



Consonanze 11.2

# ANANTARATNAPRABHAVA

## STUDI IN ONORE DI GIULIANO BOCCALI

*a cura di Alice Crisanti, Cinzia Pieruccini,  
Chiara Policardi, Paola M. Rossi*

II



*Anantaratnaprabhava*

Studi in onore di Giuliano Boccali

A cura di Alice Crisanti, Cinzia Pieruccini  
Chiara Policardi, Paola M. Rossi

II

LEDIZIONI

# CONSONANZE

Collana

del Dipartimento di Studi Letterari, Filologici e Linguistici  
dell'Università degli Studi di Milano

diretta da Giuseppe Lozza

11.2

## Comitato Scientifico

Benjamin Acosta-Hughes (The Ohio State University), Giampiera Arrigoni (Università degli Studi di Milano), Johannes Bartuschat (Universität Zürich), Alfonso D'Agostino (Università degli Studi di Milano), Maria Luisa Doglio (Università degli Studi di Torino), Bruno Falchetto (Università degli Studi di Milano), Alessandro Fo (Università degli Studi di Siena), Luigi Lehnus (Università degli Studi di Milano), Maria Luisa Meneghetti (Università degli Studi di Milano), Michael Metzeltin (Universität Wien), Silvia Morgana (Università degli Studi di Milano), Laurent Pernot (Université de Strasbourg), Simonetta Segenni (Università degli Studi di Milano), Luca Serianni (Sapienza Università di Roma), Francesco Spera (Università degli Studi di Milano), Renzo Tosi (Università degli Studi di Bologna)

## Comitato di Redazione

Guglielmo Barucci, Francesca Berlinzani, Maddalena Giovannelli, Cecilia Nobili, Stefano Resconi, Luca Sacchi, Francesco Sironi

ISBN 978-88-6705-680-4

In copertina: Rāvaṇānugrahamūr̥ti, Ellora, Grotta 29, VII-VIII sec. ca. (Foto C. P.)

Impaginazione: Alice Crisanti

© 2017

Ledizioni – LEDIpublishing

Via Alamanni, 11

20141 Milano, Italia

[www.ledizioni.it](http://www.ledizioni.it)

*È vietata la riproduzione, anche parziale, con qualsiasi mezzo effettuata, compresa la fotocopia, anche a uso interno o didattico, senza la regolare autorizzazione.*

## INDICE

### VOLUME PRIMO

- p. 7 Note introduttive  
*Veda e Iran antico, lingua e grammatica*
- 13 *Fra lessico e grammatica. I nomi dell'acqua nell'indiano antico e altrove*  
Romano Lazzeroni (Università di Pisa)
- 23 *Questioni di dialettologia antico indiana e l'indo-ario del regno di Mitanni*  
Saverio Sani (Università di Pisa)
- 31 *Chanson de toile. Dall'India di Guido Gozzano all'India vedica*  
Rosa Ronzitti (Università degli Studi di Genova)
- 41 *Abitatori vedici dell'acqua*  
Daniele Maggi (Università degli Studi di Macerata)
- 63 *A Curious Semantic Hapax in the Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra: The Priest Hotṛ as the Chariot of the Gods (devaratha) in a Courageous Metaphor*  
Pietro Chierichetti, PhD
- 77 *On Some Systems of Marking the Vedic Accent in Manuscripts Written in the Grantha Script*  
Marco Franceschini (Università di Bologna)
- 89 *Cobra e pavoni. Il ruolo linguistico e retorico di A 2.1.72*  
Maria Piera Candotti (Università di Pisa),  
Tiziana Pontillo (Università degli Studi di Cagliari)
- 107 *Subjecthood in Pāṇini's Grammatical Tradition*  
Artemij Keidan (Sapienza Università di Roma)
- 127 *Sull'uso didattico di alcuni subhāṣita*  
Alberto Pelissero (Università degli Studi di Torino)
- 137 *Avestico rec. pasuuāzah-. Vecchie e nuove considerazioni a proposito dell'immolazione animale nella ritualistica indo-iranica*  
Antonio Panaino (Università di Bologna)

- 153 *Khotanese baṣṣā and bihaḍe*  
Mauro Maggi (Sapienza Università di Roma)
- Religioni, testi e tradizioni*
- 165 *'As a She-Elephant, I Have Broken the Tie'. Notes on the*  
*Therī-apadāna-s*  
Antonella Serena Comba (Università degli Studi di Torino)
- 183 *Le Therī e Māra il Maligno: il buddhismo al femminile*  
Daniela Rossella (Università degli Studi della Basilicata)
- 195 *Asceti e termitai. A proposito di Buddhacarita 7, 15*  
Antonio Rigopoulos (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia)
- 217 *Alla ricerca del divino: figure ascetiche e modelli sapienziali*  
*nella tradizione non ortodossa dell'India e della Grecia antica*  
Paola Pisano
- 231 *A proposito del kāśīyoga dello Skanda-purāṇa*  
Stefano Piano (Università degli Studi di Torino)
- 241 *Della follia d'amore e divina nella letteratura tamil classica e medievale*  
Emanuela Panattoni (Università di Pisa)
- 255 *"The Poetry of Thought" in the Theology of the Tripurārahasya*  
Silvia Schwarz Linder (Universität Leipzig)
- 267 *Cultural Elaborations of Eternal Polarities: Travels of Heroes,*  
*Ascetics and Lovers in Early Modern Hindi Narratives*  
Giorgio Milanetti (Sapienza Università di Roma)
- 287 *Fra passioni umane e attrazioni divine: alcune considerazioni sul*  
*concetto di 'ishq nella cultura letteraria urdū*  
Thomas Dähnhardt (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia)
- 309 *Il sacrificio della satī e la «crisi della presenza»*  
Bruno Lo Turco (Sapienza Università di Roma)
- 321 *Jñānavāpī tra etnografia e storia. Note di ricerca su un pozzo al*  
*centro dei pellegrinaggi locali di Varanasi*  
Vera Lazzaretti (Universitetet i Oslo)
- 335 *Cakra. Proposte di rilettura nell'ambito della didattica dello yoga*  
Marilia Albanese (YANI)
- Appendice*
- 349 *Critical Edition of the Ghaṭakharparaṭikā Attributed to Tārācandra*  
Francesco Sferra (Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale")
- 391 *Tabula gratulatoria*

## VOLUME SECONDO

### *Filosofie*

- 9 *The “Frame” Status of Veda-Originated Knowledge in Mīmāṃsā*  
Elisa Freschi (Universität Wien)
- 21 *Diventare è ricordare. Una versione indiana dell’anamnesi*  
Paolo Magnone (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano)
- 33 *Sull’epistemologia del sogno secondo il Vaiśeṣika. Appunti per  
una tassonomia del fenomeno onirico*  
Gianni Pellegrini (Università degli Studi di Torino)
- 45 *Coscienza e realtà. Il problema ontologico e l’insegnamento  
di Vasubandhu*  
Emanuela Magno (Università degli Studi di Padova)
- 57 *Contro la purità brahmanica: lo Śivaismo non-duale  
e il superamento di śaṅkā ‘esitazione’, ‘inibizione’*  
Raffaele Torella (Sapienza Università di Roma)
- 69 *La cimosā e il ‘nichilista’. Fra ontologia, evacuazione e  
neutralizzazione dei segni figurati in Nāgārjuna*  
Federico Squarcini (Università Ca’ Foscari Venezia)
- 87 *Poesia a sostegno dell’inferenza: analisi di alcuni passi scelti dal  
Vyaktiviveka di Mahimabhāṭṭa*  
Stefania Cavaliere (Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”)
- 107 *La ricezione dell’indianistica nella filosofia italiana di fine  
Ottocento. Il caso di Piero Martinetti*  
Alice Crisanti, PhD
- 121 *Prospettive comparatistiche tra storia della filosofia ed  
estetica indiana*  
Mimma Congedo, PhD  
Paola M. Rossi (Università degli Studi di Milano),

### *Palazzi, templi e immagini*

- 147 *Descrizioni architettoniche in alcuni testi indiani*  
Fabrizia Baldissera (Università degli Studi di Firenze)
- 163 *Devī uvāca, Maheśvara uvāca. Some Katyuri Representations of  
Umāmāheśvara and the Śaivism of Uttarakhand*  
Laura Giuliano (Museo Nazionale d’Arte Orientale ‘Giuseppe Tucci’)
- 185 *Bundi. Corteo regale in onore del Dio bambino*  
Rosa Maria Cimino (Università del Salento)

*Tra ieri e oggi. Letteratura e società*

- 213 *La miniaturizzazione dell'ānanda tāṇḍava di Śiva in talune poesie indiane del '900*  
Donatella Dolcini (Università degli Studi di Milano)
- 229 *Rabindranath Tagore. The Infinite in the Human Being*  
Fabio Scialpi (Sapienza Università di Roma)
- 239 *Minority Subjectivities in Kuṇāl Siṃh's Hindi Novel Romiyo Jūliyaṭ aur Aṁdherā*  
Alessandra Consolaro (Università degli Studi di Torino)
- 249 *Jhumpa Lahiri's "Unaccustomed Earth": When the Twain Do Meet*  
Alessandro Vescovi (Università degli Studi di Milano)
- 261 *La 'Donna di Sostanza' si è opposta ai 'Miracoli del Destino': casi celebri in materia di diritto d'autore in India*  
Lorenza Acquarone, PhD
- 273 «Only consideration is a good girl». *Uno sguardo sulla società contemporanea indiana attraverso un'analisi degli annunci matrimoniali*  
Sabrina Ciolfi, PhD
- 285 *L'arte abita in periferia*  
Maria Angelillo (Università degli Studi di Milano)
- 297 *Alcune considerazioni preliminari allo studio delle comunità indigene (ādivāsī) d'India oggi*  
Stefano Beggiora (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia)

*Studi sul Tibet*

- 319 *La Preghiera di Mahāmudrā del Terzo Karma pa Rang byung rdo rje*  
Carla Gianotti
- 341 *The Dharmarājas of Gyantsé. Their Indian and Tibetan Masters, and the Iconography of the Main Assembly Hall in Their Vihāra*  
Erberto F. Lo Bue (Università di Bologna)
- 361 *In Search of Lamayuru's dkar chag*  
Elena De Rossi Filibeck (Sapienza Università di Roma)
- 375 *Torrente di gioventù. Il manifesto della poesia tibetana moderna*  
Giacomella Orofino (Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale")
- 395 *Tabula gratulatoria*

# Minority Subjectivities in Kuṇāl Siṃh's Hindi Novel *Romiyo Jūliyaṭ aur Āṃdherā*

*Alessandra Consolaro*

## 1. Introduction

The short novel/long story *Romiyo Jūliyaṭ aur āṃdherā* (*Romeo, Juliet and Darkness*, Siṃh 2008) by Hindi writer Kuṇāl Siṃh draws its title from the novel *Romeo, Julie a tma* (*Romeo, Juliet and Darkness*, 1958) by Czech novelist and playwright Jan Otčenášek (1924-1979). It was made available in Hindi in 1964 by Nirmal Varmā (1929-2005), and its translations have been highly influential on many Hindi writers of the next generations.<sup>1</sup> The Indian remake introduces a geographical deterritorialization: from the original setting in Prague during the Nazi occupation, the story is transferred to early 21st century Assam, in north eastern India. In the former narration, there is an open war, in the latter, no war is declared, but an armed conflict has been going on for decades. The time frame of the Hindi story is 2003, during the anti-Bihari and anti-Hindi violence that led to the death of up to 200 people. The impossible love story of a young couple is maintained. Manoj, a Hindi teacher from Bihar – the only non-Assamese staff member at a school in a qasba on the mountains – often visits Rāmdahin, a Bihārī friend who puts him up in Guwahati. There he meets Anubhā, an Assamese college girl studying music and dance. At first, she distrusts him, but they eventually fall in love, and secretly marry. In the midst of rising violence in an apparently normal climate, Rāmdahin is attacked and killed. Eventually, the couple are victim of an assault by a group of youngsters, who leave a dying Anubhā in the room and drag Manoj outside. A badly wounded Manoj recovers on a deserted road, in the company of a stray dog who, after being initially aggressive, sits beside him, as if to console him. Manoj springs at the dog, beating the animal wildly. The text closes in the darkness of this blind violence.

1. Since I cannot read Czech, I refer to both the Italian translation of the novel (Otčenášek 1960) and the Hindi one (Otcenášek 2010).



## 2. *A Minor Literature for Hindi*

The focus of this article is on the deterritorialization of language as it appears in *Romiyo Jūliyaṭ aur aṁdherā*. The destabilization of the traditional concepts of territory in the process that Guattari and Deleuze call becoming-minor is here exemplified with regard to Hindi, a language that apparently has a status of prominence *vis à vis* other Indian languages, both in numbers and in prestige. Talking of Hindi as a «minority language» in India might sound odd, as Hindi is the official majority language by constitutional decree. Yet, the definition of «minority language» should be given not in relation to the whole Indian territory, but rather as «a language that is spoken by the minority population in a geographic area or location».

In Assam, the state where 74 % of the total North Eastern population live, Assamese and Bodo – the major indigenous languages – are official languages; Bengali is the second most widely spoken language in the state (27%). There has been a traditional opposition to Hindi, considered as an imposition by India. Actually, language may assume a secondary role as an identity marker, because caste, religion, attire, food habits, and even personal names may often provide important identities for the individual, the family or society. But the emphasis on Assamese has highlighted the contraposition between this language and others. Even if Hindi is a pan-Indian requirement for Government jobs, most Assamese only learn it superficially. People speaking a regional language dominant in the state move towards English, whereas the people who use a non-regional language – that is, the minor and minority languages within the linguistically re-organized state – move towards the regional language or English.

In the context of *Romiyo Jūliyaṭ aur aṁdherā*, therefore, Hindi functions as an identifying/dis-identifying factor that can be used as a tool in order to develop a project of minor-becoming. Both the male Hindi-speaking and the female Assamese-speaking protagonists find their private allegiances at odds with the discourses of public culture. In both cases, they develop a state of self-awareness and of solidarity, as they find themselves part of a group that does not share «the symbols of authority, the values that are propagated from the centre, and the culture that emanates from the centre» (Weiner 1997, 243). Being predicated on various, potentially competitive axes of belonging, minority subjectivity is necessarily multi-layered and complex. The short story plays a sort of mirror game with the issue of minority, as it multiplies the effect through a complex portrayal of minority subjectivities. One aspect is linked to the status of Hindi as a symbol of the demands of the supranational Indian State that speaks the language of a majoritarian cultural nationalism. Manoj's situated experience gives rise to a deterritorialized minority subjectivity when he finds himself seen as a representative of this majority, at odds with his life experience and feelings. Being a *hindivālā* in a land of non-*hindivālā*-s,

where Hindi is nevertheless the majority language of the supranational Indian State, Manoj exemplifies a situation described by Deleuze and Guattari as «detritorialization» and becoming-minor.

Becoming-minor is the creative process of becoming different, or diverging from the majority.<sup>2</sup> This is always a process of de-identification and de-figuration. The first stage in this process is refusing the privilege of universalizing theories. In fact, we cannot speak to each other if we deny our particularities. Recognizing the minor does not erase the aspects of the major, but as a mode of understanding it enables the fissures in one's identities to be seen, the intersections of one's totalities to be disclosed. Such a process does not come about in itself: it needs an encounter. A «minority», whatever its nature, is the trigger of the becoming, it is its «active medium». For this to happen, though, it is crucial that the «minority» in question becomes something else in turn. In fact, the becoming-minor is certainly not to be confused with the belonging to a quantitative minority. The event of becoming-minor subjects the standard to a process of continuous variation or deterritorialization, and it is the real focus of Guattari and Deleuze's approach to the politics of difference. The limits of the potential for transformation are not determined by the normalizing power of the majority, but by the transformative potential of becoming-minor, or becoming-revolutionary. The process of becoming-minor comes unintendedly to Manoj: the encounter with Rāmdahin triggers in him the consciousness of his belonging to a «minority», and the feeling of being endangered gets stronger especially when things get rough for the «foreigners», and colleagues and neighbours start behaving in an over-caring way.

In the story one morning most of the people among us gulped, reading the front page news in the newspaper. Immigrant workers from Bihar and Uttar Pradesh had openly been shot dead in many places in the frontier regions of Assam. In the story, the murdered were mostly workers, cart-drivers and rikshaw-pullers. Many dealers' shops had been looted. And in the span of one night many people had just disappeared. No idea of where they were or in which conditions. But in the next few days more news of this kind began to appear on the paper's pages. One day

2. The expression «becoming-minor» and the two-word phrase «becoming minority» sound similar but are quite different. The term «minority» generally refers to the smaller part of a group, or less than half of the people in a given society (this is how it is used in the field of social advocacy and civil rights), and along with the term «majority», has an image of being rooted in numbers. Guattari and Deleuze point out that in actual fact the «majority» is less about numbers than about domination and power (for example, there are actually more women than men in the world, but under patriarchy women constitute a minority). Here the notion of «becoming» (*devenir*) is used as a critical notion meant as «becoming different». «Becoming» is not a phase between two states: it is the very dynamism of change, situated between heterogeneous terms and tending towards no particular goal or end-state.

Tinsukiya, the next day Dibrugarh, the day after Kajiranga and Digboi. [...] I felt very uneasy. In the school, I was the only Bihārī staff. All the others were Assamese. As a result, I began to be treated like a disabled person. If by chance I coughed, immediately a couple of people would be there with a medicine. If I stood up to go to the bathroom somebody would say: “Do you need anything from the market? Let me fetch it for you! Don’t go out yourself”, and so on. In the story, everybody would be over-worried about me. They started paying attention to each and every thing about me. When they talked, they were very careful that their words would not convey to me anything disturbing. At home, in Bihar, my mother and sister were very anxious. They would call me on my mobile phone every other day. Before I start telling them how I was, Sādhan Bābū would grab the phone and start yelling: “Mām̃ jī, nothing will happen to your son!”. Baṭuk Caudhurī would respectfully say hallo and say “Don’t worry”. Bīren would say that I was being kept safe as a jewel. And so on. (Siṃh 2008, 141-142) [All translations from Hindi are mine]

However, even before Manoj becomes aware of the fact that he is different, his «difference» is perceived by others. His meeting with Anubhā is marked by her recognition of his «otherness». On their very first meeting this leads to her insulting him, and afterwards, when they get acquainted, she records his physical difference from her and other Assamese people: «I observed him. Fair complexion. His eyes and nose such that one could easily know that he is non Assamese» (Siṃh 2008, 128). The general attitude towards non Assamese persons is well exemplified in a passage describing the reaction of people to the news that the corpse of a person defined by the police as a «terrorist» – in the local language, a «fighter» – has been found on the road: some say that he was murdered by his very own group, others think that it was an ambush by the Indian Army, but in saying this, «the voice modulation in the pronunciation of the word “Indian” was as if they themselves were from some other place» (Siṃh 2008, 121).

For Anubhā, becoming-minor implies her recognition of the fallacy of the divide between Assamese-non Assamese. Still, she maintains a bias towards other minorities, viz. Muslims and poor people: after Rāmdahin is murdered, when she finds out that Rāmdahin had an affair with a poor Muslim widow, she immediately hints at a possible responsibility of «those people».

“That’s really a bad story. What did you find out about those people?”.

“Which people?”.

“Those who... Rāmdahin... did you find out anything?”.

“Nothing”.

“Who was that lady with you? The one Sādhan Bābū has gone to drop off”.

“She? She was a sort of kept of Rāmdahin”.

“What?”.

“Yeah, I met her this bloody day only. I did not know all this”.

“What’s her background?... I mean, Jalukbari slum has a very bad name...”

“Hum, I went there in the morning... I think she is a widow or something like that. Divorced or something”.

“Couldn’t she have a hand in it? Or could it be that some other friend of hers... you know, na, how these people are!”

“Which people, Anubhā? What people are you talking about? Why are we pretending we are different? Don’t we perfectly know what exactly happened to Rāmdahin? If I had been in Rāmdahin’s place, would they have spared me as I am Manoj, not Rāmdahin? No, Anu. These are not all individual issues – we know it perfectly. ... Who am I? And who are you? Is our identity just that I am Bihārī and you are Assamese? Was the Hindu Muslim factor not enough for this country, now we have this Bihārī Assamese factor? And then within the Assamese this Bodo-boṛo factor. Once sovereign Assam, then divided Assam, fifty-fifty. Then who knows what else!”. (Sinh 2008, 154-155)

The protagonists of *Romiyo Jūliyaṭ aur aṁdherā* are a minority not because of their paucity in numbers, but because they are able to become lines of fluctuation that open up a gap and separate it from the axiom constituting a redundant majority. The deviation from the model represented by Manoj and Anubhā is ideally the only sensible response to identity politics: they do not belong anywhere and belong everywhere. Their minority is produced through multiple belonging, belonging to neither set, constituting a line of flight. This constant fluctuation, this becoming, is creation: it is life, it is love; minority is a becoming of everybody. On the contrary, majority is linked to a state of domination and power and it always leads to a hegemonic position. Majority is never a becoming: it is an abstract standard that can be said to include no one and to speak for nobody. It is a figure of death. In the process of becoming-minor, the figure of death (nobody) gives way to life (everybody). But in the empirical world, the triumph of life is not granted: the resistance of the majority – a negation of becoming – is strenuous, and this brings about a tragic sadness.

### 3. *The Logic of Variation: Inherent Bilingualism*

A minor language is a major language in the process of becoming minor, and a minority a majority in the process of change. The more a language has or acquires the characteristics of a major form, the more likely it is to be affected by continuous variations that can transpose it into a minor language. The problem is not the distinction between major and minor language, but the one of becoming. A person has to deterritorialize the major language rather than reterritorialize him/herself within an inherited dialect.

According to Guattari and Deleuze's definition, a minor literature does not come from a minor language; rather, it is that which a minority constructs within a major language. Minor does not designate specific literatures, but the revolutionary conditions for every literature within the heart of what is called «great», or established literature. It is the literature of a minority that makes use of a major language, a literature which deterritorializes that language and interconnects meanings of the most disparate levels, inseparably mixing and implicating poetic, psychological, social and political issues with each other (Deleuze–Guattari 1986, 16). Minoritarian authors are those who are foreigners in their own tongue: in this case Kuṇāl Siṃh – being originally from Bengal – is using a major language as an outsider. This puts him in a position of minority subjectivity, which allows oblique perspectives and off-centered views. Minority identity is not a fixed identity, it is in constant negotiation and adjustment with the mainstream identity. It empathizes with other minority subjectivities by evoking multiple affiliations over and above the supranational. Kuṇāl Siṃh's minority identity can also be seen as a reterritorialized subjectivity repenting its new complicity with dominant culture and seeking to articulate, in compensation, other marginalized positions.

The continuous negotiation, codification and modification between major and minor language creates specific linguistic ways for the occurrence of territorialization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization. In *Romiyo Jūliyaṭ aur aṃdherā* we can trace features of the tetralinguistic model used by Deleuze and Guattari. Bhojpurī (for Manoj and Rāmdahin), and an Assamese idiom (for Anubhā) function as the «maternal» vernacular language, that is a language having a territorial function on a closed community; this, according to Deleuze and Guattari, tends to be a rural phenomenon, or rural in its origins, and its spatiotemporal reference is «here». A vehicular language, identified as urban, is «everywhere», being the expression of the state or international that breaks the communion of the inward-looking community as power is exercised from the outside in the determination of events in the village. It has a function of «first deterritorialization» in respect to the previous function, but at the same time causes a reterritorialization in the economic and/or political sense, as a language of commercial exchange, bureaucratic transmission, etcetera; this is Assamese for Anubhā, Hindi for Manoj and Anubhā. «Over there» there is a referential language, the language of meaning and of culture, which can again possess a deterritorializing function in relation to other functions, but at the same time can have a «cultural reterritorialization»: standard Hindi has this function for Manoj, who works as a teacher in a school. Finally, Anubhā is shown performing traditional Assamese songs and dances in a context that is described by Deleuze and Guattari as «beyond»: this is the level of mythic language, a «verbal magic» which allows the values of the community to be recovered, usually in relation to a larger social unit with whom people con-

sider themselves tied in the sacred rather than in the secular. This scheme allows a multiple use of language without inscribing it in a binary scheme – major/minor, hegemonic/subaltern, language of power/language of the people, high/low – and, in general, without superimposing these usages on the different linguistic systems.

Bilingualism, as it continuously slides from one language to another, in an uninterrupted reference to the other language, keeps the monolithism of one-only language at a distance: notwithstanding its etymology, it creates intervals, interstices, not binary divisions. Being bilingual means to impose the heterogeneity of variation on one's own language, to withdraw the elements of power and majority, and to take out the elements of minor use, i.e. what happens in the middle (*au milieu*), that is the only relevant thing (Bene–Deleuze 2006, 73). Here the «middle» does not mean being *in* one's own time, *of* one's own time, or being historical: on the contrary, the most different times communicate through it. A «minor» author – without future, without past – has a becoming, a middle, through which s/he communicates with other times, other spaces.

Bilingualism or multilingualism seems to be a necessary condition for any minor literature. Guattari and Deleuze trace the linguistically complex picture of Prague, where German, Czech, and Yiddish coexisted and marked different layers of belonging. Minor literature means being bilingual/multilingual, but in one and the same language, without dialects or jargons: it is the experience of being an immigrant in one's own country, like Kafka's great swimmer (Deleuze–Guattari 1986, 26). In a passage of *Romiyo Jūliyat aur aṁdherā* we are shown Manoj and Anubhā after their wedding who visit her family's house in disguise, since they only convey the notion that they «like each other». The mutual incomprehensibility – or complete linguistic difference – between Manoj and his (unaware of her being) mother-in-law reiterates their reciprocal distance and symmetry, but also their similarity. The character of Anubhā, the only bilingual person among them, is crucial in order to create a circulation of meaning among them.

At home there was only Anubhā's mother. She looked older than mine. I don't know why I looked at Anubhā after seeing her. Maybe I wanted to see how Anubhā would look when she was old. I thought with pleasure that I would still love her then. Anubhā was talking to her mother, perhaps about me indeed. What they both said was beyond my comprehension. I sat on one side and looked at them. I was wondering about how to address Anubhā's mother. I was alert and conscious about the relationship between Anubhā's mother and me.

“What are you thinking, Manu?”

“I was thinking that it's good that your mother does not know Hindi and I don't know Assamese”.

“So what? I'm here with you...”.

“Well, at least I escaped the problem of telling her that I am somewhat in love with her daughter”.

“Great, so now you are ashamed even of acknowledging it?”.

“No, no, *bhāī*, my problem is not in acknowledging it, but in telling it. Especially to your ma”.

“Why, why not to ma? ... Ok, if she knew Hindi or you knew Assamese, wouldn't you tell her?”.

“What would I say? I love your daughter?... And all this knowing that no matter how much I love you I could never love you as much as she does!”.

Anubhā burst into laughter. She said that I need not tell her anything. She had told her mother that we both liked each other. I thought it was very strange: after knowing all this, what would Anubhā's mother think about me? This boy – talking in a broken language, foolish like tourists who cannot speak two words and to whom one cannot say two words... – he loves her daughter. I somehow remember that after getting to know this she became less loquacious, or who knows, maybe she had been like that from the very beginning. Anubhā was trying to fill the empty spaces created in the limited language ability of her mother adding extra playfulness to her conversation and gestures – or maybe, who knows, in her house with her people it had always been like that... Anubhā's mother was in conversation with Anubhā and whenever she would look at me she suddenly would shut up. In response Anubhā would listen quietly to her mother's words and on looking at me she would suddenly start talking. It was as if Anubhā's mother and I were like sitting in two separate rooms and Anubhā were standing on the door in between. Anubhā would convey to me the words her mother was saying in the other room peeling off the sour crust and making them soft for me and in answer she transmitted to her mother what I said sifting any fur of hesitation attached to it and making it nice and clear. It seemed to me that ma and I – we were both extremely lucky as we got the pain and grief of only one language. Poor Anubhā had to sew together the rags of both languages. (Siṃh 2008, 139-141)

Anubhā jumps from one language to another, experiencing the «pain and grief» of both, which can be a way of saying that each language can have a major or minor usage. Anubhā's bilingualism allows her to identify the elements of power or of majority in language and gestures, in the representation and in what is represented: she takes out anything that is an element of power, she identifies the elements of the minor usage, and she stitches together «the rags of both languages». In the process, dialogue is actually suppressed, as dialogue transmits the elements of power to the word and circulates them (Bene-Deleuze 2006, 95). This situation must be very clear to Kuṇāl Siṃh himself, who is bilingual. He writes in Hindi trying to impose the heterogeneity of variation to this language, which he chose as his own language. The minorization process in this Hindi minor literature implies internal heterogeneity, the weakening of grammar rules in favor of optional rules,

dynamic norms that are not dissociable from geo-political migrations, a correlative neutralization of meaning that makes this language indefinite, non-translatable – or better, as translatable as reality itself, and finally a wideness of expression that summons the reader to emotional forces – desiring intensities, in Deleuze’s words, trying to reveal true reality. There is a dimension that allows the problem of bilingualism to be solved, namely the dimension of variations inherent to the language, which cannot be reduced to structural invariants of grammaticality nor to free and non-pertinent variations, which are always in a relation of co-variation to some non-discursive pragmatic variables. This dimension suggests the idea of an «immanent bilingualism», that is the realization of an internal heterogeneity in one and the same language, which does not pass through a situation of externality of two linguistic systems. The character of Manoj is an example of this sort of bilingualism: he too tries to impose the heterogeneity of variation on his language, to extract from it the minor usage, to put aside elements of power and majority. Therefore, his language is always unclear, his speech is often murmuring, which does not mean it has a feeble intensity, but it is rather a stuttering sound with a non-definite pitch, in a formula which is as approximate as the bilingual one. He imposes a line of variation to his language, which he can speak fluently and clearly, that makes him a stranger in his own language, an immanent bilingualism due to his «being alien» (Bene–Deleuze 2006, 98).

#### 4. Conclusion

I have analyzed Kuṇāl Siṃh’s short novel/ long story *Romiyo Jūliyaṭ aur aṃdherā* through Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of minor literature, as an example of deterritorialization of language. Introducing itself as a counter-narrative, the story unfolds through an intertwining of identity politics and romance plot that produces narrative irresolution and compromised identification both with the male and the female protagonist. Hindi, a pan-Indian major language, is used by an outsider writer – Kuṇāl Siṃh who is originally from Bengal – and by characters positioned as minority subjectivities in order to create a minor literature, which deterritorializes language and interconnects meanings of the most disparate levels, inseparably mixing and implicating poetic, psychological, social and political issues with each other. This allows oblique perspectives and off-centred views, which are also emphasized by the construction of the main characters as «nomadic» identities, insofar as they do not belong anywhere and belong everywhere (Braidotti 1994; Braidotti 2002).



## References

- Bene–Deleuze 2006 = Carmelo Bene, Gilles Deleuze, *Sovrapposizioni*, Quodlibet, Macerata 2006.
- Braidotti 1994 = Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects. Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*, Columbia University Press, New York 1994.
- Braidotti 2002 = Rosi Braidotti, *Nuovi soggetti nomadi*, Sossella, Roma 2002.
- Deleuze–Guattari 1986 = Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, *What is a Minor Literature?*, in Idd., *Kafka. Toward a Minor Literature*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis–London 1986, 16-27.
- Otčenášek 1960 = Jan Otčenášek, *Romeo, Giulietta e le tenebre*, a c. di Ela Ripellino, Nuova Accademia, Milano 1960.
- Otčenášek 2010 = Yān Otčenášek, *Romiyo Jūliyaṭ aur aṁdherā*, Vāṇī Prakāśan, Nayī Dillī 2010.
- Siṁh 2008 = Kuṇāl Siṁh, *Romiyo Jūliyaṭ aur aṁdherā*, in Id., *Sanātan bābū kā dāmpatya*, Bhārtiya Jñānpīṭh, Dillī 2008, 90-160.
- Weiner 1997 = Myron Weiner, *Minority Identities*, in Sudipta Kaviraj (ed.), *Politics in India*, OUP, New Delhi 1997, 241-253.