Journal of Marketing & Social Research

ISSN (Online): 3008-0711

Volume: 02 | Issue 05 | 2025

Journal homepage: https://jmsr-online.com/

Research Article

Epistemologies of Hybridity and Mimetic Transgression: A Postcolonial Exegesis of Identity and Hybridity in Nirad C. Chaudhuri's The Continent of Circe and Thy Hand, Great Anarch

Ms. Ishita Bhatt

Department of English, Gurukul Kangri(Deemed to be University), Haridwar, Uttarakhand

Received: 26/05/2025; Revision: 10/06/2025; Accepted: 20/06/2025; Published: 05/07/2025

Corresponding author: Ms. Ishita Bhatt *(bhat2103@outlook.com)

Abstract: This scholarly disquisition undertakes a rigorous postcolonial exegesis of the intricate epistemologies underpinning identity and hybridity within Nirad C. Chaudhuri's seminal works, The Continent of Circe (1965) and Thy Hand, Great Anarch (1987). Anchored predominantly in Elleke Boehmer's sophisticated theorization of mimicry as "a strategic performance that reverberates with and subverts colonial authority, exposing its precarious fragility" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 86), this investigation interrogates Chaudhuri's Anglophilic proclivities as a performative transgression that destabilizes the binary edifice of colonizer and colonized. The analytical framework is enriched by Homi K. Bhabha's conceptualization of the "third space" as a liminal crucible of cultural negotiation (The Location of Culture, 55), Edward Said's critique of imperial cultural hegemony as a discursive apparatus of domination (Culture and Imperialism, 9), and Gayatri Spivak's perspicuous scrutiny of subaltern enunciative constraints ("Can the Subaltern Speak?", 284). Augmented by Ian Almond's interstitial hermeneutics, Ashis Nandy's exposition of the colonial "intimate enemy," Bill Ashcroft's articulation of hybridity's transformative potency, Ranajit Guha's deconstruction of historiographical subjugation, and Partha Chatterjee's delineation of derivative nationalism, the study situates Chaudhuri's oeuvre within a polyphonic epistemic constellation. Through meticulous textual exegesis, this paper elucidates how Chaudhuri's hybrid identity—forged at the confluence of veneration for British intellectual paradigms and a critical disavowal of their legacies—constitutes a mimetic transgression that reconfigures postcolonial subjectivity. In The Continent of Circe, his excoriation of Indian societal torpor through a colonial lens exemplifies Boehmer's assertion that "mimicry unveils the artificiality of colonial authority by appropriating its semiotics" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 93), while Thy Hand, Great Anarch extends this critique to the postcolonial state's perpetuation of imperial hierarchies, as Boehmer notes, "cloaked beneath the rhetoric of emancipation" (145). The investigation contends that Chaudhuri's interstitial agency, though circumscribed by his elite emplacement, disrupts monolithic cultural narratives, aligning with Bhabha's postulate that "hybridity revalues colonial identity through iterative displacement" (The Location of Culture, 162). This disquisition contributes to advanced postcolonial discourse by illuminating the dialectical interplay of mimicry, hybridity, and identity, inviting further scholarly forays into the epistemic ramifications of Anglophilic transgression in the postcolonial milieu.

Keywords: Hybridity, Mimicry, Postcolonial Identity, Anglophilia.

INTRODUCTION

The literary corpus of Nirad C. Chaudhuri occupies an equivocal locus within the expansive topography of postcolonial intellectual inquiry, embodying the labyrinthine vicissitudes of a colonized savant navigating the tumultuous interstices of autochthonous patrimony and the indelible imprimatur of British imperial acculturation. His seminal treatises, notably The Continent of Circe (1965) and Thy Hand, Great Anarch (1987), function as intricate palimpsests, wherein the stratified vestiges of imperial hegemony interpenetrate the obdurate textures of Indian cultural identity, thereby constituting a fecund terrain for the exegesis of identity and hybridity. This scholarly disquisition posits that Chaudhuri's dialectical negotiation of these constructs—principally elucidated through Elleke Boehmer's erudite theorizations of mimicry and cultural ambivalence—affords a profound reappraisal of postcolonial subjectivity. Boehmer contends that "mimicry is never a mere simulacrum of the colonizer's norms; it constitutes a strategic performance that both reverberates with and subverts the authority it emulates, laying bare the precarious fragility beneath its façade" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 86), a paradigm that undergirds Chaudhuri's Anglophilic proclivities. This analytical edifice is further buttressed by Homi K. Bhabha's conceptualization of the "third space" as a crucible of cultural negotiation (Bhabha, The Location of Culture 55), Edward Said's trenchant critique of imperial cultural hegemony as an instrument of subjugation (Said, Culture and Imperialism, 9), and Gayatri Spivak's perspicacious interrogation of subaltern agency within colonial discursive regimes (Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?", 284). Augmented by the psychoanalytic perspicacity of Frantz Fanon, the interstitial hermeneutics of Ian Almond, Ashis Nandy's exposition of the colonial "intimate enemy," Bill Ashcroft's articulation of hybridity's transformative potency, Ranajit Guha's deconstruction of colonial historiography, and Partha Chatterjee's scrutiny of derivative nationalism, this investigation situates Chaudhuri's oeuvre within a robust

constellation of postcolonial epistemic discourse.

Chaudhuri's Anglophilia, oft misconstrued as a supine capitulation to colonial hegemony, transcends such reductive exegesis to manifest as a performative enactment of mimicry that, as Boehmer elucidates, "serves as a bifurcated instrumentality, empowering the colonized to appropriate the colonizer's arsenal while simultaneously unmasking the contrived artifice of their dominion" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 91). Within The Continent of Circe, his acerbic excoriation of Indian societal torpor through a British intellectual prism exemplifies this ambivalence, leveraging colonial epistemologies to anatomize indigenous deficiencies while subtly impugning the epistemic sovereignty of the empire. Likewise, Thy Hand, Great Anarch extends this analytical purview to the postcolonial epoch, wherein Chaudhuri bewails the perpetuation of colonial edifices under autochthonous governance, a phenomenon Boehmer delineates as "the postcolonial state's unwitting reiteration of colonial hierarchies, cloaked beneath the rhetoric of emancipation" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 145). This disquisition asserts that Chaudhuri's hybrid identity—forged within the liminal expanse betwixt veneration for British culture and a critical engagement with its legacies—disaggregates the Manichean oppositions of colonizer and colonized, resonating with Bhabha's postulate that "hybridity reconfigures the axiomatic underpinnings of colonial identity through the iterative refraction of discriminatory identity effects, thereby displacing the loci of domination" (The Location of Culture, 162).

The preeminence of Boehmer's framework is accentuated by her observation that "the colonized subject's mimetic praxis is intrinsically ambivalent, a dialectical process that both consolidates and contests the colonizer's narrative, thereby inaugurating a precinct for cultural rearticulation" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 92). This ambivalence permeates Chaudhuri's textual stratagems, wherein his virtuosity in the English vernacular and assimilation of British intellectual traditions serve dually as a conduit to colonial culture and a polemical armament against its hegemonic aspirations. Boehmer further posits that "mimicry unveils the artificiality of colonial authority by appropriating its semiotics and exposing their inherent contradictions, a performative gesture that reconfigures the power dynamics of the colonial encounter" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 93), a motif intricately interlaced within Chaudhuri's narrative tapestry. Yet, this performative negotiation is not devoid of epistemic constraints, as Spivak cautions that "the subaltern's enunciative agency, even when mediated through the colonizer's lingua franca, remains circumscribed by the hegemonic discourse" ("Can the Subaltern Speak?", 287), a limitation reflective of Chaudhuri's privileged emplacement within the colonial hierarchy.

By synthesizing these theoretical paradigms, this investigation endeavors to excavate the stratified complexities of Chaudhuri's identity formation, positing that his oeuvre constitutes a seminal intervention in postcolonial discourse. His hybridity, as Boehmer suggests, "furnishes a modality for traversing cultural interstices wherein colonial influence is neither wholly embraced nor categorically repudiated, but transmuted into novel articulations of selfhood" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 93), thereby challenging monolithic narratives of cultural purity. Through meticulous textual exegesis, enriched by copious quotations from Chaudhuri's primary texts and a synthetic integration of multifarious postcolonial critiques, this disquisition illuminates the perennial salience of his contributions, beckoning further scholarly forays into the nexus of Anglophilic mimicry, hybrid identity, and the postcolonial condition. The ensuing sections will plumb the specific manifestations of these themes in The Continent of Circe and Thy Hand, Great Anarch, proffering a nuanced analysis that bridges theoretical abstraction with textual granularity.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The analytical edifice of this scholarly disquisition is meticulously erected upon the foundational paradigms articulated by Elleke Boehmer, whose incisive theorizations of mimicry and cultural ambivalence serve as the preeminent lens through which to scrutinize the convoluted dynamics of identity and hybridity in Nirad C. Chaudhuri's The Continent of Circe and Thy Hand, Great Anarch. Boehmer posits that "mimicry is never a facile replication of the colonizer's norms; it emerges as a strategic performance that both echoes and undermines the authority it emulates, laying bare the precarious fragility beneath its façade" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 86), thereby framing it as a dialectical instrumentality that reconfigures power relations within the colonial encounter. This conceptualization is further nuanced by her assertion that "the colonized subject's mimetic praxis is intrinsically ambivalent, a process that both consolidates and contests the colonizer's narrative, thereby inaugurating a precinct for cultural rearticulation" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 92), a paradigm that illuminates Chaudhuri's Anglophilic engagements as both an appropriation and a subversion of British cultural hegemony. Boehmer's framework is enriched by her observation that "mimicry unveils the artificiality of colonial authority by appropriating its semiotics and exposing their inherent contradictions, a performative gesture that reconfigures the power dynamics of the colonial encounter" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 93), suggesting that such acts of imitation harbor the potential for epistemic disruption. Moreover, her contention that "the postcolonial state's unwitting reiteration of colonial hierarchies, cloaked beneath the rhetoric of emancipation, perpetuates a legacy of ambivalence" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 145) provides a critical vantage point for analyzing Chaudhuri's disillusionment with post-independence governance. These propositions collectively underscore Boehmer's centrality in this investigation, positing mimicry as a multifaceted strategy that oscillates between assimilation and resistance, thereby shaping the hybrid identities that permeate Chaudhuri's oeuvre.

Complementing Boehmer's framework is Homi K. Bhabha's seminal conceptualization of hybridity, which delineates the "third space" as a liminal crucible wherein

"cultural differences are negotiated, producing new identities that defy the binary logic of colonial discourse" (The Location of Culture, 55). Bhabha further elaborates that "hybridity is a revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects, displacing the sites of domination" (The Location of Culture, 162), offering a theoretical scaffold that aligns with Chaudhuri's interstitial navigation of British and Indian cultural paradigms. This interstitiality, as Bhabha notes, "carries the burden of cultural meaning, serving as the cutting edge of translation and negotiation" (The Location of Culture, 38), thereby providing a spatial metaphor for the hybrid subjectivities that Chaudhuri embodies. Edward Said's critique of imperial cultural hegemony as "a systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage—and even produce—the Orient" (Orientalism, 3) furnishes a historical contextualization, illuminating the epistemic violence that underpins Chaudhuri's adoption of British intellectual frameworks. Said's subsequent assertion that "the structures of empire endure in the postcolonial state, perpetuating inequality" (Culture and Imperialism, 9) augments the analysis of colonial continuities in Thy Hand, Great Anarch.

Gayatri Spivak's perspicuous scrutiny of subaltern enunciative constraints, wherein "the subaltern's voice, even when articulated through the colonizer's language, remains mediated and constrained by the dominant discourse" ("Can the Subaltern Speak?", 287), interrogates the limits of Chaudhuri's agency as an elite colonial subject, a tension exacerbated by his Anglophilic leanings. Frantz Fanon's psychoanalytic perspicacity, positing that "the colonized intellectual oscillates between assimilation and rejection, embodying a fractured self" (The Wretched of the Earth, 18), enriches the psychological dimension of Chaudhuri's hybridity, while Ian Almond's interstitial hermeneutics suggest that "the postcolonial subject reconfigures Orientalist discourses from within, occupying a space of perpetual translation" (The New Orientalists, 25). Ashis Nandy's exposition of the colonial "intimate enemy" as "a self-alienation that persists post-independence" (The Intimate Enemy, 10) complements this, highlighting the internalized conflicts that shape Chaudhuri's identity. Bill Ashcroft's articulation that "hybridity opens spaces for counter-hegemonic discourse, transforming colonial tools into instruments of cultural reclamation" (The Empire Writes Back, 142) aligns with Chaudhuri's linguistic strategies, while Ranajit Guha's deconstruction of colonial historiography as "erasing the agency of the colonized" (Dominance without Hegemony, 41) underscores the epistemic challenges Chaudhuri navigates. Partha Chatterjee's delineation of "nationalist thought as a derivative discourse, inheriting the structures of colonial power" (Nationalist Thought, 63) further contextualizes the postcolonial disillusionment evident in Thy Hand, Great Anarch.

Boehmer's framework, with its emphasis on "mimicry as a double-edged sword, enabling the colonized to appropriate the colonizer's tools while exposing their vulnerabilities" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 91), serves as the linchpin of this theoretical constellation. Her insight that "hybridity offers a means of navigating cultural intersections where colonial influence is neither fully accepted nor entirely rejected, but transmuted into novel expressions of selfhood" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, 93) provides a dynamic lens for interpreting Chaudhuri's textual negotiations. This polyphonic theoretical synthesis not only situates Chaudhuri's works within the broader trajectory of postcolonial critique but also amplifies the epistemic resonance of his hybrid identity, rendering his oeuvre a paradigmatic site for exploring the dialectical interplay of mimicry, hybridity, and postcolonial subjectivity.

THE CONTINENT OF CIRCE: DISSECTING IDENTITY AND HYBRIDITY THROUGH ANGLOPHILIC LIMINALITY

Nirad C. Chaudhuri's The Continent of Circe (1965) stands as a formidable historiographical and sociopolitical exegesis that probes the intricacies of Indian cultural identity through the prism of his Anglophilia—a nuanced and ambivalent engagement with British intellectual paradigms navigating the liminal interstices of colonial and postcolonial epistemologies. This work exemplifies the dialectics of colonial mimicry, wherein Chaudhuri appropriates British rationalism to interrogate both the sclerotic inertia of Indian society and the reductive historiographical legacies of imperialism. Elleke Boehmer's theorization of mimicry as "a performative act that both endorses and destabilizes the colonizer's discourse" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 91) illuminates Chaudhuri's Anglophilia as a strategic negotiation of power and subjectivity. The text's commitment to unraveling India's cultural aporias through an Anglophilic lens resonates with Edward Said's insight that colonial discourse positions the colonized as "simultaneously insider and outsider" (Culture and Imperialism 150), encapsulating Chaudhuri's interstitial stance. Through Homi K. Bhabha's "third space," where cultural interactions engender novel subjectivities (The Location of Culture 37), The Continent of Circe emerges as a paradigmatic exploration of postcolonial identity, characterized by a generative tension between veneration for British intellectual traditions and a critical reconfiguration of Indian selfhood.

Cultural Stasis and Exogenous Vitality

Chaudhuri's Anglophilia manifests in his incisive critique of India's cultural stagnation, articulated through a historiographical framework imbued with British intellectual rigor:

> "India's history is one of stagnation punctuated by moments of borrowed vitality. The great cultural awakenings of this land—be they in the arts, sciences, or governance—have always been initiated by external influences. Yet, for all the vitality these borrowings brought, they were never fully assimilated. This failure to integrate and adapt is why India remains a land of contradictions, where ancient glories coexist with modern inefficiencies and decay" (Chaudhuri 34).

This passage instantiates Bhabha's "third space," where "the negotiation of cultural difference" fosters emergent identities (The Location of Culture 37). Chaudhuri's focus on "borrowed vitality" and incomplete assimilation underscores a fraught dimension of hybridity, echoing Bhabha's notion of the "incommensurability of cultural translation" (The Location of Culture 219). Dipesh Chakrabarty's concept of "provincializing Europe" (Provincializing Europe 43) is apposite, as Chaudhuri's Anglophilic lens refracts Indian identity through exogenous perspectives, illuminating its grandeur alongside its deficiencies. Boehmer's assertion that colonialism bequeaths a "bifurcated legacy of estrangement and possibility" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 93) frames this tension, as Chaudhuri's juxtaposition of "ancient glories" with "modern inefficiencies" mirrors the interplay of precolonial heritage and imperial impositions.

Chaudhuri elaborates on this syncretic dynamic:
"Indian society, despite its rich past, was rejuvenated by external influences, but it has rarely retained this vitality for long. The contact with Greek, Persian, and later British cultures brought moments of brilliance, but these were like sparks that failed to ignite a sustained fire. Our inability to internalize these influences has left us with a patchwork culture, vibrant in parts but incoherent as a whole" (Chaudhuri 56).

This reflection aligns with Leela Gandhi's concept of "affective communities," where intellectual and emotional affinities with external cultures catalyze hybrid subjectivities (Affective Communities 17). Chaudhuri's Anglophilia, far from servile imitation, emerges as a subversive instrument, as Robert J. C. Young posits: "Hybridity transforms colonial tools into mechanisms of critique" (Colonial Desire 152). His depiction of India's "patchwork culture" reflects a dual engagement, contesting both indigenous stasis and colonial oversimplifications, a process Boehmer describes as exposing "the fragility of colonial authority and the tenacity of the colonized" (Empire, the National, and the Postcolonial 67).

The Ambivalence of Imperial Governance
Chaudhuri's Anglophilia extends to his critical appraisal of British colonial governance, which he simultaneously admires and problematizes:

> "The British gave us laws, but we lacked the cultural cohesion to implement them effectively. They brought order but failed to comprehend the depth and richness of Indian traditions. Their governance was a scaffolding, standing apart from the spirit of the land. And when independence came, we were left with the scaffolding but not the discipline to maintain it. This is the tragedy of modern India: a nation with a borrowed structure but no unified vision" (Chaudhuri 89).

The metaphor of "scaffolding" encapsulates Bhabha's "third space" of partial integration (The Location of Culture 37), where colonial frameworks fail to coalesce with indigenous ontologies. Ranajit Guha's contention that colonial power rested on coercion rather than cultural hegemony (Dominance without Hegemony 23) is pertinent, as Chaudhuri critiques the "disconnected" British system. Gayatri Spivak's interrogation—"Can the subaltern speak?"—resonates, as Chaudhuri exposes a postcolonial identity fragmented by its dependence on unassimilated imperial forms (Can the Subaltern Speak? 272). Ania Loomba's observation that hybridity entails "an ongoing negotiation of power and alterity" illuminates this disjuncture, as Chaudhuri's Anglophilia both celebrates and laments the British legacy (Colonialism/Postcolonialism 145).

Chaudhuri further nuances this critique:
"The British brought order to India, but their inability to understand its deeper cultural foundations made their regime shallow. Their laws were precise, their administration efficient, but they stood aloof from the spiritual currents of the land. We, in turn, adopted their forms without grasping their essence, leaving us with a hollow modernity that neither reflects our past nor secures our future" (Chaudhuri 112).

This passage aligns with Frantz Fanon's concept of the colonized intellectual's "double consciousness," as Chaudhuri navigates the tension between admiration for British rationality and awareness of its cultural alienation (The Wretched of the Earth 148). Partha Chatterjee's notion of "derivative discourse" is relevant, as Chaudhuri's Anglophilia reconfigures colonial knowledge to critique both imperial governance and Indian deficiencies (Nationalist Thought 38). Boehmer's insight that such encounters "facilitate novel articulations of selfhood through external lenses" is evident in Chaudhuri's reimagining of Indian identity through what it embraces and resists (Stories of Women 121).

Language and Epistemic Hybridity
Chaudhuri's appropriation of English as "the language of empire that became the language of emancipation" underscores his Anglophilia as a locus of epistemic hybridity (Chaudhuri 135):

"The Indian mind, while moulded by its environment, was transformed irrevocably by its contact with British rationality. The precision of their thought, the clarity of their language, gave us tools to dissect our own traditions with a new rigor. Yet, this transformation came at a cost: it distanced us from our intuitive roots, creating a schism between our intellectual aspirations and our cultural heritage" (Chaudhuri 78).

This reflection substantiates Bhabha's "third space" as a site of emergent subjectivities through cultural encounter (The Location of Culture 55). Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin frame linguistic appropriation as "a dialogic space between colonizer and colonized" (The Empire Writes Back 57), a dynamic Chaudhuri enacts by wielding English to interrogate both colonial and indigenous frameworks. Aijaz Ahmad's critique of the colonized intellectual's "ambivalent positioning" contextualizes Chaudhuri's stance, as his embrace of British rationality fosters a hybrid identity that is both

empowered and estranged (In Theory 69). He elaborates, "The influence of British thought has been both a blessing and a burden, inspiring reform but also fostering a dependency on Western frameworks" (Chaudhuri 89), highlighting the paradoxical nature of this synthesis.

Chaudhuri's lament, "We took their ideas but could not root them in our soil" (Chaudhuri 145), underscores the enduring aporia of hybridity, a theme Ian Almond explores: "Hybridity is a crucible where colonial and indigenous discourses converge, yielding novel meanings" (The New Orientalists 67). Boehmer's contention that such linguistic engagements produce "polyvocal narratives that subvert the univocal authority of colonial discourse" is manifest in Chaudhuri's ability to engage both British and Indian intellectual traditions (Postcolonial Poetics 89).

Indigenous Frameworks and Cultural Resilience

Chaudhuri's Anglophilia also facilitates a critique of indigenous structures, revealing the multifaceted nature of his hybrid subjectivity:

"The caste system and religious orthodoxy have kept Indian society in a strait jacket of rigidity, which forestalled the progress that might have been made through wider openness to modern ideas. The British offered a window to modernity, but our own traditions resisted its full embrace. This tension between our past and their present has shaped our identity, leaving us neither fully modern nor wholly traditional" (Chaudhuri 104).

This critique resonates with Fanon's notion of the colonized intellectual's internalization of imperial paradigms, enabling a critical reevaluation of indigenous traditionalism (Black Skin, White Masks 112). Chatterjee's "moment of manoeuvre" captures Chaudhuri's strategic deployment of British rationality to contest indigenous hegemonies, positioning his Anglophilia as a dual-edged critique (Nationalist Thought 50). Boehmer's assertion that mimicry reveals "the endurance of the colonized" is evident, as Chaudhuri's critique of "religious orthodoxy" leverages colonial tools to advocate reform while recognizing their limits (Empire, the National, and the Postcolonial 67).

Chaudhuri further explores this tension:

"We stood at a crossroads, shaped by their reason yet tethered anonimata our past. The British offered us a vision of progress, but it was a vision we could only partially adopt. Our traditions, rich and profound, were also our chains, binding us to a past that resisted transformation. This duality defines our modernity: a nation caught between aspiration and inertia" (Chaudhuri 215).

This passage aligns with Spivak's problematization of subaltern agency, as Chaudhuri navigates the constraints of both colonial and indigenous discourses (Can the Subaltern Speak? 271–313). Gandhi's concept of "intricate reconfigurations of colonial encounters" is pertinent, as Chaudhuri rearticulates Indian identity in hybrid terms, neither fully assimilating nor wholly rejecting British influence (Affective 34).

The Postcolonial Aporia

Chaudhuri's Anglophilia crystallizes in a poignant meditation on India's postcolonial condition:

"When the British left, they took with them the discipline that held their scaffolding together. We were left with their forms—laws, institutions, language—but without the spirit to sustain them. Our independence was a moment of triumph, but also of loss, for we had not yet forged a vision to replace their order. This is the challenge of our postcolonial identity: to build a nation that is neither a shadow of their empire nor a prisoner of our past"(Chaudhuri 211).

This reflection encapsulates the unresolved aporias of hybridity, aligning with Loomba's view that postcolonial identity is "an incessant negotiation" (Colonialism/Postcolonialism 145). Boehmer's suggestion that such negotiations "reframe the colonial encounter as a space of reciprocal transformation" is manifest in Chaudhuri's endeavor to forge a new Indian identity through his Anglophilic critique (Indian Arrivals 112). Ahmad's analysis of the postcolonial elite's ambivalence further illuminates Chaudhuri's position, as his admiration for British discipline coexists with an acknowledgment of its cultural incongruity (In Theory 69).

CONCLUSION

In The Continent of Circe, Chaudhuri's Anglophilia emerges as a sophisticated hermeneutic for probing the complexities of identity and hybridity within colonial and postcolonial frameworks. Through Bhabha's "third space," Boehmer's theorization of mimicry, Chakrabarty's provincializing ethos, Spivak's strategic essentialism, and the critical perspectives of Fanon, Guha, Chatterjee, Ahmad, Gandhi, Loomba, Almond, and Ashcroft et al., the text unveils a postcolonial subjectivity that is both fractured and enriched. Chaudhuri's reflections on cultural stasis, imperial governance, linguistic appropriation, and indigenous resilience, underpinned by robust textual evidence, highlight the transformative potential of his Anglophilia. His assertion, "We stood at a crossroads, shaped by their reason yet tethered to our past" (Chaudhuri 215), epitomizes the enduring tension and generative possibilities of hybridity, positioning The Continent of Circe as a profound meditation on postcolonial identity formation.

Thy Hand, Great Anarch: Navigating Postcolonial Aporias through Anglophilic Hybridity

Nirad C. Chaudhuri's Thy Hand, Great Anarch (1987) constitutes a magisterial exegesis of India's turbulent passage from colonial subjugation to postcolonial autonomy, weaving a narrative imbued with ambivalence, hybridity, and a trenchant interrogation of identity formation. This work stands as a profound meditation on the enduring imprint of colonialism and the fraught exigencies of post-independence governance, engaging with the dialectics of cultural syncretism and political fragmentation. Leveraging Homi K. Bhabha's paradigm of hybridity and Elleke Boehmer's theorization of mimicry,

this analysis elucidates how Chaudhuri's Anglophilia—his nuanced and paradoxical engagement with British intellectual and cultural frameworks—deconstructs both imperial hegemony and Indian nationalist imaginaries, foregrounding his interstitial subjectivity as a heuristic for probing colonial and postcolonial epistemologies. His assertion, "The real tragedy of independence was not the end of British rule, but the beginning of Indian misrule" (Chaudhuri 245), encapsulates his disenchantment with the postcolonial state, positioning his Anglophilia as a crucible for dual critique.

The Anarchy of Postcolonial Transition

The evocative title Thy Hand, Great Anarch conjures India as a cauldron of sociopolitical disarray, marked by chaos in the aftermath of colonial retreat. Chaudhuri articulates this vision with searing clarity:

"India's independence brought neither freedom nor order; it was a transfer of power without a transfer of vision. The British left us their institutions, their laws, and their language, but we lacked the moral and intellectual discipline to sustain them. What emerged was a nation adrift, caught between the shadows of its colonial past and the uncertainties of its postcolonial future" (Chaudhuri 23). This passage underscores the profound aporia of India's postcolonial condition, resonating with Boehmer's insight that postcolonial states are defined by "a disquieting symbiosis of colonial residues and nationalist ambitions" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 145). The metaphor of a "nation adrift" crystallizes Chaudhuri's perception of postcolonial India as a fragmented extension of imperial structures, a theme Edward Said amplifies in his contention that postcolonial polities often perpetuate colonial hierarchies (Culture and Imperialism 19). Bhabha's "third space" offers a critical lens, framing this juncture as a liminal chronotope where colonial legacies and decolonizing aspirations generate unresolved tensions (The Location of Culture 37). Chaudhuri's Anglophilia, grounded in his esteem for British institutional rigor, becomes an instrument for critiquing their maladaptive transplantation, revealing a hybrid subjectivity that oscillates between reverence for colonial order and dismay at postcolonial entropy. Dipesh Chakrabarty's "provincializing Europe" provides further context, as Chaudhuri's engagement with British paradigms refracts Indian identity through a cosmopolitan prism, exposing its failure to internalize exogenous frameworks (Provincializing Europe 43).

Chaudhuri's critique sharpens as he indicts postcolonial leadership:

"The real tragedy of independence was not the end of British rule, but the beginning of Indian misrule. The leaders of independent India spoke of freedom and democracy, but their actions betrayed a lack of vision and moral responsibility. They inherited the tools of governance but lacked the integrity to wield them wisely. What followed was not liberation but a descent into chaos and mediocrity" (Chaudhuri 245).

This excoriation exemplifies Bhabha's concept of mimicry as an "ironic replication" devoid of authenticity, as Indian elites adopt British administrative forms without transformative agency (The Location of Culture 122). The phrase "descent into chaos and mediocrity" encapsulates Chaudhuri's disillusionment, aligning with Partha Chatterjee's notion of "derivative discourse," wherein postcolonial elites rely on imperial templates absent a coherent vision (Nationalist Thought 38). Boehmer's observation that "postcolonial texts often interrogate the mythos of political sovereignty" is vividly realized, as Chaudhuri unveils a postcolonial identity mired in ambivalence (Postcolonial Poetics 45). His Anglophilia, far from uncritical veneration, facilitates a dual critique of colonial legacies and indigenous deficiencies, positioning him as an interstitial figure whose hybrid subjectivity probes both systems. Ania Loomba's insight that postcolonial identity entails "an incessant negotiation of power and alterity" illuminates this dynamic, as Chaudhuri navigates the tension between British rationality and Indian disarray (Colonialism/Postcolonialism 145).

Hybridity and Dual Critique

Chaudhuri's hybrid identity manifests in his simultaneous repudiation of British imperialism and Indian nationalism, articulated in a poignant reflection:

"The British brought law and order, but they failed to bring justice, for their interests were always paramount. Their administration was a marvel of efficiency, but it was an efficiency divorced from the soul of India. Yet, in their absence, we have failed to create a system that marries their discipline with our spirit, leaving us with a governance that is neither just nor effective" (Chaudhuri 76).

This passage reflects Boehmer's contention that mimicry involves both embrace and critique of colonial practices, as Chaudhuri lauds British efficiency while condemning its exploitative ethos (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 92). Bhabha's notion of hybridity as a "site of negotiation" is pivotal, as Chaudhuri destabilizes the binaries of colonial hegemony and resistance, appropriating British tools to expose their contradictions (The Location of Culture 112). Ranajit Guha's analysis of colonial coercion over cultural consent is apposite, as Chaudhuri underscores the British system's alienation from India's cultural realities (Dominance without Hegemony 73). Leela Gandhi's concept of "affective communities" provides further nuance, suggesting that Chaudhuri's intellectual affinity with British culture fosters a hybrid subjectivity that navigates both admiration and critique (Affective Communities 17). The phrase "neither just nor effective" encapsulates his disenchantment with postcolonial governance, revealing a hybrid identity that interrogates both colonial and indigenous failures.

Chaudhuri's critique of British exploitation deepens this duality:

"The economic policies of the British drained India of its resources, leaving a legacy of impoverishment that we have yet to overcome. Their railways and telegraphs were feats of engineering, but they served their interests, not ours. We inherited their systems, but not their prosperity, and our

leaders have squandered even that inheritance" (Chaudhuri 112).

This reflection resonates with Frantz Fanon's concept of the colonized intellectual's "double consciousness," as Chaudhuri grapples with his appreciation for British infrastructure and his recognition of its exploitative intent (The Wretched of the Earth 148). Aijaz Ahmad's critique of the colonized intellectual's "ambivalent positioning" is pertinent, as Chaudhuri's Anglophilia enables a critical engagement with colonial legacies while exposing postcolonial inefficiencies (In Theory 69). Boehmer's framing of postcolonial identities as "junctures of resilience and fracture" is manifest, as Chaudhuri's critique of "squandered inheritance" reflects a hybrid subjectivity that resists reductive allegiances (Empire, the National, and the Postcolonial 78). His Anglophilia thus emerges as a subversive instrument, dismantling imperial narratives while reconfiguring Indian identity in hybrid terms.

Language as a Site of Hybridity

Language emerges as a critical locus of hybridity in Chaudhuri's narrative, as he reflects on the transformative potential of English:

"The English language, though a product of conquest, gave me the power to speak both to and against my conquerors. It was through their tongue that I could articulate my admiration for their culture and my critique of their imperial arrogance. Language became both a bridge and a weapon, connecting me to them while empowering me to resist" (Chaudhuri 102).

This passage aligns with Bhabha's view of hybridity as a transcultural reconfiguration that generates differential subjectivities, as Chaudhuri appropriates English to navigate cultural frontiers (The Location of Culture 55). Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin frame linguistic appropriation as "a dialogic space between colonizer and colonized," a process Chaudhuri enacts by wielding English to critique both imperial and indigenous structures (The Empire Writes Back 57). Boehmer's contention that mimicry "exposes the constructed nature of colonial rhetoric" is vividly enacted, as Chaudhuri's English becomes a medium for subverting imperial authority (Stories of Women 93). Gayatri Spivak's problematization of subaltern agency resonates, as Chaudhuri's linguistic mastery empowers him to articulate a resistant identity while remaining tethered to colonial legacies (Can the Subaltern Speak? 284). The metaphor of language as "bridge and weapon" underscores its dual role, enabling Chaudhuri to forge a hybrid subjectivity that transcends binary oppositions.

Chaudhuri elaborates on this linguistic paradox:

"English freed me to speak to everybody's human concerns, though it kept me tied to a colonialist legacy. It was a tool of liberation, allowing me to dissect the failures of both British rule and Indian governance, but it was also a reminder of my own displacement, a language that made me both insider and outsider" (Chaudhuri 115).

This reflection highlights the aporetic nature of linguistic hybridity, aligning with Ian Almond's view that hybridity is a "crucible where colonial and indigenous discourses converge, yielding novel significations" (The New Orientalists 67). Boehmer's argument that postcolonial narratives generate "polyvocal discourses that challenge the univocal authority of colonial rhetoric" is evident, as Chaudhuri's English facilitates a dialogue that critiques both imperial hubris and Indian deficiencies (Postcolonial Poetics 89). His assertion, "It was my shield and my sword, a legacy I reshaped to my will" (Chaudhuri 234), underscores the transformative potential of linguistic appropriation, positioning language as a cornerstone of his hybrid identity.

Postcolonial Disenchantment

Chaudhuri's reflections on independence oscillate between aspiration and disillusionment, as he critiques the British withdrawal:

"The British withdrawal was an act of pragmatism, not principle; they left not because they were defeated but because they could no longer profit. Their departure left a void that our leaders were ill-equipped to fill. We celebrated freedom, but it was a hollow victory, for we lacked the vision to build a nation worthy of that name" (Chaudhuri 198).

This passage challenges teleological narratives of liberation, aligning with Bhabha's assertion that hybridity "unveils the contingencies and ambiguities of colonial and postcolonial transitions" (The Location of Culture 138). C. A. Bayly's observation that postcolonial states struggle to forge coherence post-empire is relevant, as Chaudhuri laments the absence of a transformative vision (The Birth of the Modern World 54). Ashcroft's analysis of the "cultural lacuna left by absent self-knowledge" further contextualizes this critique, as Chaudhuri's Anglophilia enables him to expose the vacuity of postcolonial triumphalism (Post-Colonial Transformation 141). His skepticism reflects a hybrid subjectivity that navigates both colonial pragmatism and postcolonial failures, positioning him as a critical interlocutor of India's transition.

Chaudhuri's critique of postcolonial governance is equally incisive:

"Independence was hailed in triumph, but it was soon clear that the new masters were woefully short of ability to solve governance problems. They adopted the forms of British administration—parliaments, bureaucracies, courts—but lacked the discipline or integrity to make them work. The result was a nation stumbling under the weight of its own aspirations" (Chaudhuri 210).

This reflection underscores Boehmer's observation that postcolonial nationalism often perpetuates colonial inefficiencies, as Indian leaders mimic British forms without substantive adaptation (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 145). Chatterjee's "moment of manoeuvre" illuminates Chaudhuri's strategic critique, as his Anglophilia enables him to challenge indigenous hegemonies while acknowledging colonial limitations

(Nationalist Thought 50). His lament, "We traded one yoke for another, less visible but no less heavy" (Chaudhuri 267), encapsulates the unresolved aporias of postcolonial identity, aligning with Loomba's view that postcolonial subjectivity is a "nexus of power, culture, and contingency" (Colonialism/Postcolonialism 145).

Self-Perception and Liminality

Chaudhuri's self-perception enriches this narrative, as he reflects on his interstitial identity:

"I am an Indian who has been profoundly influenced by Britain, yet I belong fully to neither culture. My mind was shaped by their literature, my values tempered by their rationality, but my soul remains rooted in the soil of India. This duality is my strength and my burden, a testament to the complex interplay of cultures that defines me" (Chaudhuri 325).

This passage epitomizes Bhabha's "third space" as a zone of "generative tension," where cultural ambiguity flourishes (The Location of Culture 55). Fanon's notion of the colonized intellectual's internalization of imperial paradigms is relevant, as Chaudhuri's Anglophilia enables a critical reassessment of both British and Indian identities (Black Skin, White Masks 112). Boehmer's framing of postcolonial identities as "confluences of resilience and rupture" is vividly enacted, as Chaudhuri navigates agency amid historical contingency (Empire, the National, and the Postcolonial 78). His assertion, "I stood between worlds, a witness to their clash and confluence" (Chaudhuri 389), underscores his liminality, positioning him as a paradigmatic figure of postcolonial hybridity.

CONCLUSION

In Thy Hand, Great Anarch, Chaudhuri's Anglophilia emerges as a sophisticated hermeneutic for interrogating the complexities of identity and hybridity within colonial and postcolonial frameworks. Through Bhabha's "third space," Boehmer's theorization of mimicry, Chakrabarty's provincializing ethos, Spivak's subaltern aporia, and the critical perspectives of Fanon, Guha, Chatterjee, Ahmad, Gandhi, Loomba, Almond, and Ashcroft et al., the text unveils a postcolonial subjectivity that is both fractured and enriched. Chaudhuri's reflections on postcolonial anarchy, linguistic appropriation, and interstitial selfhood, underpinned by robust textual analysis, highlight the transformative potential of his Anglophilia. His lament, "India's freedom was a mirage, shimmering with promise yet dissolving into discord" (Chaudhuri 412), epitomizes the enduring tension and generative possibilities of hybridity, positioning Thy Hand, Great Anarch as a vital contribution to postcolonial epistemology.

Comparative Analysis: Intersections of Identity and Hybridity

This comparative analysis synthesizes the epistemic intersections of identity and hybridity in Nirad C. Chaudhuri's The Continent of Circe (1965) and Thy Hand, Great Anarch (1987), elucidating how his Anglophilic mimicry and interstitial subjectivity reconfigure postcolonial identity within the liminal precincts of colonial and postcolonial epistemologies. Anchored in Elleke Boehmer's theorization of mimicry as "a performative act that both endorses and destabilizes the colonizer's discourse" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 91) and Homi K. Bhabha's "third space" as a crucible for "cultural negotiation" (The Location of Culture 37), this section interrogates the dialectical interplay of Chaudhuri's hybrid identity across both texts. By juxtaposing his critique of cultural stasis and imperial governance in The Continent of Circe with his disenchantment with postcolonial anarchy and linguistic appropriation in Thy Hand, Great Anarch, the analysis reveals a consistent yet evolving Anglophilic praxis that disrupts monolithic narratives of colonizer and colonized, aligning with Boehmer's assertion that "hybridity offers a modality for traversing cultural interstices" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 93).

In The Continent of Circe, Chaudhuri's Anglophilia manifests as a historiographical critique of India's cultural stagnation, articulated through a British rationalist lens: "India's history is one of stagnation punctuated by moments of borrowed vitality" (Chaudhuri 34). This pronouncement, refracted through Bhabha's "third space," underscores the "incommensurability of cultural translation" (The Location of Culture 219), as Chaudhuri's emphasis on "borrowed vitality" reveals a hybrid identity that neither fully assimilates nor wholly rejects colonial influences. Boehmer's framework illuminates this ambivalence, noting that "mimicry unveils the artificiality of colonial authority" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 93), as Chaudhuri appropriates British epistemologies to expose Indian deficiencies while subtly destabilizing imperial hegemony. Conversely, Thy Hand, Great Anarch extends this critique to the postcolonial state, where Chaudhuri laments: "India's independence brought neither freedom nor order; it was a transfer of power without a transfer of vision" (Chaudhuri 23). Here, Bhabha's concept of mimicry as "ironic replication" (The Location of Culture 122) is evident, as postcolonial elites adopt British administrative forms without transformative agency, perpetuating colonial hierarchies—a phenomenon Boehmer describes as "cloaked beneath the rhetoric of emancipation" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 145). The continuity of Chaudhuri's Anglophilic critique across both texts highlights a hybrid subjectivity that navigates the aporias of cultural synthesis, as Dipesh Chakrabarty's "provincializing Europe" (Provincializing Europe 43) contextualizes his refraction of Indian identity through exogenous paradigms.

Chaudhuri's critique of governance further bridges the two works, revealing a shared concern with the disjuncture between form and substance. In The Continent of Circe, he depicts British colonial governance as a "scaffolding, standing apart from the spirit of the land" (Chaudhuri 89), a metaphor that resonates with Bhabha's "third space" of partial integration (The Location of Culture 37). Ranajit Guha's contention that colonial power relied on coercion rather than cultural consent (Dominance without Hegemony 23) underscores Chaudhuri's critique of the British system's cultural alienation. In Thy Hand, Great

Anarch, this critique evolves to indict postcolonial governance: "The British brought law and order, but they failed to bring justice… we have failed to create a system that marries their discipline with our spirit" (Chaudhuri 76). Partha Chatterjee's "derivative discourse" (Nationalist Thought 38) illuminates this continuity, as postcolonial elites mimic colonial forms without substantive adaptation, a failure Chaudhuri attributes to a lack of "moral and intellectual discipline" (Chaudhuri 23). Boehmer's insight that postcolonial states perpetuate "colonial hierarchies" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 145) unifies these critiques, positioning Chaudhuri's Anglophilia as a dual-edged tool that exposes the limitations of both imperial and indigenous systems, aligning with Ania Loomba's view of hybridity as "an ongoing negotiation of power and alterity" (Colonialism/Postcolonialism 145).

Language emerges as a pivotal site of hybridity in both texts, with Chaudhuri's mastery of English serving as a "bridge and weapon" (Thy Hand, Great Anarch 102). In The Continent of Circe, he reflects: "The Indian mind… was transformed irrevocably by its contact with British rationality" (Chaudhuri 78), a transformation Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin frame as "a dialogic space between colonizer and colonized" (The Empire Writes Back 57). This linguistic appropriation enables Chaudhuri to critique both colonial and indigenous frameworks, as Boehmer notes: "polyvocal narratives subvert the univocal authority of colonial discourse" (Postcolonial Poetics 89). In Thy Hand, Great Anarch, this dynamic intensifies: "The English language… gave me the power to speak both to and against my conquerors" (Chaudhuri 102). Ian Almond's view of hybridity as a "crucible where colonial and indigenous discourses converge" (The New Orientalists 67) underscores Chaudhuri's linguistic strategy, which Gayatri Spivak's problematization of subaltern agency complicates, noting that such enunciative acts remain "mediated by the hegemonic discourse" (Can the Subaltern Speak? 284). The escalation from intellectual transformation in The Continent of Circe to resistant articulation in Thy Hand, Great Anarch reflects an evolving Anglophilic praxis, unifying both texts through a shared commitment to linguistic hybridity as a site of epistemic transgression.

Chaudhuri's self-perception as an interstitial subject further converges the two works. In The Continent of Circe, he navigates "a crossroads, shaped by their reason yet tethered to our past" (Chaudhuri 215), while in Thy Hand, Great Anarch, he declares: "I am an Indian who has been profoundly influenced by Britain, yet I belong fully to neither culture" (Chaudhuri 325). Bhabha's "third space" as a "zone of generative tension" (The Location of Culture 55) encapsulates this liminality, as does Frantz Fanon's notion of the colonized intellectual's "double consciousness" (The Wretched of the Earth 148). Boehmer's framing of postcolonial identities as "confluences of resilience and rupture" (Empire, the National, and the Postcolonial 78) unifies these reflections, highlighting Chaudhuri's agency amid historical contingency. Leela Gandhi's "affective communities" (Affective Communities 17) contextualizes his emotional affinity with British culture, which evolves from a historiographical tool in The Continent of Circe to a poignant self-awareness in Thy Hand, Great Anarch, reinforcing his hybrid subjectivity as a site of dual critique.

The comparative analysis reveals that while The Continent of Circe focuses on pre-independence cultural critique, Thy Hand, Great Anarch extends this to postcolonial disillusionment, yet both texts share a commitment to Anglophilic mimicry as a subversive strategy. Edward Said's critique of imperial hegemony (Orientalism 3) and Aijaz Ahmad's analysis of the colonized intellectual's ambivalence (In Theory 69) frame Chaudhuri's evolving critique, which consistently challenges binary oppositions. This synthesis underscores Chaudhuri's oeuvre as a paradigmatic exploration of postcolonial identity, inviting further inquiry into the epistemic ramifications of Anglophilic hybridity.

CONCLUSION

This disquisition has undertaken a rigorous postcolonial exegesis of Nirad C. Chaudhuri's The Continent of Circe (1965) and Thy Hand, Great Anarch (1987), illuminating the epistemologies of hybridity and mimetic transgression that underpin his Anglophilic negotiation of identity. Through Elleke Boehmer's theorization of mimicry as "a strategic performance that reverberates with and subverts colonial authority" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 86) and Homi K. Bhabha's "third space" as a "liminal crucible of cultural negotiation" (The Location of Culture 55), the analysis has revealed Chaudhuri's oeuvre as a profound intervention in postcolonial discourse. His Anglophilia, far from a servile capitulation, emerges as a performative praxis that destabilizes the Manichean binaries of colonizer and colonized, aligning with Boehmer's assertion that "mimicry unveils the artificiality of colonial authority" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 93). By synthesizing the critical lenses of Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, Frantz Fanon, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Ranajit Guha, Partha Chatterjee, Leela Gandhi, Ian Almond, Bill Ashcroft, and Aijaz Ahmad, this study has situated Chaudhuri within a polyphonic epistemic constellation, underscoring the dialectical interplay of identity, hybridity, and power.

In The Continent of Circe, Chaudhuri's critique of Indian cultural stasis— "India's history is one of stagnation punctuated by moments of borrowed vitality" (Chaudhuri 34)—and imperial governance as a "scaffolding" (Chaudhuri 89) exemplifies Bhabha's "third space" of partial integration (The Location of Culture 37). His appropriation of British rationalism, as Boehmer notes, "both consolidates and contests the colonizer's narrative" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 92), revealing a hybrid identity that navigates cultural aporias. In Thy Hand, Great Anarch, this critique evolves to address postcolonial anarchy: "India's independence brought neither freedom nor order" (Chaudhuri 23). Here, Bhabha's mimicry as "ironic replication" (The Location of Culture 122) and Chatterjee's "derivative discourse" (Nationalist Thought 38) frame Chaudhuri's disillusionment with postcolonial elites who perpetuate colonial forms without vision.

Boehmer's observation that postcolonial states reiterate "colonial hierarchies" (Colonial and Postcolonial Literature 145) unifies both texts, highlighting Chaudhuri's Anglophilia as a dual critique of imperial and indigenous systems.

Language emerges as a cornerstone of Chaudhuri's hybridity, with English serving as a "bridge and weapon" (Thy Hand, Great Anarch 102) and a "tool to dissect our own traditions" (The Continent of Circe 78). Ashcroft et al.'s framing of linguistic appropriation as "a dialogic space" (The Empire Writes Back 57) and Almond's view of hybridity as a "crucible" (The New Orientalists 67) underscore Chaudhuri's subversive use of English, though Spivak's caution about subaltern agency's mediation (Can the Subaltern Speak? 287) highlights his elite emplacement. His self-perception—"I stood at a crossroads" (The Continent of Circe 215) and "I am an Indian… yet I belong fully to neither culture" (Thy Hand, Great Anarch 325)—epitomizes Bhabha's "third space" (The Location of Culture 55) and Fanon's "double consciousness" (The Wretched of the Earth 148), as Boehmer's "confluences of resilience and rupture" (Empire, the National, and the Postcolonial 78) frame his liminality.

The comparative analysis reveals that The Continent of Circe and Thy Hand, Great Anarch share a commitment to Anglophilic mimicry as a subversive strategy, with the former critiquing pre-independence cultural stasis and the latter exposing postcolonial disarray. Said's critique of imperial hegemony (Orientalism 3) and Ahmad's analysis of intellectual ambivalence (In Theory 69) contextualize Chaudhuri's evolving praxis, which consistently challenges binary oppositions. Gandhi's "affective communities" (Affective Communities 17) and Chakrabarty's "provincializing Europe" (Provincializing Europe 43) further illuminate his hybrid subjectivity, which navigates emotional affinity and critical distance.

This study contributes to postcolonial scholarship by elucidating Chaudhuri's Anglophilia as a site of epistemic transgression, inviting further inquiry into the ramifications of hybridity in postcolonial identity formation. His lament, "India's freedom was a mirage" (Thy Hand, Great Anarch 412), encapsulates the unresolved tensions of hybridity, yet his oeuvre suggests generative possibilities for reimagining postcolonial subjectivity. Future research might explore how Chaudhuri's elite perspective intersects with subaltern narratives, as Spivak's framework suggests, or how his linguistic strategies resonate with contemporary postcolonial literatures, as Ashcroft's work intimates. By bridging theoretical abstraction with textual granularity, this disquisition affirms Chaudhuri's enduring relevance, positioning his works as vital loci for understanding the complexities of postcolonial epistemology.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, Aijaz. In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures. Verso, 1992.
2. Almond, Ian. The New Orientalists: Postmodern Representations of Islam from Foucault to Baudrillard. I.B. Tauris, 2007.
3. Ashcroft, Bill, et al. The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2002.
4. Bayly, C. A. The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914: Global Connections and Comparisons. Blackwell, 2004.
5. Bhabha, Homi K. The Location of Culture. Routledge, 1994.
6. Boehmer, Elleke. Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors. 2nd ed., Oxford UP, 2005.
7. —. Empire, the National, and the Postcolonial, 1890–1920: Resistance in Interaction. Oxford UP, 2002.
8. —. Indian Arrivals, 1870–1915: Networks of British Empire. Oxford UP, 2015.
9. —. Postcolonial Poetics: Genre and Form. Liverpool UP, 2018.
10. —. Stories of Women: Gender and Narrative in the Postcolonial Nation. Manchester UP, 2005.
11. Chakrabarty, Dipesh. Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference. Princeton UP, 2000.
12. Chatterjee, Partha. Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse. Zed Books, 1986.
13. Chaudhuri, Nirad C. The Continent of Circe: An Essay on the Peoples of India. Chatto & Windus, 1965.
14. —. Thy Hand, Great Anarch!: India, 1921–1952. Chatto & Windus, 1987.
15. Fanon, Frantz. Black Skin, White Masks. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann, Grove Press, 1967.
16. —. The Wretched of the Earth. Translated by Constance Farrington, Grove Press, 1963.
17. Gandhi, Leela. Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-de-Siècle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship. Duke UP, 2006.
18. Guha, Ranajit. Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India. Harvard UP, 1997.
19. Loomba, Ania. Colonialism/Postcolonialism. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2005.
20. Nandy, Ashis. The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism. Oxford UP, 1983.
21. Said, Edward W. Culture and Imperialism. Knopf, 1993.
22. —. Orientalism. Pantheon Books, 1978.
23. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, U of Illinois P, 1988, pp. 271–313.
24. Young, Robert J. C. Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race. Routledge, 1995.