these preliminary observations in mind, we explore here the interaction of orthodoxy, ethnicity, value system and community based on a decadent Brahmin community. The events dealt with in Samskara triggered off a process which
has neither ceased nor apparently reached its peak. Yet it continues to disturb established verities related to traditional Brahminic social behaviour, religious activity, communal consciousness and family life. Ideological ripples created by nonconformist actions in an otherwise smooth ethnic unit can, positively speaking, constantly create and reshape its community existence. Since non-conformity or unconventionality in behaviour suggests a process of dynamism and change within which individual and collective identity find expression, the assumptions made in the context of this study need not be specifically confined to this particular work and can have a wider relevance.

Samskara was originally published in Kannada in 1965, and the English translation of this widely acclaimed novel appeared in 1978. The Kannada word 'Samskara' is given a multiplicity of meaning in the text itself. They are:

1. Forming well or thoroughly, making perfect, perfecting; finishing, refining, refinement, accomplishment
2. Forming in the mind, conception, idea, notion; the power of memory, faculty or recollection, the realizing of past perceptions...
3. Preparation, making ready, preparation of food, etc..., cooking, dressing...
4. Making sacred, hallowing, consecration, dedication; consecration of a king, etc...
5. Making pure, purification, purity
6. A sanctifying or purificatory rite or essential ceremony (enjoined on all the first three classes of castes)
Any rite or ceremony (9) Funeral obsequies. The subtitle for this translation, *A rite for a Dead Man*, is the most concrete of these many concentric senses that spread through the work. It is particularly about the degeneration of a small brahminic agrahara, but attempts to work out a number of traditional themes in a contemporary setting—themes related to religious, metaphysical, social and psychological dimensions of life. But one could say that in its essentials "Samskara portrays the conflict between orthodoxy and heresy, traditionalism and apostasy, asceticism and eroticism—a conflict basic in every complexly structured society."6

The novel opens with the death (by plague, we learn later) of Naranappa, who had done his best to antagonize the village Brahmins by eschewing their ways. The question that arises is whether this man, who openly lived with a low caste mistress, forsaking his lawfully wedded wife, and who drank liquor, ate meat and even caught fish from the temple tank, deserves a Brahmin's funeral rites. The novelist presents the village Brahmins as a greedy and hypocritical lot and the only person leading a life devoted to learning is their head, Praneshacharya. The central irony of the novel is that the question of the funeral rites turns into a spiritual crisis for him. Unable to find an answer in his sacred books or in the temple, he stumbles into the arms of
Chandri, Naranappa's mistress, and his sexual encounter with her opens new vistas of life for him. His wife dies of the plague, and he walks away from the deserted village, exposing himself to realities from which he had so far kept himself aloof. In the unshakable company of Putta, he wanders into a crowd at a temple festival and passes through a rite of initiation for a new life, and he realizes that he cannot run away from himself. The endless apprehensive thoughts, self-questioning, the scrupulousness with which Praneshacharya assesses himself, extricating himself from the Brahminic collectivity, renders the novel an uncommon touch of genuineness and authenticity. The novel ends with the Acharya boarding a cart to return to his village—anxious, expectant. The novel is, in fact, basically about the 'refining, refashioning' (another meaning of 'Samskara') of Praneshacharya, and Naranappa's death and funeral rites merely provide the occasion for it.

Now, it is possible to look at the novel from two significant angles—(1) as a novel which deals with an individual's transformation following a moral choice, and (2) as a work of religious satire. However, for the present study, the first of these is more crucial as the author skilfully attempts to exploit the tension between two world views. The identity that is determined by one's birth, by 'Karma' and 'Varna' as Naipaul would have it, is found in
collision with a new awareness of self, partly conditioned by existential thinking. The process of transition is always difficult and uneasy, especially when one is part of a fixed and settled order of things, and the still inchoate stirrings of the self offer only vague prospects. The novel could be said largely allegorical in nature and mythic in its conscious structure, but at the same time does not exclude the demands of realism.

The novel begins with an emphasis on the static quality of life as lived in the brahmin colony of Durvasapura village.

He bathed Bhagirathi's body, a dried up, wasted pea-pod, and wrapped a fresh sari around it; then he offered food and flowers to the gods as he did every day...(1)

The word 'routine' is repeated three times on the first page, highlighting the lack of spontaneity in the Acharya's life and activities. Whether it is a matter of offering food and flowers to the gods, reciting sacred texts, or worshipping Maruti or bathing his invalid wife, it was all part of an 'unfailing daily routine'. This inflexible schedule is established before a ripple is allowed to form in this stagnant life by the announcement of a death. As we consider the thematic development of the novel, it is significant that
if we observe Praneshacharya in the first chapter as the head of a household engaged in his daily routines, the second chapter places him in the larger routine of the village, as the spiritual head of the community and the protagonist of the novel. There is uniformity in all the brahmin houses of the agrahara, and the lives of the people are ordered by ritual, and festivals and seasonal food variations. There are vows to keep each month, and occasional feasts for death, marriage and initiation. Here time stands still; kinships and hostilities continue for generations. The negative quality of the society is emphasized by the fact that no birth or marriage takes place during the course of the novel. The crisis is precipitated by an epidemic and almost the entire novel is stalked by death. The marriages that are briefly mentioned are all joyless and sterile, including that of the Acharya. As his wife repeatedly says, "you have had no joy in this marriage" (2). However, the centre of conflict turns out to be not this ritualistic village, but the mind of Praneshacharya, the most conscious point of the community.

Thus, the picture of the agrahara that emerges in all concreteness in the mind of the writer as well as in its fictional recreation is far from positive; rather it is highly repulsive with its stench and filth, its oppressive adherence to religious dogmas and ritualistic observations.
The Acharya is very much part of the collective life of the agrahara, where all decisions are made according to an inviolable code made centuries ago. In a sense, he had, though not consciously, always equated the brahminic code with his essential self. Naipaul is not entirely wrong when he comments:

Caste and clan are more than brotherhoods; they define the individual completely. The individual is never on his own; he is always fundamentally a member of his group, with a complex apparatus of rules, rituals, taboos. Every detail of behaviour is regulated....Relationships are codified. And religion and religious practices lock everything into place.\(^7\)

In her perceptive essay on Samskara, Meenakshi Mukherjee draws an interesting contrast between the stability and norm of traditional society as depicted in R. K. Narayan's novels and the world created by Ananthamurthy at the beginning of Samskara.\(^8\) As she suggests, almost all of Narayan's novels present a stable world temporarily threatened by disruption yet resilient enough to survive the crisis and return to normalcy. And obviously Malgudi has a positive, life-affirming and abiding quality about it. Durvasapura, on the other hand, represents a decadent
structure which once jolted out of its complacency, cannot be reintegrated again. However that is, she says that to read Samskara as a critique of orthodox Hinduism is to limit it severely. What interests the contemporary reader is not merely its repudiation of a decadent value system, rather the fusion of the physical and the metaphysical; the singular skill in dealing with the interiority of an individual's social predicament in its psychological complexity. But more than any of these, what matters in the context of the present study is "the crisis of a civilization, in which, through a painful process, a collective code is giving way to individual choice."9 In the earlier part of the novel, the Acharya is never really an 'individual', rather his fate is the destiny of the community as well. In this world of internal homogeneity, where men do not differ qualitatively from one another, he is only a head taller than the mass of its fellows. An autonomous life of interiority and individual decisions is possible and necessary only when a distinction is made from other men. So in the course of the novel, he is being transformed from being a collective hero, connected by indissoluble threads to the community whose fate is crystallized in his own, to a lonely man, unsupported by God or man. He has to chart out his own path, search out a role for himself; there is no safe social niche he can occupy as his actions and speech are no longer determined by the expectations of society.
When the categorical imperative of the collective unconscious guides and constraints individuals in their pursuits, there never arises the question of a choice. But when one is faced with the question 'how best to live?' it becomes a matter of personal deliberation. Such considerations become relevant only when people are called upon to make one of those crucial choices, one which is expected to alter the course of their lives, and bestow a new character upon it. The philosophic tradition going back to Aristotle would argue that though man is regarded as being moral by nature, morality is said to be bestowed not by nature but by culture. And it is logical that to define morality, there would be as many norms applicable as there are cultural contexts. Hence the inability of the westerners to feel the radical overtones of a married Brahmin taking an untouchable mistress. But in the particular ethos where Praneshacharya is placed, a certain emphasis on 'observed conduct' cannot be ignored, as the novelist highlights modes of behaviour characteristic of his society. The question the 'awakened guru' pursues in isolation is "what manner of a man am I" to be driven by desire? (77). The concern of the novelist (and of the hero) is with more and more existential, less political and social, sense of what makes a person: individual choices, decisions, rather than dynamic relationship with others. And it would not be wrong to
conclude that the basic clash is between his earlier asceticism and present eroticism—two apparently opposed moral choices.

It is obvious from the text that in the earlier part of the novel, Praneshacharya embodies in himself a moral choice which proclaims the superiority of asceticism over eroticism. By marrying an invalid, he was practising the virtue of labouring 'with no thought of fruit', as Lord Krishna said. "The Acharya is filled with pleasure and sense of worth as sweet as the five-fold nectar of holy days; he is filled with compassion for his ailing wife. He proudly swells a little at his lot, thinking, 'By marrying an invalid, I get ripe and ready'" (2). He hopes thus to earn merit through self-sacrifice. He studied scriptures and went to Kashi where he earned everyone's respect and admiration for his learning. Since then his life has been spent in the performance of rituals, in scholastic pursuits, in giving instruction to others, and in serving his invalid wife—all this in a spirit of duty. He hoards 'his penances like a miser his money', hoping ultimately to 'get ripe and ready' for the highest spiritual attainments. He has so completely overcome bodily desires that, though his public readings of erotic tales from Sanskrit literature sometimes drives young men into sexual deviations, he himself is totally unaffected by them. And he places himself in sharp contrast to Naranappa,
who represents the erotic-epicurean human type. Having done all that a Brahmin should not do, he used to challenge Praneshacharya repeatedly: "Let's see who wins in the end--you, or me" (23). And the Acharya had always hoped to win Naranappa back to good brahminical ways and thus earn merit himself.

The contrast between the values of the agrahara which the Acharya shares in the beginning of the novel and those of his anti-self Naranappa extend well beyond the framework of religion or custom. Rather they both represent two fundamentally different responses to experience: one emphasizing order and restraint, the other abandonment and passion. The basic polarity of the novel between direct involvement in the sensuous aspects of life and a detachment through the denial of the senses is indicated as early as p.15 of the novel where there is a reference to the flowers of the agrahara. The flowers that bloomed in the gardens of the Brahmins in Durvaspura village are used only for purposes of worship and were never enjoyed for their beauty or fragrance. The description in the beginning of chapter two is a remarkable instance of realistic details and allegorical nuances, setting the tone for the rest of the novel. Only the flowers in Naranappa's yard were different because these were solely meant for 'Chandri's hair and a vase in the bedroom'--for sensuous human enjoyment and not for divine consecration.
As an extension of the disease and sterility of the agrahara, the novelist draws a sharp contrast between the frigid, dried up women of the orthodox community and the sensuous women of the lower castes. As Ramanujan himself points out in his Afterword, "while all the brahmin wives are sexless, unappetizing, smelly, invalids at best, the women of other castes are seen as glowing sex-objects and temptations to the brahmin. Lowcaste and outcaste women like Chandri and Belli are hallowed and romanticized by references to classical heroines like Shakuntala, and Menaka, the temptress of sages" (144). Even the night-queen bush in Naranappa's yard conveys to the village this message: "In the darkness of the night the bush was thickly clustered with flowers, invading the night like some raging lust, pouring forth its nocturnal fragrance. The agrahara writhed in its hold as in the grip of a magic serpent-binding spell" (15). As Meenakshi Mukherjee observes, the words 'darkness', 'night', 'serpent', 'magic', 'lust', and 'writhe' "combine to evoke an irresistibly erotic aura which is a threat to the life-denying values of the agrahara."11 She also refers to the long tradition of 'good' prostitutes as almost an archetype in Indian culture, and finds Chandri a typical addition to the line.12 It is well-known that the snake has obvious sexual connotations, and by transference so do the snake-like braids of women. "Chandri wore her black snake-like hair in a knot" (15) and Padmavati's "snake braid coming down her
shoulder, over her breast" (123) unsettles the Acharya's equilibrium. In contrast to Chandri, Belli and Padmavati, and the heroines of the legends and myths, all the brahmin women are depicted as frigid with 'dwarfish braids' and withered bodies.

If the serpent connotes feminine sensuousness, the tiger is repeatedly associated with masculine lust. Naranappa confronts Chandri's body 'like a raging striped tiger' (45). Praneshacharya, reflecting on his encounter with Chandri in the forest, recognizes "his body's tigerish lust" (81), which lay dormant all this time under pity and compassion. Once having tasted blood "now the tamed tiger is leaping out, baring its teeth" (82). Also by implication the tiger gets associated with other aspects of life that fall outside the brahminic existence—the world of violent entertainment and crude joy. At the fair, the Acharya is horrified by the 'tigerish world of cock-fights' which threatens his new found values as well as his orthodoxy.

Thus the serpent and tiger image project the Dionysian world which is constantly at war with the repressed orderliness of the agrahara. Commenting on this, R.K. Kaul observes that "the alternative to brahmin austerity is a surrender to darkness and demons." Of course, he refers to the snake symbolism, which, though not necessarily evil, is inextricably linked to poison. However, Meenakshi Mukherjee
observes that, though the world represented by Naranappa's drunken debauchery is certainly not meant to be a positive whole, one should hesitate to apply the words 'evil' or 'darkness' to them in any direct or unambiguous way. She admits that it is the opposite of the barren life of Praneshacharya, full of privation and sacrifice, where all spontaneity is stifled and where "God has become... a set of tables learned by rote" (92). And we may rightly conclude that "both Naranappa and Acharya represent distortions of certain values--restraint, control, and denial in one and abandonment to the senses in the other. They are two sides of the same coin, hence their names are constantly coupled by the author, making them adversaries in an almost equal combat." 

Naranappa had always been a problem--in life as well as in death. It was part of Praneshacharya's egotistical need to win over Naranappa to god and religion by his own penance; the Acharya fasted two nights in the week for him. His painful concern and compassion for Naranappa had stemmed from a promise he had made to the dead man's mother that he would bring him back to the right paths. In death Naranappa seems to have won his final victory over the agrahara and its values in a metaphorical as well as a real sense. The plague, the stench, the panic, the confusion, everything seems to proclaim the power of the dead man. There are vultures during the day and ghosts at night. "Naranappa's
challenge was growing, growing enormous like God Trivikrama who started out as a dwarf and ended up measuring the cosmos with his giant feet" (34). It was the same exaggerated greed for virtue which made him wilfully believe that he could win Naranappa by his own faith and austerities and also made him wed an invalid and make a penance out of daily life.

In the face of mounting uncertainty, the Acharya desperately pursues his quest for an answer for the problem Naranappa's death has created. But when he wakes up in Chandri's arms in the forest, he knows he has lost the battle: "I was defeated, defeated--fell flat on my face" (100). All the rules of culture that he had so assiduously learnt lie in ruins, and nature, manifested through hunger for food and sexual desire, triumphs. One might even say that the sad fragility of the ascetic choice, the inadequacies of idealism, is revealed here. He had always believed that no one chooses to be good, that some people, such as himself, are born with the good nature that leads them to make the right choices. This belief in inborn goodness, placing himself a level above the average, also is shattered. But Chandri's response to their physical intimacy is one of gain and gratification which gives her a sense of worthwhileness, like the fragrance of flowers hidden. By virtue of her profession, she is both outside structured society as well as recognized by it. She is in fact part of
the same bountiful nature to which the bananas and the flowing waters belong. She has been an exception to all the rules, ever-auspicious, daily-wedded, without widowhood and, in a sense, without sin or blame like the flowing river in which people wash their impurities and out of which they emerge purified. Again, it is possible to say that Chandri is a lively symbol rather than a realistic character, embodying a natural wholeness and an instinctive spontaneity which Praneshacharya can never achieve. While he is stricken by a guilty conscience, she is totally untroubled: "She was a natural in pleasure, unaccustomed to self-reproach" (68). And it is also significant that it happens in the forest—outside the frame of stratified society.

From this point onwards, the novelist's concern is shifted from the physical realities involved to the mind of Praneshacharya. While discussing contemporary American fiction, Ihab Hassan observes that "the imperatives of suffering and rebellion constitute the modern response to some grim events and strange developments of our century." Hassan's argument is that the basic and perhaps irreconcilable struggle, however, is not between man and society. The basic struggle is between primal instincts of life and death, between love and aggression in their manifold disguises. In a moment where all his bonds with his community are severed, the Acharya recoils into his own self
and reviews his entire life in the light of the new situation. Once the confidence in his own moral superiority and innate goodness is broken, he wants to be an involved participator of life rather than a dispassionate observer, and in the process he becomes human. He now realizes that he has a desire 'to tell lies, to hide things, to think of one's own welfare', and yet he wants to live openly and fearlessly like Naranappa. Although he cannot resolve his contradictions he becomes aware of them. Freud's idea of the death instinct, an idea that has been seriously questioned, suggests that the self is not only opposed to the world, but also divided in its own house. Man, in this pessimistic and perhaps ultimately religious view, is as much his own victim as he is the victim of society.

Even in the midst of intense self-absorption, his union with Chandri has enabled him to respond to the simple beauty of nature unselfconsciously. "Just sitting coolly under a tree had become a fulfilment, a value. To be, just to be; keen in the heat, the cool, the grass, the green, the flower, the pang, the heat, the shade, putting aside both desire and value" (83). It might sound paradoxical that the act of love, instead of being an initiation into adulthood, reveals to him as never before the sensory nature of a child's consciousness. He becomes aware of the sensuous joy of swimming in cold water and rolling in the sun-warmed sand afterwards. "He was astonished that after so many years, his
boyhood desires had returned to him.... He did not want to go back to the agrahara" (83). His senses become more acute; the smell of grass and wet earth hit his nostrils and the stars become as sharply visible as to a child's eye.

This is a totally new image of Praneshacharya, marking a contrast between the overtly mature Acharya, burdened with the wisdom of all the scriptures in his head and the responsibility of the agrahara on his shoulders, and the child dimension of him freshly responding to creation. The dynamism in nature is contrasted with the stasis of the agrahara, and its death stench with the smell of wet earth and grass in the forest. This polarity between the repressive human world and the lush wholeness of nature can be seen in a novel of another century, located in a different culture. Arthur Dimmesdale in Hawthorne's The Scarlet Letter (1850)—another priest protagonist grown prematurely old while carrying the heavy burden of erudition and respect—becomes human only when he is in the forest with Hester. But the priest is the repository of the collective values of a community; hence his violation of these values appears to have momentous significance. Their predicaments are strangely parallel. Both Praneshacharya and Arthur Dimmesdale undergo agonizing conflicts within themselves, but they emerge in different directions. Hawthorne not only wrote of a Puritan society, he himself held an uneasy identification with some of its values; but the Acharya casts off his old life and is
born to a new one outside its bounds, while the body of his adversary rotted in the village.

Now, as is obvious, *Samskara* is a novel where there is least action, and an enormity of introspection and self-questioning. Praneshacharya goes back to his home and his dependant wife and to the anxious Brahmins a changed person. He is filled with remorse but also experiences a "lightness in the thought" that he is now "a free man, relieved of his responsibility to lead the way, relieved of all authority" (77), of the burden of guru and acharya. During this introspection, a Sanskrit chant which he had learnt by heart and recited daily, rises in his mind: "I am sin, my work is sin, my soul is sin, my birth is sin" (78). But then he exhorts himself: "No, no, even that is a lie. Must forget all words learnt by heart, the heart must flow free like a child's" (78). This suggests a return to spontaneity hitherto unknown, to nature, and a resolve to break with memory, with culture. In fact it is a bid for escape from the tyranny of culture. But even if he had left desire, desire had not left him.

The lives of Praneshacharya and Naranappa are strangely but significantly juxtaposed, and in certain respects they do mirror each other. Naranappa too had left his brahminical culture, but brahminical culture had not left him. The novelist seems to imply that in both cases the source of the
problem is body in relation to culture, the body pulsating with desire no less than the body rotting away; the one polluted and the other polluting. And from the moment of Praneshacharya's 'initiation' into the pleasures of the body, the body rotting away ceases to be relevant and the focus is transferred to the body and mind of the Acharya.

Ihab Hassan explains the term 'initiation' as the first existential ordeal, crisis or encounter with experience in the life of a youth. He adds that its ideal aim is knowledge, recognition and confirmation in the world, to which the actions of the initiate, however painful, must tend, and that it is quite simply the visible mode of confronting adult realities. Now, the Acharya is not really a youth considering his age, he must be around thirty six, married for twenty years. But it suddenly dawns on him that "so far he didn't even live; doing only what was done, chanting the same old mantra, he had remained inexperienced. Experience is risk, assault. A thing not done before, a joining in the dark of the jungle" (82). And eventually he begins to wonder whether, just as he had received the touch of woman, Naranappa had received the touch of God in the dark, unbidden.

He does not return home after the cremation of his wife whom plague had claimed, making no distinction between a sinner and a saint's blameless wife. Leaving everything
behind he sets off from Durvasapura, with a new awareness that he is now free without duties or debts. Only too soon his introspection once again draws the Acharya to the moment of initiation. His thoughts and reveries here centre around a very crucial idea—his opportunity for choice and for self-determining action. Its context is the conflict between social and instinctive behaviour, ideal choice and physical need. In a tone of self-reproach he broods: "Even if I lost control, the responsibility to decide was still mine. Man's decision is valid only because it is possible to lose control, not because it is easy" (98). The Acharya, his moral confidence having shaken, comes to the awareness that "we shape ourselves through our choices, bring form and line to this thing we call our person. Naranappa became the person he chose to be. I chose to be something else and lived by it" (98, emphasis added). But suddenly he recalls that there has been a turning point in his undisturbed life, and agonizes over the extent of his responsibility and moral involvement in the act. "I am not free till I realize that the turning is also my act, I'm to answer for it" (98). And he confesses that at that turning, dualities and conflicts rushed into his life. He wonders whether the great sages who lost all the merits of penance for women agonized over their fate like him or whether they lived, seeing life itself as renunciation, going beyond conflicts and dualities by living through them. One can perhaps remake oneself in 'full
wakefulness', but what moral authority does one have to include another's life in one's decision? "O God, take from me the burden of decision" is Praneshacharya's anguished prayer, uttered in total loneliness.

In the prototype of initiation just considered, the opportunity for choice, for self-determining action, was present. Such action leads the hero towards a fuller confrontation of the self with reality. The burden becomes increasingly heavier, and the Acharya's thoughts hereafter oscillates between guilt and self-pity, desire and self-reproach, so much so the novel may be considered a series of partial initiations. These cumulatively reveal to the reader the inadequacies of idealism, the subtleties of self-deception and the painful anonymity of the hero, in which the private response and the public expectation are so hopelessly at odds. He longs to accept and live life on his own terms, affirming his newly found autonomy of the individual, the rights of the person against those of the group. In a sense, he is a 'rebel', but a very 'loyal rebel' at that. We might say that the strategy he has adopted is not one of ultimate recoil, but one of positive action, though after much deliberation with himself. The observation made by Ihab Hassan that in the modern novel, the dialectic between the essential Yes and the radical No found its incarnation in the figure of the rebel-victim seems relevant here.18 Controlled from the outside by an inflexible order
or structures that tend to reduce man to a function or simply an object wrecked inwardly by the sense of guilt, absurdity and contradiction, the modern self took its stand both in defiance and affliction. Its search for an identity conceived in freedom led it through the dark undersides of experience from which it emerged still human only to find itself outlawed by the collective authority of men who had relinquished their full humanity. Like Dostoyevsky's hero, the modern self is at times compelled to live underground, alienated and isolated.

Initiation can lead to estrangement, which is accompanied by an acute sense of personal anxiety, a feeling of uncertainty, loss and despair. The tortured self of the Acharya is led to new yet ordinary worlds by the ingenious Putta. Though he has no ideology as such like Naranappa, he is one of life's natural children; a man very much at home with the world around. In the guided tour through temple festival and fair, whorehouse and pawnshop, the Acharya sees a demoniac world of passion and sensation. Putta is one with this world; he is riddle-master, expert bargainer, pimp without any 'samskara'. A. K. Ramanujan says that Putta is "Praneshacharya's initiator into the mysteries of the ordinary and the familiar, the purity of the unregenerate, the wholeness of the crude. This vision of this world is part of the Acharya's new 'samskara', his 'passage' (Afterword, 142)." Observing that the story moves very much
like a 'rite de passage', the translator speaks about the many types of rituals, especially rites of initiation, which have three stages: 'segregation', 'transition' and 're-incorporation' (Afterword, 142). He further adds that in and through such rituals, individuals and groups change their state or status. Such a change of state is often symbolized, as in this book, by a change of place—a going away, a seclusion and a coming back.

Not only in myth, in literature too, a journey often serves a symbolic function, embodying a transition between two modes of existence—one that is over and the other yet to begin. During a journey a man is outside his professional or conventional framework, freed from an expected pattern of behaviour and therefore in a position to contemplate the true nature of his self. From Odysseus' nine-year-long journey home to Sinbad's voyages, from Christian's progress from the City of Destruction to the Celestial City, upto Gulliver's Travels and the expeditions of Don Quixote—all journeys have been used as different types of fictional strategy. They could imply a quest for home, a quest for treasure, for salvation, for experience and adventure, and not infrequently a quest for one's own true self. Joseph Campbell's classic study The Hero with a Thousand Faces deals elaborately with the archetypal condition of one who has broken away and has lost touch with the life and thought of his community.
Analysing themes and motifs common to all traditional mythologies, he traces the usual pattern thus: first, a break away or departure from the local social order and context; second, a long, deep retreat inward and backward in time and inward, deep into the psyche, with a chaotic series of encounters there and presently encounters of a centering kind; and finally (if the victim is fortunate enough to have fulfilling, harmonizing experiences at the second stage), a return journey of rebirth to life. So he describes the universal formula of the mythological hero journey with three distinct phases—separation, initiation and return: "A hero ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious adventure with the power to bestow boons on his fellowmen."19 Particularly rich in symbols of tradition is the Acharya's journey from his accustomed village: he wanders through forests and lonely roads, meets with the riddling, unshakable Putta, journeys through a non-verbal world of fairs, festivals and performances where he is the marginal man. Interestingly, in the agrahara, he was at the centre, commanding respect and authority. But 'during a journey, when you shed your past, your history, the world sees you as just one more brahmin'—realizes Praneshacharya after he leaves his village, and this awareness is intensified as he learns to adjust to the world's image of himself divested of
his fame and reputation. For the villagers who meet him on the way, he is no longer the 'Crest jewel of Vedanta' but a lowly brahmin perhaps on his rounds for alms collection; and if he were to lose his external appearance of a brahmin, his image of himself would have to be further adjusted to the world's image of him as an anonymous, casteless wanderer. After having lost all lustre and influence, he is preparing himself to bear the loss of public esteem as well.

The concept of the anti-hero as developed by Ihab Hassan\textsuperscript{20} offers a highly revealing approach to Samskara and to the present plight of the Acharya. "In its essence literature is concerned with the self", Lionel Trilling writes in \textit{Freud and the Crisis of Our Culture}, that "the particular concern of the literature of the last two centuries has been with the self in its standing quarrel with culture."\textsuperscript{21} The image of the self in its standing and recently embittered quarrel with culture comes to focus in the figure of the anti-hero. "In fiction the unnerving rubric 'anti-hero' refers to a ragged assembly of victims: the fool, the clown, the hipster, the criminal, the poor sod, the freak, the outsider, the scapegoat, the scrubby opportunist, the rebel without a cause, the 'hero' in the ashcan and the 'hero' on the leash."\textsuperscript{22} And, as he adds, if the anti-hero seems nowadays to hold us in his spell, it is because the deep and disquieting insights revealed to us by
modern literature often require that we project ourselves into the predicament of victims. Among the many faces of the heroes, there are the ironic heroes whose ideals, desires and feelings are in disharmony with the adult conception of reality; and there is the lower class hero with his wretched fate, caught between malignant heredity and crushing environment. They all point towards the disintegration of heroism, and finding himself a victim, with little or no control over his fate in the world, man turns inward again.

In these characters, the moral conflict is so internalized that no victory or defeat, where self is divided against itself, can claim to be more than something gained at too great a cost. Obviously introspective, the novel redefines the identity of its central character and redirects his energies toward the virtue of love and self-discovery, virtues that are a good deal more personal than social:

To become someone, to know who or what one is, to reach finally another human being with love, and to do so in terms that society may censure, this is the passionate, bitter concern of the modern anti-hero.... The sad history of the anti-hero is nothing more than the history of man's changing awareness of himself. It is the record of his recoil.23
While viewing some concrete instances of the anti-hero we see that the dagger is turned inward, the most refined tortures are reserved for the self.\textsuperscript{24}

After living for twenty years as the crest-jewel of Vedanta, Praneshacharya looks at his existence from an entirely new perspective. He feels intensely disturbed: "Even if I leave everything behind, the community clings to me asking me to fulfil duties the brahmin is born to. It isn't easy to free oneself of this" (96). And again, "unless I shed brahminhood altogether, I cannot stand aside, liberated from all this" (130). Percisely the condition which Albert Camus calls in \textit{The Rebel} metaphysical rebellion, and which our hero understands as a revolt against the whole system around him. After insistent search and endless self-questioning, he does find his way out.

The 'rebel-victim' is also the 'outsider' in search of truth. Colin Wilson in \textit{The Outsider} speaks at length about the predicament of the archetypal outsider. In a sense, Praneshacharya is an isolate genius of suffering whose fate is to live the riddle of his destiny heightened to the pitch of a personal torture, a personal hell. In his effort to grapple with the multiplicities of the human ego, he is oscillating between not merely two poles--such as the body and the spirit, the saint and the sinner--but between numerous possibilities. He hovers in indecision, caught in
the Trishanku state, and considers for the hundredth time whether "to give up a quarter century of discipline and become a man of the world" (126). As an outsider he is finally made to reckon with the fact that he has become a marginal man, looking like a mendicant brahmin. The modern hero, comprising in himself the images of rebel, victim and outsider, thus lends himself to an intense religious apprehension.

To the religious and humanist solution of man's plight in the universe must be added the Existentialist. In fact the existentialist overtones of the novel have been commented upon by quite a few critics of Samskara. K. V. Subbanna, the noted Kannada writer says that in Samskara, "in that dead and dilapidated agrahara, among those stupid, greedy brahmins we find a man like Praneshacharya, who is so original and so deeply intellectual that he can comprehend the deepest complexities, as if he knew first hand our modern Existentialism." Though this observation is made to contrast the Acharya with the low caste untouchables who lived in the vicinity of the same agrahara, Subbanna has succeeded in highlighting the intense personal qualities of the philosophic Acharya. John O. Perry, the noted American critic, in his review of Samskara, notes two significant aspects of the novel: its ambiguously loving treatment of Brahmin philosophy, village customs and south Indian environs; and more significantly, its reliance on an
international existentialist-modernist literary tradition that includes the philosophically probing, and psychologically profound novels of Camus and Sartre, perhaps Graham Greene, but pre-eminently D.H. Lawrence. In the same review he again says that what interests him about the novel is its "more and more existential, less political and social, sense of what makes a person: individual choices, decisions, will in social contexts...." In placing Ananthamurthy on a par with these writers whose existentialist leanings are obvious, John Perry is also hinting at his relevance beyond the here and now, investing the novel with a universal validity. In his existential reading of Samskara, P. P. Sharma goes in detail into the theoretical implications of this philosophic mode of analysing the novel. And for A. K. Ramanujan, "In Praneshacharya, brahminism questions itself in a modern existentialist mode" (Afterword, 141). Ananthamurthy himself speaks about the external forces that went into the making of Samskara: "...Bergman, Karanth and Marxism on which I was working at that time....and the influence of existentialist novels which I was reading and the memories of my boyhood days entered into my narrative in a magical manner."29

As one of the chief proponents of this particular philosophy, Sartre observes that "by existentialism we mean a doctrine which makes human life possible and, in addition,
declares that every truth and every action implies a human setting and a human subjectivity." 30 When the existentialists say that existence precedes essence, as Sartre says:

\[
\text{[it] means that, first of all man exists, turns up, appears on the scene, and only afterwards defines himself. If man, as the existentialist conceives him, is indefinable, it is because at first he is nothing. Only afterwards will he be something, and he himself will have made what he will be. Not only is man what he conceives himself to be, but he is also only what he wills himself to be after his thrust towards existence ... Man is nothing else but what he makes of himself.}^{31}
\]

The last sentence of the novel reads: "Praneshacharya waited, anxious, expectant" (138). The comment on it given by the translator is that: "...the last phase of the Acharya's initiation is an anxious return, a waiting on the threshold; his question seems to find no testful answers. What is suggested is a movement, not a closure. The novel ends, but does not conclude" (147). What is important for us to realize here is that the Acharya, as he stands before us now, is not the same person that he was while at Durvasapura; he is a transformed person. The process of change that took
so long to begin in him will, according to the indications made available to us, go on, moulding and modifying him in diverse ways. The chief difference between the selfhood that he had earlier and the one he has arrived at now is well brought out by the terms 'en-soi' and 'pour-soi', which mean the self in itself and the self for itself, self-contained and conscious beings respectively. In the light of Sartre's views on existentialism, the most valuable achievement of Praneshacharya is his realization that he is not committed to any role-playing, that he has the freedom to respond to each emergent situation the way he thinks best.

In his efforts to live the role defined for him by others, he was desperately anxious to provide them with a consistent image of himself which would be acceptable to his followers. So long as a person tries to conform to other people's notion of himself, according to existentialist point of view, he is living an 'inauthentic' life, because he is closer to a thing or an object rather than to an individual who is characterized by consciousness, and exercises his choice. Here we are reminded of the distinction made by Karl Jaspers between the phenomenological and existential standpoints: the first is that of a spectator, whereas the second is that of a participant, continually presenting disequilibrium and risk, open possibilities and urgent problems. It is a point where the Acharya tells himself:
"I'll remake myself in full wakefullness" (110). The Acharya's final return to the agrahara unmistakably belongs to the existentialist hero—not a withdrawal from his fellow creatures, but an active participation in the harsh realities confronting them. Orestes' significant role in the play *The Flies* is where his people stricken with pestilence need him. Thus, the Acharya has "travelled a long and arduous road, with surprising twists and turns, from decadent orthodox brahminism to modern dynamic existentialism."32

The basic question here is still one of freedom, the search for identity under the aspects of violence or alienation. A certain ambivalence may haunt the quest of such heroes, but in the case of Praneshacharya, this ambivalence, uncertainty, is seemingly resolved in favour of positive action. Hassan's observation is relevant here: "The problem of the anti-hero is essentially one of identity. His search is for existential fulfilment, that is, for freedom and self-definition."33 Society may provide for us an awareness of our situation in relation to our larger environment, but that does not mean that one exists as true self as only existence determines his stand. So we might say that the recoil of the modern self is its way of taking a stand. The retreat from active involvement in the world around, led through the paths of a sense of guilt, absurdity, isolation and alienation places Praneshacharya in a
comfortable distance and objectivity to assess himself, his life so far and his present dilemma. Living exclusively for the others, complete immersion in the otherness of things, can be deadening; it is alienation from the self. A strategic retreat into the self at the most crucial moment makes him feel relieved of the burden of his responsibility to the agrahara, and ultimately makes life lighter for him. From a position verging on the total loss of selfhood, by an unexpected turn of events, he is compelled to stand by himself and fall back on his own internal resources.

Life has its contradictions within any given structure and men may resort to various modes of response to live up to their radical essence. Hassan is of the view that "in the modern novel, man seems to overcome the contradictions of his experience, its destructive or demonic element, by assuming the role of the anti-hero, the rebel-victim. The rebel denies without saying No to life, the victim succumbs without saying Yes to oppression." In a sense both are identical: they affirm the human against the non-human. So what concerns our attention is not the wretchedness of modern existence, rather man's peculiar awareness of his own situation; the encounter between the self and the society around, the confrontation of the hero with structures and values which assume the form of victimization. But it so happens that though man is free to
reject the image which culture has of him, his relation to the world will still be determined by that image. It is in this sense that Praneshacharya feels incapable of disowning his past fully in his efforts to forge a new conscience and worldview for himself. He is aware that he "must stand apart from the community of men", but he soon finds that "he was entering another cave of self-deception" by walking close to the habitations of men even though he had decided to walk where his legs would take him (92). Hence as Ihab Hassan would argue, "the context of the individual encounter between self and world is therefore defined, to a large extent, by the permissive or limiting disposition of culture," which means his world and his freedom is conditioned and restricted. So there is an element of self-deception in the thought that one is free.

The significance of Putta in the novel is that it is this utterly unselfconscious youth that becomes instrumental in initiating the highly learned Acharya to a new mode of apprehending reality. Ananthamurthy refers to Putta as "the other in my novel who complicated and enriched my theme..., who made the act of writing for me very lively." In the Acharya's struggles to liberate himself from a dogmatic way of life that stifles spontaneity, he encounters in Putta another Hindu who is not reflective or philosophical in any sense. Rather, he accepts the stratification implicitly, yet
it has not hampered his naturalness, his zest for living, his ability to say with a great life-affirming inclusiveness, "On the whole I like people" (112). In the third part of the novel, Putta is an important character, and perhaps the only character in the novel other than Praneshacharya who is represented at some length. All the other characters make very brief appearances and Naranappa is already dead when the novel begins. Whatever we know about him is through other people's memories. Chandri disappears abruptly from the novel after shattering Praneshacharya's fortress of certitudes and having fulfilled her role, as it were, in the novel. Mahabala's story is recounted in two pages. And as for the other brahmins, they matter not individually but in their choric function. Putta is the only character who stays with us for the last quarter of this brief novel. Meenakshi Mukherjee thinks that "[it] Naranappa is Praneshacharya's arrogant anti-self, Putta is another antithesis of the Acharya in a lower key. As against the Acharya's self-absorption, Putta does not have very clear sense of the boundaries of his self."^37 It makes an interesting spectacle when Putta, in a totally uninhibited way, is willing to involve himself in other people's lives for no reason at all and participate in everything that goes on around him. He himself describes his amorphous fluidity thus: "Oh Putta? Our Putta. If you let him go you lose him; but find him, he'll never leave you" (180). And we see that in a rather
paradoxical way this common wayfarer has achieved that ideal state the Acharya has only had a glimpse of—to be, just to be... putting aside both desire and value—participating in life fully and without asking questions.

As his creator himself says, "...he is an incessant talker and a bit of a village baffoon and a typical oral story teller of villages." Unlike the erudite Acharya, he forms relationships easily and can even wear down the Acharya's forbidding silence by asking riddle after riddle until he is forced to reply. While Praneshacharya is contemplating the philosophical dimension of his present predicament, Putta chatters all the time, guiding him along the fair and conducting his business for him when the need arises. Despite all his emotional detachment, by the end of the day Putta has even managed to evoke a fatherly love in the Acharya (117-18). The Acharya has never felt this tenderness before and frightened by this feeling he withdraws immediately. Plagued by no metaphysical dilemma and directed by no special purpose, the down-to-earth Putta can change his plans and destination without a moment's notice. Though he is allowed to wear a thread, he cannot join the brahmins in their community feast, and he accepts this ambiguous caste status without resentment. Taking his full share of the festive spirit of the fair Putta moves along, but the description of the bustle and noise of the fair-ground with
its appeal to the senses recalls distant but distinct echoes of the experience the Acharya had when the veil dropped from him in the forest, enabling him to respond with his senses as never before:

... noise of reed pipes, smells of burning camphor and joss-sticks. The smell of new clothes. The song of the balloon seller, the invitation to see the peep show... (113, emphasis added).

And earlier,

He smelt the forest smells and smelt the Sarsaparilla anew,... he looked at the Vishnukranti flowers as if mere looking was wealth,... he felt the water on his skin and the fishes pricked at his ticklish toe-spaces, armpits and ribs'. (84, emphasis added)

What makes these two responses distinct from each other is that one is at the fair, right in the midst of the world of men, and the other in the forest, outside the world of men. In a sense, the Acharya is still caught between two worlds, and his newly emerging vision is not ripe enough to assimilate all the actual ties of this crude world. Putta naturally belongs here, but the Acharya—can only stand and stare from a horrified distance. The cockfight is to the Acharya the most traumatic experience of this world. The noise, the dust, the colour and the smell that assault his
sheltered and secluded sensibility at the fair are nothing compared to the intensity of violence at the cockfight. The 'sharp, cruel looks' of the audience, the glint of knives tied to the roosters, the throaty, inhuman sounds of the people encouraging the fight, all frighten him and make him reconsider his decision. He may have rejected the brahminical world of austerities and penance, but he will not be able to embrace this demonic world of cruelty either. He wavers, realizing the dual aspects of the newly discovered world: "One part of lust is tenderness and the other part is a demoniac will" (117)—the forest and the fairground representing the two realities. Chandri's touch has the compassion of a mother (63), but Padmavati's elongated dark eyes hold terror for him: "The bird is paralysed by the stare of the black serpent" (123).

Having lost one form, and yet not having the courage to acquire another, Praneshacharya continues in this indeterminate stage. He is acutely conscious that the eyes of others are investing him with a form he himself does not yet possess. Padmavati's eyes looking at him from behind the threshold terrorize him because "as soon as eye meets eye who knows what shape the unformed will take?" (123). He realizes that the decisive moment is yet to come. Within a space of half a page (123) he passes through various stages—fear, feeling of vulnerability, then an upsurge of desire obliterating all self-consciousness. In a brief
kaleidoscopic flash the scenes of his life come back to him, bringing images of Naranappa, Mahabala, Chandri, Bhagirathi. And this inner vision is paralleled by a similar view of the market place—the medicine man, the acrobat, the mutilated bodies of lepers reminding him of the rotting corpse he has left behind. To escape the collective assault of this mundane world, he enters a familiar sanctuary, the temple, postponing his decision yet a while. Seated in a line with hundreds of hungry brahmins waiting for a meal, Praneshacharya is plagued by three kinds of fear. First, since he is in the impure period of mourning his proximity has polluted everyone, whether they know it or not; second, if he is found out his act will hurt a whole crowd of people and the chariot festival will have to be cancelled; and third, if he is found out what will people think of him? Thus, as Meenakshi Mukherjee very perceptively remarks, "he is back to square one—to self-absorption and a selfish desire for social approval, now complicated by an uncertainty about what is right." 39

In this unformed stage, he even thinks nostalgically of an earlier time of certainty, the stability and order of the agrahara before the crisis, which is for ever lost to him. Twice he comes very close to making the decisive gesture of publicly owning up his changed self, but on both times he runs away from it. In Sartrean terms, he lacks the will to make an existential decision. In fact his journey back to
Durvasapura, just happens rather than voluntarily undertaken, but we find Praneshacharya moving towards his third climactic moment of confession.

As the novel ends before the journey is over, the readers are left anxious, expectant, like the hero himself. But the interior journey made by him traces an arc from the static certainty of 'the crest-jewel of Vedanta' to the dynamic uncertainty of a lonely individual in search of a code by which he can be totally himself without any self-deception. The possibilities of the arc ever being completed into a circle are remote considering the contradictions within the protagonist. Perhaps the Acharya will never attain that pure state he is searching for, but his multidimensional experience, the authenticity of his quest, has encompassed a larger area than he had known in his earlier limited life, and he cannot return completely to his former position. Praneshacharya who has all along been an ideal brahmin (in his own and others' eyes), right in the midst of that brahminic collectivity, suddenly experiences isolation, and acquires a personality that is new and distinct. He is 'individuated' and Samskara portrays the process of his individuation. He has undoubtedly undergone a conversion, and has changed, though he does not know to what.

It is surprising that Samskara, which is typically South Indian in theme and construction, has its parallels in
European literature too, a fact which reinforces the novel's significance beyond time and space. Commenting upon the diversity and multiformity of responses to Samskara, Ananthamurthy himself wonders what precisely the novel is about. It is no mean achievement for the readers to make the creator of a work of art feel puzzled about the real intentions that went into its making or its real nature. He says, "In my agrahar, people who loved me now censured me for putting some of them in my novel. Thus they responded to the novel literally. A little away from my village at the district level, people thought that I was attacking a certain sect of Brahmans--Madhwa Brahmans. As the novel further moved in space, it was seen more abstractly as anti-Brahmin in the state of Karnataka. V. S. Naipaul who was further away, read it as a critic of Hinduism. Further away still, when Erikson saw the film and read the novel, he saw it as a depiction of the crisis of middle age. What I want to ask here is this: 'which is my novel?'--a question which obviously leaves the amateur critic baffled, yet awakens him to the immense possibilities inherent in mature artistic vision.
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