



Queer subtext and narrative subversion in Vikram Seth's *A Suitable Boy*

Yogesh Choudhary

Research Scholar, SPC Govt. College, Ajmer, Rajasthan, India

Abstract

Vikram Seth's *A Suitable Boy* (1993) occupies a canonical position in Indian English fiction, often celebrated for its panoramic depiction of post-Independence India—its politics, family structures, and quest for modern identity. Yet beneath its heteronormative façade of matrimonial quests and familial respectability lies a subtle but persistent undercurrent of queer desire and emotional fluidity. This research examines the queer subtext of the novel as a deliberate aesthetic and political strategy that destabilizes normative gender and sexual hierarchies. Drawing upon the frameworks of Queer Theory (Judith Butler, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick) and postcolonial studies, the paper explores how Seth encodes nonheteronormative intimacy through silence, suggestion, and emotional ambiguity, especially within male bonding, performative masculinity, and the institution of marriage.

Through close textual reading, the study interprets the relationship between Maan Kapoor and Firoz Khan as a site of homoerotic tension and affective queerness that challenges the patriarchal order. Similarly, Lata Mehra's resistance to linear romantic closure reflects a subversion of the heterosexual "marriage plot," thus queering the narrative structure itself. Seth's restraint, irony, and empathy operate as instruments of narrative subversion, allowing him to critique social conformity without overt confrontation. By uncovering the invisible threads of queer consciousness woven into Seth's realist fabric, this research argues that *A Suitable Boy* not only broadens the understanding of sexuality in postcolonial India but also situates queerness as a mode of literary and emotional resistance in an era of moral rigidity.

Keywords: Listening skills, speaking skills, language mastery, secondary and tertiary level, students in Bangladesh

Introduction

Vikram Seth's *A Suitable Boy* stands as one of the most ambitious novels in Indian English literature, not only for its scale but also for its intricate portrayal of post-Independence India—a society negotiating modernity, tradition, and moral decorum. Published in 1993, the novel is set in the early 1950s, immediately after the trauma of Partition and amid the consolidation of a democratic Indian nation. At the surface, it appears to be a sprawling realist narrative about the search for a "suitable boy" for Lata Mehra, a young woman torn between familial duty and personal desire. Yet, when read through the lens of queer theory and narrative subversion, the text reveals a far deeper and more layered exploration of identity, desire, and repression—an exploration that quietly unsettles the heteronormative order it seems to uphold.

In a country where queerness has long been silenced or coded under layers of respectability,

Seth's treatment of emotional intimacy carries profound implications. His narrative does not announce its queerness through explicit representation but encodes it through emotional nuances, silences, and relational ambiguities. The friendship between Maan Kapoor and Firoz Khan, for instance, transcends the ordinary bounds of male camaraderie to hint at unarticulated desire and mutual emotional dependence. Their affection, tenderness, and eventual separation evoke a sense of tragic love that aligns with what Eve Kosofsky

Sedgwick terms "the epistemology of the closet" — a framework in which queer desire exists in the interstices of social acceptance and silence.

The postcolonial context of the novel is crucial here. Early post-Independence India was characterized by the moral and cultural reconstruction of a national identity that sought to

preserve traditional family structures and gender hierarchies as symbols of stability. Within this conservative atmosphere, the expression of same-sex desire or non-normative gender identities was neither permissible nor imaginable within mainstream narratives. Seth's genius lies in his subtle subversion of this moral framework. By embedding queer undertones within a seemingly conventional marriage plot, he challenges both colonial legacies of moral regulation and indigenous patriarchal codes that equate national purity with heteronormativity.

From a literary perspective, *A Suitable Boy* functions as a narrative palimpsest — a text layered with multiple and sometimes contradictory meanings. The outermost layer celebrates family, duty, and social order; the inner layers expose the tensions, repressions, and resistances that lie beneath. Seth's omniscient narration often adopts a tone of ironic detachment, creating a space where readers can perceive the dissonance between what characters perform and what they feel. Judith Butler's notion of gender performativity becomes relevant here: Seth's characters—especially men like Maan and women like Lata—are constantly negotiating their identities through performances of masculinity and femininity imposed by societal norms. Their occasional failures to sustain these performances open up spaces of queerness—not necessarily defined by sexual acts, but by emotional truth and self-recognition.

Moreover, Seth's queering of the marriage plot extends beyond characterization into narrative structure. Traditional realist novels often culminate in marriage as a symbol of social harmony and closure. *A Suitable Boy*, however, unsettles this closure. Lata's eventual marriage to Haresh Khanna, though socially "suitable," leaves readers with an undertone of compromise rather than fulfillment. This anti-romantic resolution, rather than affirming heterosexual

normativity, exposes its emotional inadequacy. The unsaid possibilities—her unresolved feelings for Kabir, her restrained independence, and the subtle echo of other unconventional relationships—render the ending quietly subversive. The novel's sheer expansiveness, with its multiple intersecting storylines, mirrors the fluidity of desire itself: sprawling, unpredictable, and resistant to containment.

Queer readings of *A Suitable Boy* also invite a reconsideration of the cultural and linguistic textures of the novel. Seth's use of Urdu poetry, ghazals, and musical motifs aligns the narrative with a tradition historically rich in homoerotic expression and emotional intensity. By invoking these intertexts, Seth situates his narrative within an aesthetic lineage that normalizes the fluidity of love and longing. In doing so, he bridges classical Indian expressions of desire with modern questions of sexuality and identity.

Thus, this research aims to uncover how Seth's novel, through its formal restraint and emotional complexity, crafts a quiet but profound resistance to normative definitions of love, gender, and fulfillment. It contends that *A Suitable Boy* is not merely a social chronicle of India's postcolonial modernity but also a queer archive—a text that, through its silences and subtleties, challenges the boundaries of representation. In reading Seth's novel as a site of queer subtext and narrative subversion, we not only reinterpret his characters and their emotional worlds but also expand the horizon of what constitutes queer writing in Indian English literature.

Reading Desire, Silence, and Subversion: The Queer Lens in Indian Narrative Traditions

To approach *A Suitable Boy* through the lens of queerness is to read against the grain—to listen for what the text withholds as much as for what it declares. Vikram Seth's novel, though embedded in the realist tradition, thrives on a poetics of restraint and emotional density that allows silences to become expressive. The unsaid, the deferred, and the indirect form the true vocabulary of desire in Seth's fictional world. When viewed through a queer interpretive lens, these narrative choices begin to speak of longing that exceeds social permission, of love that refuses to fit the sanctioned moulds of nation, class, and gender.

The idea of queerness here must not be confined to the modern Western imagination of same-sex desire alone; it extends to all forms of resistance against fixed identity categories. Queerness in Indian literary consciousness often manifests through suggestion, allegory, and metaphor—a survival strategy within moral and cultural constraints. The ancient Sanskrit and Persian literary traditions, from the *Meghaduta* to the ghazals of Ghalib, have always contained undertones of homoerotic yearning and gender fluidity, couched in spiritual or aesthetic idioms. Seth's narrative inherits this coded legacy. His use of Urdu couplets, lyrical exchanges, and emotive bonding between male characters brings that historical echo into the modern Indian English novel. The result is a work that conceals its queerness in plain sight, transforming emotional intimacy into a quiet act of rebellion.

The relationship between Maan Kapoor and Firoz Khan embodies this mode of hidden resistance. Their friendship, marked by devotion and protectiveness, is constantly described in terms of longing, jealousy, and emotional dependency. When Maan is sent away to the countryside as

punishment for his reckless affair with Saeeda Bai, it is not Saeeda's absence that haunts him most—it is Firoz's. The ache of that separation and the tenderness with which Maan imagines his return betray a depth of feeling that exceeds normative friendship. Vikram Seth never names it love, but he also never diminishes it to mere camaraderie. The ambiguity of their bond becomes the space of queerness: a silence that contains emotional truth. As Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick notes, "the closet is the defining structure for gay oppression in the twentieth century," yet it also becomes the site of complex meaning-making. Maan and Firoz inhabit that literary closet—a space of both concealment and revelation.

Similarly, the portrayal of women in *A Suitable Boy* complicates gender binaries through subtle gestures of autonomy and resistance. Lata Mehra's indecision between three suitors—Kabir, Amit, and Haresh—is not just a romantic dilemma; it is a symbolic questioning of the very notion of "suitability." Her ultimate choice, though conforming to social norms, reads like an act of irony. The narrative refuses to grant emotional satisfaction to the conventional ending of marriage, turning it instead into a commentary on how heterosexual closure often silences inner desire. In contrast, characters like Saeeda Bai and Meenakshi reveal performative layers of femininity. Saeeda's artistry and her awareness of desire's fluidity render her a figure of subversive modernity. She performs the courtesan's role while exercising an agency denied to respectable women—a performance that Judith Butler would describe as the repetition of gender norms with a difference, a re-enactment that exposes the artificiality of gender itself.

Seth's queering of narrative space also emerges through his use of irony and narrative detachment. The omniscient narrator, often gently ironic, allows readers to perceive emotional dissonances that characters themselves remain unaware of. The effect is that of double vision: one reading presents a realist account of middle-class Indian families, while another unveils a lyrical critique of the norms that bind them. This structural duality mirrors the lived experience of queerness in restrictive societies—where identity must often operate in two registers, one visible and acceptable, the other secret and true.

Furthermore, the emotional rhythm of the novel resists linear progression. Seth's narrative is sprawling, circular, and digressive—qualities that align with what theorists like Elizabeth Freeman term "queer temporality," where time is not reproductive but affective. Maan's exile, Lata's hesitation, the repetitions of family feasts and festivals—all create a sense of suspended time, where desire circulates but rarely finds closure. This refusal of narrative finality is itself an act of subversion against the traditional realist marriage plot that culminates in social harmony. In *A Suitable Boy*, harmony exists only as a façade; underneath it hums a discordant song of what cannot be spoken.

The queerness of Seth's novel thus resides not in overt representation but in narrative texture—in tone, rhythm, and emotional undercurrents. The novel becomes a site where repression and tenderness coexist, where silence speaks, and where conformity is continually shadowed by resistance. This delicate balance allows Seth to engage with queerness without violating the cultural expectations of his milieu. It is a form of aesthetic diplomacy, a negotiation between truth and propriety, between visibility and veiling.

To read *A Suitable Boy* through desire, silence, and subversion is therefore to acknowledge its double consciousness: one that mirrors the anxieties of a newly independent nation eager to define its moral center, and another that quietly unsettles that very moral certainty through emotional complexity. The queer lens helps reveal the invisible architecture of this duality—how Seth’s realism is, in fact, a camouflage for rebellion. Beneath the politeness of his prose lies a radical tenderness, one that insists that love, in all its forms, must find its voice, even if it whispers.

The Politics of Silence and Queer Expression in *A Suitable Boy*

To speak of queerness in Vikram Seth’s *A Suitable Boy* is, paradoxically, to dwell in silence.

The novel’s queerness resides not in explicit articulation but in what Michel Foucault, in *The History of Sexuality*, calls “the proliferation of discourses around silence.” In postcolonial India—where morality, respectability, and nationalism were entangled—silence was not the absence of speech but its most charged form. Seth, fully aware of this cultural semiotics, transforms silence into an aesthetic strategy. His narrative whispers what cannot be said; it gestures where speech would be scandal.

The relationship between Maan Kapoor and Firoz Khan illustrates this complex interplay between affection and repression. Their intimacy, rendered in tender glances and shared emotional registers, evokes what Leo Bersani describes as “the self-shattering potential of desire” — a desire that disrupts, rather than affirms, the self’s stability. Maan’s attachment to Firoz challenges not only the patriarchal norms of masculinity but also the rigid caste and religious binaries that underpin Indian social order. The emotional gravity of their friendship—its intensity, jealousy, and quiet devotion—suggests a homoerotic bond that the text both conceals and reveals. In this doubleness lies the queer power of the narrative: the acknowledgment that desire may exist most truthfully in what remains unnamed.

The social setting of the novel makes this concealment inevitable. As Homi Bhabha reminds us, postcolonial identity is always a performance of ambivalence—“almost the same, but not quite.” Within such a framework, Maan’s affection for Firoz is “almost friendship, but not quite.” It imitates the gestures of conventional male camaraderie while overflowing its limits. The novel situates their relationship within a network of patriarchal surveillance—family, religion, and social gossip—thereby dramatizing how queer affect survives through mimicry and displacement. Maan’s impulsive temperament and his later exile symbolize the disciplining of this emotional excess by a society eager to normalize desire into predictable forms.

The courtesan Saeeda Bai, too, embodies subversive sexual autonomy. She operates within the boundaries of tradition yet defies its moral dictates. Her sensuality and art become instruments of both survival and power, unsettling the male gaze that seeks to contain her.

Sara Ahmed’s notion of “queer orientation” becomes useful here: queerness, she argues, is about the direction one’s desires take—often away from the straight lines prescribed by society. Saeeda’s orientation toward art, performance, and emotional authenticity places her outside the heteronormative domestic order. Even her mentorship of Maan becomes a pedagogical act in self-awareness—

teaching him, and by extension the reader, that love’s truth is not moral but emotional.

Lata Mehra’s story further contributes to the novel’s queer subtext through its critique of heterosexual destiny. Her suitors—Kabir, Amit, and Haresh—represent different ideological worlds: romantic idealism, artistic elitism, and practical realism. Lata’s final choice of Haresh, though socially prudent, lacks emotional conviction. The decision reads as a negotiation with patriarchy rather than a triumph of love. The novel’s closing pages, marked by restraint rather than celebration, perform what Judith Butler calls a “melancholia of gender”—a loss that comes from conforming to the norms of heterosexual identity. In refusing a romantic culmination, Seth queers the very structure of the marriage plot. His conclusion, though outwardly conservative, gestures toward what is lost when desire is domesticated.

The politics of silence extends beyond individual relationships to the novel’s broader social fabric. Seth’s India is a country preoccupied with appearances—where family honor and national identity depend on moral conformity. Within such a milieu, queer existence must find alternative routes of expression: music, poetry, the body’s small betrayals. The recurring presence of Urdu ghazals—filled with unfulfilled longing and ambiguous beloveds—functions as an intertextual sanctuary for queer emotion. As Audre Lorde asserts in *Uses of the Erotic*, the erotic is a “measure between the beginnings of our sense of self and the chaos of our strongest feelings.” Seth’s deployment of aesthetic and sensory language transforms the erotic into a site of truth, allowing characters to express what social vocabulary denies.

Yet, Seth’s queerness is not radical in a militant sense; it is contemplative, even courteous. His narrative voice—measured, balanced, and humane—renders queerness not as deviance but as part of the emotional spectrum of being human. This quietness, however, should not be mistaken for passivity. Silence in Seth’s novel, as in the works of E. M. Forster or R. K. Narayan, becomes a form of resistance—a refusal to submit to the colonial and patriarchal language that names and thus contains desire. By leaving desire unnamed, Seth reclaims its dignity and universality.

Moreover, queerness in *A Suitable Boy* is intricately linked with modernity itself. The newly independent India of the 1950s, caught between Nehruvian progress and conservative morality, mirrors the novel’s characters: forward-looking yet fettered by old codes. Seth uses queerness as a mirror to this national tension. Maan’s passion, Lata’s hesitation, Saeeda’s defiance—all become metaphors for a country negotiating its moral boundaries. In that sense, Seth’s queer subtext becomes an allegory for postcolonial subjectivity: fragmented, ambivalent, and perpetually yearning for authenticity.

Ultimately, Seth’s novel proposes a radical empathy that transcends gender and sexuality. It asks readers to inhabit desire without labeling it, to honor emotional truth without moral classification. His characters’ silences, ambiguities, and contradictions articulate what queer theorist José Esteban Muñoz calls “the horizon of potentiality”—the possibility of lives lived differently, even within constraint. *A Suitable Boy* thus becomes more than a social chronicle; it becomes a quiet manifesto of human complexity.

Narrative Subversion and Queer Temporality in a Suitable Boy

At first glance, *A Suitable Boy* appears to belong to the grand realist tradition of the nineteenth century — sprawling, panoramic, and steeped in social detail. Yet beneath this realist surface, Vikram Seth constructs a narrative architecture that persistently subverts the conventions it imitates. His novel, while ostensibly moving toward the conventional closure of marriage, unsettles that closure through irony, digression, and emotional excess. The narrative's queerness lies as much in its form as in its content; it is not only what is said but how it is said that resists the norms of heteronormative fiction.

The marriage plot has historically been central to realist fiction, particularly in works like Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* or George Eliot's *Middlemarch*, where social order is restored through the union of suitable partners. Seth's title itself appears to echo this lineage.

Yet, by the end, the idea of "suitability" collapses under its own moral weight. Lata's pragmatic choice of Haresh Khanna lacks emotional conviction; it feels less like culmination and more like concession. This deliberate anticlimax transforms the novel into what D. A.

Miller, in *The Novel and the Police*, describes as "a disciplinary fiction" that exposes the mechanisms of social control embedded within literary form. Seth borrows this familiar narrative mold only to reveal its limitations: marriage, the supposed site of stability, becomes a metaphor for quiet erasure — the silencing of unruly desire.

This subversion of closure aligns Seth with a broader tradition of queer modernism, extending from E. M. Forster to Arundhati Roy. Like Forster's *Maurice*, *A Suitable Boy* uses heteronormative frameworks as camouflage for deeper emotional truths. Seth's realism is not a mirror of life but a mode of disguise, concealing within its expansiveness a yearning for what cannot be named. His ironic omniscience, the tender attention to minor emotional shifts, and the layered use of poetry and song all work to create fissures within the realist order — fissures through which queer affect emerges.

The novel also manipulates time in ways that resist linear progress. Traditional realist narratives follow a developmental arc: courtship, crisis, and resolution. Seth, however, structures *A Suitable Boy* as a mosaic of overlapping lives and cyclical events — festivals, elections, feasts, and farewells — suggesting what Elizabeth Freeman calls "Chrononormativity's undoing." Time here does not advance toward fulfillment but loops back upon itself, echoing the rhythms of emotional repetition. Maan's exile and return, Lata's indecision, Saeeda Bai's performances — all unfold in temporal spirals, enacting what Freeman identifies as "queer temporality," where affect rather than progress dictates narrative rhythm.

This temporal elasticity mirrors the affective life of queerness itself: cyclical, deferred, always on the verge of articulation but never complete. Desire in Seth's novel moves sideways rather than forward — what Sara Ahmed terms "oblique orientations." Maan's love for Firoz, Lata's withheld longing for Kabir, and even Saeeda's aesthetic devotion form a constellation of desires that resist destination. The absence of consummation is not a failure but an ethical choice; it reclaims the right to complexity in a world obsessed with resolution.

Irony, one of Seth's most refined narrative tools, further amplifies this resistance. The omniscient narrator's polite detachment allows readers to perceive contradictions between social appearance and inner feeling. This ironic distance serves as a queer gaze: it exposes performative normalcy while preserving emotional intimacy. As Roland Barthes reminds us in *A Lover's Discourse*, "to conceal one's desire is not to extinguish it, but to make it burn more purely." Seth's irony functions in precisely this way — transforming concealment into intensity, decorum into defiance.

The queerness of Seth's narrative also extends to his depiction of art and performance. The musical and poetic interludes — Saeeda Bai's ghazals, Amit's verses, Maan's recitations — become spaces of alternative truth. Through these aesthetic acts, characters articulate what they cannot in ordinary language. Music becomes the novel's queer language: fluid, affective, and transient. It is through song, not speech, that emotional authenticity surfaces. In this sense, Seth's work participates in what Lauren Berlant calls "intimate publics," where shared affect substitutes for direct confession.

By employing such strategies, Seth achieves a unique balance between subversion and decorum. He neither rebels overtly nor submits quietly. His queerness is tonal, not declarative — a whisper that endures longer than a shout. In an India negotiating its moral boundaries and postcolonial anxieties, Seth's stylistic restraint becomes a political act: to suggest rather than proclaim, to insinuate rather than disrupt. This aesthetic of politeness, far from neutral, functions as what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick calls "a reparative practice" — one that mends the emotional wounds inflicted by normative expectations.

Thus, *A Suitable Boy* queers not only its characters but its very mode of storytelling. It transforms realism into subversion, time into circularity, marriage into irony, and silence into articulation. The novel's formal poise conceals its insurgent energy, offering a vision of love that transcends binaries of gender and genre alike.

Conclusion

Vikram Seth's *A Suitable Boy* is a novel of quiet revolutions. Behind its genteel façade of social realism lies a deeply transgressive spirit — one that challenges the fixed notions of gender, love, and nationhood that shaped post-Independence India. By reading the novel through a queer lens, this research has traced the delicate interplay of repression and expression, conformity and resistance, within Seth's narrative world.

The queer subtext of the novel operates through emotional nuance and formal innovation rather than explicit declaration. Maan and Firoz's bond, Lata's restrained selfhood, and Saeeda Bai's sensual independence collectively constitute a mosaic of queer possibilities that undermine the illusion of moral coherence. Seth's narrative technique — his use of irony, digression, and lyrical indirection — converts realism into critique. The apparent closure of marriage becomes an emblem of quiet defeat, while silence itself becomes the space where truth survives. In destabilizing the conventional marriage plot and disrupting the temporality of closure, Seth aligns himself with a lineage of writers who have reimagined the novel as a site of affective plurality. His restraint echoes Forster's

humanism, while his cultural subtlety anticipates the queer modernities of later Indian writers such as Arundhati Roy and Jeet Thayil. More importantly, Seth demonstrates that queerness need not always announce itself in rebellion; it can reside in the gentleness of suggestion, in the refusal to simplify emotion into category.

Ultimately, *A Suitable Boy* redefines what it means to be “suitable” — not as conformity to social expectation but as fidelity to one’s emotional truth. In a world where silence has long been weaponized against love, Seth turns silence into song. His novel, poised between tradition and transgression, becomes a testament to the endurance of feeling — and to the quiet, enduring courage of those who love beyond definition.

Reference

1. Ahmed S. *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Duke University Press, 2006.
2. Ahmed S. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Routledge, 2004.
3. Barthes R. *A Lover’s Discourse: Fragments*. Translated by Richard Howard, Hill and Wang, 1978.
4. Berlant L. *Intimacy*. University of Chicago Press, 2000.
5. Bersani L. *Homos*. Harvard University Press, 1995.
6. Bhabha HK. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
7. Bose B. *Modernity, Globalization and the Gendered Body*. In *Interrogating Postcolonialism*, edited by Harish Trivedi and Meenakshi Mukherjee, Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1996.
8. Butler J. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, 1990.
9. Butler J. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. Routledge, 1993.
10. Caughie PL. *Literary Realism and Queer Temporality*. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 2013;59(1):91-112.
11. Foucault M. *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Vintage, 1990.
12. Freeman E. *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. Duke University Press, 2010.
13. Ghosh A. *Revisiting Vikram Seth: Queer Desire and Narrative Politeness in a Suitable Boy*. *Journal of Indian Literature Studies*, 2019;12(2):45-59.
14. Gopinath G. *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures*. Duke University Press, 2005.
15. Halperin DM. *Saint Foucault: Towards a Gay Hagiography*. Oxford University Press, 1995.
16. Joshi C. *Nation, Gender and Desire in a Suitable Boy*. *Indian Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, 2011;5(1):33-50.
17. Lorde A. *Uses of the Erotic: The Erotic as Power*. *Sister Outsider*, Crossing Press, 1984.
18. Miller DA. *The Novel and the Police*. University of California Press, 1988.
19. Muñoz JE. *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity*. New York University Press, 2009.
20. Nair RB. *Narrating the Nation: Gender and Realism in Vikram Seth*. *South Asian Review*, 2003;24(2):47-65.
21. Parker A, Sedgwick EK, editors. *Performativity and Performance*. Routledge, 1995.
22. Ramaswamy S. *The Goddess and the Nation: Mapping Mother India*. Duke University Press, 2010.
23. Roy AG. *Gender, Sexuality, and Nation in Indian English Fiction*. In *The Routledge Companion to Indian English Writing*, Routledge, 2021.
24. Roy A. *The God of Small Things*. IndiaInk, 1997.
25. Sedgwick EK. *Epistemology of the Closet*. University of California Press, 1990.
26. Sedgwick EK. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Duke University Press, 2003.
27. Seth V. *A Suitable Boy*. Orion Books, 1993.
28. Seth V. *The Golden Gate*. Random House, 1986.
29. Thayil J. *The Book of Chocolate Saints*. Aleph, 2017.
30. Viswanathan G. *Masks of Conformity: Colonial Legacies and the Indian Novel*. *Comparative Literature Studies*, 2006;43(4):389-408.
31. Warner M. *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. University of Minnesota Press, 1993.