https://doi.org/10.58256/398fdf58

RJAH

RESEARCH ARTICLE **Section:** *Literature, Linguistics & Criticism*

Gendered bodies, fractured nations: Feminist resistance and the politics of representation in contemporary Anglophone fiction

Aayesha Sagir Khan[1], Shoeb Saleh[2]*, Rommel Mahmoud AlAli[2], Ali Abdullatif[3]

[1]Faculty of Languages and Translation, King Khalid University, Abha, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
[2]The National Research Center for Giftedness and Creativity, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
[3]Department of Arabic Language, College of Arts, King Faisal University, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
*Correspondence: Sgsaleh@kfu.edu.sa

ABSTRACT

This article argues that contemporary Anglophone fiction does not treat the gendered body as a passive metaphor for national crisis; rather, it stages embodiment as the material and narrative interface through which nation, violence, citizenship, memory, and dissent become legible. Reading Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's Americanah, Kamila Shamsie's Home Fire, Arundhati Roy's The Ministry of Utmost Happiness, and Tsitsi Dangarembga's This Mournable Body comparatively, the essay shows how women's bodies, queer and trans bodies, and feminized subjectivities are made to bear the pressure of fractured national projects. Hair, dress, grief, sexuality, mobility, and bodily exhaustion emerge as techniques through which states and publics sort subjects into the visible and invisible, the grievable and disposable, the assimilable and suspect. Drawing on feminist literary criticism, postcolonial feminism, intersectionality, and biopolitical thought, the essay combines close reading with comparative analysis to demonstrate that these novels resist both nationalist romance and liberal narratives of individual empowerment. Their formal strategies—blogging, tragic refunctioning, polyphony, and second-person estrangement render embodied precarity neither merely private nor simply symbolic. Instead, they expose how intimate life is governed by public power while also imagining insurgent forms of relation and survival.

KEYWORDS: gendered embodiment, postcolonial feminism, Anglophone fiction, nation, biopolitics, feminist resistance, representation

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities
Volume 7, Issue 1, 2026
ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)
ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 01 **January 2026**
Accepted: 09 **February 2026**
Published: 19 **March 2026**

HOW TO CITE

Khan, A. S., Saleh, S., AlAli, R. M., & Abdullatif, A. (2026). Gendered bodies, fractured nations: Feminist resistance and the politics of representation in contemporary Anglophone fiction. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.58256/398fdf58

Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited
© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

Contemporary Anglophone fiction returns insistently to the body, but not in the old symbolic mode by which woman merely stands for tradition, homeland, or communal loss. In a striking range of twenty-first-century novels, the body appears instead as a political technology: something read, classified, disciplined, eroticized, securitized, commodified, abandoned, or mourned in ways that expose the intimate machinery of state and national power. What becomes visible through these texts is not simply that gender matters to the nation, a point long established in feminist criticism, but that the nation now often knows itself through procedures of embodied legibility. Hair, skin, clothing, reproductive capacity, religious marking, sexual nonconformity, and bodily exhaustion become sites at which citizenship is tested and belonging made conditional. The gendered body is therefore not an incidental theme within contemporary Anglophone fiction. It is one of the principal forms through which these novels think politics.

That claim requires a reading practice attentive to the difference between representation and reduction. Scholarship on nation and gender has demonstrated that women are frequently positioned as bearers of communal authenticity, cultural continuity, or threatened honour, while postcolonial feminist work has shown how such positioning is complicated by colonial discourse, racial hierarchy, and the global circulation of rescue narratives (Mohanty; Abu-Lughod; McClintock; Yuval-Davis). Yet in much criticism on recent fiction, embodiment still tends either to be treated allegorically, as if the body were merely a sign to be decoded, or sociologically, as if the novel provided transparent evidence of oppression. What such approaches often miss is that fiction does more than reflect political violence. It formalizes the conditions under which certain bodies become readable as citizens, strangers, threats, debris, or occasions for sympathy. Contemporary novels do not merely show that bodies are governed; they stage the terms of that governance and test the representational forms through which it is normalized or refused.

This article develops that argument through a comparative reading of four novels: Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's *Americanah* (2013), Kamila Shamsie's *Home Fire* (2017), Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* (2017), and Tsitsi Dangarembga's *This Mournable Body* (2018). These texts belong together not because they share a single geopolitical setting, but because each is written from a postcolonial, transnational, or diasporic horizon in which nationhood is experienced as fracture rather than coherence. They move across Nigeria, the United States, Britain, India, Kashmir, and Zimbabwe; they track migration, securitization, unemployment, caste and communal violence, racialization, trans and queer vulnerability, and the slow attrition of neoliberal survival. Across these very different sites, the body becomes the medium through which public power enters intimate life. Ifemelu's hair and accent in *Americanah*, Aneeka's public grief and the unreturnable corpse in *Home Fire*, Anjum's trans body and graveyard sanctuary in *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*, and Tambudzai's exhausted, disciplined, and estranged body in *This Mournable Body* are not parallel in any simple sense. But they are structurally comparable. Each reveals how states and publics produce embodied subjects through regimes of visibility, evaluation, and disposal.

The essay's central claim is that these novels represent women's bodies, queer and trans bodies, and feminized subjectivities not as passive symbols of national crisis but as sites where the nation attempts to secure itself by rendering difference legible, governable, and, when necessary, expendable. At the same time, the novels refuse to leave embodiment at the level of victimhood. Through blogging, polyphony, tragic refunctioning, second-person estrangement, multilingual textures, and alternative kinship formations, they transform the body into a counterarchive: a place where injury is registered, certainly, but also where resistant ways of inhabiting the political become imaginable. The body in these texts is therefore doubly charged. It is where the state writes itself, and where the state's claims are interrupted.

This intervention speaks to a specific gap in the field. Recent criticism on these novels has been rich and often incisive. *Americanah* has been read through hair politics, race, Afropolitan mobility, and narrative ethics (Cruz-Gutiérrez; Adeyelure and Roux; Pucherová; Berning). *Home Fire* has been approached through tragedy, Islamophobia, grief, necropolitics, and citizenship (Ahmed; Pishotti; Yaqin; Weiss). Roy's novel has generated important work on multilingualism, precarity, queer embodiment, and realism (Neumann; Mendes and Lau; Menozzi; Kłaniecki). Dangarembga's has been read through neoliberalism, pain, silencing, and the crisis of agency (Niemi; Ncube; Uwakweh; Glanvill). What remains less developed is a sustained comparative account of how contemporary Anglophone fiction ties gendered embodiment to national fracture and how

formal choices mediate that relation. To put it differently: critics have often analysed race, migration, trauma, and gender in these texts, but less often the shared representational logic by which the body becomes the scene where nationhood is both enforced and resisted.

The sections that follow proceed from that problem. I begin by reviewing the scholarship on feminist literary criticism, postcolonial feminism, nation, and representation that makes this comparison possible. I then outline a framework that draws feminist theory into dialogue with body politics, biopolitics, and postcolonial literary analysis. The three main analytical sections track, first, how bodily surfaces become sites of national legibility; second, how states manage the grievable and ungrievable body through securitized and necropolitical logics; and third, how the novels refigure exhausted or vulnerable embodiment as a mode of resistant knowledge. A fourth section then addresses a necessary tension: if visibility can expose power, it can also be captured by the very representational regimes it contests. The article argues, finally, that contemporary Anglophone fiction does not simply mourn injured bodies. It asks what kinds of political imagination become possible when embodiment is read as the point where the nation fractures, and where resistance begins.

Scholarship Review

Feminist literary criticism has long insisted that the relationship between gender and representation is constitutive rather than incidental. Bodies are not prior to discourse and then merely depicted by literature; they are produced through narrative, visuality, and regimes of interpretation that distribute agency unevenly (Butler; Spillers; Mulvey). When this insight enters postcolonial criticism, the question of representation acquires a further density. Gendered bodies are not only constructed within patriarchal structures; they are also situated within histories of colonial rule, nationalist recuperation, racial differentiation, and the global circulation of knowledge about the non-West. It is here that postcolonial feminism made its most durable intervention: by refusing both the universal woman of metropolitan feminism and the culturally sealed woman of nationalist discourse (Mohanty; Parashar; Chambers and Watkins). The point was never simply to add race or coloniality to gender, but to show that the categories through which bodies are known are themselves shaped by imperial histories and geopolitical asymmetries.

That insight remains crucial because the woman-as-symbol paradigm, though frequently critiqued, still exerts strong pressure on literary interpretation. Chatterjee's famous account of the inner and outer domains of nationalist discourse, McClintock's demonstration that nations are frequently figured through familial and gendered metaphors, and Nagel's work on masculinity and nationalism all established that modern nationhood routinely secures itself through a gendered division of labour: women are made to bear cultural authenticity, while masculinized state power governs public space (Chatterjee; McClintock; Nagel). Subsequent scholarship complicated that model by showing how these symbolic operations are mediated by class, race, religion, sexuality, and migration (Yuval-Davis; Crenshaw; Hasian and Bialowas; Nolan). Yet the older critical language of "women as metaphor for nation" sometimes risks its own abstraction, as if the body mattered chiefly as emblem. Contemporary fiction demands a more materialist and formal account. These novels are not content to repeat the allegorical equation between woman and nation; they ask how bodies are made administratively visible, how they are narratively framed, and how they are consumed within public cultures of fear and sympathy.
Postcolonial feminist criticism has been especially attentive to the political uses of visibility. Mohanty's critique of the homogenized "Third World woman," Abu-Lughod's challenge to rescue discourse, and Mahmood's rethinking of agency in relation to embodied religious practice each refuse the assumption that visibility naturally delivers emancipation (Mohanty; Abu-Lughod; Mahmood). Visibility can be coercive; it can demand self-explanation, cultural legibility, and moral performance on terms set elsewhere. Sara Ahmed's work on orientation, whiteness, and affect deepens this point by showing that bodies inherit social lines that make some kinds of movement comfortable and others anxious, exposed, or disallowed (Ahmed, "Orientations"; Ahmed, "A Phenomenology of Whiteness"; Ahmed, "Affective Economies"). In this sense, representation is not only about being seen. It is about being directed, aligned, and made to occupy a knowable place within a social field. This is why contemporary Anglophone fiction so often dwells on hair, dress, posture, accent, bodily comportment, and the management of public affect. Such details are not decorative. They are the very means by which the body is made available to power.

Biopolitical and necropolitical thought has supplied another vocabulary for reading these processes.

Berlant's account of slow death, Mbembe's theorization of necropolitics, and Puar's critique of homonationalism help to explain how states do not only repress bodies spectacularly; they differentiate them through attritional exhaustion, differential grievability, and the selective incorporation of some minoritized subjects at the expense of others (Berlant; Mbembe; Puar). Enguix Grau's work on masculine nations and queer bodies shows how queer embodiment may function as an index of national visibility and invisibility at once, while transnational feminist scholarship has demonstrated that globalization and migration intensify rather than dissolve these hierarchies (Enguix Grau; Deepak; Hoare et al.). These approaches are especially useful for literary study because they direct attention to the intimate scale at which power works: in grief, bodily shame, fatigue, surveillance, beauty norms, sexual vulnerability, and forms of disciplined aspiration.

Criticism on the selected novels has often illuminated precisely such scales, even where it has not yet been brought into sustained comparative conversation. Scholarship on *Americanah* has shown how Adichie turns hair into a politics of embodiment, race into an acquired grammar of visibility, and migration into a process that remakes the body's social meaning. Critics have examined the novel's hair politics, narrative ethics, Afropolitanism, bicultural liminality, border poetics, and the racialization of beauty and selfhood (Cruz-Gutiérrez; Berning; Pucherová; Amonyeze; Dasi; Adeyelure and Roux; Okolie; Òké; Yerima). This work importantly resists reading Ifemelu's experience as merely autobiographical or sociological. Even so, the novel's body politics are often discussed primarily in terms of race and migration rather than in relation to the national ordering of femininity and public legibility across both the United States and Nigeria.

A similarly rich body of work surrounds *Home Fire*. Critics have read the novel through Sophoclean tragedy, British Muslim identity, citizenship, necropolitical trauma, public grief, multiculturalism, and the criminalized body (Weiss; Mukherjee; Banerjee; Ahmed; Pishotti; Yaqin; Chemmachery; Rutkowska; Chambers; Keeble and Annesley; Hardy). This scholarship has made visible the novel's engagement with the War on Terror and the state's power over the dead, displaced, and denationalized body. What emerges less clearly, however, is the specifically gendered labor by which the novel makes that power sensible: the burden placed on Muslim women to narrate, defend, and publicly embody familial and political grief.

The criticism on Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* has clustered around multilingualism, realism, precarity, queer reading, linguistic politics, and the novel's treatment of India's marginalized and dispossessed others (Neumann; Ross; Menozzi; Mendes and Lau; Lau and Mendes; Kumar; Kłaniecki; Nayar; Pourjafari and Jamili). These readings have been vital in showing that Roy's novel neither dissolves the political into lyrical excess nor offers marginality as a redemptive spectacle. Yet the question of how the novel stages gendered and trans embodiment as a challenge to national legibility remains open. Anjum's body, like the graveyard she inhabits, is not merely excluded from the nation; it exposes the constitutive violence through which the nation distinguishes the livable from the disposable.

Criticism on *This Mournable Body* has been especially attentive to pain, narrative voice, neoliberal capitalism, ecological relation, female agency, and postcolonial dislocation (Niemi; Uwakweh; Ncube; Chikafa-Chipiro; Glanvill; Gebreyohannes and Ambachew; Gudhlanga and Madongonda; Flores; Dangarembga, "Writing as Witnessing"). Here the scholarly conversation has already moved beyond celebratory models of empowerment. Tambudzai's body is exhausted, disciplined, ashamed, and often estranged from itself; the novel's second-person narration refuses easy identification and makes crisis formally palpable. Yet this work, too, is rarely placed in dialogue with a broader corpus of contemporary Anglophone fiction that is equally concerned with how bodies are made to carry the burden of fractured nationhood.

The gap this article addresses, then, is not the absence of criticism on any single text. It is the absence of a comparative frame that treats embodied representation as the point where feminist, postcolonial, and biopolitical questions meet. Read together, these novels suggest that the body is neither simply personal nor merely allegorical. It is the scene where national fantasy, administrative violence, racialization, and feminist or queer resistance become narratable. Comparative reading is not useful here because the novels are identical. It is useful because each dramatizes, in a different register, the conversion of intimate life into political evidence. To understand how contemporary Anglophone fiction contests power, one must therefore read the body not as the endpoint of interpretation but as its method.

Theoretical Framework
The argument advanced here rests on a simple but demanding premise: bodies matter in literature not because they transparently index social reality, but because fiction renders visible the terms on which embodiment becomes politically meaningful. The article therefore combines postcolonial feminism with feminist narratology, intersectionality, and selected concepts from biopolitics and affect theory. This framework is not an attempt to subordinate the novels to theory. It is a way of naming the forms of pressure the novels themselves dramatize.
Postcolonial feminism is central because it resists two equally disabling habits of reading: the paternalist rescue of racialized or Muslim women by a putatively universal feminism, and the nationalist tendency to absorb gendered suffering into the rhetoric of cultural authenticity. Mohanty and Abu-Lughod remain indispensable here, not simply for cautioning against homogenization, but for insisting that the terms on which women become visible are historically produced and politically uneven (Mohanty; Abu-Lughod). Mahmood's reformulation of agency also matters because it dislodges the assumption that resistance is always legible as liberal self-assertion. In the novels discussed here, resistance is often indirect, compromised, or formally displaced. It may appear as self-stylization, endurance, disidentification, unruly grief, or the creation of alternate spaces of care rather than as triumphant autonomy.

Intersectionality supplies the second necessary term. Crenshaw's formulation and Yuval-Davis's subsequent work make clear that gender cannot be separated from race, class, religion, migration, sexuality, and citizenship (Crenshaw; Yuval-Davis). In these novels, no body is gendered in the abstract. Ifemelu is racialized as Black through migration; Aneeka is produced as Muslim and suspect within a securitized Britain; Anjum's trans femininity is entangled with religion, caste, and the violence of the Indian state; Tambudzai's female body bears the marks of class injury, colonial residue, and neoliberal abandonment. Intersectionality here is not a checklist of identities. It is a way of reading how multiple structures of power converge on bodily experience without ever fully fixing it.

Biopolitics and necropolitics help clarify what is at stake in that convergence. If biopolitics names the regulation of life, necropolitics names the differential distribution of death, exposure, and grievability (Mbembe). Berlant's notion of slow death is equally important for novels in which injury is not always spectacular but accumulates through fatigue, attrition, and compromised futurity (Berlant). Puar's work on homonationalism further sharpens the problem by showing how states may incorporate some queer subjects precisely in order to intensify violence against racialized or Muslim others (Puar). These concepts illuminate how the body becomes administratively intelligible. Yet literature complicates them by showing how such intelligibility is lived from within—through sensation, shame, irony, fantasy, memory, and formal estrangement.

Feminist narratology and close reading are therefore indispensable. Narrative voice, focalization, address, temporal fracture, polyphony, and the circulation of public and private speech shape how bodies appear and what can be said about them. Adichie's blog form and attention to hair discourse, Shamsie's tragic architecture and public staging of grief, Roy's multilingual and polyphonic overflow, and Dangarembga's second-person narration all constitute not just content but argument. They make visible the limits of dominant representation while experimenting with other ways of knowing embodied life. Methodologically, then, this essay proceeds through comparative close reading. It asks not only what these novels say about gender, nation, and violence, but how their forms produce legibility, opacity, and resistance. The body is approached as a site of inscription, certainly, but also as a narrative problem: a zone where fiction tests what can be represented, who may be mourned, and what kinds of life remain imaginable after the nation has fractured.

I. Surfaces of Belonging: Hair, Dress, and the Politics of Legibility
One of the most striking features of contemporary Anglophone fiction is the attention it gives to bodily surface. Hair, clothing, accent, posture, and public comportment are repeatedly treated not as trivial details but as political thresholds. They are the places where intimate subjectivity encounters national and racial scripts. In *Americanah* and *Home Fire* especially, the body becomes readable before it becomes knowable. What the novels expose is that modern power does not wait for confession or interior truth; it works through quick acts of visual and affective classification. The gendered body is apprehended as surface and sorted accordingly.

In *Americanah*, Ifemelu's body enters the United States before her self-description does. The novel's much-discussed attention to hair is not incidental to its account of migration; it is the concrete form through

which race is made newly material. Critics have rightly shown that the novel turns hair politics into a field where beauty, assimilation, and self-representation intersect (Cruz-Gutiérrez; Adeyelure and Roux; Yerima). Yet hair in *Americanah* is not merely an emblem of identity. It is a disciplinary interface. Through salon talk, professional codes, romantic expectations, and blog commentary, Adichie shows how the Black female body is instructed to become acceptable by smoothing, taming, or translating itself. The shift from Nigerian sociality to U.S. racialization is experienced not as an abstract ideological revelation but as a reorientation of the body. Ifemelu does not simply learn that race matters; she discovers that she has become visible in a way that reorganizes movement, intimacy, and self-presentation.

This is why the blog matters formally. It is often read as a vehicle for social commentary, and rightly so, but it is also a mode of embodied counter-legibility. It takes the body that has been interpreted from the outside and turns it into a site of discursive production. The blog posts do not dissolve race into discourse; they reinsert bodily life into public language. As Berning, Pucherová, and Òké suggest in different ways, the novel's ethics lie in its refusal to separate aesthetic form from the politics of mobility, race, and self-fashioning (Berning; Pucherová; Òké). Ifemelu's online voice is not disembodied. It is produced from the friction between being seen and refusing the terms of visibility offered by liberal multiculturalism. In that sense, the blog is less a neutral digital platform than a formal apparatus through which the novel stages self-inscription under conditions of racial management.

Adichie's attention to bodily surface also complicates any easy celebration of cosmopolitan mobility. Amonyeze's emphasis on liminality and Okolie's work on border poetics are useful here because they show that movement across national borders does not free the subject from categorization; it multiplies bordering practices at the level of everyday embodiment (Amonyeze; Okolie). Ifemelu's body becomes the scene on which race is not only perceived but rehearsed. Even return to Nigeria does not restore some prior wholeness. Rather, it reveals that national belonging itself has become unstable, mediated by global circuits of class aspiration, beauty economies, and transnational prestige. The body remains overdetermined, though differently so. *Americanah* therefore does not oppose an authentic home to an alienating abroad. It shows how the gendered body becomes the medium through which both spaces are negotiated, judged, and inhabited.

If *Americanah* dramatizes racialized bodily legibility through hair and public self-narration, *Home Fire* locates the problem in a different but related terrain: the securitized visibility of Muslim life in Britain. The novel is often discussed through tragedy and citizenship, but its tragic force depends on an earlier, quieter fact: the Muslim body enters the public sphere already burdened with explanation. Rehana Ahmed, Debjani Banerjee, and Claire Chambers all register, in different ways, that Shamsie's novel is concerned with how Muslim subjects are made readable within liberal democratic discourse before they speak for themselves (Ahmed; Banerjee; Chambers). That readability is gendered. Isma and Aneeka do not simply inhabit a political conflict; they are compelled to mediate it, absorb it, and display its emotional consequences.

The novel's airport scenes and border interrogations establish this logic early. What is at issue is not only surveillance in the obvious sense, but the conversion of bodily presence into evidence. Family history adheres to the body; kinship becomes a visible stain. From that point onward, the novel treats public femininity as a charged terrain. Aneeka's grief, most dramatically, is not permitted the privacy of mourning. It becomes spectacle, argument, and accusation at once. Critics such as Pishotti, Weiss, and Rutkowska have shown how *Home Fire* reworks tragic form in order to test the limits of public recognition and mourning under securitized nationalism (Pishotti; Weiss; Rutkowska). What deserves emphasis here is that the novel places a young Muslim woman's body at the center of that test. Her visibility is overdetermined: at once eroticized, pitied, mistrusted, and politically instrumentalized.

This is where *Americanah* and *Home Fire* converge. Both novels are preoccupied with bodily legibility, but neither treats visibility as intrinsically emancipatory. In one, the racialized female body is disciplined through beauty norms, workplace codes, and the performativity of cosmopolitan belonging; in the other, Muslim female visibility is bound to grief, suspicion, and the demand that private pain become publicly intelligible. The body in these novels is therefore not simply what the nation excludes. It is what the nation reads. Surface becomes a sensorium of power. Yet in both novels, narrative form interrupts the smoothness of that reading. The blog in *Americanah* and the tragic public structure of *Home Fire* do not rescue the body from politics. They show that interpretation itself is part of the struggle over who may appear, on what terms, and before which audience.

II. Grievability, Sanctuary, and the Necropolitics of the Unassimilable Body

If the first set of novels shows how bodies become visible to the nation, the second demonstrates what happens when visibility hardens into sovereign judgment. Here the central issue is not simply whether subjects are recognized, but whether they are deemed worthy of protection, mourning, burial, or continued life. *Home Fire* and *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* are especially powerful on this question because both are structured around bodies that the state cannot assimilate without remainder. The Muslim body marked by counterterror discourse and the trans body marked by communal and national normativity each expose the violence by which the nation decides what counts as a proper life.

The political scandal at the center of *Home Fire* is not only the death of Parvaiz or the state's refusal to repatriate his body. It is the novel's insistence that sovereignty extends into the most intimate rites of kinship. Chemmachery's reading of the criminalized body and Yaqin's discussion of necropolitical trauma are especially illuminating because they show how Shamsie dramatizes the state's power to turn the dead body into a political warning rather than an object of familial mourning (Chemmachery; Yaqin). Burial, return, and the right to be grieved become instruments of national pedagogy. The body, even in death, is not released from state reading. It is made to signify treachery, contamination, or failed citizenship.

What gives the novel its feminist edge is that this necropolitical logic is carried by women's embodied labor. Aneeka's refusal to accept the administrative disappearance of her brother turns grief into a public claim, but the novel is careful not to romanticize that transformation. Mukherjee, Weiss, and Hardy show that *Home Fire* mobilizes tragic form precisely because tragedy permits the novel to ask what kind of recognition remains possible when law, sovereignty, and kinship are fatally misaligned (Mukherjee; Weiss; Hardy). Yet the tragedy is not abstract. It is routed through a young woman's body, voice, and visibility. Aneeka's mourning is not simply observed; it is interpreted, consumed, and re-coded within media and state discourse. In other words, grief itself becomes a representational battleground. The state does not only police violence. It polices the terms on which loss may enter public language.

Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* broadens this question by relocating it within a far more polyphonic and spatially unstable novel. If *Home Fire* turns on the contested corpse and the spectacularly ungrievable dead, Roy asks what it means to live as a body the nation cannot narrate without distortion. Anjum's trans and hijra embodiment is central here, not because Roy offers it as a stand-in for all marginality, but because the novel insists that national order depends on producing some lives as unintelligible and therefore administratively disposable. Scholarship on the novel has rightly emphasized multilingualism, precarity, and queer or trans reading (Neumann; Kłaniecki; Kumar; Lau and Mendes). What these approaches help clarify is that Anjum's body does not merely symbolize exclusion. It reveals the instability of the categories through which the nation imagines itself.

The novel's graveyard setting is crucial. Jannat Guest House is not only a refuge for the abandoned; it is a counter-public assembled from those who exceed the state's normative account of family, religion, caste, gender, and citizenship. Mendes and Lau describe the creativity of precarity in the novel, while Menozzi's work on realism shows how Roy refuses the comforts of representational transparency (Mendes and Lau; Menozzi). Those arguments can be extended by noticing that sanctuary in Roy is inseparable from embodiment. The graveyard is not an abstract utopia. It is a material space organized around bodies the official nation has displaced from livable social life. The novel makes clear that alternative belonging begins not where difference disappears but where vulnerable bodies are allowed to persist outside the state's demand for coherent identity. Roy's treatment of language deepens that point. Ross and Neumann both show that vernacular plurality in Roy's fiction is politically charged rather than ornamental (Ross; Neumann). The same is true of bodily plurality. The novel's formal excess—its interruptions, documents, shifts in focalization, and refusal of linear containment—mirrors the impossibility of reducing its characters to a single national script. Anjum is not offered as transparent subaltern truth; indeed the novel repeatedly risks and reflects on the representational problem of speaking marginality. But that is precisely why the text matters. It refuses the state's fantasy that the unintelligible body can be made intelligible by force. Instead, it builds a form adequate to excess, contradiction, and survivance.

Read together, *Home Fire* and *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* reveal that the politics of the gendered body cannot be understood solely through visibility. Some bodies are hypervisible and still ungrievable; others

are administratively unintelligible and therefore exposed to violence. What unites the novels is their insistence that sovereignty works through this differential distribution of recognizability. The body becomes national matter not because it naturally belongs to the public sphere, but because state discourse repeatedly invades intimacy in order to sort life from threat, kinship from contamination, mourning from spectacle. Yet the novels also refuse to grant sovereignty the last word. In Shamsie, grief makes visible the cruelty of the state's claim to decide where the dead belong. In Roy, queer and trans collectivity produces a counter-sociality that the nation cannot absorb without undoing itself. Embodiment here is not simply where power lands. It is where power becomes narratively contestable.

III. Slow Violence and the Exhausted Feminine Subject

The most visible forms of national violence in contemporary fiction are often spectacular: detention, militarization, communal attack, the criminalized corpse. Yet one of the major achievements of recent Anglophone fiction is to show that domination is also lived as attrition. It takes the form of exhausted aspiration, bodily shame, stalled mobility, and the ordinary violence of having to continue under conditions that deplete the subject. *This Mournable Body* is the most unflinching novel in this corpus on that question. If *Home Fire* and *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* illuminate necropolitical exposure, Dangarembga's novel shows how the body is slowly worn down by postcolonial capitalism, patriarchal expectation, and the cruel temporality of failed uplift. The nation appears here less as spectacular sovereign than as the agent of prolonged diminishment.

Critics have increasingly recognized this dimension of the novel. Niemi reads *This Mournable Body* as a devastating account of neoliberal uneven development; Chikafa-Chipiro's phrase "Zimbabwean pain body" captures the text's insistence that injury is social before it is merely personal; Uwakweh and Ncube both emphasize that the novel's politics reside in its representational decisions, especially its refusal of triumphant agency (Niemi; Chikafa-Chipiro; Uwakweh; Ncube). Those readings are persuasive, but what deserves emphasis in the present context is the relation between bodily exhaustion and national fantasy. Tambudzai's body is not simply hurt by circumstance. It is repeatedly measured against the promises of education, development, employability, femininity, and patriotic self-making that both colonial and postcolonial regimes have attached to upward mobility. Her exhaustion is therefore ideological as well as physical. The body becomes the record of promises the nation cannot keep.

Dangarembga's most radical formal choice is the second-person narration. Glanvill has argued that the trilogy refuses the consolations of bildung, while Uwakweh notes that narrative silencing is itself political in the novel (Glanvill; Uwakweh). The second person intensifies both claims. It turns Tambu into an object of address, discipline, and estrangement. The self is split from itself, watched as though from outside, unable fully to claim the interior coherence on which liberal narratives of agency depend. This is crucial for a feminist reading of embodiment. The novel does not ask the reader to celebrate resilience in familiar terms. It asks what it means for a woman's body to become the site at which structural violence is lived as shame, numbness, aspiration, and self-reproach. Resistance, if the novel allows the word at all, is not glamorous. It inheres in the text's unsparing refusal to convert damage into inspirational recovery.

The novel's attention to labour and tourism intensifies this critique. Tambu's attempts to remain socially viable repeatedly require her to treat herself as available, marketable, and administratively useful. The body is made employable, displayable, and optimizable, yet never secure. In that sense, *This Mournable Body* extends Berlant's concept of slow death into a specifically postcolonial register: attrition is not only biological or affective but historical, tied to developmental fantasies and national betrayal (Berlant). Gudhlanga and Madongonda's work on dislocation and Gebreyohannes and Ambachew's ecofeminist reading both underscore that Tambu's body is embedded in damaged worlds rather than isolated from them (Gudhlanga and Madongonda; Gebreyohannes and Ambachew). The body in this novel does not stand outside land, labour, and environment; it condenses their crisis.

Placed beside *Americanah*, Dangarembga's novel also revises the contemporary grammar of mobility. Ifemelu's migration, racialization, and eventual return produce a highly mediated but still viable form of self-articulation. Tambu's movement, by contrast, is stunted, humiliating, and repeatedly redirected by structures she cannot master. The comparison is instructive not because one novel is optimistic and the other bleak, but because together they reveal the classed and uneven terms on which bodily movement becomes imaginable.

Adichie's novel shows how mobility re-racializes the female body; Dangarembga's shows how immobility and exhausted striving make the body available to disciplines of failure. In both cases, embodiment is a political index of whose movement the nation and the global market are willing to authorize.

Yet *This Mournable Body* does not simply document defeat. Its resistance lies in formal honesty. By refusing the sentimental recovery plot, the novel transforms exhausted embodiment into analytic force. Flores's brief but telling review notes the trilogy's commitment to race, gender, and class as ongoing structures rather than background conditions, while Dangarembga's own reflections on witnessing make clear that writing here is inseparable from recording what official narratives would rather forget (Flores; Dangarembga, "Writing as Witnessing"). The body, in this sense, is neither redeemed nor transcended. It is made available as evidence—not of pathology, but of the historical and national arrangements that produce damage as ordinary life.

What emerges from Dangarembga's novel, and from the corpus more broadly, is that feminist resistance in contemporary Anglophone fiction cannot be reduced to visible rebellion. Sometimes it takes the form of public grief or queer sanctuary; sometimes it takes the form of sustained narrative exposure of ordinary depletion. By making bodily exhaustion readable without romanticizing it, *This Mournable Body* challenges a critical vocabulary too easily seduced by agency as spectacle. It insists that the nation's violence is often lived not at the limit of life but in life's ongoing diminishment, and that literary form can make that diminishment politically legible without turning it into a consumable drama of overcoming.

IV. When Visibility Becomes Capture: Tensions in Feminist and Postcolonial Reading

A feminist argument about embodied resistance must also confront the possibility that visibility is not only enabling but acquisitive. To make the gendered body visible is not automatically to liberate it from dominant frames; indeed the contemporary cultural economy is exceptionally adept at turning injury, alterity, and dissent into consumable signs. This tension haunts all four novels and should also discipline criticism about them. If these texts expose the cultural logic through which bodies become sites of national anxiety and ideological control, they also risk being read through that same logic—especially when metropolitan audiences seek in postcolonial fiction either exemplary suffering or legible empowerment.

Postcolonial feminism has repeatedly warned against that trap. Mohanty's critique of the generalized "Third World woman," Abu-Lughod's challenge to rescue discourse, and Chambers and Watkins's insistence that postcolonial criticism cannot bracket gender all remind us that representation is never innocent (Mohanty; Abu-Lughod; Chambers and Watkins). The question, then, is not whether these novels "give voice" to oppressed subjects, a formulation that often flatters the critic more than it clarifies the text. The question is whether the novels reproduce dominant frameworks of recognizability or whether they put pressure on the very desire for transparent access.

Americanah is a useful case here because its global readability is part of its problem. The novel's elegance, wit, and accessibility have contributed to its wide uptake, but those very qualities can make its critique of racial embodiment appear more settled than it is. The blog form, for all its sharpness, is legible to neoliberal publics precisely because it translates experience into communicative capital. Ifemelu's body becomes a source of knowledge, but also a branded site of commentary. Pucherová's emphasis on Afropolitan empathy and Òké's discussion of travel are productive because they show that mobility and worldliness do not abolish asymmetry; they may aestheticize it in new ways (Pucherová; Òké). The novel knows this, which is why return is not figured as uncomplicated homecoming. Still, criticism must resist turning Ifemelu into the exemplary cosmopolitan who has solved the politics of embodiment through irony and eloquence. What the novel offers is more precarious: a form of self-representation that remains entangled with the marketability of racial difference.

A comparable tension structures *Home Fire*. Its tragic power derives in part from the public visibility of Muslim grief, but that visibility is unstable. Aneeka's mourning can move readers toward ethical recognition, yet it can also reinscribe the spectacle of the suffering Muslim woman as a familiar liberal scene. Ahmed's account of reading Muslims ethically is especially valuable because it resists the fantasy of effortless understanding; Pishotti and Yaqin similarly show that grief in the novel is inseparable from state violence and the politics of trauma (Ahmed; Pishotti; Yaqin). Even so, the text's deployment of tragic form invites a question: does the aesthetic shaping of grief intensify political critique, or does it sometimes recontain it within familiar structures of pathos? The answer, I think, lies in the novel's refusal of resolution. *Home Fire* does not ask readers to

identify compassionately and move on. It leaves grief unresolved, public, and politically contaminated. But that effect depends on reading against the grain of humanitarian consumption.

Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* raises a different challenge. Its extraordinary formal abundance—polyphony, irony, documentary fragments, lyrical detours, political exposition—can be read either as a radical challenge to national ordering or as a risky aestheticization of dispossession. Menozzi's work on realism and Mendes and Lau's reading of precarity are helpful because they refuse the crude opposition between politics and form (Menozzi; Mendes and Lau). Yet the question remains: what does it mean to write the trans, Muslim, Kashmiri, and otherwise marginalized body into a capacious national novel? Roy's answer is not purity. The novel does not pretend that representation can fully repair historical violence. Instead it stages collectivity as messy, provisional, and haunted by incompletion. That does not remove the danger of aesthetic capture, but it does make the danger visible within the text itself. The novel's excess is not decorative. It is a refusal of the administratively neat categories through which the state would organize difference.

This Mournable Body may be the least vulnerable to the glamour of visibility because its governing affect is not revelation but abrasion. The second-person mode resists easy sympathy; it keeps both reader and protagonist off balance. This is one reason the novel is so important for contemporary feminist criticism. It does not offer suffering for recognition. It makes recognition difficult. Uwakweh's emphasis on narrative silencing and Glanvill's account of irreparable reading show that the novel denies the reader any simple position of moral reassurance (Uwakweh; Glanvill). But that very difficulty poses another interpretive risk: critics may turn formal harshness into proof of political seriousness without asking what it does to the representational status of the body. Tambu's exhaustion should not become another valuable object in the global circulation of postcolonial pain. The force of the novel lies precisely in its exposure of such circulation.

These tensions matter because they prevent the article's argument from becoming triumphalist. Feminist resistance in contemporary Anglophone fiction is not guaranteed by the presence of women, queer, or feminized bodies on the page. Nor is subversive representation secured merely by transnational scope or postcolonial setting. What these novels achieve, at their strongest, is not the uncomplicated liberation of marginalized embodiment into visibility. It is something more difficult: they reveal the instability of the very frames through which bodies become culturally intelligible. They show that recognition may wound, that public legibility may be a form of capture, and that opacity, estrangement, or excessive form may sometimes do more political work than transparency. To read these novels well, criticism must therefore resist the desire for bodies that are immediately available—either as victims, heroines, or moral lessons. The body becomes politically powerful in these texts precisely when it exceeds the terms on which power would like to read it.

Conclusion

The contemporary Anglophone novels discussed here do not abandon the longstanding association between gender and nation; they radicalize it by relocating that association in the lived and represented body. What they show is that embodiment is not simply where national ideologies are reflected, nor merely the symbolic residue of political crisis. It is the terrain on which sovereignty, racialization, mobility, grief, sexuality, labour, and memory are made material. Hair in *Americanah*, public mourning in *Home Fire*, trans and queer spatiality in *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*, and exhausted self-address in *This Mournable Body* are formally distinct, but they share a structural insight: the nation secures itself by making bodies readable, and those bodies become sites of resistance precisely when they expose the violence of that readability.

This is the article's principal contribution to English literary studies. First, it argues for a comparative approach to contemporary Anglophone fiction that treats embodiment as an analytic rather than incidental category. The body is not secondary to plot, setting, or ideology; it is where literary form and political power meet. Second, it complicates familiar critical models. Against reductive nationalism, these novels show that women, queer subjects, and feminized lives are not simply metaphors for the nation. Against liberal readings of voice and visibility, they show that recognition is often tied to surveillance, securitization, commodification, or grief spectacle. And against an overly celebratory language of agency, they insist that resistance may appear as compromised self-inscription, unruly mourning, sanctuary, opacity, or endurance rather than sovereign self-possession.

The broader humanities stakes are equally clear. Debates about identity and power often oscillate

between the macro-language of the state and the micro-language of personal experience. The fiction examined here refuses that division. It demonstrates that intimate life is one of the primary scenes in which public power is organized, felt, and contested. The body becomes the archive of that contestation: a record of social inscription, but also a medium of refusal. To read gendered embodiment in contemporary Anglophone fiction, then, is not to retreat from politics into the personal. It is to see how the political is reproduced through the management of bodily visibility and how literature can make that management newly intelligible. In these novels, fractured nations are not merely narrated around vulnerable bodies. They are exposed through them.

Funding:

1- This work was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research, Vice Presidency for Graduate Studies and Scientific Research, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia [Grant No. KFU261397]

2- The author extends her appreciation to the Deanship of Scientific Research at King Khalid University for funding this work through Large Research Groups under grant number (RGP.2 /422/46).

References

Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi. *Americanah*. Anchor, 2014.

Dangarembga, Tsitsi. *This Mournable Body*. Graywolf Press, 2018.

Roy, Arundhati. *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*. Alfred A. Knopf, 2017.

Shamsie, Kamila. *Home Fire*. Riverhead Books, 2017.

Abu-Lughod, Lila. "Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others." *American Anthropologist*, vol. 104, no. 3, 2002, pp. 783–790. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.2002.104.3.783.

Adeyelure, Omotola T., and Alwyn P. Roux. "Transgressive Body in Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's *Americanah*." *Literator*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2023. https://doi.org/10.4102/lit.v44i1.1893.

Ahmed, Rehana. "Towards an Ethics of Reading Muslims: Encountering Difference in Kamila Shamsie's *Home Fire*." *Textual Practice*, vol. 35, no. 7, 2021, pp. 1145–1161. https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2020.1731582.

Ahmed, Sara. "A Phenomenology of Whiteness." *Feminist Theory*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2007, pp. 149–168. https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700107078139.

Ahmed, Sara. "Affective Economies." *Social Text*, vol. 22, no. 2, 2004, pp. 117–139. https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-22-2_79-117.

Ahmed, Sara. "Orientations: Toward a Queer Phenomenology." *GLQ*, vol. 12, no. 4, 2006, pp. 543–574. https://doi.org/10.1215/10642684-2006-002.

Amonyeze, Chinenye. "Writing a New Reputation: Liminality and Bicultural Identity in Chimamanda Adichie's *Americanah*." *SAGE Open*, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017712773.

Banerjee, Debjani. "From Cheap Labor to Overlooked Citizens: Looking for British Muslim Identities in Kamila Shamsie's *Home Fire*." *South Asian Review*, vol. 41, nos. 3–4, 2020, pp. 288–302. https://doi.org/10.1080/02759527.2020.1835141.

Berlant, Lauren. "Slow Death (Sovereignty, Obesity, Lateral Agency)." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 33, no. 4, 2007, pp. 754–780. https://doi.org/10.1086/521568.

Berning, Nora. "Narrative Ethics and Alterity in Adichie's Novel *Americanah*." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, vol. 17, no. 5, 2015. https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2733.

Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." *Theatre Journal*, vol. 40, no. 4, 1988, pp. 519–531. https://doi.org/10.2307/3207893.

Chambers, Claire, and Susan Watkins. "Postcolonial Feminism?" *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 47, no. 3, 2012, pp. 297–301. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021989412456167.

Chambers, Claire. "Sound and Fury: Kamila Shamsie's *Home Fire*." *The Massachusetts Review*, vol. 59, no. 2, 2018, pp. 202–219. https://doi.org/10.1353/mar.2018.0029.

Chatterjee, Partha. "The Nation and Its Women." *The Nation and Its Fragments*, Princeton UP, 1993, pp. 116–134. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691201429-007.

Chemmachery, Jaine. "'He Wants Me to Bring Him Home, Even in the Form of a Shell': Criminalized Bodies and Repatriation in Kamila Shamsie's *Home Fire*." *Interventions*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2024, pp. 108–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369801X.2023.2190915.

Chikafa-Chipiro, Rosemary. "Tsitsi Dangarembga and the Zimbabwean Pain Body." *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, vol. 32, no. 4, 2020, pp. 445–447. https://doi.org/10.1080/13696815.2019.1704694.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review*, vol. 43, no. 6, 1991, pp. 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039.

Cruz-Gutiérrez, Cristina. "Hair Politics in the Blogosphere: Safe Spaces and the Politics of Self-Representation in Chimamanda Adichie's *Americanah*." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol. 55, no. 1, 2019, pp. 66–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2018.1462243.

Dangarembga, Tsitsi. "Writing as Witnessing: The Tambudzai and Nyasha Trilogy." *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, vol. 32, no. 4, 2020, pp. 438–444. https://doi.org/10.1080/13696815.2019.1704700.

Dasi, E. A. "The Intersection of Race, Beauty and Identity: The Migrant Experience in Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's *Americanah*." *Studies in Linguistics and Literature*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2019. https://doi.org/10.22158/sll.v3n2p140.

Deepak, Anne C. "Globalization, Power and Resistance: Postcolonial and Transnational Feminist Perspectives for Social Work Practice." *International Social Work*, vol. 55, no. 6, 2012, pp. 779–793. https://doi.

org/10.1177/0020872811414038.
Enguix Grau, Begonya. "Masculine Nations, Queer Bodies and the In/Visibilities of Gender." *Journal of Gender Studies*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2023, pp. 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2023.2258070.
Flores, Natalia. "This Mournable Body (Tsitsi Dangarembga)." *Tydskrif vir Letterkunde*, vol. 57, no. 1, 2020, pp. 146–147. https://doi.org/10.17159/2309-9070/tvl.v.57i1.7826.
Gebreyohannes, Nigus Michael, and Abiye Daniel Ambachew. "Women's Perceptions of Nature: An Ecofeminist Analysis of Tsitsi Dangarembga's *This Mournable Body*." *Humanities*, vol. 11, no. 6, 2022, article 159. https://doi.org/10.3390/h11060159.
Glanvill, Baron. "Cruel Optimism and Irreparable Reading: Tsitsi Dangarembga's Tambudzai and Nyasha Trilogy." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol. 60, no. 3, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2024.2418830.
Gudhlanga, Enna Sukutai, and Angeline Mavis Madongonda. "Postcolonial Dislocation and the Psyche: Connecting the Dots in Tsitsi Dangarembga's *This Mournable Body*." *Ecofeminist Perspectives from African Women Creative Writers*, edited volume chapter, 2024, pp. 123–137. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-48509-1_7.
Hardy, Clara Shaw. "'Something Mythic': The Power of Shared Stories in Kamila Shamsie's *Home Fire*." *Classical Receptions Journal*, vol. 16, no. 3, 2024, pp. 317–329. https://doi.org/10.1093/crj/clae005.
Hasian, Marouf, Jr., and Kathryn Bialowas. "Gendered Nationalism, the Colonial Narrative, and the Rhetorical Significance of the Mother India Controversy." *Communication Quarterly*, vol. 57, no. 4, 2009. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370903320849.
Hoare, Joanna Pares, Ioana Szeman, and Anneeth Kaur Hundle. "What Is the Transnational in Transnational Feminist Research?" *Feminist Review*, vol. 121, no. 1, 2019, pp. 3–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/0141778918817525.
Keeble, Arin, and James Annesley. "Globalism, Multiculturalism and Violence in Zia Haider Rahman's *In the Light of What We Know* (2014) and Kamila Shamsie's *Home Fire* (2017)." *Parallax*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2021, pp. 79–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/13534645.2021.1976463.
Kumar, Sunil. "Transecology as 'Lines of Flight' in Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*." *South Asian Review*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2024, pp. 336–347. https://doi.org/10.1080/02759527.2023.2221942.
Kłaniecki, Beniamin. "'Hope and Grief Woven Together': Consolation in a Queer Reading of Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 59, nos. 2–3, 2024, pp. 329–343. https://doi.org/10.1177/00219894231162500.
Lau, Lisa, and Ana Cristina Mendes. "Romancing the Other: Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 57, no. 1, 2022, pp. 102–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021989418820701.
Mahmood, Saba. "Feminist Theory, Agency, and the Liberatory Subject: Some Reflections on the Islamic Revival in Egypt." *Temenos*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2006, pp. 31–71. https://doi.org/10.33356/temenos.4633.
Martins, Ana Margarida Dias. "Gender and the 'Postcolonial Exotic'." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2013, pp. 145–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021989412471138.
Mbembe, Achille. "Necropolitics." *Public Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2003, pp. 11–40. https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-15-1-11.
McClintock, Anne. "No Longer in a Future Heaven: Women and Nationalism in South Africa." *Transition*, no. 51, 1991. https://doi.org/10.2307/2935081.
Mendes, Ana Cristina, and Lisa Lau. "The Precarious Lives of India's Others: The Creativity of Precarity in Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol. 56, no. 1, 2020, pp. 70–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2019.1683758.
Menozzi, Filippo. "'Too Much Blood for Good Literature': Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* and the Question of Realism." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol. 55, no. 1, 2019, pp. 20–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2018.1507919.
Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Feminist Review*, no. 30, 1988, pp. 61–88. https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.1988.42.
Mukherjee, Ankhi. "On Antigone's Suffering." *Cambridge Journal of Postcolonial Literary Inquiry*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2021, pp. 214–231. https://doi.org/10.1017/pli.2021.3.
Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Screen*, vol. 16, no. 3, 1975, pp. 6–18. https://doi.

org/10.1093/screen/16.3.6.
Nagel, Joane. “Masculinity and Nationalism: Gender and Sexuality in the Making of Nations.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2, 1998, pp. 242–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/014198798330007.
Nayar, Pramod K. “Mobility and Insurgent Celebrityhood: The Case of Arundhati Roy.” *Open Cultural Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2017, pp. 46–54. https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2017-0005.
Ncube, Ndumiso. “Being ‘Woman’ and Zimbabwean in Zimbabwe: Reading the (Un)Mournable Bodies in Tsitsi Dangarembga’s *This Mournable Body*.” *Imbizo*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2023. https://doi.org/10.25159/2663-6565/12485.
Neumann, Birgit. “An Ocean of Languages? Multilingualism in Arundhati Roy’s *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*.” *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 58, no. 3, 2023, pp. 593–609. https://doi.org/10.1177/00219894211007916.
Niemi, Minna Johanna. “Critical Representation of Neoliberal Capitalism and Uneven Development in Tsitsi Dangarembga’s *This Mournable Body*.” *Journal of Southern African Studies*, vol. 47, no. 5, 2021, pp. 869–888. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070.2021.1959118.
Nolan, Emer. “Postcolonial Literary Studies, Nationalism, and Feminist Critique in Contemporary Ireland.” Éire-Ireland, vol. 42, no. 1, 2007, pp. 336–361. https://doi.org/10.1353/eir.2007.0025.
Okolie, M. J. N. “Adichie’s *Americanah*, Transnational Border and the Prospects for Identity Reformation.” *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2024, pp. 59–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2022.2060279.
Parashar, Swati. “Feminism and Postcolonialism: (En)gendering Encounters.” *Postcolonial Studies*, vol. 19, no. 4, 2016, pp. 371–377. https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2016.1317388.
Pishotti, Gabriella. “Materializing Grief: The Reclamation of Loss in Kamila Shamsie’s *Home Fire*.” *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol. 58, no. 3, 2022, pp. 349–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2021.2015618.
Pourjafari, Fatemeh, and Leila Baradaran Jamili. “Ethical Telling and the Aesthetic Told: Ethical Narratology of Arundhati Roy’s *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*.” *Critical Literary Studies*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2022, pp. 25–40. https://doi.org/10.34785/J014.2022.281.
Puar, Jasbir K. “Rethinking Homonationalism.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 45, no. 2, 2013, pp. 336–339. https://doi.org/10.1017/S002074381300007X.
Pucherová, Dobrota. “Afropolitan Narratives and Empathy: Migrant Identities in Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie’s *Americanah* and Sefi Atta’s *A Bit of Difference*.” *Human Affairs*, vol. 28, no. 4, 2018, pp. 406–416. https://doi.org/10.1515/humaff-2018-0033.
Ross, Michael Lawrence. “Arundhati Roy and the Politics of Language.” *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 57, no. 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021989419881033.
Rutkowska, Urszula. “The Political Novel in Our Still-Evolving Reality: Kamila Shamsie’s *Home Fire* and the Shamima Begum Case.” *Textual Practice*, vol. 36, no. 6, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2020.1841280.
Spillers, Hortense J. “Mama’s Baby, Papa’s Maybe: An American Grammar Book.” *Diacritics*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1987, pp. 64–81. https://doi.org/10.2307/464747.
Uwakweh, Pauline Ada. “Unmaking Agency: Intersectionality and Narrative Silencing in Tsitsi Dangarembga’s *This Mournable Body*.” *Meridians*, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1080/21674736.2023.2204575.
Weiss, Naomi. “Tragic Form in Kamila Shamsie’s *Home Fire*.” *Classical Receptions Journal*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2022, pp. 240–263. https://doi.org/10.1093/crj/clab008.
Yaqin, Amina. “Necropolitical Trauma in Kamila Shamsie’s Fiction.” *The Muslim World*, vol. 111, no. 2, 2021, pp. 234–249. https://doi.org/10.1111/muwo.12383.
Yerima, Dina. “Regimentation or Hybridity? Western Beauty Practices by Black Women in Adichie’s *Americanah*.” *Journal of Black Studies*, vol. 48, no. 7, 2017, pp. 639–650. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934717712711.
Yuval-Davis, Nira. “Intersectionality and Feminist Politics.” *European Journal of Women’s Studies*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2006, pp. 193–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065752.
Òké, Roseline. “Afropolitanism, *Americanah*, and the Illocution of Travel.” *Critical Philosophy of Race*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2019, pp. 289–307. https://doi.org/10.5325/critphilrace.7.2.0289.