

The Politics of Canons, Identity and Representation: A Study of the Counter Canonical Discourse Strategies in Arundhati Roy's Novel the Ministry of Utmost Happiness

Iesar Ahmad*

Department of English language and Literature King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Corresponding Author: Iesar Ahmad, E-mail: iaahmad@ksu.edu.sa

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: November 18, 2018

Accepted: February 10, 2019

Published: April 30, 2019

Volume: 10 Issue: 2

Advance access: March 2019

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

Key words:

Western Canons,
Counter Canonical,
Discourses,
Representation,
Identity,
Hybridity

ABSTRACT

This study is an attempt to investigate the widespread diffusion of the dominant western canonical practices embedded in the western discourses, which simultaneously, entail the counter canonical practices in terms of the ambivalence, language, representation, identity and culture in the postcolonial narratives. This study primarily bases on Arundhati Roy's (Henceforth, on ward Roy) novel 'The ministry of utmost Happiness' (MOUH, Henceforth on ward) how does She deconstruct the western dominant discourses, but simultaneously install the counter narratives in the context of the irreducible complex lived experiences of the linguistic and cultural hybridity. The research methodology of the study is to identify and to analyze the selected counter canonical strategies inducted by Roy in the novel MOUH in the context of the deconstructionist and postcolonial discourse perspective. In addition, the study also analyzes the identified texts in the framework of the multi canons and pluralistic perspective. Similarly, the polemical concern of the western canonical practices and Counter discursive strategies are still engaging the perennial and irresolvable debate among the critical literary theorists, cultural theorists, modern linguists and postcolonial discourse critics in the academic landscape across the globe. Accordingly, the study sums up that the counter discursive strategies deployed by Arundhati Roy in MOUH are also, trustworthy, pragmatic and authentic in terms of the western canonicity. In addition, the study concludes that the counter canonical strategies deployed by Arundhati Roy in her novel foreground the subtle issues of identity, language, culture and literary norms; which are also realistic and authentic on the bases of sameness but with difference.

INTRODUCTION

Arundhati Roy has emerged as the most noted novelist in the South Asian Anglophone world after the publication of her debut literary work: 'The God of Small Things' (1997). In addition, she has also published critical essays, and powerful political speeches, sarcastic journalistic writings and interviews, which are compiled in the literary books namely: *Power Politics: The Reincarnation of Rumpelstiltskin* (2001), *Thealgebra of fin-finie justice* (2002) and *The Ordinary Person's Guide to Empire* (2004). Her second much awaited novel *the Ministry of utmost unhappiness (MOUH)* is published in 2017, after the unusual lapse of two decades. In both her novels, along with these critical essays, lampooning speeches and satiric journalistic writings; she not only deconstructs and decolonizes the Anglo-American canons and its discursive practices but also simultaneously, the South Asian hegemonic political, patriarchal and cultural norms based on the fanatical caste codes, brahmanism and obscurantist norms. She also exposes racial prejudices, rigid Brahmanism, gender/transgender discrimination, extremism, terrorism, American imperialism, Globalization and brutal exploitation of the millions of Dalits, women and other mar-

ginalized communities of India in her narratives. However, the researcher in this study primarily focuses on the counter canonical strategies inducted by Roy in her novel *MOUH* in the context of the postcolonized South Asian complex experiences. She not only subverts the inherited western epistemic and ontological discourses but also simultaneously, reconstructs these western literary, cultural and linguistic tools in order to re-phrase and re-write an alternative shifting historical and cultural conditions to meet the need for change and diversity in the global perspective. Likewise, in the similar vein, Roy counter discursive practices also foregrounds the polemical concerns like gender, transgender, race, hybridity, split identity, sexuality, extremism, globalism, in the context of lived South Asian experiences. In the similar context, Roy views find support in Emilia Parpala, who cites H. Bloom views that the qualities that make an artistic work eligible for inclusion in a canon constitute its "canonicity"; it is given by originality, strange-ness and therefore influence: "All canons, including our currently fashionable counter-canons are elitist". (1)

In the similar context, the postcolonial counter canonical and deconstructionist perspective is also employed as conceptual framework for the interpretation and analysis of

the selected texts from her novel *MOUH*. This study may be very useful for highlighting the postcolonial perennial concerns like the politics and hegemony of representation, language, identity, nation, and hybridity in the context of the neo-imperialism in the post-colonial irreducible experiences. The aim and goal of the study is to suggest for the bilingual/multilingual linguists, literary theorists and critics of the Anglophone countries of Asia, Africa, west Indies as well as the settler colonies to revisit, reconstruct, rewrite and reinterpret the western canonical discourses in terms of the lived experiences of postcoloniality and neo-colonialism. It is also the objective of this study to foreground the cultural displacement, ambivalence hybridity and marginality through postcolonial discourses as the vantage site to contest and intervene the purity and universality of the Anglo-American canonicity.

Background of the Study

In this study, the researcher attempts to evaluate the evolution, growth, practice and dissemination of the western literary discourses in terms of the western epistemological, ontological and canonical perspectives. It investigate how these western discourses were disseminated in the colonized countries to construct the identity of the “self/other” or “west/East” as well as as to consolidate the vested political and economic interests of the empires. The western canonical discourses are disseminated as organic, authentic, rational and universal. But on the contrary, the non-western discourses and cultures are exhibited as atavistic, irrational and vernacular. In addition, these putative western discursive practices are spread as organic and sacred since the “revelation of the Holy Scriptures” and the present day spread of Anglo-American literary discursive norms. The researcher postulates how with the consistent imposition and spread of the dominant western texts entailed the emergence of counter literary practices on the basis of the difference and resistance. Accordingly, the emergences of such counter literary practices inducted by Roy in her novel *MOUH* and other Anglophone creative English writers contest and mediate the authenticity and purity of the western literary practices inscribed in the western canonicity.

DOMINATION AND DIFFUSION OF THE WIDE SPREAD ANGLO-AMERICAN CANONICAL DISCOURSES

In the similar context, Edward, Said W. quotes views of Renan _ a distinguished philologist of the nineteenth century who projected the “Semitic languages” and cultures as inorganic and impure; whereas the Indo-European as “organic” and living based on organic generative norms. “The European languages and cultures are alive and organic which can sustain a vision that incorporates and holds together the quasi-living of oriental creature”(143-45). His approach towards western discourses suggest that it is “logo centric” and “Euro-ethno-centric” as well as confirmation of the domination and naturalization of the western normative practices. In the similar perspective, Richard Proudfoot argues that: “Canon

transferred from its original reference to “the books of the Bible accepted by the Christian Church as genuine and inspired,” it is also defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as “those writings of a secular author accepted as genuine”. Proudfoot further add views of Harry Levin to highlight the significance of Shakespeare Canon in formulating the nature of western narratives. “as humanistic scriptures, text residue of pragmatic wisdom, a general collection of quotable texts and usable examples”. (62-64) Proudfoot views also find support in Robert Eaglestone, who contends that the exact idea of canon source is unclear but the term itself originates from the “Christian Church”. He further posits that encountering “with a number of texts about Jesus and the early Christians and with the Hebrew Scriptures, and also disputes about which ones to trust”

In the similar context, Robert Eaglestone also further quotes T.S. Eliot views on the western canon and of its literary values that the “canon is the storehouse of western cultural and aesthetic values. These western discourse and aesthetic values are unquestioningly assumed to be universal human values, the most important values that apply to all people at all times and in all places”. Alternatively, Robert Eaglestone also inserts views of Toni Morrison— American writer on the history of canon and its development tied with the development of ideas about nationality. She contends that “Canon building is empire building. Canon defence is national defence”.

Moreover, Robert Eaglestone also denotes reverse views of African critics on the western canons and its normative practices. According to him the African critics and writers like Chinweizu, Onwuchekwa Jemie and Madubuike (a trio of African writers and critics) in their book *The De colonization of African Literature*, concludes from their own perspectives

“Most of the objections to...the African novel sound like admonitions from imperialist mother hens to their wayward or outright rebellious captive chickens. They cluck: ‘Be Universal! Be Universal!’ and what they don’t consider universal they denounce as anthropological, atavistic... autobiographical, sociological, journalistic, topical ephemera, as not literary”. (51-57)

Since, nineteenth century onwards till today, the Anglo-American philologists, anthropologists, sociologists and cultural discourse theorists advocated for the authenticity and universality of the western canonicity over the non-western language, linguistic and cultural practices. The western textual canons, institutions and cultures were encouraged as transcendental, rational, scientific, logical and sacred; whereas the non-westerns were projected as primordial, irrational, sentimental, slang and aberrational. During the eighteenth century onwards, the western empiricists and scientists like Hume, Lock, Descartes and Newton also highlighted the rationality, originality and universality of the western canons over the non-western literary and textual practices in terms of their sentimentality, ambiguity and irrationality. In the similar western textual concern, Javeed, Raina A refer views of Audre Lorde on the colonial as well as indigenous powerful elites that most of the western colonial discourses “conditions us to see human differences in simplistic binary

opposition like, dominant/subordinate, white/black, superior/inferior etc. In a society ...there must always be some group of people who through systematized oppression to occupy the place of the debased inferior. Within this society, that group is made up of Black and Third World people, working-class people, older people, and women" (830).

By taking into consideration of the canonical Anglo-American practices the iconic writers like Shakespeare, Spencer, Jane Austin, Hardy, Wordsworth and Dickens were introduced much earlier in the annexed colonies of Asia and Western Africa and settler colonies rather than in their native European settings. Subsequently, by the consistent insertion of Anglo-American canonical practices entailed the emergence of counter discursive practices to address the metonymic gaps like representation, language, identity, hybridity, gender, transgender, nation and culture.

Likewise, the globalisation and digitalization has virtually transmuted the world; where the boundaries of place/space and the self/other are blurring and overlapping. Consequently, the consistent thrust of the western discursive practices entailed the emergence of counter discursive practices, which are dismantling the Anglo-American discursive strategies as well as simultaneously; reconstituting pluralistic and subversive norms on the basis of their recuperating historical, socio-linguistic and cultural lived postcolonial experiences. Likewise, the researcher also investigates how Roy also subverts as well as re-appropriates and reconstitutes the western literary norms in her novel and political writings in the context of the post-colonial lived realities. In addition, Roy deploys the counter discourse practices in her narratives to dismantle the privileged site of the Anglo-American linguistic and literary canonicity.

EMERGENCE AND GROWTH OF COUNTER DISCOURSE STRATEGIES

Harold Bloom posits on the controversy of the purity, universality and authenticity of the western canons that:

"Pragmatically, the "expansion of the Canon" has meant the destruction of the Canon, since what is being taught includes by no means the best writers who happen to be women, African, Hispanic, or Asian, but rather the writers who offer little but the resentment they have developed as part of their sense of identity" (7).

In the similar debate, Mohammad Sarwar Alam argues on the imposition of the western discursive practices about learning and practicing the language "which history has forced down our throats" could be strategically and effectively used to "generate counter discourses to resist the oppressive presence of the discourses of colonialism, neocolonialism and resultant predatory corporatization or Globalization" (1).

In the similar context, Nandita Ghosh refers Bhabha views that the "hybrid spaces" exist between "unequal antagonistic sites" without clear cut boundaries. In his opinion any expression from such a space focuses attention on the particular time and place of a speaking subject, contests principles of "rationality, revises settled hierarchies, and institute a dialogic process that reveals how power is constructed and the subaltern are marginalized" (1-23). All language

operates within this "Bhabhaesque hybrid" space in India. Margaret Kumar, also views in the similar context how in the "information, knowledge, belief, and value systems are canonized and codified to create meaning for every day livings." It is further pointed out that postcolonial subversive practices provide a conduit towards exploring the "multiplicities of language, identity and the constructs that maintains the system". It also installs the "facets of Culturalism and seeks to explore the avenues through which subjectivities are constructed, maintained and contested." Kumar concludes the constructs of both "the centre and the periphery" which also examines that dualism that shape discursive practice (82-9). In the similar vein, Hans Bertens, also postulates that "counter discourse practices... 'Disrupts colonizing powers and its particular system of values and sees cultural displacement, ambivalence and hybridity as alternative vantage points... to deconstruct and decolonize the seamless façade of western discourses.'" Bertens finds supports in Bhabha's views that postcolonial counter discursive perspective has disruptive potential which has in a paradoxically way foreshadowed the poststructuralist and postmodern views and concerns as well (200-14). In the similar perspective, Sara Mills also contends that Spivak's views that the "other" – colonized subaltern subject is irreducibly "heterogeneous." She asserts for "paradigmatic shift" from a concern with the voice of the colonizer or the voice of leading colonized subject to a concern with the voices, which are often effaced by the colonial texts. She inserts Bhabha's notions that "the colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed recognizable other, as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite...mimicry poses an immanent threat to both normalized knowledge and disciplinary powers embedded in western discourses" (120-25).

In the similar contextual perspective, Jacques Derrida postulates that "no context can determine meaning to the point of exhaustiveness". He further adds that the context neither produces nor guarantees impenetrable borders as is advocated and assumed by the western linguists and theorists (9). In the similar vein, Derrida further views during his dialogues to Kristeva on the nature of Semiology that "grammatology deconstructs everything that ties the concept and norms of scientificity to ontology, logocentrism, and phonologism" (29-30).

In the similar subversive and deconstructive perspective, the researcher has also foregrounded the counter discursive strategies deployed by Arundhati Roy in her novel (*MOUJ*) and other political discourses as the vantage site of ambivalence, difference and resistance in terms of the neo-colonialism as well as indigenous hegemonic dominating forces. Roy's subversive discourse strategies inducted in her narratives are the only possible alter/native approaches in the context of the complex South Asian experiences in this age of Neo-Colonialism and globalization. Despite the "blame game theory" and different "Isms" I choose the counter canonical discourse theory and deconstructionist practices as a frame work for the analysis of the selected texts inducted by Roy in her narratives. The researcher considers that with the wide spread of Anglo-American linguistic and literary discourses, the postcolonial societies have no any other alternative choice except to re-appropriate and re-constitute

the western discursive practices in terms of their distinctive geo-political, and ethno-linguistic lived and irreducible milieu. After investigating the western literary discourses, it is explored that the postcolonial Anglophone writers like Roy deployed counter linguistic and literary practices in her narratives to foreground the pluralistic and hybrid identities, multilingualism, and divergent cultures as the vantage sites to contest and interrogate the presumptive western canonicity on the basis of sameness but with difference.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the similar contextual perspective, David Patrick Medansky contends that

“The Canon Purists, advocate maintaining the canon in its current state, not allowing for the addition, or removal, of literature which has not previously been deemed “canonical.” Canon Pluralists support expanding the canon with additional literature. And Canon Anarchists, suggest completely dismantling and disregarding the canon, as it has grown outdated in its use”. (8)

In the similar vein, Diana Brydon cites Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o views that “colonization of the cognitive process was the everyday experience in a colonial classroom anywhere”. Experimentation in decolonizing contexts interrupts such cognitive schemas with whatever resources it finds at its disposal. In short, therefore, literary investigation may best be understood in performative terms as an intervention that seeks to trouble the predominant paradigms and scales through which readers understand knowledge production, artistic practice, and interpretation (28). In the similar perspective Patil Zumbalal Namdeoao refers to Kachru’s views with suggestion that ...the counter norms resulted a “pluricentric language along with Asian and African counter discursive practices....” Similarly, counter discursive norms with “local varieties” would evolve “diachronically and synchronically”...subsequently he remarks that most of the critical literatures is replete with a whole cluster of expression to describe the dissemination of English: “pluralization, diversification, globalization, internationalization; hybridization, localization, indigenization, decolonization, dehegemonization, liberation of the English language and so on...” (1-24).

In the similar context, Rakefet Sela-Sheffy argues that the German Romantic Novel was highly functional in transforming the field of German literature, which was the centre of the origin of the German *Kultur*, and in setting its standards. It was accepted from the beginning as a canonized model, and eventually persevered far beyond its own time as an essence of the modern notion of literature at large (155). In the similar vein, Ayobami Kehinde examines how post-colonial African novelists have used their novels to facilitate the “transgression of boundaries and abrogation of the hegemonic rigors previously mapped out in precursor western literary texts about Africa and Africans. Since Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* is typical enough in the canon of colonialist discourse”. He further adds that the “post-colonial Coetzee’s fiction is one of such attempts to engage in dialectical intertextuality with existing canonical works that present negative stereotypes of black peoples” (93). In the

similar context, Scott Rettberg contends that canonization is a vibrant process, and that in multilayer societies “alternative canons frequently to challenge the imposed canons”. After thoroughly considering conceptual and historical frameworks of canonization, she then asserts her own “alternative canon” to the mainstream: one for literary hypertext (2). In the similar context, Alan Davies also cites views of Jean Francois Lyotard - post modernist that the post-modern conditions have dismantled the “metanarrative of Hegel and Marx.” He along with other postmodernists stressed on fragmentation and significance of “localized creativity”. (171-86) In the similar vein, Ismail S. Talib, a noted literary theorist cites text from Mulk Raj Anand novel’s ‘*Untouchable*’ which authenticates the dismantling and simultaneously integrating strategies to contest the authenticity and universality of the Anglo-Western canonical representation (149). In the similar vein, Roy also like all other postcolonial Anglophone writers dismantle and reconstruct the inherited Anglo-American literary canons on the syntactical, morphological and phonological patterns of Indian languages in her novel; in order to address the metonymic gaps as well as to foreground the ambivalence, alterity, identity and hybridity as the vantage site in the postcolonial settings of South Asia.

METHODOLOGY: POSTCOLONIAL COUNTER DISCOURSE THEORY, AND DECONSTRUCTIONIST PERSPECTIVE AS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the similar contextual perspective, the postcolonial counter discourse and deconstructive perspective, Sharon Harvey inserts that Canagarajah’s suggestions in the field of language are in negotiating the “tricky terrain of linguistic appropriation – of making English their own...and mastering the discourse of power – Western/English academic and empire.” However, with the emergence of counter discursive practices, new pragmatic and “endonormative norms” the authenticity, and universality of the western linguistic and cultural norms and its privileged site is deconstructed and radically reconstituted (246-259).

In the similar context, the researcher has chosen post-colonial discourse canons and deconstructionist perspective as the theoretical framework to analyze and interpret the chosen texts in terms of the subverting and re-appropriating strategies inducted by Roy’s in her narratives. Likewise, it has been observed that the western critical and theoretical approaches since 1920s onwards sound inadequate to address the post-colonial concerns like alterity, ambivalence, representation, hybridity, identity, culture and nation, in the context of complex hybridized experiences of the post-colonized nations. The postcolonial counter discursive and deconstructionist perspectives focus on the revisionist practices that is the difference but with sameness unlike complete sameness or complete difference. Such pluralistic canons and deconstructive approaches also center on multiplicity and differentiability unlike totalizing and essentialist discourses of Euro-centric or Logo-centric. Likewise, the counter discourse strategies inducted by Roy in her narratives are analysed, judged and interpreted in terms of the

validity and authenticity in the postcolonial counter canonical discourses and deconstructionist perspectives. Hence forth, the researcher analyzes and interprets dismantling and reconstituting strategies inducted by Roy in her novel (*MOUH*) in terms of the western canonical practices. In addition her subversive and integrative strategies inducted in her novel are analysed and interpreted in the context of the theoretical framework of the counter discourse theory and deconstructionist perspective as under:

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUBVERTING AND APPROPRIATING STRATEGIES DEPLOYED BY ARUNDHATI ROY IN *THE MINISTRY OF UTMOST HAPPINESS (MOUH)*

In the similar vein, *Victor Ukaegub contends that:*

Most postcolonial societies continue to bear the scars of European colonialism in their sociocultural, political and pedagogic domains. Neo-colonialist relationships with their erstwhile colonisers continue to affect the historical and material conditions of every postcolonial nation-state to the extent of shaping the synergy between indigenous and foreign cultural systems and how postcolonial societies model their new universes. (13)

In such counter canonical perspective, Roy deconstructs as well as reconstitutes the western linguistic and cultural models to install her indigenous hybrid lived experience in her novel *MOUH*. Roy also elsewhere in her interviews posits that. "Language is the skin on my thought" She also argues about her deployment of counter discursive practices "That for me, words were broken apart, and then synthesized and coordinated together like "Later" became "Lay Ter"; "prer NUN sea ahsun"; "Rej-Oice"; "Lo-Ord Or- Orlways" Etc. Hence, in the context of such counter and subversive discourse settings, Roy's identified texts from her novel are deconstructed and decolonized as under:

Who says my name is Anjum? I 'm not Anjum, I am Amjuman. I m' mehfil, I m' gathering. Of everybody and nobody, of everything and nothing. Is there anyone else you would like to invite? Every one is invited. (Roy.4)

In the above cited text, Roy inserts urdu language words and phrases as a subversive strategy to foreground the linguistic hybridity and cultural identity in the indigenous settings. She reconstructs the inherited language as an alternative counter discourse strategy to foreground the shifting historical and cultural conditions to meet the need for ever changing postcolonial concerns and diversity. In addition, she unmasks the patriarchal norms of the subcontinent society as Anjum - being transgender is socially and culturally ostracized by the indigenous society. Her lexical strategy of neology like the term "Amjuman." Or "Mehfil" is to inscribe the subalternity and marginality of women and transgender sex in the South Asian perspective.

In the similar perspective, her subverting and integrating strategy of transliteration and un-translated words deconstructs and de-hegmonize the western discursive norms. Such instances of transliterations and un-translated words are given and interpreted as under:

All he (Sarmad – a mystic of the subcontinent) said was the first phrase: La ilaha. There is no God. He could not go an further...until then he said, reciting the Kalima would only be a mockery of prayer. Auranzeb, (Alamghir 1608-1707 the last effective orthodox Mughal emperor of India) backed by his Qazis (orthodox Mulla), ordered Sarmad's execution. (Roy.10)

In the above cited text, Sarmad was executed on the charge of blasphemy. Roy inserted the urdu language phrases like "La ilaha" and "Kalima" as a subverting strategy to foreground the dogmatic version of religion with mystic concept of religion. Mysticism focuses on the universal love of humanity, spirituality and love to God, whereas the former focuses on rigid dogmatism, ritualism obscurantism, retrogressive ideology of extremism. She reconstitutes English language in order to reflect the historical, racial, ideological and cultural plurality of the people of the subcontinent as both Muslims and Hindus till today visit to his Mausoleum for seeking love and blessing of this saint.

In the similar vein, Roy reconstitutes the inherited western language on the lexical, syntactical, morphological, and phonological pattern of her indigenous languages to deconstruct and de-hegmonize the western canonical discourses. Such linguistic pattern is given below from her novel (*MOUH*) about the transgender Aftab, who is humiliated as a marginalized by the children in the male dominated patriarchal society of South Asia:

He's a She. He's not a He or a She. He's a He and a She. She-He Hee! Hee! (Roy.12)

In the above cited text, She deconstructs the western linguistic and textual patterns in the context of her complex lived experiences. She unmasks the double marginality and low status of the transgender and women in the male dominated South Asian societies. In the above text, she subverts and simultaneously, reconstructs the inherited language on the linguistic pattern of indigenous languages of South Asia in order to transmit the meaning in the pluralistic and counter canonical perspective.

According to Nalini Iyer Roy in *MUOH*, seeks to articulate a postcolonial nation's history from the perspective of the marginalized. Anjum, a hijra, and Saddam Hussain, a Dalit, and Tilottama, a maverick young woman are the main characters in this sprawling narrative and their tales intertwine to capture the failure of the secular democratic nation state. She further adds that Roy writes of Dalit lynchings, the pogrom against Sikhs in 1984, the rise of Hindu fundamentalism and the communal riots in Gujarat, the impact of the army occupation and jihadi movements on Kashmir, and the growth of resistance movements against the government" (2).

In the similar context, Roy also deconstructs the notion of nation of post-colonial India, how the major ethnic communities like Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs turned into arch enemy of one another at the bloody partition of the subcontinent. In the similar contextual perspective.

Assumi Inakali contends that the novel (*MOUH*) 'is set against the background of Indo-Pakistan riot and this makes the after-affect of postcolonialism even more vivid' (61). It also depicts the complexities of the key characters in being unable to find a place which they could claim their own. Like

Anjum, Tilottama, one of the major female characters in the novel, is someone without a distinctive identity. In the following excerpt, Roy foregrounds the postcolonial concern of nation of fragmentation:

He electrified Hindu chauvinists with their controversial old war cry, vande Matarm! Salute the Mother... For militant moralists the old man's slogan was thieves must have their hands cut off! Terrorists must be hanged! For nationalists of all stripes he roared, 'Doodh maangoey to kheer dengey! Kashmir maangoey to chiir dengey! Ask for milk, we'll give you cream! Ask for Kashmir, we'll rip you open seam to seam! (Roy.103)

In the above cited texts, Roy highlights the post-colonial politically and culturally fragmented South Asia through the deployment of canonical subversive strategies in her novel. She subverts and deconstructs the inherited western linguistic norms by using the code mixing, code switch and glossing strategies in order to install her complex hybridized linguistic and cultural experience. Accordingly, it can be concluded that her counter discursive strategies deployed in the novel *MUOH* are very realistic and alternative norms to foreground the postcolonial lived experiences of the South Asian. In the similar vein, Ayo Bamgbose, also posits that variant englishes and "non-native counter discursive norms" may be seen as an expression of identity, representation, nationality and solidarity (1-14). After analysis of the selected texts from her novel, I authenticate the counter discursive and subversive practices as an alternative approaches to deconstruct and de-hegemonize the Anglo- American neo-colonial canonical discursive practices.

CONCLUSION

After the investigation and interpretation of the key text of the novel *MUOH*, the study substantiates that the counter discourse practices installed by Roy in her narratives deconstruct and decolonize the western linguistic and textual practices. Such counter discourse and multi-canon strategies installed in her novel also expose the indigenous political, patriarchal, cultural and social rigid practices and norms. Likewise, the study validates and concludes that the subverting and reconstituting linguistic and literary strategies inducted in her novel are pragmatic and lived practices, as these transmit the signified "message events" and "lived history". In a nutshell, the study authenticates and sums up that Roy foregrounds in her narratives a counter discursive and canonical practices as an alternative liminal and metonymic site of the ambivalence, resistance, intervention and difference. The study concludes that Roy counter canonical practices in the novel *MUOH* are realistic, authentic and alternative vantage site of the liminality for the postcolonized nations to contest and inscribe difference and resistance in the context of the neo-colonialism and globalisation rather than knowing and experiencing the world only through the western stereotypical canonical lens. It also concludes that the postcolonial literatures in English, world englishes, linguistic varieties, literary norms and cultural diversities are as much authentic and valid as are the western canonical discourses and its cultural norms.

REFERENCES

- Alam, Sarwar M. "Illusion, Deception and Dehumanization: Neocolonial Reinforcement of Colonial Legacy and the Role of English." *IJUC STUDIES* Vol. 7, 2010, p-1.
- Ashcroft et al. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: by Routledge, 1995.p.77.
- Assumi, Inakali 'Postcolonialism in Arundhati Roy's The Ministry of Utmost Happiness', *Modern Research Studies: An International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, [online] available <http://www.modernresearch.in> Vol.5. Issue 2/June 2018. P. 61 accessed Dec 24-2018
- Bamgbose, Ayo. "Torn between the norms: innovations in World Englishes." *World Englishes*, Vol. 17 No.1, 1998, PP.1-14.
- Bertens, Hens. *Literary Theory: The Basics*. London: by Routledge, 2001. pp.200-214.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon. The Books and School of the ages*. New York, San Diego, London: by Harcourt Brace & Company, 1994. p.7.
- Brydon, Diana. "Experimental Writing and Reading across Borders in Decolonizing Contexts." *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature*, Volume 47, No. 1-2, 2016, p. 28.
- Davies, Alan. "Standard English: discordant voices." *World Englishes*, vol.18, No.2, 1999, pp.171-186.
- Ghosh, Nandita. "Fixing the Language, Fixing the Nation." *Jouvert* 5-3, 2001, pp. 1-23. <https://legacy.chass.ncsu.edu/jouvert/v5i3/ghosh.htm>.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Aporia*. America: by Stanford University Press, California, 1993. P-9
- Derrida, Jacques. *Positions*. India: by Chennai Micro print Pvt Ltd, 2004. PP.29-30.
- Eaglestone, Robert. *Doing English. London: A Guide for Literature Students*. By Routledge, 2000. PP.51-57.
- Fairclough, Norman *Language and Power*. London/ New York: by Longman group, 1989. Pp. 56-7.
- Figueria, Dorothy. "The Profit of Post colonialism," *Comparative Literature*. Vol. 52, No.3.(summer 2000), pp.246-54 [online] available: <http://www.jstor.org>. The June 19-06-2007
- Harvey, Sharon. "Critical Perspectives on Language(s)." *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 7/2, 2003.,pp 246-59. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-9481.00222>
- Iyer, Nalini " Narrating a Fragmented Nation: Arundhati Roy's Ministry of Utmost Happiness," *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 76; April 2018, P-2; ISSN: e-2530-8335 DOI: <http://doi.org/10.25145/j.recaes-in.2018.76.012>. accessed on Dec 20-2018
- Javeed, Raina A. "Transgender Marginalization and Exclusion: A study of Arundhati Roy's The Ministry of Utmost Happiness", *www.thecreativelauncher.com* Vol. II & Issue IV. October – 2017, pp- 830.accessed on Dec 24-2018
- Kehinde, Ayobami. "Post-Colonial African Literature as Counter-Discourse: J.M. Coetzee's Foe and the Re-working of the Canon." *Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies*, volume. 32, no. 3, 2006, p.93. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4ph014jj>

- Kumar, Margaret. Postcolonial Theory and Cross-Culturalism: Collaborative Signposts of Discursive Practices,' *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, vol. 1, No. 2, 2007, p.82-9.
- Lyons, John. (1981). *Language and Linguistics*. London/ New York: by Cambridge University Press. PP.276- 78.
- Medansky, David Patrik. Things Fall Apart: Deconstructing the Humanities Canon'. B A thesis, University of Colorado at Boulder, 2011. *Disseration and Thesis*, https://scholar.colorado.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1885&context=honr_theses
- Mesthrie, R. (2006) 'World Englishes and the multilingual history of English,' *World Englishes*, vol.25, No.3/4, pp. 381-90.
- Mills, Sara. (1997) *Discourse*. London: by Routledge. p. 120
- Parpală, Emilia. "Alternative Canons. Postmodern Canon-formation in Romanian Poetry," *Romanian Poetic Postmodernism*. 2009. 1980–2010. P-1
- Proud foot, Richard. *Shakespeare: Text, Stage and Canon*. London: By the Arden Shakespeare, 2001. Pp. 62-4.
- Rettberg, Scott. "An Emerging Canon? A Preliminary Analysis of All References to Creative Works in Critical Writing Documented in the ELMCIP Electronic Literature Knowledge Base", *ELO August 2013* P-1 {online} available: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc>. accessed on The December 14-12-2018
- Roy, Arundhati. *The Minsitry of Utomost Happiness*. UK/ USA: by Penguin Random House UK, 2017 P.4 *Ibid*. p.10 *Ibid*. p. 12 *Ibid*. p.103
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. America: by Pantheon Books, 1978. pp.143-45
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Empire*. New York and Canada: By Routledge., 1994. Pp. 17-24.
- Sheffy-Sela, Rakefet. "Canon Formation Revisited: Canon and Cultural Production." *Neohelicon* XXIX 2, 2002, p.155.
- Talib, Ismail S. *The language of postcolonial Literature An Introduction*. London: by Routledge, 2002. P.149
- Ukaegbu, V (2017). 'Post-colonialism and performance: Political, Cultural and Pedagogic Legacies and Constraints', *REPERT, Salvador*, ano 20, n. 29
- Ward, Graham. *Barth, Derrida and Language of Theology*. United Kingdom: by Cambridge University Press, 1995. Pp. 5-29.