UNIT 4 SAMSKARA: CHARACTERS, TITLE, LITERARY CRITICISM AND CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE
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4.0 OBJECTIVES

This final unit is meant to introduce you to yet another aspect of the study of Samskara, namely, characterization and characters and other issues like the title, literary criticism of the novel and the contemporary relevance of it.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This unit will discuss the characters and characterization in Samskara and how the allegorical mould in which the writer has put the novel has influenced his presentation of characters. It will also deal with its title. A summary of important critical views expressed on the novel will follow. The unit will close with a brief note on the contemporary relevance of Samskara in our times.

4.2 CHARACTERIZATION AND CHARACTERS

Since Anantha Murthy has used the allegorical form in his novel, we cannot expect Samskara to have drawn fully-fledged realistic characters. As discussed in the previous unit, the characters in Samskara are ‘somewhat simplified and represent polar opposites’ [141]. This statement is generally true for most of the major characters in the novel. Pranesacharya and Naranappa are polar opposites as are Bhagirathi and Chandri. If Pranesacharya is the Brahmin ascetic who takes his asceticism to extremes, Naranappa is the pleasure seeker who is out to destroy brahminism-root and branch. There are other characters who we could call satellite characters who we could group with either of these characters. Mahabala and Shripati among the males and Belli and the unnamed prostitute who cohabits with Mahabala and Padmavati.
would fall among the pleasure seekers/pleasure givers. And Naranappa’s discarded wife and Lilavati, Shripati’s sex-denying wife and the other Brahmin wives would fall in with those who deny themselves/others sexual pleasure.

There are those like Dasacharya who is guilty of the sin of gluttony and Garudacharya and Lakshmanacharya and their wives who are guilty of the sin of avarice and greed.

Notes on Major Characters

i. Pranesacharya

Pranesacharya represents asceticism carried to an extreme. He is also an example of the distortion in values that takes place when asceticism is overvalued as it has often been in the Indian tradition. He is a householder but in name only, because for twenty years he has dedicatedly looked after his invalid wife and practiced asceticism in order to gain merit and achieve salvation. That he has done so out of routine becomes clear later on, after his sexual union with Chandri.

The Acharya is a learned man, the Crest Jewel of Vedant Philosophy and has won many awards in recognition of his learning. But he has no solution to the crisis facing his agrahara. Instead of trusting his instincts, he has tried to go by the books and the books fail him.

His compassionate nature is evident in his concern for Chandri as she sits outside waiting for his decision. The Acharya’s concern for Naranappa, however, doesn’t originate in compassion alone. His attitude is a blend of his egotism and willfulness and compassion. Trying to reclaim Naranappa has been a kind of challenge for him. If he is allowed to get away with his rebellious ways, the Acharya thinks, ‘how will fair play and righteousness prevail’ (21)? His belief — that ‘common men follow the right path out of fear’, shows the strain of antiquated thinking in him. When the books fail to provide him with a solution, he resorts to an act that shows the Crest Jewel of Vedant in an unflattering light — he entreats the Monkey God Maruti to give him a sign by making the flowers place on either side to fall, but nothing happens. Even if one doesn’t agree with Naipaul and call it a resort to magic, the entire episode doesn’t do any credit to him.

The Acharya is highly introspective both before and after his centrally important sexual union with Chandri and his self-analysis is characterized by complete transparency and a rare honesty. If he has been harsh with his adversary Naranappa, he is even more unsparing about himself.

The entire process of soul-searching and self-analysis is painful and bristles with uncertainty and anxiety and fear. He thinks of himself as a lost soul in limbo, a ghost who dreads being becoming a demon (117-118, 120-21, 125). We see him turning his back on his brahminical past; moving away from god and into the world of ordinary men and women and realizing the need to stand alone and finally taking a decisive step. He becomes aware of his physical needs of pleasure and hunger and those of other senses and he wants a share in all the good things of life. He has also had a close look at the violence and cruelty and passion in ordinary life. At the end there is a sea change coming in his thinking. He overcomes his fears about his exposure and starts back to
his agrahara in order to make his confession. He hopes to give up his public identity and is at the threshold of forging a new identity for himself. But there is one thing that is common to both — his consciousness that he belongs to the community and is fully responsible to it for his actions.

ii. Naranappa

If Pranesacharyya stands for asceticism, Naranappa stands for pleasure-seeking. This is how he once expressed his hedonistic doctrine to the Acharya: ‘Just keep your dharma to yourself — we’ve but one life — I belong to the “Hedonistic School” — Borrow, borrow and drink your ghee, as they say’ (20).

Naranappa was a sworn enemy of brahminism and didn’t consider the brahminism as practised in Durvasapur as worth anything. The only person he made an exception of was the Acharya. And he had broken every known taboo — he kept a low-caste mistress, he drank, he caught sacred fish and ate its meat with Muslim friends and much else. Not satisfied with defiance, he challenged Pranesacharyya: ‘Your Garuda, he robs shaven widows, he plots evil with black-magic men, and he is one of your Brahmins, isn’t he?...All right, let’s see who wins, Acharya. You or me? Let’s see how long all this Brahmin business will last. All your Brahmin respectability. I’ll roll it up and throw it away for a little bit of pleasure with one female’ (21).

But he wasn’t just an iconoclast. He had a creative side to his personality also. He was the inspiration behind the founding of the Parijata Drama Group and he donated a harmonium to the group and he himself was a good drummer.

While Naranappa was alive, he was troublesome. But he was more troublesome when he was dead. What is said about Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar — that he was more powerful dead than when alive — is also true of Naranappa to quite an extent. The major problem that proved insoluble so far as the Brahmins were concerned was: who should cremate him? This was a problem to which the Acharya with all his learning had no answer.

Naranappa also causes the Acharya to introspect. At times he begins to wonder whether there’s a route to salvation other than the route of dharma and ‘whether the quickest way to salvation was through conflict’ (47). The second occasion when he pondered over Naranappa’s words was when he told him about how his description of Shakuntala had excited a young listener and made him go and take a woman on the river bank (‘Could it be that he himself was responsible for such awful things?’) [25] Later, after his sexual union with Chandri, the Acharya thinks of him in a more positive context. He recalls his fearlessness and finds himself wanting (‘How fearlessly, how royally Naranappa lived with Chandri in the heart of the agrahara!’) [109] Still later, while fears of polluting the temple assail him, he thinks: ‘But didn’t Naranappa manage to eat the holy fish in the Ganapati tank and get away with it? He would never have the courage to defy brahmin practice as Naranappa did’ (113).

iii. Chandri

Chandri is Naranappa’s voluptuous, low-caste mistress who later mates with Pranesacharyya and initiates a process of radical change in him. In accordance
with the allegorical scheme of the novel, she and Belli are pitted against the Brahmin wives.

She is described as a perfect beauty (‘A ‘real’ sharp type, exactly as described in Vatsyayan’s manual of love’ [8]), ‘the choice object’ that Naranappa had brought from Kundapura, and is compared to Matsyagandha painted by Ravi Verma. This reference to the classical heroine is repeated in the text several times and is meant to hallow and romanticize Chandri.

The lovemaking scene in the forest brings out her femininity to the full. The mere touch of her full breasts triggers off a union that brings out all her tenderness and compassion and mother love and that also opens up the beautiful world of the senses to the Acharya. No words are spoken, but then no words are needed. The writer has made this sexual union centrally important. But if Chandri is hallowed and romanticized, she is also ‘earthly and amoral’. While the Acharya agonizes over who made the first move in lovemaking, she remains untroubled by her sexuality.

Chandri is also shown to be generous. In contrast to the avaricious Brahmin wives, she hands the gold that Naranappa had given to her to the Acharya to meet the cost of her lover’s funeral.

The cremation of Naranappa illustrates yet another feature of her personality — her commonsense. As soon as she realizes that his body has started rotting, she decides to cremate it and proceeds to do so with the help of a Muslim friend of her lover. Next morning, she packs up her belongings and leaves for her home in Kundapura.

Chandri may be physically away from the Acharya but she is never far from his consciousness. Time after time as he wanders around the fair in the company of Putta, he recalls her. The suggestion is that joining her is one of the options open to him.

If the Acharya represents culture, she represents nature. As nature, Chandri is undefileable. She is compared to a running river which can never go dirty (Born to prostitutes, she was an exception to all rules. She was ever-auspicious, daily-wedded, the one without widowhood. How can sin defile a running river? It’s good for a drink when a man’s thirsty, it’s good for a wash when a man’s filthy, and it’s good for bathing the god’s images with; ...Tunga river doesn’t dry...’(43).

iv. Putta

Putta is a special creation. How did the novelist create Putta? In one of his talks entitled ‘Tradition and Creativity’, Ananth Murthy answers Eric Erikson, the great psychologist, about how he had created Putta: ‘It is of course a mystery, the way I created Putta. Putta is a half-caste, he has none of the inhibitions of a Brahmin, and he is a free man too. That also is possible within the Indian structure, you see, as some of these people are born out of what you call varnasankara, or the hope of mankind in India. ...Putta appears at a particular point precisely because without him the novel seems to be incomplete. I sit down and say “Acharya is walking, I write. He hears footsteps. Whose footsteps? What happens now? And then Putta appears’ (Literature and Culture: 119).
If Chandri revitalizes Pranesachary through her ‘touch’, Putta ushers him into the ordinary world and he is able to do so because he has no hang-ups of the kind that a Brahmin like Pranesacharya has. (‘Putta is a half-caste, he has none of the inhibitions of a Brahmin, and he is a free man too.’) He is a man for all seasons and he takes the Acharya on what Ramanujan calls a ‘guided tour through temple-festival and fair, whorehouse and pawnshop’ where he sees ‘a demonic world of passion and sensation’ and violence and cruelty. This is an essential part of the Acharya’s transformation.

How does the Acharya view Putta? At first he wants to get rid of him and makes an attempt to do so several times. But finally the Acharya comes to look at him with affection — ‘fatherly affection’ — and later treats him like ‘a bosom-friend of the present’. He in fact contemplates making a trial confession before Putta, before his final confrontation with the Brahmins. This change of feeling suggests that the process of transformation is on.

Putta seems a holdall character. In the words of Ramanujan, ‘Putta is riddle-master, expert bargainer, pimp without any samskara; he is so completely and thoughtlessly at one with this world that he is a marvel.’ (Afterword: 140) But if he appears ‘a marvel’, we need to remember that he has to fit in the overall allegorical mould of the novel. He has to carry on the process of redirection of Pranesacharya’s life, a task that Chandri had begun. As Anantham Murthy himself says, the novel would be incomplete without him. The final responsibility is, of course, the Acharya’s.

4.3 THE TITLE

The word samskara in the title has multiple meanings. So has the title in the novel. The dictionary meanings of the word are explained before the novel begins. It reproduces the different meanings taken from A Kannada-English Dictionary by Reverend F. Kittel (1832-1903), Mangalore, 1894 as follows:

**Sam-s-kara.**

1. Forming well or thoroughly, making perfect, perfecting; finishing, refining, refinement, accomplishment.
2. Forming in the mind, conception, idea, notion; the power of memory, faculty of recollection, the realizing of past perceptions.
3. Preparation, making ready, preparation of food, etc., cooking, dressing.
4. Making sacred, hallowing, consecration, dedication; consecration of a king, etc.
5. Making pure, purification, purity.
6. A sanctifying or purificatory rite or essential ceremony (enjoined on all the first three classes or castes).
7. Any rite or ceremony.
8. Funeral obsequies.

The subtitle of the novel — *A Rite for a Dead Man* makes use of what Ramanujan calls ‘the most concrete meaning’ of the word given above. Ironically the dead man, Naranappa, is disposed of unceremoniously by his
mistress Chandri with the help of a Muslim friend of his. This unceremonious disposal of the dead remains unknown to the person who is most concerned with it — Pranesacharya. As the novel proceeds, the title acquires other meanings and other connotations till it has gathered to itself a rich resonance.

Obviously, the most important of these meanings of the title is the transformation of Pranesacharya, a kind of rebirth. The novel begins with a frantic search for an answer to the question of whether the community of Brahmins should perform the funeral rites of the heretic Brahmin and if so, who should do it. The attempt fails but the accidental mating with Chandri in the forest as he makes his way back to the agrahara begins the process of his rebirth. ‘A rite for a dead man becomes a rite of passage for the living.’ Like any birth, it is a most painful process and it is not complete when the novel ends. But there is hope.

Moreover, ironically, the rite of initiation begins with an illicit deed — the mating with Naranappa’s low-caste mistress. This implicitly interrogates the traditional notion of samskara as refinement through traditionally pious means.

The title Samskara acquires a further dimension of meaning when Naranappa’s professed anti-brahminism is contrasted with the unbrahminical conduct of the Brahmins of the agrahara. They are guilty of the sins of avarice and gluttony and are superstitious. In this, the novelist questions the notion of brahminism itself. While Garudacharya and Lakshmanacharya covet Naranappa’s gold, Naranappa’s mistress Chandri offers all her gold to pay for the funeral expenses of her lover. She has no learning nor any inherited samskaras but she shows a greater refinement of spirit than either Garuda or Lakshmana.

On the other hand Putta is a favourable character in the novel and he initiates the Acharya into the ordinary world of passion and cruelty and sensation, but he is a half-caste and is without samskaras. In this way, Anantha Murthy interrogates the entire idea of samskaras or an inherited refinement of spirit.

Ramanujan suggests yet another significance of the word samskara. He says that the novel is structured like a samskara — it has three stages of ‘separation’, ‘transition’ and ‘re-incorporation’. These three stages can roughly be seen in the Acharya’s passage through life. He goes away from his agrahara (separation), travels through the forest and the fair where he has a new orientation (transition), and is finally shown moving towards re-incorporation.

The novel thus resonates with several meanings of the word samskara.

Exercise

1. In your view how important are samskaras/inherited virtues in life?
2. Is the writer rejecting brahminism altogether or is he merely questioning it?

4.4 LITERARY CRITICISM OF SAMSKARA

According to its translator A.K. Ramanujan, Samskara was ‘popular with critic and common reader alike since its publication in 1965’. One hopes that that is true or so we would like to believe.
The first critic of the English translation was the translator himself and he has added a fine Afterword to the translated version that forms part of the book and that first appeared in 1976. In a sense, Ramanujan has set the lines along which criticism of the novel was to take place. He called it a religious novella, ‘a contemporary reworking of ancient themes’ (141) and drew attention to the allegorical form of the novel and also the ancient dichotomy between asceticism and sensuality, saying that the characters were ‘somewhat simplified and represented polar opposites’ (141). The novel, he pointed out, sometimes sacrificed realism to enforce its allegory. He also talks of the several meanings of the word samskara and goes on to suggest a threefold process of initiation or a rite of passage — separation, transition and re-incorporation through which Pranesacharya is passing.

Dissent came very early and it came very strongly, for in 1976, V.S. Naipaul in his comments on Samskara that later on formed part of his A Wounded Civilization (1977), dismissed Samskara as a portrayal of what he called ‘a barbaric civilization’. It was a civilization ‘where the books, the laws are buttressed by magic, and where a too elaborate social organization is unquenched by intellect or creativity or ideas of moral responsibility.’ These people’s, he goes on, are all helpless, disadvantaged, easily unbalanced; the civilization they have inherited has long gone sour; living instinctive lives, crippled by rules...they make up a society without a head. (Vagārtha 15: Oct 1976, 21) The obvious reference was to the decadent Brahmin agrahara. Naipaul concedes that it is ‘a difficult novel’, and even that ‘the narrative is hypnotic’ and also that ‘the brilliance of the writing in the original Kannada can be guessed’. But he charges Indians to have an ‘underdeveloped ego’ and believes that the Acharya even after he enters ‘the demon world’ would continue to be self-absorbed. ‘A changing society,’ he holds, requires ‘sharper perception’.


Madan’s essay, it should be made clear, is not exclusively on Samskara: it discusses three literary texts on the theme, the other two being Bhagwati Charan Verma’s Hindi novel Chitrālekha (1933) and Vishnu Sakham Khandekar’s Marathi novel Yayati (1959). Recognizing it as ‘the fundamental moral dilemmas’ treated for very long in Hindu traditions, he tries to develop ‘the notion of the tension between the two extremes of asceticism (tapas) and eroticism (kamukta) which the life of the householder has to overcome’ (12). The ideal Hindu solution is not a simple harmonization of opposites,’ but ‘the cultivation of a moral sensibility which carries one beyond having to make moral choices and coerce oneself into a particular course of action’ (13).

Madan examines the three texts in the context of culture-nature dichotomy. ‘The human being as a fully conscious or autonomous moral agent (a Socrates-like figure) is...the ideal Samskara puts forward; but it is an ideal difficult to realize, for no human being living in society may hope to make all his or her own moral choices without taking away from the autonomy of
others. Moral choices thus generate moral dilemmas with no easy solutions’ (Non-Remuneration: 96).

Rajagopal Parthasarathy’s essay on ‘Samskara: The Passing of the Brahmin Tradition’ (1998), written in a sympathetic vein, is ‘an elegy for the passing of the once resonant Brahmin tradition’ (190). He suggests that the novel in which the writer has tried to come to terms with ‘his own oppressive Madhava Brahmin past’, could be read ‘as an initiation story focusing on an individual’s movement from innocence to maturity through contact with experience’ (191). Like the Rishyashringa of the Mahabharat, Pranesacharya enters the real world after his baptism of passion with Chandri. But the central question of his spiritual regeneration, the author says, is left unresolved and with it ‘the question of the regeneration of Brahman India.’ He ends his paper by saying that the questions that the Acharya asks of himself are ‘the questions Brhmans must ask themselves if they expect to continue to preserve their identity’ (198).

Meenakshi Mukherjee’s lucid essay (1985) begins by repudiating Naipaul’s charge that Samskara dealt with ‘a barbaric civilization,’ saying that the significance of the novel lies in the attempt to exploit the tension between an ethos ‘where identity is determined by karma and varna on the one hand and a new awareness of self.’ (Realism and Reality: The Novel and Society in India: 167)

In the course of her long essay she offers a very perceptive critical commentary on the novel, noticing the use of allegory and also of the metaphors of the serpent and the tiger and that of the journey. She also draws attention to Lukacs’s useful distinction between the epic hero and the problematic hero of the novel, saying that the epic is always about ‘the destiny of a community’ and the epic hero is ‘never an individual’ (170). The Acharya, she says, moves from being the epic hero to the problematic hero of the novel. Also, she does not think that the novel is ‘a repudiation of Hinduism and refers to the character of Putta who though unreflective and unphilosophical, is a Hindu and whose acceptance of the caste hierarchy has not hampered his ‘zest for living’ (180).

Heidrun Bruckner’s 30-page long essay (1994) on intertextuality in Samskara is intended to pay attention, among other things, to an area neglected so far, namely the intertextual dimension of the novel. He tries to show that this dimension constitutes a kind of ‘mythological subconscious’ of the novel. ‘The novel is pervaded by images and comparisons stemming from ancient and medieval Indian mythology and literature, which do not serve a limited function in their respective context but provide an alternative conceptual framework’ (154).

A useful volume of criticism on Samskara has come out recently. Entitled U.R. Anantham Murthy’s Samskara: A Critical Reader (2005), it offers a critical survey of the criticism on the novel and also selected essays by different scholars following a variety of approaches. You will do well to sample it.

For a change let us now hear what the author has to say — not about his own work but his report of how others have responded to his novel. Here is what he said in Part II of his lecture on ‘Tradition and Creativity’ (1990):
‘In my village everyone thought *Samskara* was a totally realistic novel and they identified every character with a living person in the agrahara. And when I went back to my village the woman next door said, ‘O Anantha, you have created Chandrī perfectly.’ Each and every character was real. And the novel was considered against some people in the village. Now you come to Shimoga, the district headquarters, and see how the novel is read there. There it was seen as a novel against the Madhava Brahmins. It became a little abstract. Not against some characters, but against one set of characters. They said it was anti-Madhava. In Bangalore it was anti-Brahmin. It became more abstract. When Naipaul read it, he found it anti-Hindu. Again more abstract And to Eric Erickson the novel was a representation of the crisis of middle age. It became totally universal.’ (*Literature and Culture*, 121-22). ‘And now many of my radical friends say that it [*Samskara*] is a Pro-Brahmin novel, that I have really championed the cause of Brahmins’ (122).

Anantha Murthy’s comments don’t end there. In an interview in 1996, he reported much the same things and added the following questions: “What I want to ask here is this: Which is my novel? Whose response is truer from the point of view of the printed text — my own people in the agrahara who read it literally, or the people from other cultures who read it symbolically? (Meeakshi Sharma, ed. *Wordsmiths* [1996], 58)

Anantha Murthy’s are valid questions. But these questions in turn further raise the question of the reader response theories. As Vanamala Vishwanatha, the co-translator of *Samskara* into Swedish says, ‘meaning is not something that inheres ‘as truth’ in the text but something that is tenuously created by the active mediation of readers, who deconstruct the text based on their own location and ideological make-up.’ (*Samskara: A Critical Reader* 235) So if you find yourself disagreeing with what has been suggested in the study material or by any of the critics, take heart. Only be prepared to buttress your reading with arguments and examples from the text.

A final word. As adults you should be able to devise your own strategy of reading and coming to grips with the text. But whatever you do, remember that a thorough grounding in the text is indispensable for any independent understanding of it.

### 4.5 CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE OF *SAMSKARA*

The plain question is: what is the relevance of Anantha Murthy’s novel *Samskara* today? The novel is grounded in a small orthodox Madhav Brahmin colony in a remote Karnataka village. The timing of the events is the 1930’s or the 1940’s. Much of the caste rigidity depicted in the novel is perhaps gone. But caste hierarchy is still far from being extinct and Brahminism, though not as predominant as before, still enjoys enormous prestige. That being the case, it is good to see the wholesome spectacle of a Brahmin writer subjecting a decadent brahminism to a ruthless, sometimes even savage criticism. Such ruthless literary self-examinations need to continue if we are to keep moving towards the idea of equality of castes. *Samskara* provides an excellent example.
The novel is relevant also because the vision that its writer has seen, which is glimpsed in this novel but articulated sure definitely in another novel Bharthipura (Eg. Transl 1996), still remains unrealized today. I am referring to the ideal of a casteless society envisioned by its leading character, Jaganatha Rao, in Bharthipura. Giving details of his dreams, the character says: ‘An Indian would attain real dignity only when it became possible for a Brahmin boy to desire a dark-skinned untouchable girl with flowers in her hair, only when a Brahmin girl longed to be hugged by coarse-haired and dark-skinned untouchable boy’ (203-04). In Samskara we see a preview of this dream in the union between the ascetic and learned Brahmin Pranesacharya and the low-caste Chandri in the forest. As has been pointed out earlier, this sexual union, modeled on the union between sage Parashara and fisherwoman Matsyagandha, has been given central importance in the novel. It has in fact been romanticized and valourized and the suggestion is that unless such a paradigm shift takes place, the desirable change will still be far off.

4.6 LET US SUM UP

Samskara captures a moment in India’s transition from tradition to modern times. This is a subject in which we are all interested and in which all of us have a stake. Moreover, here you are on your home ground and it should engage your attention as most non-Indian texts may not. The novel is grounded in brahminical India. It attacks it fiercely and the attack is at times savage but the question to ask is: Does do you think the novel repudiate Hinduism?

Ponder over the other problems raised in the novel and try and connect the characters you come across in it with those around you. In fact one exercise that you could undertake is to make a list of those social evils that stand in the way of modern India. Do you think Putta is a character whom you may meet in real life? And what about the Acharya? Are their people of his kind even today? This exercise should help you fix these fictional characters clearly in your mind and even fetch you good marks in the examinations.

4.7 GLOSSARY

For glossary please consult the notes provided by A.K. Ramanujan to the Oxford edition of the translated text, pages 145-53. These notes explain all the references that a reader is likely to need while reading the novel and will help him/her to understand the text better.

The translator has retained a few local and Sanskrit words in his translation.

4.8 QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the title of the novel with particular focus on those meanings that have been used in the novel.
2. Are you satisfied with the way the novel ends? Discuss with concrete arguments.
3. What is the importance of the sexual union between the Acharya and Chandri?
4. Why has the writer chosen Chandri and Putta to catalyse the change in the Acharya? Discuss their role in the Acharya’s efforts to redefine himself as an individual.
5. What are your personal views about the contemporary relevance of the novel?
6. What are the major things that the Acharya thinks of during his journey?
7. Which character(s) do you like most in the novel? Why?
8. Do you agree with the view that the novel is a complete repudiation of the brahminism? Give arguments in favour of or against the proposition.
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