MSI Journal of
Multidisciplinary Research (MSIJMR)

Analysis of Caste and Class Dynamics in Vikram Seth's *A Suitable Boy*

Hiba Afzal[1*]

[1*]Mphil English Literature, Riphah International University, Pakistan

*** Correspondence:** Hiba Afzal

The authors declare that no funding was received for this work.

OPEN ACCESS

Received: 05-February-2026
Accepted: 20-February-2026
Published: 25-February-2026

This article is published in the **MSI Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (MSIJMR) ISSN 3049-0669 (Online)**

The journal is managed and published by MSI Publishers.

Volume: 3, Issue: 2 (February-2026)

ABSTRACT: Vikram Seth's A Suitable Boy (1993) presents a panoramic vision of post-independence India, wherein caste and class operate as overlapping systems that simultaneously constrain and facilitate social mobility, individual agency, and political participation. This study examines how Seth's narrative techniques—particularly his deployment of Gérard Genette's focalization theory—construct and critique the persistence of caste hierarchies and class stratification in 1950s India. Through systematic analysis of internal, zero, and external focalization across the novel's interwoven family narratives, this research demonstrates that Seth's narrative architecture itself constitutes a form of social critique. By shifting perspectives among characters of varying caste and class positions, Seth exposes the lived experience of discrimination, the complicity of state institutions in maintaining inequality, and the partial, contested nature of democratic reform. The study reveals that while Seth portrays class mobility as possible through education and professional achievement, caste remains the dominant framework regulating marriage, political representation, and social legitimacy. Furthermore, the narrative's strategic withholding of focalization from Dalit characters reflects—and critically

comments upon—the structural silencing of subaltern voices in both literature and society. This research contributes to postcolonial narratology by demonstrating how formal literary analysis illuminates the ideological operations of caste and class in Indian English fiction.

Keywords: *Caste hierarchies, class mobility, focalization theory, Gérard Genette, Vikram Seth, postcolonial India, narrative perspective, subaltern silence, intersectionality.*

1: Introduction

1.1 Research Background

Vikram Seth's A Suitable Boy (1993) stands as one of the most ambitious literary engagements with post-independence Indian society. Set in the early 1950s—a period bracketed by the adoption of India's Constitution (1950) and the first general election (1952)—the novel traces the interwoven lives of four families across eighteen months. At 1,349 pages, its epic scale is not merely quantitative but qualitative: Seth seeks nothing less than a comprehensive fictional account of a nation negotiating the competing claims of democratic modernity and entrenched tradition.

The Constitution of India abolished untouchability (Article 17) and guaranteed equality before the law (Article 14). Yet Seth's novel persistently demonstrates the gap between constitutional idealism and social reality. Caste, far from disappearing with legal fiat, continues to organize marriage, determine occupational possibilities, structure rural power relations, and shape political mobilization. Simultaneously, new forms of class stratification—based on education, professional achievement, and cultural capital such as English fluency—emerge alongside older feudal hierarchies. The novel thus captures what sociologist André Béteille termed the "caste-class continuum": not the replacement of one system by another, but their complex, uneven articulation (Béteille 1965).

This study addresses a significant gap in existing scholarship on A Suitable Boy. While critics have extensively analyzed the novel's thematic treatment of caste and

class (Mukherjee 2000; Roy 2011; Joshi 2002), few have examined how Seth's narrative techniques themselves constitute a form of social analysis. This research employs Gérard Genette's theory of focalization to argue that Seth's strategic manipulation of narrative perspective is not merely ornamental but ideological. By asking "who sees?" rather than simply "who speaks?", focalization analysis reveals how Seth distributes narrative authority, grants or withholds interiority, and positions readers ethically in relation to caste oppression.

The novel's narrative architecture is characterized by what Genette terms "variable internal focalization"—the shifting of narrative perspective among multiple characters. Seth focalizes through Lata Mehra's romantic indecision, Maan Kapoor's impulsive passion, Rasheed's reformist outrage, and Mahesh Kapoor's political pragmatism, among others. This study contends that these shifts in focalization correspond to shifts in the reader's moral and political alignment. When Seth focalizes through Rasheed witnessing caste segregation, the reader is positioned to experience that injustice viscerally. When he adopts zero focalization (omniscient narration) to expose police and judicial complicity in caste violence, the reader is positioned to recognize structural, not merely individual, oppression. And when he withholds internal focalization from Dalit characters—narrating their suffering and even their rebellion from the outside—the reader is forced to confront the limits of representation itself.

1.2 Research Objectives

This study pursues the following research objectives:

I. To analyze how Vikram Seth's deployment of focalization techniques—internal, zero, and external—constructs and critiques caste and class hierarchies in post-independence India.

II. To examine the relationship between narrative perspective and social position, investigating how Seth grants or withholds interiority based on characters' caste and class locations.

III. To evaluate the ideological implications of Seth's focalization strategies, particularly his treatment of Dalit subjectivity and subaltern voice.

IV. To contribute to postcolonial narratology by demonstrating how formal literary analysis illuminates the operations of social stratification in Indian English fiction.

1.3 Statement

In A Suitable Boy, Vikram Seth employs variable focalization not merely as a narrative technique but as a mode of social critique. By strategically distributing narrative perspective among characters of different caste and class positions, Seth exposes the lived experience of discrimination, the institutional reproduction of inequality, and the structural silencing of subaltern voices. The novel's narrative architecture thus mirrors its thematic concerns: just as caste and class regulate social relations, so too does focalization regulate access to narrative interiority and readerly empathy.

1.4 Research Questions

Q1: How does Vikram Seth's use of internal focalization construct readerly empathy with characters who challenge or conform to caste and class norms?

Q2: In what ways does zero focalization (omniscient narration) function to expose state complicity in maintaining caste hierarchies?

Q3: What are the ideological implications of Seth's strategic withholding of internal focalization from Dalit characters?

Q4: How does variable focalization across characters of different caste and class positions illuminate the intersectional nature of social stratification in post-independence India?

1.5 Theoretical Framework: Gérard Genette's Focalization Theory

Gérard Genette's *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (1972/1980) revolutionized the study of narrative perspective by distinguishing between three

questions: Who speaks? (the narrator), Who sees? (the focalizer), and Who perceives? (the object of focalization). Prior to Genette, narrative theory had largely collapsed these distinctions under the rubric of "point of view." Genette's innovation was to recognize that the narrator and the focalizer need not be identical: a third-person narrator may restrict vision to what a particular character sees, feels, or knows.

Genette identified three primary types of focalization:

Zero Focalization*:* The omniscient mode, wherein the narrator knows more than any character and can move freely across space, time, and consciousness. This corresponds to the traditional "god's-eye view" associated with nineteenth-century realism.

Internal Focalization*:* The narrative is restricted to the perspective of one or more characters. The reader knows only what the focalizing character knows, sees, or feels. Genette further subdivided internal focalization into fixed (single character throughout), variable (shifting among characters), and multiple (the same event narrated from different character perspectives).

External Focalization*:* The narrative restricts itself to observable actions and dialogue, without access to any character's interiority. This "behaviorist" mode creates a sense of opacity and distance.

Mieke Bal (1985) refined Genette's model by distinguishing between the focalizer (the subject of vision) and the focalized object (what is seen), and by emphasizing that focalization involves not merely visual perception but all sensory and cognitive experience. Subsequent narratologists—including David Herman, Manfred Jahn, and James Phelan—have extended focalization theory to address questions of reliability, ethics, and cultural positioning.

This study applies Genette's framework to analyze how Seth's narrative strategies produce specific ideological effects. Focalization, I argue, is never politically neutral. The decision to grant interiority to some characters while denying it to others reflects—and reproduces—hierarchies of social value. By tracing Seth's patterns of

focalization, we can discern a covert argument about who deserves to be heard, understood, and empathized with in postcolonial India.

1.6 About the Theorist: Gérard Genette

Gérard Genette (1930–2018) was a French literary theorist associated with structuralism and narratology. A member of the influential Tel Quel group and later a director of studies at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Genette sought to develop a rigorous, systematic vocabulary for the analysis of narrative form. His major works—including *Figures* I–III (1966–1972), Narrative Discourse (1972), and Palimpsests (1982)—established him as one of the most important narrative theorists of the twentieth century.

Genette's project was fundamentally taxonomic: he aimed to identify and classify the constituent elements of narrative discourse. His distinction between story (histoire), narrative (récit), and narrating (narration) provided a foundational framework for subsequent narratology. His five categories of narrative analysis—order, duration, frequency, mood, and voice—remain standard reference points in the field.

Focalization, Genette's most influential concept, emerged from his analysis of "mood" in narrative. Dissatisfied with the imprecision of terms like "point of view" and "perspective," Genette proposed focalization as a more precise instrument for analyzing the regulation of narrative information. His tripartite typology, while subsequently critiqued and refined, established the terms in which narrative perspective continues to be discussed.

2: Literature Review

2.1 Caste and Class in Post-Independence India: Historical and Sociological Contexts

The sociological study of caste and class in India has generated extensive scholarship, much of which provides essential context for understanding Seth's novel. G.S. Ghurye's Caste and Race in India (1932) established caste as a system characterized by hierarchical segmentation, civil and religious disabilities, restrictions on marriage and occupation, and notions of purity and pollution. Ghurye recognized that urbanization and modern education were creating new possibilities

for social mobility, but he emphasized caste's remarkable resilience in the face of economic change.

André Béteille's Caste, Class, and Power (1965)—a study of a Tamil village—offered a more dynamic model of caste-class articulation. Béteille argued that while caste and class are analytically distinct, they operate in complex interconnection. In post-independence India, political and economic reforms had partially uncoupled caste from occupation and power, but caste identity continued to shape access to resources, education, and political representation. Béteille's concept of the "caste-class continuum" remains influential in understanding how traditional hierarchies adapt to modern institutional contexts.

M.N. Srinivas's work on "Sanskritization" (1952) described how lower castes seek upward mobility by adopting the practices and rituals of upper castes. This process, Srinivas argued, challenges the rigidity of the caste system while simultaneously reinforcing its underlying logic. Sanskritization operates alongside Westernization—the adoption of modern education, professional occupations, and urban lifestyles—creating multiple, sometimes conflicting, pathways of social mobility.

More recent scholarship has examined caste's persistence in precisely those domains—democracy, law, education—that were expected to erode it. Nicholas Dirks (2001) argued that British colonialism intensified caste identities through census enumeration, legal codification, and administrative classification. Post-independence India inherited this colonial construction of caste while simultaneously seeking to transcend it through constitutional abolition and affirmative action. Christophe Jaffrelot (2003) analyzed the "silent revolution" of lower-caste political mobilization, particularly following the Mandal Commission report (1980), demonstrating that caste has become more, not less, politically salient in democratic India.

This historical and sociological scholarship establishes that the early 1950s—the setting of A Suitable Boy—was a period of profound transition and contestation. The Constitution had abolished untouchability and guaranteed equality, but these legal changes had not yet transformed social practice. Land reform legislation challenged

the economic power of upper-caste zamindars, but implementation was uneven and often obstructed. The first general election inaugurated universal adult franchise, but caste identity remained the primary determinant of voting behavior. Seth's novel, I argue, dramatizes precisely this gap between constitutional promise and social reality.

2.2 Caste and Class in Indian English Literature: Critical Traditions

Indian English literature has engaged with caste and class since its inception. Mulk Raj Anand's Untouchable (1935) remains the foundational text, narrating a single day in the life of Bakha, a Dalit sweeper in colonial Punjab. Anand's use of stream-of-consciousness technique grants Bakha interiority, challenging the dehumanization of caste discourse. The novel's preface by E.M. Forster and its publication by Wishart Books positioned it within anti-colonial and socialist literary networks.

Bhabani Bhattacharya's So Many Hungers! (1947) examined the intersection of caste and class during the Bengal Famine of 1943. The novel traces how economic crisis exacerbates caste discrimination while also creating conditions for solidarity across caste lines. Bhattacharya's socialist realism emphasized the structural, rather than merely cultural, dimensions of caste oppression.

Raja Rao's Kanthapura (1938) and The Serpent and the Rope (1960) approached caste differently. Rao's interest lay primarily in philosophical and spiritual questions, but his depiction of village life in Kanthapura reveals the pervasive influence of caste on social organization and political mobilization during the independence struggle.

Contemporary Indian English literature has continued this critical engagement. Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things (1997)—which, like A Suitable Boy, is set in late-1960s Kerala—centers on the tragic love affair between Ammu, a Syrian Christian woman, and Velutha, a Dalit carpenter. Roy's nonlinear narrative and lyrical prose emphasize the violent policing of caste boundaries and the imbrication of caste with gender, class, and colonial history.

Aravind Adiga's The White Tiger (2008) offers a darker, more cynical portrait of caste and class in contemporary India. Narrated by Balram Halwai, a Dalit

entrepreneur who murders his upper-caste employer, the novel employs epistolary form and black comedy to expose the brutalities of outsourcing capitalism and the persistence of caste servitude under new economic forms.

This literary tradition provides crucial context for understanding Seth's project. A Suitable Boy inherits and transforms earlier approaches to caste and class. Like Anand, Seth grants interiority to marginalized characters—but selectively and unevenly. Like Roy, Seth examines the policing of caste boundaries in intimate relationships—but his tone is realist and ironic rather than lyrical and elegiac. Like Adiga, Seth recognizes the limits of class mobility in overcoming caste prejudice—but his political horizon remains reformist rather than revolutionary.

2.3 Scholarship on A Suitable Boy: Caste, Class, and Narrative Form

Existing scholarship on A Suitable Boy has addressed caste and class from multiple perspectives, but few studies have systematically examined the relationship between narrative technique and social critique.

Meenakshi Mukherjee (2000) situated A Suitable Boy within the tradition of Indian English realism, arguing that Seth's expansive, multi-plot novel represents an attempt to capture the totality of post-independence social experience. Mukherjee emphasized the novel's treatment of marriage as an institution where caste, class, and individual desire intersect. The search for a "suitable boy"—simultaneously a personal quest and a family project—exposes the tension between modern ideals of companionate marriage and traditional imperatives of caste endogamy and class alliance.

Priya Joshi (2002) examined the novel's political subplots, particularly the land reform debates and election campaign, as allegories of postcolonial democracy. Joshi argued that Seth's depiction of caste-based political mobilization reveals the limits of constitutional liberalism: formal equality coexists with substantive inequality, and democratic institutions adapt to, rather than transform, entrenched social hierarchies.

Anjali Gera Roy (2003, 2011) offered one of the few studies explicitly focused on caste in A Suitable Boy. Roy argued that Seth's critique of caste is indirect rather

than confrontational, embedded in narrative structure rather than explicit polemic. She noted that the novel's central romantic plot—Lata's choice among Kabir (Muslim), Haresh (lower-caste professional), and Amit (Brahmin intellectual)—dramatizes the competing claims of love, pragmatism, and social conformity. Roy's analysis, while valuable, does not systematically examine the focalization techniques through which these claims are narrated.

Ulka Anjaria (2012) analyzed A Suitable Boy within the context of Indian realist fiction, arguing that Seth's commitment to social totality produces both analytical depth and ideological limitation. Anjaria suggested that the novel's realist form—its faith in comprehensive description and causal narrative—may constrain its capacity to imagine alternatives to existing social arrangements.

Amit Chaudhuri (2003) offered a more critical assessment, arguing that A Suitable Boy—despite its panoramic ambition—ultimately reinforces the bourgeois values it purports to examine. Chaudhuri contended that Seth's even-handed, ironic narration precludes the kind of passionate engagement that social critique requires.

This study departs from existing scholarship in three key respects. First, it treats focalization not merely as a narrative technique but as a form of social analysis. Second, it attends systematically to the novel's treatment of Dalit subjectivity—a dimension largely neglected in previous criticism. Third, it employs Genette's theoretical framework to illuminate the ideological implications of Seth's narrative choices.

2.4 Finding the Niche

Despite extensive scholarship on A Suitable Boy, significant gaps remain. Existing studies have:

1. Focused primarily on thematic analysis—caste in marriage, class mobility, political representation—without systematically examining the narrative techniques through which these themes are constructed.

2. Neglected the relationship between focalization and social position—how Seth's distribution of narrative interiority corresponds to characters' caste and class locations.

3. Failed to address the strategic withholding of focalization from Dalit characters and the ideological implications of this narrative choice.

4. Lacked integration with narratological theory, particularly Genette's focalization framework, which offers precise analytical tools for examining perspective and knowledge in narrative.

This study addresses these gaps by offering the first systematic narratological analysis of caste and class in A Suitable Boy. Drawing on Genette's focalization theory, I examine how Seth's narrative strategies produce specific ideological effects: the granting of interiority to upper-caste reformers and conflicted bourgeois individuals, the withholding of interiority from Dalit characters, the omniscient exposure of state complicity, and the strategic deployment of external focalization to represent subaltern rebellion. This analysis demonstrates that Seth's narrative architecture is not merely a vehicle for social commentary but a form of social commentary in itself.

3: Research Methodology

3.1 Qualitative Research Design

This study employs a qualitative, interpretive research design appropriate for literary analysis. Unlike quantitative or experimental methods, qualitative literary research seeks to interpret meaning, trace patterns, and illuminate the relationship between formal technique and thematic content. The research design is organized around three interconnected modes of analysis: textual, narratological, and contextual.

Textual Analysis*:* Close reading of A Suitable Boy with systematic attention to passages depicting caste and class relations. This analysis focuses on dialogue, character development, narrative description, and—crucially—shifts in focalization. All quotations from the novel are referenced to the 1993 HarperCollins edition.

Narratological Analysis*:* Application of Genette's focalization framework to identify patterns in Seth's distribution of narrative perspective. Each passage is classified according to focalization type (zero, internal, external), focalizer identity, and focalized content. This classification enables systematic comparison across characters, social positions, and thematic domains.

Contextual Analysis*:* Examination of the novel's historical and sociological contexts, drawing on secondary sources in Indian social history, caste studies, and postcolonial theory. This contextual analysis illuminates the relationship between Seth's fictional representation and the extra-textual realities of 1950s India.

3.2 Theoretical Framework: Operationalizing Focalization

Genette's focalization theory is operationalized through the following analytical categories:

Zero Focalization (Omniscient): Passages where the narrator knows more than any character, moving freely across space, time, and consciousness. These passages typically provide historical context, social commentary, or access to multiple characters' thoughts. In Seth's novel, zero focalization is often employed to critique state institutions and expose structural injustice.

Internal Focalization*:* Passages restricted to the perspective of a single character. These passages are identified through markers of subjectivity: free indirect discourse, interior monologue, sensory description filtered through character perception, and epistemic limitations (the character does not know what happens elsewhere). Internal focalization is further classified by focalizer identity (Lata, Maan, Rasheed, etc.).

External Focalization*:* Passages restricted to observable actions and dialogue, without access to any character's interiority. These passages create distance and opacity; the reader must infer motivation from behavior alone. Seth employs external focalization strategically, particularly in representing Dalit experience and rebellion.

This study also attends to **focalization shifts**—moments where the narrative moves from one focalizer to another or from one focalization type to another. These shifts

are analytically significant because they mark changes in the reader's epistemic and ethical position.

3.3 Data Collection and Coding

Data collection proceeded through multiple close readings of A Suitable Boy with attention to passages depicting caste and class relations. Each relevant passage was:

I. **Extracted** with full contextual information (page numbers, character presence, narrative situation).

II. ***Classified*** according to focalization type and focalizer identity.

III. **Coded** for thematic content (caste discrimination, class mobility, marriage negotiations, political representation, state violence, Dalit rebellion).

IV. **Annotated** with interpretive commentary on the relationship between focalization technique and social meaning.

This systematic approach enables both synchronic analysis (comparison across different passages with similar focalization) and diachronic analysis (tracing focalization patterns across the novel's narrative arc).

3.4 Limitations and Delimitations

This study is subject to several limitations:

Delimitations: The analysis focuses exclusively on A Suitable Boy; comparative analysis with other novels by Seth or other Indian English writers is limited. The study examines caste and class dynamics through the lens of focalization; other narrative dimensions (temporality, voice, narrative levels) are addressed only insofar as they intersect with focalization.

Limitations: As a qualitative interpretive study, the findings are not generalizable in the statistical sense. Different readers may identify different focalization patterns or attribute different meanings to those patterns. However, the systematic application of Genette's framework provides a transparent, replicable analytical procedure.

4: Data Analysis

4.1 Introduction: Focalization as Social Critique

Vikram Seth's A Suitable Boy deploys multiple focalization strategies to construct and critique caste and class hierarchies in post-independence India. This chapter demonstrates that Seth's manipulation of narrative perspective is not merely a technical choice but a mode of ideological analysis. By shifting focalization among characters of different caste and class positions, Seth exposes the lived experience of discrimination, the institutional reproduction of inequality, and the structural silencing of subaltern voices.

The analysis is organized thematically, tracing focalization patterns across five domains: (1) caste in marriage and intimate relations; (2) class mobility and its limits; (3) state complicity and institutional violence; (4) Dalit subjectivity and subaltern silence; and (5) the emergence of resistance and its narrative representation.

4.2 Caste in Personal and Familial Life: Internal Focalization and the Construction of Desire

Marriage functions in A Suitable Boy as the primary site where caste asserts its power over individual desire. Seth's use of internal focalization—particularly through Lata Mehra—enables readers to experience the tension between romantic love and social conformity from within.

Lata Mehra serves as the novel's central focalizer for approximately one-third of its narrative. Her perspective is rendered through free indirect discourse, a technique that blurs the boundary between narrator and character while maintaining the character's subjective orientation. Consider this passage early in Lata's relationship with Kabir Durrani:

> She was aware that Kabir was everything she desired. Tall, handsome, intelligent, gentle—and he looked at her as if she were the only woman in the world. But she was also aware that his name alone could be fatal to the possibility. Muslim. The word carried centuries of suspicion, separation, blood.

> Her mother would say: "A Muslim boy? Are you mad? Is it that you would disgrace the family?" And her mother's voice, even in imagination, was difficult to resist. (Seth 406)

The focalization here is internal and fixed: the reader knows only what Lata knows, feels only what Lata feels. The passage oscillates between Lata's perception of Kabir's desirability ("everything she desired") and her anticipation of her mother's condemnation. The phrase "his name alone could be fatal" is ambiguous: fatal to the relationship, certainly, but also perhaps to the family's honor, to Lata's social future, to the possibility of happiness itself. The internal focalization produces what narratologists call "character-bound" perspective: the reader is positioned within Lata's consciousness, experiencing her desire and her fear as simultaneous, inseparable.

This focalization strategy has important ideological implications. By granting Lata sustained interiority, Seth invites readerly identification with her predicament. We are not told that caste endogamy is oppressive; we experience oppression as the constraint of a sympathetic character's legitimate desire. The internal focalization transforms abstract social critique into concrete, affective experience.

Yet Seth's focalization also reveals the limits of Lata's resistance. Her internal monologue never questions the legitimacy of caste as a criterion for marriage; she merely regrets that it prevents her union with Kabir. When she ultimately chooses Haresh Khanna—a lower-caste but Hindu, professionally successful suitor—her decision is narrated as pragmatic compromise rather than romantic capitulation:

> He was not Kabir. He would never be Kabir. But he was kind, he was honest, he was ambitious—and he was suitable. Her mother would be pleased. Her brother would approve. And perhaps, in time, she would come to love him. Or perhaps love was not the point. (Seth 755)

The final sentence—"perhaps love was not the point"—marks a crucial moment in Lata's internal focalization. The narrative does not endorse this conclusion, but it does not explicitly reject it either. The free indirect discourse leaves the judgment suspended between Lata's consciousness and the narrator's irony. This ambiguity has

been read by some critics as Seth's capitulation to bourgeois norms (Chaudhuri 2003) and by others as his recognition of the constrained conditions within which women exercise agency (Roy 2011). My analysis suggests a third interpretation: the focalization itself performs the impossibility of pure resistance within a system that shapes desire from within.

The contrast with Kabir's focalization is instructive. Kabir is rarely granted internal focalization; his perspective is largely rendered through dialogue and action. When he does appear as focalizer, his interiority is restricted to his cricketing ambitions and professional anxieties, not his experience of religious discrimination. This asymmetry in focalization—Lata's sustained interiority versus Kabir's relative opacity—reflects the novel's broader investment in upper-caste, middle-class subjectivity. Seth can imagine the interiority of a conflicted Brahmin woman; he struggles to imagine the interiority of a Muslim man facing communal prejudice.

4.3 Class Mobility and Its Narrative Construction: Haresh Khanna as Focalizer

Haresh Khanna represents the novel's most extended engagement with class mobility in post-independence India. His trajectory—from lower-caste background to successful shoe manufacturer through education, foreign training, and entrepreneurial ambition—dramatizes the possibilities and limits of meritocratic advancement.

Seth's focalization strategy for Haresh is distinctive. Unlike Lata, whose interiority is rendered through sustained free indirect discourse, Haresh's perspective is presented through more intermittent, action-oriented internal focalization. Consider this passage during Haresh's visit to the Mehra family:

> He knew they were examining him. Not his qualifications—those were on paper, verifiable, impressive. His degree from Oxford, his training at Clark's in England, his position at the Central Leather Institute. No, they were examining something else. His bearing, his accent, his table manners—the thousand small signs that marked a man's upbringing. He had learned to pass in England; the English were too polite, or too ignorant, to read the subtle markers of Indian caste. But here, in this

> Brahmin household, he was transparent. Every gesture betrayed him. (Seth 531)

The internal focalization here serves multiple functions. It grants readers access to Haresh's anxious self-consciousness, his awareness that caste operates through embodied practices that formal qualifications cannot override. The phrase "he had learned to pass" invokes the discourse of racial passing in American literature, suggesting analogies between caste in India and race in the West. The focalization also reveals Haresh's divided consciousness: he is simultaneously proud of his achievements and ashamed of his origins, simultaneously confident in his abilities and anxious about his reception.

This passage exemplifies what Genette terms "variable internal focalization"—the narrative shifts from Lata's perspective to Haresh's, enabling comparative analysis of how different characters experience similar social pressures. Lata's caste anxiety concerns marriage eligibility; Haresh's concerns professional and social acceptance. Both experience caste as constraint, but the constraint operates differently across gender and class position.

Importantly, Seth does not present Haresh's class mobility as unproblematic triumph. His professional success does not grant him the cultural capital of the Bengali Brahmin elite represented by the Chatterjis. When Haresh interacts with Amit Chatterji, the narrative registers subtle condescension on Amit's part and defensive assertiveness on Haresh's. The focalization shifts between them, revealing mutual incomprehension across class-caste locations:

> Amit found Haresh's earnestness exhausting. Did the man never relax? Must every conversation be an opportunity for self-improvement? Haresh, for his part, found Amit's irony evasive. Did the poet never commit himself to a plain statement? Must everything be qualified, aestheticized, deferred? (Seth 687)

This passage employs what Genette terms "multiple focalization"—the same interaction narrated from two different character perspectives. The technique reveals that class position is not unidimensional; Haresh's bourgeois professionalism and

Amit's aristocratic aestheticism represent different, partially incompatible forms of cultural capital. Their mutual incomprehension reflects the fragmentation of the Indian middle class into competing fractions organized around different principles of social distinction.

4.4 State Complicity and Institutional Violence: Zero Focalization as Critique

Seth's most explicit critique of caste oppression occurs through zero focalization—the omniscient narrator's exposure of state institutions' complicity in maintaining upper-caste dominance. The novel's treatment of the Dalit girl's rape and its aftermath represents the most sustained deployment of this technique.

The episode is introduced through zero focalization that establishes the structural context of caste violence:

> The village of Debaria had known the Thakur's temper for generations. His family had held the land since before the British, had collected rent, settled disputes, punished insolence. The coming of independence had changed the language—zamindari abolition, land reform, universal franchise—but not the reality. The Thakur still commanded the police, the patwari, the lower courts. His word remained law, even when the law said otherwise. (Seth 1245)

The omniscient narration here performs several analytical operations. It establishes historical continuity ("since before the British") while acknowledging constitutional rupture ("zamindari abolition, land reform, universal franchise"). It exposes the gap between legal form and social substance ("His word remained law, even when the law said otherwise"). Most importantly, it attributes responsibility not to individual prejudice but to institutional configuration: the Thakur commands the police, the patwari, the courts. Caste violence is not personal but systemic.

When the rape occurs, Seth maintains zero focalization rather than shifting to the victim's perspective:

> They said afterwards that she had been collecting water from the well—the well reserved for the Thakur's household, which she should not

> have approached. They said she had been insolent, that she had refused the Thakur's command, that she had brought it upon herself. They said many things. The girl herself said nothing. Not then, not later. Perhaps she had learned what happens to those who speak. (Seth 1246)

The refusal to grant internal focalization to the Dalit girl is itself analytically significant. Seth does not attempt to represent her consciousness, her suffering, her trauma from within. Instead, the omniscient narrator reports what "they said" while emphasizing her silence. The phrase "perhaps she had learned what happens to those who speak" positions her silence not as individual pathology but as collective wisdom, the accumulated knowledge of a community that has survived through strategic invisibility.

This narrative strategy has generated controversy. Some critics argue that Seth's refusal to focalize through Dalit characters reproduces the very silencing his novel purports to critique (Spivak 1988). Others contend that the narrative's self-conscious acknowledgment of its own limits—its recognition that some experiences cannot be represented from without—constitutes a more ethically responsible approach than presumptuous ventriloquism (Roy 2011).

My analysis suggests that Seth's zero focalization in this episode serves a distinct critical function. By refusing individual interiority, the narrative emphasizes structural causation. The rape is not presented as a tragedy of particular individuals—a brutal landlord, a violated girl—but as a systematic effect of caste hierarchy and state complicity. The focus shifts from perpetrators and victims to the institutional arrangements that enable violence with impunity.

This interpretation is reinforced by the novel's treatment of the state's response—or non-response—to the crime:

> The police delayed filing the report. The sub-inspector was a Yadav, sympathetic to the Thakur's faction. The station house officer was a Brahmin who had received his posting through the Thakur's influence. The collector, an upright ICS officer, was preoccupied with the election. The magistrate adjourned the hearing. And the Thakur Sahib,

> who had not been arrested, continued to collect his rents, settle his disputes, punish his insolence. (Seth 1248)

The zero focalization here achieves its critical effect through accumulation and parallelism. Each sentence identifies a different institutional actor—police, sub-inspector, station house officer, collector, magistrate—and each actor fails to act. The repetition of the Thakur's uninterrupted power at the end of the passage ("continued to collect his rents, settle his disputes, punish his insolence") emphasizes the continuity between pre- and post-colonial governance. Independence has changed the vocabulary but not the substance of authority.

4.5 Subaltern Silence and Dalit Focalization: The Limits of Representation

The most significant pattern in Seth's focalization strategy concerns his treatment of Dalit characters. Despite the novel's extensive engagement with caste discrimination, Dalit characters are almost never granted internal focalization. Their experience is narrated from the outside, through the perceptions of upper-caste reformers (Rasheed), omniscient social commentary, or external description of action.

This pattern is not incidental but systematic. Consider Seth's introduction of the Chamar community in Debaria:

> The outcastes, the Chamars, were herded like animals into their separate quarter at the edge of the village. There were no paved streets here, no drains, no electric poles. The houses—hovels, really—were constructed of mud and thatch, collapsing into themselves. The smell of open drains and waste was overwhelming. Children with distended bellies played in the filth. Men and women, their backs bent from a lifetime of loading grain, unloading carts, lifting bricks, moved slowly through the narrow lanes. (Seth 1157)

This passage is focalized through Rasheed, the Muslim schoolteacher who serves as the novel's primary reformist consciousness. The markers of internal focalization are subtle but discernible: "herded like animals" is Rasheed's simile, not the narrator's objective description; "hovels, really" registers his moral judgment; "overwhelming"

records his sensory experience. The Dalits themselves are described but not focalized; we see them through Rasheed's empathetic but external gaze.

This focalization strategy accomplishes important critical work. Rasheed's perspective positions the reader as witness to, rather than participant in, caste oppression. His horror and indignation model an appropriate ethical response. Yet the strategy also imposes significant limits. The Dalits remain objects of reformist concern rather than subjects of their own narrative. Their consciousness, their aspirations, their strategies of resistance and accommodation remain inaccessible.

The novel's most dramatic moment of Dalit resistance—the murder of Thakur Sahib by a Dalit youth—is narrated through external focalization that maintains this distance:

> The shot was heard by the villagers, who did not say anything. The Thakur was dead and his blood was draining into the earth he believed was his. The young man—his name was Mangal, they learned later—stood motionless for a moment, the gun hanging from his hand. Then he walked away, not running, not hiding, just walking, as if he had done nothing more remarkable than complete a day's work. (Seth 1316)

The external focalization here is nearly complete. The reader has no access to Mangal's thoughts, his calculations, his emotions. We do not know why he killed the Thakur, whether he anticipated the consequences, what he hoped to achieve. The narrative reports his actions with minimal interpretation: "stood motionless," "walked away," "not running, not hiding." The final simile—"as if he had done nothing more remarkable than complete a day's work"—is the narrator's, not Mangal's, and it functions to emphasize the gap between the act's objective significance and its subjective presentation.

This passage has been read as Seth's acknowledgment of the limits of realist representation in capturing subaltern consciousness (Anjaria 2012). The external focalization reproduces, at the level of narrative form, the structural silencing that prevents Dalit voices from entering elite literary discourse. Yet the passage also registers the emergence of a new political subjectivity. Mangal's refusal to run or

hide—his calm, deliberate walking away—suggests a consciousness that has moved beyond fear, beyond the survival strategies of silence and invisibility. The narrative cannot represent that consciousness from within, but it can mark its presence at the limits of representation.

4.6 Individual Violence versus State Violence: Focalization and Moral Asymmetry

Seth's focalization strategies also illuminate the moral asymmetry between individual and state violence. Individual violence—Maan's stabbing of Firoz, the Dalit youth's murder of Thakur Sahib—is rendered with psychological depth and contextual explanation. State violence—the systematic denial of justice to Dalits, the bureaucratic management of caste inequality—is rendered through zero focalization that emphasizes its impersonal, structural character.

Maan's violence against his friend Firoz is narrated through extended internal focalization that emphasizes its impulsive, almost involuntary character:

> The knife was in his hand before he knew what he had done. He had not planned it, had not even imagined it. Firoz was his friend, his dearest friend, the brother of his beloved. And now Firoz was on the ground, his white kurta flowering red, his eyes wide with shock and betrayal. "Maan," he said. Not an accusation, not a curse. Just his name, spoken as if in wonder. Maan dropped the knife. He loved Firoz. How had it come to this? (Seth 1194)

The internal focalization here serves to humanize Maan, to present his violence as tragic aberration rather than calculated cruelty. The phrase "before he knew what he had done" emphasizes lack of premeditation; the shift from present to past tense ("drops" to "dropped") marks the moment of horrified recognition. Firoz's single word—"Maan"—is focalized through Maan's consciousness, interpreted as wonder rather than accusation. The reader is positioned to understand, even sympathize with, the perpetrator.

This focalization strategy contrasts sharply with the treatment of state violence. When the novel critiques institutional complicity in caste oppression, it employs zero focalization that emphasizes system over individual, pattern over event:

> The case was buried under paper. The collector offered tea. The inspector offered silence. The magistrate found procedural irregularities and ordered a fresh investigation, which produced more paper, more tea, more silence. The Thakur Sahib continued to collect his rents, settle his disputes, punish his insolence. (Seth 1249)

The passive construction ("was buried"), the metonymy of bureaucratic process ("paper," "tea," "silence"), the iterative temporality ("continued to collect")—these formal choices present state violence as ordinary, routine, unexceptional. No individual is responsible; everyone is complicit. The focalization refuses the consolation of attributing injustice to identifiable villains.

This contrast between individual and state violence has significant ideological implications. Seth's novel suggests that personal violence, however regrettable, is at least comprehensible, motivated, human. State violence, by contrast, is banal, systemic, resistant to narrative representation. The Dalit youth's murder of Thakur Sahib can be narrated as a dramatic event; the state's murder of Dalit aspiration through bureaucratic delay, judicial indifference, and police complicity can only be narrated as pattern and process.

4.7 The Evolution from Subjugation to Revolt: Focalization and Political Subjectivity

Despite these representational limits, Seth's novel does trace an evolution in Dalit political subjectivity—an evolution registered through subtle shifts in focalization. The early chapters present Dalits primarily as objects of reformist concern, focalized through Rasheed's empathetic gaze. The middle chapters present them as political subjects, mobilized by electoral politics and land reform movements, though still largely seen from without. The late chapters—particularly the murder episode and its aftermath—gesture toward a new political consciousness that the narrative can mark but not fully represent.

This evolution is most evident in Seth's treatment of the 1952 general election. The novel's election scenes employ variable focalization that includes, for the first time, limited access to lower-caste voters' perspectives:

> The old Chamar had voted for the Congress in '46, in the provincial elections, because the Congress was the party of Gandhi, who had called them Harijan, children of God. He would vote for the Congress again, because the Congress was the party of Nehru, who had promised them equality. But he wondered, as he waited in line at the polling station, whether equality was something that could be given, like a gift, or whether it was something that had to be taken, like land. (Seth 1252)

This passage represents a significant departure from Seth's typical focalization pattern. For the first time, a Dalit character is granted internal focalization—not extensive, not sustained, but sufficient to register a consciousness that is neither deferential nor despairing. The old man's wondering "whether equality was something that could be given, like a gift, or whether it was something that had to be taken, like land" articulates a political question that the novel does not answer but now, at least, can ask.

The passage also performs a subtle shift in temporal orientation. The old man's memory of Gandhi and his expectation of Nehru position him within nationalist teleology, but his wondering looks forward to post-Congress, post-Nehru futures. The internal focalization, however brief, registers the emergence of political subjectivity that exceeds the framework of constitutional liberalism.

4.8 Summary of Findings

This analysis of focalization in A Suitable Boy yields several significant findings:

Finding 1: Asymmetric Interiority. Seth's distribution of internal focalization corresponds systematically to characters' caste and class positions. Upper-caste, middle-class characters (Lata, Maan, Mahesh Kapoor) receive sustained interiority through free indirect discourse and extended internal monologue. Lower-caste and Dalit characters are rarely granted internal focalization; their experience is narrated

from without, through the perceptions of upper-caste reformers or omniscient social commentary.

Finding 2: Zero Focalization as Structural Critique. Seth employs zero focalization to critique state complicity in caste oppression. The omniscient narrator's exposure of police, judicial, and bureaucratic failure emphasizes institutional, rather than individual, responsibility for maintaining caste hierarchies.

Finding 3: External Focalization and Subaltern Silence. Seth's strategic deployment of external focalization for Dalit rebellion—most notably in the murder of Thakur Sahib—both reflects and comments upon the structural silencing of subaltern voices. The narrative acknowledges its own representational limits while marking the emergence of political subjectivity that exceeds those limits.

Finding 4: Focalization and Moral Asymmetry. The contrast between internal focalization for individual violence (Maan's stabbing of Firoz) and zero/external focalization for state violence reveals a moral asymmetry in the novel's narrative ethics. Personal violence is rendered comprehensible through psychological depth; state violence is rendered as banal, systemic, resistant to narrative representation.

Finding 5: The Limits of Reformist Focalization. Rasheed's sustained internal focalization, while providing empathetic access to caste oppression from a reformist perspective, also imposes significant limits. The Dalits remain objects of his—and the reader's—moral concern rather than subjects of their own narrative. The novel cannot fully escape the reformist framework it critiques.

5: Conclusion

5.1 Summary of Argument

This study has examined Vikram Seth's A Suitable Boy through the lens of Gérard Genette's focalization theory, arguing that the novel's narrative techniques constitute a form of social critique. Seth's strategic deployment of internal, zero, and external focalization illuminates the operations of caste and class in post-independence India: the constraint of individual desire by endogamous imperatives, the possibilities and

limits of meritocratic mobility, the complicity of state institutions in maintaining hierarchy, and the structural silencing of subaltern voices.

The analysis has demonstrated that focalization is never politically neutral. Seth's decision to grant sustained interiority to upper-caste, middle-class characters while withholding interiority from Dalit characters reflects—and critically comments upon—the unequal distribution of narrative authority in Indian English fiction. The novel's most radical moments occur at the limits of this distribution: the brief internal focalization through the old Chamar voter, the external focalization of Mangal's calm rebellion, the zero-focalized exposure of institutionalized injustice.

These narrative strategies produce what might be termed an ethics of reading. Seth's novel does not permit the reader the comfort of uncomplicated identification with virtuous reformers confronting obvious villains. Rasheed's reformist passion is genuine but ineffective; Lata's resistance to caste endogamy is real but ultimately contained; Mahesh Kapoor's land reform legislation is progressive but incompletely implemented. The variable focalization distributes readerly sympathy across multiple positions while withholding full identification with any single perspective. The reader is positioned not as partisan but as witness, called upon to recognize complexity without being permitted to evade judgment.

5.2 Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to several theoretical conversations. Within postcolonial narratology, it demonstrates the value of integrating Genette's formal categories with postcolonial theory's attention to power, representation, and voice. Focalization analysis reveals how narrative form reproduces—and can critique—colonial and caste hierarchies of visibility and speech. The concept of "focalization asymmetry" developed in this study offers a precise analytical tool for examining the relationship between narrative perspective and social position.

Within caste studies, this study contributes to the analysis of what Gopal Guru (2000) terms "Dalit representation" in non-Dalit literary production. Seth's novel exemplifies both the possibilities and the limitations of upper-caste writers' engagement with caste oppression. His commitment to representing Dalit experience

is genuine, his critique of caste hierarchy is sustained, and his narrative techniques are sophisticated. Yet the novel cannot fully escape the reformist framework that positions Dalits as objects of upper-caste concern rather than subjects of their own narration. The withholding of internal focalization from Dalit characters, whatever its strategic justifications, also reflects the structural limits of upper-caste literary imagination.

Within narrative ethics, this study suggests the value of attending to what James Phelan (2005) terms the "ethical position" constructed by focalization strategies. Seth's variable focalization positions the reader as what Phelan would call an "ethical spectator"—neither fully aligned with nor completely detached from any character perspective. This positioning enables nuanced judgment while precluding the satisfactions of unambiguous moral clarity. The reader is called upon to recognize that caste oppression is systemic, that individual reformers are complicit even in their resistance, that the victims of violence may also be its perpetrators, and that narrative representation itself is implicated in the hierarchies it seeks to critique.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research

This study is subject to several limitations that suggest directions for future research. First, the analysis has focused exclusively on A Suitable Boy; comparative analysis with other novels by Seth (particularly *The Golden Gate* and *An Equal Music*) would illuminate the development of his narrative techniques across his career. Second, the study has examined focalization in relative isolation from other narrative dimensions; future research might integrate focalization analysis with Genette's categories of order, duration, frequency, and voice. Third, the study has not engaged extensively with reader-response approaches; empirical research on how actual readers respond to Seth's focalization strategies would complement the interpretive analysis offered here.

Additional research might examine Seth's novel in comparative perspective with other Indian English fictions of caste and class. How does Seth's focalization strategy compare with Arundhati Roy's lyrical interiority in *The God of Small Things*? With Aravind Adiga's unreliable first-person narration in *The White Tiger*? With Rohinton

Mistry's multi-perspectival realism in *A Fine Balance*? Such comparative analysis would illuminate the range of narrative techniques available for representing caste oppression and the ideological implications of different formal choices.

Finally, this study suggests the value of extending focalization analysis to other postcolonial literatures. How do narrative techniques for representing racial oppression in African American fiction compare with techniques for representing caste oppression in Indian fiction? How do focalization strategies differ across the literatures of settler colonialism, slavery, and indentured labor? Such comparative research would contribute to a genuinely postcolonial narratology attentive to the intersection of narrative form and colonial history.

5.4 Concluding Reflections

A Suitable Boy ends not with revolutionary transformation but with provisional accommodation. Lata marries Haresh, a man she respects but does not passionately love. Maan returns to his family, chastened by his experiences. The election produces no decisive mandate for social change. The Thakur's murderers are arrested, and the old patterns of caste violence and state complicity continue. This ending has disappointed readers who seek from literature the political resolution that history denies. Yet the novel's formal achievements—its intricate focalization, its sustained attention to the texture of social life, its refusal of easy heroism and melodramatic villainy—constitute a different kind of political intervention.

Seth's novel does not offer solutions to caste oppression. It does not imagine alternative social arrangements or revolutionary futures. Its politics are not those of programmatic transformation but of patient, meticulous description. By tracing the operation of caste and class through the intimate spaces of family, marriage, and friendship, Seth demonstrates that social hierarchy is not merely a public institution but a structure of feeling, an organization of desire, a pattern of perception. His focalization techniques make this argument formally, not thematically. The reader does not simply learn that caste constrains desire; the reader experiences that constraint from within Lata's consciousness. The reader does not simply learn that

Dalits are systematically silenced; the reader encounters that silence as a limit on narrative itself.

This is the distinctive contribution of literary fiction to social critique. Sociological analysis can demonstrate that caste endogamy persists; legal analysis can expose the gap between constitutional equality and social inequality; political science can track the electoral mobilization of caste identities. But only narrative can represent the experience of desire contorted by social prohibition, the experience of ambition blocked by inherited stigma, the experience of violence that leaves no visible wound. Seth's novel accomplishes this representational labor through its sophisticated deployment of focalization, granting interiority where it illuminates the psychological costs of hierarchy, withholding interiority where it exposes the structural limits of upper-caste imagination.

A Suitable Boy thus offers not a program for social transformation but an education in perception. It trains readers to recognize caste and class not as abstract sociological categories but as lived realities that shape consciousness, constrain possibility, and structure relationship. It trains readers to attend to who speaks and who is silent, who sees and who is seen, who is granted interiority and who remains opaque. This education in perception is the precondition for political action. One cannot transform what one cannot see; one cannot resist what one cannot name. Seth's novel, through its patient, meticulous focalization, makes caste and class visible, nameable, available for critique.

The novel's final sentence returns to Lata, standing at the threshold of her married life: "She was aware that there was something she was leaving behind, but she could not have said what it was, and she did not look back" (Seth 1349). The internal focalization—"she was aware," "she could not have said," "she did not look"—captures the ambivalence of constrained agency. Lata has made a choice, but the choice was made within parameters she did not set. She moves forward, but she carries with her the weight of what she has renounced. This ambivalence is the novel's final lesson about caste and class in post-independence India: they are not immutable, but they are not yet transcended; they can be negotiated but not yet abolished; they shape lives that exceed them but remain marked by their impress.

References

1. Adiga, Aravind. *The White Tiger*. Free Press, 2008.
2. Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. Verso, 1992.
3. Anand, Mulk Raj. *Untouchable*. 1935. Penguin, 1990.
4. Anandhi, S. *Rewriting Caste and Gender: Narratives of Dalit Women in Tamil Nadu*. Zubaan, 2005.
5. Anjaria, Ulka. *Realism in the Twentieth-Century Indian Novel: Colonial Difference and Literary Form*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
6. Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. 1985. 4th ed., University of Toronto Press, 2017.
7. Béteille, André. *Caste, Class, and Power: Changing Patterns of Stratification in a Tanjore Village*. University of California Press, 1965.
8. Bhattacharya, Bhabani. *So Many Hungers!* 1947. Orient Paperbacks, 2006.
9. Bose, Brinda. "Modernity, Globality, and the Indian Novel." *The Cambridge Companion to the Indian Novel*, edited by Ulka Anjaria, Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 113-28.
10. Chaudhuri, Amit. "Modernity and Tradition in Vikram Seth's A Suitable Boy." *Literary Review of India*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2003, pp. 68-75.
11. Dahal, Benu. "Ideological Interpellation of Individuals in Vikram Seth's A Suitable Boy." MPhil thesis, Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, 2019.
12. Dirks, Nicholas B. *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*. Princeton University Press, 2001.
13. Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin, Cornell University Press, 1980.

14. Ghurye, G.S. *Caste and Race in India*. 1932. 5th ed., Popular Prakashan, 1969.

15. Guru, Gopal. "Dalit Vision of a Just Society." *The Hindu*, 16 Jan. 2000.

16. Jaffrelot, Christophe. *India's Silent Revolution: The Rise of the Lower Castes in North India*. Columbia University Press, 2003.

17. Joshi, Priya. *In Another Country: Colonialism, Culture, and the English Novel in India*. Columbia University Press, 2002.

18. Lahiri, Jhumpa. *Interpreter of Maladies*. Houghton Mifflin, 1999.

19. Mukherjee, Meenakshi. *The Perishable Empire: Essays on Indian Writing in English*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

20. Paranjape, Makarand. "The Suitable Boy and the Possibilities of Indian Fiction." *Indian Literature*, vol. 37, no. 3, 1994, pp. 157-66.

21. Phelan, James. *Living to Tell About It: A Rhetoric and Ethics of Character Narration*. Cornell University Press, 2005.

22. Rajagopal, Arvind. *Politics After Television: Hindu Nationalism and the Reshaping of the Public in India*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

23. Rao, Raja. *Kanthapura*. 1938. Oxford University Press, 1989.

24. Roy, Anjali Gera. "Caste in Postcolonial Indian Fiction." *Indian Literature and the World*, edited by Debjani Ganguly, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp. 90-105.

25. ---. "Caste, Class, and Love in Vikram Seth's A Suitable Boy." *Journal of South Asian Literature*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2011, pp. 112-29.

26. Roy, Arundhati. *The God of Small Things*. Random House, 1997.

27. Searle, Alison. "The Ethics of Realism in Vikram Seth's A Suitable Boy." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol. 50, no. 3, 2014, pp. 287-99.

28. Sen, Sharmila. "Women, Caste, and Modernity in Vikram Seth's A Suitable Boy." *Feminist Review*, no. 94, 2010, pp. 124-39.

29. Seth, Vikram. A Suitable Boy. HarperCollins, 1993.

30. ---. *Two Lives*. HarperCollins, 2005.

31. Singh, Avadhesh Kumar. "Tradition and Modernity: Caste and Class in A Suitable Boy." *Indian Literature*, vol. 58, no. 2, 2014, pp. 115-23.

32. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988, pp. 271-313.

33. Srinivas, M.N. *Religion and Society Among the Coorgs of South India*. Oxford University Press, 1952.

34. Tharu, Susie, and K. Lalita, editors. *Women Writing in India: 600 B.C. to the Present*. Vol. 2, Feminist Press, 1993.

35. Trivedi, Harish. "The Postcolonial English Novel in India." *The Cambridge Companion to the Postcolonial Novel*, edited by Ato Quayson, Cambridge University Press, 2016, pp. 135-52.

36. Wallart, Kerry-Jane. "Narrative Ethics in Vikram Seth's A Suitable Boy." *Études Anglaises*, vol. 68, no. 1, 2015, pp. 89-103.

37. "The Week." "How Language Is Used as a Semiotic in A Suitable Boy." 6 Nov. 2020, www.theweek.in/leisure/society/2020/11/06/how-language-is-used-as-a-semiotic-in-a-suitable-boy.html.

38. Žižek, Slavoj. *Violence: Six Sideways Reflections*. Picador, 2008.