CHAPTER - I
INTRODUCTION

Although most of Narayan’s critics acknowledge his excellence as a comic-ironist dealing with life’s inherent absurdities and incongruities, they never cease to register a distinct note of dissent as regards his characterization or the ‘flat’ characters in his novels. In fact Narayan’s characters present a peculiar case. Having been created in the preordainedly conceived world, they neither show any sign of apparent growth in their natural attitude or outlook. However, the Narayan characters, particularly the protagonists, seem to be growing on a different plane of realization which, being mostly spiritual, remains imperceptible. Foster’s terms, ‘flat’ and ‘round’, although useful as points of reference, remain inadequate in the context of the typical Narayan characters. Other western critics like Edwin Muir, Mary McCarthy and W.J. Harvey, although offer valuable pointers and, in fact, seem to defend the unchanging and undeveloping characters, may not be of much help to deal with the Narayan characters characteristically realized through the cultural ethos and seem to suggest spiritual growth. Finally, even the existing Narayan criticism, despite the wider perspective it offers to understand the
Narayan character, remains inadequate mainly because of its disparate nature. It is here that the idea for a new framework to deal with the typical characters in the Narayan novels is conceived.

What in fact begins as a common need for a device to deal with the traditionally conceived and realized characters in the novels of Narayan, eventually becomes a necessity for a much wider framework to underline the essentials of the novelists, synoptically though. Thus, what seems to have been conceived, in the final analysis, is a kind of three-tier framework which may be able to (a) deal with most of the Narayan characters and present them with their traditional trappings, (b) underline different modes used by the novelist to reveal the character-roles in the novels, and (c) note the world view of the novelist.

It may be essential to make a brief note of a sort of backdrop against which this framework operates. Narayan imbibes the spirit of his culture. His indomitable faith in the eternal spirit of India, his firm belief in the preordained and karma-operating word, his high regard for the ancient Shastras and his philosophy of acceptance and quietism clearly reflect the sacrosanct tradition he belongs to. The characters in his novels not only imbibe the creator’s spirit but are also realized through it. Logically enough, in their world of acceptance rebellion has hardly any meaning: in fact it is considered as cultural aberration. And if found rebelling, the characters finally withdraw from it and return to the world of
sanity. This basic trait of the Malgudi character forms the basic of the present study.

The typological study is designed as a character-oriented approach. Narayan’s novels are novels of character and, significantly, the novelist has always tried to explore human existence with its elemental issues through the central consciousness of his novel. The character-oriented approach may be taken as a device to focus on Narayan’s character delineation and to analyze the characteristics of the so-called flat character.

The typology underlines four major types of characters in Narayan’s novels. The types seem to have a distinct identity bespeaking the mark of Narayanesque conception of character and may show kinship with the other types underlined by Foster, Ben Jonson, Reye, Scholes and Kellog. The four types in the present study are: innocent, rebel, eccentric and sanyasi. Taken in their wider sense, the typological characters may also show kinship with their prototypes in the works of other writers. The children in the typology of innocence may be compared with the children in *Lord of the Flies* and Marco as a cuckold, in the typology of eccentrically, may be cast against Casaubon in *Middlemarch*.

This study runs into six chapters. The chapter one opens with a focus on the legendary image of Narayan, underlining the salient features of his craft. It also presents a review of the representative Narayan-criticism, a brief note on character criticism followed by Narayan’s views on character. Finally, it argues
out the case in favour of a new approach, defining the terms to be used in the book and underlining its modus operandi.

Although every Malgudi character has 'a nuclear innocence,' the second chapter deals with only those characters who are basically realized through innocence. Understandably the frame focuses on the children in Narayan, underlining the Blakean and the Wordsworthian sense of innocence and projecting the incorruptible and untrained human consciousness. The chapter also deals with the characters realized through their 'second childhood' and the rustics playing the collective unconscious reflecting the traditional morality. Taken in its entirety, the chapter comments on the nature and treatment of innocence in the novels of Narayan.

The third chapter considers the concept of rebellion in Narayan's novels. A close study of the central characters in the Malgudi novels reveals that rebellion is realized more as a deviation from the traditional codes than as a defiance. It is underlined that beneath the veneer of rebellion, in all the novels, runs the theme of illusion versus, reality. Rebellion seems to be Narayan's strategy to reiterate his philosophy of acceptance and quietism realized through the device of *rite de passage*. The chapter considers the protagonists' middle-class milieu, the essentially sacrosanct tradition they belong to, and the myths as the most important influence making the rebels withdraw from the deviation and accept
sane normalcy in life. Finally, it has been possible to note the spiritual growth through the reiterate theme of most of the Malgudi novels: the return of the native.

The fourth chapter underlines the notion of eccentricity in the Malgudi novels. The typology presents a bizarre kind of human spectacle. Most of the eccentric playing different roles—e.g. the protagonist’s alter ego, or catalyst or ‘ficelle’—become the source of the comic laughter with a ring of sadness. In the final analysis, if the typology of eccentricity mirrors Narayan’s thoughtful laughter, it may also be taken as the novelist’s strategy to present life’s inherent absurdities and inconsistencies.

The fifth chapter focuses on the forth frame of the typological study: the role of sanyasa in Narayan’s novels. As Narayan presents every conceivable face of a sanyasi, from the fake and the sceptic to the symbolic and the full-fledged one, he seems to be stressing the traditionally acknowledged spiritual significance of renunciation realized through his characteristic irony. Finally, sanyasa seems to be Narayan’s yet another strategy to realize the basic in his novels: illusion versus reality underlining the assertion of the ordinary over the extraordinary.

As the typological approach seems to be viewing the entire Malgudi humanity through its four houses, the seemingly compartmentalized study may appear rather unusual. It may, however, be pointed out that although human characters are rarely realized through a single trait of their personality, it seems to be the prerogative of the writer to telescope and illumine a single dominant trait of
his characters. Such characters in Narayan, realized basically as type may occupy
the individual houses-the family frames- with natural ease. The full-fledged
character in Narayan, however, may be seen occupying more than one house. For
such characters one may add that it is probable to see one individual playing more
than one life-role during the entire span of his/her life. And even Shakespeare
seems to endorse this view as he says¹; ‘and one man in his time plays many
parts.’

The last chapter draws conclusions as emerging from the overall
typological study. The conclusions are considered under a three-tier analysis: the
milieu, the mode, and the mind. Narayan may basically be regarded as a delineator
of middle-class people. In fact, the middle constitutes the matrix of all the
Malgudi novels. It offers the novelist excellent material to dramatize his
conception of humanity and the notion of man’s existence. In the final analysis it
may be said that Narayan’s middle class, acquiring representativeness and
universal tone, seems to present the ‘theatre of the absurd,’ to stress the
preordainedly conceived universe, to underline the sanity of the tradition and
finally to explore the myth of the flat character and to note its subtle growth of
consciousness.

As regard the mode, the typology telescopes irony as the overall strategy
the novelist employs for the delineation of his characters. In fact it is through the
device of irony that Narayan seems to underline the essentially paradoxical and

¹ And one man in his time plays many parts.
contradictory nature of life. The typology also notes Narayan’s strategic use of comedy, as a mode, to stress the inherent incongruity and inconsistency in life. In the final analysis Narayan’s serious comedy seems to have become a maturing school and a redeeming agent for the folly-proned protagonist, and seems to imbibe the celebrative and continuity principle of life.

The last tier of the conclusion, the mind, considers Narayan’s world-view. Narayan seems to regard the world as lila or maya, human life as a game of shadows and man as a mere role player. In the preordainedly conceived world human life runs according to the inexorable law of Karma; Nature is realized with its inherent power of establishing peace in the temporarily disrupted order of the world. The tradition remains sacrosanct and the Shastras have irrefutable supremacy in life.

It is hoped that the traditionally conceived typological study may be regarded as a viable approach to the understanding of Narayan as it seems to underline the essentials in the art of his novel. The essentials reflected in the corpus of the Narayan novel may be summed up as: Narayan’s presentment of the epic of the commonplace, his bifocal vision of comic irony to view the human predicament and, finally, his positive vision of life despite its Mayaic conception.

Rasipuram Krishna Swami Narayan belongs to the first generation of the Indian novelists writing in English. One of the three bigs -- the other two being Raja Rao and Mulk Raj Anand -- Narayan alone enjoys a remarkably unique
position as the Indian novelist. The uniqueness of Narayan, realized through his multi-faceted image, has created what may be called the aura of his imagination. The significance of the ‘aura’ may hardly be exaggerated, especially as one tries to approach the writer with a re-appraisal. Says Lionel Trilling: “Every established writer exists in the aura of his legend: the accumulated opinion one cannot help being aware of, the image of his personality that has been derived, correctly or incorrectly, from what he has written.”

The first striking thing about Narayan’s legendary aura may be spelt with the writer’s almost religiously taken up penmanship as the sole and life-time profession. The hazards of the writer, determined to live by his pen alone, can hardly be exaggerated, but for Narayan there seemed to have been absolutely no choice. As a matter of fact, his father did initiate Narayan into the teaching profession but, lacking the patience and the discipline indispensable for that kind of vocation, the son decided to “simply write novels... and live off the joint-family system.” It is only when one compares the paltry sum of nine rupees and twelve annas Narayan had earned for his first story with the fabulous royalty of $5000 he is offered for a short story by the New Yorker, that one realizes the success story of his survival as a writer. The past fifty fruitful years of his penmanship underline a rare example of the writer’s most assiduously followed profession.

As one considers Narayan’s use of the English language as one of the salient features of the story of his aura, one realizes that his choice of the language
of his creative writing seemed to have been as decisive as the choice of his profession. Futile as it seems to enter into the perennial debate—whether the Indian writer should write in English—it may be noted that Narayan has always tried “to convey in a language that is not one’s own the spirit that is one’s own”\(^6\). And Narayan was well aware of the role he was playing as an Indian English writer. He states:

> We are not experimentalists... we are not attempting to write Anglo-Saxon English. The English language through sheer resilience and mobility, is now undergoing a process of Indianization... I am able to confirm... that it has served my purpose admirably, of conveying unambiguously the thoughts and acts of a set of personalities, who flourish in a small town located in a corner of South India\(^7\).

The case could not have been stated in a better way. Suffice it to say that Narayan’s English, although lacking the poetic resonance and the gusto of imaginative prose, remains plain and simple and yet effective enough to transmute the sensibilities of his people.

The highly striking element contributing greatly to the writer's multicoloured image is spelt with the immortal letters: MALGUDI. Narayan himself narrated the genesis of the fictitious locale to Ved Mehta thus: “I remember walking up with the name Malgudi on Vijayadasmi...I sat down and wrote the first sentence about my town: ‘The train had just arrived at Malgudi Station’\(^8\)."
Like the creators of the Yoknapatawpha County and the Wessex Territory respectively, Narayan has cast Malgudi as a permanent backdrop to his fictional world and has remained confined to the well-defined boundaries of the imaginary town. There have been a number of attempts to identify Malgudi on the map of India and some scholars Naik for instance- have even presented Malgudi maps in their books on Narayan. Narayan’s Malgudi uniquely combines the pastoral simplicity of an Indian village with the ever-changing modernity of a city.

Ever since Narayan had written *Swami and Friends*, he has been painting the Malgudi saga, novel after novel, strictly centring round the middle-class milieu. One cannot help musing over the fact that Narayan seems to be enjoying a writer’s prerogative to select his material to the maximum. As for the novelist’s middle-class milieu, William Walsh, focusing on the basics and the essentials of the class, says:

Narayan’s pre-occupation is with the middle class, a relatively small part of an agricultural civilization, and the most conscious and anxious part of population. Its members are neither too well off... nor too indigent.... They may take their religion more easily than the passionately credulous poor.... It is the members of the middle class who are psychologically more active, and in whom consciousness is more vivid and harrowing, that Narayan chooses his heroes-modest, unself-confident heroes, it is true.
An analysis of the middle-class milieu may further reveal that Narayan locates it in the South India. Having a first-hand acquaintance with his people and knowing their mental make-up as closely as the skin of his palm, Narayan seems to have determined to focus on that class alone and never to shift his lense to other human territories. One may note the characteristic middle-class traits so authentically mirrored in Narayan’s novels:

1. An average and ordinary individual engaged in the common and unflattering pursuit of life.
2. His tendency to opt for the security and his instinct to escape or postpone the challenges of time.
3. His inclination to rebel but the final preference for acceptance and withdrawal.
4. His passive nature suited for the life of non-doing and non-action.
5. His remarkable sensitivity and high sense of religiosity.
6. His cowardliness and his tendency to indulge in fantasizing life’s minor issues.

The most significant feature of Narayan’s aura, with which the writer has often been identified, is the noncommittal stance. It is particularly here that Narayan stands out in the company of his fellow-novelists, Mulk Raj Anand and Raja Rao, because, as against the writer of Untouchable, who is primarily known for his social concerns, and that of The Serpent and the Rope, known for his metaphysical preoccupations, Narayan alone seems to have refused to jump on the bandwagon of an ideology or an ism. The only commitment, which he has been
following with a religious zeal, is the writer’s commitment to his art. As far back as in 1953, Narayan had clearly voiced his views regarding the role of an Indian English writer in the context of the Indian novels. In the special Atlantic Monthly Supplement on India, Narayan pointed out that the subject matter of fiction during the nationalist movement, “became inescapably political... the mood of the comedy, the sensitivity to atmosphere, the probing of psychological problem factors, the crisis in the individual soul and its resolution, and above all the detacher observation, which constitute the stuff of fiction, were forced into background”.

If the non-committal stance prompted Narayan to stress the objectivity as the crux of (comic) fiction, it has also impelled him to remark that the issues, particularly like the social reforms could never be dealt with through a novel. He said:

In dealing with social evils, one might employ a poem, a play, a novel or an essay as the medium. In my view the least satisfactory form for this purpose is the novel. A novel’s form and structure are too diffuse to carry through successfully a message, or sustain it.

The aura of Narayan’s imagination has one more influential shaft to contribute. It is the novelist’s moral attitude. It may, perhaps, read like a paradox for the proverbially non-committal write. The paradox, however, gets dispelled, as soon as one realizes that unlike a theologian or a moralist, Narayan has
unobtrusively and imperceptibly merged his moral attitude with the themes of his novel. Although Narayan does not seem to overtly profess the ethical issues, his moral consciousness seems to linger like a shadow of the novel. The entire fabric of the human drama is woven under the moral care of the writer, as it were.

The moral attitude, though expressed through different devices like the idealized roles of the mother and the wife in the Hindu family, has been prominently dramatized through the man-woman relationship in Narayan’s novels. Time and again, Narayan has expressed his restlessness, at times even aversion at the depiction of open sex in literature. Significantly, the novelist seems to have been preoccupied with it since the beginning of his career as a writer. This is what he says in his memoir: “I had on hand about twenty short stories written mainly to see if other subjects that love … could be written about. I wished to attack the tyranny of love and see if life could offer other values than the inevitable man-woman relationship to the writer”.

True, Narayan has certainly depicted a few rather bold and embarrassingly unNarayanesque man-woman relationship. Here, the characters seem to indulge in the kind of sexual relationships which, in Narayan’s India, may never be endorsed by social or cultural codes. And it has repeatedly been seen that such deviating men and, especially, women ultimately meet their fated end, a sort of doomed, frustrating or miserably lonely existence.
Equally unique and significant is Narayan’s image as the presenter of India. Although Narayan casts his novels against a specified period of time — right from the Raj days to the present time — the unmistakable feel that he always gives is that of the eternity or timelessness embodied in the eternal spirit of India evoked through the river Sarayu, realized as Malgudi’s Ganga. India, despite her diversified culture, innumerable castes and creeds, social hierarchies and economic inequalities, has come to be generally regarded as the symbol of unity. Such a belief may not be shared by everyone; none, however, would disagree with the fact that India has always presented herself as the most enigmatic country. In the context of Narayan’s presentment of India in his novels, the (‘Indian reality’) focused in the works of a few noted writers may offer cross references and in the final analysis Narayan’s Indian experience may be considered with a right perspective.

Raja Rao has superbly evoked the spirit of place located in the Indian village through his sthala purana, Kanthapura and has extensively dealt with the metaphysical India, focusing on the transcendental and advaita philosophy in The Serpent and the Rope. Mulk Raj Anand, however, determinedly fixed his lense to focus on the socio-economic injustice-ridden and caste-and-creed-dominated society. In his Untouchable and Coolie, for instance, Anand vividly presents the agony of the underdog who suffered primarily at the hands of the privileged class. Bhabani Bhattacharya too presents, in He Who Rides a Tiger and So Many
Hungers, the gloomy spectacle of the have-nots, smitten by the ugliest inequality and deadliest hunger. Indian’s “Scholar Extraordinary” Nirad C. Chaudhuri takes up the most exhaustive study, a sort of ethnological survey, of the peoples in India in his The Continent of Circle. Imbibing controversial spirit and alienist’s attitude, Naipaul projects India as An Area of Darkness. The title of Naipaul’s book is too eloquent to need any comment. Thus, one may go on ad infinitum telescoping the images of India in the books of several writers. Suffice it to say that India, the Orient Sphinx, has always remained the most enigmatic and paradoxical subcontinent.

As for Narayan’s India one may feel its presence as one feels the atmosphere. The Indian experience in the Malgudi novels is chiefly expressed through the collective mind, which in fact, is the Hindu consciousness. The family frame with its characteristic web of relationships always serves as a stage for the projection of the traditional ethos. Most of the protagonists seem to be Hindu Brahmins. Horoscope figures as a deciding factor in match making. Finally the people in Narayan’s India seem to believe in the preordained universe, Karma consequence and rebirth.

The oral tradition is the vitally significant factor in Narayan’s writings. Although he does not consciously write about in like the author of Kanthapura, Narayan speaks of it in the preface to Gods, Demons and Others. In the course of narrating the tale of the story-teller (pandit), Narayan underlines some of the
elements of the art of story-telling, which, incidentally, constitutes the crux of the oral tradition. The basic element of the tradition, points out Narayan, is its oral nature. The narrative substance at some point of time seems to have descended to us mostly by word of mouth at first, and later, it was recorded. The narrative, with its perennial human interest and vitality, is told again and over again. Most of the tales have certain common elements: the sages meditate mostly in the forests and the asuras, embodying the evil principle, dig in some way their own grave. Since the stories run on the ethical principles they have a moral at the end. Most importantly digressions with lots of interludes would continue for days together.

Narayan seems to present himself as a copy-book example of the storyteller. The overall structure of his novel unmistakably shows his adherence to the oral tradition in its content and form. The pattern of his themes seems to have moral undertones, although subtle and unobtrusive, and the novels have an easily noticeable episode (and circular) structure. The novelist seems to be so much obsessed by the spirit of oral tradition that he seems to have cast himself in the character of Nambi in the story, Under the Banyan Tree

The recurring thematic pattern underlining illusion versus reality in the Narayan novels with their implicit but unmistakably felt moral overtones may impel one to consider the novelist as a fabulist. In fact Narayan shows a close kinship with the fable-writers. It is pertinent to consider Salman Rushdie’s comment on William Golding’s statement that the fabulist is didactic and
inculcates moral codes: “He’s right about the Fable-Aesop’s Fables or the Panchatantra—where the machinery of the tale is designed inexorably to reach that moral statement which the story is seen to have proved. It carries with it the dreadful warning against not behaving in the moral way the fable recommends”\textsuperscript{15}. If asked to comment on Narayan’s novels, Rushdie would not have said anything different. In fact, the parabolic tone and the mythological souls of most of his novels, in the final analysis, seem to acquire fabulistic dimensions. A close reading of Narayan’s novels reveals that the novelist has invariably employed the thematic parallels from the rich and inexhaustible storehouse of Indian mythologies, legends and the puranas. It is in this context that Narayan’s \textit{A Tiger for Malgudi} stands out. The story of tiger with a soul and spiritual awakening is narrated on the structural pattern of the Panchatantra. Thus, as one takes into account the total corpus of Narayan’s novels, one may state that the fabulistic form of narrative seems to be most suited to the novelist’s moral attitude and his adherence to the oral tradition. It is not surprising that Narayan’s novels are regarded as the ‘religious fables’\textsuperscript{16}.

Despite the moral overtone in and the fabulistic structure of his novels, Narayan escapes from being branded as a conscious moralist. The saving grace is none other than the novelist’s employment of the comic wit and the ironic point of view. The bifocal perception so artfully and subtly merges with the moral tone in Narayan’s novels that it is difficult to consider the one without the other.
Realizing the inherently paradoxical and ambivalent nature of life, Narayan seems to have been left with no choice but to capture and focus on the theatre of the absurd through his irony. Muche, D.C.\(^{17}\) points out that Friedrich Schlegel had come to believe that irony was the “recognition of the fact that the world in its essence is paradoxical and that an ambivalent attitude alone can grasp its contradictory totally.” As one considers Narayan’s novels in their entirety, one realizes that irony for him becomes a strategy to underline the predicament of the common man caught in the illusory web of life and his characteristic struggle to extricate from it. M.K. Naik, analysing the developmental stages of Narayan’s irony, points out that it begins as the simple technique of creating a mild shock out of sudden deflation of anticipation, it matures into a strategy to focus on the predicament of the protagonist bogged down in the illusory world in his later novels and, finally, it emerges as the novelist’s vision underlining the overall human existence in his masterpieces\(^{18}\).

If the basic absurdities of life prompt Narayan to treat human existence ironically, the inherent incongruities and inconsistencies of life seem to impel the novelist to view the human spectacle through the comic filter. Like the employment of irony, comedy too for Narayan becomes the strategy to focus on the ordinary man’s characteristic journey from the illusion of disorderliness to the reality of orderliness, because “Comedy at once distorts and clarifies, and even distorts in order to clarify the human situation”\(^{19}\).
Narayan’s comedy has generally been regarded as gentle in nature, having an edifying purpose. More importantly, it has also been tolerant and sympathetic towards human foibles and frailties. It is not known for emitting harsh and loud laughter but often creates ripples in the mind and has an inevitable ring of pathos. Significantly, it is characterized, by its complete isolation from the sentimental tone. It is here that Narayan seems to have imbibed the true spirit of comedy. Bergson observes: “absence of feeling... usually accompanies laughter.... Indifference is its natural environment, for laughter has no greater foe than emotion ...highly emotional soul, in tune and unison with life, in whom every event would be sentimentally prolonged and re-echoed would neither know nor understand laughter”.

Narayan’s realization of comedy is directly linked with the delineation of his characters. Narayan’s characters seems to remain undeveloped not merely because he lacks the psychological plumbing but more importantly because it is the inherent nature of comedy that they remain so.

Northrop Frye puts the case so aptly: “The society emerging at the conclusion of comedy represents’ by contrast’ a kind of moral norm, or pragmatically free society. Its ideals are seldom defined or formulated .... We are simply given to understand that the newly married couple will live happily ever after.... will get along in a relatively unhumorous and clear – sighted manner.
That is one reason why the successful is so often left undeveloped: his real life begins at the end of the play."\(^2\)

Thus, the foregoing analysis of Narayan’s kaleidoscopic images, convincingly emerging out of his creation and culminating into formidable aura of his imagination, may imply one to regard him as a legendary figure. Significantly, if this aura asserts the strength of the novelist, it may equally pose problems both for the write and his critics, the former may obviously prefer to remain under the “halo,” and the latter, influenced by the aura, my possibly hesitate to assess the writer objectively. And this takes us to Narayan criticism.

It may seem obvious that as one tries to look at Narayan through a critical prism, one is quite likely to recall the injunction given by the American humorist in the context of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*: “Person attempting to find a plot in it will be shot dead”\(^2\).

Time and again Narayan has expressed his genuine desire to be left alone. In fact quite often he has shown displeasure with the over-enthusiastic researchers who keep on (labelling and boxing) the writer. And yet, ironically, Narayan often finds himself stretched on the Procustean bed of criticism. It may, however, be added that by and large the novelist has enjoyed more and suffered less at the hands of the critics.

K.R.S. Iyengar thinks that Narayan is quit “content like Jane Austen, with his little bit of ivory just so many inches high”\(^2\). Despite this limitedness, he
opines, Narayan has universal appeal because, “Malgudi is everywhere”²⁴. Iyengar also seems to be the first to regard Malgudi as the real ‘hero’ of Narayan’s novels,”²⁵ the implication being, the spirit of place has the dynamism to control and shape the destiny of its characters.

C.D. Narasimhaiah regards Narayan as the product of Hindu middle class whose sensibility and consciousness he not only shares but also sympathizes with. He also points out that Narayan has an eye for the comic in life around him and he telescopes the oddity in ordinary men who possess the marked potentialities for the uncommon and who seem to be caught in the struggle toward maturity “within the accepted religious and social framework”²⁶.

M.K Naik, having already offered significant perspectives on Narayan’s novels, in his recent book critically analyses the developmental stages of the novelist’s employment of irony. More importantly, he points out that Narayan’s primary preoccupation is “with man’s fulfilling the life – roles entrusted to him by tradition and environment”²⁷.

Meenakshi Mukherjee pinpoints Narayan’s treatment of the rebellion, and comments that the novelist has the belief in Nature’s inherent scheme to balance the unruly and disorderly world and to restore peace and order: “Narayan sees any sudden change not for what it produces, for what new possibilities it brings into existence…. But much more negatively as a pay of shadows, an illusion, an
unreality like a bubble, which will burst open sooner or later, and the normal order of the cosmos will prevail again.”

Mukherjee also contrasts the stability and vitality of Narayan’s traditionally static society (in the Malgudi novels) with the static but decadent society depicted at the beginning of Anantha Murthy’s Samsakara and underlines the dynamism of the “static” world in Narayan’s novel.

Uma Parameswaran regards Malgudi as the only round character, other characters being one-dimensional and because Narayan lacks the plumbing of the depth. Observing that both Narayan and his work underline unpretentiousness, she thinks that the positive vision expressed through his novels, “Perhaps, is Narayan’s contribution to modern fiction.”

Rajeev Taranath, making a precise evaluation of the novelist, observes that it is certainly possible to locate Narayan’s creative genius in his “creative use of the ordinary.” He also notes the cyclic pattern as the protagonist in Narayan’s novel journeys “from average to extraordinary and back again in to a more poignant state of average.”

K.V.S. Murti tries to trace the spiritual development of the common and average protagonist in Narayan’s novels. If the average Protagonist in Narayan beings as a monkeyish character, wrapped up in the illusory air of distractions in life, confronting the absurdities and incongruities around him, he ultimately comes out as a chastened person, and the spiritual realization turns him a Hanuman
character: “Narayan’s bifocal vision comprises the ‘ludicrous’ and the ‘ideal’... while earthly monkey is ludicrous, mythical Hanuman is ideal”33.

G.S. Amur tries to perceive Narayan from the Indian perspective. He points out that since Narayan is deeply rooted in his own culture - the Hindu culture - his characters have all along been controlled by the values and ideals origination in his own culture. Insisting that Narayan needs to be approached from the Indian perspective, Amur notes the cultural influences in Narayan: “The important of these concepts are Purusharthas (Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha) and ashramadharana (Brahmacharya, Grahasthya, Vanprastha and Sanyasa), concepts unique to Hindu culture and Hindu way of Life”34.

William Walsh tries to delve into the psyche of Narayan’s characters and considers that their entire life style has been imperceptibly controlled by the Indian ethos. As the most characteristic trait of the Malgudians, Walsh notes:

“even the seedy, the stupid and vain, retain what Lawrence called ‘a peculiar, unclear innocence”35.

Edwin Gerow tries to identify the literary roots of Narayan and puts forth a theory that Narayan’s “art expresses a genuine formal as well as contextual continuity with the best efforts of Indian literature generally, which, as elsewhere in the world, achieved their typical formulation in a ‘classical’ period. Narayan’s is a classical art”36.
A.N. Kaul presenting a kind of insider’s point of view, comments on the typically Narayanesque domestic comedy which seems to have been shaped under the puritanical care of the creator: “The centre of life, as in the case of other comic writers, is of course domestic life. And how severely Narayan maintains his position . . . Romantic or passionate love has no place in it. Any deviation from it, any impulse or act that denies its centrality is a prime aberration in Narayan”37.

John Updike, reviewing Narayan’s My Days, notes, among other things, “his delightful gifts of character”38. The most significant comment of the American novelist, however, seems to be this: “Narayan is one of the vanishing breed – the writer as citizen... but of writers immersed in their materials and able to draw tales from a community of neighbours, Faulkner was our last great example”39.

Berry Margaret observes that Narayan’s novels have a crystal clear reflection of the Indian metaphysical conception of the world as ‘Lila.’ She also points out that the novelist seems to be totally influenced by the philosophy of the transcendental Absolute: for Narayan, “the real world is the Eternal Static world of Absolute Being”40. It is in this context that his role as a writer assumes greater significance. She further adds: “Literature, too, like life, is a lila, another level on which the shadows play.... the novelist is thus certainly not a reformer. He is a story – teller, a raconteur, repeating the work of the god”41.
Bhalchandra Nemade, in his most scathing article against Indian Writing in English predicts, “that the present day blossoming of Indian Writing in English is a swan-song”\textsuperscript{42}. As for Narayan, Nemade asserts that the novelist lacks “the native rhythm of Indian life”\textsuperscript{43}, and that in The Guide, Narayan misrepresents the “Indian we know”\textsuperscript{44}.

V.S. Naipaul, possibly the most controversial of Narayan critics, may also be regarded as the most dissenting voice in Narayan’s criticism. Regarding Narayan’s novel as such and the depiction of India in his novel, Naipaul has this to say: “The India of Narayan’s novel is not the India the visitor sees. He tells the Indian truth. Too much that is overwhelming has been left out: too much has been taken for granted. There is a contradiction in Narayan’s form, which implies concern and his attitude, which denies it”\textsuperscript{45}. And later, modifying his earlier stance about Narayan’s novel, Naipaul states: “Narayan’s novels are less the purely social comedies I had once taken them to be than religious fables, and intensely Hindu”\textsuperscript{46}.

T.D. Brunton regards Narayan’s work as unpretentious and un-theoretical and, (recalling Naipaul) states that Narayan “runs the opposite danger of having no commitment whatever. This is dangerous vacuum for a writer of such a socially involved from as the novel”\textsuperscript{47}. He makes a comment, not acceptable to everyone, regarding Narayan’s use of fantasy. He says: “His typical art is an original
compound of fantasy and realism. But when "...the vein of fantasy. Predominates, his writing slips into escapism and triviality".

The list of the Narayan critics may indeed be extended ad infinitum. Considered in its entirety, the criticism offers a wider perspective and a comprehensive view of Narayan's world, underlining several salient characteristics of his writing. Taken individually too, these critical opinions seem to focus on the valuable features of Narayan's craft of fiction. These views serve as excellent pointers underlining characterization, themes, and modes (comic, ironic) of writing, world - view, in fact almost all the elements of Narayan's novel.

A closer look at the Narayan criticism may reveal that the commentators generally seem to form two distinct groups which may conveniently be called the Positivists and the Negativists, simplicity in terms of his language, his concern for the epic of the ordinary, his two-inch ivory tower and its miniature world miraculously acquiring representativeness, his therapeutic comedy, subtle irony and gentle satire and finally, his artful treatment of the essentially ambivalent nature of life underlining the predicament of human existence. The Negativists as the name suggests seem to find fault with Narayan's handling of the novel form, implying the novelist's lack of social concern, his essentially flat characters suggestive of the novelist's inability to delve deep into the psyche of his/characters and dealing only with the surface realities and thus remaining oblivious of the
bitter actualities of life around and finally, his failure to evoke any kind of poetic or emotional response through his ‘pedestrian’ language.

It may be said that if the formidable aura of his ‘legend’ is likely to baffle the Narayan reader; the vast criticism with its contradictory overtones may leave him puzzled. Consequently the essential Narayan has always been an eluding figure. In fact, out of an uneasy awareness of the reader’s puzzlement and an urge to perceive the novelist with the essentials, though synoptically, the present study is conceived. In fact, behind the study there have been a number of issues, the most teasing one being the employment of the most popular, and possibly the only, term, flat, to describe the Narayan characters, particularly the protagonists and, Narayan’s microscopic and absolutely insulated world of Malgudi realized chiefly through the middle-class milieu.

E.M. Foster as a critic of novel is primarily known for his division of character into flat and round. Although Forster’s terms have a wider acceptance among the critics, they do not seem to have total approval. Forster defines his terms thus: the round character is the one that is capable of surprising the reader. The one incapable of surprising, developed round a single idea and, which may be summarized in a single sentence is a flat character.48 About the flat character Forster says: “For we must admit that flat people are not in themselves as big achievements as round ones, and also that they are best when they are comic. A serious or tragic flat character is apt to be a bore”49.
Edwin Muir, discussing the novel of character, remarks that the characters in this type of novel are known for their unchangeability and completeness from the beginning itself. He then argues in defence of the unchanging characters whom Forster calls flat, and points out ‘a method in their flatness.’ Muir argues thus: “Why indeed, should not a character be flat? The only answer to this is that the present taste in criticism prefers round character. The taste of the next generation may prefer flat, for all we know.”

Suggesting that it is the incorrigibility and changelessness of the flat characters that constitute the stuff reality is made of, Mary McCarthy underlines the story of the flat characters, making the most significant, although rather controversial, comment: “The principle of growth in human being is as real, of course, (though possibly not so common) as the principle of eternity or inertia represented by the comic.”

W.J. Harvey covers a wide range of characters and groups them into different categories underlining their nature and purpose in the novel. According to him the most important are the protagonists “who conflict and change as the story progresses.” The characters at the other end are known as the background characters. These characters, recalling Hardy’s rustics, represent the voices of the community rather than individualized traits. These characters are given a moment’s intensity, and generally have anonymous existence. The category of character that falls between these two is known as ficelle. A ficelle, certainly more
individualized than the background character, serves a specific function in the novel. The last on Harvey's list is the Card about whom he says: "The distinguishing feature of the card is his relative changelessness, combined with a peculiar kind of freedom... he is like a child's toy, its base is filled with lead, which always bobs upright no matter how far he is pushed over".

Henkle Roger considers the understanding of people, and by implication, the characterization, as the centrality of the fictional experience. To him the essential factors in the characterization reflection, the basic human elements "are the complexity of the characterization, the attention given to certain figures, and the personal intensity that the character seems to transmit". He also observes that the secondary characters serve the primary purpose or populating the novel, provide the human context, and time and space are realized through them.

Scholes and Kellog, like Edwin Muir seems to defend the flat character and stress that both the types - the round and flat - have equally significant existence. Their view is: "To suggest that one order of characterization is better than another is folly. To realize that differences exist is the beginning of wisdom". Referring to the characterization in Hebraic and Hellenic literature, School and Kellog remark that the opaqueness of such characters should not be taken as their limitation or defect but simply as a characteristic. Considering the types as a part of some large framework, they point out that the types as such are always referable
to the most general sort of idea, for instance, "Everyman as a type of general humanity"\textsuperscript{56}.

Defending the flat characters Liddel thinks that as in drama, their significance in fiction is inestimable and that "every successful comic character is 'flat.' For when a comic character begins to put on three dimensions, to abandon his stock phrase and to say something else... we are generally displeased"\textsuperscript{57}. He also points out that it is quite likely for the writer to see his self projected in his own work.

The list of the 'character critics' may still be extended. The critical views, then in their entirety, offer valuable pointers in the present study as they seem to consider the flat characters from a much wider perspective. In fact, they underline the definition, the nature and the scope of the so-called flat character. Finding them greatly relevant in the context of the Narayan characters, these views may be referred to throughout the present study. W.J. Harvey's framework, in particular, may remain a constant point of reference. But, as the study intends to suggest a traditional framework conceived with an Indian perspective these foreign parameters may remain inadequate to measure the typical Narayan characters fully. And it is here that one may think it essential to understand Narayan's concept of human character especially because it has a pervasive influence upon the entire corpus of the writer's fiction and also because it occupies the centripetal position in Narayan's novel.
Narayan may be regarded as a rare case of a practising novelist whose ideas, personal convictions and beliefs related to the overall scheme of life have an unmistakable stamp in his creative art. As regards Narayan's notion of (human) character, *The World of the Story-Teller*, Narayan's preface to *Gods, Demons and Others*, reflects it fully, being the only major source. Narayan has underlined certain salient features of the 'epical-narration.' These features may certainly serve as useful pointers and devices to understand Narayan's notion of character. They are:

1) The characters as prototypes and moulds.
2) The human race cast in the moulds having permanent existence.
3) Personality remaining unchanged.
4) Goodness triumphing and prevailing over evil.
5) No death at the end and no tragedy in the Greek sense.
6) Belief in the miraculous power of Nature, the Supreme agent establishing the ultimate peace and order.
7) Faith in rebirth and reincarnation

To these pointers one may also add a few equally significant elements of the 'Story-Teller's World.' The human action in this context is realized on an enormous time and space scale which often goes beyond the human reckoning. Karma consciousness is a deeply ingrained factor of the cultural ethos: the law of Karma is believed to determine the nature of human action passing through a series of births. The universe has been realized through a cyclic structure. It
passes through four periods-yugas-and is ultimately followed by a delusion, *Pralaya*. Thereafter the universe is recreated and it passes through the cyclic pattern all over again.

These guiding principles taken in their entirety may indeed be regarded as the 'Commandments' in the context of Narayan's creative world. They may even seem to control the novelist's *modus operandi* shaping the delineation of characters in his novels. What is now to be seen is whether these principles completely mingle with the writer's creative proves and become the indivisible part of his creative world or they appear like overtly conceived message and thus mar the craft of Narayan's novel. And this brings us to the intended study itself.

Having already had a fairly good background of the writer and his mind and the overall nature of his creative process mainly in the context of his novels, we may now introduce the intended study, spelling out its essentials, the operative framework and the *modus operandi*. In other words, words, what may immediately be focussed is the why, the what and the how of the typological approach to the study of the characters in Narayan's novels.

If the general critical consensus agrees in acknowledging Narayan as a remarkable comic-ironist and as a gifted caricaturist, it also registers a vivid note of dissent on account of his unchanging, ungrowing and undeveloped characters, particularly the protagonists in his novels. Forster's term flat seems to have become a stick for many to beat Narayan's characters with. In short, many of his
critics argue that since the novelist fails to delve deeply into the minds of his protagonists, he seems to be incapable of creating round characters, and consequently remains a surface delineator of characters.

In all fairness to Forster, it may be admitted that his labels, flat and round, have a wider acceptance and a great relevance in the context of 'character criticism.' Likewise, the Forsterean yardsticks may be useful to a certain extent in the case of Narayan's characters and serve as a point of reference. Dealing with Narayan's characters in their entirety, however, the terms become inadequate. There seem to be some discrepancies in Forster's use of his labels. In fact Edwin Muir points out that Forster does injustice "by claiming certain flat characters as round". Muir goes on to assert that Becky Sharp "never surprises us enough to pose as a round character". But besides the discrepancies in Forster his terms may serve an extremely limited purpose as one deals with the Narayanesque protagonists who present a peculiar case. It may indeed be essential to briefly note the characteristic features of the protagonists in Narayan's novels and underline the nature of their unchanging character.

There has always been a general critical consensus that the protagonists in Narayan novels do not show any perceptible development. Putting it differently, they do not seem to be growing and thus remain unchanged to all appearances. The term unchanged is loaded with several implications. Basically, Narayan's characters have been realized through the cultural ethos and they essentially
belong to the preordainedly conceived world of their creator. The karma-conscious characters seem to be accepting their lot, in life and, thus, finally remain changeless.

When it comes to rebellion—a sure ground to develop and row from it is observed that the rebellious tendencies though expressed as natural human instincts and traits of diversified nature, are regarded as cultural deviations in Narayan. Significantly, the rebels never seem to lead a satisfying life. In fact, as the rebels ultimately withdraw from their rebellion and return to the common world of acceptance, they seem to, almost invariably, head towards a peaceful and contented life. Since rebellion is regarded as deviation from the tradition and acceptance-through withdrawal—is taken as the sane and desirable attitude, the rebels seem to remain unchanged at the end.

The story of the unchanging and undeveloping protagonist in Narayan has another cultural dimension. Albert Camus observes that the Hindus do not face the problem of revolt because for them “tradition is sacrosanct”⁵⁰. What is implied in Camus’s comment is that the individual, totally nourished in the sacrosanct society not only remains aware of the myths of his cultural world but also finds himself greatly influenced by them. As for the Narayan protagonist (man or woman), the myths have an indivisible part of his/her cultural ethos. Thus the Rama myth, the Sita myth, the Satyavan-Savitri myth and a number of well known myths epitomizing the vales and the ideals seem to influence the lives of the Narayan
characters, particularly in the context of their rebellion which, as already suggested, is interpreted as cultural aberration. It is here that the rebel ultimately accepts the mythic injunction and finds himself unchanging.

And most importantly, the reason accounting for the undeveloping characters in Narayan’s novels is concealed in the nature of comedy itself. It is the very nature of the comic characters that they do not change. Their incorrigibility and undeveloped life are taken as their personality traits. Mary McCarthy has gone to the extent of stating that “the principle of growth in human being is as real . . . as the principle of eternity or inertia represented by the comic.”

But, if the growth in Narayan’s characters, especially in the protagonists, is precluded on the material plane of existence, there has always been another opening to grow and even to develop their consciousness. The protagonist, during his/her characteristically struggleful life, passing more often through the blind alley of illusory world, finally seems to attain some kind of spiritual realization or revelation. This spiritual awakening itself, in the typically Narayanesque world, may indeed be interpreted as the growth or the development of the protagonist. This imperceptibly subtle growth of consciousness may not be measured by the Forsterean terms. Thus, out of the basic realization that Forsterean labels remain inadequate to measure Narayan’s characteristically traditional characters and the
urgency felt for a possible approach to adequately realize them that the typological study was first conceived.

After Forster, many other critics were also referred to as the present approach was being shaped. Interestingly enough, some of them proved immensely useful for the Narayan characters as they defended and even advocated the role of flat characters. Scholes, Kellog and Liddel argued in favour of the flat characters and emphasized their importance in the novel. Other critics offered several valuable pointers in the context of character study. Of all the critics, W.J. Harvey proved to be extremely useful with his critical framework covering a wide range of characters. Harvey’s Cards may in fact be the closes to the types Narayan depicts in his novels. Harvey does not consider them as totally immune from change and growth a Mary McCarthy does and underlines the distinguishing feature of the Cards as their “relative changelessness combined with a peculiar kind of freedom”. So also Harvey’s ficelle, though playing minor roles with their characteristically functional values, serve excellently to deal with Narayan’s one-liners, mostly the eccentrics. But when it came to consider the absolutely traditionally realized characters in Narayan’s novels, the alien parameters would only describe them and not reveal their essentials. Thus, although the present approach may always refer to the western labels, particularly Harvey’s, they too were considered inadequate in dealing with Narayan characters in their entirety.
The obvious choice in terms of character-criticism (for Narayan) should have been the existing Narayan criticism. Needless to say, the massive Narayan criticism, although rather far-fetched and controversial at times, has been able to offer a wide variety of perspectives focusing on the salient features of the Narayan novel. The critics, both Indian and Western, seem to have considered every possible aspect of the Narayan novel. As already seen, the Narayan critics have extensively dealt with the structural patterns, the character delineation, the (recurring) thematic patterns, the modes of writing, the milieu and several other elements in Narayan's novels. Individually, they offer valuable insights and useful pointers, especially in the context of Narayan's character-delineation. But again, their disparate sort of criticism remains inadequate to deal with the Narayan characters in their entirety. What in fat was being looked for was a kind of three-tier framework which would take care of (a) almost all the characters in Narayan and present them through their essentially traditional trappings, (b) underline the different modes used by the novelist to reveal their roles and, (c) telescope the world view of the novelist realized through the thematic development and character delineation in his novels.

It may be stressed that the intended approach was primarily conceived with a view that if tradition breathing novelist like Narayan is approached with the foreign parameters, he may not be properly understood with the essentials of his creative world. In other words, it was seriously thought that an Indian novelist,
underlining the Indian sensibility in its widest sense of the meaning, necessarily required, for a close up as it were, the culturally conceived framework. The other important consideration contributing to the conception of the present typological study was its character-oriented approach. Narayan’s novels are novels of character and, significantly enough, the novelist has always tried to explore the human existence with its elemental issues through the central consciousness in his novels. His insistence on character portrayal assumes great importance in this context. Says Narayan: “My focus is all on character. If his personality comes alive, the rest is easy for me”\(^{63}\). Finally, the character-oriented approach may also be taken as a device to focus on Narayan’s delineation of characters and underline the features related to his characterization.

It may be essential to briefly explain the central term in the title of this study, namely typology, before it is properly spelt out in come details. The term type as a character (or personality) trait has been widely used in the context of character criticism, in Drama and Novel. Forster, as already pointed out, has considered the types in the context of the flat characters. Narayan seems to have plenty of such types as they exemplify Forster’s definition: “they remain in his (reader’s) mind as unalterable for the same reason that they were not changed by circumstances; they moved through circumstances”\(^{64}\).

Ben Jonson elaborates the nature of the types in his theory of the humours. The term humour has been associated with Ben Jonson’s satirical portrayal of the
characters in his comedies. This is an old medical term applied to each of the four fluids in the body—"choler, melancholy, phlegm, and blood"—the prompting of which was supposed to determine man's constitution and his temperament. The excess of any of the humours gave to the temperament a peculiar bias reflected in man's actions. Ben Jonson defines or rather illustrates it thus:

And when some peculiar quality.
Doth so possesse a man, that it doth draw,
All his affects, its spirits, and his powers,
In their confluctions, all to runne one way,
This may be truly said to be a humour.

The types, chiefly affected by humours, have been found jostling about in the lanes of Malgudi. They are commonly known as the eccentrics in Narayan's novels.

One may also recall the types dealt with by Scholes and Kellog. The critics underline the most characteristic and equally common trait of the types as "the most general sort of idea, as Everyman is a type of general humanity". They also point out different types: the religious, the psychological, the intellectual et al. Many of Narayan's types may have a close kinship with these and even Northrop Frye's "the alazons or imposters, the eirons or self-deprecators, the buffoons (bomolchoi) and the agroikos (churl)" seem to have their distant relations in Narayan's novels.
These types, despite their obvious kinship with Narayan's may remain inadequate to cover the large number of types in the Malgudi novels. The proposed framework is to accommodate almost the entire humanity of Malgudi. Narayan's novels, taken in their entirety have nearly every conceivable face in the world. The entire Malgudi comes alive with its infants, school boys, young lovers, householders, sanyasis, poets, teachers, advocates, doctors, printers, editors, vendors, moneylenders, taxi-drivers, drunkards, lunatics, seducers and prostitutes. And even an elephant named Kumar and a tiger named Raja have their meaningful existence here. The typology is designed in such a way as to accommodate almost every soul according to his/her own characteristic role. The characters are divided into four distinct types: innocent, rebel, eccentric and sanyasi. They are basically realized through their traditional and social trappings. The typology, therefore, bears a sort of indigenous stamp.

At the outset the typological approach may pose the basic problem emerging out of the so-called compartmental nature of the study. Needless to say, human characters are rarely realized through a single trait of their personality. It is, however, the prerogative of the writer to telescope and illumine a single dominant trait of a character. Thus, the characters with such dominant traits may naturally be fitted into the typological frames. Accordingly, in Narayan the basic typecasts with their strikingly single and identifiable trait may certainly occupy the individual family frames with natural ease. The full-fledged characters, however,
may be seen passing through more than one frame of the typology. The only possible and probable explanation for this may be offered in the words of Shakespeare “one man in his time plays many parts”.

The typological study may be considered as a valid approach to the study of the Narayan characters who have been traditionally realized. The Narayanesque conception of the characters, taken in their entirety, naturally lends to the typological families, each of which may have fully-qualified types underlining individual traits. It may be essential to briefly note the *modus operandi* of the typological approach to get the synoptic view of entire project.

The typology intends to note the strategies used by the writer to focus on the basics of his world projected suggestively through different human appearances. Thus, innocence may be primarily regarded as the untainted world of the child or grown-ups necessarily imbibing the childlike state of mind; rebellion may be taken as the projection of the distorting world of illusion; eccentricity may be understood as the reflection of the inherent absurdities and incongruities in life and sanyasa may be interpreted as the ideal state of human existence. Certain recurring themes emerging commonly from all the typologies and reflecting themes emerging commonly from all the typologies and reflecting the writer’s world-view may also be noted. Thus, themes like illusion versus reality, tradition and modernity, the return of the native and, the dynamics of the average may be underlined.
Every section of the typology may also underline the deceptively used strategy called the *rite de passage* by the writer to suggest the (spiritual) realization or the growth of the protagonist. This may also be taken as Narayan’s way of showing the characteristically realized development of his flat characters. The types in Narayan’s novels may be compared with their prototypes in the works of other writers of the world particularly with a view to focusing on the Narayanesque notion of human character. Thus the child characters in *Swami and Friends* may be contrasted with Golding’s *Lord of the Flies* and Marco, the cold blooded cuckold in *The Guide*, may be cast against Casaubon in George Eliot’s *Middlemarch*. Finally, this study intends to present the Narayan characters in the chronological order of their appearances and to consider the following twelve novels of Narayan: *Swami and Friends* (1935), *The Bachelor of Arts* (1937), *The Dark Room* (1938), *The English Teacher* (1945), *Mr. Sampath* (1949), *The Financial Expert* (1952), *Waiting for the Mahatma* (1955), *The Guide* (1958), *The Man Eater of Malgudi* (1961), *The Vendor of Sweets* (1967), *The Painter of Signs* (1976), and *A Tiger for Malgudi* (1983). *Talkative Man* (1986), (‘too long for a short story and too short for a novel’) *The World of Nagaraj* (1990), and *Grandmother’s Tale* (1993). In fact, the approach adopted comes to a full circle with *A Tiger for Malgudi*. 
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