Chapter-3

A detailed study of the language and style used in *The God of Small Things*
Chapter-3

A detailed Study of the language and style used in *The God of Small Things*

I

After having analysed the basic elements of the language and style of Arundhati Roy used in her works, a detailed analysis of the narrative style used in *The God of Small Things* will be made. Her narrative technique also shows some extraordinary distinctions though she has been influenced by writers such as Salman Rushdie, James Joyce and Gabriel Garcia Marquez. Many critics are of the opinion that she is the master of style and technique. Indeed, one sees a wonderful use of various literary devices throughout the novel. Full of innovative features and a ceaseless urge for experimentation on technique and style, *The God of Small Things*, is one of the technically most accomplished novels. The novel gives new experience to the readers to go through a world of both fact and fiction simultaneously producing an effect that intensifies certain experiences which she is capable of doing as many postmodern writers do by mixing history with fiction.
In technique and style, *The God of Small Things* can be looked upon from certain angles also, such as its narrative technique, its satire, irony, and humour. Under the broad topic of its narrative technique, a study of the points of view in the novel, autobiographical narrative style, architectural method, stream of consciousness technique and the magic realism will be minutely discussed as found in her novel.

The most prominent aspect of *The God of Small Things* is its structure. Using clipped scenes and episodes, the story is narrated from many points of view, the major one being that of the two children—Rahel and Estha and also focusing mostly from the point of view of Rahel, one of the main characters. It is also an autobiographical narrative, mingled with fictional elements which have sprung from the school of experience while the layers of narrative seem to come from the school of architecture. The main action of the story, the accidental drowning of Rahel’s half English cousin, Sophie Mol during her visit to Kerala, triggers a series of tragic incidents but there are many more tales to be lifted in order to uncover the whole of the tragedy.

The plot of the novel covers a period of a little more than a fortnight but it takes twenty three years and a new narration of that past time as well as a hint of the narratives of ancient times for the missing parts to be added to the story when it is narrated for the second time through a different voice and point of view. The main drama is the brutal murder of Velutha, the untouchable lover of Ammu and the beloved untouchable friend of Rahel and her twin brother Estha, who witness the murder in silent horror and after that, their lives have been shattered.
Rahel, the dizygotic twin sister of the now silent Estha, summons their joint memory to relate their stories as well as their death mother’s, twenty three years after the stories given by their great aunt, Baby Kochamma, and the police, who were instrumental in disrupting their lives. This palimpsestic rewriting of the official story is to be deciphered through memory, time and voice. It is a postmodern narrative technique. Such a story is told from the point of view of what really one has seen by his or her own eyes and from the point of view of how it affects his or her life personally.

The epigraph from John Berger, “Never again will a single story be told as though it’s the only one,” indicates obviously to this subtext underlying the official narratives. The narrative is a palimpsestic one, because it remembers the shattered history of Rahel and her mother’s life by inscribing on known versions of the tragedy, as recounted by her great aunt, Baby Kochamma, the silenced truth, some twenty three years later. The narrative simultaneously comments on the values upheld by society through the maintenance of religious law and social rules of interaction as opposed to the twin’s innocent world. The narrator focuses primarily on the perception of the two helpless twins in the narration of the tragic events. Once again, this child-dominated narrative is a modernist tale of what lies beneath the mainstream myths of propriety, family ties or inherent decency of members of the high caste. This kind of narrative exposes the hypocrisy of the high caste behind the veneer of the idealized genteel communities. The writer exposes people who resemble wicked witches like Baby Kochamma and gnomes like Kochu Maria, using the point of view of the innocent children. This narrative is a revisit of the archetypal myth like a detective unearthing hidden facts.
II

The plot of the novel moves along different planes of sensation using multiple time frames which moves in a circular motion; the story begins with its concluding part and ends with the suggestion of the future with a past incident. The stream of consciousness technique is used to move across time barrier and this technique weaves a new kind of surrealistic experience. In this shuttling technique in the beginning of the plot, we are in the middle of two scenes—Sophie Mol’s funeral ceremony and the encounter of Inspector Thomas Mathew in the Kottayam Police station.

The very beginning scene is described with a cinematographic effect with the outside world of trees, blue bottles, the green countryside, wet weather of June, peppervines snaking up electric poles and the old house of Ayemenem to which Rahel returns. After this, memories awakened by petty incidents throng endlessly page after page. Rahel’s return is mixed with memories of her relation with her brother Estha, old Mammachi, and others. This is indicated by Arundhati Roy in an epigrammatic manner as in the line; “She has other memories too that she has no right to have.” Suddenly, the scene moves to that moment when a deeply shocked Ammu pays a desperate visit to the Kottayam Police station in a last bid to save the poor Paravan, Velutha. This event is actually a sequel to the one in which the Policemen brutally killed Velutha. Then, the novelist introduces the tragic incident of Sophie Mol’s loss which indeed precipitated the frightful collapse of Ammu’s world.
Arundhati Roy has deviated from the conventional style and has invented in its place an amalgamated or montage technique which uses segment of scenes and events from diverse time frame and place them in one spot. Arundhati Roy who has begun her writing career writing film scripts, is found to be very skilled in this technique which has its origin in the visual arts, painting and film-making specifically to create a shock-effect on the readers. The Sophie Mol Funeral incident has in it Ammu-in-the-police station scene too. Then, this scene is followed by the resumption of the narration that has begun earlier.

Thus the action of the plot moves to and fro throughout the novel in this pattern. It is not a linear narrative. First, Baby Kochamma’s life at home is presented portraying her as a fussy, self-centred, aged woman still fond of cosmetics and make-ups. Then, the action moves backwards down memory lane to the times when she fell in love with a handsome young Irish monk, Father Mulligan, who was in Kerala for a year on deputation from his seminary from Madras. The narrative once again takes a surprising turn to briefly tell how Velutha is arrested:

His arms had Goosebumps where the handcuffs touched his skin. Cold handcuffs with a sourmetal smell. Like steel bus rails and the smell of the bus conductor’s hands from holding them.²

Then, a sequence of scenes follows one after another consisting of the section presenting Estha being sent to Calcutta, a scene that occurs in the Chapter, “The Madras mail.” In this manner, the story moves rather haltingly, bumpy and flitting in backward—forward motion which strains readers’ attention. Incidents presented in this zigzag manner are the family’s visit to Cochin to see the movie, ‘the Sound of Music’ for
the third time before going to the Airport to pick up Chacko’s ex-wife, Margaret Kochamma and their daughter, Sophie Mol. Then, interrupted by narrative to reveal the past of Baby Kochamma and Ammu, the latter’s marriage that failed and killed all her hopes. Then, the story again lapses into a psychological tug of war that involves the ladies of the Ayemenem house and goes to unfold the comic as well as tragic life of old Pappachi whose high ambition in the field of Entomology was woefully crushed by the cruel and dishonest man in the profession. Thus, incidents and people are the crowd in a haphazard and conglomerate which offers a chaotic reading.

The narrative style adopting various time frames and memories breaks the barriers in a way that makes the past merge with the present. The structure is consciously devised to symbolically represent the chaos that surrounds the life of Ammu, her children, Rahel and Estha, Chacko, Margaret Kochamma, Mammachi, Pappachi and Baby Kochamma. This structure also enables one to see that the present is as livingly connected with the past as the past time significances to the present unfolding its deep mysteries and enigmas. This deviation from chronological order used in fiction is as old as the classical epic and the narrative of *Odyssey* which begins in the midst of the story. According to David Lodge:

> Through time-shift, narrative avoids presenting life as just one damn thing after another, and allows us to make connections of causality and irony between widely separated events. A shift of narrative focus back in time may change our interpretation of something which happens much later in the chronology of the story, but which we have already experienced as readers of the text.³
Again, in the analysis of Muriel Spark's novel, *The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie* (1961), he opines that "frequent time shift with authorial third person narrative is typical postmodern strategy . . ." This kind of narrative is what Arundhati Roy herself employs as her style of telling this tragic story. The shifts in time are linked to the shifts in point of view as we have the opposing perceptions of the seven year old twins and of the adults in the interpretation or relation of events. This link between time and view point allows the narrator to gain the readers' sympathy by revealing which of the two groups are unreliable narrators of the story contained in the main narrative through a cunning juxtaposition of the children's incomplete understanding of what is being recorded by adults and fateful depiction of the scenes they have witnessed, which belie the adult narrative. The "grand narrative" of the adults is that of powerful people who apply double standard to others in relation to their belonging to a particular gender or caste. The private or small story of the children in the narrative are opposed to the grand narrative.

III

Point of view in a fiction is an important part of it. It signifies the way a story gets told, the vision of the author being which is presented through characters, actions, settings, and events. We know that it is the events, and settings which constitute the narrative. The point of view has become a prominent concern of modern critics and
novelists after the publications of the two books—*The Art of Novel* (1934) by Henry James and *Craft of Fiction* (1921) by Percy Lubbock. Point of view in a novel means the perspective of characters in the novel and of the narrator. David Lodge states that:

... a novel can provide the different perspective on the same event—but only one at a time. The choice of points of view from which the story of the novel is told is arguably the most important single decision that the novelist has to make, for it fundamentally effects the way the readers will respond, emotionally and morally, to the fictional characters and their actions.⁵

The most common point of view in a fiction is the omniscient point of view in which the narrator knows everything about the events having the privilege to move from one place to another or from one character to another; he is called "intrusive narrator." In the limited point of view technique, the narrator tells the story in the third person. But he confines himself to what is experienced, thought and felt by a single character or a very limited number of characters. This method of narration was later developed into the stream of consciousness technique. James Joyce and Virginia Woolf have amply used this technique in many of their great works. In the first person point of view, the whole events and actions of the novel are mainly dependent on the first person narrator who himself knows, experiences, and finds out by talking to other characters. For example, Marlowe in *Heart of Darkness* by Joseph Conrad, Ishmael in Melville’s *Moby-Dick* and Nick in F. Scott Fitzgerald’s *The Great Gatsby*. 
In *The God of Small Things*, Arundhati Roy uses all the techniques in amalgamated manner. The dominant point of view, however is that of Rahel who represents Estha also. The authorial voice is also present here and there in the novel. Most of the episodes of the story of the novel deal with the musings and observations of the twins—Rahel and Estha. A very significant point of view of Rahel which has a lot of meanings in the later vision is found when Rahel saw Velutha in their family’s trip to Cochin from the window of their Plymouth car:

*It was Velutha.*

*Rahel was sure of. She’d seen him. He’d seen her. She’d have known him anywhere, any time. And if he hadn’t been wearing a shirt, she would have recognized him from behind. She knew his back. She’d been carried on it. More times than she could count.*

This point of view of Rahel has given a hint to the later course of the story. Some of the visions or consciousnesses of the twins are the fine examples of puerilism which means reverting to a child’s state of mind and vision. The passage in which Rahel sees a number of ants and tries to kill them aptly reflects this state of mind— the psychological ups and downs in the mind of little Rahel.

A large part of the novel is concerned with the point of view of Ammu, the mother of the twins. Her point of view shows her secret passion and isolation, trials and tribulations, her fears and uncertainty, her dream and reality. Ammu’s point of view shows her restlessness after divorce, the tussle between the mother and the lover in her. When she sees Velutha, she is attracted by his muscular body. At her first sight, she sees:
... the ridges of muscle on Velutha's stomach grow taut and rise under his skin like the divisions on a slab of chocolate. She wondered at how his body had changed—so quietly, from a flatmuscled boy's body into a man's body. Contoured and hard. A swimmer's body. A swimmer-carpenter's body. Polished with a high-wax body polish.\textsuperscript{7}

Chapter eleven shows Ammu's point of view. In this chapter, she dreams about a one-armed lover, which symbolically represents Velutha, one arm suggesting helplessness and degraded social condition of untouchable Velutha. The act of Baby Kochamma at the end of the story makes her a villain who lodges a false F.I.R of alleged murder and the abduction of the kids against Velutha. She is very disturbed when she comes to know that Ammu also goes to the police station to inquire about Velutha. She is conscious that she has to get Ammu out of Ayemenem house as soon as possible. She thinks:

\begin{quote}
Ammu, whatever else she did, however angry she was, would never publicly admit to her relationship with Velutha . . . . . that would amount to destroying herself and her children. For ever.\textsuperscript{8}
\end{quote}

Having discussed these different points of views of the novel, it is seen that Arundhati Roy employs a new and different technique in which many elements fuse together. She has employed a circuitous narrative, full of her idiosyncratic treatment of the points of view by fusing many points of views in a single narrative. The novel deals with the points of view of all the leading characters and the third person narrator is omniscient and it is her point of view that gives shape to the linguistic innovativeness and the conventional structure.
Despite various allusions to the charge of artificiality in structuring *The God of Small Things*, many critics have applauded the new pattern as a break-through in narrative technique. It is very important to discuss the architectonics or the structural pattern and to analyse them systematically in order to understand the narrative style of Arundhati Roy. The structure of the novel is an analogy of the world of living things; the text is an intricate organism with internal and external injuries as R.S Sharma and Shashi Bala Talwar rightly observes: "... the whole creature is brought to over view with an invisible hand that holds it by the tail."

Roy is found to take more interest in assembling all the intricate elements that her imagination has perceived into an artistic whole. Roy, the artist, is very impressively visible at the very glance of the novel. This is an important turning point in the history of the novel as an art form. At this point, the observation made by Virginia Woolf in one of her essays, "The Art of Fiction," may be recalled. The essay is a reflection of Virginia Woolf on the various critical opinions given by many critics like E. M Forster and others about novel. She expresses on the importance of aesthetic or artistic qualities of a novel in the following lines:

> If the English critics were less domestic, less assiduous to protect the rights of what it pleases him to call life, the novelist might be bolder too. He might cut adrift from the eternal tea-table and the plausible and preposterous formulas which are supposed to represent the whole of our human adventure. But then the story might wobble; the plot might crumble; ruin might seize upon the characters. The novel, in short, might become a work of art.
Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things* may be treated as a great art form even greater than poetry and drama. By displaying the whole of the novel at the first chapter in an enigmatic nut-shell, she tries to bring forth the backbone of her plot at the very outset. Her knowledge of architecture in designing, perhaps, has made an impact on her building the story of the novel. Another artistic designing is noted in its chronological closure with the subsequent chapters unraveling the different strains which are hopelessly jumbled up in the first chapter. Like a surgeon, the narrator opens the wounds one by one and investigates the decayed parts and the rotten tissues. Being similar to the opening of *Wuthering Heights* by Emile Bronte which also begins near the end from the year 1801 but telling the story of thirty years of eventful history becoming since 1757, the opening of *The God of Small Things* begins with Rahel coming back to Ayemenem to see her brother Estha in June 1993. Though the action of the plot covers a period from December 1969 to 1993, a study of the book shows that it moves to the events of as far back as 1876, when Baby Kochamma’s and Pappachi’s father was seven years old. The structure of the novel is indeed “like designing an intricate balanced structure.”

Using the stream of consciousness technique, Arundhati Roy uses, as mentioned earlier, the points of view of various characters—major or minor. This technique is an effective modernist technique of writing fiction “first pioneered by Dorothy Richardson in *Pilgrimage* (1915-35) and by James Joyce in *Ulysses* (1922) and further developed by Virginia Woolf in *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925), and William Faulkner in *The Sound and the Fury* (1928).”
Stream of consciousness is a continuous flow of sense perception, thoughts, feelings and memories in human mind. It is a literary method of representing a blending of mental processes in fictional characters, usually in an unpunctuated or disjointed form of interior monologue, but they can also be distinguished in two such ways. In the first sense (psychological), the stream of consciousness is the technique for representing it. In the second sense (literary), stream of consciousness is a special style of interior monologue, while an interior monologue always presents a character’s thought ‘directly,’ without the apparent intervention of a summarizing and selecting a narrator, it does not necessarily mingle them with impressions and perceptions, nor does it necessarily violate the norms of grammar, syntax, and logic; but the stream of consciousness technique also does one or both of these things. This technique has been in use since early twentieth century very popularly because conventional narrative technique cannot accommodate all what a writer feels. Further, Virginia Woolf feels in her career as a fiction writer that:

Life is not a series of gig lamps symmetrically arranged; life is a luminous halo, a semi-transparent envelope surrounding us from the beginning of consciousness to the end. Is it not the task of the novelist to convey this varying, this unknown and uncircumscribed spirit, whatever aberration or complexity it may display, with as little mixture of the alien and external as possible?  

Thus, Arundhati Roy also represents the luminous ‘halo,’ semi-transparent membrane of the life of her characters mainly that of Rahel, Estha and Ammu. Her use of architectural method, stream of consciousness technique and interior monologue enables her to de-doxify the conventional narrative technique. Though the novel begins with the
arrival of Rahel after twenty three years to Ayemenem, it ends with the beginning in the word “Naaley,” which means tomorrow. What is going to happen after tomorrow has already been told in the beginning and other preceding chapters of the novel. This is a very effective technique of using stream of consciousness.

Interior monologue, an effective device through which various states of mind of various characters reveal through their own words, is employed in The God of Small Things. The use of this device enables the author to reveal the inner drama of the character, thus giving the novel a depth that is so essential in the kind of fiction which The God of Small Things is. It gives the novel multi-dimensionally created form, an amalgam of different style and techniques seeking to produce different dimensions of realities. This artistic design suits the subversive theme and innovativeness of the language used in the novel. Interior monologue can work within a novel somewhat like a soliloquy works in a play. Estha’s painful and filthy experience with the orangedrink lemondrink man is described in a way that uses partly interior monologue:

Estha convulsed, but nothing came. Just thoughts. And they floated out and floated back in. Ammu couldn’t see them. They hovered like storm clouds over the Basin City. But the basin men and basin women went about their usual basin business. Basin cars, and basin buses, still whizzed around. Basin Life went on.¹⁴

This is not an exact interior, monologue. But it shares with this technique, the important features of articulating the thought and feeling processes that shake the child. In another incident, Arundhati Roy describes Mammachi’s early days, beginning with, “... a
grand old house, the Ayemenem house, but aloof-looking. As though it had little to do with the people that lived in it.”

Mammachi with a “gleaming violin under her chin” is portrayed from a point of view that is located “Inside her head, it was like a room with dark drapes drawn across a bright day.” Then, the narrative moves smoothly over her fluidly coursing ideas; “As she played, her mind wandered back over the years to her first batch of professional pickles. How beautiful they had looked!” and so on, one idea leads to the other. This style is also used by Anita Desai in *Fire on the Mountain, Summer in Calcutta* and a few other novels. The woman in a violin held under her chin goes back crossing milestones in her life to the days marked by unforgettable memories. A remarkable example is found in the following lines: “Then she thought of Margaret Kochamma and the languid, liquid notes of Handel’s music grew shrill and angry.”

Ammu, in the same chapter, watched quietly, at a distance, Velutha, half-naked, and playing with her children, and was aware of strange emotions forming and rising within her:

> She was surprised at the extent of her daughter’s physical ease with him. Surprised that her child seemed to have a sub-world that excluded her entirely. A tactile world of smiles and laughter that she, her mother, had no part in. Ammu recognized vaguely that her thoughts were shot with a delicate, purple tinge of envy. She didn’t allow herself to consider whom it was that she envied. The man or her own child. Or just their world of hooked fingers and sudden smiles.
The scenes in which Arundhati Roy uses interior monologue remind us of Jane Austen in her use of third person, singular rather than first person. This allows her to maintain the authorial control over the narrative; the cover point of view is the third person omniscient point of view and the final vision that arises out of this technique is that of the narrator who enters into the inner mindscape of the characters and symbolically externalizes it in the form of interior-monologue-like compositions.

IV

Among Arundhati Roy’s stylistic concerns, her use of satire in *The God of Small Things* as a medium of novelistic discourse is found as has never been used in this manner by any other novelist. Satire, in fact, is her primary objective though she has concerns for aesthetic qualities when she writes her novel. *The God of Small Things* is a satire on social and political institutions like the caste system, patriarchy, the Communist party of Kerala and Christianity.

Satire forms traditionally a prominent stylistic element in the novel. It is a mode of writing that exposes the failings of the individuals, institutions, or society to ridicule and scorn. Satire is often an incidental element in literary works. They may not be wholly satirical especially in comedy. Its tone may vary from tolerant amusement as in the verse satires of the Roman poet, Horace, to bitter indignation, as in the verse of Juvenal and the
prose of Jonathan Swift. Various forms of literature may be satirical. Novels and plays are used as satirical writings which are an indirect form of satire because through the actions of characters but not through the direct involvement of the writer, failings are exposed for ridicule and scorn. Arundhati Roy exposes the failings of the social institutions in her novel through the acts of her characters such as the police personnals, Chacko, Mammachi, Pappachi, Baby Kochamma, Kochu Maria, K.N.M Pillai and E.M.S Namboodiripad. It is the satire on the powerful people, the rich who exploit and suppress the poor people. The vision of men’s life is twisted by those in power.

The perception of power alliances between various pockets of authority have been set in motion by the powerful satire in The God of Small Things. The novelist satirizes the double standard of Syrian Christian Community which is still prejudiced by caste system, the Communist party of Kerala, which is also more or less prejudiced by caste system. These powerful groups of people are represented by Chacko, K.N.M. Pillai, Inspector Thomas Mathew, Baby Kochamma, Pappachi, Mammachi and E. M. S. Namboodiripad. This group is dominated by men.

Under the oppressive activities of these characters at different level of society, women, children and the low castes become victims. Oppression of such kinds like gender oppression, oppression of the lower caste, police atrocity, subjugation of children are exposed in the novel. The local Marxist leader, Mr. Pillai, is exposed as a hypocrite who does not leave any opportunity to oppress anybody for personal gains. It is also ironical that the church makes a distinction between a lower caste and an upper caste. When
Ammu marries outside her caste, she is an outcaste, unaccepted by the Syrian Christian community. Arundhati Roy ridicules the double standard of the Syrian Christians who do not even allow a proper burial of Ammu after her death.

It is also ironical to see Mr. Pillai using Marxism for personal gains rather than for the betterment of the poor labourers and the low castes. Mr. Pillai refuses to help Velutha, when the latter needs his help saying "... you should know that Party was not constituted to support workers' indiscipline in their private life." Marxism was committed to the eradication of caste system by providing equal status to the labourers in the society but Mr. Pillai's words affirms the negative of this slogan. Velutha is told he could not fight for it on personal matter. Such discrimination in Pillai's act and ideas brings out the hypocrisy of such Marxists.

Arundhati Roy, in her scrutiny of the Communist hypocrisy, targets three representatives of Communist party—the Marxist political leaders (Comrade Pillai and E. M. S. Namboodiripad), members of the party (Chacko) and the Police organisation. Her target of criticism is against people or organisation not the philosophy. Comrade Pillai, the local communist leader, a trade unionist who organises workers for increase in wages and who enjoys seeing himself worshipped by the poor as their messiah, is one of the main subjects of satire in the text. He is portrayed as a very common uncouth person, a victim of all those ordinary temptations, greed, lust and deficiency that normally urge an ordinary man to commit errors in life. It is this flaw in his character that is ridiculed in the novel. The significance of the line reflected as an interior monologue of Estha when he had
passed the printing press of K. N. M. Pillai, "The flag that fluttered on the roof had grown limp and old. The red had bled away,\textsuperscript{21} speaks out all the sarcasms against the injustices of the members and leaders of the communist party.

Through characterization, she, thus, projects the tone of her satire very impressively. Her portrayal of Comrade Pillai as she did in the portrayal of other ridiculous characters is satirical. Arundhati Roy calls Comrade Pillai and Inspector Thomas Mathew "mechanics" which ironically suggests their lack of humanity. Pillai is caricatured as a man who treats his wife as a slave, changes the name of his son for personal benefit and whose baser instincts dominate over the bigger problems. He is a hypocrite who even went to the police in order to liquidate Velutha. In a Dickensian manner, Pillai is depicted as a cold blooded good-for-nothing person completely devoid of human quality. The writer has also pointed out sarcastically the way how Pillai manipulates for the collapse of Chacko’s business.

Chacko and his character is another target of Arundhati Roy’s satire against the Communist Party of Kerala. She mocks at both the communists, Pillai and Chacko who take to Marxism as a fashion. It is because of this, he cannot outwit Pillai. He is also presented as another snob, a double standard, hopeless hypocrite. Ammu calls Chacko, "An Oxford avatar of the old zamindar mentality -- a landlord forcing his attentions on women who depended on him for their livelihood."\textsuperscript{22} Arundhati Roy exposes Chacko as a double-standard Marxist who likes to present himself as a Marxist but he has an evident weakness for pretty women. Another example of exquisite piece of satire against such
Marxist leader is represented in the activities of a real historical Marxist leader, E. M. S. Namboodiripad who is thought to be the Mao-Tse-Tung of Kerala, as expressed in the following lines:


Arundhati Roy further exposes the criminal act of usurping public properties such as the “History house” as his own ancestral property by E.M.S. Namboodiripad, an icon figure as saviour of the poor in the real history of Kerala. Arundhati Roy ridicules the contemporary leader who is the only non-fictitious character in the novel. It is really a satire on contemporary political scenario of Kerala and of India. Thus, in many ways, Arundhati Roy scorns the members of the Communist party of Kerala.

The novelist depicts that the forces of power work in alliance. She brings out how the caste system with its hierarchy, which is still prevalent in India, operates and is a powerful ally of patriarchy, which is another component of the powerful group of people of Indian society. Women, children, the untouchables and the poor are the oppressed lot. The agents of this alliance are patriarchy, upper castes, the church, the political parties and the police. Arundhati Roy satirizes this complicated power structure by exposing the ironical situation of Baby Kochamma though herself a woman exploiting other women like Ammu and children like Rahel and Estha. Thus, the novelist successfully depicts the
stratified structure of oppressive agents. Patriarchy is exposed in her satire as a colonial force forcing women to oppress other women. This is the most horrifying ironical condition set by patriarchy.

Mammachi is also a powerless agent of patriarchy. Even though she is beaten black and blue by her husband, she discriminates between her son Chacko and daughter, Ammu. Arundhati Roy is trying to show by exposing this ironical situation of patriarchy to divide the subordinated group and ruling them by maintaining its status-quo. The shocking incidence of sexual abuse of Estha in Chapter 4 titled “Abhilash Talkies” is a bitter satire on the insecurity of the children under caste-ridden patriarchy. The adult men who are supposed to be the protector of women and children in a patriarchal set-up become abusers. The orangedrink lemondrink man’s abominable act of forcing Estha to masturbate his penis and enjoy sexual pleasure is deliberately described with the four lined verse:

_Fast faster fest_
_Never let it rest_
_Until the fast is faster,_
_And the faster’s fest._

These four lines signify the irony which is clearly expressed in the following lines which describe the traumatized mental state of Estha. Not only Estha, Rahel was also traumatized. She could perceive the reason for Estha getting sick, suddenly running high fever as expressed in the following lines:
'Take mine!' Estha said quickly, not wanting Rahel to go near the man.

But Rahel had already started towards him. As she approached him, he smiled at her and something about that portable piano smile, something about the steady gaze in which he held her, made her shrink from him. It was the most hideous thing she had ever seen. She spun around to look at Estha.

She backed away from the hairy man.

Estha pressed his Parry's sweets into her hand and she felt his fever hot fingers whose tips were as cold as death.²⁵

By way of juxtaposed meanings, expressed in rhyme in the traumatized mental state of the children in the lines quoted above, Arundhati Roy, very successfully, expresses bitter indignation and scorn at the adult male attitude towards children. It is all the more shocking to know that Estha was happily singing songs of the film "The Sound of Music" a while ago before this nasty incident.

Similarly, Arundhati Roy, in bringing out the incestuous relationship between Estha and Rahel, suggests the irony of caste system which restricts a high caste man or woman not to marry a low caste man or woman. In other words, marriage should take place within the caste itself—a kind of inbreeding for preserving the purity of the caste but the irony is that the incestuous relationship is a form of inbreeding—though an extreme form of its kind. So, it is a warning to the Syrian Christian community that the orthodoxy of the caste system barring the inter-caste marriage, most often is the cause for such kind of incest between brother and sister. What the novelist is trying to suggest
through this incident is that sex relations are purely personal matter which need not be meddled with any restrictions as long as they are based on equality and consent. It is not that Arundhati Roy encourages incest. Instead she laments in a tone of utter shock over this relationship in the following lines: “Only that what they shared that night was not happiness, but hideous grief.”

The love making scene in the last chapter “The Cost of Living,” also suggests another irony through which Arundhati Roy gives a satirical answer to the high-caste people for their hatred of low caste people. At this point, the observation of Amitabh Roy, an Arundhati Roy critic may be recalled:

To me, it appears as a befitting reply to the “Paravan smell” both Mammachi and baby Kochamma are worried about. It shows that nature disregards distinction of caste and class and pleasure and satisfaction in sex relations depends on love, on willing and equal partnership only. Possibly the significance of the scene lies in its projection of love as the ultimate answer to all class and caste prejudices in society.

Satire brings out the co-existence of the mutually incompatible elements and forces, the essential contradictions in the lives of people, pulling the masks of their faces and holding them to ridicule. Thus, Arundhati Roy evolves satirical modes into a refined weapon whereby to expose the fraudulent, the spurious and lay bare injustices practiced in a society that considered itself highly civilized. She sharpens her language to be satirically effective, employing various modes that often remind us of various masters of satire ranging from Ben Jonson to Jonnathan Swift, Alexander Pope, Charles Dickens and
Aldous Huxley. The reader is intensely aware of the hard-hitting approach to certain things ranging from the personal to the social; the familial and political topics where subtle use of literary devices enable her to launch a direct attack. In fact, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the novel is nothing without the satirical elements; it is full of various forms and modes of satire that the author so masterfully handles.

Arundhati Roy’s satire operates on different plain, for example, language, character, situation and incident. A writer has to explore language, appropriate to be the purpose of his or her satire in order to rouse a feeling of anger and dissatisfaction in the readers. The God of Small Things is full of descriptions sparkled with satirical comments. The descriptions of the house in the opening section of the novel suggest a satirical tone:

The house itself looked empty. The doors and windows were locked.
The front verandah bare. Unfurnished. But the skyblue Plymouth with chrome tailfins was still parked outside, and inside, Baby Kochamma was still alive.28

The tone of satire in the description of the happenings in the Kottayam Police station has a devastating sarcasm in the manner in which Inspector Thomas Mathew treats Ammu by tapping her breasts with his baton, being described in the following lines, “As though he was choosing mangoes from a basket. Pointing out the ones that he wanted packed and delivered,” 29 and the manner in which the police could arrest anyone without having account for their act as expressed in the words “Inspector Thomas Mathew seemed to know whom he could pick up on and whom he couldn’t.”30 Further, the satirical tone hangs on in the following sentences:
Behind him a red and blue board said:
  Politeness
  Obedience
  Loyalty
  Intelligence
  Courtesy
  Efficiency.  

This red and blue board which is inscribed with ethical principles, under which Indian police supposedly would behave, is brought in at the exact moment in the text to remind the readers of the terrible satirical significance of its presence on the wall. It has become somewhat symbolic. Further, the policemen and their act are satirized in Chapter 18, entitled "History House" by describing the police as "A posse of Touchable Policemen." They are satirized by being described as "Servants of the State" and then mentioning the six principles of ethical behavior. After that they are ridiculed in the following words:

  Dark of Heart.
  Deadlypurposed.
  They lifted their thin legs high, clumping through tall grass
  ... Wet mud farted under their feet as they squelched through the swamp. 

They are reduced to mere cardboard puppets, the killers of a helpless being; their murder of Velutha is a tragic mockery to the ethical principles of the police. The
children’s reading of the six words backwards is symbolical of this satire. Again, the word
‘touchable’ in the phrase, “Touchable Police,” suggests to the readers, the oppression of
the untouchable by the police often as they will. A classic use of a satirical obliquity is
found in these lines:

    Unlike the custom of rampaging religious mobs or conquering
armies running riot, that morning in the Heart of Darkness the posse
of Touchable Policemen acted with economy, not frenzy. Efficiency,
not anarchy. . . . After all, they were not battling an epidemic. They
were merely inoculating a community against an outbreak.33

The concluding sentence is satirical against the suppression of the awareness of
freedom among the untouchables. Some memorable satirical expressions are, “Inspector
Thomas Mathew gave her a cup of police tea,”34 the phrase “police tea” adding a touch of
sarcasm, and “They were mechanics who serviced different parts of the same machine,”35
the word “they” here refers to Inspector Thomas Mathew and Comrade Pillai who do not
trust each other but they work as faithful servants exploiting the low castes and also of the
power alliance. Both of them represent hostile forces. This is a satire of situation, not of
language.

Arundhati Roy shows her expertise as a master of satire in The God of Small
Things. Drawing upon the great artists of the past, Miguel de Cervantes, W.M.
Thackeray, Victor Hugo, George Orwell, Anton Chekhov and G.B. Shaw, Arundhati Roy
is skilled in the use of satire among the contemporary novelists. Devastating, merciless,
amusing, revealing superbly irological, her satire is of a rare variety. For purpose of satire,
she uses irony and humour in *The God of Small Things*. Irony works subtly causing pin-prick feelings of discomfort and creating intensely amusing effect. The ironic sting in sentences such as, “The flag that fluttered on the roof had grown limp and old. The red had bled away,” 36 is felt in its underlying meaning about the true nature of the Marxists who have become bourgeois having deviated from the tenets of revolutionary transformation. The image of the red flag growing limp and old with its discoloured look symbolizes the dilution of the revolutionary zeal. The novelist is very skilled in the use of irony in the different forms—in language and in situations. The novel itself is scattered with small ironical observations and remarks.

Irony, by definition, is a subtly humorous perception of inconsistency, in which an apparently straightforward statement or even is undermined by its context as to give a very different significance. Verbal irony in its simplest form involves a discrepancy between what is said and what is really meant.

Arundhati Roy is sharply critical against the state of affairs in the Syrian Christian community in Kerala in her novel. The novel is a severe criticism of the social and political institutions expressed in sarcasm and bitter indignation through her use of many figures of speech and innovativeness in language. Irony with underlying meanings is one of her best tools to put forth her sharp criticism in literary expression. After close analysis of her language and style, Arundhati Roy is found more inclined towards looking at literature as a criticism of life than an imitation of life. No doubt, she represents human life and the environment very realistically in her novel. However, she uses literature as a
tool to expose the evil forces which deform and twist life. In such a situation, as a woman writer, she leaves no stone unturned to serve her purpose. Every tool she uses very effectively.

Arundhati Roy’s use of irony in language has multiple functions. One significant function is that revealing ironical force in certain situations. The writer seems to have the full knowledge of the immense power concealed in the simple ironic descriptions. Her ironic descriptions are very compressed, concise and deeply discomforting. She can win the readers on her side to be drawn into her vision of irony. To cite an example, the very name, “History House,” makes us conscious of the role of history in keeping an oppressive social system going and so called modern and progressive people that side with such a system. While describing Kari Saipu’s house, the author’s vision penetrates through history and brings out the irony in the elaborate exercise of conversation. She writes:

Like the sheaves of rice in Joseph’s dream, like a press of eager natives petitioning an English magistrate, the old house had been arranged around the History House in attitudes of deference. ‘Heritage’, the hotel was called.37

What the irony tells us in these lines is that the colonial system of the master and servant relationship still persists in democratic Kerala. The rich and the poor have nothing to show by way of change. The writer also satirizes the practice of the so called preservation of old culture in the description of the Heritage Hotel. The phrase, “the dark of heartiness,” is repeatedly used as irony in the novel. It suggests the inner or domestic
greatest setback was not having had the moth that he had discovered name after him. In a sneering tone, the author observes:

Pappachi's Moth was held responsible for his black moods and sudden bouts of temper. Its pernicious ghost – grey, furry and with unusually dense dorsal tufts -- haunted every house that he ever lived in. It tormented him and his children and his children's children.41

Another irony in situation that Arundhati Roy has created is the appearance of Chacko and Comrade Pillai together both communists and yet desperately wary of each other. Though Pillai prepares the labels of Chacko's new products, we learn that later on he mobilizes the workers of Chacko's factory against the management. It was Pillai who was partly responsible for the damage caused to the factory and its final closure. The whole development is a kind of mockery of the move to forge Marxist unity as professed by the communist usually.

Velutha's brutal death after the extreme torture of the police is also an irony of situation because he is brutally tortured in the History House, which was once the house of Kari Saipu and later, the ancestral home of Comrade E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Kerala's Mao-Tse-Tung. Arundhati Roy delights in the caricature of her characters. But she does it purposefully in order to give a test of ironic twist to rip open the hollowness. Her caricature of "old communists," as "fawning bearers in colourful ethnic clothes" in the hotel's dining room of Comrade Namboodaripad reduces the so called communists to the entertainers of a hotel in an ironic twist. Ammu's fate is another example of irony of
situation. The juxtaposition of the children's world with that of the grown-up people especially the politicians is also an example of situational irony.

It may be concluded that Arundhati Roy uses most effectively the situational irony in order to emphasize the essential point which she wishes to make in it. The effectiveness of her use of ironies in the novel testifies to her ability of her commanding over her craft.

As it has been practiced to use humour in the mode of satirical writings, Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* is also not devoid of humour. However, the author has deviated from the general mode of expression found in the works of woman writers who do not generally use the potential of humour in their works. In patriarchal society, this mode of expression has been preserved as men's domain. Women, who possess a healthy sense of humour have not been socially acceptable. This traditional convention having been stratified into the cultural institutions has restrained women writers not to speak in a rhetoric having the full potential of humorous mode of expression; so, "woman writers, in general, do not exploit the potential of humour which can act as a vehicle of protest and assertion, since it is perceived as a masculine prerogative and as an aggressive, unfeminine mode."

Yet, Arundhati Roy, in her protest against the various institutions of patriarchy, political ideologies and caste-system and Western forces, uses the full potential of humour as an essential part of her satire in *The God of Small Things*. She shows the ease of an experienced practitioner and exploits the workability of this mode in the novel as a mode of protest and satire. Her humour used in the novel is so tinged with irony, exaggeration, sarcasm and wit.
Thus, The God of Small Things, having all the attributes of a work deliberately made free from sentimentality, demands an intellectual exercise to understand it. A close reading of her novel reveals an exuberant use of humour as a style of expression in her language. Using humour in order to invoke a comical mood, she shows a typical mixture of satire, irony and poetic flight of imagination. She possesses highly creative talents such as Charles Dickens’ approach to life’s harsh realities and Lewis Carroll’s sense of fantasy amalgamated together.

The social realities are mostly presented through the eyes of the children whose views of things frequently give way to adults’ acceptance. Children’s view of people is often charged with comic element and can reveal the most startling mode of reality that might escape the eyes of an adult. This kind of vision has originated either in Estha or Rahel in the narrative. However, there are cases in which the author has developed this angle of vision. We may cite two examples from the text respectively.

I. Children’s viewpoint is expressed in a comical mood in the following lines:

The luggage would be in the boot.

Rahel thought that boot was a lovely word. A much better word, at any rate, than sturdy. Sturdy was a terrible word. Like a dwarf’s name. Sturdy Koshy Oommen—a pleasant, middle-class, God-fearing dwarf with low knees and a side parting.43

This humorous caricature of Chacko in the reasoning of Rahel compares him to a “boot” which is much better than him. He is a “dwarf” in the child’s view. The humour implied in this word expresses well the bitter sarcasm against male dominance, which in
this context ironically is in aligned with the colonial outlook of the Western colonial period in India. With the use of humorous mode of expression, the speech is a sharp criticism of the system.

II. Again, in the following lines, the novelist uses the same mode of humour in criticizing the adverse effect of patriarchy:

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. . . . . The fate of the wretched Man-less woman. The sad, Father Mulligan-less Baby Kochamma.44

The mode of satirical humour implied by the utterance, “the unfortunate sometimes dislike the co-unfortunate,” is intensely depicted by showing the sordidness of patriarchy which imposes hierarchy even among its victims. Baby Kochamma herself is a victim of patriarchy as an unmarried woman who “lived on sufferance in the Ayemenem House,” like the twins but still she does not like Rahel and Estha whom she thinks “doomed.” Baby Kochamma is caricatured humorously in this passage.

In a feminist humour, the novelist lays her focus on the irrationalities and injustices of domestic and social life. She attacks the double-standard that women are to be sheltered and judged and kept from power while man, regardless of his behavior, runs the world. She describes the chauvinistic tendencies of male characters in the Kochamma family chronicle. There are descriptions evoking laughter depicting the loyalty of
Mammachi, Rahel’s great grandmother to her husband as in, “With her eyes she looked in
the direction that her husband looked. With her heart she looked away.” It is a
description of the photographs of Mammachi and Pappachi. The way the woman is
described is sardonically humorous. It depicts the woman who is torn apart and has been
tortured by her husband. Another instance of sadistic trait of Pappachi is drawn with a lot
of irony and humour in which Pappchi is called the emperor of entomologist who is
“Imperial Entomologist”:

. . . 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.

Pappachi is portrayed as the most grotesque ridiculous character, full of
incongruities and absurdities. Another absurd and priggish character is Chacko. In
tauntingly mocking words he is called the “Rhode’s scholar” with his Oxford moods
whose managerial skills destroy a profitable business enterprise and reduce the family
resources to shambles. The irony and humour in the phrase “. . . his Balliol Oar and his
Pickle Baron Dreams” speaks volumes about the folly and foibles of Chacko. He is a
“male chauvinist pig” who declares “What’s yours is mine and what’s mine is also
mine.” Arundhati’s attack against patriarchy is delivered magnificently in the humour of
the repetition of the word “mine” three times. Thus the novel is strewn with flashes of
cautic humour which exposes the ugliest form of male aggression.
The social ostracism is also depicted by irony, bitterness, and silent protest. Passages tinged with scathing irony and humour highlight the political and religious conspiracy against the subalterns who are represented by the untouchables. The novelist reveals the real predicaments of the untouchables who had to crawl backwards with a broom sweeping away their foot prints during pre-colonial days, in order to prevent the upper castes from defiling themselves by accidentally stepping on their footprints. Thus, despite its pre-occupational trauma, horror and impending tragedy, the novel allows natural and spontaneous wit to supersede sentimentality. Arundhati Roy’s mode of expression through wit and humour shows her pre-occupation with direct and open expression of perception. She has deconstructed the traditional myth of patriarchy and political and other social institutions. She has broken the taboos imposed by masculine culture. An example is the hilarious comical scene in which she punctures male vanity describing the indigenous dress habit of Comrade K.N.M. Pillai in the following words, “... in a greying Aertex vest, his balls silhouetted against his soft white mundu.”

As already referred in the analysis of irony in situation, Arundhati Roy employs situational humour. These two terms are synonymous. Mammachi’s acceptance of the bad marriage as a norm is itself suggested by the author as a situational humour or situational irony. Based on sharply functional and vibrant brand of humour cast from the woman’s point of view, Arundhati Roy has deconstructed the phallocentric dominant values of patriarchy and political ideology. It is a creditable achievement as a fiction writer in employing all the facets of language and style with an intense innovativeness.
A distinct feature of Arundhati Roy's language and style is her use of the technique of 'magic realism,' "a form founded on the juxtaposition of two modes of representation which normally exist in opposition; realism and the fantastic." Originally coined by Franz Roh in 1925 to describe a form of art that portrayed scenes of fantasy and imagination through the use of clear-cut, documentary painting techniques, this manner of description has been widely used in literature. Latin American writers such as Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Carlos Fuentes and Octavia Paz have started using this technique in creating narratives in which the realistic elements of the text are continually being undercut by the intrusion of impossible or inexplicable events.

Since the 1970s it has become a label for any writing that subverts realistic expectations having associated with the works of writers such as Salman Rushdie, Angela Carter and Jeanette Winterson. These writers exploit the disruptive potential of fantasy in order to pose a challenge to cultural perceptions of 'normality.' This technique is primarily used by postcolonial writers to:

interrogate the assumptions of Western, rational, lineal narrative and to enclose it within an indigenous metatext, a body of textual form that recuperate the pre-colonial culture. In this way it can be
seen a structural device in text as varies as Salman Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children*, Ben Okri’s *The Famished Road*, Keri Hulme’s *The Bone People* or Thomas King’s *Green Grass, Running Water*. In text like these and many others, the rational, linear world of the Western realist fiction is placed against alter/native narrative modes that expose the hidden and naturalized cultural formations on which Western narration are based.  

Arundhati Roy as a novelist has very successfully used this style of taking the readers beyond the trodden paths and revealing the hidden realities of truth which otherwise would not be possible. Her imagination is often engrossed into many poetic flights with an extraordinary powerful force in many separated segments or isolated episodes, for example, as in the following:

*Estha had slanting, sleepy eyes and his new front teeth were still uneven on the ends. Rahel’s new teeth were waiting inside her gums, like words in a pen. It puzzled everybody that an eighteen-minute age difference could cause such a discrepancy in front-tooth timing.*

*Most of Rahel’s hair sat on top her head like a fountain. It was held together by a Love-in-Tokyo – two beads on a rubber band, nothing to do with Love or Tokyo. In Kerala Love-in-Tokyoos have withstood the test of time, and even today if you were to ask for one at any respectable A³ Ladies’ Store, that’s what you’d get. Two beads on a rubber band.*

Arundhati Roy is found to use a simile and a metaphor in these lines to cover a wide range of temporal and spatial realities. That means her similes and metaphors are
evocative creations that lift the characters or situations above the ordinary prosaic realities and enclose both the real and unreal into a new perceptual whole. Estha and Rahel are Ambassadors and Estha particularly assumes the idea of partly the pope singer, Elvis Priesley. The two things become part of his identity.

‘Ssss...’ his mother hissed.
First persuasively, then savagely, but her baby thought was the Pope.
He smiled and waved and smiled and waved. With his penis in a bottle.

‘Don’t forget that you are Ambassadors of India,’ Baby Kochamma told Rahel and Estha. ‘You’re going to form their First Impression of your country.’

Two-egg Twin Ambassadors. Their Excellencies
Ambassador E(lvis). Pelvis, and Ambassador S(tick). Insect.52

The two-egg image too sticks to both Rahel and Estha. It becomes another side of their identity. Such kind of magic realistic descriptions wash over the real life situation in moments of imaginative upsurge. Another such instance of using highly poetic language to dissolve a realistic scene of June rain in Ayemenem taking the readers’ imagination into flight is found again and again as in the following passage:

It hadn’t changed, the June rain.
Heaven opened and the water hammered down, reviving the reluctant old well, greenmossing the pigless pigsty, carpet bombing still, tea-coloured puddles the way memory bombs still, tea-coloured minds. The grass looked wetgreen and pleased. Happy earthworms frolicked purple in the slush. Green nettles nodded. Trees bent.53
In this passage, the author uses this technique of making her language tinge with magic and thus revealing anew the charm and beauty of a single rainfall. Words like ‘greenmossing,’ ‘carpet bombing’ and ‘wetgreen’ create fresh and bold association if one is perceptive enough to the imaginative evocativeness of these words. The novelist has crossed the boundaries of conventional writing by the use of such words which can give an effect of animation and vigour of new life and thus giving birth to new realities. Nature’s delight in renewed life forces is symbolized in personified images of trees bending and earthworms dancing as much as in the sentence, “The grass looked wetgreen and pleased.”

Throughout the novel, Arundhati Roy employs this technique in describing a scene, portraying a character and depicting a situation. Arundhati Roy uses the technique of magic realism as an effective means to explore the interior life of her characters. This technique reveals the potential areas in moments isolated from day-to-day life and lifts those moments to define a character’s state of mind. A character’s life is characterized by the external compulsions as much as his or her inner, imaginary dream-like drives. These elements often merge and mingle to provide substance to the life of the character.

By the use of this technique, Arundhati Roy creates dramatic effect through powerful metaphors and single word sentences arranged in different cases and structures. A remarkable use of magic realism in the novel is found in the description of the “History House” which is described like a living thing allowing imagination to take over and project the essence of reality:
It was a beautiful house. White-walled once. Red-roofed. But painted in weather-colours now. With bushes dipped in nature's palette. Mossgreen. Earthbrown. Crumbleblack. Making it look older than it really was. Like sunken treasure dredged up from the ocean bed. Whale-kissed and barnacled. Swaddled in silence. Breathing bubbles through its broken windows.⁵⁴

It may be concluded that Arundhati Roy’s language and style which is dominated by highly imaginative sensibility to appropriate for poetry in this fictional narrative is very successful in depicting the social and political realities of Kerala of the 1960s with an extended universal note telling the tragic stories of marginalized people who are butchered by the repressive social and political institutions in any part of the world. By the use of this new technique, Arundhati Roy can create an atmosphere of “ironic distancing.” In the words of David Myers:

Arundhati Roy is almost like a Brecht, deliberately breaking the illusion of fiction with the alienation device of a style-and-mood-change and distancing the reader ironically, for example, from the horror of the barbaric crime committed by the policemen against the victim Velutha. But this ironic distancing compels the reader to take a more universal, impersonal, historic view of the personal tragedy.⁵⁵

As a post modernist, she deliberately mixes poetry and fiction “and alternates scenes of almost unbearable tragedy with calculated play with parody, black humour and farce.”⁵⁶ The God of Small Things is indeed a novel woven by the yarns of postmodern and postcolonial elements in language and style.
The next chapter, that is, Chapter 4, will examine the ingredients of her language and style employed in her essays.
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