

1 | Essay Template

1.1 | General Information

Due Date	Topic	Important Documents
In two days	God of Small Things	God of Small Things, Duh

Copy and paste the passage to the top of the essay!!

1.2 | Prompt

Select one of the following citations from Roy's *The God of Small Things* for your in-class close reading writing. Be sure to examine the specific denotation and connotations of Roy's language.

Chacko said:

- You don't _go_ to Oxford. You _read_ at Oxford.

And

- After _reading_ at Oxford, you _come down._

"Down to earth, d'you mean?" Ammu would ask. "_That_ you definitely do. Like your famous airplanes." Ammu said that the sad but entirely predictable fate of Chacko's airplanes was an impartial measure of

Reading, the double entendre. "Study (an academic subject) at a university." (OED, AA) However, in this passage, there's also "understand or interpret the nature or significance of." (OED, AB).

Come down — a sense of superiority — a sense of criticism w.r.t. Chacko has a sense of superiority. Chaco's aeromodeling kit kept crashing, shows dichotomy between reality and fiction.

Chacko's airplanes, kits — arranged — that he always messes up. Similar to his running of the factory. Prearranged systems that he messes up.

Effect of sarcasm: famous. *Is famous sarcasm??*

The sense of British superiority used against him. Infatuation with titles.

1. Infatuation with titles and male chauvinism

You don't go to Oxford, you "understand" at Oxford. And after you understand at Oxford, you rid yourself of your corrupt ways. One does not simply head to Oxford, one attempts to see and understand (Luke 19:5), and Come Down to rid of sins.

Inherent sense of superiority, for Chacko, Oxford is the tree that allows him to see Jesus. Marxist.

Ammu instead offers an alternate interpretation, instead of meeting a Jesus like figure, one actually meets a harsher figure: the ground. One actually comes down to earth, and, instead of seeing Jesus and achieving salvation, Chacko bites the dirt.... by destroying prebuilt systems.

Unexpected use of famous — well known, but not because they were good but instead because of they were expressly terrible — offers sharp dichotomy like that offered by Ammu before.

Highlights the contrasting nature of the sibling dynamic.

1.3 | Defluffifying

CHOSEN THESIS CLAIM

- Point a
- Point b
- Point c

So what? SO WHAT

Now, defluffify by re-writing the three points + so what in as little words as possible.

RESTATED CLAIM

1.4 | Outline

- Claim 1: *claim*
 - How
 - HOW IS CLAIM TRUE?
 - Evidence -> HOW IS YOUR REASONING TRUE?
 - So What
 - WHY DO I CARE?
- Claim 2: *claim*
 - How
 - HOW IS CLAIM TRUE?
 - Evidence -> HOW IS YOUR REASONING TRUE?
 - So What
 - WHY DO I CARE?
- Claim 3: *claim*
 - How
 - HOW IS CLAIM TRUE?
 - Evidence -> HOW IS YOUR REASONING TRUE?
 - So What
 - WHY DO I CARE?

There is always UCLA Writing Lab