

Nithin Varghese*

ORCID: 0000-0002-9622-5356

Indian Institute of Technology Mandi
nidhinvetu23@gmail.com.

Suman Sigroha

ORCID: 0000-0003-3122-881X

Indian Institute of Technology Mandi
suman.sigroha@gmail.com

Understanding Rivalry: Staging Jealousy in Karnad's *Broken Images*

Abstract: Acclaimed Kannada and English playwright, Girish Karnad's play *Broken Images* focuses on human relationships and their intricacies, as well as on the relationship between languages. Outwardly, it addresses the sibling relationship and focuses on its destructive side. However, on a close reading, this monologue unfolds a series of diverse human relationships, viz., the relationship of the two sisters, Manjula and Malini; the husband-wife relationship between Manjula and Pramod; the camaraderie of Pramod and Malini; the friendship between Pramod and Lucy; and the amity between Lucy and Manjula. Besides these personal relationships, the play deals with and explores at length another important relationship, the one between two languages, one regional and one global, the legacy of the erstwhile colonizers. The relationship between Manjula and Malini acts as a metaphor for the mismatch and the hierarchy between regional language writers and Indian English writers on the Indian literary scene. This paper, therefore, examines the aforementioned human relationships in the play to reveal the motives behind the enmity and the causes which lead to sinful actions that remain invisible at all times, and in the process comments upon the relationship between different language writers, as well as what leads to the formation of existing hierarchies. First, the paper investigates the sororal bond between Manjula and Malini; second, it examines the tripartite relationships and how the third party is perceived as a rival in the relationships of Manjula-Lucy-Pramod and Manjula-Malini-Pramod; and finally, it looks at the relationship that exists between the *Bhasha* writers and Indian English writers, and exposes the enmity in these relationships and its various causes.

Keywords: sibling rivalry, Romantic jealousy, sexual jealousy, sinful actions, Girish Karnad, literary rivalry

* Corresponding author.

The biblical narrative of Cain and Abel, a “second account of the fall of man, this time as a result of jealousy” (Crownfield 58), is, perhaps, the world’s most famous example of sibling rivalry. Marguerite de Thérèlles, the younger sister in Guy de Maupassant’s short story “The Confession” confesses on her death-bed: “I was jealous, jealous! ... I became crazy ... He shall not marry Suzanne, no, I will not have it! It is I whom he will marry when I am grown up ... I was angry” (50). It is human, very human, to be jealous, and jealousy, the “green-eyed monster”, as Shakespeare called it (*Othello* 3.3.168), occupied Thérèlles’ mind. Jealousy, Cervantes’ “fierce tyrant of the realms of love” (74), is a ubiquitous emotion that affects human beings in every relationship. It has a darker and more sinister side, though, which causes human beings to become violent, destroy previously harmonious relationships, commit sinful actions, and so on. This paper focuses on the diverse human relationships in Karnad’s *Broken Images* to study the contention and conflict in the interactions of characters that result in jealousy (sibling rivalry, romantic jealousy, sexual jealousy) and rage leading to hate, animosity, and sinful actions that also metaphorically stand for the rivalry and the animosity that exists between *Bhasha* and English language writers. It does so through the intellectual foundations of Sigmund Freud on the workings of the human mind and critical observations of David M. Levy and other later psychoanalysts.

It is a fact that rivalries are prevalent in different fields in society and “abound at all levels of human interaction” (Thompson 3). Over the past few years, scholars have made substantial advances in enhancing the comprehension of the causes of inception, escalation and cessation of rivalry. With the advent of psychoanalysis, scholars have delved deep into rivalry and studied its variant forms, placing considerable emphasis on sibling rivalry. David M. Levy, a pioneer in child psychiatry, introduced the term “sibling rivalry” in the 1930s; the term refers to the “feelings of envy, jealousy, and competitiveness that exist between brothers and sisters within the family” (Volling, Kennedy, and Jackey 387). They add that siblings also compete for their parents’ care and love in addition to the competition for status, objects, and achievements (387–388). The Maupassant’s aforementioned story sheds light on this age-old universal human phenomenon — the rivalry among siblings.

The title, *Broken Images* / *Odakalu Bimba* (Kannada), which Karnad borrows from T. S. Eliot’s 1922 masterpiece, *The Waste Land*, “A heap of broken images” (5), says a lot about human relationships in the play. Eliot in *The Waste Land*, alluding to passages from the Bible, refers to the desolation and dismal future of human beings. Because of its novel technique and subject matter, this play marks a watershed moment in Karnad’s literary career. However, in comparison to his other plays, the setting of this play is rather costly, as it requires a large plasma screen on one side, as well as multiple television sets with screens of varying sizes. A chair and a “telly” table are on the opposite side of the stage. A red bulb also shines high above the table, out of sight of the television screen. Manuja, who is surrounded by television sets, exclaims, “Ah! I see. New Technology. Isn’t it scary?

... No camera. I just look ahead and speak to an invisible audience in front of me ... Direct. Fine..." (261–262). This surveillance, or Panopticon, to use Foucault's term, compelled her to reveal her suppressed desires and fears to her own image on the giant screen. In the play, we can see the delineation of the unfolding of the dejection and the discontent in the protagonist, Manjula. The play shows how Manjula was broken at different times in her life, and at the end of the play, the audience sees a broken image of Manjula, exposing her false identity.

Broken Images, a play about human relationships, articulates the relationship of the sisters, Manjula and Malini; the husband-wife relationship between Manjula and Pramod; the camaraderie of Pramod and Malini; the friendship between Pramod and Lucy; and the amity between Lucy and Manjula. Besides, the relationship of Manjula and Malini acts as a metaphor for the hierarchy that exists between English and Indian languages, and also conveys the relationship that exists between regional language writers and Indian English writers in the Indian literary scene. The subsequent sections examine these relationships that gradually lead to hate, animosity and sinful actions due to jealousy.

1. The Sibling Rivalry: Manjula and Malini

The play is set in the studio of a TV channel, where the protagonist, Manjula Nayak, gives a brief presentation introducing the film version of her now-bestselling book written in English, *The River Has No Memories*. She is a celebrated short-story writer who used to teach English at a college in Bangalore until a year ago. She surprised the world with her debut novel, *The River Has No Memories*, which becomes a bestseller, and the advance she receives for her novel makes headlines in both India and the West. It is worth noting the intertextual connotations in the title of Manjula Nayak's *The River Has No Memories*. The title is taken from Bhagavata's song in Karnad's *Hayavadana*, a play about human identity in a world of entangled relationships. Published in 1975, *Hayavadana* takes us into the realms of folklore. The plot is based on *Kathasaritsagara*, an ancient collection of stories in Sanskrit. However, Karnad has appropriated it from Thomas Mann's retelling of the story in *The Transposed Heads* (*Hayavadana* iii). In his song, Bhagavata compares the flow of nature to a river and sings, "[y]ou cannot engrave on water nor wound it with a knife, which is why the river has no fears or memories" (*Hayavadana* 58). Since *Broken Images* is about human relationships and the search for completeness, Karnad subtly hints at all of these themes with the title of *The River Has No Memories*.

When she prepares to leave the set, at the end of her 10–15 minutes speech, Manjula's image on the monitor televising her presentation continues to speak. Overcoming her initial fear, she starts talking to her image on the television, her conscience, which makes an attempt to question her act (revealed subsequently) and

her bogus identity. The Image remarks, “A good speech, I must say. My compliments. An excellent performance. The viewers loved it. ... Your performance now ... this introduction ... it will be the best thing this evening” (268). Their conversation reveals Manjula’s inner world, and her life, which is full of pain, frustration, jealousy, betrayal and agony, is laid bare in front of the audience.

Sigmund Freud writes about the sibling relationship first and foremost in terms of rivalry for parental love. According to him, “feelings of enmity towards brothers and sisters must occur far more frequently during the age of childhood” (*The Interpretation of Dreams* 213). He emphasizes that the elder child has intense jealousy and strong competitive emotional states when the next child is born into the family. “The little child does not necessarily love his brothers and sisters”, Freud writes in *The Dream: Archaic Remnants and Infantilism in the Dream*. “Often, obviously, he does not ... he hates his rivals and ... this attitude continues for many years until maturity, and even beyond, without interruption” (171). The rivalry among siblings stems from different factors, one among them being the parents’ treatment of their children. This is intensified to an intolerable level when children become aware of their parental favouritism or merely perceive it in their jealous state of mind. Similar to Freud, Neubauer also argues that sibling rivalry derives from “the competition among siblings for the exclusive or preferred care from the person they share” (326).

The sororal bond between Manjula and Malini is revealed to be one such relationship rife with rivalry and is therefore by no means a smooth one. In fact, this Cain syndrome is apparent in their relationship. As Thérèlles unwraps her mind in Maupassant’s story, Manjula unburdens herself to the Image: “I have always been reconciled to being the second best” (269). She admits, “I was a shallow woman, a pretentious mediocrity, a gushy, conniving and devious relative who had taken her [Malini] in for her inheritance” (285). Malini, Manjula’s younger sister, is physically challenged, she — “[s]uffered from what is technically called, meningomyelocoele — the upper part of her body was perfectly normal; below the waist, the nervous system was damaged. Completely dysfunctional” (265), and remains confined to the wheelchair. While she is the apple of her parents’ eye, and is always the focus of attention, their parents leave Manjula with her grandparents, who, despite fussing over her, are, according to her, “no substitute for parents” (269). The most cherished moments of Manjula’s life are the ones she spends with her parents during holidays. Behrman (1997) and McGuire et al. (2000) point out that siblings compete frequently for the resources, including time and attention, of parents, and the financial assets and material possessions of the family. While Malini lives in Koramangala with their parents, Manjula lives in Dharwad with their grandparents. Not only the contrasting familial relationships, but also the contrasting locations evoke a sense of deprivation and inferiority in Manjula’s mind, who, therefore, competes to get both love and care, and a sense of equal socio-cultural status from their parents. In pursuit of parental attention and love, Manjula finds

a job in Bangalore upon finishing college, and comes to live with her parents and Malini in Koramangala. Afterwards, she meets Pramod, and upon her marriage settles down in Jayanagar; again, emphasizing the skewed socio-economic status between the two sisters. These two places have a lot to unfold about the difference in the socio-economic status of the sisters, while Koramangala, one of the premium areas in Bangalore, invokes wealth: “big house. The garden. The sense of space” (270); Jayanagar is a traditional middle-class residential area. Even the division of family property and money between the two sisters leaves Manjula feeling the same dejection and discrimination. She says “[f]ather helped with the house but he left most of his money in her [Malini’s] name — for her care. She was always the focus. Naturally” (269). Yet again, the parents’ concern for their physically dependent daughter is misjudged by the other daughter, who has always felt neglected.

Another common cause of sibling rivalry is competition. Manjula believes that Malini surpasses her in all areas, including appearance and intelligence, which means that she has to accept the second place at all times and is constantly ignored. She admits: “She was attractive—more attractive than me. Intelligent—more intelligent than me. And vivacious, which I never was. I accepted that. She radiated life from the wheelchair to which she was confined. I have always been reconciled to being the second best” (269). Due to her constant dejection and perceived second position in love and life, Manjula becomes jealous of Malini. Interestingly, Manjula’s book is based on her sister’s suffering. She affirms, “my beautiful, gentle sister” is the “only character in the novel drawn from life. The other characters and the plot are entirely fictional. Invented” (266). Manjula, feeling devoid of parental affection, care and love, over these years like Cain, as Webb and Szondi note in another context, “accumulates rage, hatred, vengeance, anger and rage, envy and jealousy” (58). Kruger (1993) also notes, sibling conflicts can assume a destructive quality, especially if they persist and become frequent or intense. Even though Manjula obeyed the saying, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*,¹ in the book and the television presentation, she later discloses to the Image that “... I hated the cripple. I had always hated her. I was only waiting for her to die” (285). Her constant dejection and perceived secondary position in life, and the resultant hatred and envy of Malini, ultimately leads her to steal and publish the novel written by Malini as her own. The explosive revelation happens in front of the conscience keeper, the Image, thusly: “I didn’t write the novel. She did. She wrote it. Every word of it” (282).

It is disclosed that Manjula chances upon Malini writing something on her laptop, and after the latter’s death, she finds a draft of the novel: “it was brilliant. A masterpiece. ... as a writer you could never dream of such heights. The passion. The clarity. The insights. The total control. A work of genius” (283). In the twist of fate, Manjula grabs this chance to become the centre of attention for a change,

¹ A Latin phrase that means “say nothing but good of the dead”.

as well as take revenge upon her perceived rival, the dead sister. It is her chance to finally lead, become the heroine of her own life, and attain primacy, as well as opportunity to create an image of her sister in her own words and on her own terms. The very nature of her revenge, as Poland writes, is “to hide itself while awaiting its chance, shrouded darkly, skulking in the wings” (355). She has been brewing with jealousy and rage like Cain, and been waiting for the right moment to strike. “I had to do something she could not have possibly anticipated. I had to solve all problems at one stroke. I had to survive. ... And this time I had one advantage. She was dead and I was not. ... I published the novel in my name. I won!” (285–286). Therefore, Manjula’s act of stealing Malini’s creativity, in a way the latter’s life force, as well as her language, is her revenge upon her dead sister, caused by years of agony, frustration, and anguish. Manjula manages her celebrityhood with care, and she patiently answers all questions. When the Image confronts her, she loses her cool and begins yelling, “[y]ou—you—I’ll show you. ... I’ve had enough of you. I want to unplug you. I want to wipe you out” (286). The image (her doppelgänger), however, reveals Manjula’s true identity. The act of attempting to disconnect the cable represents her attempt to conceal her guilt and silence the truth. With his innovative use of images on the plasma screen, Karnad creates a sense of virtual reality. The “real” Manjula deceives herself and the audience, whereas the “virtual” Manjula discovers the truth. In short, artificially-created virtual reality questions reality and eventually reveals the truth.

Despite the fact that the stage directions in the play are minimal, Karnad gives a few stage directions near the end of the play. For instance, when Manjula tries to unplug the screen, the image appears to become the upper part of her body, and Malini’s personality takes over. The image says, “I shall continue with the name of Manjula Nayak. ... However I am in truth Malini” (287). This theme is not unfamiliar in Karnad. He has already used it in *Hayavadana*, where Devadatta and Kapila get their heads transposed. As a result, the intertextual elements are prominent in this episode.

2. The Anatomy of Rivalry in Other Relationships

Moving on to Lucy–Manjula–Pramod’s friendship and Malini–Pramod–Manjula’s camaraderie in the play, it is evident that jealousy plays a vital role in these relationships as well. Philosophers and psychologists contend that jealousy comes from the fear of losing someone or something you love (Purshouse 180). If analysed carefully, jealousy is a three-party relationship, and involves a specific competition with a third party (Ben-Ze’ev 41). This three-party relationship consists of the individual, his or her relationship partner, and a third party, and this three-party relationship is obvious in Lucy–Manjula–Pramod’s friendship and Malini–Pramod–Manjula’s camaraderie.

The amity between Lucy and Manjula, who have been friends until now, is affected by Pramod's entry. Pramod, Manjula's husband, is an "[a]lmost simple-minded" (272) man. Attracted to Manjula, but unfortunately unable to convey directly, he resorts to the old trick of exchanging letters in order to express his feelings. He writes a letter to Lucy, Manjula's close friend, telling how Manjula tortured him, and another letter about Lucy to Manjula, such that Lucy got Manjula's letter and vice versa. Both confront him. Lucy's act of confrontation results in her stepping away angrily, not only from the situation, but also from her friendship. This act is the result of jealousy on her part that arises from the belief that Manjula's relationship with Pramod threatens her friendship with Manjula. As Parker et al. opine, "individuals who are jealous may feel they are in danger of being replaced in the relationship by the interloper, thereby losing the relationship entirely" (236). Pramod confesses his love to Manjula and marries her; she in turn knows that she cannot get a man of his calibre, which becomes the major cause of her insecurity. Manjula says "[w]omen found him attractive" (272) because he is "intelligent, warm and lovable person. Fun loving. Fond of practical jokes. Noble and simple" (272). Feeling inferior, she sees Lucy as a competitor in her relationship with Pramod, and after the incident, despite their earlier friendship, Manjula makes no attempt to mend her friendship with Lucy. She expects Lucy to be distant from her relationship, which could be one of the reasons why she does not even try to revive her friendship.

After their parents' death, Malini moves to Jayanagar to live with Manjula and Pramod. Pramod, a software wizard, who usually works from home, comes into Malini's life "like a storm and stayed centre stage" (273). He is in fact, the only man in Malini's life and they develop a warm camaraderie. For Manjula, this camaraderie is both a relief and another cause of jealousy. Because she regards Malini as a rival in her life, it comes as no surprise that this friendship "bothered" her (280), and she comes to think of Malini as an intruder in their relationship, which in turn gives rise to sexual jealousy. She constantly tries to unravel what she believes to be the secret illicit romance between the two and uncover their seeming deception through various experiments. Sometimes, when she would return from college and herald her arrival by banging on the door, she would find both of them absorbed in their work, but her quiet return would always find them in serious discussion. Once she came home early to find both of them arguing, "squabbling like a married couple" (280) about the idea of ethics. Upon seeing her, they stop the discussion abruptly, as if "I had caught them making love" (281). In Manjula's own words, such moments make her feel that "[t]his isn't my home. I am an intruder here: someone external to the soul of this house — along with the cook, the maid and the nurse" (281). This self-equating with a service provider shows her perception of the self, and of socio-economic inequality within the home, which further builds upon her aforementioned perception of denigrated status. The jealousy goes a step further when she wonders "if he was fantasizing about having Malini instead of me in bed

with him” (281). Eaten up by the green-eyed monster, Manjula opines that “[t]here was something insidious in the way she has taken over my home” (279). This unfounded suspicion and jealousy ultimately destroys her romantic relationship with Pramod and leads to the collapse of their marriage.

Malini died a couple of months before the book was released. Immediately after Malini’s death, Manjula finds the typescript, printed and arranged neatly inside Pramod’s drawer, hidden from her in vain. She reads the novel and is devastated to find herself recreated as a cousin, as if Malini wished her so. Her portrayal is very rancorous; she is rendered as a Machiavellian relative who takes the disabled cousin in for her inheritance, almost in preemption of her own admission to the Image mentioned in the earlier section of the paper. “The events were from my life. They were accurately described. The conversations were recorded verbatim” (285). What Malini experienced during her six years in Manjula’s house is reflected in the novel. To Manjula, publishing the novel as the author is the only way to win over her perceived rival, for if someone else were to publish it, everyone will see who the “venomous ... first cousin” (284) is. Manjula tellingly “dedicated [the book] to her [Malini’s] memory” (265). When Pramod finds out about this final act of vendetta on Manjula’s part, he becomes angry. She brazenly confronts him with her denial, and though the topic is never ever mentioned, they begin to live entombed in silence, a step closer towards finally parting ways.

The success of the book, released a couple of months after Malini’s death, “inundated [Manjula] with invitations to public functions, cultural events, literary conferences” (277) and so on, to which, however, Pramod never accompanies her. The rift widens further when unexpectedly, one day, Lucy makes a call to Pramod after which they start meeting and dining in expensive restaurants. Although he cracks jokes that are “carefully selected, polished, tabulated and fitted into the larger narrative ... [which is] hilarious” (278), they never talk about Manjula, but this “inexhaustible gaiety” (278) of his worries Lucy. She communicates her concern to an unperturbed Manjula, and consequently informs the latter that “[i]f it doesn’t worry you, it doesn’t worry me. If you don’t mind, I would like to continue” (278).

The chasm between Manjula and Pramod widens so much that he decides to go to Los Angeles, and although the novel is released with a lot of fanfare in the States, he never meets her or invites her over to his place. Instead, he sends her a congratulatory e-mail with apologies that “he couldn’t get leave to attend” (276). The rift in their relationship now stands wide and unbridgeable.

3. Staging the Noxious History of Literary Rivalries

The rivalry between the sisters also functions as a metaphor for the hierarchy of languages of literary expression in India. The rivalry among the writers, which arises from jealousy, is not new, for there have been many such verbal and literal

wars between writers over the ages. The rivalries and hatred between Byron and Keats, Ernest Hemingway and F. Scott Fitzgerald, Derek Walcott and V. S. Naipaul, and between Salman Rushdie and John Updike are well-known. Perhaps the jealousy arising out of the perceived talent of the other, perhaps of success, or even associates and acquaintances makes even the writers who write about human emotions fall prey to the Cain syndrome.

However, while these rivalries have been between the writers of the same language, Karnad's play delineates the rivalry between two different languages: Kannada and English. It is true that the English language is supposed to be higher in the hierarchy bestowed the status by the erstwhile colonizers, and which in a way continues today in India, the writers of regional languages are looked down upon. Therefore, choosing the language of literary expression has always been a highly-debated critical issue in India. The tussle between one's own mother tongue and the language of literary expression remains a conspicuous, complicated and unresolved issue in India. The hostility Manjula experiences from different corners of the Kannada literary circle for writing her debut novel in English, in a way that is self-admittedly autobiographical, owes its origin to Shashi Deshpande, who confronted Karnad in the writers' conference at Neemrana in 2002 (Basu 254). Karnad takes that as the basis for this play and gives a rejoinder to the critics who accuse him of writing in English. Karnad, a polyglot, says in an interview, "I have become a bilingual writer over the years through various processes. My mother tongue is Konkani but I grew up speaking Kannada. Whereas I speak only in English with my wife and children though they know Kannada!" ("The Return of Karnad").

As a result of writing her debut novel in English, Manjula, the "Literary Phenomenon of the Decade" (263), is questioned about the language of her literary expression thusly: "After having written in Kannada all your life, why did you choose—suddenly—to write in English? Do you see yourself as a Kannada writer or an English writer? What audience do you write for? And variations on that theme" (263). She is strongly criticized for writing her debut novel in English rather than in her native tongue. "How dare [she] write in English and betray Kannada!" (263). The fact that the novel is written in English by Malini and is published by Manjula, who used to write in Kannada, seemingly creates another level of hierarchy between the languages, as well as another point of contention between the two sisters. That Manjula gets it published to resounding success, if analysed carefully, shows that an author can shift naturally between two languages and achieve equal success, irrespective of the language used. The content dictates the reception rather than the language in the long run.

Many writers encounter this question: why did not s/he write in her/his native tongue? Manjula responds that "it was not a matter of conscious choice" (264); she just wrote in English because it burst out in English. She adds, "[i]t surprised even me. I couldn't understand why it was all coming out in English. But it did. That's all. There is no other explanation" (264). She is unable to understand this line of

questioning and also why the intellectuals cannot grasp this simple fact and accuse her of writing to foreign readers as if she committed some “cardinal sin” (266), a betrayal of sorts. However, she is told by her British publishers, “[w]e like your book because it’s so Indian. ... Your novel has the genuine Indian feel!” (264), or in other words, hers is a genuine Indian work, not one merely written with Western readers in view. Although she and Karnad find it funny when one intellectual says that “no Indian writer can express herself — or himself — honestly in English” (264), this is the criticism that regional writers also level against those writing in English besides the other one of writing and pandering to the Western taste.

Despite the fact that she took Malini’s words and made them her own, she vehemently defends Malini’s decision to write in English. As a response to the allegation of the Kendra Sahitya Academy president [without naming U R Ananthamurthy], that the Indians who write in English are doing this to make money, Manjula [Karnad] retorts, “... Why not? Isn’t that a good enough reason? Would you like to see what royalties I earned when I wrote in Kannada?” (264), and that for people like him, “English is a medium of dishonesty” (264). Accused of declaring her complicity in the global consumer market society by writing in English, these accusations show a grim reality and anxiety: what is at stake here is not creativity, but money. “What hits everyone in the eye is the money a writer in English can earn” (265). Karnad confesses, in an interview, “It’s not just me, it’s the whole genre of Indian writers in English who are attacked. It’s the money and recognition that English brings which is a point of envy” (qtd. in Basu 255). Here, Manjula who has been struggling in Kannada for so long becomes the spokesperson for English [and Karnad], and points towards the intention of the critics behind such harsh criticisms. In the play, the advance she gets is enough for her to resign from her job and focus only on her passion, writing. This leads, of course, to jealousy. Writers like Nissim Ezekiel, P. Lal, Keki Daruwalla and Arvind Krishna Mehrotra express that “English was not a deliberately chosen or elitist medium, but simply a natural expression of their private and social experience” (Karnad xxviii). On the other hand, U. R. Ananthamurthy, B. Jayamohan, Rajendra Yadav, Gurdial Singh and so on make heated charges “against English in public forums of all kinds” (Karnad xxviii). Ananthamurthy infamously commented that “Indians writing in English were like prostitutes since they wrote with an eye for money and global reach the language offers” (“The Ink is Still Wet”). Still, there are many charges against the Indian writers who write in English: being ignorant of their own language, lacking Indianness, ambitious intentions to have a wider readership, or aspiring to acquire status and so on. Some critics even argue that the “Bhasha” writers, the term coined by Devy in *After Amnesia*, and popularized by Mukherjee in her essay, “The Anxiety of Indianness: Our Novels in English”, are more genuine than the Indian English writers in portraying the richness and ethos of India (Mishra 166). And sadly, if one dares ask a counter-question, like “are all those who write in Kannada genuinely honest?”, one is sure to be condemned as a traitor.

Manjula's speech reveals the real cause behind the skirmish between the regional writers and Indian English writers. It is obvious that the publishing houses, the question of readership, the economic dimensions of writing, the rewards of literary achievements, public recognition and so on stand in sharp contrast when regional writers and Indian English writers are compared. Ramnarayan sheds light on the anguish of the regional writers thus, "[t]he regional writer remains invisible on the national scene. The media largely ignore him or her unless he or she gets involved in politics or embroiled in controversy. Awards from apex literary bodies are no more than news flashes of the day and writings in Indian languages hardly cross state borders" (qtd. in Mannur 73). Because of this deprivation, their hearts bleed, and out of rage and jealousy they brutally criticize, show their coldness and hostile nature towards the others. Karnad says, "... many Kannada writers are upset about the money that Indian English writers earn, the publicity they get, there is something theatrical about all this, so I used it" (qtd. in Basu 254). Karnad, on the other hand, occupies a unique position in the language debate because he writes in both Kannada and English and translates from one to the other. Rather than remaining a regional author, he has achieved national acclaim since the beginning of his career. Therefore, Karnad's writing career appears to contradict the premise of *Broken Images*, as Dharwadkar points out (Karnad xxx).

To conclude, Sylvia Plath once said, "I am jealous of those who think more deeply, who write better, who draw better, who ski better, who look better, who live better, who love better than I" (39). This is more or less applicable to all in this world. Sibling rivalry, romantic jealousy, sexual jealousy, and other variants of jealousy are inbred in human nature. The discord, hate, and animosity between Manjula and Malini, Manjula and Pramod, Lucy and Manjula, and the mismatch that exists between languages of literary expression and status of regional language writers and Indian English writers in *Broken Images* are all the result of competition and jealousy, and eventually, enmity which leads to sin. This paper, therefore, explores the diverse human relationships in Karnad's *Broken Images* to study the disagreement and dispute in the interactions of characters that result in jealousy, which often remain invisible at all times, and simultaneously through an analysis of those relationships, explicates the relationship between *Bhasha* and English language writers.

References

- Basu, S. 2014. "Bilingualism, Translation and Girish Karnad's Theatre." *The Criterion* 5.3. June. 251–257.
- Behrman, J. R. 1997. "Intrahousehold Distribution and the Family." In: Rosenzweig, M. R., O. Stark and N. Holland (eds.). *Handbook of Population and Family Economics*. Vol. 1. Elsevier, 125–187.
- Ben-Ze'ev, A. 2010. "Jealousy and Romantic Love." In: Hart, S. L. and M. Legerstee (eds.). *Handbook of Jealousy: Theory, Research, and Multidisciplinary Approaches*. UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 40–54.

- Chatterjee, G. 2005, April 22. "The Return of Karnad." *The Hindu*. Retrieved from www.thehindu.com/thehindu/fr/2005/04/22/stories/2005042200700400.htm. 5 May 2019.
- Crownfield, D. 1973. "The Curse of Abel: An Essay in Biblical Ecology." *The North American Review* 258.2, Summer. 58–63.
- Eliot, T. S. 2001. *The Waste Land*. North, M. (ed.). New York: Norton & Company, Inc, A Norton Critical Edition.
- Freud, S. 1933. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Trans. Brill, A.A. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- . 1920. "The Dream: Archaic Remnants and Infantilism in the Dream." *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Hall, G. S. New York: Boni and Liveright 167–179.
- Karnad, G. 2005. *Collected Plays*. Vol. 2. New Delhi: OUP.
- . 1975. *Hayavadana*. New Delhi: OUP.
- Kruger, A. C. 1993. "Peer Collaboration: Conflict, Cooperation, or Both?" *Social Development* 2.3. Nov. 165–182.
- Mannur, A. 2000. "The Changing Face of Translation of Indian Literature." In: Simon, S. and P. St-Pierre (eds.). *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 227–243.
- Maupassant, G. de. 2011. "The Confession." In: Hawthorne, J. (ed.). *The World's Best Mystery and Detective Stories*. Auckland: The Floating Press, 46–52.
- McGuire, S. et al. 2000. "Children's Perceptions of Sibling Conflict During Middle Childhood: Issues and Sibling (Dis)similarity." *Social Development* 9.2. May. 173–190.
- Mishra, G. R. 2007. "Situating Post-1980 Indian English Fiction in the Present Context." In: Khan, M. Q. and B. Kumar Das (eds.). *Studies in Postcolonial Literature*. New Delhi: Atlantic, 163–172.
- Neubauer, P. B. 1983. "The Importance of the Sibling Experience." *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* 38. 325–336.
- Parker, J. G. et al. 2005. "Friendship Jealousy in Young Adolescents: Individual Differences and Links to Sex, Self Esteem, Aggression, and Social Adjustment." *Developmental Psychology* 41.1. 235–250.
- Plath, S. 2007. *The Unabridged Journals of Sylvia Plath*. Kukil, K. V. (ed.). New York: Anchor Books.
- Poland, W. S. 2006. "Revenge." *American Imago* 63.3. 355–357.
- Purshouse, L. 2004. "Jealousy in Relation to Envy." *Erkenntnis* 60.2. 179–204.
- Saavedra, Miguel de Cervantes. 1998. *The Life and Exploits of the Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Trans. Jarvis, C. Oxford: OUP. Oxford World's Classics.
- Shakespeare, W. 2003. *Othello*. Norman Sanders (ed.). Cambridge: CUP. The New Cambridge Shakespeare.
- Srinivasaraju, S. 2005, April 4. "The Ink is Still Wet." *Outlook*. Retrieved from www.outlookindia.com/magazine/story/the-ink-is-still-wet/226970. 2 May 2019.
- Thompson, W. R. 1999. "Why Rivalries Matter and What Great Power Rivalries Can Tell Us about World Politics." In: Thompson, W. R. (ed.). *Great Power Rivalries*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 3–28.
- Volling, B. L, D. E. Kennedy, and L. M. H. Jackey. 2010. "The Development of Sibling Jealousy." In: Hart, S. L. and M. Legerstee (eds.). *Handbook of Jealousy: Theory, Research, and Multidisciplinary Approaches*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 387–417.
- Webb, M. W. and L. Szondi. 1964. "Thanatos and Cain." *American Imago* 21.3/4. 52–63.