Conclusion

The earlier chapters approach Amitav Ghosh’s novels simultaneously from the viewpoints of humanism, poststructuralism and postmodernism. Poststructuralist tenets are applied to the deconstruction of discursive totalities. Along with this, a humanist ethics is laid as the ground on which new constructed relationships are built. The idea of universal human experience in the fiction of Amitav Ghosh is most evident in his call for connections across cultures. As already discussed in the study of his novels, he adopts weaving, or experience or narration which has no specific country or continent. In this sense, it is a universal feature of mankind.

The instantaneous emphasis on the diversity and the universality of humankind that emerges from Amitav Ghosh’s narration is close to what Patrick Colm Hogan has named “particularist universalism” (Colonialism and Cultural Identity xvii). To the characters in Amitav Ghosh’s novels, ethnic or racial differences, although acknowledged, are of surprisingly little consequence. Amitav Ghosh’s way of narrating multiple histories and the creation of connections where they usually have not been discerned circumvents the traditional postcolonial discourse contemplating racial and ethnic differences. Ranjita Basu notices this fact in her article on Amitav Ghosh’s novels: “It is curious to note that no false note is struck in Ghosh’s delineation of Egyptian or Arabic characters and this is because their emotions and passions are related to their universal humanity rather than to their racial identity” (Indian English Fiction 152).

The discussion in the earlier chapters illustrates that a polyphonic reading of Amitav Ghosh’s novels opens up a new perspective in literary criticism. The polyphonic narration allows Amitav Ghosh to give freedom to his characters to express their distinctive world-views and ideologies. Unlike the traditional novels in which authorial voice reigned supreme, holding an overall control over all the characters in the novels, Amitav Ghosh allows the narration to sieve through the perspective of different characters as well as narrators. The authorial voice is heard only as that of an impartial commentator, at par with other narrators, neither high nor low but enjoying equal status.

Another noticeable feature of his novels is that they maintain maximal contact with the contemporary reality in all its open-endedness. Being the author of a
polyphonic novel Amitav Ghosh does not put a finalising period at the end of his novels. As one can put Amitav Ghosh in the context of what Bakhtin has suggested:

[Amitav Ghosh] excludes all one sided dogmatic seriousness, and does not permit any single point of view, any polar extreme of life or of thought to be absolutized. All one-sided seriousness, all one-sided pathos is handed over to the heroes, but the author, who causes them to collide in the “great dialogue” of the novel, leaves that dialogue open and puts no finalizing period at the end. (The Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics 165)

The ideological tensions of life are left unresolved leaving the gaps and absences for the readers to interpret in their own way.

His fictional world disavows the dominance of binary structures in the systems of thoughts as it holds back the augmentation of the Other/neglected element of the binary. There are numerous instances as explored in the earlier chapters of the thesis about the endeavour of Amitav Ghosh establishing his marginalized characters - the subalterns as the agents of social and political change.

A very interesting thing about the art of characterization in Amitav Ghosh’s fiction is that his characters are not god-like creatures doing every time good deeds but are in constant dilemma with having basic goodness valuing the essence of life. Deeti in Sea of Poppies has drugged her mother-in-law to the level of death just to know the reality of her first wedding night. Zindi in The Circle of Reason is not without selfishness to grab Jeevanbhai Patel’s shop. Piya and Kanai in The Hungry Tide represent the ‘outsiders’ trying to irk a better living with their modern comforts through wealth and material possessions. But even then, they have unique attributes of confidence and conscientiousness to understand the quintessence of life. It is through the polyphonic narration of different characters that the novelist enables them to find their own voice; often hints at the answers of the dilemma they frequently fall trap into.

The deliberation in the five chapters reveals the significance of reading the fictional works of Amitav Ghosh against the background of Bakhtin’s theoretical models and deconstruction which enables the novelist to carve a way for the ignored
and dispossessed group to transcend the hegemonic divisions of society. The representational strategies developed by Amitav Ghosh advocate the establishment of connections through deconstructive principles, which help in avoiding the pitfalls lurking in the mechanisms of an unguarded discursive representation of the Other. The fiction of Amitav Ghosh is representative of the simultaneous representation of both contradictory dimensions of human existence.

As I have attempted to establish that the subtle amalgamation of the traditional mode of oral narration and the new generic variety of polyphonic narration in Amitav Ghosh’s works remain unparalleled in the current literary scenario. The traditional mythologies like the Nachiketa myth and the newly fabricated myths like the Bon Bibi myth are incorporated into the body of the text to give emphasis to the local cultures. What creates the more innovative dimension of his fiction is the outlining of this strategy for transcending the boundaries set by the mainstream society for the mute and dispossessed people who have their own distinct culture.

The art of focalization discussed in length in Chapter Five of the study establishes Amitav Ghosh’s craft of narration with credibility given to all antagonistic viewpoints or ideologies in equal manner. It further confirms the subversive act of his fiction by eliminating the so-called supremacy of the Western dominated discourse which has points of absences about the subaltern. Amitav Ghosh seems to affirm the theoretical framework of polyphony which helps him attain this kind of subversion. With the portrayal of multiple representations of lives of varied characters, his readers become enwrapped in the various textures of life and begin to feel the commonalities that all human beings share.

Mysticism through magic realism is employed to the utmost limit to achieve the subversion of hitherto acknowledged traditional modes of representation of the characters and narration. Amitav Ghosh owes the understanding of the richness of Indian mysticism through Indian folk culture and epics. The novels explore the darkness of mysticism and religious tantra rituals having their own light of intuitive insights and wisdom bestowed to the followers and believers. The way people worship their gods and goddesses in shrines, mythic legends, keeping their pictures, holding yajanas has its own peculiar way of redressing their grievances. It serves the basic purpose of subverting the misleading notion that only the theory-loaded
educated people can do wonders, thereby privileging the affluence of common people who are true mystics. Mystics highly regard supernaturalism, myth and folk practices of healing which enable them to build a sense of belonging to a larger cross section of society and situate their sufferings in the wider social milieu which is the ultimate way to cure. Amitav Ghosh brings to light the hidden talent of the secret mysterious group who are actually far ahead of all the advancements in science and technology. Such mysterious encounters help people see through the darkness of ignorance with the eyes of inner mind.

The argument of the thesis has veered around the concept of silence. On an epistemological level, Amitav Ghosh implies that one can know through language. Consequently, in knowing the world, one simultaneously changes it by projecting onto it ideological meanings conveyed by words. Silence represents the kind of unattainable experience that transcends the level of language, or knowing. This would be the experience of the ultimate truth that has not been changed through knowing, in other words by the meanings carried by language. In the words of Murugan, this would mean “the ultimate transcendence of nature” (The Calcutta Chromosome 106) and as the novelist himself expresses this view in The Hungry Tide when the narrator comments, “Speech [was] only a bag of tricks that fooled you into believing that you could see through the eyes of another being…” (159).

In his writing, Amitav Ghosh seems to operate on two levels. First, he acknowledges that the world is a narrative and discursive social construction where alternative narrative realities and ideologies clash and unite. This is evident in his foregrounding of oral stories which examines the multiple narrative realities and the construction of personal and national identities out of these realities. In The Shadow Lines, Sea of Poppies and The Hungry Tide, reality comes into existence through the narrative ordering of images but in The Calcutta Chromosome, where silence and the transcending of language have a more prominent role, Phulboni is less certain of the order:

I have never known, whether life lies in words or images, in speech or sight. Does a story come to be in the words that I conjure out of my mind, or does it live already somewhere, enshrined in mud and clay- in an image, that is, in the crafted mimicry of life? (The Calcutta Chromosome 226)
But there is an alternative to the discursive, in a sense poststructuralist, epistemology, which Amitav Ghosh increasingly finds unsustainable. He acknowledges a reality beyond human knowledge or narration. This is the world of silence: a unified, but not homogeneous world, free of the power politics distributed by language. It is a space that transcends temporal and spatial distances, as well as differences of social position, without making them vanish. It also brings us back to Amitav Ghosh’s theme of diversity (which is polyphonic, heteroglossic) in one.

It is in this world that Alu, in the scene in *The Circle of Reason* referred to earlier, is speaking in his turmoil of languages. This mixture of ideology does not put forward any particular ideology or it does not know as it does not provide a definite answer. It does not claim to power in the way a specific language would. It is only a question, to which everyone can have their own response. Therefore, it speaks to everyone, regardless of class and language, without treating them as a homogeneous group. As Phulboni says in *The Calcutta Chromosome*, although this is the world of silence, it is animate, it exists and it has a spirit.

Consequently, the crowd is capable of communicating with Alu through silence. And finally, it is to this kind of the world of diversity that Murugan, Tara and the numerous other voices are taking Antar in the closing lines of *The Calcutta Chromosome*, “There were voices everywhere now, in his room, in his head, in his ears, it was as though a crowd of people was in the room with him. They were saying: “We’re with you; you’re not alone; we’ll help you across” (306).

The discussion in Chapter Four emphasizes the need of translating human emotions even without any common language. There are people like Fokir who value the existence of all living and non-living beings transcending the narrow mindedness, prejudices and social, economic and cultural divisions. The novelist puts focus on the inner comfort of the self of such people who engage in the communication of the minds. The novelist attempts to illustrate that sometimes the power of language is subverted through silence because the act of putting anything into words actually “distorts the truth of the thing it seeks to describe.”

Metaphors like claws, test-tube and GPS gadget are a means to highlight the obsessiveness of modern beings to achieve technological advancements without bothering about knowing the essence of life. On the contrary, metaphors relating to
water, birds, weaving, pictures, river, dolphins are an explicative medium adopted by the novelist to foreground the aesthetic appreciation of life which values cross-cultural interaction, inter-religious tolerance and acceptability of practical life with timely changes incorporated according to the need of the day. As stated in Sea of Poppies, “The Ibis was not a ship like any other; in her inwardly reality she was a vehicle of transformation, traveling through the mists of illusion towards the elusive, ever-receding landfall that was Truth” (390). The Ibis is also a metaphor for bringing together various cultures and their differences together. The metaphor of journey which is a popular one in Amitav Ghosh’s writings is used to great effect to examine the typical issues which concern the destinies of subalterns struggling to find their voice and space in dominating ambiance of injustice.

The feature of caricature is found in abundance in the fiction of Amitav Ghosh. The comic traits of characters and their social and cultural life settings are made humorous. Mrs. Burnham, Baboo Nob Kissin, the alliterative name of Benjamin Brightwell Burnham, Balaram’s obsession makes him appear comic in Presidency College and the village of Lalpukar with his conflict with Bhudeb Roy.

It may be pertinent to consider here the discussion of the earlier chapters about the prominence given to the female characters in Amitav Ghosh’s fiction. His portrayal of women characters is imbued with an innate sense of observation of character and indicates strong gender awareness. The representation of the gender can be seen as a part of the voice given to marginality. He portrays women of all sections of society- housewives, researchers, working women, prostitutes, tantrics, villagers and so on.

As deliberated in the character-analyses of the earlier chapters, Deeti, Urmila, Paulette, Ila, Piya, Moyna, Kusum, Zindi, Kulfi and Mangala are some of the characters who embody conscious beings having the power of insight and capability to deliberate upon their surroundings. They are not mere observers or objects of pleasure. Their particular responses show them as thinking beings who have the aptitude to make images, inferences and understand complex discursive formations. They are equal and active participants in the larger process of struggle playing whichever role they are given. Amitav Ghosh does not indulge in the futile debates of patriarchal and matriarchal divisions. It seems for him that both are interdependent to get the most of human life. These gender divisions are to be seen as integrated in the process of assertion.
An analysis of his novels reveals that Amitav Ghosh’s travel and fictional works are closely linked as he depicts characters travelling to different places. Amitav Ghosh’s world-wide travel and his life in various locations of the world helped him to come into contact with different cultures and languages. The experience of the immigrants expressed in his novels must have been the direct representation of his personal experiences. Calcutta is a kind of constant that runs through all the novels of Amitav Ghosh as it has been a centre of his imaginative world, just like Madna in the novels of Upamanyu Chatterjee and Malgudi in the novels of R.K. Narayan. Amitav Ghosh’s representation of the life of the migrated and dispossessed signals to the bleak reality of the future of their life in the alien land. The insecurity and alienation do not bind them to the new place but even then they find their own sources of joy, contentment and peace through companionship of fellow beings and recourse to their folk culture.

The narrative stances discussed earlier in the study reveal that the fictional works of Amitav Ghosh are teeming with stories to indicate diversity in the social and cultural backgrounds of his characters. Story-telling, as already observed, helps him deal with the problem of appropriation. By shifting his narrator to the backseat, in a way, he tries to give authentic voice to various kinds of people coming from different social classes and cultures. Through their stories, Amitav Ghosh tries to avoid appropriation on several levels. One of these is narratorial appropriation. The narrator in his novels is often from educated class of society, belonging to the privileged group and is fluent in English like the author himself. The way in which the lower classes are described using a language they are not supposed to know at all can be seen as an act of appropriation. It makes them part of the privileged discourse, both linguistically and ideologically.

Amitav Ghosh tries to give these people agency and their own point of view by locating them as the narrators of their own stories, instead of relating their lives from a privileged point of view. Tabish Khair examines Amitav Ghosh’s use of language in relation to appropriation (Babu Fictions 314-17). He points out that Amitav Ghosh does not ‘stage’ the coolie and his/her use of English, or any other language. In other words, Amitav Ghosh does not use anything like the Rushdian chutney or Sanskritised English of Raja Rao to represent the language of the coolie, be it Bengali or some kind of English. Everything is translated into English.
grapholect, with an indication in the text of the kind of variety in question. Vernacular words and Indianisms are used only to explain something or to “fill a gap in the English grapholect” (Babu Fictions 316). As Tabish Khair points out, this is a good way of representing the subaltern without “appropriating a sense of authenticity” (Babu Fictions, 316). Tabish Khair’s reference here is to The Calcutta Chromosome only, but this feature seems to be present in Amitav Ghosh’s other novels also.

Amitav Ghosh considers the novel as a diversity of speech types, sometimes even diversity of languages and a diversity of individual voices artistically organized. Heteroglossia which means “social diversity of speech types,” is according to Bakhtin, the indispensable prerequisite of the novel as a genre. It is the internal stratification of different registers within any single national language. Novelistic discourse is a profound intermixture of linguistic social register, which is achieved in the novel by the creation of fictional characters. They contribute to the heteroglot variety of the novel by using a particular kind of language and by having a particular viewpoint on the world around them. Characters may use a different dialect, jargon or personal idiosyncrasy of utterance as most of Amitav Ghosh’s characters do, adding to the variety of style which make up the novel’s style as a whole.

Polyphony and heteroglossia make Amitav Ghosh’s fictional world unique. Numerous voices or discourses emerge and engage in dialogue with one another in his novels. The ideological incompatibility of different characters as well as contradictions in the society finds expression in his polyphonic novels. Neither the character nor the narrator is subordinated to the authorial voice. As in the novels of Dostoevsky, “a plurality of unmerged voices and consciousness, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices” is the chief characteristic of his novels. Through polyphony Amitav Ghosh deconstructs the hierarchy of systems which do not value human life of common people and tries to bring to the forefront these subalterns, the marginalised and the oppressed.

The working of heteroglossia is to be seen in the merging of the language of science with everyday speech to describe the experiences of life. As discussed in the earlier chapters, the novelist’s attempt to merge myth with geology, tantric beliefs with scientific facts, religious wisdom with technical and methodological pragmatism are all different instances of the functioning of heteroglossia. For this, code-switching
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is also another discernible narrative device to present the distinctiveness of dialects, registers and jargons. In addition, the sense of Indian folk life and its cultural discreteness is being re-inscribed through the above mentioned techniques. All these are a part of the novelist’s project of stylistic innovations and linguistic experiments to subvert the traditional method of narration. These techniques are, by no means, exhaustive and can provide immense scope for further literary research.

As I have endeavoured to establish, the writing of Amitav Ghosh is affiliated both with postmodernism and a latter-day humanism. In general, the criticism written on his works tends to adopt one of the following four stances in relation to this ambivalence: the avoidance of both postmodernism and humanism (eg. Dixon), affiliation with both (Mondal, *Contemporary World Writers*), or seeing his writing as primarily humanist (eg. Vishwanathan 1996) or postmodernist (eg. Kaul). Mondal offers his views on the evident presence of both postmodernist and humanist sentiments in the writing of Amitav Ghosh. It does not indicate an escape from both realms by avoiding affiliation with either, as Dixon would have it. On the contrary, it “denotes a strategic commitment to both” (Mondal, *Contemporary World Writers* 171) [original emphasis]. His texts weave together elements of both ideologies for certain purposes. Priya Kumar draws attention to Amitav Ghosh’s fiction which “offers a more complex account of the intermeshing of religions and cultures, one that is not limited by, and indeed exceeds the bounds of, the nation-state” (*Limiting Secularism* xxiv).

The discussion of the chapters so far signifies that Amitav Ghosh is above all attempting to create narrative representations that establish connections across totalities constructed by modernist discourses. He does this by narrating into existence the subversion in various forms ensuring agency and voice to all while avoiding the appropriation of these voices to any one discourse. This is achieved by juxtaposing representative strategies of Bakhtinian theories and deconstructing the hegemonic position of certain versions. The transcending of divisions inevitably requires a certain emphasis on difference, as well as awareness of realities as discursive constructions in the poststructuralist vein. In a sense, Amitav Ghosh has to play the postmodernist games of textuality and of “discourse as power” in order to deconstruct the modernist totalities and to be able to avoid discursive appropriation and abstract homogenizing of heterogeneous groups. But this recognition of difference is affected on the basis of
relationships as an outcome of subversion that transcends the discursive totalities created by representations. The overall value of Amitav Ghosh’s texts has to be seen in the context of deconstructing the controlling position of discourses by trying to excavate Other, silenced ways of being and realising the world that might enable the creation of a more inclusive and globally just future.

Subversion provides the horizon of deconstructive stance with portrayal of heteroglossic and dialogic speech types. The idea here is to create a form of life which repeatedly interrupts all totalizing impulses. The passage from *The Circle of Reason*, which I have already discussed in detail in Chapter Two, where Alu is speaking in a mixture of languages, illustrates Amitav Ghosh’s stance on the power of silence:

> It was like a question, though he was not asking anything, bearing down on you from every side. And in that whole huge crowd nobody stirred or spoke. You could see that silently they were answering him, matching him with something of their own. [...] Tongues unravelled and woven together - nonsense, you say, tongues unravelled are nothing but nonsense - but there again you have a mystery, for everyone understood him, for his voice was only the question; the answers were their own. [...] I saw mysteries, all around me, one growing out of another, and I could find no grasp on them, not the slightest hold [...] and you could feel – if such a thing is possible – the silence beginning to stir. (*The Circle of Reason* 279-280)

Here, Alu is voicing his subversive program of waging war on money, abolishing the use of money from the Souq. This is represented in an amalgamation of linguistic blend and deconstruction of the dominating social and economic systems. Alu uses language, but this language is not identifiable as any distinct language which would establish a discursive totality through a certain claim to know the world and the Other. Significantly, the crowd is approached by Alu simultaneously as the Other (as conceived in Deconstruction) and also in a way that signifies one-ness. The negative aspects associated with binary constructions are called into question, thereby securing for both the entities positiveness and the acknowledgment of interdependence.

This characterizes the co-existence of language and silence where the influence of silence is emphasized. For instance, Alu’s communication in the above...
scene establishes this connection. The silent answer, in a way, deconstructs the claim to answer the question in language. It is something of everyone’s own, that each person has to Alu’s discursive but unintelligible question, establishes the subversive streak among individuals. In a sense, Alu’s discourse is within the realm of the systems of knowledge: it treats the crowd as a conglomeration of dialogues, who are approached discursively. But each individual in the crowd addresses Alu as the Other in deconstructive sense: their answer is within the silent saying which is beyond discourse. Simultaneously, the people react to Alu’s discourse to subvert the hitherto acclaimed social structures: the silence begin to stir.

In Amitav Ghosh’s narration, the discourses and epistemologies of discursive totalities are interrupted or deconstructed and transcended by the narrative representation of the techniques of subversion and dismantling of binaries. But his narrative strategy does not stop at mere deconstruction of discourses. The constructive and affirmative elements of the Other that bears with it traces of the subverting hegemonic discourses, unfolds as the outcome of the narrative process. Alu’s unintelligible discourse can be realised as an example of the deconstruction of the dominating discourse: its totality has been interrupted by the linguistic blend in the sense that it does not presume any specific way of constructing the world in the manner one distinct language would. However, even though it is a mixture, Alu uses discourse in his address to the group: it is just that this discourse has been affected by the subversive prerogative as his mixture of languages treats everyone as an equal.

The deconstructive dimension beyond linguistic totalities is symbolized by silence in Amitav Ghosh’s novels. The alternative mode of being that is achieved in the realm of silence would result in a unified, but not homogeneous world, which is not defined merely by power politics disturbed by language. This world would transcend temporal and spatial distances, as well as differences of language or social position, without, however, making them vanish. All in all, it would enable the dialogic and heteroglossic representation of multiple speech types existing on their own terms independently, while still in close relationship with one another. The sketching of multiple realities through the representation of characterization woven into a network of stories or reconstruction of the way of approaching binaries is a subversive act in itself.
In Critchley’s model, deconstruction has some incapabilities which he describes as,

Deconstruction [...] opens an ethical space of alterity or transcendence. However, the move that deconstruction is unable to make - what I have called its impasse – concerns the passage from undecidability to decision, from responsibility to questioning, from deconstruction to critique, from ethics to politics. (The Ethics of Deconstruction 236).

The way out of this impasse is to follow the move made by Amitav Ghosh in his narratives from annihilation of hegemonic constructions to questioning and criticising the dominating order by introducing justice to the neglected and ignored group of society. This is analogous to the move from the responsibility towards the Other to the questioning of the equality of all the others and of society and its structures. It is the move from the anarchy of the hegemonic formation, which is not yet justice, to the questioning and criticising of the authoritative order. For instance, in The Calcutta Chromosome, the hegemonic colonial version of the history of malaria research becomes subversively deconstructed in its narration. There is the ethical responsibility towards the Other, that is, Mangala’s silent and secret group, which demands that this group be approached without appropriating it into any discursive frame. The narrative tries to reach this goal by not defining or knowing the group and by presenting only textual traces of it. The group is characterised by silence and secrecy that transcend the discourse of colonial medical history.

But, at the same time the narrative is involved in the act of deconstructing the hegemonic version and privileging the eclipsed presence and agency of Mangala’s group. It acknowledges three strands of the innovative process which include the Western construction (colonial medical history), Mangala’s group (subversive, subaltern history) and the narrative itself (the narrative as a whole). In other words, deconstruction in itself is not justice in the political sense, it only opens a space in which transcendence can take place. The society in the novel has a double structure. The acknowledgment of the presence of Mangala’s group is made evident to the extent of considering them as significant as the controlling western group along with the deconstruction of hegemonic version of the events. But there is also the innovative attempt for all three versions (colonial medical history, its deconstruction and the novel as a whole) which is to be acknowledged equally in the narrative.
Hence, the narrative includes the hegemonic version as discursive totality and the point of alterity from which it is deconstructed (Mangala’s group not altogether graspable through language). By interweaving these two, the narrative process, that is, the novel as a whole, constitutes the move from deconstruction to the polyphonic orchestration of different versions. The overall attempt of Amitav Ghosh is to subvert the perception of the world conditioned by hegemonic structures, thereby privileging the silent and muted subjects of such structures. It is done through polyphonic representation of characters’ diverse viewpoints, multiple versions and contradictory perspectives.

The fiction of Amitav Ghosh has been referred to as the simultaneous embracing of modernist universalism and postmodernist emphasis on difference, or “at times confusing deployment of the lexicons of both liberal humanism and poststructuralism” (Dixon 16) varying between Derridean trace and universal humanism, turns out to be a narrative strategy that constructs human societies as the simultaneous double structure of binary oppositions and heteroglossic presentation of speech types. The discourse of the narrative manages to narrate these poles of modernist binary constructions simultaneously, as it were, without defining them as separate and antagonistic. And this narrative strategy aspires to globally just universal representations while meticulously narrating difference in particular circumstances in time and space. It juxtaposes multiple representations and deconstructing the hegemonic position of various versions.

In conclusion, it does seem that Amitav Ghosh acknowledges that there are multiple textual constructions of the world. These versions can always be deconstructed from a point of otherness that lies inside them. It seems that Amitav Ghosh attempts to create narrative representations that establish connections across culturally constructed totalities through the subversion taking place at various levels in the narrative. These representations ensure agency and voice to all while avoiding the appropriation of this voice to any one discourse. In the light of the novels studied in this thesis, the significance of the politics of subversion seems to have strengthened with the expansion of Amitav Ghosh’s literary output. Generally speaking, the career of Amitav Ghosh as a writer of fiction can be characterized as progressing from the accentuation of the reality-constructing power of narration (The Circle of Reason, The Shadow Lines) to the exposition of the relationality and ambiguous reality of all
discursive models (In an Antique Land, The Calcutta Chromosome) to an outright distrust of language as the builder of ontological totalities like nations, religions, sciences, social classes and subjectivities and as incapable of transcending these totalities (The Glass Palace, The Hungry Tide) and finally to the focalization of polyphonic characters. Thereby, it serves the novelist's thematic concerns with the challenges of the homeless world, where the nomadic characters experience solidarity and oneness with fellow migrants (Sea of Poppies, The River of Smoke). These are a way of offering us a refuge from the oppressive power struggles of everyday life into an ethically constructed world that “has been made one and blessed with diversity” (The Circle of Reason, 58). It seems that the idea of heterogeneous whole is Amitav Ghosh’s answer to the modern dilemma of human beings confronted with dispersal and fracturing of cultures. In addition to the awareness of multiple histories, agencies and voices highlighted in the novels by Amitav Ghosh, this change in the way one thinks of the world may constitute a major step towards more authentic multicultural representation.