Dialogue on Partition

Literature Knows No Borders

Syrrina Ahsan Ali Haque

Dialogue on Partition

Dialogue on Partition

Literature Knows No Borders

Syrrina Ahsan Ali Haque

LEXINGTON BOOKS
Lanham • Boulder • New York • London

Published by Lexington Books
An imprint of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
www.rowman.com

6 Tinworth Street, London SE11 5AL, United Kingdom

Copyright © 2021 The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Haque, Syrrina Ahsan Ali, 1971- author.
Title: Dialogue on partition : literature knows no borders / Syrrina Ahsan Ali Haque.
Description: Lanham : Lexington Books, [2021] | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Summary: "Dialogue on Partition shows how shared time and space as depicted in partition literature can foster dialogue despite separation and relocation. By incorporating the multiple and eclectic perspectives of characters, narrators, writers, and historians, art and literature can be used as tools of integration between sects, religions and differences"—Provided by publisher.
Identifiers: LCCN 2020050857 (print) | LCCN 2020050858 (ebook) | ISBN 9781793636249 (cloth ; alk. paper) | ISBN 9781793636256 (epub)
Subjects: LCSH: Indic fiction (English)—History and criticism. | Pakistani fiction (English)—History and criticism. | Partition, Territorial, in literature. | National characteristics, East Indian, in literature. | National characteristics, Pakistani, in literature. | Collective memory in literature. | Space and time in literature. | India—History—Partition, 1947—Literature and the partition.
Classification: LCC PR9570.S64 H37 2021 (print) | LCC PR9570.S64 (ebook) | DDC 820.9/954—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020050857
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020050858

∞™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

To the spirit and soul of bygone years,
Molding and melding yonder paths and yonder times
Living The Quest of "Who Am I?"

Contents

List of Acronyms ix

Foreword xi

Acknowledgments xv

Introduction xvii

1 Dialogization of Identities in Bapsi Sidhwa's *Ice-Candy-Man* 1

2 The Heteroglot World in Khushwant Singh's *Train to Pakistan* 35

3 Chronotopal Movement in Anita Desai's *Clear Light of Day* 67

4 The Coexistence of Polyphonic Voices in Mehr Nigar Masroor's *Shadows of Time* 93

5 Creation of Dialogic Paradigms 127

Bibliography 135

Index 141

About the Author 147

List of Acronyms

DI	*The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* by M. M. Bakhtin
FCS	"Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel: Notes Towards Historical Poetics" by M. M. Bakhtin:
PHB	Pakistan History Board
TLC	*Theory of the Literary Chronotope Reflections* by Bemong, et al.
SGLE	*Bakhtin's Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* by M. M. Bakhtin
I&P	*India and Pakistan: Continued Conflict or Cooperation?* By Stanley Wolpert
DPH	"In Theory Bakhtin: Dialogism, Polyphony and Heteroglossia" by Andrew Robins

Foreword

Every country has a national museum of collective memory in which one event holds central space. In Pakistan that memory is very well the 1947 partition of the subcontinent into the sovereign nations of Pakistan and India and the intercommunal violence that saw 14 million people displaced and countless more losing their lives. The subsequent legacy of partition, one of death, destruction, and mayhem, in terms of both emotional and material wealth, continues to haunt survivors as well as their descendants in the form of memories both welcome and unwelcome.

Memories are retrieved in myriad ways—through artifacts, scent, photos, letters, song, music, but the most fundamental way of retrieving and making sense of memory is perhaps through dialogue. Dialogue, again, can be welcome or unwelcome; however, it is nevertheless an interaction which facilitates the deeper retrieval of experiences and one where even silence is meaningful. Dr. Syrrina Ahsan Ali Haque's timely book *Dialogue on Partition: Literature Knows No Borders*, a conversation between four Indo-Pak partition novels, splendidly fills in the pockets of silence created in the wake of partition trauma.

Dr. Haque's *Dialogue on Partition: Literature Knows No Borders* is an intertextual exchange between Bapsi Sidhwas's *The Ice-Candy-Man*, Khushwant Singh's *Train to Pakistan*, Anita Desai's *Clear Light of Day*, and Mehr Nigar Masroor's *Shadows of Time.* Dr. Haque expertly draws on the religious, cultural, social, and economic spaces that these communities jointly inhabit to foster an intertextual discussion in four time periods: pre- partition, on the eve of partition, during partition, and post-partition. Her selected novels are written by authors who are Parsi, Sikh, Hindu, and Muslim and feature, respectively, protagonists with the same religious cultural identities. The texts have much to say to each other and Dr. Haque's Bakhtinian Dialogic

prism sheds light through rotating perspectives on various multiple identities both fractured and intact.

Dr. Haque's interest in the potential of dialogue to cross borders and boundaries was sparked at age twelve during a conversation she had with a teacher. Upon her British teacher asking her why 1857 was an important historical date, she replied, "War of Independence" to which the teacher replied that she was wrong; the event was known as the "British Mutiny." That both labels referred to the same date and historical event stayed with her and made her realize that, as Dr. Haque told me, "truth can be negated, hence, there are multiple truths and must be explored."

Dr. Haque's interest in the malleable meaning of truth via dialogue and whose truth is it anyway and how do novelists write "truth" through dialogues encapsulate the scope and focus of *Dialogue on Partition: Literature Knows No Borders*. Dr. Haque's book explores the plurality of truth in partition narratives. Interfaith couples and relationships are explored via their often-fraught conversations, especially in Masroor's *Shadows of Time*, in order to illustrate opposing loyalties and perspectives on same events and thereby a clash-of-dialogues which, nevertheless, even in opposition, is communication and thereby connection.

I first met Dr. Haque at Kinnaird College upon her invitation to interview me for my novel *Unmarriageable: Pride and Prejudice in Pakistan*, a parallel postcolonial retelling of Jane Austen's classic. I was struck by Dr. Haque's keen observations. In her eyes what I had written was not just a "retelling" but also a "re-presentation." What were the differences between a telling and a presentation and how did her label and mine change and/or challenge the dialogical perspective and in turn our own responses?

Our interview went from classroom to the staff room where we continued talking over chai and sandwiches about the "Britishness" of *Unmarriageable* and how this reorienting/remapping had yet rendered it "Un-British," and as Dr. Haque noted a transference of "landscape" in all its variety. Our conversation turned to how texts "talk/argue/play" to each other, what they say as well as what they leave out—deliberately or otherwise—or are incapable of saying. Where does, we wondered, intertextual conversation succeed and where does it fail and where does it fill in the gaps and *Dialogue on Partition: Literature Knows No Borders* subsequently provided me a wide window of possibilities to these queries.

In terms of partition narratives those who lived through the events have either gone or may be reluctant to talk. In this case silence is a resistance to dialogue. In other words the silences are a resistance to *actively* remembering and thus sharing memories and passing down experiences and thus keeping them *alive*. And yet within these silences also resides a form of communication—what is not being said—and Dr. Haque's *Dialogue on Partition:*

Literature Knows No Borders seeks to and succeeds in filling these gaps and silences through her exploration of Indo-Pak novel-narratives formed by imagination yet based on facts as well as history.

Dr. Haque and I are both personally aware of the gaps and silences within our own families and how the ages of the current chroniclers during partition itself might be one reason for gaps. As Dr. Haque told me, often those who are now our elders and replay their memories of partition were themselves, at the time, merely school-going children, some still in their parents' laps. As such their memories are those of children, in other words innocent bystanders dependent for safety and story on adults as we see in the protagonist of Sidhwa's novel *Ice-Candy-Man*.

Dr. Haque's family was directly affected by partition, as was mine. Her family was from Jullundar, Punjab, which they believed, till very late, was going to be part of Pakistan, but after it fell into India's lot, her family scrambled to evacuate and migrate into Pakistan. "My Aunts," says Dr. Haque, "told stories of fraternity between Muslims and Sikh neighbors even at the time of Partition." It is thus fitting that her interests should lie in, as she says, the "celebration of diversity over division" and that *Dialogue on Partition: Literature Knows No Borders* should be a conversation between the different communities in the subcontinent as well as a celebration of their disparate voices merging together under Dr. Haque's Bakhtinian Dialogic lens.

While Dr. Haque's partition memories are of her aunts praising communal solidarity in those difficult times and thus maintaining a semblance of gain, mine involve losses. My mother's family is from Srinagar, Kashmir, and my maternal grandfather was involved in the politics of partition and therefore freedom struggle. My grandparents would eventually move to Muzaffarabad from Srinagar, leaving behind two of their children. This separation of family members living on different sides of a border was further exacerbated by requiring visas which were themselves dependent on good diplomatic relations between the two now-independent countries and *Dialogue on Partition: Literature Knows No Borders* delves into these artificial separations through the conversations that take place in its chosen texts, in particular in Anita Desai's *Clear Light of Day*.

The geography of separation and belonging, both physical and emotional, interested Dr. Haque, and I and she were most interested in the dialogic elements in my novel *An Isolated Incident*, set against the Kashmir conflict, a direct result of the parted geography of partition. We discussed the paradox of hyphens forming their own dialogue of connection and disconnection and questions of legitimacy, authenticity, and identity came up. Whose Kashmir is it anyway and by dint of that whose partition is it anyway? *Dialogue on Partition: Literature Knows No Borders* asks who has the right to lay claim to

"real" history, territory, story, and the dialogues between the Indo-Pak texts chosen as a guide on how to navigate these fraught questions.

And what of inanimate objects as markers of memory and history? Dr. Haque's book masterfully probes into all the ways Khushwant Singh's novel *Train to Pakistan* displays Singh's use of the natural world to deliver lasting legacy and rootedness. These questions of interconnectedness, animate and inanimate, in the event of communal trauma and how dialogue forms the crux of bonds are the heart of the four Indo-Pak partition novels Dr. Haque discusses in *Dialogue on Partition: Literature Knows No Borders*. In fact, the very act of writing a book contains a dialogic relationship between writer-book-reader: Syrrina-*Dialogue on Partition: Literature Knows No Borders*-Reader.

Under Dr. Haque's rigorous microscope of Bakhtinian dialogic, as well as her own history and scholarship, the intertextual dialogues reflect a room, nay a world, of revolving mirrors. In initiating conversation between these four novels—Sidhwa's *Ice-Candy-Man*, Singh's *Train to Pakistan*, Desai's *Clear Light of Day*, and Masroor's *Shadows of Time* written from and told through a Parsi, Sikh, Hindu, and Muslim point of view—these texts allow a much required interreligious-communal conversation and thereby multiple perspectives within their pages. Dr. Haque shows us that disparate dialogue is not cacophony and chaos but, instead, the fruits of collective memory. And what else is collective memory if not a collective history that belongs to everyone connected to a land and what else is dialogue if not an eternal manifestation of belonging where, despite partitions, voices cross borders to simply and forthrightly connect, through conversation, as they do in *Dialogue On Partition: Literature Knows No Border*.

Foreword Courtesy
Soniah Kamal, an award-winning and critically acclaimed novelist, essayist, public speaker, and teacher.
Her Novel: *An Isolated Incident, Unmarriageable: A Novel*
Member of National Book Critics Circle, USA
Faculty at Reinhardt University, USA

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge and extend my gratitude to all the individuals who proved to be spiritual as well as physical scaffolds in the deliverance of this book.

First, I am extremely indebted to the immaculate and substantial support offered by Dr. Rizwan Akhtar. I take this opportunity to show my heartfelt gratitude for his esteemed and indelible guidance as well as meticulous and thorough perusal of the study. His ardent interest in my work has empowered me to explore, expound, and express the contention, texts, and the results in a methodical and thorough manner.

Next, I would like to extend my gratitude to the chairperson, Department of English Language and Literature, University of the Punjab, Dr. Amra Raza, for her mentorship and facilitation during and after the course of my doctoral research. She has been a source of inspiration throughout my research work. I am extremely grateful to the Pakistan Study Centre, University of the Punjab, for their cooperation and support in the publication of my research article "Exploring Chronotopal Politics in Hindu Indian Culture Incorporating Muslim Traits in Anita Desai's *Clear Light of Day* as a Nexus for Indo-Pak Dialogue." I have added more analysis and subtracted theoretical references from the research articles. I am grateful to ICLLL and IJLLL for awarding my paper from this research, Best Paper Award at ICLLL, Tokyo, and to IMPACT journals.

Furthermore, I am thankful to NeMLA Boston for awarding this manuscript, Book Award Honorable Mention at the 51st NeMLA Conference, Boston 2020.

I am extremely grateful to my husband and daughters for providing the most conducive atmosphere for my research endeavors. I am thankful to my parents for instilling a passion for knowledge and fostering a need for

acquiring excellence in my endeavors. I owe my late mother-in-law for her extensive support and encouragement. My family has imbued me with the confidence to pursue my dreams.

My prayers and ardent belief in God's endowments have been reciprocated by His Divine Mercy in the culmination of one of my most esteemed professional and academic desire.

Introduction

The event of the partition of the subcontinent in 1947 created geographical as well as psychological boundaries among religious ethnicities. Literature written in English and vernaculars produced around and after the event of partition particularly include social, cultural, and political complexities surrounding the events of 1947. Urdu writers, particularly, Saadat Hasan Manto, a Pakistani playwright and author, and Qurratulain Hyder, an Indian novelist and short story writer, documented the events of partition in Urdu. Similarly, Indian and Pakistani novelists writing in English, such as Bapsi Sidhwa, Khushwant Singh, Anita Desai, and Mehr Nigar Masroor to name a few, also document the event of partition of 1947. These writers, by recreating the event of partition in their novels, show the effect of partition on different religious groups of the Indian subcontinent. Moreover, these novelists present similarities and differences that subsequently divided the multireligious groups, which had been living together for centuries. While the ethnic and political boundaries in real life are clearly demarcated, in the fictional arena writers traverse ideological fissures and anticipate a dialogic fluidity between different communities driven apart by historical forces. Thereby, fiction can be a tool for integration between sects, races, and other differences at large. The novels, in particular novels on partition, transmit the inherent individualities of idiosyncratic voices of narrators, characters, and writers as promulgators of dialogue in the wake of the contentious event of partition and post-partition conflict. This book proffers and shows dialogue as an embedded demand and anticipation in Indo-Pak English literature on partition, in the face of the dialectics of the event and act of partition. The novels under perusal in this book are *Ice-Candy-Man* by Bapsi Sidhwa, *Train to Pakistan* by Khushwant Singh, *Clear Light of Day* by Anita Desai, and *Shadows of Time* by Mehr Nigar Masroor.

The fictional narratives on partition engage with various social and ideological crises which different religious groups encountered during and after 1947. These sociological issues were due to the coexistence of different ethnicities in India. There are "2000-odd castes, there are 'major eight religions, 15-odd languages spoken . . . and a substantial number of tribes and sects" ("Ethnic and Religious Conflicts in India" 1983, 1) in India. There are differences in the practices and beliefs of these different ethnic groups. The ideological issues arise due to the clash between the beliefs and the subsequent array of solutions for these issues. Thus, these sociological and ideological issues, as presented in the novels on partition, play a pivotal role in dividing the subcontinent.

Hence, diversity of religions is a predominant feature in creating fissures in the geographical as well as psychological terrain of the subcontinent and its people. The major religions which are practiced in the subcontinent are Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Sikhism, Buddhism, Jainism, Zoroastrianism, and Judaism (Daniel 1999–2005, 1). The code of conduct of various religions for the well-being of people is similar as is shown in the narratives; however, practices vary according to the demand of the religion and ethnicity. One important issue depicted in these narratives is the ideology behind the creation of Pakistan. It was based on the politically contrived Muslim demand for the creation of an Islamic State providing religious and political freedom to Muslims and minorities at the outset of independence from the British. Furthermore, the novels highlight the role of political forces, in this case the political parties, which were the Indian National Congress and All India Muslim League in particular. The novels show how these political parties as well as British colonial administration were responsible for creating ideological fissures by using religion as a tool for separation, since religious diversity may cause disparate social and ideological norms. Therefore, it is important to understand the differences as well as the similarities that exist among various religious factions. The literary narratives of the Indo-Pak region present these differences and at the same time, the struggle to efface problems arising out of these differences. These narratives proffer the existence of shared archetypes, which are exploited upon by differing religious archetypes. Hence, this book locates and dissects shared symbols, regional fraternity, Sufi and mystic eclecticism, and diversity of heteroglot and polyphonic voices in the chronotopal space and time of partition. However, in doing so, it is seen that the narratives provide evidence of interrelationships dating back to centuries of coexistence.

Thus, the literary narratives of partition show the interrelationship of multiple religious groups, depicting issues arising due to intersection of different social and ideological norms of these groups. For example, in Sidhwa's novel, *Ice-Candy-Man*, a group of friends comprising Hindus, Sikhs, Christians,

Muslims, and Parsees sit together daily and discuss their sociopolitical issues. These issues arise due to the oncoming independence of India from the British rule and the political demand for a separate state by Muslims. The narratives also portray assimilation of these groups as a result of coexistence. Therefore, this book focuses on the interrelationships of ethnic and religious groups living together for centuries. Furthermore, it locates possibilities of dialogue arising from these relationships in the literary narrative of partition. In this regard, the theory of dialogism is integral to this study. It provides a frame of reference in understanding the concepts of dialogism, making dialogue an applicable phenomenon. A dialogic novel, according to Mikhail M. Bakhtin, the coiner and proponent of *dialogism*, encompasses "the world" into "an open-ended, multi-voiced, dialogical whole," showing "many worlds, all equally capable of expressing themselves and conceptualizing their objects." Bakhtin lays emphasis on the "dynamic interplay and interruption of perspectives" to "produce . . . new ways of seeing. It is incommensurability which gives dialogue its power" (Robinson DPH 2011, 1–5). So, the dialogic novel celebrates this incommensurability in ethnicities and religions. This book critiques the role of Indo-Pak novels in propagating dialogue, thereby proposing ways of reducing fissures implanted in the psychosocial terrain of the inhabitants of the region by offering junctures of confluence between distinct and diverse voices present within the literary domain.

The novels on partition show how different religions construct dialectical disparities, yet it is an inherent demand of each religion to initiate dialogue. In the subcontinent, religion plays a vital role in shaping private and public life and though various religious ethnicities endeavor to preserve their individual identity in social and cultural spheres, it is the exclusive religious identities which tend to subside thus creating a space for a more pluralistic and dialogic renegotiation of religious content. This can be seen in the novels of partition, which delegate the significance of religion as a dividing force in the wake of instigation from the outsider. In *Ice-Candy-Man*, the Ayah's Hindu religious identity is a pretext for some of her friends to protect her and at the same time, it is the reason why some of her close friends attack her. While Hari and Imam Din protect her, the Ice-candy-man and the butcher assail her integrity as a retribution for the slaughtered Muslim women in general and Ice-candy-man's sisters in particular, owing to Ayah's distinct Hindu identity. Since religion is a seminal factor in defining the events of 1947, literary narratives on partition also include religion as a key factor defining the more pervasive drama of ideological and political collusions and collations. The history of the subcontinent tells us that there had been a symbiosis between religion and art. From the times of the arrival of the Aryans, the subcontinent was ruled by many rulers of different religious and cultural groups, namely, the Persians, the Greeks, the Maurayans, the Guptas, the Rajputs, and then a succession of

Muslim rulers starting from Muhammad bin Qasim, Yaminiu'izzuddin, the Khiljis, the Tughlaqs, the Sayyids, the Lodhis to the Mughals leading up to the British. These empires left their marks on the soil as well as on the psyche of the people of the subcontinent. This is reflective in the propagation of an inclusive art and literature. Thus, the distinct identities, Hindu, Persian, and Arabic are preserved and presented as receptive social interplay. Therefore, while on the one end religion defines a diverse psychological and cultural tapestry of the Indian subcontinent, at times it becomes a negative instrument of division and disruption and at other times an assimilative and cohesive force.

By that very fact, religion is a dialogic concern of many different ethnicities and it is the literary narratives that use this rather lucrative and intriguing situation to their ends. These narratives offer allegiance to a regional identity in the face of religious disparities, as is seen in *Train to Pakistan*, where belonging to the village, Mano Majra, has been an innate unifying force, when religion is used as an instrument to spread disorder. Even the rulers of this region have used this regional affiliation to coalesce disparate religious identities, weaving them into the yoke of the subcontinent's tapestry, with diverse rulers and subjects.

Though opinions and historical critiques on the Mughal Empire's pragmatic polity vary, however, Emperor Akbar's reign in India, which started in 1556, is often quoted as an era when religion became a private matter and debates on interreligious interactions were widely engaged. In all intents, Akbar wanted to accomplish religious and cultural harmony, therefore introducing *Din-i-Ilahi* (Religion of God), a new religion. It was a project with a view to establish sociopolitical harmony among Hindus and Muslims of the region. He strove to build an empire on the foundation of eclecticism bringing closer the diverse religious groups under one platform. He was influenced greatly by the *bhakti* movement, and supported Muslim and Hindu mystics propagating unity of all religions. Although Akbar's project of religious homogeneity did not achieve the desired results and was prematurely denounced by a reactionary factionalism, it did pave way for a religious dialogic in India and modern secular India remained indebted to Akbar's vision of religious pluralism despite its homogenous inclinations.

While religion in India is a factor that calibrates different kinds of allegiances, language is another important signifier of one's ethnic identity because India, owing to its cultural and geographical enormity, has a vast reservoir of regional and international languages brought together by diverse rulers. Though Persian remained the courtly and official language, Mughals also used Urdu language as a unifying force because Urdu took birth in India unlike Persian, which came to India with its conquerors. However, this is not to deny that a great body of knowledge and discourse had already been produced in classical Indian language, Sanskrit. Therefore,

encouraging Urdu was on one hand an attempt to subjugate India lingually under a new order of cultural priorities while on the other hand, it was a method to create a bridge between communities divided by their parochial religious concerns. By a dint of fortune and a spirit of aesthetic cultivation Urdu not only replaced Persian but also became a symbol of unification between the Hindus and Muslims. It is noteworthy that the Mughals as they collectively deemed it to be their aesthetic prerogative patronized art and literature greatly. According to *A Short History of Hind-Pakistan*, “A special feature of the Mughul Emperors was that each one of them was fond of the arts and letters. Their generous patronage of the arts attracted the greatest of Persian artists and poets to Hind-Pakistan” (266) creating an equal space and facility for all communities to express their aesthetic of cultural transcendence consequently accomplishing a literary domain of dialogic creativity and potential.

Once again it was Akbar who showed the greatest of proclivity for bridging gaps between religions through art. Akbar himself was fascinated by the drawings of a young boy Vishwanath who was the son of a Hindu water-carrier. Akbar placed Vishwanath under Khwajah Abdul Majid [a Muslim artist], and the water-carrier’s son attained unique artistic dexterity due to the influence. This was a supreme example of the patronage of art beyond religious identity. Therefore, in literature, painting, and architecture, Muslims and Hindus found a dialogic of creative interaction and assimilation. The dialectic of the ruler and the ruled deflated, entailing a larger compendium of literary and aesthetic production. On a symbolic level it was the initiation of dialogic imaginary constituting disparate cultural and religious elements converging for the accomplishment of a more inclusive vision of art. The rediscovering of similarities between different religious groups showed that art as compared to a dogmatic blend of religion was a more flexible and productive medium of bringing people together under an interreligious arch of pantheistic mysticism.

Since pantheistic mysticism often bypasses rigid dogmatic affiliations and harbors an intrinsic dialogic capacity, therefore, it is instructive to explore the Sufi discourse of India. In *A Companion to Philosophy of Religion*, Charles Taliaferro, an American philosopher specializing in Theology and Philosophy of Religion, explains, “Pantheists do not believe in a distinct personal or anthropomorphic God” (Taliaferro et al. 2010, 340). Hence, with reference to how pantheism is directly related to Sufism, E. G. Parrinda, a professor of comparative religion at King’s College London, writes, “The Islamic religious tradition in particular, Sufism and Alevism has a strong belief in the unitary nature of the Universe and the concept that everything in it is an aspect of God itself. . .may lean closer to pantheism” (Parrinda 1970, 3). Therefore, a more flexible form of pantheism founded roots in Indian

soil creating a mutual space where different mystic ideals could negotiate for a common and consensual ground. Hence, these shared symbols remain unifying mediums. Both Hindus and Muslims were equally influenced by the preaching of Sufi saints which brought the two communities closer, paving way for interaction both on mundane and more sublime levels of life. The reciprocity of faith and practice between Islam and Hinduism is seen in the efforts of saints such as Kabir, Nanak, and Dadu. These saints believed strongly that interaction between these faiths can lead to dialogue, and can reduce the intensity at least of external strife perpetuated by a history of animosity and rivalry. By that very fact, the "tenacity with which attempts continued to be made to establish links between the two religions" is seen in "the cultural history of the Mughals" (Ikram 1964, IX) and the Sufi saints in particular.

Moreover, sufis used Urdu as a language of interaction with different communities. From an objective point of view this is an evidence of politics of language while for orthodox Hindus it was an onslaught on their identity, as much of Hindu religious literature and scriptural discourse was in Sanskrit and in other regional languages as well as dialects. Nevertheless, sufis were successful in attracting and enfolding the marginalized sections of Indian population who were desperate for social recognition, may it come in any way or through any lingual path. The Sufi saints, as depicted in *A Short History of Hind-Pakistan*, "used it [Urdu] in conveying their message of goodness and humanity to every nook and corner of the region." Urdu was "synthetical in construction" (PHB 1955, 270) and it was this synthesis that was predominant in the art and literature of the subcontinent. The literary influence of Sufi mystics of the region, especially Rumi, claiming, "Love alone takes us to Reality" (qtd. in Iqbal 2004, 280) contributed to a yearning for integration. Therefore, Urdu language initiated a lingual dialogue between different communities and this can also be seen in a surge of Hindu writers adapting Urdu not only as a language of literary mode, but a language which can help clarify historical and cultural haze hanging over divergent communities as India remained a site of external invasion and conquest.

The Mughals maintained a general policy of integration and assimilation through art and literature, and in this regard, Emperor Aurangzeb's approach was more orthodox. Although Aurangzeb became a little controversial by adapting a strict religious policy for the state and by showing his ruthless political will by persecuting his opponents, killing his brothers, and imprisoning his father, there is much about him that needs to be rediscovered. Although, personally he was initiated into a Sufi order and had lived an austere life, his political decisions were more or less in conjunction with his religious convictions. Nonetheless, his predecessors were mostly successful in cultivating a secular ideal for India which even Aurangzeb was not successful

in dislodging and which perhaps was his earnest intention. According to Hindu historian, Devyani Onial, Aurangzeb "tipped the scale . . . the fact is that he was an able administrator but also one who contributed to creating schisms." Therefore, while Aurangzeb showed his skills of governance in matters related to religion owing to his cut-and-dried policies, hostilities among Hindus and Muslims increased with "re-impositions of jizya, tax on non-Muslims" and "desecration of temples" (Onial 2015, 1). This also suggests that Aurangzeb was unable to see the working of his state without the support of religious dogma. He gave grants to temples and fostered cordial relations with the Rajput nobles, but his policies continued to create an air of antagonism between Hindus and Muslims. Consequently, from a political point of view, the disintegration of the Mughal Empire started with Emperor Aurangzeb's rule. He "was largely responsible for the downfall of the empire. His predecessors did a lot to win over the loyalties of their subjects. . . . But Aurangzeb was a fanatic and could not tolerate the non-Muslims" (Nandita 1). It is quite understandable that why Aurangzeb could not attract a more attributive attention of historians and was often seen as a religious fanatic threatening the norms of coexistence perpetuated by his predecessors with a great degree of ordeal. The single-mindedness with which he pursued his ideals is also reflected in the architecture of his time. He concentrated more on architecture which showed his entrenched love for Islamic art and therefore a puritanical element dominated the aesthetics of his era.

Inferentially, before Aurangzeb, literary aesthetics was more dialogic and was vulnerable to experimentations and influences as seen in depiction of birds, flora and fauna, or a painting of the valley of Kashmir and the Hindus' contribution to Persian literature. Mughals were nature-lovers, and the portrayal of nature promoted a universality of values and ethics till the time of Aurangzeb's reign. In *A Short History of Hind-Pakistan*, it is recounted that "there was an incessant and bitter struggle" between "rival parties," making the "Court a hot-bed of intrigue" (PHB 1955, 120). Earlier Mughal emperors tried to work toward integration through teachings of Sufi saints; however, Aurangzeb's successors completely lacked the "valor and vitality" for integration which created an "internecine strife" (PHB 1955, 313). Seeing this trajectory of vacillation between orthodox and liberal elements it is clear that while Mughals were committed to a dialogic representation of India, there were also intervening phases when representation of an interactive communal spirit ebbed away. However, this also proves that each Mughal emperor had an independent perception of governing India, which in turn suggests the existence of an internal spirit of competitive dialogic which the Mughal Empire implemented and from time to time revamped and questioned.

Colonization and the arrival of European merchandise on Indian soil embarked on a note of awareness of adding to the necessity of consolidating

the dialogic spirit preciously nurtured by the Mughal Empire. However, Europeans had an economic interest in the region therefore, Portuguese, Dutch, and British traders in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, approached the local communities from a financial perspective. They also tried to exploit local authorities in a bid to shake the roots of an already disintegrating Mughal Empire. Europeans' colonial economic greed and moral bankruptcy of a decaying Mughal authority further contributed to the necessity of renewed terms of engagement; hence, local people anticipated new terms of social and mercantile culture later introduced by European business-class settlers.

This meant that communal interaction which earlier struggled to gain a common ground between India's communities represented by different faiths was now extending its mental and physical territory to a foreign element. Now the dialogic actors of India represented by different faiths found a new arena of East encountering the colonial West. In this regard, the role of East India Company was decisive. Initially, the English East India Company predominated the Deccan and Bengal regions, weakening and dividing Hindus and Muslims across ethnic concerns. The subsequent conquest of the British Empire further deteriorated the relations among religious communities. In all intents, the decline of the Mughal Empire and gradual taking over of India by the British initiated the urgency of recognizing and establishing dialogic interaction between the European native groups, and this led to a new phase of crisis of identity so to say, indigenous groups did not relinquish their ethnic identity but their collective identity was subsumed by a modern and more capable empire. The dialogic interaction which was once a historical hallmark for different religious faiths, and which the visionary Mughals achieved valiantly now surrendered to colonial scrutiny, approval, and gaze.

The British colonial empire was the new body of surveillance now monitoring the complexities of communal strife and harmony. In this regard, they brought their version of communal dialogic spirit. However, one cannot dismiss the fact that their primary concern was to protect their vested interests as the new rulers of India. Consequently, the ideology behind the British governance was "divide and rule" (Stewart 1951, 49). As Sir John Strachey, a British civil servant, writes, "the existence side by side of the hostile creeds is one of the strongest points in our political position in India" (Strachey 1988, 225). Therefore, the events of 1857 suggest that colonial intervention of upbringing communities to loggerheads was not greatly successful; however, as the demand for independence attuned to a vociferous ethnic tone, the animosity among different religious groups increased and reached its climax at the time of partition in 1947. The writers of the region, such as Sidhwa, Singh, Desai, and Masroor display the animosity as an engendered tool to divide the populace as they engage with recollections, memories, and

recorded data on the event of partition in their fictional works. In *Ice-Candy-Man*, the Government House gardener proclaims beseechingly, "When our friends confess they want to kill us, we have to go . . . ," as his "tears" run down, his eyes "blurred and soggy . . . as if he has become addicted to weeping" (Sidhwa 1998, 157). The fiction projected the emotions, feelings, and expressions of the multiple religious groups, thus incorporating a psychological dimension to the event as well, procuring another dialogic site which converges the characters due to the common psychological trauma.

Therefore, the partition of India is a seminal juncture in the history of the subcontinent as it almost seals the fate of communities from further interaction but in an ironic vein of history it also provides an ample opportunity of the resurgence of dialogic intervention appropriated through literacy medium. This means that fictional geography is vast enough to accommodate the fissures and ruptures happening on physical geography. This book provides an insight into narratives on partition presenting dialogic possibilities in the wake of antagonism witnessed between India and Pakistan at the time of partition and post-partition. Stanley Wolpert, in his book *India and Pakistan: Continued Conflict or Cooperation?* points out that the British Empire left India planting a legacy of antagonism (2010, 2). Therefore, in the first instance, fiction from writers in the Indian subcontinent responds to this inheritance of antagonism and then diagnostically addresses the psychological patrimony of the partition of 1947 by constructing narratives hinged on dialogic capacity. The subsequent chapters divulge how literary fiction offers dialogue through heteroglossia, polyphony, and chronotope which are all salient elements of Bakhtin's theory of dialogism. As mentioned earlier, the theory provides a platform on which the idea and concept of dialogue rests, especially with reference to the narratives of partition. The novels surveyed in this project, document the event of 1947 egregiously and their plots loom around embedded stories of communal strife, violence, and hatred.

These novels present a conglomeration of ethnic and communal ethos. One of the central concerns in these novels is the element of coexistence. Before partition coexistence was the healing center of India witnessing a rather perennial ebb and flow of religious contingencies. As Quit India Movement gathered momentum the collective concern was to drive out the British; however, as Hindus and Muslims developed differences the much-celebrated culture of coexistence began to wither off giving way to contentious nevertheless an entrenched ideological dialogic of national and patriotic rhetoric imbued with religious and ethnic tones. The harmony between different religious faiths split into factions controlling public spaces with hatred and violence. Political parties such as Indian National Congress and All India Muslim League were initially in favor of Hindu–Muslim unity and conceived the British as their sole rival but gradually became exclusive representative

voices of ethnic identities, although they also maintained a veneer of pluralistic nationalism.

The four novels, *Ice-Candy-Man*, *Train to Pakistan*, *Clear Light of Day*, and *Shadows of Time,* portray communal coexistence as the backbone of Indian society. These novels both in tone and intent are narratives of dialogism. With this context in mind, the question is how the novels about partition show differences and similarities among the multireligious populace of India and Pakistan as precursors of dialogue? Now that the event of partition is physically over, the literary reappropriation of this event offers alternative and more dialogic ways of reading the desire for a communal coexistence wiped by an indifferent wave of religious and political vendetta. In this regard, the book investigates and presents polyphonic voices of narration in these novels and how narrators' and fictional characters' voices illustrate the event of partition.

Taking the same point further, Nicholas Stewart, a science fiction writer, in his essay "Magical Realism," claims that the modern novel "comprises and compresses" "cultural history" (1999, 2); therefore, the novel offers alternative perspectives on the real event of history. According to Simon Dentith, a professor of English at the University of Reading, UK, in *Bakhtinian Thought*, claims the novel is not "passive"; it "reflects relation to history that surrounds and produces it." Hence, the novel reflects the multiple voices which make it "an active intervention in the heteroglossia in which it lives and moves" (Dentith 1996, 4). Consequently, it enables a "dialogized heteroglossia" (Dentith 1996, 4). Heteroglossia offers representation of multiple voices. Therefore, the novels which I have chosen document the Parsees', Sikhs', Hindus', and Muslims' perspectives on the partition of the subcontinent contributing to a broad spectrum relay of voices. In short, these novels are polyphonic in terms of their engagement with India's history of ethnic and communal content; that is to say, that novel and history impact upon each other in a counterproductive way. Inferentially, the novels written on the event of partition also produce an alternative version of the event of the partition, thus, the historical and ideological voices are not the only voices and that there are other voices present, broadcasted through narrators and characters, which compete in dialogic fashion stressing on the unheard, embedded, and subterranean layers of communal interaction despite the fact that ideological and religious forces wanted communities to remain partisan and loyal to single dogma and one nationalism.

Interestingly, what is consigned to and lost through perpetuation of bias and ideological vigilantism is partly recovered on fictional terrain housing disparate voices on partition. The novels on partition offer ample space for dialogic consumption and accordingly document personal and public, historical and political, as well as religious and secular discourses contending and

imbricating for diverse implication. The four novels, mentioned above, are about the events of 1947 and demonstrate a diverse tapestry of the event of partition through narrators', characters', and authorial voices belonging to Parsee, Sikh, Hindu, and Muslim religions. Thereby these novels, as Mikhail M. Bakhtin explains dialogism in his essays, can be categorized as heteroglot novels since they entertain polyphonic voices of different religious and communal groups in India and Pakistan, while concurrently engaging with the repercussions contingent upon geographical and ideological fissures, overlapping the time and space of partition and post-partition.

Hence, the various fictionalized narratological trajectories of ethnic and communal life depicted in these novels are deconstructed. The underlying concern is to show the points of convergence and disjunctions among these communal identities that all went through the horrors of partition and were both induced and disillusioned by ideological and religious inflections revolving around the events of 1947.

Furthermore, as I have argued that the novels on partition hold a polyphonic fabric of narrative so one more aspect, mentioned earlier, which these novels address, is the shaping of the psychology of communal response to the events of 1947, and how its consequent political turpitude re-evolves in psychological terms. Therefore, the partition of 1947 has often been called a traumatic discourse. Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs, Christians, and Parsees arguably shared a collective trauma of displacement, dislocation, and relocation. The similarities and elisions between communal suffering and trauma springing from the tumultuous events of 1947 are in fact stories of displacement, dislocation, murder, rape, and arson which signify an exceptionally pernicious range of religious loyalties ramifying into intricate psychological communal aberrations.

While dialogic communal voices resisting hatred and religious frenzy articulate their concerns and accumulate sizably in these narratives, individual voices are also audible and alive. In *Ice-Candy-Man*, Sidhwa's characters belonging to different faiths and beliefs, find a common space, the Queen's Park, to engage in a dialogue while voicing their individual opinions with respect to induced communal disparateness. Each character outpours his or her grievances of partition. The Parsee narrator and character serves as a major link weaving the opinions of Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, and Christian characters. Similarly, Khushwant Singh, in *Train to Pakistan,* portrays the shared spectrum of loyalties which existed between Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims as they lived together for centuries in the village, Mano Majra. The desire for larger coexistence is stronger than taking care of narrow religious ties. Anita Desai in *Clear Light of Day* also shows the partition of 1947 from dialogic and individualistic perspectives. In Desai's novel, a Hindu boy, Raja, marries a Muslim girl that suggests that the author's intention is secular as

well as dialogic. Raja's sisters and his widowed aunt have divergent views on this intercommunal marriage. Similarly, *Shadows of Time*, by Mehr Nigar Masroor, also provides the changing patterns of orientation between Hindus and Muslims of nineteenth-century Bengal and post-partition India and Pakistan. Under colonial empire the relationship between communities changed to mutual ends, thus damaging the fabric of dialogic vision. The extramarital relationship between Gul Rukh, a Muslim woman and an orthodox Hindu character, Sisr, points out toward the dominance of passion and love over ideology and religion. This also suggests that dialogic ties are not subservient to hackneyed traditions and outdated norms, and all novels included in this book problematize implications of such resistant, defiant, and unyielding complexion of communal dialogic.

Having illustrated the working dynamic of dialogic element in the narratives of the novels which I choose to explore, I find it instructive to explain the valance and transference of dialogism in relation to monologism. This explanation provides an understanding of the framework of dialogism, on which, this study and the subsequent argument bases its main premise. Dialogism denotes "the quality of an instance of discourse that explicitly acknowledges that it is defined by its relationship to other instances, both past, to which it responds, and future, whose response it anticipates" (Shepherd 2011, 1). For Mikhail M. Bakhtin, a single word is as dialogic as the entire work. So, Bakhtin takes the concept of dialogism further into language, making language dynamic and in relation to how one engages with and describes the world. In this context, I will vehemently engage and recast concepts such as the "utterances, evaluation, accent, social dialogue," polyphonic voices, and heterology. Bakhtin's work on dialogism, internalized dialogism, and "dialogized heteroglossia" (Denitith 1996, 4) shows ways of understanding the genre of novel, its language, words, and utterances. Bakhtin's concept of dialogism conceives space and time as two significant markers in the plot and narration of a novel, hence, the notion of chronotope, distinctness of voices through heteroglossia, and polyphony are relevant to the concept of partition novels, which specifically pirouette around the space of India and the time of partition, offering different voices of individuals, experiencing the event of partition from their distinct perspective, yet maintaining a dialogic of coexistence.

In comparison to Bakhtin, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's philosophy has a monologic stance and offers dialectically monologic discourse. For dialogism contextual meaning is of prime significance. It is noteworthy, that the "perception of an event" is called "dialogue" (Brandist and Tihanov 2000, 24). However, according to Bakhtin, "monologization is a prerequisite for a singular consciousness to enter into a dialogue or a monologue." So, "monologism is not so much an opposition, as a complement to dialogism, . . . the

structure of a particular event [speech act] that is 'waiting' to be" (Brandist and Tihanov 2000, 25). Hence, if historical documents are monologic, these complement the dialogic novels in understanding structure of the event. Historical documents are utterances with a singular conscious and they do not "relinquish the floor to the other or . . . make room for the other's active responsive understanding" (Bakhtin *SGLE* 1986, 71). There is thus, a relationship between the dialectic, dialogic, and dialogism. The "dialectic stands as the essential [or ontological] structure of experience, in the same way as dialogue stands as the central feature of existence. But it is dialogism that mediates between them in the understanding of their mutual relation." Thus, Bakhtin presents how and why "dialogue and dialectic differ." The differences are embedded in the presentation. Hegelian dialectic is "logically and historically" presented whereas, "dialogism functions in relation to historically reproduced, existing forms" (Brandist and Tihanov 2000, 28). The novel as a genre has the capacity to transmit multiple voices and thereby offer plural consciousness. These multiple yet distinct voices provide subjectivity to art. In order to abandon complete reliance on historical discourse the concepts of chronotope, heteroglossia, and polyphony are presented one by one after analyzing the position of the novel in presenting dialogic invocations as opposed to historians' monologic inferences.

Therefore, a close analysis of monologism as opposed to and as a complement to dialogism is significant. Bakhtin suggests unfolding of historical events through exploration of multiple sources. He does not ask for a monologic response to events but a dialogic response, which engages with all the sources. In this regard, dialogue present in different perspectives of characters in fiction is explored and understood in comparison to monologue proffered in historical discourse by a singular voice. Therefore, polyphony and heteroglossia in fiction, which form the core of the dialogue initiated in the four novels, in particular, are surveyed in greater detail and located in texts for the invocation of dialogue. The dialogue in a novel exists between characters, author, and the reader. The multiple voices which a novel hosts are seen as polyphony, which is borrowed from musicology, and "literally means multiple voices" (Robinson 2011, 2).

The novels show "an interaction of distinct perspectives or ideologies, borne by the different characters. The characters are able to speak for themselves, even against the author" (Robinson 2011, 2). This aspect becomes the core of these novels, as the authority of the author is suspended as the ideological bedrock. The characters appear to "speak directly through the text . . . the author can no longer monopolise the 'power to mean'" (Robinson 2011, 2). This is allotted to the reader, and the characters with their distinct voices allocate this power. The concept of polyphony is thus, understood as an antonym to the homophony which confers "one transcendental perspective"

as an integrating force. This is thus, a monologic perspective, "made up of objects, integrated through a single consciousness." The other's opinions and ideas are "reduced to the state of objects. They are not recognized as 'another consciousness.'" The polyphonic dialogic novel opens the world to the others word while monologic discourse "closes the world" to a supposedly "ultimate word" (Robinson 2011, 2). Hence, "rights of consciousness" are removed, constructing monologic truth. The subjects are "denied" the right to "produce autonomous meaning" (Robinson 2011, 3). Such an autonomous meaning is integral for interpretation of reality as experienced by many and not a single subject, as each subject has to offer his or her opinion and ideas in the world they live in. The novels on partition chosen for this book carry the subject and his or her voice as a means of conveying and conferring differing ideas.

Monologic novels on the other hand, use characters to "transmit the author's ideology" (Robinson 2011, 3). While Bapsi Sidhwa, Khushwant Singh, Anita Desai, and Mehr Nigar Masroor may have their distinct religious and ethnic identities, as writers they offer multiple perspectives of their characters, propounding the "autonomy of the other's voice." As a contrast to monologism, these novels broach "multiplicity of perspectives and voices." The significant feature is that the characters have their final word and each word has an interactive and relative quality allowing dialogue between characters and even the setting.

These authors do not subordinate the characters rather interact with them on an equal level. Since, "Human consciousness is not a unified entity, but rather, is always conflict-ridden between different consciousnesses," it cannot and does not "exist in isolation." As is apparent in the case of the conflict-ridden ideologies of Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, and Parsees at the time of partition, and the novels introduce and attend to the opinion of all rather than one. The conflicts are shown as a source of interaction, "addressivity, engagement, and commitment" to multiple versions of the truth. Thus, "truth requires many incommensurable voices" (Robinson 2011, 3) which do not supersede the other's voice. This, in turn, is heteroglossia, which this book manifests that it is present within these partition novels and thereby these are dialogic sites on partition, rather than monologic sites offering a dialectic approach of the authoritative historian.

These heteroglossic novels portend, "even within a single perspective, there are always multiple perspectives." Therefore, the task of the author is cumbersome, as he has to display this social heteroglossia through the "combination" of "elements." In the case of the partition novels written in English, a "unified language" (Robinson 2011, 3) is used to offer multiple voices. According to Bakhtin, "Most often, the 'standard' language [such as standard English] is taken from the speech of the elite. Such an elevation of a particular hegemonic language suppresses the heteroglossia of multiple

everyday speech-types" (Robinson 2011, 3). Therefore, it can be assumed that the English novel tends to portray hegemony. However, the English language in these novels is used as a means to suppress one dominant discourse of the Oriental or the Occident and produce multiple discourses. Therefore, the English language is not used to close any voice rather it is used to close nationalism, which does not allow relay of diverse and multiple voices, as nationalism is "ambivalent" and a "representation of social life" only and not "social polity" (Bhabha *Nation and Narration* 1990, 1). The "dominant discourse" of the Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, and Parsees are centripetal, however, adopting a language common to all allows a "centrifugal process which" can "diversify language." This defamiliarizes "one's own perspective" and creates a "social field of interacting ways of seeing" which mediates "relationship between speaker and the world." Hence, language in this regard, proffers "social ways of seeing" (Robinson 4) which are fundamental for dialogue.

Dialogue offers "a necessary multiplicity of human perception," which in turn helps in "homogenizing" the "rest of the world" (Holquist 2001, 22). In this context, the question is, can the "internal dialogism of the word" (Bakhtin *DI* 1981, 279) of the narrative hold possibilities of heterogenization in a land divided by borders and boundaries? This book shows how these possibilities are inherent in the world of the narrative and thereby the significance of dialogue in a heterogeneous rather than homogeneous world. The shared symbols within the narratives are surveyed as "existence is shared," and "it will manifest itself as the condition of being addressed. Existence is not only an event, it is an utterance. The event of existence has the nature of dialogue" (Holquist 2001, 27). Holquist elaborates, "In dialogism this sharedness is indeed the nature of fate for us all" (2001, 28), and therefore leads the way toward the exploration of these shared symbols within the narratives. He writes, "Relation, . . . is also a telling, a narrative," and "Sharing existence as an event means among other things that we are—we cannot choose not to be—in dialogue, not only with other human beings, but also with the natural and cultural configurations we lump together as the world." He says, "we are compelled to respond" (Holquist 2001, 30), which implies a natural responsibility to indulge in dialogue. The word demands a response. The narrative demands a responsive utterance, which can be another narrative in turn. Thus, the book presents relations within the word and the narrative through exploration of words, symbols, and shared symbols offering a dialogic site.

The dialogic site is composed of spatial and temporal sites which make up the whole entity. Since, this book focuses on the space of India and Pakistan as undivided and divided as well as the time particular to the event of partition 1947, the spatiotemporal relationship becomes significant. The narratives can then be "perceived as a whole" by being "shaped in the time/space categories of the other" (Holquist 2001, 31), sharing the events of that time and

space. Hence, dialogism can be understood from the angle of shared perceptions, as “sharing is not only an ethical or economic mandate, but a condition inherent in the very fact of being human” (Holquist 2001, 34).

Accordingly, sometimes at the cost of overwhelming theoretical framework an overview of the concepts of dialogism, heteroglossia, polyphony, and chronotope as located in the novels provides an understanding of connected perceptions in the narratives. This reliance on the time—space categories can help “make sense of existence” through dialogue. As time and space are “basic categories of perception,” “We perceive the world through the time/space of the self *and* through the time/space of the other” (Holquist 2001, 35), making sense of the “whole.” Indians and Pakistanis shared a space: the subcontinent, for centuries, and the event of partition 1947 proved to be a time when the space was divided between the two political entities, Indians and the Pakistanis. The quest is to show how the narratives written about this time and space provide means of heterogeneity, wholeness, and connectivity through the scrutiny of “internal dialogism of the word” (Bakhtin *DI* 279) and “dialogized heteroglossia” (Bakhtin *DI* 1981, 272). Heteroglossia as we know it is the celebration of distinctness in voices in a single language and how these varieties can coexist.

There are three categories: hybridization, dialogized interrelation, and pure dialogues (Bakhtin DI 358) which are found embedded within the novels of Indo-Pak opening avenues in exploration of possibilities of these dialogized relations amid the two countries. As, there is an interplay between the discourse of the novel and the discourse of life, fiction from Indo-Pak region may contribute to interaction of multiple yet inimitable voices (which are heteroglossic) of the people of this region.

Additionally, in heteroglossic novels, “Speech is always directed towards or through a field of ‘alien words’; . . . an active and engaged understanding of other’s discourse incorporated the other’s perspective into one’s own frame, giving it new inflections and nuances.” This incorporates “new elements” and thus, “Dialogue” “orients to the perspective of the other.” Therefore, as a corollary, “assimilating other’s perspectives’ can lead to “self-actualization” which interestingly, “makes something new of the other’s perspective by merging it with one’s own” (Robinson 2011, 4). This merger, interaction, and subsequent adaptation of the other’s discourse in a novel mark the recognition of such traits in the real world. In this manner, literature has “enormous social power,” meaning “that entire world-views are shaped by changes between monological and dialogical types of literature. Epics and poetry create fatalistic and closed worlds, whereas novels create open worlds” (Robinson 2011, 5). These open worlds thereby connote possibilities of opening borders and boundaries.

Furthermore, the book proffers how these novels are polyphonic and that polyphony creates a world transmitting many sounds or voices. In literature,

however, polyphony is an element of the narrative including diversity of perspectives, views, and even voices. The "texture of voices" in texts offers multiple perspectives by decoding "layers of voices and languages embedded within that voice," which imbues from the notion that there is a "collective quality of an individual utterance; that is, the capacity of my utterance to embody someone else's utterance even while it is mine, which thereby creates a dialogic relationship between two voices" (Park-Fuller 1986, 2). These novels have "different voices, unmerged into a single perspective, and not subordinated to the voice of the author. Each of these voices has its own perspective, its own validity, and its own narrative weight within the novel" as a polyphonic novel does according to Robinson (2011, 2). These present the Muslim, Hindu, Parsee, and Sikh voices of the inhabitants of united India and the partitioned India and Pakistan. The voices carry their sociopolitical and religious ideologies with regard to coexistence and partition. Since these different identities coexisted for centuries their voices reveal a nexus of opinion and ideological consensus which the historical and political discourse neglected. The novel thus becomes a site for the demonstration of their shared yet distinct voices.

In the case of partition, the standpoint of each religious group becomes important in discerning their voices on division and its repercussions. Even after the partition, the political voice is presented in the politico-historical discourse but the individual voice is presented in the fiction that generates from this region. Thus, the "reader does not see a single reality presented by the author, but rather, how reality appears to each character" (Robinson 2011, 2).

Therefore, exploration of these polyphonic voices offers a dialogic "relationship between ideology and utterance" (Park-Fuller 1986, 1) inherently present in the narrative and inter-narrative discourse of and about partition.

Concomitantly, chronotope is used to identify the dialogic possibilities in the novels about partition as they use space as a literary trope of real and imagined dislocation of various communities at the time which is pre-partition, partition, and post-partition. The traumatic experience of both spatial and temporal dislocation is deeply encoded in the novels about partition. Chronotope is a study of time and space. Hence, with a view to deconstruct the spatiotemporal ramifications of the event of partition, documented in the novels by Indian and Pakistani writers, I co-opt chronotope as a dialogic medium which also questions the complex configuration of time and space in fictional narratives. It is time and space that make up the "whole entity" (Bakhtin *DI* 1981). The research examines the novels written about the "space" or land of India and Pakistan in the context of the "time" of partition; hence these literary representations of the region provide an insight into the region and its dynamics as a whole entity: the united India and the partitioned space of India and Pakistan. The concept of chronotope means,

"the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships" (Bakhtin *FTC* 1981, 84). Bakhtin "borrowed" this concept from German philosopher Immanuel Kant and German physicist Albert Einstein. Einstein's relativity theory, which states that "time and space are in essence categories through which human beings perceive and structure the surrounding world and hence 'indispensable forms of cognition,'" is seminal to the concept of chronotope. So, in both fictional and "physical worlds," there is an "intrinsic connectedness of time and space." It is so "because in both realm chronology cannot be separated from events and vice versa" (Bemong *TLC* 2010, 5). Holquist further explains this as "[a]n event is always a dialogic unit in so far as it is a co-relation; something happens only when something else with which it can be compared reveals a change in time and space" (Holquist 2001, 5). Hence, "an opening of history more than a 'definitive' judgement of it" (Brandist and Tihanov 2000, 36) is important, and fiction provides this possibility through its engagement and interaction with time and space as whole rather than isolated elements.

Furthermore, the multiple voices of the fictional characters belonging to multiple faiths are explicated as mediums of dialogue while endorsing heteroglot and polyphonic existences in the wake of politics of division. As history is a voice too in the multiple spectrum of voices on partition, historical discourses can be used in conjunction, forming a dialogic nexus between the various perspectives on the event of partition which are fictionalized by Indian and Pakistani novelists. Historical discourse which lacks the space and word for the other's speech and voice is thus studied in relation to the novels opening spaces for the word of the other.

Non-fictional, historical, and political discourse provides a parallel study of the event of partition, its causes and outcomes in deciding the political and strategic framework of the region. The disparity in the monologic and dialogic perspectives of the different types of discourses is conveyed with textual references.

Moreover, historical texts also engage with the geographical divisions consequent upon the event of 1947. Ilyas Chattha's book *Partition and Locality* offers a historical background to the event of partition and a commentary on the outcome of partition. Chattha is a history lecturer at University of Southampton, and he presents the "backdrop" of violence and the subsequent partition, attributing the differences as engendered by the "heightened religious identities" "politicized" by the British to encourage "polarization" (Chattha 2011, 253), in a bid to dissolve alliances against the British. On the other hand, Ayesha Jalal, a professor of history at Tufts University, in her book *The Pity of Partition*, argues that poets, writers, and artists have shown the "pity of partition" more effectively than academics. She explores Saadat Hasan Manto's works and offers an alternative perspective of the monologic

experience of partition as reported by historians as opposed to the dialogic experience narrated in fiction. Therefore, it is not only the fictional endeavors which form the focus but inclusion of the historian's perspective is mandatory in incorporating the whole picture of the event of partition. The non-fictional narratives provide scaffolding to the critical references on the themes of dialogic communalism.

Conversely, Stanley Wolpert's *India and Pakistan*: *Continued Conflict or Cooperation?* proffers political dynamics responsible for the division of the subcontinent, providing a discursive perspective on the event of partition and its players. Wolpert, is an American academic and Indologist, and he describes how political players first manipulated the idea of division and then mishandled it, thereby, contributing to death of "one million" Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs. He writes, "Britain's last viceroy, Admiral Lord Louis Mountbatten . . . , foolishly halved the timetable allotted to him by British Prime Minister . . . to resolve the conflicts that divided India's political leaders" (Wolpert 2010, 7). However, Mountbatten "quickly grew bored" of the "squabble" between the two, Indian National Congress and the Muslim League that "he urged" the prime minister to "advance Britain's withdrawal . . . to mid-August 1947 rather than . . . June 1948" (Wolpert 2010, 7). This urgency led to an unorganized partition and imposed an embittered acceptance of new borders leading further to events of cross-border migration submerged in bloodshed. In this context, Wolpert's *India and Pakistan: Continued Conflict Or Cooperation?* and *Shameful Flight* are both seen reflections of a traumatic experience through the lens of a detached observer. According to Isaac Chotiner in "Enough is Enough," Wolpert's first line in *India and Pakistan*, " No Asian Conflict has proved more deadly, costly, or intractable than that which continues to divide India and Pakistan over Kashmir" (qtd.in Chotiner 2011) presents "his limited vision" (Chotiner 2011). Chotiner, a political strategist, claims Wolpert has a limited view of partitioning of countries since he has seen only these two countries. Therefore, he cannot proclaim judgment on the pretext of limited knowledge. He is unaware of the Asian crises, like the Cambodian and Korean crises and the subsequent trauma these countries faced. While Wolpert's book aims to display a "fervent hope" that "solution can be found before a nuclear war commences" (Chotiner 2011), his book does not take into account the voice of the Indians and Pakistanis as fiction webbed around this issue does. Therefore, it is integral to see his view in the light of the points of view of the subjects of partition, the participants of the event as they observed the event while engaging with it firsthand. The novelists gave these participants their voices.

In the same manner, Jaswant Singh's *Jinnah*: *India-Partition-Independence* is an arduous effort at relaying a journalist's perspective of a political leader, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, however, Singh's voice as a historian is quite

dominant, which is partial and biased. Furthermore, he has consciously tried to subdue his Sikh voice, which is a monologic stance as dialogue demands the presentation of all voices. He writes in the acknowledgments section, "This work is situated with emotions; it has to be, for how do you separate what Gandhi termed 'vivisection' from pain and feelings and emotions?" He further affirms his view as distinct from historians, "Historiographers will doubtless frown upon such an approach, I know, but I do not write as a cold, linear narrator of events alone" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, xv). Hence, Singh has tried to set the mood of the narrative as personal and partial, yet, the recording of events and their implications is akin to historiography.

As Singh records the events, he adds his opinion too, which makes his narrative subjective and distinct from a historian's narrative. However, the opinion is singular and monopolizes the author's voice as opposed to the genre of novel where the opinion is delegated to multiple characters allowing the reader access to various opinions rather than one. Singh further singularizes truth, when he claims, "The cruel truth is that this partitioning of India has actually resulted in achieving the very reverse of the originally intended purposes; partition, instead of settling contention between communities has left us a legacy of markedly enhanced Hindu, Muslim, Sikh or other such denominational identities, hence differences."(Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 8). Contrary to his claims of impartiality and of retracting from a particular identity, he speaks as an Indian and at places as a Sikh, since he confesses the account is subjective, his Indian and Sikh identities remain intact, while paradoxically claiming to erase his Sikh voice. He writes, "Reservation results finally in compartmentalizing society, hence ultimately in fragmenting national identity. That is what 'special reservation' for Muslims in India did" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 8). While he perpetually claims that he is not writing as a historian, there are contradictions in his writings which display his allegiance to the historians. He relays an embedded communal psyche when he claims, "Is not Indian historiography, therefore, [at least in part] responsible for creating a mindset of separateness, and that too, only from Islam, or fixedly as Hindus and Muslims?" at the same time, he proffers this separation embedded in his own discourse, when he writes, "Little wonder that thereafter this separation of the invader from the invaded, Muslim from the Hindu began to permeate our social consciousness and fabric."(Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 16–17). Hence, as opposed to fiction, Jaswant's book provides historical facts from the lens of an involved Indian Sikh who recognizes the politics of separation. He provides a rationale for Sikh's demand for Sikhistan, As opposed to the historian's proclamation of the demand of Sikhistan, fiction writer, Khushwant Singh in *Train to Pakistan* does not advocate or promote such a separatist demand. He merely presents the multifarious voices and opinions which can conjugate toward a dialogue.

Therefore, in the novels, there is a collage of opinions proffered distinctly, which are absent in the historians' accounts. Yet, Jaswant Singh's work cannot be undermined. His account is not linear and does incorporate feelings as part of opinion-making strategies, although the feelings project a singular consciousness of the author. In the genre of non-fiction writing his work propounds the significance of opinion as well as an objective observation of Muslim and Hindu characteristics.

Contrary to Wolpert's opinion, Singh claims, "Despite this it is difficult to place all blame on the British, that they alone divided the two communities so as to facilitate their rule; it was more that finding divisions already existing, these were rubbed raw by the British whenever they could do so, exploitatively" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 27). British rule in India, thus, played a manipulative role affecting dialogue between the two communities especially since 1905, when new reforms by Viceroy Minto, supposedly extending the elected principles, were introduced. However, historical discourse adverts that the Muslims realized the ineffectuality of these reforms and demanded separate electorates reiterating the "divide" induced by the colonizer.

Hence, apart from these historical discourses and novels, partition of united India by the British cannot be understood without reference to the colonial and postcolonial ideology and subsequent texts on the conceptualizations and postulations of colonized communities in the wake of dialogics of decolonization. The postcolonial writer is allocated a voice too, and his/her inclusion is unavoidable.

Contextually, decolonization is dependent on a variety of factors, economic dependence being one of these. There are other factors like hybridity or "mixed societies" which further complicate the process of decolonization. These mixed societies denote multiplicity in opinion. Thus, postcolonial identity in novels "shifts [*sic*] the focus from locations and institutions to individuals and their subjectivities" (Loomba 1998, 17). These have greater scope for presentation and are therefore reflected in the genre of the novel incorporating a dialogic potential.

While, "'postcolonialism' recognizes both historical *continuity* and *change*" (McLeod 2000, 33), according to John McLeod, the word *change* is significant in this regard, as it denotes "the promise, the possibility, and the continuing necessity of change, while recognizing that important challenges and changes have already been achieved." McLeod identifies the salience of "reading texts produced by writers from countries with a history of colonialism," "reading texts produced by those that have migrated from countries with a history of colonialism," and "re-reading texts produced during colonialism." Rereading thus, becomes an integral part since it is not a "neutral activity. *How* we read is just as important as *what* we read" (McLeod 2000, 33). Therefore, "rethinking conventional modes of reading is fundamental" to

postcolonial writing. Reading and rethinking is an active process and "colonial discourses can function in particular ways for different people at different times." Thus, according to McLeod "we should not presume consensus and totality where there is instead heterogeneity" (McLeod 2000, 34). Variations in time and space thereby offer variant perspectives of the same novel.

Nevertheless, merely reading texts is not going to bring the necessary change, writing and rewriting are important too. In order to communicate the individual's point of view in a postcolonial setting, fiction is once again referred to as the preferred choice. However, McLeod stresses the importance of rewriting. McLeod writes, "A re-writing does much more than merely 'fill in' the gaps perceived in the source-text. Rather, it enters into a productive dialogue with the source-text." He further emphasizes that a "re-writing often exists to resist or challenge colonialist representations of colonized peoples and cultures." It "implicates the reader as an active agent in determining the meanings made possible by the dialogue between the source-text and it's re-writing" (McLeod 2000, 168). There is "a relationship between the two novels" which "is much more dynamic and dialogic, enabling an interrogation of the agency of the 'classic' text to fix meaning" (McLeod 2000, 161). Therefore, reading, rethinking, writing, and rewriting are the active proponents of postcolonialism and are thus the source of communication and dialogue.

In this respect, while the event of partition of the colonized subcontinent marked a supposed disconnection from the colonial rule, the time and space determine a complex re-carving of physical and mental borders appearing in the wake of the event of 1947 and thus, re-presented in fictional narratives as sources of connection. The act of partition subjected the geography of India to various permeations and alterations. Arguably, the narratives or the novels on partition share thematic concerns but at times they tend to diverge as Indian and Pakistani writers are partly influenced by their subjective geographical circumstances. Therefore, through the close reading of the novels this book identifies a dialectically dialogic trajectory of symbols, images, and characters externalizing a socially, culturally, and politically eclectic reception of the event of the partition of 1947 leading to a flexible terrain of dialogue spatially. Thus the novels, *Ice-Candy-Man, Train to Pakistan, Clear Light of Day*, and *Shadows of Time* set a subjective as well as hybrid lens to scrutinize the consequences of partition. However, major communal outfits involved both in the obliteration and reconstruction of the spirit of dialogic pluralism are given a focal representation in these novels. The cultural and religious resilience which was once the base and strength of the community became a point of vulnerability. Therefore, the novels project both the exclusive and the inclusive rendition of the predicament and crises of Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, and Parsees.

These communities were exploited to engage in a politics of revenge and hatred but ironically, in fictional narratives, they are shown to resolve the bitterness among communities while all differences cannot be put to a consensual conclusion. But these novels deconstruct ambivalences and contradictions which the post-partition societies come to terms with on a dialogic platform and, of course, not in an absolutist sense. The partition as it configures in the national and official discourse is notably a hermeneutically sealed concept; however, in the literary domain, primarily in the novels, it affords a flexible and dialogic interpretation much to the interest of seeing ideological causalities, stalemates, and complications in the aftermaths of the geographical division of the Indian subcontinent.

One aspect which inspires this project to employ the concept of dialogic interaction is the language too, as discussed earlier. Apart from the fact that the English language is "a unified language" (Robinson 2011, 3), and is a common factor between all the participants of the event of partition, it is in sync with the postcolonial rewriting tradition of the colonized. These novels can also be categorized as postcolonial novels as they also present the necessity of constructing an alternative worldview. Moreover, postcolonial novels also make alternative claims on the language of the colonized. The English language provides a common ground for writers, writing about the same event, but belonging to two different countries, India and Pakistan, with different national languages. Therefore, specific focus on Indo-Pak writers using English language allows the emergence of indigenous perspective on partition, whereas it also provides a tenacious variety of expression to narratives on partition. It is obvious that writers from India and Pakistan see partition differently but they also share their visions and perspectives and one of the common and yet not a fanatically common aspect is the reterritorialization of English language, which is a colonial legacy.

Whereas these writers bend language to their respective interests it is obvious that language is another name of cultural identity and since dialogic identity is discursive hence, English language becomes a dialogic medium of narrating the events of partition, in which the colonial mindset also played a substantial role. So far, partition narratives have not been given a profound angle of insertion from the perspective of dialogic paradigm.

There is, thus, a possibility of reading fictional narratives as conduit of integration between sects, ethnicities, and nations. This book shows how narratives can aid in opening borders to shared art and literature which inherently engenders response and dialogue leading to possibilities of coalition and integration. The focus is on reading and rethinking the writings of postcolonial writers which provide new possibilities in engagement and dialogue between the chosen novels and postcolonial thought as it progresses toward change. In this context, the partition novels and their relationship to the historical

discourse proffers a new way of seeing partition and the outcome. The historical events are presented in a dialogic limelight as the novels broadcast multiple voices. Dialogic possibilities in Indo-Pak English novels on partition are propounded in the subsequent chapters. Each of these chapters describes the event of partition from different perspectives. Thus, the vantage point of the event shifts between Parsee, Sikh, Hindu, and Muslim view of the event. The perspectives are then perceived in the light of dialogic possibilities between these differing and/or different views in the subsequent chapters.

Chapter 1

Dialogization of Identities in Bapsi Sidhwa's *Ice-Candy-Man*

In Bapsi Sidhwa's novel *Ice-Candy-Man*, the partition of India into a Hindu state and a Muslim state is unraveled from the eyes of a Parsee narrator, who is entrapped in this division being an Indian, despite her allegiance and amiability to all religious identities belonging to the united India. In this context, *Ice-Candy-Man* is the alternative paradigm of the event of partition as retold by a Parsee child narrator. Therefore, in this chapter, the story of this Parsee child, Lenny, is explored to reveal her understanding of religion, differences due to religions, and the means and tools of maintaining dialogue between the different religious identities. Sidhwa, herself, is a Parsee Pakistani writer who had witnessed the events of partition. In this novel, Sidhwa chronicles the events of the partition of the subcontinent, and the ensuing riots and massacres. Her narrator is a Parsee child who depicts the violence perpetuated by Muslim, Sikh, and Hindu communities, as she sees it and tries to make sense of. The religious impartiality of a Parsee child narrator to the violent Hindu, Muslim, and Sikh groups, comprising adults, facilitates a terrestrial view of the event of partition. Thus, *Ice-Candy-Man* is a story of a child and her relationship to her group of friends, who are older, belonging to different faiths and classes. Needless to say, their relationship is affected by the event of partition, which creates schisms and craters within the amity the group relished for years. Therefore, partition of India, not only divides Lenny's country geographically but also her friends socially, psychologically but most importantly religiously. Lenny becomes aware of religious differences and how these differences lead to hostilities among friends, who had enjoyed a dialogic coexistence for years. However, Sidhwa retains the thread of dialogue through intercommunal affinities, symbols, and unified anti-English sentiment.

In the novel, the Parsee child, Lenny narrates the events of partition as she experiences them as an eight-year-old. It is noteworthy that she does not

belong to the Muslim, Hindu, or Sikh faith; the groups belonging to these faiths were the major stakeholders of the division of India, yet she feels the effects of the event of partition, since, she feels they all belong together as friends. Nevertheless, Lenny is a child and her friends are adults, who see the world differently. For the child, acts of violence are unnerving. It is difficult for her to comprehend hostility between friends or her countrymen. Consequently, dismemberment of her country leaves her feeling shredded and thus emotionally disturbed. Despite despondence, her impartiality is a source of bondage between the friends who have turned violent and hostile to each other as they engage with the political discourse of the region. These friends suddenly recognize differences rather than similarities that had initially bonded them. Lenny has to unlearn her experiences of social amicability, interaction, and friendship to understand the world at large. Yet, she retains the desire for assimilation between different religious and social identities. In order to propagate this seemingly impartial, yet simplistic view of assimilation, Sidhwa empowers the child perspective by giving it the narrator's voice, which promulgates the conceivability of dialogue to continue among friends turned enemies.

In this regard, Anne Burke's "Empowering Children's Voices Through the Narrative of Drawings" illustrates how a child learns and understands his/her world through, "Their rich social interactions, found through play, provide [*sic*] opportunities for both rehearsals and re-enactments of roles and experiences" (Burke 2012, 1). The Parsee child narrator, Lenny, in this case, is a link between all the characters of the novel. It is crucial to note that they meet and confer with each other in the presence of Lenny. Her Ayah, the maidservant, named Shanta, takes Lenny to the park for strolls and exercise; these characters who are her friends gather around her at the park and discuss their daily lives. It is reiterated here that they all belong to different religious groups. As the characters meet and communicate through Lenny, this communication among the characters reveals the shared experiences of the multiple communities inside India at the time of partition. She shows the varied effects of partition on different characters of different faiths. Since, Lenny suffers from polio, she is home-schooled and her access to children of her age is reduced. Therefore, her life revolves around the Ayah and the multireligious group which orbits the Ayah, thus, she narrates the experiences accordingly.

Interestingly, the Ayah attracts men regardless of their age, ethnicity, or religion, making her a pivot for the activities of her friends as well as strangers in the park. Lenny narrates how men "ogle" at the Ayah, even "Stub-handed twisted beggars and dusty old beggars on crutches drop their poses and stare at her hard, alert eyes. Holy men, masked in piety, shove aside their pretenses to ogle her with lust." Men from all walks of life, "cart-drivers,

cooks, coolies and cyclists" (Sidhwa 1998, 3), gape at her. Even the English gaze at her voluptuous "chocolate-brown" (3) body. Lenny observes one such English marcher who spins around the Union Jack in a bid to attract the attention of the Ayah, an Indian "Hindu goddess" (3). The closest "circle of admirers" (88) of the Ayah consists of the Muslims, Ice-candy-man and Masseur, the Sikh, Sher Singh, and the Hindu, Hari. Consequently, the Ayah becomes their unifying force, and brings them together.

The Ayah's character becomes a dialogic site on which Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs act and interact. Here, the character of the Ayah can be seen as a metaphorical representation of India, which is symbolically and literally desired, seduced, and raped. Accordingly, like the character of the Ayah, India can be seen as a dialogic site, where Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Parsees, and Christians coexist under the English colonizer, wishing to possess more of this exotic land.

Colonization, which was a precursor of the event of partition, initially conjugated the different religious groups toward a fulcrum which is their Motherland, India. However, later the colonizer surmised that it would be efficacious to "divide and rule" (Stewart 1951, 1). For the English, "by the late nineteenth century India had become the greatest, most durable, and most profitable of all British, perhaps even European, colonial possessions" (Said 1993, 160). According to Edward Said, founder and professor of postcolonial studies, "India had a massive influence on British life, in commerce and trade, industry and politics, ideology and war, culture and the life of imagination" (Said 1993, 160). Therefore, English writers and poets, "wrote about India," and writers like Kipling "not only wrote about India, but was [*sic*] *of* it" (Said 1993, 160). However, Said questions whether such English writers, "portray the Indians as inferior, or as somehow equal but different?" (Said 1993, 163) the answer remains with the origin of the reader. The Indians consider his views "racialist" whereas, the "English and the American readers . . . stress on his affection for Indian life" (Said 1993, 164). Said further claims that the Europeans "premised upon" the "ideological rationale for reducing, then reconstituting the native as someone to be ruled and managed" (Said 1993, 158). The words "Indian" and "native" coalesced Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs under one umbrella term and differentiated them from the English. However, in Sidhwa's novel *Ice-Candy-Man*, India is projected by a child who observes India through her Ayah, a "goddess" loved and yearned for by all, English Christian, Hindu, Muslim, Parsee, and Sikh. Even the English soldier is subdued by this "goddess." The English "gaze" at her, which renders a particular godliness to her, rather than inferiority. At the park, where Ayah's admirers meet for discussions, the group around the Ayah remains loyal to each other, regardless of ethnicity, caste, or creed, while all other groups remain scattered. Lenny reflects how "the group around Ayah remains

unchanged. Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Parsees are, always unified around her" (Sidhwa 1998, 97). Thus, the divide and rule principle which the colonizer promulgated found its antithesis in communities bound by regional, and contentiously even religious symbols, as shown by Sidhwa. However, the most integral point of conjugation and thus unification can be ascribed to the Indian identity as a whole rather than the parts as proselytized by the colonizer.

It is this unification that inculcates a sense of wholeness among Sidhwa's characters which concedes dialogue. Mikhail Bakhtin delegates the importance of recognizing groups as "whole entity" in creating a site for dialogue. In the novel, as mentioned earlier, the group forms a "whole entity" around the Ayah. This wholeness is eventually severed by the act of gang rape of the Ayah, followed by the subsequent partition of India. Although there are possibilities of dialogue inherent in the unification of the group and its affiliation with each other, as is elucidated in the beginning of the novel, the brutal death of Masseur, and the abduction of Ayah by the Ice-candy-man terminate the dialogue between the friends temporarily. Sidhwa interfuses these events of corporal disjunct with the division of the country. Naturally, as a child, Lenny is haunted by the idea of "a torn Punjab," as she questions, "Will the earth bleed? And what about the sundered rivers? Won't their water drain into the jagged cracks? Not satisfied by breaking India, they now want to tear the Punjab" (Sidhwa 1998, 116). Therefore, Lenny articulates her fears of differences spreading into the "cracks" abetted by this partition. Further on, upon seeing a crowd holding "knives, choppers, daggers, axes, staves and scythes," Lenny wonders whether they have "A lot of meat to cut" (Sidhwa 1998, 150), and thereby questions the collective intentions of crowd mentality. She realizes the precarious nature of the situation as she recognizes the crowd members. These had once been a group of friends, neighbors, and countrymen; however, at this juncture they are ready to cut meat of their own, their fellow-countrymen. These visions of dismemberment and slicing resonate in Lenny's head as nightmares. As a child the thought of slicing a piece of land was to make it bleed. This "religious arsenal" (Sidhwa 1998, 150) of knives and daggers, which the crowd carries is prophetic of splitting India. Each "breast they cut off" (Sidhwa 1998, 156) signifies the bleeding Mother India and her deprivation from nourishing her inhabitants further. Thus, the "whole entity" (Bakhtin *DI* 1981) of the subcontinent is threatened by the "religious arsenal" (Sidhwa 1998, 150). Friends and neighbors are suddenly equipped with a new kind of weaponry which is prompted by religious differences, disrupting the wholeness this region had been boastful of.

Notably, the arsenal delineates religious distinctions, in the literal and metaphorical sense. The Sikhs equip themselves with *kirpans*,[1] the Muslims with knives, and the Hindus with scythes. Hence, the group which indulges in dialogue suddenly opts for non-dialogic tools, such as knives, *kirpans*, and

scythes. Nevertheless, the novel depicts a "dialogic negotiation of power" (Pechey 2007, 24) through Lenny's perturbed yet impartial narration. The significance of dialogue is embedded in the "ideology of the text" (Pechey 2007, 25), when Lenny realizes that it is in forgetting a past "none of us control" that one can stay "whole" (Sidhwa 1998, 211). This yearning for wholeness is prevalent throughout the text. Lenny's physical anatomy of a polio-ridden child depicts her incompleteness; however, she negotiates with her physical condition through her social "wholeness" of belonging to a united group, where "Sikhs, Hindus, Muslims form a thick circle round" (Sidhwa 1998, 99) her. Lenny dreams of physically mutilated bodies which symbolically represent the mental trauma she suffers when she sees her friends dismembering body parts of each other for a newly found ideology of religious differences.

In this regard, the consequences of religious and sectarian conflagration are also voiced in political narratives on the division of the subcontinent. Jaswant Singh (2012), in his most recent work, *Jinnah: India-Partition Independence*, describes the "surgical operation" (305) of dividing a united India like splitting a family home into pieces. Just as Lenny fears dismemberment as a character in the novel, the politicians fear such a vivisection of land through "surgical operation." According to Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, an eminent Indian leader, the "division" could be one like "between two brothers" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 321). He claimed, "Children of the same family, dissatisfied with one another by reason of change of religion, if they wished, could separate, but then the separation would be within themselves and not separation in the face of the whole world." Gandhi explained, "when two brothers separate, they do not become enemies . . . in the eyes of the world. The world would still recognize them as brothers" (Singh 2012, 321). Therefore, Gandhi's vision is dialogic and open as opposed to the ideology of splitting one from the other, and shredding parts of oneself as is metaphorically represented in Jaswant Singh's perception of partition as a "surgical operation" or Lenny's vision of dismemberment of limbs. It is important to note here that the other exists only as a separate entity not as part of the "whole entity" (Bakhtin *DI* 1981) but has to be brought within the frame of reference of the whole entity for dialogic possibility. The dialogue between the two brothers would remain intact. The relationship between the brothers is further analyzed as a relationship between self and other, while both remaining part of each other, thus, inculcating a never ending dialogue.

In order to understand the concept of dialogue in fiction and non-fiction, it is important to penetrate dialogism with reference to the novel *Ice-Candy-Man*, in particular. According to Michael Holquist's interpretation of Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogism, "In dialogism, the very capacity to have consciousness is based on *otherness*." In this regard, there is no negation or denial of another

consciousness making one higher to the other, "on the contrary: in dialogism consciousness *is* otherness" (Holquist Dialogism 2001, 18). The terms *self* and *other* are "relative" rather than "absolute" (Holquist 2001, 18). Thus, where "Dialogism argues that all meaning is relative," it is to be noted that there is a relationship between "physical," "political," and "ideological bodies" "occupying *simultaneous but different* space" (Holquist 2001, 20–21). In conjunction with this, a survey into non-fiction, political discourse of Jaswant Singh, shows that the recognition of the existence of otherness contributes to a dialectical alienation of all three types of bodies, mentioned above. One can apply this to Sidhwa's novel where the group of friends is like Gandhi's analogy of brothers living together, separated only when their common factors are removed consciously from the group; yet, Lenny's awareness of the presence of the Other depicts her efforts at negotiating with the ideologies of the other in a bid to cohere the disparate credos. There are common factors that make the group of friends akin to a family, a unit, and a part of a "whole entity" and these are: Lenny's impartiality to their religions, the Ayah, regional affinity, and anti-English political ideology. There is, thus, an unbreakable relationship between the characters which binds them together despite dismemberment and separation and is analogous to Bakhtin's demand for belonging to the "whole entity" (Bakhtin *DI* 1981). despite differences.

Thus, referring back to the Holquist's interpretation of dialogism, he writes, "It cannot be stressed enough that for him [Bakhtin] 'self' is dialogic, a relation. And because it is so fundamental a relation, dialogue can help us understand how other relationships work." He further explains how these relationships are not just "binary oppositions, but asymmetrical dualisms." For Bakhtin, thus, the "key to understanding all such artificially isolated dualisms is the dialogue between self and other," making self/other a "relation of simultaneity" and in order to understand relationships, the concept of simultaneity is integral. It is "simultaneity" which "deals with ratios of same and different in space/time, which is why Bakhtin was always concerned with space/time" (Holquist *Dialogism* 2001, 19). This relationship between space and time is studied in chapter 3 as it requires an in-depth analysis of chronotopal liaison between the space India and time of partition. However, the relationship between self and other is seen as a medium of dialogue.

Hence, when there is a relationship and a dialogue is open between different people, their concepts and beliefs also reflect similarities alongside differences. Where dialects focus on sublation, and elimination of the other, "dialogue knows no sublation," rather it focuses on merging to encompass a whole entity as opposed to subtraction of one from the other, as is predominant in sublation. Focusing on relationships between different ideologies is thereby the key to dialogue, which includes "differences that cannot be overcome," seeking "separateness and simultaneity" as "basic conditions of

existence," making dialogism "a version of relativity" (Holquist 2001, 20). Therefore, reiterating that "Dialogism argues" "all meaning is relative . . . it comes about only as a result of the relation between two bodies occupying *simultaneous but different* space." Furthermore, "bodies may be . . . ranging from the immediacy of our physical bodies," as is apparent in the physical relationship between the Masseur and the Ayah as well as the Ice-candy-man and Ayah "to political bodies" as Congress and Muslim League political parties, and "to bodies of ideologies" (Holquist 2001, 20–21) in this case, the ideology behind creating a new Islamic state for Muslims and the ideology of living as united Indians. There is an affiliation present in the concept of bodies living together whether in the same house, neighborhood, country, or the same mindset escorting a particular ideology. For Bakhtin, "reality is always experienced, not conceived, and further it is always experienced from a particular position." This position is integral for dialogism, and Bakhtin "conceives the position in kinetic terms as a situation, an event, the event of being a self" (Holquist 2001, 21). In Sidhwa's novel, the event of partition is conceived as a proclamation of self of the physical body, political body, and body of ideology. Instances relating to these different types of bodies as means of proclamation of self are: acquiring the Ayah's body, delineating political affiliations to Hindus or Muslims, and proclaiming a separatist ideology based on religion but actually supporting a political stance of separate electorates according to religious differences. Consequently, splitting of these bodies, whether these are physical, political, or ideological leads to a cessation of relationships, which in turn proves to be dialectical in nature.

Hence, the acts of murder and rape whether in real life or depicted in a novel are dialectical, creating breakages in relationships between self and the other. In order to decipher these kinds of dialectical acts and their implications, it is important to understand the difference between dialectics and dialogue. Bakhtin claims in his essay "Towards a Methodology for the Human Sciences," that once "born of a dialogue" must "return again to dialogue on a higher level" (1986, 162), which means that despite the dialectical nature of violent acts, dialogue is possible. In the same way, Masseur in *Ice-Candy-Man* professes that there is simultaneity in ideologies, and says, "The holy Koran lies next to the Granth Sahib in the Golden Temple. The shift Guru Nanik wore carried inscriptions from the Koran. . . . In fact, the Sikh faith came about to create Hindu-Muslim harmony! . . . There are no differences among friends. . . . We shall stand by each other" (Sidhwa 1998, 131). He exposes the capacity and extent of a dialogue that is accommodative and internalized by different communities and faiths. As, dialogism is not "just dualism" but is necessary for "*multiplicity* in human perception" (Holquist *Dialogism* 2001, 22), this is perceived in the interaction between the group of friends in Sidhwa's novel. Evidently, there is a multiplicity of beliefs and

ideologies of the group which circles around the Ayah, and subsequently can be seen to "manifest itself as a series of distinctions between categories appropriate to the perceiver on the one hand and categories appropriate to whatever is being perceived on the other" (Holquist 2001, 22). In this case, the relationship between the multireligious groups is discerned by the reader as a source of harmony.

Therefore, Sidhwa's novel elucidates that the partition on the one hand exposes cultural and religious gulfs and on the other hand creates space for renewing interaction across different faiths. The novel reappropriates the ambivalences and contradictions post-partition societies come to terms with on a dialogic platform, which in the absolutist sense is neither religiously codified nor culturally inflected. In national and official discourse the event of partition is constructed in such a manner that it terminates hermeneutic interpretation of the event providing an institutionalized assimilation of concepts according to the political discourse, as opposed to the literary narrative, which offers a heterogeneous overview of the multiple discourses as well as ideologies prevalent at the time and space of the event.

In the official historical discourse, for instance Stanley Wolpert's *India Pakistan: Continued Conflict or Cooperation?*, Ilyas Chattha's *Partition and Locality*, and even Jaswant Singh's *Jinnah: India-Partition Independence*, the partition is seen as a monologic event. The novel on the other hand, carries within the genre the concept of dialogic answerability. However, "'monologism' is not so much an opposition, as a complement to dialogism. Actually, . . . 'monologism' is but the structure of a particular event . . . that is 'waiting' to be *understood dialogically*" (Brandist and Tihhanov 2000, 25). This act of "waiting" can be related to the anticipation of utterances in a novel. In Sidhwa's novel, Parsee utterances anticipate the voice of the other in an attempt to comprehend events. It is a cyclical process in a novel, newer utterances anticipate newer answers. The notion of dialogism as it appears in theoretical, political, and alternative discourses can be employed to elicit its literary version from fictional narratives. However, non-fictional texts can also be used as alternative templates to deconstruct fictional narratives. Despite Jaswant Singh's claim that he does not "write as a cold, linear narrator of events alone" (Singh 2012, xv), he primarily writes as a Sikh and a "political figure from India" to "fill the gap" of non-Muslim historiographies written on Jinnah. Singh's perspective is cold and at the same time biased because he records the "vivisection" (2012, xv) of his India with a certain element of contempt, it is somewhat linear because of the nature of his discourse, which is political and historical. In the same manner, Wolpert provides an overview of partition by himself; however, he is a non-participant of the event. Since he never experienced the event, despite his theoretical knowledge of the event, he was not a part of the space or time of partition.

His view is credible for its impartiality to a religious or political group; however, it is distant and thus, does not offer a subjective view as is presented by the writers who experienced the event. Bapsi Sidhwa's personal involvement with the event of partition is impacted in the story as well as the character of Lenny who provides a subjacent as well as a terrestrial view of the event. Despite her objective view, Lenny's narration includes and engages with subjective ideologies of her friends. She is accordingly in dialogue with the land she writes of and fiction provides the relationship duly required for dialogue to develop.

Therefore, in novels written on the event of partition, one can access the plurality of ontological and cosmological truths with multiple characters voicing their perspectives and the natural element of answerability in utterances embedded within the language and content of the novel. In a novel, "there is an intimate connection between the project of language and the project of selfhood: they both exist in order to mean," which is a "drive to meaning" of self. The "self . . . is a cognitive necessity" (Holquist *Dialogism* 2001, 22–23). In the case of fiction, there is a demand for answer inherent in the word, utterance, and narrative as all words are uttered in anticipation of an answer. While investigating history in a non-fictive text, the discourse is seen as "monologized," since "'its division of voices' is abolished in a single voice" (qtd. in Pechey 2007, 17). On the contrary, the novel acquires "an inner territory," and recoils into a "militant out sidedness, an explicit politics of the boundary removed altogether from the logic and implicit politics of the binary." This process of displacement of boundaries is aptly described by Bakhtin, as "dialogization of its monologism" (qtd. in Pechey 2007, 17). Thus, a historiographic novel like *Ice-Candy-Man*, is autonomous and self-determined as opposed to a historical discourse, which is orchestrated by an agenda of an organization or state. *Ice-Candy-Man* also accommodates "historical contextualization" (qtd. in Pechey 2007, 1) in the fictive plot which makes it autonomous and reflexive. The novel depicts the dialectical nature of news and reporting of events as biased and monologic. Lenny recalls how the "accounts are contrary . . . they cannot be believed" (Sidhwa 1998, 109)

In order to decipher the intricacies of the genre of the novel and the dialogue ever-present in its modus operandi, Bakhtin's interpretation of the genre of the novel is instructive, he elucidates, the "novel's peculiar ability to open a window in discourse from which the extraordinary variety of social languages can be perceived. The novel is able to create a space in which this variety is not displayed, but where it becomes an active force in shaping cultural history" (Holquist 2001, 72). When variety is merely displayed, the history of the event is then "a kind of collective biography" (Holquist 2001, 73), and offering a "dialectical version" (Holquist 2001, 77) of the events. Novel, on the other hand, carries an "internal organization" (Holquist 2001, 85), which

is an “activity that plays an important role in defining relations between individuals and society” (Holquist 2001, 86), and this in itself is dialogism. The dialogic potential in the novels, therefore, offers multiple answers to questions regarding division, cause of division, and in this particular case, consequences of division of the subcontinent into two different countries.

Consequently, it can be discerned that geographically and politically, partition led to disconnection of one unit: the pre-partition India, which is also seen as a psychological division of self from other. Bakhtin’s proclamations about self and other are significant in understanding fictional narratives as tools of dialogue. Bakhtin declares, “The novel is the characteristic text of a particular stage in the history of consciousness not because it marks the self’s discovery of itself, but because it manifests the self’s discovery of the other” (Holquist 2001, 75). In Bapsi Sidhwa’s novel it is the other’s religion that is the point of dialectic; however, dialogue always returns with the discovery of self as a separate entity due to its alterity or otherness, and “other-voicedness,” since this is the “condition for the voice, . . . the solitary voice, full of itself and the intentions of a subject-speaker, like the notion of a closed linguistic system and the concept of form derived from it, depends on the denial of an ‘original’ dialogic condition, on the suppression of the traces of other voices from every voice” (Carrol 1983, 71). Therefore, relay of voices is the means to dialogue. In the novel there are many sites of dialogue in the voices present, absent, or dead despite the discordant act of partition. This chapter analyses these sites as means and tools of dialogue in the novel, which can be seen in the Parsee narrator, the character of Ayah, regional affinity, shared religious symbols, and anti-English sentiment. These are explored in succession.

PARSEE NARRATION AS A MEANS OF DIALOGUE EMBEDDED IN SIDHWA’S MULTILATERAL NARRATIVE

In the novel, the Parsees form an unbreakable link between the different religious groups which collide and confer during and after the event of partition. In order to understand this, it is important to comprehend the traits of Parsees and their religion. The Parsee religion is one of the “oldest if not the oldest revealed religion in the world—Zoroastrianism.” The number of Parsees in the world is “barely a hundred thousand” (qtd. in Dadrawala 2007, 1). They may be very few in numbers but Gandhi recognized their importance, he claimed “I am proud of my country, India, for having produced the splendid Zoroastrian stock, in numbers beneath contempt, but in charity and philanthropy, perhaps unequalled, certainly unsurpassed” (qtd. Dadrawala 2007, 1). The Parsees came to India in the tenth century CE to seek protection from the

Arabs in Persia. Despite their ill treatment in Persia by the Arab Muslims, the Parsees decided to opt for a neutral position in India, under Muslims, with respect to religious politics. When they moved to India, in order to "preserve their identity, religion and culture" (qtd. in Dadrawala 20007, 1), they ensured their survival and presence through public acts of charity instead of directly becoming involved in commerce and politics. Colonel Bharucha, in *Ice-Candy-Man,* tells the story of Parsee migration to India, "When we were kicked out of Persia by the Arabs thirteen hundred years ago, what did we do? Did we shout and argue? No! . . . We got into boats and sailed to India!" He further explains, "Do you think it was easy to be accepted into a new country? No! . . . Our forefathers were not given permission even to disembark!" The colonel continues the story, "Our forefathers and foremothers waited for four days, not knowing what was to become of them. Then, at last, the Grand *Vazir* [2]appeared on deck with a glass of milk filled to the brim." Colonel Bharucha asks his audience, "Do you know what it meant?" then explains, "It was a polite message from the Prince, meaning 'No, you are not welcome. My land is full and prosperous and we don't want outsiders with a different religion and alien ways to disturb the harmony!' He thought we were missionaries" (Sidhwa 1998, 38).

A unique aspect in the Parsee religion is that it is not a missionary creed. Thus, there is no element of hostility toward other religions, nor a zest to multiply their numbers through warfare, aggression, or any kind of manipulation. This makes them genial yet perceptible. The Parsees consider themselves a minority. However, as M. J. Akbar explains in his essay "The Major Minority," "A minority . . . is not a consequence of numbers, but" it is "a definition of empowerment" (qtd. in Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 489). Since Parsees do not aspire for power, they remain a minority by definition. They live in the land assimilated with the others although adding significantly to the social structure of the land through their charitable acts as Colonel Bharucha explains how the Parsees eventually convinced the rulers of India. Continuing his story, he narrates, "Our forefathers carefully stirred a teaspoon of sugar into the milk and sent it back." The Prince immediately understood the meaning of this act, "The refugees would get absorbed into his country like sugar in the milk. . . . And with their decency and industry sweeten the lives of the subjects" (Sidhwa 1998, 39). Hence, it is integral for the Parsees of India to "move with the times," and "Let whoever wishes rule! Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Christian!" (39). Bharucha cajoles the audience further, "We will abide by the rules of their land! . . . As long as we do not interfere we have nothing to fear! As long as we respect the customs of our rulers-as we always have- we'll be all right! Ahura Mazda has looked after us for thirteen hundred years: he will look after us for another thirteen hundred years. . . . We will cast our lots with whoever rules Lahore!" (Sidhwa 1998, 39).

This may not be a neutral position but it is a neutral stance which the Parsees adopted with respect to partition. They are fully aware of their position, they "are the smallest minority in India. . . . Only a hundred and twenty thousand in the whole world," they have to be "extra wary," or they will be "neither here nor there" (Sidhwa 1998, 16). Under the Muslim Moguls, the Parsees "prospered." Emperor Akbar "invited Zarasthushti scholars to *darbar*" and said "he'd become a Parsee if he could" (Sidhwa 1998, 40). The Parsee cannot proselytize; hence, they remain small in number but "sweet as sugar." Even under the English rule the Parsees "served the English faithfully, and earned their trust" (Sidhwa 1998, 16), and as long as the Parsees "conduct" their "lives quietly," they are "no threat to anybody." However, the banker points out to the Parsee gathering and says, "don't ever try to exercise real power" (Sidhwa 1998, 40), it is this power struggle which leads to aggression, hostility, and in the end rifts, divides, and separation. As there is no aspiration for gaining control or exercising power, it is easier for the Parsees to maintain dialogue. It is also easier for others to mingle and interact through Parsees with their seemingly unbiased position.

The Parsee perspective provides a diluted view of the event of partition as it entails the tales of Muslims, Hindus, and Christians, encoding and decoding their versions of the prospects and eventually the outcome of division. Furthermore, the child narrator provides a terrestrial view of the event rather than an aerial view thus connecting her to the land she lives in and its parts rather than the holistic world of politics, power dynamics, and religious stratagem polluting her mindscape.

In order to reiterate the significance of the child perspective, Gordon Well's work, *Wells, Dialogic Inquiry: Towards a Sociocultural Practice and Theory of Education* is important. Wells is a Professor of Education, and he writes that "The very essence of a child's understanding stems from the social events that characterize each young child's life, and their understanding of these events become apparent through play" (Well 2004, 1). In the case of Lenny, her play revolves around her social circle of friends, belonging to different ages and religious groups. Her understanding of the event of partition is learned through the lens of her social group. However, she develops her own cognitive skills and questions religious and political norms and creeds. Her core question, "What is God?" (Sidhwa 1998, 94). opens yet another dialogue. Burke writes that, "Children often tell narratives along a time-line, describing self-identifying features," and "Notably, these stories help children make sense of their world by engaging their feelings, exploring complicated feelings and emotions, or connecting them to childhood memories through their association with characters" (Burke 2012, 1). Sidhwa's child narrator tries to make sense of her world, and conversely, Sidhwa uses the child narrator to make sense of her own world. Lenny being a child and

that too a Parsee child, most importantly ought to be disconnected from the adult world, yet her social interactions connect her to the complexities of a multireligious group. She sees the events as a child terrestrially connected to the event yet disconnected religiously, ideologically, and politically to the happenings. Sidhwa's use of a child narrator is an endeavor on the part of the writer to subvert an adult religiously aligned view. Sidhwa detaches Lenny from a particular political, sociological, or historical reality by affiliating her with all such realities, making her a "whole entity" (Bakhtin *DI* 1981). comprising all religious, sectarian, and social orders. Therefore, Sidhwa's narrator sustains the advantage of an all-encompassing narration, as opposed to a sequestered narration.

Apart from the child narration technique, Sidhwa uses a Parsee to narrate the events that led to the independence of India. As mentioned earlier Parsees maintained an objective stance to the ruling bodies of India, therefore, recruiting a Parsee for narration is a way of stressing the objectivity of the narrator. Since, India is home to Parsees as well as all other religious groups, it is significant to note that Sidhwa offers a view disconnected from the political contrivances of the English as well as the Hindus and Muslims, most affected by the colonizer's orchestrations of policies. Therefore, Sidhwa's novel falls under the ambit of postcolonial writing, as the aim is to represent all and for all, on a secular basis. In *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, Ania Loomba refers to the significance of secular writing and its specific standpoint, despite the demand of separatism in postcolonial writings. Loomba quotes Neil Lazarus, "the 'specific role' of postcolonial intellectuals is 'to construct a standpoint-nationalism, liberationist, internationalist-from which it is possible to assume the burden of speaking for all humanity'" (Loomba 1998, 206). Lenny's social interactions support dialogue with the adult group with seemingly unbiased interpretations of the event of partition. Her interpretation is based on her evaluation of the event as an act of dismemberment rather than a constructive act. For the Muslims, all the murders and violence as well as the division of a country would lead to the construction of a new country. Conversely, for the Hindus and Sikhs, the violence may contribute to keeping India united. Hence, Singh asserts that despite the claims of partition being a constructive act, it remained as the "final deconstruction of India" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 277) for its participants. Sidhwa presents these varied ideologies through the eyes of a non-aligned participant, who is affected by the events, yet is not a contributor to the events.

Lenny reflects upon differences and amalgamations as well as the possibilities of assimilations while remaining non-aligned to the contentions attached with these differences. She refers to Jinnah's wife who was a Parsee, which complicates the issue of a demand of a separate country on the base of religious ideology. It is seen that religious and political ideologies compete

and collate before and after the partition. As controversy would have it, Jinnah's own stance on religion remains dialogically ambivalent. Jaswant Singh quotes M. R. A. Baig, in *Jinnah*, "Islam, as such, came very little into his [Jinnah's] thinking" (Singh 2012, 485). Jaswant Singh reiterates that "The Muslim community for Jinnah became an electoral body; his call for a Muslim nation, his political platform; the battles he fought were entirely political- between the Muslim League and the Congress." Singh then categorically states, "Pakistan was his political demand. . . . Religion in all this was entirely incidental" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 486). Inspired by Jinnah's dialogic capabilities and ambivalences in the political arena as she sees him, Lenny favors Jinnah even as an adult. She recalls his wife's "innocence" (Sidhwa 1998, 160) whose romantic involvement with a man having lofty political ideals recedes in the background. Forty years later, Lenny reclaims Jinnah's position and questions, "But didn't Jinnah, too, die of a broken heart? And today, forty years later, in films of Gandhi's and Mountbatten's lives, in books by British and Indian scholars, Jinnah, who for a decade was known as 'Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity,' is caricatured, and portrayed as a monster" (Sidhwa 1998, 160).

Lenny is thus claiming her position as a nationalist but neutral narrator, when she describes how biased perspectives create monsters out of humans. Her conscious shunning of bias is apparent in her choice to quote Sarojini Naidu, an "Indian" (rather than calling her a Hindu) poetess, as she describes the Muslim leader, Jinnah as "the calm hauteur of his accustomed reserve masks, for those who know him, a naïve and eager humanity, an intuition quick and tender as a woman's, a humour gay and winning as a child's pre-eminently rational and practical, discreet and dispassionate in his estimate and acceptance of life, the obvious sanity and serenity of his worldly wisdom effectually disguise a shy and splendid idealism which is of the very essence of the man" (Sidhwa 1998, 161).

Lenny creates a dialogic possibility between the Indian rather than Hindu poetess and the Muslim leader's idealism with Sarojni's lyrics. Accordingly, Lenny's Indian nationality overwhelms her Parsee identity, which is another point of dialogic conference with her multiple identities, and she recognizes that art can become a medium of communication between differing identities.

In the same manner, a child becomes a medium of communication between the Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs with her terrestrial view grounded on the events as she sees them. Lenny's narration has dialogic potential since she sees them herself as a non-aligned participant rather than through any religious or political leader's lens. Lenny is engaged with the act of partition, but does not engage *in* the act of partition. She is therefore, not a tool for separation but a tool for amalgamation. She tries to make sense of the act of splitting a whole entity by shredding her dolls. She is particular about the dolls she

wishes to shred. Some of them she finds purely Indian, so she opts for the neutral-looking dolls. In this regard, she examines the "sari-and dhoti-clad Indian dolls," finds them "unreal," "exaggerated," "painted," "too fragile," and herself opts for the more neutral "life-like doll with a china face." Here, she considers herself Indian but neutral. There is hostility rearing inside her, which she vents through pulling the doll, which she feels represents her. Thereby, she externalizes her emotions toward separation or division. She pulls "its pink legs apart," and in doing so takes the help of her cousin till "the cloth skin is right up to its armpits spilling chunks of grayish cotton and coiled brown coir," baring the dolls "spilled insides." Adi, another Parsee child and Lenny's cousin innocently but "infuriated at the pointless brutality" asks Lenny, "Why were you so cruel if you couldn't stand it?" (Sidhwa 1998, 138–39). Here, Sidhwa has used a child to show that the act of splitting a "whole entity" is "pointless brutality." The children cannot understand this act of tearing apart but indulge in it, to make sense of the adult world. Lenny's perturbance with respect to her brutal act is a remark on the negative effect of the act of partition on those who engineered and/or endorsed it, despite being traumatized by the act. Thus also questioning the rationale behind the division, be it in the children's sphere of game or adult's political contrivance. There is an apparent dialogue between the child and the adult world which leads to the loss of innocence. They become part of the "pointless brutality," just the same way as the Indians cannot comprehend the pointlessness of dismembering body parts, yet, indulge in it in any case. The child narrator loses her all-pervasive neutrality by becoming a part of "brutality" (Sidhwa 1998, 138–39). However, throughout the novel no Parsee is shown indulging in any violent act toward their human counterparts.

With their seemingly neutral stance toward the politics of India, Parsees are constantly maneuvering their positions to adapt, adjust, and side with the ruling elite. Lenny reflects how "the Parsees have been careful to adopt a discreet and politically naïve profile" (Sidhwa 1998, 16). Nevertheless, they "must tread carefully," as Colonel Bharucha, the president of Parsee community, declaims in a "thunderous voice," "We must hunt with the hounds and run with the hare!" (Sidhwa 1998, 16). Despite their endeavor to steer clear of politics they tend to reprimand the British and provide a haven for Indians of different religious affinities. In this regard, Lenny's household is an important focal point, as it is an amalgamation of Hindus, Sikhs, Christians, and Muslims. Lenny's family gives protection to Raana, a Muslim boy; they fight for Hari the Hindu manservant; and search almost endlessly for the Ayah. Here, Sidhwa's narrator, a Parsee child, is exposed to multiple truths and Sidhwa uses her as a means to authenticate these versions of the event of partition, as Sidhwa's character, Sharbat Khan, proclaims "Children are the Devil. . . . They only know the truth" (Sidhwa 1998, 192). In order to decipher

the multiple truths, apart from the child narrator, the character of the Ayah is delineated by Sidhwa in such a manner that she becomes the pivotal force around which all other characters move and confer with these truths.

THE AYAH: A NEXUS FOR MULTIRELIGIOUS CONVERGENCE AS WELL AS DIVERGENCE

Metaphorically, the Ayah can be seen as the united India, melding all religious groups on a common ground. This common ground, spatially and spiritually, in the novel *Ice-Candy-Man* is the Park, where Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs communicate, and continue their dialogue while sitting around the Ayah. She is a "magnet" imposing "tyranny over metals" (Sidhwa 1998, 20). Lenny reflects on how the Ayah draws "covetous glances" (Sidhwa 1998, 3). This "Hindu goddess" (Sidhwa 1998, 3), as they perceive her, is the pivot of attraction which makes her a common site for interaction, intermingling, and intercourse between different ethnicities, castes, religious identities, and colors. Interestingly, it is not merely the Hindus, Muslims, or Sikhs whom the Ayah attracts; even the Englishmen are attracted toward her. In the novel, Lenny observes an Englishman, from the Salvation Army, bearing the flag, marching past Lenny and the Ayah, and "Of its own volition his glance slides to Ayah and, turning purple and showing off, he wields the flag like an acrobatic baton" (Sidhwa 1998, 17–18). Again, if the Ayah stands for the country, united India, the Englishmen are attracted to her exotic beauty and erotic charm, which she is fully aware of. She is "chocolate-brown and short. Everything about her is eighteen years old and round and plump . . . she has a rolling bouncy walk that agitates the globules of her buttocks under her cheap saris and the half-spheres beneath her short sari-blouses. The Englishman no doubt had noticed" (Sidhwa 1998, 3). The Ayah's magnetism is all-prevailing; it engulfs and envelops the entire group which revolves around her. There are no color, religious, or ethnic barriers that can separate the Ayah's admirers. She tempts all.

Contextually, William Dalrymple, in his historiographic fiction, exposing this kind of Indian aura for the foreigner and the subsequent amalgamation, explains, "there was a wholesale interracial sexual exploration and surprisingly widespread cultural assimilation and hybridity: what Salman Rushdie-talking of modern multiculturalism-has called 'chutnification'" (Dalrymple *White Mughals* 2003, 10). Dalrymple believes that this Indianization of the English is curtailed after 1857 AD; however, the Englishman remained enamored by Indian beauty as always. In this manner, the Ayah becomes a connection between the Englishmen and the Indian men. This can be discerned further in Ania Loomba's claim about the gender politics of colonization, as she

writes in *Colonialism/ Postcolonialism*, "from the beginning of the colonial period till its end [and beyond], female bodies symbolize the conquered land" (Loomba 1998, 152). The Ayah, ergo, becomes a "porous frontier" which can be "penetrated" by any "race, culture" or "nation" (Loomba 1998, 159).

The group at the park is more in awe of the Ayah than the "majestic, massive, overpowering, ugly" "statue of Queen Victoria imposing 'English Raj.'" The group includes, "The Falettis Hotel cook, the Government House gardener, and an elegant, compactly muscled head-and body masseur." There is also the Ice-candy-man who sells "popsicles" to other groups, interacting with a larger crowd. Intriguingly, Lenny has full faith in the Ayah's ability to seduce all. She is a part of the seduction process and interaction, as is seen that the Masseur, who massages the Ayah "under her sari" "does it only when he and Ayah" and Lenny are alone. There is a subtle dialogic interaction in Masseur's massages and Ice-candy-man's crawling toes into the Ayah's sari, which leads to coexistence among the group members around one common factor, which is the Ayah. The Ayah, therefore, becomes another link for communication between the cook, the zoo attendant, the Ice-candy-man, and the Masseur. Each character engages in conversation, keeping the Ayah as the center of attraction. Lenny narrates how she learns "also to detect the subtle exchange of signals and some of the complex rites by which Ayah's admirers co-exist" (Sidhwa 1998, 18–19). Although as partition draws nearer, animosity among the Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs spreads across Lahore; Sikhs remain with their sect, and Muslims prefer to converse solely with Muslims, but, "Only the group around Ayah remains unchanged. Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Parsee are, always, unified around her" (Sidhwa 1998, 97). At this time when there is acrimony among neighbors and friends, the Ayah is a nexus of coalescence for her group of friends and neighbors. Sidhwa creates a pivot around which conversation can revolve and maintain.

Thus, Sidhwa shows how the Ayah remains the focal point of interaction and dialogue among the rival Hindu, Muslim, and Sikh men. By showing the possibility of interaction and dialogue, she projects that rivalry among friends is bred by the British to counter anti-British sentiment. This can be contextually discerned and its rationale understood upon examining Jaswant Singh's *Jinnah: India-Partition*, as he writes, "anti-British freedom had sadly now got centered on Hindu-Muslim rivalry," and the "focus against the British Raj had diffused" (Singh 2012, 267). Although, even in this circumstance the group of friends in Sidhwa's novel continue to coexist. This coexistence is around the Ayah, which implies that the Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs are "co-beings," and the Ayah provides them with the "simultaneity" Bakhtin proposes is required for dialogue, making existence "shared." According to Bakhtin, existence is "shared," "existence is not only an event, it is an utterance. The event of existence has the nature of dialogue," where existence

becomes the source of dialogue. In the Ayah's case "the other" can be perceived "in the realm of completedness," whereas the Ayah herself undergoes a transformation toward an incomplete self, decentralized within by her own admirers. However, she remains "at the centre of space" (Holquist 2001, 25–27). Her interactions with the multireligious group do make her vulnerable yet, the group becomes integrated around her. Her abduction by a group member at the time of the event of partition shows how the event is shared but the time of her abduction is solely hers. Nevertheless, the Ayah's absence signifies the loss of center of space, and a collective search is conducted to relinquish the lost space. In this regard, Lenny's narration, further, procreates the Ayah as the compounding force, as Lenny is the collaborator in this dialogue.

Lenny recalls, "We are looking for Ayah. We are all looking for Ayah" (Sidhwa 1998, 192). The collective "we" and "all," display the unity that still surrounds the being of Ayah. A new maidservant Hamida is hired, but she is not the pivot around whom the group whirls. It is the Ayah around whom the multireligious group converses and engages. When Cousin pompously proclaims, bursting into Lenny's room that, "I saw Ayah!" Cousin knows the significance of Ayah in Lenny's life, and he wishes to please Lenny. The Ayah is not at the Recovered Women's Camp, because she is no ordinary woman. If she stands for the Indian nation at large, she has to have been seduced, ravished, and divided. When she is found, she is seen decorated artificially with makeup, thus, masking her natural beauty. Lenny sees the transformation of her beloved Ayah, she is now a, "flashy woman with the blazing lipstick and chalky powder and a huge hibiscus in her hair, and unseeing eyes enlarged like an actress's with kohl and mascaraed eyelashes, sitting squashed between two poets" (Sidhwa 1998, 233), divided, shared, and still sought after. The Ayah becomes a dancing girl living in *Hira Mandi* (Diamond Market, an area notorious for prostitution), and "men pay" her to "dance and sing . . . to do things with their bodies," any man "who has the money . . . cook, wrestlers, Imam Din, the knife-sharpener, merchants, peddlers, the governor, coolies" can ravish her. This means, Ayah is in "trouble" (Sidhwa 1998, 240–41). She still manages to gather an audience, but there is no dialogue this time. The Ayah is no more a dialogic site, around whom all grouped together, conversed, laughed, and loved each other. She is a trophy to be paid for and acquired; she is a site of contestation. The men have "shamed her." Sadly, it is not the "men in the carts" that shamed her "they were strangers—but Sharbat Khan and Ice-candy-man and Imam Din and Cousin's cook and the butcher and the other men she counted among her friends and admirers" (Sidhwa 1998, 253–54). are the cause of her real distress. A collective search is carried out when the Ayah is abducted, showing how newly created enemies could still find unity. Though, she is betrayed by her own, her suitor,

the Ice-candy-man, the Ayah is a means for dialogic possibilities among the multireligious groups living in the same region, savoring a shared existence, searching for their focal point, in this case, the Ayah, to unite and confer.

REGIONAL AFFINITY AS A CONTRIBUTOR OF DECONSTRUCTION OF DISPARATE IDENTITIES

One of the means of dialogue, as presented in the novel, among the multireligious group is the racial and regional affinity. India is a vast land of diversified ethnicities, cultures, and languages. The strand that kept the Indians together was their affiliation to the land of India; hence, demographically the inhabitants of one region remain bound to one another. There is a tacit bond among multireligious groups which keeps them united even in Sidhwa's *Ice-Candy-Man*. As the character, Jagjeet Singh, pompously proclaims, "If need be, we'll protect our Muslim brothers with our lives!" and the *chaudhry* declares in response, "I am prepared to take an oath on the Holy Koran," "that every man in this village will guard his Sikh brothers with no regard for his own life," while the mullah responds, "Brothers don't require oaths to fulfill their duty" (Sidhwa 1998, 56–57). Such is the unity among the group of friends living in the same village. As the *chaudhry* points out, "our villages come from the same racial stock. Muslims or Sikhs, we are basically Jats. We are brothers. How can we fight each other" (Sidhwa 1998, 56)? In this regard, Sidhwa shows Lenny's experiences with people belonging to the same region. She recounts Raana's (a Muslim boy) escape from his own village, Pir Pindo. Sidhwa had already established Lenny's affiliation to the village and its inhabitants earlier in the novel. She visits Pir Pindo with Dost Mohammad and enjoys the communal ambience of the village, where regardless of religious differences the villagers celebrate all religious festivities equally. Thus, she recognizes her affinity to Raana, another child, because of his rootedness to the land Lenny belongs to.

In order to understand the role of regionalism in breeding dialogic possibilities in Sidhwa's work, it is important to explore the role of regionalism and its definition as delineated by Louise Fawcett in "The History and Concept of Regionalism":

> The concept of regionalism has had a complex history because of its essentially contested and flexible nature and because of a divergence of views as to whether or not regionalism is an effective or desirable organizing mechanism in international politics. In respect of the concept itself there has been considerable debate, (perhaps too much debate) about what constitutes a region, how a region is operationalized and consequently, what is regionalism. Theoretically

> the problem has been compounded by the variety of qualitative and quantitative approaches on offer which seek both to measure and understand the process. A related issue is the inherent flexibility and evolving nature of the concept: regions and regionalisms share common features but these are subject to adaptation and change. (2012, 4)

There is scope for dialogue in sharing common features yet having divergent views which evolve and adapt. The characters in *Ice-Candy-Man* are bound within the district of Lahore, including the villages on the periphery of the metropolis, Lahore. Hence, Lahore and Pir Pindo become the common sites for the characters, and they share anti-British sentiments as well as sentiments of regional cooperation. Even the Parsees speak of their involvement in the political strife that is engulfing the whole of India but with specific reference to Lahore. Colonel Bharucha refers to their community as "Lahore Parsee," hence, they cannot "remain uninvolved," since, their "neighbors will think" they are "betraying them." A Parsee member categorically questions the Lahore Parsee community, "Which of your neighbors are you going to betray? Hindu? Muslim? Sikh?" (Sidhwa 1998, 37). The Parsees feel threatened by each one of the religious groups; however, so far as they are all together and equally empowered, they are merely neighbors, helping each other. Even Lenny's mother admits her involvement in the political situation. She contributes to the regional integration at a time when the very same neighbors slit each other's throats who had been friends. Interestingly, Lenny believes her Mother is burning Lahore with all the gasoline which she keeps transporting to an unknown place, and this conjecture upsets her inordinately. However, Mother affirms her involvement not in burning Lahore, but saving her friends and neighbors in Lahore. Mother admits, "We were only smuggling the rationed petrol to help our Hindu and Sikh friends to run away. . . . And also for the convoys to send kidnapped women, like your ayah, to their families across the border" (Sidhwa 1998, 242). The regional integration and regional integrity are however attacked by outsiders who wish to dismember this whole entity by provoking religious differences. There are external forces with political motives that create fissures among the regionally homogeneous group, which shares the land of Lahore. These political forces whether they are "'British' not 'Christian'" (Singh 1998, 15), Hindu, Muslim, or Sikh start violence to acquire power on a local level initially. Ilyas Chattha, in *Partition and Locality*, writes about how different regions of the subcontinent are dissected to acquire power from the grass root level. He writes, "while the localities thus had specific characteristics of violence, there were also commonalities. One important characteristic was that violence was politically, rather than religiously or culturally, motivated. The political aims were not so much tied into the wider all-India issues, but

were to attain local and territorial control" (Chattha 2011, 255). However, the regions were eventually divided into political domains on the pretext of religious differences.

Subsequently, multireligious groups which are "demographically transformed" (Chattha 2011, 257) eventually fight among each other as Sikh slaughters Muslim "brother" and Muslim murders his Hindu and Sikh "brother" (Sidhwa 1998, 56). Chattha explains how this kind of hostility was fueled. He writes, "weapons were stockpiled and volunteers were recruited into paramilitary units." The level of violence which was witnessed at the time of partition shows that there was a tremendous amount of "pre-planning and organization" involved. He writes, it was not "temporary madness," there were "prime perpetrators of violence" (Chattha 2011, 254). with clear motives of attaining power locally rather than any larger motive of power acquisition of India. Since the motive was to attain power, once parted and the country was divided, "the conflict between the refugees and locals was muted, because of cultural affinity and pre-existing kinship ties" (Chattha 2011, 257). Thus, reverting allegiance to religious kinship reinforces the importance of regional integration as a means of dialogue and coalition.

Therefore, it is proven that there is an element of heterogeneity at the same time an interface in kinship in coexistence which cultivates regional integration not in spite of differences but because of the very differences. Sidhwa employs this as a means to invoke dialogue between the dissected populace of the same region. The Ice-candy-man infuses the spirit of regionalism in his multireligious group, as he says, "If we want India back we must take pride in our customs, our clothes, our languages. . . . And not go mouthing the got-pit sot-pit of the English." He further questions the Ayah, as to why she does not wear "shalwar–kamize" (Sidhwa 1998, 29), which is a sign of her belonging to the region Lahore as a Punjabi, that is from the province of Punjab. She is Punjabi which creates a bond between her and her Punjabi friends, despite her "Goan" (from the city of Goa) dressing. In the same manner, Sidhwa exposes an affiliation to the region rather than religion when her character, Imam Din, a Muslim, feels the tension that could spread to his village and fears for the safety of his "kin in Pir Pando," most of whom are Sikhs. At another occasion, Lenny remembers how there were "groups of villagers converging on Dera Tek Singh—Hindu, Muslim, Sikh—as they raise their own majestic trails of dust" (Sidhwa 1998, 105), rendering solidarity to the land on Baisaki. Baisaki is a Sikh festival; however, it binds the Muslim, Hindu, and Sikh community to the land from which they derive their livelihood. It is "the day that celebrates the birth of the Sikh religion and of the wheat harvest" (Sidhwa 1998, 104), yet Muslims contribute to the celebrations equally. Interestingly, Lenny, the Ayah, Imam Din, and his son come from the city and join Imam

Din's entire clan of nephews, uncles, cousins, brothers, grandsons, and great-grandsons at the Baisaki Fair in his village. The intriguing significance of this occasion is that the fair and its attendance has been a tradition followed by generations, as Sidhwa delineates how all the men have been going to the Fair even before Imam Din's grandfather was born.

However, the year Lenny goes with her friends, they witness strangers at the Fair. The presence of strangers is disturbing for the communally homogeneous group of Pir Pando dwellers. These strangers are "Akalis . . . the Immortals . . . Maharaja Ranjeet Singh formed the sect when he conquered the Punjab a hundred years ago," the Akalis "swarm around" the Temple in Amritsar like "angry hornets." The villagers are discomforted by their presence, as their presence signifies the onset of trouble. The Akalis, strange to their region, speak of "a plan to drive the Muslims out of East Punjab . . . to divide the Punjab. They say they won't live with the Mussulmans if there is to be a Pakistan" (Sidhwa 1998, 107). The *granth* despite being a Sikh calls Akali Sikhs "Troublemakers," and warns his Muslim fellow villagers to "look out till this evil blows over" (Sidhwa 1998, 107). Such is the nature of their regional affinity that they watch out for each other and disown outsiders for creating trouble. Lenny recalls, "The Sikhs of Dera Tek Singh escort us halfway to Pir Pando" (1998, 108). Here, Sidhwa raises a significant point that people of the same region endanger their lives for their kinsmen; however, it is the politically motivated instigators who attack this communal diversity in the name of religious disparity. Therefore, Sidhwa shows two aspects of regional coexistence, thereby Sidhwa's text engages the other perspective too. It is instructive to recognize and discern the existence of the other to comprehend the dynamics of division in a communal setting. In this regard, Andrew Robinson's explanation of dialogism and its engagement with the utterance of the other are crucial. He explains it as "not simply different perspectives on the same world," but "it involves the distribution of utterly incompatible elements within different perspectives of equal value," it should be noted that "truth requires many incommensurable voices," and "truth is established by addressivity, engagement and commitment in a particular context" leading to a "vast multitude of contesting meanings," so "A novel . . . is constructed as a great dialogue among immerged souls or perspectives." This shows that a "dialogical text presents relations as dialogical rather than mechanical" (Robinson 2011, 4). Sidhwa presents this dialogical relationship in communal heterogeneity as a contrast to the contestation pervasively present in celebration of religious disparities.

As these disparities are wielded further, Lenny hears of attacks on Muslim villages near Amritsar and Jullunder, with accounts of unbelievable brutality. However, the resilience of communal unison is predominant as villagers claim to die for their kinsman. In the same manner, the group at

the Park is compounded by communal loyalty and remains well integrated. Thereby melding and synthesizing their identities hence, "what is restored is not identity or self-coincidence but non-identity," which is a form of integration that pants over incongruities. A mock synthesis "which all institutional or conceptual syntheses endlessly posit themselves against," leads to a kind of "felix culpa of discourse, propelling dialogue-in-itself into dialogue-for-itself which is dialogism" (qtd. in Pechey 2007, 17). This dialogue is integral to the conditions of existence in a region suffused with diversity and variegated ideologies. Sidhwa's novel proffers the two sides of coexistence, presenting multiple voices and ideologies. The novel offers diversity of voices as a means of relaying a historical event which designated differences.

Therefore, Sidhwa's individuals interact, intercommunicate, and intermingle with each other as a group as well as antagonists. The Akalis are one such example of an antagonistic force, as outsiders create havoc and destroy Pir Pando. Regional affinity gels the community, but when their kith and kin is attacked by the other regional group, the individuals turn against social disparities and relinquish their lifelong regional affinity. The other group invokes religious affinity as a compounding force as opposed to regional. This is dialectical in nature as religion is monologic, when considered in its absoluteness. The Government House gardener proclaims that "When our friends confess they want to kill us, we have to go" (Sidhwa 1998, 157). Furthermore, the Ice-candy-man, devastated by the loss of his sisters at the hands of vigilantes and vandals, "loses" his "senses," when he thinks of the "mutilated bodies" (Sidhwa 1998, 156), and throws "grenades through the windows of Hindus and Sikhs" whom he had known all his life. He screams out, "I want to kill someone for each of the breasts they cut off the Muslim women" (Sidhwa 1998, 156). The Ice-candy-man turns against his group of friends due to the prevailing frenzy, as the gardener realizes, "there are some things a man cannot look upon without going mad" (Sidhwa 1998, 157). The Lahore group disintegrates, some change their religion while others escape and few take the routes of vengeance and violence. This fictional representation of chaos and mayhem is also represented in non-fictional discourse on partition by Ilyas Chattha. However, after the partition, when the fury of religious madness subsides, their animosity is partially diluted on account of their shared histories of "cultural affinity and pre-existing kinship ties" (Chattha 2011, 257), depicting hostility as aberrant to the natural demand of the region for communal affiliation.

Sidhwa presents these affinities to show "commonalities" (Chattha 2011, 225) and common ground among the characters, thus establishing that riots and manslaughter are unnatural to the region and its people. These common aspects denote tools of integration and dialogue in heterogeneous existence.

SHARED RELIGIOUS SYMBOLS AS TOOLS OF INTEGRATION AND DIALOGUE IN SIDHWA'S NARRATIVE

Sidhwa presents the contentious characteristics of different religions through her Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, and Parsee characters. Yet, she provides an antithesis by showing integration despite religious differences. These common features are amalgamation of religious symbols and anti-English sentiment prevailing among the characters. There are inferences in the novel that there is rancor between Sikhs and Muslims; however, these feelings of antagonism are instigated by those who have ulterior political motives rather than any loyalty to a particular religion. Masseur rejects this type of antagonism by calling it, "all *buckwas*![3]" and finds religious affinity in the religious symbols rather than disparities, when he proclaims, "The holy Koran lies next to the Granth Sahib in the Golden Temple. The shift Guru Nanaik wore carried inscriptions from the Koran" (Sidhwa 1998, 130–131). Thus, Sidhwa uses religious symbols as tools to show harmony and cordiality which existed since the time Muslims and Hindus started living together on the same land, which is India.

In order to understand the country, India and its inhabitants, it is important to explore the code of conduct which they followed and thus managed to live together for centuries. As mentioned earlier, there were eight important religions practiced in India, each with its disparities and some similarities. Furthermore, coexistence contributed to intermingling of religious ideologies, customs, and rituals. However, it was integral to adopt a code of conduct in order to coexist harmoniously. This involved adoption, adaptation, and toleration of the other's religion. Hence, it is extremely pertinent to understand the variety of religions, the advent of these religions, and their subsequent influence on various sects, races, and castes. This exploration provides an understanding of how communities assimilate and that there is a permanent scope of dialogue. Before the advent of Islam in the subcontinent, this region was inhabited by first the Paleolithic man, then the Indus civilization, Aryans, Buddhists, Jains, Persians, Greeks, Mauriyans, Indo-Greeks, Guptas, Rajputs, and neo-Hindus. All these races practiced a variety of religions. The Aryans wandered about in search of pastoral lands. In 1400 BCE they were found in Asia. In *The Short History of Hind-Pakistan*, we see a record of the Aryan gods. Their religion, the Rig Veda "inculcates worship of the personification of various natural phenomena" (PHB 1955, 29), this pantheistic approach is mimicked by later religions too, uniting the succeeding religions with one ideology. The Rig Vedic pantheon consisted of " (i). terrestrial gods, like *Prithvi* [the earth], *Soma* [fire], (ii). atmospheric gods, like *Indra* [rain], *Vayu* [air], (iii). heavenly gods, like *Varuna* [sky] and *Surya* [sun]." There

is a definite reflection of this pantheon in the religions of the succeeding races. Despite Aryan warfare superiority, the non-Aryan influence "gradually gained ground"; in this respect, the epics *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana* are referential points. These contain "great variety of religious and historical, didactic and mythological" (31), tales describing social customs, wars, and war heroes, thus deifying Rama and Krishna. Since most of the wars were fought against the non-Aryan tribes, they were considered different thus, inferior by the Aryans. This development led to the caste system of Hindu society. Writers writing about the Indian subcontinent and its subsequent division tend to refer to the division outlined by the Hindu tradition. The caste system grew out of the difference in color of skin between the Aryans and the Dasyus, since the Sanskrit word *varna* which is used for caste, really means color (PHB 1955, 34). A myth was "created to explain" this division, and "a belief was developed that the Brahmins were born out of the mouth, the *Rajanyas* [*Kshatriyas*] out of the arms, the *Vaishyas* out of the things and the *Shudras* out of the feet of Brahma, the Creator" (PHB 1955, 34). According to the Hindus, this caste system created harmonious relationships due to acceptance of their code of religion and religious identity as well as stature on the hierarchical order. This caste system thus becomes a core subject-matter in the novels written on the subcontinent, debating the role of the caste system in procuring harmony.

Moreover, there are diversions with respect to the acceptance of the caste system as a tool for maintaining order, thereby producing disharmony and chaos. Sidhwa, writing about the Indian Peninsula and its inhabitants, thus, refers to the caste system in her novels too, depicting the stratification of this caste system and contrary to popular belief, she shows the drawbacks of the system. In *Water*, Sidhwa shows the Brahman tradition of isolating widows. This is significant as it depicts another hierarchical subdivision within the same caste. The widows despite being Brahmins were segregated delineating another disparity within the strata of division. Such disparities are explicated in *Ice-Candy-Man* as well. Hari, is an untouchable who belongs to those that remain outside the pale of caste system, since they are non-Aryans. He lives a life devoid of any privilege due to the position he has on the caste strata. Therefore, he readily converts to Islam and saves his life in his hometown, Lahore, which has suddenly become a part of the Muslim state. Sidhwa shows, where men are ready to kill in the name of religion, there are those who merely adopt and drop their religious identities in favor of living. There were other reasons of conversion too, since, Islam had been the conqueror's religion, many professed Islam in a bid to become part of the ruling body, others were forced to convert to Islam, while there was a huge number of *Dalits*, "who are at the bottom of the hierarchy" ("Dalit Muslim of India" 2015, 1), they converted marking their allegiance to the "egalitarian ideology

of Islam" (Onnudottir and Possamai 2016, 66) rather than hierarchical strata demarcating caste and color disparities.

Religion, thus, becomes a uniting force and at the same time, a force which draws boundaries. In India, apart from Hinduism and Islam, other religions have managed to thrive as well. Among these flourishing religions, Jainism and Buddhism find an immensely significant space. Jainism is a "religion, known after Jina, the conqueror. He was the conqueror of the self, and not of any worldly territory" (PHB 1955, 36). The Brahmin caste system fueled the territorial discriminations, between the haves and the have-nots, hence, religions such as Jainism and Buddhism gained popularity as an antithesis. Buddhism "is the result of a revolt against caste and Brahmin claims" and "derived its name from its founder, Buddha, the enlightened one" (PHB 1955, 39). He had been "disappointed with the abstruse teachings of the monks at Rajgriha" and "did not concern himself with the philosophical discussions about the existence of God." His "subject of teachings was life in this world, which is full of sorrow and suffering," and "desire" is the cause of sorrow; thus, annihilation is the "surest means of ending unhappiness." According to Buddha, desire "can be controlled" (PHB 1955, 41) through Ten Commandments and one of the commandments is "not to kill" (PHB 1955, 42). This is replicated in all religions. These religions have been intertwined because of being practiced in the same locale for centuries. Some religions have acquired attributes from the previously governing religious body; hence, they carry some kind of emblem of the other religion. Here, it is important to note that Parsee religion is not an invader's religion, thus it carries its importance as the other's religion. Keeping in view the significance attached to religion in the subcontinent, fiction generating from this region is full of references to religion. Sidhwa's novels depict cohesion through religious symbols. Therefore, an understanding of the religious ideologies which coax unity or profess the presence of indigenous unity in human kind is extremely important.

With reference to natural unity, Rabindranath Tagore (a Bengali polymath and Nobel Laureate), in *The Religion of Man*, a collection of his lectures, speaks of this tacit unity among the living in general and humankind in particular. He claims, "the process of evolution, which after ages has reached man, must be realized in its unity with him; though in him it assumes a new value and proceeds to a different path." According to Tagore, "It is a continuous process that finds meaning in Man . . . his multi-personal humanity is immortal. In this ideal of unity he realizes the eternal in his life . . . The unity becomes . . . an energizing truth . . . the consciousness of this unity is spiritual, and our effort to be true to it is religion" (Tagore 2011, 3–4). Sidhwa, in her novels, *The Croweaters* and *Ice-Candy-Man*, shows this unity as spiritually binding to some of her characters. Her character, Faredoon

Junglewalla-Freddy, in *The Croweaters*, keeps his book of "Famous English Proverbs," "on a shelf right above the prayer table, snug between the Bible and the Bhagavad Gita. Other books on the shelf were a translation of the Holy Quran and Avasta [the holy book of the Parsees], the complete works of Shakespeare, Aesop's fables, *Das Kapital*, and the books representing the Sikh, Jain and Buddhist faiths" (Sidhwa *The Croweaters* 2012, 38). Freddy's table "echoed his reverence for all faiths, a tradition dating back 2,500 years to the Persian kings. Darius and Cyrus the Great, who not only encouraged religious tolerance, but freed the Jews" (Sidhwa *TC* 2012, 39). There is a yearning in characters such as Masseur and Freddy for adoption of cultural and religious plurality. Yet, there is a common feature in this plurality which binds all religions in a chain. Sidhwa makes a reference to how all the religions are united by the same thread. She writes:

> The Torah, written at this time, testifies to the influence of Zoroastrianism on Judaism, and the influence of the ancient religion of the Parsees on other Semitic religions can be dated to this period. A Hindu scholar says that "the Gospel of Zarathustra, the *Gathas*, covered all the ground from the Rig-Veda to the Bhagwad-Gita, a period extending over 1,500 years at least, in the short span of a single generation. . . . Zoroastrianism lies, thus, at the centre of all the great religions of the world, Aryan and Semitic." (Sidhwa *TC* 2012, 39)

This religious affinity is seen in Sidhwa's character, Freddy, and as his name suggests, he is an amalgamation of all religious identities. His "yearning heart discovered an affinity with all religious thought," he kept the "picture of Virgin Mary" "framed with an inset of the four-armed, jet-haired goddess Laxmi. Buddha sat serenely between a sinuous statue of Sita, . . . and an upright cross supporting the crucified Christ" (Sidhwa *TC* 2012, 39). Freddy keeps religious relics such as prayer beads, flowers, photographs of Indian saints, *piganis*, and anointing bowls, just as Masseur points out how all these religious relics and symbols of different religions are stored in the Golden Temple.

Sidhwa uses these shared religious symbols as tools to bridge the gaps created by discordant religio-political ideologies. These types of differences as Jaswant Singh points out in *Jinnah: India-Partition Independence*, "were rubbed raw by the British whenever they could do so, exploitatively" (1998, 27). Concurrently, Sidhwa's characters accentuate the differences among themselves, yet, maintain a fraternal bond. The Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims, and Christians sit in a circle and discuss these differences objectively. Sidhwa presents multilateral view by showing disparate symbols and the Parsee child overviews these differences as an onlooker, observes and absorbs the differences subtly till she starts questioning the religious symbols connoting differences.

With the Parsee child narration, Sidhwa further maintains a cord between the variant religious groups. Lenny questions fixed adult beliefs. The Parsee child translates these symbols objectively; she reconsiders "What is God" (Sidhwa 1998, 94)? She ponders about various religious symbols that designate differences, like Hari's *bodhie*,[4] "The tuft of bodhie-hair rising like a tail from Hari's shaven head suddenly appears fiendish and ludicrous" (Sidhwa 1998, 95). The bodhie-hair has been part of Hari's identity, it made him a Hindu, yet for Lenny, it had been merely a part of Hari. However, as soon as he cuts it off, Lenny realizes that this dismemberment has altered his existence. He can now live or be allowed to live on one side of the border. A mere tuft of hair had been the source of difference in caste, creed, and religion. It was a symbol of difference. It is this same symbol that is quite easily dismembered by Hari to join the Muslim sect. For many, like Hari, the act of circumcision "By a barber" (Sidhwa 1998, 161), allows admission in the Muslim sect. Lenny sees this dismembering of physical parts and attributes as acts that do not signify shunning of faiths but a natural integration. Circumcision may seem like a practice; however, it is a symbol of alliance to a religious sect. It is, thus, a religious symbol of proclaiming ones identity. It signifies the fact that dismemberment of a physical membrane leads to affinity to a particular religion. At the same time, cutting a tuft of bodhie-hair and dismembering a layer of skin for circumcision signify flexibility present in the symbols, which are also identity markers. These are not fixed and can be dispensed with, as can various identities and religions. Lenny predicts this dismemberment in her nightmares, as violent acts. Furthermore, she is upset with the thought of dismemberment as her nightmares involve limbs of children. Lenny recalls her nightmares, "Godmother sits by my bed smiling indulgently as men in uniforms quietly slice off a child's arm here, and a leg there. She strokes my head as they dismember me" These children hold no religious affinity neither do the uniforms; she feels an "abysmal loss" (Sidhwa 1998, 22), because of the irrationality of the act. This anatomical dismemberment as opposed to that of religious symbols is disconcerting to her, as it signifies loss of innocence, and a natural physical anatomization. Lenny had predicted trouble and had been fearful for Hari and his bodhie. She always used to wonder "why must he persist in growing it? And flaunt his Hinduism? And invite ridicule" (Sidhwa 1998, 117)? Although Lenny is an outsider, an outcast as a Parsee, yet in her fears for her friends she remains a part of them.

However, religious symbols no more remain symbols but turn into weapons of hatred and violence. *Kirpans* and knives flourish and zealot mobsters chant religious mantras, *Bolay so Nihal!*[5] *Sat Siri Akal!*[6] and *Allah-o-Akbar*,[7]*(*Sidhwa 1998,154) and aligning religious mantras with political chants of *Pakistan Zindabad*[8](1998, 178). The same religious groups had been chanting "Allah o Akbar Om" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 108). "Om Shanti,[9]

Ameen" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 111). at one time, as is also shown in *Train to Pakistan* by Khushwant Singh. Therefore, both writers depict that by sharing religious symbols there are possibilities of assimilation. Though, Sidhwa demarcates lines and the differences among the multireligious group Lenny lives with, through Lenny's panoramic view, she also shows assimilative tendencies present in the symbols which separate them. Lenny acknowledges these symbols as differences and her child mind tries to find answers to questions, which the adult mind has stopped questioning.

Lenny becomes aware of religious anxieties and fissures when she hears names of political players such as "Gandhi, Jinnah, Nehru, Iqbal, Tara Singh, Mountbatten," because these names do not signify India anymore but stand for some or other kind of religious exclusivity. She realizes that the seemingly one Nation, is divided, "And I become aware of religious differences." She reflects how sudden it was, "One day everybody is themselves—the next day they are Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Christian. People shrink dwindling into symbols." Lenny discerns how "the all-encompassing Ayah—is also a token. A Hindu," and "Hari and Moti-the-sweeper, his wife Muccho are untouchables," "Crammed into a narrow religious slot," all are "diminished," "dehumanized" (Sidhwa 1998, 93). The Jumah prayer, a call specifically for Muslims, becomes a defining act and fact for Imam Din and Yousaf. In the same context, the Ice-candy-man tries to proclaim and maintain his Muslim identity by aligning himself to a Muslim politician, Muhammad Ali Jinnah and a Muslim ideologist, Muhammad Iqbal. She learns the difference between English Christian and Anglo-Christian, through the treatment accorded by one to the other. In the same manner, she discovers the concept of hierarchy in religion through Hari's "untouchable" caste as opposed to the "lofty caste" of Nehru (Sidhwa 1998, 93). Her "perception of people changed [*sic*]" (Sidhwa 1998, 94). because of the religious symbols. The symbols had always been present, however, never used to demarcate borders and boundaries among Lenny's group of friends. The religious symbols are exploited for political motives and disparate ideologies are used to create divisions in the united India instead of promoting harmony and tolerance. As "Allah-u Akbar and Om [the mystic Hindu formula] are one name" (Singh Jinnah 2012, 108), these became political catchwords against the English invader, thereby the invader decides to "incite, create" and "encourage a separatist tendency" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 49). Therefore, instead of achieving a common platform to oust a colonial empire, different religious groups became engaged in their individualistic ideological warfare, which often manifested a diverse trajectory of emblematic violence. Consequently, communal rifts were propagated among Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs by focusing attention on the divergent symbols and suppressing the united anti-English struggle, which exemplified the point of integration for these different religious groups.

ANTI-ENGLISH SENTIMENT: A CONCLAVE FOR INTEGRATION

As the novel begins the motive behind all action and thought of the characters in Sidhwa's *Ice-Candy-Man* is the "Quit-India sentiment" (Sidhwa 1998, 17). Whether it is the Parsees cursing the British as "The goddamn English," (Sidhwa 1998, 16) or Sidhwa quoting the Muslim poet, Iqbal, exposing them for "conjuring tricks" (Sidhwa 1998, 111) there is resentment among all for the English. This resentment is a source of dialogue between the "broken" Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, and Parsees. They sit together under the Queen's "statue, which imposes the English Raj in the park" (1998, 18) discussing ways of freeing India from the colonial empire. However, with the removal of the Queen's statue, "the garden scene has depressingly altered" (Sidhwa 1998, 236) and "h-o-o-o-l-i" is played with the "blo-o-o-d" (Sidhwa 1998, 134) of friends and neighbors. Thus, symbolically the Queen unifies them. The English are the cause of their grievances; hence, they are all together for one cause, and ready to help each other. Interestingly, these are the same friends for whom the Ice-candy-man was once willing to help, whom he kills later. He had earlier told his Sikh friend, "So what if you're a Sikh? I'm a friend to my friends. . . . And an enemy to their enemies. . . . And then a Mussulman! God and the politicians have enough servers. So, I serve my friends" (Sidhwa 1998, 122).

Accordingly, a rift is acknowledged by different communities and fueled by the colonizer in a bid to retract the anti-English sentiment. Jaswant Singh explains how the rift was created between different communities, because "For the British it was principally 1857 that made them conscious of Muslims as Muslims . . . separate (from the Hindu) political character . . . one of the two pans of political balance of India" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 23). Therefore, Hindu–Muslim unity created a balance. The "Hindu-Muslim combine always greatly troubled the British" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 94). The divide as the British tried to portray was due to religious differences as the words Hindu and Muslim depict. However, the discord between these two communities was always on constitutional reforms. Singh writes, "communal accord between the Hindus and Muslims almost always moved in tandem with constitutional reforms" (94). In this regard, Jinnah "endeavored and succeeded in creating an ideational unity between the League and the Congress" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 94). Gandhi too tried to focus on this "camaraderie," he said, "'born of the same mother, belonging to the same soil.' Hindus and Muslims must love each other," he continued to say that "it was their duty to share each other's sorrows" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 107). As Jaswant Singh quotes, Edmund Chandler, from the *Atlantic Monthly*, "The politician who could unite these incompatible currents in a combined stream would have won half

the battle of independence," thus "Hindu-Moslem entente" had to be severed by the British (Singh 2012, 107). Sidhwa uses this entente to show affinity among the multireligious group already present and as a pervasive force of conjugation. Her characters realize that it is the English who are responsible for the riots, as Mini Aunty asserts, "All English will burn in hell for the trouble they've started in the Punjab! And let me tell you. The Christian hell is forever!" (Sidhwa 1998, 112). They discern, it is Mountbatten who plans to "tear up the Punjab" (Sidhwa 1998, 113). For the Parsee child the thought of a torn Punjab is above any religious or political differences. She is disturbed by the "vision of a torn Punjab. . . . Not satisfied by breaking India, they now want to tear the Punjab" (Sidhwa 1998, 116). As a child, she asks questions what the adults assume as fate, and as a Parsee she feels her land torn between the Hindus and the Muslims, quite unnecessarily by the English.

Interestingly and wittingly maneuvered by the colonizer, the Quit India slogans change to "'*Jai Hind!*'[10] or '*Pakistan Zindabad!*' depending on the whim or the allegiance of the principal crier" (Sidhwa 1998, 127). With such subtlety the English disband the Hindu–Muslim entente. The English divided the land which the Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs feel a part of, yet their anti-English sentiments change to anti-Hindu/Muslim/Sikh. The Masseur, who has suddenly developed a Muslim identity proclaims, "Lahore is bound to go to Pakistan," on the other hand, the Hindu gardener insists, "Lahore will stay in India!" while "the Sikh zoo attendant shouts, 'And what about us? . . . The Sikhs hold more farm land in the Punjab than the Hindus and Muslims put together" (Sidhwa 1998, 128–29)! Intriguingly, the divide transforms their objective identities pertaining to their professions to specifically Hindu, Muslim, or Sikh. Sidhwa introduces them as the gardener, the zoo attendant, the cook, the Masseur, and the Ice-candy-man without reference to their names, which in turn, may reveal their religious identities. Hence, initially they are known for their craft and skill, but later these characters stand for their religious identities, becoming religious symbols themselves. Their speeches are replete with inclinations to their respective religions and thus portraying new ideologies pertaining to disparateness in religious symbols. They indulge in fighting in a bid to assert their religious identities above all. The Parsees observing objectively realize "if anyone's to blame, blame the British!" (Sidhwa 1998,16). Lenny sees this declaration from Colonel Bharucha as an "insurgence-an open declaration of war by the two hundred Parsees of Lahore on the British Empire!" (Sidhwa 1998,16). "The goddamn English!" (Sidhwa 1998, 16). coalescing the Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims in their Quit India sentiment, are soon forgotten as culprits by the Muslim Masseur, the Hindu gardener, and the Sikh zoo attendant. Thus, a delegated strategy is enforced to create fissures to subvert the Quit India movement and later to relinquish power to disrupt systems of governance among the

two bodies of strife, Hindus and Muslims. Contextually, Stanley Wolpert has explained the dynamics behind this type of division in *India and Pakistan: Continued Conflict or Cooperation?*:

> Gandhi and Jinnah tried their best to slow Mountbatten down, pleading with him not to move so fast, knowing how terrified their people would be at what Mahatma Gandhi called the "vivisection of Mother India." But for Dickie, speed was always of the essence. Even Nehru, eager though he was to welcome the night of India's "tryst with destiny" after a decade wasted in British prisons, begged Mountbatten not to rush the transfer of power, anticipating only too well the panic and dangers that would be unleashed by partition. (2012, 8)

The panic caused mistrust among friends and neighbors. The Government House gardener infers to the hand behind the trouble, he says, "It is the English's mischief. . . . They are past masters at intrigue. It suits them to have us all fight" (Sidhwa 1998, 92). Thus, it can been discerned that, so far as the enemy is common, there is dialogue, the moment the course of "discussion" diverts to "Hindu-Muslim business," there is discord. The Ayah predicts the outcome of this strife and "stands up smoothing the pleats in her limp cotton sari and says 'pertly,'" "If all you talk of nothing but this Hindu-Muslim business, I'll stop coming to the park" (Sidhwa 1998, 92). Despite, the Ice-candy-man's assurances that "Such talk helps clear the air" (Sidhwa 1998, 92), for the Ayah, it breeds animosity among friends and severs dialogue. Thus, this group of friends is dismembered in the name of political harmony by a "religious arsenal" (Sidhwa 1998, 150) deployed by the English. The English colonizer turns a political strife over the issue of separate electorates into a war of religion. As mentioned earlier, Singh claims in *Jinnah: India-Partition*, "The Muslim community for Jinnah became an electoral body; . . . the battles he fought were entirely political-between the Muslim League and the Congress. . . . Religion in all this was entirely incidental" (Singh 2012, 486). The English believed that this demand for separate electorates for the Muslims could help delineate a border between Muslims and Hindus, thus, dividing the two communities. This strategy did work, though temporarily; however, the unified anti-English sentiment was so strong that transfer of power was inevitable. The division merely derailed the peaceful transfer of power and suffused hatred for the period of time of the division of land. According to Akhtar Hussain Sandhu, in "Reality of Divide and Rule in British India,"

> The policy of "divide and rule" is seen as a mechanism used throughout history to maintain imperial rule. It identifies pre-existing ethno-religious divisions in society and then manipulates them in order to prevent subject peoples' unified

> challenges to rule by outsiders. Many Indian scholars have maintained that the British adopted this strategy in order to strengthen the Raj. Both communal conflict and Muslim separatism are seen as being factors which forced the Muslims to seek a homeland. (Sandhu 2009, Abstract)

The divide and rule strategy seemed like the only way possible for the English to establish hold, since the unification of the two greatest communities meant bloodshed of the English. The English had faced Hindus', Sikhs', and Muslims' unified wrath in 1857. The colonizer relied on inbred differences "*within* each group" (Loomba 1998, 109) and fueled their respective "religious arsenal" (Sidhwa 1998, 150). By "foolishly" or with connivance halving "the timetable" (Wolpert 2010, 7), Lord Louis Mountbatten created panic and enemies out of friends and neighbors. The British, therefore, play gods "under the ceiling fans of the Falettis hotel-behind Queen Victoria's gardened skirt-the Radcliff Commission deals out Indian cities like a pack of cards. Lahore is dealt out to Pakistan, Amritsar to India. Sialkot to Pakistan. Pathankot to India" (Sidhwa 1998, 140). The colonizer dissects an Indian population of 450 million into 400 million Hindus, "the remaining quarter" Muslims, "plus six million Sikhs and a million or so Parsis, Christians, and Jews" (Wolpert 2010, 9), and with this dissection geared up the religious arsenal into a nuclear arsenal sitting kilometers away from each other.

Sidhwa's novel depicts this process of division of friends but maintains the need of dialogue in the utterances of her characters. Since, "an utterance only acquires meaning in relation to the utterance of another . . . all utterances ought to anticipate the word of the other . . . the words of the novels are highly dialogized—that is, they are shot through with anticipation of and rejoinders to the word of an other" (Dentith 1996, 44–43), therefore, dialogic. Thus, novels are dialogic between each other as well, and each novel with its distinct characters portrays distinct perspectives, as in this chapter, the Parsee view of the partition of India is discussed. It can be asserted that despite the political motives of the colonial empire the division remains only a ground reality. There is an all-pervasive allegiance to kinsmen, which is targeted by political bodies across borders. Sidhwa's novel delineates a longing for dialogue, which is inherent in the utterances of all the characters. The Parsee perspective allows these characters a neutral ground for dialogue. The succeeding chapters show the utterances of Sikhs, Hindus, and Muslims. These "utterances" then connect and create dialogue between the narratives and the narrators as well as dialogue among different voices in the novels particularly selected for this book. In chapter 2, "the background of heteroglossia, appropriate to the era," in this case of partition, "that dialogizes it" (Bakhtin *DI* 1981), and allows the voices to be heard "in different eras, far distant from the day and hour of their original birth" (Bakhtin *DI* 1981), even the place of

birth, is discussed. Since "human being's consciousness cannot be conceived in isolation" (Dentith 1996, 41), "the discourse of self and other interpenetrate each other" (Denitith 1996, 40), and thus have to be discussed and analyzed accordingly. In this respect, the multiple voices of religio-political sects are studied further. In chapter 2, the heteroglot villages of India at the time of partition are analyzed in the light of the novel *Train to Pakistan* by a Sikh writer, Khushwant Singh, another participant of the event of partition.

NOTES

1. "Kirpan." A ceremonial sword or dagger carried by baptized Sikhs. Web. 1 Mar 2015.
2. "Vazir." A high officer in a Muslim government. Web. 25 Feb 2015.
3. "Buckwas." Nonsense. *Urban Dictionary*. 28 Feb 2015. Web.
4. "Bodhi." A Sanskrit word, meaning enlightenment. In Hindu tradition it is a tuft of hair on an otherwise bald head. Web. 28 Feb 2015.
5. "Bolay so Nihal" Whoever utters, shall be fulfilled. It is a part of the traditional greeting used by Sikhs, it is also a call to action or duty. Web. 1 Mar 2015.
6. "Sat Siri Akal." A Punjabi greeting used mostly by the followers of the Sikh religion. It means God is the ultimate truth. Web. 1 Mar 2015.
7. "Allah-o-Akbar." God is Great. It is a part of the call to prayers for Muslims. Web. 1 Mar 2015.
8. "Pakistan Zindabad." Long Live Pakistan. Web. 10 Sep 2014.
9. "Om Shanti." A Vedic Mantra. It means peace for all humankind, living, non-living things and everything in this whole cosmic manifestation. Web. 1 Mar 2015.
10. "Jai Hind." Long live India. It is a battle cry. Web. 2 Mar 2015.

Chapter 2

The Heteroglot World in Khushwant Singh's *Train to Pakistan*

In the novel *Train to Pakistan*, Khushwant Singh, a Sikh Indian novelist, journalist, and politician, describes the division of a unified India in to a "Hindu India and a Muslim Pakistan" (Singh 1988, 9), through an omniscient narrator, who recounts the event of deporting Muslims from a village, Mano Majra. The village has a Muslim, Hindu, and Sikh population, bordering the newly created Pakistan and divided India. This chapter elucidates how heteroglot symbols and imagery encrusted in the novel coerce dialogue between the Hindu, Sikh, and Muslim characters, thereby explicating heteroglot voices of villagers from an Indian village voicing their concerns about partition and the possibility of coexistence through dialogue between different religious groups.

Singh's characters Hukum Chand, Iqbal, and Juggut Singh present three angles of partition, thus providing multiple perspectives of the same event. Hukum Chand is a Hindu regional magistrate, and hence provides a Hindu perspective of the event of partition. However, he is, at the same time, a government official therefore, his ideologies, values, and actions depict human welfare rather than the bias he has against Muslims. Iqbal's religious identity remains unknown and a point of contention till the end of the novel. Contentiously, he stands for all religious identities, since, the name, Iqbal, is shared by Muslims, Sikhs, and Hindus—it is name commonly kept in all three religions. Thus, it is a shared symbol and is used against him as well as for him by the magistrate according to the situational entailment. Intriguingly, he can become, or made to become, a part of all three religious communities, as and when needed by the authorities, in this case the police. Iqbal does not have to "say what Iqbal he was. He could be a Muslim, Iqbal Muhammad. He could be a Hindu, Iqbal Chand, or a Sikh, Iqbal Singh" (Singh 1988, 48). In the pre-partition India, this shared symbol is a tool

for integration; however, post-partition, such symbols have to be assigned to one group or the other, entirely for divisive purposes. Singh shows that Iqbal is arrested by the police because of this ambiguity that his name bears and, concomitantly, how this ambiguity can be employed to the benefit of the authorities. The police, as Singh portrays, follows an official discourse of law enforcing agency, and thereupon maintains a secular identity. The police can use this ambiguity to their advantage, during the course of an investigation. Thus, Iqbal becomes a means of depicting the fate of three different religious identities. The third main character, Juggut Singh alias Jugga Singh, is a Sikh rogue. He is under the scrutiny of the police, and is not allowed to leave the village. His liaison with the Muslim muezzin's (a person who calls Muslims to prayer) daughter takes him outside the village. In the meantime, some Sikh dacoits loot and murder the Hindu landlord of Mano Majra. Due to Jugga's previous involvement in dacoities, suspicion is immediately drawn toward Jugga. He cannot prove his alibi without vindicating his lover, Nooran, hence, he is detained. Jugga's role in the novel is to portray the power of love as a foil to the hatred bred by the actual rogues disguised by their civic alliances to the community.

In a climactic moment, Hukum Chand uses Jugga to stop the mass murder of Muslims. He knows that only love of a girl can overcome the mob, which is determined to kill the Muslims. Singh proffers that Jugga is a Sikh but his love for a Muslim girl maintains and produces a dialogue between the two religious groups, and his unborn child would be a source of continuum of this dialogue. The mob which incites honest, loving villagers to kill their own friends and neighbors is defeated by Jugga's determination to save his beloved. Jugga cuts the rope which the villagers have planted to kill the passengers on the roof of the train and at the same time stop the train going to Pakistan, so that they could slaughter all the passengers onboard, sending a message of hate, aggression, and vengeance to the Pakistanis. While cutting the rope he is attacked by the mob and despite injuries he cuts the rope to let the train pass by, thus, saving hundreds of lives on the train to Pakistan.

It can be deduced that Khushwant Singh's characters show an innate desire to live peacefully with people belonging to different faiths, yet bearing close alliance due to centuries of living together. Inferentially, Singh shows the traits which are common among religions rather than the differences. His character, Meet Singh, who is a peace-loving caretaker of the gurdwara, claims that "Everyone is welcome to his religion. Here next door is a Muslim mosque. When I pray to my Guru, Uncle Imam Baksh calls to Allah" (Singh 1988, 49). Thus, Singh's attempt to show love and shared symbols is an attempt at a dialogue. As a fictional writer, writing about a fictional village he has created a world where dialogue is possible, since, it is a natural corollary of harmonious coexistence in real life. On the contrary, historical discourse

depicts the political and religious differences, focusing on the strife and dialect which entail divisive political policy.

In his fiction, Singh presents multiple voices of his characters showing multiple perspectives, each unique yet dialogic. In this context, it is important to differentiate between dialogic and monologic novels as well, "In a monologic novel . . . , characters exist solely to transmit the author's ideology," bearing a "single consciousness." Bakhtin calls these "flat" novels which fail "to respect the autonomy of the other's voice" (Robinson 2011, 3). In contrast, a dialogic novel "recognizes the multiplicity of perspectives and voices." Since "each character has their own final word," which "relates to and interacts with those of other characters." Significantly, "discourse does not logically unfold but rather interacts," maintaining objectivity and never subscribing wholly to the "ideology of the author" (Robinson 2011, 3). In *Train to Pakistan,* Khushwant Singh's characters interact and confer, yet maintain their distinct voices whether Muslim, Hindu, or Sikh. Even Khushwant Singh's voice does not supersede any voice at any point.

In the novel, Singh's characters, belonging to different religions, invoke God as an integrated divine entity but each God maintains his/His identity. The multireligious group chants in unison, "Ya Allah. Wah Guru" (Singh 1988, 96). This chant suggests the desire of the multireligious group for communication to a divine entity common to all. The chant shows the potential of dialogue between the people as the divine entity becomes a symbol of communication. These religious symbols are a source of communication between the heterogeneous religions of the Indian populace. There is a dialogue between the call to prayer of the Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs as well. Singh shows the possibility of coexistence when he describes the location of a mosque in close affinity to the gurdwara and the Hindu temple. The spatial closeness between the temple and mosque also suggests that the two communities lived in harmony. The places of worship, instead of creating differences, become instrumental in engaging people into a dialogically religious discourse. Subsequently, however, these religious symbols become the force behind division as well. At the same gurdwara, where anyone could find refuge, plans of execution of Muslims are made. Singh portrays how this animosity is bred by outsiders but the villagers abandon their lifelong affiliation to their fellow villagers as soon as they are incited. The symbols of worship and the relics, which were never considered antagonistic, merely different prior to the infiltration of the mob, are seen as malicious. Yet, there are shared symbols which keep the different communities connected.

Art is one such symbol, which provides a common and stronger ground for all religious groups, even at this time of antagonism and strife. Singh shows that art is beyond boundaries of religion, cast, creed, and culture. Hukum Chand's involvement with a Muslim singer introduces him to the

humane side of the issue. He realizes that love and art are beyond religious encapsulation. As his character, Haseena, says "Singers are neither Hindu nor Muslim" (Singh 1988, 122), defying all religiously contrived borders. Thus, Singh's novel presents the human aspect of the dialectical event of partition. This human chain which connects the characters is dialogic in nature as there are archetypal symbols present within the communities coexisting for centuries which are shared, yet, expressed by each character with his or her distinct voice.

On the contrary, Singh shows that imposed geographical borders deter a shared existence. The division of a geographical land at the time of partition marks the division of humanity as well. Singh's characters demonstrate a yearning for existence beyond the confinement of borders, and his characters do not essentially wish to kill in the name of partition. As Iqbal says, "Now with this partition there is so much bloodshed going on someone must do something to stop it" (Singh 1998, 48). It is apparent that the driving force to stop the murders is love. Nevertheless, Singh delineates how religion becomes a driving force in dividing and prosecuting people, when he proclaims that it is the criminals who should be punished, not Muslims or Hindus or Sikhs. In his novel, Singh projects the different ideological inferences that he has drawn while being a participant of the event of partition; the partition of India is not because of religious demographics instead it is the blind adherence to religious fanaticism that laid the foundations of separation. People had subtracted the ethics from their religions and focused on the religious differences as a source of strife. He writes, that "Ethics, which should be the kernel of a religious code, has been carefully removed" (Singh 1988, 196). Singh presents that the people of the village needed to approach the differences with a secular mindset. However, religious dogmas instilled by religious fanatics, who are ignorant of the core quality of peace in religion, override the secular approach. Singh's novel depicts events that lead to riots among friends and neighbors, because of the instigations by these religious fanatics. However, the omniscient narrator shows that the connections and linkages among the rioting groups are stronger than the engendered differences. He offers connectors, such as "the singers," the call to prayer, and common names within the community, which present dialogic possibilities through their conflicting and collating yet distinct voices, which are heteroglot.

Heteroglossia in a discourse is diversity of style and voices as Andrew Robinson explains Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia in "In Theory Bakhtin: Dialogism, Polyphony and Heteroglossia." Even in a single perspective there are multiple voices and perspectives. This can be seen to be an inherent quality of the character Iqbal who stands for all three religions as well as a-religious ideals. Bakhtin urges the need for "diversity of languages" (Robinson 2011, 1), including the carnivalesque folk and festive language. In the case

of Singh's novel, the folk language of the village and the specific Muslim, Hindu, and Sikh languages are a means of dialogue. Language, thus, becomes a mediator between each speaker and allows an interactive way of seeing different perspectives within a group of villagers as well as within the character himself. Robinson writes, "an active and engaging understanding of other's discourse incorporates the other's perspective into one's frame," leading to possibility of "learning from incorporating the other's discourse making dialogue" in turn "possible" (Robinson 2011, 2), thus, a novel becomes a "site of heteroglossia because it can represent multiple speech genres, debates of a time period and bring perspective into fuller understanding of each other" (Robinson 2011, 4). Each language and voice "embeds" "social and worldview," leading to an "irreducible plurality of belief systems" (Robinson 2011, 4). Therefore, heteroglossia is "larger polyphony of social and discursive" (Robinson 2011, 4), defying predominance of one voice while showing the presence and cohabitation of incommensurable ideas, concepts, and voices in a shared existence.

It is this "incommensurability which gives dialogue its power," as "all subjects are able to speak and act autonomously" (Robinson 2011, 2). In *Train to Pakistan*, each character has a distinct voice and perspective regarding their village, Mano Majra and India at large. Evidently, united India provided an "abundance of dialogue, of coexistence of differences" with different religious groups living side by side with each other; however, politics of dialectics, of "one centerpoint" overarching all other opinions and ideas, led to the division of geographical land as well as the slitting of throats of neighbors and friends. The "rediscovery of dialogue is now conditioned on overcoming the imposition and enforcement of a social setting of monologue" (Robinson 2011, 2), which is prominent in a historical discourse. The novel *Train to Pakistan* compiles various but distinct perspectives, approaches in which Singh projects that "each ideology can hold more salience in particular circumstances" (Robinson 2011, 2). This is extremely relevant to the concept of religion which Singh attempts to render. In his narrative account, he evinces how each religion can hold salience of its own, without compromising its integral characteristics and demands. Singh elucidates religious differences, as well as similarities, which contribute to the inclusion of all without allocating predominance to one. In Mano Majra, there is a majority of Muslim population so they have their own place of worship and practice their religious rites openly and freely. While the Hindus and Sikhs are landlords hence, they could have dominated and trampled Muslim rites and religious festivities, on the contrary, despite their superiority economically they encourage and uphold Muslim ways, in fact, they converse on a tangent beyond hierarchical discrepancies, prioritizing their regional and spatial affinity over financial disparity. This heteroglot village is an example of the greater India as it had

been and *Train to Pakistan* is an endeavor at portraying these multiple yet distinct voices.

Therefore, it can be discerned that heteroglossic novels emphasize "the combination of existing statements or speech genres to construct a text. Each novel is constructed from a diversity of styles and voices, assembled into a structured artistic system which arranges differences in a particular way." Resultantly, "even in a single perspective, there are always multiple voices and perspectives"; however, these perspectives ought to be given space and time for presentation. A novel has that expanse for transmitting and relaying all the perspectives and voices. In *Train to Pakistan*, Hukum Chand may be a Hindu but his voice depicts his magisterial objectivity, his affiliation to the village, his manhood and inclinations toward a Muslim girl, his love for art, and his loyalty toward the Sikh population. Thus, he is an amalgamation of diverse axioms, which interact and imbricate at points of confluence. Another character, Meet Singh is a caretaker of the Sikh Gurdwara (Sikh temple), yet he has his own postulations of coexistence in the Sikh temple. Like the Gurdwara his thoughts are open to all religious individuals and their rites and rituals, embracing the beliefs and convictions of all as integral traits of the other, rather than as antagonistic forces of deviations. As opposed to these characters, the younger Sikhs are swayed by the outsiders and function on the premise of mob mentality, which is dichotomous to a heteroglot mind-set. Essentially, mob mentality suppresses individual thought and voice and unequivocally one voice superimposes all voices, as is the case in Nazism for example. It is mob mentality which recruits and collects hundreds of individuals to abandon their distinct voices and opt for mass murder. Inexorably, in the case of massacres and carnages, everyone is slaughtered regardless of age, gender, and occupation. Singh presents the relentless conviction of the herd mentality as a contrast to the effusively distinct voices of characters such as Meet Singh and Hukum Chand.

Thus, Khushwant Singh's narrative "performs a particular syncretic expression of social heteroglossia" to show the difference between distinct voices voicing their opinions and the voice of the herd. He presents not only his own perspectives but also multiple perspectives radiating out of his perspective. Additionally, he allocates voices to characters in the manner that each voice has supremacy and no one voice predominates the other. It is in "the combination, not the elements" that "originality" (Robinson 2011, 2) is found. Hukum Chand, Meet Singh, and Iqbal all have their opinions and premises but neither is used to override the other's point of view. Hukum Chand does not even use his magisterial powers over others but concocts a plan which he feels is foolproof as it involves love. His plan is to not impose on any one authoritatively to terminate the plan devised by the Sikh rogues to massacre Muslims, as that would show his inclinations and intentions, but

contrives an intendment conducive to saving hundreds of lives. Thereupon, whatever Jugga Singh does is out of his own freewill, once he has been opportunely informed of the rogue group's intentions. He cuts the rope and allows the train to pass, fully aware of his possible death in the process. He takes the decision himself and acts according to his judgment, offering heteroglossic innate deviations full credence.

Thus, not only does Singh include each and every character's outlook and opinion, he creates a canvas for the projection and reception of each voice equally by using a language which is common to all religions rather than allocating authority to one language of a sect over another in his narrative. In this context, Singh could have used a Sikh dialect or Punjabi language for the narration of events, yet he opted for English. It is instructive to note that Singh's works are mostly in English. Thereupon, he writes his heteroglossic novel *Train to Pakistan* in English to offer another voice, which is not in allegiance with either the Hindu, Muslim, or Sikh dialect, rather it is an integrating mode of communication, which is common to all.

Hence, an English novel on partition provides a new voice, distinct from the voices of the characters. This is the speech of the "elite," which was elevated to the level of hegemonic language. However, writers writing on the event of partition use the "elite" language not to "suppress" the heteroglossia of multiple speeches but to suppress any particular national language to predominate as monoglossic and "close" off discourse. In this context, the carnivalesque "folk" and "festive" (Robinson 2011, 3) language is a means to decentralize a centrifugal process.

In Singh's narrative, carnivalesque is the voice of the village. It reflects the shades of all the villagers. The activities of the villagers revolve around the timings of the trains; they look to it for determining the time of the day rather than the sun. The trains are a source of communication with the world outside Mano Majra, at the same time, these bring activity to the village and it is the train at the beginning of the novel which brings outsiders to the village. Iqbal disembarks from the train as an outsider and is used as a foil to the village folk. He does not like to drink the water they drink or the food they eat. Singh uses folk terms such as "in the name of Guru" (Singh 1988, 18) and "Ya Allah. Wah Guru, wah Guru" (Singh 1988, 96) to show how language, greetings, and prayers can comprise distinct features of different religions, maintaining their distinctness yet form a collated phrase, prayer, or greeting. Folklore has this quality embedded in it, thus, the greetings of the village folks, prayers, and language are essentially folk rather than comprising purely religious connotations. However, even these folklores and religious terms are used sparingly to avoid hegemony of one religious chant or folklore in Singh's novel.

In a bid to project connections between these folk symbols, Singh, uses names like Iqbal; religious slogans such as "Ya Allah" and "Hey Wah

Guru" (Singh 1988, 97); chants and symbols such as the geographical triangle which has the temple, the mosque, and the Hindu landlord's house to elevate plurality in voices and at the same time employs connectors such as bridges, regional associations, common natural elements like animal imagery, and hybrid relations between different ethnic or religious groups to relay bonds and fraternization despite incongruous sectarian identities. However, he incorporates incongruities and differing identities as a means to address these differences. He reiterates that Nature remains the same for all. When the muezzin calls to prayer, " God is Great," "the Sikh priest murmurs the evening prayer to a semicircle of drowsy old men and women," at the same time as a ritual, "Crows caw. . . . Little bats go flitting about"(Singh 1988, 14), where the "girls play under the trees. Women rub clarified butter into each other's hair," "bullocks go round and round," and "Sparrows fly about the roofs. . . . Pye-dogs seek the shade. . . . Bats settle their arguments" (Singh 1988, 13). Thus, till the summer of 1947 the villagers and nature follow a set course. Singh explains how "It had always been so, until the summer of 1947" (Singh 1988, 13), when all changed, trains became late disturbing the call to prayers, and

> Crows began to caw in their sleep. The shrill cry of a koel came bursting through a clump of trees. . . . The river had risen further. Its turbid water carried carts with the bloated carcasses of bulls still yoked to them. Horses rolled from side to side. . . . There were also men and women . . . little children sleeping on their bellies with their arms clutching the water and their buttocks dipping in and out. The sky was full of kites and vultures. (Singh 1988, 164)

This became the common sight for all the villages of united India and the novel depicts and unravels these common sights and sounds.

On the other hand, in *Train to Pakistan*, Singh also depicts a village where Muslims, Sikhs, and Hindus share a dialectical space as well as a dialogic space, which is the triangle hosting the Hindu lord's house, the mosque, and the gurdwara. A dialectical space is seen as a place where "things don't exist 'in themselves,' but only in their relations to others and to other spaces and time dimensions"(Robinson 2011), Mano Majra also exists in its relation to the newly created Pakistan and dissected India, and thus, the village of Mano Majra bears the turbulent time of partition. More than anything else it witnessed events of bloodshed and vengeance. In order to understand the dynamics of coexistence, Bakhtin's concept of co-being is important to decipher. According to Bakhtin, "being" is a "'unique and unified event,'" it is "always 'event' or co-being, simultaneous with other beings" (Robinson 2011, 4). Hence, Singh's characters can be seen as these co-beings living together, sharing the same time and space yet retaining their "uniqueness."

In a heteroglossic novel, each character seems to "exist as relation between particular coordinates in time and space, differentiating to other coordinates" (Robinson 2011, 4). Hence, if each character, ethnic or religious group is seen as a whole entity, it comprises multiplicity of that time and space as well as his coinhabitant's traits.

These coinhabitants can be humans living with humans or humans living with animals and natural elements. In presenting this multiplicity of cohabitation, Singh creates a heteroglot world, always in dialogue. Even the gecko in Hukum Chand's room is in dialogue with Hukum Chand as it reveals to him the truth about life and destiny. He sees a "moth" fluttering "round the chimney. . . . The geckos darted across from the wall. The moth hit the ceiling well out of the geckos' reach and spiraled back to the lamp. . . . Hukum Chand knew that if it alighted on the ceiling for a second, one of the geckos would get it fluttering between its little crocodile jaws. Perhaps that was its destiny." Hukum Chand learns from the animal world that "It was everyone's destiny" (Singh 1988, 103). In this context, it is instructive to explore, Robinson's explanation of dialogue between different species, worlds, and entities. He writes, "We are always in dialogue, not only with other people, but also with everything in the world. Everything 'addresses' us in a certain sense. Each of us is uniquely addressed in our particular place in the world, one can see one's exterior only through other's perspectives" (2011, 1). Singh's heteroglot narrative not only depicts his specific Sikh perspective of the event of partition and an indifferent authorial voice but in using a plural village he endeavors to show the perspectives of Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs, and even every animal which lives in the village, be it a bullock, a sparrow, a vulture, and a kite. He proffers the voice of each being and non-being, in the case of the train and the bridge.

These voices can be categorized as four distinct voices in the text, Sikh, Hindu, Muslim, and the author's omniscient voice carrying the voice of the animals, the village, and the train, which in turn carry multiple voices within, apart from the sounds and voices of the animals, whistle of the train, and cries of the people also contribute to the conundrum of transmission of multiple voices. However, these voices are connected by an unimposing and anodyne voice of Iqbal, which disallows supremacy of any voice. He can only "curse his luck for having a name like Iqbal" and "Where on earth except in India would a man's life depend on whether or not his foreskin had been removed" (Singh 1988, 188)? He would have proclaimed proudly, "I have no religion" before the arrest but after the arrest he suppresses all other voices and adopts his Sikh identity to save himself. In the same way, the heteroglot world of Mano Majra becomes alive to these multiple voices and the shared symbols which connect these voices, such as animal and the natural world; hybrid relations and bridges; new religious symbols; and loyalty toward villagers. Each

voice is connected with archetypal religious voices, voices of natural elements, spatial and psychological multiplicity of perspective, idiosyncrasies of art and different names as connectors, and love as a conjoiner as opposed to the propaganda of hate. Each distinct voice is analyzed further.

HETEROGLOSSIC VOICES OF MULTIPLE RELIGIOUS SECTS

The novel is about a village with a Sikh and Muslim population numerically at par, however, a larger part of agricultural land is owned by Sikhs whereas Muslims work as their tenants. Hence, it provides an alternative perspective of the event of partition in a primarily Sikh space where Muslims are not the rulers but tenants. Singh begins his omniscient but strictly Sikh narration, allocating the blame to both sides, in this case Muslims and Sikhs. Although he refracts blame from the Hindus almost completely in his novel, in fact, he projects that, position of power creates objective and balanced thinking as seen with Hukum Chand. Singh largely speaks from a Sikh perspective; however, he does not lose sight of other communities and their perspectives but often sees both Muslims and Sikhs as equal proponents of discord and rifts which is highly debatable and thus dialogic. However, this does lend a mild taint of prejudice to his narrative if one analyzes it from an aligned position. On the contrary, it also establishes that events such as partition are enveloped in contradictory perspectives; each perspective, while it resonates with another, also contradicts hence dialogical. He writes, "Muslims said the Hindus had planned and started the killing. According to the Hindus, the Muslims were to blame. The fact is, both sides killed. Both shot and stabbed and speared and clubbed. Both tortured. Both raped" (Singh 1988, 9). He also writes about Sikh's forced migration as they were uprooted from the Northwest frontier. Both Sikhs and Hindus, "traveled on foot, bullock carts, crammed into lorries, clinging to the sides and roofs of trains," and on the way "they collided with panicky swarms of Muslims fleeting to safety" (Singh 1988, 9). By using the term, "panicky swarms of Muslims," Singh tries to manifest Muslim voice as well, but depicts it in retrospect as a writer writing after the events of partition in 1952 and not in 1947, thus, reflecting on the events as a distant narrator rather than an involved participant. Though Singh has seen the cataclysmic event of partition, when he writes about these he writes as an omniscient narrator from above rather than below.

However, there are instances where his Sikh perspective overwhelms his neutrality as a writer. In the beginning, he claims that Mano Majra belongs to the Sikh villagers, as they "own the land around the village; the Muslims are tenants and share the tilling with the owners" (Singh 1988, 10) yet the

Sikhs continue to wish to live in harmony with the Muslims. As opposed to the historian Jaswant Singh, another Sikh historiographer, who writes that Sikhs demanded a separate state on the pretext that they owned most of the land in Punjab, Khushwant Singh as a fiction writer does not either support or uphold such demands. Jaswant Singh writes, "fearing that Gandhi was going to accept the League's demand for Pakistan, the Sikhs had come out with their demand for Sikhistan, a self- determining state in the Punjab-formed on property basis." This meant that "areas where they had their toil turned waste land into rich agricultural farms, and in which the bulk of their landed property was located, should be constituted into a separate Sikh state" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 312). However, no such claim is made by any Sikh character in the novel *Train to Pakistan*.

Interestingly , yet, contentiously, in the fictional representation of the Sikh community there is no insinuation or endorsement of demanding a separate homeland for Indian Sikhs; however, in the 1970s the demands for Khalistan became a strong Khalsa voice, more militant and unflinching, leading to unfortunate incidents of Operation Blue Star as the Indian Army invaded the Sikh's most sacred place of worship, The Golden Temple, further leading to assassination of Indra Gandhi, the then-prime minister of India, and an enraged wave of communal violence (Weiss 2002). In this context, as opposed to historical discourse, which presents the voice of the historian singularly, the novel is "a site of the heteroglossia" as it "creates open worlds" and can "represent multiple speech-genres, debates of a time-period" thus, "bring perspective into fuller understanding of each other" (Robinson 2011, 4). *Train to Pakistan* provides that debatable perspective opening dialogue rather than closing it. The cohabitation and the harmonious lives of Sikhs, Muslims, and Hindus in the novel surely depict this.

History, on the other hand, as is apparent in Jaswant Singh's, Chattha's, and Wolpert's accounts of partition, is monologic in nature, "made up of objects integrated through a single consciousness. . . . Monologism is taken to close down the world it represents, by pretending to be the ultimate word" (Robinson 2011, 2). Truth is "constructed abstractly and systematically from the dominant perspective," removing all "rights of consciousness," rendering a "discursive 'death' of the other," denying the other subject's ability to "produce autonomous meaning," thus making the subject a "non-being" (Robinson 2011, 3). As is apparent in the differentiation of monologic and dialogic novels, Khushwant Singh's novel shows interaction between characters rather than showing a single consciousness and the discourse interacts never superimposing the author's ideology. His Sikh characters' concepts "interact" and "engage" with the ideologies of their Muslim, Hindu, and atheistic characters. Meet Singh, a *bhai* of the Sikh temple, proclaims "Everyone is welcome to his religion. Here next door is a Muslim mosque. When I pray

to my guru, Uncle Imam Baksh calls to Allah" (Singh 1988, 48–49). The religious worldview of Sikhs welcome people belonging to other faiths. They attempt to build differences by voicing ontologically pluralistic communal values so much so that places of worship and symbols do not create fissures across religious dogmas, contrary to the depiction of coexistence and its relative cosmological strife presented in the historical discourse.

In the fictive village, Sikhs coexist with their Muslim and Hindu "brothers" (Singh 1988, 30), thus, engaging and interacting with different ideologies become integral for their coexistence. Evidently, the political forces at the time of partition exploited religion and destroyed the possibility of a harmonious existence based on the notion of coexistence, which was the conceptual backbone of life in the Indian subcontinent. However, the literary narratives re-invoke and reinvent alternative paradigms and roads of dialogic traffic between communities still smarting from the mental scars of partition. Mano Majra remains devoid of communal trouble till these political agents and police with the monologic stance of supremacy and singular predominant force overwhelm the otherwise engaging and interactive populace of the village. Thus, the literary narrative which is dialogic in nature provides an alternative reality, which history cannot depict.

Keeping in view the multiplicity of voices in a literary narrative, the Sikh voice needs to be explored as a distinct yet interacting voice. Singh's occasionally celebratory drift toward Sikhs is an implicit recognition of Sikhism's core humanistic values. Therefore, to identify the embedded appreciation of Sikh's moral and religious superiority in the narrative of *Train to Pakistan* it is here instructive to overview the history of Sikhism as a religion. Sikhism as a religion originated in 1499. Guru Nanak founded Sikhism, at a time when the "dominant religion of the country, Hinduism, was in conflict with one of the newest religions from the West, Islam. Sikhism developed as an alternate third path for Indians." The word "'Sikhism' comes from 'Sikh,' which means 'a strong and able disciple.'" Sikhism is a combination of "Hinduism and Islam in its beliefs, practices, and traditions. Some of its aspects of its teachings on God, reflect Islam more than Hinduism, while other doctrines, such as karma, reflect Hinduism more than Islam" ("Sikh Religious Beliefs" n.d.). Hence, Sikhism is an integration of two religions in the subcontinent. It came into being in order to integrate two opposing forces, initiating a dialogue between the two religions.

This is evident also in the practices engendered by Guru Nanak. Guru Nanak propagated the common meal *Langar*, which according to *Collins Dictionary* means, "the food served, given to all regardless of caste or religion as a gesture of equality." It was and is a communal practice of sitting together and eating. Although this form of communal eating has been a part of Sufi tradition of Persia and India, it is associated to Sikhism as an integral

religious and traditional element. Sikh religion is younger than Islam, and has borrowed elements of welfare for community from its predecessor religions. Dr. Abdul Alim in his paper, "Baba Guru Nanak- A Muslim Saint" quotes Reverend Thomas Patrick Hughes, a British missionary, "Sikhism, in its inception, was intimately associated with Muhammadanism; and that it was intended as a means of bridging the gulf which separated the Hindus and the Muslims." Hughes further reiterates, "The literature and traditions of Sikhism present a strange intermingling of Hindu and Muhammadan ideas. . . . Nanak purposely intended his creed to be a compromise between those two great religions" (Alim 2013, 1). Guru Nanak, according to Hughes was a "Hindu by birth" but he "came under Sufi influence, and was strangely attracted by the saintly demeanor of the faqirs.[1] . . . It is therefore, only reasonable to suppose that any Hindu affected by Muhammadanism would show some traces of Sufi influence." In fact, Alim quotes Hughes's claim that "the doctrines preached by the Sikh Guru were distinctly Sufistic and indeed, the early Gurus openly assumed the manners and dress of faqirs, thus plainly announcing their connection with Sufistic side of Muhammadanism" (Alim 2013, 1). Hence, the sufistic element which comprises love, harmony, and integration is common to Sikhism and in general to all religions, since it is pluralistic and universally beneficial for humanity.

According to the Guru, "Religion was a way to unite people," but in practice he found that it set men against one another. He further declared, "There is no Hindu, there is no Muslim, so whose path shall I follow? I shall follow the path of God" ("Sikhism's Origin's: The Life of Guru Nanak," 2016). It can be inferred that a new religion was created to bridge two religions, which in itself is dialogic in nature. In *Train to Pakistan*, Khushwant Singh is displaying this characteristic of Guru Nanak's Sikhism by creating a space, Mano Majra where Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs coexist peacefully till outsiders intervene and highlight only the differences inbred within the various religious ideologies.

Initially, the Sikhs according to the Sikh narrator Khushwant Singh "allow" the "muezzin" to call for prayers because they believe that the Muslims are "their brothers" (Singh 1988, 30). So far, the village has been one of the "oasis of peace" (Singh 1988, 10), because Mano Majra has not seen any of the "convoys of dead Sikhs" (Singh 1988, 29). Wherever, death and killing has been witnessed, there has been retaliation, of "Man for man, woman for woman, child for child" (Singh 1988, 30). According to the Punjabi viewpoint, rather than strictly Sikh, it is believed that, "truth, honour, financial integrity" were "placed lower down the scale of values than being true to one's salt, to one's friends and fellow villagers" (Singh 1988, 54). However, when confronted with the choice between their fellow villagers and fellow Sikhs, the monologic position of the police force overtakes and overrides

their loyalties as well as integrity. Khushwant Singh, as a Sikh writer does not blame the Sikh community at large, rather he blames the instigators who follow no religious ethics or morality yet entertain a religious identity, since in his novel, they have a Sikh identity. He saves his communal standing by using Juggut Singh as a tool of dialogue and engagement. Juggut Singh engages with the train and its occupants by slicing the rope which could have halted the train and led to a massacre. In that instance, the narrator transforms him from a rogue to a savior of the entire Sikh clan by not letting them become murderers of their Muslim brothers in the train. Although it is love between a Sikh man and a Muslim woman which saves hundreds of lives, when Juggut Singh finds that his lover Nooran is on board the train destined to doom by his Sikh counterparts. He saves hundreds of innocent Muslims while saving his love, Nooran.

Singh further illustrates how the blame is shifted from Sikh culprits to the "Mussulmans" (Singh 1988, 117). Hukum Chand's plan of allocating the blame on a "Muslim Leaguer" (Singh 1988, 117) from outside the village would convince Mano Majra Sikhs to let their Muslim brothers leave the village, thus, saving their lives indirectly and saving themselves from indulging in heinous acts. Although Hukum Chand is a Hindu and confesses that had he not been a magistrate he would have taken full revenge from the Muslims for abandoning their country. He says, "God alone knows what I would have done to these Pakistanis if I were not a government servant" but his Hindu voice has to be subsumed by his governmental authority and responsibility. Yet, in doing so, he retains his human voice, which saves hundreds of lives. He has to ensure that there is no killing in his region, "just peaceful evacuation" (Singh 1988, 32). With the sharpness of his mind, he averts a massive tragedy and manages to evacuate hundreds of Muslims peacefully. He uses love as a tool rather than the sword as a weapon.

In Hukum Chand's character, Singh also provides a Hindu perspective. The village has "only three brick buildings, one of which is the home of the moneylender Lal Ram Lal. The other two are the Sikh temple and the mosque" (Singh 1988, 10). Singh equates the status of the three buildings as they form a "triangular common with a large peepal in the middle" (Singh 1988, 10). Lal Ram Lal's house is a source of money for the villagers, thus, a sacred space just like the gurdwara (the Sikh temple) and the mosque. There is only one Hindu family, yet, due to Lal Ram Lal's financial status, it is an important family. Hindus gain importance as they have bureaucratic power in this area, as is seen in the character of Hukum Chand, the magistrate and deputy commissioner, who exercises immense power in the region. The course of events is manipulated at the hands of the magistrate. Singh, however, alludes to the innate goodness of the magistrate who discerns the need of the hour. Hukum Chand is aware of the fragile relationship between

Muslims and Hindus. He realizes that their strengths can become their weaknesses and in order to maintain peace in his region he plays with facts. He hides some facts exhibiting them only when needed. Hukum Chand despite being a Hindu looks at the entire situation objectively and in compliance with his bureaucratic stance. His voice is powerful, yet, contemplative. He foresees trouble and tries to manage the situation as a magistrate only. Thus, in spite of his distinct Hindu identity, his post as a magistrate enables him to see things objectively. He says to his sub-inspector, "Your principle should be to see everything and say nothing. The world changes so rapidly that if you want to get on you cannot afford to align yourself with any person or point of view. Even if you feel strongly about something, learn to keep silent" (Singh 1988, 31). Hukum Chand does exactly as he preaches till peace is at stake. According to him, "We must maintain law and order. . . . If possible, get the Muslims to go out peacefully. Nobody really benefits from bloodshed" (Singh 1988, 32). Despite, Hukum Chand's hatred for the Pakistanis and Muslims, Singh shows his stance tilting toward maintaining law and order.

Thus, Singh broadcasts the Hindu perspective also while remaining detached and offering the benefits of detachment. Metaphorically, Mano Majra is safe and at peace till its inhabitants remain detached. Although, Mano Majra is "the most important village on the border" since "no refugees," meaning outsiders, "have come through the village yet," the sub-inspector believes, "no one in Mano Majra even knows that the British have left and the country is divided into Pakistan and Hindustan" (Singh 1988, 33). Therefore, it is the outsiders that bring trouble to this oasis of peace.

The novel begins with the arrival of Iqbal, an unknown outsider bearing no religious identity, but a harbinger of trouble. Hukum Chand plays with his name, and religious ambivalence. He uses Iqbal to initiate the process of evacuation of Muslims from the village. Hukum Chand as a magistrate believes that their presence would lead to trouble. The sub-inspector informs Hukum Chand about the arrival of Sikh refugees from neighboring villages. Fortunately, these Sikhs have not been molested or looted therefore, there is no animosity. The Muslims of Mano Majra "have been bringing food at the temple" (Singh 1988, 116) for the Sikh refugees. There is a probability that more refugees might come in with hatred and grievances toward the Muslims leading to difficulties for them. Hukum Chand conjures up a plan to evacuate Muslims from the village in order to save their lives and avoid any kind of bloodshed under his jurisprudence. He orders the sub-inspector to release the Sikhs who murdered the Hindu moneylender and lay the blame on Iqbal. The rumor that Iqbal is a "Muslim Leaguer" (Singh 1988, 80) would impel Sikhs of the village to ask Muslims to leave Mano Majra for their own safety. Singh creates a Hindu character to show that despite his Hindu identity and embedded hatred for the Pakistanis, his duty as a magistrate engenders in him

neutrality. He plans a chain of events to save Muslim lives and bloodshed. Hence, his voice is a driving force for peace for the general community, rather than a divisive voice of a Hindu in particular.

In Singh's narrative, the Muslims of Mano Majra have a voice too. However, Muslims appear as marginal community but their muezzin has a voice—he calls to prayers five times a day. Interestingly, he is blind physically, thus, he cannot see differences. He remains detached from the divisive features of the community, rather he is objectified as a voice of conglomeration only. Nooran, his daughter, is sexually involved with a Sikh man and is pregnant with his child. The unborn child is thus a hybrid species, carrying features and qualities of both races. The rest of the Muslims are tillers, laborers, and tenants indebted to their Sikh landowners. Their collective voice is seemingly subservient, despite the fact that the Sikhs do not exercise any aggressive power as landlords. However, the Sikhs' love for their Muslim neighbors implies the significance of their existence in Mano Majra. This amicable coexistence is a source of constant dialogue between the two communities. The temple, the mosque, and the money lender's house situated in the same vicinity become a dialogic space. Each call for prayer from the mosque and the temple is dialogic rather than a dialect of difference. Their heteroglot coexistence is a source of peace in the region, as is evident in the fact that there has been no trouble in Mano Majra so far, despite partition. The Muslims lived peacefully with the Sikhs till the head constable voiced his opinion regarding the coexistence of Muslims and Sikhs. The cause of this division is the introduction of outsiders: "The head constable's visit had divided Mano Majra into two halves as neatly as a knife cuts through a pat of butter" (Singh 1988, 141). He shows, how "Quite suddenly every Sikh in Mano Majra became a stranger with an evil intent" to the Muslims. He claims that the Sikh's religious symbols, "His long hair and beard appeared barbarous, his kirpan menacingly anti-Muslim," and "Pakistan came to mean something to them—a haven of refuge where there were no Sikhs" (Singh 1988, 141). Subtly, Singh shows how voices can be a source of mediation as well as division. The hybrid existence had muted all the other voices, but the voices are never fully mute. Therefore, interaction and conference are a natural requirement of coexistence, so that no voice ever remains voiceless. However, the introduction of the other's voice in this case, the *other* denotes a non-resident of Mano Majra, led to the predominance of one voice over the other. The Sikhs, who vouched for the safety of their Muslim brothers, suddenly changed their stance overnight on hearing the outsider's voice subsuming all other voices.

In this context, Singh shows that the symbols which once were the unifying force of the community now became exclusive and divisive. This transition in interpreting symbols signifies an ideological transition too. The symbols

do not change but the perspective changes leading to uncertainties, ambivalences, and eventually hatred. The dialogic culture disseminated with the incursion of ideologies is reflective of differences rather than similarities. The foundation of these ideologies was grounded on political empowerment of one group over the other. This ideology is repugnant to the heteroglossic view of amicable existence of multiple voices without the superimposition of one voice over the other. Singh writes, "Sikhs were sullen and angry. ' Never trust a Mussulman,' they said. The last Guru had warned that Muslims had no loyalties. He was right. All through the Indian history, sons had imprisoned or killed their own fathers and brothers had blinded brothers, to get the throne" (Singh 1988, 141). So, historical accounts passed down by monologic historians of the Sikh religion in this case start holding credence over years of harmonious coexistence. Recounting recorded accounts of murder, slaughter, and rape by the Muslims belonging to another space and time in historical accounts becomes a source of antagonism and subsumes their peaceful cohabitation for years in their own time and space—Mano Majra.

Thus, Singh depicts this recorded history with reference to Guru's warning to the Sikhs as a means of schism and fissure which overpowers a shared reality of harmonious living in one space and time at Mano Majra. Singh adopts the role of an objective observer as a writer writing from no vantage point yet he passes the verdict that "Logic was never a strong point with Sikhs; when they were roused, logic did not matter at all" (Singh 1988, 142). Singh crafts his characters in such a manner that each contributes to the dialogue as well as debate at large. Hukum Chand knew of this trait and played on this emotionally contrived characteristic of Sikhs to save Mano Majra and its Muslims. In one stride, Hukum Chand saves the Sikhs from committing murder and thus, saves innocent Muslim lives. Concomitantly, Singh's character, Iqbal Singhji, who is at this point in the novel, referred to as Iqbal Singhji tries to voice his concern for the Muslims in a bid to rekindle feelings of fraternity in the Sikhs of Mano Majra. Singh consciously uses Iqbal, now Singhji, to convey the Sikh voice of reason. Iqbal says, "You cannot let this happen! Can't you tell them that the people on the train are the very same people they were addressing as uncles, aunts, brothers and sisters?" Meet Singh, "wiped a tear" and proclaims, "They will kill. If it is a success, they will come to the gurdwara for thanksgiving. They will also make offering to wash away their sins" (Singh 1988, 192). The Muslim fate lies in the hands of their Sikh brothers. Although, years of living together has not bonded the two communities enough, yet the Muslims and Sikhs do not know an alternate way of life. Imam Baksh speaks on behalf of the Muslim community, "What have we to do with Pakistan? We were born here. So were our ancestors. We have lived amongst you as brothers" (Singh 1988, 147). The Muslims have lived all their lives in Mano Majra, they "don't know . . . Pakistan" (Singh 1988, 149) as

Nooran claims. Nooran voices the feelings of her Muslim counterparts when she says, "This is our village" (Singh 1988, 150). Despite reassurances, while Sikhs and Muslims fall into each other's arms and weep like children, singing "Friendships not forever last"(Singh 1988, 149), the Sikh Muslim entente ends in the departing embrace. The entire village "was awake" that night, "the women sat on the floors hugging each other and crying. It was as if in every home there had been a death." There has been a death; it is the death of friendship, coexistence, and harmonious living. Despite Iqbal's reminder that the people in the train the Sikhs mean to attack are the same people "they were addressing as uncles, aunts, brothers and sisters" (Singh 1988, 192), Meet Singh knows that hatred has been instilled and Sikhs will react to rumors. So, it is not religious preaching, ethics, or Western morals that save the trainload of people, it is love, which finds no place in recorded history.

Singh shows the Hindu, Sikh, Muslim, and the neutral Western perspective at the same time showing that years of living together do not guarantee eternal bonds but love is the source of peace and in this case, the hybrid existence of the unborn child could herald an eternal bondage. Ergo, as Hukum Chand predicts it is love that saves lives in the novel, while all the other villages burn with vengeance as per recorded history.

Intertextually, it is love again which Hanif Kureishi, in his works, depicts as a bridge between two races, the English and the British-born Indian. In the screenplay *My Beautiful Launderette*, Hanif Kureishi shows how "national romance," which "emerged in the eighteenth century as a literary genre in which star-crossed lovers from opposing nations . . . marry, healing the conflict between their respective communities" (Baron 2007), becomes a means of hybrid relations in a plural society. The colonized colonizes the colonizer through love, when Omar, living in Great Britain, takes care of Johnny, uplifts him financially and protects him from committing crimes due to his love for him. They enjoy homosexual love, which keeps them bonded despite an obvious racial difference. Intriguingly, homosexual love signifies blurring of gender boundaries too. So, Kureishi shows how homosexual love between a "Paki" (a derogatory term used for South Asians living in Great Britain) and a British is a two-pronged means to achieve a hybrid coexistence.

Since, writing generated by subcontinent writers is a means of countering the Master discourse of the colonizer, Kureishi, Sidhwa, Desai, and Masroor, write and project the hybrid coexistence of their characters and the subsequent peace derived from this existence. In order to understand this hybrid coexistence, Ania Loomba's work is seminal. Loomba writes, "Postcolonial studies have been preoccupied with issues of hybridity, creolisation, mestizaje, in-betweenness, diasporas and liminality, with the mobility and crossovers of ideas and identities generated by colonialism." Furthermore, she quotes Robert Young, "Hybrid is technically a cross between two different

species" (Loomba 1998, 173) and since "identity is a matter of 'becoming' as well as 'being'" in the case of hybridity between the colonized and colonizer an "alterity, or binary opposition" (Loomba 1998, 181–82) is challenged.

Contextually, William Dalrymple also writes of hybridity conversely, he is a white man writing about the consequences of white mingling with brown in his fictive writing. His story, *White Mughal* is a story of love, betrayal, and loss between the colonizer and the colonized. However, the paradigmatic shift in the power structure due to hybrid relationships and the introduction of a hybrid race as a consequence of confluence of two races set the parameters for dialogue. So, in postcolonial writings, whether the author is the colonizer or the colonized, the significance of hybrid relations has been highlighted to show possibilities of integration, assimilation, and dialogue. Since decolonization with reference to the acknowledgment of independence of the colonized in the absolute sense did not occur as an event, the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized continues. According to Dipesh Chakrabarty, "the colonizer and the colonized are often engaged in a hybridizing encounter" (Chakrabarty, Majumdar and Sartori 2007, 3), which retains the dynamics of the power structure in the relationship involving two races. In Kureishi and Dalrymple's case they reverse it, empowering the colonized. However, their hybrid existence contributes to their dialogic stance. Fiction, thus, provides a stage for interaction between communities. This communal hybridity finds a voice in *Train to Pakistan* in the love between Juggut Singh and Nooran, which saves hundreds of lives. Despite the fact that when a Sikh falls in love with a tenant Muslim girl, the same criterion of "power" and powerlessness is applied, the hybrid unborn child carries the distinctness of both "races," and conjoins the "different species" (Singh 1988, 173) beyond the dynamics of power. Thus, Juggut Singh's liaison with the Muslim girl, Nooran remains a source of love instead of hatred.

Furthermore, Singh portrays that the villagers hold a sacred bond of living and dying for each other but instigation and conspiracy overwhelms all such connections. Singh dwells on the idealistic belief that it is only love that lasts forever. Juggut Singh, at this point in the novel, only referred to as Jugga, deeming his religious identity redundant, lets Nooran migrate but saves her life. At this point he is not even aware of his unborn child. It is therefore, the purity of his love for a girl which coerces his action, and her Muslim identity is irrelevant in determining his actions. At this point, even "God; He is irrelevant" (Singh 1988, 195). There is no need for heroism in the face of religious fury and fervor if there is no personal interest involved. According to the character, Iqbal, "When bullets fly about, . . . the bullet is neutral. It hits the good and the bad, the important and the insignificant, without distinction" (Singh 1988, 194). Iqbal tries to convince himself that the Western world, logic, and proof matter but "We are the mysterious East.

No proof just faith. No reason; just faith." There is no philosophy which can combat the religious fervor the people of India breed and embroil, "We climb to sublime height on the wings of fancy" (Singh 1988, 196). As Iqbal sips his whiskey and sleep overtakes him, numbing him to the world outside, Singh depicts how reason has been intoxicated by the "humbug" called religion and that ethics and logic have been laid to rest. Thus, Singh voices his opinion through Iqbal at the closing chapter proclaiming religion the source of trouble and "so long will our brand of humbug thrive" (Singh 1988, 196) ethics and logic may not interfere. He contemplates on the condition of India:

> India is constipated with a lot of humbug. Take religion. For the Hindu, it means little beside caste and cow-protection. For the Muslim, circumcision and kosher meat. For the Sikh, long hair and hatred of the Muslim. For the Christian, Hinduism with a sola topee. For the Parsi, fire- worship and feeding vultures. Ethics, which should be the kernel of a religious code, has been carefully removed. (Singh 1988, 195–96)

In the same context, Sidhwa's character, Lenny, in *Ice-Candy-Man*, calls religion venomous and questions the existence and subsequent identity of God. Both Sidhwa and Singh have witnessed how religion was used as a tool to breed hatred, and therefore, pose questions as to the worth of the religion practiced in the wake of its usage as a medium of hate and disharmony rather than ethics.

In *Train to Pakistan*, however, Singh gives a distinct voice to Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs to show their different perspectives with respect to religion. The characters meet at gurdwara and discuss their plight in the wake of the overwhelming hatred for each other outside Mano Majra. At the same time, in this heteroglot novel, Singh gives the author a distinct voice too. Though Iqbal is a Sikh, there is ambivalence as to his religious identity due to his name and his appearance. Since he is circumcised it is automatically assumed that he is a Muslim. So, he stands for all religious identities. Singh uses this character to voice his own opinion, yet intermittently. Iqbal does not stand for any specific identity, yet he has an Indian identity which is an amalgamation of West and East, Hindu, Sikh, and Muslim.

Singh voices his opinion through this ambivalent character, Iqbal, when he contemplates that "there does not seem to be a code either of man or of God on which one can pattern one's conduct. . . . In such circumstances what can you do but cultivate an utter indifference to all values? Nothing matters. Nothing whatever" (Singh 1988, 197). However, Juggut Singh as Jugga, proves that love does matter. It is only love that can save humanity, as it connects rather than disconnects humans.

In this context, Rabindranath Tagore's *The Religion of Man* is significant in understanding the chain connecting humans. Tagore claims, "Relationship is the fundamental truth, a piece of coal. When we pursue the fact of its ultimate composition. . . . These are units" and the coal exists due to the "inter-relationship" and the "pervasive truth of inter-relation which is manifested in them will remain" (Tagore 2011, 9). It is this kind of interrelationship with others of his kind which man is composed of. He exists due to interrelationships with others, just like the elements in the piece of coal, which "unites them not merely in an individual piece of coal, but in a comradeship of creative co-ordination with the physical universe" (Tagore 2011, 10). Therefore, it is not a superimposed idea of religion which unites the human kind, it is Man himself. Tagore says, "The individual man must exist for Man the great, and must express him in disinterested works, in science and philosophy, in literature and arts, in service and worship. This is his religion" (Tagore 2011, 4). Though man's "multicellular body is born and it dies; his multi-personal humanity is immortal. In this ideal of unity he realizes the eternal in his life and the boundless in his love . . . whatever name may be given to it, and whatever form it symbolizes, the consciousness of this unity is spiritual and our effort to be true to it is religion" (Tagore 2011, 4). Thus, ideologically religion unites humankind to a chain of existence rather than divide into segments.

According to Jacques Waardenburg, "Applications of a religion imply the presence of ideological elements." In the case of Islam, Waardenburg explains, where there is a problem, "Islam is defined, identified in such a way that an answer becomes possible. Such applications are tied to particular situations" (Waardenburg 2002, 331). Hence, religion apart from its spiritual elements is a means of providing solutions to problems on this earth. In the same context, Sikh religion, "emphasizes that man is not only capable of transcending this ego-consciousness, but is destined to do so. . . . There is a crusade to enable man to rise above his present level and remove the hurdles that plague him and solve the problems that face him." For the Sikhs, the world is not to be derided. This is however, "a departure from the Indian religion tradition," where the Sikhs preach "Living in this World is not a bondage for them but a rare opportunity" (Daljeet Singh 1990). The Indian religion comprises Hinduism as well as Islam, Jainism, and Buddhism. Timothy Fitzgerald quotes Babb who observes, "Hinduism as a religion . . . is fundamentally a ritual system, or rather many ritual systems that share a common core structure. Religion is 'a thing done, not believed.'" Babb further explains,

> Ritual is a symbolic activity which conveys information. The basic core of all rituals, however, diverse is found in the value of purity and its opposite, pollution. This value of purity and the eradication of pollution is the point at which

> society and religion "fuse." The value of purity is equally fundamental in relation with a deity and in the hierarchical relations. This concern with purity is found in the whole range of rituals that he analyzes. (Fitzgerald 2000, 143)

Thus, in Hinduism, "stratification of deities is related to human hierarchy and levels of social organization" (Fitzgerald 2000, 143), this makes it different from other religions. However, the essence behind its rituals is purity, which fuses it with the society and its benefit to the eternal social system.

Thus, Khushwant Singh's attempt to address this eternal social order is significant. He writes of the eternal unity in his novel too. He explores and questions the idea of religion as created by different sects but shows how man exists for love and the savior of humanity is love. Tagore, refers to *humanity* as an eternal entity united by a bond which is present in Man. He says, "A seed carries packed in a minute receptacle a future which is enormous in its contents both in time and space. The truth, which is Man, has not emerged out of nothing at a certain point of time. . . . The truth of Man is in the heart of eternity" (Tagore 2011, 9). Singh's own voice can be discerned as a mimicry of this ideology when he connects Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs in a hyphenated existence. He writes, "All lanes met in the temple-mosque-moneylender's house triangle" (Singh 1988, 59). However, "a few subhuman species were going to slaughter some of their own kind" (Singh 1988, 194). In this regard, Singh allocates a subhuman status to the mass murderers, relinquishing them from the chain of humanity and therefore blame, yet, observing that they were about to slaughter their own kind, elucidated their allegiance to mankind and the inherent animalistic desire to kill. The Sikhs of Mano Majra had been living with their fellow villagers, Muslims, for centuries connected by the bond of humanity. Suddenly, instigated by a subhuman race they plunge to that level too, and only then do they contend to kill. They hear the voice of these subhumans, as they say:

> for each Hindu or Sikh they kill, kill two Mussulmans. For each woman they abduct or rape, abduct two. For each home they loot, loot two. For each trainload of dead they send over, send two across. For each road convoy that is attacked, attack two. That will stop the killing on the other side. It will teach them that we can play this game of killing and looting. (Singh 1988, 171)

Meet Singh's plangent reasoning to reconsider as "what have the Muslims here done to us for us to kill them in revenge for what Muslims in Pakistan are doing? Only people who have committed crimes should be punished" (Singh 1988, 171), is set as a contrast to the outsiders convincing the villagers that killing is the only choice. Meet Singh insists on following the teachings of the Sikh Guru, Gobind Singh, but the outsider calls the peace-loving Sikhs

another brand, "Teach this sort of Sikhism to someone else" (Singh 1988, 172). It is to be noted that, Gobind Singh was the son of Guru Tegh Bahadur, "second only to Guru Nanak in importance" ("Sikhism's Origin" 2016). This creed of subhumans which Singh depicts in his story cannot "view . . . the immense time and space" which is "occupied by innumerable human individuals engaged in evolving a common history," if they could view it they would realize "the positive truth of their solidarity" is evident "and not the negative fact of their separateness" (Tagore 2011, 35). Hence, violent elements present in the society do not depict the essence of religion as preached by the gurus and saints. There is a filtration process within these violent members to locate aggressive chapters in religious teachings and propagate them according to their separatist ideologies. Singh attempts to expose these elements in his fictive account to humanize the issues prevalent at the time of partition.

With reference to this humanization, Stanley Wolpert, in *Shameful Flight*, writes,

> Khushwant Singh's searing novel Mano Majra [*Train to Pakistan*, New York, 1956], first made me aware of the human impact of Partition's tragedy on Punjab. I became more acutely conscious of the historic dimensions of Britain's irresponsibly hasty withdrawal from India and the economic and political consequences of Partition when I worked on my *Jinnah of Pakistan* twenty years later. (Wolpert *SF* 2012, ix)

Singh's novel provides figurative illustrations and metaphorical references of these images. These in turn, show connections between the Muslim, Sikh, and Hindu worlds. The human aspect as Wolpert describes is relevant, but the imagery also depicts the voice of the author. Like a ventriloquist, Singh implants his voice in different images and symbols, however, these images carry their own distinct voices. At this point, a detailed interpretation of these implanted voices of the animal world, trains, images of bridges, religious symbols, and the village at large, is significant to show how Singh proffers dialogue through distinct voices, symbols, and images.

HETEROGLOT IMAGES OF ETERNAL CONNECTIVITY IN NATURE

Singh shows how there are certain voices which propagate harmonious living. He uses Nature to show connectivity, as nature holds this faculty of unison with its surrounding elements. He employs animal imagery to demarcate the difference between Man and Beast in their response to the external environment. Metaphorically, he shows how animal relations thrive in the

village despite the filth surrounding them. Despite human feces and urine on the road, there is "a mangy bitch . . . with a litter of eight skinny pups yapping and tugging at her sagging udders," "a small patch of muddy water" is "full of buffaloes" (Singh 1988, 57) bathing together. An integral point to be noted is that in the beginning of the novel, Singh refrains from allocating religious identities to the villagers and describes their day-to-day chores as objectively as he describes the animal population of that village. Nature is the common force that keeps them integrated to each other. He writes,

> Men are in the fields. Women are busy with their daily chores. Children are out grazing cattle by the river. Persian wheels squeak and groan as bullocks go round and round, prodded on by curses and the jabs of goads in their hindquarters. Sparrows fly about the roofs, trailing straw in their beaks. Pye-dogs seek the shade of the long mud walls. Bats settle their arguments fold their wings, and suspend themselves in sleep. (Singh 1988, 13)

He describes the correlation of humans and animals and their activities as they are connected by the entity, Nature. Therefore, it is the "living cell" which represents an "intimate unity of kinship" (Tagore 2011, 14). Even, the "carcasses of bulls" float in the river with the corpses of men, women, and children, as is shown later in the novel. Just as there are human onlookers and planners of these events, the animals also react to the happenings in the human world. The "crows" cawed and the "shrill cry of a koel" awaken both humans and animals. The sky is flooded with "kites and vultures" which aim for the carcasses just as the humans who engineer the killings of other humans for a greater agenda to precipitate more killing. It is a cycle which Singh depicts through animal imagery and the distinct voice of both animals and humans. However, heteroglossia is significant as it incorporates the other's perspective too, and dialogue between inter- and intra-species is only possible when there is an "active and engaged understanding of other's discourse incorporating the other's perspective" (Robinson 2011, 4). In this case, the animal kingdom is the other yet a distinct part of the village and Singh does not ignore these participants and their voice in any way.

Singh's novel is a site of heteroglossia as it represents "multiple speech" of different races, identities, and species. He writes of geckos, buffaloes, dogs, and humans. Just as Nature is indifferent to killing, Hukum Chand is shown indifferent, however, he is human and manipulates events to avoid mass killings. He sees and contemplates over how the geckos crawl down and how one of them "crept up stealthily behind" the moth "pounced and caught it fluttering in its jaws. Hukum Chand watched the whole thing with bland indifference" (Singh 1988, 107). Hukum Chand knows the gecko's destiny whether it was in a "hospital," in "trains or in the jaws of reptiles, it

was all the same" (Singh 1988, 103). Here, Singh defines, quite pertinently, the difference in humans and animals. He shows that the love for a young Muslim prostitute keeps his humanity alive and becomes the maestro in saving hundreds of lives, as opposed to the gecko, which remains entrapped in its mundane acceptance of its fate. Thus, Singh's narrative is replete with images of animals and humans connected by the strand of inherent kinship in their natural coexistence. Aside from these images, the novel has heteroglot symbols, spatial and psychological, which commune with each other and provide dialogic possibilities.

INTERLOCUTORY SITES IN THE CONSORTIUM OF SPATIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL HETEROGLOT SYMBOLS

Apart from the animal imagery, Singh has employed symbolic points of references which propagate discursive and dialogic sites. These are present intrinsically in bridges and trains. The trains that commute over these bridges come from different destinations thus, they carry different types of humans so the image of bridge connecting these destinations and humans shows a dialogic possibility in itself. Singh writes, "About a mile north of Mano Majra the Sutlej is spanned by a railroad bridge." but the "bridge has only one track" (Singh 1988, 11), which allows one train to pass through at one time. Metaphorically, the most important train passes first but each is given an opportunity to pass, thus, the connection is not broken. When there is no sound in Mano Majra, the sound of the train reverberates in the landscape voicing its arrival or departure on the bridge. Thereupon, the train has a voice too. There is one exception when the train with dead corpses arrives it makes no sound. Hukum Chand recalls a man "holding his intestines, with an expression in his eyes which said: 'Look what I have got!'" remaining soundless yet conveying the voice of his agony and torment. Images of "women and children huddled in a corner, their eyes dilated with horror, their mouths still open as if their shrieks had just become voiceless" haunt Hukum Chand despite their silence. Hence, the silence of the images depicts a heteroglot and distinctly silenced voice as well.

Singh shows it is not the dead only which have been silenced, even the powerful magistrate loses voice as he suffers from shock upon exposure to such a cataclysmic spectacle. He engages with the misery of those silenced with his voiceless projection of dismay, as a man, almost dead, "gripped the magistrate's right foot. Cold sweat came all over Hukum Chand's body. He tried to shout but could only open his mouth . . . Hukum Chand tried to shout again. His voice stuck in his throat." Finally, Hukum Chand revives from the

"nightmare with an agonized shriek" (Singh 1988, 102). His shrieking voice at this juncture is important as it breaks him out of his voiceless reverie and indifference. His shriek enables him to act as a barrier to violence. Therefore, his shrieking voice in the soundless train at this point is immanent in showing the frustration with respect to the situation and the disaster which pervaded the atmosphere, producing another distinctly mordant voice in the space of the desolate train.

Singh writes about the time when, due to flooding, no trains ran for two days, thus, flooding disconnected the villages, portraying how the symbol of connection can be disrupted. Similarly, the bridge is a connector, yet, it is used to execute a disaster, discordant and deliberately contrived to orchestrate disharmony and rancor among the Muslims and the Hindus, or Pakistanis and Indians. The inherent quality of a bridge is to connect, but at the hands of rogues it becomes a weapon to kill. However, Jugga connects the two countries and two religious groups by disrupting the "plan" to use the bridge as a means of disconnection. The strangers and the volunteers "plan" to "stretch a rope across the first span of the bridge" and "when the train passes under it, it will sweep off all the people sitting on the roof of the train" (Singh 1988, 176), and once the train stops, the killers would get the opportunity to kill with ease. The massacre would lead to a reaction from the Muslim side and so on and so forth the killing would continue disconnecting Muslims and Sikhs forever. In this case brothers and sisters living for centuries together in one village would disconnect. A fraternity established over the period of centuries would disband in one disastrous act over the bridge. Nevertheless, Jugga's action and sacrifice on the bridge managed to retain the sanctity of the bridge to connect and communicate, relinquishing a dialectical outcome of the event.

Therefore, Singh provides counterfoils to violent instigations too. He shows how voices infiltrate and pollute the space of Mano Majra yet the voice of a lover supersedes all by superimposing the psychological space of communion between a man and a woman. Yet, geographically, it is the "most important village on the border here" (Singh 1988, 33), it is isolated from politics till outsiders rampage the streets of the village. The outsiders provide another voice to the villagers. Singh questions, "How could outsiders dare to do 'something' to their fellow villagers?" Despite their animosity for the Muslims, the village carries a comradeship. The "youth who had referred to Muslims as pigs spoke haughtily: 'We would like to see somebody raise his little finger against our tenants while we live" (Singh 1988, 145). Singh, shows that in Mano Majra, "loyalty to a fellow villager" is "above all considerations," while "hospitality was not a pastime but a sacred duty" (Singh 1988, 145). Mano Majra is the only village "left where there are Muslims," as the villagers feel they could never ask their tenants to leave. Significantly, the Sikhs believe the village is as much theirs as the Muslims. They are willing

to lay down their lives for the Muslims as a young man claims, "We die first and then you can look after yourselves," "we first, then you. If anyone raises his eyebrows at you we will rape his mother." The Muslims bear the same sentiments and voice their opinion, "What have we to do with Pakistan? We were born here. So were our ancestors. We have lived amongst you as brothers." However, the lambradar[2] speaks the voice of reason, "But Chacha, we are so few and the strangers coming from Pakistan are coming in thousands" (Singh 1988, 147). It is the strangers who instigate the same youth of the village, which claimed to lay their lives for their village fellows, to kill the same so-called brothers, sisters, and mothers. Singh metaphorically through the symbol of the space of the village depicts the state of India. So, the outsiders in the village may be the symbolic representations of the colonizer, taking on the role of the "parent" (Loomba 1998, 1). They do not share any roots biologically or physically with the indigenous populace but adopt a parental role. In the same context, analysts like Ayesha Jalal, also show how all races, ethnicities, and religious groups lived in harmony for centuries till the outsiders, the British, came and disrupted the harmony. They divided the communities to establish their hold, since it is easier to rule divided subjects than a unified body of people. As Ayesha Jalal declares in *The Pity of Partition*,

> The issue is knottier in the case of Partition violence than in that of the Holocaust. In the latter, a totalitarian state orchestrated a genocidal campaign against a community for racial and supremacist reasons. By contrast, there were perpetrators and victims of a murderous orgy in 1947 among Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs in the midst of the abdication of all sense of responsibility by managers of a departing colonial state. (Jalal 2013, 87)

Most significantly, this ruling party, the British, used the same religious tools for division which had been employed as means of integration. In the subcontinent, the Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims revered their places of worship. They upheld their religious symbols above all material aspects of the world. However, as they lived together for centuries these symbols diluted and emerged hybrid in certain areas. In *Train to Pakistan*, Singh depicts how the Bhai from gurdwara and the muezzin from the mosque are given respect equally. He writes, "The only men who voiced their opinions at village meetings were Imam Baksh, the mullah of the mosque, and Bhai Meet Singh . . . Imam Baksh's age and piety had made him respected . . . Meet Singh was a man of peace. Envy had never poisoned his affection for Imam Baksh" (Singh 1988, 95–96). Both these religious men enjoy an "undercurrent of friendly rivalry," which further induces dialogue and debate.

Interestingly, the communities have been living together for centuries taking part in each other's rites and rituals, so much so that their religious slogans

and chants merge too, procuring a psychological space for unison as individuals rather than separatist ideologies. They invoke an eclectic God, "Ya Allah. Wah Guru, wah Guru" (Singh 1988, 96). Nevertheless, the geographical as well as the psychological location of the religious places is such that it allows each religion its autonomous entity. Thus, the call for prayers is heteroglossic too, "The mullah at the mosque knows that it is time for the morning prayer. He has a quick wash, stands facing west towards Mecca and with his fingers in his ears cries in long sonorous notes, 'Allah-ho-Akbar,'" and when he finishes the call, the Sikh priest awakens to summon Sikh followers. Thus, there is no hindrance from any sect in Mano Majra in running religious activities of the other's community. However, as the strangers arrive in the village they instigate animosity and target the Sikh youth in breeding this antagonism. So the young have a separate voice. A young boy says, "Our problem is what are we to do with all these pigs we have with us? They have been eating our salt for generations and see what they have done! We have treated them like our own brothers. They have behaved like snakes" (Singh 1988, 144). Meet Singh enquires of them, "What have they done to you? Have they ousted you from your lands or occupied your houses? Have they seduced your womenfolk? (Singh 1988, 144) and the response of the young boy is, "They are Muslims" (Singh 1988, 144), thus, terminating any further dialogue. Singh, therefore, shows that even within the Sikh community there are multiple voices, and despite contentious ideologies, each voice is given a chance to speak.

ART AND NOMENCLATURES: PARADIGMS FOR INTEGRATED IDEOLOGIES AND WAY OF LIFE

As a heteroglossic novel represents all voices, Singh writes about another community too, which has been a tool for integration for centuries. This is the artist community, which has a separate and distinct voice as well. Notably, it is devoid of all religious symbols and connotations. Haseena Begum, a singer and dancer informs the magistrate, "Singers are neither Hindu nor Muslim in that way. All communities come to hear me," devoid of any inclinations due to her religious identity. At the same time, Haseena points out that the hermaphrodites stand for borderless existence, which in turn, makes them connectors between genders and the artist as well as the audience. They may be Muslim, Hindu, or Sikh, female or male, it is irrelevant, according to Haseena, "You can call them Muslim, Hindu or Sikh or anything, male or female" (Singh 1988, 122). Religious identity is discerned by the names rather than actions and rituals. When Hukum Chand asks Haseena, "You are Muslim?" Haseena retorts, "Yes, I am Muslim. What else could Haseena

Begum be? A bearded Sikh?" thus, coalescing religion and genders as irrelevant identity markers. Apart from her name, nothing connotes her religious identity. Hukum Chand says, "You are not Hindu or Muslim, but not in the same way as a hijra [hermaphrodite] is not a Hindu or Muslim" (Singh 1988, 122). Yet, there are names which do not signify religious identities without their last name that stands for their caste, creed, race, or religion.

One such name is Iqbal that commonly used by many religious groups. Thus, in the novel, his ambiguous identity misleads the villagers. He walks into a gurdwara and is immediately considered a Sikh. He exits a particular train which carried a majority of Muslims, hence, he is understood to be a Muslim, since "All passengers appeared to be Muslims on their way to Pakistan," and as his home is in Jhelum, the place "confirmed the likelihood of his being Muslim: Jhelum was in Pakistan" (Singh 1988, 52–53). If he is a member of the communist party then even the first name is irrelevant, as Meet Singh says, "Comrade Something-or-other" (Singh 1988, 63). Iqbal hosts two religious symbols on his body. One is his circumcised organ, which denotes that he is a Muslim. The second is more apparent, as he wears a "steel bangle all Sikhs wear" (Singh 1988, 183), which in turn, makes him a Sikh. Therefore, his name can be manipulated to the advantage of the authorities. Thus, the name Iqbal carries multiple voices of different religions in it. The head constable reiterates that the "Babu's name is Iqbal Singh. He is a Sikh. He has been living in England and had his long hair cut," but the sub-inspector wishes to show Iqbal in a different light, he says, "There are many Iqbals. I am talking of a Mohammad Iqbal, you are thinking of Iqbal Singh. Mohammed Iqbal can be a member of the Muslim League" (Singh 1988, 133). Eventually, when Hukum Chand needs to use Iqbal's Sikh identity, he abrogates Iqbal's allotted Muslim identity and calls him Sikh. The sub-inspector says apart from Jugga Badmash, the other prisoner is "Iqbal Muhammed or Mohammed Iqbal. I am not sure which," and Hukum Chand replies, "Not Iqbal Mohammed, Inspector Sahib. Nor Mohammed Iqbal. Iqbal Singh" (Singh 1988, 182). He provides a rationale for his belief that Iqbal is a Sikh. He says, "Do you really believe an educated Muslim would dare to come to these parts in times like these" (Singh 1988, 183)?

Interestingly, even Iqbal realizes the significance of his name and religious symbols, "He cursed his luck for having a name like Iqbal, and then. . . . Where on earth except India would a man's life depend on whether or not his foreskin had been removed" (Singh 1988, 188)? Thus, Singh shows how names carry distinct voices too, for Iqbal himself the name carries different perspectives. As a narrator, Singh interchangeably, calls his characters different names in order to correlate with the demand of the situation. Iqbal is referred to as Iqbal only, when Singh wishes to converse with the reader and convey his thoughts on the significance of ethics in all religions. In the same

manner, Juggut Singh is referred to as Jugga, when his religious identity is irrelevant in performing an ethical deed due to love alone.

THE DICHOTOMOUS VOICE OF LOVE AS DISTINCT FROM PROPAGANDIST CHANTS OF HATRED

There is thus, one shared symbol which integrates all communities and that is love. Singh presents, different types of love to highlight different perspectives. He shows the love of the villagers for each other, which can be tarnished and eroded by outsiders. He shows the love of a Hindu magistrate for a prostitute, who may be a Muslim but that is irrelevant for Hukum Chand. Finally, he depicts romantic love which supersedes religious differences. It is the hybrid relationship between a Sikh man and a Muslim woman which opens avenues of connections. The culmination of their love is in the hybrid existence in the womb of a Muslim woman. These hybrid creations do not merge two different bloods rather they offer a new and distinct intermingling of blood. Jugga saves the lives of hundreds to save one life, which has a Muslim identity, Nooran. It is universally known that love would be the last resort for peace, as is apparent in the mystic concept that, "Love alone takes us to Reality" (qtd. in Iqbal 2004, 280) and Hukum Chand uses this tool to save hundreds of lives. Hence, love is a tool to continue dialogue and resist contestation.

There are moments when Hukum Chand fears that Jugga might not love Nooran enough to save the train but he opts to rely on a "budmash" (Singh 1988, 200) in love, rather than his magisterial power. Hukum Chand's emotional involvement with a Muslim prostitute could not be advertised but the girl has to be saved too. Jugga would also save Hukum Chand's love unknowingly. Thus, Jugga "stretched on the rope" fearless for his own life and "hacked the rope vigorously." He is fired at by the Sikh mob, "and one of his leg's came off the rope and dangled in the air," the mob fires another shot but Jugga continues to hack the rope. The rope shreds, "There is a volley of shots. The man shivered and collapsed. The rope snapped at the centre as he fell. The train went over him, and went to Pakistan" (Singh 1988, 206). Jugga's love reconstructed the master plan of spreading hate and revenge by constructing an eternal bond with his conceived child in the train. Singh shows the selfless quality of love, in this case, hybrid relations, which is a continuum of humanity, as opposed to the separatist ideology of religious disparities celebrating massacres.

Juggut Singh as a Sikh, asks Meet Singh to read the holy scripture before he sets out to save his beloved Muslim woman. He wishes to know the meaning, but Meet Singh says, "What have you to do with meaning? It is

just the Guru's word. If you are going to do something good. Guru will help you; if you are going to do something bad, the Guru will stand in your way. If you persist in doing it, the Guru will punish you till you repent, and then forgive you" (Singh 1988, 199). Jugga realizes there is no need to know the meaning, his action is for love therefore, it bears a direct dialogue with God. He relies on his instinct to choose the correct course of action. No holy scripture is required for that instinct, yet, he listens to it for a spiritual connection with God. The scripture carries a dialogic voice too, which connects Man eternally.

According to Tagore, "Man the Eternal" inspires "love," "the consciousness of this unity is spiritual and our effort to be true to it is religion," widening "the realization of his[Man's] immortal being, the perfect, the eternal." Tagore points out further that, "It inspires those creations of his that reveal the divinity in him- which is humanity" (Tagore 2011, 4). Singh uses this "faculty" of Man to connect with the Eternal Man due to his inspired humanity to connect two countries on the train bridge. The passengers on the train bear their separate identities yet, are connected to the savior, Jugga, through love. Whenever, this connection has been disrupted, Singh shows, the world has become "voiceless" with dead corpses (Singh 2011, 102). He shows that before the mob mentality set in on the villagers they could hear human voices in distress, "they heard human voices calling for help. The cries came from over the water." The lambardar has doubts whether these are human voices or "jackals," but the villagers till this point are pure enough to recognize that these are human voices "like someone in pain" (Singh 1988, 162). However, like vultures and kites which "flew down . . . pecked till the corpses themselves rolled over" (Singh 1988, 163), the villagers team up to render their brothers and sisters "voiceless" (Singh 1988, 102) on the bridge. Thus, whether the voices are silenced or distressed, Singh has depicted their presence. Jugga listens to his inner voice and reacts according to his impulse which is untarnished by any outsider's teachings. It bears God's purity and Jugga knows that.

Jugga's action on the bridge is Singh's endeavor to show that the possibility of dialogue lies in hybrid love. Hukum Chand orchestrates the action to save humanity and the Muslim prostitute. As Nooran carries a Sikh child in her womb she is a harbinger of Sikh Muslim entente. Therefore, Singh's novel depicts possibilities of interaction and integration through the distinctness of each character's voice. Chapter 3 analyzes how time and space contribute to dialogic possibilities. The space of a united India at the time of partition is rendered divided. The chronotopal transience which Anita Desai's characters embody in *Clear Light of Day*, as discussed in chapter 3, depicts their connection with the past and the space which changes its identity from the subcontinent to India and Pakistan.

NOTES

1. "Faqir." Faqir is derived from the word *faqr*. It is a Muslim Sufi ascetic in Middle ssEast and South Asia and the faqirs were wandering Dervishes teaching Islam and living on alms. Web. Sep 2015.

2. "Lambardar." A village officer hired by the government to collect revenue. Web. Jan 2014.

Chapter 3

Chronotopal Movement in Anita Desai's *Clear Light of Day*

In India there are many religious identities and denominations; however, Hindus make the largest religious majority in the country. In previous chapters, Parsee and Sikh perspectives of partition of India have been analyzed and discussed, this chapter peruses *Clear Light of Day*, a novel written by an Indian writer, Anita Desai of Hindu descent; however, she refrains from exhibiting Hindu culture, religion, or norms. This aspect of distancing her novel from her own religion and its details yet depicting Muslim ways and values makes *Clear Light of Day* a dialogic site, although, this chapter analyses the Hindu perspective, in particular, from a Hindu household situated in the space of Old Delhi in India. The novel presents "time frame shifts" to incorporate different perceptions of the event of partition. Thus, the novel is divided into four time frames. Its parts depict different eras. The first part is set in the present, the second shifts the reader to the past, the time of partition of India, the third part transports the reader to a distant past much before the partition while the fourth part brings us back to the present. The setting however remains the same space of Old Delhi, the effects of moving time on the space, make the space kinetic. Thus dialogue is studied through exploration of the space of Old Delhi which the characters occupy and the time shifts between past and present as depicted in the novel. In this chapter, the spatio-temporal ramifications of the event of partition are deconstructed. Bakhtin's work on chronotope in conjunction with dialogism questioning configuration of time and space in Desai's novel is explored. Thus, chronotope is studied to identify the dialogic possibilities in this novel about partition as it uses space and time to show dislocation of various communities with different perceptions.

Interestingly, it has Muslim characters in the background. They are not given a mouthpiece at any time, that is none of the Muslim characters speak

directly, yet they are spoken of by other characters (except when Raja visits the house with his family). The dialogue is between the Hindu characters who discuss at length Muslim characters and their ways. Hence, there is a distinct influence of the Muslim norms, values, and culture but it is shown indirectly through other characters like Raja. Thus, there is an indirect dialogue present between the Hindu characters and the Muslims despite the physical absence of Muslim characters. This technique is employed to depict the marginalization of Muslims in the wake of the horrors of the partition this novel presents both graphically and intellectually as well as philosophically, imbricating history both precolonial and postcolonial.

There is a dialogue between Hindus and Muslims without the Muslim participation in the conversation or their presence. To understand this dialogue between two different religious groups, it is important to delve into the foundation which enables the growth of such a collaboration. Hence, "A dialogic poetics must first of all be able to identify and arrange relations between points of view: it must be adequate to the complex architectonics that shape the viewpoint of the author toward his characters, the characters toward the author, and all of these toward each other" (Holquist 2001, 162). Since, architectonic "concerns questions of building" (Holquist 2001, 150), it is important to understand how Desai builds from "individual components" "but in the particular combination," a relationship between races, religions, spaces, and time both past and present. In "dialogism wholeness, or consummation, is always understood as a relative term . . . always a function of a particular point of view" (Holquist 2001, 150) so "in a world in which a thing can be seen only from a particular point of view, so must the very concept of point of view itself" (Holquist 162). It is therefore, significant to see and analyze all points of view of the event of partition.

The novel, *Clear Light of Day* is written by Anita Desai, an Indian writer and published in 1980. Since the novel is written in 1980 and the event of partition took place in 1947, the novel is in retrospect distancing it from the time of partition providing another perception through recollection. It is a novel about a Hindu family living in Old Delhi depicting the degeneration of the family. The story is woven around siblings and their relations rather than focusing on the parents and their contribution to the family. In the exposition, the reader finds out that Bimla (Bim), the eldest sister is running the family house and taking care of her autistic (a person having a developmental disorder) brother, Baba. Tara the youngest sister is visiting with her husband, Bakul, and is joined by her daughters later in the novel. Their parents are dead and so is their aunt, who used to look after the children. One of the brothers, Raja, has left the house and migrated to Hyderabad. He has married a Muslim princess. Most importantly, Bim and Raja had been extremely close in their adolescence, thus, his abandonment of his duties to the house and

loyalty toward his sister has left a fissure in their relationship, which starts to fill up at the end of the novel, as Bim releases her inbred hatred for Raja's faithlessness. Metaphorically, the house can be taken as India where all lived in harmony as a family unit. However, with the actual event of partition, the house members develop differences and preferences for different lives and roles except for Bim and Baba. Bim dwells on these differences till she accepts the past, shuns away the stored historical documents in her study, and comes to term with the present day rather than dwelling in the past glory of a relationship. Hence, the novel's inner and outer meaning can be seen as ways of coming to terms with others' differences, in time and space.

The novel presents multiple perspectives which are eventually cherished at the end of the novel. Thus, the style and form of the novel with its back and forth movements in time and space creates the possibility of dialogue in time and space. This relationship between time and space is termed as chronotope. According to Bakhtin, "Chronotope," which "is one of the very few non-Russian words Bakhtin uses," is "the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature." He simplifies it further by stating, "The chronotope is the place where the knots of narrative are tied and untied" (Holquist 2001, 109). To locate this place, the novel is perused in terms of its spatial and temporal points of nexus.

The novel is set in an Old Delhi house. While Old Delhi remains the same with the passage of time, New Delhi changes in the aftermath of colonial departure and the events entailing partition. In pre-partition Old Delhi, Hindus, Muslims, British, and Sikhs lived as neighbors. The house where the characters resided has a significant entity of its own. It is constantly referred to as an integrating feature. It is situated next to Hyder Ali Sahib's house with Muslim inhabitants. Time shows how the house remains the same but its neighborhood changes. The house where the Muslims lived is rendered vacant and depletes with time. Thus, the novel is a depiction of transience in time and space, showing chronotopal movements bearing dialogic possibilities through connection between moving time and altered space. It offers a different point of view from the space of Old Delhi and the time which moves back and forth. In this reference, Bakhtin's claim regarding the point of view is significant, "A point of view is never complete in itself; it is rather the perception of an event as it is perceived from a particular place, locatable only as opposed to any other place from which the event might be viewed" (Holquist 2001, 163). As mentioned earlier, it is time and space that make up the "whole entity." However, the "whole entity" (Bakhtin *DI* 1981) of India is split by the act of partition. This schism is depicted in Desai's novel through the rift in relationship between the brother and sister metaphorically, as well as the difference in the situation between the Hindus and the Muslims living in Old Delhi.

Thus, *Clear Light of Day* provides a multi-perspective approach in its technique also with continuous focus on space and time. As Kirsti Weel Sannurd in "Themes, Symbolism and Imagery in Anita Desai's *Clear Light of Day*," writes, "The novel deals with the aftermath of what happened in India during the partition in 1947, when British India became independent and was divided into Pakistan and India. Through families of varying types of cultural heritage the novel shows us some of the consequences the partition had for the nation as well as its impact on a personal level" (Sannurd 2008, 3). The shifts in time are connected by the space the characters occupy which is the house. The text explores and presents this time and space; hence, Bakhtin's chronotope is a means to understanding the dialogic nature of the text.

The reasons for understanding the concept of time and space in relation to literary form are clearly outlined here, "Bakhtin has shown how literature can help us to appreciate the fact that, in the course of cultural history, transformations of time concepts and spatial representations reflect radical changes in cultural attitudes and lived experience" (Bemong et al. *TLC* 2010). He explores chronotope in conjunction with dialogism and the role of literature in exploring possibilities of dialogue. He writes:

> The second reason is that the concept of the chronotope has helped us to understand more profoundly and more completely the concepts of 'dialogism' and 'heteroglossia' by connecting literary communication with concrete imaginative units and generic patterns. Literature, then, is not merely an ideational phenomenon, but has to be considered as a unique epistemological instrument that concerns intellectual, imaginative and emotional attitude. (Bemong et al. 2010, Preface III)

Anita Desai's novel also epitomizes emotional attitudes and places in relation to the space and time which the characters occupy at different instances. The narrative introduces Tara revisiting India, and the subsequent change in her attitude toward the same space over the period of time. The story is a journey through time spent in the house during childhood, adolescence, and later middle age. Bim and Tara grow in the house in Old Delhi, however, their personal lives are shaped by the choices they take and subsequently the places which they also chose to live. Bim, becomes the caretaker of the family, nurses her sick brother Raja, looks after her alcoholic aunt, Mira Masi, and her autistic brother Baba. She continues to live in the same house. However, Raja and Tara leave the house, their presence is embedded in their belongings stored and cared for by Bim. Raja's poems remain in the house as a reminder of the dynamic relationship between Bim and her brother. These poems symbolically connect Bim to Raja's Muslim world.

Tara is present through the course of the novel. Even their neighbor, Hyder Ali Sahib, lives on in the house through his belongings, which Bim has kept for safe-keeping. Baba brings Hyder Ali Sahib's daughter Benazir's gramophone and plays it daily. Bim and Tara recollect how their parents barely stayed in the house, and how can feel the presence of their dead Aunt and the dead cow. The house retains the living and the dead, as well as the memory of time spent together and apart. Bim refuses to go to Raja's daughter's wedding since she feels alienated from her most beloved sibling, Raja. She feels abandoned by him. Raja, not only severs ties with his endearing sister, Bim and their brother Baba, but also bids farewell to his religion and language. Raja connects the two houses and at the same time disconnects himself from family members living in his own house. His fascination with Urdu and Muslim ways bridges the Hindu household with the distinctly Muslim household of Hyder Ali Sahib. Yet, his abandonment of his siblings detaches the bond they share. Eventually, Bim releases her pent up emotions for Raja's faithlessness and is ready for dialogue with him. Thus, despite the distance and radical change in Raja, once Bim reflects and relinquishes negativity toward her brother, there is a possibility of dialogue. In the same context in the wake of the metaphorical reference of the house to India, despite partition it is possible to initiate dialogue between both the partitioned countries by recognizing and accepting the differences and not by subsuming the other's identity.

Bim tears away Raja's letter in which he writes as a benevolent relation rather than an endearing brother. Bim's act of tearing away this letter reconnects her to Raja, opening a dialogue with her pseudo Muslim brother. She asks Tara to tell him that "he should come," she wants Tara to explain to Raja how she is not used to traveling, but Tara should "Bring him back or tell him to come in the winter. All of them." She says, he can come "to see Hyder Ali's old house-and repair it. Tell him I'm waiting for him-I want him to come-I want to see him" (Desai 2008, 273–74). Bim wishes to connect with Raja but not leave her space. She opens a dialogue with him through maintaining the space. Raja can come to the house and they will connect, but at Hyder Ali's mansion, she would feel alienated and unable to connect. Hence, space is a dominant motif and site of interaction in Desai's novel. A dialogic space is a site representing the development of relations and both dialogic space and time in the novel are explored further to understand their impact on dialogue. Moreover, time is used as a tool to connect and disconnect characters, and most importantly the space of united India. So both space and time create and maintain dialogue, and subsequently, dialogic possibilities are seen in Desai's specific spaces in the novel, in time frames, and in both space and time as seen through the characters at the junction of political and sociological space of partitioned land at the time of partition.

CHRONOTOPAL SPACE AS A DIALOGIC RECOURSE TO DIVISIVE SPACE

The novel is set in Old Delhi. References of New Delhi are frequent with respect to the contemporaneity of New Delhi as opposed to the archaic nature of Old Delhi. Thus, there is a connectedness of time through the demarcated space of Old and New Delhi. In order to understand their connectedness, it is imperative to explore both spaces separately first, to perceive their connectivity to each other. According to Stephen Legg, Assistant Professor of Geography at University of Nottingham, in *Spaces of Colonialism: Delhi's Urban Governmentalities*, "New Delhi was one of Britain's most spectacular showcases of imperial modernity" (Legg 2007, Chap. 1). Legg declares that New Delhi showed the "material reality" of the "longevity" of the "empire," but it was a "utopic vision" (Legg 1). However, "At the level of administration, bureaucracy and governance, Delhi's colonial landscape was . . . dominated by the older city to the north of the imperial headquarters. This was *Shahjahanabad*, the walled city that had functioned as the capital of the Mughal Empire from 1648 to 1857" (Legg 2007, 1). In *Delhi: Ancient History*, Upinder Singh, a historian at University of Delhi, explains why Old Delhi was the original capital. She writes, "The Yamuna is another major landmark of Delhi's physical landscape . . . the Yamuna has a long and eventful history and has played an important role in the history of settlements in the Delhi area" (Singh *Delhi* 2006, xiv). In ancient times, river bed provided the most fertile soil for cultivation and settlements were always along the river banks. British rulers shifted the capital to Calcutta, however, "it was commissioned in 1911 to facilitate the transfer of the capital of British India from Calcutta to Delhi and it took 20 years to construct" (Singh *Delhi* 2006, xiv). Once it was constructed, New Delhi became the pride of British Empire. Legg writes, "As against the neo-classical monumentalism of the imperial capital, and the sterile, geometric spaces of New Delhi, 'Old Delhi' was depicted as an organic space of tradition and community. Urban life was conducted in congested and winding streets between communities defined by historic location and cast." Thus, "geographies of interaction and incursion" were the most important feature of Old Delhi. Legg reiterates the amalgam of communities in the old town when he states, "Temporal flows were dictated by calls to prayer and a thriving annual schedule of Hindu, Sikh, Jain and Muslim festivals" (Legg 2007, 1). The space of Old Delhi was and is a means of interaction with communal temporal schedules and the festivals, which all communities celebrated since they occupied the same space.

These spaces as seen even in *Clear Light of Day* are, therefore, dialogic sites. However, in the historical narrative these are presented as contentious sites with religious positioning since the event of partition questions

India's religious adherence to secular ideals. In the novel, on the other hand, Desai maintains a secular stance and portrays the spaces as dialogic rather than contentious when she presents Old and New Delhi. Even the riots and violence are shown from a distant view which preserves objectivity rather than a biased religious inclination. The chronotopal space remains a trope of violence and contention, however, Desai projects its decay only and not its cause, thus, refraining from allocating blame on anything or anyone.

In *Clear Light of Day*, Bim declares, "Old Delhi does not change. It only decays. My students tell me it is a great cemetery, every house a tomb. Nothing but sleeping graves. Now, *New* Delhi, they say is different. That is things happen. The way they describe, it sounds like a nest of fleas. So much happens there, it must be a jumping place. I never go." Thereupon, Bim does not leave her space, which is Old Delhi, a tomb of memories just like the house Bim lives in. Old Delhi has become stagnant like the waters of the River Ganges, "here nothing happens at all. Whatever happened, happened long ago—in the time of the Tughlaqs, the Khiljis, the Sultanate, the Moghuls—that lot," so the time is not feasible for change. The British "built New Delhi and moved everything out. Here we are left rocking on the backwaters, getting duller and grayer, I suppose. Anyone, who isn't dull and grey goes away—to New Delhi, to England, to Canada, the Middle East. They don't come back" (Desai 2008, 13–14). Those who do not return to Old Delhi, their voices are thus, detracted from the space they used to occupy. In Desai's novel, Raja, who is extremely vocal with respect to Muslim culture and rights leaves Old Delhi and his opinions and his specific voice are lost too. Therefore, Delhi is an important spatial trope in the novel which has undergone centuries of armed conflicts and political strife. It maintains its stature as a potent space for harboring ideological conflicts, colonial revisions, and anticolonial nationalist ideals all at the same time. It is thus, a dialogic site with multiple contentious perspectives. Hence, in Desai's novel, Old Delhi and the house bind the narrative and as these spaces are unraveled, the narrative unravels to show dialogue of characters belonging to different faiths and ideologies.

This dialogue is rooted in the history of the city as well as the historical events the city has witnessed. Desai unravels the disputable yet shared past of all the characters through the space of the city at the time of partition. She writes,

> The city was in flames that summer [1947]. Every night fires lit up the horizon beyond the city walls so that the sky was luridly tinted with festive flames of orange and pink, and now and then a column of white smoke would rise and stand solid as an obelisk in the dark. Bim, pacing up and down the rooftop, would imagine she could hear the sound of shots and of cries and screams,

> but they lived so far outside the city, out in Civil Lines where the gardens and bungalows were quiet and sheltered behind their hedges, that it was really rather improbable and she told herself she only imagined it. (Desai 2008, 73)

Despite the distance in its physical sense, Bim connects on the psychological level with events of the city. Desai shows that the Hindu house does not undergo any change during the riots and the event of partition; however, within the same space of "garden and bungalows," Hyder Ali Sahib's house witnesses a change. Bim describes its condition to Raja, "There's no one there, not even a gardener. The house is dark, all the doors are shut. There's no one there. They must have planned it in advance, Raja- it all looks quite orderly" (Desai 2008, 74). Raja is perturbed by the state of the Muslim house, since he feels connected to it. He has visited the house on many occasions and enjoyed its glory. Hyder Ali Sahib organized many garden parties and Raja was invited to these. Therefore, Bim's description of the depleted space affects Raja more than Bim. Raja decides to leave the space where he has lost his Muslim friends and their tradition. He realizes that the space of India is not safe for the Muslims, he exclaims, "Safe? For Muslims? Here in India? It will be safe after every Muslim has had his throat slit." His distinct and different voice disturbs Bim, "She felt her exasperation blotted by wonder at Raja's ways of thinking and feeling, so different from anyone else's at that time or day. She could not help admiring what she saw as his heroism, his independent thinking and courage" (Desai 2008, 75). He is heroic but "too ill" (Desai 2008, 76) to change anything. He is unable to follow his political ambitions therefore, he channelizes rather restricts himself to the acquisition of personal ambitions. However, poetry transports him to different spaces as opposed to Bim, who remains attached to the house.

As Bim reads Lord Byron, "Raja lay quiet, his hands gathered together on his chest, stilled by the splendor of this vision, transported by the strength and rhythm of the lines, and Bim gloated that she could lead him so simply into a world out of this sickness and anxiety and chaos that burnt around them and across the country that summer" (Desai 2008, 76). It was this quality of imagination and being able to dissociate himself from reality that enabled Raja to disconnect with Old Delhi and connect with Hyderabad. As an avid reader of literature, he recognizes beauty of art in Muslim art and poetry. Thus, he adopts Muslim garb, language, and food in a bid to connect with Muslim art and poetry.

Therefore, despite his love of poetry in general, Raja writes and reads Urdu poetry with greater enthusiasm. He explains to Bim, "Now any Urdu poet could put all that into one couplet, Bim, just one couplet" (Desai 2008, 77). Urdu "had come into existence before the Mughals, yet it was under them in particular that it grew." It is important to note that "people" in the "caravans"

that came from "Persia" and "Central Asia" "adopted" "Hind-Pakistan" and "worked for its development and prosperity" and "men of every status and in every walk of life created altogether new conditions" for the indigenous population and themselves. The "Urdu language is a memory of the same cooperation." Hence, the role of this language which integrates the people of India is extremely important. Despite the fact that "Persian" language remained the official and court language, "Urdu continued to grow and develop" and "possessed such vitality in its structure that it continued to grow and spread on its own, adjusting itself to the new conditions." Contrary to common belief, "This language was not specially a language of the Muslims. It is on the other hand, a symbol of the unity of the Hindus and Muslims" (PHB 1955, 269). Both Hindus and Muslims contributed to its development. However, the poets played the key role in its growth, "the *sufi*[1] saints who dealt with the common people used it in conveying their message of goodness and virtue . . . from the beginning it was synthetical in construction. The warp and woof of Islamic culture and Indian civilization were woven together in its texture" (PHB 1955, 270). Raja's interest in the language shows his interest in Islamic studies as well.

He wishes to study Islamic Studies at the Jamia Millia University, which is a Muslim space. Thus, his inclination toward the Muslims is a cause of concern for his father. Through Urdu poetry he feels a part of the Muslim community too. However, Raja's father realizes that if "a Hindu boy" is "caught in Jamia Millia, the center of Islamic studies" he "will be torn to bits . . . burnt alive" (Desai 2008, 85). So, a language which was developed to integrate and amalgamate the communities of India in the same space of India becomes a threat for the Hindu scholar. Raja's father knows that Raja "will be torn to bits" by the "Muslims, for trying to join them . . . and the Hindus, for deserting them and going over to the enemy" (Desai 2008, 85). For Raja, Hindi is not even a language. He "had studied Urdu in school . . . before the Partition when students had a choice between Hindi and Urdu. It was a natural enough choice to make for the son of a Delhi family," meaning Urdu is the "natural" language of Delhi. Each space has a language of its own, Delhi had Urdu. It was "the language of the learned and cultivated. Hindi was not then considered a language of great pedigree" (Desai 2008, 78). According to Raja, the angles of Hindi script "impede the flow of the composition" (Desai 2008, 78), as opposed to Urdu. He finds conjoiners in Urdu between languages, cultures, mystic thought, and physical world.

His neighbor and landlord, Hyder Ali Sahib hears of Raja's interest in Urdu and invites Raja to his space, a spacious library in his bungalow. Raja's thinking and voice alter as he changes his space, from "swinging on the garden gate" (Desai 2008, 78) he moves into Hyder Ali Sahib's library first, then his garden parties and next his daughter's room. Eventually, Raja adopts

the Muslim house in Hyderabad abandoning his own house in Old Delhi. Thus, the movement within the space of these two houses leads to dialogue as well as space becoming a site of dialogic interaction. In this context, it is instructive to peruse dialogism and chronotope further so that a clearer understanding of the relationship of time and space in literary genre can be established. Holquist's interpretation of Bakhtin's chronotope displays the bifocal approach of history and literature, space and time, "Chronotope, like most terms characteristic of dialogism, must be treated 'bifocally'" for "close-up" analysis and "to serve as an optic for seeing at a distance." Therefore, the chronotope space which feature in the narrative, in this case, *Clear Light of Day*, "are not merely devices," and "not cut off from the cultural environments in which they arise: 'Out of the actual chronotopes of our world,'" so, "while art and life, when conceived as abstract topics *in general*, have no connections between them, in the experience of a particular living subject who consume works of art, who, as it were, 'utter them, there is a possibility for effecting exchange.'" Therefore, as Holquist explains, "Art and life are two different registers of dialogue that can be conceived only in dialogue" (Holquist 2001, 111). Holquist further elucidates that "literary chronotopes are highly sensitive to historical change," and "different literary societies and periods result in different chronotopes both inside and outside literary texts" (Holquist 2001, 112). Raja's entrance in to Hyder Ali Sahib's domain is his transference and not an exit from his house. He is connected through the literary works he indulges in at both houses.

In the same manner, Bim is connected to another family, Dr. Biswas's. There are loci of confluence between these spaces too, just like Raja finds such loci in Hyder Ali Sahib's house. Nevertheless, in *Clear Light of Day*, different communities coexist in Old Delhi, such as Bim's Hindu family, Dr. Biswas's Bengali Hindu family, the Misras, and Hyder Ali Sahib's Muslim family; the point of confluence is an event. They are all united in witnessing the event of partition; however, each one presents a unique and distinct reaction to it. This correlation despite distinctness due to the united space of Delhi is a means of dialogue. While Bim's family has the privilege of living on in their space, Hyder Ali Sahib's family does not. They leave Old Delhi and move to a Muslim-ruled state which is Hyderabad. Hyderabad is a space within the space of India where Muslims would continue to rule despite partition.

Hyderabad, "was founded by Nizam al- Mulk," but "When the Indian subcontinent was partitioned in 1947, the ruling Nizam elected to resume independent status rather than join India. On November 29, 1947, he signed a standstill agreement with India to last one year, and Indian troops were withdrawn." However, "difficulties persisted" and despite Nizam's endeavors to "assert his autonomy," "On September 13, 1948, Hyderabad was invaded

by India, and within four days Hyderabad's accession to India was achieved" ("Hyderabad" 2015, 1). This extra-textual reality is depicted in the novel, so, there is a correlation in "intra- textual" references and "extra-textual world" (Holquist 2001, 110). Hyder Ali Sahib's abandonment of his house in Old Delhi and his return to his ancestral place as depicted in Desai's work shows the correlation of the two worlds—art and life. Thus, the two worlds are in a state of dialogue too.

In this context, it is also important to see another Indian but Muslim writer, Salman Rushdie, writing about three spaces: united India, divided India, and Pakistan. Therefore, "chronotope may also be used as a means for studying the relation between any text and its times, and thus as a fundamental tool for a broader social and historical analysis" (Holquist 2001, 113). Contextually, in Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*, where time is of utmost importance, which is midnight, the space is extremely significant in deciding the fate of the children born at midnight of August 14–15, 1947. Rushdie writes, "all over the new India, the dream we all shared, children were being born who were only partially the offspring of their parents-the children of midnight were also the children of the time: fathered, you understand, by history. It can happen. Especially in a country which is itself a sort of dream" (Rushdie 1980, 159). However, this was a dream for the rich but a nightmare for the poor. His character Joseph D'Costa says, "This independence is for the rich only: the poor are being made to kill each other like flies. In Punjab, in Bengal. Riots, riots, poor against poor. It's in the wind" (Rushdie 1980, 139). So, Rushdie draws another line, which is between the rich and poor apart from the Hindus and Muslims. He writes of the act of independence as a dream fulfilled for some and a nightmare for others. The time and space are shared but the consequences are distinct and opposite for the people of India.

Similarly, Desai's novel shows the degeneration of Hyder Ali Sahib's house but not of Hyder Ali Sahib and his family. They are merely dislocated to their old home, enjoying the same grandeur and splendor. Raja, however, does not see it as that. He empathizes with Hyder Ali Sahib and his dislocation as if a great loss has been borne by him. In reality, Raja is translating his loss of an endearing neighbor on to Hyder Ali Sahib. The loss is apparent in the degeneration of the space, which is Hyder Ali Sahib's house. Pre-partition, Hyder Ali Sahib's house is full of splendors and extravagancies; however partition and abandonment of the house depose the house off its glamor. When Bim and Baba visit the deserted mansion, "The house was so strangely unlit and deserted as it had never been . . . like a body whose life and warmth they were accustomed to and took for granted, now grown cold and stiff and faded. It looked accusing, too, as if it held them responsible" (Desai 2008, 116–17). Desai retracts the blame from the politicians, the lawyers, and the freedom fighters and narrows it down to the people of India. She shows

how the inhabitants of Old Delhi lived side by side as one entity, belonging to Delhi, but remained silent as their neighbors and friends parted ways. In this regard, Raja's illness at the time of partition signified the metaphorical decay of India, thus, it stands for the maligned condition of Hindus and Muslims; the sickness also signified the diseased country. He is unable to fight for his neighbor, due to his disease. In the same way, India is unable to defend herself due to the infirm and maligned minds of the inhabitants of India who are unable to maintain dialogue among themselves.

At the same time, Raja, being a Hindu, is summoned by his Hindu classmates to conspire against the Muslims to take part in maligning his own country. They give him "news of refugee camps and killings, of looting and burning in the city, and pleading with him, in conspirator's voices, to join their society" (Desai 2008, 95), but he threatened to inform the police about their intentions. To these Hindu boys he is a traitor, to Raja these boys are traitors to their countrymen. He complains about his condition, since he has tuberculosis, "why must I have t.b *now*?" (Desai 96) thus, he is unable to contribute and help Hyder Ali Sahib at that time. He proclaims his wish for "fighting the mobs—saving Hyder Ali and Benazir" (2008, 97). He feels responsible for not being able to prevent Hyder Ali Sahib's ill-fated departure, and protests that, "people like Hyder Ali Sahib are going to be driven out, their property will be burnt and looted, the government is helpless, they're not preventing" (2008, 97). He fears the loss of dialogic interactivity with the eviction and dispersion of Hyder Ali Sahib's family and belongings. Later, just like Raja, Bim feels responsible for the decay of Hyder Ali Sahib's house, "Ripe fruit had fallen to the ground" and there is a "wilting potted plant." As Bim moves inside, she sees,

> All the rooms were unnaturally enlarged by emptiness for all the small objects of ornaments and comfort had been taken away and only the large pieces of furniture left, ornate and heavily carved sofas and marble-topped tables that, stripped of cushions and vases and silver boxes and coloured glassware, sulked and looked as accusing as abandoned husbands in the gloom. The squares and oblongs on the walls from which pictures had been removed were marked by brown rims of grime. (Desai 2008, 117)

Desai uses the words "accuses" and "abandoned" to highlight her perspective of the event of partition, which is self-reflexive. Furthermore, she uses Bim, to depict this feeling of guilt of abandoning their neighbors. Despite the fact that Bim outwardly denies this and provides a counterargument to her own thoughts, when she "scornfully" says to Hyder Ali Sahib's servant, "Escape? . . . What do you mean, escape? They have every right to leave their house in

Delhi and go and live in their house in Hyderabad. If they took their belongings with them, well, they were *their* belongings, it's not theft" (Desai 2008, 121). Desai is extremely cautious in not aligning blame to any mob, Hindu or Muslim, and showing the decay of the house as a result of Hyder Ali Sahib's own choice. Yet, subtly she accuses and feels the guilt, when the servant wails, "Ah, but they were Muslims. . . . We should not have allowed them to go" (Desai 2008, 121). The servant explains to Bim, he is unable to travel to his village since he has served Muslims, thus, Hindus will not spare him. Hence, Desai living in India creates a space where she allots the blame to the Hindus who are left behind in their familiar surroundings, while the Muslims had to leave. Desai presents different points of view and lets them interact.

In this context, Bakhtin's explanation of differing points of view from different space and time is significant in understanding prospects of dialogue embedded in divergent and diverse points of view. He claims, "Point of view is often taken to be a merely 'characterological' or 'psychological' category. In other words, point of view is frequently taken to be a 'viewpoint' whose fixity serves to define a character associated with it . . . it is a static category, and therefore, one that dialogism will avoid," but Bakhtin provides an important "distinction between character and person" (Holquist 2001, 162). He relates this to the distinction of "I" and "another." He explains, "Character is a monologic, finished off, generalized category that is given and determined-all aspects of 'anotherness.' Person, on the other hand, is a dialogic, still-unfolding, unique event that has the 'made-ness' and unpredictability rooted in conditions relating to 'self'" (Holquist 2001, 162). Likewise, Desai unfolds her characters as persons living together in a united space but enjoying differing points of view.

She narrates the story from the space of Old Delhi although she takes the reader to the places Tara traveled to as well as Hyderabad, yet the storytelling remains based in Old Delhi to show the contrast in this space over time. The families which lived in Old Delhi belong to it despite their departure from the city. The outsiders living in the city are not welcomed by the inhabitants. However, Desai shows that discrimination against the outsiders does not yield positive results. Mr. Misra exclaims about Brij's business, "Can it succeed when Brij, the manager, cannot go to the office because he thinks it is degrading and refuses to speak to his clients because they are Punjabis, from Pakistan, and don't belong to the old families of Delhi?" (Desai 2008, 56). Accordingly, changing space becomes an issue from the point of view of inhabitants of Old Delhi. These inhabitants are skeptical of the outsiders and disrupt the dialogic process. Inversely, Bim is disconcerted by the idea of her brother leaving Old Delhi and moving to Hyderabad, which is a space within the space of India, but is tolerant toward those who move across borders, whether it is Tara and Bakul or the Punjabis from Pakistan.

Therefore, Desai's characters have to be understood as persons involved in the event. Their values are embedded to the events of the novel. So, each person has a "'voice,' as in expressions such as 'to speak in one's own voice,' has long been a means for representing the distinctiveness of what otherwise is called a 'point-of-view.'" Thus, perception "can only be achieved from a unique point in the spectrum of possible perspectives . . . what we see is governed by how we see, and how we see has already been determined by where we see *from*" (Holquist 2001, 164). Although, partition of India is experienced and witnessed by those who had to evict their space and those who remained lodged to their roots, yet it affected both in dispersing their location. With the partition, the perspective of the other and of the space they occupy shifts, creating a new space psychologically as well as geographically. Desai's novel projects this new place as Hyderabad, where one can see *from* differently, the event of partition and its effect on a Muslim family, that is Hyder Ali Sahib's family. This family does not migrate to Pakistan and continues to enjoy the same splendor in India and paradoxically is simultaneously present in its old abode through its abandoned belongings. Thus, the presence as well as the absence of the Muslim landlord and neighbor is reiterated through the abandoned house. So these different spaces, distant yet engaging, provide different points of view yet remain in touch and interactive through the spaces of the house and India. Tara says, "We must come-if we are not to lose touch, I with all of you, with home, and he [Bakul] with the country . . . if you lose touch, then you cannot represent your country, can you" (Desai 2008, 14)? Tara needs to reoccupy her home and its attendant spaces physically in order to remain in touch. Bim, on the other hand, needs to disconnect from the letter Raja wrote and her memory of events attached to this letter to connect with her past and her brother who lives in a different space. Bim is "Touched" by Raja's writing, despite being away from him, she could not tear his papers but "in the end, the only paper she tore that night was the letter he had written her and she had never answered. . . . Having torn it, she felt she had begun the clearing of her own decks, the lightening of her own barks" (Desai 2008, 263). She tears away from the negative memory and saves all the positive memories of his poetry and writing. Desai subtly voices her point of view regarding disconnection to negative thoughts and connecting with positive thoughts. Bim, "flung" all unnecessary papers "in a heap in the centre of the floor, and her shelves and desk were bare except for dust" (Desai 2008, 264). This is Bim's turning point, she bares herself of the past aggression and all that remains is the dust of the years gone by. Desai attempts to show a way of starting anew, connecting with past glories only, and flinging aside all unnecessary burdens to engage in dialogue. Bim, sees from another perspective, thus it is neither "visual" nor "vocal," it is a condition more accurately expressed in terms of time and space" (Holquist 2001,

164). Architectonics of chronotope can thus only be understood when both space and time are explored separately as well as together. Desai's novel is distinct in its treatment of time. The "dust" which remains on the space of Bim's shelf depicts the time gone by, which needs to be revisited. In Desai's novel, time also is shown in dialogue with the characters. Past, present, and future are all in dialogue whether it is through memory or a prediction of the future.

CONTINUANCE OF CONJOINERS IN CHRONOTOPAL TIME

In the case of a novel referring to a historical event, it is important to analyze the event as well as how it has been retold in the form of a story. Therefore, it is integral to explore the importance of "the difference between the *fabula* and the *syuzhet*: the distinction between the way in which an event unfolds as a brute chronology (fabula), and as the 'same' event, ordered in a mediated telling of it, a construction in which the chronology might be varied or even reversed, so as to achieve a particular effect" (Holquist 2001, 113). Hence, we understand that the order of the plot "against a background" story determines the textual content of it in relation to the figural. Bakhtin claims that, "Chronotope is the indissoluble combination of these two elements," leading to "simultaneity and difference of time/space" which "works itself out in the story/plot ratio (chronotope)" (Holquist 2001, 113–14) which in turn makes it a narrative, and unravels the time sequentiality in novels. Desai's novel, *Clear Light of Day*, is a perfect example of deforming "the sequentiality of events" "(always involving a segmentation, a spatialization)" by dividing it in to parts according to time frames. The first part of the novel narrates the present, the second takes the reader to a flashback of the summer of 1947, the third part to a distant past of the characters as children, and the fourth and final part brings the reader back to the present. The warping of sequence of events enables a connection between the characters, the events, and reader as the characters and events are woven together by the story rather than by a chronological sequence. Despite, its deformation, the order of events can be "'recovered,' as it were, by rearranging the 'distorted' pattern of events back into their 'proper' or, as it is sometimes said, their 'real-life' chronology" (Holquist 2001, 114). So, time is an important element for unraveling events in a novel. So as a recourse to dialogue, "It is necessary simultaneity of figure [in this case, plot] and ground [or story] that constitutes the dialogic element in the chronotope" (Holquist 2001, 114). However, in literature "events can be arranged in any sequence," as opposed to "real life," where the events are "chronological." Therefore, "literary time is pure convention. Its laws do

not coincide with the laws of time in 'real life,'" thereby, "in dialogism, the chronotope is grounded in simultaneity at all levels" (Holquist 2001, 115), so there is "no purely chronological sequence inside or outside the text." Thus, "Einsteinian ideas about inseparability of time and event" (Holquist 2001, 116) are significant to chronotope and subsequent dialogism. These are seen in Desai's novel as corelation of time and event.

In *Clear Light of Day*, the corelation of the event and the time is integral to the story. Desai correlates the event of partition to the present timeline of the novel. She uses the past to unravel the present-day issues. When Bim flings her books and papers from the past into a pile, she reconciles with the past to make sense of her present. She accepts Raja's marriage and invites his family, rejecting the past aggression she had immersed herself in by keeping the letter that Raja wrote as a connection to the past hostility she felt upon reading the letter the first time. In the act of tearing of her brother's letter she simultaneously owns and disowns a moment of her past. In the same manner, the event of partition shown in retrospect distances it to the present, although, it is not abandoned as a memory. It is used as a tool to show integration between the brother and sister as well as a shared memory. However, it provides a reason for separation between the brother and the sister. Thus, it correlates to the present as a cause of Raja's absence from the house and Bim's hollowness as a result of it.

Furthermore, the house is rendered as a metaphor for India, and Bim's disconnection with Raja, a subtle metaphor for the separation of India and Pakistan. Raja has always represented Muslims and their ways, yet Bim and Raja have also shown their inclination to the history of India meaning they stand for the united India inhabiting all races, castes, and creed. Their family house deteriorates but Bim continues to look after it. Baba is the other inhabitant and he is fixated to the past glory. Besides the old servants, there is Hyder Ali Sahib's servant and dog in the house, reminders and remainders of the Muslim neighbor who left. Thus, the corelation between the past and present persists in memorable items and beings which occupy the mental and physical space of the inhabitants of the house. Hence, there is a continuous dialogue between the past integrated existence of the family and the present anticipation of corelation.

In this context, it is imperative to divulge the relationship and corelation of time of an event in order to understand the mechanics of dialogue between these two elements of existence. Bakhtin's expanded explanation of corelation between time and event through Einstein's theory of relativity is a point of reference. He says,

> For Einstein there is no chronology independent of events. The movement of the clock's hands, if that movement is to be an event-if it is to mean anything to a

> human being perceiving it- must always be correlated with something happening outside the clock. An event, in other words, is always a dialogic unit in so far as it is a co-relation: something happens only when something else with which it can be compared reveals a change in time and space. (Holquist 2001, 116)

Time and the events are interwoven in the plot of *Clear Light of Day* in such a manner that the back and forth movement is connected by events which produce a dialogue between the past and present. Baba finds comfort in living in his own time zone, where he plays records of a particular era and does not like to play recent records. Bim tries to escape from the past but her indulgence in history and historical texts keeps her in a constant dialogue with the past events. Tara, on the other hand, is haunted by the memories of the past, yet she visits the house to connect with it. For Bim the event of partition "was the great event of our lives-of our youth. What would our youth have been without it to round it off in such a definite and dramatic way?" (Desai 2008, 71) but Tara finds it extremely traumatic, and is glad it was over and that she doesn't need to be young again. For Bim, living in the same house and the same neighborhood partition is the only event she witnesses through her childhood and adolescence. She exclaims, "Isn't it strange how life *flows*, like a river, but moves in jumps, as if it were held back by locks that are opened now and then to let it jump forward in a kind of flood?" Her parents' death, Mira Masi's death, and the cow's accidental death are not enough for her to call them events, these are "jumps" in the flow, but partition is like a flood, she recounts how, "There are these long stretches—nothing happens—each day is exactly like the other—plodding, uneventful—and then suddenly there is a crash-mighty deeds take place—momentous events—even if one doesn't know it at the time-and then life subsides again into the backwaters till the next push, the next flood? That summer was certainly one of them-the summer of '47'" (Desai 2008, 71). Bim considers the event of partition only from her perspective but Tara reflects upon the event from the Hindu and Muslim perspectives. So, the same event is seen differently, recounted differently, as its time and space are seen through different perspectives in the same novel. Tara reminds Bim that the summer of 1947 was eventful for all, "For everyone in India. . . . For every Hindu and Muslim in India and Pakistan" (Desai 2008, 71). Hence, "everything" depends on "how the relation between what happens and its situation in time/space is mediated. That is to say, not only are particular happenings subject to different interpretations . . . the very question that an event has occurred at all is already an act of interpretation." Bakhtin's "distinction between 'given' and 'made'" is a reminder that "an event is always a dialogue between both possibilities." Furthermore, an event is "always interpreted in different ways at different times" (Holquist 2001, 116). Thus, if the event of partition is seen from the perspective of different

characters at different times in the novel, the various aspects and dimensions of the event can be studied and explored diversely as well.

Therefore, Bim's interpretation of the event of partition a few decades later shows indifference, which makes the event lose the significance it earlier held. However, in Bim's case she has not lost her space either, so she feels remoteness toward the feelings of those who suffered during the event of partition. Tara, on the other hand, leaves her space, thus, on her return to the house, memories associated with the house come back to her. She exclaims, "I was glad when it was over. . . . I'm so glad it is over and we can never be young again" (Desai 2008, 72). Raja's sickness is another event coinciding with partition that summer. His disease is metaphorically represented as the disease of the country, but a "surgical operation" (Singh *Jinnah* 2012, 305) is used to cure the land. However, Desai is careful in not maligning the reader with gruesome details; in fact, she tries to maintain the same distance as Bim does to the event of partition.

Bim sees the events from her rooftop, "The city is in flames that summer," with the sky "orange and pink" and sporadic columns of "white smoke" (Desai 2008, 73) were reminders of a burning city. These proceedings perturb Bim enough to make her "pace up and down the rooftop" imagining but not hearing "the sound of shots and of cries and screams, but they lived so far outside the city, out in Civil Lines where the gardens and bungalows were quiet and sheltered," she could only hear the "ratting of the frog in the mud of the Jumna" or a "tonga horse" (Desai 2008, 73). Therefore, even in the space of Old Delhi there is a division, between where the cataclysmic events are taking place and the quiet neighborhood where Bim's family resides peacefully. Desai is distancing her perspective and provides a remote and seemingly detached view by distancing the characters from the event at the time and space of disaster. However, her references to the event contribute her perspective of partition and provide a historical context. As with historical novels "the most elementary form of chronotope, abstract adventure, is subject to intertextual and historical conditions that make any appropriation of its repeatable features an *utterance*, that is a text with a particular meaning in a specific situation" (Holquist 2001, 118). An utterance which demands an answer, thus, a dialogue is initiated between texts. Intertextually, Salman Rushdie's perspective in his novel, *Midnight's Children* provides a zoomed in view of the event.

Whereas Rushdie sees religious hatred expediting the partition of 1947, Desai sees intercommunal trust surviving against a blinding wave of fanatic violence. Rushdie portrays hatred as a hysteria, and in one particular incident he points out to this hysteria, when a character Lafifa Das spots a Hindu in the gathering and the crowd turns in to a mob full of anger and fury within minutes shouting, " Hindu! Hindu! Hindu!" Once the attention has been

drawn it is a matter of minutes, hatred becomes contagious enveloping the entire crowd. A man cries out "Mother raper! Violators of our daughter!" and such a charge is enough to instigate punishment from the mob. They cry out, "Rapist! *Arre* my God they found the badmash![2] There he is!" (Rushdie 1980, 98–99). This charge is allocated without evidence, but the mob was the master and executioner in that time and space. So, the chant overrides the law and the mobs at the time of partition decided the fate of the Hindus and Muslims. Desai's distant recount, on the other hand, focuses on the survival through the difficult time of partition. Thereupon, it looks beyond the historical event.

However, the event of partition depicted in the novel is a historical event, and the historians view provides another perspective of the event, which needs perusal as well. This interconnection between the monologic view of historians and the dialogic view of the fiction writers also contributes to dialogue between the dialogic novels and the monologic discourse of history. In this regard, it is interesting to note that historian Stanley Wolpert does not blame religious factions for using mob violence but the methods which the British administration employs to stem the tide of violence. Desai does not mention the empire in her novel in a bid to lay the responsibility on the British Empire; she distances her characters from the Empire. On the other hand, Wolpert claims, that the tragedies which the Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs suffered could have been avoided. According to him, the time allocated for the partition was the major factor in discerning the fate of the Indians. He writes, "I believe that the tragedy of partition and its more than half century legacy of hatred, fear, and continued conflict—capped by the potential of nuclear war over South Asia—might well have been avoided, or at least mitigated but for the arrogance and ignorance of a handful of British and Indian leaders." Wolpert claims, "Mountbatten might have helped all parties to agree that cooperation was much wiser than conflict, dialogue more sensible than division, words easier to cope with and pay for than perpetual warfare" (Wolpert *Shameful Flight* 2012, 2). In this regard, Mountbatten could have achieved all this and saved one-fifth of humankind from one of the most tragic events in history by not cutting the time to a few weeks rather than ten months. He "took it upon himself to cut ten months from the brief time allotted by the Labor government's cabinet to withdraw its air and fleet cover, as well as the shield of British troops and arms, from South Asia's 400 million Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs." The lines were drawn "hastily and ineptly," slashing "through multi-cultural heartlands. They were drawn by an English jurist who had never set foot on the soil of either province [North India, Punjab, Bengal]." This hastiness and slashing of land led to "Hindus and Sikhs" rushing to "leave their ancestral homes in newly created Pakistan, Muslims fled in panic out of India," leading to an estimated expiration and murder of "at least one million" (Wolpert *Shameful Flight* 2012, 1). Thus, time curtailment led to

the slashing and subsequent abandonment of ancestral land creating a tragedy of immense magnitude, which is the subject-matter of historical discourse, as opposed to Desai's novel.

In Desai's novel, subtle references are made by the characters toward the political landscape of the event. In the novel, Desai quotes the poet, Mohammad Iqbal, and shows that despite his ideologies regarding separatism, his poetry reflected timelessness and a continuum of space for all mankind. Bim would read his poetry out to Raja and connect with his poetic ideology. Furthermore, Bim is seen reading books like Gibbon's *The Fall and Rise of the Roman Empire*, which shows her interest in the political conditions as well as the historical background from a distance in time. This further reiterates a dialogue between the political scape of past empires and the British Empire.

Thereupon, Desai does not take sides but focuses on dialogic possibilities. Rather than dwelling on blame and breeding further hatred, she shows the shared interests and qualities of the inhabitants of India which were severed. She shows how Raja manages to mend these differences and retain and establish dialogue. Raja is interested in Urdu and Islamic Studies as seen from the beginning of the novel, however, the time is not favorable for him to pursue his interests. Raja, as opposed to the rest of the household, with his poetic zeal is "quickly aroused" and "drawn into" the political situation of the country. The entire family remains inactive and isolated from the "political fanaticism" which has taken over the people of India. Raja is "drawn into this feverish atmosphere by curiosity and by an adolescent need for a cause" (Desai 2008, 89). However, the Hindu College and English Literature could not sway him toward "fanatical Hindu beliefs" (Desai 2008, 90). Desai presents a Hindu character, which remains steadfast to live his ideals and concerns. He resists becoming part of a Hindu fanatic faction because he does not uphold fanatic opinions, rather believes in coexistence of different communities. When he defies his friends, he experiences animosity and violence from his co-religion friends. However, to release his enthusiasm about the political condition of the subcontinent, he visits Hyder Ali Sahib, a Muslim rather than converse with his Hindu counterparts. Aunt Mira recognizes the danger of affiliation with the enemy in this case, Hyder Ali Sahib—a Muslim—and tries to stop him. Even Bim, does not realize the danger in visiting neighbors. She proclaims innocently, "They are our neighbors, Mira-*masi*" (Desai 2008, 91). Desai encapsulates the issue of the subcontinent in one statement unconsciously proclaimed by Bim. Desai shows how perspectives change for the adults as the time changes. Aunt Mira sums up the inclinations of the time when she whispers rather than exclaims, "But Muslims—it isn't safe" (Desai 2008, 91).

For Bim and Raja the sanctity of neighborhood, friendship, and coexistence remains untarnished. For them time and space are static and unvarying. Later in the summer, Raja's illness isolates him further to the flow of time.

His disease makes his space fixed and time inert, albeit, Hyder Ali Sahib's house guests do change their stance toward the Hindu boy, Raja. He "felt the welcome at the Hyder Ali's not quite warm, as gracious and effusive as before." At this point, Raja does not associate his religious difference and the dangerous time as the cause but wonders "if it could be because he had joined Hindu College and was studying English Literature instead of Urdu at Jamia Millia as Hyder Ali had advised him to do." Though, "it was [*sic*] not Hyder Ali who was cool to him—in fact there was something gently loving in his gesture" but it is Hyder Ali Sahib's friends who behave differently with Raja. They drop the subject of discussion, which is Pakistan and then pick it up again disregarding "Raja's Hindu presence," once "poetry" is "quoted" and "Glasses of whiskey passed" (Desai 2008, 92). The political tide filters through Raja as he listens "silently" to Muslims speaking of "Jinnah, of Gandhi and Nehru, of Mountbatten and Atlee and Churchill" and "he began to see Pakistan as they did—as a possibility, very close to them, palpable and real" (Desai 2008, 93). Thus, Desai presents in Raja's character a Hindu advocating the creation of a separate Muslim state. She shows the Hindus resenting Raja's inclination, but Raja remains constant in his beliefs. His Hindu college mates "found that Raja accepted the idea of Pakistan as feasible, they changed from charmed friends into dangerous enemies," he is called a "traitor" (Desai 2008, 93). Hence, despite Desai's secular stance she presents a character taking sides rather than remaining indifferent. Raja's obvious inclination toward the Muslim household suggests his affiliation toward the Muslims and opposition toward any ideals supporting antagonism.

Here, Desai portrays Hindu fanaticism rather than Muslim. She writes, "When he spoke to them of Pakistan as something he quite accepted, they turned on him openly, called him a traitor, drowned out his piping efforts at reasonableness with the powerful arguments of fanatics." These Hindu boys accept that they are "members of terrorist societies" and would fight "to defend their country, their society, their religion" (Desai 2008, 93). Thus, Desai presents a Hindu adopting Muslim ways and a Romantic imbued with spiritual life in contrast to a vast majority which is politically engaged not only to secure ideals of Indian nationalism but also their ancient religious identity.

DIALOGUE IN THE DIVERGENCE OF POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL SPACE AT THE TIME OF PARTITION

As opposed to scholarly opinion, as that of, Wolpert and Jaswant Singh, in their historical accounts, that partition was the solution for religious strife and turmoil, Desai points to the presence of conflict on political and sociological issues in particular. The geographical space of India is rendered contentious

due to political agendas. However, political agents mask these agendas and try to portray the strife due to religious differences. Desai's characters portend violence as a precursor of religious rift created by politically contrived religious parties. Raja does not align himself with any violent faction as he does not support religious fanaticism induced by these religious political bodies. However, he cannot even fight for his cause because of his weak position as opposed to the position and space occupied by his college mates in the society. He falls ill, and "His father and his aunt were [*sic*] convinced it was something to do with the atmosphere of that spring, the threatening, advancing violence in the air" (Desai 2008, 93–94). The boys continue their attempts to instill feelings of aggression and violence against the act of partition. They inform him of "news of refugee camps and killings, of looting and burning in the city, and pleading with him, in conspirator's voices, to join their society." Desai in a confessional tone writes of the Hindu boys' plans to attack and kill, when her characters claim they would show Raja where they "hide" their "guns," "daggers," and where they "meet and practice." Upon his refusal to become part of such an organization which kills they turn against him, calling him "more dangerous to India" than they could ever be, since he is a "traitor" favoring Muslims, being a "Muslim sympathizer" (Desai 2008, 95–96). He idealizes the thought of "fighting for the Hyder Alis, brandishing a sword, keeping a mob at bay" (Desai 96), but he is physically incapable of defending anyone. Thus, Desai paints him as a character that idealizes violence only for defensive purposes but is incapacitated to do that even. Therefore, he is rendered useless in his space which is his bed in his house. However, Raja does not appropriate his space in the house he lives in, rather appropriates Hyder Ali Sahib's house. According to Henri Lefebvre, a French Marxist sociologist, "An existing space may outlive its original purpose and the raison d'etre which determines its forms, functions, and structures; it may thus in a sense become vacant, and susceptible of being diverted, reappropriated and put to a use quite different from its initial one" (qtd. in Kristen 1999, 1). The house Raja idealizes is rendered vacant, thus he reappropriates Hyderabad. Although, the dialectics of societal, political, and religious oppositions become powerful at the time of partition, appropriation of a new space, Raja's presence, and subsequent convalescence is a proof of prospective dialogue. Thus, the confluence of space and time is rudimentary in understanding dialogue.

CONFLUENCE OF DIALOGIC REAPPROPRIATION OF SPACE AND TIME

Since Raja is a connection between the Hindu and Muslim household in time and space, he is a dialogic site and through him Desai depicts possibilities

of integration and hybridity, which are significant at the time of partition and even later in the space of Hyderabad. However, initially, his illness maligns hope of such integration. Later, Raja's marriage to a Muslim girl, Benazir, and their child having both Muslim and Hindu ancestors is Desai's endeavor at portraying probability of dialogue through change in space and time. He visits the house which depicts his endeavor at reappropriation of his space, and at this time, Raja enjoys immaculate health signifying potential and hope. Earlier, Desai is cautious in showing how idealism was abandoned and lost to unnerving terrorist ideas. Raja's situation with his illness and incapacity to provide a countermovement is "Romantic in the extreme," "he hoped, like Byron, to go to the rescue of those in peril. Instead, like Byron, he lay ill, dying," except in Desai's novel, the character is saved. Bim is "sure he is dying," but he did not, and managed to commune and unite with his Muslim friends procreating a hybrid breed, his daughter, at the same time, maintaining dialogue with his own family.

However, at the time of partition, the city of Delhi burned, the city walls "smouldered and smoked by day and blazed by night"(Desai 98), and expelling Hyder Ali's family but Raja could not save them. Nevertheless, Raja survives his rising temperature, and near fatal illness, to reunite with his mentor and soul mate. Through Raja, Desai focuses on the distant time and its potential. To understand time and its potential relationship to space, as shown in the novel, further delving into chronotope with respect to the confluence of space and time is central, "Chronotope, like most terms characteristic of dialogism, must be treated 'bifocally,' as it were . . . a lens for close-up work and its ability to serve as an optic for seeing at a distance," while it is used to show "the middle distance" between "the extremes." In this regard, chronotope is important in showing a "relation between any text and its times, and thus as a fundamental tool for a broader social and historical analysis" (Holquist 2001, 113). Thus, Desai's novel, as pointed out earlier, has both the fabula and syuzet needed to depict events. There is a "simultaneity and difference of time/space [which] works itself out in story/plot ratio (chronotope)" and she "deploys as a category of narrative" (Holquist 2001, 114) hence, it can be discerned that dialogic possibilities are present in her work. For instance, Bim points out to this time–space difference when she retorts to a comment regarding Bakul claiming that a part of him still lives in India, while he is not in the space of India. Bim says, "Then it is definitely important to live abroad. In all the comfort and luxury of the embassy, it must be easier, *very easy* to concentrate on the Taj, or the Emperor Akbar. Over here I'm afraid you would be too busy queueing up for your rations and juggling with your budget, making ends meet." Idealizing the "eternal India" (Desai 2008, 60) from a different space is easy but living in the space with changing times is a challenge. Hence, Bim tries to encapsulate time for herself by remaining in

her house, remote and aloof to the events changing the fate and space of Old Delhi and even India. Her history books dwelling on past events imprison her in a time frame, restricting her vision to the past. Nevertheless, Tara's family breaks that time frame, bringing change, and a connection with the ongoing world like Raja's daughter's wedding in Hyderabad.

In this way, Desai weaves the story, but disrupts the chronology of events, thus, the story vacillates between past and present. However, the story never disconnects with the history of the house or Delhi. As discussed earlier, the concept of chronotope is related to the "sequentiality of events" being "deformed" with "segmentation and spatialization," so it is "this simultaneity of figure [in this case, plot] and ground [or story] that constitutes the dialogic element in the chronotope" (Holquist 2001, 114). Despite, this deformation in sequentiality, it is important that deformation of it is recognized and can be rearranged for perception of this distortion. It is thus fundamental to understand the "conception of separation between story and plot" in the light of the phenomenon that there is a "discrepancy" between literature and life. In literature events can be "arranged in any sequence whereas in real life they are always chronological" (Holquist 2001, 115). So, when the story is seen as not conforming to a chronological order, simultaneity is the key to reorder the plot. Simultaneity is a "corollary of dialogism's emphasis on dynamism of texts" meaning "no single time/space can be definitive," so that the text is not a "prisonhouse of language" but a "three-ring . . . circus of discourse," therefore, "dialogism stresses the role played by temporal and spatial frames of reference inherent in *formal properties of the text*," forming a "hierarchy among them." Such a hierarchy requires "a kind of standard space as well as standard time for orienting other time/space" (Holquist 2001, 120–21). In Desai's novel, partition becomes the focal point for reference to time and space. Thus, paradoxically, partition is the dialogic site for characters and action. As Bim, reflects upon her life while listening to the music played at Mulk's house, her innate connection to Raja's poetic inclinations is reiterated when she sees "with her inner eye"(Desai 2008, 284),

> [H]ow her own house and its particular history linked and contained her as well her whole family with all their separate histories and experiences- not binding them within some dead and airless cell but giving them the soil in which to send down their roots, and food to make them grow and spread, reach out to new experiences and new lives, but always drawing from the same soil, the same secret darkness. That soil contained all time, past and future, in it. It was dark with time, rich with time. It was where her deepest self lived, and the deepest selves of her sister and brothers and all those who shared that time with her. (Desai 2008, 284)

As the novel closes, Desai gives voice to Bim's inner eye, and sums up time and space of the Indian soil, turning time into a space where all her siblings, and friends, herself reside and share events and happenings of their lives. Poetry, as it had been for Raja, becomes the medium of her transportation into the space of time, where she connects with her disconnected brother, Raja. Though Raja's world is different, it is connected by the world of timeless music and poetry in which, as Muhammad Iqbal says, "Your world is the world of fish and fowl. My world is the cry at dawn" (qtd. in Desai 2008, 284), but both are shared in their timeless existence. Muhammad Iqbal, Raja's favorite poet connects the Muslim and Hindu world in a timeless chain of poetry. Art thus, has the power to connect time and space.

Desai connects her Muslim and Hindu characters by acknowledging a human chain as depicted in art of shared events present in the space of timelessness. This connectivity and dialogue is further explored in chapter 4 with reference to polyphonic voices delineating possibilities of accumulation of shared ideas, ideals, and values as well as celebration of distinct ideas, ideals, and values initiating and propagating dialogue in Mehr Nigar Masroor's *Shadows of Time*.

NOTES

1. "Sufi." A Muslim ascetic and mystic. Web. 29 July 2015.
2. "Badmash." A Hooligan. Web. 20 Oct 2015.

Chapter 4

The Coexistence of Polyphonic Voices in Mehr Nigar Masroor's *Shadows of Time*

Shadows of Time by Mehr Nigar Masroor is a saga of Hindus and Muslims living in united India and the migration of Muslims to the newly created Pakistan. The narrative continues post-partition displaying conditions of Pakistan and India as separate states. Masroor, a Muslim Pakistani writer, presents post-partition trauma of separation of friends, lovers, and offsprings, and the ramifications of a divided land on the psyche of the people of the subcontinent. The novel begins with the seeds of partition sown in the Indian state of Bengal. Masroor then reconstructs the events leading up to the partition of the subcontinent in to India and Pakistan in 1947. The narrative traces characters and their offsprings living in territories of contentious warfare because of both politics of separation and intolerance. As the story unfolds, it displays multiple perspectives of partition and post-partition. There is an omniscient narrator, however, Masroor manages to maintain an authorial detachment in a manner that Masroor's voice does not at any point subsume the voice of any character. Narrative voice is as recognizably individuated in its projection of ideas and ideals as the voice of each character. Since all the characters are given distinct voices, the novel projects multiple voices, true to polyphonic novels. Andrew Robinson outlines how polyphonic novels have voices which are "unmerged into single perspective, and not subordinated to the voice of the author. Each of these voices has its own perspective, its own validity, and its own narrative weight within the novel" (Robinson 2011, 2). *Shadows of Time* refracts from assimilation and projects particularity and exclusivity of each perspective, rendering a dialogic anticipation to the novel's words and utterances.

The story commences with a political discussion on the Ilbert Bill by three Bengali friends. They voice their opinions regarding the impact of the withdrawal of this bill. This bill was:

> A controversial measure proposed in 1883 that sought to allow senior Indian magistrates to preside over cases involving British subjects in India. The bill, severely weakened by compromise, was enacted by the Legislative Council on Jan 25, 1884. The bitter controversy surrounding the measure deepened antagonism between British and Indians and was a prelude to the formation of the Indian National Congress the following year. ("Ilbert Bill" *Britannica*)

Since the bill "would have allowed Indian magistrates to try European subjects" ("Ilbert Bill" *Britannica*), thereby giving a voice to the Indians as a nation under colonial rule, its withdrawal was indicative of malicious hegemony on the part of the British. Masroor relayed skepticism of Hindus toward this detraction of rights. At the same time, Masroor presents the Indians as "surrogate Englishmen" (Loomba 1998, 98) demanding their rights as Indians, albeit they have shed their Indian identities. Although the three friends have assimilated some of the more obvious trends of Anglo-Indian culture, their allegiance to Indian nationalism is quintessentially intact. The novel displays such syntheses[1] and assimilations while showing distinct identities living side by side. It is this presentation of binaries as a part of the "whole entity" (Bakhtin DI 1981) that makes Masroor's novel dialogic. Here, the polyphonic voices in the novel relay particularized views, pertaining to nationalist and antinationalist ideologies.

Manilal in the beginning of the novel is of the view, "Over the centuries a synthesis had taken place between Brahmin thought and the Muslim ideas espoused by the ruling mughals" (Masroor 1987, 2). However, the problem remains embedded in synthesis. It requires subsummation of distinct voices, leaving relationships fragile and vulnerable to dominance of one over the other. The synthesis Manilal speaks of is monologic, in which either the Muslims have to lose a part of their voice and identity to embrace the Brahmin thought or the Brahmins have to absolve their conceptualization to appropriate the Muslim thought, eventually giving a final word to one conviction, which may be a combination of both ideologies but not a representation of either one as an individual identity. This makes synthesis monologic in its nature, and thus is bound to breed resentment among groups, as a "monological world is made up of objects, integrated through a single consciousness," and "Since other subjects have value only in relation to the transcendent perspective, they are reduced to the status of objects. They are not recognized as 'another consciousness' or as having rights. Monologism is taken to close down the world it represents, by pretending to be the ultimate word" (Robinson 2011, 2). Keeping in view this theoretical perspective of the dominance of the "ultimate word" (2011, 2) and its repercussions, it is important to understand that absolutism and axiomatic dogmas have exposed India to bitter divisions and fissures often.

In this regard, Masroor presents Suresh, another friend, who recognizes the British strategy of dissolving the fragile synthesis of Muslims and Hindus by advocating dogmatic principles of religious disparities. He says, "They fear the educated Hindu class, the Hindus and the Muslims were united in the mutiny against the British, they dare not allow this to happen again . . . hence we must strive for a national organization" (Masroor 1987, 24). Yet, the animosity between the Hindus and the Muslims is deeply set with the endorsement of adoption of a single consciousness as opposed to multiple, which in turn, hinders the possibility of a united front. This monologic medium of separation is also reflected in the novel as an antithesis to the dialogic overview of characters with respect to division and coexistence. Moreover, characters like Kauna, Manilal's educated wife, believe that the Hindus require a "Deliverance not only from evil Rakshis, but the invading Muslims who destroyed temples and then the English who treated you [*sic*] like outcasts" (Masroor 1987, 27). Such overtures offer dialectic points of view, which in turn, are also dialogic, since Masroor portrays dialogism as a response to monologism.

Similarly, Masroor's novel broadcasts eventualities of divisive agendas as a response to apprehensive assimilation of Hindus and Muslims as Indians. Therefore, in a turn of events in 1905 Lord Cruz's announcement of the partition of Bengal meant that the Indian identity would further split into a Hindu identity versus a Muslim identity. The division of Bengal was thought over ethnic and religious lines. Masroor shows how the religio-political schism develops into a division of a land while projecting the varied and multiple views of Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims on coexistence enabling possibilities of dialogue.

With reference to the paradigmatic exposition of "dialogism," it "is the name not just for a dualism, but for a necessary multiplicity in human perception. This multiplicity manifests itself as a series of distinctions between categories appropriate to the perceiver on the one hand and the categories appropriate to whatever is being perceived on the other" (Holquist 2001, 22). Contextually, Masroor's novel presents multiplicity of perspectives while maintaining distinctness as a predominant feature. Her characters voice their opinions, which may be contradictory to the other's opinion, yet the strand between the characters remains intact. The reader is thus exposed to differing ideologies and opinions, about partition as the plot of the novel unravels, exposing these multiple perceptions.

The novel begins with three Hindu friends, Keshab, Manilal, and Sisir and their wives. There is a Muslim household's story running parallel to the story of the Hindu friends. Sisir has an extramarital affair with a Muslim girl, Gul Rukh, and has a child Kamini from this liaison. However, Kamini is brought up in a Hindu Brahmin household. Subsequently, the

children of these friends become friends with each other. At the same time, Farhan from the Muslim household becomes romantically involved with a Hindu political activist, Sarla. Sarla marries a Hindu politician but gives birth to Farhan's children. These children remain oblivious to their Muslim parentage. The novel thus shows interreligious relationships and their outcomes. Furthermore, the novel presents the difference in Hindu activism and Muslim political movements as a strong backdrop to the interreligious liaisons, as a paradoxical imbrication of ideologies. In doing so, Masroor exhibits both Hindu and Muslim perspectives with respect to independence from the British and partition while projecting each character's voice as an individual affected by the movements, thus maintaining a dialogue through the course of the novel.

Masroor first collates then reflects the distinct voices of Hindus and Muslims. Thus, her novel presents multiple perceptions of the event of partition and its aftermath. The novel first allocates the Hindu perspective on the division of Bengal, the British reaction to the Ilbert Bill, then the Muslim perspective through Farhan, and the Hindu viewpoint through Sarla, in particular yet not wholly to a divisive political movement. Interestingly, the novel is peculiar in its style, making it polyphonic, since there is no single protagonist, and each character retains his or her predominance. Their opinions and preferences retain distinctness. In this context, interracial preferences and love are presented as common features of coexistence. Sisir's involvement with a Muslim girl, Gul Rukh (a police officer's daughter) introduces the possibility of interracial love and hybrid offsprings. In the turn of events, their daughter, Kamini is brought up in a Hindu Brahmin household; however, Brahmins do not allow non-Brahmins to enter their kitchens or quarters. Masroor shows how mixed blood of Kamini contaminates this Hindu Brahmin household by being brought up there. In addition, Sisir's son, Nosho falls in love with Mehnaz, Gul Rukh's legitimate child. In order to marry Mehnaz, Nosho converts to Islam. As opposed to his father, who had abandoned both his lover and child, Nosho is willing to subsume his Hindu heritage by adopting a new religion and a different culture for love. Parallel to the story of the Hindu friends, Masroor introduces a Muslim household descendent of "the old nawabs of Murshidabad, . . . who had stayed on in Calcutta" (Masroor 1987, 57). This parallel story is woven around Nawab Amir Khan's sons, Akbar and Asghar and daughters Najma and Safia. Initially, Masroor depicts the Muslim perspective through the distinct and different voices present in this household. Later, it is their children who convey Muslims' response to the events leading to partition and post-partition. Farhan is (Salma's son, who is Akbar's wife, Seema's sister) a Muslim zealot; however, his involvement with a Hindu girl deprives him of establishing an association to a country he fought for. Ironically, his son, who is an Indian and brought up as a Hindu is

killed in combat with Pakistani Air Force. At the end, Farhan finds the ultimate solace when he returns to India. In the light of this story, the multiple shifts in perspectives which Masroor adopts carry polyphonic views of the event of partition.

At this point, it is integral to comprehend contextually what a polyphonic novel is and can project. Masroor's polyphonic novel has the potential to elicit dialogue since in a polyphonic novel,

> The author does not place his own narrative voice between character and the reader, but rather allows characters to shock and subvert. It is thus as if the books were written by multiple characters, not a single author's standpoint. Instead of a single objective world, held together by the author's voice, there is a plurality of consciousnesses, each with its own world. The reader does not see a single reality presented by the author, but rather, how reality appears to each character.
>
> The text appears as an interaction of distinct perspectives or ideologies, borne by the different characters. . . . The role of the author is fundamentally changed, because the author can no longer monopolise the "power to mean." (Robinson 2011, 2)

Masroor does not attempt to superimpose any voice in the text by detaching her opinions and merely relaying the views of all her characters rather than one particular character. However, the multiple voices which she projects through her characters, true to a dialogic novel, "do not exist 'in themselves,' but only in their relations. . . . Being is always 'event' or 'co-being,' simultaneous with other beings" (Robinson 2011, 1). Hence, the event of partition is seen through the relations between the characters. A polyphonic novel, "grants the voices of the characters as much authority as the narrator's voice, which indeed engages in active dialogue with the characters' voices." The "narrator renounces" the "right to the last word granting full and equal authority to the word of the characters" which leads to a " plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices." However, polyphony "does not mean relativism, which grants life to the differing discourses of the characters only by failing to engage with them. Rather, the dialogue of the polyphonic novel is authentic only in so far as it represents an engagement in which, in various ways, the discourses of self and other interpenetrate each other" (Dentith 1996, 41–42). This is seen in Masroor's novel, when Sikhs, Hindus, and Muslims are shown as friends with contesting ideas and discourse yet their rapport remains intact. Furthermore, Masroor's novel on partition displays dialogic possibilities as it encompasses the following elements of dialogism:

> Authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia [raznoreeie] can enter novel; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships [always more or less dialogized]. These distinctive links and interrelationships between utterances and languages, this movement of the theme through different languages and speech types, its dispersion into rivulets and droplets of social heteroglossia, its dialogize-tion—this is the basic distinguishing feature of the stylistic novel. (Bakhtin *DI* 1981)

Masroor's characters engage with the "social heteroglossia" present within the heteroglot Indian landscape, while relaying multiple yet discursive voices disavowing any hierarchical representation. *Discursive hierarchy* is "the view that realist novels are made up of a hierarchy of discourse, with the narrator's discourse at the top speaking the language of unproblematic truth," whereas a polyphonic novel, "affirms someone else's 'I' not as an object but as another subject." Thus, the characters are not explained but, provoked to "ultimate revelations of themselves in extreme situations, which are never closed or resolved" (Dentith 1996, 42–43). To understand how characters as beings relate to each other and thus maintain dialogue, it is instructive to understand Bakhtin's interpretation of dialogue further. He claims, "Each of us exists as a relation between particular coordinates in time and space, differentiating and relating to other coordinates." In this context, a close perusal of *Shadows of Time* shows that, Masroor's characters indulge in these intertwined relations and her narrative shows that "the site of the event" (Robinson 2011, 1) of partition becomes dialectical only when "Each subject's ability to produce autonomous meaning is denied" (Robinson 2011, 2). In *Shadows of Time*, Keshab claims that the Aryan caste system is responsible for divisions among the Hindus, which in turn denies a unified Hindu nation. According to him, the divisions among Hindus paved way for Muslim invaders and later the English, "but it must go now, this division of human beings for all times" (Masroor 1987, 5). As mentioned earlier, the caste system of the Hindu society engenders disparities and differences. The four castes have designated roles in the society which cannot be overrode by acquisition of knowledge or wealth. Brahmins are the "priestly class," Kshatriyas are the "rulers and the warriors," Vaishyas "are merchants and agriculturist," while the Shudras are "the servile caste." The untouchables are "Non-Aryans," thus "reduced to slavery." Therefore, the caste system is based on the color difference between the Aryans and Dasyus, as "varna" means "color" (PHB 1955, 33–34)

Furthermore, it is reiterated here that, in the *Rig Veda* tradition, "a myth was created to explain the structure of the society. . . . A belief was developed that the Brahmins were born out of the mouth, the *Rajsnyas* (*Kshatriyas*)

out of the arms, the *Vaishyas* out of the things and the *Shudras* out of the feet of Brahma, the Creator" (PHB 1955, 33–34). This caste system led to the division in the Hindu society. However, when the Muslims invaded the subcontinent they spread Islam's anti-racial and universal message of brotherhood and its denunciation of all forms of discriminations. The Hindus on the lowest level of the caste system converted readily as it meant for them a "sense of equality" as opposed to being "branded" as low "human beings" (PHB 1955, 35). Yet, staunch Brahmins continued to label non-Brahmins, especially Muslims as *melech* (unclean, barbarian). Keshab's mother depicts the sentiments of the Hindus breeding hatred and distrust between the Hindus and the Muslims. For her, the Muslims and the British are both *feringhees* (foreigners), that is foreign to her land. However, on the other end of the spectrum there are characters such as Surinder and Amlok, who are staunch Hindu supporters but are not entrenched with hostility to the ideas of cultural and religious integration. As Amlok points out about the Hindu religious ritual of counting beads, "if Surinder was here, he would probably remark on the similarity of you counting beads and taking Sham's name, because the Muslims count their rosaries and repeat Allah" (Masroor 80). Therefore, India's history of religious pluralism reasserts itself with such imbricating ideals despite religious bigotry. This is an oppositional as much as a dialogic cycle of discursive religious identities. Masroor writes, "By the time the Brahmo Samaj movement which proclaimed the basic unity of all religions had become quite popular," it molded with "Bengali tradition of *bhakti*" (Masroor 1987, 54). The Bhakti movement "was a silent revolution in society brought about by a galaxy of socio-religious reformers . . . this movement was responsible for many rites and rituals associated with the worship of God by Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs of Indian subcontinent" ("Medieval History of India: Bhakti Movement" n.d., 1). Therefore, Islamic thought initiated an interreligious dialogue in India maligned with caste disparities.

Moreover, the intermarriages between the Muslims and the Hindus began in the eighth century as the Muslims landed on the shores of India. As the "religious and political disorder in the south greatly facilitated their task, and the charming ideas of Islam soon began to appeal to the people," thereby Islamic ways spread as well. The "raja of Malabar, . . . used to wear Arab dress" (PHB 1955, 89) chanting Muslim slogans. Thus, the Arabs managed to "establish a position of honour and respect" in the subcontinent. They "carried on missionary work side by side with their business," and "the most effective weapon of their preaching was the nobility of their character. . . . Gradually Hinduism itself began to be deeply influenced by Islam" (PHB 1955, 89). Masroor also corroborates this in the narrative, "It was the message of social democracy and equality for individuals which came as Islam's message giving impetus to suppressed desires" (Masroor 1987, 51). Yet,

her characters provide multiple voices which defy the singular voice of the historian. The novel shows that there is resentment within the Hindu priests with respect to the Muslims when a priest at a funeral claims, "how abjectly we accepted the Muslim rulers telling us that their Allah is the greatest and that they were the first to discover his greatness, when all the time the secret was always there in our own scriptures that there is One Supreme Being and we were the first in time also." According to another voice of another priest, "Their mysticism prevailed because we forgot ours" (Masroor 1987, 55–56). While the historian, claims that "The Islamic conception of *tauhid* deeply influenced Hindu ideas, and some of the great Hindu thinkers laid much emphasis on it and abandoned other doctrines," and the "concept of *Tasawwuf* [Islamic mysticism] also gave some of its features to the system of Hinduism" (PHB 1955, 91). According to the Sufis, devotion to God is the ultimate desire. Such ideas are seen in the Bhakti movement that soon spread expressing "the feelings of divine love" (PHB 1955, 91)This integration of ideas further found space in the social set up of the Hindu society marred by caste system, thus, Islam managed to affect the laws of the Hindu society.

Furthermore Sufism, which gained force along with the Bhakti movement, led to a religious dialogism in India, as "Sufism represents the inward esoteric side of Islam or the mystical dimension of Muslim religion," and does not demand suppression of one voice by another, rather, "Sufi saints transcending all religious and communal distinctions, worked for promoting the interest of humanity at large" ("Medieval History of India; Bhakti Movement" 2). However, Masroor's narrative provides an antithesis to the Bhakti movement and Sufism through another fictional voice, which is that of a radical Muslim, Shafqat. He is an "orthodox, rigid, religious fanatic, who . . . had never approved of the Mughal ways, which encouraged accomplished Hindus to hold positions of eminence. Living in India, these men continue to abhor the Hindus, looked on all *bhakti* movements as a diffusion of the true faith." Masroor points out how these men galvanized hatred and became the voice of Muslim majority. She writes, "it was the teaching of such men that had crystalized the attitudes of Muslims, and decided for them to participate in any administrative schemes put forward by the English." These men "prevented Muslims from acquiring knowledge of English, thereby ensuring a start of advancement to the Hindus, and complete backwardness of Muslims in the march of time" (Masroor 1987, 59). Here, Masroor shows how multiplicity in human perceptions is depicted in characters belonging to different faiths as well as same faith but carry different opinions and ideologies as they perceive them according to their experience. In this context, Holquist's explanation of multiplicity is significant, since Masroor's novel hosts multiplicity as a tool for integration rather than division. Hence, corroborating diversive over divisive. Holquist explains how multiplicity "manifests itself as a series of

distinctions and categories appropriate to the perceiver on the one hand and categories appropriate to whatever is being perceived on the other" (Holquist 2001, 22). However, it is important that the "person, or object must be shaped in the time/space categories of the other, and this is possible only when the person or object is perceived from the position of outsidedness" (Holquist 2001, 31). Masroor provides this outsider's perspective by incorporating the voices of the Hindus and the Muslims in the same text defying predominance to any community or even a character, at the same time offering confluence of esoteric ideologies as well.

Thereupon, her character, Sarla is given as much space in the novel to present her view on Hindu nationalism as Farhan on Muslim nationalism. Within the Muslims too, Masroor presents characters like Shafquat who depict a view outside the spectrum of Muslim leaders demanding a separate state. In fact, Masroor's novel presents a new version of the polyphonic novel by subtracting the "hero" (or protagonist) altogether. Conversely, according to Qian Zhongwen, "The polyphonic" phenomenon deals first of all with the heroes in fiction. Zhongwen quotes Bakhtin, "Hero has his own ideological authenticity, and meanwhile, has an independent nature; he might be regarded as a creator who possessed his own complete ideology" and the hero is "not the object through which the author manages to issue his speech . . . but a free man who could place himself in an equal position with his creator, being able to review the latter's opinion and even revolt against him" (Zhongwen 2012, 1). Therefore, it can be asserted that by eliminating the traditional prototypical role of the hero from her novel, Masroor has placed mouthpieces in front of all her characters relaying their subsequent voices and ideas. This technique has rendered hierarchy within characters redundant and erased any possibility of endorsing singular perspective of the hero as supreme. Thus, differing ideologies as well as propaganda are given almost equal space in the novel, as the characters speak their minds and convey their ideological standing.

It is noteworthy that while Farhan is shown as an ardent follower of Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Masroor presents an oppositional view as his brother Salman joins the Ali brothers instead. Despite warnings from Farhan, Salman remains loyal to a different group of Muslims. Farhan exclaims, "Are you crazy Salman to join this religious group? Are you aware of how much damage Gandhi did to the Indian cause . . . and now Muhammad Ali wants the Muslims of India to fight for the Khilafat." The argument was "Will the Muslims of India never weep for themselves?" (Masroor, 1987, 150). Masroor conveyed both ideologies as "Salman defied Farhan and joined the movement," thus, she presented the Hijrat movement through Salman, and its defiance through Farhan. At the same time, Masroor continues to offer distinctness in Hindu and Muslim ideologies at large too. Farhan does not

approve of an “alliance between the Congress and Muslim reactionaries” (1987, 154). Sarla, a Hindu girl speaks of Hindu–Muslim unity formula, yet fears the nature of Muslims, “why is there always an element of destruction in a Muslim male’s love? Could it be taught as a child, to destroy temple, to slash the statue with a sword” (Masroor 1987, 170). By presenting both Hindu and Muslim characters equally, Masroor projects arguments and counterarguments in their speech and debates while maintaining love between them. In the case of Sarla and Farhan, the love never perishes but they remain argumentative throughout their lives about their ideals.

This presentation of the multiple speech genre and debate is in turn a means to show that differences do not necessarily depict strife and dialect; these differences “incorporate the other’s perspective” (Robinson 2011, 2). Similar to this ideology of the multiple speech genre is Edward Said’s explanation in the Afterword of *Orientalism*, where he writes, “My aim was not to dissipate difference itself . . . but to challenge the notion that difference implies hostility, a frozen reified set of opposed essences, and a whole adversarial knowledge built out of those things” (Said 1993, 350). Masroor’s characters thus respond to the ideas of the other without subscribing wholly to these ideas and maintain their stance without reclamation to hostility as is seen in Sarla and Farhan’s relationship. There is argument and debate in their dialogue yet there is no hostility. Farhan and Sarla differ enormously in their ideologies, concepts, and opinions with respect to the division of a country. Yet, neither their differences nor their geographical boundaries separate them. Through their hybrid offsprings they maintain their affiliation and integration eternally as Farhan dies peacefully in India rather than in Pakistan, the country he fought for. Both spaces thus remain an integral part of Farhan. Neither space is given predominance, as Farhan chooses to spend his life in Pakistan and die in India, thus developing a dialogue between the two spaces and their respective differing perspectives.

In Farhan and Sarla’s case, the acceptance of the other and his/her subsequent country as well as the other’s country and its acceptance as “outsidedness” are integral to their relationship. They know that the ideals, religion, and the country remain outside the parameters of their concepts, ideals, and values yet they share the urge to remain in dialogue. Dialogue demands the incorporation of the other as a relation to self and its social and historical context to the world, so with “respect to two people, one must make sense out of the existence each other shares with the other.” Holquist explains this further, “The other is always perceived in terms that are specific socially and historically. . . . Dialogism’s primary thrust is always in the direction of historical and social specificity” (Holquist 2001, 32). However, the question is, “will he or she be able to reach that extreme degree of outsidedness toward the second which Bakhtin calls ‘transgradience’?” Bakhtin explains how Transgradience

"is reached." It is "reached when the *whole* existence of others is seen from outside not only their knowledge that they are being perceived by somebody else, but from beyond their awareness that such another even exists." Thus, "it is cardinal assumption of dialogism that every human subject is not only highly conscious, but that his or her cognitive space is coordinated by the same I/other distinctions that organize my own: there is in fact no way 'I' can be completely transgredient to another *living* subject, nor can he or she be completely transgradient to me" (Holquist 2001, 33). Masroor's fiction offers the space where "I" and the "other" evolve as distinct yet a part of each other.

This space is coordinated in Farhan and Sarla's liaison in particular. Masroor offers an equilibrium in their stance and space they occupy on the podium, rather than allocating equality to each voice. Equilibrium has the capacity to accommodate differences. Farhan recognizes the differences in ideologies and concepts of Sarla and vice versa. The two of them enjoy a relationship which acknowledges the "outsidedness" of the other thus giving the other complete space to exist and not subsume the existence of the other. The reason why Farhan finds peace in Sarla's company is his complete disregard for pretensions and facades of loyalties which he has to project in order to exist with others. Therefore, Farhan does not feel his voice is ever silenced in the presence of Sarla, neither is Sarla's in the presence of Farhan. Both the characters are extremely inclined to their religious and political ideologies yet, they coexist encouraging articulation of each other's concepts and beliefs. In the same way, Masroor creates characters which evince their own voices with respect to their ideas and beliefs. Masroor, in a way, "permits" "characters to have the status of an 'I'" with a distinct voice thus creating polyphony. On the other extreme, there are authors who "treat their characters not only as others, but as having the otherness of mere things, lacking subjectivity. They exploit the transgradience of their characters as much as scientists exploit theirs toward laboratory rats" (Holquist 2001, 34). Masroor's novel has an element of "self-analysis" (Holquist 2001, 34) by the equal representation of both Hindus and Muslims in the story.

Thus, both Hindu and Muslim characters carry heroic features. None of the characters enjoy monopoly in voicing their opinions. Each character is allotted equal opportunity to voice his/her opinion and beliefs in her polyphonic novel. As opposed to having mere "otherness" Masroor's characters exhibit qualities distinct so that the "I" is always in dialogue with the other. With reference to polyphonic dialogue, Bakhtin asserts, "it was the dialogue that formed the fundamental content of 'polyphony,'" as opposed to monologic fiction, like Thucydides's *History* and Tolstoy's works, in which "another person becomes the object of thinking, and not one who can think himself." Thus, monologue projects a "final conclusion" neglecting the "nature of characters" (Robinson 2011). In *Is History Fiction?* the difference between

a monologic work and a polyphonic work is further exposed with examples. According to Ann Curthoys and John Docker, Thucydides's *History* is monologic and Herdotus's *The History* is polyphonic. In their book *Is History fiction?* they write,

> The terms monologic and polyphonic immediately reprise the literary theory of Mikhail Bakhtin. In Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics Bakhtin contrasts a contrast between Tolstoy and Dostoevsky as two opposing kinds of auto-narrators. In Tolstoy's monologic fiction, Bakhtin feels, Tolstoy as author dominates his text; the author, all-knowing and all-controlling, constructs his characters, juxtaposes and contrasts them to one another, and then evaluates them: the author does not speak with but about them; the characters are not active subjects but become objects of his fixed authoritative gaze, his all-encompassing field of vision. The characters, that is , are derived anything like equal rights with the author. . . . By contrast Dostoevsky's texts are polyphonic: the author acts as a kind of arranger, an organizer and participant in the dialogue, the clashes of conflicting positions and voices, but without retaining for himself the final word. His characters remain unfinalised and with strong rights as autonomous subjects in the narrative. (Curthoys and Docker 2010, 37)

Thus, it can be discerned that the polyphonic literary text or fiction correspond to situations in real life, as is seen in Masroor's novel on partition. The multireligious fraternity of characters is vocal, and Masroor's personal religious identity does not interfere in the declaration of any character's ideology or voice in her alternative reality.

A polyphonic novel is in dialogue with the real and alternative world at the same time. Bakhtin proclaims, "In reality, however, to live means to take part in social intercourse and in dialogues" thus it is "all-embracing," seeping "into all languages, all relationships as well as manifestations of human life" permeating "all the significant and valuable fields" (Zhongwen 2012, 1). The polyphonic voices interact and remain in a "social intercourse" as is apparent in a polyphonic novel. Masroor's novel depicts this reality and at the same time presents the advantages of depicting all views equally whether it is through Sarla or Farhan. Contextually, Holquist's claim that, "Dialogism has rightly been perceived by certain thinkers" as "a useful correlative of Marxism, for it argues that sharing is not only an ethical or economic mandate, but a condition built into a structure of human perception, and thus a condition inherent in the very fact of being human" (Holquits 2001, 34) is important in showing how equal representation is integral to dialogue. Thereby, Masroor's novel has polyphonic qualities which can be seen in shared symbols present within the rituals, customs of Indian populace, as well as distinct yet shared languages of music, poetry, mystic Sufis, Urdu, English,

and Sanskrit. Hybridity is thus a corollary to coexistence and interreligious liaisons, and its representation in fiction endorses plural religio-cultural identities as a means of coalition. In fact, Homi K. Bhabha develops his notion of hybridity from Mikhail Bakhtin. For Bakhtin, "hybridization is a process involving both linguistic and cultural aspects, . . . Bakhtin's unconscious hybridity is a natural process in which one language or culture absorbs elements from the other without making any fuss about it, whereas international hybrids 'shock, change, challenge, revitalize or disrupt through deliberate intended fusions' and in so doing 'create an ironic double consciousness'" (Kuortti and Nyman 2007, 6–7). Hence, shared symbols, Sufi universalism, hybridity, coalescence of political voices, diversity of languages, and religious voices presented in Masroor's narrative contribute to polyphony. At the outset, it is important to understand the nature of polyphony with respect to shared symbols as depicted in the novel.

POLYPHONIC AND DIVERSE SHARED SYMBOLS IN COEXISTENCE

As the novel begins, Masroor's narrative establishes the significance of shared symbols in a land where distinct religious groups exist. Masroor presents symbolic characters as proponents of shared ideologies of coexistence, "In 1886, Ram Krishna died. It shook Bengal as no other event would for years. He had become a legend in his own life. His disciples came from all over India and from all classes. Maharajas, pundits, beggars, artists, journalists, Christians and Muslims all had rubbed shoulders at his temple meetings." Ram Krishna, was prone to religious frenzy, however, with the help of two gurus "he learnt the true technique of mysticism and then the ability to transfer his love of Kali to first a personal deity and then to an impersonal formless God of the Vedanta." He "began a reappraisal of Hinduism and started stressing the eternal values of the religious philosophy." As "by that time the Brahamo Samaj movement which proclaimed the basic unity of all religions had become quite popular," he "moulded this also into his being, weaving it with the Bengali tradition of *bhakti*" (Masroor 1987, 53–54). Masroor shows two priests mourning the death of Ram Krishna, yet advocating the superiority of Hindu mysticism over Muslim. The presence of an antagonistic approach to Muslim mysticism depicts antagonism to the very concept of mysticism. Dr. Alireza Nurbakhsh, present Master of the Nimatullahi Order and a Doctor of Philosophy, explains the Nimatullahi Order, which "stems from an initiatic chain, going back to the beginning of Isla," and the "word Nimatullahi is derived from the name of Shah Nimatullahi Wali, who founded the order." Sufism "as practiced in

the Nimatullahi order, emphasizes practical expression rather than doctrine and dogmas" ("Sufism" *Nimatullai Sufi Order* 2011–2014, 2). Muslim and/or Hindu mysticism suggests "actualization of divine ethics" transcending "social conventions" ("Sufism" n.d., 1). Sufism is thus "the selfless experiencing and actualization of the Truth" ("Sufism" n.d., 1).

The practice of Sufism is "the intention to go towards the Truth, by means of love and devotion. This is called *tarigat*, the spiritual path or way towards God," thus, Sufism "involves an enlightened inner being, not intellectual proof" ("Sufisim" *Nimatullahi* 2011–2014, 1). In Masroor's novel, the two priests echo the intellectual thought behind separation rather than the spirit of assimilation, of being One as professed by mystic thought. However, Masroor shows that Sufism has followers in India. The Hindu priest's claim, "how abjectly we accepted the Muslim rulers telling us that their Allah is the greatest"—"Nur," "when all the time the secret was always there in our own scriptures that there is One Supreme Being"(Masroor 1987, 55), reiterates the phenomena of ethics and a common divine entity which promulgate "actualization of divine ethics" ("Sufism" *Nimatullahi* 2011–2014, 1). Suresh, despite being a Hindu, recognizes the strength of Islam, and proclaims, Islam brought the "message of social democracy and equality for individuals," the "poems of Doulat Kazi and Alawal displayed a new synthesis. . . . The process whereby Bengal absorbed outside influences but adapted them to its own particular style" (Masroor 1987, 51–52). Thus, the projection of a new particular style offers newer avenues of conference.

Masroor thus presents Suresh's voice as well as the Hindu priests' voice to depict the peculiarities in Hindu voice too. The Hindu priest further spoke of Hindu superiority, yet, imbued by the spirit of One Being he connects to the Human chain, "Man in his ignorance identifies himself with the material sheaths that encompass his true self. Transcending these, he becomes one with Brahma who is pure" (Masroor 1987, 56). This elucidates the fact that both Islam and Hinduism, despite one being monotheistic and the other apparently polytheistic profess that there is One Supreme Being.

With specific reference to a communal divine entity, Rabindranath Tagore's *The Religion of Man*, a collection of lectures, offers an explanation of One being and the Human chain as part of it. He says, "The Spirit of Life began her chapter by introducing a simple living cell against the tremendously powerful challenge of the vast Inert. . . . This is the harmony of self-adjusting inter-relationship impossible to analyze. She brought close together numerous cell units and, by grouping them into a self-sustaining sphere of co-operation, elaborated a larger unit." He further explains, "It was not a mere agglomeration. The grouping had its caste system in the division of functions and yet an intimate unity of kinship" imparting a "communal spirit" (Tagore 2011, 14). It is this unity of kinship and communal spirit that

is the force behind dialogism. Masroor's narrative is replete with references of such relationships.

Furthermore, Masroor's characters and their ideologies depict shared symbols in the form of mystic thought as well, "Samaj movement" and Bhakti movement. At the same time, her character, Shafquat, provides yet another voice of separatism since he "belonged to those men who had never approved of the Mughal ways, which encouraged accomplished Hindus to hold position of eminence," he "abhorred" "bhakti movements as a diffusion of true faith" (Masroor 1987, 59). By presenting differences between intra-Muslim and intra-Hindu communities, Masroor shows "the interaction of distinct perspectives or ideologies, borne by the different characters." She detracts from the role of the domineering author, and offers viewpoints. Masroor does not "monopolise the 'power to mean'" (Robinson 2011, 2), which explicates its presence as a novel projecting multiple voices. Masroor merely presents how, devoid of politics of power, the Sufi and Hindu mystic conjoin around shared existence in the universe carrying shared symbols of ritualistic affinities and interfaith dialogue.

It is noteworthy here that Masroor's character, Surinder, dwells on the similarities present between different religions making dialogue possible. Amlok's bitter remark about the similarity in counting beads as rituals of both religions is reiteration of shared concepts. It is such shared symbols which the Muslims and Hindus enjoy that bind them in the spirit of one living cell. The source of existence of all races and castes is one, therefore, the rituals and symbols of different religious groups are shared too. Furthermore, years of cohabitation have led to overlapping of certain religious customs and traditions as well. The connection thus, remains within the Human chain as the Sufis point out in their sayings and poetry.

SUFISM AS A MEDIUM OF UNIVERSALISM FOR POLYPHONIC EXISTENCE

Sufi poetry connected the region and its inhabitants to the human chain as well as the Supreme Being. Masroor's character, Shabbir had a passion for "the sufi poetry of Punjab," thus, any one belonging to Punjab, whether Hindu, Muslim, or Sikh had been introduced to mysticism of all sorts. Shabbir proclaims to Farhan, "See Farhan how the shape, texture and family of every leaf varies, it reminds me of the people of the Punjab, so many ethnic and religious differences, yet all have been welded into one harmonious whole by the sufi poets of Punjab" (Masroor 196). So, despite different "flavors" of "fruits and twigs," they all grow in the same orchard and even thrive, while retaining their distinctness yet connecting the "people of five rivers" with the "carefully

woven cobweb of sufi thought" (Masroor 1987, 197). The symbolic reference to different flavors and fruits as well as variety of twigs in the same orchard is a significant example of coexistence and thriving conditions. The people of the subcontinent could thrive like the different fruits in the same orchard without marring the flavor of one for the other.

Contextually, Shabbir indulges Farhan with the "web of history" of Punjab:

> At first there were the Nath Jogis, who used to roam the countryside reciting verses which was accompanied by simple music. By the end of the tenth century, a new religion and culture had established itself in the land. It was then that the individuals from that race had entered as conquerors felt that their particular outlook on life needed to be interpreted afresh for the people residing there. (Masroor 1987, 196)

When the Muslims invaded, there was an adaptation of ways on both sides. Initially, with the English invasion, as mentioned in *White Mughals* by William Dalrymple, there was assimilation from both sides. But with time, the English acknowledged that such an assimilation cannot establish supremacy of one over the other. As Farhan points out "unlike . . . the Indians" who "emulated the English dress and manners" (Masroor 1987, 196) the adoption remained one-sided, which disrupted the equilibrium. Therefore, with the Muslim invasion for centuries there had been assimilation and adaptation which maintained distinctness as well as equilibrium.

> According to Shabbir, . . . there was no exclusiveness in the mosques either, which were not limited for prayers. The school in the mosques were open to all non-Muslims also. Thus all were imbued by the sufistic ideas of Saddi, Hafiz and Rumi. You know how much Punjabi sufi poetry is preserved in the *Granth*, the holy book of the Sikhs. (Masroor 1987, 196)

Thereby, Farhan is compelled to make sense of how interreligious ties are formed with Sufi ideas. He acknowledges that "*gurumukhi* contains pearls of Persia"; this symbol connects him to his Sikh friend, Jaswant, and he exclaims, "No wonder I always felt so close to Jaswant" (Masroor 1987, 196). Farhan's relationship with his Sikh friend has historical, ancestral, and interreligious binding. It is marred by differing political ideologies. Such liaisons had been common pre-partition, yet they suffered due to separatist mindset which was inculcated by outsiders as well as political usurpers. These political parties encouraged a power struggle between Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs to the benefit of maintaining separatist ideologies. Ironically, India had been the land where the Sufis had infused love between Man and faiths, but the outsider had pervaded India with hatred for the Other's faith.

In this regard, Shabbir's explanation of the Sufi ideology which imbibed the spirit of Love and an antonym to dogmatism is significant. Shabbir's voice resonates with the Sufi voice of love and presents a distinct school of thought from the politically maligned ideologies of leaders and clergymen. He speaks of Baba Farid of Pakpattan, whose main theme is "the march of time," Shah Hussain's concern is "'Wahadat-ul-wajud' or Unity of Being" (Masroor 1987, 197). Interestingly, Hindus despite being largely polytheistic were inspired by Shah Hussain's "revolt against the mullah's ritual and dogma" (Masroor 1987, 197) as well as the Unity of Being. As Shabbir claims, "the most popular poet of all was Bullah Shah who died in 1750." His " biggest battle was against the clergy, the self-appointed custodians of what is right and what is wrong. . . . He lashes out in verse against their soulless religious practices, meanness and hypocrisies" (Masroor 1987, 198) and opens the debate about Man and his space on this universe. There is universalism in Sufism and a quest for finding identity in the midst of shared existence of Man at large. This is evident in the following verse:

bulhya key janan mien kon?
Who am I? Does anyone know? (Masroor 1987, 198)

In the same manner, poetry of Khawaja Ghulam Farid, 1844–1901, displays the message of Unity of Being, of universality through depiction of "flora and fauna" (Masroor 1987, 198). Most importantly, his poetry like other Sufi poets is infused with the spirit of Unity and Oneness in creation as well as the Creator. He speaks of borderlessness, of erasing differences and adapting rather than adopting distinct ways of the Other.

Shabbir quotes him,

O Beauty, O Light Eternal
Your Being is necessary as well as a possibility
You are also the Creator and Eternal One
You are Masjid, Mandir and Magi's temple
You are Hindu's sacred book and also the Quran
You are the Gita, Granth and Veda
You are knowledge and its absence, both. (Masroor 1987, 198)

Khawaja Ghulam Farid cajoles the mind with images of Beauty as Light Eternal and the Creator being One for all religions, faiths, and beliefs. The demarcation of differences with divergent buildings like a mosque or a temple and different Holy Books is shunned in his ideology, although as an antithesis it can be asserted that these different buildings offer distinctness and thereby, dialogue. However, in the macrocosmic perspective, which is

yet another view, there are no differences in the creations of God, there is total immersion of being One with the Eternal Being. In the same manner, the dialogue Sufi poets speak of is akin to the dialogue which is inherent in the theoretical concepts of heteroglossia and polyphony, although, heteroglossia and polyphony advocate celebration of differences without assigning power to one ideology or voice. Sufis do not shun the Other's voice or religion or faith but accommodate and adapt to differences through tolerance and love. As Shabbir further explains to Farhan, "Farhan, in the United Provinces of British India, you all learnt much hate. We in Punjab, heard the preachings of our poets which espoused the ethics of tolerance, saying that all religions were true and lead to salvation" (Masroor 1987, 199).

Moreover, Farhan finds affinity with Hindu and Sikh colleagues more than his religious counterparts. His friend Jaswant is Sikh and despite the closeness between both boys, they retain their individual sense of pride in their different heritages. In the novel their relationship is presented as complicated, "Secretly at heart both boys were inordinately proud of their families. Farhan with a Mughal background and Jaswant with ties of kinship linked to the one-time Lion of Punjab." Jaswant plays with the idea of marrying a Muslim girl and turning her Sikh. Farhan resents this, yet because of his friendship, he is willing to forgo Jaswant's intentions. However, as a harbinger of future troubles, Masroor shows that, "Both boys stared at each other, a naked hatred shone like a candle, flickered and then went out" (Masroor 1987, 136). Such is the predicament of all friends coexisting in united India pre-partition as they are maligned with dogmatism and ritualistic adherence to religious rules and regulations. The literature of India and Pakistan however demand a subtraction of these regulations, and a focus on ethics. As Khushwant Singh points out in *Train to Pakistan*, "Ethics which should be the kernel of religion has been carefully removed" (Singh 1988, 196) in India. The writers advocate tolerance which even the Sufis professed in their poetry. The Sufis imbued the spirit of unity, connecting the people across Persia and Bengal. One important way to encourage unity is through celebrating cultural and racial hybridity which exists as a consequential reality of coexistence.

POLYVOCALITY IN HYBRID EXISTENCE

According to Homi K. Bhabha, Professor of English at Harvard University, there is a space "in-between the designations of identity" and that "this interstitial passage between fixed identifications opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy" (Bhabha *Location of Culture* 1994, 4). Anthony Easthope explains Bhabha's concept of hybridity at length. Hybridity can have "at least three

meanings—in terms of biology, ethnicity and culture. In its etymology it meant the offspring of a tame sow and a wild boar, hybrid, and this genetic component provides the first meaning." A second definition of hybridity might be understood to mean an individual "having access to two or more ethnic identities" (Easthope 1998, 1).

Hence, when the colonizer takes over a country, a communication between the colonized and the colonizer is required. Such a communication develops through different kinds of relationships between different ethnicities. At the onset of the British Empire's interest in India, communication was developed between the different ethnicities through male and female interactions. In *White Mughals*, William Dalrymple shows how the colonizer was "colonized" by the Oriental and the exotic women of India. This led to their assimilation with the Indians breeding a hybrid race of the White Man and the Mughal, which Dalrymple calls White Mughal. This miscegenation contributed to assimilation. At the same time, it was an indication that colonizer's identity may be subsumed. The English soldiers started wearing Indian clothes and eating with their hands as was the Indian custom. The English authorities acknowledged the threat to their cultural norms and shunned such affiliations between the Indians and the English. Despite regulations, coexistence meant that the English had to interact with the Indians and vice versa. Eventually, the Indians adopted the garb, mannerism, and language of the Englishman, as is reflected in Ahmed Ali's character Asgher in *Twilight in Delhi* and the Bengalis in *Shadows of Time*.

The Indians were "wearing the clothes of the ruling class, . . . sipping brandy and soda in complete imitation of the white man's dusk ritual," Sisir's manner of speaking "had crept" in "the English style of emphasizing certain vowels and words" (Masroor 1987, 2) thus appropriating the colonizer's language, however, their minds are afflicted with the loss of pride and honor to the English. It is the "assimilationist phase" as the postcolonial critic, Frantz Fanon in *The Wretched Earth* (2001, 179) calls it, however, the new Brown Sahib as he is called the pseudo-English Indian, becomes a hybrid breed, a cross between brown and white with the adoption of English ways, yet, retaining Indian loyalties. In the assimilationist stage [which is the first out of the three, the second is resistance. and the third is combat] (Fanon 2001, 179) the colonized adopts ways and mannerisms of the colonizer to become one with him. He tries to emulate the colonizer. In Masroor's narrative, Keshab is described as " the Bengali *babu*[2], the first to come under the British influence-the first to imbibe the spirit of the modern age-the babu who had so faithfully learned the language of the Sahib-is now feeling the need for an Indian organization" (Masroor 1987, 23). He demands equality from the colonizer yet, tries to incorporate his Indian identity in the process. Suresh narrates Keshab's

hybrid existence, "this Indian who has emulated the British in dress, in manner, in food and drink is now . . . begging to be treated as an equal" (Masroor 1987, 23). Despite his appearance and mannerisms of the modern English ways, he retains his Hindu customs because of his mother, who is "the custodian of the old ways" (Masroor 1987, 9).

Nevertheless, while hybridity and assimilation are means of dialogue between the two ethnicities, adherence to old customs offers resistance to complete subsummation. The Hindus managed to adopt the ways of the English better but recognized their Indian ways too. Manilal reflects that "we had absorbed their [English] culture while retaining our links with rural Bengal," therefore, the Hindus are "able to survive." Muslims on the other hand, "are like lost people, unable to find their past and unwilling to accept the present" (Masroor 1987, 49). The new Hindu hybrid race however, still focused on synthesis, which is not dialogic. It merely superimposes one identity leading to the supremacy of the other. A similar issue had to be dealt with at the time of Muslim rule, "Over the centuries a synthesis had taken place between Brahmin thought and the Muslim ideas espoused by the ruling Mughals" (Masroor 1987, 2), yet it was not proponent of dialogue. So, if dialogism "recognizes the multiplicity of perspectives and voices," a hybrid character, belonging to two or more different races, has multiple voices and perspectives handed down genetically and environmentally. Since, dialogism, is "referred to as 'double-voiced' or 'multi-voiced,'" it is "a 'principle' which can become the referent of a particular aesthetic field." As each character "has their own final word" relating to and interacting with that of the other, making "dialogical works a lot more 'objective' and 'realistic' than their monological counterparts, since they don't subordinate reality to the ideology of the author" (Robinson 2011, 2). This is seen in Masroor's novel as there are interreligious, inter-caste relationships. The outcome of these relationships are hybrid offsprings. Kamini, borne of Sisir, a Hindu, and Gul Rukh, a Muslim, brought up in a strictly unadulterated Brahmin household offers one such example.

Similarly, Farhan and Sarla's offsprings are hybrid, borne of a Hindu mother and a Muslim father. They are brought up in India as Hindus and Indians yet, they have Farhan's blood. The point to be noted is that Masroor does not offer a patriotic end to the story, with the children's affiliation to the country of their father. On the contrary, Sarla's son lived in India and dies as a martyr defending his country. Therefore, Masroor, "objectively" presents the hybrid characters opting for their own voices and interacting according to their perspectives. The Pakistani author does not pervade the narrative by displaying a patriotic end, where Farhan yearns for his country or dies for it. As Robinson claims, "In a fully dialogical world-view, the structure of the text should be subordinate to the right of all characters to be treated as

subjects rather than objects. A novel in this tradition is constructed as a great dialogue among unmerged souls or perspectives. Ideas are not presented in abstraction, but are concretely embodied in the lives of protagonists." Therefore, Masroor's narrative, true to its polyphonic nature, is "a dialogical text presents relations as dialogical rather than mechanical or object-like, and avoids authorial finality" (Robinson 2) and exhibits the same relations. However, political relations are replete with disparate views and discrepancies even between Sarla and Farhan. But Masroor exhibits that voicing ones opinion can be a means of correlation rather than disengagement even in the face of such dissensions.

COALESCENCE OF POLITICAL VOICES IN DIALOGUE

It is noteworthy that in Masroor's narrative individual political opinions are given full scope of dialogue. Sarla is the voice of the Hindus and she claims India as Hindu's ancestral privilege. She lashes out at Farhan for his ideals and concepts:

> You have asked for the laceration of the sacred body of the Aryadesh. How could you the Muslims of India demand this? For centuries you trampled on our homeland, you destroyed our temples, you set yourselves up as kings. Your swords made us bow our heads and we perforce accepted all your customs. Not content with desecrating our idols you sacrificed the cow daily to assuage your hunger, and yearly decked the cow as a sacrifice for Abraham. Our *gaomata* whom we the Aryans of Hind revere, was made the symbol of your devotion to your God. Our deepest feelings expressed either in stone or in life counted for naught beneath the Muslim blade. All this we endured with a suffering born of helplessness because we were the ruled, and now when freedom draws close, you want to put this dear precious land to the knife, cut it into pieces and serve it forever. (Masroor 1987, 285)

Sarla voices her concern with respect to division of a land that hosted both Hindus and Muslims and many other religious groups on the mere basis of religion. She begs Farhan to demand a bigger share in political representation as opposed to dividing her land. Her love for India is so great that she feels she has been "touched by an outcast" (Masroor 1987, 285), and betrayed and recognizes why the Muslims are called "unclean-*melech*" (Masroor 1987, 285). Sarla speaks with autonomy, devoid of the Pakistani/Muslim writer's intervention, as she has full scope of voicing her concerns as a Hindu. Despite her loyalty to Hindus, she loves her children borne off a Muslim. In fact, she cherishes their mixed breed.

On the other spectrum, Farhan's voice broadcasts the Muslims' concerns. He criticized the role of the Congress in driving the Muslims toward their demand for division. According to him, Nehru should have curbed the Hindu extremists, and Gandhi ought not to have detracted the Muslims toward the Khilafat movement. He expects Sarla to overlook the political dissensions. These should not come between their relationship, and their relationship does prove to be independent of animosities, as after the debate, "They lay in stillness that sang of a long parting, then the old magic asserted itself. She moved and her cheeks became damp. All his latent energy rose to meet this need and their bodies fused one to another, although politics separated them utterly" (Masroor 1987, 286). He maintains that "We can never be *truly* separated, we have lived too long on this soil together" (Masroor 1987, 286). The word "together" is an integral counterargument to the concept of hybridity; together denotes subsummation of distinctness. However, it leads to synthesis. Hybridity thus is a consequence of synthetical existence but does not portray the inherent traits of synthesis, rather projects a new form or species, with distinct characteristics, different from the two synthesized bodies. In this case, the new breed is Farhan and Sarla's two offsprings born out of wedlock as a result of their clandestine affair. Although the outcome of this synthesis is two Hindu children who are extremely patriotic toward their land, India, but both engender Farhan and Sarla's passion for rights of people and are therefore dialogically inclined toward distinctness.

Nevertheless, the arguments between Farhan and Sarla are prolific and effusively outline differences between both ethnicities. Farhan presents his arguments in favor of the Muslims, yet, his eventual silence in the face of Sarla's arguments denotes Masroor's detachment as a Muslim writer from the conversation between the two characters. Such autonomy in characters' voices is proof of polyphony, which disseminates possibilities of dialogue in strife. Sarla points out, "how many Muslims you will leave in India, in Hindu India for the sake of an idea?" This is a very strong argument, and Farhan can merely say, "The League thought it all out, they feel it is better to have some place where you are independent to keep the Muslim entity alive." To this, Sarla's response is rudimentary and coaxes Farhan to think of the antithesis of the League's demand. Sarla proclaims, "So it is still the vanity of the rulers, they must be supreme somewhere even if it means cutting their own community in half" (Masroor 1987, 286). She points out how Muslim masses which are supposed to be "tyrannized" would be left behind to "face further everlasting Hinduisation." Farhan can merely answer "sadly." Masroor lets the argument continue between the two characters, without puppeteering the two voices and forcing an omnipotent overview. Sarla retorts, "Perfect, a partition where half the Muslims become a sacrificial cow for the other half who anyway feel secure enough to desire partition" (Masroor 1987, 287). Farhan

is rendered speechless, which is also dialogic space allocated to accommodate the other's opinion. This is an indication of Masroor's detachment from her national or religious inclination, which many writers aim at. Masroor's narrative has proved to be the mouthpiece for all communities and individuals separately. Therefore, the characters present multiple views independent of the author's steering or maneuvering.

These views offer intertwined as well as separate points of references. A scholarly critic, and a Professor of English, Muhammad Ayub Jajja, in "*Shadows of Time*: Colonial Encounter and Partition," claims that Masroor celebrates "the long and ancient history of Hindu-Muslim synthesis" through "the portrayal of the intermingling of the Muslim and the Hindu cultures, achieved over the centuries. Farhan, a Muslim and a lover of Hindu woman, Sarla, refers to the coexistence of the minarets of the mosques and the domes of the temples" (Jajja 2012, 22). Jajja points out a distinctness in Masroor's perspective in comparison to Mumtaz Shahnawaz's point of view in *The Heart Divided*. According to Jajja, "the thrust of the narrative in *Shadows of Time* is on the expression of the common Hindu-Muslim cultural and social heritage through the union of Brahmin Sisir and Muslim Gul Rukh and many other such unions across and beyond religious lines." He further reiterates that Masroor, "shows that over the centuries these interactions have created common memories, common past and syncretic Hindu-Muslim culture" (Jajja 2012, 22). In *The Heart Divided*, Mumtaz Shahnawaz feminizes the political discourse, thus, presenting singular feminine voice at the time of partition. Whereas, Masroor, despite being a female writer presents masculine as well as feminine perspectives through female characters, Sarla, Maheen, and Gul Rukh and male characters, Farhan, Manilal, and Keshab. In Masroor's novel, there are androgynous dialogic voices revealing a political polyphony with respect to gender dynamics too, in the aftermath of partition.

Thereby, Masroor projects gender politics as the female voice adopts a new role over the period of time in this saga. In Sisir and Gul Rukh's relationship, Sisir has the power to steer. However, Sarla and Farhan's liaison is proof that each voice can have autonomy, as both characters have the power to maneuver their relationship. Thereupon, Masroor, as in the case of a polyphonic novel, "grants the voices of the characters as much authority" as she has as a narrator, thus, engaging "in active dialogue with the characters' voices" (Dentith 1996, 41). Masroor renounces the "right to the last word granting full and equal authority to the word of the characters." The novel shows "plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses" (Dentith 1996, 41–42) true to polyphonic tradition of opening dialogue.

Moreover, Farhan knows that Sarla hates the Muslims' demand for a separate country on religious basis. Despite having opposing views and ideologies, they remain intertwined emotionally and find solace in each other's

company. At the time of partition, Farhan has to abandon his soil, which is India as a whole entity. He has to leave it in order to enjoy the freedom of voicing his opinions and views. Farhan advocates coexistence till he hears Jawaharlal Nehru's speech in reaction to the verdict of the Cabinet Mission. The Cabinet Mission had drawn a plan in which, "a Union of India embracing both British India and the Indian states. The provinces were to be divided into three sections. By grouping the Muslim provinces into solid autonomous units, it removed the fears of the Indian Muslims and it preserved the Indian Union" (Masroor 309). In this manner, a polyphonic India was possible where each community, religious group, and caste could have an autonomous voice. However, Farhan is enraged by Nehru's reaction. Nehru proclaimed, the Congress was not "bound by the Mission plan." Farhan remarks, "Does he not realize that this speech is going to mean the end of Akhand Bharat, the destruction of the unity of India?" (Masroor 1987, 311). He lays the blame on Nehru and Sarla stops him. He immediately withdraws the blame, allowing her full freedom to voice her opinion too. Through these two characters, Masroor shows the need for dialogue within the two communities rather than an authoritative declaration of one over the other.

On the key political front, Masroor shows that there is usurpation of voice, as is seen in Congress's stance over the Cabinet Mission's proposal. This development proved that the Congress "was only a Hindu body which was incapable of doing justice to the Muslims" (Masroor 1987, 314). So, even a political party becomes monologic once its participants and members are not given autonomy of voice. Masroor then narrates the riots which followed as a course to this monologic stance,

> Men stabbed or shot each other, they raped women and then cut their breasts off. Babies were bashed to death against the walls, women were pushed off the roof tops screaming their way to silence. Shops and houses were burnt, inmates pushed inwards to be reduced to ashes along with their goods. . . . India it seemed had decided that it did not like the multi-community mingling. It preferred a single ethnic existence. (Masroor 1987, 314)

This is a premature end of a rather nascent dialogic condition of political ideologies under colonial rule. However, in post-partition situation, these differences should have resolved, since, each party had acquired its voice. The wars between the two countries India and Pakistan prove that a partitioned land does not vouchsafe peace; it is dialogue which may contribute to peaceful coexistence. Since the abandonment of, "the embracing kindness of sufi thought, the vigorous bhakti movements" "all dissolved as snow on the desert face" (Masroor 1987, 314), as soon as political dynamics of power imbalance govern the minds. The basic concept and ideology of Sufism is borderless

existence, the borders cannot define peaceful existence but dialogue can underline peaceful coexistence in a spiritually borderless condition.

Masroor shows how centuries of coexistence tore relations in the face of struggle for political power:

> The Aryans had destroyed or enslaved the Dravidians; the Muslims had ruled the Hindus, living as privileged, superbly confident of their own civilizing powers; the British had established their paramountcy by the policy of divide and rule, and that fanning of hatred was making the fires glow red hot, while blood was sprinkled like sacred ghee causing fresh spurts of flame. (Masroor 1987, 314)

Yet, in spite of the partition, Muslims continue to visit the shrine of Ajmer in India, while Hindus and Sikhs visit their shrines and holy places in Pakistan. So, spiritual affinities connect and collate borders which are products of politics of postcolonial thought. Nonetheless, Masroor exhibits eternity in love, which in turn, is confirmation of an eternal dialogue. Farhan visits India and meets his "Rajput princess," his offsprings, and chooses to die in his India, despite his love for Pakistan. So, in this context, Masroor presents the reader with the outcome of hybrid existence of multireligious groups, which amplifies love, in the face of political dialectics.

As India was home to "eight racial groups" (PHB 1955, 6) in particular, each group contributed a new language for communication and dialogue gave rise to initially "175 different languages and more than 500 dialects"(PHB 1955, 6), which are hybridized and carry political diversity. This diversity in languages due to hybrid existences and coexistence of multiracial groups can contribute to polyphonic voices too. Masroor's characters speak different languages and use different discourses for communication of thought, allotting privilege to each language and discourse one time or the other. There is the discourse of poetry and its particular language, which interconnects ideologies, the language of music, and finally the language of communication. In India, with 780 languages post-partition and around a 1,000 languages pre-partition according to a report dated July 2013 in *Hindustan Times*, a polyphonic existence is integral. Masroor shows how language plays a role in engaging dialogue.

DIVERSITY OF DISCOURSE AND LANGUAGE DISSEMINATING CULTURAL PLURALISM

Masroor has shown a variety of ethnicities, castes, and creeds in her novel. Thus, there is diversity in languages as well as discourse. Furthermore, the

difference in the language of these discourses has diverse ramifications on the sociopolitical Indian landscape.

Masroor's novel presents the Bengalis, the Muslims of the Nawab family, and the Punjabi Sikhs; therefore, her characters speak multiple languages as well as the common language of the colonizer and the invader. The languages English and Urdu are connectors apparently; however, inherently the characters are connected by the language of poetry and music. The two genres, music and poetry reflect fluidity of thought and ideology in their unique rhyme and rhythm. Both genres were used to connect the different communities. As Haseena, a singer in *Train to Pakistan* by Khushwant Singh says, "Singers are neither Hindu nor Muslim" (1988, 122). The language of poetry and music is a source of dialogue between the Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs. Interestingly, Bengali verses, Punjabi poetry, and Urdu poetry enthralled Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims. In *Shadows of Time*, Masroor shows that "in 1929 spacious sitting rooms of large houses known as baithaks were still the model. Here almost daily some kind of musical activity was held" (Masroor 1987, 190). Apart from the social and cultural activity at the baithaks, another area where men of all religions, castes, and creeds came was the Mori and Mochi gate. Here, "the young men went to mushairas, the gatherings where poets recited their latest compositions" (Masroor 1987, 191). They "listened to the music of the different *gharanas* [families], hotly debating the skills of the various *ustads*[teachers], " and drank "Punjabi wine" (Masroor 1987, 191). Thus, there is an amalgamation as well as a dissemination of all cultures, religions, and social constructs in these areas. In the same context, the poetry of the Sufi poets, as mentioned earlier, "welded" all "religious differences" "into one harmonious whole" (Masroor 1987, 195). Hence, the music and poetry of the Indian subcontinent continued to "weld" (Masroor 1987, 188) the schisms created by the politicians and religious priests; therefore, the language of poetry, art, and Sufism-induced cultural plurality leading to integration.

The language of mystic poetry is indigenous to the soil; it has a Bengali, Urdu, Sanskrit, and Punjabi flavor adding variety and distinctness. At the same time it is inclusive as it engages with all languages. Masroor writes,

> Although Urdu was not the mother tongue of the masses, Punjab had become the biggest champion of Urdu. The linguistic position in the Punjab remained constant throughout the British occupation; English held sway at the administrative and professional levels, Urdu was used for creative expression and journalism, and Punjabi was the means of communication at home and the market place. (1987, 188)

Urdu had an official bearing since it was used to communicate political situation of the country by creative writers as well as journalists. Hindus, Sikhs,

and even some English also employed Urdu for different reasons and purposes. Speaking in Urdu, Persian, or English revealed the "rich literary legacy of Lahore" and "Lahore had become, in time, the third great centre for Urdu, after Delhi and Lucknow. Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims all switched from Persian to Urdu, and it remained the most important language for all, for over a hundred years" (Masroor 1987, 188). Here, the appositeness of Urdu might have monopolized the language; however, Masroor shows the supremacy of regional languages too. Her characters continue to quote Punjabi poetry and accredit Sanskrit and Bengali in their customs and traditions.

In Masroor's work, it is seen that "all speech utterances are heteroglot and polyphonic in that they partake of different languages and resonate with 'many-voices,'" as a polyphonic novel carrying many voices. Bakhtin explains, "Heteroglossia (other-languagedness) and polyphony (many-voicedness) are the base conditions 'governing the operation of meaning in any utterance.'" By "other-languagedness," he "refers to ideologies inherent in various languages to which we all lay claim as social beings and by which we are constituted as individuals: the language and the inherent ideologies of our profession . . . of age group, of the decade, of our social class, geographical region, family, circle of friends etc." (Park-Fuller 1986, 2). Thus, while the characters carry distinct voices one voice never supersedes another, each voice retains its integral distinctness. Masroor depicts this by portraying the "capacity" of her characters' "utterance to embody someone else's utterance even while it is 'theirs'" which "thereby creates a dialogic relationship with his/her opinion." Apart from reappropriation which is an obvious corollary of many-voicedness, Bakhtin claims that "Each word tasted of the context and contexts in which it has lived its socially charged life; all words and forms are populated by intentions." Thus, "polyphony is inherent in all words or forms" (Park-Fuller 2). The writer, in this case, Masroor, displays this adroitly. She projects real-life utterances, and thereby makes the novel dialogic and thus alive. There is a "layering of voices within one voice." As is apparent in a polyphonic novel, Masroor has inserted "voices within voices [e.g. character speech within narrator speech, narrator speech within authorial speech, etc] and to orchestrate a dialogue among them" (Park-Fuller 1986, 2). The languages and discourses intersect at points of universality of music and mystic thought then diverge toward their distinctness.

In Masroor's case, the characters belong to different religious and regional groups, which present diversity of voices and ideologies, voicing their concerns against colonial or sub-colonial society. Thereby, Urdu as shown in Masroor's novel "developed new modes of expression," evolving and incorporating other languages. Even Farhan is shocked to "glimpse a new Urdu, vibrant, boisterous, free of the classic rivalry of Delhi and Lucknow, a language engaged in creating new forms, endowing old symbols with new meanings." This is a language which has evolved from the diction of the

"great masters, Mir Taqi Mir, Sauda, Ghalib, and Dard." Masroor writes, "Urdu had become the cultural language of the urban elite of the Punjab" (Masroor 1987, 189). However, Urdu is a combination of all languages, it has Sanskrit, Persian, and Arabic words, which connects it to all languages yet never usurping the other languages essential distinctness, which in turn contributes to cultural pluralism.

Similarly, music provides a connection between the characters. The "many-voices" of music resonate in the novel, starting from Nibha, Keshab's wife. Nibha's "voice rose to the sky," there is the "lovely sound of raga" which fills the air while "Nibha's lyrical voice rose in notes so pure." The effect of pure *bhakti* music is displayed as "his [Keshab's] whole body was wafted, trance-like into an ecstasy" "soaring his mind" (Masroor 1987, 5–6). Furthermore, Jaswant and Farhan are enthralled by the music at the brothels, *mushairas*, and political parties as well. Music is a common denominator in the friendship of these Sikh and Muslim boys. Nuzhat's brother "was an ardent lover of western classical music. Beethoven's symphonies resounded in the house, but that did not prevent him from enjoying Indian music" (Masroor 1987, 189–90). There is an amalgamation of languages in music yet, each type of music retains its potency and power. Apart from Urdu, Sanskrit is seen as an important part of music too. Kauna, Manilal's wife, infused by her love for Hindu customs, chants her religious mantras in Sanskrit only. Sanskrit is an integral part of her belief, thus, her invocations are in Sanskrit, and her ecstatic dance is to the Sanskrit chants at the temple of Kali. She advocates the importance of this language and her regional language Bengali, "It is the song *Bande Mataram*[3] which India needs for unity" (Masroor 1987, 13). *Bande Mataram* has religious connotations as well, as there is an evocation to the Goddess Kali. This aspect is contentious as it is argued that a national song has to be secular. In *Frontline*, A. G. Noorani, an Indian lawyer, historian, and author, argues that it is not appropriate to impose the song. According to Noorani, one may respect the song but not impose it (Noorani 1999, 1). So, music is a means of displaying religious ideologies as well. However, music remains dialogic so far as the ideologies reflect humanitarian concepts and ethics. Thus the diversity of language and discourse may contribute to coexistence and cultural plurality, if there is a nexus for generating eclectic points of view. For that matter, Masroor's novel portrays multiple religious voices as well, which interact and counteract at points.

PLURALITY OF RELIGIOUS VOICES AS A CONFLUENCE OF DIVERGENT IDEOLOGIES

The political situation changed as the colonizer shifted control to the colonized. Hindus were about to rule the subcontinent, and inversion of power

with respect to specifically religious identity was imminent. Such a proposition troubled the Muslims, and Masroor reflects this in her novel, "The people the Muslims had ruled for centuries were now part rulers in the provinces. This irked the Muslims" (Masroor 1987, 257). To reflect the plural religious voices, Masroor's religious identity remains detached from her omniscient narration, thus, she broadcasts the eclectic intersections and divergences of plural religious ideologies. The characters have complete freedom to voice their opinions according to their religious or political identities.

In the novel, there are references to hegemonic and thus monologic ideas and ideologies which are introduced by the Hindus as soon as they foresee their political rule as an imminent reality; yet, Masroor offers examples of tolerant and integrating policies as well. For instance, the national song is a prayer to the Hindu Goddess Kali, which is unacceptable for the Muslims, since they do not pray to any God but One Supreme Being. Masroor writes that the song *Bande Mataram* had "aroused the Muslims, since it had distinctly anti-Muslim tones, and the song was addressed as a prayer to Kali Mata. This was intolerable to Muslims whose pride is that they only pray to and bend before the One God" (Masroor 1987, 257). The national song of India thus, induces a religious divide and voices "Hindu supremacy" as it "was read in all the educational institutions every morning." Nonetheless, the "tricolor," "orange, white and green" (Masroor 1987, 257) becomes the national flag, which the Muslims salute reluctantly. However, the three colors signify the conglomeration of all religions; the saffron color signifies Hinduism, the green color stands for Islam, and the white color for all other religions. In this regard, Muslim retaliation is questionable. It proves their urge to continue projecting their hegemonic position. Even the educational institutions awakened to the ideals and ideologies of Hindu religion. Masroor presents this awakening as an incumbent need of the hour, since the curriculum taught for centuries had been focusing merely on Muslim ideologies. Nevertheless, the syllabi the Hindus suggested are also inequitably structured. The Hindus, thus, used the educational institutions to infuse Hinduism and Hindu ideology as a counter to centuries of Muslim ideologies being taught to the populace. Masroor writes, "Books were written, which suggested that meat should not be eaten, only vegetables" (Masroor 1987, 258). Despite these monologic infusions as mediums of change from Muslim primacy to Hindu predominance, Masroor offers examples of tolerant and all-encompassing ideologies in the new educational framework designed by the Hindus. This in turn, agitated the Muslims disposed to centuries of myopic adherence to Islamic thought. Thus, Masroor's narrative incorporated Hindu point of view as equitably as Muslim.

In the novel, she writes there is another stance that the Hindus incorporated in the curriculum which is dialogic between religions and religious identities.

She writes, “Children were taught all religions were true and that the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) is one of many founders of new religions” (Masroor 1987, 258). Historically, India cherished Hindu culture, however, the Hindu way of life had been greatly affected with the imposition of Muslim rule. In the wake of the Hindus’ success in the political arena, the Hindus could finally assert their identity. However, Masroor claims that this reappropriation of culture and religious duties does not subsume other religious practices in India. The educational curriculum is polyphonic and dialogic. Yet, there is a contestation in the rituals and duties of religions which is disturbing for the Muslims as they had enjoyed complete freedom in practicing their religious duties as rulers.

With specific reference to the high stature that the Prophet Muhammad enjoyed in Muslim tradition, the Muslims could not rally the idea of aligning him with other religious leaders. Muslims, “felt that such teachings impaired the truth of Islam . . . They felt it was likely to shake the children’s belief in the unique status held by the Prophet” (258). Hence, Masroor shows that the contention between the two religions grows with apparent secularism. Muslims feel that the Hindus are trying to supersede Islamic teachings by inculcating their Hindu traditions. Additionally, according to Muslim belief, music and coeducation in the “new scheme” violates “their religious sanctity” (Masroor 1987, 258). After winning the elections Hindus started using religion in politics too. It is noteworthy here that they win the elections because the Muslims are divided among themselves. The Jamiat-e-Ulema believes that the League is “secular” and “negates Islam.” Masroor’s character, Reena as a Christian observer, claims she is attacked as a *kafir* (a disbeliever). Reena proclaims, “League itself is a cover for the devil and will be the undoing of Islam.” Such antagonism within the Muslim sect as well as Gandhi’s religio-political strategies of reaching out to the “vastness” of rural population led to the defeat of the Muslim League. Gandhi’s strategy to “reach the Hindus” in the “village interiors” by “using the words of the *Gita*[4] and the *Mahabaharat*”[5] worked better than the “maulvis” (cleric) approach to target the “urban” population with their “pontifically” “closed *chardewari*.”[6] mind (Masroor 1987, 255–56). Hence, using religion as a dialogic possibility turns to the advantage of Hindus while the closed mindset of Muslim clerics isolates Muslims. In this context too, Masroor shows all aspects of Muslims rather than focusing on one.

Reena, a Christian woman married to a Muslim, is another seminal character who shows another angle of Islam. She says Muslims do not accept Islam as a violent religion, however, according to her, violence is propagated in the preaching. She claims,

> The religion of Islam, the same Judiac tradition as of Christianity, yet so unlike Christ’s message of love. This is closer to Moses’s teachings. The same

> vengeance, the same harshness when dealing with human folly, similar commandments couched just as mercilessly; yet in Islam they are unending, a hadith for every occasion. As a child I was told that Hinduism is an erotic religion, . . . but as a grown woman, I discover when studying Islam that in the faith I have adopted how greatly occupied by sex is the mind of the religious ones. How even the different *fiqahs*[7] gave their injunctions on it! (Masroor 1987, 248)

Reena further explains her dilemma of living like a Muslim, but a Christian at heart.

> I wonder at all the patriarchal religions of Jehovah and even think its more honest and natural to be a pagan like the Greeks were, or voluptuous like the Hindus are. And the hypocrisy of the revealed religions overwhelms me and I run, flee to the same reality of Indian politics only to find that the sword of hate has enhanced the snake poison of religion, and here there is another insanity, hatred has become the biggest zest and then I weep for Christ's compassion and I feel lost like a child, and . . . I want to go back to the Church where Christ preached "Let the children come to me." (1987, 248)

Reena's exclamations about the religion Islam are heartfelt and spontaneous. Masroor thus presents all angles of Islamic preaching. Her narrative explores these angles as the characters continue to discuss religion and religious practices.

Consequently, each character voices his opinion whether in favor of his religion or even against his own religion. However, Masroor's characters point to the supremacy of political agenda over religious ideologies too. When Salman protests that the Muslims lost in Punjab and Bengal because of Fazl-i-Hussain and Fazal-ul-Haq of Calcutta, Farhan explains, "Salman, the feudal lords of Punjab are not the hereditary taluqdars of the United Provinces, claiming their lineage and lands from Mughal and Oudh days; they are the creation of the British . . . it brings very little to bring a jagirdar to heel. The Unionist Party is the British lapdog" (Masroor 1987, 259–60). Thus, there is an implication that the British played a role in engendering differences among religions.

To explore this point further, historians' versions of the role of the British as a divisive force needs to be analyzed as a supplementary source of information, despite its lack of heterogeneous perspective. Stanley Wolpert writes in *Shameful Flight*, "In Mid-August of 1947 the world's mightiest modern empire, on which 'the sun never set,' abandoned its vow to protect one fifth of humankind" (Wolpert 2012, 1). Just as Ayesha Jalal in *The Pity of Partition*, writes, "India's partition along ostensibly religious lines in 1947 is simply the most dramatic instance of postwar decolonization based on arbitrary

redrawing of boundaries" (2012, 3). Jalal quotes Saadat Hasan Manto's character, Mumtaz,

> Don't say that a hundred thousand Hindus and a hundred thousand Muslims have been massacred. . . . Say that two hundred thousand human beings have perished . . . the loss of life is futile. Muslims who killed a hundred thousand Hindus might think they had eradicated Hinduism, but it is alive and will remain alive. . . . Religion, faith, belief, devotion are matters of spirit, not of the body. Knives, daggers, and bullets cannot destroy religion. (Jalal 2013, 20)

This reflects Sufi thought and spirit, which is borderless as an opposition to the political need to create borders. Jalal further reiterates that Manto's tales provide a "symbiosis between Manto's life and work," thus, "Creative writers have captured the human dimensions of Partition far more effectively than have historians" (Jalal 2013, 23). This is apparent in Jaswant Singh's non-fiction, *Jinnah*. It is a historical account of partition, and carries biased tones of inclination toward a singular ideology rather than portraying the emotions of all the participants of the event of partition. Hence, despite Wolpert's and Jaswant Singh's endeavors to portray the tragic elements of partition, the human aspect of the tragedy is embedded only in fiction.

Thus, the novel as opposed to non-fiction historical work has a "reflecting relation to history that surrounds and produces it." It has "an active intervention in the heteroglossia in which it lives and moves" (Denitith 1996, 59). As these "novels orchestrate all themes, the totality of the world of objects and ideas depicted and expressed in them, by means of the social diversity of speech types [raznorecie] and by the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions" (Bakhtin *DI* 1981). For Manto, "Partition—with its multifaceted ruptures, political and psychological" was "a collective madness" (Jalal 2013, 24), thus, he reflects the human frenzy attached to a political event. He portrays this madness through the madness of his characters in "Toba Tek Singh." In this short story, he shows how Sikh inmates are asked to leave Pakistani mental asylum and the Muslim inmates are asked to leave Indian mental asylum. For the inmates, the concept of Sikh and Muslim as well as Pakistan and India is alien. They do not comprehend the conjecture behind this demand. For them, their space is adequate, however, it is a matter of strife for the assumed mentally stable individuals of the subcontinent. Manto's character, Toba Tek Singh lies down in No Man's land for solace from this madness of migration. However, even Jalal points to the responsibility of the tragedy of partition not merely on the religious fervor but the engendered haste in allotting boundaries. She claims, "there were perpetrators and victims of a murderous orgy in 1947 among Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs in the midst of the abdication of all sense of responsibility of a departing

colonial state" (Jalal 2013, 87). Thus, the religious frenzy created by the political parties is not merely the reason for the tragic demise of "at least one million" human beings and a "tsunami of more than ten million desperate refugees . . . Hindus and Sikhs" (Wolpert *Shameful Flight* 2012, 1–2) and Muslims who had to leave their ancestral homes, but politically contrived sectarian divisions in the wake of an unorganized British departure, which led to the cataclysmic consequences of partition.

According to Wolpert the mayhem and chaos was caused by the "hastily and ineptly drawn lines" by "an English jurist who had never set foot on the soil" (Wolpert *Shameful Flight* 2012, 1). Furthermore, if they had waited ten more months, the tragedy and bloodshed that followed partition might have been avoided. The tragic loss of lives and hasty division of lines are the causes of hatred and insecurities, rather than the plurality of religious ideologies, which had coexisted for centuries. Wolpert claims, "it's more than half century of hatred, fear, and continued conflict" that keeps "the potential of nuclear war over South Asia" (Wolpert *Shameful Flight* 2012, 2) looming perpetually. Thus, elucidating that centuries of plural religious coexistence is not responsible for the broad-based schism, it took only half century of poorly planned political division to create discord of immense magnitude.

Conclusively, Masroor's novel depicts the lines drawn out by political parties on the soil of India, which intriguingly produced fundamental religious identity markers for Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, and Parsees. However, India, with her history of centuries of coexistence is a reservoir of shared symbols, Sufi thought and ideals of universalism, hybrid races, diverse languages, and plural religious coexistence despite dialectics of sectarian strife. Thus, her narrative precludes singularity of voice whether it is politically or religiously contrived and enervates each voice with its distinct ideology and ideal for conference with another voice. Her polyphonic novel conveys the possibility of accordant and congenial coexistence in the face of contentious effectuation of separatist ideologies and superimposition of singular thought.

NOTES

1. "Synthesis." "Something that is made by combining different things (such as ideas, styles etc)" Merriam Webster. Web.
2. "Babu." A term used in South Asia as a sign of respect toward men. Web.
3. "Bande Mataram" Vande Mataram is the National song of India since 1950. Written by Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay in 1882. It was written in Bengali and Sanskrit. It is a hymn to the Motherland. The song's first two verses were given official status of the "national song" distinct from the national anthem of India, Jana Gana Mana. Web. 28 Jan 2016.

4. Bhagvad Gita. Referred to as Gita Is a 700 verse Hindu scripture in Sanskrit. Web. Feb 2016.
5. Mahabharat is one of two major Sanskrit epics of ancient India. Web. 2016.
6. "Chardewari." The aggregate of the fences put up for inclosure. Web. 4 Feb 2016.
7. Fiqah. Sect. from Fiqh which is Islamic jurisprudence, the human understanding of Islamic law. Web. 4 Feb 2016.

Chapter 5

Creation of Dialogic Paradigms

This book demonstrates dialogic possibilities in Indo-Pak English novels on partition, and conclusively has arrived at the result that there are words, utterances, symbols, and ideological opinions and views in the novels which are in constant anticipation of the word of the other. Thus, these novels open a dialogue and project avenues of communication through references to a shared past of coexistence and separation. In doing so, the writers of the novels transmit multiple perspectives of the event of partition as opposed to the monologic relay of historic events by historians, barred by the stylistic requirement of constrictive and myopic view of the historian or the dictates of an organization. In contrast, to this hegemonic narrative discourse, the English novels on partition provide an array of voices, viewpoints, perspectives, and ideologies of the multiple religious groups that resided in the subcontinent and continue to reside in India and Pakistan through the voices of multiple characters. Moreover, these English novels do not empower any national language, rather English as a language becomes a conjoiner for the disparate nationalities. Additionally, the book exposes the history of coexistence of Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs in conjunction with these mediums of dialogue to locate points of nexus as elucidated by the writers. Mikhail M. Bakhtin's dialogism is used as a paradigmatic approach to understand dialogue, the concepts of dialogue—heteroglossia; polyphony; chronotope—and the demands of dialogue, with reference to the words, symbols, and utterances in the novels as well as intertextual references of communication.

Thus, the four novels, Bapsi Sidhwa's *Ice-Candy-Man*, Khushwant Singh's *Train to Pakistan,* Anita Desai's *Clear Light of Day*, and Mehr Nigar Masroor's *Shadows of Time* are hermeneutically deconstructed as means of communication intercommunally as well as intracommunally. There has been an assiduous examination of texts and it may be discerned

that these novels are replete with images and symbols of interconnectivity and integration on a transnational level, opening rather than closing points of view. The religious diversity of the writers contributes to the ambivalent perspective, reordering political and religious vantage points of view as opposed to singular perspective of monologic discourse. What is required is a rethinking, reordering, and rereading of national discourse in the light of dialogic possibilities prevalent in the transnational discourse of novels by hyphenated Indo-Pak writers, thus, incorporating the quiddities of both identities, rendering dialogue possible. A survey of history is inevitable, yet a re-evaluation of history in the light of the alternative reality as presented in the novels is offered here.

Since the twelfth century CE, Muslims and Hindus had been living in the subcontinent, adopting and adapting cultural, social, political, and even religious ways in an endeavor to integrate, communicate, and exist beyond the differences inherent between the religious identities. With the intrusion from the British and their subsequent colonization, there was initially adoption of English ways too, however, a united struggle against the English created an ideological similarity between the two religious identities, Hindus and Muslims. The Sikhs, who were supposedly a congruence between these two religious identities, also joined the struggle. While the Parsees, considered foreign to the land, retaliated toward English colonization as well. The united front comprising Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims became an eminent threat to the British rule, thus the British devised ways and means to divide and continue to rule. In doing so, the British created factions and groups among the Indians at large. This in turn, created irredeemable fissures between the multireligious populace, breeding resentment and animosity among friends and neighbors on the basis of religious disparity.

The novels on partition proffer the introduction of this animosity, bred and nurtured by the colonizer in a bid to inculcate discord among the multireligious groups, thereby dismembering a unified movement against the rulers. While the novels, discussed in this project, depict the differences inherent within religious ideologies, the English novels on partition, in particular, celebrate these differences as a nexus for coexistence as well. Due to coexistence, there has been a cultural, social, and psychological imbrication of ideas, ideals, and values. This in turn has created bridges and communication between distinct identities within the region. The research focuses on these points of confluence as means of dialogue among the dialectically separated individuals of the subcontinent. The novels, *Ice-Candy-Man, Train to Pakistan, Clear Light of Day*, and *Shadows of Time* are mediums of intertextual fluidity offering dialogic conference through the acknowledgment and projection of distinct voices of Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims, and Parsees. In these novels, there is no monopolization of one voice, which induces an

anticipation of dialogic utterance from each word, giving full scope for contribution of unequivocal ideas and values.

Interestingly, these novels present contentious, dialectical ideologies and dissensions yet engage with the crisis at hand using dialogue as a tool. Thus, the multiple voices in the novels rise above the clash of beliefs, and confer at points of correspondence inherent within the strain of sociological and ideological differences. Therefore, the novels offer an alternative reality to the dialectical events of partition by offering intersections, conferences, and debates. These novels celebrate and condone rather than reprove differences. Thus, contentiously, enervating the divisive force, that may be in the form of religious, social, racial, or cultural disparity, as a medium of dialogue rather than strife.

In this context, this book has explored these four novels, and other fictive discourse while referring to historical non-fiction and Bakhtinian theoretical template to first, deem the relevance and significance of the novel in creating dialogic possibilities as opposed to the monologic stance of non-fictive historical discourse. Second, the book introduces the avenue of dialogue by dissecting and evaluating the words, symbols, and utterances of the characters in the novels with their distinct voices. The multiple voices as broadcasted by the writers present the multiple perspectives of the event of partition, of religio-social differences and political strife, as opposed to the singular perspective of the historian or state organization. Third, this project has shown that the novels on partition portray the exclusive and inclusive reconstruction of events of partition, deconstructing ambivalences, and contractions indicated by post-partition monologic narrative declaring an absolutist ideology of divided existence. Thus, the novels project dialogic pluralism, by offering polyphonic and heteroglossic voices conferring at points of nexus of shared symbols, words, and utterances as well as distinct and emphatically discrete values, ideas, and ideals. Finally, the novels chosen here are records, narratives, and utterances in English. The English language carries two important points of reference; it is a common language disabling subsummation of one regional or national language over the other, while at the same time, conferring power to the colonizer's language as a voice and paradigm for integration between the multilingual discourse of India and Pakistan. These postcolonial novels celebrate the colonial legacy by using the colonizer's symbols, utterances, and words as a common medium to relay possibilities of dialogue, thus, reappropriating its significance in the postcolonial landscape. Therefore, each event, character, religion, and language is celebrated for its distinctness in these novels.

There is a dialogic fluidity in these texts when deconstructed and evaluated as mediums of dialogue in the presence of monologic discourse deluging the mindscapes with absolutist ideologies of supremacy. However, the study

deconstructed hermeneutically historical data on the possibilities of dialogue present in the archetypal shared symbols, as well as monologic presentation of ideologies. In doing so, it can be discerned that there are symbols, tools, means, and mediums of confluence present in the texts under peruse, which convey an eclectic intertextuality. This is further explored in the light of Mikhail M. Bakhtin's theory of dialogism, and its subsequent elements—heteroglossia, polyphony, and chronotope to enervate the dialogic stance as point of reference. These elements are threaded in a chain of dialogue, keeping it alive intratextually as well as intertextually.

In order to create the dialogic paradigm, a re-evaluation of the mediums of integration is indispensable. The introduction of the communion of Muslims and Hindus during the Mogul era is an integral reference to dialogic possibilities inherently embedded in the Indian scape. Next, the inclusion of the East India Company in the subcontinent as an economically governing force and a precursor to the British rule and finally the struggle for independence from the dialectically contrived inhabitants of the subcontinent is surveyed. The elements of Sufisitic integration are shown as tools for heterogeneous coexistence, and further located in the fictive discourse. Each novel is seen in reference to its dialogic stance and configurations in the light of dialogism. Hence, the paradigms of dialogic conferences are presented in the ensuing chapters in a bid to expose and convey the inherent symbolic tradition of the novels in terms of dialogic heterogeneity, which is a natural corollary of years of coexistence and hybridization.

The first novel under perusal is Bapsi Sidhwa's *Ice-Candy-Man*. It is surveyed and proffered as a dialogic text, incorporating means and tools of dialogue within the text, offering symbolic and concrete mediums of integration. With reference to concrete elements of confluence, there is a Parsee narration which affords a seemingly neutral stance of the event of partition of the subcontinent between Hindu-majority area and Muslim-majority area. The Parsees are onlookers of the event, yet, they project and present the Hindu, Muslim, and even Sikh characters' opinions, views, and actions. They become the unifying force of multireligious groups as they confer with their ideologies in the narrative. Through the eight-year-old Parsee narrator, an awareness is launched with respect to recognition, acknowledgment, and later acceptance of differences. As a child she was unaware of religious dissensions, yet the approaching event of partition sets a precedent for her as partition of friends, neighbors, and lovers becomes imminent. While, she realizes the culprit for this discord to be founded in disparate religious ideologies, she also recognizes the presence of dialogue in religious thought, in the form of shared symbols. Furthermore, Sidhwa reveals the integration inherent in regional affinity as well as the unified anti-English sentiment. For instance, she shows how the Punjabis dress alike irrespective of their religious

identities and how each character is imbued with the spirit of antagonism toward the English hegemony. Thus, the recognition and acknowledgment of these affinities and similarities in the presence of ambivalent and conflicting ideas, shows that there is scope for dialogue between contradictory elements, so far as there is a denial of monopolization of one voice over the other. Sidhwa confers the Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, and Parsee voice equally on the tangent of differences.

In the same manner, there is a celebration of these distinct voices in *Train to Pakistan* by Khushwant Singh. Upon his visit to Pakistan in 1990, speaking at a tutorial at Kinnaird College for Women, Singh spoke of his religious identity markers rather than his religious identity as a defining force in him. According to him, as he spoke while I interviewed him, the turban, the beard, and the *kara* (steel bangle) delineate his Sikh tradition, while he remains a-religious in his stance. His novel is a reflection of this ideology. He crafts the story of a Punjabi village, Mano Majra, inhabited by Muslims, Sikhs, and a Hindu family, while the civil government officials are Hindus. The Muslim tenants have been coexisting with the Sikh landlords for centuries. He categorically elucidates the similarity between the Muslims and Sikhs as a natural consequence of living together. They perform their daily work as naturally as the natural elements such as animals, birds, reptiles, and unnatural objects like the train execute tasks. Thus, he objectifies human characters as elements of nature contributing to the life of Mano Majra. In doing so, Singh, projects and broadcasts the voices of animals, reptiles, the train, the river, and the Muslims as well as the Sikhs distinctly. Each voice is heteroglossic, discrete yet never subordinating the other's voice. He proffers the need to detract from politics of division while acknowledging the possibility of coexistence through maintenance of distinctness. A heteroglot world is inclusive as well as exclusive. Mano Majra is corrupted by the outsiders, just the same way as its river is polluted by the bodies of Muslims, Hindus, corpses of babies, women whether Sikh or Hindu or Muslim, and animal carcasses, which definitely do not have allegiance to any religious faction. Yet, a Sikh rogue is willing to sacrifice his life to save his Muslim lover. Moreover, Singh shows how the Hindu magistrate orchestrates the act of saving hundreds of Muslims by using a Sikh rogue and his love for a Muslim woman. *Train to Pakistan*, therefore becomes a medium for relaying an ideology of heterogeneity and coexistence. Furthermore, his character, Iqbal, reiterates the importance of ethics in any religion, which means if a man is killed it is irrelevant whether he is a Muslim or a Hindu, a human life is lost, and must be condoled. Thus, each individual is unique in his life and death. He has a unique perspective of each event. Singh detracts from providing a vantage point to any of his characters by broadcasting from all points of view.

Anita Desai, provides yet another perspective of the event of partition. In her novel, *Clear Light of Day*, she questions the fixity of geographical borders in a fluid world, where time and space are fluid. This novel is perused and evaluated in the light of her chronotopal representation of the events of partition, which focus on the back and forth movement of time in the space of Old Delhi pre-partition and post-partition. This chronotopal movement establishes a dialogue between time, past and present, as well as a dialogue between time and space. Desai's character Bim is a major link between past and present as she remains in a space which connects the past and present of the entire family. Thus, despite differences the family interacts and communicates through Bim and the meeting ground is the house. Toward the end of the novel, Bim finally accepted the differences and "her voice flying, buoyant," as it had never been, "urged," says, "Tell him [Raja] how we're not used to it-Baba and I. Tell him we never travel anymore. Tell him we couldn't come-but he should come. Bring him back with you, Tara-or tell him to come in the winter. . . . Tell him I'm waiting for him-I want him to come-I want to see him" (Desai 2008, 273–74). Thus, she reconciles with the distinctness of Raja's ideologies, wishes to connect with him, confer with him while retaining her distinct space and respecting his space. She finds solace in listening to the verses Raja always listened to. The verses provide a nexus for dialogue between the two estranged brother and sister. Desai evokes an awareness for respecting the other's view, despite religio-social disparities. Moreover, she projects how shared time and space can corroborate in the resumption and subsequent retention of dialogue. Old Delhi and the house would always be the pivot of their past adventures and shared memories. Raja may have been displaced yet the memories bind Bim and Raja through the passage of time and space. Thus, metaphorically, the novel depicts how communal and mutual existence retains the element of dialogue despite dislocation and separation. Even disparate ideologies can hinge on a fulcrum and oscillate toward their inclinations, yet remain dialogic and connected.

Similarly, Mehr Nigar Masroor's novel, *Shadows of Time,* traces the history of coexistence of Sikhs, Hindus, and Muslims in the subcontinent, while showing the engendered differences dispersing the centuries-old intercommunal harmony perfused by mystic Sufi thought, pantheistic conjoiners, and celebration of multiple voices in interfaith relationships. There is a projection of polyphonic voices in Masroor's novel, relaying simultaneous voices, each voice retaining its distinctness, thus, no singular voice acquired hegemony over the other. Her Hindu characters like Sarla had complete autonomy in presenting the Hindu perspective while the Sikhs portrayed their anticipations, anxieties, and reservations with respect to the partition. The Muslims conveyed their ideologies, however, characters like Farhan gave full scope of intervention, communication, and dialogue to the Hindu characters, especially

Sarla. The novel can be discerned as a podium for polyphonic transmission disseminating and propagating each voice as novel and sui generis. Masroor does not empower any voice to subordinate another, however, each voice is empowered in its entirety as an individual voice. Moreover, like Khushwant Singh's character Jugga, Farhan is a perpetrator of hybrid voices. Both characters unknowingly contribute in the creation of hybrid beings, which carry traits of both ethnicities, yet remain unique as creations. Hybridity due to miscegenation can be investigated further as a source of integration and dialogue expressed within the ambit of art and literature. In this regard, Homi K. Bhabha's theoretical work and Dalrymple's fictive work may elucidate junctions and points of confluence between races, ethnicities, and different religious groups.

The uniqueness and discrete representation of plural and heterogeneous groups, yearning and struggling for points of convergence in the divergent setting of partition is thus identified as a medium of coalition. Bakhtin's dialogism provides a foothold to the interpretive faculties of investigation and perusal in a bid to locate heterodoxic chronotopal existence, heteroglossia, and polyphony present in the partition novels. Thus, dialogic literature projects an anticipation for a word in response to an utterance, which is unique in its time and space of utterance as well as in its transmission as a voice distinct from the other.

In this regard, the historical discourse on coexistence of Muslims, Sikhs, and Hindus in the subcontinent as well as post-partition identifies areas of monologic precepts indoctrinated as sources of division according to classification into homogenous identities. The historical discourse perused here is Jaswant Singh's *Jinnah: India-Partition-Independence*, Stanley Wolpert's *India and Pakistan: Continued Conflict or Cooperation?*, *Shameful Flight*, Ilyas Chatha's *Partition and Locality*, and Pakistan History Board's *Short History of Hind-Pakistan.* These texts have been exclusively chosen due to their configuration of perspective according to the historian and his national interest. These historical-cum-political sources provided an antithesis to the hypothesis of dialogism in fictive narrative discourse. While fiction provides a medium of conference, these non-fictive narratives close the debate by allocating power to a singular narrator and his required ideology. Nevertheless, these non-fictive books proffer a view of partition, thus, these are key elements of deconstruction, when multiple perspectives have to be investigated. Therefore, these monologic voices contribute to the dialogic site too, as a separate and distinct voice. The region after all, is embroiled with strife, and continues to remain a hot-bed for confrontation, owing to the contrived politics of division at the time of partition. Keeping in view, the strategically fragile, sometimes hostile, situation of India and Pakistan after partition, dialogue is inevitable. This is reiterated by journalists and politicians from

both sides, as was discussed in a talk held at Alhamra Arts Council, on the occasion of Lahore Literary Festival, held on February 28, 2015. The participants of the talk, "Anticipating Peace: India and Pakistan," the former foreign ministers of Pakistan Hina Rabbani Khar and Khurshid Mahmud Kasuri, Pakistani journalist Najam Sethi, British historian John Elliott, and Indian journalist Shekhar Gupta, emphasized that dialogue is integral to the stability and economic growth of the region. According to Kasuri, around six hundred million in both countries live under the poverty line; peace among the two countries is the only recourse to addressing these issues. However, Rabbani contradicts this unrealistic situation of attaining peace overnight. According to her, to attain peace, the two countries need to sit at the table and talk. All four participants agreed that the solution is dialogue. In this context, it is important to point out that fiction generating from India and Pakistan, whether it is Sidhwa's or Khushwant Singh's work, has proved that it has dialogic potential, as it encapsulates the opinions of all and anticipates the response of the other as a means of dialogue and not strife.

This potential in the four writers presenting multiple perspectives of the event of partition is the foreground for dialogue on partition, since literature survives beyond boundaries, it opens borders, and in fact literature knows no borders. These writers, Sidhwa, Singh, Desai, and Masroor, in particular, decentralize the author's religious identity and incorporate a regional identity which is borderless yet, impacted by the cultural diversity of coexistence in a region, which demands communication and response to their utterances. So far as the communication line is open there is a potential for utterances and responses. The distinct voices are broadcasted for acknowledgment and a non-violent discursive response is thus a requisite for communication. The novel is therefore a medium which "is located in the discursive to and fro of a particular society at a particular time . . . the novel is an active intervention in that struggle, seeking to re-accent the other's word, to parody, subvert, overcome, accede to, or argue with that other word in multiple, different, but traceable ways" (Dentith 1996, 58). The novels chosen here are written in English on Indo-Pak partition. The English language has an audience beyond the Indian subcontinent, and is the official language of India and Pakistan. Thus, these novels can be a source of dialogue between the Indians and Pakistanis, as these four novels are four angles of looking at the event of partition thereupon enabling communication between these angles, approaches, and perspectives as a means of establishing dialogue despite partition, rather because of partition.

Bibliography

Alim, Abdul. 2013. "Baba Guru Nanak-A Muslim Saint." *Al-Islam. The Muslim Times* Accessed Sep 12, 2014. https://themuslimtimes.info/2013/07/08/baba-guru-nanak-a-muslim-saint-2/.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas.

———. 1981. "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes toward a Historical Poetics." In *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 84–258.

———. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* Ed. And Trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

———. 1986. *Speech Genres & Other Latin Essays*. Austin: University of Texas, Print.

———. 1986. "Toward a Methodology for the Human Sciences Essays." Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bal, Micke. 2009. *Narratology: Intro to the Theory of Narrative*. Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Barron, Alexandria. 2007. "Fantasies of Union: The Queer National Romance in My Beautiful Laundrette." *Genders* 45(June): n.p. *Questia Gale.* Accessed Sep 2014. https://www.colorado.edu/gendersarchive1998-2013/2007/02/01/fantasies-union-queer-national-romance-my-beautiful-laundrette.

Bemong, Nele, Boghart, Pieter et al. eds. 2010. *Bakthin's Theory of Literary Chronotope: Reflections, Applications, Perspectives*. Gent: Ginko Academia Press.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture.* London: Routledge.

———. 1990. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge.

Brandist, Craig, Galin Tihanov. eds. 2000. *Materializing Bakhtin: The Bakhtin Circle and Social Theory*. London: Macmillan.

Burke, Anne. 2012. "Empowering Children's Voices Through the Narrative of Drawings." *Memorial University* 40 (Fall): 1–2. Accessed Oct 2014. http://www.mun.ca/educ/faculty/mwatch/mwatch_sped13/Burke.pdf.

Carrol, David. 1983. “The Alterity of Discourse: Form, History, and the Question of the Political in M. M. Bakhtin.” *The Johns Hopkins UP*. Spec. issue of *Diacritics* 13(2): 65–88. *JSTOR*. Accessed Jan 12, 2015. https://www.jstor.org/stable/464660?seq=1.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh, Rochna Majumdar and Andrew Sartori. 2007. *From the Colonial to the Postcolonial: India and Pakistan in Transition*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Chatta, Ilyas. 2011. *Partition and Reality.* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Chotiner, Issac. 2011. “Enough is Enough.” *New Republic*. (January 27). Accessed Feb 8, 2016. https://newrepublic.com/article/81345/india-pakistan-stanley-wolpert&ved.

Curthoys, Ann and John Docker. 2010. *Is History Fiction?* Sydney: UNSW Press.

Dadrawala, Noshir H. 2007. “The Parsees, Their History, Religion and Contribution to Indian Society.” *Zoroastrian Association of Western Australia.Z.A.WA*. Accessed Sep 10, 2014.

“Dalit Muslims of India.” 2015. *Human Rights, Politics, Arts & Culture, India, Asia. Al-Jazeera World.* Sep 04. Accessed Nov 10, 2015. https://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/aljazeeraworld/2015/09/dalit-muslims-india-150902080746653.html.

Dalrymple, William. 2003. *White Mughals*. London: Harper Perennial.

Daniel, Aharon. 1999–2005. “Religions in India.” *Tripod.* Accessed April 10, 2016. http://adaniel.tripod.com/religious.htm.

Denitith, Simon. 1996. *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*. London: London and New York: Routledge.

Desai, Anita. 2008. *Clear Light of Day*. New Delhi: Random House.

Devi, Morirangthem Linthoingaambi. 2011. “Multiculturism and Conflict in Khushwant Singh’s Train to Pakistan.” Abstract. *Open Journal Academic System*. 3.586. Accessed October 2014.

“Dialogism.” 2005. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. Great Britain: Taylor & Francis Books.

Easthope, Anthony. 1998. “Homi Bhabha, Hybridity and Identity, or Derrida versus Lacan.” *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 4(0.5): 145–51. *Theory and Criticism (Part I).* https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09502369808582312.

Eliot. T. S. “Tradition and the Individual Talent.” *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism.* Accessed Sep 3, 2016. https://www.gutenberg.org/files/57795/57795-h/57795-h.htm.

“Ethics and Religious Conflicts in India.” 1983. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*. (Sep). Accessed April 10, 2016. https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/ethnic-and-religious-conflicts-india.

Fanon, Frantz. 2001. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Constance Farrington. London: Penguin Books.

Fawcett, Louis. 2012. “The History and Concept of Regionalism.” *European Society of International Law* 4: 1–18. *SSRN.* Accessed June 2014. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2193746.

Fisher, Walter R. 1984. *"Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument."* 51. *Communications Monograph*. Accessed July 8, 2012. http://redmonky.net/utpa/4324/fischer.pdf.

Fitzgerald, Timothy. 2000. *The Ideology of Religious Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Holquist, Michael. 2001. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. London: Routledge.

"Hyderabad: Historical State, India." 2015. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. (May 29). Accessed July 30, 2015. https://www.britannica.com/bps-ssl-gsm-topic-75000-3000.xml.

Ikram, S.M.1964. Introduction. "The Interaction of Islam and Hinduism." Columbia: Columbia University. Accessed Feb 9, 2016. http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00islamlinks/ikram/part0_ikrampreface.html.

"Ilbert Bill." Britannica. Accessed July 28, 2016. https://www.britannica.com/event/Ilbert-Bill.

Iqbal, Ahmed. 2004. *The Life and Works of Jalaluddin Rumi*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Jalal, Ayesha. 2013. *Pity of Partition*. London: Oxford University Press.

Jajja, Ayub Mohammad. 2012. "Shadows of Time: Colonial Encounter and Partition." *Explorations*, vol. 23. Lahore: GC University Press.

Kuortti, Joel and Jopi Nyman, eds. 2007. *Reconstructing Hybridity: Post-colonial Studies in Transition.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kureishi, Hanif. 1992. "Borderline." *Outskirts and Other Plays*. London: Faber & Faber.

———. 1986. *My Beautiful Launderette*. London: Faber and Faber.

Legg, Stephen. 2007. *Spaces of Colonialism: Delhi's Urban Governmentalities*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Loomba, Ania. 1998. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London; Routledge.

Loretta, Fowler. 1987. *Shared Symbols: Contested Meanings Gros Ventre Culture and History 1778-1984*. USA: Cornell University Press.

Masroor, Mehr Nigar. 1987. *Shadows of Time*. Delhi: Chanakya Publications.

McLeod, John. 2000. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

"Medieval History of India: Bhakti Movement." *Know India: Culture and Heritage*. Accessed July 28, 2016. https://knowindia.gov.in/culture-and-heritage/medieval-history/bhakti-movement.php.

Mossman, Mark.1999. "Salman Rushdie's Midnight's Children: National Narrative as a Liminal Voice." *The Midwest Quarterly*. 41(1): 66. *Questia Academic Journal*. Accessed Sep 2014. https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-57564360/salman-rushdie-s-midnight-s-children-national-narrative.

Nandita. "What are the causes for the decline of the Mughal Empire?" *Preserve Articles*. Accessed Sep 10, 2016. https://www.preservearticles.com/history/causes-for-the-decline-of-the-mughal-empire/2862.

Noorani, A. G. 1999. "How Secular is Vande Mataram?." *Frontline* 16(1): 2. Accessed Oct 8, 2015. https://frontline.thehindu.com/magazine/issue/vol16-01/.

Nurbakhsh, Javed. 2011–2014. "What is Sufism?: A Comparison Between Sufism and Psychoanalysis." *Nimatullahi Sufi Order*. Accessed 13 Jan 2016. https://www.nimatullahi.org/sufism-and-psychoanalysis/.

Onial, Devyani. 2015. “Explained: Assessing Aurangzeb.” *The Indian Express*. Accessed Sep 9, 2016. https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/explained-assessing-aurangzeb/.

Onnudottir, Helena and Adam Possamai. 2016. “Conversion among Indigenous Peoples in Australia and New Zealand.” *Religious Change and Indigenous Peoples: The Making of Religious Identities*. London: Routledge.

Pakistan History Board. 1955. *A Short History of Hind-Pakistan*. Pakistan: Pakistan Historical Society.

Park-Fuller, Linda M. 1986. “VOICES: Bakhtin’s Heteroglossia and Polyphony, and the Performance of Narrative Literature.” *Literature in Performance* 7: 1–12. Accessed Jan 15, 2015. http://www.csun.edu/~vcspc00g/604/voices-lpf.html.

Parrinda, E. G. “Monotheism and Pantheism in Africa.” *Journal of Religion in Africa* 3: 81–88. doi: 10.1163/157006670. Accessed Sep 26, 2012. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1594816?seq=1.

Pechy, Graham. 2007. *Mikhail Bakhtain: The Word in the World*. London: Routledge, Print.

Quayson, Ato. 2000. *Postcolonialism: Theory, Practice of Process*. Wiley.

Ross, Kristen.1999. “Review of Henri Lefebvre’s *The Production of Space*.” *Not Bored* 30. Accessed Feb 13, 2016. http://www.notbored.org/space.html.

Robinson, Andrew. 2011. “In Theory Bakhtin: Dialogism, Polyphony and Heteroglossia.” *In Theory, New in Ceasefire*. Accessed Jan 20, 2015. https://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-bakhtin-1/.

Rushdie, Salman. 1980. *Midnight’s Children*. London: Penguin.

Sandhu, Akhtar Hussain. 2009. “Reality of ‘Divide and Rule’ in British India.” *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture* 30(1). Abstract. Accessed July 4, 2015. http://www.nihcr.edu.pk/latest_english_journal/reality_of_divide_rule.pdf.

Sannurd, Kirsti Weel. 2008. *Themes, Symbolism and Imagery in Anita Desai’s Clear Light of Day* (thesis). Oslo: University of Oslo.

Santiago, Juan-Navarro. 1993. “The Dialogic Imagination of Salman Rushdie and Carlos Fuentes: National Allegories and the Scene of Writing in *Midnight's Children* and *Cristóbal Nonato*.” *Neohelicon* 20(2): 57–312. Accessed July 7, 2012. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF02538816.

Said, Edward W. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism.* London: Vintage.

Schwartz, Stephen. 2008. *The Other Islam: Sufism and the Road to Global Harmony*. Canada: Doubleday.

Shepherd, David. 2011. “Dialogism.” *The Living Handbook of Narratology*. Accessed April 26, 2014. https://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/node/67.html.

Sidhwa, Bapsi. 1998. *Ice-Candy-Man*. London: Penguin.

———. 2012. *The Croweaters*. Lahore: Ilqa Publications.

———. 2013. *Water.* Lahore: Ilqa Publications.

“Sikhism’s Origins: The Life of Guru Nanak.” 2016. *History of Sikhism. Religious Facts.* Accessed June 1, 2016. http://www.religionfacts.com/sikhism/history.

“Sikh Religious Beliefs.” Accessed June 1, 2015.

Singh, Daljeet. 1990. *The Sikh Ideology* (Feb 9). Accessed Oct 2015. https://www.sikhmissionarysociety.org/sms/smspublications/TheSikhIdeology.pdf.

Singh, Jaswant. 2012. *Jinnah: India-Partition Independence*. New Delhi: Rupa.

Singh, Khushwant. 2003. *Best Indian Short Stories*. New Delhi: Harper Collins, Print.

———. 1988. *Train to Pakistan*. New Delhi: Penguin.

Singh, Upinder. 2006. *Delhi: Ancient History*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Stewart, Neil. 1951. "Divide and Rule: British Policy in Indian History." *Communicative Science and Society 1951.* Accessed July 10, 2014. https://philpapers.org/rec/STEDAR.

———. 1999. "Magic Realism in Relation to the Post-colonial and *Midnight's Children*." Accessed Feb 2012.

Strachey, Sir John. 1988. *India*. London: Paul- Trench Trubner.

"Sufism." 2011–2014. *Nimatullahi Sufi Order*. Accessed Jan 13, 2016. https://www.nimatullahi.org/.

Tagore, Rabrindranat. 2011. *The Religion of Man*. New Delhi: Rupa.

Taliaferro, Charles, Paul Draper and Philip L Quinn. eds. 2010. *A Companion to Philosophy of Religion*, 2nd edition. UK: Wiley- Blackwell.

Waandenburg, Jacques. 2002. *Islam: Historical, Social and Political Perspective*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Wegerif, Rupert. 2008. "Dialogue or dialectic? The Significance of Ontological Assumptions in Research on Educational Dialogue." *British Education Journal* 34(3): 347–61. doi: 10.1080/01411920701532228. Accessed May 2, 2012. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236950609_Dialogic_or_Dialectic_The_significance_of_ontological_assumptions_in_research_on_Educational_Dialogue.

Weiss, Meredith. 2002. "The Khalistan Movement in Punjab." *All About Sikhs: Your Gateway to Sikhism, Operation Bluestar*. Accessed 8 Oct 2014. https://www.allaboutsikhs.com/operation-bluestar/the-khalistan-movement-in-punjab.

Well, Gordon. 2004. *Dialogic Inquiry: Towards a Sociocultural Practice and Theory of Education.* UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wolpert, Stanley. 2010. *India and Pakistan: Continued Conflict or Cooperation?* Berkley: University of California Press.

———. 2012. *Shameful Flight*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Zhongwen, Qian. 1997. "Problems of Bakhtin's Theory about 'Polyphony.'" *New Literary History* 28(4): 779–90. Accessed May 4, 2012. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20057455?seq=1.

Index

Ahura Mazda, 11
Akbar, xx–xxi, 12, 89, 96
All India Muslim League, xviii, xxv
ambivalent, xxxi, 14, 54, 128, 131
anti-English, 1, 6, 10, 24, 29–32, 130
archetypes, xviii
art, xix–xxiii, xxix, xxxix, 14, 37–38, 40, 44, 62, 74, 76, 91, 118, 133
Aurangzeb, the Mughal emperor, xxii–xxiii
author's voice, xxxvi, 97

Bakhtin, Mikhail, xi, xiii–xiv, xix, xxv–xxvi, xxvii–xxxiv, 4–7, 9–10, 13, 17, 33, 37–38, 42, 67, 69–70, 76, 79, 81–83, 94, 98, 101–5, 119, 124, 127, 129–30, 133
Bande Mataram, 120–21
Bengal, xxiv, xxviii, 77, 85, 93, 95–96, 105–6, 110, 112, 123
Bhabha, Homi K., xxxi, 105, 110, 133
Bhakti Movement, xx, 99–100, 107, 116
boundaries/boundary, xii, xvii, xxxi–xxxii, 9, 26, 29, 37, 52, 102, 124, 134
Brahmin(s), 25–26, 94–96, 98–99, 112, 115
British rule/rulers, xix, xxxvii, 72, 128, 130

Calcutta, 72, 96, 123
carnivalesque, 38, 41
caste(s), xviii, 3, 16, 24–26, 28–29, 46, 54, 63, 82, 98–100, 106–7, 112, 116–18
Christian(s)/Christianity, xviii, xxvii, xxxviii, 3, 11–12, 15, 20, 27, 29, 31, 33, 54, 105, 122
chronotope, xxv, xxviii–xxix, xxxii–xxxiv, 67, 69–70, 76–77, 81–82, 84, 89–90, 127, 130
coalescence, 17, 105, 113
coexistence, xviii–xix, xxiii, xxv–xxviii, xxxiii, 1, 17, 21–24, 35–37, 39–40, 42, 46, 50–52, 59, 86, 93, 95–97, 99, 101, 103, 105, 107–11, 113, 115–17, 119–21, 123, 125, 127–28, 130–34
colonial, xviii, xxiv, xxviii, xxxvii–xxxix, 3, 17, 29–30, 33, 61, 69, 72–73, 94, 115–16, 119, 125, 129
colonization/decolonization, xxiii, xxxvii, 3, 16, 53, 123, 128
communal, xiii, xiv, xxiii–xxviii, xxxvi, xxxviii, 19, 22–23, 29–30, 33, 45–46, 48, 53, 72, 100, 106, 132
communication, xii, xxxviii, 2, 14, 17, 37, 41, 70, 111, 117–18, 127–28, 132, 134

Dalrymple, William, 16, 53, 108, 111, 133
decentralize(d), 18, 41, 134
degeneration, 68, 77
Dentith, Simon, xxvi, 33–34, 97–98, 115, 134
Desai, Anita, xi, xiii–xv, xvii, xxiv, xxvii, xxx, 52, 65, 67–71, 73–75, 77–91, 127, 132, 134
dialectical, xix, 6–7, 9, 23, 38, 42, 60, 98, 129
dialogic actors, xxiv
dialogic novel(s), xix, xxix, xxx, 37, 45, 85, 97
dialogic site(s), xxv, xxx, xxxi, 3, 18, 59, 67, 72–73, 88, 90, 133
dialogue, xi–xv, xvii, xix, xxii, xxv–xxxii, xxxiv, xxxvi–xxxix, 1–2, 4–7, 9–10, 12–13, 15–24, 30, 32–33, 35–37, 39, 43, 45–46, 48, 50–51, 53, 57–58, 61–62, 64–65, 67–71, 73, 76–89, 91, 95–99, 102–4, 107, 109–10, 112–19, 127–34
discourse(s), xx–xxii, xxvi–xxxiv, xxxvi–xl, 2, 6, 8–9, 23, 34, 36–39, 41, 45–46, 52, 58, 85–86, 90, 97–98, 115, 117–20, 127–30, 133
discursive hierarchy, 98
dislocation, xxvii, xxxiii, 67, 77, 132
diversity, xiii, xviii, xxxiii, 22–23, 38, 40, 105, 117, 119–20, 124, 128, 134
divide and rule, xxiv, 3–4, 32–33, 117
division(s), xiii, xx, xxxiii–xxxv, xxxvii, xxxix, 1–2, 4–5, 9–10, 12–13, 15, 22, 25, 29, 32, 33, 35, 37–39, 50, 61, 84–85, 94–96, 98–100, 102, 106, 113–14, 125, 131, 133

East India Company, xxiv, 130
eclectic, xxxviii, 62, 120–21, 130
eclecticism, xviii, xx
Einstein, Albert, xxxiv, 82
English gaze, the, 3
ethic(s)/ethical, xxiii, xxxii, 38, 48, 52, 54, 63–64, 104, 106, 110, 120, 131
ethnic identity, xx, xxiv
ethnicity/ethnicities, xvii–xx, xxxix, 2–3, 16, 19, 61, 111–12, 114, 117, 133

fabula, 81, 89
fanaticism, 38, 86–88

Gandhi, xxxvi, 5–6, 10, 14, 29–30, 32, 45, 87, 101, 114
goddess, 3, 16, 27, 120, 121
Granth Sahib, 7, 24
Guru Nanak, 46–47, 57
guru(s), 7, 24, 36, 37, 41–42, 46–47, 51, 56–57, 105

hatred, xxv, xxvii, xxxix, 28, 32, 36, 49, 51–54, 64, 69, 84–86, 99–100, 108, 110, 117, 123, 125
hegemonic, xxx, 41, 121, 127
heterogeneity, xxxii, xxxviii, 21–22, 130–31
heterogeneous, xxxi, 8, 23, 37, 123, 130, 133
heteroglossia, xxv–xxvi, xxviii–xxx, xxxii, 33, 38–41, 45, 58, 70, 98, 110, 119, 124, 127, 130, 133
hierarchy, 25, 29, 56, 90, 98, 101, 110
Hindu-Muslim, xxv, 7, 14, 17, 30–32, 102, 115
Hindu(s), xi, xiv, xv, xviii, xix, xx–xxvi, xxvii–xxviii, xxx–xxxi, xxxiii, xxxv–xxxviii, xl, 1–5, 7, 11–17, 20–21, 23–50, 52, 54–57, 60–64, 67–69, 71–72, 74–79, 83–89, 91, 93–103, 105–10, 112–28, 130–33
historical discourse, xxix, xxxiii–xxxiv, xxxvii, 8–9, 36, 39, 45–46, 86, 129, 133
historiography, xxxvi
Holquist, Michael, xxxi–xxxii, xxxiv, 5–10, 18, 68–69, 76–77, 79–84, 89–90, 95, 100–104
hybrid, xxxviii, 42–43, 50, 52–53, 61, 64–65, 89, 96, 102, 110–12, 117, 125, 133

hybridization, xxxii, 105, 130
Hyderabad, 68, 74, 76–77, 79–80, 88–90

Ilbert Bill, the, 93–94, 96
in-betweenness, 52
independence, xii, xviii–xix, xxiv, xxxv, 5, 8, 13, 27, 31, 53, 77, 96, 130, 133
Indian National Congress, xviii, xxv, xxxv, 94
Indo-Pak, xi, xiii–xv, xvii–xix, xxxii, xxxix, xl, 127, 128, 134
integration, xvii, xxii–xxiii, xxxix, 20–21, 23–24, 28–30, 36, 46, 47, 53, 61–62, 65, 82, 89, 99–100, 102, 118, 128–30, 133
intercommunal, xi, xxviii, 1, 84, 132
interfaith, xii, 107, 132
intermingling, 16, 24, 47, 64, 115
interrelationships, xviii, xix, 55, 98
intertextual, xi–xii, xiv, 84, 127–28
Islam, xviii, xxii, xxxvi, 14, 24–26, 46–47, 55, 66, 96, 99–100, 106, 121–23
Islamic, xviii, xxi, xxiii, 7, 75, 86, 99–100, 121–23, 126

Jinnah, Muhammad Ali, xxxv–xxxvii, 5, 8, 11, 13–14, 17, 27–30, 32, 45, 57, 84, 87, 101, 124, 133

Kashmir, xiii, xxiii, xxxv
Kureishi, Hanif, 52–53

Lahore, 11, 17, 20–21, 23, 25, 31, 33, 119, 134
langar, 46
language(s), xv, xviii, xx–xxii, xxviii, xxx–xxxiii, xxxix, 9, 19, 21, 38–39, 41, 71, 74–75, 90, 98, 104–5, 111, 117–20, 125, 127, 129
Legg, Stephen, 72
literature, xi–xv, xvii, xx–xxiii, xxxii, xxxix, 47, 55, 69–70, 74, 76, 81, 86–87, 90, 110, 133–34
Loomba, Ania, xxxvii, 13, 16–17, 33, 52–53, 61, 94

Masroor, Mehr Nigar, xi–xii, xiv, xvii, xxiv, xxviii, xxx, 52, 91, 93–123, 125, 127, 132–34
Mcleod, John, xxxvii–xxxviii
mob(s), 36–37, 40, 64–65, 78–79, 84–85, 88
mogul(s), 12, 130
monologism, xxviii–xxx, 8–9, 45, 94–95
Mountbatten, Lord Louis, xxxv, 14, 29, 31–33, 85, 87
multi-perspective, 70
multiple voices, xxvi, xxix–xxxi, xxxiv, xl, 23, 34, 37–38, 40, 43, 51, 62–63, 93, 97, 100, 107, 112, 129, 132
mystic(s), xviii, xx–xxii, 29, 64, 75, 91, 104, 106–7, 118–19, 132
myth, 25, 98

narrative(s), xii–xiii, xviii–xx, xxv–xxviii, xxxi–xxxiii, xxxv–xxxvi, xxxviii–xxxix, 2, 5, 8–10, 12, 24, 33, 39–41, 43–44, 46, 50, 59, 69–70, 72–73, 76, 81, 89, 93, 97–100, 104–5, 107, 111–13, 115, 121, 123, 125, 127, 129–30, 133
nexus, xv, xxxiii–xxxiv, 16–17, 69, 120, 127–29, 132

Occident, xxxi
Old Delhi, 67–70, 72–74, 76–79, 84, 90, 132
Oriental, xxxi, 111
Orientalism, 102
otherness, 5–6, 10, 103

paradigm(s), xxxix, 1, 46, 53, 62, 127, 129–31, 133
Parsee(s), xix, xxvi, xxvii, xxx–xxxi, xxxiii, xxxviii, xl, 1–4, 8, 10–15, 17, 20, 24, 26–28, 30–31, 33, 67, 125, 128, 130–31

partition, xi–xiv, xvii–xix, xxiv–xxviii, xxx–xl, 1–10, 12–15, 17–18, 20–21, 23, 27, 32, 32–36, 38, 41–46, 50, 57, 61, 65, 67–78, 80, 82–85, 87–90, 93, 95–98, 104, 108, 114–17, 123–25, 127–30, 132–34
patriotic, xxv, 112, 114
Persia, 11, 46, 58, 75, 108, 110
perspectives, xii, xiv, xix, xxiv, xxvi–xxviii, xxix–xxxv, xxxviii–xl, 2, 8–9, 12, 14, 22, 33, 35, 37–40, 43–45, 48–49, 51–52, 54, 58, 63–64, 67, 69–70, 73, 78, 80, 83–86, 93–97, 101–2, 107, 109, 112–13, 115, 123, 127–29, 131, 132–34
phenomenon, xix, 70, 90, 101
political, xvii–xix, xxii–xxvii, xxxii–xxxv, 2, 5–9, 12, 13–15, 20–21, 24, 27–34, 37, 46, 51, 57, 71, 73–74, 86–88, 93, 95–96, 99, 103, 105, 108, 113–18, 120–25, 128–29, 133
polyphony, xxv, xxviii–xxix, xxxii–xxxiii, 38–39, 97, 103, 105, 110, 114–15, 119, 127, 130, 133
postcolonialism, xxxvii–xxxviii, 13, 16
post-partition, xi, xvii, xxv, xxvii, xxviii, xxxiii, xxxix, 8, 36, 93, 96, 116–17, 129, 132, 133
psychological, xvii–xviii, xx, xxv, xxvii, 10, 44, 59–60, 62, 74, 79, 124, 128

Quit India Movement, xxv, 31

regional, xviii, xx, xxii, 4, 6, 10, 19–23, 35, 39, 42, 119–20, 129–30, 134
regionalism, 19, 20, 21
religious, xi, xvii–xxvii, xxx, xxxiii–xxxiv, xxxviii, 1–5, 7–16, 19–33, 35–44, 46–50, 52–54, 57–58, 60–64, 67–68, 72–73, 84–85, 87–88, 95, 99–101, 103–5, 107–10, 113, 115–16, 118–25, 127–31, 133–34
rights, xxx, 45, 73, 94, 104, 114
Robinson, Andrew, xix, xxix–xxxiii, xxxix, 22, 37–43, 45, 58, 93–94, 97–98, 102–3, 107, 112–13

Sanskrit, xxi–xxii, 25, 34, 105, 118–20, 125–26
sectarian, 5, 13, 42, 125
secular, xx, xxii, xxvi–xxvii, 13, 36, 38, 73, 87, 120, 122
secularism, 122
shared symbol(s), xviii, xxii, xxxi, 35–37, 43, 64, 104–5, 107, 125, 129–30
Sidhwa, Bapsi, xi, xiii–xiv, xvii–xviii, xxiv–xxv, xxvii, xxx, 1–6, 7, 9–33, 52, 54, 127, 130–31, 134
Sikhs, xi, xiii–xiv, xviii, xxvi–xxvii, xxx–xxxi, xxxiii, xxxv–xxxvi, xxxviii, xl, 1–5, 7–8, 11, 13–17, 19–24, 27, 29–31, 33–57, 60–65, 67, 69, 72, 85, 95, 97, 99, 107–8, 110, 117–20, 124–25, 127–28, 130–33
simultaneity, 6–7, 17, 81–82, 89–90
Singh, Jaswant, xxxv–xxxvii, 5–6, 8, 14, 17, 27, 30, 45, 87, 108, 110, 120, 124, 133
Singh, Khushwant, xi, xiv, xvii, xxvii, xxx, xxxvi, 29, 34–37, 39–41, 43, 45, 47–49, 51, 53, 55–57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 110, 118, 127, 131, 133–34
space, xi, xviii–xix, xxi–xxii, xxv–xxviii, xxxi–xxxiv, xxxviii, 6–9, 18, 26, 40, 42–44, 47–48, 50–51, 56–57, 60–62, 65, 67–77, 79–91, 98, 100–103, 109–10, 115, 124, 132–33
subcontinent, the, xi, xiii, xvii–xx, xxii, xxv–xxvi, xxxii, xxxv, xxxviii–xxxix, 1, 4–5, 10, 20, 24–26, 46, 52, 61, 65, 76, 86, 93, 99, 108, 118, 120, 124, 127–28, 130, 132–34
synthesis, xxii, 23, 94–95, 106, 112, 114–15, 125
syuzhet, 81

time, xi–xiv, xvii–xx, xxiii–xxviii, xxx–xxxiv, xxxvi, xxxviii, 2, 6, 8, 11–12, 17–18, 20–21, 24, 26–29, 32, 34–43, 45–46, 51–52, 54, 56–57, 59–60, 62, 65, 67–74, 76–79, 81–91, 93–94, 96, 98–101, 104–9, 110–12, 115–19, 127–29, 132–34
timelessness, 86, 91
time/space, xxxi–xxxii, 81, 83, 89–90, 101
transgradience, 102–3
transnational, 128
trauma, xi, xiv, xxv, xxvii, xxxv, 5, 93

unification, xxi, 4, 33
universalism, 105, 107, 109, 125
utterance(s), xxviii–xxix, xxxi, xxxiii, 8–9, 22, 33, 84, 93, 98, 119, 127, 129, 133–34

Vedic, 24, 34
violence, xi, xxv, xxxiv, 1–2, 13, 20–21, 23, 28–29, 45, 60–61, 73, 84–86, 88, 122
Vishwanath, xxi

whole entity, xxxi, xxxiii, 4–6, 13–15, 20, 43, 69, 94, 116
Wolpert, Stanley, xxv, xxxv, xxxvii, 8, 32–33, 45, 57, 85, 87, 123–25, 133

Zarathustra, 27
Zoroastrianism, xviii, 10, 27

About the Author

Dr. **Syrrina Ahsan Ali Haque** teaches English literature, creative, academic writing, and research methodology at the University of Lahore, Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore School of Economics, LGSIDP-University of London, and Government College University. Dr. Haque's first book *Sand in the Castle: A Collection of Short Stories* was published in the United States in 2010. Her second book, an academic nonfiction, *Cultural Confessions in Khaled Hosseini's Works,* was published in Germany in 2017.

Her manuscript *Dialogue on Partition: Literature Knows No Borders* has won Honorable Mention Award at NeMLA 51st Convention, Boston, USA. She has held many talks at universities as well as on television and conducted workshops on writing, academic as well as creative. She has been a freelance writer for newspapers and magazines. Her research articles have also been published in scholarly journals. Her research paper received the Best Paper award in Japan. She has won Summer Fellowship Award, USA.

Dr. Haque was placed on the Principal's Roll of Honor list.