

Short Fiction in Indian Literature
Prof. Divya A
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology – Madras

Lecture – 11B

Plotting and Ideology in R.K. Narayan's A Horse and Two Goats - Overview

Hello and welcome back to another conversation and this time we are going to talk about A Horse and Two Goats by R.K. Narayan. It is a really heartwarming tragic comic story about a villager in the deep south in the Indian subcontinent. I have here Gayathri with me who is an MA student and she has a couple of questions for me and we are going to discuss the story.

Hello mam, hello. R.K. Narayan's stories have always been a pleasure to read from the beginning when our generation we have been growing up with Malgudi Days and all that and thank you for introducing the story here. Let us start with a couple of questions, the significance of the word Kritam, the place where Muni lives in the protagonist.

A Kritam means crown in Tamil, but it is very ironical because it is so irrelevant and the way he describes its irrelevance is very nice. So, what do you think of the. Yeah, it is highly ironic as you mentioned. Kritam suggest glory, grandeur, a lot of wealth, and power and none of these adjectives seem to apply to this particular village and especially to the central character Muni, whom we are concerned about in this story.

In fact, we can even go back to R.K. Narayan's own words about how he describes this small village. He himself says that "But its size did not prevent its giving itself the grandeur's name Kritam, which meant in Tamil a coronet or crown on the brow of this continent. The village consisted of less than 30 houses, only one of them built with brick and cement. So, it is highly ironic there is not a lot of common grandeur amongst the villagers, it is just one house, the big house which has built in a large scale with brick and cement.

The rest of the villagers, on the 30 villagers or so, living in really small houses made of thatch and mud. Again, it is very insignificant, it is just a dot on the map and that dot too has been

apparently created on the map to make sure the revenue collector comes and gets the taxes. It is a very, very interesting title in that regard and it suggests a kind of exaggerated sense of self worth that the villagers have about themselves with the lifestyles and even the neighboring villages, what is the name Kuppam, right, that is supposed to be containing all the bad guys, whereas this one has important people like avvaiyar supposedly and things like that.

It is a very interesting title in that regard. One more brilliance of R.K. Narayan, the motive of the foreigner to visit India. How he exoticizes it? How he says that one day there was no electricity and he says it to Muni, who has been living like this for so long. For him it is the other way round. That premise for getting up and coming out all the way to India seems to be really flimsy ground from the Indian point of view.

He says that he did not have electricity or something for a while in his workplace and he suddenly thinks that they are ready to visit India, he and his wife are ready to visit. I do not know why, perhaps that experience of living with electricity kind of gets them ready to visit this hot subcontinent or something, but it is a very simplistic rationale that we have and as you said, people like Muni, most of the population and the villagers have been living without electricity for ages together and again the power of this business man from New York, who could drop everything and leave and travel, you know it suggests his wealth and power in that regard.

They can just get their hearts desire because they are very capable of, the financial capability makes them do such things. No, it seems like he exoticizes this place very typical to a westerner and very typical attitude. But, when he comes here, he does very little to actually understand the psyche of the people who are here. Yeah, absolutely. He is very narrow-minded. He just does not want to listen to what he says, as soon as he sees the horse all he wants to do is get the horse for himself.

It is a very materialistic way of thinking. Yeah, absolutely. There are several things in what you have just said. He does not understand the Indian way of life, that is for certain, because he assumes that everybody in India will speak the language, because he has got through this far with that help apparently and he says everyone in this country seems to know English. "I have got

along with English everywhere in this country, but do not you speak it. Have you any religious or spiritual scruples for avoiding the English speech.”

His assumption is pretty wrong in the first place. Not everybody in this country speak the language and the other question, which tells us that he partially understands the cultural and the spiritual mindset of the people because he thinks that religious and spiritual scruples will prevent the local population from doing certain things, which are quite common for the western or the non-Indian populations.

It is a half-baked kind of understanding about the Indian lifestyle and the classic example of how he does not understand really the spiritual strata of the Indian psyche is, his attitude towards the clay horse. For him it is just a marvelous piece of architecture or sculpture. We have the horse and the warrior on a big pedestal and that pedestal almost serves that kind of a home space for Muni, but for this figure it is just an aesthetic object. Something that he can just take away by picking at the cement which attaches the horse to the pedestal.

The repetition of the word marvelous, that is the word that keeps coming up once again. Again, he is limited even in his aesthetic appreciation he is limited because there is varied vocabulary there, that is one thing and then he says you do not have to spend too much time talking about the finer points of the horse, I know about this horse more than anybody. I can do a fine sales talk than anybody else. How on earth can you do it? You do not even understand the context for this horse.

Muni has a very, very vast kind of context in which he places this horse and how it would come to life at the end of time and how it is a source with the various religious and mythical subset of Indian culture. Even though he is a very simplistic villager, he has this rich body of knowledge about the cultural and the spiritual traditions of this place and this guy who has just arrived in India he thinks that he knows everything. That really kind of justifies your point that he has no big understanding of the Indian.

It is a very stereotypical western attitude towards the East and also talking about his attitude, let us contrast both their attitudes towards life itself. As I already mentioned, from my perspective I think the foreigner is very materialistic, while he is very spiritual. He just goes on monologues of how time is very cyclical and by the end of the time, karma will come all this. Could you contrast attitudes?

Yeah, Muni as I said looks at life through the spiritual lands in one way or the other because he believes that God will ultimately save us from evil beings. There will be a comeuppance for all these criminals, bad guys at the end of the day when this world is coming to an end and Vishnu in his various avatars will come and rescue the good people and even the horse itself will come to life and save the good people on its back, whereas it will trample down the evil people.

It is a kind of philosophical and spiritual attitude towards life. Whereas, we have a materialistic perspective from this American businessman in coffee and from his monologues we understand that he spends time cutting up drift wood and making a big fire in his house. He has big book cases. He has a big TV and all that will be kind of moved away to make space for this object from India and he thinks that when they are going to have a party, they can stand around the statue and enjoy their drink.

He does not think about the mismatch of this particular object from this oriental space and its presence in his living room, it does not make much sense, because he has no understanding about the source of where this significance for this horse comes from. For him it is just a clay horse with bright colors. May be it just adds its aura because of its mysticism. He does not know well if may be somebody comes and asks him where does it come from, what is its source?

He would not know and he would say it is from the East and everybody would actually understand that if it is from the East, then it is something exotic and there would be no source, it must be a hundred years old or 200 years old. The understanding towards these is very as you said half-baked and very problematic. Yeah. We can understand that this American has a very impulsive sort of attitude towards life.

He thinks that he is going to cancel his air tickets and then jump on a boat and travel back. He says his wife can think about flying by air back home, but I am going to hug this horse and enjoy being with a horse in a cabin all the way back home. It is almost like a child-like enthusiasm for novelty and this horse is all but a novelty for him. It is nothing but a novelty, so this collector's attitude is there.

When it is an object from the East, we are inevitably reminded of the plunder that has gone on in all these colonized spaces by these western presences which have been intrusions, not welcome presences, anyway historically speaking. Taking away this cultural, spiritual object from its place is almost without knowing the context and he is not even sure that Muni understands. The narrator does not tell us whether Muni completely understands and that is where the problem lies.

This man gets what he wants and he is willing to throw away money at it to get his heart's desire and the kind of the chasm between the East and West, that stereotype is also there in this particular story. As we were talking before it is almost a thievery, a robbery that is going on. Because this villager does not know and it is not his property, it is a cultural property. It is a property of the villagers who invest a lot of spiritual faith in this horse and the warrior, they are supposed to be guardians.

Look at the arrogance, I do not if I could call it arrogance of the westerner, he comes and he says I could take better care of this. This was here for so long and he just comes in and says I could take better care of this. Again, when you look at the bigger picture of India itself, they just came here and they thought I could take better of this place, this place is so rich in culture, tradition and all that, but the thing which is rich, they suppressed it for their own means.

Absolutely, absolutely. Instead of the horse and the warrior figure, playing the guardians for the local population we have American who is kind of arresting that responsibility from the villagers without their acceptance, without any kind of contract being agreed to, that is one thing and as you said he says he could take care of it better and he says he has the best home in USA. This horse will have the best home.

He is the ultimate authority for what is right and wrong and that is very arrogant. That is a very egoistic character talking in this particular story. So, we need to understand that. Muni is quite opposite. There I no ego there and he is kind of very expensive. He just shares whatever information he has about his cultural tradition, about his past and he is also very curious to know whether this guy has children.

He does that from the goodness of his heart, because he thinks that having progeny is a good thing. Because that means the God's blessing is there on you. So, he wants to find out about the good things in the American's life, whereas this guy does not even ask a single question about the family background of Muni, all he wants is the horse and he very selfishly he pretends to be interested in the two goats, because he thinks that that is a good marketing strategy to please this trader called Muni into selling him the statue of the horse.

That is a very, very superficial commercial, materialistic, egoistic, self-centered American right there in the story. R.K. Narayan just takes him to pieces in that regard. While we were contrasting the attitude, let us talk about the contrast between how they treat their woman. Their woman is a very problematic term, but still, their wives. The foreigner is willing to let his wife travel alone and it is a kind of, you do not know whether it is problematic or progressive.

He does not want to always see what she does, does not want to protect her as such. But, while Muni, we will talk about the relationship of Muni and his wife. It is a bit complex because there are two cultures involved here and each culture has a particular way of looking at its woman. Both the perspectives could be complicated and problematic. Let us look at the American first and he says that, page 31 in my collection, "Ruth will probably say what about when we have a party. I am going to keep him right in the middle of the room.

I do not see how that can interfere with the party. We will stand around him and have our drinks." He says that Ruth may have a difference of opinion, but I am going to have it in the living room. That is one thing. He says later on when he is going to transport it, he says that Ruth can fly by air if she wants to, I will take the boat back and again he really enforces things that he

will enforce his point of view, so that is narrative that we have from him and that could suggest his extreme independence which can put his wife's wishes to the second place.

The wife's wishes do not matter, ultimately he is going to have his way. Even this American with liberal perspective about independence for the sexes and things like that is going to have his own way. That is to be noted, so there is no equality of will applied in terms of the arrangement of the house, in terms of transportation and things like that. Because we have this mistaken notion sometimes that equality is played out in all spaces, in all spheres in the western world. That is not happening at least in this narrative.

Let us come back to Muni's home, where the wife despite being thrashed at the beginning of their marriage a few times by Muni, now has to upper hand. She is powerful enough to cut back at him, shout at him, and ask him to go fast the entire day and things like that. She is very rough at least on the surface, she has the authority to shout at her husband who is supposed to be the supreme-being in her life.

Externally at least, she seems to be very powerful and she is also very powerful in another sense, because she gets the food for the husband at the end of the day, by hook or crook, she goes and grinds corn in the big house and does something somehow, odd jobs here and there, and ultimately make sure that he has a decent meal. So, she is also powerful in that regard. When Muni is not able to get some food stuffs for the home.

If you compare these two, this one is the cleverer, smarter, and more productive in that sense, in the primitive sense of bringing food to the table. We have two very interesting woman characters, one is silent, almost non-present in the story. The western woman does not appear at all, she is somewhere there in Delhi in a hotel probably, while the husband is just traveling across the continent and that is one interesting thing.

But, apart from these issues, the sexual dynamics in this story is a bit complex too. Because if you remember the gossip of the shop man and Muni, what happens there, tell me about it? He talks about the postman's wife eloping with somebody else and after that the postman never

being able to actually live with the guilty and it is again, a stereotype is being played out. If you cannot protect your woman.

Yes, you have to keep an eye on the woman, or else she will sell the home or something like that. It was very derogatory and that is why I wanted to contrast the western attitude. Here they say you should always have an eye or else they would sell your home along with themselves or something like that.

While the westerner, he just leaves her there and he comes here. She could be doing anything. Yeah, which was why I said it is not a one-dimensional picture that we can derive at. It is very complex with very various narrative trajectories running about. This woman, Ruth is independent enough to stay on her own, do may be her own kind of sight seeing that she really likes instead of just tying along with the husband and she is also independent enough to make her way back on her own, which is very admirable instead of just tagging along with the husband on the boat.

All these things are there, so that needs to be acknowledged as well and something which is very problematic is the gossip which Muni, he uses it as a leverage and he says because he does not like the postman let me just thrash the postman more to get whatever I want. Again, talking about somebody else to get what you need is extremely, I found it very problematic.

It is like manipulation on his part, quite a good deal of manipulation on his part to get into the good books of the shopkeeper so that he could get the food stuffs that would help him get his drumsticks also the end of the day and again the shopkeeper hated the postman and he talks about his wife. This is again very, so a revenge is always about attacking the vulnerable female sex in a family so that is there and the other thing is that if you also remember he says that you have enough of the imp in you to have a second wife.

That is what the shop man says about Muni and Muni laughs again to kind of affirmation, so that he does not disagree with the shopkeeper and that is very interesting too, but you have your second wife, so you cannot do that. That is also very interesting so, at this age, generally

speaking when all these jokes are not part of your usual discourse, and suddenly we have Muni placed in that context makes us wonder about his younger self.

There is also this thing with the brother-in-law who apparently set fire to his house and he also wonders why does this brother-in-law set fire to his home, so what did Muni do to make him react in such ways and all these things just come up in our minds when we think about Muni. So he is thought an uncomplicated figure of himself and he also does a little bit of minor thieving too. I mean that is the suggestion there because if you remember the village head man.

The Village head man being terribly angry with Muni because he suspects Muni of having stolen the pumpkin and the creeper and all. So there are slightly subversive discloses here and there about Muni, which are kind of marginalized to kind of highlight his pathetic which is freely true pathetic situation of poverty and the bareness are very interesting. This couple is bad and dry and the entire village discriminates them because of that. That is mentioned in the narrative too.

So, they do suffer this kind of discrimination because the other odd one is out, they have nobody and they live on nothing. In the past they were rich, but now they have fallen on bad luck and so they have nothing to live on, so it is a really pathetic situation, where getting a decent meal at the end of the days itself is very, very difficult. You were talking about the barrenness, so he talks to the shopkeeper about how his daughter will send him money. Why does he do that? What is his motive behind it?

That is very interesting, because he himself again makes a reference to that, let us clear this one thing, does he really have a daughter. No he does not have any children. They are barren (()) (23:15), which is why they suffered discrimination of the hands of the village folk and they also said that they have nothing, nobody to look after to think about, so why do they have to worry about anything.

It is almost that they have been like totally ignored by the rest of the community and some people even say that why do not they get rid of the two goats. It is good riddance for them. So, they completely without any kind of extended relatives or children and on page 25, he says fertility

brought marriage. People with 14 sons were always so prosperous and at peace with the world and themselves. He recollected the thrill he had felt when he mentioned the daughter to that shop man, although it was not believed what if he did not have a daughter.

He enjoys that fantasy, the momentary fantasy that he kind of creates to talk about a daughter sending money for his birthday and that is also a very weird thing in those days, in the 1960s, elderly people celebrating birthdays, it is a bit of a stretch in the villages when they hardly even know how to keep count of the ages. So it is again an exaggeration on his part and the shop keeper says 50 you are more like 70 and he asks with the sneer have you even a daughter.

So, the contempt there is for his back barrenness. The lack of children, the inability to produce progeny and that even has association with God not blessing you with his grace, so that you do not have children. Somehow you are all in the bad books of God. Again, when this is an imagination why does he imagine a daughter and not a son, plus here he says people at 14 sons are always so prosperous.

Yes, yes very good, probably because it is the belief for the tradition in the Indian society that the daughters are the ones who will take care of the elderly parents unlike the sons, who might go after their wives and not look after the older parents. That trajectory is also there even though technically speaking they are the ones who have the money and the wealth, who are supposed to take care of the older parents according to religious guidelines and all. But, when it comes to practical everyday stuff, it is the daughters who come by check in on the older parents and things like that.

Also, there might be this again stereotype that the daughter leaves the house, if it was the son, then there would be a discourse where the parents did not raise him well enough to look after them. Because, the son stays in the house and the daughter goes away, so they do not have to account for her absence. Yes, yes, yes, so even the lie will not be possible with a son, because the son is supposed to as you say will live with the parents.

Only if it is a daughter she will away out of sight and still save money for this old man, which he will get at the first of the month to pay off his debts. It is a charming lie, but as you say it is a very clever lie, but it is seen through by the people around him. Muni, he can be seen as a representative of the subaltern, the very poorest of the poor and his attitude when he saw the khaki-wearing man, he was scared.

Though his first instinct was to be scared and the khaki-wearing man, they are the police who are supposed to protect them. What do you conclude from this? Again this was written in the 1960s, soon after post independent India. So, do you think these are vestiges of colonialism of how they were treated by the khaki-wearing men and, yes possible, very possible. You are quite right. He thinks that he has come to investigate some crime.

He is an inquisitor. He did not even know what he was being, he was just scared, that is all he was. After a point somehow he came to the conclusion that he was talking about a dead body. Yeah, as soon as he sees this man in khaki, he kind of thinks about the crime that he remembers, the latest crime and that is about a mutilated body under a tamarind tree and tamarind tree is also very interesting right, which has very supernatural associations and all, so a dead body underneath the tamarind tree between the two villages in that liminal space, neither here nor there in between space we have this body and he talks about that crime and he says that I do not know anything about it.

Our villages have a clean record. It perhaps is the actions of somebody in the next village and things like that. He just peels the beans from how, very defensive attitude. Very, very defensive. The immediate response is that the khaki-wearing men would address people willy-nilly regardless of whether there is cause for (()) (28:17) arrest or warrant. He shows him the card he thinks that as a warrant for an arrest.

People like him have no trust in the judiciary, which is reflected, represented by this khaki-wearing men and that could have these associations with the colonial regime of the British in India. So, it could a vestige of that, that inability to trust the men in cover. On the contrast, he trusts the village Poojari. He trusts him. He says that the village priest can look at the camphor

flame and he can see the face of the criminal, so that trust in the local guardian is there but there is no trust in his institutional figure of a policeman of an inquisitor and he always is beware of the khaki.

So he does not trust the man. He keeps talking as a strategy, that is a very, very interesting strategy, I can get my way out of this tricky, sticky situation through my talk. The conversational skills somehow come to his rescue that is what he thinks will have been. That is again a stereotype right. They do not even know what rights they have. They can resist arrest; they can ask for why they are getting arrested.

They are very ignorant of all of these and this shows that the people who are supposed to be protected, they feel vulnerable towards it, which is very problematic again. Which reminds me of this as you pointed out conversation as a streaker strategy. It reminded me of Homi Bhabha's theory of the sly colonial is seen in the sly subaltern who can work his way out of any kind of problem that oppresses him or suppresses him and Muni seems to be doing that here.

Talk is way out of the problem presented by this American. R.K. Narayan, he uses mythology quite a lot here and there. He just weaves it into the story. So, what do you think is the purpose for the mythological elements in the story. Until the first half of the story, it is about Muni and his life and Kritam and his really difficult situation of having no food on a regular basis and then he sees that some American appearing on the highway and he thinks that he is a policeman and then he talks about all this crime and somehow tries to pack him off and send him on his way.

So, the first half is occupied in that context in this particular narrative; however, if we look at the second half of the story and the second half begins with Muni getting a sense that this American is interested in the clay horse. He gets a sense of that and then he starts to explain about the horse and from that point onwards, he talks about the religious beliefs and traditions of this local community and as he is described that he just comes to his personal rule as well.

The role that he plays in these cultural traditions, in this traditional narratives and he kind of also talks about the role he plays in the local dramatics that they put up in the village community and

how he trusts if his God is Lakshmi and Seeta and they always gave him parts, because he has a soft voice and that is also a very interesting thing. The fact that he got the women's roles rather than the men's roles, he is also very interesting and significant in the regard.

Is he seen as a powerless figure in the village, which is why he has been kind of given all these rules, so that is something we can speculate on as well. Why he does that he gets some kind of glory out of that, some kind of reflected glory from this rich cultural traditional pass and through the small roles he plays. So he wants to ascertain that perhaps we do not know.

From the person he also goes back to the religious epics Ramayana, the Mahabharata that he curses this man, do you know about that, do you know about this and he talks about Krishna, the birth story of Krishna and again about demon that he destroyed and again the sexuality aspect plays a role there. How Krishna succeeded eventually. There is a lot of power there. There is also a lot of joy, sexuality, it is a heady blend of all these various human emotions there in that rich narrative.

Muni is a great story teller. He is a bard. And if you look at the story closely, he sometimes goes back home and tells his wife all the details that he has seen while he has been at the highway. He is a story teller in that regard, a very good story teller and the sad or the tragic part is that the American does not have any idea whatsoever about all the stories, but he enjoys the tone, the voice of Muni. Again you are talking about the tone and voice. His motive to come here was to explore cultures is what he claims. But, he does not want to understand the nuances or anything.

He does not even know what language he is speaking. It is very superficial admiration is what I think. Yes, yes. It is a very again exoticised view of the East, where he just appreciates the tone and he does not even make an attempt to understand the basic question of what language or the rich cultural and tradition associated with it. Yes, I have similar interpretations of this perspective and let me put it in a very, very simplistic white in a black and white way. He is interested in the form rather than in the content.

He does not know about the content; he does not care about the content. He really does not even want to know anything about it. He said stop I know what it is. I understand it. When he hears Muni talk, the really nuance way he utters all these words in the Tamil language, he says I wish I had a tape recorder. I could record it and take it away. Again, the idea of man just taking away the things he likes the looks of or those that sound of.

The idea that his van can also take an elephant. Again the idea of taking away of the natural resource of this country if you just take it to that level of interpretation. The constant thing that seems to be in his mind is take away stuff, take away interesting things and this horse statue catches his eye, not his mind, catches his eye and then he wants to take it away. He does not know the extent of the role that this horse plays in the lives of these villages.

In fact, the horse' statue is the only one that is not vandalized by the youth of the village. They do not scribble anything vulgar on it. Whereas, all the walls and even the tree trunks are scribbled on. Even with the use of our knives, it is a only figure. The horse' statue is the only one that is kept pristine. That is because it has spiritual value, which is why it has been protected. It is the guardian for them and he takes away that guardian.

You were mentioning the highway once or twice. Do you think it is a symbolism of modernity? He keeps staring at the highway and he learns from the highway and he goes back to his wife and tells her, do you think it is a symbolism of sorts. It is very symbolic in a very usual sense to the sense that it represents modernity. Because once the highway has come up on the landscape, the village moves away. It has moved a few miles away from that space, from that horse itself.

May be the horse represents the ancient tradition, the richness of the past and how the village moving away from the statue of the horse is symbolic again of the intervention played by modernity and its impact on the villagers where they just give up their old values and move away. So, all these associations are there, but more on the individual level, let us look at that particular passage on page 25.

Muni is on his way to the spot near the highway where he can graze his goats and the cronies of Muni, they beckon at him, but does not look at them. He says that I am the poorest fellow and no caste, no wonder that they spun me. But, I would not look at them either, so he passed on with his eyes down cast along the edge of the street and people left him very much alone and then further down only on the outskirts did he lift his head and look up.

He does not feel worry at home within the village. The outskirts give him the confidence to look at the rest of the world. It gives him a lot of peace and that is a very ironic sense of peace because there is nobody there. He cannot have any kind of genuine bond with anybody. He just sits on the horse all day, looks at the vehicle passing down on the road. It is a very interesting state for him.

He urged and bullied the goats until they meandered along the foot of the horse statue in the edge of the village. He sat on its pedestal for the rest of the day. The advantage of this was that he could watch the highway and see the lorries and busses pass through to the hills and it gave him a sense of belonging to a larger world. So, he feels connected through the highway to the rest of the world, but he does not seem to have lot of connection within his home space in the village.

That is because of his fallen fortunes, lack of children and other things. All the things that the village thinks as important for a person's self birth is not there for him, which is why he looks at the larger world. Even though he is not able to relate to it at a personal level, he just enjoys being that dot on the map of the Indian subcontinent.

One last question, talking about how Muni was once a very rich person and his wealth dwindled and now he has two goats from 40 goats in (()) (38:55). Can we extrapolate it to the plight of India itself? Because India was once very rich in culture, tradition and wealth as such. But, the fall in the status was gradual, but once when everything went, we could see it was poor. Can a parallel be drawn between these two?

Yes, yes we can draw a parallel in fact the very beginning, the opening lines of this story has a connection to what you have mentioned of the 700,000 villages dotting the map of Indian in

which the majority of India's 500 billion live, flourish and die. Kritam was probably the tiniest indicated on the district survey map by a microscopic dot, the map being meant more for the revenue official out to collect tax than for the guidance of the motor arrest and so on.

The majority of the Indian population lives in the villages and that majority if we treat this village as a kind of a symbol does suggest that the majority is poor and just barely scraping out a living on the margins of society. Again, the loss and grandeur wealth and richness of the past, the village moving away from the horse' statue being one kind of indication. It is kind of suggested there in the story and it could have some connections to the colonial past, the past in which its various invaders came and plundered in and ruled the country.

So, it could be connected to that and before we knew it, in the 20th century we realized that we have lost everything, we have lost our wealth on so many different levels. That is also kind of an interpretation that we can draw out from this particular story and the word 'Kritam' as I said let us go back to the question that you asked, which suggest a lot of wealth and glory and power is no longer there. We are just hanging on to the vestiges of that past here and there.

Thank you Gayathri for you questions. I hope you had a good time listening to this conversation, we will continue in the next session.