The principle of साधर्मणिकरण in Bharata's theory of रस which is also interpreted as aesthetic relish. Bharata's view of the relationship between art and reality was based on the three concepts of imitation of worldly occurrences (लोकवर्त्तनुकरण), the poet's creative interpretation of reality (नात्यधर्मि), and universalisation (साधर्मणिकरण). Art should present an experience in a form which is at once generalised and particular. This is the meaning of the term साधर्मणिकरण.

Bhattanayaka it is, who first expounded the theory of universalisation (साधर्मणिकरण) in the context of refuting Anandavardhana's theory of suggestion (ध्वनि). His book called श्रद्धवदर्पण is now extinct, but extracts from them are quoted by Abhinavagupta, the greatest champion of Anandvardhana's dhvani concept. Bhattanayaka says that dhvani is व्यायामत्त्वका which has been proved to be only a feature or aspect of the body of poetry (काव्यान्त्वका) and not its soul. If the soul-body distinction is applied to all poetry, रस, and not dhvani, becomes its soul. Abhinavagupta also concedes that रस alone is the soul of poetry रस एवं वास्तुतन्त्र तारा (Dhvan}aloka Lokana, p. 27), and that dhvani is only a limb of poetry. (वस्तु आलोकाना ...)
dhvanistu sarvathā rasam prati paryavasyetē iti vacyātkrstau
tau ityabhīpavāna dhvaniḥ kāvyātmāti, sāmānyenōktam). But
dhvani is the most important limb of poetry, and therefore
it is called the soul of poetry. Ānandavardhana ascribes to
the word the power of suggestion (vyanjana). But Bhatta-
nāyaka considers the very poetic consciousness intrinsically
suggestive. The very nature of poetic consciousness being
suggestive, the words that give expression to that
consciousness inherit that power. He further says that in
vedic utterance, intonation (śabda) is of prime importance
and the meaning (artha) gains significance in mythology and
history, because they give directives as to the moral
conduct. But in poetry neither sound nor sense is important.
Vyāpāra, which he defines as the capacity of the words to
evoke rasa, is of paramount importance. This function is
called by him bhāvakatya-vyāpāra which is equated with the
dhvani of Ānandavardhana. While explaining the conditions
under which this function comes into being and operates,
Bhattanāyaka introduces the concept of universalisation
(sādhāranīkarana). Universalisation is the primary
principle in creative imagination by which a neutral
attitude is taken up by the poetic consciousness with regard
to persons and feelings. In the real life situation persons
and passions are viewed with prejudices and predilections by
which there is made a distinction between beautiful and
ugly, familiar and strange, noble and mean, friendly and
inimical, attractive and repulsive, things and persons.
These discriminations affect our perceptions, create our perspectives and distort our judgements. But in the principle of universalisation, no such distinctions are made and everything has equal importance and value. A Desdemona is as valuable as an Iago. The creative consciousness is concerned with all alike. Empirical value separates, but the aesthetic view synthesises so much so that everything becomes equally interesting and significant leading to rasānubhava. From such a consciousness, the poetic utterance springs.

Abhinavagupta underlines the importance of sādhāranīkaraṇa and recognises its indispensability when he says that without sādhāranīkaraṇa there can be no vibhavatva and rasatva cannot even be dreamt of apart from it. So Abhinavagupta also associates the term sādhāranīkaraṇa with the essence of rasa experience. The term implies the twofold process of impersonalisation and identification, or the objectification of a subjective experience. The term, generalisation, commonly used to translate this state, does not adequately convey that aspect of its meaning whereby it is understood to be the inward realisation and actual participation within the aesthetic situation. In short, the very poetic consciousness cannot exist without it. It works along with aesthetic consciousness and its vision (darsana or prakhyā) and its expression (varṇana or upākhyā). While dhvani is concerned with expression (upākhyā) or
(śabdavyāpāra), śādhārānīkaraṇa pertains to prakhyā as well upākhyā, and is thus, more comprehensive than dhvani. Vision there can be without expression, but varṇana is impossible without darsāna, and that is why it is said that one who does not have vision cannot write poetry (nāmrṣih kurutē kāvyam). If Vālmiki's poetry is full of dhvani, it is because he had vision. So while Ānandavardhana considers poetry from the reader's view point, Bhattachāyaka sees poetry from the poet's as well as the reader's points of view (bhōktṛtyam sahrdava visāyam). He calls the poet's activity bhāyakatva and the reader's enjoyment bhōktṛtya.

Raniero Gnoli, in his rendering of the aesthetic experience according to Abhinavagupta, feels that śādhāranya or generality is the principal character of aesthetic experience.

The images contemplated on the stage or read in poetry are seen by the man of aesthetic sensibility independently of any relationship with his ordinary life or with the life of the actor or of the hero of the play or poem, and appear, therefore, in a generalised (śādhārānīkṛta) way, that is to say, universally, and released from individuality. The drama performed or the poem recited has the power to raise the spectator, for the moment, above his limited ego, his practical interests, which in everyday life, like "a thick layer of mental stupor," limit and dim his consciousness. Things and events that in practical life when associated with "I, mine," repel or grieve us, are felt as a source of pleasure - the
aesthetical pleasure of rasa - when they are described or represented aesthetically, that is when they are generalised or contemplated universally.¹

This idea postulates "a state of self-identification with the imagined situation, devoid of any practical interest and hence impersonal."²

So sādhāranya is an important aspect where aesthetic appreciation is concerned. The word sādhārana means common. It can refer to common elements in a play or a poem, or it may also include the commonness of feeling between the poet and the sahrdaya. The rasa is thus a common or shared experience. The etymology of the word sādhāranākarana is self-explanatory. What is not common is made common. The imaginative experience of the poet which gets objectified in the fictional characters and the total design of the novel is certainly not a common experience. But the magic power of art can transform this uncommon and even unique experience into something that is common or shareable. The love and suffering of Rama and Sita when treated thematically are regarded as vibhāvas of the sthāvibhāvas, namely of rati and sōka respectively. No one, not even the poet, has seen the actual life emotions of these legendary persons. The poet imagines them and gives them an ordered form in his work. In

¹ Gnoli, p. xxii.
² Ibid.
the former state they are laukika and the causes are associates of mental states. But in their imagined, alaukika state, they feature as the vibhāvas and anubhāvas of the sthāvibhāvas. This means that they have an existential status only when they are imaginatively conceived and artistically objectified by the poet. Once they are rendered in this form they can be shared by any number of readers and spectators. The vibhāvas and anubhāvas are sādhāranīkṛita or rendered shareable to all sahrdayas, transcending the boundaries of time and space. In a way they may become archetypal or typical human conditions as in Keats's Grecian Urn. This is one way of understanding the term.

But Abhinavagupta sees this effect in poetic suggestion or manifestation. He quotes an instance from Kālidāsa's Sākuntala where fear becomes a rasa in the spectator while witnessing the scene of the hunted deer. The rasa presented is bhayānaka, that is, fear which is rendered artistically shareable. The emotion of fear is a common enough experience. Kālidāsa's description is so vivid, realistic and convincing that the created structure of the emotion is shared by the readers. But the poet is not narrating what has really happened. He has created a likely happening through his poetic imagination. The imaginative reconstruction of a possible emotion in artistic

3 Bhat, Rasa Theory, p. 8.
terms is achieved through universalisation. This process is called śādārāniṃkaraṇa.

Krishnamoorthy comments on Abhinavagupta's famous passage:

It should be noted that the word used is śādārānya or śādārāniḥbhāva. Its scope is not limited but unlimited. The actors on stage can only contribute to the spectacle taking the form of self-realisation. It is not the object deer that they perceive: they realise within themselves the very mental state of fear in all its depth. The conditioning elements of an object-consciousness like time, space and subject are totally annihilated by reason of their mutual cancellation. The resultant emotion which is divested of all individuality shines out in general form only. That is why all the spectators get a singularly unified identical awareness and this adds to the nourishment of the rasa. ⁴

In another passage, Abhinavagupta explains how a glutton's eating of food differs from that of a gourmet. The glutton is attentive to the food object outside. But the gourmet is inattentive to it though it is present. This is technically called vyaṇḍāna. He is the most attentive to the taste within himself. In poetry and drama, the feeling of separate identity (anyathabhāva) is overshadowed. Only the taste of joy is grasped. ⁵

⁴ Krishnamoorthy, Literary Theories, p. 254.
⁵ Ibid., p. 254.
Sādhāraṇya is mentioned in connection with vyāvādānatirōdhaṇa-vigna-nirāša. This is the corollary of the rule that private and personal attitudes must be consciously or unconsciously shed. Those who are unable to keep aside empirical feelings cannot experience the true joy of rasa. It is the state which provides for both involvement and detachment. One is psychologically involved though practically detached and impersonal.

Interpretations of the term sādhāraṇīkaraṇa by Indian aestheticians reveal the close similarity between this concept and the concept of psychical distance as well as the German theory of einfühling. Krishnamoorthy says:

Even the emotions depicted shed their associations with particular characters, and become universalised element emotions of universal man. This philosophy sādhāraṇīkaraṇa has its analogues in Edward Bullough's theory of "aesthetic distance" and Lipps's theory of einfühling. The Sanskrit term for this is tanmayābhāvāna; and the aesthetic process is regarded as one of hṛdayaśāṃvāda or heartfelt response.6

Indian aestheticians do not regard beauty as a subjective experience, because in their view aesthetic relish or rasa is absolutely impersonal and detached.

The similarity with Bullough's theory of psychical distance is striking.

6 Ibid., p.22
This distance appears to lie between our own self and its affections, ... that is between our own self and such objects are the sources or vehicles of such affections.

The transformation by distance is produced by putting the phenomenon, out of gear with our practical, actual self: by allowing it to stand outside the context of our personal needs and ends - by looking at it objectively, by permitting only such reactions in our part as emphasise the objective features of the experience, and by interpreting even our subjective affections not as modes of our being but rather as characteristics of the phenomenon.7

This distance serves to bridge the subjective-objective dichotomy in view of its aesthetic principle. Objectivity and subjectivity are a pair of opposites which in their mutual exclusiveness when applied to art soon lead to confusion. Bullough's theory of distance tries to synthesise this dichotomy while describing the conditions needed for an artistic temperament and aesthetic consciousness.8 Bullough's idea of distance does not separate the self from the object. The common paradoxes which are inevitable in discussions of art are somewhat reconciled through this concept of distance. Distance, by changing the relationship with the characters, renders them seemingly fictitious.

7 Bullough, p. 96.

8 Ibid.
The proof of the seeming paradox that it is distance which primarily gives to dramatic action the appearance of unreality and not vice versa, is the observation that the same filtration of our sentiments and the same seeming 'unreality' of actual man and things occur, when, at times, by the sudden change of inward perspective, we are overcome by the feeling that all the world is a stage.⁹

With reference to art appreciation, Bullough shows how distance is a variable factor depending on two different sets of conditions affecting the degree of distance in any given case, namely those offered by the object and those realised by the subject. To quote Bullough again,

In short, distance may be said to be variable according to the distancing power of the individual and according to the character of the object.¹⁰

Bullough also rightly points out that distance as an aesthetic principle is very necessary both on the part of the creative artist and on the part of the critic or audience. This distance helps each individual shed his personal feelings and enter the art world where again he has to experience emotions, the enjoyment of which gets marred if he is affected by personal associations. The objectivity needed in creative and critical spheres of art while also concentrating on the valid issues of life is possible if the

⁹ Ibid., p. 98.
¹⁰ Ibid.
aesthetic distance is maintained. The rasa theory implies the very same criterion in the term sādhāranīkaraṇa which helps the reader and artist to rise above the limits of the personal and subjective attitude to more general and universal dimensions.

Patankar in his analysis of rasa theory discusses the concept of sādhāranīkaraṇa as universalisation achieved in two ways. The first can be seen as a one-way process from a particular to the universal which subsumes it. The second is a two-way process from a particular to the universal and back again to the particular where the second particular is not the same as the first.11 Patankar quotes Aristotle's stand on universaliation:

Poetry, therefore, is a more philosophical and a higher thing than history: for poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular. By the universal I mean how a person of a certain type will on occasion speak or act, according to the law of probability or necessity.12

But whether the particularity is completely transcended when the characters become mere abstractions is not discussed. This issue has been the central feature of all aesthetic debates. Especially in the context of modern literature where the individual is highly personalised, creative artists have resorted to different shades of presentation

11 Patankar, Philosophy East and West, pp. 293-303.
12 Ibid., p. 295.
where the particular does not merge with the ideal completely. Yet their individuality gives them an identity of their own which allows for critical discussions and speculations.

Edwin Gerow defines rasa as a generalised emotion from which all elements of particular consciousness are expunged. Rasa is thus an aesthetic ideal in its own terms and this ideal persists even today in contemporary literature:

Generalisation of character, event, or response is thus the key to understanding the continuing Indian aesthetic. Many reflexes of this doctrine in the work of art are patent, and amount to a statement of radical antirealism. Intuition is seen as direct apprehension of reality—generalised emotional being. And the only important function of the aesthetic work is to enable that apprehension.13

Gerow sees Abhinavagupta's attempt to explain the psychological and ontological implications of the transcendent nature of rasa experience, as defining the restrictive places of art and reality. That is why Abhinavagupta makes art experience alaukika, sui generis. But the familiarity with the workings of the human heart is an essential prerequisite for aesthetic enjoyment. Such enjoyment

---

13 Gerow, Literatures of India, p. 217.
presupposes, of course, that the spectator in his ordinary life has not neglected to make a close observation of the characteristic signs (effects, causes and concomitant elements) of other people's mental processes, in other words, to deduce one from the other. 14

The feelings of an individual man are based on personal, accidental and incommunicable experiences. Only when they are ordered, depersonalised and rendered communicable by the prescriptions of art do they participate in rasa. But though it is not personal experience it is related to it: hence the distance between the world of art and the real world. The world of art is outside normal time and space. King Lear and Caesar are recognised by their virtual presence in the drama. The aesthetic context in which these characters act and speak has a reality with special dimensions. They do not belong to the world of practical reality which we inhabit. This aesthetic distance which separates the world of art and the world of reality also disengages the spectator from the selfish, pragmatic preoccupations of the world of activity. Freedom from practical preoccupations which the world of art affords, gives the spectator a new vision, as it were, in which the characters appear not as individuals but as typifying the general traits of human nature. Lear's suffering on stage can give a kind of aesthetic delight or tragic pleasure, and this paradox is explained by Arthur Sewell:

14 Gnoli, p. 44.
We recognise Hamlet's problem as it appears to him; but how the problem appears to him never absolutely determines how it appears to us. His problem is known to us as his, not as ours; and although we look at the world through his eyes, it is we who look at the world.\textsuperscript{15}

The principle of \textit{sādhāranīkaraṇa} is at work when the spectator witnesses a play. What he sees enacted is a world which he knows to be not the real world, but something parallel to it. In the real world the spectator may be subject to practical selfish interests. But there is no reason why these should vitiate his attitude to a dramatic spectacle in the theatre. It completely absorbs his mind and as a result, he is lifted out of his personal, selfish, limited and practical ego. It is this unegoistic attitude which constitutes the aesthetic distance between him and the work of art. But still he remains essentially a human being capable of feelings during aesthetic experience and changes his attitude. The characters in literature exist only in the imaginative consciousness of the spectator during aesthetic experience. It is for this reason that he takes them in an idealised, generalised and universalised form. He is no doubt involved in what he witnesses, but his involvement is aesthetic and not empirical.

It follows a priori that three levels of emotion can be traced. The first is the personal level, the second, the objective or generalised, and the third, the aesthetic. Though it is not stated explicitly, it is implied in the discussions of the aesthetic thinkers. Modern aestheticians sometimes draw the distinction between emotion and feeling on the basis that the former is "the private phenomenon of the individual psychic state passively undergone and suffered" and the latter "the generalised presentiment of an emotional state felt by no one in particular, yet finding correspondence in the experience of mankind in general as feeling." T.S. Eliot also makes this distinction between art emotion and personal emotion. This is the feeling which aestheticians declare as belonging impersonally to works of art and which constitutes the basic principles in art experience. The distinction between the emotional levels centres on the psychological which includes the intensely private affections of the subject and the aesthetic which signifies broadly an objectified emotion. The psychological level of the emotional experience is rendered clearly in the term bhāva.

Abinavagupta explains that the world of literature is not an imitation of the real world. Sir Philip Sidney in "The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism" says that

16 Pandit, pp. 40-42.
the past does not imitate, but creates." It is a world parallel to and existing in its own right. The crucial difference is that the practical world is a permanent physical fact, whereas the world of literature is real only during aesthetic experience. But some experience of the real world is necessary to understand literature fully. The real world is the substratum on which the world of literature is super-imposed. The end product of the creative process thus becomes a concrete universal.

How do creative writers invest characters with universal appeal? Easily recognisable types help in the process of generalisation, because they involve fewer idiosyncrasies. The personal peculiarities of Rāma have either been filtered by hagiographic tradition or have themselves been made significant symbols of his persistent character (bending the bow, leaving Sīta behind).\(^\text{17}\) such types (they need not be stereotypes) are known to a larger audience and require fewer idiosyncratic explanations as to time, place, and motive to be understood. If this be the case, characters in literary works will become abstractions on account of the sādhāranākarana they undergo. But this does not mean that all literary characters are abstractions. In fact, many characters in literary works are individualised. Especially in works after the romantic age

\(^{17}\) Gerow, p. 217.
the presence of individualised characters is considered a source of literary value.

The balance between the universal and the particular is not easy to maintain. There is always the danger of slipping into the universalist position, or the Crocean particularist position, that it is the function of art to reveal the individual physiognomy of things.\(^{18}\) Patankar rightly summarises the relative importance of these two issues.

Every individual combines both, the universal and the particular. The dispute between the universalists like Aristotle and the particularists like Croce may therefore be regarded as a dispute about the relative importance of the two, the Aristotelians subordinating the particular to the universal, the Croceans doing exactly the opposite. This shows that universalisation like particularisation might be obtainable in different degrees.\(^{19}\)

If the creative writer has to balance the universal and the particular in the right proportion to mould his work through \(s\)ādhāran\(\)karana, he relies on the art process and on the alaukikatva of the art world, bearing in mind the difference between lōkadharmi and nātyadharmi.

Nātyadharmi includes the concept of poetic autonomy. The creative interpretation of reality in art and the

\(^{18}\) Patankar, p. 297.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., p. 295.
intensity of its effect are important to this discussion. This *nātyadharmi* is the dialectic of the poet's art which justifies his reshaping of reality according to the needs of his art. Abhinavagupta emphasises that *nātyadharmi* is not completely divorced from the reality of life. It is, in fact, the basis of all poetic invention. He explains the relationship between *nātyadharmi* and *lōkadharmi* in a fine analogy of a mural painting and the wall supporting it. What is seen in the mural is the picture and not the wall, but the picture cannot exist without the wall. The wall and the artistic materials of the painter are the material support of the mural which is the artist's creation. But the created work is different from the material he uses. What the artist creates and the connoisseur appreciates is the picture. Likewise, the poet's work cannot exist without the support of some experience of reality; but what he creates in art is not a duplicate of reality.20

Wordsworth's solitary reaper is a creation who has her existence in empirical reality, and also exists as a unique creation. The significance of reality is practical and very strong from individual to individual. So the art experience is not an undifferentiated generality. The experience from one work of art to another is bound to be different. But universalisation explains how the experience

---

becomes shareable and is rendered shareable. The concept of nātyadharma and of literary art and experience as not of this world are important in as much as they explain the intense nature of the work of art and how this heightened quality attunes the spectator’s attitude to enable him to enjoy the work of art. The artist on the other hand makes full use of language, and other literary devices to enable him to distance his art from the real world. This principle expects the reader to approach the work of art in a detached and impersonal attitude and lend his willing suspension of disbelief to the author's attempt at capturing reality.

The process of sadhāranīkaraṇa as envisaged by Indian thinkers tries to provide a balance between life and art, life experience and art experience, and finally derive a great enjoyment from the artistic excellences of the art work where its inherent beauties are also recognised and enjoyed.

In the creative process of a novel the principle of sadhāranīkaraṇa calls upon the creative writer to reconcile the paradox of the universal in the particular and the truth of the converse. The novelist relates the story using common characters and a probable plot. But he has to invest these with the stamp of particularity on the one hand, and the stamp of universality on the other. In fact these two aspects are like the two sides of a coin. These two levels enable the novelist to realise his imagination in artistic
terms. The following study of R.K. Narayan's *The Guide* tries to see Narayan's attempt at reconciling the two forces into an artistic whole.\(^{21}\)

*The Guide* is the story of a tourist guide by name Raju. He has just been released from jail and has taken refuge in an old temple by the river. A peasant takes him for a saint and asks for advice on a domestic problem. By uttering some general platitudes, Raju unwittingly helps the villager to solve his problem. Gradually Raju acquires the reputation of a holy man. When the village is hit by a severe drought and the villagers turn to Raju for help, he reluctantly undertakes a fast to propitiate the rain gods. It is at this point that he confesses that he is an impostor, and recounts to one of the villagers the tragi-comedy of his love for Rosie, the dancer.

The very first pages define Narayan's method of narrating the story. He is aware of the implied reader who has to be informed about the details of the characters, situations and other matters. Even within the span of thirty or forty lines, the necessary clues are provided to make the narrative gripping. The point of view of the narration in the beginning is the third person narrator's. The casual

reference to Raju's last shave "paid with the hard-earned coins of his jail life" is a significant intimation to the reader. The brief conversation with the barber, recollected as an aside by Raju, is to give the reader more details of the story's hero, or anti-hero, if Raju may be so called. In the next brief conversation with the villager, many such asides, intended to be spoken, but left unspoken, create a situation packed with dramatic irony. For instance, when the villager starts talking to Raju and Raju prepares to make a clean breast of his earlier life of deceit and fraud which had landed him in jail, the villager intercepts his replies with his own comments and worries.

Raju wanted to blurt out, "I am here because I have nowhere else to go. I want to be away from people who may recognise me." But he hesitated wondering how he should say it (p. 8).

Narayan puts to full use the advantages of a third person narrative when he focalises the story through statements like

It looked as though he would be hurting the other's deepest sentiments if he so much as whispered the word 'jail'. . . (p. 8).

and a few lines later,

It was in his nature to get involved in other people's interests and activities (p. 9).

The story is then supposed to be narrated to Velan at a later stage. This is parenthetically given in the text (p. 208). Gradually Narayan describes the manner in which
the villagers consider Raju as a swami. Raju's cryptic utterances somehow acquire great meaningfulness in the context of Velan's misery. Even Raju's silences gain in tremendous value, as Velan's sister remarks,

He doesn't look at anyone, but if he looks at you, you are changed (p. 29).

Starting with Velan the circle widens with many villagers gathering in the evenings to meet this swami. Even this is presented in the form of a conversation which Raju is made to overhear:

'He is a big man, he may go anywhere; he may have a thousand things to do!
'Oh, you don't know. He has renounced the world; he does nothing but meditates. What a pity he is not here today!' (p. 29).

The reader overhears with Raju this impression which Raju has created among villagers. The sincerity of their belief in Raju's greatness is now very clear to not only the readers but to Raju himself. There is room for contrast to be evoked between this image of Raju and what he actually is. The reader is left guessing as to whether Raju will live up to their expectations or not.

These nuances are aspects of dhvani which Narayan is shown to have exploited to the best advantage. By the process of sādhāranākaraṇa, Narayan has to invest the situation and character with interest and also a touch of reality. The plight in which Raju finds himself, forced into
it by circumstances, is something very rare no doubt, yet not totally improbable. The situation is particular, even unique. But Raju who faces it, is human. This makes way for a rapport with the reader and this is the concept of sādhāranīkaraṇa at work. Raju's hunger is described to emphasise the reality of the situation. Narayan adds that as long as Raju is able to get food, he was (initially) prepared to play the role of the swami.

He had already begun to feel that the adulation directed to him was inevitable. He sat in silence eyeing the gift for a while (p. 17).

Raju is thankful that he is getting food unasked.

Raju was filled with gratitude and prayed that Velan might never come to the stage of thinking that he was too good for food and that he subsisted on atoms from the air (p. 30).

He knows that the only other place which could feed him without work was the jail. So he decides to play the role Velan has given him. One day when Velan and his group do not come he even feels panicky. Narayan gives the account of Raju's gamble of giving a banana to the boy which brings him visitors. The picture of Raju is drawn with irony no doubt; but nevertheless it manages to give the reader a whole and authentic personality of Raju.

The banana worked a miracle. The boy went from house to house, announcing that the saint was back at this post. Men, women and children arrived in a great mass (p. 39).
Slowly Raju manages to acquire a natural grandeur while expressing sentiments which fall on the ears of the villagers and infuse a new vigour and vitality into their lives.

With the growth of a beard and long hair his prestige had grown beyond his wildest dreams. His life had lost its personal limitations. His gatherings had grown so large that they overflowed into the outer corridors and people sat up to the river's edge... his influence was unlimited... It was even believed that when he stroked the head of the child, the child improved in many ways (p. 48).

The picture of Raju as swami is drawn by Narayan in objective terms and is rendered in the manner of omniscient narration. Now Raju is made to assume a totally new role, contrary to his usual nature. In fact the whole experience of Raju is alaukika. But it is made shareable by the creative writer's method of narration which borders on irony. The irony consists not only in the ambiguities and double references which get magnified because of the peculiar situation (situational irony), but also in the author's ironic comment on human nature.

Narayan emphasises Raju's humanness at every stage either directly or more effectively through ironic comments. When Raju is asked to give a discourse, Narayan comments:

Raju felt cornered. "I have to play the part expected of me, there is no escape." He racked his head secretly wondering where to start... The
only subject on which he could speak with any authority now seemed to be jail life and its benefits, especially for one mistaken for a saint (p. 45).

This kind of portrayal makes the reader comprehend the character as the author would like him to be comprehended. This is the writer's attempt at universalisation.

On the part of the reader, a certain distancing is also necessary to enjoy a work of art. In this case, the reader has to first set aside his personal feelings to enter into this literary experience. Once in the world of Raju, the reader has to identify himself with the strange experiences of Raju, if he has to comprehend the situation fully. So Raju is to be seen at the fictional level as well as the human level. The latter helps in identification, the former in distancing.

Earlier it has been shown that the writer's ironic comment through the omniscient narrator's voice helps to create an authentic picture of Raju. Raju is also made to reveal himself when he relates his past life. While the dual role of Raju as swami and jail-returnee is focalised through the author's voice or third person narration, the early life of Raju is rendered in autobiographical narration without authorial comment. Whether it is about Raju, the tourist guide, or about Raju, the swami, the narration never sags. The self-portrait of Raju is vivid and makes the reader identification easy. The reader is taken into full
confidence. Even in matters relating to dishonesty, or in the relation of his amorous ventures with Rosie, there is an uncanny frankness and an authenticity which cannot be doubted.

I awaited the receipt of certain data. . . . The data was how much time and how much money he was going to spend. . . . I could let a man have a peep at it or a whole panorama. It was adjustable. I could not decide how much to give or withhold until I knew how much cash the man carried, or if he carried a cheque book how good it was (p. 56).

Nor does he mince matters when he discloses Rosie's arrival on the Malgudi scene. He realises that he waxes poetic when it comes to describing her. He is an excellent self-analyst and presents himself frankly to his readers. The instant dislike he picks up towards Marco and the equally spontaneous liking he evinces towards Rosie are portentous. With his natural shrewdness of observation Raju could spot the disharmony between the couple; and the relationship which ensues between Raju and Rosie is not the outcome of ill-suited personalities alone. It is largely because of Raju's positive intervention into Rosie's life. Even the first attempt of Raju which is supposed to bridge the gap between the quarrelling couple only ends in widening the gap, while it brings Raju and Rosie closer to each other.

Raju relates how his efforts launch Rosie into a dancing career which brings along with it fame and wealth
not only to her but also to him. Though initially Rosie enjoys all this, particularly the opportunity to give expression to her natural dancing gifts, she soon realises that Raju is after the money from her performances. He does not care for her or for Marco. Only then she sees herself as a 'performer' as Marco would have put it, alluding to circus performers. The final act of forgery which causes the snapping of ties between the two is imaginatively conceived by Narayan. Rosie tries to minimise Raju's punishment, and she and Marco go on different ways, while Raju himself wends his way to the jail gates. All this is narrated to Velan in the first person by Raju, now revered as a swami; but Velan is unaffected by this confession and there seems to be no change whatsoever in his attitude towards this swami.

Though Narayan gives a picture of Raju in two contrasting situations, there is a consistency in the portrayal which ensures the authenticity and credibility of the character. Raju in the role of enforced swamihood is similar to the Raju who had led the life of a tourist guide and who even committed forgery. The likenesses are touched upon so delicately that the reader cannot but feel an empathy with the character.

But there is yet the denoument when Raju's character transcends itself and which is also rendered shareable to the readers by the creative genius of Narayan. Raju, the swami (one with a mask to the readers and Velan) is believed
to have undertaken a penance to end the terrible drought which has affected the village. Raju does not himself believe in the idea of the fast initially; in fact, he thinks more about food in its absence. On the first day of the fast Raju eats stale food. The crowd which has gathered to give moral support for his penance makes his fast a real one. It is then that Raju realises:

Why not give the devil a chance, Raju said to himself, instead of hankering after food which one could not get anyway? He felt enraged at the persistence of food thoughts. With a sort of vindictive resolution he told himself, "I will chase all thought of food. For the next ten days I shall eradicate all thoughts of tongue and stomach from my mind" (p. 213).

From this resolution it is not a long way to make the earnest effort in which he "was not personally interested" and one which was "outside money and love" (p. 213).

If by avoiding food I should help the trees bloom, and the grass grow, why not do it thoroughly? (p. 214).

He has made a sincere effort leading to a conversion. Finally before he sinks he realises that the rains do come. Raju does live up to the hopes of his followers. The true change in the convict turned swami from his earlier life as tourist guide is presented with a matter-of-fact air most befitting a guide's nature. Raju has the frankness to show himself in his true colours, even at a point in his life when he is mistaken for a swami. This reveals how
disinterested and non-self-seeking he is. This act also allays any doubt on the part of the reader as to be genuineness of his practical transformation towards the end of the novel.

The character of Raju and his unique experience have been interpreted by critics in many ways. William Walsh sees Raju as an institutional figure, one who is naturally a public character; one of those who could hardly be said to exist in private. Walsh notes an unbroken connection between Raju the guide who said, "Anything that interested my client was also my interest. The question of my own preference was secondary" (p. 57) and Raju, the prophet. In each case he is a projection of what the people need. He is there to be used, a tractable form prompt to assume any shape that may be required.22

Critics like Narasimhaiah and Walsh infer that Raju dies to save the community, martyr-like.23 These critics have waxed eloquent on the unique experience of selflessness, a self-sacrifice which is the supreme assertion of spiritual ascent. Uma Parameswaran, on the other hand, is not sure of Raju's death or of the coming rains and feels that the writer has deliberately left the end

22 Walsh, p. 131.
ambiguous. If Narayan could render human experience in literature by his ironic vision, Raja Rao renders metaphysical experience in his novels. Narayan distances himself from his characters in his portrayal in order to make them universal. But Raja Rao identifies himself with the characters and situations to bring about sādhāranīkarana. His characters are drawn from personal experiences, deeply felt emotions. So he enters into their personalities, rather, lends them his personality. The narrative strategy adopted by Raja Rao is the first person narration. This does not mean that there is no difference between the author and the character. It is here that the concept of sādhāranīkarana helps the author to distance himself from the character. The form of the novel, the peculiar situations it presents and the different movements of the story contribute to the effect of distance which the author has to maintain. The very same effect is transferred to the readers who are thus able to identify and yet be detached from the characters. Such an ideal state is what is required by the sahrdava, a concept which will be discussed subsequently.

The Serpent and the Rope is faithful to the realities of everyday life, yet it is not a faithful copy of the life around. Raja Rao has selected or rejected aspects

of life according to his vision. In Raja Rao's world many big things are rendered small and vice versa, for the creative artist has the freedom to shift the emphasis. The whole novel can be seen as a metaphysical challenge for it has many strands of history, philosophy, religion, heresies and personal themes, running through the length and breadth of the novel. But the all-embracing vision of life which the novel captures and the method and manner of narration render the experience of Ramaswamy shareable though it is a rare kind of experience. The dichotomies spoken of earlier in this chapter get resolved through the process of sādhāranīkarana. Raja Rao has understood the human psyche so well that he has presented a rich experience which is capable of enriching the reader's own experience. As is true of creative literature, Raja Rao has conveyed his knowledge and puzzles of life in his novel through characters with whom the readers are likely to identify.

In a similar manner Anita Desai's method of seeking sādhāranīkarana in her art is through creative psycho-analysis. She uses this strategy for establishing a rapport with her readers. Anita Desai maintains that her novels are a part of (her) private effort to seize upon the raw material of life - its shapelessness, its meaninglessness, that lack of design that drives one to despair - and to mould it and impose upon it a design, a certain composition and order that
pleases (her) as an artist and also as a human being who longs for order.25

Anita Desai believes more in the capacity of psychology to probe into the deepest recesses of the human soul than in its role as a contributory factor in the evolution of a narrative mode. Here the sadharanikarana is dependent on the awareness of the existence of the subterranean psychological forces beneath normal everyday existence. The psychological mode of creation places the emphasis upon the assimilation of the particular mindscape into the universal archetype. It . . . always takes its materials from the vast realms of conscious human experience - from the vivid foreground of life . . . 26

The psychological representation does not transcend the bounds of psychological intelligibility. Here novels are based on the fundamental human impulse to gestalt-formation whereby the compulsion or the need to integrate impressions, moods and emotions has been the starting point of her creative efforts.27 This is very different from the way R.K. Narayan or even Raja Rao approaches his art. Nevertheless it has its own means of achieving the effects


27 Yashodara Dalmia, "Interview with Anita Desai," The Times of India, 29 April 1979.
of साधारणिकराण to invite reader identification with the experiences presented. Even mental aberrations become shareable as has been rendered by Anita Desai in *Cry, The Peacock*. *Fire On the Mountain* delineates loneliness and alienation in a form which is a model of structural perfection and brings credit to the novelist in her attempt to shape her fluid fictional material into an artistic whole. Her characters and situations may seem strange because of their heightened sensibilities but, nevertheless, they are true basically and fit into the fictional world fashioned for them.

Mulk Raj Anand's strategy has been described as environmental determinism. He has exposed social evils in different manifestations and has evocatively portrayed levels of human experiences in his novels. His sympathy towards the underdog in society reveals his humane approach to life, and gives his novels a shareability which is the prime requirement of साधारणिकराण. His ideological commitment to art renders his characters as recognisable types in a social setting which, however, does not preclude an identifiable individuality to be given to them.

साधारणिकराण when interpreted as distance can be said to have three strands of meaning. The first is the distance which the artist should maintain from the man in him. This restores a balance between the creating "I" and the narrating "I". This is the only way to ensure that the
subject matter does not dominate the creative process and the created artistic work. In Narayan this is easily maintained as he takes an ironic view of human behaviour and attitudes. His insight into human behavior is remarkable and gives his characters a universal appeal.

The second distance is that between art and life which every artist should be aware of. The concept of sadhāranīkaraṇa emphasises the other-worldliness of art and tries to establish the likeness and difference between the world of art and the world of reality.

The third distance is that attitude or state of mind which helps the spectator/reader to participate in the art experience in a detached manner. This principle is a true guideline for a good critic who has to appreciate a work of art without any idiosyncrasy or prejudice.

As Bhattaṇāyaka, the greatest exponent of sadhāranīkaraṇa, says that the proper and right enjoyment of rāsa is the domain of an ideal reader (sahrdaya), the next chapter will deal with the ideal reader, sahrdaya.