

# Self-Representation in Sara Suleri's Meatless Days

Najia Asrar Zaidi

## **Abstract**

*Women writings have special relationship with the genre of autobiography. Since autobiography is about self-life therefore, it not only captures the spirit of an age but the writer also makes an effort to establish her/his autonomy through singularization of her/his experiences. As a literary form it offers more space and freedom to women experiences. Hence, it has become the most appropriate form to portray women's struggle for autonomy. Generally, this genre is chosen by women to express deference and resistance. Suleri's 'Meatless Days' is also included in this category. Suleri's account of her life and family is highly relational and contextual. Therefore, Suleri views her 'self' in relation to familial and social roles. As a Pakistani woman Suleri earlier led a sheltered and protected life. She also throws light on the considerable pressures that women are subjected to in South Asian countries and the way kinship system affects the lives of women in many ways. Despite rejecting male hegemony Suleri interestingly celebrates motherhood and wifehood clearly. This paper seeks to examine the development of her 'othered self' into 'empowered self'. Her 'self' just like her text appears in pieces and fragments. It is after connecting the pieces that her 'self' can be reconstructed. Meatless Days is Suleri's journey from 'otherness machine' to self-determination and actualization.*

## **Introduction**

Autobiographical writings have significantly contributed to identity formation for women. The genre emphasizes the birth of female experience, interdependent existence and consciousness of self to

achieve desired aims. Suleri's 'Meatless Days' also protests against patriarchy and the socio/political set-up of Pakistani society which establishes values and gender prescriptions entrenched in prejudices and biases. Hence, the Pakistani woman is represented as 'doubly othered,' first as Pakistani and second as a Muslim woman. This paper examines that how 'Meatless days celebrates the strengths and weaknesses of womanhood, and the development of 'autonomous self' which leads her to empowerment. Suleri's discourse introduces woman through their bodies. She asserts that women in South Asian societies are socially marked by the body they live into. Yet, at the same time she also romanticizes the bodies of her mother and sisters. Suleri's mother and sister also conform to social order, which the society demands. However, it is the role of her mother that casts powerful influence over her 'self'. As a diasporic South Asian writer Suleri is entrapped by multiple languages and identities which deeply impact her. This paper would highlight the events and the persons that lead to 'self' development in Suleri.

### **Self-Development And Suleri**

Since autobiography is about "self-life" therefore, one's life is constructed and reconstructed to establish one's individuality and autonomy. In *Meatless Days* Suleri's disregard of chronology, blending of fact and fiction and search for identity singularizes her work. However, the most important aspect of her work is the representation of women. "Autobiography as a genre permits women to write in the contestary mode, not only as women who challenge the patriarchal discourse, but also as (post) colonial subjects refuting the colonial frame of representation" (75)says,Zekmi (2003). Peterson (1999) in her chapter on institutionalizing women's autobiography writes, " that women's self-representation assumes a form different from men's, one that is "relational" rather than "positional" or linear' (82). Suleri's account of her life and family I feel is highly relational and contextual. It is the death of her sister 'Ifat' that she

decides to pen her memories. 'Ifat being put away at last; and I combing through a day for some injunction of what is possible impossible to write. It brings me certain spirit. Like a baughness every word to walk into your head deserves protection, a punctiliousness of manner that puts hiding everywhere' (175). It is not easy to construct Suleri's 'self' from *Meatless Days* only. It is after going through *Boy will be Boys* and her article on feminism that some aspects of her personality can be constructed. Being a daughter of Pakistani influential journalist and a Welsh mother she negotiates and mediates her stance between these two stools of identification. Her father born in undivided India, fighting in the struggle for Pakistan sails to England. It is ironical that fighting against the Raj he married the woman "who looked like the past it, sought to forget? (164). Suleri's father remains "mysteriously handcuffed to history(164). "Just like Rushdie's Saleem in his "Midnight's children." Thus, Suleri shuttles between her father and mother. This shuttling deconstructs her identity as a woman and as a Pakistani. As she ponders "I used to think that our sense of place would be the first to go, after the hurly-burly of our childhood's constant movement"(181). She identifies places with the faces they inhabit. Excluding herself she writes "It is hard for me to picture Nuz without seeing simultaneously Karachi's maniacal sprawl, it's sandy palms and crazy traffic. Shahid looks like London now in the curious pull with which London can remind, 'I, also, was your home.'" Tillat in desert-land is busy, surrounding herself with pools of infancy, converting in my mind a grain of sand into signs of impressive fertility and it is still difficult to think of Ifat without remembering her peculiar congruence with Lahore a place that gave her pleasure' (181).

Though it is easy to portray Suleri's family members but difficult to write about her "Self" as she like water or milk escapes containment. Suleri's text resists showing her 'real self'. However, reading her texts many times resolves to some extent the mystery of her 'self'. As she testifies, "For writing is the tricky milk that runs like

metaphor through shab-e-Maraj (184). The close readings of the text suggest that there are two selves appearing in her discourse. The 'othered self and the 'new self.' The glimpses of Suleri's childhood from the text suggest that she was highly dependent on Ifat. She (Ifat) always remained a great source of information and tales for Sara. Narrating one of her story she writes, "Qayyum the cook insisted on making me eat kidney.... wicked Ifat came into the room and waited till I had started eating; then she intervened. ... Kidneys make pee" Iffat told me. And she looked so pleased to be able to tell me that, it made her feel so full of information" (26). Ifat would make her play different games, "For games were Iffat's provenance. She make us play and play until the very intensity of her invention make us feel as though we collaborated with her in the most significant work of our lives, knowledge that "you know, don't you, that all these shyness are just a way of telling children about the horrid parts of sex. (137). It is the first twenty-three years of her life that Suleri lives "as an otherness machine" as she was handed over many of her mother's wifely duties.

However, it was at the hands of her father that she was at times humiliated and who required her services the most. All of a sudden her father would choose his victim and start thrusting him/her. Suleri narrates one such instance "Now Sara, why do you do such terrible things to you eyebrows? Look at what lovely eyebrows Tillat has? (100). Earlier he had reproached Tillat for the same crime. The most tiring duty of Suleri in these days was to proof read his articles and to copy them out. If being annoyed with Suleri on some trivial matter, he would communicate through her mother or sister. "Tillat, take the article to your sister and tell her to copy it out" (99).

She knew her use of being serviceable to Pip and he of her indispensable services. In earlier times, when we were all at home, it soon became clear to me that the only reason for me not being in more frequent disfavor was because I was too useful. Pip was politic enough to know that he needed me to copy out his articles, to proofread, to care for Mama, to cope with the cook. And I was politic enough to

know my uses and to stretch like an elastic band the boundaries between favor and disfavor. The band would snap, of course, and sometimes on the most incomprehensible occasions” (99).

Since Pip was a strict disciplinarian therefore, his absence from home was counted as a great blessing. It was in this vein that Sara suggested Pip that he should go on Haj. “Our joy, I’m afraid, had nothing to do with religion, but with the truth that these three weeks without Pip’s strict disciplinary habits constituted for us a glorious holiday” (126) It is after completing her Master’s in English-Literature from Punjab University that Suleri decides to leave Pakistan. ‘But we were coming to a parting, Pakistan and I felt supped full of history, hungry for flavors less stringent on my palate, less demanding on my loyalty’ (123). However, it was not an easy task to take permission from her father “For a while he looked at me as though I were telling him that I was not a nation anymore, that I was a minority; then, slowly, his face crossed over into dignity. If I say no, you still will go child, I have no choice” (123). Suleri’s first step to attain self-hood was her rejection of the Dr. Sadik’s proposal of his son. The decision to leave Pakistan was the second step in the ladder of self-realization and actualization. This “self” which reveals itself slowly and gradually had always been there but was waiting for the proper moment to rear it’s head. She would leave the scene when things go against her “self”. In Suleri’s childhood this “unconscious self” was inactive. A distinct feature of her nature had always been to run away from not a very likable situation. It is this germ that takes her away from Pakistan. At a certain moment of the awakening of this “selfhood” that is denoted by an “I” that force her father to let her proceed for higher education. This “I” learns to challenge the existing order by attaining “selfhood.” This “New self” is self-assured, independent and ambitious. Exposing, her philosophy through the events in her life and the family she establishes a relationship between self and the text. The reader studies events and the character portrayals through the mutual contribution of self and the text, endorsing self-willed decisions and rejecting anti-self decisions.

One such instance is her father's adoption of a daughter called "Shahida."

With professional efficiency, as though orchestrating governmental change, Pip cleared the family stage of his mind and ushered a new one in. It made me admit that I would never be imminence to the exigence of information: in Pakistan, the propriety of every eyebrow raised itself at Pip, publicity insisted that his was his play, both to direct and to act in...." (129).

This act considered shameful on my next visit to Pakistan, I found him in the Punjabi pink his brand-new daughter by his side by Suleri makes her deny the fact that her father yearned for her return to Pakistan reluctant as he was to read the never in my eyes (127). "Do you ever have sensations of daughterly compunction? He asked" (127). At that stage she had rejected her earlier self, the dutiful daughter, all caring and loving Sara. This was the result of the realization that dawns "Remember, that I have lived many years as an otherness machine, had more than my fair share of being other, so if my brother or my father start picking up on the trend, I have every right to expostulate" (67). This development of the self leads her to self-actualization. She finally decides to marry an American man whose daughter was older than her. Though Suleri's father accepts him but requests her to "make him a Muslim". At another place talking about the gift as Quran from her father she mentions again "your heart lurched to see me return to Islam" (4). But Suleri's decision to marry a man who was not Muslim was also a result of her father's attitude towards religion as she shares with the reader in the same paragraph "I was not born in London, as two of your other children were, but we were transplanted soon enough to think of London as our home, such as homes be. And you were so secular then, with politics and nationhood swarming from your discourse into our brains" (21).

In this situation the writer of the text too becomes more of herself and follows what her 'self' dictates that in a way singularizes her from her siblings. This individuated sense that she should answer

the inner calls of the 'self' asserting not to live as a slave lets her disclose a very important secret, "Visiting Lahore one summer, I was frightened that I might have conceived, so Tillat and I went with great trepidation to a clinic. We must have lied about my name for unmarried women are not supposed to be in any need of a pregnancy test in Pakistan. .. then at last the physician's assistant showed his face to tell us, sadly and compassionately, that the test was negative. Tillat and I were hugging each other with relief"(114). Suleri's defiance can be analyzed in the words of Tillat, who being her younger sister and knowing her well and her friendships scolds "Sara you must learn to settle now" (83). Similarly, Shahid expressing his concern for Sara-Tom affair say 'what have you got out of this' (83). Again mentioning Tom's letter which her father had read and frankly tells her "It was porno. Well, then I hope you enjoyed it. I exclaimed with indignation." (17)

Suleri in writing about "herself" follows the advice of Cixous "She must write her self, because this invention of a new insurgent writing which, when the moment of her liberation, has come, will allow her to carry out the indispensable ruptures and transformations in her history" (321). In the case of Suleri her gender and identity create confusions in life as she writes in *Boys will be Boys*

What a strange confused map we could create by simply making a geography of all the places of our births! My parents, of course, born continents apart, but then children... there was Ifat in London, Shahid and me in Karachi, Tillat in Lahore, and Irfan in London again. Amidst so much movement, it makes me wonder what happened to our filaments of identity, whether they bruised, strengthened or simply became themselves. But much of them must remain necessarily rooted in Lahore—"Oh city of lights" the poet Faiz called it- the grave homes of our mother, our sister, and now our father" (22).

For Suleri home is the place where she had spent her childhood i.e. London and Lahore and where her dead are buried i.e. definitely

Lahore. Though she has been living in USA for more than thirty years but she never calls that home. Another reason contributing to this definition is patriarchal and matriarchal links with the respective countries. Suleri identifies herself with her father's country through multiple connections such as; her father's career as a journalist, politicians and politics, food and language and the family events. However, it is through the ideal representation of her mother that she identifies the West or specifically England. On comparing the Yale architecture with the mosque she writes,

..... the gothic roofs of Yale, the architecture of the academy-that proliferation of cupola and dome-deranges into something different in my eyes, offering me a landscape that sometime in it's history was devoted to making mosques with irregular metallic domes, representing an Islam I do not know. Then the city dissonance seems in collusion with some shrill Quranic cry, as though destiny has placed me, as it always will, in a Muslim country. In those moments I am glad to go out wandering again, breathing in the intellection of the West, feeling in the air a heavy peace books written and unwritten never to be read" (183).

Regarding her brother Shahid's departure to England she writes, that her mother like an Indian women who sends away her sons and runs the risk of seeing them to succumb to the greater alternatives represented by the West. Again, suggests the superiority of West.

In her dream describing the fractured identity of the mother she steals a part of her body and hides it under her tongue. "It was piece of her foot I found, a small bone like a knuckle, which I quickly hid inside my mouth, under my tongue" (12). Taking away the piece of her foot suggests Suleri departure to the West to take refuge in it's intellection and the opportunities which her mother represents. Suleri's mother becomes her role model. Focusing on the hybrid identities and the complications it incurs Zekmi (2003) writes, "hybrid identities with conflicting elements that are particularly hard to deal with for the new generation that are born in the new country and do not have a



stable sense of belonging. They are the “in-between’s not quite accepted by either the French, or the North Africans because culturally (or in some cases, racially) they do not belong completely to either group. Conflicts caused by this continuous identity crisis often leads to rebellion” (178). Being quite familiar with her case Suleri therefore, on one hand writes in contestatory tone and pinpoints the singularity of her experiences with the spirit of the rebel and on the other, deconstructs the homogenous identities of the postcolonial female subject. Homi Bhabha connects the ‘idea of cultural displacement to the broader issues of cultural and national identity’ (145). According to him then ‘the nation becomes luminal signifying space that is internally marked by the discourses of minorities, the heterogeneous histories of contending peoples, antagonistic authorities and tense location of cultural difference’ (145-48). Hence, in the words of Zekhmi. ‘Autobiography as a genre permits women to write in the contestatory mode’. Suleri’s Autobiography *Meatless Days* which is also an elegy for her mother definitely centers on Mair Suleri. The chapter that portrays Mair ‘What Mama knew’ highlights the difference between her father and mother. ‘They were rhetorically so different’ (157). Her father highly ambitious, dominating, possessive and exuberant about his articles. To adjust with such a man Mair devised a strategy of “abnegating power showing”, “disinterest in owning in belonging” and took refuge in distraction, resisting to draw line between lesson and herself”(164) and above all learned to accommodate herself in the new surroundings i.e. Pakistan. Mair covers her indigenous identity with a scarf of disinterestedness. Suleri’s mother becomes her role model when she herself marries a non-Muslim white American widower and decides to live in USA forever. Grewal (1994) comments in this context “Suleri reveals a longing to adopt and valorize (her) mother’s mode of disinterested love, and negotiation of a life, formed by an oblique connection to the society in which she lives.” (246) She follows the mode of behaviour practiced by her mother “The Roosevelt’s (her husband’s family)

welcomed me. We certainly enjoy the time we spend with their children, a lovely brood, now producing broods of their own. It makes me feel quite proud of myself, to think that I have leapfrogged all intervening generations to achieve the accomplished status of step-great-grandmother. That I think, is quite a feat (43). According to Dalal (2007) Suleri's text reenacts Mair's mode of balancing the cohesion afforded by social discourses with a declaration of individualism. Even while *Meatless Days* acknowledges the author's indebtedness to multiple languages and discourses, it nevertheless remains intensely comfortable with a unique position at the interstices of divergent social, cultural and linguistic influences" (20).

The feminist agenda as depicted in *Meatless Days* advocates the weightlessness and meatlessness and of women as reflected in Suleri's mother. The two most important components of Suleri's feminism are fluidity and mothering. According to Dalal 'Suleri's act of putting Mair's body in her mouth evinces a progression from the transfer of liquid sustenance from Mair to the author in the later's, Dayal (13). Cixous in the 'Laugh of the Medusa' writes.

Even if phallic mystification has generally contaminated good relationships, a woman is never far from mother, (I mean outside her role functions. The mother as nonname and as source of goods.) There is always within her at best a little of that good mother's milk. She writes in white ink. There always remain in women that force which produces is produced by the other-in particular, the other woman. In her matrix, cradler, herself giver as her mother and child; she is her own sister-daughter. There is hidden and always readily in women the source; the locus for the other. The mother too is a metaphor. In women there is always more or less of the mother who makes everything alright who nourishes, and who stands up against separation; a force that will not be cut off will knock the wind out of the codes we will rethink womankind beginning with every form and every period of her body" (322).

It is with the good mother's milk that Suleri re-constructs the stories of her family women in the amniotic enclosure of her text. Regarding Suleri's reproduction of this text Dalal (2007) writes, "Despite the physical absence of her dead mother and her refusal to become mother herself, Suleri's figurative child-her text- and the memory of her mother provides her with non-corporeal notions "of home". She holds both Mair's memory and her own imagination within her autobiography, thereby conflating the two position of comfortable inhabitation as engenderer and engendered to which Ifat refers (17).

The lives of her family women become a treasure for her "Self". She carries their stories like "lymph" unknowingly and unconsciously. In defining her "Self" Suleri points to the confusion of being caught between two language. At times it blurs the system of representation of "Self". "Living in daylight, after all, is not so different from living between two languages; it is a lie to say that people only live in one, for to know a couple of different languages in merely a matter of demonstrating the pangs of intimacy that beset mouths each time we speak" (177).

The site of Diaspora is also the site of alienation and affiliation. "Thus, being Diasporic involves a process of transference from a somewhat acknowledged and accepted identity to one that exists only in the realm of future, perhaps to be equally acceptable one day" (118) writes Chakraborty (2007) in her article "Will the real South Asian stand up please?" Suleri's diasporic narrative *Meatless Days* while exploring the identity of her "Self" also dwells on the part language plays in it. For diasporic women home becomes a much contested site and with it comes food and language. Being the daughter of Anglicized father and a Welsh mother, Suleri definitely is more comfortable in English than Urdu. "Coming second to me, Urdu opens in my mind a passageway between the sea of possibility that what I cannot say in English. When those waters part, they seems to promise

some solidity of surface, but then like speech they glide away to reconfirm the bigandry of utterance” (177).

Though Suleri accepts that her first language or mother tongue is English but she is ready to give chance to Urdu as it's importance remains intact because 'it is what she cannot say in English'(177). However, like her fluid identity the two languages she speaks have also learned to accommodate one another as they slip into one another. Thus, she establishes a connection between her 'post-modern self' and the languages that surround her. But the problem arises when,

'Speaking two languages may seem a relative affluence, but more often a second establishment even thorough your body can be at one place at a time. When I return to Urdu, I feel shocked at my own neglect of a space intimate to me: like relearning the proportions of a once familiar home, it takes me by surprise to recollect that I need not feel grief; that I need not bury my mother but instead can offer her into the earth, for I am in Urdu now.... Urdu like a reprimand disturbs my sense of habitation. "Do you think you ever lived on the inside of a space, it tells me with some scorn, "you who lack the surety of knowledge to intuit the gender of a roof a chair? Similarly I can live in courtyard, afternoons, I muse in departing arenas of regressed significance- a soothing notion, genderless". In this paragraph Suleri again reaffirms that Urdu comes after English and specially when the writer is diasporic and the standing is slippery. Again to the above passage Dayal's response is "Suleri expresses her sense of guilt at "neglecting" Urdu in favor of Anglicized expression, as the idiomatic quirk of Urdu offer her novel modes of expressing her sentiments (20)

Suleri feels that it was like home in which she lived now it disturbs her living style because of its patriarchal and highly gendered nature. Therefore, she walks out of her Urdu home which is so restrictive and infact would like to take breath in the "courtyards," areas of regressed significance a soothing notion, genderless"(177). She wants to be free of patriarchal order. "Language then is not a reliable home, and though some are fortunate to be at home in it,

others feel uneasy” (113) writes Saravan (2007) in his article. Fortunately, Suleri never took leave of Urdu, her father's biography *Boys will be Boys* has all the titles of the chapters in Urdu verse. Luckily her latest work is the translation of Ghalib's (father of Urdu poetry) work into English. This shows her intimacy with her father's language. Suleri feels 'that living in language is tantamount to living with other people' (197). For Suleri language contains ethnicity and culture. It depends on a person that how she/he acquires stability i.e. equilibrium when speaking a language which is not one's own or when a person can speak more than one language. Speaking a language requires assimilation to an extent that it becomes an identity and a part of one's personality. Broodzki and Schenc (cited in Dalal 2007) posit in the introduction to their book *Life/Line* (in reference to Roland Barthes' autobiography) the author's textual self comes across in *Meatless Days* as an “effect of language as identity formation enabled through signification”. (21) Language then becomes like a theater. ‘But then, the grace of habit. That for me, is what the theater was, a commingling of habitation with habitual speech; to learn a part until it turned to habit was entrancing, particularly since I did not know any other space that could tell me quite so firmly, you are just a part” (178). In Suleri's view, one then becomes a part of the language one is speaking and also of the people and culture that are housed in it. The principle of fluidity also applies to language. In this regard Gunew's (2007) article “Mouth word” is quite interesting and informative.

Gunew formulates that there is the taste of language in the sense that the tongue is involved in the swallowing (or not) of words, choking on words, or for craving their particular nourishment. Think of the specific and often private linguistic terms we reach for in designating family\_ coles. She mentions the work of Mars and Mars in this context. They speak of the “habit of hands’ involved in learning the rituals of traditional cooking. Thus, memory is constituted by the way of relating ritually to objects and the processes they are set out to

serve (Mars & Mars 159) Gunew draws the analogy with the orality. The body, more particularly the habit of mouth; acquires very specific physical traits in the process of utterance. These might then further animate the whole body as in the example of gesticulatron associated with some language”(106).

The sight of language for Suleri becomes shocking when she re-learns about Kapura. Narrating an incident of Tillat's visit to new Haven she writes “Sara said Tillat, her voice deep with the promise of surprise. “do you know what kapura are? They are sweet breads, and they are cooked with kidneys, and they're every good.”.... Not sweetbreads” She gently said “they are testicles, that's what kapura really are. Of course I refused to believe her, went on cooking, and that was the end of that (22).

It is important to return to the subject of 'selfhood or the 'Self' that Suleri projects in *Meatless Days* and *Boys will be Boys*. As a feminist-post Modernist writer Suleri's discourse on “self” resists interpretation and solid construction. Several questions remain unanswered on her account. The details of the relationship given in the chapters are incomplete and confusing. Suleri's description of Tom is humorous. “How deranging it must have been when at twelve that body began growing- and would not stop growing to have the coverage of only such a foreshortened name as Tom” (78). With reference to Tom she mentions size and proportion. I think what Tom lacks is articulation. Suleri is appalled when she says “I have known you for five years.... And I don't even know your blood type” (76-77). The real cause of her walking out of the relationship is not known and the chapter is left incomplete with Suleri's bidding farewell to Tom. “But I knew it meant that had I in Bombay- bearing India in the opposite direction from the gateway that should have heralded me- visited the Elephant cause, I knew already what I would have found. The mind would have whipped in warmth around the coves, emptying them of echo, and wrinkled out of sight across the flatness of that sea: all that would remain for me to hear would be the way they howled to

the other “Goodbye to the greatness of Tom”(89-90). Similarly, the details of her relationship with T. who was pilot are not given and the facts not mentioned. There is only a passing reference when Suleri visits her school in Pakistan and the Mother Baptist inquires ... and did you merry that T.K, lunatic in the airplane? And Suleri’s answer is “No mother” I meekly said and sipped my tea.” (8) We realize that there was something between Tarik Khan and Suleri she writes “Down in Lahore- so yellow in June, so green in September- enough of that stayed with us that we nearly got married, not once, but twice out of a sheer spirit of comedy” (35). Again the nature of the relationship is not given only superficial details mentioned. Her “Self” just like her text appears in fragment and pieces. It is after connecting the pieces that the picture of ‘self’ becomes somewhat clear. Suleri plays hide and seek with the readers. Again her decision to marry Austin is only half salutatory. One cannot learn anything from the text about Suleri’s criteria of an eligible husband. No explanations given regarding her decision to marry Austin. Hence, privacy invades Suleri’s autobiography. Therefore, her “Self” turns into “absolute authority” in the text and in real life as well. As a Pakistani woman Suleri earlier led a sheltered and protected life, is no longer bogged down by traditions and conventions. Consequently, Suleri, redefines man-woman relationship and the ‘othered self’ turns into ‘empowered self’. She then as a woman becomes “unrelenting champion” of the upper middle-class Pakistani woman and the representative of Western academic elite too.

## **References**

**Bhabha, Homi** (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London. Routledge.

**Chakraborty, Mirdaul Nath** (2007). *Will the Real South Asian Standup Please. Interpreting Homes in South Asian Literature* In *Interpreting Homes in South Asian Literature*. Maleshri Lal and Sukrita Paul (eds). New Delhi. Pearson Longman.

**Cixous, Helene** (1986). The Laugh of the Medusa in Feminist Literary Criticism.

**Cixous, Helene** (1977). La Venue a l'écriture, in La Venue al ecriture, Helene Cixous in Collaboration with Madeliene Gagnon, and Annie Leclerc ( Union Generate d'Editeurs). Paris UGE 10/18.

**Dalal, Isha** (2007). I Will Not Grip; Writing Identity in Sara Suleri's Meatless Days. Haberford College. [www.dalalisha](http://www.dalalisha)

**Grewal, Inderpal.** (1994). AutobiographySubjects and diaspora Locations. Meatless Days and Borderlands. Scattered Hegemonies. Grewal, I, Kaplan, C (eds). Minnesota. University of Minnesota Press.

**Gunew, Sneja. Mouthwork;** Food and Language as Corporeal Home for the Unhoused Diasporic Body. In Interpreting Homes in South-Asian Literature. New Delhi. Pearson Longman.

**Mohanty, Chandra** (1989). Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses. In The Empire Writes Back: Theory And Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures. Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin London. Routledge.

**Sarvan, Charles** (2007). The Colonial and Post -Colonial Experiences of Home in Two Srilankan Works. In Interpreting Homes in South Asian Literature. New Delhi. Pearson Longman.

**Suleri, Sara** (1989). Meatless Days. Chicago University Press. USA.

**Suleri, Sara** (2003). Boys Will Be Boys: A Daughter's Elegy. The University of Chicago Press Books. USA

**Zekmi, Silvia Nagy.** (2003). Images of Sheherzade Representations of the Postcolonial Female Subject. Journal of Gender Studies. Carfax Publishing.