CHAPTER – III

THE CONCEPT AND NATURE OF REBELLION

One of the meanings of the word rebellion in the Oxford English Dictionary is: “Open or determined defence of, or resistance to, any authority or controlling power.” Albert Camus in The Rebel views rebellion thus: “The problem of rebellion only seems to assume a precise meaning within the confines of Western thought.... In fact for the Inca and [Hindu] pariah the problem of revolt never arises, because it has been solved by tradition before they had time to raise it — the answer being that tradition is sacrosanct”. To the OED’s and Camus’s views, which may serve as the backdrop and the pointers throughout the typology of rebellion, one may add that rebellion as such is a part and parcel of human consciousness. As a natural human tendency, it seems to have its roots in the stout of “Man’s first Disobedience.” Satan, in the guise of the talking serpent seemed to have instilled the essence of rebellion into Eve’s consciousness. But apart from its Biblical roots, the idea behind the forbidden fruit has a universal appeal. It underlines the instinct to break the code and disobey the commandment. Incidentally, it may account for the number of “Thou Shalt Nots.”
At the outset, the typological term rebellion may indeed appear paradoxical and irrelevant in the context of Narayan’s novels. The Narayan characters are realized through a preordainedly conceived world, have an acute karma-consciousness and imbibe the pervading spirit of the cultural tradition. Theirs is essentially a sacrosanct tradition. Rebellion against the accepted norms of their tradition appears meaningless. Camus’s view that the Indians cannot rebel because they hot their answers ready in their myths, becomes pertinent on this context. In other words, in the tradition of Acceptance, rebellion may be interpreted as cultural aberration. In fact, rebellion as such in the world of Narayan’s novels is regarded more of a deviation than a defiance. It is here that Narayan’s presentment of his typical rebels may be considered as an interesting study of rebellion suggesting socio-psycho-cultural implications.

Swami in (SAF), though stands obviously as a clear illustration of innocence, he is viewed as the eternal rebel. One is aware of the innocent nature of his rebellion and therefore, he may in fact be conceived as the innocent rebel. And despite an extremely flimsy nature of his rebellion, he deserves consideration, because Swami is Narayan’s first potential rebel. He seems to have been realized through the novelist’s dual perception of rebellion: rebellion as Swami’s natural and instinctive trait and rebellion, in its symbolic connotation, born out of Swami’s illusive understanding of life. Putting it differently, although Swami
displays certain revolting or defying tendencies, in their mild realization perhaps, his rebellion in its entirety is taken as a deviation from the accepted norms.

Interestingly, Narayan’s first (young) protagonist, presenting himself as a typical rebel seems to be installing the rebels in the later Narayan novels, Swami, the ordinary and average school boy with his instinct to play the rebel, finds himself inadequately equipped, having no huts worth the name, to translate it into action. His potential urge is paralyzed, every time, by his dominant cowardice in the face of challenge. It is the middle-class psychology of the boy that nullifies his desire to reach the fruit. Nor can he snap the ropes of the codes. But ultimately, even the innocent Swami has his day as he finds himself playing the biggest rebel of his life. But rebellion at what cost? This seems to be a million dollar question in Narayan’s Malgudi. It is here that several implications emerge out of Swami’s rebellion. The typology intends to consider them in the context of Narayan’s novels.

To understand the nature of Swami’s rebellion is, perhaps, to telescope the rebellious influences on him. Mani, the young hero’s alter-ego and who, in fact, moves like his shadow, remains one lasting influence on Swami. Swaminathan cannot remain unaffected in the company of Mani who seems to be epitomizing and exuding rebellious tendencies. As a matter of fact the sensitive and impressionistic Swami comes to hero-worship Mani and keeps feeding his own fancy on the latter’s heroic deeds.
Besides Mani's influence, Swami's rebellion impulses get fanned as Rajam appears on the scene. Rajam proves the most dominating and snobbish influence on the plebeian Swami. He lands as the tempestual whirlwind in the quiet life of Swami's cowardice. Thus, Mani and Rajam seem to succeed may be underlined to telescope Swami's (rebellious) action: We may recall Swami as he finds himself in the company of the patriotic crowd on the day of the Hartal. Carried away by the mob psychology, he refuses to enter into the school, despite the Head Master's repeated appeals to get back to the classes. Instead, he executes his first real defiance thus: "He uttered a sharp cry of joy as he discovered a whole ventilator, consisting of small square glasses in the Head Master's room, intact! He sent up a stone at in and waited with cocked up ears for the splintering noise, as the piece crashed on the floor. It was thrilling". The second act of Swami's rebellion in fact follows as the consequence of the first. As the Head Master, determined to teach Swami a lesson for his devilry gives him six whacks of cane and orders him to stand on the desk, he acts fast. "He jumped down, and grasping his books, rushed out muttering, 'I don't care for your dirty school'". His third and final act, however, becomes more pronounced. Standing fully exposed to the Head Master of Board School for bunking drill practice, Swami, sensing the imminent punishment, gets alerted: "He hardly knew what he was doing. His arm shot out, plucked the cane from the Head Master's hand, and flung it out of the window".

As the rebel lands in the no man's land, the Mempi Forest, as he undergoes the painful journey and finally is brought back home, almost from the death-trap, providentially perhaps, Narayan seems to have added a dimension to the popularly understood notion of rebellion. It no more remains just one more rebellion. What seems to make the writer's approach to Swami's defiance different and even unique is his conception of the boy's forest escapade. As suggested earlier, the journey becomes the writer's strategy, known as rite de passage. Taken in its sense of "the passage of educating experience, normally by change of place", the rite de passage offers a new perspective to Swami's rebellion.

The young hero's rebellion may be regarded as the novelist's strategy to project the world of Swami's illusions. Considered thus, Swami seems to have been misled, thanks mainly to his inflated ego nourished by the tempting influences of Mani and Rajam, making him blind to the reality of his self and consequently living in the world of illusion. But the trip to the Mempi Forest seems to have made the erring and the wayward boy realize the reality about himself and finally brought him back to the proper and desirably normal state of mind. It is in this sense that the rite de passage marks Swami's development too. Putting it differently, although Swami appears flat, he seems to have made a subtle development by realizing the folly of taking illusion for reality. His growth may be viewed in his return to the ordinary and essentially normal state of existence.
In the final analysis, the rebellion in *Swami and Friends* may be viewed as Narayan’s strategy to underline the theme of illusion versus reality. His concept of rebellion, therefore, may be taken as the protagonist’s deviation from the accepted reality to the undesirable word of illusion. The treatment of rebellion is realized through the cyclic pattern of the hero’s development. It also suggests the theme of the return of the native and stresses the influence of the tradition as the protecting and sheltering spirit.

Narayan’s second novel, *The Bachelor of Arts*, constitutes the second part of his autobiographical trilogy. As the entire locale of the first novel progressively continues in the second, it may also be postulated that Swaminathan of the Board School grows as the graduating Chandran of the Albert Mission College in *The Bachelor of Arts*. As for the motif of rebellion, the novel seems to be following the pattern employed in *Swami and Friends*. Putting it differently, rebellion in *The Bachelor of Arts* also seems to be the novelist’s strategy to realize the basic theme of his novels: illusion versus reality. Chandran, although an improved version of Swami as a rebel, in the final analysis, is realized more as a deviant than as a defier.

Chandran (as a rebel) comes out as a carefully realized study of rebellion. It may be pointed out that before he plays the decisive rebel, Chandran displays a gradual but unmistakable progress as a defier. A mere mention of his suggestive behavioural pattern may underlie Chandran as the most rebellion prone youth:
1. The ego-centric myth of his oratory, like Swami's Tate in (SAF).

2. His superior notion of himself, particularly with reference to the class fellows and the younger brother Seenu.

3. His individualistic attitude and cynicism particularly with regards to Principal Brown as an Englishman.

4. Being status conscious and considering his Bachelor's degree as the symbol of it.

5. A non-conformist exemplified in his attitude in his attitude to the sanyasi.

6. Bellittling teachers, lampooning Prof. Gajapathi and posing fearless before Prof. Raghavan.

7. Going to late film-shows, enjoying pan and cigarettes.

8. Promenading on the banks of Sarayu and staring at girls.

9. Malathi-affliction: falling in love with a total stranger.

It may be essential to consider the nature of Chandran's Malathi obsession because it is basically through his romantic love for Malathi that he emerges as a rebel. Chandran's love at first sight and his open declaration of it remain unheard of in the Malagudi locale, his educated and liberal father notwithstanding. Chandran's declaration of marrying the absolute stranger sends a shock-wave through his entire household. Obsessed with the girl and having reached the mad degree of love, Chandran is often caught fantasizing: "Could he not just dash into her household, hide in the passage, steal up to her bed at night, crush her in his arms, and carry her away?"5
Chandran’s second rebellion follows as a consequence of the first. As the stars seem to have conspired against him, Chandran gets the NO from the girl’s camp, feels dejected and unable to face the harsh reality, and determines to leave the horrible town. Chandran’s departure to Madras may be regarded as a rebellion because, however natural may be the feeling and psychology of the unrequited love, Chandran, in the first place fails to understand the illusory nature of love and secondly he seems to have denounced the sacrosanct tradition (symbolized in Malgudi).

Chandran’s final rebellion occurs in Madras. The hostile city was to present Chandran with the most horrifying face of reality. Accidentally, the Malgudi youth runs into the most shocking company of a drunkard, Kailas, who takes the former, of all the persons, to a prostitute: “This was the first time he had been so close to a man in drink; this was the first time he had stood at the portal of a prostitute’s house. He was thoroughly terrified”. The nightmarish experience precipitates a crisis of conscience in his case and the already turned desperado decides impulsively to play a sanyasi. Eventually Chandran finds himself at Koopal village and there he plays the last rebel and a sanyasi simultaneously.

But the rebel could not play the holy man for long. Eventually, he realizes the nature of his fake sanyasi. The conscience-smitten man, knowing fully that the rustics took his appearance for reality, decides to stop the fraud. But ironically enough, the rustics obliged him to stay on. Finally, feeling that he was feeding
himself on the poor community’s lifeblood, Chandran determines to cast off the borrowed role. Eventually he throws away the suffocating robes of a sanyasi and returns to the loving and caring fold of Malgudi.

As one considers the concept of rebellion in *The Bachelor of Arts* one realizes that, as in *Swami and Friends*, here too, Narayan seems to employ the strategy of rebellion to deal with the theme of illusion versus reality and to underline the philosophy of acceptance. Narayan presents the illusory aspect of life through Chandran’s romantic love and his playing the sanyasa role. As for the romantic love realized through Chandran’s obsession for Malathi, it may be pointed out that Narayan’s typically conventional notion of man-woman relationship does not entertain the idea of love before marriage. Says the novelist: “We believe that marriages are made in heaven and a bride and a groom meet, not by accident or design, but by the decree of fate, the fitness for a match not be gauged by letting them go through the period of courtship but be the study of their horoscopes; boy and girl meet and love after marriage than before”.

As for Chandran’s fake-sanyasa, besides symbolizing the illusory concept of life it has deeper ironic overtones. In fact the moment the terrified man dons the ochre-coloured clothes (symbolizing the holy man) as an alternative to suicide, he as good as underlines its illusory nature. The sanyasa also becomes illusory because it involves the cheating of the innocent rustics and Chandran’s own deception of his self. By playing a sanyasa he wanted to take “a revenge on
society, circumstances, and perhaps, too, on destiny. In its ironic realization Chandran's sanyasa may be taken as the parody of the serenely and spiritually conceived Hindu concept of renunciation.

In Chandran, Narayan presents a typically conventional rebel. In other words, although he is conceived as a modern youth—his smoking, his romantic love, beneath the veneer of modernity, the Malgudi lad stands traditional. One may recall Chandran's musings immediately after the most impulsive act of love at first sight: "If she was more than fourteen she must be married... what was the use of thinking of a married girl? It would be very improper." He also displays the same kind of conventional attitude as he thinks of the name of the strange girl. It may also be noted that to the typically Malgudian—and by implication the traditional—the city of Madras appears hostile and his confrontation with Kailas and later with the prostitute sends a shocking current in him and the tradition nourished young man feels terrified.

Regarding the treatment of rebellion in The Bachelor of Arts, it may be pointed out that, despite the underlying themes like illusion versus reality, convention versus modernity and, perhaps, innocence versus experience, the novel does not have even a shadow of didactic appearance. The saving grace, as usual, comes from the novelist's comic-ironic filter of perception. The novel abounds with the instances underlining such perceptions. One may recall how the chastened Chandran views his old flame in the context of his new goddess of love:
“Sushila, Sushila, Sushila. Her name, music, figure, face and everything about her was divine. Sushila, Sasshila-Malathi, not a spot beside Susila; it was a tongue twister; he wondered why people liked that name”\textsuperscript{11}. Besides the apparent irony, what possibly seems to have been suggested is the nature of human attitude. Chandran, perhaps, would have reversed his judgement, had the girls also reversed their roles. Needless to say one feels amused at the innocent rebel’s reaction.

In terms of characterization, Chandran is often regarded as a flat character, who, despite the painful experience in his first love and his equally restless sanyasa-interlude, remains incorrigibly romantic. One may, however, say that the novelist, using the strategy of rite de passage, seems to suggest a subtle realization in him. In fact Chandren seems to have decided to imbibe the spirit of reason and common sense in life. The narrator puts Chandran’s resolution thus: “Chandran settled down to a life of quiet and sobriety. He felt that his greatest striving ought to be for a life freed from distracting illusion and hysterics”\textsuperscript{12}.

Chandran’s resolution may suggest his awareness of the illusory nature of life. In fact the subtly suggested growth in Chandran (reflected in his resolution) may be taken as the guiding principle of all the Narayan protagonists. In the final analysis, The Bachelor of Arts may be read as a sequel to Swami and Friends. It seems to be following the pattern, especially of the theme, structure and mode, employed in the first Narayan novel.
For obvious reasons, The Dark Room has been regarded as Narayan’s version of Ibsen’s The Doll’s House. Through it Narayan seems to handle, unobtrusively though, major issues like marital disharmony, the status and role of the Hindu wife in society, the implication of the other woman, free will and disobedience et al. Significantly, these issues have been dealt with through the basic theme of the Malgudi novels; illusion versus reality. As for the typology of rebellion, The Dark Room may be regarded as a unique case, because the basic theme of the novel is realized through the rebellion of the husband, the wife and the other woman. To understand the notion of rebellion is in fact to focus on each agent’s nature of rebellion and underline the emerging implications. Since the rebellion in the novel springs from the marital disharmony, Ramani, as its major contributor, stands out.

At the outset it may be essential to point out that since Ramani represents the male chauvinism established by tradition, be taken as a deviation in the context of Ramani. In fact it is because of his excessive deviation that Savitri rebels. Bearing the Narayanesque notion of rebellion in mind, we may approach Ramani.

Narayan makes his ironic intention clear as he presents Ramani as Savitri’s husband. Ramani is anything but the legendary Satyavana. On the contrary, of all the Malgudians, Ramani is revealed as the most arrogant, ego-centric, conceited and caddish husband. He proudly regards himself as the Commander-in-chief and
exemplifies the role to the last letter. Ibsen's Helmer may certainly appear a paler version of his Malgudi counterpart.

Ramani is primarily projected through his absolute dictatorship at home and the slavish treatment he gives to his wife. Significantly enough, on the first page of the novel the tyrant is seen violently snubbing Savitri because she tries to defend her son against the will of the dictator. Ramani shouts at her saying: "Go and do any work you like in the kitchen, but leave the training of the grown-up boy to me. It is none of a woman's business."\(^\text{13}\) The instance clearly shows Ramani's male chauvinism and the Manu-based attitude to keep woman to her life-long servility and to the confines of the hearth. He seems to have given her the command, Thou Shalt Obey, which Savitri feels obliged to respect and execute all her life.

Although Ramani's rebellious deviation is realized through several situations, primarily it is projected in the context of his most scandalous affair with Shanta Bai. The affair has many serious implications. At the outset, it may be taken as Ramani's flouting of the sacred family codes-to be faithful and honest to one's wife. It may also be interpreted as Ramani's violation of the time-honoured social norms as he gets involved in an extra-marital affair. Although he continues to call Savitri, "My pet"\(^\text{14}\) reminiscent of Helmer's "Is that squirrel frisking around?"\(^\text{15}\), Ramani at any rate does not give her the promise not to go near the other woman and says defiantly, "I don't want you to dictate me"\(^\text{16}\). But the
unkindest cut of the cad comes when to Savitri’s threat to leave the house if he did not come to senses, he callously says: “You can please yourself. Put out the light. I want to sleep”\(^\text{17}\). Ironically enough, one recalls Othello’s words “Put out the light” and his excessive love for Desdemona.

In Ramani, Narayan presents a full-fledged deviant, an inborn rebel to be precise, when his father had advised him to continue his studies after matriculation, the egoist snubbed him with: “I know better, what I must do”\(^\text{18}\). He also boasts of tendering his resignation if the company dared to dishonour his. As for the affair, Ramani seems to have continued it, even after the disquieting interlude of Savitri’s disappearance from home. In the context of his children, one may say that he is never realized as a loving father. They seem to read rather than love their sire. And as for the other woman, Ramani succumbs to her charms and continues the affair, despite the danger it entails. Thus, his entire life may be regarded as a series of deviations. As already suggested, the rebellious tendencies seem to be running in his blood-stream. He, therefore, does not have to rebel, he simply lives a rebel.

Significantly, Narayan seems to have offered a silver lining to the otherwise darkish portrait of the tyrant. It is exemplified in his playing a loving husband rarely though, petting and finding Savitri. One also hears him mentioning his buying Savitri a six-sovereign necklace at the beginning of his career and his
suffering when she had labour pains. At times he plays a good daddy. Most importantly, he always insists on his near ones to eat more, lot more.

In terms of characterization, Ramani remains a Card, almost in every sense Harvey defines the term, especially when he, disagreeing with McCarthy, points out that, “Cards are not absolutely immune from change and growth” Having faced the nerve-killing experience and realized that even Savitri could say No to his amorous intentions, Ramani may have had second thoughts regarding the irresistible but equally trying affair.

As one takes into account the nature of Savitri’s rebellion, ironically enough, she seems to contribute, helplessly though, the rebellious tendencies of Ramani. In other words, the life-role she plays obliges her to keep her husband’s ego burning. And, in the process, she comes to realize, with a painful and shocking tense, that she herself has become A Burn-out Case. A typical product of the preordained world and of the household harshly reflecting, the corruption of Hinduism, Savitri remains a copy book of the Manu framed society. Therefore, to say that Savitri symbolizes the pains suffered by a tongueless creature, would be to state the factuality, and, to consider her role as a total subjugation to her Lord, may be to say the obvious.

As for Savitri’s rebellion, the basic and overall image she projects vividly shows her as a person failed miserably to play a convincingly full fledged rebel. In other words the emphasis in considering Savitri’s rebellion may be on how
rather than why she cannot play the rebel. Significantly enough, if Narayan builds up the case of Ramani's total rebellion (deviation), he also carefully presents the story of Savitri's acceptance. Suffice it to recall some instances underlining Savitri's negative rebellion.

Savitri even after fifteen years of marriage and three children remains the epitome of the second sex. Faced with the constant bullying and humiliation by her husband, she has been left with only one resort: to vent her anger and suffocation in The Dark Room. In the early part of the novel, snubbed by her husband, Savitri is seen sulking in the "dark room." The "dark room" becomes a metaphor in the novel, symbolizing an externalization of her mental condition created by the stuffy oppressiveness, which, women of the orthodox Indian middle-class are destined to endure.

The first instance of Savitri's rebellion reflects the total disharmony in her household. When, despite Savitri's pleas, Ramani refuses to forsake the other woman and yet takes his wife's intimacy for granted, she rebels. Years pent-up feelings and the smothered voice in her suddenly well up and to Raman's shock, perhaps, Savitri shouts at him: "Don't touch me.... You are dirty, you are impure. Even if I burn my skin I can't cleanse myself the impurity of your touch". Importantly, if the scene vividly reflects the agonized and tormented wife's real outburst, it also underlines her unmistakably acute awareness of chastity in fact
Savitri's entire revolt underlines an overwhelming despotism of the traditional morality.

As the desperate Savitri insists on leaving the house without a thing, she seems to be believing that in man's world a woman cannot possess anything: "What possession can a woman call her own except her body? Everything else she has her father's, her husband's or her sons'"[^21]. Although Savitri's comments underline a universal tone, sub-consciously perhaps, she must certainly be rendering Manu's famous dictum:

\[
\begin{align*}
pita & \text{ raksati kaumare} \\
bhrata & \text{ raksati yauvane} \\
raksanti & \text{ sthavire putraha} \\
na & \text{ stree svatantryamarthat.}
\end{align*}
\]

(The father protects her in childhood, the husband in youth and the son in her old age. A woman does not deserve independence)[^22].

Interestingly, Savitri's rendering echoes the similar utterances of Nora in The Doll's House: "When I look back on it now, I seem to have been living here like a beggar, from hand to mouth. I lived by performing tricks for you, Torvald.... You and your father have done me a great wrong"[^23]. But Narayan's Savitri is a far cry from the Ibsenite heroine. Unlike Nora, who banged the door, Savitri simply "walked out, softly closing the door behind her"[^24].

As Savitri strips out with the intention of committing suicide, she appears more pathetic than determined and angry. Her mind, instead of dwelling on her
husband's inhuman treatment towards her, dwells on Yama's Cauldron, symbolizing punishment for disobeying the husband. And when she finds herself just a moment away from the act of suicide, Savitri cries: "no, no. I can't die. I must go back home."

Savitri, with her formidable impact of the religious codes paralyzing her mind, presents herself as the feeblest creature in the context of her suicide. In fact, her failure to commit suicide seems to prepare us for her final retreat. Her attempt to earn the bread by the sweat of her brow and her staying out all by herself at the temple ring feeble. Finally, as she comes back home, Savitri betrays the typical middle-class psychology. The narrator says, "And she grew homesick. A nostalgia for children, home and accustomed comforts seized her."

Thus, Narayan's Savitri, although raising our expectations for a Nora-like confrontation and unequivocal rebellion, ends up in a tame reconciliation. One may read Narayan's ironic intention in naming his heroine Savitri as she appears just a puny figure before the legendary Savitri in the Mahabharata. She stands dwarfish in the company of Aurobindo's divinely conceived Savitri and Raja Rao's symbolically realized Savitri. Narayan's Savitri basically seems to project the Indian womanhood realized through the idealized roles of mothers and daughters in the male-dominated society. It may, however, be pointed out that through her sacrifice and suffering Savitri seems to have stopped the house from the fall. Her traditionally realized act may not have the endorsement of the
feminists, but Savitri has the consent of those who value human concern, besides, of course, the whole Indian tradition.

As for Savitri's characterization, although in her tame withdrawal one may view her as a flat unchanging character, there seems to be a subtle growth in her consciousness: she no more rushes to welcome the lord of their house. Despite her painful realization that a part of her being is dead, Savitri has said "No" when Ramani wanted her. And a gesture is all that counts in Narayan.

Narayan's ironic intention in naming the other woman Shanta Bai in (TDR) seems to be clear. Contrary to the suggestion of peace denoted by her name, the woman seems to be an epitome of restlessness; what's more, she also makes Ramani restless. Shanta Bai, a thoroughly promiscuous woman, having dubious credentials, is the first other woman in Narayan's novels. At the outset she wins Ramani's sympathy with her sob story and his heart by her charm. Although a probationer, she is hardly realized as one. Her philosophy "Living Today and Letting Tomorrow Take Care of itself... However being the One Important Possession" sounds shallow and her obsession for Omar Khayyam also appears to be just a fancy. Her car-drive and going to see the late movie with Ramani come out airily. In fact, her whole affair has an airy appearance. Although Shanta Bai remains a two liner and a flat character, she plays an important role: on the one hand she expose Ramani's outside appearance as a mad and uncertain lover and his double-dealings and, on the other, she reflects Savitri's marital disharmony.
Even her watching a film with Ramani seems to be for the benefit of Savitri’s friend, Janamma, who reports their “togetherness” to Savitri. Thus far from being impressive and well drawn Shanta Bai remains a shadowy figure and becomes a symbolic character.

In the final analysis, *The Dark Room* may be regarded as Narayan’s characteristic study of rebellion. It may also suggest the author’s endorsement to the philosophy of acceptance and the reiterative theme of the return of the native.

With *The English Teacher* Narayan completes his autobiographical trilogy. Chandran, the young graduate from Albert Mission College, in *The Bachelor of Arts* may be imagined, to have grown as Krishnan, the lecturer in English, in the same college, in *The English Teacher*. The novel is believed to have been based (mostly the second half) on the writer’s personal experiences. It may neatly be divided into two parts covering the events before and after the death of Susila, *The English Teacher’s* wife. As for the theme of rebellion, it seems to be presented through Krishnan, the central consciousness of the novel, also known as ‘the uncompromising idealist.’ The novelist builds up the case of his rebel, marking distinctly the developmental stages in his unique rebellion.

Significantly enough, at the beginning of the novel, Krishnan, although having nothing to complain about (on the worldly plane of existence), is seen expressing a restless and nagging sense of missing something valuable. He also feels a vague dissatisfaction with himself and thinks that he is doing a wrong work.
Once introduced, the rebellious attitude runs all through the novel until it gets dissolved and the protagonist sees the light in the form of proper understanding of the mysteries of life and death.

One of the issues in the rebellion of *The English Teacher* is Krishnan’s total dissatisfaction at the colonial system of education. As a product of the same system he does not even spare himself and vents his dissatisfaction thus: “If they paid me the same one hundred rupees for stringing beads together or tearing of the paper bits every day for a few hours, I would perhaps be doing it with equal fervour.” It may be noted that Krishnan’s mysteriously nagging sense of missing something vitally important and his unhappiness with himself may be interpreted as the poet’s inner urge for “a life freed from distracting illusions and hysterics” felt by Chandran. The teacher’s inner urge, however, seems to have been bypassed temporarily as he happily gets ensconced in the warm love of his beloved wife. It is, therefore, essential to gauge the marital relationship between *The English Teacher* and his spouse. It may also be noted that if the happy relationship lulls the poet’s restless spirit, eventually it becomes instrumental in reviving the teacher’s potentially rebellious attitude.

May be because of the intensely personal overtones of the novel, Narayan’s portrayal of the marital relationship in *The English Teacher* comes out with a touch of delicacy. Says Iyengar: “The story of their wedded life is a prose lyric on which Narayan has lavished his gifts as a writer.” In fact *The English Teacher*
may be regarded as Narayan’s notion of the ideal marital relationship. Krishnan, basically a poet, has been realized as the most caring and loving husband and father. One catches Krishnan as he paces the little Malgudi station in ‘great agitation’ when he goes to receive his beloved wife and the darling (infant) daughter. Although the entire scene has a Narayanesque touch of comicality, what is concealed beneath is the sensitive teacher’s tenderly realized human concern. Krishnan has come out as a caring husband (particularly during Susila’s illness) and a beloved ‘daddy’ (particularly after Susila’s death). But it is the portrayal of the ideal womanhood, projected through Susila’s character which seems to be the crux of the marital harmony. Needless to say, her character merits a close look.

In the first half of the novel, Susila is realized as the epitome of the classical ideal of womanhood mentioned by Kalidasa: Grhini sacivah sakhi mitha/ Priyasisya lalite kalavidhau (you are my beloved wife, a counselor, a playful companion and a dear pupil in all the arts). Susila basically plays the role of a beloved wife with all the tenderness and classical restraint. She also plays the roles of a playful companion, a mischievous pupil and a stern counselor with equal ease. She also excels as a perfect budgeter and even as a conscious family planner. As regards her mother’s role, Susila has come out vividly as loving and educating mother fully aware of the child philosophy.

But more than Susila’s worldly excellences, Narayan seems to be concerned with her spiritual attributes. It is here that the mention of jasmine becomes
significant. The word jasmine evokes our unearthly senses. And as it “brings whiffs of fragrance from another world,” it underlines, suggestively though, Susila’s spiritual beauty. The novel has as many as 22 mentions of jasmine which seems to have become the husband’s idee fixe. Krishnan mostly refers to his wife in terms of her divine or spiritual appearance. When for instance, Susila prays at the Iswara temple, the husband says: “her eyes...shone with unearthly brilliance” \(^{34}\). But the most significant instance, though presented playfully, is when Krishnan, in a frolic mood plagiarizes Wordsworthian terms, ‘phantom,’ ‘apparition’ ‘spirit’ and ‘angel-light’ suggest the ‘other-worldliness,’ as a symbolic projection of Susila’s imminent state of being.

It is natural that the teacher feels stunned and benumbed to witness the premature and tragic death of his beloved wife. What, however, seems relevant to note is that the loss of the essential harmony in his life turns the bereaved husband philosophical. One may recall, for instance, his view of the crematorium: “This is a sort of cloak-room, a place where you leave your body behind” \(^{35}\). – the moment he realizes the possibility of establishing communication with the soul of his departed wife, the old restless spirit strikes again. It is essential to note the process of this rebellion itself to underline its nature.

The devout husband, with the genuine and the almost preordainedly realized help of the medium, passing through many trials and errors at the occult seatings, ultimately seems to succeed in establishing the link with the soul of
Susila. He describes it thus: "When I opened my eyes again she was sitting on my bed looking at me with an extraordinary smile in her eyes". One may certainly regard the meeting as the symbolic projection of the union of the two souls. What seems to be of primary importance is that the meeting helps the disturbed teacher in restoring the psychological balance of his mind. In the final analysis it helps him attain the spiritual catharsis of despair and salvation. As the teacher fights against the darkness in his heart—the darkness of despair and warring attitudes basically emerging from the agnostic’s illusory perception of life—and attains a state of quietude and a balanced view of life Narayan seems to present a rare kind of rebel, a spiritual rebel.

In fact Krishnan’s final rebellion may be taken as the extension of his spiritual rebellion. It is realized in the form of his resignation of his job and his decision to join the headmaster’s Leave Them Alone School. The resignation may, however, be taken as the reaction of the uncompromising idealist’s complete dissatisfaction with the nature of his job. The kind of education which he himself had and which he has been imparting to the new generation, was criticized and found fault with by the idealist himself from time to time. Krishnan views the colonial education system as the brain-child of the English ruler and having no relevance to the Indian students. The first draft of his resignation faithfully reflects the view of the idealist: “I am up against the system, the whole method and
approach of a system of education which makes us morons, and cultural morons, but efficient clerks for all your business and administrative offices”.

Krishnan has all along lived with the feeling of doing a wrong work (of teaching in the college) and a nagging feeling of having missed something vitally important. Leave Them Alone comes as a Godsend. Here he could do the work of his choice. He views his decision in these words: “I’m seeking a greater inner peace, I find I can’t attain it unless I withdraw from the adult world and adult work into the world of the children”. The contemplative idealist and poet, besides writing poetry, may spend his time purposefully in the company of children symbolizing “the meaning of the word joy… in its purest essence”. The Leave Them Alone may also be regarded as Narayan’s concept of education (though symbolically present), best and ideally suited to the Indian pupils.

In the final analysis, the contemplative poet exemplifies Narayan’s notion of “positive rebellion” underlining positive philosophy. A rebellion born and developed out of selflessness and human concern and, more importantly, out of the dedicative approach to a noble cause, may certainly have a place of pride in Malgudi. May it also be noted that the rebellion in The English Teacher, is realized through grahasthashrama. One may endorse the view that Krishnan is the first of Narayan’s three dimensional characters. His development is realized as he passes through his journey from despair and doubt to hope and belief.
Mr. Sampath is the first Narayan novel to install a dual central consciousness. Its two heroes not only represent diagonally opposite attitudes and personality traits, but they also play complimentary roles to each other. If Srinivas is realized as a middle-class person imbibing the basic attitude of acceptance and the spirit of reconciliation, Sampath plays a rogue, a swindler and a moral deviant. Sampath with the dubious prefix 'Mr' suggesting a sort of foreign element, plays the rebellion incarnate and exemplifies the dark image (particularly as a deviant) of a rebel. Srinivas (destined to breathe virtually under the spell of the rebellious rogue) is charmed by Sampath, in the process, unknowingly though, plays to certain extent a rebel himself. It is through Srinivas, misled by Sampath, that the novelist seems to have presented the inherent theme of the Malgudi novels: illusion versus reality or innocence versus experience.

Srinivas may be regarded as an improved version of Krishnan of The English Teacher. He is presented basically as a contemplative type. In a way he shares the restless and unsatisfied spirit of Krishnan-having tried many professions he finally seems to have settled with the readings of the Upanishads—but unlike the latter, Srinivas, at the beginning of question: "who am I?" Narayan seems to underline the inquiring spirit of the protagonist.

As Srinivas tries desperately to find a printer to launch his weekly, Sampath appears, almost preordainedly, on the sense. The meek and contemplative Srinivas seems to be charmed by the irresistible rogue who exemplifies the old proverb, A
friend in need is a friend indeed, to the last letter. In a bizarre development that follows, Srinivas finds himself as the editor of The Banner. What is, however, significant is that although Srinivas accomplished to bring out a 12-page tabloid single handedly, he “could not pass a copy downstairs without feeling like a school boy presenting a composition to his master”\(^1\).

As regards the editorial view, if The Banner reflects the rebellious spirit of the editor in its grand declaration of “attacking ruthlessly pigheadedness whenever found and ... prodding humanity into pursuing and ever-receding perfection”\(^2\) it also distinctly underlines the editor’s characteristically unconcerned attitude towards the current events. When for instance, the other papers, sensing the 1938 war, wrote about it, The Banner philosophised the current issue thus: “The Banner has nothing special to note about any war, past or future. It is only concerned with the war that is going on... between man’s inside and outside”\(^3\).

Srinivas seems to have been controlled by the two forces simultaneously: the one propelling him to rebel, to attack and to assert, and, the other, enforcing him to retreat, to compromise and to accept the prevailing situation. The queer rebel seems to practice exactly the opposite of what he professes. This contradictory attitude is vividly reflected throughout the novel. As, for instance, if the editorial voice “thundered against municipal or social shortcomings”\(^4\), almost immediately his subconscious voice went on asking: “Life and the world and all this is passing-why bother about anything? The perfect and the imperfect are all
the same. Why bother? Thus the non-doing attitude, probably developed out of his readings of the Upanishads, makes Srinivas's rebellious voice an ambiguous one or rather a dubious one.

Srinivas seems to be the most contemplative protagonist. He is realized mostly through his philosophic preoccupations. He is always found viewing the human world philosophically. More often than not, he is caught practically lost in the philosopher's world trying to relate the common and the ordinary human experiences to some higher, philosophic ideas. For instance, as he hears the sharp cry "Brinjals greens" of the vegetable vendor, with other voices, Srinivas speculates about the source of each voice and the spectacle behind it. Out of the off-hand speculation he brings out a philosophic intimation: "Srinivas was filled with great wonder at the multitudinousness and vastness of the whole picture of life that is presented." Or, while Ravi was feelingly telling Srinivas about his predicament he couldn't draw the sketch of Sampath's child, being simply uninspiring, nor could he discard it for fear of hurting the man who promised to show his 'sweat heart'-Srinivas was lost in his contemplative world perceiving a wonderful balance of power in the world. He speculates: "If only one could get a comprehensive view of all humanity, one could get a correct view of the world: Things being neither particularly wrong nor right, but just balancing themselves.

These consistently realized scenes of Srinivas's contemplation unmistakably suggest the basically meditative nature of the protagonist. It is only
when one considers the philosophic speculations of Srinivas in their entirety that one realizes Narayan’s ironic intention of presenting his wise man and his folly of mistaking the illusion for reality.

The most glaring folly of Srinivas may be seen in his involvement with Sampath’s film project, as a script writer. The bizarre episode of the film, ‘The Burning of Kama’ has rich ironic overtones. It is ironic that Srinivas, a devotee of Nataraj fails to imbibe the principle of balancing the unruly world. (He seems to install Nataraj, the lord of the Misrule in The Man-Eater of Malgudi.) But the telling irony strikes as Srinivas, the script writer of ‘The Burning of Kama,’ contrary to the message of the film, finds himself unknowingly perhaps, charmed by the youthful beauty, Shanti, playing Parvathi.

Besides the ironic overtones, the film episode may also be considered for its symbolic implications. Although Ravi stands as one of the absurdly realized eccentrics, the artist’s infatuation for Shanti and in fact his madness may be taken as the symbolic projection of Srinivas’s subconscious mind, more importantly, however, the entire film episode seems to be the novelist’s strategy to project the protagonist’s philosophy of quietism. It may be pointed out that it is in the context of Ravi’s madness that Srinivas’s development of the philosophy of nonaction deems to touch the highest mark. Despite his initial desire to stop the absurd and cruel exorcism and save his friend Ravi from the inhuman thwackings, the Pegasus Vision, see recently, “had given him a view in which it seemed to him all
the same whether they thwacked Ravi with a cane or whether they lift him alone ... all that seemed unimportant and not worth bothering about“⁴⁸.

In the final analysis Srinivas may be regarded as Narayan’s presentation of the philosophic rebel. The novelist suggests the negative nature of his rebellion in the sense of deviation-first, in his excessive involvement in The Banner and his utter negligence of his wife and son, and, secondly, in his unwittingly playing the script writer and getting lost in the illusory world. More important to note is that if as a rebel Srinivas exemplifies contradictions, he shows remarkable consistency and development as a believer in the philosophy of withdrawal and non-action. As a character, he is mostly realized as a philosophic type. In fact, one remembers him either as he talks or as he contemplates.

Sampath, the other part of the dual-central consciousness of Mr. Sampath seems to be Narayan’s presentment of the rebel as a rogue. If the critic complains about the novel being ‘hump backed’ in shape, and if Srinivas is resented as a wordy and ‘airy’ character, there seems to be a general consensus about Narayan’s portrayal of the colourful rogue Sampath as a contribution to his portrait gallery. Strangely enough, although Sampath is presented as the printer from the beginning of the novel, it is only after 64 pages that he is properly introduced as ‘Sampath’. And maybe because Narayan lifted him from ‘life,’ he merely describes him with the “furcap and the scarf flung around his neck”⁴⁹.
Since the moment the dynamic and roguish Sampath dramatically introduces himself to the awe-struck Srinivas, Narayan projects a series of scenes displaying the rogue’s rebellious tendencies. Thus, in a sort of exposition the rebel is heard telling a brazen lie, at the Registrar’s office, that The Banner is going to be a literary paper and is seen defiantly enjoying himself ‘cracking nutshell’s and eating them merrily. Like his roguish cousins Margayya and Raju, Sampath keeps up the myth of the ‘staff’ at his press and allows no one to go beyond the curtain displaying ‘a lion attacking a spotted deer,’ possibly symbolizing the swindler’s own image. The myth is dispelled when Srinivas, after the closure of the press, realizes that the entire press was virtually manned by the superman Sampath and a boy.

Sampath’s launching of the film, ‘The Burning to Ashes of Kama’ may be regarded as the most crucial episode in the novel. If the episode basically speaks for Sampath’s most enterprising character, more importantly, it also dramatizes the rogue’s rebellion in the sense of deviation. When the original Shiva character, V.L.G., refuses to play his part, the ever enterprising Sampath immediately drives the Shiva out and enters himself on the stage as Shiva. It turns out to be an act of utter blasphemy as Sampath, playing Shiva, approaches with impious desire for Shanti playing Parvathi. Although Narayan handles the whole scene with his characteristic irony,
the basic act of deviation he stresses remains prominent. Narayan also seems to suggest the consequences—in fact the Karma consequence—of Sampath's moral aberration in the form of the pandemonium witnessed during the shooting of the film. As for the film, Sampath seems to have made a travesty of the sacrosanctly conceived Indian mythology. Sampath's playing of the role of Shiva may also be interpreted as the rogue's betrayal of the artist Ravi, who honestly, although illusively, took Shanti as his Beatrice.

As a matter of fact Sampath epitomizes the spirit of the rogue. If one word were required to reflect the rogue's nature of relationship with the simpleton's involved in his schemes, it would be none other than the word Betrayal. In a way the story of Sampath's Great Betrayal begins with his own household as he gets obsessively involved with his cousin Shanti (with the intention of marrying her too) at the cost of his wife playing yet another Savitri. The next gullible Sampath hooks is Soma Sundaram who is destined to see the ruin of his fortune, as the financier of the film, after there film flops. Yet another fly he entices and ultimately catches in his web is the old landlord. Promising to get Ravi his Beatrice, he exploits the artist and asks him to draw the sketch of his child. These are some of the known victims. The unknown ones may be alarmingly large number. One cannot help recalling the picture of a spotted deer attacked by a lion seen on the curtain of his press.
But, Sampath, after all, belongs to the human species. Narayan, therefore, paints him with a silver lining. For Srinivas, playing his friend, philosopher and guide, Sampath did everything which he possibly could do. He has also come out as a caring and lovable father and householder before his fall. As regards his affair with Shanti, Sampath, having an intention to marry her, believes in his two-wives theory: "Every sane man needs two wives—a perfect one for the house and a perfect one outside for social life". It may, however, be recalled that Sampath has also said: "Here goes my solemn declaration that my wife and children shall lack nothing in life, either in affection or comfort". And, one has also witnessed Sampath having a good sense of hospitality.

As a character, Sampath (to all appearances) remains unchanged and possibly gets ready for another scheme (like, perhaps, that of Margayya) at the end of the novel. He may also be conceived as a symbolic character, underlining Srinivas's illusion. It is here that the end of the novel appears quite meaningful. Although failed in the film production and ditched by Shanti, the inherent rebel may continue to work out his schemes. He, almost prophetically, says: "Well, I may probably try and save myself if I can interest them [Sohanlal and Somu] in a new story". Srinivas, however, symbolizing the spirit of non-action and withdrawal exemplifies the theme of the return of the native, waving off Sampath's illusory influence once for all, as it were. Says the narrator: "He raised his hand, flourished a final farewell, and set his face homeward".
Narayan's *The Financial Expert*, a moving story of Margayya's rise and fall of fortune, has rich ironic overtones. In fact with it the novelist seems to have reached a higher watermark as an ironist. Every character (in a particular situation) is realized through the Narayanesque ironic filter. Although the novel offers themes like generation gap, modernity versus tradition, the typology, however, considers here theme of rebellion in it. Considering the nature of the rebellion in *The Financial Expert*, one may read the novel as the story of Icarus or the story of Midas. In the Indian context, however, the novel may be the exposition of Sanskrit Shloka:

Dharmarthkamah samameva sevya,
Yastvekasevi sa naro jaghanyah
Dyoyos tu daksam pravadanti madhyam,
Sa uttamo yo niratas trivarge

(Righteousness, wealth and desire should be resorted to in an equal manner. One who resorts to only one is the most despicable. One who is adept in two is mediocre. One who is engaged in resorting to all the three is excellent)\(^5^4\).

At the outset, the title of the novel and the name of the protagonist, both seem to have ironic implications. Margayya is not the protagonist's original name. In fact, he was named Krishna but, as fortune would have it, he came to be known as Margayya, the path-shower, (TG). Margayya basically lives up to his name, guiding first the rustics and later, the greedy business sharks. Ironically, however, getting obsessively involved in money, he seems to turn Midas and gets divorced.
from the world of common human existence. The title of the novel, The Financial Expert, too has a dual ironic realizations. It may indeed seem a travesty of the title applied to an uneducated man, transacting his entire business virtually sitting under the banyan tree, having the old knobby box as his only furniture. And yet, solving the needy villager’s perennial problems, enticing them to borrow, when in fact they did not need to borrow and in the intricate process earning an income for himself, seems to be the work of The Financial Expert only.

Margayya begins his rebellion, unconsciously though, with a bang. As a petty moneylender, he executes his ingeniously worked out scheme which practically defeats the very purpose of the Bank, namely, the principle of promoting thriftiness and elimination of middle men. A perfect reader of human psychology, Margayya knew that the rustics, bothered by the bank-scare and the red-tapism, would turn to him for human services, their slight loss notwithstanding. Knowing their entire geneology and the details of their family affaire, Margayya could afford to play brutal and arrogant at times, but he always gave them the impression of being their benevolent benefactor. One recalls Margayya’s transaction with the villager called Mallanna from Koppal in this context.

Margayya’s rebellion -- again, as deviation -- is strangely realized through the factual and the fantastic elements. If the humiliated Arul Das becomes instrumental in obliging Margayya to close his shop under banyan tree, his own son, the enfant terrible precipitates the crisis in Margayya’s by throwing the
Bread-giver account book into the Malgudi gutter. But ironically enough, the
catastrophe turns out to be a blessing in disguise, as it propels and spurs him to go
towards the Goddess of Wealth.

As Margayya propitiates the Goddess Laxmi, through his rigorously
performed 40 days’s Puja, the Lady Fortune seems to smile ironically on him
because, the ‘gate’ of Goddess Laxmi opened through a ‘wicket’ door to Goddess
Saraswati. In this seemingly accidental act one may, however, discern at least
three layers of irony: (a) despite the rivalry between Saraswati and Laxmi,
Margayya leads to the realm of gold, through the publication of the book, called
Bet Life or Domestic Harmony written by Dr. Lal, the journalist, correspondent
and author; (b) the pornographic nature of the book strikes an odd note in the
context of Margyya’s plebian and ethically realized household; (c) the Domestic
Harmony in fact is instrumental in creating domestic disharmony in Margayya’s
later life.

As the instinctively shrewd Margayya, thanks to his timely selling of the
rights of the Domestic Harmony to Madanlal, thrives in business, he also dreams
of his dunciad so becoming a doctor. The wealthy businessman ever influences
the (entire) education system. (One may here read Margayya’s slighting of the
Goddess Saraswati.) But Balu, instead of accepting the father’s suggestion just to
appear for the Matriculation exams, tears off the school Record and throws the bits
of paper into the gutter. He also quits Malgudi and later, to the consternation of
the entire family, is reported ‘dead.’ It is significant to note the ironic implications of Balu’s death. In its typically Narayanesque realization, it underlines the rascallc nature of Margayya who feels worried because the next door people may come and stay with the bereaves family. The “loss” of Balu may be taken as Margayya’s sacrifice of his son to the Goddess of Wealth. And the loss of Balu also symbolically suggests Margayya’s loss of his family link and his disregard of family concern.

The most glaring instance of Margayya’s deviation is reflected in the context of Balu’s marriage. The money maniac was looking forward to a financially reputed alliance. Margayya, therefore, felt happy to receive a horoscope of a girl named Brinda, especially because her father was the owner of a tea estate in Mempi Hills. It may be noted that the astrologer who was called to study the horoscopes was snubbed when he showed impatience by Margayya with, “Hey, Pundit, can’t you remain at peace with yourself for a moment?” If one plainly reads Margayya’s arrogance in slighting the astrologer, one also reads the psychology of the puffed up Lord of the Uncounted Lakhs: “It seemed necessary as a first step to dictate to the planets what they should do. Margayya had made up his mind that he was going to take no nonsense from the planets, and that he was going to tell them how to dispose their position in order to meet his requirement”. It seemed logical that when the astrologer declared the impossibility of the march, he was unceremoniously disposed of with a single
rupee. In another case, Dr. Pal proved helpful as he “helped Margayya to find a different astrologer who re-arranged the stars of Balu to suit the circumstances”.

It was purely his business instinct that propelled him to use the unprecedented opportunity, created by the war, to amass fortune. He enticed the black-marketers and greedy business sharks, offering them highest rate of interest to invest their money in his scheme. In a story span of time Margayya’s success rose to its zenith. Ironically, however, the meteoric rise of misfortune turned into the meteoric fall as well. Ironically again, the fall of the money-wizard, in a way, seems to have been hastened by his son, Balu. It was the son who shocked the father by asking his share in the property and again because of him Margayya beat Dr. Pal with his chappal, and ultimately felt obliged to declare insolvency as the depositors proved a virtual threat (demanding their deposits back, thanks to Dr. Pal’s doing) to his life and property. What is, however, significant is the ironic realization of the insolvency, spelling Margayya’s total fall, underlining oddity in life. The narrator notes: “Margayya’s could sit up no longer. He just flung himself down on the floor beside the window. No air could come in. There were terrifying faces all around and the babble of voices, and over it all came the cry of an ice cream pedlar: ice cream. Ice-Cream for thirst! As his bell tinkled.”

In the final analysis, Margayya’s fall and consequently his willingness to return to the old banyan tree have symbolic implications. If the fall, as suggested earlier, symbolizes the universally acknowledged principle in the Sanskrit Shloka
quoted earlier in the chapter, it equally runs on parallel lines of the story of Icarus. The fall, in fact, resembles the fall of Midas wonderfully. If in the end Midas found it impossible to eat the food (turned gold), Margayya, too, lost his appetite for food. Further, if the fall may be taken as the toll consequent upon Margayya’s slighting of Saraswati (as a rival to Laxmi), it may equally be taken as the consequence of Margayya’s total disregard of his wife, who in the Indian tradition is regarded as the Laxmi in the household. The protagonist’s honest inclination to return to the folds of the banyan tree and especially his genuine desire to be in the company of his grandchild — “Now get the youngster here. I will play with him. Life has been too dull without him in this house” — symbolizes the return of the native.

Margayya’s rebellion may be considered as the symbolic realization of the reiterative theme of the Malgudi novels: illusion versus reality. Taken in this sense the theme has four deciding agents: Dr. Pal, Balu, the rustics, and the banyan tree. Dr. Pal catapults Margayya from the position of almost nobody to the grand status of everybody, as it were. In fact, he is responsible for Margayya’s overall rise and fall. Narayan casts him as a caricature and he seems to have a symbolic rather than physical existence in The Financial Expert. In the final analysis he may be considered as Margayya’s sense of value and ironic nature of life.

Balu’s entire role may be taken as a symbolic projection his own playing with the fire of lust, it equally projects Margayya’s playing with the fire of money.
If Balu’s throwing of the account book into the gutter and tearing off the board record symbolize his disregard for the Goddess Saraswati, it equally projects Margayya’s wealth-drunk consciousness slighting the image of Saraswati. Balu’s running away to Madras and his supposed death may project Margayya’s running away from the family ties and sanity to the abnormal and fantastic world of fortune, and the loss of his good self. Balu’s disregard of Brinda and his involvement with women of easy virtue may project Margayya’s own disregard of his wife and his indulgence in the excessive greed of wealth. And finally, Balu’s return to the world of sanity and normalcy symbolized in the banyan tree and the rustics.

As for the rustics, besides taking as Margayya’s bread giver, they symbolize the normal and sane life of Margayya. They may also represent the life ‘freed from distracting illusions and hysterics.’ One cannot think of the rustics without the banyan tree symbolizing the cultural ethos. But more importantly, the banyan tree symbolizes the basically protective and forgiving ‘spirit of the place’ and may be compared to the spirit of the place symbolized in Hardy’s Egdon Heath, depicted in The Return of the Native. Hardy’s Egdon Heath symbolized the primitively formidable and elemental force which does not seem to hesitate to take the life of the individual not conforming to its spirit: Eustacia Wye, for instance, pays a heavy penalty-death.
In the final analysis Margayya as a character may not show any perceptible change in his outlook. Says Parameswaran: “he remains an unrepentant rogue, who, given his life to live over again, would follow the same course except for attacking Pal”\(^1\). One may, however, read a subtle growth in his consciousness suggested in his return. The typology suggests that once again Narayan seems to have used rebellion as deviation to underline the notion of withdrawal and acceptance as the desirable things in human life.

**Waiting for the Mahatma** has met the most unfavourable critical appraisal. The failure of the novel is mainly attributed to Narayan’s mishandling of the political novel. M.K.Naik, for instance, thinks that Narayan fails in his experiment with the political novel primarily because “his treatment of political theme is superficial, sketchy and uninformed by a meaningful vision”\(^2\). Another reason attributed to the failure of the novel is that it fails to capture the spirit of the Mahatma. C.D.Narasimhaiah, for instance, thinks that the novel “has not enlarged our awareness of Gandhi or his era one bit”\(^3\). Against their views Narayan’s own declaration that he never meant Waiting for the Mahatma “to be political chronicle” and that he wrote it because of the great personality sounds interesting. Apart from these views, the fact remains that as the novel is realized through the national movement spearheaded by Mahatma Gandhi, one can hardly exaggerate its importance; nor can one forget that the characters in the novel are delineated against the background of the movement.
Sriram, the typical middle-class hero of *Waiting for the Mahatma* presents yet another and characteristic specimen of rebellion. Of all the Narayan heroes he remains the dullest and the palest type and he is realized as an idiotic sort of rebel. In fact Sriram does not seem to be the stuff the rebels are made of. He has been vegetating till he reaches twenty. And all these twenty years he has been “comfortably reclining on the cold cement window-still, and watching the street...... morning to night”\(^6^4\). The day he completes twenty, he realizes that he has become the sole inheritor of an enormous amount: “Thirty-eight thousand, five hundred rupees, seven annas, and six pies”\(^6^5\). If the freedom to spend or squander the money comes, the basic intelligence to go about it doesn’t. And the bewildered lad, not knowing how to spend the money, ultimately buys a folding arm-chair for his granny. (The possibility of the indulgent mind behind it may not be altogether ruled out.) It is essential to bear in mind this pre-Bharati period in Sriram’s life because the nature of his rebellion is projected mainly through it.

And then Bharati comes, and along with her comes the sense (however mild) of restlessness in the youth. It is interesting to note that as Sriram encounters the pretty girl he almost repeats Chandran’s reaction at the first sight of Malathi in (TBA): “He wanted to ask, ‘How old are you?’ What cast are you? Where is your horoscope? Are you free to marry me?”\(^6^6\) It is obvious that the impulse to love always accompanies the honourable intention of marriage, and
along with the marriage there comes the thought of the horoscope, the most deciding factor in the Indian context.

Sriram's first encounter with Mahatma Gandhi underlines his absolute mediocrity and his lack of basic knowledge about Gandhi, not to speak of Gandhism. And, although the novelist says: "Sriram suddenly came out of an age-old somnolence, and work to the fact that Malgudi was about to have the honour of receiving Mahatma Gandhi", the commonplace youth does not measure up to the one thrillingly and impatiently awaiting the arrival of the Mahatma. On the other hand, feeling thirsty and unable to get the tantalizing piece of cucumber, Sriram thinks, "Waiting for the Mahatma makes one thirsty". It is tempting to compare Murthy's enthralling experience of the first vision of the Mahatma, in Raja Rao's Kanthapura: "And he sat beside the platform, his head in his hands, and tears came to his eyes, and he wept softly, and with weeping came peace. He stood up, and he saw there, by the legs of the chair, the sandal and the foot of the Mahatma, and he said to himself, 'That is my place'."

One also recalls the characteristically childish reply Sriram gives when the Mahatma asks him: "What exactly do you want to do?" he is heard saying: "I like to be where Bharati is". When it becomes clear to him that unless he joined Bapu's encourage, he would never be able to be with Bharati, Sriram decides to leave his granny. He, however, couldn't take her permission, despite Gandhi's insistence, because the old woman had shockingly anti-Gandhi views: "For her the
Mahatma was one who preached dangerously, who tried to bring untouchables into the temples, and who involved people in difficulty with the police”.

In leaving granny to join Bharati Sriram plays the first role of a rebel. His rebellion underlines two things. One, despite the sacrificial love and upbringing of the granny, the love-lorn moth charmed by the flame called Bharati, forsakes the old lady. Two, he longs to be with Bharati and succeeds in doing so under the cover of patriotism. Ironically, what he failed to realize was that by leaving granny without her permission, he was in fact breaking the first Gandhian principle of Truth.

Sriram’s involvement in the Quit India movement is in fact a series of his idiotic actions and responses to the national struggle, and the comprehension of the Gandhian principle was something far beyond his reach. One recalls his idiocy in his musing over the tail of the letter “Q” as the Britishers’ evil intention of wasting the national wealth (paint,) when he was writing the Quit India notices. And when the teacher in the village, disliking Sriram admonishes him with: “Be careful, you will be beheaded when Britain leaves India. We have a list of everybody who has to be beheaded”. An absolute travesty of the Quit India movement. Sriram’s concealed threat to Mathieson, “if the Indians decide to throw you out, it may not be safe for you” rings false. And his prostrating in front of a shopkeeper for keeping foreign biscuits, and his requesting everyone to
abstain buying from the treacherer’s shop, vividly comments on Sriram’s childish view of swadeshi and satyagraha.

It may, thus, be noted that in every act of Sriram, done under the misconception of the Gandhian principle, the simpleton was in fact doing exactly the opposite of the Mahatma’s teaching. If Bharati, as the true disciple of the Mahatma, practiced the principle of self-control admirably, Sriram found it excruciatingly painful to control his desire. And when the opportunity came, he “suddenly threw himself on her... held her in an iron embrace in his madness”\(^7\). Although as one take into account Sriram’s enforced celibacy, Bharati’s youthful and loving presence and the absolutely lonely place, the youth’s act may be interpreted as natural, yet the fact remains that the Gandhian disciple was trespassing the teachings of abstinence from passion and disregarding brahmacharya.

But the most fantastic is Sriram’s role as the “patriot” Jagadish’s associate. As he merrily indulged in derailing the trains and setting fire to the government buildings, Sriram was oblivious of the fact that he was in fact involved in violence and thus exemplified his ignorance of Gandhian non-violence. And his writing of the unheard speech of Subhash Chandra Bose\(^7\) is the height of his idiocy.

Characteristic is Sriram’s behaviour as he watches the dead body of his granny. He neither strikes as a guilty person nor as a grieved grandson; instead he feels uncontrollably hungry and feeds himself at Kanni’s shop, leaving the dead to
the vigilance of the sleeping women. Ironically enough, one is reminded of Camu’s rebel under a similar situation. Needless to say Sriram is a far cry from Meursault.

In the final analysis, Narayan’s portrait of Sriram remains two-dimensional and without colour. Just before the end of the novel, Bharati, sensing the mad rush of his passion remarks, “You have not changed at all.” The critics may happily endorse her view of Sriram. In fact he remains the most cardish and dwarfish of all the Narayan heroes. His role may be interpreted ironically or parabolically. Thus, taken ironically he exemplifies the pseudo and misconceived attitude to Gandhism, but taken parabolically he may be realized as the wayward child obtaining a reward, having passed the test.

Bharati is a sprightly portraiture of the ideal womanhood. In her, one finds a rare specimen of a rebel. She also exemplifies a unique compound of free will and obedience. If her childish lover remains undeveloped even on the last page, Bharati seems to attain as all-sided development. To underline the nature of her characteristic rebellion is to see her as she is realized through different roles.

At the outset her name (given by Gandhi) symbolizes the ideal woman Mahatma Gandhi conceived. She seems to have inherited the sense of patriotism from her father. Her first appearance, although seen through the lover’s eyes, underlines India’s new woman grown completely on the native ideals. As for her role as Babu’s true disciple, she imbibes all the Gandhian principles. In fact she
symbolizes Gandhi’s concept of a bramacharini and feels herself committed to precious than-one’s-life principle—woman’s honour. She proudly remembers Gandhi as “he advised some woman in a village that they should sooner take their lives with their own hands than surrender their honour”.

Bharati as a woman of natural aspirations too stands convincingly and is realized as the common human being underlining desire and dreaming one’s household. The feminine principle in her seems eager to be realized through the mate’s love and desire. It is with the extremely light touch that the novelist reveals or rather conceals the throbbing heart of the maiden. She shows her desire to be in Sriram’s company, her inclination for his native but passionate heart, her preference for him as (future) husband, through a number of ways. She lets the lover stay with her whenever it is possible, shows eagerness to take him under Babu’s fold, visits the far off and lonely place for his sake, understands his mad passion, anxiously receives him at the Delhi railway station and feels excited to take him to Bapu for their marriage permission.

Critics find it difficult to reconcile with the fact that Bharati not only consented to be Sriram’s wife but also encouraged him to woo her. The ‘Malgudi Portia’, with her dynamic, sprightly and vicarious nature seems to have accepted the dwarfish, dullish and even moronic Sriram. To the confused reader M.K. Naik offers a plausible explanation: “Perhaps Freudianism can alone explain why the intelligent, able and domineering Bharati... should at all feel drawn to this totally
unheroic hero". Besides Freudianism, one may suggest that Bharati basically seems to have fallen for Sriram's utter devotion to her. It is in the context of her determination to marry Sriram that she symbolizes the traditionally conceived resurrecting principle in woman. Hopefully, she may improve her man.

Although the typology deals mainly with Sriram's rebellion, it may be noted that it is through Bharati that Sriram plays the rebel, however half-hearted it may be. In fact, Bharati may also be conceived as a typical rebel, although she imbibes the principle of acceptance. Her rebellion may mainly be seen in her keeping herself against the world of desire. She also selects her man, though not without the Mahatma's consent. Her dedicating and sacrificial life may also be conceived as her self-made world as against the ordinary woman's role. In the final analysis, since she is realized mostly through telling (as against showing) as a character, she may not be called round, but has all the potentialities to accomplish roundness.

The Guide may indeed be regarded as a remarkable achievement of Narayan, excelling in the delineation of character, the construction of the plot, the setting, in fact, every branch of the novel. The flashback technique and the swinging of the past and the present afford the novelist to present two levels of consciousness. The ambivalent nature of the novel lends to several thematic interpretations like illusion versus reality, crime and punishment, the ensainted sinner et al. Read with apparent meaning The Guide may be taken as Narayan's
ironic presentation of the triangular love story. If the predominant element of adulterous love in the novel shows its close kinship with its Western counterpart, the love story is primarily realized through the Indian ethos, focusing particularly on the Indian psyche.

As for the theme of rebellion in *The Guide*, the triangular love becomes the fountainhead to realize it. Significantly, the love story itself remains the most complex one in the entire corpus of Narayan’s novels. The complexity of the love story lies basically in the fact that the individual lines of the triangle have the strength and the characteristically assertive nature to run and have an independent course of action. On the second stage of realization, as if propelled by some gravitational force, the lines find themselves drawn to each other, they cross each other, entangle to each other and form a pattern, a triangle. On the third and final stage, the lines, after temporarily forming the triangle, find themselves violently disentangling from each other and running their independent existence. The love story has Raju the lover, Rosie the beloved and Marco the husband.

Raju is the protagonist in the sense Harvey uses the term. He, as the central consciousness of the novel, is mainly realized through his title role. The entire story of Raju’s rebellion may be read as “the later Raju Sober sees the earlier Raju Drunk”¹. Raju’s rebellion here may be properly realized from the period he became the tourist guide or Railway Raju as he loved to be called. It may be pointed out that dealing with Raju’s rebellion it may be essential to
underline the other people involved directly or indirectly, with Raju. They are, beside the most obvious accomplice Rosie, Marco the cuckold, Raju’s mother and Gaffur the taxi-driver playing Raju’s alter-ego.

The first act of Raju’s rebellion begins at the Malgudi railway station. Significantly, the train, symbolizing the temptation, brings Rosie to Malgudi, to Raju. Although Raju’s first reaction as he beholds the divine beauty is that of a young romantic, it is decidedly different from Chandran’s (The Bachelor of Arts) who regards it unethical to think about a married woman. Raju, fully aware of the fact that the charmer happens to be a Mrs. Marco, doesn’t, even subconsciously, feel bad to regard Rosie as his lady-love. At his first encounter with Rosie, Raju goes poetic and slender one, beautifully fashioned, eyes that sparkled, a complexion, not white, but dusky, which made her only half visible as if you saw her through a film of tender coconut juice”. This possibly prompts Iyengar to regard Raju as the “romantic doubled with the rascal”. Significantly, as Raju discards his old khaki bush-coat and dhoti and puts on a silk jibba and lace dhoti, he seems to be playing a new role of a lover given by Rosie. The act is well in keeping with Raju’s nature. He seems to be destined to play the roles other people want him to play. Says Walsh: “It is Raju’s fate to be the projection of other people’s convictions”.

Raju is well aware of his water diviner’s instinct as he, in his very first encounter with the odd couple, judges that they hardly seemed made for each
other. Having already fallen for the divine creature who wanted to see the king cobra, Raju instinctively disliked the husband who said to his wife, "Don't expect me to go with you, I can't stand the sight of a snake. Your interests are morbid". It may also be noted that Raju shows his willingness to fulfil Rosie's wish not because she happened to be his lady-love but basically because of his nature. He explains: "I never said, 'I don't know.' Not in my nature, I suppose. If I had inclination to say 'I don't know what you are talking about,' my life would have taken a different turn". Thus, the rebel, fully gauging the nature of disharmony between Rosie and Marco realizes that while the instinctively vivacious and exuberantly youthful woman has neither attained the fulfilment as a woman nor has she been able to pursue her traditionally imbibed art, the classical dance, thanks to Marco who, as a husband was perhaps helpless to fulfil his basic duty and as a morbid scholar disregarded her dance as 'street acrobatics.' Raju immediately starts playing the double role: a symbolizing lover and a genuine appreciator of her dance. Following his habit of getting involved in other people's affairs, Raju fully exploits his inherent art of the gab (like Margayya) as he says to Rosie: "Don't you know my voice? Didn't I come with you yesterday to that cobra-man? All night I did not sleep... the way you danced, your form and figure haunted me all night".

In fairness to the opportunist Raju, whom Balaram Gupta views as a "Sinner, is a sinner", it may be said if he appears to be an artful seducer, Rosie,
on her part wasn’t an unwilling partner either. Undeniably Raju comes to her as a harbinger of new hope, in fact as a new lease of life, and Rosie feels a tremendous sense of gratitude for him.

Having such a deep sense of gratitude for Raju, Rosie also finds in him an intimate friend and a confident. And, as Marco gets mercifully engrossed in his obsessive research far away in the cave, taking Rosie’s faithfulness and Raju’s trust for granted, the forbidden fruit appeared too enticing and too irresistible to the lovers. In his characteristically suggestive way Narayan describes the fall.

Raju says:

At the door of No.28 I hesitated. She opened the door, passed in and hesitated leaving the door half open... “shall I go away?” I asked in a whisper. “Yes. Good-night,” she said feebly. “May I not come in?” I asked trying to look my saddest. “No, no. Go away,” she said. But on an impulse I gently pushed her out of the way, and stepped in and locked the door on the world.

At the outset, the fall underlies Raju's total disregard of the socio-cultural morality. The fact that Rosie too played an accomplice hardly condones the gravity of Raju's disobedience of the Holy Commandment: Thou Shalt Not Commit Adultery. It may also be stated that, perhaps, Freudian interpretation of adultery may describe it as a natural reaction from Rosie’s point of view (suppression of desire), but the fact remains that Raju betrays Marco’s trust and condemns the innocent man to the life of humiliation.
Raju, infatuated by Rosie, could hardly ponder over his mother's comment on her as 'a snake-woman,' and 'a bad sort.' It may be viewed that in disregarding her advice, Raju was in fact disrespecting the sacredly followed morality symbolized by his mother. Raju's rejection of the alter-ego Gaffur's warning, "she is a married woman, remember", may be interpreted as his rejection of the social codes and the sanctity of the family institution. Finally, Raju also seems to stifle the voice of his conscience as it advises the deviant: "A part of my mind went on saying, 'No, no, it is not right, Marco is her husband, remember". Thus, Narayan projects Raju's act through multiple consciousness.

In a way Raju's other rebellions seem to be emerging from his cardinal sin-adultery—he committed. It may be noted that Raju would have indulged in the sinful act had he not been forced to stop it. When Marco accidentally realized his wife's unforgivable crime, he, though shocked beyond words, simply abandoned the adulterous woman to her fate and left the town alone. As for Raju, Marco, though disgusted with him, in keeping with his dignified posture simply but curtly said to him: "Let us be done with everything and then you felt out of my sight". Raju's allowing a married woman to stay with him and caring two hoots for the public opinion may be regarded as his second rebellion.

As Raju, in a way, continues to flout the norms of the sacrosanct tradition, Narayan once again offers a multiple view—a sort of Vox Populi—to underline the socio-cultural implications of Raju's rebellion. Gaffur, playing Raju's conscience
keeper, once again advises Raju: “send her away and try to get back to ordinary, real life. Don’t talk all this art business. It is not for us”. Gaffur seems to telescope the essentially ordinary nature of the Malgudi milieu. It is here that A.N.Kaul’s observation appears most appropriate. Pointing out that revolt, art and love are the three sources of temptation he says: “The idea of life in Malgudi novels is reduced not just to this [middle-class] man’s life, but further, his ordinary life, which alone seems to constitute reality, all the rest being illusion or aberration.

Narayan also offers a common man’s view regarding Raju’s aberration in the form of the railway porter. When Raju slaps the porter’s son, suspecting him to have ruined his business at the railway shop, the porter taunts: “It is not he who has ruined you, but the saithan inside”. One also recalls Raju’s mother using the term ‘she devil’ and her brother ‘wench’ referring to the sinner Rosie. And, finally, it is Raju’s mother again who, realizing that her deviant son would not forsake Rosie and see reason, leaves for her ancestral home with her brother. Significantly, having no name, she symbolizes (besides the traditional morality) the idea image of a mother. Her parting words to the deviating son were, “Don’t fail to light the lamp in the God’s niche... Be careful with your health”.

In the third and final act of his rebellion, Raju plays multiple rebels. At the outset Raju and Rosie “were a married couple to all appearances” but, true to his word, he also helps her pursue the Bharat Natyam. One may read his devotion to
her art as he says: "I could honestly declare that while I watched her perform, my mind was free, for once, from all carnal thoughts; I viewed her as a pure abstraction." Once he knew that Rosie could present a grand performance, he changed her name and she was given a new one: Nalini. If he felt thrilled to see his beloved soaring higher in her art, Rosie graciously acknowledged his contribution to the realization of her dream. She said, "Even if I have seven births I won't be able to repay my debt to you." But with the unprecedented success came money and fame and Raju, playing the prestigious role of the star’s impresario, changed beyond recognition. Soon the egoist, already swelled with pride, he grew uneasy and became jealous of her companions. And the arrival of Marco’s book worsened his state of mind. He became extremely restive to witness Nalini’s change of attitude towards Marco and despite his love for her he started behaving callously with her. It was in such a restless state of mind that Raju received the letter from the Madras lawyer requesting Rosie’s signature for the release of the jewellery box and Raju, unable to fathom Marco’s intention, and also fearing that the repentant Rosie may rush back to him, commits forgery, not realizing, perhaps, the serious nature of the crime.

In this crucial rebellion, too, Narayan underlines multiple reactions. As for Raju’s motive, although he did have the monetary consideration to square up the income tax, he basically wanted to keep his beloved away from the villain Marco. Rosie, though shocked to realize the gravity of the crime, contrary to Raju’s
anticipation that she would break down, reacted like a typically traditional woman:

"I felt all along that you were not doing right things. This is Karma, what can we do?" Obviously, she regarded him as an epitome of hedonism and lost trust in him. Raju's mother viewed it as a shameful act and the spirited lady told the son that she would have preferred to see him dead rather than committing the crime. And most important is the reaction of Raju sobers who charged the forger with the "lack of ordinary character".

In the final analysis, it may be pointed out that Raju's rebellion, mostly as moral deviation, has been dealt with ironic overtones. The irony in The Guide has been realized on multiple levels. The basic purpose of its employment, however, seems to be to underline life's inherent inconsistencies and paradoxes. One recalls Raju's reaction on Mani's help to Rosie after the forgery episode. He says: "I felt like telling Mani, Be careful, she'll lead you on before you know where you are, and then you'll find yourself in my shoes... Beware of the snake woman". And as Raju goes to jail the underlying message of deviation seems to be clear.

Rosie occupies perhaps the most unique position among Narayan's women. In her, one notes a remarkable blending of tradition and modernity. It is the combination of the two attitudes that enables her to naturally display the caged existence of Savitri (TDR) and the liberal spirit of Daisy (TPS). Interestingly, Rosie plays the characteristic role of linking and delinking herself with the other two men in the contest of the triangular development in the novel. Although
Marco virtually treats her as a 'Second Sex' and Raju betrays her trust in him.
Rosie, in the final analysis, seems to be rising from the ashes of betrayal and soaring in her achievement like a phoenix. Of the three major characters in *The Guide*, Rosie remains the tallest one. Although she determinedly fights against the slavish tradition, she cannot totally liberate herself, and in the final analysis, remains essentially Indian.

As one considers Rosie's rebellion, Narayan's ironic intention becomes clear in giving her a characteristically symbolic name. Like the rose, her life remains surrounded by the thorns. Her first assertiveness is grandly exemplified as she breaks the fetters of darkness of the devadasi clan and leaps towards the light of learning, obtaining an M.A. in Economics. Using her degree as the window on the world, Rosie takes one more off-beat step in her ascent responding to the rich bachelor of academic interest, and marries Marco. In marrying Marco, particularly through the matrimonial advertisement, Rosie seems to have scored not only over her devadasi sisters but also over all the Malgudi women. The caged bird shook her wings and flew in one sweep to Marco's nest. The marriage symbolizes Rosie's adventurous spirit and her aspirations for the freedom of the outer world.

Rosie's most defiant act, coming a few years after her marriage, constitutes the most crucial stage of her life-she commits adultery. It may be essential to understand the nature of her marital relationship with Marco, which seems to have
been the propelling force behind her scandalous affair with Raju and, by implication, decidedly moral deviation.

At the outset Marco and Rosie exemplify the oddest couple yoked together unnaturally, having nothing in common which they may share together. Narayan strategically underlines their diagonally opposite ‘appearances’ noted by Balarama Gupta thus: “Rosie with her bright hued and gold laced sari diamond earrings and gold necklace, and with her curly hair braided and deflowered, is a contrast to Marco with his coloured glasses, thick jacket, and a thick helmet”\textsuperscript{104}. Further, they were poles apart in terms of their nature, attitudes, and interests. Thus, if Rosie was vivacious, sprightly and passionate, Marco remained cold, grim and unemotional. Raju describes them against the beautifully natural surroundings of the pack House. He says: “The girl was in ecstasy.... She ran like a child from plant to plant with cries of joy, while the man looked on with on emotion”\textsuperscript{105}. Rosie loved the company of people and was destined to play her role in the open world. Marco deemed to have forgotten the human world and seemed to have fated to flourish in his solitude. Significantly, their life – long interest too were divergent in his nature. If Rosie’s art involved the pulsating human body, Marco’s research was confined to stone – walls and stone figures. And to top it all, their attitude to each other’s interests was characteristically critical: Marco regarded Rosie’s dancing as street – acrobatics\textsuperscript{106} and she thought of his archaeological research as the “ruin collecting activity”\textsuperscript{107}.\textsuperscript{152}
The irony of ironies was that such individuals were destined to be married. Obviously, theirs was the marriage of convenience. Rosie wanted to get away from the dark and marshy background of her family and Marco wanted it as a status symbol. Balarama Gupta comments: “Far from being a minglement of hearts (Thomas Moore), it is not a blessing but a curse where hands alone consent, and hearts abhor. (Byron)” One may further say that even their hands didn’t consent. As Rosie suggestively says: “I’d have preferred any kind of marriage proved utter failure because, Macro, engrossed in his research, remained totally blind to the reality that Rosie might have physical and emotional yearnings. One could see their marriage poised on the rocks beneath which the volcano, though silent for the moment, was very much alive.

And then Raju came and he brought with him the promise of spring for the inherently rebellious Rosie. Raju became her friend, philosopher and guide. When she realized that he was inviting her to go to the land of her dreams, her individualistic spirit stirred with excitement. She also realized that the man who instantly became her emotional anchor, was also capable of fulfilling her creative and physical cravings, and she revolted: “And no wonder we witness the awful daring of a moment’s surrender to the weakness of the flesh”.

Narayan focuses on Rosie’s infidelity as the emotional outburst of the suppressed women who was basically nurtured in the cultural ethos. Therefore, Rosie could never feel herself free from the haunting thought that she had
trespassed the sacred codes of conduct and committed the sin as a Hindu wife. As a guilt-ridden woman she showed excessive consideration to Marco, so much so that, Raju says: "In the midst of my caress she would suddenly free herself and say, "Tell Gaffur do bring the car. I want to go and see him". More often she would just keep brooding and say: "After all, he is my husband. I have to respect him. I cannot leave him there". Significantly, when she felt that the husband showed some signs of cordiality towards her, she even thought of abandoning her plans of pursuing her ambition for his sake. And, after the discovery when Marco denounced her and walked away, Rosie, haunted by the look and shock in her husband's face, followed him to his cave and said: "I have come to apologize sincerely, I want to say I will do whatever you ask me to do. I committed a blunder". All along she was painfully aware of the enormity of her sin.

Significantly, Rosie could not get away from her guilt even much after Marco's exit from her life. Although her inherently aspiring spirit continued to feel restless till she found herself touching the sky as the national artist, confronting with the nauseatingly commercialized attitude of her impresario, she lost all the thrill of her act. Ironically enough she even quoted Marco to show her disgust: I feel like one of those parrots in cage taken around village-fairs, or a performing monkey, as he used to say. And when she read about Marco's achievement, once again the latent thought of her infidelity revived and she said: "I deserved nothing less. Any other husband would have throttled me then and
there. He tolerated my company for nearly a month, even after knowing what I had done". Although, as a stunned and dazed woman she expressed her reaction to Raju’s forgery as a typically Karma conscious woman, her reaction to Raju sounded almost like Marco’s as she said: “If I have to pawn my last possession, I’ll do it to save you from jail. But one it is over, leave me once for all”.

In the final analysis, though abandoned by Marco and betrayed by Raju, she stands steadfast and dignified and does her dharma. The man who gave her a new lease of life, Rosie tried to save him by paying the Star Lawyer’s exorbitant fees and to show a sense of gratefulness to Marco for taking her out of darkness, Rosie takes his book with her when she leaves Malgudi. Curiously, she too, like Savitri (TDR), may be regarded as the victim of man’s world. First her unknown sire, then Marco and finally Raju—all of them played the game of betrayal to her. And yet, with her aspiring spirit, she could manage to find her own way with a sense of pride and dignity.

Thus, The Guide may be regarded as a characteristic study of rebellion. If Raju’s rebellion underlines the moral and social deviation in a traditionally realized milieu and a kind of nemesis the rebel meets, Rosie, as a rebel, reflects the complex blending of tradition and modernity. She seems to be reiterating Camus’s view of the Indian’s inability to play the full rebel due to the mythic influences.
The Man-Eater of Malgudi is based on the mythological tale of Bhasmasura-Mohini. It may be possible to perceive almost every Narayan novel with a mythological soul. (Murti) The Man-Eater of Malgudi, however, stands apart because it seems to be the only novel in which Narayan has consciously employed the mythological theme in the modern context. The novelist himself tells about it:

At some point in one’s writing career, one takes a fresh look at the so-called myths and legends and finds a new meaning in them... Some years ago, I suddenly came upon a theme which struck me as an excellent piece, of mythology in modern dress. It was published under the title, The Man-Eater of Malgudi...I based this on a well-known mythological episode, the story of Mohini and Bhas-masura.116

Read thus, The Man-Eater of Malgudi, according to Naik, seems to deal with the “fundamental questions about good and evil and their roles in human life”117. But, despite its allegorical nature, the novel does not appear a parabolical novel as such. The saving grace comes, as such. The saving grace comes, as always, in the form of Narayan’s bifocal vision of comic irony.

As one considers The Man-Eater of Malgudi under the typology of rebellion, one notes that the novel presents yet another face of rebellion, in the form of Vasu. One may suggest that since Vasu is realized as the metaphor of Evil, he may be regarded as Narayan’s last word in the delineation of the rebellious characters. In keeping with the general belief that the Evil appears in
many faces Vasu’s rebellion too may be viewed through different stages of its realization.

Vasu’s first appearance as a rakshasa seems to be making a strikingly ominous note in the context of the decidedly sacrosanct Malgudi society. Narayan stresses Vasu’s unholy rebellion as he storms like a tempest and unceremoniously trespasses on the sanctity of Nataraj’s Truth Printing Press. To Nataraj, Vasu appeared as “a tanned face, large powerful eyes under thick eye-brows, a large forehead and a shock of unkempt hair, like a black halo”\(^{118}\). And before Nataraj could fully size him up, Vasu came forward, “practically tearing aside the curtain, an act which violated the sacred traditions”\(^{119}\) of his press and introduced him as a taxidermist.

Nataraj, the naive altruist and god-fearing printer becomes the first victim of Vasu’s rebellion. Entering into the attic Nataraj’s press, as an excuse to casually inspect it, the cunning ruffian virtually occupies it before the printer could collect his wits. He occupies the attic as a birth right, deeming it unnecessary to express his gratefulness to the owner and to pay the rent. Viewed symbolically, the evil spirit seems to have occupied and violated the peaceful and sanctimonious mind of Nataraj.

Once Vasu gets defiantly installed himself at the attic, he begins to display a series of rebellious acts. Soon enough, his ominous shadow falls on Nataraj’s essentially benevolent circle of friends: Vasu made the poor poet squirm and
ridiculed him as “a poetaster obsessed with monosyllables”\textsuperscript{120}. And although Sen, whom Vasu called local Nehru\textsuperscript{121} (obviously a dig at Sen’s perennial criticism of Nehru’s policies), refused to take things lying down, ultimately he too preferred to leave the villain to himself. As Vasu displays the unusually reserved and humiliating attitude towards Nataraj’s coterie [calling them “chair-fixers”\textsuperscript{122},] the novelist seems to underline Vasu as the enemy of the people or the misanthrope.

As the essentially soft-hearted Nataraj listens to Vasu’s horrifyingly inhuman and diabolically cruel episode of the latter’s behaviour with his guru, a pahelwan, he instinctively shudders. Vasu recoins the incident thus: “I knew his weak spot. I hit him there with the edge of my palm with a chopping movement ... and he fell down squirmed on the floor. I knew he could perform no more”\textsuperscript{123}. Vasu displays his devilish nature as he concludes the narration laughingly. Symbolically viewed, the accident underlines, in the reversal of guru-shishya tradition, Vasu’s essentially sacrilegious attitude. In Nataraj’s world the shishya pays his guru dakshina (fees), in Vasu’s the disciple hits him.

But the rebellion, which is realized for its thematic relevance and casts its ominously pervading shadow over all the creatures of Malgudi, is Vasu’s profession: taxidermy. Significantly enough Vasu has his own philosophy related to his specialized occupation. He says: “we have constantly to be rivalling Nature at her own game. Posture, look, the total personality, everything has to be created”\textsuperscript{124}. It is essential to note that if Vasu shows his determination to play a
rival to Nature his overall attitude towards tradition has an unmistakable note of sacrilege. When, for instance, Nataraj points out that the garuda Vasu killed, is regarded sacred and also is believed to be God Vishnu's messenger, Vasu retorts: "I want to try and make visnu use his feet now and them"\(^{125}\).

It may also be noted that despite the Forest Department's order to spare the rare species, Vasu, possibly palming the middle men, defiantly kills a man-eater. The irony is too obvious. Vasu as the man-eater is referred to just once in the novel. Nataraj says: "Now it was like having a middle-aged man-eater in your office and home, with same uncertainties, possibilities, and potentialities"\(^{126}\). The title of the novel unmistakably suggests Narayan's ironic intentions. Vasu, the man-eater, is realized more dangerous than the man-eater as such. And, more importantly, Vasu, as the man-eater, imbibles the evil spirit, feels exhilarated if the kill happens to be innocent or regarded holy.

Vasu's every act, every gesture, every utterance underlines his rebellion with the dark design. As he almost drags Nataraj right through his work, takes him to the Mempi village in his jeep, plays devilry with the scared pedestrians and unceremoniously leaves the printer behind to his fate, Vasu in fact underlines rebellion his views too. One discerns, how sacrilegious is Vasu's view on the marriage institution. He says: "If you like a woman, have her by all means. You don't have to own a coffee estate because you like to have a cup of coffee now and then"\(^{127}\).
Vasu, epitomizing an anti-social spirit, makes the whole press and the neighbourhoods contaminated with the foulest odour emanating from his operation. He virtually turns the attic into a living hell. Nataraj says: “Not in my wildest dream had I ever thought that my press would one day be converted into a charnel house”\textsuperscript{128}. And the irony lies in the fact that Nataraj, brought up in the ahimsa tradition, was destined to witness the himsa in every conceivable form. And to top it all, Vasu, caring two hoots for the social concern or morality, invites woman of easy virtue at night to his attic.

Neglecting several wicked acts of minor dimensions, one may consider the last rebellion of Vasu as it seems to be telescoping the essence of his evil character. The rebellious act of Vasu is dramatized in the last episode of the novel, namely, the shooting of an elephant. Vasu’s plan to kill the temple elephant, Kumar, is motivated by his commercial interests. Little does he care for the people’s religious or sentimental feelings; nor can be realized the cultural heritage expressed through the festival and the procession (carrying God’s idol) led by Kumar. For Vasu, the dead elephant is more valuable than living Kumar. He tells Nataraj: “I can make ten thousand out of the parts of this elephant”\textsuperscript{129}. But, despite his determination to kill the elephant, he fails. Fighting off the mosquitoes he kills himself.

The death of Vasu underlines several implications. Basically, taken as the mythological parallel, it may be interpreted as: “Every demon carries within him,
unknown to himself, a tiny seed of self-destruction, and goes up in thin air at the most unexpected moment". It may also be related to the popular story of the Gajendra - Moksha in Vishnupuran. The principle behind the story has the universal appeal as it underlines the common belief in the intervention of supernatural agency to demolish the killer and save the innocent (devotee). Says Edwin Gerow: "The irruption of the rakshasa can be countered by the introduction of an equally potent and inexplicable force: The divine (daiva), fate". Nataraj, as he appealed and prayed to Lord Vishnu to save Kumar, distinctly remembered the story of Gajendra-Moksha.

But apart from the mythological undertones in the novel, what keeps up the enlivening spirit of the novel is the character of the rebel filtered through the bifocal perception of Narayan's comic irony. The novel is replete with such instances. When, for instance, Nataraj asks Vasu how he can kill the tiger without permit, the latter retorts, "The tiger didn't mind the informality". Or, when the forester wants him to explain the story behind the stuffed hyena, Vasu says: "That hyena came in search of me, I shot it right where you are standing now". Vasu, the virtual threat to the wild life in Mempi Forest, requests Nataraj to print his book. He says: "I have made many important points in my book, and I want it to be ready for the conference on wild life... My book is also about better methods of preserving wild life". The irony it too obvious to need any comment.
In the final analysis Vasu may not be considered as a totally black rebel. Vasu suggests, faintly though, some touches of being human after all. Despite his antagonism with Nataraj, Vasu not only offers him a lift in his jeep as the latter gets stranded at the Mempi village, but also compels Nataraj to accompany him. Although Vasu is realized as the enemy of the people, he seems to have developed a soft spot in his heart for the temple prostitute Rangi. He also ungrudgingly expresses his admiration for and gratitude to Suleiman for teaching him the art of taxidermy. Narayan’s balanced view seems to go well, even in keeping with Vasu’s rakshasa image as such. Says Narayan, “Yesterday’s demon, perhaps, becomes tomorrow’s god, after an evolutionary or purgatorial process of change”\(^\text{135}\).

Although M. K. Naik considers that *The Vendor of Sweets* betrays Narayan’s distinct decline\(^\text{136}\), the novel seems to make a remarkable contribution to the study of rebellion in Narayan. As in the earlier novels, the rebellion in *The Vendor of Sweets* has unmistakably been realized as a clear case of cultural deviation, a moral aberration to be precise. Narayan dramatizes the rebellion in *The Vendor of Sweets* through the new generation represented by Mali, Jagan’s deviant son, and Grace, the half-Korean, half-American wife of Mali. It may also be noted that though the rebellion in *The Vendor of Sweets* seems to have been realized as a telling instance of moral degradation in Narayan’s sacrosanct traditional society, it has a pervading thematic relevance related to Jagan’s gradual
preparations for the final renunciation. It may certainly be significant to underline
the rebellion in The Vendor of Sweets through the rebellious pair of Mali and
Grace and note the implications.

Mali in (TVS), as a young hero, conceived elder than the child Balu in
(TFE), is realized as a distinct rebel. The rather spoilt motherless boy gives some
really trying moments to his father by not eating enough. Narayan underlines the
boy’s early rebellion as the collegian Mali dares the college authorities and
defiantly cuts the coupon from the library magazine under the nose of the librarian
just to “teach that librarian a lesson”\textsuperscript{137}. In fact, as has already been noted in the
typology of innocence, what begins as a causally seen defiance of Mali as he
shows his fascination for the ‘aspirins’\textsuperscript{138}, (installing his own future self), becomes
in the later life a continuous chain of defiant acts.

However, one notes the first clear and unmistakably perceptible defiance of
Mali, reminiscent of Balu’s similar defiance in The Financial Expert, in his total
lack of interest in the formal education system as he quits the college, keeping the
father in the dark. Knowing fully the sacrosanct tradition Jagan belongs to, Mali’s
act may be symbolically interpreted as his disregard for the Goddess Saraswati.

Mali’s first decisive rebellion may be seen in his well-schemed tour of
America. What may be regarded as defiance is Mali’s treating of his father almost
like a stranger and leading Malgudi (and India) much to the latter’s consternation
and grief. Mali’s trip to America seems to have a meaningful implication.
Significantly, it does not add a whit to make the reader aware of the foreign culture. His letters mostly written by Grace, give one the superficial and extremely sketchy picture of America. It is here that Narayan's intention of treating the entire American Interlude as a strategy to underline Mali's deviation as the root cause of Jagan's sanyasa become clear.

Mali's next rebellious act may again be interpreted symbolically: in America Mali takes a crash course in the art of writing a novel. The novel-writing machine may underline Narayan's subtle satire and a parody of the devastating commercialization in the field of art. The non-committal novelist, however, offers both the points of view on the business of writing. If Jagan asks, not without a note of sarcasm: "Did Valmiki go to America or Germany in order to learn to write his Ramayana?"139, much later when Mali decides to market the novel writing machine with his American collaborators he puts his own point of view in no uncertain words: "Excepting for Ramayana and Mahabharata, those old stories, there is no modern writing, whereas in America alone every publishing season ten thousand books are published"140.

As Mali returns from America, his rebellion acquires one more dimension: he brings a half-Korean, half-American wife from the States much to the stress and agony of his bewildered father. Needless to say, the orthodox Shastra abider Jagan must really have been shocked beyond words, but the Gandhian principle of tolerance seems to have made his accept Grace as his daughter-in-law.
Grace factor obviously underlines Mali’s cultural aberration it also seems to comment on the delicate and tender feeling of the old man for the daughter-in-law who wonderfully fills the lacunas left by the death of his wife years ago.

Mali’s rebellion strikes again and in fact, kills the equanimity of the Gandhian once for all, as the son reveals to his father the disastrous plan to invest a large capital of the latter with the American collaborators for the marketing of the dubious sounding novel-writing machine. Beneath the apparently bizarre idea about the machine, however, is concealed the perverse influence of the modernity. Iyengar puts it thus: “The machine that is offered as a substitute for the imagination is the last abomination of all, and terribly attractive it could be like the Toy Nightingale in Anderson’s fairy tale”141. But the dubiously conceived novel-writing machine seems to suggest a mere serious implication than the mere parody of modern art. There seems to be a subtle and suggestive comparison between Mali’s America-made novel-writing machine and Jagan’s interest in the Goddess Gayatri. It is significant to note that Jagan’s interest in the Goddess Gayatri. It is significant to machine and Jagan’s interest in the Goddess Gayatri. It is significant to note that Jagan seems ready to accept the sculptor’s proposal to buy the place and turn it into a retreat, whereby he, perhaps, would see the birth of the Goddess of Radiance. He, however, is just unwilling to accept Mali’s proposal to invest the capital to market the novel-writing machine. Putting it plainly, Jagan seems to realize the significance of the spiritual investment rather than the material one.
To worsen the matter and to add misery to the grieved Jagan, Grace, the supposed daughter-in-law, reveals to him the darkest truth. To the religious reader of the Puranas, which insist that the wife’s place is beside her husband under all circumstances, the daughter-in-law says: “But we are not married...He promised he’d marry me in the Indian way, because I like it, and brought me here”\(^{142}\). It may be noted that for the already broken moralist, the blasphemous news of their cohabitation sans marriage shocks beyond words. In fact the news seems to have proved the last straw for the religiously sensitive and pollution conscious Jagan. The fact of the sinner’s cohabitation may be regarded as the sharply and disturbingly realized vice of modernity presented against the sanctimonious world of (Jagan’s) tradition. It may also be realized that the painful awareness of the reality must certainly have advanced Jagan’s renunciation.

Mali’s last act of rebellion, a clear act of defiance, seems to have recoiled upon himself. Mali was reported to have been caught by the police for breaking the prohibition law and carrying a bottle of liquor in his car. More than the obviously realized act of Mali’s defiance, the arrest may suggest the inevitable enemies for the deviant Mali and underline Jagan’s decision to get away from the family involvements and ties.

Taken in their entirety, Mali’s acts of deviation seem to underline several significant issues in *The Vendor of Sweets*. Thus, one becomes conscious of the Karma consequence in the preordainedly designed world of Mali. Mali also seems
to exemplify and illustrate the price of temptations, particularly visualized in his cohabitation with Grace without the sanctimonious marriage. In the land of Saraswati, the Goddess of learning, Mali's novel-writing machine strikes a kind of unholy and jarring note. One also becomes aware of the fact that the sinners do not seem to be completely condemned and that they are given a chance to learn and realise. Mali’s deviation strikes trivially modem against Jagan’s sanity of sublime tradition. Unlike the television film version of the novel, Mali’s character, in The Vendor of Sweets, is mostly reported and summarized by the cousin. Only in a few scenes he is shown in confrontation with Jagan, as he plays the rebel. Mali, in the novel, remains a two dimensional portrait.

At the outset Grace is realized as the willing partner in Mali’s sin or fall. One may also note Narayan’s ironic intention of naming the disgraceful woman, Grace. Grace seems to begin as a link character between the East and the West. Ironically enough, she not only fails to bridge that gap but, in a way, helps to widen the gap between the son and the father. In the last analysis, she remains a functional character. As she plays an accomplice in Mali’s moral degradation, Grace seems to symbolize Mali’s moral and cultural fall. As regards her role as a daughter-in-law, Grace seems to evoke a thinly registered tremor of feeling (with her ‘ivory hued kneecap’ exposed to the fascination of Jagan) in the mind of the lone widower. As an individual, she seems to represent the most permissive and amoral culture of the West.
Grace seems to be the only American woman occupying a significant position in the context of Narayan's portrayal of feminine consciousness. With her permissive background she seems way shed of Rosie in (TG) and installs her obviously superior Indian counterpart Daisy in (TPS). But in the final analysis, Grace's permissiveness seems to become a veneer beneath which one may see her illustrating the law of karma realized through Mali's deception. As a character Grace remains a flat one, a mere sketch, playing a symbolic role.

In the final analysis, The Vendor of Sweets, especially in the context of the rebellion, seems to underline some significant issues: one becomes aware of Narayan's presentment of the dual perspectives, of the man-woman relationship: Jagan's traditional, and, therefore, moral and Mali's Western and amoral perspective. One also notes the unmistakable suggestion of the Karma consequence and the assertion of the tradition against the modernity.

The Painter of Signs may be considered as one of Narayan's major minor novels. One may, perhaps, agree with M.K. Naik's) view that The Painter of Signs displays tell-tale signs of the writer's ironic vision getting blurred. As regards the theme of rebellion, The Painter of Signs seems to be decidedly contributing to the over-all typological study of rebellion in Narayan's novels. Significantly, the rebellion is realized through a modern youth, all set to establish the Age of Reason, and a young lady determined to regard her duty as her only passion in life. The rebellion in The Painter of Signs is taken in the sense of
deviation though it is realized in the sense of defiance as well. The Painter of Signs introduces the family planning motif and the legend of Shantanu-Ganga in the *Mahabharata*, both of which have thematic relevance. And with the portrayal of the New Woman, the wheel, displaying the faces of Indian womanhood, turns a full circle in the Narayan novel.

At the outset, Raman, the protagonist in *The Painter of Signs*, is presented through his ordinarily realized but assertively balanced world. There seems to be three major factors decidedly responsible for the youth's balanced and rather happy state of mind: (a) His occupation: the painting of signboard keeps him reasonably busy and contented. The job has thematic relevance too. It is through the painting of signboards that he meets his lady-love. Ironically, however, Raman finds himself writing family planning messages without any interest not to speak of any conviction. (b) Raman’s ‘Boardless’ fellow lunchers: They may underline solid and matter of fact world enabling him to experience the realistic existence. The ‘Boardless’ also has thematic relevance. At the end of the novel, as Raman returns to it, the ‘Boardless’ symbolizes the sanity and solidity in life. (c) Raman’s aunt: Basically, she represents the cultural ethos and Raman’s confined world.

At the outset Raman is introduced with two characteristic notions in his character. They are his overall attitude to life, and his determination to establish the Age of Reason in the world. He declares: “I’m a rationalist, and I don’t do
anything unless I see some logic in it". Interestingly, Raman’s rebellion is realized through the topsy-turvyng of these two notions and ironically, he is caught operating the exact opposite of his cherished ideals.

Although Raman’s chance encounter with the youthful Daisy, the Family planning Officer, begins yet another love story, it is decidedly different from the earlier love stories in Malgudi novels. In the first place he falls head over heels in love with Daisy plainly as a physical attraction. Daisy on her part remains impassive, cold and an absolutely unresponsive image of sex. Ironically, Raman confesses to himself that he has become sex-obsessed with reference to Daisy and tries hopelessly to distort the beautiful image of the young lady by using cheap Hong Kong goggles. And yet the passion exuding Daisy charms him beyond measure and he goes blind to read reason and finds his emotional mercury touching the mad degree.

Raman’s first rebellion may be taken s a matter of accident. He finds himself accidentally stranded on the wayside with the most desirably company of the tempting but eluding Daisy. The cartman mistaking them for a pair of husband and wife, leaves them alone. The cool air, the starry night and the desire incarnate Daisy beside him propel the passionate lover with the fantasizing notions of seduction: “he debated within himself whether to dash up, seize her, and behave like Rudolph Valentine in The Sheik... Woman liked an aggressive lover so said the novelist” . On an impulse Raman plunges into the cart expecting Daisy there.
But, sensing the blind lover's mad act, Daisy thwarts his intention by leaving the cart and climbing the tamarind tree.

Raman's rebellion may be taken as a clear deviation from the codes underlying the religious and social norms. Significantly, Daisy, who escaped from the prowling tiger by climbing the tamarind tree, quotes the proverb: "When you are married to the devil, you must be prepared to climb the tamarind tree". Viewed symbolically, the fall seems to have been averted because the tamarind tree has played the protective spirit. One may also discern irony beneath the event: Daisy, who keeps herself away from Raman, was in fact destined to remain away from him forever.

The fall in *The Painter of Signs*, marking Raman's second rebellion, may recall the fall in *The Guide*. One may obviously note that Narayan's New Woman seems to have left her counterpart Rosie in (TG) wayout, especially as regards her attitude to sex. As the seducer expresses his desire in no uncertain gestures, Daisy says: "If you must stay, please bring your bicycle in. I don't want it to be seen on my veranda at this hour". As Raman and Daisy succumb to the temptation of the flesh, it is possible to imagine the sense of horror and shame felt by the spirit of place. Malgudi has the essentially traditional society. Say A.N.Kaul: "Romantic or passionate love has no place in it. Any deviation from it, and impulse or act that denies its centrality is a prime aberration in Narayan. This is especially true of women".
Raman’s next rebellion involves his own aunt symbolizing traditional morality. The traditionally nurtured Hindu old lady could never reconcile to the idea of having a daughter-in-law with a Christian name. As Raman shows his determination to bring the bride home the aunt leaves for Benares as a pilgrim. Raman’s deviation may be seen in his disowning the tradition and asserting his permissive attitude. As Raman’s aunt leaves for Benares, one may recall Sriram’s granny (WTM) also leaving for Benares. Raju’s mother (TG) for her ancestral place, and Jagan (TVS) for the forest retreat under similar situation. One may discern the novelist’s implicit suggestion of the deep influence of the cultural tradition.

Raman’s last rebellion may also be conceived symbolically. In a thrilling anticipation of the bird’s arrival, Raman clears out all the family gods and locks them up in a cupboard to make more room for Daisy. The Gods seem to have taken their revenge, obviously for the deviant’s ill-treatment: Daisy never come to Raman’s house. The clearance has proved useless.

Narayan’s New Woman, Daisy, underlines a distinct rebellion, realized in the dense of deviation. One may certainly read Narayan’s symbolic intention in naming his heroine Daisy, decidedly a foreign (and by implication unMalgudian) name. Significantly, the traditionally conceived names like Ambika (TVS), Meenakshi (TFE), Susila (TET) and Malathi (TBA) signify the quiet and balanced
life mostly ‘freed from distorting illusions and hysterics.’ Names like Rosie (TG), Grace (TVS) and Daisy (TPS) seem to suggest moral deviation.

The nature of Daisy’s rebellion is different from that of Raman’s, realized from her childhood itself. The girl with distinctive individual aspirations found herself a total misfit and the atmosphere suffocating in the joint family. Her first rebellion, although realized on almost farcical lines, distinctly marks her deviation from the traditional norms. When told that she was to be inspected as a bride, Daisy stunned her parents with her declaration: “I told my people that I’d not allow anyone to inspect me as a bride and that I’d rather do the inspection of the groom”. Her essentially liberal and self-made spirit anticipating all sorts of constraints, took decision to leave the household for good. Significantly, unlike Savitri (TDR), Daisy refused to look back. Her departure from the house, reflecting vividly the departure from the essentially sacrosanct tradition, was final and unequivocal.

In her selecting the apparently arduous and obviously dull role of a family planning propagator, and fighting assiduously with the country’s biggest enemy, the population explosion, Daisy may be compared with Bharati (WTM) plying her equally educative role. Bharati, however, strikes a different note in the context of her relation ship with Sriram.

Daisy displays the most ambivalent nature in her attitude to sex. The work-obsessed and duty-conscious woman almost defiantly discouraged her lover and
thwarts his impulsive seduction and even threatens him to report to the police. But eventually the tough exterior gives way and she succumbs to the desire of the flesh. In this she displays an absolutely amoral and a sort of clinical approach to man-woman relationship and seems to have taken sex as a physical necessity, discarding the socio-religious norms. This attitude may account for her premarital sex with Raman. It is here that she appears different from Rosie who, though commits adultery, can never forget the sexual morality.

Daisy's attitude to marriage also strikes a distinct note. In fact marriage as such never figures in her life. But in deference to her love she agrees for the Gandharva type which gives one the liberty to snap the ties any time one feels inclined. And there also she leaves a catch. She makes Raman agree to her proviso. The proviso gives her liberty not to have a child, and even if one comes, she would give it to orphanage to keep herself free for her duty. Nor would the husband ever ask her any thing related to it. She says: “The moment you ask me why or how I will leave you”\(^1\). It is reminiscent of the legend of Shantanu-Ganga in the Mahabharata.

Her anti-children campaign may certainly be taken as laudable and admirable in the context of her profession. But Daisy shows a basic, disregard for children. Says the narrator, “She was not really a lover of children... never patted a child of tried any talk. She looked at them as if to say, you had no business to arrive—you lengthen the queues that’s all”\(^2\). Her entire attitude towards children
may be interpreted, particularly in the milieu she operated, as Daisy's total disrespect for the Indian woman's cherished dream of attaining motherhood or matrițva. One may recall Margayya's wife (TFE) praying to the God of seven hills for it and Ambika (TVS), having suffered as the woman with a barren womb, suddenly found her prestige elevated because of it.

Daisy's last rebellion has also serious implications. Having promised to stay with Raman as a wife, she certainly must have stunned Raman declaring that due to an emergency assignment she was to leave Malgudi and was unable to fulfil the promise. The decision of the New woman, however, may sound logical as Daisy tells Raman: "Married life is not for me...It frightens me... I am not cut out for the life you imagine. I can't live except alone"\textsuperscript{151}. But Daisy's departure from Malgudi may be viewed as the deviant's nemesis. Her relationship with Raman, flouting the socio-moral codes and her anti-traditional attitude reflected in her profession, may after all, have the Karma consequence: Daisy may have a lonely existence and may lead a busy life sans marital bliss.

In the final analysis the rebellion in \textit{The Painter of Signs} may again be taken as Narayan's presentment of the recurring theme of illusion and reality. For Raman, illusion seems to have been symbolized in the form of Daisy and his relationship with her. His flinging away the key, saying "To hell with it"\textsuperscript{152}, and his return to the solid, real world of the Boardless\textsuperscript{153}, may be taken as his return to the world of reality. Although the rebellion is mostly realized through sex,
Narayan, however, depicts it comically. One, for instance, recalls Raman’s comment about Daisy’s family planning obsession: “If she were a despotic queen of ancient days, she would have ordered the sawing off of the organs of generation”\textsuperscript{154}. The typology also marks both Raman and Daisy as Cardish characters.

Considering the typology of rebellion in its entirety, one may underline certain characteristic features emerging out of the study focusing on the nature of rebellion in the Narayan novel. Generally, rebellion in Narayan’s novels is taken as deviation from the Accepted Norms: the socio-cultural codes. The events in the novels seem to suggest a view: those who accept the tradition lead a balanced and quiet life and the deviant’s head for a lonely sort of existence. The most obvious deviation is realized as sex aberration. Sex has a purposeful existence in Malgudi. As The English Teacher exemplifies, sex may have fruitful and balanced realization within the confines of the social norms. The novelist’s respecting the privacy of his characters may underline his treatment of sex. When obliged to depict a sort of open sex, Narayan employs the strategy of treating sex comically.

As most of the rebels, excepting perhaps Rosie (TG) and Daisy (TPS), return to the point of beginning, they underline several implications: the influence of the socio-cultural codes, Manu’s deciding norms, the mythic images (Sita, Savitri), the idealized images (mother, wife). The return of the rebel also marks the cyclic pattern of the journey, the epic of the ordinary and the preordained
nature of life. It also underlines the novelist's strategy to use the rite de passage to symbolize the spiritual growth of his characters as they pass from illusion to reality. The typology vividly focuses on the novelist's comic ironic perception of life underlining his notion of Comedy bordering on the tragic lines and his ironic vision telescoping the essentially paradoxical and incongruous nature of life.
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