



National Identity Through Cognitive Style of Narration: An Analysis of Naipaul's Indian Trilogy

V. Balasingh, Senior Research Fellow, Indian Institute of Technology-Roorkee.

Dr. Sanjit K. Mishra, Professor, Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology-Roorkee.

Abstract: Travel literature, one of the prominent genres in the representation of foreign cultures and panorama accommodates all sorts of narrative styles. The relationship between travel literature and narrative is not a new phenomenon but in practice ever since ancient Greek epics with the different purpose- adventure, quest etc....and the journey itself is considered a narration. The intention of this paper is to analyse the narratives in Naipaul's Indian trilogy as an empirical data for studies of cognitive narrative in addition to structuralist narratology situated in postindependentIndia in the light of David Herman's "socio narratology" (1999) contextualizing the personal life and mental development as a voyage.

Key Words: Travel literature, Narratives, Cognitive Narrative, Structuralist narratology.

I. INTRODUCTION

Travel literature, one of the prominent genres in the representation of foreign cultures and panorama accommodates all sorts of narrative styles. The relationship between travel literature and narrative is not a new phenomenon but in practice ever since ancient Greek epics with the different purpose- adventure, quest etc....and the journey itself is considered a narration. The intention of this paper is to analyse the narratives in Naipaul's Indian trilogy as an empirical data for studies of cognitive narrative in addition to structuralist narratology situated in postindependentIndia in the light of David Herman's "socio narratology" (1999) contextualizing the personal life and mental development as a voyage as "it is a story about the structure and dynamics of participation in discourse" (David Herman 2009: 43). Naipaul's travel narrative about India is immensely different from other travel narratives like, E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* and Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* as "he has the ability to see with a fascinatingly composite perspective; his observations and interpretations are all the more insightful as a result" (Christopher K Brown, 2000: 157). Travel literature "as a literary form...is a notoriously raffish open house where very different genres are likely to end up in the same bed. It accommodates the private diary, the essay, the short story, the prose, poems, the roughnote and polished table talk with indiscriminate hospitality" (Jonathan Raban, 1987: 253). V.S. Naipaul is, without doubt, an incredible author of fiction and non-fiction with full of artistic gadget, a skilled worker of style and symbolism. His craft as far as his travel literature is concerned comprises in lessening complexities to straightforward pictures and making unique portrayals that are conceived with interesting potential outcomes as "a perceived sequence of non-randomly connected events" (Michael J Toolan, 1988: 7). Naipaul unequivocally represents that writing is a declaration of society: "I wrote my book. What had been a mere idea, an impulse, a series of suggestions, what at the start of the writing had felt unreal, began to have its own life and to exercise its own power in that room with the two views. That had also been the part of the comfort and reassurance of that season, that feeling of a book growing day by day" (Naipaul, MMN, 2010: 493). His anecdotal world is worried about the practical depiction of people, societies and social orders. His repetitive subjects in his Indian trilogy are provincial psychosis, conflict of societies and quest for personal as well as national identity. Be that as it may, this honest depiction of the different shortcomings of the general public within the context of colonial and postcolonial does not need craftsmanship as far as nonfiction is concerned yet his works are delightfully bound with lovely magnificence and glory of "an attribute of narrative media, the status of a given narrative representation as factual or fictional derives from the semantic profile of its story world" (David Herman 2009: 46). As a creative artist, he attempts continually to comprehend human condition especially in the colonial context as "social spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash, and grapple

with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination – such as colonialism and slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out across the globe today” (Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, 2008: 7). Naipaul’s narrative sections throughout his Indian trilogy incorporate ethnographic and empirical subtleties and artistic pictures, written in a journalistic style whereas “western travel writing” like Forster’s and Kipling’s “is inherently or invariably imperialist and exploitative” (Carl Thompson, 2011: 136). In his travel books, Naipaul gives both genuineness and artistic quality to his account and inserts them with shades of unexpected tones of dissatisfaction also “mediating consciousness that monitors the journey, judges, thinks, confesses, changes, and even grows” (Blanton, 2002: 4) because the narratives are “social products produced by people within the context of specific social, historical and cultural locations” (Lawler 2002: 242). In his first travel book on India, *An Area of Darkness*, Naipaul utilizes a comparable strategy of including ethnographic subtleties and scholarly pictures to extend his impressions of bafflement about his genealogical land as a “traveler/narrator’s well-being and eventual safe homecoming become the primary tensions of the tale, the traveler’s encounter with the other its chief attraction. Indeed the journey pattern is one of the most persistent of all narratives – both fiction and non-fiction” (Blanton, 2002: 2).

A close reading of his Indian set of three books reveals a discourse and illustrative sections of cognitive narrative in addition to structuralist narratology situated in post-independent India and so “the narratives show how extended turns at talk required to tell a story must be slotted into those contexts in ways jointly negotiated by participants, with the stories themselves shaping such negotiations as they unfold” (David Herman 2009: 50). These are Naipaul’s individual responses to the Indian situation in colonial context after political independence, and his references about the situation are critical as well as “crucial epistemological category for the displacement of normative values and homogenizing, essentialist views” (Patrick Holland, 2003: ix). Both of them enclose in the narration from memory and experience which thusly are drawn from two living reports of human presence: history and writing. Aside from this, Naipaul has additionally attempted to offer an incorporated structure to the narration by setting up a legitimate system as far as mindfully prearranged sections. Naipaul is a specialist and smart, as well in “the axis and the alignment” (Rajagopalan Radhakrishnan, 2012:76). He communicates effectively and obviously however his aptitude likewise enables him to have control over the readers, as “we dream in narrative, remember, anticipate, hope, despair, believe, doubt, plan, revise, criticize, construct, gossip, learn, hate and love by narrative” (Barbara Hardy, 1977: 31) and he maybe too promptly does it. Naipaul in *An Area of Darkness* starts with people like Ramon in Trinidad and continues to project the characters like Malhotra because “characterization is technique or method and character the product” (Richard, 1995: 127) which, really had slipped into history and writing from his memory. In India, he thinks about on the historical backdrop of the Kashmir valley before the takeover of the Mughals. He utilizes this to draw consideration towards the absence of recorded sense in the contemporary masses that have no memory of their history before the intrusions. In Shimla, he harps on the British guideline and the way of life that it bestowed to the individuals to narrate as “narrative technique is actually the means by which he discovers, objectifies, explores, and evaluates his subject and his dexterity determines his success” (Mark Schorer, 2003: 251). In the South, he thinks about on the destruction of Vijayanagar and sees the demise of antiquated land and the downfall of verifiable India. In Shimla, he chooses the British guideline and the way of life that it gives to the individuals. Through history, he attempts to follow the explanation for India’s concern that he had outlined in his Indian trilogy from the past colonialism till the contemporary political emergency that he considers a “wounded” civilization which is “psychologically prior to all the other uses of language” (James Kinneavy, 1980: 396-397). In the second book titled *India: A Wounded Civilization*, he examines the historical backdrop of Vijayanagar Kingdom and the historical backdrop of Maratha fighting drove by Shivaji against the Mughal Empire. From these two examinations, Naipaul carefully draws the contemporary issue of Indian culture and legislative issues. The pressure is on close to home and family ancestry: chronicles of people inside the grids of social, cultural and political change. This assessment of individual history of people develops to give a clear and exhaustive delineation of social change. Exceptionally common story style, essentially assortment of meetings, however there is some basic stream or string that holds the content together. The narration of historical backdrop in the three books taken into picture are the main areas in Naipaul’s fluctuating strategy that have stayed unaffected over his voyage because “when we speak of technique, we speak of nearly everything. Because, technique is the tool or means by which the writer’s experience, which is his subject matter, compels him to attend to it; technique is the only means he has of discovering, exploring, developing his subject, of conveying its meaning and finally of evaluating it” (Mark Schorer, 2003: 249-250).

Naipaul's accomplishments surpass his deficiencies as "there is nothing absolutely good, there is nothing absolutely right. All things flow and change and even change is not absolute" (D. H. Lawrence, 1962: 290). The straightforwardness, effortless in respect of his composition, the eye for solid detail, the appeal of his initial books, the fine feeling of incongruity, the tidiness and clearness of his work or more and all, his savage trustworthiness, all taken together, make him maybe the most clear observer of India in the throes of good and profound vulnerabilities as in "the background on which the writer builds the plot and characters. It involves the entire environment: time, place, experience, and mood. Setting can be revealed through narration, dialogue and illustrated by the characters' actions, thoughts, and speech patterns" (Nancy Kress, 2005: 32) and Naipaul tries to get back the precolonial oral narrative pattern of ancient India as "it will be argued that oral narratives cognitively correlate with perceptual parameters of human experience and that these parameters remain in force even in more sophisticated written narratives, although the textual make-up of these stories changes drastically over time" (Fludernik, 1996: 12). His way of writing by and large and the qualities of his composition in various periods of his profession are important. He owes devotion to foundation of Hinduism, hence teaching it as a religion because through which he can view "last traces of a great culture and a great civilization" (Orhan Pamuk, 2005: 191). Subsequently, his responsibility to his own vision of life is "another history of agency and knowledge alive in the dead weight of the colonial past" (Gyan Prakash, 1995: 5). His glorious exposition, the clarity of language and felicity of articulation award him an unmatched writer of situation in the realm of letters. Composition of fiction and non-fiction for Naipaul is essentially a requesting of understanding of colonial and imperial context in the colonized country. To him, an author's creative mind constantly forms and takes part in the requesting of his encounters. Landeg White expresses, "Naipaul's is a shaping rather than an inventive imagination" (1975: 24). Actually, it is formed in non-fiction itself and is viewed as a comprehension of the truth of the third world countries. Writing and life interpenetrate, fiction and the genuine supplement contrasts one another, whereas in nonfiction it is purely a record of personal experience. A large number of his books is well outside the points of confinement of what one anticipates from a conventional work of nonfiction. It is through his composition that he lands at a dream of present day vagrancy as a result of recorded powers and to his very own acknowledgment vagrancy as "literary forms, ideas movements, inspirations, even very humble techniques cross frontiers with immense ease" (Robert Wilson, 1990: 13). He has likewise landed at an observation that his very own situation is not solitary however is commonplace of the postcolonial world. The discernment and anguish at his very own removal and rootlessness is vital to his imaginative ability and it has been the upgrade just as the subject of his work as "cognitivism thus reinstitutes a conception of mind rejected by the behaviorists, who considered the domain of the mental to be epiphenomenal rather than genuinely explanatory of human conduct, but redefines the mind as an information processing device" (David Herman, 2011: 256). In Naipaul's vision of the world, cynicism might be said to be a focal strain, while his responsibility to truth is firm. As an onlooker and translator of ex-states, he is unsparingly basic and uncovered the insufficiencies of such social orders, which he accepts to be the result of the oblivious acknowledgment of the standards and estimations of the colonized society. The full effect of Naipaul's work cannot be measured in a vacuum however should be seen against the foundation of the social powers he investigates especially in the context of structuralist narratology. Naipaul, like Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* deliberately conjures satire so as to state something profoundly and truly felt in regard to a social scrape in the concept of "socio narratology" David Herman (1999). He asserts in a "particularly critical to the making of experiential knowledge" (Rentz 1999: 54) that his work focuses on social remark and analysis of "the adaptation of expressions to idea that clenches a writer's meaning" (William Hazlitt, 2005: 28). He doesn't try to deliver social purposeful publicity yet considers to be scholarly creation as being profoundly engaged with the longing to deliver perceptions of a sociological sort and given abundant degree and full opportunity to outline his narratives in a clear and inconspicuous way, the vast majority of his narratives are made accessible to the readers straightforwardly as the storyteller enters their cognizance and uncovered them. There is an amusing complexity between what the characters think and believe and what they state and do as "the story and the novel, the idea and the form, are the needle and thread, and I never heard of a guild of tailors who recommended the use of the thread without the needle, or the needle without the thread" (Henry James, 2001: 866). Notwithstanding the peep that one gets into the mind of the characters, they are additionally exposed to advance evaluation through their observations around each other. It is anything but difficult to derive that Naipaul's anxiety is coordinated towards the scholarly and social parasitism and the mimicry of the West, which are the diseases basic to all the ex-pioneer social orders during colonial and postcolonial period. In the early fictions, for instance *A House for Mr. Biswas* and *Mimic Men* and in non-fictions like *Indian Trilogy* similar weaknesses are seen thoughtfully however in

the later ones his analysis turns out to be particularly acidic because “form is substance to the degree that there is absolutely no substance without it” (Henry James, 2001: 853). It is as if Naipaul has begun to feel that it requires something fierier than compassion to back the ex-colonials out of their smug demeanors. Ensuing to his mistake with India, Naipaul sees the ideas of characteristics of national and personal identity and home in another light. Vagrancy is presently observed as a help as opposed to a bane in the light of the fact that an entire universe of potential outcomes opens up to individuals without a side. In a general public ruled by materialistic qualities, it is inescapable that traditional traditions should respect political interests and his endeavor is to uncover the unavoidable impact of social convictions on political moves in Trinidad. While Naipaul's view about culture is dynamic, there is simultaneously a lament at the dying of the old request. In *An Area of Darkness*, he admits, “the thought of the decay of the old customs and reverences saddened me” (Naipaul, 2010: 36).

He is, simultaneously, engrossed with the more extensive postcolonial topics of intensity, opportunity and neocolonialism in the emanant countries of the Third World and subsequently one sees the books on India as seriously political with “social science disciplines such as sociology, psychology, anthropology, education, and so on have long had an interest in narrative as a human cognitive and discursive device for sense-making and for ordering one's life experiences” (JarmilaMildorf, 234:2010). Naipaul's vision, along these lines, offers little to the third world social orders that have been damaged without hope. In his terms, at that point, the arrangement is to be had at the individual level through self-de-colonization - by conquering the pilgrim attitude of inertness and untrustworthiness as “it refers specifically to the theories of narrative structure” (Gerald Prince 1982: 4) like “a systematic study of Narrative firmly anchored in the tradition of the Russian and Czech formalism of the early twentieth century and French Structuralism and semiotics of the sixties” (O'Neill 1994: 12).

Travel, without a doubt, demonstrated to be a significant upgrade for the further advancement of Naipaul's books “by describing the world in a way that contests or resists the interpretations of it offered by the more official organs of power” (Teverson, 2010: 15). For, it helped him to defeat his vulnerabilities as well as empowered him to discover his vision of national and personal identity. This clarifies the checked move in accentuation from the previous distractions of a fairly close to home nature, to the more extensive and increasingly broad ones that rise in progress having a place with the second period of his vocation. Notwithstanding the widening of vision, there is a fundamental contrast in approach that draws a reasonable line between the two stages. Fundamentally, Naipaul's compositions in after emergency period will in general be not kidding but intelligent. He looks at the postcolonial social orders and the ends he lands at in that discover a repetition in his works. His gloom is successfully passed on in the terrible and humorless tone one finds in the later works. His vision of the world, from this time forward, turns out to be continuously hopeless and the tone, as needs be, increasingly horrid. Naipaul is a voyager, a cosmopolitan with an all-inclusive way of “enactivism can be viewed as part of a constellation of post-cognitivist approaches that also includes work on the extended mind, or how intelligence is distributed across social groups as well as physical structures” (David Herman, 2011: 256). He is a pro with regards to portraying cultural changes and bigotry, zeal and strict fundamentalism and destruction and disappointment. He gathers stories that become grand recognitions in his books. They are the contents removed from reality and are additionally the examined history joined with creative mind as is show in the portrayal of the world throbbing with life in his books “but beyond shifting from the authorial to the figural narrative situation as their preferred method of narration, and thus interweaving with reports of events characters' spoken or unspoken perceptions, inferences, memories, and evaluations, modernist writers also sought to develop an even finer-grained representation of the form and flow of mental activities as they unfolded in time” (David Herman, 2011: 247). Naipaul shifts from his subjective narration to objective narration by letting his characters narrate in *India: A Million Mutinies Now* which is totally varied from his earlier books *India: An Area of Darkness* and *India: Wounded Civilization*. He has been postmodernist in narration at the same time he travels back to precolonial past through his narrative style as the precolonial narratives of Indian stories is storytelling which is perfectly done by his characters in *India: A Million Mutinies Now*. Previously, during and after his numerous adventures, Naipaul has mentioned plain and incognito objective facts on countries, societies, networks and races which have constrained overall consideration on him and his work. His books vouch for his capacity as an adroit delineator of individuals, settings and circumstances. They mirror his unordinary ability for the telling point of interest and infiltrating perception dependent on it. The abnormal portrayal possesses large

amounts of criticism and parody. It might be noticed that Naipaul's pictures, impulsive and exposed, are likewise phenomenally and lavishly fashioned out "this account of modernist narrative as an exploration of psychological depths, an attempt to move away from the external world to map out an interior, mental domain, has functioned for many commentators as a literary-historical given" (David Herman, 2011: 251). There is no space for humor. He is progressively gruff and basic and decides to utilize darker shades of negativity.

In formal terms, Naipaul explores along the limits of fiction and verifiable in his travel books. While his books are described by his own encounters and the ethos of the network he has a place with, in his travel writings he every now and again attempts to keep himself good and gone yet at the same time establishes the spirit of the account. He shows his capacity of account by making his readers share the unavoidable incongruity and oddity of contemporary life torn by its quintessential self-division and inward clash. Subsequently his movement composing displays differed perspectives like his unerring perception, forceful method of appraisal, worry for the powerless, compassion toward the misery, and his veritable assessment of men, habits and improvement of the nation he visits. Or more all, they express in eager terms his narrow mindedness of torpidity, flightiness and lack of involvement. In Naipaul's works, there is a consistent attention to the past of India and its intrusions. Be that as it may, it is just one of the numerous strands that educates his bigger vision as "a prominent conception of mental phenomena is buttressed by a Cartesian geography of the mental, whereby the mind constitutes an interior space separated off from the world at large. In turn, frameworks for studying narrative representations of mind have inherited this Cartesian geography of mind. Analysts typically identify an array of positions or increments along an internal- external scale to which various methods of narration can be assigned — with some more proximal to the internal domain of the mind being represented, others closer to the characters' outward actions and thus more distally related to mind" (David Herman, 2011: 254)

Naipaul's exposition is profoundly discernible and his style is unmistakable to the point of being supreme. A fascinating component of Naipaul's exposition style is its moderate and stately cadence and the deliberate tone reflects stylish robustness and awards to it the status of certainty. Naipaul stands apart for his restriction and virtue of style in examination with the unbridled overabundance of a portion of his counterparts. Naipaul works in straightforward modes, recording solid specifics in an extra style so he furnishes his readers with prompt access to real circumstances. He doesn't trust in making them work their way through degrees of interlocking pictures to discover meaning and "the nature and scope of the experiences falling within the domain of the mental, including sense impressions, emotions, memories, associative thought patterns, and so on" (David Herman, 2011: 243). It is this straightforward class of his exposition style that has earned him the notoriety of being a deft and recognizing observer. Naipaul is of the supposition that a craftsman is to develop something significant out of savage reality. Subsequently, his principle business as an author is to disregard completely the fantasy and dream of sentimental elation and put in their place, the dry and hard certainties of everyday life. One can see that his works are the declaration to his achievement in satisfying his crucial an author in undisputable terms in "suffusing third-person narrative reports with the subjectivity and sometimes the language of the characters whose actions are being recounted" (David Herman, 2011: 245)

The analysis of the country in Indian trilogy, other than being the proportion of the liminality of India's social innovation, likewise typifies the indecisions of the country state trapped in the throes of the creation of its own political and social character from one viewpoint, while giving up its past, on the other whereas "in the western tradition it goes back at least to Plato and Aristotle" (Barry, 2002: 224). The development of the Third-World country expresses—those that either through ridiculous clashes of autonomy or political contracts won their opportunity from hundreds of years' old provincial principle subjects individuals to another account of accomplished opposition and the bewildering space of the postcolonial. India of the 1960s the focal point of Naipaul's request in Indian trilogy is where the befuddled febrile jibber jabber of post-Independence battles to accomplish univocity and to unionize itself into the regularizing langue of the new country state "if canonical structuralist accounts of plot, from Vladimir Propp to the present, place an Aristotelian emphasis on character as agent... suggests the importance of a category narrative voice that narratologists have struggled to fit into these Aristotelian frames. Put another way, nervousness the life of the nerves rather than, or even as, the life of the mind suggests a new way to understand the stresses and

complexities" (Nicholas Dames, 2011: 236). Naipaul's status as a traveler and an author from the majestic metropole goes to personally to this rising nationhood that gradually spreads out itself to uncover the strength of its representative capacity to both bring together just as separation and "capable of this kind of linguistic and temporal self-alienation, in which a faculty of judgment looks at past behavior and attaches abstract terms (ignorance, reason, discernment) in order to arrive at a stable, and potentially consensual, self-knowledge" (Nicholas Dames 2011: 226). That Naipaul's Indian family line contributes him with any better comprehension of the indigenous culture of India than those without is plainly illogical conclusion; in any case, the pariah's objectivity which he brings to the account of Indian trilogy does, as it were, mitigates the probability of its dying down into a vacant and exuberant talk of patriotism. In any case, its excessively skeptical tone has requested solid basic objection floated by the possibility that its creator's intrinsic comprehension and conception of Indians and Indianness has been, all things considered, instrumental in producing a shaped picture of the country and its way of life. However, Naipaul has travelled across India, despite the negative touring that regularly saturates the ethical texture of the story, challenge the direct accounts of a progressively clear patriotism by uncovering the ceaseless slippage of classifications which "is responsible for dissolving the usual cognitive boundaries of individuals by appealing to the commonest aspect of human response" (Nicholas Dames, 2011: 217). The account of "response" would mean reaction rather than judgment or even affect" (Nicholas Dames, 2011: 217) while unmistakably captivating with the tropes of travel literary genre and personal history, plots the narrative of the country and the social development of nation building. These books plan to land at a progressively educated comprehension regarding how social distinction influences enunciation and reshapes it inside the procedure of transcultural exchanges and why the metanarratives of expansionism must be falsely effective if at all in articulating the advancement of developing country states. Country as a story procedure has been accepting extensive basic consideration "the mighty force of knowledge which European Science bestows is a weapon for the hands of a giant, it is the mace of Bheemsen; what can a weakling do with it but crush himself in the attempt to wield it" (Aurobindo, 1996: 77).

In supporting the indecision and the aporia of present-day society, the country vouches for its own reasonable indeterminacy as "globalizing forces of an international division of labour, transnational companies, great power blocs, an ideology of mass consumerism, and the growth of vast networks of communications" (Hutchinson and Smith 1994: 11). At the printed level, the irresoluteness of the country space typified in its social transience, the indeterminacy of language and the intermittent age of new fields of significance, problematizes enunciation by declining to be affected by the prohibitive explicitness of any pre-decided relationship amongst signifiers and connoted. Any elaboration of the country or national culture, thus, must oppose the customary and not extraordinarily, over-decided authority of signs all things considered a strategy for articulating the country would clearly and hazardously block the broadly scattered implications of social impacts only for keeping up recorded coherence. The half and half domain of Naipaul's India—a site meaning the heimlich just as its bewildering inverse—is a space that is interestingly debased with both the natural just as its new Other; the multi-accentual changes of social impacts; the warring powers of political sanity and nonsensicalness; the pressure between the past and the present and the injury of removal and dispossession: "the Heimlich pleasures of the hearth, the unheimlich terror of the space or race of the Other; the comfort of social belonging, the hidden injuries of class; the customs of taste, the powers of political affiliation; the sense of social order, the sensibility of sexuality; the blindness of bureaucracy, the strait insight of institutions; the quality of justice, the common sense of injustice; the langue of the law and the parole of the people" (Bhabha, 1990: 2). The story of the country in Naipaul's Indian trilogy is misleadingly relied on its creator's flashy endeavors at rediscovering the place that is known for his ancestors while "the arrival of a sensation (or set of related sensations) at the forefront of attention was not necessarily a process of repression and return, as twentieth-century psychoanalytic critics so often claim; it might be simply a gradual process of additive, minute bodily impulses that with the addition of one more sensation, the proverbial straw that breaks the camel's back finally are noticed by the intellect" (Nicholas Dames, 2011: 223). In spite of the fact that, Naipaul gets on track to do only that as he steps onto the Indian soil just because, the rising account appears to treat India, the article vital to its request, as a site set apart by class battles and wounds; the political discernment and silliness of post-Independence administering tip top and the ambiguities resultant of the postcolonial condition and "they did not want their society to be caught in a situation where the idea of the Indian nation would supersede that of the Indian civilization, and where the

actual ways of life of Indians would be assessed solely in terms of their needs of an imaginary nationstatecalled India” (AshisNandy, 2010: 3).

At the end of the day, India in Naipaul's account is a social portrayal of a developing country that “entered Indian society in the second half of the nineteenth century, riding piggy-back on the western ideology of nationalism” (AshisNandy, 2010: v) express whose vacillations go far in molding the story methodologies that its creator utilizes so as to light up new fields of significance past the unmistakably increasingly dictator at the same time, to a great extent unimportant account of recorded coherence. Considering the crevices of history and the great separation between the past and the present, the country space that Naipaul brings out, is an inquisitively necessary domain and clearly it is portrayed with its deficient with regards to the guaranteeing indications of nation or a focal will that he was to find twenty-six years on in the India he expounds on in his last book of Indian trilogy and whose prominent nonattendance in Indian trilogy he explores “for Tagore, nationalism itself became gradually illegitimate; for Gandhi, nationalism began to include a critique of nationalism. For both over time, the Indian freedom movement ceased to be an expression of only nationalist consolidation; it came to acquire a new stature as a symbol of the universal struggle for political justice and cultural dignity” (AshisNandy, 2010: 2-3). In any case, one of the most significant parts of Indian trilogy is that it catches the rising country space that is India at an essential crossroads in its history; the content sanctions the conflicted portrayal performed by the country and all the while, both composes and is composed on. At the printed level, Naipaul's account methodologies are planned for investigating the warring powers of pulverization and creation, enslavement and opportunity, quietness and expert articulation—the shifted social powers that direct the introduction of countries and that must go up against each other so as to set the procedure of authentic change moving.

The possibility that a territory as a “nation is a territorial relation of collective self-consciousness of actual and imagined duration” (Grosby 2005: 11-12) of the creative mind ought to likewise be overwhelmed in an early stage haziness of not-knowing is obviously unnatural as creative mind is connected to a somewhat uninhibited sentimental hypothesis about some thought or thing and underlines the deficiencies of the customary authority of national items as suffering indications of nations “while an ethnic group may, therefore, be other-defined, the nation must be selfdefined”(Connor, 1994: 45-46). Besides, the substances of a postcolonial and post-IndependenceIndia required the quest for new fields of importance so as to understand the modern andquestionable social space that rendered each previously established inclination about the countryboth superfluous and hazardous. Country as portrayal is constantly a shaky because “we are nowpartly of the West. Our identity is at once plural and partial. Sometimes we feel that we straddletwo cultures; at other times, that we fall between two stools” (Salman Rushdie, 1991: 15),speculative exercise and as a procedure can never be finished so “we must not imagine that theworld turns towards us a legible face which we would have only to decipher. The world is notthe accomplice of our knowledge; there is no pre -discursive providence which disposes the world in our favour” (Michel Foucault, 1981: 67).Hence, the transformative account of nation in Indian trilogy admits to the difficulty ofappropriating the country by either submitting it to memory or through etymological dominanceand strict intensity. The possibility of the country in Indian trilogy is supplied with a figurativequality; to portray the country and to contribute it with a transnational measurement is likewise to take part in a nonstop age of the Self that isn't controlled by the antiquated authority ofcustoms yet is fairly participatory and performative in nature of “text emerges from priorconventions for storytelling that provide both an orienting context and a basis for narrativeinnovation” (David Herman 2009: 42). Notwithstanding, so as to have the option to producecognizance about one's own distinction and social situation inside the provisional interiority ofthe national-space, “what is new in the contemporary metropolitan philosophies and the literaryideologies which have arisen since the 1960s, in tandem with vastly novel restructuring of globalcapitalist investments, communication systems and information networks – not to speak of actualtravelling facilities – is that the idea of belonging is itself being abandoned as antiquated falseconsciousness” (Aijaz Ahmad, 1992: 129) one should initially figure out how to draw in with and arrange the uncertainty of the country. In post-Independence India, it was the notorious stature of Gandhi that proliferated famous patriotism. Veneration for the Mahatma—on whom as Naipaul grumbles in Indian trilogy, animated India to all her undefined, otherworldliness—is to be viewed as a dish Indian marvel. He symbolized Indian patriotism, meticulously taking shape the feeling of country in spite of and regardless of his inability to rise above the quality of sacredness agreed to him by his compatriots. The imagery of Gandhi—an especially mysterious figure given, the simultaneousness of his prosperity and

disappointment with regards to Indian patriotism—repeats the indecision of the cutting-edge country as a sign separated from its unique import or, as one whose vagueness is hard to address but utilizing “Intertextuality replaces the challenged author-text relationship with one between reader and text, one that situates the locus of textual meaning within the history of discourse itself. A literary work can actually no longer be considered original; if it were, it could have no meaning for its reader. It is only as part of prior discourses that any text derives meaning and significance” (Linda Hutcheon, 1998: 126- 130). The way of life space of the country in Indian trilogy is an inquisitively mixture domain full of a steady pressure among innovation and artifact; change and balance; force and ineptitude; abundance and neediness.

The frontier mimicry of the boxwallah—both absurd and clever—intimates another heading that the country has taken observing its autonomy from religious perspectives. The jargon of the rising country is conditional and thought about dynamic. The country as an office of authentic change shapes portrayal and the subsequent jargon notwithstanding its fundamentally unsure nature comes to mean new connections between the current plan of signifiers and connoted “the idea of the singularity of national history has inevitably led to single source of Indian tradition, namely, ancient Hindu civilization. Islam here is either the history of foreign conquest or a domesticated element of everyday popular life. The classical heritage of Islam remains external to Indian history” (Chatterjee, Partha, 1993: 113). The indecisions of the country and its applied indeterminacy as it is written in Indian trilogy, are frequently imparted by methods for parallel classes: the heimlich versus the unheimlich; advancement versus vestige; confidence versus doubt et cetera. It would maybe, not be nonsensical to state that the story is ready between boundaries—undermining, at once, to respect the very simple separation of the easygoing guest while at another, to give up to the fiendish anguish of outright and irredeemable misery. An especially upsetting part of the story is its unmitigated fixation on rawness: with the pervasive Indian group, Naipaul partners a feeling of claustrophobia combined with a difficult deletion of personality. What is observable is that these mild bodies littering the story space are quiet and not supplied with a discourse as “one important sub-type of natural-language narratives – namely, stories elicited during interviews – but does not necessarily apply equally well to other storytelling situations, such as informal conversations between peers, he-said-she-said gossip, or conversations among family members at the dinner table” (David Herman 2009: 34). This languageless nearness of unknown bodies can thus be deciphered as the quiet other of an account’s authoritative articulateness. At the story level, the bombed discourse of these quiet, tame bodies goes about as a consistent token of the country’s indecision and a definitive insufficiency of portrayal to detail a counter-talk that would offset the dissonant hushes bringing about a unisonant talk of patriotism. Country as portrayal in Indian trilogy battles to accomplish authentic progression of “strength physical, strength mental, strength moral, but above all strength spiritual which is the one inexhaustible source of all the others” (Aurobindo, 1996: 68) as the totalizing information on its frontier past stands tested by present day sensibilities because “it is she (India) who must send forth from herself the future of religion of the entire world, the Eternal Religion which is to harmonise all religion, science and philosophies and make mankind one soul. In the sphere of morality, likewise, it is her mission to purge barbarism out of humanity and to Aryanise the world” (Aurobindo, 1996: 70). Albeit a developing political and social cognizance of the account of postcolonial India establishes itself as a tale of the envisioned networks and their own private stories “in this ideology of patriotism rather than of nationalism, there is a built-in critique of nationalism and refusal to recognize the nation-state as the organizing principle of the Indian civilization and as the last word in the country’s political life” (AshisNandy, 2010: 3).

REFERENCES:

1. Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes Nations Literatures*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010.
2. Aurobindo, Sri. “Bhawani Mandir.” *On Nationalism*. Pondicherry: Aurobindo Ashram Publications, 1996. 65-78.
3. Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester and New York: MUP, 2002.
4. Bhabha, Homi, ed. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.
5. Carl Thompson, *Travel Writing, The New Critical Idiom*. London: Routledge, 2011.
6. Casey Blanton, *Travel Writing: The Self and the World* New York: Routledge, 2002.

7. Chatterjee, Partha. *The Nation and its Fragments*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
8. Christopher K. Brown, *Encyclopedia of Travel Literature*. England: ABC Clio, 2000.
9. Connor, Walker. "A Nation is a Nation, is a State, is an Ethnic Group, is a ...". *Nationalism*. Eds.
10. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford, 1994. 36-46.
11. Dames, Nicholas. "1825–1880 The Network of Nerves". *The Emergence of Mind*:
12. *Representations of Consciousness in Narrative Discourse in English* Ed. David Herman, 215- 239. University of Nebraska Press: United States of America, 2011.
13. Fludernik, Monika, *Towards a 'Natural' Narratology*. London: Routledge. 1996.
14. Foucault, Michel. "The order of discourse", R. Young, (ed.) *Untying the Text: A Poststructuralist Reader*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
15. Grosby, Steven. *Nationalism: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford, 2005.
16. Hardy, Barbara. "Towards Poetics of Fiction: An Approach Through Narrative". *Towards A Poetics of Fiction*. Ed. Mark Spilka. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977.
17. Hazlitt, William. "On Familiar Style". *William Hazlitt: Selected Essays*. Ed. Ramji Lal. New Delhi: Rama Brothers, 2005.
18. Hazlitt, William. "On Familiar Style". *William Hazlitt: Selected Essays*. Ed Ramji Lal. New Delhi: Rama Brothers, 2005.
19. Herman, David. "1880–1945 Re-minding Modernism". *The Emergence of Mind: Representations of Consciousness in Narrative Discourse in English* Ed. David Herman, 243-272. University of Nebraska Press: United States of America, 2011.
20. Herman, David. "Toward a Socionarratology: New Ways of Analyzing Natural-Language Narratives." *Narratologies: New Perspectives on Narrative Analysis*. Ed. David Herman.
21. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.1999, 218–46.
22. Herman, David. *Basic Elements of Narrative*. United Kingdom: Wiley BlackWell, 2009.
23. Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. New York and London: Routledge, 1998.
24. Hutchinson, John, and Anthony D Smith, eds. *Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford, 1994.
25. James Kinneavy, *A Theory of Discourse: The Aims of Discourse*. New York; London: W.W. Norton, 1980.
26. James, Henry. "The Art of Fiction". *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Vincent Leith. New York: Norton, 2001.
27. James, Henry. "The Art of Fiction". *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*.Ed. Vincent Leith. New York: Norton, 2001.
28. Jonathan Raban, *For Love and Money: Writing, Reading, Travelling, 1969-1987* (London: Collins Harvill, 1987.
29. Lawler, Steph, "Narrative in Social Research." *Qualitative Research in Action* Ed. Tim May.
30. London: Sage. 242–58. 2002.
31. Lawrence, D.H. "Why the Novel Matters", *English Critical Texts*. Eds D.J. Enright and Ernest De Chickera. Bombay Calcutta and Madras:1962.
32. Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* [1992] 2nd edn, London: Routledge, 2008.
33. Mildorf, Jarmila "Narratology and Social Sciences". *Postclassical Narratology Approaches and Analyses* Ed. Jan Alber and Monika Fludernik The Ohio State University, (234-254), 2010.
34. Naipaul, V.S. *An Area of Darkness*. London: Picador, 2010.
35. Naipaul, V.S. *An Area of Darkness*. London: Picador, 2010. Print.
36. Naipaul, V.S. *India: A Million Mutinies Now*. London: Picador, 2010. Print.
37. Naipaul, V.S. *India: A Wounded Civilization*. London: Picador, 2010. Print.
38. Nancy Kress. *Characters, Emotion and View Point*. Ohio Cincinnati: F and W Publication, 2005.
39. Nandy, Ashis. "The Illegitimacy of Nationalism" *Return from Exile*. New Delhi: Oxford, 2010. 1-91.
40. O' Neill, Patrick. *Fictions of Discourse; Reading Narrative Theory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.
41. O' Neill, Patrick. *Fictions of Discourse; Reading Narrative Theory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.
42. Orhan Pamuk, *Istanbul: Memories and the City*. London: Faber and Faber, 2005.
43. Patrick Holland and Graham Huggan, *Tourists with Typewriters: Critical Reflections on Contemporary Travel Writing* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.

44. Prakash, Gyan, ed. *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*. New Jersey: Princeton, 1995.
45. Prince, Gerald. *Narratology: The Form and Functions of Narrative*. Berlin: Mouton, 1982.
46. Prince, Gerald. *Narratology: The Form and Functions of Narrative*. Berlin: Mouton, 1982.
47. Rajagopalan Radhakrishnan, A *Said Dictionary*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
48. Rentz, Kathryn C. "What Can We Learn from a Sample of One? The Role of Narrative in Case Study Research." *Narrative and Professional Communication* Eds. Jane M. Perkins and Nancy Blyler. Stamford: Ablex. 1999, 37–62.
49. Richard. *Mastering English literature*. China: Palgrave publication, 1995.
50. Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. London: Granta, 1991.
51. Schorer, Mark. "Technique as Discovery". *Critical Approaches to Fiction*. Eds. Shiv.K and Keith Mc Kean. Eds. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2003.
52. Teverson, Andrew. *Salman Rushdie: Contemporary World Writers*. New Delhi: Viva Books, 2010.
53. Toolan, J. Michael. *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 1988.
54. White, Landeg. *V S Naipaul: A Critical Introduction*. London: Macmillan Press, 1975. Print.
55. Wilson, Robert. "National Frontier and International Movements: Postmodernism in Canady Literature". In *Ambivalence: Studies in Canadian Literature*. Eds. OmpJuneja and Chandra Mohan. New Delhi: Allied Publisher, 1990.