

# 琉球大学学術リポジトリ

沈黙・発話・陰翳 –

アマタヴ・ゴーシュの『シャドウ・ライズ』

メタデータ	言語: 出版者: 琉球大学法文学部国際言語文化学科欧米系 公開日: 2007-12-23 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Kobayashi, Masaomi, 小林, 正臣 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.24564/0002002322">https://doi.org/10.24564/0002002322</a>

**Silence, Speech, and Shadowiness:  
Amitav Ghosh's *The Shadow Lines***

**Masaomi Kobayashi**

I

As the title suggests, Amitav Ghosh's *The Shadow Lines* centers on the shadowiness of existing borders. The author's interest as an Indian-born American lies in making the lines between the personal and public shadowy. In his local library, the unnamed narrator makes archival researches into the street riots in Calcutta, 1964, because no one but him seems unable to recollect the events: "they had dropped out of memory into the crater of a volcano of silence" (230). In the light of other events that happened in post-Partition Dhaka or postcolonial India, the riots were rather small events, but what matters most to him is that they did happen: according to "the edition of Saturday, 11 January 1964, and sure enough, there it was: a huge banner headline which said: *Curfew in Calcutta, Police Open Fire, 10 dead, 15 wounded*" (224). Rather than ascertaining whether the author tells us an historical fact, we are set the task of assessing the narrator's transformation of his memory into the reality, since he reconstructs his private history and public history in order to reveal "the shadow lines."

The narrator's researches are made by his indigenous effort to transform his private story into the public history. Viewed from other standpoint, the correlation between story and history is that between literature and history, if those disciplines can be assumed to deal respectively with fictional and actual events (albeit broadly defined). In

an essay entitled "A Literary Representation of the Subaltern," Gayatri Spivak argues that those discourses are possibly inseparable from one another: "What is called history will always seem more real to us than what is called literature," but "the archival or archeological work of historiography might resemble a certain work of reading which is usually associated with literary interpretation" (243). In short, she is suggestive of a resemblance between historiographical approach to events and critical approach to texts.

Spivak's particular stress in the abovementioned essay is placed on the need of traffic between literature and history. In *The Shadow Lines*, the narrator actualizes this very trafficability by making archaeological rediscoveries of the past, and it is in this context that Ghosh's academic background is worth remarking: he received a B.A. in History, a M.A. in Sociology, and a Ph.D. in Social Anthropology. That he has crossed the disciplinary boundaries among history, sociology, and archaeology is indicative of his great interest in interdisciplinarity. The practice of interdisciplinarity can then be said to have close relevance to that of postcoloniality. For one thing, "postcolonialism is a heterogeneous field of study" (Bressler 266). For another, "interdisciplinary undertakings have revealed how, when used comparatively, the idea of the 'West' has been employed repeatedly to the disadvantage of its discursive opposites (the 'Orient,' the 'Third World,' 'newly liberated peoples')" (Gunn 254).

In brief, such "discursive opposites" as "the Orient" and "the Third World" have been exploited so as to articulate "the idea of the West." What enables us to recognize their existence is a wide variety of "interdisciplinary undertakings," each of which is in essence an attempt to demonstrate that the discursive goes interdiscursive—that outside a discourse (e.g. colonial/imperial discourse) there is another discourse (e.g. postcolonial discourse). The point in practicing "interdisciplinarity

— an endless combination and recombination of genres and discourses —” (Fairclough 134) is to speak of what has been excluded from a given discourse; by doing so, the practitioner will be able to discover silence within discourse and shadowiness between discourses. As mentioned earlier, Ghosh’s narrator likens his researches into the riots to those “into the crater of a volcano of silence.” That is to say, he takes plunge into the discourse of silence. It can reasonably be said, then, that “*The Shadow Lines* is an archaeology of silences, a slow brushing away of the cobwebs of modern Indian memory, a repeated return to those absences and fissures that mark the sites of personal and national trauma” (Kaul, “Separation” 269). In postcolonial India, the narrator translates “archaeology of silences” into action so as not to translate “silences” into “absences.” Thus he comes to realize the following: “The enemy of silence is speech, but there can be no speech without words” (218). Here he polarizes between “silence” and “speech.” As we shall see, their polarity is quite crucial for postcolonial writing, by which what has been unspoken is revealed. The present study conducts an analysis of writing by Ghosh, providing insights into the act of speaking for the benefit of postcoloniality as interdiscursivity.

## II

It goes without saying that words are not only to be written but to be spoken. It is then important to remember that *The Shadow Lines* is written in the first person—which means that the narrator speaks to us with words he writes in order not to let the past pass into silence: “Every word I write about those events of 1964 is the product of a struggle with silence” (218), for “once the riots had started they produce thousands of words of accurate description. But once they were over

and there was nothing left to describe they never speak of it again" (228). Basically, "words of accurate description" are used to be written, but they must also be spoken to let them reappear both in memory and in history. In a context of postcolonial production of knowledge or narrative, therefore, speech is of particular significance.

At the close of her representative essay, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Spivak draws the following conclusion: "The subaltern cannot speak" (104). "In that paper," reflects she, "I suggested that the subaltern could not 'speak' because, in the absence of institutionally validated agency, there was no listening subject" ("Ethics" 24). This is exactly why she argues against violence in both epistemic and hegemonic terms. Similarly, Ghosh's answer for the question she poses can be supposed to be negative, although his narrator speaks of the riots not only for himself but for others, including his father: "And yet he *knew*, and *they* must have known too, all the canny journalists: everybody must have known in some voiceless part of themselves—for events on that scale cannot happen without portents. If they knew, why couldn't they speak of it?" (227) In this fashion, or in this fiction wherein "[k]nowing and not knowing are so intricately linked" (Mukherjee 259), he gets to discover the subaltern, rather than the nation, to be those unaware of "some voiceless part of themselves." It can then be said that speaking of what (has) really happened enables him to play an important role as an indigenous agent of those who cannot "speak of it."

In *The Shadow Lines*, therefore, "the subaltern cannot speak." That is to say, the narrator cannot make their voice heard; what he can do utmost is to direct his and our attention to them, just as done by Spivak. The problem confronting him and her is the standpoint from which they speak for the subaltern. In Spivak's case, it is currently the United States. Born in India in 1942, Professor Spivak received a B.A.

at the University of Calcutta, came to the United States in 1961 and then graduated with a Ph.D. from Cornell University in 1967. It is well known that she is one of the original editorial members of the Subaltern Studies Group and has raised her voice for subalterns, especially those from India. That she has been speaking from America, not India, has often been open to criticism, however. This issue can best be understood by examining the dispute between her provocative essay and its reactive essay.

In her essay on Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Spivak draws much closer attention to Antoinette/Bertha than her black servant Christophine (let alone other blacks such as Amélie), who is deprived of her perspective and is driven out of the narrative: "Christophine is tangential to this narrative. She cannot be contained by a novel which rewrites a canonical text within the European novelistic tradition in the interest of the white Creole, rather than the native" (*Wide* 246). Spivak's treatment of Christophine in connection with Antoinette/Bertha as "the white Creole" has been the subject of much controversy. An obvious example is seen in Benita Parry's "Two Native Voices in *Wide Sargasso Sea*," in which Christophine is purposefully rediscovered to be "the possessor and practitioner of an alternative tradition" who "delivers a frontal assault against antagonists, and as such constitutes a counter-discourse" (249).

Such critical forms of utterance as "frontal assault" and "counter-discourse" imply that the novel can be heard as a double-voiced text in a manner employed by Henry Louis Gates Jr. As a multiculturalist, he sees an ethnic writer's text as "inherently double-voiced, drawing on energies from both white and black cultural traditions to produce the complex mode of discourse" (Booker 159). Consciously or not, Parry has internalized the notion of double-voiced textuality, since she listens intensively to the voices of the women from different ethnic backgrounds, Antoinette/Bertha and Christophine. Accordingly, at the

end of her essay, she directs her critical attention to Spivak: "Spivak's deliberated deafness to the native voice where it is to be heard, is at variance with her acute hearing of the unsaid in modes of Western feminist criticism," and "Spivak in her own writings severely restricts (eliminates?) the space in which the colonized can be written back into history, even when 'interventionist possibilities' are exploited through the deconstructive strategies by the post-colonial intellectual" (250).

Ironically enough, Parry's argument is that "Spivak's deliberated deafness to the native voice" shows her deliberated openness to "modes of Western feminist criticism," by means of which she has established her own status as a "post-colonial intellectual." More often than not, the conflict between intellectuals is politicized in the secular sense of the power/knowledge nexus. In the Introduction to *Feminisms*, for instance, the editors reach the conclusion that "there is no unchanging feminist orthodoxy, no settled feminist conventions, no static feminist analyses. Feminism is diverse and it is dynamic" (Kemp and Squires 12). In actual fact, the same holds true even for postcolonial feminism, just as shown by Parry's criticism of Spivak's.

More importantly, however, Spivak offers a counterargument against Parry, who has charged her and other leading postcolonial critics, Homi Bhabha and Abdul JanMohammed: "When Benita Parry takes us to task for not being able to listen to the natives, or to let the natives speak, she forgets that the three of us, post-colonials, are 'natives' too. We talk like Defoe's Friday, only much better" ("Theory" 172). It is by no means unreasonable to associate her counterreply with multiculturalism, given the following statement of Gates: "Yet commonsense reminds us that we are all ethnic" ("Ethnic" 288).<sup>1</sup> Spivak's principle of we-are-all-natives and Gates's principle of we-are-all-ethnic are doubly significant: they take into account their global and local perspectives.

In order to develop multicultural/postcolonial theory on a broader scale, Gates says, we must paradoxically, yet positively, accept that “our own theoretical reflections must be as provisional, reactive, and local as the texts we reflect upon” (*Signifying* 470). What he means here is that multicultural/postcolonial critics need not only to situate themselves as intellectuals in general but also to domesticate themselves as locals in particular. Spivak holds similar concern:

Whatever the identitarian ethnicist claims of native or fundamental origin (implicit, for example, Patty’s exhortation of to hear the voice of the native), the political claims that are most urgent in decolonized space are tacitly recognized as coded within the legacy of imperialism: nationhood, constitutionality, citizenship, democracy, even culturalism. (*Outside* 60)

Spivak points to the paradox that our seemingly common usage of such “political claims” as “constitutionality,” “citizenship,” and “culturalism” has actually been regionalized or “recognized as coded within the legacy of imperialism.” Doubtless, she is here conscious of Parry’s argument that she has been notoriously open to intellectual Westernization. Thus she makes the following counterstatement: “My special word to Parry, however, is that her effort as well as mine are judged by the exclusions practiced through the intricate workings of the techniques of knowledge and the strategies of power” (*Outside* 61).<sup>2</sup> In order not to uproot their postcolonial (feminist) efforts, however contested, we must always remember that “our own theoretical reflections must be as provisional, reactive, and local as the texts we reflect upon.” It is hence necessary to make literally down-to-earth “our own theoretical reflections,” especially when it comes to “the texts we reflect upon.” In this point, *The Shadow Lines* is highly worth reflecting upon as one of those texts, given that the author aims at

domesticating himself by domesticating his narrator in postcolonial India.

Born in Dhaka in 1956, Ghosh graduated from Delhi University, went on to take a Ph.D. at Oxford, and teaches currently at Columbia University, whose professors include Spivak. Both Spivak and Ghosh have thus paid special attention to Indians from the United States. Does this mean that he is one of those postcolonial intellectuals charged as incapable of listening to the natives or letting the natives speak? The answer may be yes, considering that he gives no voice to the subalterns in, at least, *The Shadow Lines*. What counts far more is his narrator, however. With an emphatic sense of nativity, Ghosh speaks for the subaltern through his fictitious spokesman's narration. Imaginatively enough, as stated above, therefore, Ghosh invents the native narrator situated within postcolonial India. In this context, the narrator's own position must be brought into sharp focus: he speaks from the middle of nowhere.

Since the novel is narrated through his recollection of persons and his reflection on events that dominated his early life in Calcutta in the 1960s (and later in London), the reader has next to no clue what he is. Given his postcolonial approach to silences and his personal stance on subalterns, however, we can tell that he occupies an in-between position: he, as a native in a narrative, is situated between those who can speak (e.g. "all the canny journalists") and those who cannot, namely those who "must have known in some voiceless part of themselves." More particularly, during his childhood he was placed between his father who could know but could not speak and his father's brother's cousin, Tridib. As we will see, Tridib plays an important part as a kind of mentor who gives the narrator lessons in knowing and speaking through imagination and desire, each of which is fundamental to

practicing postcoloniality.

### III

As a child, the narrator projected his self onto Tridib, a diplomat's son who is well traveled but chooses his life to live in Calcutta where he works at Ph.D. in Archaeology. Looking back upon his childhood, he says: "Tridib was an archaeologist, he was not interested in fairly lands: the one thing he wanted to teach me, he used to say, was to use my imagination with precision" (24). Tridib's archaeological lesson tells us that imagination is in principle a vehicle for polarization, just as England and Jamaica/Dominica are mutually mystified as "fairly lands" in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. For Antoinette/Bertha, "England must be quite unreal and like a dream" (61), and, for her husband, Jamaica/Dominica appears "quite unreal and like a dream" (48). Apparently, it is their imagination that romanticizes each other's home as "there."

By comparison, "imagination with precision" is in essence a vehicle for depolarization: it enables natives to transcend borders that have distinguished between "here" and "there." To put it in different terms, Ghosh attaches great importance to imagination as a counterforce against distinction. As Said puts it, "imaginative geography of the 'our land-barbarian land' variety does not require that the barbarians acknowledge the distinction. It is enough for 'us' to set up these boundaries in our own minds; 'they' becomes 'they' accordingly" (*Orientalism* 54). For recapitulation: the boundaries drawn by "us" are no more than imaginary because they are drawn "in our minds" wherein "'they' becomes 'they.'" Thanks to Tridib, the narrator is now able to disqualify those arbitrary boundaries since he knows that "[t]hey had drawn their borders believing in that pattern, in the

enchantment of lines" (233). Of equal importance is that he has also known "that a place does not merely exist, that it has to be invented in one's imagination" (21). What does he mean by "one's imagination"?

It is vitally significant to note that the protagonist's imagination, unlike the colonialist/imperialist's, is a vehicle not for distinction but for dissolution: it enables him to know and speak about other periods and places as precisely as possible; it is therefore an argumentation to write about what really happened, "which means to be able to recognize the contemporaneity of the past, to be able to see historical memory as vital to any understanding of the present, and to be able to see different times and places as inextricably intertwined with one's own" (Kaul, "Separation" 277). *The Shadow Lines* can then be seen as a story of mirror-image relations between periods and between places — "the contemporaneity" and "the past," "historical memory" and "the present," and "different times and places" and "one's own." Far from insignificant, Ghosh's introduction of these reflective mirror-images into his fiction renders him dissimilar to writers like E. M. Forster or several writers from India:

When it comes to east and west, Forster, in *A Passage to India*, ruled out the possibility of even a limited meeting-ground between the two under conditions of imperialistic domination. Several Indian writers have also explored this theme, not so much in terms of whether the two can meet or no as in terms of the political and cultural consequences of the historical fact that they have met and, what is more, have been locked together for years in a colonized-colonizer relationship. (Kaul, "Reading" 300)

*The Shadow Lines* is admittedly set in postcolonial India. At the same time, however, the novel deals not only with "a colonized-colonizer relationship" that excludes "the possibility of even a limited meeting-ground between the two," for it is also concerned with "whether the

two can meet." The point is reflexivity, not exclusivity.<sup>3</sup>

The narrator refers to his investigation of the riots as "a voyage into a land outside space," and it is "a land of looking-glass events" (224). By "looking-glass events," he means mutual reflexivity between the sphere of one's own and the sphere of our own. Notably, his concept of reflexivity derives from Tridib, who has ever told him "that one could never know anything except through desire, real desire, which was not the same thing as greed or lust; a pure, painful and primitive desire" which "carried one beyond the limits of one's mind to other times and other places" (29). Tridib's "imagination with precision" is based on "real desire" or "pure, painful, primitive desire," by which one can imaginatively, albeit precisely, situate oneself in "other times and other places." The reflection between one and oneself contrasts markedly with the distinction between self and other. What is achieved by the praxis of reflexivity is hence depolarization, through which it becomes feasible to accelerate decentralization and decolonization. It is then worth drawing a parallel between the narrator's depolarization and the polarization by his grandmother and cousin, Tha'mma and Ila.

As stated earlier, the narrator transforms his private story into the public history. Such transformation is also exemplified by Tha'mma. When she was a schoolmistress, she wanted to make a terrorist attack on the colonial government of the Empire. "It was for *our* freedom," she reflects, "*I* would have done anything to be free" (39; emphasis added). Tha'mma has struggled for both personal and national freedom; that is, "her" private ideal of freedom is entirely defined by "our" public ideal of freedom. It is in this very point that her struggle for national freedom presents a sharp contrast to Ila's desire for personal freedom: she leaves Calcutta for London simply because she wants to be free. Free of what? This is precisely the narrator's question, and: "Free of

*you!* she shouted back. Free of your bloody culture and all of you" (89).

Tha'mma's nationalism and Ila's internationalism form a stark contrast to one another. This is why the former has an antipathy against the latter as antinational. Viewed from another angle, however, they do have something in common with each other: they gain neither national nor personal freedom. For Tha'mma, it is one's blood-consciousness that sharpens his/her sense of nationhood; she cannot hence recognize the significance of the crossing of borders. It can be assumed, then, that her firm disbelief in "them" is based on her firm belief in "us." As the story unravels, moreover, the reader notices that she has gained next to nothing; rather, she plays a unique role as a "loser" in the literal sense: her birthplace Dhaka was changed by "them," her nephew Tridib was killed by "them," and her gold was gifted to the war fund "to kill *them* before they kill *us*" and "to wipe *them* out" (237; emphasis added).

In contrast, Ila's belief is that her internationalism can liberate her from what she considers representative of upper-class society as "us." Besides, she possesses an irresistible desire for anywhere but "here," especially for the center as "there." Granted, she knows that "there are famines and riots and disasters," yet "those are local things after all—not like revolutions or anti-fascist wars, nothing that sets a political example to the world, nothing that's remembered," and therefore "local things" are nothing but "voiceless events in a backward world" (104). In addition to such a spatial distinction between "here" and "there," she draws a temporal distinction, too. In the narrator's view, Ila seems to have always lived in the present alone. "For Ila," say he, "the current was the real: it was as though she lived in a present which was like an airlock in a canal, shut away from the tidewaters of the past and the future by steel floodgates" (30). The observation reveals that she has

assimilated herself into an arguable system of thought based on binary oppositions concerning time and place.

Geopolitically speaking, Ila can be considered as an Orientalist in the so-called Orient. In the following self-critical manner, Said refers to this particular aspect of Orientalism: "the geopolitical Orient solicited the West's attention, even as-by one of those paradoxes revealed so frequently by organized knowledge-East was East and West was West" (*Orientalism* 216). The paradox he touches upon is what is signified by the cultural definition of hegemony. According to the Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci, hegemonic control is maintained not merely by threat, but by consent as well. It is then supposable that Ila's polarization of central/marginal is, in fact, what she has naturally acquired rather than what has forcibly required her. It seems, in other words, that she has consciously or unconsciously internalized the colonialist/imperialist's binary operations in order to release herself from "a backward world."

What is ironical is that the political activists with whom Ila shares her house in London "regard her as a kind of guest, a decoration almost" and "talk of her as 'our own upper-class Marxist'" (97). Furthermore, the striking disharmony between her intellectuality and nativity is reinforced by the following irony: it is never brought to her knowledge that her future husband "Nick Price was ashamed to be seen by his friends, walking home with an Indian" (77). In what she centralizes as "there," she is thus forced to act as an Other. For this reason, she is in no way free from "here," nor does she gain her personal freedom; and Tha'mma insists that "Ila shouldn't *be* there" since "she doesn't belong there" (77). Wherever she is, therefore, Ila remains a daughter of an Indian diplomat, whose vast wealth attracts Nick—an English Orientalist.

At a certain point in his early life, Nick announced that he wants to

become like his grandfather Lionel Tresawsen, a self-made man who acquired his great wealth from “all around the world—Fiji, Bolivia, the Guinea Coast, Ceylon” (51). In *Capital* Marx observes, “The exchange of commodities...first begins on the boundaries of...communities” (100). What he describes here is mercantilism as a way to make a profit on the intermediation between different markets or “communities.” Marx would then see Tresawsen as a mercantilist who takes advantage of different value systems by locating himself “on the boundaries.” It should be hastily noted, though, that Nick is a materialist as well as a mercantilist. Indeed, as stated above, the reason for his marriage lies simply in his desire for his wife’s property. Initially, Nick was the narrator’s blonde altar ego, but later the former was demystified by the latter, to whom his mentor had given “words to travel in” and “eyes to see them with” (20).

When analyzed in this way, Ghosh’s characters are all provided with their mirror-images. To name just a few: Tridib and the narrator as archaeologists; Ila and Tha’mma as polarists; Tresawsen and Nick as mercantilists; and Nick and Ila as Orientalists. By making mutually reflexive one gender/generation and another, Ghosh exhibits what has remained in postcolonial India. The prefix “post-” is hence significant in the senses of “a break into a phase and consciousness of newly constructed independence and autonomy ‘beyond’ and ‘after’ colonialism” and “a continuation and intensification of the system, better understood as neo-colonialism” (Selden and Widdowson 196). It is plain that *The Shadow Lines* encompasses both meanings of the prefix, incorporating characters who are able and who are unable to break away from colonialism/imperialism. It is, after all, an ongoing narrative on postcoloniality.

## IV

This study has conducted an analysis of Ghosh's postcolonial writing, employing a manner developed principally by Spivak. As has been pointed out, postcolonialism is associated with postmodernism in that postmodernity has laid up the foundations for postcoloniality. As a heterogeneous field of study, postcolonialism requires us to remain open to all possible perspectives generated between discourses—discourses “which cross each other, are sometimes juxtaposed with one another, but can just as well exclude or be unaware of each other” (Foucault 67).

If interdiscursivity cannot be achieved without recognizing “how knowledge is always open to further interpretation and criticism” and “how understanding is always susceptible to further correlation and realization” (Gunn 255), then postcoloniality is certainly no exception: its practitioners should always be conscious of knowledge's openness and understanding's susceptibleness. In an enclosed context of colonial/imperial production, the subaltern can seldom or never speak. More often than not, as discussed previously, however, they can seldom or never speak even in an open-ended context of postcolonial production, either. The first and foremost task we are thus confronting is not to discontinue speaking of silence, whose cultural synonym is “consensus” and whose critical antonym is “controversy.”

Always controversial, Spivak and Parry have reached little or no consensus, “but consensus for a research area as a whole is equivalent to stagnation, irrelevance, and death” (Lucas 226). If “consensus” means a state of knowing in “a research field as a whole,” the researcher must then be in a state of not knowing in order to rescue the entire field from its “stagnation, irrelevance, and death.” For the postmodern writer Donald Barthelme, to be in a state of not knowing is to be in an

in-between space. In his essay "Not-Knowing," for example, he likens himself to an idiosyncratic player of banjulele—a cross between a banjo and a uke—in order to tell us how he, as an artist, will play a number like "Melancholy Baby": "I will play something that is parallel, in some sense, to 'Melancholy Baby'" since "[t]he interest of my construction, if any, is to be located in the space between the new entity I have constructed and the 'real' 'Melancholy Baby'" (23).

Barthelme's example sounds quite playful, yet the importance should be attached to its meaningfulness rather than playfulness. The point of his is "to be located in the space between." The postcolonial practitioner is placed in a space between discourses, as the banjulele player is placed in a space between "the new entity" and the original "Melancholy Baby." This analogy indicates that both the artist and the postcolonialist are expected "to attain a fresh mode of cognition." Given Barthelme's emphasis on art as "a meditation upon external reality," namely a vehicle for speaking of "the as-yet unspeakable, the as-yet unspoken" (15), his writings can readily be imagined as equivalent to his variations on "Melancholy Baby." Just like playing variations on "Melancholy Baby," he enjoys writing variations of "external reality."<sup>4</sup> If the postmodernist pursues the possible by making lines among genres blurry, then the postcolonialist does so by making lines among discourses shadowy, thereby (re)discovering "the as-yet unspeakable, the as-yet unspoken." Is it high time to further expanding the universe of postcolonial discourse into an external universe of discourse?

## Notes

1 At the same time, Gates's claim might sound somewhat reductionistic, especially in practicing multiculturalism in the classroom:

How to teach about multiple cultures without homogenizing them "We are all human beings/Americans," "We have all suffered") or essentializing them "Let's consider the black experience in the U.S.") but also without abandoning hope of finding commonalities and connections ("If every racial/ethnic sexual group is distinct and every identity is heterogeneous, how can anyone ever have anything in common with anyone else?"). (Edelstein 15)

2 In a quite similar way, Said is fully conscious of the relation between his critical position and political situation:

I am as aware as anyone that the ivory-tower concerns of technical criticism-I use the phrase because it is very useful as a way of setting off what I and the others we've mentioned do from the non-theoretical, non-philosophically based criticism normally found in academic departments of literature-are very far removed from the world of politics, power, domination, and struggle. But there are links between the two worlds which I for one am beginning to exploit in my own work. (14)

3 George Soros, the founder of the hedge fund, Quantum Fund, has propounded the theory of reflexivity as "the relationship between thinking and reality is reflexive-that is, what we think has a way of affecting what we think about" (4).

4 According to an editor, "Barthelme's work is uncategorizable.

It's so notoriously uncategorizable, in fact, that its uncategorizability is almost the first thing we notice about it. Categories are a way of signifying meaning in advance, and Barthelme concedes nothing in advance; his work playfully resists being resolutely fixed" (Herzinger v).

### Works Cited

- Barthelme, Donald. "Not-Knowing." *Not-Knowing: The Essays and Interviews of Donald Barthelme*. Ed. Kim Herzinger. New York: Vintage, 1999. 11-24.
- Bressler, Charles E. *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1999.
- Edelstein, Marilyn. "Multiculturalisms Past, Present, and Future." *College English* 68.1 (September 2005): 14-41.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. "The Order of Discourse." Ed. Robert Young. *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981. 48-78.
- Gates, Henry Louis, Jr. "'Ethnic and Minority' Studies." *Gibaldi* 288-302 ---. *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism*. New York: Oxford UP, 1988.
- Ghosh, Amitav. *The Shadow Lines*. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 1988.
- Gibaldi, Joseph, ed. *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1992.
- Gunn, Giles. "Interdisciplinary Studies." *Gibaldi* 239-61.
- Herzinger, Kim. Preface. *The Teachings of Don B.* By Donald Barthelme. New York: Vintage, 1998. v-viii.
- Kaul, A.N. "A Reading of *The Shadow Lines*." Ghosh 299-309.

- Kaul, Suvir. "Separation Anxiety: Growing Up Inter/National in *The Shadow Lines*." Ghosh 268-86.
- Kemp, Sandra, and Judith Squires, eds. *Feminisms*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Lucas, Robert, Jr. Interview. Eds. Brian Snowdon, Howard Vane, and Peter Wynarczyk. *A Modern Guide to Macroeconomics: An Introduction to Competing Schools of Thought*. Brookfield, Vt.: Edward Elgar, 1993. 219-16.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Ed. Friedrich Engels. Trans. Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. New York: Modern Library, 1906.
- Mukherjee, Meenakshi. "Maps and Mirrors: Co-ordinates of Meaning in *The Shadow Lines*." Ghosh 255-267.
- Parry, Benita. "Two Narrative Voices in *Wide Sargasso Sea*." Rhys 247-50.
- Rhys, Jean. *Wide Sargasso Sea*. New York: Norton, 1999.
- Said, Edward W. "Beginnings." Ed. Gauri Viswanathan. *Power, Politics, and Culture: Interviews with Edward W. Said*. New York: Pantheon, 2001. 3-37.
- . *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- Selden, Ramen, and Peter Widdowson. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1993.
- Soros, George. *Open Society: Reforming Global Capitalism*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2000.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Williams and Chrisman 66-111.
- . "Ethics and Politics in Tagore, Coetzee, and Certain Scenes of Teaching." *Diacritics* 32.3-4 (Fall-Winter 2002): 17-31.
- . "A Literary Representation of the Subaltern: A Woman's Text from

- the Third World." *In Other Words: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Methuen, 1987. 241-68.
- . *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- . "Theory in the Margin: Coetzee's *Foe* reading Defoe's *Crusoe/Roxana*." Eds. Jonathan Arac and Barbara Johnson. *Consequences of Theory*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990. 154-80.
- . "Wide Sargasso Sea and a Critique of Imperialism." Rhys 240-47.
- Williams, Patrick, and Laura Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994.

沈黙・発話・陰翳  
—アミタヴ・ゴーシュの『シャドウ・ラインズ』

小林 正臣

アミタヴ・ゴーシュの『シャドウ・ラインズ』(*The Shadow Lines*)は、カルカッタ、ダッカ、そしてイギリスを舞台にしており、当時の植民地インドにおいて語られなかった歴史が語られることに重点が置かれている。この点において本作は、典型的な脱植民地的な文学作品である。知られているように、思想化・理論家のガヤトリ・C・スピヴァクは、「サバルタン」(subaltern)を定義することで、語られない歴史における語(ら)れない人々(特に女性)に注目する。しかし同時に、現在は合衆国の大学人として一すなわち現在は発信できる場所において地位にある知識人として一彼女自身が批判されることもある。いずれにしても、サバルタンを語ること・代弁することは、発声・発信を可能にする場所にいることと関わっている。ゴーシュの語り手も、語られなかった歴史を語るためには「正確な想像力」(imagination with precision)が必要であることを学習したのち実践する。中流階級に位置する彼は、語る声を奪う者でも奪われる者でもない地点から知識を活用することで「脱植民地」(postcoloniality)を試みる。最後に本論は、その試みを無数の言説に包囲されつつも「間言説性」(interdiscursivity)を実践することの類推として捉え、新たな知の発信地を開拓する可能性を提示する。