REVIEW OF LITERATURE

“Virginia Woolf suggests in Orlando that memory is a “seamstress and a capricious one at that…. This wily and slippery entity is of prime importance in the novel, The God of Small Things for Roy deals with things and events past but “recalled to life” by Estha’s return. Memory is then required to stitch into the fabric of present consciousness a range of collected experiences” (Nair R. Hema, 1998).

“Women? very simple, say the fanciers of simple formulas: she is a womb, an ovary, she is a female – this word is sufficient to define her. A work than can undoubtedly be called the book of the decade is the much discussed The God of Small Things by Arundhati Roy. The Booker citation described the novel as one written with extraordinary linguistic inventiveness” (Surendran K.V., 1998).

“The God of Small Things has received very high acclaim from both Indian and Western reviewers. Various aspects of the novel have been singled out for praise. According to Supriya Chaudhari, “Roy handles the shifting surface of past and present with extraordinary fineness and delicacy.” (Naik M.K. and Narayan, Shyamala, 2001).

“This paper tries to focus on the caste consciousness as reflected in the novel The God of Small Things. Is the novel social? Does it present social issues of dalit class? Did the issues raised by the novelist were present during that time?” (Khobragade, Grishma, 2011).
“More than sixty years have passed since Indian gained its political autonomy but the fact remains that women and untouchables living in India are yet to witness freedom in truer sense” (Dwivedi O.P., 2010).

“New Historicism provides a critical method of interpretation of a literary work of art, which came into being as a reaction against new criticism just as new criticism came into being as a reaction against historical and biographical methods of literary criticism” (Chandra, N.D.R. and Tiwary, Narendra, 2009).

“From the ‘Princess of Prose’ to ‘The Death of the Novel’ much heat and dust have flown across Arundhati Roy’s book ever since its publication. But polemics apart, none can afford to ignore the novelist’s strong vision of childhood as represented in the novel” (Sharda, T., 1998).

“The phenomenal popularity of Arundhati Roy’s The God of Small Things compels our attention in a serious way. That it has sold about nine millions of copies the world over and has been translated into as many as twenty nine languages put a stamp on its unprecedented popularity” (Dwivedi, A.N., 1998).

“It is a modern novel in its theme and treatment of the theme, a postmodern novel in its knitting and knitting of narrative treads, manipulation of expressive literary forms and creation ‘play’ with words” (Roy K. Mohit, 1997).
“This is the first novel and it’s a Tiger Woodsian debut – the author hits the long, socio-cosmic ball but it also exquisite in her short game” (Updike John, 1997).

“I propose to focus on one feminist theme while responding to The God of Small Things from a feminist angle – namely feminist assertion of female body as a female estate or to be precise, feminist rejection of man’s ownership of the female body” (Harish, Ranjana, 1999).

“Roy’s greatest gift is her power of memory, the kind of memory Charles Dickens and George Eliot had, which can bring alive for the reader what most of us have forgotten but can recalled if jogged” (Ruth, Vanita, 1997).

“Roy’s anger at the crushing and destructive effects of patriarchal oppression runs through the novel, making it explicitly poetic” (Wilson, Kalpana, 1998).

“Roy’s fiction gives us much insight into her world – the world she depicts in her novel, and the world she inhabits as author” (Ahmed, 1997).

“Arundhati Roy’s use of English is flexible, pliant, stretchable and resonant enough to accommodate every shade and nuance, arch of eyebrow and curl of lip of a family sketching across several generations. Not just feeling and gestures but even images of familial memory representing a sense of frustration or envy or bitterness are caught and pinned through skillful use of language, passing through the consciousness of the children who are the centre of the novel” (Ram Rao Vimla, et al., 1998).
“Arundhati Roy’s novel The God of Small Things is all about atrocities against the small things – childhood and youth, women-young and old and the untouchables. Though at the centre stage Roy places Velutha who is crushed to death. This paper attempts to examine how all the small ones – the children, the women and the untouchables have been victimized and how they in their small ways, consciously or unconsciously victimize each other” (Indira Bhatt, 1999).

“Roy admits that there is “cold deep set anger” in her book and that this “unforgiving” anger is born of her own “Naxal sensibility” against the established order and its pieties, obscene rituals smugness and hypocrisy” (Alok Rai, 1997).

“The world they weave around themselves is according to Aijaz Ahmed, a close fatalistic world at the heart of individual choice, death foretold on the obverse of phallic ecstasy” (Aijaz Ahmed, 1997).

“The Ayemenem House of the novel cannot be found in the Aymanam village; however it is not entirely fictional: An architect by training, Arundhati has borrowed bricks and timber from two old building in the Puliyampallil House and Shanti House to construct her Ayemenem House” (Donald Eichert, 1997).

“Rahel account of her deprived childhood, reckless adulthood and drifting womanhood bears a straight and obvious equivalence with Roy’s own life graph. She drifts into “marriage like a passenger drifts towards an unoccupied chair in an airport
luggage. Rahel lives up to the “flattering butterfly and jet setter” image of Roy without much deviation” (Vinayak Purohit, 1998).

“Wilson joins issue with Ahmed for reading The God of Small Things as if it were a novel about class struggle instead, she points out, it is not a novel about mass struggle but about women’s tragic struggle against the value of a male dominated society. Roy’s anger at the crushing and destructive affects of patriarchal oppression runs through the novel, making it explicitly political” (Kalpana Wilson, 1998).

“We soon become aware of the novelist has a palpable design to create an effect, not by her keenness of observation of what is there but by the manipulation of words – the words don’t mediate experience as she is busy peddling them. Consequently what started as a place in the first two sentences (of chapter one) becomes any place with her seeking in view to invest airy, nothing with a local habitation and a name” (Narasimhaiah C.D., 1997).