

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

Ana Beliajeva

Study programme “English and another foreign language (Norwegian)”

**STYLISTIC EXPRESSION OF OTHERING VIA PRONOUNS IN ZADIE SMITH’S
*WHITE TEETH***

BACHELOR THESIS

Academic Supervisor – ✓ Andrius Ledas

Vilnius
2021

ASSESSMENT SHEET

Academic Supervisor's evaluation:

Reviewer's evaluation:

Final Mark for the Thesis:

(Date of Paper evaluation)

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
1.1. Othering	6
1.2. Othering techniques	11
1.3. Othering via pronouns	14
III. METHODOLOGY	18
IV. EMPIRICAL RESEARCH DATA ANALYSIS	21
1.1. Book summary	21
1.2. Sample analysis	23
1.3. General tendencies	33
V. CONCLUSIONS	36
VI. REFERENCES	38
VII. SUMMARY	41
VIII. APPENDICES	43

I. INTRODUCTION

Othering is a widely known concept that is related to the division between two or more people described. There are many criteria that allow humanity to be divided into two groups. Generally, one group's characteristics and identities are valued, empowered and glorified. Characteristics and identities of the second group are devalued, dishonoured and discriminated. This division can be found in every field possible, starting from the politics and ending with the stylistics. However, each field needs an analysis in order to identify possible othering and its ways.

Many scholars (e.g. Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik, 1985; Pennebaker, 2011; Van Dijk, 1984) have analysed stylistic expressions of othering. However, the concept of "the Self" and "the Other" is complex and multifaceted. There is a lot of ways to analyse such concept in the stylistics. Coupland (1999, p. 9) discusses five general discursive manifestations of othering: homogenization (stereotyping), pejoration, suppression and silencing, displaying "liberalism" and subverting tolerance. Steinitz (2015, p.7) presents the way of construing otherness through use of tropes. Semino (2008, p. 31) explains how metaphors shape the otherness in the text. Riggins (1997, p.8) have analysed how pronouns reflect *othering* in the text. I found it fascinating how one pronoun can construe and show othering. Thus, **the subject** of the research is the stylistic expression of othering via pronouns.

In order to conduct such research, types of pronouns and their features must be perceived. According to Riggins (1997, p. 8), pronouns can be *inclusive* and *exclusive*. Narrator can unite himself with a group of people being described; or, on the contrary, create a distance between them. In other words, one pronoun can reveal narrator's outlook on the person or group of people, even if outlook is not openly expressed in the speech. Usage of *inclusive* pronouns shows narrator's positive point of view towards described object/person. However, usage of *exclusive* pronouns creates a distance and manifests narrator's negativity towards described object/person. This can be influenced by many factors, such as different ethnicity, race, religion or beliefs.

To understand factors for othering, context and characters should be analysed. It is important to know whether characters are from different countries, have different religions or were grown and brought up with different teachings. It is also important to know author's work background. Zadie Smith (born 1975) is known for her interest in race, religion and cultural identity. Her works are based on the postcolonial theme and reflect social, cultural and historical trauma. Zadie Smith in her works try to show how people of different cultural and religious background struggle with finding a peace and understanding for each other. She shows the need for people to understand postcolonial history and forms of oppression and how characters in her book deal with the postcolonial suffering and trauma. Knowing this information, it becomes clear that characters in the book feel versatile emotions towards each other and the concept of the othering should appear.

Due to the fact, that othering should appear in Zadie Smith's *White Teeth* and othering can be analysed through the pronouns, **the aim** of the research is to analyse whether othering in Zadie Smith's *White Teeth* can be seen via pronouns.

The aim was achieved through following **objectives**:

1. To collect samples from the book;
2. To present the background of the samples;
3. To distinguish *exclusive/inclusive* pronouns that describe person or a group of people
4. To identify whether othering can be seen through the pronouns
5. To discover the conflicts faced by the characters;

Such analysis was chosen due to lack of similar researches in the Lithuanian and English languages. Due to the fact that stylistics is an important field of linguistics and othering via pronouns is narrowly analysed, this stylistic analysis of author's book has a great value for linguistic students. To add, similar analyses (e.g. Riggins, 1997) date back to 2000's and are outdated. Therefore, such analysis of stylistic expressions is needed in order to update and complement already existing information.

My **hypothesis** is that othering will be seen through the pronouns and most cases will be based on cultural othering, since the characters of the book have different cultural backgrounds (Western vs. non-Western).

The paper consists of four parts, including introduction, theoretical framework, methodology, empirical analysis, which are followed by conclusions, a summary and a reference list. The first part consists of literature review, including the general characteristics of othering, overview of othering techniques and a deeper analysis of theory on the othering via pronouns. The methodology is provided after the theoretical part alongside with the empirical results collected from the novel written by Zadie Smith called *White Teeth*. Finally, the results of the research will be concluded at the end of the paper.

The following section will provide an overview of the key concepts and theoretical framework, upon which the current study is based.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1. Othering

It can be said that language is arranged around differences. When we characterize something, we are at least implicitly characterising it in terms of what it is not. For example, the Cambridge Dictionary defines “dark” as “with little or no light”. Thus, the term *dark* is defined as not what it is, but what it is not. Al-Saidi (2014, p. 96) says that in the mid of 20th century, two major European academic thinkers, Claude Levi Strauss and Roland Barthes, came up with the insight that “the way we understand certain words is based not on a meaning that they directly carry, but much more on our understanding of the difference between the word and its 'opposite' or, as they called it “binary opposite”” (p. 96). They understood that words act only as symbols for society's beliefs and construed the idea that the meaning of words, therefore, was “a relationship rather than a fixed thing: a relationship between opposing ideas” (p.96). In other words, oppositions that can help us understand the idea are the youth/age binary, the masculinity/femininity, the good/evil binary, and so on. There have been many debates among language theorists over whether language reflects divisions or creates them, but we can definitely say that language is built around the very idea of difference. This becomes even more clear when thinking about human relations. For instance, all languages have different ways in which they distinguish “them” and “us”. By using these pronouns we can “underline the distinction between the groups” (Hadley, 2013, p1.). To consider the pronoun “us”, it places the speaker within a group with a shared identity. On the contrary, “them” is used to refer to group of people at a distance. According to Hadley (2013, p. 1), “in their denotation, their meaning, the words “us” and “them” contain no indication of power structures or perceptions of these groups. In other words, these words do not carry a negative meaning on their own. However, negative meaning is applied through different aspects.

The power of words does not just derive from their definitions, but also from the connotations that they acquire through usage” (Hadley, 2013, p.1). The words we use can implement negative connotation on the discussed subject and *other* it. An example can be a Tweet

written by President Trump (2019) “go back and help fix the totally broken and crime infested places from which they came”. On the one hand, a phrasal verb “to go back” does not have a pejorative meaning. However, it can be understood that you are not welcome here. In this context, it means the same as “you are not allowed here” and specifically, “no immigrants allowed”. This is an example of how phrasal verb that does not carry a negative meaning on its own, can acquire a negative connotation on discussed subject and to *other* person or particular group described (in this case, immigrants).

To continue, othering can be applied to a particular group of people of different identities. Wolfreys analyses postmodern literature and culture which explores dramatic shift in conceptions and attitudes towards race. As Wolfreys emphasises, othering is “the distinction that one makes between one’s self and others, particularly in terms of sexual, ethnic and relational senses of difference” (2006, p. 74). In other words, othering is an instrument for the distinction of people of different regions, religions, genders and beliefs. This phenomenon has deep historical roots and is mostly analysed in the field of post-colonial literature and culture studies, which focuses on the effects of colonialism on cultures and societies. It analyses how European nations controlled the “Third World” cultures and how those cultures responded to it. According to Al-Saidi (2014, p. 96), “postcolonial theory, as a term can be traced to 1950s. However, it "became part of critical toolbox only in the 1970s, and many practitioners credit Edward Said's book *Orientalism* as being the founding work”. This brings us to another term called “postcolonial literature”.

As Quayson (2020, p.1) explains, postcolonialism involves topics such as “slavery, migration, suppression and resistance, difference, race, gender”. All of the mentioned topics revolve around the alienation or suppression of a particular group of people, according to their nationality, race, gender and etc. Which means, that othering is an important concept in the field of postcolonial literature as it plays a big role in shaping attitudes and outlooks towards groups of individuals. Postcolonial literature represents a long-time process and change of the politics, including expansions of countries, colonialism, feminist, gay, lesbian and ethnic movements that date back to 1970s and 1980s, enslavement and migration (Quayson, 2020, p.1). Harrison, whom also analysed African literature, says that postcolonial literature tries to counteract alienation by restoring a connection between othered people

through “description, narration, and dramatization (2012, p.1). To take this into consideration, several characteristics of the postcolonial literature can be described. According to Harrison, postcolonial writers use detailed descriptions of indigenous people, places, and practices “to counteract or “resist” the stereotypes, inaccuracies, and generalizations which the colonizers circulated in educational, legal, political, and social texts and settings” (2012, p. 1). In other words, they try to disprove the information and eliminate various stereotypes that were used against *othered* people. The second characteristic, is an appropriation of the coloniser’s language. In India, for example, there are many languages that exist alongside English. The authors of the postcolonial literature will choose to write in the colonizers’ “language”, rather than in the English language. However, Harrison (2012, p.1) mentions, that some authors choose to write in English, but “reflect the rhythms and syntax of indigenous languages” and invent new words or even styles to demonstrate mastery of a language that was forced upon indigenous people. Third characteristic is a reworking of colonial art-forms. Some authors rework European art-forms such as the novel to reflect indigenous modes of invention and creation. Authors reshape imported colonial art-forms in order to “incorporate the style, structure, and themes of indigenous modes of creative expression, such as oral poetry and dramatic performances” (Harrison, 2012, p.2). As we can see, authors tend to base their works on the history of colonized people instead of colonizers. Many techniques are used by the authors of the postcolonial literature to create meaning. Some authors use magical realism, absurd and black humour in order to resist a usual sense of logic. Fragmentation is a common approach in both narrative and with characters, this creates an effect that people are not developed or whole. Multiple, mock and parodic endings are often used in order to confuse the reader where is the ending of the story. Parody, allusions and pastiche are added, so “that part of the humour depends on your “getting” it (Harrison, 2012, p.2). Different techniques are used by different authors of the postcolonial literature. However, Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) is considered to be crucial in the shaping of postcolonial studies.

As Said (1978, p.1) says othering almost dates back to a “European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experience”. In his works, Said analyses Europe’s greatest and oldest colonies,

“the source of civilizations and languages, its cultural contestant, and one of its deepest and most recurring images of the Other.” (p.1). This leads us to a concept of Orientalism which is used to describe the West’s (i.e. Occident) outlook towards the East (i.e. Orient). The Oriental was almost the whole Asian continent which was created by many nations of different cultures. Name “Oriental” was given to them in order to other them from the Western people (the Europe), since the Western colonizers were convinced that they are superior to other races. Orientalists were spreading falsified information and reinforcing the subjugation towards the Orient and quickly this false understanding grew into politics and economics. As Said (1978, p. 7) emphasizes that “it is hegemony, or rather the result of cultural hegemony at work, that gives Orientalism the durability and the strength”. Great power and dominance was acquired over the Orient. Coming back to hegemony discussed by Said, Coupland (1999, p.12) also discusses homogenization (stereotyping) as one of the five discursive manifestations of othering. Therefore, it only confirms that Orientalism is all about othering as mentioned in Said’s work. Orientalism is still alive and consequences of it are felt to this day. Grouping people into Arab, Oriental or Jew helped Westerners to understand Eastern part of the world. However, since Occident mixed up a lot of different nations into one, much of the diversity within individuals was lost. Even to these days, the East, “Muslims” or “Islamic culture” is seen as threat to the West.

To continue on post-colonial literature, Al-Saidi (2014, p. 96) says that by the mid-1980s the term post-colonial and post-colonialism appeared in scholarly journals as subtexts in the book written by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin's: (*The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. 2002). In this book, Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, (2002, p.3) describe the concept of otherness "as divided into mutually excluding opposites: if the Self is ordered, rational, masculine, good, then the Other is chaotic, irrational, feminine, and evil". In other words, they are a total opposite to each other. Al-Saidi (2014, p. 96) continues, that by the mid-1990s, both terms established themselves in academic and popular discourse. This concept was mentioned in several linguistic works. Bhabha (1994, p. 55) adds to Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin’s concept that “the paradoxical nature and ambivalent nature of the colonizer\colonized relationship has been a focus for post-colonial theory”. Similarly, in the field of the literature, this relationship between Us

and Them (colonizer\colonized and etc.) is a key concept in post-colonial novels. Similarly to Bhabha and Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, Kehinde (2006, p. 108) believes, that post-colonial novels are written to present the "unequal relations of power based on binary opposition: "Us" and "them", "First World" and "third world", "White" and "black", "Colonizer" and "colonized", "Self" and "other", "Powerful" and "powerless", "Torturer" and "tortured", "Master" and "slave", "Civilized" and "savage", "Superior" and "inferior", "Human" and "subhuman". All of them are grounded on the One being superior and the Other being inferior. In other words, the aim of colonization is to impose ones culture\language\meaning onto the Other.

Post-colonial literature was also influenced by Karl Marx's approach to theory, latter known as Marxism that deals with class relations and social conflicts. As Kucuk (2016, p. 1) states, "Marxist philosophy, which is believed to have declared its defeat since the end of the Cold War and is now regarded only as a "form of interpretation", has managed to produce a more stirring literature on the otherness than its competitors." Marxism tries to track down "the other" by the concept of alienation. According to Swingewood (1998, p. 88), who analysed Marx's approach, Marx has identified the "four main characteristics of alienation (the secondary meaning of the otherization we assign here) as follows: alienation of a man from the nature, from himself, from "species-essence" (Gattungswesen, a term derived from Feuerbach) and from others". There are several types of alienation and one even can separate itself from itself, so "it becomes objective to itself" (Hegel, 2004, p.418). Of course, some missing points were found in Marx's theory, but according to Kucuk (2016, p. 16) in a world where all of us are the other of one another on any subject (as Marx's theory explains), the problematic of the other is very complex.

Despite advances in postcolonial theory, othering is still prevalent in intercultural settings. As Dionne and Turkmen (2020, p. 1) say, as the global pandemic of Covid19 emerged, people started discriminating and judging people of Asian identity and call the outbreak a "Chinese virus". There were even records of committing violence against people because of their perceived identity. "Social scientists refer to these acts of targeting marginalized groups as "othering." (2020, p.2). As mentioned earlier, othering is a practice that takes place when one group of people (often majority) treats another group of people (often a marginalized

group) unequally, as if there is something wrong with them. Another example is a racial othering. Movement called “Black Lives Matter” was founded in 2013 in response to the acquittal of Trayvon Martin’s murderer. This movement was created in order to eradicate white supremacy and build power to intercede in violence inflicted on Black communities. There are many records of hate crimes towards people of colour. According to Hepp, Ross, Dominguez and Parham (2018, p. 1), since 1995 black Americans have been the victims of 66% of all racially motivated hate crimes. These are only a couple examples of all of the othering cases recorded to this day.

To conclude, our perception of world is based on the “binary opposites” Al-Saidi (2014, p. 96). We mostly understand things by knowing what they are not, rather than what they are. Talking about postcolonial literature, there are certain rules and patterns for how speech should be construed (according to Harrison, 2012, p. 2). There were many factors that influenced the postcolonial literature and one of them is Karl Marx’s approach to theory (Kucuk, 2015, p. 1). I agree with Hadley’s (2013, p. 1) explanation that “in their denotation, their meaning, the words “us” and “them” contain no indication of power structures or perceptions of these groups. In other words, these words do not carry a negative meaning on their own. Negative meaning is applied by people and mostly it is based on historical and cultural differences. As Said (1978, p. 1) says, othering almost dates back to a “European invention” and as Dionne and Turkmen (2020, p. 1) add, othering is still prevalent and common to this day.

1.2. Othering techniques

Othering can be analysed through different stylistic approaches and tools. Coupland (1999, p. 9) discusses five general discursive manifestations of othering: homogenization (stereotyping), pejoration (typically represented by various terms of verbal abuse, racial slurs, etc.), suppression and silencing (e.g., omission, selective representation), displaying “liberalism” (e.g., hedging racist remarks by claiming nonprejudicial intent), and subverting tolerance (e.g., ridiculing “political correctness,” humorous, parodic mockery of minorities).

Talking about pejoration, Trask (1996, p. 43) emphasizes that a word becomes pejorative when it acquires an insulting or disapproving meaning other than its original one. Generally, it has something to do with the speaker's evaluation of something as being wrong or bad. For example, the English word *moron* was used as a medical term denoting mental illness. However, it is used today derogatively to insult one another. Pejoration can be expressed via whole text, not only through several words, e.g. pamphlets, propaganda articles, etc. (Fritz, 2008, p. 109). We can find many pejorative texts that contain pejorative items, e.g. texts used in cybermobbing (Marx, 2013, p. 104). All in all, pejorative words or texts can be used to present people of other cultures, races, genders and ethnicities in a negative connotation. In other words, to *other* them.

Another way for othering is a *linguistic stereotyping*. *Linguistic stereotyping* is an attributing traits, characteristics and/or behaviours to a person on the virtue of shared and overgeneralized beliefs regarding the social groups she/he belongs to (Puddifoot, 2019, p. 71). This seems to be as a tool to categorize, simplify and process the complex world that surrounds us (Rakic, Steffens, Mummendey, 2011, p. 17). By stereotyping we use to denote behaviour and have an idea about what a particular group of type of person is like and it makes it aims in grouping people. However, according to Rakic, Steffens and Mummendey, (2011, p. 17) stereotyping leads to unmotivated definitions which further lead to social prejudice, discrimination and structural injustices. To continue, there are two types of stereotyping according to Kang and Rubin (2009, p. 441). First type is called *reversed linguistic stereotyping* (Deutschmann and Steinvall, 2020, p.1), i.e. how “attributions of a speaker's group membership trigger distorted evaluations of that person's speech”. In other words, stereotyping tends to affect language perception and according to Deutschmann and Steinvall (2020, p.1) it appears that it “leads us to notice behaviours that confirm our preconceived expectations and ignore behaviours that do not.”. Therefore, language and stereotypes influence hearer's perception and judgement. Second type is called *linguistic stereotyping* and it deals with the language output, with the accent, to be precise. In order to analyse stereotyping, pronouns have to be taken into consideration. According to Kennison and Trofe (2003, p. 3) the personal pronouns *he* and *she* are “gender-specific”. Recent research suggests that comprehending the pronouns *he* and *she* may be influenced by the

gender stereotype associated with the “antecedent” of the pronoun (Trofe, 2003, p. 4). In other words, language users store the representation for each word and its stereotype in their head. This leads one to evaluate different genders, professions, races and religions according to previously constructed stereotype.

Another way of construing *otherness* is a use of tropes. Steinitz (2015, p.7) in his analysis of metaphors, troping and counter-troping in Holocaust victim language describes tropes as a tool that is used for “-not only describing, but also shaping the reality of its users”. Trope “*Kapo*” was used among the prisoners to denote prisoners that the Germans designated to head a work force. Word “*Kapo*” originates from the Italian word for *head*. Steinitz (2015, p. 31) explains that in Nazi language metaphors and tropes related to human body were reserved only for Germans). The initial Nazi intention was to use an inmate to perform tasks such as keep order in lines, barracks, the tasks that the Nazis would typically do. Calling these inmates “Kapos” is very ironic since the prisoners assigned as “Kapos” were destined to the same fate of death as all the prisoners, even though they were doing tasks more related to Nazis, not other inmates. By its appropriation, it enabled victims to create a kind of logical order to their world that would otherwise be missing (Friedlander 1980, p. 111). The victims are creating order in a world that lacked order as they knew it. Friedlander (1980, p.111) explains that the Nazi intention of assigning Kapos among the other prisoners was to “manipulate these inmates into believing that they would be spared life”, when in reality, they simply would be killed last. This is a great example of how trope can shape the reality of its users, in this case the reality of victims. By shaping one’s reality and beliefs, it is easy to influence one’s outlook on the world and particular phenomena. In other words, it is easy to unite or alienate groups of people.

Othering can also be represented through metaphors. As Semino (2008) puts it, “the main set of functions of metaphors in discourse relates to the representation of (particular aspects of) reality” (p. 31). This gives metaphor a significant role in construing reality and even “shaping our world-views” (Semino, 2008, p. 10). As already mentioned before, such formation of the outlook can influence one’s attitude towards particular aspects. Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) aims to analyse roles metaphor plays in different discourses. It can be said that CMA “demonstrates the importance of metaphorical patterns in the

vocabulary and grammar of English for representing and shaping ideological and social practices” (Goatly, 2007, p. 2). Metaphor is one of these strategies used for describing other countries, cultures, people, conduct etc. As Fairclough (2001, p.100) writes, “different metaphors have different ideological attachments”. In other words, each metaphor carries a meaning and can make an influence. To conclude, there are different stylistic devices that can create a sense of the *otherness* and each of them creates an interesting pattern of the text. To conclude, othering can be shaped via different tools. Coupland (1999, p. 9) discusses five general discursive manifestations of othering: homogenization (stereotyping), pejoration, suppression and silencing, displaying “liberalism” and subverting tolerance. Trask (1996, p. 43) explains pejoration in more details. Puddifoot (2019, p. 71) describes *linguistic stereotyping* as a way of othering. Steinitz (2015, p.7) emphasizes that othering can be created via tropes. Semino (2008) explains one more stylistic way for othering and it is usage of metaphors. Analysis shows a great variety of stylistic tools that can be used for othering.

1.3. Othering via pronouns

Othering can be represented via pronouns. The terms *inclusive* and *exclusive* pronouns have been used in linguistics for a very long time. In linguistic terms, “expressions that are most revealing of the boundaries separating Self and Other are *inclusive* and *exclusive* pronouns and possessives such as *we* and *they*, *us* and *them*, and *ours* and *theirs*” (Riggins, 1997, p. 8). By using these structures, writers can create rhetorical perspectives and distance between one group or another. In a comprehensive review of English grammar, Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1985, p. 108) explained the classification of personal pronouns as: 1st person pronouns: *I, me, my, mine, myself, we, us, our, ours, ourselves*, in which the referents include the author of the message; 2nd person pronouns: *you, your, yours, yourself, yourselves*, in which the referents include the addressee, but not the author; and 3rd person pronouns: *he, him, his, himself, she, her, hers, herself, it, its, itself, they, them, their, theirs, themselves*, in which the referents exclude both the author and addressees. To illustrate the *inclusive* and *exclusive* functions of pronouns Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1985, p. 339) applied the symbols: *s* (speaker, the originator(s) of the message), *h* (hearer, the

addressee(s) of the message), and *o* (other, any other referent(s) excluded from the definition of *s* and *h*) along with + and – indicators to show the presence or absence of an agent. Term *inclusive* “we” refers to the speaker, hearers (you) and others (S+H+O) and *exclusive* is used when “hearer/s” are not involved (S-H+O). As an example, in the English language, both *inclusive* and *exclusive* plural pronouns are translated as “we”. The personal pronoun “we” is normally not used to refer to something in the text; rather, its referents are decided by the role of a speaker and hearer depending on the context and they are interpreted by reference to the situation (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 64). Similar to English, there is no clear distinction between *inclusive* and *exclusive* personal pronouns in European languages. However, Hawaiian, Mauritian, some Australian and aboriginal languages have this distinction (Cysouw, 2002, p. 13). This means that the use of pronouns can be ambiguous and confusing, since the English language does not have a clear distinction between *inclusive/exclusive* pronouns. However, to whom and how the speech is constructed can still denote a speaker’s attitude and opinion towards the phenomenon or the other person/group of people.

In addition to linguistic function, pronouns can tell more about the authors’ “personalities, thinking style, emotional state, and connections with other people” (Pennebaker, 2011, p. 16). When we understand authors’ preferences, it is easier to understand whether authors’ detach anything from themselves and make it seem like *other*. When analysing different speeches, Pennebaker (2011, p. 93) emphasizes that the usual sex differences arise— women use far more pronouns (especially I-words), auxiliary verbs, and cognitive words, whereas men use more articles and nouns. But there are large differences even within the men’s and women’s descriptions. For almost every function and emotion word category, each person has a unique pattern of word use. Pennebaker (2011, p. 20) analyses Lady Gaga’s speech and where she conveys that she is a bit wild but also thoughtful and, judging by her use of pronouns, somewhat prone to depression. Also, she tends to be highly personal in the ways she communicates – she is self-reflective in her use of words such as *I* and *me*. Because of these different patterns and usage of pronouns we can analyse insights into speakers’ worlds. We can analyse speakers’ outlooks and judgement towards different topic. The ways we use pronouns in our word patterns may be different, but in the end they help to communicate

ideas, emotions and experiences. As the result, *othering* can be examined through usage of the pronouns and their patterns.

To add, all pronouns have implied meaning and if they are used to describe large group of people, it is believed that the speaker tries to judge or evaluate them. Sykes (1985, p.100) says that “any discourse that treats large numbers of people as though they were homogenous, and hence denies normal social variety” often functions to create judgments and social distance from the group being described. This means that different pronouns can point out *othering* towards a particular group of people. This can be examined through analysis of Us vs. Them. Let’s consider an example: “Is starvation *our* problem? It is true that *they* are unlucky, but it is not *my* fault”. We can see an opposition between *our* and *my* and on the other hand *they*. According to Van Dijk (1984, p. 125) such pronouns are labelled as “demonstratives of distance” since their major function is to establish a difference and distance in the groups being described. In the given example, writers or speakers distance themselves from the starving people through the linguistic pronominalizations. As a result, starving people are *othered* from other groups of people.

Duszak (2002, p.6) points out that:

Both *we* and *they* can be skilfully managed in discourse in order to construct, redistribute or change the social values of ingroupness and outgroupness. *We* in particular opens up a number of referential and pragmatic options (esp. the inclusive—exclusive distinction) and enjoys a strong cultural salience across languages and contexts.

This means that *inclusive/exclusive* distinction can form and change opinions towards particular group of people described. This is a powerful tool of the discourse that is able to manipulate social values and attitude. In written language, authors can create a bond with their readers by using inclusive pronoun *we*. Valle (1996, p. 70) finds that S. J. Gould (American palaeontologist, evolutionary biologist, and historian of science) only uses *we* inclusively in his nonspecialist texts. Valle believes that use of inclusive *we* in Gould’s writings functions as “one of several high involvement discourse strategies he uses that contributes to the public popularity of his works” (1996, p. 72). On the contrary, Kuo (1999, p.132-33) in his analysis of corpus of scientific texts shows that the most common function of inclusive *we* is to “presuppose shared background knowledge and beliefs” when sharing

information with expert readers. Both Valle (1996) and Kuo's (1999) studies of the use of inclusive *we* have demonstrated that such pronouns have a general rhetorical function in English academic and popular academic writing—they encourage the reader to sustain interest and belief in the integrity of the text and given arguments, just the same as the belief in the author her/himself. This grounds that the use of *exclusive/inclusive* pronouns is a technique used for either bonding or dissociating the author from his audience. By using this tool author can influence the reader and affect their beliefs.

To conclude, many scholars have analysed othering via pronouns. Riggins (1997, p. 8) explains that “expressions that are most revealing of the boundaries separating Self and Other are *inclusive* and *exclusive* pronouns and possessives such as *we* and *they*, *us* and *them*, and *ours* and *theirs*”. Van Dijk (1984, p. 125) presents term “demonstratives of distance”. Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1985, p. 339) illustrated *inclusive* and *exclusive* functions of pronouns by adding *s*, *h* and *o* symbols. There is no clear distinction between *inclusive* and *exclusive* personal pronouns in the English language (Cysouw, 2002, p. 13). However, these pronouns show speakers attitude towards described object/person. Pennebaker (2011, p. 16) adds that pronouns can tell us about the authors’ “personalities, thinking style, emotional state, and connections with other people”. Different pronouns and their patterns can be used in order to influence others by shaping their outlooks and opinions.

III. METHODOLOGY

After the literature analysis, several analytical frameworks on othering via pronouns can be described. According to Riggins (1997, p. 8) Self and Other can be analysed through the usage of *inclusive* and *exclusive* pronouns and possessives such as *we* and *they*, *us* and *them*, and *ours* and *theirs*, since these pronouns demonstrate rhetorical perspectives and distance between one group or another. Repetitive manipulation of these pronouns creates a division between described individuals or groups of people. By applying this framework we can understand whether a particular object/subject is being *othered*.

Very similar yet more complex framework is described by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1985, p. 108). According to them, *inclusive* and *exclusive* pronouns can be analysed through a SHO structure. SHO structure is explained by *s* (speaker, the originator(s) of the message), *h* (hearer, the addressee(s) of the message), and *o* (other, any other referent(s) excluded from the definition of *s* and *h*) along with + and – indicators to show the presence or absence of an agent. Such classification is based on the personal pronouns as: 1st person pronouns: *I, me, my, mine, myself, we, us, our, ours, ourselves*, in which the referents include the author of the message; 2nd person pronouns: *you, your, yours, yourself, yourselves*, in which the referents include the addressee, but not the author; and 3rd person pronouns: *he, him, his, himself, she, her hers, herself, it, its, itself, they, them, their, theirs, themselves*, in which the referents exclude both the author and addressees. As we can see, to whom and how the speech is constructed denotes a speaker's attitude and opinion towards the phenomenon or the other person/group of people and shows whether it is *othered*.

Continuing on the different frameworks, Van Dijk (1984, p. 125) analyses pronouns that are labelled as “demonstratives of distance” since their major function is to establish a difference and distance in the groups being described. This framework is based on the analysis of the oppositions, such as *we* and *they*, or *our* and *theirs*, since such pronouns are used to establish a contrast/separation in the groups being described.

Last framework presented in the theoretical part is based on the different patterns and usage of pronouns presented by Pennebaker (2011). She explains that pronouns can tell more about

the authors' "personalities, thinking style, emotional state, and connections with other people" (p. 11). By analysing different individuals speeches and usage of pronouns we can analyse speakers ideas, emotions and outlooks on different topics or towards particular groups of people.

Taking all of the frameworks into consideration, I decided to apply Riggins (1997) framework which is based on the usage of *inclusive* and *exclusive* pronouns and possessives such as *we* and *they*, *us* and *them*, and *ours* and *theirs*. I have chosen this framework because it is commonly applied in stylistic analyses by many other scholars such as Valle, Duszak and Kuo. Besides that, many of Riggins' analyses are based on the discourses of self and other, stereotypes and self-presentation. Therefore, I believe that his framework is the most suitable for my analysis, as the aforementioned themes are a significant part of the narrative in the book.

Talking about the samples, I decided to choose them from the whole book, since book consists of different characters' life periods. This way, we can see if characters' outlooks change in the course of the book and whether different situations influence them. I have noticed, that characters tend to use pronouns more often in the dialogues than in the monologues. Therefore, I will be analysing dialogues between the characters and will try to discover whether characters tend to openly *other* particular individuals or groups of people. I will be analysing the short paragraphs with the dialogues from approximately every 10th page of the book. Hence, I will have approximately 50 samples for a thorough analysis. My samples will contain pronouns that describe a person or a group of people.

I will only analyse samples that show *othering*. When analysing them, I will try to find whether the characters tend to *other* particular groups of people and if it can be see via pronouns. If they tend to do that, I will analyse what *othering* is based on (religion, ethnicity or other reason). I will be using Pandey's (2004) chart that contains different types of othering and their explanations. Pandey's chart has five categories (cultural othering, cognitive othering, migrational othering, visible othering and religious othering). I added one more category that will include samples that have no othering (according to the chart) in them. Cultural othering is related to the division between the stranger and the native; cognitive othering is related to the othering between persons with high and low cognitive

abilities; migrational othering is related to the division between the migrant and the non-migrant; visible othering is related to the othering based on visual appearance (e.g. the coloured and the non-coloured; the disabled and the non-disabled and etc.); religious othering is related to the othering based on religion (religiously different and the religiously non-different). I have chosen this chart because it is related to the subjects presented in the book and reflects on the most sensitive topics.

When doing sample analysis, I will be describing the context of the sample. Context will contain description of the situation and the characters. It will be described what conflicts characters face and what are they related to (according to the chart).

In the end of the analysis, I will discuss the trends of othering; what topics Zadie Smith uses to reveal and highlight othering; and what topics are the most sensitive for the characters of the book.

To conclude, I will analyse whether othering can be seen via pronouns, which topic is most related to an increased use of othering pronouns and what are the general tendencies of othering. General tendencies will include explanation on reasons for othering. I will explain general characteristics of each main character and analyse how they influence the usage of *othering* pronouns in their speech. It will be seen how different life experiences correlate with the pronoun pattern.

IV. EMPIRICAL RESEARCH DATA ANALYSIS

1.1. Book summary

White Teeth is a 2000 novel written by Zadie Smith. Novel's timespan is from 1975 to 2000; however, sometimes even reaches 1907 and beyond. Action mostly takes place in the London. This book revolves around events in the family lives of two friends (Samad and Archibald). Story begins on New Year's day in 1975, when one of the main characters of the book (Archibald Jones) attempts to commit a suicide. He was stopped by the butcher from a nearby butcher shop and was given another chance at life. Archie joins an End of the World party where he meets his future Jamaican wife Clara Bowden. Clara Bowden was raised in a very religious household (her mother Hortense Bowden is a Jehovah's Witness) and wanted to leave her family as soon as possible. Therefore, she accepts Archibald's proposal even if he is twice her age.

Samad and Archibald met during World War II. They served together, grew friendship and from that day they never separated. They love spending time at O'Connell's pub where they meet to discuss the newest events. Samad is a married Bangladeshi man that works at an Indian restaurant. His wife Alsana becomes pregnant with twins, Magid and Millat and Clara becomes pregnant with a daughter, Irie. Time passes by, and their children, Irie, Magid and Millat start to attend the same elementary school. Samad is very controlling of his sons' and attends every school meeting. During one meeting, Samad becomes attracted to the music teacher Poppy Burt-Jones and has an affair with her. It continues until the day Magid and Millat catch father with her. Samad decides that he needs to be more responsible and raise his children to be good Muslim men. Therefore, he kidnaps one of his sons (Magid) and sends him to his relatives in Bangladesh. As a result, Millat becomes troubled and rebellious.

Millat meets Joshua Chalfen (school's "nerd") and smokes weed with him. As a punishment for smoking weed, Raid Committee forces Millat to study at Joshua's house twice a week. Joshua's mother becomes very interested in Millat because of his "exotic" identity and appearance and wants to spend with him as much time as possible. Irie meets

Joshua's father, Marcus Chalfen, and becomes interested in his genetic project called FutureMouse. Marcus Chalfen changes mouse's DNA in order to develop certain cancers at planned times. Meanwhile, Joshua joins FATE (*Fighting Animal Torture and Exploitation*) organisation in order to protest the FutureMouse project. Similarly, Millat joins a radical Islamic organisation called KEVIN (*Keepers of the Eternal and Victorious Islamic Nation*) which also fights against the FutureMouse project.

FutureMouse conference takes place at the Perret Institute. Joshua and Millat with their groups are waiting to take an action. Samad recognizes the founder of the Perret institute (Dr. Perret). He is the Nazi who was captured by Samad during WWII. At the same time, Millat is preparing to shoot Dr. Perret and Archie jumps in order to cover him. He was shot in the thigh and as he falls he trips over the mouse's cage and mouse escapes. In the end, the narrator presents what happened next. Magid and Millat serve community service for Millat's crime. O'Connell's pub was finally opened to women. Irie and Joshua become a couple and travel to Jamaica.

1.2. Sample analysis

Pandey (2004): Types of othering

DPOs	Implicit contrasts between groups	Count
Cultural othering	The stranger and the native	4
Cognitive othering	Persons with high and low cognitive abilities	1
Migrational othering	The migrant and the non-migrant	0
Visible othering	The coloured and the non-coloured The disabled and the non-disabled	1
Religious othering	The religiously different and the religiously non-different	1
None		5

Sample Nr. 5

In this sample, Archibald and his wife Clara are having an argument over Clara's clothes and a coat-stand. Clara is a toothless black woman that immigrated to England from Jamaica. From Jehovah's witness she became Archie's wife, even though her mother Hortense was against it because of Archie's skin colour. Clara does not love Archie, but she decided to marry him in her young age of 19 in order to leave her parents' house. Three months after their marriage, they move into a new house. Conversation from the sample occurred when they were fighting about a furniture and clothes. However, they were actually fighting over Archie's indecisiveness. Clara shows her dissatisfaction towards Archie, since he is never able to make a decision and tries to avoid a direct answer. In this sample, several inclusive pronouns "we" and exclusive pronouns "them" were used. However, exclusive pronouns "them" are referring to the object (in this case clothes and coat-stand) and do not indicate

othering. Evaluating from the context, Clara is showing negative emotions towards Archie. However, no indications of othering were found.

Sample Nr. 7

In this sample, Archibald (Archie) and his Company Director Mr. Hero are having a conversation about Archie and Clara. He begins to say that he is not a racist; however, Archie and Clara make people uncomfortable. Hero gives Archie fifty pounds worth of vouchers for food and tells that he does not need to come to a work dinner. Archie did not understand the idea of this conversation and felt pleased with the vouchers. I have underlined only pronouns that describe individual or group of people. Hero begins the dialogue by telling Archie that he is not “racialist”. He proceeds by using a lot of exclusive pronouns in order to describe other employees in a negative way. In this part of the sample “men don't like it 'cos they don't like to think they're wanting a bit of the other when they're sitting down to a company dinner with their lady wives <...>“ he sets himself apart from the other employees, since he does not want Archie to think that he feels uncomfortable around Clara too. This creates an effect of division between Hero and other people in the company. Hero does not mention that Clara is Jamaican or black; however, he mentions her physical appearance “let's face it, she's a sort, a real beauty incredible legs, Archie, I'd like to congratulate you on them legs”. Interestingly, Hero tries to hide his negative outlook towards Clara by complimenting her and saying that it is other people that feel uncomfortable around her. He tries to exalt himself to look good and places guilt on others by using exclusive pronouns “they” and “their”. In this case, Hero uses a classical Us vs. Them method by dividing him from others and make himself look better. At the same time, it means that he cares what Archie thinks about him, since if he did not, he would not create such a division. This is an example of the othering according to beliefs (racialist vs. non-racialist).

Sample Nr. 9

In this sample, 2 characters Samad and Archibald have a conversation during the military regiment in tiny Bulgarian village (World War II). They appear to be in a specialist

division and are travelling by tank and serving in different countries, building bridges and making pathways for battles. Archibald is an English-heritage Christian with an unremarkable personality. In other words, *the everyman*. Samad is a Bangladeshi Muslim dark-skinned man that tries to accommodate in the England. He came to the Europe to fight for the English army. He believes that this way he will Indianize the army and show them that they are good fighters and need to be respected, meanwhile others find it ridiculous. On one day, something in the tank explodes and Archibald with Samad are the last man standing. They start to spend a lot of time together and build a friendly relationship. They become even more close when Samad tells Archie the story about his great-grandfather who was the first to shot the bullet in the Indian Mutiny. He explains that his great-grandfather was a hero. However, he was not accredited for his achievement by the English army. Therefore, Samad is disappointed and has a negative outlook towards English. As Samad says “Naturally, you will get these petty English academics trying to discredit him, because they cannot bear to give an Indian his due”. Pronoun “these” is not included into Riggins’ framework; however, it describes a group of people and acquires pejorative meaning towards English academics. Since Samad uses a lot of exclusive pronouns “they while talking about English people, I make an assumption that he is *othering* and has a negative outlook towards them. This example of othering has a cultural background (Indian vs. English).

Sample Nr. 10

In this sample, Archie and Samad are having a conversation about the death. They are still in the Bulgarian village and Samad is acting very strangely due to the morphine (he was addicted to morphine back in the 1945). Samad asks Archie what would he do in the hours before his death. Archie says that he “slap the salami” (in other words, masturbate). Samad is horrified by Archie’s answer and shows a disguise. He continues by saying that “**They** weren't slapping their salamis spreading the white stuff-they were looking for something a little more permanent.”. Pronoun “they” refers to the dissenters who were unwilling to pay a burial tax during cholera epidemic and they were locked in the church by a corrupt landlord and left to die. What I find to be strange, is that Samad feels a kinship with dead

dissenters; however, he uses exclusive pronouns to describe them. Furthermore, he feels respect towards them and does not try to describe them negatively. In one of the samples, Samad was using inclusive “we” in order to diminish group of people he belongs to and in this case he uses exclusive “they” in order to empower the particular group that he does not belong to. It is not common to classic Us vs. Them method, when you try to empower group you belong to and diminish the group you do not belong to. This means that he does not feel good in his environment and tries to find another group of people that he could equate himself to. He tries to divide himself from the group of people that surrounds him and idealize other people. Samad says that they are “creatures of consequence” and that their children will be born of their actions. He believes that the future is influenced by the past. This is the reason why Samad was so disgusted by Archie’s answer about “slapping the salami”. However, we will later see that Samad will acquire a desire to masturbate, even though this act is forbidden by Allah. This sample is an example of cognitive othering, since Samad believes that you have to live your life with the knowledge and dissenters would not just “slap their salami”, but search for something more permanent. He tried to show that Archie’s answer was foolish and other people would be more smart in the hours before their death.

Sample Nr. 11

In this sample Samad and Archie are awakened by Russians soldiers. War has been over for two weeks. Samad feels enraged, since he thought that he will do something memorable and bold and will gain respect for the Bangladesh. However, he has not accomplished anything in the war. Later that day, they speak to one of Russian soldiers that stopped in Bulgaria to catch a Nazi named Dr. Marc-Pierre Perret (also known as Doctor Sick). Samad believes that catching Dr. Sick will allow him to live up to the heroic wartime legacy of Mangal Pande and continue traditions of the past. Samad uses a lot of inclusive pronouns “we”. He uses this pronoun to refer to Samad and Archibald. However, instead of empowering them and making appear better than others, he makes them look worthless, e.g. “**We** have been playing silly buggers in this war, you and I.” and “And **we** have done nothing”. I have noticed a tendency with Samad and it is that he uses inclusive pronouns to

make a group of people he belongs to appear worse and exclusive pronouns to make another group of people described appear better. Of course, it correlates with the fact that Samad feels like he have not achieved anything in the war and tries to convince Archie that they must capture Dr. Sick since he is their opportunity to appear as heroes. We can envisage othering between them (Samad and Archie) and war heroes. However, Samad does not try to other them. On the contrary, he tries to equate to them but does not feel good enough. After several sample analysis, we can see that Archibald does not tend to other another group of people, he always stays neutral. However, Samad always feels the need to create a division, even if he does not feel better than others. From the pronoun analysis we can see that Samad always compares himself to others and tries to group people.

Sample Nr. 13

This dialogue occurs between Samad and an elderly Alim in the mosque of Croydon. Samad finds his marriage very unsatisfying sexually and asks a scholar of Islamic law whether a man is allowed to masturbate. Alim explains that it is against Islam teachings to have an intercourse with oneself. Samad tries to defend himself by saying that “to the pure all things are pure” and masturbation cannot harm anybody. Alim continues by saying that “And we know who they are. Allah have pity on the Anglicans!” and uses one inclusive “we” and exclusive “they” pronouns. By saying “we” he refers to the Muslims and by “they” he refers to the Anglicans. This creates a division between two religions that have different practices and principles. From exclusive “we” we can see that Alim refers to the Anglicans negatively, as if their teachings are wrong and they should follow teachings of Allah. This is a great example of religious othering, where two different religions are opposed and one of them is seen as a right one and the other one is underestimated. This part of the sample shows strong othering and we can see how it can be created only through usage of we vs. them pronouns. To continue, Samad in this dialogue does not use exclusive neither inclusive pronouns and I believe that it is related to his confusion between sexuality and faith. Samad is struggling between Western vices and his own Muslim heritage. On the one hand, he is living in a country with Western society, different religion and feels

temptation for masturbation and drinking. On the other hand, he wants to stay truthful to Allah, not betray principles of Islamic religion and pass the heritage and teachings to his sons. He does not create a division between different cultures or religions by using pronouns, since he is not sure himself who he wants to be and what teachings he wants to follow. From the context we can see how difficult and confusing it is for the immigrants to exist comfortably in England. Especially, if they are from the subjugated groups.

Sample Nr. 17

Sample consists of Samad's dialogue with the "Mad Mary". Mad Mary is a crazy raging street lady that everyone tries to avoid. Samad tells Poppy (his sons' music teacher and the woman Samad has an affair with) that she should not look at her, since Mary is dangerous and does not like white people. Mad Mary starts screaming at them and surprisingly, Samad reacts very calmly and tries to pacify her. He uses a lot of inclusive pronouns "we" while talking to her, despite she is not his friend or related to him in any way. However, this repetitive usage of pronouns "we" and "us" indicates that Samad is feeling a relation or similarity with her. From the context I understood that they look at each other with recognition. Samad sees her as a fellow traveller that cannot find inner peace. He similarly to Mary feels disoriented and off-track, since he is a Muslim immigrant that tries to understand his place in Christian Western society (e.g. "**We** are divided people, aren't **we**"). Correspondingly Mary is lost in the society as he is. The main difference that occurs between them in this dialogue, is that Mary appears screaming and raging; however, Samad understands that the only way to be accepted in the white society is to stay calm. By using inclusive pronouns "we" Samad tries to make Mary feel accepted and understood. He does not make a division between them, but rather make them feel as one, because he knows how difficult it is to be rejected and split by others. He could have applied cognitive othering, but rather he chose to unite them. This is a very interesting pattern of his usage of pronouns and for that reason I decided to expand on this sample. Samad uses pronouns according to situation, rather than his consistent beliefs compared to the other characters of the book.

Sample Nr. 18

In this sample Samad and Archibald meet in O'Connell's. O'Connell's bar is a place where Samad and Archie meet for the past 10 years. This place makes them feel comfortable, because nothing there changes. It preserves traditions and keeps the secrets. It is a place where different religions, ethnicities, cultures and opinions meet. Samad has called Archie to confess his affair with Poppy. Samad explains that his sons have seen him while he was on a date with Poppy. Samad does not know how can he teach his sons anything about being good when he himself is having an affair and secretly masturbating. Later Samad starts talking about "rebellion" in his sons and that they do not respect traditions. He uses a lot of exclusive pronouns "they" to separate them from himself and make them appear bad. He blames them for not going to mosque, not praying, dressing extravagantly, having intercourse. Samad believes that tradition is something that should be respected and followed. Of course, this leads to emotional separation between Samad and his sons. However, what I find interesting is that Samad himself does not follow traditions and acts not according to teachings of Allah. Instead of changing his point of view and accepting that his children want to adapt in the Western society, he blames them for changes that they have gone through. Samad uses exclusive pronouns that create a distance between him and his sons and demonstrate how dishonourable his sons act. Interestingly, he tries to separate himself from the group of people he belongs to. He either closes his eyes to his sins and truly believes that he is better than his sons or he does not want to believe that he is same or even worse than they are. However, from his usage of pronouns is clear that he does not want to associate with them and believes that they are a shame of the family.

Sample Nr. 35

Millat begins to tell Shiva about his ex-girlfriend Karina with who Millat broke up about two weeks ago. Millat saw a problem with his girlfriend's way of dressing up (it was too revealing) and her choice of a song "Sexual Healing" at the pub karaoke (sex is a private thing and should not be for everybody). Shiva gets mad and says that he does not want to hear anything about Western women. He believes that women in the West are like men and has desires and urges as men do. He continues on saying that they dress inappropriately.

Shiva uses exclusive pronoun of distance “they” to refer to Western women in order to disclose them in a negative light. He follows practices of Islam where women are expected to be obedient, abstaining from desires for other men and modest. Therefore, his pattern of the pronouns can be understood. He feels hatred toward Western women and tries to disparage them. According to the context, this is an example of cultural othering (Western women vs. Eastern women). Of course, it is possible to interpret this situation as a visible othering, since Shiva begins by saying “Don't talk to me about white women”, which is considered to be othering based on the skin color; however, later he mentions that “It's got to the point in the West where the women are men!” by emphasizing different regions and cultures. Shiva’s outlook is very similar to Samad’s. They both struggle with adapting to the new culture and tend to reject it rather than get used to the changes. However Samad’s character is rather complex and likely to change in comparison to Shiva. Shiva’s opinion does not change and he openly shares it.

Sample Nr. 41

In this sample Samad is having a conversation with his wife Alsana. Alsana is not happy about Joyce Chalfen spending so much time with her son Millat. Alsana believes that Millat does not spend as much time with the family as he used to because Chalfens have involved him with something that is not related to their culture and beliefs. Joyce is fascinated by Millat because he is from a different culture and she believes that he needs to be “saved” from himself and his traumatic upbringing. Alsana is mad and does not want Joyce to communicate with her sons because of her negative influence. She believes that Joyce should spent time with her own four children, not Millat or Magid. Alsana continues by saying “Why does she not go and for a change mess **them** up? She has boys, four boys? How many boys does she want? How bloody many?”. She refers to Joyce’s children as “them”; however, from what she says, negative outlook is not directed towards Joyce’s children but rather towards Joyce. From the usage of exclusive pronoun “them” we cannot see her othering directed to Joyce. However, in the second part of the dialogue, she uses exclusive “they” to refer to men. Alsana was disappointed that Samad does not contribute to her efforts to estrange Joyce from her family. She shows her anger by saying “This is

what the men do. **They** make the mess, the century ends, and **they** leave the women to clear up the shit.”. From her words we can interpret that the reason for Magid and Millat distancing the family is Samad’s relationship with them. Since they were not understood by their own father, they found a shelter somewhere else and now it is Alsana who is supposed to fix this. This is an example of gender othering; however, in Pandey’s (2004) chart of othering this type is not found.

Sample Nr. 47

This is an excerpt from the dialogue between Abdul-Colin and Millat. They are members of the KEVIN group. KEVIN stands for Keepers of the Eternal and Victorious Islamic Nation and it is a radical Islamic organization. They fight against the FutureMouse project because they believe that Marcus (founder of FutureMouse) is playing God by experimenting with animal’s DNA. Since KEVIN group acts according to Islamic beliefs and Qur’an, they find the whole project horrifying. KEVIN members meet in Trafalgar Square to discuss their plan on stopping FutureMouse project. Abdul-Colin says that the English build their statues “with their backs to their culture and their eyes on the time”. “Eyes on the time” symbolises Big Ben. This comment reflects on the England’s colonial past and the history of the British Empire. The real idea behind the “future” is England’s desire to “develop” non-Western countries. England wanted to separate non-Western countries from their traditions and push them into the “future” by equalizing them with Western countries. This dialogue reflects to contemporary problems in postcolonial countries and it is an important topic in Zadie Smith’s works. Coming to analysis of the pronouns, Abdul-Colin uses a lot of exclusive pronouns “they” when referring to the English. It shows a negative outlook and grudge towards them. He mocks them by saying that “Charles II Street and South Africa House and a lot of stupid-looking stone men on stone horses.”. He undermines England’s cultural and historical heritage by seeing them as colonizers. This pronoun pattern is rather predictable since Abdul-Colin is a member of Islamic organization. According to usage of his pronouns he does not try to empower non-Western countries; however, he is trying to diminish England. It shows that Abdul-Colin is sincere with his beliefs and does not have internal conflicts. His character is flat and

stereotypical, just as his pronoun pattern. Discussed sample shows cultural othering (Western vs. non-Western countries).

Sample Nr. 48

This is an excerpt from the dialogue between Irie and her family. They had a discussion about the changes in bus tickets, since now tickets include more information about the trip (this way the same ticket cannot be used twice). Everyone had a different opinion and shortly discussion turned into a mess. Irie gets really mad and asks everyone to hush. She is tired hearing about who she is or who should be and all about her historical and ethnical “roots”. She is tired of being told to be religious and hearing stories about Samad’s great-grandfather and her only wish is to be “normal” like other. She refers to other families by using pronoun “they”. She idolizes other families by portraying them as unaffected by problems, having no secrets, not making mistakes and supporting their children. Exclusive “they” creates a distance between her and other children of “happy families”. Interestingly, she does not use pronouns “they”, “them” and “their” to undervalue group of people that is being described. On the contrary, she admires them. My explanation is that she uses pronouns this way because she is jealous of them and her distance from others occurs because of her jealousy and confusion. Through the whole book Irie tries to analyse her heritage, past and who is she. Irie has come to an impasse in her life and questions why she and her family are the way they are. This pronoun pattern is unique because exclusive pronouns are used to admire group of people described, rather than to despise it. It shows Irie’s self-doubt and disappointment in her family. She wants to match other families rather than embrace her own even if it has flaws. I decided to analyse this sample in order to show how exclusive pronouns of distance can praise rather than criticize others.

1.3.General tendencies

After sample analysis, several tendencies and characters' features were noticed. The majority of the characters are not prone to *othering*. They rather tend to use *inclusive* than *exclusive* pronouns, which shows that they are not willing to create a distance between them and individual or group of people described. This can either indicate that they feel comfortable in the environment they are in or their opinions are restrained. Talking about Archibald Jones, he is not opinionated and finds it rather difficult to discuss issues. Therefore, I believe that even if he feels negative emotions towards some individuals, he would not openly talk about it. However, Clara Bowden Jones is the opposite of Archibald and in her speech negativity is not found. This indicates that she is not feeling divided from anyone and does not divide anyone herself. Irie (their daughter) finds it difficult to fit herself in Western standards of beauty. A lot of her insecurities are related to the fact that she is mixed-raced and she struggles to accept her identity. She feels like her family and friends do not fit in Western society and it is visible from her speech. When talking about other families, she tends to use exclusive pronoun "they" that creates a distance; however, she does not use pronoun "they" to diminish other families. She uses this pronoun to diminish her own family and this shows that she finds it difficult to accept her family and its historical and cultural heritage. Hortense Bowden is strictly religious Jehovah's Witness. In her speech we can find religious othering. She has a negative outlook towards people that are not religious and it is seen through her usage of exclusive pronoun "they" when she talks about people that do not belong to Jehovah's Witnesses.

Coming to family of Iqbal, Alsana Iqbal is protective of her children and does not appreciate Chalfens' relationship with her sons. She is very opinionated and is not afraid to show it. However, othering via pronouns in collected samples is not seen. Talking about Magid Iqbal, he is absent from family's drama since he was sent to Bangladesh by his father. After eight years in Bangladesh, Magid leaves his identity and "becomes" English. He wants to become a lawyer, abandons religion and invests himself in science. It is hard for him to decide who is he and where he belongs. Millat's behaviour, however, is the opposite of Magid. He drinks, smokes, has intercourses with a lot of women and is a part of

many crowds. What unifies Magid and Millat is an identity problem. Millat struggles with his identity and joins KEVIN group. His father wanted him to be a good Muslim; however, he chooses the most radical version of Islam. From his speech and usage of pronouns we can see his negative outlook towards non-Muslim Western people. Cultural difference is one of the sorest issues of the book. From my point of view, the most versatile character in the book is Samad Miah Iqbal. He struggles with his Bangladeshi heritage and place in Western society the most. On the one hand, he wants to be a believing Muslim man and follow Allah's teachings. He goes so far with it that he even sends his own son to Bangladesh to "protect" him from Western society. From his speech we see othering towards non-Muslim and white people. He uses a lot of exclusive pronouns "we" when presenting English people and aspects related to their society and religion (e.g. he wants more Muslim celebrations to be added to his sons' school). On the other hand, he is also adapting to a Western culture and does things that are not allowed to Muslim man (e.g. he has an affair with his children's white teacher Poppy, he masturbates and drinks alcohol). He struggles with his identity and does not know how to raise his children if he is not even sure who he is himself. Each of the characters has a different viewpoint on what they face in a daily life; however, there are several aspects for othering that repeat.

The most repetitive aspect for othering is related to the culture. Since the book revolves around people of different cultures, some misunderstandings or arguments between Western and non-Western characters appear. Second aspect for othering is a religious othering (Muslim vs. non-Muslim). Christian teachings are different from teachings of Islam, therefore, Muslim characters of the book tend to other Christians and empower Muslims. One more othering that appears in the book is a visible othering. It is related to physical appearance and to be more precise it is related to the colour of skin (white vs. brown). Least example of othering is related to cognitive othering; however, it does not reveal main book's issues.

After analysis, I have noticed several pronoun patterns. Pronoun usage mostly increases when characters deal with cultural othering. They tend to use exclusive pronoun "they" more often. This shows that the cultural othering is the most sensitive topic for them. Decreasing, although still high number of pronouns is noticed when characters deal with

the religious othering. Othering is also seen via increased usage of exclusive pronoun “they”. The lowest number of the pronouns is noticed when characters deal with the visible othering. In all cases, othering is mostly visible when characters use exclusive pronoun “they”. However, I have noticed that some situations involve othering that is not seen through the usage of pronouns. I assume that pronouns serve only as an auxiliary measure for othering rather than the primary one.

V. CONCLUSIONS

I have conducted a research on the stylistic expressions of othering via pronouns in Zadie Smith's *White Teeth*. The subject of the present paper is the stylistic expression of othering via pronouns. The purpose was to collect samples from the book, analyse the usage of *exclusive/inclusive* pronouns, present background of the samples and discover the conflicts faced by the characters. Steps and outcomes are following:

1. To collect samples from the book was the first objective of the present research paper. My goal was to analyse dialogues from approximately every 10th page of the book. I have chosen this method in order to have an adequate number of samples (in total 50) and to be unbiased.
2. The second objective was to present the background of the samples. In sample analysis I delivered a characters' description and explained the context. Since samples are collected from the whole book, various characters' life stages were analysed. Sample background was presented in order to understand the reasons for othering.
3. The third objective was to distinguish *exclusive/inclusive* pronouns that describe person or a group of people. I have underlined *exclusive/inclusive* pronouns in the chosen samples. It was decided to underline only *exclusive/inclusive* pronouns that describe person or a group of people, since othering is related to process whereby a person or group of people attribute negative characteristics to other person or group of people.
4. To identify whether othering can be seen through the pronouns was the fourth objective. After analysing samples and presenting their background it was discovered that othering can be seen through pronouns. Different patterns of pronouns' usage show characters' outlook on a described person or group of people. It can be determined whether character is creating a distance between himself and a person or group of people described or unifies himself with a person or group of people described. It was noticed that exclusive pronoun "they" creates a distance and shows a negative outlook and inclusive "we" shows a positive outlook and empowers a

person or group of people described. Pronoun usage mostly increases when characters deal with cultural othering. They tend to use exclusive pronoun “they” more often. Decreasing, although still high number of pronouns is noticed when characters deal with the religious othering. The lowest number of the exclusive pronouns is noticed when characters deal with the visible othering. In all cases, othering is mostly visible when characters use exclusive pronoun “they”. However, I have noticed that some situations involve othering that is not seen through the usage of pronouns. I assume that pronouns serve only as an auxiliary measure for othering rather than the primary one.

5. The fifth and the final objective was to discover the conflicts faced by the characters. It was discovered that the most frequently arising conflicts are related to difference in cultural backgrounds. Non-Western characters tend to other Western characters because of their cultural differences. Another reason for conflicts is related to religion. Conflicts arise between Muslim and non-Muslim people because of differences in Christian and Islam teachings. Third reason for conflicts is based on differences in visual appearance. Brown people tend to other white people. Last conflict noticed was based on cognitive differences; however, it does not reveal the main book’s issues.

VI. REFERENCES

1. A.van Dijk, T. (2021). Politics, Ideology and Discourse. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
2. Al-Saidi, A. (2014). *Post-colonialism Literature the Concept of self and the other in Coetzee's Waiting for the Barbarians: An Analytical Approach*. Academypublication.com. Retrieved 8 May 2021, from <https://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/jltr/vol05/01/12.pdf>.
3. Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
4. Byington, L., Brown, B., & Capps, A. (2018). *Black Americans still are victims of hate crimes more than any other group – Center for Public Integrity*. Center for Public Integrity. Retrieved 8 May 2021, from <https://publicintegrity.org/politics/black-americans-still-are-victims-of-hate-crimes-more-than-any-other-group/>.
5. Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). Dark. In *Cambridge dictionary*. Retrieved April 8, 2021 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/dark>
6. Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.
7. Cysouw, Michael. (2002). ‘We’ rules: The impact of an inclusive/exclusive opposition on the paradigmatic structure of person marking. In Horst Simon & Heike Wiese (eds.) *Pronouns: Grammar and Representation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
8. Dione, K., & Turkmen, F. (2020). *The Politics of Pandemic Othering: Putting COVID-19 in Global and Historical Context*. <https://www.cambridge.org>. Retrieved 8 May 2021, from <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-organization/article/politics-of-pandemic-othering-putting-covid19-in-global-and-historical-context/5435248FC7AEF1468E4A8946FA57A92A>.
9. Duszak, A. (2002). *Us and Others: An introduction*. John Benjamins Publishing Catalog. Retrieved 8 May 2002, from <https://benjamins.com/catalog/pbns.98.01dus>.
10. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. ResearchGate. Retrieved 8 May 2021, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281506450_Critical_Discourse_Analysis.
11. Finkbeiner, R., Meibauer, J., & Wiese, H. (2016). *What is pejoration, and how can it be expressed in language?.* Academia.edu. Retrieved 8 May 2021, from

[https://www.academia.edu/26362594/What is pejoration and how can it be expressed in language.](https://www.academia.edu/26362594/What_is_pejoration_and_how_can_it_be_expressed_in_language)

12. Friedlander, W. (1968). *Introduction to social welfare* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall.
13. Fritz, Gerd (2008): Communication principles for controversies: A historical perspective. In: van Eemeren, Frans H./Garssen, Bart (eds.) (2008): *Controversy and Confrontation: Relating Controversy Analysis with Argumentation Theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 109-124.
14. Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing the brain - metaphor and hidden ideology*. Benjamins.
15. Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (2000). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
16. Hast, S. (2012). *Beyond the Pejorative*. University of Lapland.
17. JAWORSKI, A., & COUPLAND, J. (2005). *Othering in gossip: "you go out you have a laugh and you can pull yeah okay but like..."*. Cardiff University.
18. KÜÇÜK, A. (2016). *"The Other" in the Roots of Marxist Philosophy*. Kırıkkale University.
19. Pandey, A. (2003). *Constructing Otherness: A Linguistic Analysis of the Politics of Representation and Exclusion in Freshmen Writing*. Salisbury University.
20. Pennebaker, J. (2013). *The secret life of pronouns*. Bloomsbury Press.
21. Puddifoot, K. (2019). Stereotyping Patients. *Journal Of Social Philosophy*, 50(1), 69-90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josp.12269>
22. Rakić, T., Steffens, M., & Mummendey, A. (2011). When it matters how you pronounce it: The influence of regional accents on job interview outcome. *British Journal Of Psychology*, 102(4), 868-883. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.2011.02051.x>
23. Rundell, M. (2009). *OTHERING (noun) definition and synonyms | Macmillan Dictionary*. Macmillandictionary.com. Retrieved 16 May 2021, from <https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/othering>.
24. Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge University Press.

25. Steinitz, J. (2015). *What's metaphor got to do with it? To do with it? Troping and counter-troping and counter-troping in troping in Holocaust victim language*. University of Iowa.
26. Swingewood, A. (2000). *Cultural theory and the problem of modernity*. Palgrave.
27. Uzum, B., Yazan, B., & Selvi, A. (2017). *Inclusive and exclusive uses of we in four American textbooks for multicultural teacher education*. The University of Alabama.

VII. SUMMARY

I conducted on stylistic expression of othering via pronouns in Zadie Smith's *White Teeth*. **The subject** of the research is the stylistic expression of othering via pronouns. **The aim** of the research is to analyse whether othering in Zadie Smith's *White Teeth* can be seen via pronouns. The aim was achieved through following **objectives**: (1) to collect samples from the book; (2) to present the background of the samples; (3) to distinguish *exclusive/inclusive* pronouns that describe person or a group of people; (4) to identify whether othering can be seen through the pronouns; (5) to discover the othering-inducing conflicts faced by the characters.

I applied Riggins (1997) framework which is based on the usage of *inclusive* and *exclusive* pronouns and possessives such as *we* and *they*, *us* and *them*, and *ours* and *theirs*. The outcomes are following: (1) I have analysed dialogues from approximately every 10th page of the book; (2) In sample analysis I delivered a characters' description and explained the context; (3) I have underlined *exclusive/inclusive* pronouns in the chosen samples. It was decided to underline only *exclusive/inclusive* pronouns that describe person or a group of people, since othering is related to process whereby a person or group of people attribute negative characteristics to other person or group of people; (4) After analysing samples and presenting their background it was discovered that othering can be seen through pronouns. Pronoun usage mostly increases when characters deal with cultural othering. They tend to use exclusive pronoun "they" more often. Decreasing, although still high number of pronouns is noticed when characters deal with religious othering. The lowest number of the exclusive pronouns is noticed when characters deal with visible othering. In all cases, othering is mostly visible when characters use the exclusive pronoun "they". However, I have noticed that some situations involve othering that is not seen through the usage of pronouns. I assume that pronouns serve only as an auxiliary measure for othering rather than the primary one; (5) It was discovered that the most frequently arising conflicts are related to difference in cultural backgrounds. Another reason for conflicts is related to religion. Third reason for conflicts is based on differences in visual appearance.

Aš atlikau stilistinę kitoniškumo raiškos per įvardžius analizę Zadie Smith knygoje „Balti Dantys“. Tyrimo objektas yra stilistinė kitoniškumo išraiška per įvardžius. Tyrimo tikslas yra išanalizuoti, ar Zadie Smith knygoje „Balti Dantys“ kitoniškumo išraiškos matomos per įvardžius. Darbas buvo atliktas remiantis šiais tikslais: (1) surinkti pavyzdžius iš knygos; (2) pateikti pavyzdžių kontekstą; (3) pabraukti inkliuzyvius/ekskliuzyvius įvardžius, apibūdinančius asmenį ar žmonių grupę; (4) nustatyti, ar per įvardžius galima pamatyti kitoniškumą; (5) aprašyti su kitoniškumu susijusius konfliktus, su kuriais susiduria knygos veikėjai.

Tačiau Riggins (1997) sistemą, kuri remiasi inkliuzyvių/ekskliuzyvių bei savybinių įvardžių, tokių kaip *mes* ir *jie*, *mus* ir *juos*, taip pat *mūsų* ir *jų*, vartojimu. Rezultatai yra šie: (1) išanalizavau dialogus iš maždaug kiekvieno kas dešimto knygos puslapio; (2) Atlikdama pavyzdžių analizę, pateikiau veikėjų aprašymą ir aprašiau kontekstą; (3) Surinktuose pavyzdžiuose pabraukiau inkliuzyvius/ekskliuzyvius įvardžius. Pabraukiau tik tuos inkliuzyvius/ekskliuzyvius įvardžius, kurie apibūdina asmenį ar žmonių grupę; (4) Išanalizavus pavyzdžius ir pateikus jų kontekstą, buvo nustatyta, kad kitoniškumas yra matomas per įvardžius. Įvardžių vartojimas dažniausiai padažnėja, kai veikėjai kalba temomis, susijusiomis su kultūra. Jie dažniausiai naudoja ekskliuzyvų įvardį „jie“. Retesnis, nors vis dar dažnas įvardžių skaičius pastebimas, kai veikėjai kalba religinėmis temomis. Rečiausias ekskliuzyvių įvardžių kiekis pastebimas, kai veikėjai kalba apie kitus veikėjus, kurie skiriasi nuo jų vizualiai (pvz. kitokia odos spalva). Visais atvejais kitoniškumas dažniausiai matomas, kai veikėjai naudoja ekskliuzyvų įvardį „jie“. Tačiau pastebėjau, kad kai kurie kitoniškumo atvejai nepastebimi per įvardžių naudojimą. Darau prielaidą, kad įvardžiai naudojami tik kaip pagalbini, o ne pagrindinė priemonė kitoniškumui išreikšti; (5) Buvo nustatyta, kad dažniausiai kylantys konfliktai yra susiję su kultūrinės padėties skirtumais. Kita konfliktų priežastis yra susijusi su religija. Trečioji konfliktų priežastis grindžiama vizualinės išvaizdos skirtumais.

VIII. APPENDICES

Inclusive – we, us, ours, our

Exclusive – they, their, them, theirs

1.

"He's gassing himself, Abba."

"What?"

Arshad shrugged. "I shouted through the car window and told the guy to move on and he says, "I am gassing myself, leave me alone." Like that."

"No one gasses himself on my property," Mo snapped as he marched downstairs.

"**We** are not licensed."

Once in the street, Mo advanced upon Archie's car, pulled out the towels that were sealing the gap in the driver's window, and pushed it down five inches with brute, bullish force.

"Do you hear that, mister? **We're** not licensed for suicides around here. This place hal al Kosher, understand? If you're going to die round here, my friend, I'm afraid you've got to be thoroughly bled first." (10-11p)

2.

"What's the deal, man?" Merlin blinked in the doorway at the man in corduroy who stood on his doorstep illuminated by winter sunshine.

"Encyclopedias or God?"

Archie noted the kid had an unnerving way of emphasizing certain words by moving his head in a wide circular movement from the right shoulder to the left. Then, when the circle was completed, he would nod several times.

"Cos if it's encyclopedias **we've** got enough, like, information . and if it's God, you've got the wrong house. **We're** in a mellow place, here. Know what I mean?" Merlin concluded, doing the nodding thing and moving to shut the door.

Archie shook his head, smiled and remained where he was.

"Em . . . are you all right?" asked Merlin, hand on the doorknob. "Is there something I can do for you? Are you high on something?"

"I saw your sign," said Archie.(p21-22)

3.

"But what if **we** saved '

"Some people," Hortense asserted with a snort, 'have done such a hoi'

heap of sinning, it late for **dem** to be making eyes at Jehovah. It take effort to be close to Jehovah. It take devotion and dedication.

Blessed are the pure in heart for **they** alone shall see God. Matthew 5:8. Isn't dat right, Darcus?" (p. 31)

4.

"Clara! Come out of de cold."

It was the voice Hortense put on when she had company an over-compensation of all the consonants the voice she used for pastors and white women.

Clara closed the front door behind her, and walked in a kind of terror through the living room, past the framed hologram of Jesus who wept (and then didn't), and into the kitchen.

"Dear Lord, she look like so meting de cat dragged in, hmm?"

"Mmm," said Ryan, who was happily shovelling a plate of ackee and salt fish into his mouth on the other side of the tiny kitchen table.

Clara stuttered, her buck teeth cutting shapes into her bottom lip.

"What are you doing here?"

"Ha!" cried Hortense, almost triumphant. "You tink you can hide your friends from me for ever? De bwoy was cold, I letim in, we been havin'

a nice chat, haven't we young man?"

"Mmm, yes, Mrs. Bowden."

"Well, don' look so shock. You'd tink I was gwan eatim up or so meting eh Ryan?" said Hortense, glowing in a manner Clara had never seen before.

"Yeah, right," smirked Ryan. And together, Ryan Topps and Clara's mother began to laugh. (p. 39)

5.

"Look, Clara, love, just get out of my way and I'll get on with it, OK?"

Clara watched him roll up his sleeves with some determination, and tackle the coffee table once more.

"If you really want to be of some help, love, you can start bringing in some of your clothes. God knows there's enough of 'em to sink a bloody battleship. How we're going to fit them in what little space we have I'm sure I don't know."

"I say before we can trow some dem out, if you tink it best."

"Not up to me now, not up to me, is it? I mean, is it? And what about the coatstand?"

This was the man: never able to make a decision, never able to state a position.

"I alreddy say: if ya nah like it, den send da damn ting back. I bought it 'cos I taut you like it." (p.51)

Inclusive - 3

Exclusive – 3

6.

"Alsana, you look like dog shit," Neena called over in Bengali. "What is that horrible coat?"

"It's none of your business, is what it is," replied Alsana in English.

"I came to collect my husband's shoes, not to chitchat with Niece-of-Shame."

Neena was used to this, and now that Alsana had moved to Willesden there would only be more of it. It used to come in longer sentences, i.e. "You have brought nothing but shame ... or My niece, the shameful.. . but now because

Alsana no longer had the time or energy to summon up the necessary shock each time, it had become abridged to Niece-of-Shame, an all-purpose tag that summed up the general feeling.

"See these soles?" said Neena, moving one of her dyed blonde bangs from her eye, taking Samad's shoes off a shelf and handing Alsana the little blue ticket. "They were so worn through, Auntie Alsi, I had to reconstruct them from the very base. From the base! What does he do in them? Run marathons?" "He works," replied Alsana tersely. "And prays," she added, for she liked to show people her respectability, and besides she was really very traditional, very religious, lacking nothing except the faith. (p.60)

7.

"You see the wives don't like it because, let's face it, she's a sort, a real beauty incredible legs, Archie, I'd like to congratulate you on them legs and the men, well, the men don't like it 'cos **they** don't like to think **they're** wanting a bit of the other when **they're** sitting down to a company dinner with **their** lady wives, especially when she's . . . you know . . . **they** don't know what to make of that at all."

"Who?"

"What?"

"Who are we talking about, Mr. Hero?"

"Look, Archie," said Kelvin, the sweat now flowing freely, distasteful for a man with his amount of chest hair, 'take these." Kelvin pushed a large wad of Luncheon Vouchers across the table. "**They're** left over from that raffle you remember, for the Biafrans."

"Oh no I already won an oven mitt in that, Mr. Hero, there's no need'

"Take them, Archie. There's fifty pounds' worth of vouchers in there, redeemable in over five thousand food outlets nationwide. Take them.

Have a few meals on me."

Archie fingered the vouchers like they were so many fifty pound notes.

Kelvin thought for a moment he saw tears of happiness in his eyes.

"Well, I don't know what to say. There's a place I go to, pretty regular like. If they take these I'm made for life. Ta very much." (p.69)

8.

"You see, Jones," said Samad, 'the real mistake the viceroy made was to give the Sikhs any position of power, you see? Just because they have some limited success with the kaffir in Africa, he says Yes, Mr. Man, with your sweaty fat face and your silly fake English moustache and your pagri balanced like a large shit on the top of your head, you can be an officer, **we** will Indianize the army; go, go and fight in Italy, Rissaldar Major Pugri, Daffadar Pugri, with my grand old English troops! Mistake! And then **they** take me, hero of the 9th North Bengal Mounted Rifles, hero of the Bengal flying corps, and say, "Samad Miah Iqbal,

Samad, **we** are going to confer on you a great honour. You will fight in mainland Europe not starve and drink your own piss in Egypt or Malaya, no you will fight the Hun where you find him." On his very doorstep, Sapper Jones, on his very doorstep. So! I went. Italy, I thought, well, this is where I will show the English army that the Muslim men of Bengal can fight like any Sikh. Better! Stronger! And are the best educated and are those with the good blood, **we** who are truly of Officer Material." (p.83)

9.

I'm a Jones, you see. "Slike a "Smith". **We're** nobody . My father used to say: "**We're** the chaff, boy, **we're** the chaff." Not that I've ever been much bothered, mind. Proud all the same, you know. Good honest English stock. But in your family you had a hero!"

Samad puffed up with pride. "Yes, Archibald, that is exactly the word. Naturally, you will get these petty English academics trying to discredit him, because **they** cannot bear to give an Indian his due. But he was a hero and every act I have undertaken in this war has been in the shadow of his example."

That's true, you know," said Archie thoughtfully. "**They** don't speak well about Indians back home; **they** certainly wouldn't like it if you said an Indian was a hero . . . everybody would look at you a bit funny."

Suddenly Samad grabbed his hand. It was hot, almost fevered, Archie thought. He'd never had another man grab his hand; his first instinct was to move or punch him or something, but then he reconsidered because Indians were emotional, weren't **they**? All that spicy food and that.

"Please. Do me this one, great favour, Jones. If ever you hear anyone, when you are back home if you, if **we**, get back to our respective homes if ever you hear anyone speak of the East," and here his voice plummeted a register, and the tone was full and sad, 'hold your judgement. If you are told "**they** are all this" or "**they** do this"

or "**their** opinions are these", withhold your judgement until all the facts are upon you. Because that land **they** call "India" goes by a thousand names and is populated by millions, and if you think you have found two men the same amongst that multitude, then you are mistaken. (p.94)

10.

"Tell me," inquired Samad, irritated to have been dragged from his pleasant contemplation, 'what great challenge would you undertake in the hours before your death? Unravel Fermat's Theorem, perhaps? Master Aristotelian philosophy?"

"What? Who? No ... I'd you know . . . make love to a lady," said Archie, whose inexperience made him prudish. "You know for the last time."

Samad broke into a laugh. "For the first time, is more likely."

"Oh, go on, I'm serious."

"All right. And if there were no "ladies" in the vicinity?"

"Well, you can always," and here Archie went a pillar-box red, this being his own version of cementing a friendship, 'slap the salami, as the GIs say!"

"Slap," repeated Samad contemptuously, 'the salami . . . and that is it, is it? The last thing you would wish to do before you shuffled off this mortal coil is "slap your salami". Achieve orgasm."

Archie, who came from Brighton, where nobody ever, ever said words like orgasm, began to convulse with hysterical embarrassment.

"Who is funny? Something is funny?" asked Samad, lighting a fag distractedly despite the heat, his mind carried elsewhere by the morphine.

"Nobody," began Archie haltingly, 'nothing."

"Can't you see it, Jones? Can't you see . . ." Samad lay half in, half out of the doorway, his arms stretched up to the ceiling, ' . . . the intention? **They** weren't slapping **their** salamis spreading the white stuff-**they** were looking for something a little more permanent."

"I can't see the difference, frankly," said Archie. "When you're dead, you're dead."

"Oh no, Archibald, no," whispered Samad, melancholic. "You don't believe that. You must live life with the full knowledge that your actions will remain. We are creatures of consequence, Archibald," he said, gesturing to the church walls.

"**They** knew it. My great-grandfather knew it. Some day our children will know. (p.96)

11.

"I want the Doctor," said Samad, refusing to catch the eye of Archibald Jones, who sat open-mouthed and drunk in his chair. "In exchange for the things I have won."

"What on earth for?" said Nikolai, astonished, leaning back in his chair. "What possible use '

"My own reasons. I wish to take him tonight and not to be followed, and for the incident to go unreported."

Nikolai Pesotsky looked at his hands, looked round the table, and then at his hands once more. Then he reached into his pocket and threw Samad the keys.

Once outside, Samad and Archie got into the jeep containing Dr. Sick, who was asleep on the dashboard, started the engine and drove into the blackness.

Thirty miles from the village, Dr. Sick woke up to a hushed argument concerning his imminent future.

"But why?" hissed Archie.

"Because, from my point of view, the very problem is that **we** need blood on our hands, you see? As an atonement. Do you not see, Jones? **We** have been playing silly buggers in this war, you and I. There is a great evil that we have failed to fight and now it is too late. Except **we** have him, this opportunity. Let me ask you: why was this war fought?"

"Don't talk nonsense," blustered Archie, in lieu of an answer.

"So that in the future we may be free. The question was always: What kind of a world do you want your children to grow up in? And we have done nothing. We are at a moral crossroads." (p.112)

12.

"Mr. Iqbal, we have been through the matter of religious festivals quite thoroughly in the autumn review. As I am sure you are aware, the school already recognizes a great variety of religious and secular events: amongst them, Christmas, Ramadan, Chinese New Year, Diwali, Yom Kippur, Hanukkah, the birthday of Haile Selassie, and the death of Martin Luther King. The Harvest Festival is part of the school's ongoing commitment to religious diversity, Mr. Iqbal."

"I see. And are there many pagans, Mrs. Owens, at Manor School?"

"Pagan I'm afraid I don't under "

"It is very simple. The Christian calendar has thirty-seven religious events. Thirty-seven. The Muslim calendar has nine. Only nine. And they are squeezed out by this incredible rash of Christian festivals.

Now my motion is simple. If we removed all the pagan festivals from the Christian calendar, there would be an average of Samad paused to look at his clipboard 'of twenty days freed up in which the children could celebrate Lailat ul-Qadr in December, Eid-ul-Fitr in January and Eid-ul-Adha in April, for example. And the first festival that must go, in my opinion, is this Harvest Festival business." (p.121)

13.

"And what, Alim," Samad had inquired, dismayed, 'if he is not fasting?"

The old scholar looked grave. "Ibn 'Umar was asked about it and is reported to have answered: it is nothing except the rubbing of the male member until its water comes out. It is only a nerve that one kneads."

Samad had taken heart at this, but the Alim continued. "However, he answered in another report: it has been forbidden that one should have intercourse with oneself."

"But which is the correct belief? Is it hal al or hara am There are some who say ..." Samad had begun sheepishly, "To the pure all things are pure. If one is truthful and firm in oneself, it can harm nobody else, nor offend .. ."

But the Alim laughed at this. "And we know who they are. Allah have pity on the Anglicans! Samad, when the male organ of a man stands erect, two thirds of his intellect go away," said the Alim, shaking his head. "And one third of his religion. There is an hadith of the Prophet Muhammad peace be upon Him! it is as follows: O Allah, I seek refuge in you from the evil of my hearing, of my sight, of my tongue, of my heart, and of my private parts." (p. 130)

14.

"Where in hell's name are they?"

"Hell's bells!"

"Millat!"

"You swore," said Millat, taking lap fourteen and getting a five-oh-oh bonus for causing the combustion of Yellow Car. "You always do. So does Mister Jones."

"Well, we have special swearing licences."

Headless Millat needed no face to express his outrage. "NO

SUCH THING AS-

"OK, OK, OK," back-pedalled Samad, knowing there is no joy to be had in arguing ontology with a nine-year-old, "I have been caught out. No such thing as a licence to swear. Millat, where's your saxophone? You have orchestra today."

"In the boot," said Millat, his voice at once incredulous and disgusted: a man who didn't know the saxophone went in the boot on Sunday night was some kind of a social retard. "Why're you picking us up? M'ster Jones picks us up on Mondays. You don't know anything about picking us up. Or taking us in." (p. 140)

15.

Samad saw that he had flustered her with the accidental solemnity of the question; she drew her fingers through her fringe, fiddled with a small tortoiseshell button on her blouse, laughed shakily. "I like to think I'm not all bad."

"And that is enough?"

"Well. . . I. . ."

"Oh my dear, I apologize . . ." began Samad. "I was not being serious, Miss Burt Jones

"Well. . . Let's say I'm no Mr. Chippendale that'll do."

"Yes," said Samad kindly, thinking to himself that she had far better legs than a Queen Anne chair, 'that will do.'

"Now: where were we?"

Samad leant a little over the desk, to face her. "Were we somewhere, Miss Burt Jones (p.149)

16.

"God's harvest, innit Mr. Hamilton! Mr. J. P. Hamilton!"

And then that slow process of disappearance began to rewind as he reconstituted himself via the atoms of a staircase and a dresser until he was large as life once more, curled around the door.

Millat, lacking patience, thrust his school information sheet into his hand.

"God's harvest."

But the old man shook his head like a bird in a bird-bath. "No, no, I really won't be intimidated into purchases on my own doorstep. I don't know what you are selling please God let it not be encyclopedias at my age it is not more

information one requires but less."

"But it's free!"

"Oh . . . yes, I see . . . why?"

"SGod's harvest," repeated Magid.

"Helping the local community. Mr. Hamilton, you must have spoken to **our** teacher, because she sent **us** here. Maybe it slipped your mind," added Me in her grown-up voice. (p. 160)

17.

"With wide aisles He pointed to the smelly bustle of black, white, brown and yellow shuffling up and down the high street. To the albino woman who stood outside the Cash and Carry, selling daisies picked from the churchyard. "Which my friend and I would like to continue walking along if it is all right with you. Believe me, I understand your concerns," said Samad, taking his inspiration now from that other great North London street-preacher, Ken Livingstone, "I am having difficulties myself **we** are all having difficulties in this country, this country which is new to **us** and old to **us** all at the same time. **We** are divided people, aren't **we**."

And here Samad did what no one had done to Mad Mary for well over fifteen years: he touched her. Very lightly, on the shoulder.

"**We** are split people. For myself, half of me wishes to sit quietly with my legs crossed, letting the things that are beyond my control wash over me. But the other half wants to fight the holy war. Jihad! (p. 170)

18.

"Archibald, are you concerned about my sons or my sperm?"

"Sons," said Archie. "Definitely sons."

"Because there is rebellion in **them**, Archie. I can see it it is small now but it is growing. I tell you, I don't know what is happening to **our** children in this country. Everywhere you look, it is the same.

Last week, Zinat's son was found smoking marijuana. Like a Jamaican!"

Archie raised his eyebrows.

"Oh, I meant no offence, Archibald."

"None taken, mate. But you shouldn't judge before you've tried it.

Being married to a Jamaican has done wonders for my arthritis. But that's by the by. Carry on."

"Well, take Alsana's sisters all their children are nothing but trouble. **They** won't go to mosque, **they** don't pray, **they** speak strangely, **they** dress strangely, **they** eat all kinds of rubbish, **they** have intercourse with God knows who. No respect for tradition. People call it assimilation when it is nothing but corruption.

Corruption!" (p. 181)

19.

"You do not even know what you are, where you come from. **We** never see

family any more I am ashamed to show you to them. Why did you go all the way to Bengal for a wife, that's what they ask. Why didn't you just go to Putney?" Alsana smiled ruefully, shook her head, while Samad made a pretence of calm, filling their metal kettle with water and slamming it down on the stove. "And that is a beautiful lungi you have on, Samad Miah," she said bitterly, nodding in the direction of his blue-to welling jogging suit topped off with Poppy's LA Raiders baseball cap. Samad said, "The difference is what is in here," not looking at her, thumping just below his left breast bone. "You say you are thankful **we** are in England, that's because you have swallowed it whole. I can tell you those boys would have a better life back home than **they** ever' "Samad Miah! Don't even begin! It will be over my dead body that this family moves back to a place where **our** lives are in danger! Clara tells me about you, she tells me. How you have asked her strange things. What are you plotting, Samad? I hear from Zinat all this about life insurance .. . who is dying? What can I smell? I tell you, it will be over my dead body ' (p.189)

20.

"Hey, Abba! Where **we** going, Abba? To a secret disco party? Are **we** really?" Samad looks severely at Archie; Archie shrugs. "**We're** going on a trip to an airport. To Heathrow." "Wow!" "And then when **we** get there, Magid - Magid ' It is like a dream. Samad feels the tears before he can stop them; he reaches out to his eldest-son-by-two-minutes and holds him so tight to his chest that he snaps the arm of his glasses. "And then Magid is going on a trip with auntie Zinat." "Will he come back?" It is Millat. "It would be cool if he didn't come back!" Magid prides himself from his father's headlock. "Is it far? Will I be back in time for Monday only I've got to see how my photosynthesis is for science I took two plants: put one in the cupboard and one in the sunlight and I've got to see, Abba, I've got to see which one ' Years from now, even hours after that plane leaves, this will be history that Samad tries not to remember. That his memory makes no effort to retain. A sudden stone submerged. False teeth floating silently to the bottom of a glass. "Will I get back for school, Abba?" "Come on," says Archie, solemnly from the front seat. "**We've** got to get cracking if **we're** going to make it." (p.199)

21.

"Millat? Answer me, Millat! Are you there?" "Maybe, Abba, maybe not." Samad followed the voice to the bathroom and found Millat chin-high in dirty pink soap suds, reading Viz.

"Ah, Dad, wicked. Torch. Shine it over here so I can read."

"Never mind that." Samad tore the comic from his son's hands. There's a bloody hurricane blowing and your crazy mother intends to sit here until the roof falls in. Get out of the bath. I need you to go to the shed and find some wood and nails so that **we** can-

"But Abba, I'm butt-naked!"

"Don't split the hairs with me this is an emergency. I want you to '

An almighty ripping noise, like something being severed at the roots and flung against a wall, came from outside.

Two minutes later and the family Iqbal were standing regimental in varying states of undress, looking out through the long kitchen window on to a patch in the lawn where the shed used to be. Millat clicked his heels three times and hammed it up with corner shop accent, "O me O

my. There's no place like home. There's no place like home."

"All right, woman. Are you coming now?"

"Maybe, Samad Miah, maybe."

"Dammit! I'm not in the mood for a referendum. **We're** going to Archibald's. Maybe they still have light. And there is safety in numbers. Both of you get dressed, grab the essentials, the life or death things, and get in the car!" (p.210)

22.

"What did you call me? You what did you say? You little bastards.

Can't tell me in English? Have to talk your Paki language?"

Millat slammed his fist so hard on the glass that it reverberated down the booths to the ticket-man down the other end selling tickets to Milton Keynes.

"First: I'm not a Paki, you ignorant fuck. And second: you don't need translator, yeah? I'll give it to you straight. You're a fucking faggot, yeah? Queer boy, poofter, batty-rider, shit-dick."

There was nothing Millat's Crew prided themselves on more than the number of euphemisms they could offer for homosexuality.

"Arse-bandit, fairy-fucker, toilet-trader."

"You want to thank God for the glass between **us**, boy."

"Yeah, yeah, yeah. I thank Allah, yeah? I hope he fucks you up wicked, yeah?

We're going to Bradford to sort out the likes of you, yeah? Chief!" (p.220)

23.

"With respect: the world is complex, Clara. If there's one thing these children need to understand it is that one needs rules to survive it, not fancy."

"He's right, you know," said Archie earnestly, ashing a fag in an empty curry bowl. "Emotional matters then yes, that's your department '

"Oh women's work!" squealed Alsana, through a mouth full of curry.

Thank you so much, Archibald."

Archie struggled to continue. "But you can't beat experience, can you?

I mean, you two, you're young women still, in a way. Whereas **we**, I mean, **we**

are, like, wells of experience the children can use, you know, when **they** feel the need. **We're** like encyclopedias. You just can't offer **them** what **we** can. In all fairness."

Alsana put her palm on Archie's forehead and stroked it lightly. "You fool. Don't you know you're left behind like carriage and horses, like candle wax Don't you know to **them** you're old and smelly like yesterday's fishnchip paper? I'll be agreeing with your daughter on one matter of importance." Alsana stood up, following Clara, who had left at this final insult and marched tearfully into the kitchen. "You two gentlemen talk a great deal of the youknowwhat." (p.231)

24.

"Archibald, just because the word exists, it does not follow that it is a correct representation of the character of Mangal Pande. The first definition **we** agree on: my great-grandfather was a mutineer and I am proud to say this. I concede matters did not go quite according to plan. But traitor? Coward? The dictionary you show me is old these definitions are now out of currency. Pande was no traitor and no coward."

"Ahhh, now, you see, **we've** been through this, and my thought is this: there's no smoke without fire," Archie would say, looking impressed by the wisdom of his own conclusion. "Know what I mean?" This was one of

Archie's preferred analytic tools when confronted with news stories, historical events and the tricky day-to-day process of separating fact from fiction. There's no smoke without fire. There was something so vulnerable in the way he relied on this conviction, that Samad had never had the heart to disabuse him of it.

Why tell an old man that there can be smoke

Samad 1984, IS!7

without fire as surely as there are deep wounds that draw no blood?

"Of course, I see your point of view, Archie, I do. But my point is, and has always been, from the very first time **we** discussed the subject; my point is that this is not the story. And, yes, I realize that **we** have several times thoroughly investigated the matter, but the fact remains: full stories are as rare as honesty, precious as diamonds. If you are lucky enough to uncover one, a full story will sit on your brain like lead. They are difficult. They are long-winded. They are epic. They are like the stories God tells: full of impossibly particular information. You don't find them in the dictionary." (p.240)

25.

"So. Let me get this straight. Now you're telling me that without Pande there'd be no Gandhi. That without your mad gran dad there'd be no bloody Independence'

"Great-gran dad

"No, let me finish, Sam. Is that what you're seriously asking **us**'

Archie clapped an uninterested Clarence and Denzel on the back 'to believe? Do you believe it?" he asked Clarence.

The kyan believe dat!" said Clarence, having no idea of the topic.

Denzel blew his nose into a napkin. "Troof be tol, me nah like to believe any ting. Hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil. Dat my motto."

"He was the tickle in the sneeze, Archibald. It is as simple as that. I do believe that." (p.247)

26.

Me approached the counter. A hugely fat woman in a said was waddling to the cash till and back again to hand over twenty-five pounds to an Indian girl whose hair had been shorn haphazardly close to the scalp.

"And please don't be looking at me in that manner. Twenty-five is very reasonable price. I tell you I can't do any more with all these split ends."

The girl objected in another language, picked up the bag of hair in question from the counter and made as if to leave with it, but the elder woman snatched it away.

"Please, don't embarrass yourself further. **We** both have seen the ends.

Twenty-five is all I can give you for it. You won't get more some other place.

Please now," she said, looking over the girl's shoulder to Me, 'other customers I have."

Me saw hot tears, not unlike her own, spring to the girl's eyes. She seemed to freeze for a moment, vibrating ever so slightly with anger; then she slammed her hand down on the counter, swept up her twenty-five pounds and headed for the door.

The fat lady shook her chins in contempt after the disappearing girl.

"Ungrateful, she is." (p.264)

27.

"Biscuits, Irie? Come and have some biscuits. With me. In the kitchen."

Neena groaned. "Don't panic, Auntie. **We're** not enlisting her into the cult of Sappho."

"I don't care what you're doing. I don't know what you're doing. I don't want to know such things."

"**We're** watching television."

It was Madonna on the TV screen, working her hands around two conically shaped breasts.

"Very nice, I'm sure," sniped Alsana, glaring at Maxine. "Biscuits, Me?"

"I'd like some biscuits murmured Maxine with a flutter of her extravagant eyelashes.

"I am certain," said Alsana slowly and pointedly, translating code, "I don't have the kind you like."

Neena and Maxine fell about all over again.

The?" said Alsana, indicating the kitchen with a grimace. Irie followed her out.

"I'm as liberal as the next person," complained Alsana, once they were alone.

"But why do **they** always have to be laughing and making a song-and-dance

about everything? I cannot believe homosexuality is that much fun. Heterosexuality certainly is not."

"I don't think I want to hear that word in this house again," (p.270)

28.

Irie frowned. "KEVIN?"

"**We** are aware," said Hifan solemnly, pointing to the spot underneath the cupped flame where the initials were minutely embroidered, 'that **we** have an acronym problem."

"Just a bit."

"But the name is Allah's and it cannot be changed . . . but to continue with what I was saying: Millat, my friend, you could be the head of the Cricklewood branch '

"Mill."

"You could have what I have, instead of this terrible confusion you are in, instead of this reliance on a drug specifically imported by governments to subdue the black and Asian community, to lessen **our** powers

"Yeah," said Millat sadly, in mid-roll of a new spliff. "I don't really look at it like that. I guess I should look at it like that." (p.281)

29.

"Do **we** really have a choice?" asked Me.

"You've been honest with me," said the headmaster, biting his colourless lip, 'and I want to be honest with you."

"**We** don't have a choice."

"Honestly, no. It's really that or two months of post-class aberration consideration periods. I'm afraid **we** have to please the people, Me.

And if **we** can't please all of the people all of the time, **we** can at least please some of-'

"Yeah, great."

"Joshua's parents are really fascinating people, Me. I think this whole experience is going to be really educational for you. Don't you think so, Joshua?"

Joshua beamed. "Oh yes, sir. I really think so."

"And you know, the exciting thing is, this could be a kind of guinea-pig project for a whole range of programmes," said the headmaster, thinking aloud.

"Bringing children of disadvantaged or minority backgrounds into contact with kids who might have something to offer **them**. And there could be an exchange, vice versa. Kids teaching kids basketball, football et cetera. **We** could get funding." At the magic of A funding, the headmaster's sunken eyes began to disappear beneath agitated lids. (p.292)

30.

"**We** like that around here a healthy eater. All Chalfens are healthy eaters. I don't put on a pound, but Joyce does. In all the right places, naturally. You're staying for dinner?"

Irie stood dumb in the middle of the kitchen, too nervous to speak.

These were not any species of parent she recognized.

"Oh, don't worry about Marcus," said Joshua with a jolly wink. "He's a bit of an old leech. It's a Chalfen joke. **They** like to bombard you the minute you get in the door. Find out how sharp you are. Chalfens don't think there's any point in pleasantries. Joyce, this is Irie and Millat. **They're** the two from behind the science block."

Joyce, partially recovered from the vision of Millat Iqbal, gathered herself together sufficiently to play her designated role as Mother Chalfen.(p. 300)

31.

"He'll be along in a while. He's on a date."

"When isn't he on a date! All those busty girls! **We** might get jealous, mightn't **we**, Oscar? He spends more time with **them** than **us**.

But **we** shouldn't joke. I suppose it's a bit difficult for you."

"No, I don't mind, Joyce, really. I'm used to it."

"But everybody loves Millat, don't **they**, Oscar! It's so hard not to, isn't it, Oscar? **We** love him, don't **we**, Oscar?"

"I hate him."

"Oh, Oscar, don't say silly things."

"Can **we** all stop talking about Millat, please."

"Yes, Joshua, all right. Do you hear how he gets jealous? I try to explain to him that Millat needs a little extra care, you know. He's from a very difficult background. It's just like when I give more time to my peonies than my Michaelmas daisies, daisies will grow anywhere ..(p.312)

32.

"But where's Wilkins?" inquired Marcus, bending where the ceiling got low and tapping the photo with a pencil. '1962, Wilkins won the Nobel in medicine with Crick and Watson. But no sign of Wilkins in the photos. Just Crick and Watson. Watson and Crick.

History likes lone geniuses or double acts. But it's got no time for threesomes."

Marcus thought again. "Unless **they're** comedians or jazz musicians."

"Spose you'll have to be a lone genius, then," said Me cheerfully, turning from the picture and sitting down on a Swedish backless chair.

"Ah, but I have a mentor, you see." He pointed to a poster-sized black and white photograph on the other wall. "And mentors are a whole other kettle offish."

It was an extreme close-up of an extremely old man, the contours of his face clearly defined by line and shade, hachures on a topographic map.

"Grand old Frenchman, a gentleman and a scholar. Taught me practically everything I know. Seventy-odd and sharp as a whip. But you see, with a mentor you needn't credit **them** directly. That's the great thing about **them**. Now where's this bloody photo (p.319)

33.

"Ah ha! But **they** live two roads away!" cried Alsana triumphantly.

"No, Auntie. Conceptually far away from you. Being an Iqbal is occasionally a little suffocating, you know? He's using this other family as a refuge. **They're** probably a good influence or something."

"Or something," said Alsana ominously.

"What are you afraid of, Alsi? He's second generation you always say it yourself you need to let **them** go **their** own way. Yes, and look what happened to me, blah blah I may be Niece-of-Shame to you, Alsi, but I earn a good living out of my shoes." Alsana looked dubiously at the knee-length black boots that Neena had designed, made and was wearing. "And I live a pretty good life you know, I live by principles. I'm just saying.

He's already having a war with uncle Samad. He doesn't need one with you as well

Alsana grumbled into her blackberry tea.

"If you want to worry about something, Auntie, worry about these KEVIN people he hangs around with. **They're** insane. And there's bloody loads of **them**. All the ones you wouldn't expect. Mo, you know, the butcher yes, you know the Hussein Ishmaels - Ardashir's side of the family.

Right, well, he's one. And bloody Shiva, from the restaurant he's converted!"

"Good for him," said Alsana tartly.

"But it's nothing to do with Islam proper, Alsi. **They're** a political group. And some politics. One of the little bastards told me and Maxine **we** were going to roast in the pits of hell. Apparently **we** are the lowest forms of life, lower than the slugs. I gave his ball-bag a 360-degree twist. Those are the people you need to worry about."

Alsana shook her head and waved Neena off with a hand. "Can't you understand? I worry about my son being taken away from me. I have lost one already. Six years I have not seen Magid. Six years. And I see these people, these Chaffinches and **they** spend more time with Millat than I do. Can you understand that, at least?" (p. 329)

34.

So are you a good girl these days, my dear? Gossip informs me Mrs.

Brenton has introduced you to her church. Very interesting, these Witness people. But are **they** prepared, I wonder, for this new mulatto member of **their** flock?

Hortense remembered well the feel of that fat hand landing hot against her mother; she remembered kicking out at it with all her might.

Oh, it's all right, child. The Captain told me your little secret. But naturally secrets have a price, Ambrosia. Just as yams and pimento and my tobacco cost something. Now, have you seen the old Spanish church, Santa Antonia? Have you been inside? It's just here. It's quite a marvel inside, from the aesthetic rather than religious point of view. (p.341)

35.

About two weeks later, he was doing a shift in the Palace for a little extra money, and he brought the matter up with Shiva, a newish convert to KEVIN and a rising star within the organization. "Don't talk to me about white women," groaned Shiva, wondering how many generations of Iqbals he'd have to give the same advice to. "It's got to the point in the West where the women are men! I mean, **they've** got the same desires and urges as men **they** want it all the jucking time. And **they** dress like **they** want everyone to know **they** want it. Now is that right? Is it?"

But before the debate could progress, Samad came through the double doors looking for some mango chutney and Millat returned to his chopping.(p.352)

36.

He always strike me as a peacekeeper. But it more de principle of de ting, you know? Black and white never come to no good. De Lord Jesus never meant us to mix it up. Dat's why he made a hoi' heap a fuss about de children of men building de tower of Babel. "Im want everybody to keep tings separate.

And the Lord did confound the language of all the earth and from thence did the Lord scatter **them** abroad upon the face of all the earth.

Genesis 11:9. When you mix it up, nuttin' good can come. It wasn't intended.

Except you," she added as an afterthought. "You're about de only good ting to come out of dat.. . Bwoy, sometime it like lookin'

in a mirror-glass," she said, lifting Irie's chin with her wrinkled digits. "You built like me, big, you know! Hip and tie and rhas, and titties. My mudder was de same way. You even named after my mudder."

"Irie?" asked Me, trying hard to listen, but feeling the damp smog of her fever pulling her under.

"No, dear, Ambrosia. De stuff dat make you live for ever. Now," she said, clapping her hands together, catching Irie's next question between them, 'you sleepin' in de living room. I'll get a blanket and pillows and den **we** talk in de marnin'. I'm up at six, 'cos I got Witness biznezz, so don' tink you sleeping none after eight. Pickney, you hear me?"

"Mmm. But what about Mum's old room? Can't I just sleep in there?"

Hortense took Irie's weight half on her shoulder and led her into the living room.

"No, dat's not possible. Dere is a certain situation,"

said Hortense mysteriously. "Dat can wait till de sun is up to be hexplained. Fear **them** not therefore: for there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed," she intoned quietly, turning to go. "And nothing hid, that shall not be known. Dat is Mat-chew, 10:26." (p.362)

37.

Mr. Topps is jus' misunderstood. "Im mean a lot to me. Me never have nobody

before. Your mudder don' like to tell you since she got all hitey-titey, but de Bowden family have had it hard long time. I was barn during an cart-quake. Almost kill fore I was barn. An' den when me a fully grown woman, my own darter run from me. Me never see my only grandpickney. I only have de Lord, all dem years. Mr. Topps de first human man who look pon me and take pity an' care. Your mudder was a fool to letim go, true sir!"

Irie gave it one last try. "What? What does that mean?"

"Oh, nuttin, nuttin, dear Lord... I and I talking all over de place dis marnin . . . Oh Mr. Topps, dere you are. **We** not going to be late now, are **we**?"

Mr. Topps, who had just re-entered the room, was fully adorned in leather from head to toe, a huge motorcycle helmet on his head, a small red light attached to his left ankle and a small white light strapped to his right. He flipped up the visor.

"No, **we're** all right, by the grace of God. Where's your helmet, Mrs. B.?"

"Oh, I've started keepin' it in the oven. Keeps it warm and toasty on de col' marnins. Irie Ambrosia, fetch it for me please." (p.371)

38.

"Do you know how battery chickens live?"

Me didn't. Joshua explained. Cooped up for most of their poor chicken lives in total chicken darkness, packed together like chicken sardines in their chicken shit and fed the worst type of chicken grain. And this, according to Joshua, was apparently nothing on how pigs and cows and sheep spent their time. "It's a fucking crime. But try telling Marcus that. Try getting him to give up his Sunday hog-fest. He's so fucking ill informed. Have you ever noticed that? He knows this enormous amount about one thing, but there's this whole other world that.. . Oh, before I forget you should take a leaflet."

Me never thought she would see the day when Joshua Chalfen handed her a leaflet. But here it was in her palm. It was called: Meat is Murder: The Facts and the Fiction, a publication from the FATE organization.

"It stands for Fighting Animal Torture and Exploitation. **They're** like the hardcore end of Greenpeace or whatever. Read it **they're** not just hippy freaks, **they're** coming from a solid scientific and academic background and **they're** working from an anarchist perspective. I feel like I've really found my niche, you know? It's a really incredible group. Dedicated to direct action. The deputy's an ex-Oxford fellow." (p.380)

39.

"I mean, **they** talk about progress," said the girl shrilly, becoming somewhat excited. "**They** talk about leaps and bounds in the field of medicine yada yada yada, but bottom line, if somebody knows how to eliminate "undesirable" qualities in people, do you think some government's not going to do it? I mean, what's undesirable? There's just something a little fascist about the whole deal.."

I guess it's a good book, but at points you do think: where are **we** going here? Millions of blonds with blue eyes? Mail order babies? I mean, if you're Indian like me you've got something to worry about, yeah? And then **they're** planting cancers in poor creatures; like, who are you to mess with the **make-up** of a mouse? Actually creating an animal just so it can die it's like being God! I mean personally I'm a Hindu, yeah?

I'm not religious or nothing, but you know, I believe in the sanctity of life, yeah? And these people, like, program the mouse, plot its every move, yeah, when it's going to have kids, when it's going to die. It's just unnatural." (p. 391)

40.

"So you see I have these beautiful American Levi jeans, white jeans, that Joyce's sister brought back from a holiday in Chicago, the Windy City they call it, though I don't believe there is anything particularly unusual about its climate, considering its proximity to Canada. My Chicago jeans. Such a thoughtful gift! I was overwhelmed to receive them. But then I was confused by this label in the inner lining that states that the jeans are apparently "shrink-to-fit". I asked myself, what can this mean: "shrink to-fit"?"

"They shrink until they fit, Magid. That would be my guess."

"But Joyce was percipient enough to buy them in precisely the right size, you see? A 32, 34."

"All right, Magid, I don't want to see them. I believe you. So don't shrink them." That was my original conclusion, also. But it appears there is no separate procedure for shrinking them. If one washes the jeans, they will simply shrink."

"Fascinating."

"And you appreciate at some juncture the jeans will require washing?"

"What's your point, Magid."

"Well, do they shrink by some pre-calculated amount, and if so, by how much? If the amount was not correct, they would open themselves up to a great deal of litigation, no? It is no good if they shrink-to-fit, after all, if they do not shrink-to fit me. There is another possibility, as Jack suggested, that they shrink to the contours of the body. Yet how can such a thing be possible?" (p.400)

41.

"Well, why don't you do something, Mr. Iqbal? Make her go away.

Instead of standing there with your flabby gut and your tiny willy on display." Samad grunted and tucked the cause of all his troubles, two huge hairy balls and a defeated-looking limp prick, back into the inner lining of his shorts.

"She won't go away," he murmured. "And if she does, she will only return with reinforcements."

"But why? Hasn't she caused enough trouble?" said Alsana loudly, loud enough for Joyce. "She has her own family, no? Why does she not go and for a change

mess **them** up? She has boys, four boys? How many boys does she want? How bloody many?"

Samad shrugged, went into the kitchen drawer and fished out the earphones that could be plugged into the television and thus short-circuit the outside world. He, like Marcus, had disengaged.

Leave them, was his feeling. Leave them to their battles.

"Oh thank you," said Alsana caustically, as her husband retreated to his Hugh Scully and his pots and guns. "Thank you, Samad Miah, for your oh so valuable contribution. This is what the men do. **They** make the mess, the century ends, and **they** leave the women to clear up the shit. Thank you, husband!" (p.410)

42.

"And yet I am an Iqbal, Michael," said Magid, laying that look of total empathy on Mickey and the other dregs of humanity huddled around the hot counter, 'though I have been gone a long time."

"Say that again. Well, this is a turn-up for the books. I've got your . . . wait a minute, let me get this right . . . your great-great-grandfather up there, see?"

"I noticed it the moment I came in, and I can assure you, Michael, my soul is very grateful for it," said Magid, beaming like an angel. "It makes me feel at home, and, as this place is dear to my father and his friend Archibald Jones I feel certain it shall also be dear to me. **They** have brought me here, I think, to discuss important matters, and I for one can think of no better place for **them**, despite your clearly debilitating skin condition."

Mickey was simply bowled over by that, and could not conceal his pleasure, addressing his reply both to Magid and the rest of O'Connell's.(p.420)

43.

"And one bacon sandwich," said Mickey, who had insisted on breaking fifteen years of tradition in bringing this one dish over himself, 'for the young professor."

"He will not eat that at my table."

"Oh, come on, Sam," began Archie gingerly. "Give the lad a break."

"I say he will not eat that at my table!"

Mickey scratched his forehead. "Stone me, we're getting a bit fundamentalist in our old age, ain't **we**?"

"I said '

"As you wish, Abba," said Magid, with that same infuriating smile of total forgiveness. He took his plate from Mickey, and sat down at the adjacent table with Clarence and Denzel. (p.428)

44.

"Very impressive, Millat, hey? Everything **we** hope for."

"Yeah," said Millat, despondent. "I s'pose. Less talk, more action, though, if you ask me. The infidel are everywhere."

Mo nodded vigorously. "Oh definitely, Brother. **We** are two birds from the same bush on that matter. I hear there are some others," said Mo, lowering his voice and putting his fat, sweaty lips by Millat's ear,

'who are very keen on action. Immediate action. Brother Hifan spoke to me.

About the 31st of December. And Brother Shiva and Brother Tyrone

"Yes, yes. I know who **they** are. **They** are the beating heart of KEVIN."

"And **they** say you know the man himself this scientist. You in good position. I hear you are his friend."

"Was. Was."

"Brother Hifan says you have the tickets to get in, that you are organizing'

"Shhh," said Millat irritably. "Not everyone can know. If you want to get near the centre, you've got to keep shtoom."

Millat looked Mo up and down. The kurta-pyjamas that he somehow managed to make look like a late seventies Elvis flared jumpsuit. The huge stomach he rested on his knee like a friend.

Sharply, he asked, "You're a bit old aren't you?"

"You rude little bastard. I'm strong as a bloody bull."

"Yeah, well, **we** don't need strength," said Millat tapping his temple,

'we need a little of the stuff upstairs. **We've** got to get in the place discreetly first, in nit The first evening. It'll be crawling." (p.443)

45.

"The minutes, Josh. After the stuff Joely was saying about protest strategy. **We'd** moved on to the hard part. I want to hear what Paddy was saying a few minutes ago about Punishment versus Release."

Joshua looked at his blank clipboard and placed it over his de tumescent erection.

"Umm ... I guess I missed that."

"Er, well that was actually really fucking important, Josh. You've got to keep up. I mean, what's the point of doing all this talking Cunt, cunt, cunt.

"He's doing his best," Joely interceded, reaching down from her tabletop once more, this time to ruffle Joshua's Jewfro. "This is probably quite hard for Joshi, you know? I mean this is quite personal to him." She always called him Joshi like that. Joshi and Joely.

Joely and Joshi.

Crispin frowned. "Well, you know, I've said many times if Joshua doesn't want to be personally involved in this job, because of personal sympathies, if he wants out, then '

"I'm in," snapped Josh, barely restraining the aggression. "I've no intention of wimping out."

"That's why Joshi's **our** hero," said Joely, with an enormous, supportive smile.

"Mark my words, he'll be the last man standing." (p.451)

46.

"Look at him Chalfening around in that trough. Exploit everything and everybody, that's the Chalfen way, eh Josh?"

Joshua grunted and turned his back on Crispin, in favour of the window and a view of the frost over Hyde Park.

"That's a classic photo, there, see? The one **they've** used for the head. I remember it; that was the day he gave evidence in the California trial. That look of total fucking superiority. Very Chalfenesque!"

Joshua bit his tongue. don't rise to it. if you don't rise TO IT, YOU GAIN HER SYMPATHY.

"Don't, Crisp," said Joely firmly, touching Joshua's hair. "Just try to remember what **we're** about to do. He doesn't need that tonight."

BINGO.

"Yeah, well

Crispin put his foot down on the accelerator. "Minnie, have you and Paddy checked that everyone's got everything **they** need? Balaclavas and that?"

"Yeah, all done. It's cool."

"Good." Crispin pulled out a small silver box filled with all the necessities to roll a fat joint and threw it in Joely's direction, catching Joshua painfully on the shin.

"Make **us** one, love."(p.462)

47.

"**They** do love their false icons in this country," said AbdulColin, with his odd mix of gravity and satire, unmoved by the considerable New Year crowd who were presently spitting at,

dancing round and crawling over the many lumps of grey stone. "Now, will somebody please tell me: what is it about the English that makes **them** build **their** statues with their backs to **their** culture and **their** eyes on the time?" He paused to let the shivering KEVIN Brothers contemplate the rhetorical question.

"Because **they** look to **their** future to forget **their** past. Sometimes you almost feel sorry for **them**, you know?" he continued, turning full circle to look around at the inebriated crowd.

"**They** have no faith, the English. **They** believe in what men make, but what men make crumbles. Look at **their** empire. This is all **they** have.

Charles II Street and South Africa House and a lot of stupid-looking stone men on stone horses. The sun rises and sets on it in twelve hours, no trouble. This is what is left." (p.470)

48.

"I say, lucky fuckers. Lucky, lucky fuckers."

The Jones!" cried Clara. "Watch your mouth!" But Irie couldn't be stopped.

"What a peaceful existence. What a joy **their** lives must be. **They** open a door and all **they've** got behind it is a bathroom or a lounge. Just neutral spaces. And not this endless maze of present rooms and past rooms and the things said in **them** years ago and everybody's old historical shit all over the place. **They're** not constantly making the same old mistakes. **They're** not always hearing the same old shit. **They** don't do public performances of angst on public transport. Really, these people exist. I'm telling you. The biggest traumas of **their** lives are things like re carpeting Bill-paying.

Gate-fixing. **They** don't mind what **their** kids do in life as long as **they're** reasonably, you know, healthy. Happy. And every single fucking day is not this huge battle between who **they** are and who **they** should be, what **they** were and what **they** will be. Go on, ask **them**.

And **they'll** tell you. No mosque. Maybe a little church. Hardly any sin. Plenty of forgiveness. No attics. No shit in attics. No skeletons in cupboards. No great-grandfathers. I will put twenty quid down now that Samad is the only person in here who knows the inside bloody leg measurement of his great-grandfather. And you know why **they** don't know? Because it doesn't fucking matter. As far as **they're** concerned, it's the past. This is what it's like in other families.

They're not self-indulgent. **They** don't run around, relishing, relishing the fact that **they** are utterly dysfunctional. **They** don't spend **their** time trying to find ways to make **their** lives more complex.

They just get on with it. Lucky bastards. Lucky motherfuckers." (p.480)

49.

"It is just that **we** were wondering," Samad interrupts, spotting a sermon and wanting to sever it at the root, 'if you could possibly reduce the noise somewhat... if only '

But Hortense is already overlapping him, eyes closed, arm raised, testifying to the truth in the old Jamaican fashion: Two kind of people: **dem** who sing for de Lord and **dem** who rejek 'im at de peril of **dem** souls."

She turns back. She stands. She shakes her banner furiously in the direction of the drunken hordes moving up and down as one in the Trafalgar fountains, and then she is asked to do it again for a cynical photo-journalist with a waiting space to fill on page six. (p.492)

50.

'please stop talking. I'm not a fortuneteller."

But the Doctor collapsed once more, like a jack-in the-box. "No ... no ... **we** are not fortunetellers. I could never have predicted my life would end up in the hands of a child ... Corinthians I, chapter thirteen, verse eight: Whether there be prophecies, **they** shall fail; whether there be tongues, **they** shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. For **we** know in part, and **we** prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in

part shall be done away. But when will it come? For myself, I became tired of waiting. It is such a terrible thing, to know only in part. A terrible thing not to have perfection, human perfection, when it is so readily available." The Doctor lifted himself up, and tried to reach out to Archie just as Archie backed away. "If only we were brave enough to make the decisions that must be made . . . between those worth saving and the rest . . . Is it a crime to want ' (p.501)