

**HYBRIDITY IN MONICA ALI'S *BRICK LANE* AND
ARUNDHATI ROY'S *THE GOD OF SMALL THINGS***

Reyhan AYDIN

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı Danışman:

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Cansu Özge ÖZMEN

2019

**T.C.
TEKİRDAĞ NAMIK KEMAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ**

**HYBRIDITY IN MONICA ALI'S *BRICK LANE*
AND
ARUNDHATI ROY'S *THE GOD OF SMALL THINGS***

Reyhan AYDIN

İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI

DANIŞMAN: DR. ÖĞR. ÜYESİ CANSU ÖZGE ÖZMEN

TEKİRDAĞ-2019

Her hakkı saklıdır.

BİLİMSEL ETİK BİLDİRİMİ

Hazırladığım Yüksek Lisans Tezinin bütün aşamalarında bilimsel etiğe ve akademik kurallara riayet ettiğimi, çalışmada doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak kullandığım her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, yazımda enstitü yazım kılavuzuna uygun davranıldığını taahhüt ederim.

30 / 07 / 2019

Reyhan AYDIN



T.C.
TEKİRDAĞ NAMIK KEMAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Reyhan AYDIN tarafından hazırlanan “**Monica Ali'nin Brick Lane ve Arundhati Roy'un Küçük Şeylerin Tanrısı İsimli Romanlarında Melezlik Kavramı – Hybridity in Monica Ali's Brick Lane and Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things**” konulu YÜKSEK LİSANS Tezinin Sınavı, Tekirdağ Namık Kemal Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Öğretim Yönetmeliği uyarınca 30/07/2019 günü saat 13:30'da yapılmış olup, tezin kabulüne..... OYBİRLİĞİ / OYÇOKLUĞU ile karar verilmiştir.

Jüri Başkanı:	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Cansu Özge ÖZMEN	Kanaat: Başarılı	İmza: Cansu
Üye:	Doç. Dr. Petru GOLBAN	Kanaat: Başarılı	İmza: Petru Golban
Üye:	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Seda TAŞ	Kanaat: Başarılı	İmza: Seda Taş

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu adına

30.../07/20..19

Prof. Dr. Rasim YILMAZ

Enstitü Müdürü

Rasim Yılmaz

ABSTRACT

Institution, Institute	:	Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University, Institute of Social Sciences
Department	:	Department of English Language and Literature
Title	:	Hybridity in Monica Ali's <i>Brick Lane</i> and Arundhati Roy's <i>The God of Small Things</i>
Author	:	Reyhan Aydın
Adviser	:	Asst. Prof. Dr. Cansu Özge Özmen
Type of Thesis, Year	:	MA Thesis, 2019
Total Number of Pages	:	79

This study presents an analysis of Monica Ali's *Brick Lane* and Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. In each novel, the characters go into a transformation period to find their identities in the cultures they live in. The first chapter explains the theory of postcolonialism by focusing on the ideas of Edward Said, Frantz Fanon, Robert Young, Bill Ashcroft and others. Terms such as hybridity, mimicry, ambivalence and cultural identity are defined mainly in reference to Homi Bhabha. The hybrid characters with different problems find different techniques to cope with them and they reach different levels of hybridity which is studied in detail in the second and third chapters. The final chapter draws a conclusion commenting on different hybrid situations. Finally, it is observed that all hybrid characters try to find their own voice to create a 'Third Space' but only some of them can achieve this.

Keywords: Arundhati Roy, English Literature, Homi Bhabha, Hybridity, Monica Ali, Postcolonial Novel.

ÖZET

Kurum, Enstitü : Tekirdağ Namık Kemal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
ABD : İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı
Tez Başlığı : Monica Ali'nin *Brick Lane* ve Arundhati Roy'un *Küçük Şeylerin Tanrısı* İsimli Romanlarında Melezlik Kavramı
Tez Yazarı : Reyhan Aydın
Tez Danışmanı : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Cansu Özge Özmen
Tez Türü, Yılı : Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2019
Sayfa Sayısı : 79

Bu çalışmada, Monica Ali'nin *Brick Lane* ve Arundhati Roy'un *Küçük Şeylerin Tanrısı* adlı romanları incelenmiştir. Her iki romanda da karakterler yaşadıkları toplumlarda varolabilmek için bir dönüşüm sürecine girerler. Sonuç olarak bütün karakterler farklı melezlik seviyelerine ulaşırlar. Bu çalışmanın ilk bölümü Edward Said, Frantz Fanon, Robert Young, Bill Ashcroft gibi kuramcıların fikirlerine dayanarak sömürgecilik sonrası teorisini açıklar. Melezlik, duygu karmaşası, taklitçilik ve kültürel kimlik kavramları genel olarak Homi Bhabha'ya değinerek tanımlanır. Farklı problemleri olan melez karakterlerin bunlarla başa çıkmak için kullandıkları yöntemler de farklıdır ve bu durum ikinci ve üçüncü bölümlerde detaylı bir biçimde analiz edilmiştir. En son bölümde ise farklı melezlik durumlarından bahsedilerek bir sonuca varılır. Sonuç olarak gözlemlenmiştir ki; bütün melez karakterler kendi seslerini bularak 'Üçüncü Uzam' larını yaratabilmek isterler fakat sadece bazıları bunu başarır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Arundhati Roy, İngiliz Edebiyatı, Homi Bhabha, Melezlik, Monica Ali, Sömürgecilik Sonrası Roman.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to those who helped me during one of the most challenging processes of my life which was writing a thesis. First, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Cansu Özge ÖZMEN for her constant support and great patience I admire. She was always there for me whenever I needed her, and provided me with constructive feedback which helped me complete my thesis. I also wish to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Petru GOLBAN for his invaluable comments on my thesis and his support and encouragement throughout my career. I would also like to thank my colleagues at Tekirdağ Namik Kemal University, School of Foreign Languages for their support. I am also grateful to my parents for believing in me in every step of my life, and my brother to whom I owe my love of literature. Finally, I would like to thank my husband Serkan AYDIN for being supportive and helpful during the writing process of this thesis and being a constant source of inspiration.

CONTENTS

BİLİMSEL ETİK BİLDİRİMİ.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
CONTENTS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	8
1. POSTCOLONIALISM.....	8
1.1. CULTURAL IDENTITY.....	14
1.2. AMBIVALENCE AND MIMICRY	17
1.3. HYBRIDITY	19
CHAPTER 2: ANALYSIS OF THE NOVEL	24
2. HYBRIDITY IN BRICK LANE.....	24
2.1. FIRST GENERATION HYBRIDS.....	26
2.1.1. Nazneen, Chanu and Other Characters.....	26
2.2 SECOND GENERATION HYBRIDS.....	46
2.2.1. Shahanah, Bibi, Karim and Other Characters	46
CHAPTER 3: ANALYSIS OF THE NOVEL	53
3. HYBRIDITY IN ARUNDHATI ROY'S <i>THE GOD OF SMALL THINGS</i> . 53	
3.1. FIRST GENERATION HYBRIDS.....	54
3.1.1 Pappachi and Mammachi.....	54
3.2. SECOND GENERATION HYBRIDS.....	58
3.2.1. Baby Kochamma, Ammu and Chacko	58
3.3. THIRD GENERATION HYBRIDS	67
3.3.1. Estha, Rahel and Sophie Mol.....	67
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION.....	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY	75

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to analyze the hybridization process in two Postcolonial novels: Monica Ali's *Brick Lane* and Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. In both works, the fixed identities imposed by colonialism are challenged by representations of hybrid identities. The characters in these novels reach different levels of hybridity and first and second generation hybrids differ from one another to a great extent. They all have different experiences and each person develops a different strategy to find his/her own identity. The problems the characters face are explored individually.

The analysis is based on post-colonial theory. The works of theoreticians like Edward Said, Frantz Fanon, Robert Young and Bill Ashcroft and others are referenced to but especially Homi Bhabha's terms are employed to explain the difficulties faced by the hybrid characters. In the first chapter a brief introduction to postcolonial theory is given to provide the theoretical framework of the study. Terms such as "hybridity", "mimicry", "ambivalence" and "cultural identity" are defined. In the second chapter, Monica Ali's *Brick Lane* is analyzed in terms of the hybrid characters in the novel. In the third chapter, Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* is analyzed. A conclusion is drawn as a result of the analysis of two novels in the fourth chapter.

One of the writers in question is Monica Ali who is a hybrid herself in that she is the daughter of a Bengali father and an English mother. She grew up in England and studied at Oxford University. Her first novel, *Brick Lane* was published in 2003 which is about the British immigrant experience of a Bengali family. The novel was an immediate success and was shortlisted for a very prestigious award which is Man Booker Prize for Fiction. Despite its literary success, the novel was harshly protested by Bangladeshi community living in Tower Hamlets. They found the novel offensive and accused Ali for being disrespectful to their community. As observed by Amit Roy, the inhabitants said that they objected to the way Ali portrayed Bangladeshi community in the novel and they found the book as a "despicable insult to Bangladeshis at home and abroad" (2003, p.1). Especially the remarks by the central male character Chanu describing Bangladeshi immigrants as

“Most of them have jumped ship ... They have menial jobs on the ship, doing donkey work, or they stow away like little rats in the hold” (Amit Roy, 2003, p.1) offended them and they criticized the novel as “It says we got here by jumping ship, that we have lice in our hair and live like rats. These comments are hurtful and untrue” (Amit Roy, 2003, p.1).

The novel was also made into a film which was released in 2007. The people from Tower Hamlets who accused the novel of containing “pro-racist, anti-social stereotypes” (Lea and Lewis, 2006, p.1) and “a most explicit, politically calculated violation of the human rights of the community” (Lea and Lewis, 2006, p.1) also protested the movie. They tried to prevent the filming process because they thought that it was not fair to make a movie about the book which caused a lot of controversy. They said: “Nobody can come with a camera make a film about that book here. She [Ali] has imagined ideas about us in her head. She is not one of us, she has not lived with us, she knows nothing about us, but she has insulted us” (Lea and Lewis, 2006, p.1). Despite the fact that Monica Ali is a Bangladeshi writer, they accused her for not being one of them and not understanding them.

Monica Ali was also accused for not being “authentic” enough by some critics. In her article “Outrage Economy” Monica Ali comments on this authenticity issue as: “It appears that some people object to my having written about a Bangladeshi housewife who speaks hardly any English, when I myself am reasonably fluent in the language” (2007b, p.1). She alleges that she is not the only writer to be accused of not being authentic and gives an example: “Gautam Malkani, author of *Londonstani*, was reprimanded last year for writing about Asian homeboys in Hounslow because he is educated and in full-time employment” (2007b, p.1). She finalizes her argument by saying if a man can not write about a woman or vice versa: “we are left only with memoir and autobiography, for which admittedly there is a strong demand these days, perhaps because nothing else is authentic enough” (2007b, p.1). She thinks that authenticity is not an issue of debate for the white writers because they are allowed to write about whatever they want. The reason why she receives this kind of criticism, which she finds unjust, is because she belongs to a group of ethnic minority. As a writer who belongs to a minority group, she –like

most minority writers- is expected to be a typical representative of that group. Jane Hiddleston comments on Ali's reaction against the critics who want to label her just as a representative of the community as: "She claims neither to write as a Bangladeshi woman living in London's East End (she lives in South London in any case), nor as a distant observer, but from the periphery, occupying no fixed or specified position" (2005, p.70). Hiddleston emphasizes the fact that Ali did not -and did not have to- share the same experiences with Nazneen to be able to write *Brick Lane*. She finalizes her comment by locating the role of Ali as a writer in a mediate state to the Bangladeshi community by pointing out that "She is an uncertain and indistinct figure who tries not to voice her own experiences but to allow the text to speak for itself" (2005, p.70) which emphasizes the importance of the literary work itself.

Brick Lane has been widely studied in terms of various themes by critics using postcolonialism, feminism, multiculturalism and other theories. One of the literary critics who studied *Brick Lane* is Alistair Cormack. He describes the novel as "a realist narrative with a postcolonial story, it offers an excellent opportunity to examine the relationship between the formal strategies of mimetic fiction and the historical contexts of multiculturalism and immigration" (2006, p.695). There were some counter arguments to his analysis regarding *Brick Lane* as a realist novel. He replied to them by referring to Georg Lukacs as his source of definition of the term realism. Taking the limitations of the form into consideration, his analysis reveals that *Brick Lane* takes universal themes of the novel tradition of nineteenth century and applies them to a new form today which he calls "postcolonial realism". Another influential study on *Brick Lane* is by Michael Perfect. In "The Multicultural Bildungsroman: Stereotypes in Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*", Perfect refuses the allegations of some scholars that *Brick Lane* does not challenge but reinforces cultural stereotypes. He suggests that: "Ali employs stereotypes as counterpoints in order to further emphasize her protagonist's final integration into contemporary British society, and that the novel might usefully be understood as a "multicultural Bildungsroman" (Perfect, 2008, p.109). Perfect agrees with Cormack in defining the novel as realist, and also focuses on the multicultural aspect of the novel which

combines socialization and individuality. Yıldız Kılıç also focuses on the multicultural nature of the novel. In her article “The Paradox of the ‘Muslim British National’ in Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane*” she alleges that the main issue of the novel is not post-colonialism but multiculturalism because “The struggle for identity is not limited to the disenfranchised immigrant” (Kılıç, 2010, p.51). She determines the difference of two theories as “while post-colonialism implies confrontational opposition of East and West, multiculturalism makes allies of the two sides and implies integration and common motive” (Kılıç, 2010, p.51) and she finally argues that the emphasis is on the authentication of the self rather than postcolonial issues in *Brick Lane*. Irene Fernandez on the other hand acknowledges the multiculturalism of the novel which challenges “a homogenous view of British identity” (2009, p.157) yet points out that the identities are depicted as “fluid and space(s) as continuously negotiated” (2009, p.157) suggesting transformational nature of identities in Bhabha’s terms. Among various studies on *Brick Lane*, Syeda Samara Mortada has a feministic approach. She suggests that the novel is “essentially about the quest of identity for Nazneen” (Mortada, 2010, p.54). In her analysis of *Brick Lane* she observes “how women are blamed and rejected if they do not take on the roles and responsibilities expected of them by their society/culture” (2010, p.58). She focuses on what it means to be a woman in Bangladeshi community in her analysis of Nazneen. She points out that being a woman requires giving birth to babies – especially male ones-, accepting everything as fate, never questioning the husbands and doing whatever is “appropriate” according to culture. Mortada argues that the women who do not meet these requirements are regarded as threats to their societies.

The other writer to be studied is Arundhati Roy who was born in Kerala, India in 1960 to a Syrian-Christian mother and a Bengali Hindu father. She studied architecture and also worked as a scriptwriter. She is also an activist who has written a lot of political essays and attended conferences. Democracy, nuclear tests in India, environmental issues and poverty are some of the issues she is interested in as an activist. The links between a writer and his/her book have always been a matter of interest for readers. The fact that *The God of Small Things* also takes place in the same location she grew up raises the question of whether it is an autobiographical

work or not. Moraes suggests in “In Praise of Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*” that “this book ain't a memoir or an autobiography, but something much more ambitious: an Indian tragedy, set to the background of a nation in turmoil” (2014, p.1). However, it is known that she portrays the rural Ayemenem in the book based on her childhood memories: “The kind of landscape that you grow up in, it lives in you ... if you spent your very early childhood catching fish and just learning to be quiet, the landscape just seeps into you” (Tickell, 2007, p.12). Despite pointing out to several parallels between Roy's life and the novel, Tickell warns the reader not to make naive connections since this is a work of fiction after all.

The God of Small Things was a best-seller and won the Booker Prize in 1997. A brief review of criticism on *The God of Small Things* shows that the novel has been studied by using postcolonial, feminist and other theories. Some critics have commented on the reasons of the success of the book. The novel is a success “because of its preoccupation with matters related to Kerala – its society, politics, culture, economy, environment, caste questions” (1999, p.25) as suggested by Dasan. Another critic who studied the novel is Alex Tickell who comments on the worldwide success of the novel. He alleges that the success “to a large extent, be attributed to Roy's use of literary tropes which are already recognizable markers of cultural difference for a metropolitan readership” (Tickell, 2003, p.76). By also suggesting the power of marketing which contributed to this not only literary but also commercial success, he contends that the most important reason is the inclusion of cultural elements of the West in 1960s (such as Estha dressing as Elvis, the movie they watch at the cinema etc.) in most parts of the book.

With a linguistic approach, Anna Clarke in “Language, Hybridity, and Dialogism in *The God of Small Things*” alleges that “the linguistic playfulness and the lack of narrative certainty in Roy's novel can be read as a radical literary strategy ... to control narrative meaning and structure of our perception through forms of linguistic order (Clarke, 2007, p.132). Therefore, it may be said that the linguistic structure of the novel which is not strict, and is in a flux also suggests hybridity. An interesting criticism on the linguistic elements of the novel is by Shaima Rizvi. In “Building a Story: The Architecture of Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*”

she suggests that “Roy's training as an architect underlies her syntax, her language, and her orchestration of the novel's events, and it likely governs her artistic and literary choices” (Rizvi, 2014, p.129). Dr. Prasad who is the author of *Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things: A Critical Appraisal* refers to the architectural structure of the narrative as: “design, language, mode and material of the novel are so beautifully employed and tugged together” that it goes beyond the traditional structure and into an “innovative and revolutionary style” following an “architectural methodology” (qtd. in Rizvi, 2014, p.130). Arundhati Roy agrees with these comments and she describes the writing process of *The God of Small Things* “like designing an intricately balanced structure” (Tickell, 2007, p.14) acknowledging the effects of her architectural training on her writing style.

Arundhati Roy comments on the meaning of the striking title of the book in an interview as “To me the god of small things is the inversion of God” (Dallmayr, 2004, p.3-4). She suggests that small things we see in our everyday lives “whether it is the insect life in the book, or the fish or the stars” may seem unimportant when compared to big things. However, what they represent is much more important. In another work Roy states that “that’s what the twenty-first century has in store for us: the dismantling of the Big. Big bombs, big dams, big ideologies, big contradictions, big countries, big wars, big heroes, big mistakes. Perhaps it will be the Century of the Small” (qtd in Dallmayr, 2004, p.3). Hence, it may be inferred that Roy is optimistic about the future. As pointed out by Dallmayr: “In the end, Roy’s writings exude not despair, but hope and commitment to a better—more just, more humane—future” with no wars (2004, p.5). As for the juxtapositions of big things with small things, Koparanoglu suggests that “Roy’s novel demonstrates that postcolonial dynamics also involve multi-dimensional forms of oppression, enhanced and layered by the experience of colonialism over the already existing dynamics of local forms” (2011, p.74). In the context of the novel which refers to India, the theme of big-small opposition may bring binary oppositions to mind which is a colonial technique to label a country or a nation. However, as Tickell observes Roy’s narrative manages to relate to universal issues and her juxtapositions lead to grander levels of meaning. As stated by Tickell, it is “Roy’s use of childhood language, her virtuosity with metaphor

and her attention to literal/figurative disjunctions also provides a way of speaking about human exploitation, familial guilt and political violence which carries an ethical charge rare in cosmopolitan fiction” (2003, 81).

On the whole, what this particular study attempts to achieve is to trace hybridity in these novels with reference to postcolonial theory and Homi Bhabha’s terms. The novels will be analyzed by observing the relationship of the individuals with their families, cultures and societies in general. Although the stories take place in different times and different places, the theme of hybridity is what these novels have in common. Hybridity becomes a technique to challenge culturally constructed stereotypes, fixed identities and binary oppositions in both novels.

CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1. POSTCOLONIALISM

Postcolonial literature deals with the relationship between the colonizer West and the colonized East during and after colonial rule. Literary and critical works pertaining to this period reveal the social, ideological, cultural and economical effects of colonialism by drawing on a variety of theories such as poststructuralism, feminism, postmodernism, Marxism and other cultural and social paradigms. This interdisciplinary nature of postcolonial theory can be seen as a reaction against monocentric nature of colonialism. As suggested by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, postcolonialism is a “continuing process of resistance and reconstruction” (2003, p.2) which implies that postcolonial theory is a counter discourse against colonialism. Therefore, a brief explanation on colonialism is necessary.

Colonialism has been an important part of human history dating back to very early times. It is constructed as a power relation between the Western colonizer and the Eastern colonized suggesting the superiority of the former to the latter. It is not only an economical but also a cultural phenomenon which aims to make the colonized feel inferior. This idea of superiority of the colonizer stems from the need to provide an excuse or justification for the exploitation of the colonized. Exposure to the civilized colonizer is assumed to turn the colonized into a much more “civilized” human being hence justifying the acts of colonialism. Throughout the colonization period, main countries such as Britain, Germany, Belgium, France, Italy and Portugal colonized countries in Asia, Africa and the West Indies. They exploited these countries politically, culturally and economically. By imposing their own languages and cultures, they made the colonized feel inferior. According to Loomba, the process of colonialism is described as involving “a wide range of practices including trade, plunder, negotiation, warfare, genocide, enslavement and rebellions” (1998, p.7-8). It can be inferred that the colonial experience was mutual, affecting the lives of both the colonizer and the colonized at different levels as also suggested by Loomba: “Colonialism was not an identical process in different parts of the world but

everywhere it locked the original inhabitants and the newcomers into the most complex and traumatic relationships in human history” (1998, p.8).

The main aim of colonization is: “to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and inclusion” as Bhabha suggests (2004, p.101). Bhabha and Fanon’s ideas complement each other in this sense. They both think that the aim of colonialism is to alienate the colonized from their history and cultural values until they start to see the colonizer as their single source of hope. Continual efforts leading to cultural alienation are typical traits of colonialism and “nothing has been left to chance and that the total result looked for by colonial domination was indeed to convince the natives that colonialism came to lighten their darkness” (Fanon, 1963, p.210-11).

It was in the beginning of the twentieth century that the colonized started to question the exploitation they faced and rebelled against colonialism. The First World War gave rise to nationalist movements which led the colonized to disintegrate themselves from their colonizers, but it was the Second World War which started a new phase of decolonization period. As a result, most of the colonized countries gained independence and the experiences of the colonized were started to be told by the native writers. Then, a new canon of literature was born called “Postcolonial Literature” which deals with the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized and the effects of colonization on both. Postcolonial literature “has established a specific practice of post-colonial writing in cultures as various as India, Australia, the West Indies and Canada, and has challenged both the traditional canon and dominant ideas of literature and culture” (2004, p.i) as observed by Ashcroft et al.

The term postcolonialism is a much debated term in terms of its usage and meaning. Some scholars allege that the meaning of the word changes if you write it with or without a hyphen (postcolonial/post-colonial) because the first one refers to theory in general whereas the latter refers to a certain period of time. For Loomba, the hyphenated term post-colonial refers to a historical period of time whereas the unhyphenated term postcolonial is "the theoretical framework that is postcolonial

theory which aims to scrutinise relations of domination between cultures and nations” (1998, p.19). As suggested by Ashcroft et al., the term post-colonial “addresses all aspects of the colonial process from the beginning of colonial contact. Post-colonial critics and theorists should consider the full implications of restricting the meaning of the term to ‘after-colonialism’ or after-Independence” (2003, p.2). Therefore, the term postcolonial should not be limited to the time after colonization but should encapsulate the time from the start of colonization period. Ashcroft et al., in their preface of *The Postcolonial Studies Reader* go on to define the scope of the term as follows: “We use the term ‘post-colonial’ to represent the continuing process of imperial suppressions and exchanges throughout this diverse range of societies, in their institutions and their discursive practices” (2003, p.1). In *The Empire Writes Back*, the term ‘post-colonial’ is defined as: “to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonisation to the present day...because there is a continuity of preoccupations throughout the historical process initiated by European imperial aggression” (2004, p.2).

Some of the early texts of Postcolonial Theory and Criticism are: Aimé Fernand David Césaire’s *Discourse on Colonialism*, Frantz Fanon’s *Black Skin, White Masks* and *The Wretched of the Earth* and; Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o’s *Homecoming Essays* and *Decolonising the Mind*. Césaire sees colonialism as a mutual constitution and regards it as destructive not only for the colonized but also for the colonizer which he calls “boomerang effect” (1972, p.36). In *Discourse on Colonialism*, Césaire emphasizes the dehumanizing aspect of colonialism. He defines colonialism as a notion which “dehumanizes even the most civilized man; that colonial activity ... which is based on contempt for the native and justified by that contempt, inevitably tends to change him who undertakes it” (1972, p.41). The colonizers cannot escape the grip of this structure which is because “the colonizer, who in order to ease his conscience gets into the habit of seeing the other man as an animal, accustoms himself to treating him like an animal, and tends objectively to transform himself into an animal” (Césaire, 1972, p.41).

Another important contributor to the theory is Frantz Fanon who was also a psychiatrist. He focuses on the psychological and sociological effects of

colonization. According to Fanon: “The effect consciously sought by colonialism was to drive into the natives' heads the idea that if the settlers were to leave, they would at once fall back into barbarism, degradation, and bestiality” (1963, p.211). He maintains that colonial stereotyping is racist and the identity of the colonized is constructed in relation to the colonizer. In *Black Skin, White Masks*, he points out that “For not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to the white man” (2008, p.82-3). This brings us to the “so-called dependency complex” in Fanon’s terms described as: “I begin to suffer from not being a white man to the degree that the white man imposes discrimination on me, makes me a colonized native, robs me of all worth, all individuality, tells me that I am a parasite on the world” (2008, p.73). Emphasizing the role of racism in the construction of identities as a result of colonial relationship Fanon states that: “The feeling of inferiority of the colonized is the correlative to the European’s feeling of superiority. Let us have the courage to say it outright: It is the racist who creates his inferior” (2008, p.69). Fanon’s work reveals that colonialism makes the colonized feel inferior and voids them of their individuality. The colonial discourse not only forces them to lose their integrity but also calls them debasing names such as “Dirty nigger!” or simply, “Look, a Negro!” (Fanon, 2008, p.5) which has profound psychological effects on the colonized.

Kenyan writer Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o also contributes to theory with his fictional works and essays. Thiong’o points out to the aim of colonialism as “to control the people’s wealth” (1986, p.16) and alleges that “colonialism imposed its control of the social production of wealth through military conquest and subsequent political dictatorship” (1986, p.16). He also believes the most important tool of sovereignty to be “the mental universe of the colonised, the control, through culture, of how people received themselves and relationship to the world” (1986, p.16). Thiong’o emphasizes the importance of mental control as “Economic and political control can never be complete or effective without mental control. To control a people’s culture is to control their tools of self-definition in relationship to others” (1986, p.16). The importance of culture is emphasized further in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o’s influential work *Decolonizing the Mind*: “The effect of a cultural bomb is

to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves” (1986, p.3). As a result of the “cultural bomb” the colonized are alienated from their own cultures and languages as it leads them to “see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland. It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves: ... other peoples' languages” (Thiong'o, 1986, p.3). Since Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o believes language to be a carrier of culture, he decides to write in his native language. He declares that “This book *Decolonising the Mind* is my farewell to English as a vehicle for any of my writings. From now on it is Gikuyu and Kiswahili all the way” (Thiong'o, 1986, p. xiv). He elaborates on this aspect of language and states that: “Language as culture is the collective memory bank of a people's experience in history” (1986, p.15). He believes in the empowering nature of language as culture, therefore he uses language as an instrument of subversion of the cultures of the colonized.

Some of the other influential texts were Gayatri Spivak's *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*, Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and the Spread of Nationalism*, Homi Bhabha's *The Location of Culture*, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin's *The Empire Writes Back: Theories and Practices in Postcolonial Literature*, Ania Loomba's *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, Robert Young's *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction* and Edward Said's *Orientalism* which was a milestone in Postcolonial Theory. In his groundbreaking book *Orientalism*, Edward Said defines Orientalism in a broad sense which encompasses not only Western academic scholarship which studies the “Orient” but also “the general Western image of the “Orient” depicted in novels, political accounts, and contemporary media” (qtd in Leitch, 2001, p.1988). Said shows us that “Western writers, archeologists, linguists, historians and politicians from eighteenth century to the present day have ‘discovered’ and in a sense invented the Orient” (qtd in Leitch, 2001, p.1988). Therefore, Orientalism reflects more of the West than the reality of the East as Said suggests: “Orientalism is more particularly valuable as a sign of European-Atlantic power over the Orient than it is as a veridic discourse about the Orient” (Said, 1979, p.6). For Said, Orientalism

is “a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (1979, p.3). The aim of Orientalism is to construct a positive identity for the West in contrast to negative national identity of the East. The Eastern population is primitive, weak, corrupt etc. whereas the Western people are civilized, kind, honest etc. As also stated by Hans Bertens: “The sensuality, irrationality, primitiveness, and despotism of the East constructs the West as rational, democratic, progressive, and so on” (2001, p.205). Bertens emphasizes the existence of binary oppositions by stating that “The West always functions as the centre and the East is a marginal other that simply through its existence confirms the West’s centrality and superiority” (2001, p.205).

V. Andreotti refers to some criticism on Edward Said’s *Orientalism* and concludes the problematic aspect of the work to be “the assumption of a flat relationship of domination and subordination between the West and the East” (2011, p.23). Andreotti goes on to allege that this problem is a starting point of Homi Bhabha who “criticizes Said for promoting a static model of colonial relations in which “colonial power and discourse is possessed entirely by the colonizer” with no room for negotiation or change” (2011, p.23). Andreotti suggests that “Homi Bhabha conceptualizes this relationship as “ambivalent” and open to negotiations” (2011, p.23) which will be discussed in the forthcoming parts of this study.

To sum up, Postcolonial literature can be defined as a rebellion against colonial powers suppressing and silencing the colonized. It is a period when the suppressed and silenced image of the colonized is deconstructed as they gain a chance to express their ideas. All studies which are labeled as postcolonial are concerned with the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized resulting in emergence of new concepts. These concepts are mainly cultural and are related to identity issues which are mostly observed in postcolonial

l novels. Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane* and Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things* are two of the influential postcolonial novels concerned with issues of identity as a result of contact with colonial powers. The problems faced by the characters will be analyzed in detail in the forthcoming chapters of this thesis. In this

regard, some certain themes such as ambivalence, mimicry, hybridity and cultural identity will be defined to help in the analysis of these texts.

1.1. CULTURAL IDENTITY

All immigrants face problems while trying to establish their own places in another culture. It is also the same for the individuals who are born into a culture other than their own. There are also cases when there is no immigrant experience, yet a country is exploited by colonial powers. In all cases, substantial changes occur in the identities of the individuals. In order to be able to survive in another culture, people try to build a new identity which requires adaptation to the new culture. These individuals may need to learn a new language, adapt to new traditions and adopt a totally new lifestyle so that a transformation can take place and without a doubt it is a difficult process. Despite the difficulties, people are inclined to change which is in the nature of human beings.

There have been many definitions of identity in the social science disciplines. One of the most important scholars Stuart Hall describes identity not as a finished entity but as a “‘production’ which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation” (1994, p.222). He explains the term identity in two different ways. The first one is from a social aspect where individuals establish themselves in a shared culture. The second one is from a personal aspect which differentiates the individuals from others. In this sense, the colonized already have different identities even before the transformation process. Hence, cultural stereotypes which classify and label people in terms of their religion, language and historical background are deceptive because two individuals of the same culture do not have to have similar identities. As a result of the transformation of identity, people reach different levels of change in this ongoing process. In Hall’s terms: “Cultural identity ... is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being' culture” (1994, p.225) and he goes on to suggest that “It belongs to the future as much as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history” (1994, p.225). This shows us that cultural identity is not fixed but is inclined to change continuously. In parallel with Hall’s definition, Bhabha defines the process of building an identity in *The*

Location of Culture as a notion which leads to a never-ending transformation phase. While trying to adopt a new sense of belonging to the new culture, the individual in the process of transformation cannot totally forget about “the other place” (Bhabha, 2004, p.64) and as Bhabha suggests: “The question of identification is never the affirmation of a pre-given identity, never a self-fulfilling prophecy – it is always the production of an image of identity and the transformation of the subject in assuming that image” (2004, p.64). In order for the transformation process to be efficient, Bhabha’s suggestion is to refuse binary oppositions and renounce the stereotypes. He defines the stereotype as “a complex, ambivalent, contradictory mode of representation, as anxious as it is assertive, and demands not only we extend our critical and political objectives but that we change the object of analysis itself” (Bhabha, 2004, p.96). It is only possible to build new identities by denying “the repertoire of positions of power, and resistance domination and dependence that constructs colonial identification subject” (Bhabha, 2004, p.95). As a result of interaction between two cultures and by refusing binary oppositions, the identities are equalized where neither of them is superior.

The theme of identity in *Brick Lane* and *The God of Small Things* is not only personal but also social and cultural. Therefore, it is essential to define the importance of culture in the formation of identity in order to be able to understand the struggles of the characters in both novels. The identity development process is described by Erickson as “one in which the two identities of the individual and of the group are merged into one” (qtd. in Kim, 2007, p.240). This idea suggests that personal and social aspects of an individual are inseparable. Thus, cultural identity is defined by Tajfel as: “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (qtd in Kim, 2007, p.241).

The quests for identity of the characters in both novels express their cultural identities. Throughout their journeys, the characters question their own cultures as well as the other culture they are subjected to. Before stating the effects of culture in the identity formation, a brief history of the word “culture” is also required. It was

first used as “a noun of process, almost, we might say anachronistically, of organic process: the ploughing of the earth, the cultivation of crops and animals: ‘agriculture’” (Young, 2005, p.29). Then, it was in the sixteenth century that the term “extended to the process of human development: the cultivation of the mind” (Young, 2005, p.29). In the eighteenth century the word was used to “represent also the intellectual side of civilization” and “The OED cites 1764 as the date that ‘cultured’ was first used in the sense of ‘refined’” (Young, 2005, p.29). As pointed out by Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* by referring to Matthew Arnold, culture is an element which involves “each society’s reservoir of the best that has been known and thought” (1994, p.xiii) and “the ravages of a modern, aggressive, mercantile, and brutalizing urban existence” (1994, p.xiii) can only be minimized by culture. By reading “Dante or Shakespeare” (1994, p.xiii), you can “keep up with the best that was thought and known, and also to see yourself, your people, society, and tradition in their best lights” (1994, p.xiii).

The characters face the limitations of their own cultural heritage in both *Brick Lane* and *The God of Small Things*. Homi Bhabha observes this effect of culture which is essential in the process of identity formation as follows:

Culture becomes as much an uncomfortable, disturbing practice of survival and supplementarity—between art and politics, past and present, the public and the private—as its resplendent being is a moment of pleasure, enlightenment or liberation. It is from such narrative positions that the postcolonial prerogative seeks to affirm and extend a new collaborative dimension, both within the margins of the nation-space and across boundaries between nations and peoples (2004, p.251-52).

This may lead us to think that the cultural heritage and environment of an individual have a profound effect in the process of identity formation. Especially immigrants trying to fit into another culture may find it difficult to adjust because of their cultural background. Tawfiq Yousef suggests that “Cultural identities can be divisive and even destructive, but they can also be positive and creative” (2019, p.71). Robert Young in *Colonial Desire; Hybridity in Theory Culture and Race* elaborates on this

paradox by referring to Matthew Arnold who also sees culture both as a positive and a negative force: “For Arnold the public functions for culture are all rigorously stabilizing, harmonizing and reducing all conflict or dissent. But at the same time, culture’s role is also, paradoxically, to destabilize” (Young, 2005, p.55). Young emphasizes that it is the critical aspect of culture which “ ‘subverts’ (Arnold’s word) by encouraging detachment from received notions; it encourages and enables a discriminating distance from stock habits and conservative assumptions—it is, we might say today, anti-reifying, indeed antiideological” (2005, p.55).

In conclusion, it may well be said that Bhabha’s focus concerning the identity issue is on “in between” spaces which “provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood –singular or communal- that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself” (Bhabha, 2004, p.2).

1.2.AMBIVALENCE AND MIMICRY

In *The Location of Culture* Homi Bhabha introduces a very important concept related to identity which is mimicry. He emphasizes the fact that mimicry is a source of anxiety for the colonizer because it is a strategy of resistance used by the colonized. Further on in his study, colonial mimicry is defined as “the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite” (2004, p.122). The idea of mimicry stems from the desire of the colonizer to be copied by the colonized in terms of appearance, culture and tradition which is a kind of effort to present evidence to serve as redemption from savagery. However, when the colonized adopts the cultural values of the colonizer, the inevitable result is a ‘blurred copy’ of the colonizer. This threatens the authority of the colonizer because “mimicry is never very far from mockery, since it can appear to parody whatever it mimics” (Ashcroft et al, 2007, p.125). Thus, mimicry can be seen as a menace for the colonizer which causes “a crack in the certainty of colonial dominance, an uncertainty in its control of the behaviour of the colonized” (Ashcroft et al, 2007, p.125). David Huddart in *Homi K. Bhabha* points out that mimicry is "an exaggerated copying of language, culture, manners, and ideas. This exaggeration means that mimicry is repetition with difference, and so it is not evidence of the

colonized's servitude" (2006, p.39). Therefore, mimicry does not mean assimilation into the colonizer culture. In fact, Huddart suggests that mimicry is "a form of mockery, and Bhabha's colonial mimicry theory is a comical approach to colonial discourse, because it mocks and undermines the ongoing pretensions of colonialism and empire" (2006, p.57). The phrase used by Bhabha to define mimicry as "almost the same, but not quite" (2004, p.122) also suggests this comical aspect because it has a 'partial' (2004, p.123) presence which is "incomplete and virtual" (2004, p.123). In Bhabha's terms, the result is inclined to become a mockery. This leads to the fact that mimicry is "potentially destabilizing to colonial discourse, and locates an area of considerable political and cultural uncertainty in the structure of imperial dominance" (Ashcroft et al, 2007, p.127).

Huddart suggests that "colonial discourse wants the colonized to be extremely like the colonizer, but by no means identical" (2006, p.40) which is because "mimicry represents an ironic compromise" (Bhabha, 2004, p.122). The irony is that the colonizer desires a "reformed, recognizable Other" (Bhabha 2004 122) but it should be "*almost the same, but not quite*" (Bhabha, 2004, p.122). As Memmi points out that "All that the colonized has done to emulate the colonizer has met with disdain from the colonial masters. They explain to the colonized that those efforts are in vain, that he only acquires thereby an additional trait, that of being ridiculous" (2003, p.168). It is impossible to mimic the colonizer exactly as "He can never succeed in becoming identified with the colonizer, nor even in copying his role correctly" (Memmi, 2003, p.168). If mimicry were to be implemented precisely, it would ruin the power relation of colonialism. The colonizer would no longer be 'superior'. Bhabha elaborates on this effect of mimicry on power relations as follows: "Mimicry is, thus, the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation, and discipline, which 'appropriates' the Other as it visualizes power" (2004, p.122). Mimicry is not only a threat to the colonial power, but "also the sign of the inappropriate, however, a difference or recalcitrance which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance" (Bhabha, 2004, p.122-3). Then, if implemented effectively, mimicry has the power to challenge authority.

Another definition coined by Bhabha is that: “mimicry is constructed around ambivalence: in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference” (2004, p.122). Bhabha makes use of the term ambivalence to define mimicry which was first used in psychoanalysis. Robert Young suggests that it is “a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite. It also refers to a simultaneous attraction toward and repulsion from an object, person or action” (qtd. in Ashcroft et al., 2007, p.10). It was Homi Bhabha who used the term in terms of colonial discourse to mean “the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between colonizer and colonized” (Ashcroft et al., 2007, p.10). In his *Colonial Desire* Robert Young defines in Bhabha’s understanding of ambivalence as quoted below:

In making ambivalence the constitutive heart of his analyses, Bhabha has in effect performed a political reversal at a conceptual level in which the periphery—the borderline, the marginal, the unclassifiable, the doubtful—has become the equivocal, indefinite, indeterminate ambivalence that characterizes the centre (Young, 2005, p.153).

This reversal leads us to the idea that ambivalence affects both the colonized and the colonizer which is inevitable despite the dominance of the colonizer. This may be because “ambivalence ‘decentres’ authority from its position of power, so that authority may also become hybridized when placed in a colonial context in which it finds itself dealing with, and often inflected by, other cultures” (Ashcroft et al. 2007, p.11). Because of its power to disrupt the authority of colonial power, ambivalence is undesirable for the colonizer which is suggested by Bhabha as “the menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority” (2004, p.126).

1.3. HYBRIDITY

In biology a hybrid is “the offspring of two plants or animals of different species or varieties, such as a mule” as Oxford English Dictionary puts it. In nineteenth century, hybridity was widely discussed in terms of mixing of two species.

Robert Knox, an anatomist and racial theorist claimed that: “if an animal be the product of two distinct species, the hybrid, more or less, was sure to perish or to become extinct...the products of such a mixture are not fertile.” (qtd. in Young, 2005, p.7) which shows that hybridity was mostly regarded as negative. The term hybrid stems from the word ‘hybrida’ and Robert Young states that the term ‘hybridity’ was first used in terms of crossing of people from different races between 1843 and 1861 (2005, p.6) The term also has an ethnical connotation which is defined as “having access to two or more ethnic identities” (Easthope, 1998, p.342). An ethnical hybrid is “somebody like Homi Bhabha himself who is brought up as a Parsee in a predominantly Hindu culture and who then takes an identity within Western anglophone culture” (Easthope, 1998, p.342).

Apart from its biological and ethnical contexts the term was mainly used as a cultural phenomenon in twentieth century. Terms such as creolisation, métissage, introgression, bricolage, mêlée, liminality, in-betweenness and transculturation are also used to define different forms of hybridity. There have been many works analyzing this concept in the field of cultural and literary studies. Literary theorists such as Mikhail Bakhtin, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Roland Barthes, Gayatri Spivak and Stuart Hall also elaborated on this subject. Bakhtin’s idea of hybridity is linguistic hybridity and he categorizes the concept as intentional and unconscious/organic hybridity. In his *Discourse in the Novel* essay in *The Dialogic Imagination Four Essays* he defines hybridization as “a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter ... between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor” (Bakhtin, 2006, p.358). As Antony Easthope suggests in “Bhabha, hybridity and identity”, Bakhtin uses the term hybridity “to discriminate texts with a “single voice” (lyrical poems) from those with a “double voice” (such as novels, whose narrator cites characters speaking in their own voice — these texts are hybridic)” (1998, p.342).

Bhabha derives the term hybridity from Bakhtin, but he focuses on crosscultural relationships whereas Bakhtin analyzes transformative processes mainly in terms of language. Young puts forward that: “Bakhtin’s intentional hybrid

has been transformed by Bhabha into an active moment of challenge and resistance against a dominant cultural power” (1995, p.21). Bhabha’s theory is based on the assumption that the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized should not be a power relationship in which the former dominates whereas the latter is suppressed and dominated. According to Bhabha, this binary opposition should be overcome by forming a different identity which can be defined as ‘hybrid’. In *The Location of Culture* Bhabha gives a definition of hybridity as “a Third Space of enunciation which makes the structure of meaning and reference an ambivalent process” (2004, p.54) which suggests the idea of “in betweenness”. His proposition is to create a “third space” enabling a cultural mixture of the colonizer and the colonized and it is possible to create new cultural forms and identities by achieving hybridity. This suggests that the interdependence of colonizer and the colonized is inevitable resulting in a mutual construction of cultural identities. Bhabha defines the term as follows:

Hybridity is the sign of productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the ‘pure’ and original identity of authority). Hybridity is the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects (2004, p.159).

As the quotation implies, hybridity leads to multiple layers of cultures and traditions, instead of homogenous identities assuring the power of the dominant culture. In *The Location of Culture* Bhabha points out that disavowal and hybridity show a different perspective of a colonized culture. He suggests that disavowal can only be beneficial “where the trace of what is disavowed is not repressed but repeated as something different—a mutation, a hybrid” (2004, p.111). This hybrid trace is an accomplishment in the sense that it annihilates the excuse of the colonial powers to have control over the colonizer as there is no cultural purity to speak of. Thus, the power relationship between the former colonized and colonizer can be eliminated and the hybridized identities occur which means that the suppressive forces can be

turned into an advantage. Bhabha denounces the idea of hierarchical purity of cultures and suggests that it is not possible for the colonized to go back to pre-contact purity because this would mean denying the historical reality of colonialism. Hybridity acknowledges colonialism and as Guignery points out "stands in opposition to the myth of purity and racial and cultural authenticity, of fixed and essentialist identity, embraces blending, combining, syncretism and encourages the composite, the impure, the heterogeneous and the eclectic" (2011, p.3). Bhabha who thinks that 'purity' of cultures is untenable (2004, p.55) challenges the myth of pure cultures by introducing the term "Third Space of enunciation" (2004, p.54) which is a space where all cultural elements are constructed resulting in hybridity as "new, neither the one nor the other" (2004, p.178):

The intervention of the Third Space of enunciation, which makes the structure of meaning and reference an ambivalent process, destroys this mirror of representation in which cultural knowledge is customarily revealed as an integrated, open, expanding code. Such an intervention quite properly challenge our sense of the historical identity of culture as a homogenizing, unifying force, authenticated by the originary Past, kept alive in the national tradition of People. In other words, the disruptive temporality of enunciation displaces the narrative of the Western nation which Benedict Anderson so perceptively describes as being written in homogeneous, serial time (2004, p.54).

The third space of enunciation which defies the purity of cultures enables the cultural elements to be "appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew" (Bhabha, 2004, p.55) which is the starting point of hybridity. Bhabha's proposition is that acknowledging the impossibility of pure cultures "may help us to overcome the exoticism of cultural diversity in favour of the recognition of an empowering hybridity within which cultural difference may operate" (Ashcroft et al. 2007, p.108). As suggested by Bhabha:

It is significant that the productive capacities of the Third Space have a colonial or post colonial provenance. For a willingness to descend into that

alien territory – where I have led you – may reveal that the theoretical recognition of the split space of enunciation may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of the cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's hybridity (2004, p.56).

In short, Bhabha refuses a power relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. His aim is to destabilize the binaries such as centre/margin or inferior/superior. It is only after they are destabilized that an interaction between cultures can occur. Therefore, it is important to note that Bhabha quotes from Heidegger: "A boundary is not that at which something stops but, as the Greeks recognized, the boundary is that from which something begins its presencing" (2004, p.1) which in a way summarizes the whole concept of Bhabha's hybridity. Hybridity makes it possible for both the colonizer and the colonized coexist in equal terms. Thus enabling each nation put forward its own culture resulting in diversity. In contrast to the power relation which existed in the past, there is a possibility of interaction, transgression and transformation between cultures.

As suggested both by Said and Bhabha, hybridity poses a threat against colonial discourse. The menace of the term stems from mimicry which enables the colonized to become civilized like the colonizer. As a result, the authority of the colonizer is shaken and challenged by hybridity.

CHAPTER 2: ANALYSIS OF THE NOVEL

2. HYBRIDITY IN BRICK LANE

Monica Ali's *Brick Lane* which was published in 2003 is an example of the postcolonial novel tradition. It is the story of a Bangladeshi family living in England, Brick Lane where a lot of Bangladeshi immigrants live. As Santesso suggests:

The London neighbourhood of Tower Hamlets does not at first glance seem like a place that Muslim immigrants would struggle to acclimatise to: the local high streets boast not just mosques and cultural centres, but Islamic schools, halal grocers, shops selling everything from “halal toothpaste” to “Islamic toys”—even organisations offering “Islamic medical advice” (2013, p.57).

This shows that Brick Lane is very much like a Bengali town in terms of social, cultural and religious life. However, this does not mean that the people living in this place do not have difficulties in adapting into British culture and traditions. The problems occurring through this adaptation process is the main theme in this novel. As migration requires leaving one's own country, it leads the immigrant to try to make sense out of the new environment. Self-discovery of the immigrant to look for a meaning in this new place is a difficult process which requires adaptation. In postcolonial literature identity issues have always been an area of great interest. The ambiguous status of identity of the immigrant can remain ambiguous or by acknowledging the historical, cultural and traditional differences a new hybrid identity can be gained. This new identity offers new insights to the immigrant and hence he/she can realize that identity is not static, but can be transformed into a better status.

The characters in *Brick Lane* are going to be analyzed to find out about their integration skills and whether they lead to hybrid identities or not. They are categorized as first and second generation immigrants because the interaction levels of the inhabitants of Tower Hamlets and the society living outside this terrain is different from one another. Also, the fact that the first generation immigrants were

born in their own countries and then immigrated to England whereas the second generation immigrants were born into the host culture differentiates the two immigrant experiences. Therefore, the problems they face and the techniques to cope with them are also different for the first generation and second generation immigrants. Nazneen is our main focus in this analysis because of the fact that she is the protagonist of the novel, and her transformation process is exemplary of the immigrant experience in general. Her husband Chanu is going to be our second focus of interest in terms of the qualities he has which make him a perfect example of another immigrant situation which is in complete contrast to Nazneen's. Other than Nazneen and Chanu, Mr. and Mrs. Azad and Razia are also going to be mentioned in order to reveal different strategies to cope with the experience of trying to exist in a country other than their own. Shahana, Bibi and Karim are going to be analyzed as second generation immigrants who were born into the host culture which makes their experience more different than of the first generation immigrants. Other second generation characters such as Razia's children and Mr. and Mrs. Azad's daughter will also be mentioned to present different levels of hybridity situations of the second generation characters.

Although real time events are peripheral to the novel, it is necessary to pinpoint the timespan of the story as stated by Poon starting with the birth of Nazneen in 1967 to 2001. 2001 is important as Oldham riots took place in the UK and 9/11 event occurred in the USA influencing the whole world. Oldham riots which stemmed from ethnic, racial and religious animosities between the English and the immigrants in the UK are introduced to Nazneen via Karim. As the novel focuses on Nazneen's journey of identity formation, these events are touched upon but Nazneen does not have to deal with racism first hand. The events remain in the background (Poon, 2009, p.429).

2.1. FIRST GENERATION HYBRIDS

2.1.1. Nazneen, Chanu and Other Characters

Nazneen, the protagonist of the novel, is a Muslim Bangladeshi woman who immigrates to East End London, Tower Hamlets (mainly inhabited by immigrants working in garment industry) after getting married to a much older man. The marriage is arranged by her family, so she has no right to resist. “For the typical Bangladeshi women, living inside or outside her motherland, her culture expects her to act in certain ways. It is a well-known belief in Bangladesh that ... women are usually shy, patient, and subservient” (Mortada, 2010, p.54). Yasmin Hussain states that “culture is not genetically inherited but is instilled by upbringing within a given cultural context” (2016, p.3). Her identity is shaped by her culture which requires submissiveness and no self authorship is allowed. In fact, she believes in fate and accepts whatever happens to her. Fate plays an important role in her life. She never cries out against her fate and accepts everything as God’s will. She always remembers her mother’s remarks: “If God wanted us to ask questions, he would have made us men” (Ali, 2007a, p.80). Her upbringing which dictates her to believe in fate, also orders her to submit to her father, and then to her husband. She can not express her feelings and her ideas to her father. Her inability to talk about her own marriage also foreshadows that she will not have the power to express her ideas in her marriage. Chanu is not only older, but also has “a face like a frog” (Ali, 2007a, p.17) but Nazneen has no objections whatsoever. She conforms to the traditional expectations of the society and her family. She obeys her father by saying “Abba, it is good that you have chosen my husband. I hope I can be a good wife, like Amma” (Ali, 2007a, p.16) which shows how compliant she is.

In the early years of her new life in London, she keeps thinking about her life in Bangladesh. Despite being physically very far away from her country, the flashbacks she has show the reader that her mind is occupied with the memories of her past. This is an indicator that her identity consists mainly of her own culture and this is because she has almost no contact with the host culture. Her own historical and social background determines who she is. As stated by Stuart Hall:

Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything which is historical, they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous 'play' of history, culture and power (1994, p.225).

Hence, Nazneen has to go into a transformation period to be able to construct a new identity reconciling her life in Bangladesh and in England. For a Bangladeshi immigrant living in Tower Hamlets with no chance to communicate with the outside world makes it dearly difficult to believe that Nazneen can achieve this. However, we see that her change happens gradually as the novel continues. By immigrating to England, her journey of self discovery begins. It is obvious that it is not an easy journey, but it leads to her self realization and finally self authorship. The vivid memories of her life in Dhaka weaken at times, but they never disappear. Later on in the novel we notice that “The village was leaving her. Sometimes a picture would come. Vivid; so strong she could smell it. It was only in her sleep that the village came whole again” (Ali, 2007a, p.217). This shows that she has begun to form a new identity without disregarding her Bangladeshi identity. As Bhabha suggests it would be impossible to totally forget about the native culture because “identification ... is always the return of an image of identity that bears the mark of splitting in the Other place from which it comes” (Bhabha, 2004, p.64). The identity Nazneen forms, encapsulates qualities both from her old self and her new self.

The difficulty of adjustment to the new culture has many different reasons for a Muslim immigrant woman. One of the most important of them is her culture. The patriarchal society she belongs to dictates the rules and she has no other choice but to obey. The women who do not obey are destined to live in shame like Nazneen's sister Hasina who eloped with her lover and had a tragic life. Therefore, the expectancies of the patriarchal society make things harder for her. Her transformation process becomes problematic because the social norms she obeyed all her life are now inherent to her which can be observed in an inner dialogue of Nazneen's:

It was her place to sit and wait. Even if the tornado was heading directly towards her. For her, there was nothing else to be done. Nothing else that God wanted her to do. Sometimes she wanted to get up and run. Most of the time she did not want to run, but neither did she want to sit still. How difficult it was, this business of sitting still. But there was nothing really to complain of. There was Chanu, who was kind and never beat her (Ali, 2007a, p. 101-2).

She tries to assure herself that there is nothing to be unhappy about her life. She should be grateful for she is not beaten, but there is something in her which tries to come out, making her feel uneasy:

And there was this shapeless, nameless thing that crawled across her shoulders and nested in her hair and poisoned her lungs, that made her both restless and listless. What do you want with me? She asked it. What do you want? It hissed back. She asked it to leave her alone but it would not ... It listened quietly, and then burrowed deeper into her internal organs (Ali, 2007a, p.102).

We can see how much she struggles during this transformation process not only because she is an immigrant but also because she is an oppressed woman. As Cormack also suggests she suffers from “the double bind that female migrants face, treated as alien by their host nation and commodities by the man in their own communities” (2006, p.700). Therefore, in her journey towards self discovery, she has to overcome the difficulties imposed on her identity by colonial discourse as well as the patriarchal society she is a member of. And as the aforementioned inner dialogue suggests, she is in conflict with her cultural identity and feels that she is somehow betraying her culture by giving in to “shapeless, nameless thing” (Ali, 2007a, p.102).

In her transition to hybridity, Nazneen undergoes several experiences which can be observed in important moments throughout the novel. The first impetus of this process can be the first time she watches ice-skating on television which provides a

link to the outside world. Nazneen is almost confined to the apartment they live in. She observes that in the first eighteen years of her life in Dhaka, she was never alone, but now she “came to London to sit day after day in this large box with the furniture to dust, and the muffled sound of private lives sealed away above, below and around her” (Ali, 2007a, p.24). She has no connections with her surroundings and has no freedom of choice in life. Chanu is her only connection with the outside world. As a representative of patriarchal society Chanu thinks that the only reason of Nazneen’s existence is to give birth. As overheard by Nazneen in a telephone conversation Chanu describes her saying: “Hips are a bit narrow but wide enough, I think, to carry children” (Ali, 2007a, p.23). Under these circumstances ice-skating scene on TV serves as an “almost spiritual affinity” (Kılıç, p.50) providing her with an opportunity to identify herself with something suggesting self-authority and action instead of passivity. For a few moments she forgets about her mundane life, taken aback by the sight of:

A man in a very tight suit (so tight it made his private parts stand out on display) and a woman in a skirt that did not even cover her bottom gripped each other as an invisible force hurtled them across an oval arena. The people in the audience clapped their hands together and then stopped at exactly the same time. ...The couple broke apart. They fled from each other and no sooner had they fled than they sought each other out. Every move they made was urgent, intense, a declaration (Ali, 2007a, p.36).

A scene which is quite ordinary for a Westerner is very unusual for Nazneen. As James Wood suggests, what Nazneen feels is “destrangement” (qtd. in Cormack, 2006, p.709). How she feels is conveyed to the reader via the narrator. As stated by Cormack: “the skaters’ movements and the responses of the crowd appear magical. The female figure represents everything that Nazneen is not: she dominates nature, the opposite sex, and her own body” (2006, p.709). Therefore, the state of dullness of Nazneen (trapped in the house) is only broken when she sees ice-skating on TV. Until then, “the days were tolerable, and the evenings were nothing to complain

about (Ali, 2007a, p.41). After the first time she sees ice-skating, she can't stop dreaming about it and looks for it on TV:

For a whole week it was on every afternoon while Nazneen sat cross-legged on the floor. While she sat, she was no longer a collection of the hopes, random thoughts, petty anxieties and selfish wants that made her, but was whole and pure. The old Nazneen was sublimated and the new Nazneen was filled with white light, glory (Ali, 2007a, p. 41).

The ice-skater is completely in control of her body and acts in unison with her partner. Her "spiritual affinity" (Kılıç, 2010, p.50) stems from her need to get control of her life and to be in harmony with her environment just as the ice-skater is. As pointed out by Kılıç ice-skating is a metaphor for active life which foreshadows the final scene of the novel where Nazneen has completed her metamorphosis and has a promising life ahead of her (Kılıç, 2010, p.30). Then, ice-skating can be seen as a stimulant that leads to her transformation. Her identification with something active like ice-skating also suggests that she is open to change. As Stuart Hall suggests: "Diaspora identities are those which are constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew, through transformation and difference" (1994, p.235). Therefore, the role of ice-skating in her transformation is important, because it stimulates the thoughts that lead to her hybridization at the end of the novel at an ice rink.

Another important moment in her journey to reach her hybrid identity is the first time she goes out alone in London and gets lost. Although this part of the novel is regarded as a kind of epiphany for Nazneen according to some critics, it is difficult to agree with this idea because her struggle for identity is not resolved after this encounter. Her journey is still to be finished. Yet the importance of what Nazneen accomplished can not be ignored and should be regarded as another step towards her new identity. Concerning her passive and resilient self, it took a lot of courage to go out alone without asking for Chanu's permission. This can be interpreted as an indicator that she is becoming more and more self-confident and rebellious. She succeeds in going back home which is a small but significant achievement for a woman who hardly ever leaves home and does not speak English. Her mind is still

occupied with her sister in Bangladesh, but she is relieved by this act of independence which can be observed as follows:

Nazneen, hobbling and halting, began to be aware of herself. Without a coat, without a suit, without a white face, without a destination. A leafshake of fear- or was it excitement?- passed through her legs. But they were not aware of her. In the next instant she knew it. They could not see her any more than she could see God. They knew that she existed but unless she did something, waved a gun, halted the traffic, they would not see her. She enjoyed this thought. She began to scrutinize (Ali, 2007a, p.56).

She realizes that she is an independent individual, and has an existence outside the boundaries her own community without her husband. Her inner monologue afterwards connotes how self-content she is with what she has accomplished:

Anything is possible. She wanted to shout it. Do you know what I did today? I went inside a pub. To use the toilet. Did you think I could do that? I walked mile upon mile, probably around the whole of London although I did not see the edge of it. And to get home again I went to a restaurant. I found a Bangladeshi restaurant and asked directions. See what I can do! (Ali, 2007a, p.62-3).

Despite the fact that she can not say these words out loud at that time, there are moments when she surprises Chanu by her words. The results of a survey in the newspaper which allege that Bangladeshis are the happiest people in the world supports Chanu's continual emphasis on the greatness of Bangladeshi culture. When he reads it to his family, it is to his great surprise that Nazneen does not believe in it. Although he tries to convince her that the research is reliable, the reaction does not change. Chanu is startled because he does not expect such a reaction from Nazneen who always confirms his ideas. "His eyebrows shot up high, leaving his small eyes vulnerable, unprotected, like two snails out of their shells" (Ali, 2007a, p.351). Nazneen also gets so angry when Chanu does not show any interest in going back to

Dhaka to bring Hasina back. No more waiting for things to happen, she takes action. “her heart ... was ablaze, with mutiny” (Ali, 2007a, p.63). In order to teach Chanu a lesson, she sabotages him by neglecting her domestic duties and also by no more praying for him to get his promotion: “Unwashed socks were paired and put back in his drawer. The razor slipped when she cut his corns ... Small insurrections, designed to destroy the state from within” (Ali, 2007a, p.63). She is no longer the passive and obedient wife. Even though her actions do not cause drastic changes, they are important to show that she gradually takes action and challenges Chanu’s authority.

Another change which can be observed in Nazneen is her relationship with religion leading to her hybridization. Old Nazneen never questions fate but new Nazneen takes control of her child’s life unlike her mother. Nazneen’s mother did not want to defy against her fate and did not take her to the hospital when she was born saying: “Whatever happens, I accept it. And my child must not waste any energy fighting against Fate” (Ali, 2007a, p.14). At this point of her life, Nazneen does not act passively and tries to fight against her fate by taking Raqib to the hospital. It can be inferred that Nazneen’s self-discovery journey goes on when she notices that there is something wrong in the way she perceives religion:

She realized with some amazement that, while she had knelt, while she had prostrated herself and recited the words, she had never fully engaged in them. In prayer she sought to stupefy herself like a drunk with a bottle, like a fly against a lantern. This was not the correct way to pray. It was not the correct way to read suras. It was not the correct way to live (Ali, 2007a, p.130-1).

Unlike Chanu, Nazneen is very keen on her religion. She is in purdah which means she has a religious lifestyle, she reads suras and prays. Therefore, it is not easy for her to come to this realization that she practices the requirements of her religion, but does not internalize them any more. Just like when she keeps dreaming about ice-skating and sabotages Chanu in her own ways, she finds it difficult to get rid of the sense of guilt which stems from her sense of betraying to her own cultural identity.

“She made bargains with it... no more dreaming of ice, and blades, and spangles. No more missed prayers. No more gossip. No more disrespect to my husband. She offered all these things for it to leave here” (Ali, 2007a, p.102). However much she struggles, the feeling inside her does not leave her. She no longer blindly adheres to fate, but decides to take control. However it can not be interpreted as a lack of faith. As Kılıç points out: “Nazneen’s journey to self-empowerment is provoked by detachment from her native background nevertheless the novel insistently maintains that she leaves behind her ‘social’ Islamic identity rather than her faith” (2010, p.40) which can also be observed in her relationship with Karim which challenges her faith to a great extent. Hence, to mark another important point in Nazneen’s hybridization process, one should think about her affair with Karim. He plays an important role in Nazneen’s transformation of independence. He helps her to find her own identity by creating a link between her and the outside world. Before their affair, Nazneen is not integrated into the society. She does not know about the outside world because Chanu is not interested in her cultural development. He does not even let her learn English “Where is the need anyway?” he says to her when she mentions an English course (Ali, 2007a, p.37). In contrast to Chanu, Karim introduces information about what is going on around them: “He began to talk to her about the world. She encouraged him ... His knowledge shamed her. She learned about her Muslim brothers and sisters. She learned how many they were, how scattered, and how tortured. She discovered Bosnia” (Ali, 2007a, p.243). She starts questioning the way Chanu treats her: “Chanu had never given her anything to read. And what good were his books anyway? All that ancient history” (Ali, 2007a, p.243). Unlike Chanu, Karim treats her as an individual and actually listens to her: “This was something he did: made her feel as if she had said a weighty piece, as if she had stated a new truth” (Ali, 2007a, p.262). Karim appeals to her not only intellectually, but also sexually: “The way he stood with his legs wide and his arms folded ... he was sure of himself. He took a strong stance. They looked strong, those arms. His hair. Razored short against the skull. It was odd, that the shape of a skull could be pleasing” (Ali, 2007a, p.210). Throughout their affair, Nazneen feels guilty, but also goes on with her fatalistic approach. As a muslim, she knows that committing adultery is a sin, but she justifies herself: “She had submitted to her father and married her husband; she had

submitted to her husband. And now she gave herself up to a power greater than these two, and she felt herself helpless before it” (Ali, 2007a, p.299-300). As taking control of things is the opposite of giving in to fate, she gives in so that she does not have to go against her faith at the beginning of the affair. She even prays to be killed “Let my husband find out, Nazneen prayed. Let him kill me, she added” (Ali, 2007a, p.384) Santesso states that: “rather than abandon her religion for the sake of acquiring a fully independent individuality, she wishes that her life be taken away” (2013, p.77). But then, she learns that Karim loves her because she is an ideal Bangladeshi woman:

Well, basically you’ve got two types. Make your choice. There’s your Westernized girl, wears what she likes, all the makeup going on, short skirts and that soon as she’s out of her father’s sight. She’s into going out, getting good jobs, having a laugh. Then there’s your religious girl, wears the scarf or even the burkha. You’d think, right, they’d be good for wife material. But they ain’t. Because all they want to do is to argue. And they always think they know best because they’ve been off to all these summer camps for Muslim sisters ... You are the real thing (Ali, 2007a, p.384-85).

She does not like what she hears because this reminds her of Chanu’s description of her as “an unspoilt girl. From the village” (Ali, 2007a, p.385). The reasons of Karim and Chanu for loving her do not satisfy her because this means that they do not love her for who she is, but because of what she represents: a Bengali mother, a symbol of the ideal home. Then, being associated with this stereotypical image makes her come to a realization that this is not who she is. By rejecting this stereotype, Nazneen also rejects a great power which suppresses her. Bhabha suggests that: “stereotype, which is its major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always ‘in place’, already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated” (2004, p.94-5). She realizes that she does not have to be the epitome of perfect Bangladeshi woman which leads her to reject static, fixed identities imposed on her.

By leaving Karim and Chanu she takes responsibility for her actions, instead of depending on fate to rule her life. As Kılıç states, “Blind adherence to fate is Nazneen’s ingrained social and psychological point of departure and signifies her native Muslim roots; ‘freewill’ is the western ‘self-determination’ that she achieves at the end of the novel” (2010, p.40). Considering her old self which was shaped by her culture and her upbringing which dictated her to leave everything to fate and let all the decisions about her life to be taken by others, it is a big transformation. To compare Nazneen then and now, we can resort to her own description of her situation as follows:

What could not be changed must be borne. And since nothing could be changed, everything had to be borne. This principle ruled her life. It was mantra, fettle and challenge. So that when, at the age of thirty-four, after she had been given three children and had one taken away, when she had a futile husband and had been fated a young and demanding lover, when for the first time she could not wait for the future to be revealed but had to make it for herself, she was as startled by her own agency as an infant who waves a clenched fist and strikes itself upon the eye (Ali, 2007a, p.16).

Just like she had to take control when she was born, she again realizes that it is the best way to live. On Nazneen’s journey of hybridization, there are other moments when she finds the courage to take control of her own life instead of relying on others to make a decision. One of these moments is when Chanu decides that they should go back to Dhaka. Even though Chanu buys the tickets and they start packing, she is not sure whether they will go or not. She thinks that Chanu might change his mind. She is also not sure about Karim. She does not know whether he will try to stop her if she decides to go with her family. Buried under the weight of her thoughts, she comes to a realization that she does not have to wait: “She felt as strongly as if someone, standing beside her in the kitchen, had taken a piece of paper, written down the answers and then set light to the page while she watched” (Ali, 2007a, p.404). Then, forgetting that she was chopping chillies, she rubs her eye which makes her angrier: “Suddenly her entire being lit up with anger. *I will decide*

what to do. I will say what happens to me. I will be the one. A charge ran through her body and she cried out again, this time out of sheer exhilaration” (Ali, 2007a, p.405). She found the strength to refuse Karim’s marriage proposal: “From the very beginning to the very end, we didn’t see things. What we did – we made each other up” (Ali, 2007a, p.455). Then she managed to get rid of the usurer Mrs. Islam who exploited them for a long time.

Nazneen’s transformation is established at the turning point of the novel when she decides to stay in London. Ending the exploitation of Mrs Islam, and her relationship with Karim and becoming a business partner with Razia are other important actions she had to take in order to become who she is. At the end of the novel Razia says: “This is England ... You can do whatever you like” (Ali, 2007a, p.492). Wearing a sari while ice-skating is not an obstacle for Nazneen, it is rather a symbol which shows that she does not have to sacrifice everything to reach her third space. She can skate freely in her sari, and this suggestion of mobility at the end of the novel is significant. As suggested by Poon:

Whether this is a statement of intent or wishful thinking, what seems significant ... is that the novel ends on a note of mobility ... Instead of stasis and closure, then, there is an allusion to continued rhythms and journeys, a final gesture reiterating and valorizing change that is rooted in the willingness to take small steps (2009, p.435).

In the last analysis, Nazneen constructs a hybrid identity blending two different cultures. This new identity is in “the third space” in Bhabha’s words because it belongs neither to the host culture nor to Bangladeshi culture. Her new identity is not imposed on her and it is not a fixed entity. In contrast, it suggests fluidity and it does not rely on time and space as Bhabha also suggests. Nazneen is freed from all stereotypical restrictions and she does not “live out a tragedy” (Ali, 2007a, p.112) unlike Chanu. She is a free individual in the mostly desired “third space”.

Although most critics see Nazneen's transformation as a triumph including Yasmin Hussain and Alistair Cormack, not all critics agree on the idea that Nazneen's hybridity is a hundred percent successful one. Santesso claims that "given Nazneen's lack of interaction and her continuing resistance to Westernisation" (2013, p.81) she can not be regarded as a fully hybridised individual. However, if we consider the starting point of Nazneen, it is inevitable to regard her as a successful hybrid. As Poon suggests: "In the development from a naïve Bangladeshi bride sent to marry a man chosen for her by her father, to an independent and self-supporting mother of two children in London's East End, Nazneen's story may be read as one of qualified immigrant success" (2009, p.428).

The fact that her only encounter with a person out of her own community is the tattoo lady may be the reason for this kind of criticism. The tattoo lady who keeps sitting by the window drinking all day is the only representative of the West in the novel. As suggested by Southmayd, Nazneen finds it tremendously difficult to achieve physical mobility because of "her own sense of inertia and Chanu's unwillingness to encourage her to leave their building without him; although she longs to ... visit the neighbouring tattoo lady, whose appearance fascinates her, she finds herself too frightened to do so" (2015, p.92). However, we know that she waves at her and imagines giving her samosas and bahjis which shows that she has the enthusiasm to embrace differences and interact with the host culture. It is also important to note that the end of the novel also suggests mobility not only with the ice-skating metaphor but also with the fact that there is not any one in her life who can restrict her mobility. She is a free individual. The life ahead of her as a woman entrepreneur is promising, because she does not have to work at home anymore which suggests that she will meet new people as a result of the mobility her new job entails.

Nazneen's husband Chanu is another hybrid character in the novel. Despite his English Literature degree and his westernized appearance, his mind is not westernized at all. In fact, he is only able to create an identity for himself through his education. Due to his repetitive criticisms of the West, Nazneen does not feel the need to interact with the world outside. On the contrary, she feels secure at home.

Unfortunately, Chanu does not regard Nazneen as his equal. She is inferior because she is just a woman whose sole responsibility in life is to look after her family. Chanu cannot see her as an individual. He describes her by saying that “a blind uncle is better than no uncle” (Ali, 2007a, p.31). He does not let his wife leave home without him. “She did not go out. ‘Why should you go out?’ ... ‘And I will look like a fool’” (Ali, 2007a, 39) he says to Nazneen which shows that he is not capable of embracing the cultural set of values of the Western society. He seems to be trapped between longing for adapting to the new culture and his incessant love and admiration of his homeland. As Alistair Cormack states, “[Chanu] constructs a mythic Bangladesh to compensate for his failure to succeed in English culture” (Cormack, 2006, p.702). As all immigrants, he dreams of a better lifestyle and he depends very much on his talents, but he can not make his dreams come true:

Chanu is an embattled figure who desperately lurches between an outmoded aspirational Englishness embodied in a Leavisite account of literary culture and a version himself as an "educated man" who has stooped to the condition moneymaker in order to return to an unsullied home. He repeatedly refuses to confront the realities of his situation in favor of a fantasy built on pedagogic notions of both Bangladesh and England (Cormack, 2006, p.703).

He says earlier that he will be “a success, come what may” (Ali, 2007a, p.44) and aims at “going home a Big Man” (Ali 2007a, p.400) which never happens. Finally he decides to go back home, but not as the “Big Man” he imagines to be. Therefore, he is not going because his love for his ‘home’ prevails, but because of his inability to find his own place in the host culture. Unfortunately, he is not able to adapt to English culture and gets more and more marginalized. He describes his discontent with his life in England as:

I’m talking about the clash between Western values and our own. I’m talking about the struggle to assimilate and the need to preserve one’s identity and heritage. I’m talking about children who don’t know what their identity is. I’m talking about the feelings of alienation engendered by a society where

racism is prevalent. I'm talking about the terrific struggle to preserve one's sanity while striving to achieve the best for one's family (Ali, 2007a, p.88).

Chanu keeps expressing his discontent about not being able to get the promotion he thinks he deserves. He alleges that his colleague Wilkie is treated better although he is late for work and is not qualified enough. He questions Wilkie's abilities to quote from prominent English writers such as Chaucer, Dickens and Hardy. He thinks he is superior to Wilkie because he can quote English literature works. His frustration leads him to blame racism in his failure:

Wilkie is not exactly underclass. He has a job, so technically I would say no, he is not. But that is the mindset. This is what I am studying the subsection 'Race, Ethnicity, and Identity.' It is part of the sociology module. Of course, when I have my Open University degree then nobody can question my credentials. Although, Dhaka University is one of the best in the world, these people here are by and large ignorant (Ali, 2007a, p.24-5).

Even when he starts working as a taxi driver, he still believes that there is a discrimination against him. "Though Chanu was a careful and able driver, it seemed that the Authorities conspired against him. There were fines for speeding and one for going too slow" (Ali, 2007a, p.318) and he is frustrated again when he goes to trial for an indictment thinking "They don't know who they are dealing with... They think it is some peasant-type person who will tremble at their gowns and wigs" and he came home in a bad mood saying "The trial was not fair" (Ali, 2007a, p.318). With his disillusionment with work and by realizing that his Dhaka University diploma does not earn him the respect he pleases, he starts getting British certificates. He thinks that this can pave the way to success he so desperately needs. What Chanu cannot understand is getting more English certificates will not solve the problem. Although he seems to be trying to fit into the host culture, he does not want to blend in. He can not make concessions, and his ideas and his boundaries are so fixed. Bhabha's "Third Space" rejects the fixity of identities and points out that only through cultural negotiation can this be achieved. Drawing on a metaphor of an art

gallery as stair well Bhabha suggests: “The stairwell as liminal space, in-between the designations of identity, becomes the process of symbolic interaction, the connective tissue that constructs the difference between upper and lower, black and white” (Bhabha, 2004, p.5). As a result of the interaction between different identities polarities are prevented. Hence, “this interstitial passage between fixed identifications opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy” (Bhabha, 2004, p.5). Chanu’s relationship with his wife, daughters and other members of the society (both white and non-white) reveals that Chanu cannot reach this liminal space. He is superior to his wife because she is just a woman and she is not educated. He is superior to other Bangladeshi immigrants because they are ignorant. Westerners are racist and some of them like Wilkie are not as well-educated as he is. The fact that he collects furniture can be interpreted as another technique to assert his superiority. “There was a lot of furniture, more than Nazneen had seen in one room before. Even if you took all of the furniture in the compound, from every auntie and uncle's ghar, it would not match up to this one room” (Ali, 2007a, p. 20). In fact, there is much more furniture and items in the house than they need, but they seem to be proud of this because

Nobody in Gouirpir had anything like it. There were plates on the wall, attached by hooks and wires, which were not for eating from but for display only. Some wires were rimmed in gold paint. "Gold leaf," Chanu called it. His certificates were framed and mixed with the plates (Ali, 2007a, p.21).

He collects these items creating himself a personal territory. He knows that he wouldn’t be able to collect these items if he lived in Dhaka. Chanu hopes that the furniture is also going to make him respected.

Later on in the novel, “He lay on the sofa in lungi and and vest. He no longer wore pyjamas, a sign of imminent return to home, and he often spent the day prostrate on the sofa without dressing, or pinned to the floor beneath his books” (Ali, 184). This image of Chanu is significant because it symbolizes his failure. He does not have a job, and they are in a financial crisis. He is in complete isolation from the

society. He insists that they are going to Dhaka. When Nazneen suggests that Razia can help her get a job, he shows his discontent with her friendship with Razia. Then, he agrees with her suggestion by emphasizing that he is superior to other immigrants: “Some of these uneducated ones, they say that if the wife is working it is only because the husband cannot feed them. Lucky you I am an educated man” (Ali, 2007a, p.184). Still, unable to accept his reality, Chanu proves that his identity is static and he is in a kind of paralysis not able to judge the situation he is in. The only transformative experience Chanu has throughout the novel is when their son Raqib stays in hospital for ten days. Nazneen notices the change in Chanu:

It had not occurred to her that, in all those years before he married, he must have cooked. And since, he had only leaned on the cupboards and rested his belly on the kitchen surfaces while she chopped and fried and wiped around him. It did not irritate her that he had not helped. She felt, instead, a touch of guilt for finding him useless, for not crediting him with this surprising ability (Ali, 2007a, 127-8).

Traditional roles are changed when Nazneen gains authority and Chanu cooks and takes care of Raqib. He realizes that: “All these years I dreamed of going home a Big Man. Only now, when it is nearly finished for me, I realized what is important. As long as I have my family with me, my wife, my daughters, I am as strong as any man alive” (Ali, 2007a, p.477). However, it is Nazneen who decides to take control of her life. His state of mind is not changed. It is Nazneen’s success which instills in him a little bit of change. Unfortunately, this is not enough to make him a successful hybrid as Nazneen becomes. He is very similar to Bhabha’s idea of ‘mimic man’ described as “almost the same, but not quite” (Bhabha, 2004, p.122). As a first generation immigrant, Chanu employs mimicry in order to survive in the host culture. Bhabha refers to Lacan and explains that: “mimicry is like camouflage, not a harmonization of repression of difference, but a form of resemblance” (Bhabha, 2004, p.128). Unfortunately, he is not a mimic man in Bhabha’s sense as Poon also suggests: “Unlike Bhabha’s unintentionally subversive mimic whose ineluctable hybridity shows up the cracks in colonial authority, Chanu registers no comparable

impact as an immigrant so displaced emotionally and culturally in contemporary London” (2009, p.430). Despite his expectations to be valued and treated as equals by the host country, he realizes that his English Literature degree does not suffice. His constant effort to differentiate himself from other immigrants also does not help. He fails despite his attempts to mimic English culture. He cannot combine British and Bangladeshi cultures and this prevents him from finding his “Third Space”. He isolates his wife from the society they live in, he sees himself superior to other immigrants rejecting to form connections with them. Unable to get his promotion he is alienated, disillusioned and his “Going Home Syndrome” prevails. This state of a migrant is defined as “unhomeliness” by Homi Bhabha. Drawing on Bhabha’s ideas Tyson says that “to be unhomed is to feel not at home even in your own home because you are not at home in yourself: your cultural identity crisis has made you a psychological refugee” (2006, p.14).

Chanu’s idealized home is far from reality which is obvious in the letters of Hasina. As hybridity in Bhabha’s terms requires a kind of balance in one’s perception of his/her own culture and the host culture, Chanu can not be regarded as a successful hybrid. Although he seems to glorify his culture, he does not respect other Bangladeshis and does not see them as equals. With his British Literature education he seems to embrace British culture, but he thinks that his children would be contaminated by this culture, so they should go back. A man of contradictions, Chanu fails to establish a hybrid identity in the “Third Space” and eventually he goes back to Dhaka. He does not embrace cultural diversity and remains a static identity. As stated by Poon: “Chanu’s hybrid knowledge of two cultural traditions, however, disperses rather than centres him, befuddles rather than enlightens” (2009, p.430).

Another first generation hybrid in the novel is Nazneen’s friend Razia who is not the “respectable type” (Ali, 2007a, p.83) according to Chanu for many reasons. He criticizes her hair: “Razia cuts her hair like tramp. Perhaps she calls it fashion” (Ali, 2007a, p.83). He also thinks that her husband is an uneducated illiterate man who cannot write his own name. Her son is like “a vagabond, throwing stones and what have you” (Ali, 2007a, p.83) as Chanu suggests. His dislike for Razia is mainly because she represents everything that Nazneen is not. She wears westernized

clothes: “She was wearing a garment she called a tracksuit. She would never, so she said, wear a sari again. She was tired of taking little bird steps” (Ali, 2007a, p.95). She smokes and takes care of her family when her husband dies. Very far from the stereotypical image of the Bangladeshi woman, Razia is able to integrate herself into the host culture. She also inspires Nazneen in her identity formation, encouraging her to learn English and finally start a new business together. Razia plays a significant role in Nazneen’s success by providing her with a successful model.

As the third space requires negotiation, Razia also has to make a sacrifice to gain her hybrid identity:

Razia has sacrificed her femininity to rid herself of residual weakness, replacing it with masculine clothes and demeanour which lends her an air of street-wise nonchalance; she keeps purdah (Islamic segregation of the sexes) by *transforming* and then *transporting* herself from female to male camp, maintaining independence without undermining Islamic propriety and therefore her place within her community (Kılıç, 2010, p48-9).

What makes Razia equally successful as Nazneen is her ability to embrace change. As a first generation immigrant, she not only copes with the problems by herself, but also inspires her friend in a positive way. She has the self-confidence and power to say: “I don't need anyone. I live like the English” (Ali, 2007a, p.358). At the end of the novel, by establishing a business enterprise called “Fusion Fashions” she proves that she does.

Dr. Azad, another first generation immigrant is the only Bangladeshi in the novel that Chanu wants to socialize with. The main reason is he is educated like Chanu, hence different from the other Bangladeshis. Insinuating that they both are equals Chanu says “we intellectuals must stick together” (Ali, 2007a, p.35) to Mr. Azad. In another conversation when Chanu says that his family will go back to Dhaka before the children get spoiled by Western culture, Mr Azad calls it a “disease that afflicts us” (Ali, 2007a, p.32). He further explains the disease to be “Going Home Syndrome” (Ali, 2007a, p.32) which is basically the fact that all immigrants

want to go back to their countries, whenever they have enough money. As a first generation immigrant Mr. Azad admits that he also had a similar intention of going back: “Every year I thought, ‘Maybe this year.’ And I'd go for a visit, buy some more land...and make up my mind to return for good. But something would always happen. And I'd think, ‘Well, maybe not this year’” (Ali, 2007a, p.33). Now, he is not sure, he says: “And now, I don't know. I just don't know” (Ali, 2007a, p.33). He cannot even express his ideas, because his wife does not let him which shows that he has no self-authorship. As Mrs. Azad states, it was not easy to gain their current social status: “When we first came – tell them, you tell them –we lived in a one-room hotel. We dined on rice and dal, rice and dal. For breakfast we had rice and dal. For lunch we drank water to bloat out our stomachs. This is how he finished medical school” (Ali, 2007a, p.113). Despite his endeavour through which he gains professional success, his inability to form a functioning relationship with his family positions him as an unsuccessful hybrid.

Mrs. Azad is considered as a mouthpiece for Orientalist view of Islam by Santesso (2013, p.69) which is also suggested in her portrayal as follows:

Mrs. Azad stubbed out her cigarette in an ivory dish. She adjusted her underwear with a thumb, and a wiggle of her opulent backside. 'One minute,' she said, and strode to the hallway. 'Azad!' she screeched. 'You've got visitors.' She scowled at Chanu and her husband when they talked and held up her hand when she wished to silence them altogether. She drank a second glass of beer and belched with quiet satisfaction (Ali, 2007a, p.108).

Mrs. Azad criticizes the immigrants for their inability to adapt to Western culture. She says: “Some women spend ten, twenty years here and they sit in the kitchen grinding spices all day and learn only two words of English” (Ali, 2007a, p.114). She also criticizes them for wearing burkah: “They go around covering from head to toe, in their little walking prisons, and when someone calls to them in the street, they are upset. The society is racist ... Everything should change for them. They don't have to change one thing. That's the tragedy” (Ali, 2007a, p.114). For

Mrs. Azad everything is so simple. This can be observed in her answer to Chanu when he talks about the struggles of immigrants:

'Why do you make it so complicated? 'Assimilation this, alienation that! Let me tell you a few simple facts. Fact: we live in a Western society. Fact: our children will act more and more like Westerners. Fact: that's no bad thing. My daughter is free to come and go. Do I wish I had enjoyed myself like her when I was young? Yes! (Ali, 2007a, p.113).

She thinks that everybody should embrace the cultural and social elements imposed on by colonial powers without questioning them. She lacks the ability to sympathize with the immigrants who are different from her in terms of embracing the modernity. Her description of immigrant women who live in London and can hardly speak English and spend their lives in the kitchen fits Nazneen. What Mrs. Azad fails to comprehend is that things are not that simple for women like Nazneen who do not want to trade their religions with a brand new identity void of their old selves. Religion is important to Nazneen and for a lot of Muslim immigrants and they do not want to abandon their beliefs.

Mrs. Azad can not be regarded as an immigrant who has balanced her old and new identities. Instead she is a comical figure with her too westernized behaviour and the fact that she blames the immigrants for wearing burkah or not being able to speak English show that she is alienated from her own culture. Therefore, she cannot be regarded as a hybrid in Bhabha's sense of the word. This idea of complete assimilation into the host culture does not conform to the Bhabha's concept of hybridity because Bhabha rejects traditional notions of identity. He states that: "The time for 'assimilating' minorities to holistic and organic notions has dramatically passed. The very language of cultural community needs to be rethought from a postcolonial perspective" (2004, p.251).

2.2 SECOND GENERATION HYBRIDS

2.2.1. Shahanah, Bibi, Karim and Other Characters

Shahanah, Bibi, Karim, Razia's children and Mr. and Mrs. Azad's daughter can be categorized as second generation hybrids because their identities are constructed in the Western society they were born into. They are totally different from their parents who immigrated to the host country. Their existence in London is not their choice but a result of the decision of their parents. As suggested by Parker the second generation immigrants were

stranded between two cultures, in conflict with their parents, facing difficulty of negotiating two incommensurable value systems. The problem was that they might not integrate smoothly into British society; the authoritarian and old-fashioned cultures of their parents deemed to be holding them back (qtd. in Tongur, 2013, p.563).

Therefore, apart from the problems deriving from being born into a host culture, they have to deal with their parents to overcome the difficulties in forming new identities. The clashes between generations can be observed in the relationship between Nazneen and Chanu and their daughters. As Bibi has always been a compliant daughter, Shahanah's relationship with her parents will provide the framework. Shahanah shows no interest in Bangladesh despite her father's concurrent imposition of Bangladeshi culture and tradition. When Chanu declares that they are going back home (meaning Dhaka) Shahanah gets rebellious and tries everything in her capacity in order not to go to Dhaka. To quote from Ali:

Shahana did not want to listen to Bengali classical music. Her written Bengali was shocking. She wanted to wear jeans. She hated her kameez and spoiled her entire wardrobe by pouring paint on them. If she could choose between baked beans and dal it was no contest. When Bangladesh was mentioned she pulled a face. She did not know and would not learn that Tagore was more than poet and Noel laureate, and no less than the true

father of her nation. Shahana did not care. Shahana did not want to go back home (2004, p.18).

She does not want to go back, because she has never regarded Bangladeshi as “home”. In her rejection of Bangladesh there is a clear juxtaposition between Chanu’s highly idealized home. Chanu clearly lives in the past and calls Bengali: “the paradise of nations” (Ali, 2007a, p.185) desperately trying to make his daughters feel proud of their Bengali roots. “In the sixteenth century, Bengal was called the Paradise of Nations. Do they teach these things in the schools here? Does Shahana know about the Paradise of Nations? All she knows about is flood and famine. If you have history you have pride” (Ali, 2007a, p.185). Despite all efforts of Chanu, Shahana cannot comply with Bengali culture and integrates with the dominant culture she is subjected to. Her conflict with her first generation immigrant parents shows “frustration and disorientation of a particular generation, caught between cultures and struggling to define itself on its own terms, according to its own choices and beliefs” as suggested by Hiddleston (2005, p.61). Being second generation hybrids, Shahanah and Bibi do not question their lives in England and never think of returning their ‘homeland’ despite their father. Fernandez suggests that,

Shahana and Bibi are quite well integrated in British society. Their identity is constructed according to British cultural norms; they have no sense of belonging to Bangladesh. Chanu forces his daughters to maintain a link with his native culture. Yet, this link seems meaningless to the girls, who are unable to relate to a place and a culture they have never known (2009, p.152).

The only obstacle in their identity formation is their parents -especially Chanu- who do not let them make their own decisions about what to wear, what to read, what music to listen to and even which language to speak. Shahanah objects to not speaking English at home rule of Chanu” ‘We are not allowed to speak English in this house,’ said Shahana, transgressing at top volume. There was always this tension

between them. They could never get over their disappointments” (Ali, 2007a, p.193). Nazneen acts like a mediator between the girls and their father. ““And we are always keeping to the rule?’ said Nazneen. ““But it's his stupid rule in the first place!’ I know,’ said Nazneen. When Chanu went out the girls frequently switched languages. Nazneen let it pass” (Ali, 2007a, p.193-4). Nazneen was much more understanding than Chanu towards the girls, and usually let them do whatever they like.

Shahana uses moisturizer and refuses to use Fairy Liquid and wants to use shampoo instead. Unlike her mother, she does not suffice with what is given to her. She always challenges the authority to gain her identity. She wants to wear whatever she wants, she wants to get her ears pierced and get a tattoo. She also uses it as a strategy so as not to go to Dhaka: “She did not bring these demands to her father. She presented them to her mother as proof that she could not be ‘taken home’. When she asked for the lip ring, she said, 'It’s my body’” (Ali, 2007a, p.292). Chanu does not let them wear the clothes they want. “Chanu sat down in the armchair. 'Shahana, go and put on some decent clothes.' She looked down at her uniform. 'Go and put some trousers on’” (Ali, 2007a, p.252p). Not only Chanu but all first generation characters worry that their children are going to be badly affected by the host culture, so they try to protect them. Chanu tries to restrict her children’s actions in order to protect his daughters. This is also why he wants to go back before it is too late. In a conversation with Mr. Azad Chanu says that: “In all my life, I feel this is the best decision I have made – to take my daughters back home. I am preparing them” (Ali, 2007a, p.249). Despite all efforts of Chanu, Shahana does not want to go back. As a second generation hybrid, she tries to find her own place in the host culture by rebelling against her first generation parents. As Upstone suggests about Shahana when she says: ““We go on the Internet at school,’ said Shahana, in English” (Ali, 2007a, p.200) that: “This new identity is encapsulated in one sentence. Shahana’s declaration at once emphasizes her global culture, her British identity in language, and her commitment to the future” (2007, p.338). Born and bred in Britain, Shahana is a typical second generation hybrid who is open to British culture. In fact it can be argued that it is the first generation hybrids who make it much more difficult for Shahana and other second generation hybrids to find their identities.

A similar tension between Shahana and her parents can also be observed in Shefali's relationship with her parents "Shefali tried to go out of the house wearing some little thing like this. I told her no way... Daughters! They are trouble" (Ali, 2007a, p.229) said Razia in a conversation to Nazneen. Like Shahana, Shefali is also trying to assert her own identity. Despite all the economical hardships, she gets an acceptance to a university. She also wants to have a year off before she goes to university, just like the British which shows that she is also well-integrated into the host culture. Among all second generation characters she is the most successful one in terms of the promising future awaiting her.

Razia's son Tariq is another second generation hybrid who fails to establish a third space. His involvement with drugs and gangs shows another side of Bengali youth which is quite problematic. They are not only in conflict with the first generation immigrants, but also with the society. The outlook of the first generation also problematizes this issue. One of the neighbours of Razia reflects their mentality: "Of course you hear all sorts about boys getting mix-up in drugs these days. The parents can't control and they bring shame on the family. Anyone who had any sense would send them back to Bangladesh" (Ali, 2007a, p.390). As a result: "The families and the community are unable to help these young Bangladeshis because rather than looking for medical aid, the families are more concerned with moral burden of their addiction" (Tongur, 2013, p.564).

Nazneen's lover Karim is also a second generation hybrid who was born and raised in Britain by his Bangladeshi immigrant parents in Tower Hamlets. As other second generation immigrants, he feels that his homeland is Britain, not Bangladesh. There is a moment in the novel when Nazneen talks about "our country" and she means Bangladesh, but Karim responds as "This is my country" suggesting Britain. (Ali, 2007a, p.212). Similar to Shahana, he has problems with his first generation parents. Disturbed by his father's frequent phone calls he tells Nazneen: "And what's he ringing up for anyway? Hasn't got anything to say to me man" (Ali, 2007a, p.232) which shows that there is a conflict of generations in their relationship too.

When they first meet, Nazneen thinks that he has “a place in the world” (Ali, 2007a, p.218). The fact that he speaks English, and looks modern but also uses technology as a reminder of religious duties (salaat alarms) seems to have fascinated Nazneen. Unlike Nazneen, Karim fails to negotiate his religious beliefs. Instead of negotiating, he succumbs to the superiority of his cause and never lets his identity be challenged. Also, instead of focusing on similarities, he focuses on the differences between his culture and the host culture. These can also be seen as the reasons why Nazneen did not want to marry him. He does not have “a place in the world” like she hoped.

Dr Azad’s daughter who is only introduced to us in Nazneen and Chanu’s visit to Dr Azad’s home: “A girl walked in and stood with her hands on her hips in the middle of the room. She had inherited her mother’s sturdy legs, but her skirt was shorter by a good few inches” (Ali, 2007a, p.111). The description suggests a similarity between the daughter and her mother. She spoke in English, and chewed a gum. She apparently asks for money to go to the pub. Her behaviour makes her father ashamed: “The doctor gripped his seat. His feet and knees pressed together. His helmet-hair held a circle of light. He would never let go of that chair. It was the only thing holding him up” (Ali, 2007a, p.112). After taking the money, “She looked at Nazneen and the baby. She looked at Chanu. The girl tucked the Money into her blouse pocket. ‘Salaam Ale-Koum,’ she said, and went out to the pub” (Ali, 2007a, p.112). As implied, she is an assimilated figure just like her mother. Therefore, we can not regard her as a hybrid in Bhabha’s terms.

In *Brick Lane*, the common feature of second generation hybrids is they are in conflict with their parents and with their communities. Some of them like Karim are in conflict with the British society too. Rather than adapting into their current situation, the Bangladeshi youth rebel against the society. This is what differentiates the second generation hybrids from the first generation hybrids as Chanu also notices: “the young ones don’t want to keep quiet anymore” (Ali, 2007a, p.258). It is true in that Karim and his Islamic resistance group Bengal Tigers protest against the people who regard Islam as “a religion of hate and intolerance” (Ali, 2007a, p.251) and they organize a demonstration against them. He tries to construct his identity

around his religion and he resents the other members of his community who do not believe in his cause: “He bemoaned the lack of interest shown by the dissolute youth, most of whom had resisted the charms of the Bengal Tigers” (Ali, 2007a, p.260). In this sense he is unable to balance his faith with his social identity.

To sum up, second generation hybrids do not accept the traditional values of their families and their cultures. In contrast to passivity of their parents, they try to challenge and subvert the dominant principles of the society they live in. Fernandez alleges that the characters in *Brick Lane* Monica Ali shows a: “(multi)community-based organisation of society where both first- and second- generation characters, linked initially to a monolithic community, show dissimilar levels of integration in it” (2009, p.145). The characters “those which are constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew, through transformation and difference” (Hall, 1994, p.235) can be said to have reached hybridity. However, as the analysis reveals, not all characters can achieve this. The problem with the relationship between the two generations is that the first generation hybrids see the host culture as a threat. This is also why they can not reach full hybridity in Bhabha’s sense. As we have observed in the relationship of different characters between their children, almost all first generation characters think that their children are going to be badly affected by the host culture. Some of the first generation hybrids like Mr. and Mrs. Azad embrace complete assimilation which is also problematic.

Thus it can be concluded that in Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane* hybridity is presented as something productive leading to a heterogeneous society by questioning static identities which is in conformity with Bhabha’s ideas of hybridity as a positive entity. As the aim of this study is to find out hybridity in terms of Bhabha, the only characters which fit his description are Nazneen and Razia. They are able to create heterogeneous and malleable identities, emancipated from the restrictions of the society they are in.

At the beginning of the novel, Nazneen’s existence in London depends on Chanu. He is her only link with the outside world, because she does not speak English, she does not work or go out without his assent. Later on, she starts working and she meets Karim who introduces new ideas and a new connection with the

society outside her home and she also needs Karim as a middleman for the sewing job. At first, she belongs to her own parents who marry her to an older man who takes her to another country. Then, she is subjected to Chanu and Karim. Clearly, without these men she cannot exist. Little by little, as the novel develops she encounters different experiences and finally she is a different person whose existence does not necessarily depend on another person. Similarly, Razia builds an identity which is neither fixed nor static. She also plays a significant role in Nazneen's transformation and sets a good example for her. Cormack reveals the secret of Nazneen and Razia's success as: "One may overcome the problems of postcolonial identity, the novel seems to argue, through transcending history and achieving self-authorship" (2006, p.717). It is by challenging and subverting the stereotypes imposed on their identities that they overcome the hardships of immigrant identity.

CHAPTER 3: ANALYSIS OF THE NOVEL

3. HYBRIDITY IN ARUNDHATI ROY'S *THE GOD OF SMALL THINGS*

Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* which was published in 1997 takes place in Ayemenem, a village in the Kerala state of India and it is a story of an upper-class Syrian Christian family. The protagonists are Estha and Rahel who are dizygotic twins. When the novel starts, they are thirty-one years old and their mother Ammu is no longer alive. The narrative goes back and forth in time to tell their memories of the past and to show what they have become today. The sudden death of their half-white nine-year-old cousin, Sophie Mol leads to the separation of the twins and it is only years after that they meet again at the beginning of the story. The shifts in the narratives also refer to the time when Velutha who was an "Untouchable" in the Indian caste system was killed. In India, the caste system which divides people into classes and the people from lower class are called "untouchable" It is necessary to give a brief explanation of the caste system, concerning the fact that it is essential to the understanding of the novel.

The term 'caste' comes from the word 'casta' in Spanish which means 'race, breed or lineage'. Casta is an Iberian word meaning "lineage", "breed" or "race." It derives from the Latin word castus which means "chaste," implying that the race has been kept pure (caste, 2019). Although the exact origins of the caste system is uncertain, it is known that Aryans wanted to remain racially 'pure' (Brown, 1994, p. 21) and created this system which has racial, occupational, economic, migrational and religious roots. However, it was in the twentieth century that class became a consequential term in India. According to Louis Dumont in his work *Homo Hierarchicus : The Caste System and Its Implications*:

the caste system divides the whole society into a large number of hereditary groups, distinguished from one another and connected together by three characteristics: separation in matters of marriage and contact, whether direct or indirect (food); division of labour, each group having, in theory or by tradition, a profession from which their members can depart only within

certain limits; and finally hierarchy, which ranks the groups as relatively superior or inferior to one another (1966, p.21).

An individual who is born into a certain caste can not change his/her caste and “Untouchables were not allowed to drink from the same well as Touchables, and they could not hand food to touch Touchables. They had to announce their presence by calling out and even their shadow was believed to be polluting” (Brown, 1994, p.20) which shows the extent of social restrictions and its effects on the identities of people.

In addition to caste system, It is also crucial to note to add to the specific context of this novel that a generation of “in-between” quality was deliberately engineered in India by colonial powers. As Anna Clarke suggests “the historian and politician Thomas Babington Macaulay advocated ... English education in India for the creation of ‘a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect’” (2007, p.138). Then, in 1835, a colonial rule was set up to teach English to Indians. By doing so, colonial powers “masked the economic exploitation of empire and ‘implied that moral behaviour and English behaviour were synonymous’, so that the English literary text ‘function[ed] as a surrogate Englishman in his highest and most perfect state’” (Tickell, 2007, p.51).

Since this novel is a resonance of Roy’s critical perspective on colonization, the deteriorating effects of the caste system are going to be analyzed in the next chapter of this study. In relation to the effects of colonization different forms of hybridity are also going to be investigated which is the main aim of this thesis.

3.1. FIRST GENERATION HYBRIDS

3.1.1 Pappachi and Mammachi

Pappachi is Ammu’s father who works as an imperial entomologist until his retirement. The most tragic event in his life is the fact that he discovers a new species of moth, but his discovery is rejected on the grounds that the moth had already been discovered and named. After his retirement, it is revealed that the moth was indeed a different species, but it was too late. The moth is named under somebody else’s

name, and Pappachi cannot get credit for the moth. His inability to name the moth leads to a life-long resentment and anger. As Tickell suggests “the unclassifiable moth that haunts Pappachi’s dreams of entomological discovery” is a hybrid entity which “‘blurs’ laws and transgresses rules” (2007, p.9). Therefore, his inability to name the moth which would give him fame becomes a tool to ruin his power as a patriarch.

He is the product of Macaulay’s English education system which aimed to create “a class of ‘brown white men’, educated to value European culture above their own” (Ashcroft et al., 2017, p.56). According to Ammu, Pappachi was “an incurable British-CCP, which was short for chhi-chhi poach and in Hindi meant shit-wiper” (Roy, 1997, p.51-2). Chacko says that he was an Anglophile which means “person well disposed to the English” in dictionary but in fact it means that “Pappachi’s mind had been brought into a state which made him like the English” according to Chacko (Roy, 1997, p.52). Therefore, he is a representative of colonial mimic man who is described as “the effect of a flawed colonial mimesis, in which to be Anglicized is *emphatically* not to be English” (Bhabha, 2004, p.125).

In addition to being a representative of colonial mimic man, Pappachi is also a symbol of patriarchal power. His identity is very much shaped under the influence of British colonial powers because as we know, “Colonialism ... reshapes, often violently, physical territories, social terrains as well as human identities” (Loomba, 1998, p.185). The effects of colonialism on patriarchal power were tremendous: “Colonialism intensified patriarchal relations in colonised lands, often because native men, increasingly disenfranchised and excluded from the public sphere, became more tyrannical at home” (Loomba, 1998, p.168). As implied in the way his children describe him, Pappachi did not have a good relationship with his family because he was violent towards his wife Mammachi and his daughter Ammu:

In her growing years, Ammu had watched her father weave his hideous web. He was charming and urbane with visitors, and stopped just short of fawning on them if they happened to be white. He donated money to orphanages and leprosy clinics. He worked hard on his public profile as a sophisticated,

generous, moral man. But alone with his wife and children he turned into a monstrous, suspicious bully, with a streak of vicious cunning. They were beaten, humiliated and then made to suffer the envy of friends and relations for having such a wonderful husband and father (Roy, 1997, p.18).

Being an “Anglophile” he believes in the superiority of British colonizers and tries to mimic them. After his retirement:

He bought the skyblue Plymouth from an old Englishman in Munnar. He became a familiar sight in Ayemenem, coasting importantly down the narrow road in his wide car looking outwardly elegant but sweating freely inside his woolen suits (Roy, 1997, p.48).

He wears westernized clothes: “he wore khaki jodhpurs though he had never ridden a horse in his life” and drives a Plymouth which is a symbol of colonial powers. He also sends his son to Oxford to study. However, “Pappachi insisted that a college education was an unnecessary expense for a girl” (Roy, 1997, p.38). Despite his looks, his mind is not westernised at all. As an oppressor figure, he does not acknowledge women as his equals and tries to subjugate them. His relationship with his family is similar to a relationship between the colonized and the colonizer. Assuming the powers granted to him by colonial powers, he tries everything in his power to make his daughter and his wife feel inferior.

The extent of Pappachi’s love and admiration for the English is revealed when Ammu tells him about something that happened to her. Her husband’s English boss Mr. Hollick wants to sleep with her in return for her alcoholic husband not to lose his job. Pappachi accuses Ammu of making the story up: “not because he thought well of her husband, but simply because he didn’t believe that an Englishman, any Englishman, would covet another man’s wife” (Roy, 1997, p.42). As the examples reflecting Pappachi’s identity show, he suffers from lack of self-esteem as a result of colonialism and his experience can be summarized as follows:

When the black man comes into contact with the white world he goes through an experience of sensitization. His ego collapses. His self-esteem evaporates. He ceases to be a self-motivated person. The entire purpose of his behavior is to emulate the white man, to become like him, and thus hope to be accepted as a man (Fanon, 2008, p.xiii).

Mammachi, settles for her position as a stereotypical Indian mother and imposes a double standard on Ammu who does not obey the rules and regulations of the society. Ammu is not welcome in their home when she gets a divorce. However Chacko has a privileged lifestyle and can have as many women as he can because of “Men’s Needs” (Roy, 1997, p.168). Mammachi turns a blind eye on Chacko’s escapades, whereas when she learns about Ammu’s relationship with Velutha, she almost vomits and fears that “For generations to come, forever now, people would point at them at weddings and funerals. At baptisms and birthday parties. They’d nudge and whisper. It was all finished-now” (Roy, 1997, p.258). Regarding Ammu as a threat to social structure Mammachi is furious.

As can be inferred, every person reacts differently to the effects of colonialism, and Mammachi chooses to stay fixed. As a first generation hybrid, Mammachi is subjected to double bind which limits and suppresses her. However, she does not do anything to change her fate. She is so passive and resilient that she does not do anything to stop her husband, although “Every night he beat her with a brass flower vase” (Roy, 1997, p.47). Luckily, one night: “Chacko strode into the room, caught Pappachi’s vase-hand and twisted it around his back. “I never want this to happen again” he told his father, “Ever” (Roy, 1997, p.47). If it weren’t for Chacko who stopped his father, this would have continued. Apart from physical violence, he also employs psychological violence: “Though Mammachi had conical corneas and was already practically blind, Pappachi would not help her with the pickle-making because he did not consider pickle-making a suitable job for a highranking ex-Government official” (Roy, 1997, p.47). Even though Pappachi does not beat her any more, he finds another way to punish her: “He never touched Mammachi again. But he never spoke to her either as long as he lived. When he

needed anything he used Kochu Maria or Baby Kochamma as intermediaries” (Roy, 1997, p.48). By ignoring her, he wants her to feel insignificant. He also tries to conceal his abusiveness by trying to make people see Mammachi as a negligent wife. “In the evenings, when he knew visitors were expected, he would sit on the verandah and sew buttons that weren’t missing onto his shirts, to create the impression that Mammachi neglected him” (Roy, 1997, p.47).

Just like a colonizer he tries to assert his superiority and he is also jealous of her ability to produce pickles because she gets all the attention (Roy, 1997, p.47). To make her feel inferior “He wouldn’t allow Mammachi or anyone else in the family to use it, or even to sit in it” (Roy, 1997, p.47). Her success at playing the violin is unbearable to him and he breaks her violin and throws it into the river.

A more comprehensive portrayal of Mammachi’s identity can be observed in Spivak’s terms. By challenging the juxtaposition of colonial and colonized, Spivak introduces the “‘brown woman’ as a category oppressed by both” and claims that: “Elite native men may have found a way to speak, but ... for those further down the hierarchy self representation is not a possibility (qtd. in Loomba, 1998, p.234). Mammachi falls into the category of those who can not speak and Pappachi’s colonial mind does not let his wife build an identity free from the restrictions of the society. She can not have a different identity other than a wife and a mother.

3.2. SECOND GENERATION HYBRIDS

3.2.1. Baby Kochamma, Ammu and Chacko

Ammu’s sister Baby Kochamma tries to adopt a hybrid personality her whole life by trying to mimic Father Mulligan which is her only chance to become accepted by the colonizer culture. However, she fails to accomplish hybridity due to the fact that Father Mulligan rejects her. She even converts to Roman Catholicism in order to win the favour of Father Mulligan, but she can never reach him. Nevertheless, she tries to justify herself that she is doing the right thing. For years she does not want to marry another man. Unlike Ammu who does not yield to fate, Baby Kochamma admits: “The fate of the wretched Man-less woman. The sad, Father Mulligan-less Baby Kochamma” (Roy, 1997, p.45). She prefers a life without men, and criticizes Ammu for marrying a “wretched man”. Baby Kochamma

disapproves of Ammu's marriage as it is against the social structure which prohibits intercommunity marriages. When Ammu comes back to Ayemenem, Baby Kochamma is irritated by her existence:

She subscribed wholeheartedly to her commonly held view that a married daughter had no position in her parents' home. As for a divorced daughter, according to Baby Kochamma, she had no position anywhere at all. And as for a divorced daughter from a love marriage, well, words could not describe Baby Kochamma's outrage. As for a divorced daughter from an intercommunity love marriage. Baby Kochamma chose to remain quaveringly silent on the subject (Roy, 1997, p. 45-46).

Her silence stems from her anger, because she thinks that Ammu must not fight against her fate and accept the situation she is in, just like herself. It can be argued that there is a double standard here in terms of Baby Kochamma's reaction to another divorced person, Chacko who was married to an English woman and this is a privilege in the eyes of Baby Kochamma. When Sophie Mol and Margaret Kochamma come to visit, Baby Kochamma fakes a British accent (Roy, 1997, p.137) which stems from the inferiority of the colonized trying to imitate the colonizer and "to set herself apart from the Sweeper Class" (Roy, 1997, p.138). Baby Kochamma's obsession with English can also be observed when she forces the twins to speak English:

That whole week Baby Kochamma eavesdropped relentlessly on the twins' private conversations, and whenever she caught them speaking in Malayam, she levied a small fine which was deducted at source. From their pocket money. She made them write lines –'impositions' she called them - *I will always speak in English, I will always speak in English*. A hundred times each. When they were done, she scored them with her pen to make sure that old lines were not recycled for new punishments. She had made them practice an English car song for the way back. They had to form the words properly, and be particularly careful about their pronunciations (Roy, 1997, p.36).

They have to speak English and pronounce the words correctly. Otherwise, they stand corrected by Baby Kochamma whenever they make such a mispronunciation as “Thang God” (Roy, 1997, p.154). Her obsession in accurate English can be associated with her desire to mimic the colonizer and just like the colonizer she tries to impose “her language” to the colonized. It is also important to note that Baby Kochamma herself is a product of English indoctrinization. Internalizing the myth of the colonized as inferior, Baby Kochamma identifies herself with anything that is English. Therefore, she needs the affection and approval of Sophie Mol and Margaret Kochamma desperately. Hence, she forces the twins to speak English as correctly as possible, so she is not ashamed of their behavior.

Her life-long love for Father Mulligan does not end even after he dies. She does not like the fact that Father Mulligan becomes “a Vaishnavite. A devotee of Lord Vishnu” (Roy, 1997, p.297) before his death. In her fantasy world:

Baby Kochamma stripped Father Mulligan of his ridiculous saffron robes and re-clothed him in the Coca-Cola cassock she so loved. (Her senses feasted, between changes, on that lean, concave, Christlike body.) She snatched away his begging bowl, pedicured his horny Hindu soles and gave him back his comfortable sandals. She re-converted him into the high-stepping camel that came to lunch on Thursdays. And every night, night after night, year after year, in diary after diary after diary, she wrote: I love you I love you (Roy, 1997, p.298).

Even though he is dead, she can not envisage a non-westernized Father Mulligan for whom she spent a whole life in vain. This is another indicator which shows that Baby Kochamma has a fixed identity and does not want to change. Her admiration for the colonizer never fades and she happens to become an epitome of the colonized mind with an inferiority complex. According to Fanon: “inferiority complex ... is the outcome of a double process: —primarily, economic; —subsequently, the internalization—or, better, the epidermalization— of this inferiority” (2008, p.4).

Just like Pappachi who also suffers from inferiority complex, Baby Kochamma mimics the colonizer. However, all her efforts are futile, and her last chance to gain approval of the colonizer is also denied her. Sophie Mol shows no affection, so she has no hopes for the future. Roy's description of Baby Kochamma's house also reflects the stability of her identity:

She kept her doors and windows locked, unless she was using them. She used her windows for specific purposes. For a Breath of Fresh Air. To Pay for the Milk. To Let Out a Trapped Wasp (which Kochu Maria was made to chase around the house with a towel). She even locked her sad, paint-flaking fridge, where she kept her week's supply of cream buns (1997, p.28-9).

By locking herself inside the house, she tries to keep herself from any kind of contact which would result in change. Also her reaction to Ammu's relationship with Velutha is an example of her refusal to change. As she sees Ammu and Velutha's relationship as a threat to social structure, she does everything in her power to stop them.

Estha and Rahel's mother Ammu differs from other second generation hybrids in her reaction against colonialism. Unlike Baby Kochamma and Chacko, she does not believe in the superiority of colonial powers, and also social norms which lead to binary oppositions. The way she treats the white guests is quite different from other characters. When Sophie Mol and Margaret Kochamma arrived:

Ammu leaned against the bedroom door in the dark, reluctant to return to the dinner table, where the conversation circled like a moth around the white child and her mother as though they were the only source of light. Ammu felt that she would die, wither and die, if she heard another word" (Roy, 1997, p.312).

She does not regard them as superior and does not need their acceptance like Baby Kochamma and others.

Another gauge of Ammu's difference can be observed in her relationship with her brother Chacko. As a result of Pappachi's discriminative idea that girls don't have to go to college, Ammu waits for a decent marriage proposal, but she never gets one as Pappachi does not give her a suitable dowry. Years go by, she becomes eighteen and, "Ammu grew desperate. All day she dreamed of escaping from Ayemenem and the clutches of her ill-tempered father and bitter, long suffering mother" (Roy, 1997, p.38-9). On a visit to a distant aunt she meets someone: "There, at someone else's wedding reception, Ammu met her future husband. He was on vacation from his job" (Roy, 1997, p.39) and marries him in order to get away from her family. As the double standard is at work again, her family does not welcome this marriage because her husband is a Bengali, but Chacko's marriage is not objected by the other members of the family. Only Ammu does not like the fact that Chacko marries an English woman. For her this would mean: "Marry our conquerors is more like it" (Roy, 1997, p.53) which means that her perception of colonial powers is different from other members of her family.

Another example of the double bind that restricts Ammu's identity formation is the fact that she can not have a college education, whereas Chacko receives a top notch education at Oxford University. Moreover, Chacko depends on his family financially and he can live in England by living on them. On the contrary, Ammu does not have any financial power. As a woman in India she has no right to have any properties, so she has to endure Chacko's 'male chauvinism' when he says: "What's yours is mine and what's mine is also mine" (Roy, 1997, p.57). The case is the same with the factory:

Though Ammu did as much work in the factory as Chacko, whenever he was dealing with food inspectors or sanitary engineers, he always referred to it as my Factory, my pineapples, my pickles. Legally this was the case, because Ammu, as a daughter, had no claim to the property (Roy, 1997, p.57).

Even if she wanted to, she would not gain economic freedom because of the social structure of India which undermines women. Her condition is exemplary of the colonized woman who has to endure restrictions imposed on them because of their

gender. According to Loomba: “It is important to remember that colonised women were not simply objectified in colonial discourses, but their labour (sexual as well as economic) fed into the colonial machine” (1998, p.172). This also reminds us the worker women Chacko engages with to satisfy a man’s needs. When it is a woman who engages in a similar act, the result is devastating. As Therese Saliba suggests, “with the hybridization of culture resultant from colonialism, indigenous women’s bodies have come to signify, within indigenous male ideology, sites of cultural impurity, bodies polluted or sickened by “diseases” of Western influence” (qtd. in Froula, 2009, p.138). Ammu uses her body, to have an affair with an “Untouchable”, and transgresses boundaries of the society, corrupting “generations of breeding”. Acknowledging the threat Ammu poses against the authority, Inspector Thomas Mathew bullies her: “Thomas Mathew came around his desk and approached Ammu with his baton. “If I were you,” he said, “I’d go home quietly.” Then he tapped her breasts with his baton. Gently. Tap tap. As though he was choosing mangoes from a basket” (Roy, 1997, p.8). She is punished for her actions, by the bearers of authority.

As the portrayal of Ammu reveals, she reacts differently to the effects of colonialism, and the double bind which afflicts all women. Unlike her mother, she does not accept being beaten on a daily basis, and immediately leaves her husband. Marrying him was also against the conventions because it was an intercommunity marriage. She does not admire or mimic the colonizers, and does not approve of the ones who do so. She says that her father is a “shit wiper” and defines Chacko’s marriage as marrying a conquerer. She violates “Love Laws” (Roy, 1997, p.33) which dictate who you can and can not love, by having an affair with Velutha. All these show her mindset as a person who does not believe in the categorizations of the caste system and does not obey the rules and regulations and challenges and subverts cultural stereotypes. Therefore, Ammu is “the liminal figure of the nation-space (who) would ensure that no political ideologies could claim transcendent or metaphysical authority for themselves” (Bhabha, 2004, p.212). This in-between place is not acceptable for her family, especially for Baby Kochamma who thinks that as a divorcee of an intercommunity marriage, she has no place in the world at all. “This interstitial passage” (Bhabha, 2004, p.5) which may lead to her cultural hybridity

requires crossing some boundaries and “exceeding the barrier or boundary – the very act of going *beyond* – are unknowable, unrepresentable” (Bhabha, 2004, p.6). This in-between quality of Ammu is described by Roy as an “Unsafe Edge”, “Unpredictability”, “An unmixable mix” including “The infinite tenderness of motherhood and the reckless rage of a suicide bomber” (Roy, 1997, p.44).

As we observe later in the novel, in order to take control of her life, she defies the cultural norms imposed on her by the society and her family. However, the result is destructive both for herself and the people she loves. She is different from the other Ipe family members in her cross-cultural transgressions. She is in “penumbral shadows between two worlds, just beyond the grasp of their power” (Roy, 1997, p.44). The ‘penumbral shadows’ can be referred to Bhabha’s “third space” and her space has the power to unsettle the authority figures representing the colonizer. Ammu defies all expectations of the society and her family. She transgresses certain boundaries risking to be alienated. And the third space she inhabits threatens Chacko’s authority: “Therefore, he banishes her to a state of subalternity drained of its former potential for power—she dies alone, cast out of the system, after years of betweenness—between jobs and between mothering and orphanhood” (2009, p.41-2). Her actions result in exclusion from her society and her family.

Mammachi and Pappachi’s son and Ammu’s brother Chacko is a hybrid character with his Oxford education and his English ex-wife Margaret Kochamma. His struggle in his hybridization process can be inferred when he says:

Our minds have been invaded by a war. A war that we have won and lost.
The very worst sort of war. A war that captures dreams and re-dreams them.
A war that has made us adore our conquerors and despise ourselves” (Roy, 1997, p.53).

Regarding himself and his family as “anglophiles”, Chacko tells the twins that though he hates to admit it, but “They were a family of Anglophiles” (Roy, 1997, p.52). His coping technique is mimicry. His marriage to an English woman

supports this idea. It is important to note that this marriage ends with a divorce which is a dysfunctional element in his hybridization process by causing him to go back to Ayemenem. Chacko and Margaret Kochamma's relationship resembles one of a colonizer and the colonized in terms of stereotypical elements they are habituated by.

As for Chacko, Margaret Kochamma was the first female friend he had ever had. Not just the first woman that he had slept with, but his first real companion. What Chacko loved most about her was her self-sufficiency. Perhaps it wasn't remarkable in the average English women, but it was remarkable to Chacko (Roy, 1997, p. 245).

His admiration for her is because she is the personification of British superiority. Margaret finds him exotic and is enchanted by the "helpless, exiled prince" (Roy, 1997, p.244) who can not keep his room clean and tidy: "Books, empty wine bottles, dirty underwear and cigarette butts littered the floor. Cupboards were dangerous to open because clothes and books and shoes would cascade down and some of his books were heavy enough to inflict real damage" (Roy, 1997, p.244-5). He brought chaos to her ordered life, which at the time was fun: "Margaret Kochamma found herself looking forward to the Rumpiled Porcupine's visits. Without anxiety, but with a sort of creeping affection. She learned that he was a Rhodes Scholar from India. That he read Classics. And rowed for Balliol" (Roy, 1997, p.244). But then, their relationship does not work, ironically because of the chaos Chacko causes. "It no longer amused her that while she went to work, the flat remained in the same filthy mess that she had left it in. That it was impossible for him to even consider making the bed, or washing clothes or dishes" (Roy, 1997, p.247).

Their marriage ends when Margaret Kochamma leaves him for another man. However, Chacko finds a way to glorify her and put the blame on himself:

He spoke of her often and with a peculiar pride. As though he admired her for having divorced him. "She traded me in for a better man," he would say

to Mammachi, and she would flinch as though he had denigrated her instead of himself (Roy, 1997, p. 249).

When years later, he waits at the airport to welcome Margaret and Sophie Mol: “Anybody could see that Chacko was a proud and happy man to have had a wife like Margaret. White. In a flowered, printed frock with legs underneath. ” (Roy, 1997, p.143). The extent of his inferiority complex is revealed in his relationship with Margaret. Even the fact that once they were married is something to be proud of.

It is obvious that Chacko acknowledges the historical necessities that result in his being an anglophile and tries to build a sense of hybridity through mimicry. Despite all his efforts he can not succeed. His marriage fails, his daughter dies and he is just a victim as a result of his interaction with the superior colonizer. He can only be resembled to Bhabha’s mimic man who fails to establish hybridity. Despite his Oxford diploma, his European looks he can never get rid of his colonized state of mind. As pointed out by Clarke:

From Chacko’s disillusioned perspective, cultural hybridity is seen as emphatically negative as it alienates the subject from both cultures, making closer identifications on which identity so strongly depends ultimately impossible. (2007, p.138)

Therefore, he can never reach a third space, and he suffers from the inferiority complex of the colonized. As pointed out by Elwork: “Sophie Mol’s rejection of Chacko reenacts the shattering of his dream of uniting with the West” (2009, p.185). Admitting his position as the colonized he states that: “We belong nowhere. We sail unanchored on troubled seas. We may never be allowed ashore” (Roy, 1997, p.53). His words resonate Fanon’s description of the colonized as “individuals without an anchor, without a horizon, colorless, stateless, rootless--a race of angels” (1963, p.218). His identity is shattered just like the model airplanes he so desperately tries to fly. They never fly more than one minute and “Chacko’s room was cluttered with broken wooden planes” (Roy, 1997, p.56). As Elwork observes: “The broken bodies

of his planes collect in his room as reminders of failures he is reluctant-or emotionally unable-to part with” (2004, p.9). Unable to recover from his inferiority complex, Chacko cannot make a fresh start. He focuses on his failures and cannot find his “Third Space”.

3.3. THIRD GENERATION HYBRIDS

3.3.1. Estha, Rahel and Sophie Mol

Estha and Rahel can be considered as biological and cultural hybrids who are half Hindu and half Syrian-Christians. As “products” of an intercommunity marriage, they are discriminated against and held with contempt even by other family members such as Baby Kochamma:

In the way that the unfortunate sometimes dislike the co-unfortunate, Baby Kochamma disliked the twins, for she considered them doomed, fatherless waifs. Worse still, they were Half-Hindu Hybrids whom no self-respecting Syrian Christian would ever marry. She was keen for them to realize that they (like herself) lived on sufferance in the Ayemenem House, their maternal grandmother’s house, where they really had no right to be (Roy, 1997, p.45).

The description of Sophie Mol and Estha-Rahel are juxtaposed as Sophie Mol is portrayed as one of the “little angels who were beach-colored and wore bell bottoms” (Roy, 1997, p.179). On the contrary, Rahel and Estha are described as evil: “Littledemons were mudbrown in Airport fairy frocks with forehead bumps that might turn into horns. With fountains in Love-in-Tokyos. And backward-reading habits. And if you cared to look, you could see Satan in their eyes” (Roy, 1997, p.179). They are portrayed as evil because: “the twins are the physical manifestation of Ammu’s transgression” (Froula, 2009, p.42). As a manifestation of transgression, they symbolize the violation of the caste system and as Gairola suggests they “inhabit borderlines” (qtd in Froula, 2009, p.42) and as a result of undermining the

traditional structure of India, they are perceived as threats to the society. As a result, while Estha and Rahel are treated as strangers, Sophie is more than welcome due to her British roots. Baby Kochamma resembles her to Ariel in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* saying "Sophie Mol was so beautiful that she reminded her of a wood-sprite Ariel. Of Ariel" (Roy, 1997, p.144) whereas the twins are depicted as: "They're sly. They're uncouth. Deceitful. They're growing wild. You can't manage them" (Roy, 1997, p.149). The way Baby Kochamma treats the twins stems from her own inferiority complex:

In Baby Kochamma's attitude toward Sophie Mol, we observe the reflexive quality of colonial subjugation, sometimes referred to as the colonization of the mind. The oppressed individual does more than accept his or her limited/unjust circumstances; the oppressed embraces the values inherent in the oppression (that is, finds him or herself unworthy of any better treatment) (Elwork, 2004, p.183).

Rahel and Estha show similarities to their mother in terms of their reaction against social and cultural rules and regulations. These twins develop a different technique coping with the effects of colonialism. They use language as a rebellion against the authority. They make fun of words, read backwards. As they are forced to speak English by Baby Kochamma, they make up this technique to challenge and subvert the rules of authority. As stated by Clarke:

The twins also play with language by breaking semantic unity (Lay Ter, A Live, A Lert, A Wake), as well as forging and shifting grammatical categories and innovating words (Bar Nowl, for barn owl, and Stoppited, as a past tense of an imperative verb with its object 'stop it') (2007, p.136).

Clarke uses Bakhtin's theory in reading of *The God of Small Things* to explore hybridity which is used to show heterogeneity of linguistics and culture. Bakhtin's theory of linguistic hybridity is relevant because:

Mikhail Bakhtin, who is principally famous for his theory of the novel as a modern, hybrid literary form in which a multiplicity of voices coexist and intermix ‘dialogically’, in contrast to ‘monologic’ writings which reflect a single, authoritarian viewpoint (Tickell, 2007, p.93).

Hence, by analyzing Bakhtin’s model of hybridity, Clarke points out to the only positive representation of hybridity in the novel. She suggests that the novel is “an amalgamation rather than contestation” suggesting a positive model of hybridity in which “confluence of cultures whose inherently *contradictory forces are kept in a playful balance*’, just as they are in the world of the children” (Clarke, 2007, p.140).

Twins are constantly othered not only by the family members but also by the maid who compares Sophie Mol and Rahel as “One beach-coloured./ One brown./One Loved. /One Loved a Little Less’ (Roy, 1997, p.186). Sophie Mol is also aware that the twins are othered. As observed by Elwork:

Sophie Mol hurls her own perceived superiority at Rabel and Estha, revealing to us that she has absorbed the colonial lesson, as well: "You're both whole wogs and I'm a half one" (Roy, 1997, p.16). She applies the slur to denote levels of contamination-the twins are all Indian and all dirty; she is half white and half clean (2004, p.181).

Despite being othered and also being forced by Baby Kochamma to speak English and being regarded as inferior to Sophie Mol, the twins are able to achieve their third space by rebelling against these limiting powers in their own way. By employing linguistic hybridity, they can get rid of the inferiority complex which is continually imposed on them: As Ohumani observes:

In *The God of Small Things*, Ammu and her children function as subversive liminars between cultural borders that would protect difference in religion, caste, and gender. By defying caste laws, she, Rahel, and Estha “map out new territories and enter forbidden in-between spaces, thus forming relationships that defy the laws of a world where center and periphery still determine social intercourse” (qtd. In. Froula, 2009, p.39).

Another child in the novel, Sophie Mol, is a hybrid in both biological and cultural sense. She is the daughter of an Indian father and an English mother and symbolizes a union of the colonized and the colonizer. One expects her to be a hybrid in Bhabha's terms because hybridity perturbs the discourse of the colonizer and enables the colonized to state their ideas. Bhabha argues that hybridity is "the most common and effective form of subversive opposition since it displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination" (Ashcroft et al., 2003, p.9). Sophie Mol's death represents a failure in this sense. Her arrival is a key point in the development of the novel. At metaphorical level she is a representative of the colonizer, and contact with her brings agony and death to both the colonizer and the colonized in postcolonial understanding. As Elwork also points out: "She is both English and Indian, white and Asian; like the failed dreams of her Indian elders she is doomed to die," (2004, p.179) Despite all their efforts, hoping to be approved by the colonizer: "Sophie Mol rejects Chacko, Mammachi, and Baby Kochamma-the three adult members of the household most desperate for her affection. She is the dream spitting them back out again" (Elwork, p.179) leaving them hopeless.

As observed in the detailed analysis of the novel, the problems brought about by colonialism are entwined with the problems caused by the caste system. To conclude, there are hybridized characters in both novels who adopt mimicry or develop other techniques to cope with the effects of colonialism. Those who adopt mimicry can not achieve their Third Space. However, even if they reach their hybrid spaces, this does not bring them happiness: As Clarke suggests:

We can gauge how unsettling hybridity is seen to be in the novel from the fact that all the central instances of hybridization, where characters try to breach the established hierarchies (of colonizer and colonized, touchable and untouchable, grammatical order and 'disorder') and 'entertain the difference' of hybridity are punished, criticized or controlled within the narrative (2007, p.139).

Then, the reason for hybridity to be punished - as in the case of Ammu - is the fact that it is seen as a power to challenge the power structures.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

The elements of hybridity can be found in most novels written in the postcolonial period and the aim of this study was to analyze the concept of hybridity in two postcolonial novels by Monica Ali and Arundhati Roy. In the decolonizing period, people of the former colonies begin to tell the stories of their experiences and these two novels are examples of this. As a result of colonialism, identity problems occur in the lives of the characters as can be observed in both novels. People find it difficult to integrate themselves into the societies they live in. Therefore, identity has been a very important issue in postcolonial theory. In both novels, the theme of hybridity is analyzed and Homi Bhabha's theory is mostly referenced to as the third space which is achieved by some of the characters. Other characters fail to reach this status due to different reasons shaping their identities. To mark the differences and similarities between two novels:

1) The main difference between two novels is the way that the characters experience the effects of colonialism. In postcolonial literature, issues of identity and hybridity are generally explored through stories of migration or exile. As George Lamming states: "the 'exile is a universal figure' (and) it is always tempting to present this experience in universalised terms" (qtd in Loomba, 1998, p.180). However, there are other experiences than exile which are quite different but equally destructive through which identity issues can be explored. Loomba maintains that the historical change which is the division of Pakistan and India is as traumatic as immigration experiences of the colonized. Even if they did not physically move, most third world colonized countries suffered and "have to speak from 'where they are', which is also often an equally ideologically or politically or emotionally fractured space" (Loomba, 1998, p.181). In *Brick Lane* identity issues related to the effects of colonialism are experienced through the story of Bangladeshi immigrants in Britain. *The God of Small Things* differs in its representation of the effects of colonialism. The characters do not have immigrant experiences, but the effects are equally destructive. Then, the two novels differ from each other in the way the issues of identity are represented.

2) Even though the novels are different in the way the characters deal with the effects of colonialism, female characters are affected by the double bind which is imposed on them in both novels. In order to assert their identities, they have to overcome colonial powers imposed on them as well as the patriarchal societies they belong to which label them with stereotypical images. In *Brick Lane* Nazneen and Razia are able to transgress the boundaries limiting them because of their gender and culture by renegotiating their spaces. They both have different strategies stemming from different situations they are in. However, at the end of the novel they are in the same level of hybridity, which is in the third space in Bhabha's sense of the word. In *The God of Small Things* Ammu and Rahel are the only female characters who try to find a way to establish their own identities. They can achieve their third space despite the caste system which limits them by imposing fixed identities. Nazneen and Razia in *Brick Lane* conform to Bhabha's idea of hybridity, creating their own third space emancipated from social restrictions they had to endure. In *The God of Small Things*, Ammu, Estha and Rahel can also be regarded as hybrids in Bhabha's sense of the term, but the caste system interfering with the process worsens their situation. Although hybridity in Bhabha's terms can be achieved by Ammu and the twins in *The God of Small Things*, they differ from the characters in *Brick Lane* in terms of what this third space enables. As a part of the multicultural society they live in, Nazneen and Razia have the chance of social mobility through economic freedom. However, Ammu and twins cannot even claim to property because of the restrictions of the caste system. Therefore, despite their ability to transgress boundaries which challenge social and cultural stereotypes, they do not have a chance to build a new life. On the contrary, they are punished. Their family shatters, Velutha dies and eventually Ammu dies alone in a hotel room at the age of 31. In short, in both novels women have to deal with the double bind of gender as well as the cruel effects of colonialism. However, *The God of Small Things* differs in the sense that the characters also have to deal with the caste system. As a result, Nazneen's identity formation observed in *Brick Lane* is impossible for the characters in *The God of Small Things*. The social mobility is not an option which may enable the characters to have different identities. Through the characters who have new identities after going into a transformation process in *Brick Lane* it is seen that it is possible to

create hybrid identities not based on the postcolonial notions suggesting polarity but as a positive fusion of contrasting cultures. This positive space is associated with Homi Bhabha who questions static identities and prefers fluid ones. In *The God of Small Things* hybridity in Bhabha's sense which is positive and enabling new levels of possibilities is not functional. The Indian Caste System which labels a person once and forever as the same, enabling no mobility, is the ultimate cause. Ammu, by going "beyond" and by "transgressing boundaries" poses a threat against the social order, hence she is severely punished. Whereas in *Brick Lane* Nazneen and Razia have a promising life ahead of them. In *Brick Lane*, hybridity is regarded as success. In *The God of Small Things* although some characters are able to achieve the third space, they are punished because of the restrictive forces of the society. The only successful form of hybridity is linguistic hybridity in Bakhtin's theory.

3) Every single person reacts differently towards colonialism and in both novels there are characters who use mimicry as a technique to reach hybridity. As the analysis has revealed, characters who use mimicry do not reach their third space, because of their lack of ability to negotiate their cultures, beliefs and their static identities. Their stable identities stem from assuming the identities of the colonizer as their own. Their belief in the myth of the superiority of colonial powers leads to the inferiority complex which is a setback in their lives. These characters are not open to change, and they are against everything that could pose as a threat to the social structure they are in. Chanu and Karim in *Brick Lane* and Baby Kochamma, Chacko and Pappachi in *The God of Small Things* are exemplary of this category. Hence, they cannot reach hybridity in Homi Bhabha's terms. They cannot embrace the host culture in a way that would enable them have fluid identities. They remain static because they cannot make sacrifices unlike successful hybrids.

4) In both novels, the characters are categorized in terms of the generations they belong to. The first generation hybrids in *Brick Lane* are different from their children as it is their own choice to be immigrants. As for the second generation hybrids in *Brick Lane*, it is possible to maintain that they try to find their way into hybridity by challenging the first generation hybrids and as for Karim through society and religion. Other second generation hybrids such as Dr. Azad's daughter

and Tariq are fully assimilated characters. All in all, neither of the second generation characters can be regarded as hybrids in Bhabha's sense because of their inability to negotiate their beliefs and also because of their first generation parents who try to restrict them. The only second generation hybrid in *The God of Small Things* who is in clash with the first generation parents is Ammu. She challenges their authority and just like the characters in *Brick Lane* she is restrained by the first generation hybrids. The third generation hybrids in *The God of Small Things* try to gain their hybridity through challenging authorities and using language as a tool. To sum up, the reactions of the characters to colonialism are shaped to some extent by the generations they belong to. Therefore, in both novels characters employ similar coping techniques with the effects of colonialism in terms of the generations they belong to.

In the last analysis, devastating effects of colonialism have been portrayed in this thesis and hybridity is shown as a technique to overcome the difficulties resulting from colonial experiences. As George Lamming puts it: "the myth of England's superiority-even in the postcolonial world--begins with the devaluation of the colonized identity: "The first to be cut down is the colonial himself" (qtd. in Elwork, 2004, p.180). Hybridity thus becomes a valuable technique to protect one's integrity, and at the same time to adapt to new situations. In Bhabha's understanding of cultural hybridity, the concept of homogeneous cultures will become extinct in the future as "The process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation" (Rutherford, 1990, p.211). Therefore, hybridity in Bhabha's theorization is a mostly desired space for the people who have to deal with the effects of colonialism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed, E. A. M. (2010). *East Meets West: Gender and Cultural Difference in the Work of Ahdaf Soueif, Farhana Sheikh and Monica Ali* (Doctoral dissertation). Cardiff University, UK.
- Ali, Monica. (2007a). *Brick Lane*. UK: Black Swan.
- Ali, Monica. (2007b). Outrage Economy *The Guardian* 1. Retrieved May 20, 2019, from <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2007/oct/13/fiction.film>
- Andreotti, Vanessa. (2011). *Actionable Postcolonial Theory in Education*. US: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (2003). *The Post-colonial Studies Reader* New York: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (2004). *The Empire Writes Back, Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. New York: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (2007). *Post-colonial Studies The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (2006). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. (Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bertens, Hans. (2001). *Literary Theory: The Basics*. London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, Homi (2004). *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge Classics.
- Brown, J. M. (1994). *Modern India: The Origins of an Asian Democracy*. Oxford: OUP.
- Caste. 2019. In Nativeheritageproject.com. Retrieved May 20, 2019 <https://nativeheritageproject.com/2013/06/15/las-castas-spanish-racial-classifications/>
- Cesaire, A. (1972). *Discourse on Colonialism*, New York and London: Monthly Review Press.
- Clarke, Anna. (2007). Language, Hybridity and Dialogism in The God of Small Things. In Tickell, Alex (Ed.), *Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things* (pp. 132-141), New York: Routledge.
- Cormack, Alistair. (2006). Migration and the Politics of Narrative Form: Realism and the Postcolonial Subject in Brick Lane. *Contemporary Literature*, 47, 695-721 Retrieved March 30, 2019, from

- <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4489184>,
- Dallmayr, Fred. (2004) But on A Quiet Day . . . A Tribute to Arundhati Roy *Logos Journal*, 3(3), 1-18, Retrieved May 29, 2019 from <http://www.logosjournal.com/dallmayr.pdf>
- Dasan, M. (1999). Arundhati Hits the Socio-Political Ball. In *The Critical Studies of Arundhati Roy's. The God of Small Things*. (Eds.) J. S Dodiya et.al, New Delhi: Atlantic Publisher.
- Dumont, Louis. (1969). Homo hierarchicus. *Information (International Social Science Council)* 8(2), 69-87, Retrieved May 10, 2019 from <https://doi.org/10.1177/053901846900800204>
- Easthope, Antony. (1998). Bhabha, hybridity and identity. *Textual Practice*, 12(2), 341-348 Retrieved March 24, 2019, from <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502369808582312>
- Elwork, Paul. (2004). The Loss of Sophie Mol: Debased Selfhood and the Colonial Shadow in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. *South Asian Review*, 25(2), 178-188 Retrieved March 10, 2019 from <https://doi.org/10.1080/02759527.2004.11932353>
- Fanon, Frantz. (2008). *Black Skin White Masks*. (Trans. Charles Lam Markmann). New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. (Trans. Constance Farrington). New York: Grove Weidenfeld.
- Fernández, Irene P. (2009). Representing Third Spaces, Fluid Identities and Contested Spaces in Contemporary British Literature. *Atlantis*, 31, 143-60 Retrieved April 6, 2019 from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41055369>.
- Froula, Anna. (2009) In-Between and Elsewhere Liminality in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* In R. Ghosh, A. Navarro-Tejero. *Globalizing dissent: essays on Arundhati Roy* (pp. 39-47), New York: Taylor&Francis.
- Guignery, V., Pessô-Miquel, C. and François, S. (2011). *Hybridity: Forms and Figures in Literature and the Visual Arts*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- Hall, Stuart. (1994). Cultural identity and diaspora. In Williams, Patrick and Laura Chrisman, *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: a reader* (pp. 227-237), London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Head, Dominic. (2002). *The Cambridge Introduction to Modern British Fiction, 1950—2000*. New York: CUP.
- Hiddleston, Jane. (2005). Shapes and Shadows: (Un)veiling the Immigrant in Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*. *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 40, 57-72. Retrieved April 6, 2019 from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021989405050665>,
- Huddart, David. (2006). *Homi K. Bhabha*. New York: Routledge.
- Hussain, Yasmin. (2016). *Writing Diaspora: South Asian Women, Culture and Ethnicity*. London: Routledge.
- Kılıç, Yıldız. (2010). The Paradox of the “Muslim British National” in Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*, *Litera*, 22, 37-52.
- Koparanoglu, Hafize G. (2011). *Colonialism, globalization and resistance in Jean Rhys' Wide Sargasso Sea, Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things and John Updike's Terrorist* (Doctoral dissertation). Dokuz Eylül University, Turkey.
- Lea, Richard and Lewis, P. (2006). Local Protests over Brick Lane Film. Retrieved May 21, 2019 from <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2006/jul/17/film.uk>
- Leitch, Vicent B. (2001). *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. USA: W. W. Norton&Company, Inc.
- Loomba, Ania. (1998). *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Memmi, Albert. (2003). *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. UK: EarthScan Publications.
- Moraes, E. Carli de. (2014). In Praise of Arundhati Roy's "The God of Small Things. Retrieved April, 1 2019 from https://www.academia.edu/8125707/In_Praise_of_Arundhati_Roys_The_God_of_Small_Things.
- Mortada, Syeda Samara. (2010). The notion of women as bearers of culture in Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*. *BRAC University Journal*, 1, 53-59. Retrieved March 3, 2019 from

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1021.7289&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

- Perfect, Michael. (2008). The Multicultural Bildungsroman: Stereotypes in Monica Ali's Brick Lane. *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 43(3), 109-20. Retrieved March 10, 2019 from <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0021989408095241>
- Poon, Angelia. (2009). To know what's what: Forms of migrant knowing in Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 45(4), 426-437. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449850903273614>.
- Rizvi, Shaima. (2014). Building a Story: The Architecture of Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. *South Asian Review*, 35(2), 129-41. Retrieved May 12, 2019 from <https://doi.org/10.1080/02759527.2014.11932974>.
- Roy, Amit. (2003). East End novel insults us, say Bangladeshis. Retrieved May 20, 2019 from <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1448414/East-End-novel-insults-us-say-Bangladeshis.html> 20.05.2019.
- Roy, Arundhati. (1997). *The God of Small Things*. London: Flamingo.
- Rutherford, Jonathan. (1990). The Third Space. Interview with Homi Bhabha. In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference* (pp. 207-21), London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Said, Edward. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. USA: Vintage.
- Said, Edward. (1979). *Orientalism*. USA: Vintage.
- Santesso, Esra. (2013). *Disorientation: Muslim Identity in Contemporary Anglophone Literature*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Southmayd, S.S. (2015). Diasporic Mobility and Identity in Flux in V.S. Naipaul's *The Mimic Men* and Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*. In Mehta, S. R. (Ed.), *Exploring Gender in the Literature of the Indian Diaspora* (pp. 85-104), UK: Cambridge Scholars Publisher.
- Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ wa. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind*. Nairobi: Heinemann.
- Tickell, Alex. (2003). The God of Small Things: Arundhati Roy's Postcolonial Cosmopolitanism. *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 38(1), 73-89. Retrieved March 21, 2019 from

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0021989404381007>

- Tickell, Alex. (Ed.) (2007). *Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things Routledge Guides to Literature*. UK: Routledge.
- Töngür, A. Nejat. (2013). Rebellion: Second Generation Bangladeshi Immigrants in Brick Lane by Monica Ali. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 6(26), 561-67. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt6/cilt6sayi26_pdf/tongur_nejat.pdf
- Tyson, Lois. (2006). *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Upstone, Sara. (2007). SAME OLD, SAME OLD. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 43(3), 336-349. Retrieved February 20, 2019 from <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449850701669666>.
- Young, Robert J. (1995). *Colonial Desire; Hybridity in Theory Culture and Race*. London: Routledge.
- Young, Yun Kim. (2007). Ideology, Identity, and Intercultural Communication: An Analysis of Differing Academic Conceptions of Cultural Identity. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 36(3), 237-253. Retrieved May 25, from <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475750701737181>.
- Yousef, Tawfiq. (2019). Cultural Identity in Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*: A Bhabhian Perspective. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies (IJAES)* 19(1), 71-86. Retrieved May 4, 2019 from <http://ijaes.net/article/FullText/4?volume=19&issue=1>.