PARODY IN THE CONTEXT OF SALMAN RUSHDIE'S MAGICAL REALISTIC FICTION: *MIDNIGHT'S CHILDREN, THE MOOR'S LAST SIGH, AND SHALIMAR THE CLOWN*

KUĞU TEKİN

JANUARY 2010

PARODY IN THE CONTEXT OF SALMAN

RUSHDIE'S MAGICAL REALISTIC FICTION: *MIDNIGHT'S CHILDREN, THE MOOR'S LAST SIGH, AND SHALIMAR THE CLOWN*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

KUĞU TEKİN

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

JANUARY 2010

Approval of the Graduate School of (Sciences)

(Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata)
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

(Prof. Dr. Wolf König)
Head of Department
Foreign Language Education

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Professor, Dr. Oya Batum Menteşe	(Atılım, İDE)	___________________
Assistant Professor, Dr. Margaret Sönmez	(METU, FLE)	___________________
Assistant Professor, Dr. Nurten Birlik	(METU, FLE)	___________________
Assistant Professor, Dr. Nazan Tutaş	(AÜ, İDE)	___________________

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Tekin, Kuğu

Signature :

ABSTRACT

PARODY IN THE CONTEXT OF SALMAN

RUSHDIE'S MAGICAL REALISTIC FICTION: *MIDNIGHT'S CHILDREN, THE MOOR'S LAST SIGH, AND SHALIMAR THE CLOWN*

Tekin, Kuğu

Ph.D., Department of English Literature

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz

January 2010, 141 pages

The aim of this dissertation is to trace the function of parody in the context of Salman Rushdie's magical realistic fiction. The magical realism of Rushdie's fiction presents a complex Third World experience which constitutes an alternative to, and challenges the Eurocentrism of western culture. The form and content of Rushdie's novels are so intense and rich that the whole body of his work comes to the fore, not as an outcome of the two clashing civilisations, that is East and West, but rather as an immense medley of the two cultures. While "writing back to the empire", Rushdie draws on innumerable sources ranging from such grand narratives as *Genesis*, *Iliad*, *Ramayana*, *A Thousand and One Nights*, Hindu, Persian, Greek, and Norse mythologies, and local cultural traditions, to modern politics mingling fiction and reality in a broad historical perspective, so that his work becomes a synthesis of East and West, an international aesthetic plane where diversities express themselves freely. The dissertation focuses particularly on Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*, *The Moor's Last Sigh*,and *Shalimar The Clown*.; it contains an introductory chapter, a theory chapter, including two subchapters, a development chapter with three subchapters which analyse the above

mentioned three novels, and a conclusion chapter. The introductory chapter presents an overview of the issues to be investigated in the subsequent chapters. The theory chapter deals with the concepts of colonialism, nationalism, and the past and the present of postcolonial literary theory with reference to its leading theorists, such as M. Foucault, E. Said, H. Bhabha, and other recent critics; this chapter also introduces magical realism by reference to a number of current definitions and approaches. The following three subchapters, which focus on the analyses of the three novels, explore how parody functions both thematically and structurally in relation to Rushdie's magical realism. The concluding chapter demonstrates that Rushdie's work creates an unrestrained plane of an international culture where multiple visions and diversities can find a room to assert themselves.

Keywords: Parody, carnivalesque parody, magical realism, postcolonial literature, Salman Rushdie.

ÖZ

SALMAN RUSHDIE'NIN *MIDNIGHT'S CHILDREN*, *THE MOOR'S LAST SIGH* VE

SHALIMAR THE CLOWN BAŞLIKLI ROMANLARINDA

KURGULADIĞI PARODİNİN BÜYÜLÜ GERÇEKÇİLİK BAĞLAMINDA

İNCELENMESİ

Tekin, Kuğu

Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü

Danışman: Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz

Ocak 2010, 141 sayfa

Bu tezin amacı Salman Rushdie'nin romanlarında kurguladığı parodinin büyülü gerçekçilikle olan ilişkisini ortaya koymaktır. Rüştü'nün romanlarındaki büyülü gerçekçilik, üçüncü dünyalının batı kültürünün Avrupa merkeziyetçiliğine meydan okuyan farklı ve çetrefilli deneyimlerini aktarmaktadır. Rüştü'nün romanları biçim ve içerik açısından o kadar yoğun ve zengindir ki, ortaya çıkan sonuç doğu ve batı olarak ayrıştırılan iki uygarlığın çatışması değil, bu iki kültürün muazzam bir karışımıdır. Rüştü romanlarında *Genesis*, *A Thousand and One Nights*, *Iliad*, *Ramayana* gibi büyük anlatıları, Hint, Pers, Yunan ve Kuzey mitlerini, yerel kültürel gelenekleri ve modern siyasi yaklaşımları geniş bir tarihsel çerçeve içinde, kurgu ve gerçekliği harmanlayarak farklı olanın kendini özgürce ifade edebildiği bir doğu-batı sentezi, uluslararası edebi ve estetik bir kültür yaratır.Tez yazarın *Midnight's Children*, *The Moor's Last Sigh* ve *Shalimar The Clown* başlıklı romanlarını incelemektedir. Tez, bir giriş bölümü, iki alt bölümden oluşan bir kuram bölümü, yukarıda belirtilen üç romanı inceleyen ve üç ayrı

alt bölümden oluşan bir gelişme bölümü ve sonuç bölümünden oluşmaktadır. Giriş bölümü tezde incelenen konuları genel olarak tanıtmaktadır. İki alt bölümden oluşan kuram bölümü sömürgecilik ve milliyetçilik gibi kavramlarla, kolonileşme sonrası edebiyat kuramının geçmişini ve şimdiki durumunu Foucault, Said, Bhabha gibi önde gelen kuramcılara göndermeler yaparak incelemektedir, kuram bölümü ayrıca büyülü gerçekçiliği çeşiti kuramcılardan alıntılar yaparak tanımlamaktadır. Üç romanın üç ayrı alt bölümde incelendiği gelişme bölümü parodinin tematik ve yapısal işlevini ve bu kurgunun büyülü gerçeklikle olan ilgisini araştırmaktadır. Tezin sonuç bölümü, Rüştü'nün eserleriyle doğu ve batı arasında çok önceden çizilmiş keskin sınırları silerek farklı görüşlerin ve anlayışların varlıklarını özgürce ortaya koyabildikleri uluslararası bir kültür yarattığını göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Parodi, karnaval parodisi, büyülü gerçekçilik, kolonileşme sonrası edebiyatı, Salman Rushdie.

To my loved ones,
Uğurtan, Sabiha, Ahmet, Yağız Ahu-
Onur, and Duru

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am greatly indebted to Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz for her invaluable help and guidance throughout this study, also for the constant moral support and encouragement she has given me throughout this study. Without her, this thesis would never have been completed.

I wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Oya Batum Menteşe and Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret J-M. Sönmez for their positive attitude and constructive criticism throughout this study.

My sincere thanks are also forwarded to Assist. Prof. Dr. Gökşen Aras and Instructor Zeynep Rana Selimoğlu for their constant encouragement, technical support and invaluable friendship.

I also extend my sincere thanks to Dr. John Mark Vanderheide for providing me with all the primary sources.

Finally, I offer my deepest gratitude to my family, Uğurtan, Sabiha, Ahmet, Yağız, Ahu, who have smoothed this path for me with their love and understanding, and above all, to Duru for being my muse, my endless source of inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM……………………………………………………………………..iii

ABSTRACT…………………………………………………………………..…iv

ÖZ……………………………………………………………………………..…vi

DEDICATION ..……………………………………………………………….viii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS…………………………………………………..…ix

TABLE OF CONTENTS……………………………………………………...x

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION………………………………………………………....1

1.1 The aim and the Scope of the Study…………………………………......1

2. THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY ……………….......6

2.1 History of British Colonial Expansion in the Late 18th and 19th Centuries……………………………………………………………...6

2.2 Colonial Nationalism, Anti-Colonial Resistance, Post Colonialism and Postcolonial Discourse……………………………………………18

3. ANALYSES OF THE NOVELS PARODY in RUSHDIE'S MAGICAL REALISTIC FICTION...30

3.1 *Midnight's Children*..30

3.2 *The Moor's Last Sigh*……………………………………………..59

3.3 *Shalimar The Clown*…………………………………………….... 89

4. CONCLUSION...120

REFERENCES……………………………………………………………...125

CURRICULUM VITAE……………………………………………………………130

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY………………………………………133

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The aim and the Scope of the Study

This dissertation attempts to explore the function of parody in the context of Salman Rushdie's magical realistic fiction. To this end, the first step to be taken is to focus on colonial and postcolonial periods. The first part of the theory chapter entitled "British Colonial Expansion in the Late 18th.and 19th. Centuries" deals with the history of British imperialism, its power mechanisms and institutions, its motives and justifications, that is the ideas which brought about the late 18th. and 19th. centuries' colonial expansion; information about colonial literature, with particular emphasis on Indo-Anglian literature, is also included in this part. The first subchapter defines colonialism, and dwells on its causes and consequences as well as its practices; the definition of colonial literature, with its writers and dominant genres, is followed by that of postcolonial literature. The wide scope of colonial literatures and postcolonial literary theory is mentioned by reference to the works of such theorists as Elleke Boehmer, Ania Loomba, Bill Ashcroft et al., and Abdul Jan Mohamed. The rise of neo-colonialism with the recession in the world economy and its consequences in the second half of the twentieth century are also included in this part. The subchapter then moves on to the discussion about the impact of imperialism on literary works produced in and about the British empire, the construction of colonial institutions and strategies of control, with particular emphasis on the British colonial expansion in India which ended in 1947 with India's declaration of independence. The subchapter then focuses on the definition of discourse and Michel Foucault's correlative knowledge-power relationship and its role in the construction of colonial discourse and policies. The dissertation also discusses Edward Said's work entitled *Orientalism*, which further explores Foucault's treatment of the knowledge-power relationship in the making of

the western originated discourse about the Orient, the Oriental identity and Orientalism.

The second subchapter of the theory chapter entitled "Colonial Nationalism, Anti-Colonial Resistance, Postcolonialism and Postcolonial Discourse" initially presents a survey of the first independence movements in India, and then quotes Simon During's definition of current postcolonialism prior to the discussion about Loomba's idea of nation and Benedict Anderson's comments on the birth of modern nation and the former colonies' struggles for creating a national consciousness. Anderson's idea, which presents anti-colonial nationalism as a derivative discourse, is contested, to a large extent, by Partha Chatterjee's argument which interprets anti-colonial nationalism as a construction based on both borrowing and difference. The second subchapter moves on to the discussion about the defect of nationalism by reference to Boehmer's views; to Boehmer, the common defect of colonial and nationalistic discourses, though they seem to be two distant polarities, is that both are monologic; both prefer to administer alterity by homogenizing it. Hence, the second subchapter suggests that Indian nationalism, just like colonialism, has turned out to be another medium of suppression due to the imposition of homogeneity on the heterogeneous Indian society which shelters multitudes of ethnicities and religious beliefs. Mikhail Bakhtin's ideas about monologism and monologic discourse that are in direct contrast with the dialogic nature of discourse are followed by Homi Bhabha's comment on the impossibility of building a true multicultural system of thought and disciplines within a homogeneous community where all differences are treated as though the same. The second subchapter also puts emphasis on Bhabha's distinction between cultural diversity and cultural difference. Andrew Teverson's definition of the place and function of minority discourse is followed by Bhabha's idea of the "Third Space" as the only way for "conceptualizing an international culture" which is based on the expression of cultural hybridity. Frederick. Jameson's "The Three World's Theory" and Aijaz Ahmad's counter argument, which presents India as an example, are also referred to in this part. The second subchapter then, attempts to define the exact stance of Rushdie's fiction in a world divided into two sharply distinct polarities as East and

West. This part makes use of Shailja Sharma's ideas about the true stance of Rushdie's fiction, and draws the conclusion that Rushdie's work encompasses not just East and West but all the corners of the world because he adopts and employs multiple cultural elements. The concluding part of the theory chapter discusses the link between Rushdie's multi-layered parody technique and magical realism; it also contains a number of definitions of and approaches to magical realism by reference to such critics as Franz Roh, Alejo Carpentier, Luis Leal, Amaryll Chanady, Erwin Dale Carter, Lois P. Zamora, Gabrielle P. Foreman, and Patricia Merivale.

The three subsequent subchapters of the development chapter investigate Rushdie's use of parody in *Midnight's Children*, *The Moor's Last Sigh*, and *Shalimar The Clown*; the titles of the novels name the three subchapters as well. The reason for choosing these three particular novels is that they share a number of thematic and structural correspondences. They provide Rushdie with a platform to foreground cultural differences, or in Bhabha's words "cultural hybridity". The unrestrained expression of cultural hybridity appears to have priority for Rushdie because it is through the articulation of cultural hybridity that the author succeeds in creating what Bhabha calls an "international culture" in the chosen novels. All the three novels have dialogic structures that are set to challenge the restrictive, monologic national discourses, in Rushdie's case the Indian nationalistic discourse; one might easily notice Rushdie's advocacy for heterogeneity against homogeneity as a significant common point in the three novels. In each of the three novels the ending is given at the beginning. This cyclical structure is an expression of the endless cycle of natural life. The idea is that every beginning has an end and every end has a beginning in itself. Although there is death at the end of the novels, the mood is optimistic because to Rushdie, death is not an end but a new beginning. Another common point which can be traced in all the three novels is the figure of Scheherazade. While *Midnight's Children* and *Shalimar The Clown* refer to the legendary storyteller Scheherazade at the very beginning, she is alluded to in the last chapter of *The Moor's Last Sigh*. Rushdie's persistent use of the figure of Scheherazade indicates the neverending process of storytelling. Like Scheherazade, who saved not only her own life but also

that of the whole female population of her community, Rushdie's characters, especially Saleem and the Moor, give meaning to their personal as well as national histories through their narratives. In all the three novels Rushdie employs parody, especially carnivalesque parody, to turn the existing hierarchical orders upside down. The author's parodic characters, who populate the novels analysed in this dissertation, are multi-layered and multi-dimensional in that they embody within themselves various other figures from eastern and western literary traditions. These characters introduce the reader to multiple perspectives as alternatives. In all the three novels Rushdie continually draws parallels between a personal history and the turbulent historical development of India and/or Kashmir. Rushdie does even more than establishing parallels; he systematically mingles individual histories with the history of contemporary India by using parody and magical realism interdependently. The use of these two subversive forms not only contributes to the rich texture of the novels but also enables the author to surpass the predetermined borders. The multi-layered and rich texture of Rushdie's novels requires any study of his novels to be equally multi-layered and multi-dimensional as well.

The first subchapter entitled *Midnight's Children* firstly introduces a survey of historical and contemporary definitions of parody by reference to Margaret A. Rose; the second theorist whose ideas about the nature of parody are drawn largely is Bakhtin; this part of the dissertation is intended to provide the theoretical link between the double-voiced nature of parody with Rushdie's peculiar technique of character formation in all the three novels. What is also extensively alluded to in this part is Bakhtin's theory of the carnival because there are many examples of carnivalesque parody in the three novels studied in this dissertation. The remaining part of the first subchapter entitled *Midnight's Children* and the two subsequent subchapters entitled *The Moor's Last Sigh*, and *Shalimar The Clown* focus on Rushdie's application of parody through subversion in the context of his magical realistic work. All the three subchapters analysing the novels conclude with a discussion of a number of magical realistic incidents so as to draw attention to the interdependent relationship between parody and magical realism as two subversive forms. In these three subchapters

references are also made to the works of such authors as Sigmund Freud, Indira Karamcheti, Thomas Coburn, John J. Su, Andrew S. Teverson, David Quint, Frantz Fanon, Chidi Amuta, Sonia Gallico, Mircea Eliade, and David Danow.

The conclusion of the dissertation dwells on the interdependent relationship between Rushdie's parody techniques and his use of magical realism as an inexhaustible source enhancing, stratifying, and diversifying the fictional characters and worlds in the aforementioned three novels. The conclusion puts emphasis on the structural affinities between carnivalesque parody and magical realistic style, and displays how these two forms serve Rushdie's desire to travel beyond the boundaries of history, time, space, and politics. This part also makes reference to works of such writers as Beata Gesicka, Shirley Neuman and Robert Wilson, and David Danow. The conclusion also refers back to the theory chapter, to Homi Bhabha's notion of the "Third Space", that is the unrestrained, hybrid channel through which cultural difference is expressed; to Bhabha, the articulation and inscription of cultural difference, or what he calls "culture's hybridity" is the only possible way to build an "international culture". In this respect, Rushdie's fiction appears to be the "Third Space" which exactly fits Bhabha's preconditions required for the realisation of an international culture. The conclusion also poses new questions on Rushdie's powerful defense of heterogeneity in the construction of individual and communal identity against homogeneity by reference to the work entitled *Kimlik İnşası* (*Identity Construction*) by Nuri Bilgin; this discussion is included in the conclusion so as to open a platform for the future studies on Rushdie's work.

CHAPTER 2

THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

2.1 History of British Colonial Expansion in the Late 18th and 19th Centuries

The theoretical chapter of this dissertation includes a detailed investigation of colonial and postcolonial periods. The first subchapter focuses on the history of the British colonial expansion, i.e. imperialism, its power mechanisms and institutions, its motives and justifications, in brief, the idea on which the late 18th and 19th centuries' imperialism was based. General information about colonial literature is also given in this part. The second subchapter discusses the historical and socio-political occurrences, and literary tendencies of the postcolonial period with particular emphasis on Indo-Anglian literature. This second part of the theoretical chapter firstly analyses the struggles for independence in general and then moves on to the discussion concerning Indo-Anglian postcolonial literary theory, its underlying reasons and needs, its implicit and explicit impacts on the West and the Subcontinent, its recent directions and tendencies. The theory chapter attempts to hold a mirror to the past and present of colonial, postcolonial, and Indo-Anglian literary theories by giving references to various theorists in the field. The chapter aims at drawing a profile of the Western perception of the East in general, and in particular, of India, Indianness and vice versa. The discussion about magical realism – the definition of the term, its temporal and spatial treatment, its perception of reality, man, the world and the universe, and its difference from the traditional realist, or the fantastic, or the surreal text – ends the theory chapter. The analyses of the novels in the dissertation provide the links between Salman Rusdie's use of parody and its relation to magical realism.

It is agreed that the history of the world for the past few centuries has been constructed by colonial interests; therefore, what should be done prior to the discussion about the recent state of postcolonial studies in English is to focus on the colonial period. Elleke Boehmer's book entitled *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* is an

illuminating guide, a reliable study on the writing of and against empire, involving colonization and its aftermath. At the beginning of the book the writer draws a chronological and geographical map of European colonialism. The historical past of European colonialism goes back approximately “five hundred years or so to the days of European mercantile expansion, Columbus landing in America, and the exploration of the coast of Africa past the Cape of Good Hope” (Boehmer 5). Since the field of European colonialism is too vast to be analysed in the limits of one single chapter, the attention is limited to the British Empire and the literature written in English. Also the time zone of the study must be restricted to the 18th and 19th centuries because “the last two hundred years have witnessed both the moment of greatest expansion of that Empire [British], and its demise” (Boehmer 6). To begin with an explanation of the terms like “imperial”, “colonial”, “postcolonial”, “native”, “nativist”, and “neo-colonial” might be illuminating. Though some writers use the terms “imperialism” and “colonialism” interchangeably, Boehmer makes a distinction between them and puts more stress on the ruthless, exploitative aspects of imperialism in her definition of colonialism. Imperialism is the authority applied by a state into another territory; this authority is expressed through military and economic power. The term “imperialism” is “associated in particular with the expansion of the European nation state in the nineteenth century” (Boehmer 6). Boehmer defines colonialism as the consolidation and manifestation of imperial power “in the settlement of territory, the exploitation or development of resources, and the attempt to govern the indigenous inhabitants of occupied lands, often by force” (6). According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the word colonialism comes from the Roman “colonia” which meant “farm” or “settlement”, and referred to Romans who settled in other lands but still retained their citizenship. The *OED* definition of colonialism,

> a settlement in a new country… a body of people who settle in a new locality, forming a community subject to or connected with their parent state; the community so formed, consisting of the original settlers and their descendants and successors, as long as the connection with the parent state is kept up

supports the critic Ania Loomba’s claim that “colonialism and imperialism are often used interchangeably” (1), because the above definition includes no reference to

people who might already have been living in those places before the arrival of the colonisers. It does not mention an encounter between original dwellers and newcomers, or of conquest and domination. The definition is not a satisfying one because there is no clue that “the new locality” may not be so new due to its already existing population and that the ways of “forming a community” may be unjust. For Loomba, who describes colonialism as “the conquest and control of other people’s land and goods” (2), the process of establishing a new community in other people’s lands meant either destruction or reconstruction of the population that existed there already. And this process of destroying or reestablishing new communities “involved a wide range of practices including trade, plunder, negotiation, warfare, genocide, enslavement and rebellions” (Loomba 2). Though the causes or intentions behind the colonialist urge were varied in different parts of the world, the ultimate consequence of colonialism was the same: “… everywhere it locked the original inhabitants and the newcomers into the most complex and traumatic relationships in human history” (Loomba 2). Colonial literature, on the other hand, comprises the works dealing with the perceptions and practices, written not only by metropolitans but also by creoles and indigenes during colonial times. Colonial literature includes public and private records, letters, trade documents, government papers, fiction and scientific literature. In fact, it is difficult to define the precise scope of colonial literature because it is so heterogeneous. The reason for its being heterogeneous is that colonial literature contains “literature written in Britain as well as in the rest of the Empire during the colonial period” (Boehmer 6); nevertheless, texts like *King Solomon’s Mines* or Rudyard Kipling’s poems reflecting either a touch of local colonial feature or a particular colonial motif like “the quest beyond the frontiers or civilization” (Boehmer, 6), are undoubtedly considered to be colonial. Bill Ashcroft and his colleagues’ definition of postcolonial literature, however, appears to have a wider scope than Boehmer’s definition of colonial literature because it includes the writings of both colonial and postcolonial times:

> Although the term ´postcolonial` seems to suggest a concern only with the national culture after the departure of the imperial power, it covers all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day. (Ashcroft 2)

Similarly, the critic Loomba points out the interdependent and "the inter-disciplinary nature of [colonial and] postcolonial studies which may range from literary analysis to research in the archives of colonial government, from the critique of medical texts to economic theory and usually combine these and other areas" (12). The critic's diagnosis indicates that postcolonial studies are as heterogeneous and diffuse as colonial writings. Boehmer's explanation of postcolonial theory, in a sense, is more assertive: "a narrative about the writing, that accompanied empire, and the writing that came to supplant it" (7). Boehmer's definition is assertive because it embodies a challenge to the monolithic, oppressive, silencing imperialistic discourse. According to Boehmer, the liberation of the formerly colonized and the articulation of his voice by means of postcolonial theory have paved the way to "the making of the globalized culture of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries; [to] the entry of once-colonized others into the West and the West's otherness" (7). Other terms that should be taken into consideration are "native", "nativist", "Third World", and "neo-colonial". As Boehmer suggests, "native", which was "once a derogatory label for colonized people,… has more recently been reclaimed by postcolonial critics to designate those who belong to a particular place by birth" (8). "Nativist" is meant to be "an early form of nationalist writing" (Boehmer 9). The collective term "Third World" which was first used "by the Non-Aligned movement at the Bandung Conference in 1955 … came to designate those states distinct from the West, the First World, and the Second World, the Soviet bloc, in the context of the Cold War" (Boehmer 9). The terms "postcolonial" and "neo-colonial" sometimes overlap and cause confusion because both refer to the post-independence period. "Neo-colonialism", which is "a term from economic theory… signifies the continuing economic control by the West of the once-colonized world under the guise of political independence, and the betrayal therefore of the ideals of postcolonial liberation" (Boehmer 9). Neo-colonialism, also called super or new imperialism, is what Boehmer calls an "insidious" reincarnation of the imperialism which declined in the independency movements of the 1940s, 50s and 60s. The recession of the world economy, especially the piling up of the Third World debt in the 1970s, not only led to the collapse of the Soviet bloc in the late 1980s, but also gave the rich Northern countries the opportunity to control the South more tightly.

As a result, the rise of neo-colonialism in the twenty-first century has become hegemonic, and global, undoubtedly. Hence colonialism, though its name has been changed, is not a remnant of the past and is still valid, even more powerful than it had once been:

> Despite anti-imperial developments, despite the apparently subversive energies of postcolonial writing, in a world order powered by multinational companies, colonialism is not a thing of the past. (Boehmer 10)

In every possible way imperialism affected the texts produced in and about the British Empire. The power of the British Empire in the late 18th and 19th centuries was represented not only by the Royal Navy and Queen Victoria but also by texts. One of the mediums through which the Empire diffused and exercised its power on British India was texts. All the definitive Victorian genres, such as the triple-decker novel and adventure tale, or non-fictional writings like political treatises, diaries, acts and edicts, administrative records, letters home and letters back to settlers and so on were filled with "imperial ideas of race pride and national prowess" (Boehmer 14). It was through the texts that colonists revealed their intention to make a home, to begin a new history in their newly invaded lands. They deliberately ignored the other lives, other cultures that had been going on in that particular territory. The colonists either totally erased or manipulated the remaining cultural signs of the natives according to their own needs. For example, the British ruled India by blending ancient religious laws – "the Islamic sharia and the Hindu Shastras" – with what was deemed to be modern, scientific knowledge in the late 18th and 19th centuries. (Boehmer 14). What the early European colonizers did was to unravel unfamiliar lives and cultures through using known rhetorical devices. In other words, the unknown was made known "by using everyday names, dependable textual conventions, both rhetorical and syntactic" (Boehmer 15). Literature was a significant means of interpreting other lands, justifying the ideas of exploration, of Western conquest, of new colonial acquisitions before the eyes of the home audience:

> … literature created channels for the exchange of colonial images and ideals. In writings various as romances, memoirs, adventure tales, or the later poetry of

> Tennyson, the view of the world as directed from the colonial metropolis was consolidated and confirmed. (Boehmer 15)

Until the late 18th c. the European knowledge of the non-West was based on the stories of riches and marvel inspired by the fantastical tales of earlier travellers:

> By the later 18th c., travel to distant places, to strange cultures was to become, at least potentially, every man's source of philosophical, secular knowledge… . In the experience of non-European cultures, the traveller seeks and finds manifestations of Europe's past; he perceives relatively primitive social formations that serve to confirm Europe's singular, exemplary modernity. (Randall 43)

Curiosity inflamed by financial profit and the desire to discover and to comprehend the unknown paved the way for European expansion in Africa and India. The imaginative expectations were realised by the actual riches encountered in distant territories. Among them were gold, ivory, ginger and cinnamon, exotic beasts, people of very different cultures etc. The colonialist narrative was continually turning around the fascination with difference which was ultimately related to the ideas of sameness and familiarity to interpret the different: "Classifications and codes imported from Europe were matched to peoples, cultures, and topographies that were entirely un-European" (Boehmer 17). The accumulation of information about non-European lands and peoples and classifying them in different ways enabled the coloniser to set up colonial institutions and strategies of control:

> The different stereotypes of the ´mild Hindoo', the 'warlike Zulu', the 'barbarous Turk', the 'New World cannibal', or the 'black rapist' were all generated through particular colonial situations and were tailored to different colonial policies. (Loomba 97)

Nevertheless, the act of stereotyping was not persistent; it underwent change according to the changing circumstances in time: "Following the 1857 rebellion in the Indian Army [Indian Mutiny] … the 'mild Hindoo' figure gave away to an image of the Hindu rapist …" (Loomba 98). Colonial ethnographies and catalogues of colonial peoples helped the British colonizers codify enormous varieties of Indian peoples into categories of caste, race, and religion. For instance, *The People of India*, eight volumes published in 1868-1875 by the Politics and Secrets Department of the India Office in London, was photography pressed and offered to the service of colonial ethnography.

These eight volumes, which became fundamental reading for colonial administrators, categorize the enormous varieties of Indian peoples according to differences of caste, race, and religion. "*The People of India* reveals the attempt both to master colonial subjects and to represent them as unalterably alien" (Loomba 99). Thus imperial texts suggest the ways to dominate the lives of millions as well as ways to legitimize such world order. A further function of colonial writing was to mask suffering:

> Colonial writing is important for revealing the ways in which that world system [colonial] could represent the degradation of other human beings as natural and innate part of their degenerate or barbarian state. (Boehmer 21)

The role of colonial writing mentioned in the above quotation constitutes the basis for later postcolonial theorists to develop their concepts of the *subaltern*, meaning of inferior or subordinated rank, and the *colonial other*, or simply the *other*: "The concept of the other, which is built on the thought of*, inter alia*, Hegel, Sartre, and Said, signifies that which is unfamiliar and extraneous to a dominant subjectivity, the opposite or negative against which an authority is defined" (Boehmer 21).

The colonial act of renaming new regions, for example, was another manifestation of those colonised places to be contiguous, subject and secondary to Europe. Although Europeans saw local cultures as primitive, they made use of scripts and artefacts of the colonised for their administrative needs. For instance, in Asia European scholars, together with colonial officials, absorbed many indigenous texts, including the Koran, the Veda, *al-Hidaya*, the *Arabian Nights*. "The classical and vernacular Indian languages were transformed into textual archives – grammars, dictionaries, and guidebooks" (Boehmer 20). In Bengal, for example, a wide range of local specialists – linguists, scribes, spiritual leaders, pundits, and interpreters – worked to legitimize the British colonial rule in an indigenous idiom. According to many nineteenth and twentieth-century writers, the expansion of European colonisation was a result of the victory of science and reason over the forces of superstition, and surprisingly many colonised people believed in the same idea:

> An Educatión Despatch of 1854 explicitly connected the advance of European knowledge in India to the economic development of the subcontinent… . The Indian reformer Raja Rammohan Roy had already written to the Governor-General Lord

> Amherst some thirty years earlier that the government policy of support to Sanskrit and Arabic-Persian education would serve only to keep India in darkness. (Loomba 21-22)

Although Europe's enterprise to dominate distant lands and oceans goes back several centuries, it was in the 19th c., which is also called the imperial century, that the economic and political superiority of Europe and in particular of Britain, became global. During Queen Victoria's reign (1837-1901), the period representing Britain's great age of colonization, the nation established itself as a dominant world power, a pioneer of European industrialization and expansion. Most British imperialists developed a heroic image of themselves as conquerors and civilizers of the world. Britain's military and economic power supported by ideologies of moral, cultural and racial supremacy, which were made evident in the writings of the period, both fictional and non-fictional, led to the belief that it was Britain's ordained destiny and mission to rule the world, or at least that one-quarter of the earth's surface over which the Empire now extended. For Britain the second half of the 19th c. was the period of high –also called formal or new – imperialism the foundations of which had already been established in the late 1700s and early 1800s. Boehmer summarizes the causes and effect of the British imperial expansion as follows:

> … the opening of the South Pacific, the annexation of territory in southern Africa, the consolidation and then dismantling of the slave trade, and, most important economically, the expansion of dominion in India… . Between 1790 and 1820 approximately 150 million people in lands as far apart as southern Africa, Australia, and the Indian subcontinent were declared under British control. (30)

By 1833, the British consolidated their presence as the political power in India, and in 1876 Queen Victoria was named Empress of India, 'Kaizer-i – Hind'. Imperialism was taking place not only abroad but also at home. British public taste at home inevitably turned to the excitements of British power abroad that were recounted in missionary and explorer travelogues and adventure romances. It was understood that the endurance of the Empire was heavily dependant on aesthetic display which included stimulating ideas and propaganda; stories, songs, verse, games, and youth movements all embodied imperial dreams. National selfhood was articulated "against the inferior

state of being which the colonized were said to represent" (Boehmer 31). The British selfhood, which was superior in every way, was reflected in texts of the period:

> Any white colonial officer, whatever his origins, was seen as forming part of an elite. His education, his military or administrative skills – in effect, his mastery of texts, – became a key marker of that status. (Boehmer 31)

Nevertheless, along with the outbreak of the South African War (1899-1902), seeds of suspicion and anxiety, concerning the maintenance of the possessions of the empire, were spilled. Consequently, the British assumed a greater defensiveness. The shifting economic power bases in Europe during the Great Depression of 1873-96 shattered Britain's pioneering status. Other European nations started to challenge Britain's dominance not only by trade, manufacture and technological development but also by increasing their colonial possessions abroad. There were also threats against colonial authority within the Empire. The Indian Mutiny or War of Rebellion of 1857 tightened British imperial policies in India:

> The British began to concentrate on firm rule and showed greater caution in reform. It was … acknowledged that the strength and security of the Empire had to rest on force, that authoritative control and responsibility alone would guarantee its permanence. (Boehmer 34)

Thus fears and doubts about the empire, which began with the outbreak of World War I, diffused until the final dissolution in 1914. Britain's domination of India, however, continued a few more decades; India declared independency on August 15th, 1947 and put an end to the period of British colonial rule in the subcontinent.

The matter of discussion in the remaining part of the theory chapter attempts to clarify the Western perception of the East, the Eastern culture and identity with respect to colonial discourse and the Eastern response to the West reciprocated in postcolonial discourse. What is colonial discourse? How does it function to legitimize the British colonial rule? And how does it instigate postcolonial discourse? As stated in the OED, 'discourse', derived from the Latin cursus or 'running to and fro', has several meanings:

> onward course, process or succession of time, events, actions; the faculty of reasoning or rationality; communication of thought by speech or conversation; a narrative, tale or

> account; familiarity, and a spoken or written treatment of a subject in which it is treated or handled at length.

The last meaning of 'discourse' given in the above definition marks the recent prevailing usage of the word; and it is on this last meaning that Michel Foucault founded his concept of discourse. Foucault's studies on the origins of modern medical and social scientific disciplines have brought about an interest in the nature of knowledge and its relation to power mechanisms. In *Discipline and Punish* Foucault explored the concomitant, interdependent knowledge-power relations in society:

> We should admit that power produces knowledge (and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful); that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations. (465)

For Foucault, knowledge is neither objective nor innocent; it is produced to dominate 'the other', and it might be possible to assert that Foucault's formulation of the power-knowledge relationship lies at the very heart of western colonial discourse which Boehmer defines as,

> …the collection of symbolic practices, including textual codes, conventions, and implied meanings, which Europe deployed in the process of its colonial expansion and … in understanding the bizarre and apparently untranslatable strangeness with which it came into contact. (Boehmer 48)

Foucault's notion of discourse, which was an outcome of his work on madness, does not regard language merely as a tool to produce meaning; instead, his concept of discourse suggests that systematic ways of thinking about the world are already built into established patterns of language use. Discourse contains ideology and hence plays a major role in supporting or challenging power. To M.H. Abrams, Foucault's concept of discourse is "a body of anonymous, historical rules, determined in the time and space of a given period and for a given social, economic, geographical, or linguistic area, the conditions of the expressive function" (262). Foucault's discourse, or the entire conceptual territory on which knowledge is formed, produced, and distributed "includes not just what is thought or said but the rules which govern what can be said and what not, what is included as rational and what left out, what is thought of as

madness or insubordination and what is seen as sane or socially acceptable" (Loomba 39). In this sense, discourse, the bases of which can be traced in human practices, institutions and actions, operates as the domain within which language is used in particular ways.

Foucault's concept of discourse as a system of possibilities for knowledge has been broadened in Edward Said's *Orientalism.* The work "points out the extent to which knowledge about the Orient [what is today referred to as the Middle East] as it was produced and circulated in Europe was an ideological accompaniment of colonial power" (Loomba 43). In the work Said argues that "Orientalism" as a discourse became a systematic discipline which enabled European culture to produce and conduct "the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period" (873). Said defines "Orientalism" as a "certain will or intention to understand, in some cases to control, manipulate, even to incorporate what is a manifestly different world" (873-4). For Said, "Orientalism" as a discourse does not represent "the Orient" truly; it is rather a representation of the Western idea of the East, reflecting a prejudiced, ill-intentioned perception of the Orient and the Oriental. As Said suggests, certain European texts representing the Orient are believed to be carrying the authority of academics, institutions, and governments. Said interprets the power of such texts in the Foucaultian sense:

> … such texts can create not only knowledge but also the very reality they appear to describe. In time such knowledge and reality produce a tradition, or what Michel Foucault calls a discourse, whose material presence or weight, … is really responsible for the texts produced out of it. (877)

According to Said, the knowledge-power relationship has helped the Western world to establish imperial authority over the Orient; knowledge and power have become the indivisible and indispensable foundations of imperial authority. Within the boundaries of imperial rule, knowledge is piled up, cultivated and then transformed into more power "to create the Orient, the Oriental and his world" (Said 880). In Said's words,

> Orientalism… [is] the corporate institution … dealing with it [the Orient] by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it: in short, Orientalism as Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. (873)

For Said, in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Western civilization not only exploited the Orient politically and economically, but also applied what might be called "cultural oppression" on the Orient through a total abstraction of local cultural traditions, and in place of them, establishing their own tradition of Orientalism with a vocabulary, imagery, rhetoric, and figures to draw the picture of the Orient and the Oriental. As Said states, the representations of the 'Orient' in European literary texts, the travelogues for example, created a dichotomy between Europe and its 'others'; this dichotomy was central not only to the creation of European culture but also to the maintenance and extension of European hegemony over other lands. As a discourse, Orientalism has created the Oriental type who is in all circumstances – mentally, morally, and physically – inferior to the Occidental; within this picture, the European always has a superior position compared to the Oriental. In a critical essay titled "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature", Abdul Jan Mohamed questions the abundance of binary oppositions in works of colonial representations. Mohamed claims that the idea of the 'othering' of a particular group of people and their construction as backward and inferior are essential not only for creating images of the outsider but also for constructing the insider (59-60). The role of stereotyping is also worth mentioning in the process of 'othering' which helped to acknowledge and justify the superior image of the Occidental. As Loomba points out,

> In India they [stereotypes] carried strong underpinnings of caste divisions, for instance, wiliness and cunning were attributed to upper caste Brahmins, traditionally the keepers of education and learning. Various tribal peoples, historically repressed by the upper-castes and already relegated to the margins of Hindu society, were also regarded by the British authorities as less sophisticated, more warlike, child-like and gullible. (98)

According to the Western idea,

> The Oriental lived in a different but a thoroughly organized world of his own with its own national, cultural, and epistemological boundaries and principles of internal coherence… [yet] what gave the Oriental's world its intelligibility and identity were still not the result of his own efforts [because he was an infant] but rather the whole complex series of knowledgeable manipulations by which the Orient was identified by the West. (Said 880)

In other words, Western cultural imperialism created and moulded the world and identity of the non-West, regardless of the already existing rich cultural traditions of the so-called "Third World". Loomba puts emphasis on the importance of the colonialist production of knowledge because… "it necessarily included a clash with and a marginalisation of the knowledge and belief systems of those who were conquered… (66). For Loomba, the originality of Said's work lies in its extension of "Foucault's work to make connections between the production of knowledge and the exercise of power, and ... in its use of literary materials to discuss historical and epistemological processes" (46-47).

2.2 Colonial Nationalism, Anti-Colonial Resistance, Post Colonialism and Postcolonial Discourse

It is quite ironical that anti-colonial resistance movements of the late 19th and 20th centuries were first activated by the European rhetoric of cultural "self-determination" which might be explained as the right of a country to be independent, instead of being controlled by a foreign country, and to choose its own form of government. It was this rhetoric of self-determination, "of national autonomy that Europe itself had propagated contributed to balking colonial expansion" (Boehmer, 100). Nationalistic undulation that shelters the desire for national sovereignty and self-expression of those who bore the burden of colonization, was the predictable response to colonizers. But when and how did the anti-colonial nationalistic ideas diffuse throughout the world? According to Boehmer, "the world-wide spread of anti-colonial nationalist feeling in the twentieth century can be officially dated from 1919 when the rights of dependent nations were officially acknowledged at Versailles" (101). The

impact of the two World Wars, undoubtedly, brought about what Boehmer calls "cataclysmic changes" (102). As Europe experienced the breaking down of its ideals of scientific and technical superiority, of its faith in progress in the catastrophe of World War I, the success of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 set an oppositional and admirable example for those who were under the yoke of colonization. The Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 inspired the declaration of Irish Free State in 1922, for example. Another attempt against British hegemony, though unsuccessful, was made in India:

> In India, revolutionaries such as those involved in the Ghadr movement attempted to exploit 1914-18 international hostilities in order to strike off their British bonds… the War also fed into the anti-imperialist upsurge which began under Mohandas Ghandi's leadership in 1919. (Boehmer 102)

World War II further inflamed the anti-colonialist sentiment in the world. As for the Indian subcontinent, while the collaboration between Subhas Chandra Bose's Indian National Army and the Japanese in the final years of the War was proven to be influential on the call for independence, the use of Indian Army units to re-establish French and Dutch colonial rule in South-East Asia heightened anti-imperialist feelings considerably (Boehmer 102). Boehmer conveys the final phase of the historical process leading to an independent India and Pakistan as follows:

> For Britain, the militant Quit India upsurge of 1942 had emphasized the importance of a negotiated transfer of power. Two years after the cessation of hostilities, in 1947, came the independence of India and Pakistan, the first 'non-White' British colonial territories to achieve this status. (102)

In fact, the first signs of colonial nationalism and anti-colonial resistance can be detected as early as 1857 in the Indian Mutiny. It was the rebellion of Hindu and Muslim soldiers in the Indian army against the British colonial authority. The Indian nationalist historiography accepted the Mutiny of 1857 as the First War of Independence because it spread from the Sepoys of the army and involved local rulers as well as peasants. In Jenny Sharpe's words, "…the punishment of Indian rebels by the colonial authorities was excessive, ritualised and ceremonial. It was designed to strike terror in the rebellious native…" (79). The 1857 rebellion made the British rule

over India stricter and harsher; the idea was that any challenge against authority must be punished collectively.

Coming back to the first half of the 20th c., in the aftermath of World War II, the British abruptly quit the subcontinent in 1947. Until 1947, Britain resisted Indian self-government on the grounds that the country was both too old to learn how to govern and too young, for Indian people were believed to be infants. August 15th, 1947, the date of independence is considered to be the starting point for the Indian nationalists. 1947 also marks the beginning of postcolonial era in India. This removing, virtually eradication of the colonial power and declaration of independence brought about radical changes in India, inevitably. So there appears a series of questions that must be answered to highlight the occurrences and tendencies taking place in India after the withdrawal of the colonizer: What is post-colonialism? How do the formerly colonized Indians perceive independence and in what ways does nationalism affect post-colonial discourse? Do the Indian state mechanisms fulfil the requirements of a democratic, egalitarian regime? What are the negative cultural and political effects of imposing homogeneity on such a heterogeneous society as India to achieve a homogeneous national community? What are the dangerous outcomes of creating a national discourse under the pretext of embracing the whole nation, regardless of ethnic and religious differences? And finally, what is the function of minority discourse in this context? Such are the questions to be investigated hereafter.

Simon During in his article titled "Postmodernism or Post-colonialism Today" defines post-colonialism "as the need, in nations or groups which have been victims of imperialism, to achieve an identity uncontaminated by universalist or Eurocentric concepts and images" (125). According to During, the pivotal drive for decolonized communities is the desire for an identity. The idea of nation-state, which includes nations born of anti-imperialist struggles, would be the plane for the materialization of this long awaited identity:

> Anti-colonial struggles … had to create new and powerful identities for colonised peoples and to challenge colonialism not only at a political or intellectual level, but also on an emotional plane …[and] the idea of nation was a powerful vehicle for harnessing anti-colonial energies at all these levels. (Loomba 185-6)

Of course, it is not possible to generalise the conditions that awaken national consciousness because every colonial experience is unique. Yet it is the idea of nation, which Benedict Anderson defines as “an imagined community” (46) that is the common bond between those whose past is marked by the experience of colonialism. In *Imagined Communities*, Anderson states that the convergence of capitalism, allowing bonds to exist across national or linguistic boundaries, and print technology, making newspapers, novels and other forms of communication available to the literate and creating a shared culture, has destroyed the barrier of the diversity of human language and given way to the possibility of a new form of imagined community, and thus “set the stage for the modern nation” (46). According to Anderson, the bilingual native intelligentsia awoke nationalist consciousness for they had access “to modern Western culture and to the models of nationalism, … and nation-states produced elsewhere in the course of the nineteenth century” (116). Western cultural imperialism which is dependent upon the dissemination and imposition of European languages and ideas resulted in a kind of self-destruction by teaching the colonial subject the models of nationalism. In Loomba’s words, “anti-colonial nationalism is itself made possible and shaped by European political and intellectual history” (189). Anderson’s argument, which sees anti-colonial nationalism as a “derivative discourse”, echoes those of “English historians [who] had even suggested that Indians learnt their ideas of freedom and self-determination from English books…” (Loomba 189). Anderson’s argument is challenged by Partha Chatterjee’s book titled *The Nation and Its Fragments*. For Chatterjee, anti-colonial nationalism is not a mere imitation of European models, but a construction, the process of which is based on both borrowing and difference. Chatterjee distinguishes between nationalism as a political movement, challenging the colonial state, and nationalism as a cultural construct, allowing the colonised to assert their difference and autonomy. Nationalism, as a political movement, is derivative, but as a cultural construct, it nourishes on indigenous sources (6-7).

While talking about India’s Independence Day, Boehmer quotes from Jawaharlal Nehru, the first prime minister of independent India who ruled the country and the Congress Party for fifteen years. Nehru’s speech “heralded the moment

[August 15th, 1947] as historical and rare, an earth-changing move from an old world into a new 'when the soul of a nation, long suppressed, finds utterance'" (Boehmer 173). Despite Nehru's enthusiastic remarks welcoming independence and nationalism as the liberation of a "long suppressed nation", it was later proven that nationalism could be used as a homogenizing tool to silence the opposing heterogeneous voices in a country like India, which embodies multitudes of ethnicities and religious beliefs. When nationalism turned out to be another form of oppression, because its chosen "way to manage alterity was to homogenize it" (Boehmer 51), new resistance movements appeared inevitably. Both nationalistic and colonial ideologies try to impose a monopoly on discourse to consolidate their existence. The apparent defect of nationalistic discourse, similar to that of colonial discourse, is that it is monologic. According to Bakhtin,

> …monologism denies that there exists outside of it another consciousness, with the same rights, and capable of responding on an equal footing, another and equal *I* …The monologue is accomplished and deaf to the other's response; it does not await it and does not grant it any decisive force. (667)

However, the nature of discourse or utterance, to Bakhtin, is dialogic.

> …even in discourse or utterance which was not overtly interactive, dialogue was to be found. Because all utterances involve the importing and naturalization of the speech of others, all utterances include inner tensions, collaborations, negotiations which are comparable to the process of dialogue. (673)

Bakhtin's discussion on the nature of discourse marks the functional difference between national discourse and minority discourse. The restrictive monologic national discourse aims at making all the same and equal; it melts the different within its homogeneous unity. Homi Bhabha conveys his views concerning multiculturalism in the work titled *The Location of Culture*. To Bhabha, it is not possible to realize a true multicultural system of thought and disciplines, or what Bhabha calls "cultural relativism" within a homogeneous national community where the different is either suppressed or given a would-be liberation to express itself. According to Bhabha,

> If cultural difference is understood as the free play of polarities and pluralities in the homogeneous empty time of the national community, then multiculturalism becomes little more than an argument for a cultural relativism in which all are equal because all are the same and all are included because no one is different. (162)

Bhabha's counter argument defends "perplexity" in the living and writing of the nation. He explains "perplexity" as a more antagonistic vision of cultural difference in which social contradictions and antagonisms are foregrounded and discussed on the spot (162). Parallel to Bhabhas's views, the critic, Andrew S. Teverson, in the article titled "Fairy Tale Politics:…" defines the place and function of minority discourse with respect to national discourse as follows:

> Minority discourse, … must not be seen as a discourse to be incorporated *into* the national discourse but as a form of *intervention* that repeatedly subverts and transforms the national narrative without ever offering the promise that there will be a point at which the national narrative accumulates into an organic unity. (462)

To put in another way, what Teverson claims is that minority discourse is always in favour of variety, operating in the precisely opposite way to that of nationalistic discourse which is always seeking for unity. Bhabha's article titled "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences", about the possibility of realising "an international culture", is also worth mentioning in terms of defining the channel through which cultural enunciation is realised in the post-independence period. He first distinguishes between "cultural diversity" and "cultural difference":

> Cultural diversity is an epistemological object –culture as an object of empirical knowledge- whereas cultural difference is the process of the enunciation of culture as 'knowledgeable', authoritative, adequate to the construction of systems of cultural identification. (206)

For the critic, postcolonial discourse is feeding on not cultural diversity but cultural difference because cultural difference "undermines our sense of the homogenizing effects of cultural symbols and icons, by questioning our sense of the authority of cultural synthesis in general" (207). According to Bhabha, cultural difference is enunciated through an invisible channel, which he calls "a Third Space". The act of communication between the "I" and the "You" is "mobilized in the passage through a Third Space, which represents both the general conditions of language and the specific

implication of the utterance ...”(Bhabha 208). The Third Space, wherein the meaning is produced, casts an ambivalence on the act of interpretation because “it destroys the mirror of representation in which cultural knowledge is continuously revealed as an integrated, open, expanding code”(Bhabha 208), ...[and in doing so, it] challenges our sense of the historical identity of culture as a homogenizing unifying force, authenticated by the originary Past, kept alive in the national tradition of the People” (Bhabha 208). To the critic, all cultural statements and systems are produced in the hybrid, contradictory, and ambivalent space of enunciation which he calls “Third Space”:

> It is that Third Space, though unrepresentable in Itself, which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized, and read anew. (208)

Bhabha’s final emphasis is on the idea that the Third Space, which is “the precondition for the articulation of cultural difference, ... may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism or multi-culturalism of the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity”(209). This hybridity, this “Third Space” will not only enable the once colonized to avoid “the politics of polarity ... [but also] emerge as the others of our selves” (209). Considering Bhabha’s views it might be possible to claim that Rushdie’s fiction is the articulation of the “Third Space” because it is the hybrid, ambivalent, and contradictory representation of cultural difference. Hence, his fiction appears to be fulfilling Bhabha’s preconditions required for the realisation of “an international culture”.

In the twentieth century nationalism was absorbed by the newly independent countries to such an extent that the concept of nationalism has become a distinctive trait of Third World countries, just as capitalism has come to be associated with First World countries and socialism with Second World countries. Loomba criticizes the western association of nationalism with Third World as follows:

> In contemporary European or American discourse, ..., nationalism is often regarded as an exclusively ‘Third World problem’ (and for that reason almost always implies atavistic religious fundamentalism and bigotry). Even in the writings of radical

> Western academics, there is often a reductive equation of nationalism with the third world. (203)

Parallel to Loomba's views, Aijaz Ahmad's essay titled "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness and the National Allegory" presents a critical approach to Frederic Jameson's essay "Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capital" which defends the idea that " a certain nationalism is fundamental in the third world … [where] the telling of the individual story, the individual experience cannot but ultimately involve the whole laborious telling of the experience of the collectivity itself" (Jameson 85-86). Ahmad mainly opposes Jameson's definitive categorization of the world 'The Three World's Theory' according to production systems: "I find it significant that First and Second Worlds are defined in terms of their production systems (capitalism and socialism, respectively), whereas the third category – the Third World – is defined purely in terms of an externally inserted phenomena – [i.e. colonialism and successively nationalism] (Ahmad 78). To Ahmad, "this classification divides the world between those who make history and those who are mere objects of it" (78). This classification restricts broadly divergent cultures, histories and narratives into what Loomba calls "a single formal pattern" (204). In addition, this classification blurs minds while locating particular countries. Ahmad's example is India due to its colonial experience and enormous cultural, ethnic and religious diversity:

> Take, for example, India. Its colonial past is nostalgically rehashed on US television screens in copious series every few months, but the India of today has all the characteristics of a capitalist country: generalized commodity production, vigorous and escalating exchanges not only between agriculture and industry but also between Departments I and II of industry itself, and technical personnel more numerous than those of France and Germany combined … So – does India belong in the First World or the Third? (78)

According to Ahmad, Jameson's Three Worlds Theory which defines the 'First World' and 'Second World' in terms of their systems of production and the 'Third World' in relation not to production systems but to the experience of colonialism, leaves the formerly colonised with only one possible way of response, which is to narrate the experience of colonialism from a nationalistic perspective:

> If this 'Third World' is constituted by the singular 'experience of colonialism and imperialism', and if the only possible response is a nationalist one, what else is there that is more urgent to narrate than this experience?... For if societies here are defined not by relations of production but by relations of international domination; if they are forever suspended outside the sphere of the conflict between capitalism (First World) and socialism (Second World); if the motivating force for history here is neither class formation and class struggle nor the multiplicities of intersecting conflicts based upon class, gender, nation, race, region, and so on, but the unitary experience of national oppression, … then what else can one narrate but that national oppression? (79)

To Ahmad, Jameson's insistence on the idea that all Third World literature is shaped by one single experience, i.e. colonialism and nationalism in response, is a way of imposing homogeneity on the heterogeneous cultures of the so-called Third World. Ahmad's argument is that Jameson's categorization defining all Third World texts as national allegories produced by the single experience of colonialism is epistemologically impossible for neither history- time nor geography allows such a categorization:

> Jameson also suggests that the difference between the First World and the Third is itself primordial, rooted in things far older than capitalism as such. So, if the First World is the same as 'the West' and the 'Graeco – Judaic', one has, on the other hand, an alarming feeling that the *Bhagavad-Gita*, the edicts of Manu, and the Qur'an itself are perhaps Third World texts (though the Judaic elements of the Qur-an are quite beyond doubt, and much of the ancient art in what is today Pakistan is itself Graeco-Indic. (81)

As Ahmad suggests, Jameson's 'Three Worlds Theory' gives way to duality inevitably. Ahmad says that the very reason lying behind Jameson's insistance on a singular form of narrativity for Third World literature is his desire to produce a theory of Third World literature:

> … one knows of so many texts from one's own part of the world which do not fit the description of 'national allegory' that one wonders why Jameson insists so much on the category 'all'. Without this category, of course, he cannot produce a theory of Third World Literature. (81-82)

Within this context, where to situate Salman Rushdie's fiction is worth considering. Is it possible to regard Rushdie's fiction as a representative of Third World literature? Does his work belong to the Western mainstream? Where does Rushdie belong to? East or West? Rushdie's fiction appears to be standing aloof from any kind of distinction or polarization between East and West. Rushdie's exact position is that he

is the mediator between East and West. His fiction tells the Western reader of the Indian customs, traditions, beliefs, myths, stories as well as of historical, sociological, political occurrences from a fresh new perspective. Rushdie's uniqueness is the result of his, what might be called "placelessness". He is in-between the two cultures, i.e. the East and the West, belonging to neither, yet in full command of both. Shailja Sharma's comment on the variety of Rushdie's sources explains the multi-cultural dimensions of his work as: "The deliberately hybrid, mongrel, multireferential nature of the literary and experiential inheritance that Rushdie claims, not just from East and West but from all corners of the world…" (604). Sharma's article titled "Salman Rushdie: The Ambivalence of Migrancy" defines Rushdie's stance and concern as follows:

> Rushdie situates himself in a position of perpetual in-betweenness, a migrant caught between three countries [India-Pakistan-Britain], unable to exist comfortably in any one. The trajectory of his work … shows an increasing concern with metafictional issues of representing peripheral histories and experience through a combination of modernist metropolitan and Third World narrative styles adequate to the postcolonial experience. (599)

Rushdie's fiction encompasses both East and West, for he adopts multiple cultural elements instead of "belonging to one country alone: one history, one loyalty, one language, and one set of problems" (Sharma 603). As Sharma states, Rushdie appeals to both the Eastern and Western reader; he enchants the former with his extended verbal and political satire, the latter with his use of myth, his pace of narration and brilliant stylistics and his magic realism (606). Reflecting upon Sharma's categorization of Rushdie's readers, one gets the impression that the Eastern reader is unaware of the novelist's use of myth, the dexterity of his narrative technique and style and magical realism, while the Westerner is incapable of understanding his verbal and political satire; however, needless to say, Rushdie deliberately avoids making any kind of distinction between East and West and his fiction appeals to both kinds of readers in every aesthetic and intellectual sense- despite the recognized fact that, as remarked by Erwin Dale Carter, his fiction appeals to a well-informed, sophisticated readership (3-4). It is through magical realism that Rushdie travels beyond the boundaries of history, time, space, and politics. Magical realism is his tool to construct a rich, polyphonic synthesis of Eastern and Western cultures. But what is magical realism? In what ways

does it function? The term “magical realism” was coined around 1924 or 1925 by the German art critic, Franz Roh who saw “magical realism simply [as a] painting where real forms are combined in a way that does not conform to daily reality. In fact, what Franz Roh calls magical realism is simply Expressionist painting” (qtd. in Carpentier 102). Luis Leal’s definition of magical realism is also illuminating:

> Magical realism is … an attitude toward reality that can be expressed in popular or cultured forms, in elaborate or rustic styles in closed or open structures. In magical realism the writer confronts reality and tries to untangle it, to discover what is mysterious in things, in life, in human acts. The principle thing is not the creation of imaginary beings or worlds but the discovery of the mysterious relationship between man and his circumstances. In magical realism key events have no logical or psychological explanation. The magical realist does not try to copy the surrounding reality or to wound it but to seize the mystery that breathes behind things. (119-123)

As Amaryll Chanady suggests “magical realism offers a multifaceted fiction that incorporates not only metropolis thinking but also the traditions of indigenous cultures” (127). Erwin Dale Carter’s explanation of the term also points out the target audience. To the critic,

> First it [magical realism] is the combination of reality and fantasy and second, it is the transformation of the real into the awesome and unreal, thirdly an art of surprises, one which creates a distorted concept of time and space, fourth a literature directed to an intellectual minority; characterized by a cold cerebral aloofness, it does not cater to popular tastes, but rather to that of those sophisticated individuals instructed in aesthetic subtleties. (3-4)

Lois Parkinson Zamora and Wendy B. Faris give a short list of magical realist features and functions. For the critics, magical realist fiction is:

> - a disruption of modern realist fiction
> - creates a space for interaction and diversity
> - no less real than traditional realism
> - about transgressing boundaries, multiple worlds
> - on the boundaries and destabilizes normative oppositions
> - subversive
> - an international phenomenon. (5)

P. Gabrielle Foreman, on the other hand, distinguishes magical realism from the fantastic or the surreal: “Magical realism, unlike the fantastic or the surreal, presumes that the individual requires a bond with the traditions and the faith of the community, that she/he is historically constructed and connected (286). For Patricia Merivale

"Rushdie sees magic realism as a development out of surrealism that expresses a genuinely third world consciousness and as a way of showing reality more truly with the marvellous aid of metaphor (331).

In short, the analytical part of the thesis, containing three subchapters titled *Midnight's Children, The Moor's Last Sigh*, and *Shalimar The Clown* will explore the use of parody in the context of Rushdie's magical realism and also will provide room for the applications of the various concepts of postcolonial literary theory mentioned in the theory chapter.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSES OF THE NOVELS

PARODY in RUSHDIE'S MAGICAL REALISTIC FICTION

3.1 *Midnight's Children*

The third chapter of the thesis attempts to explore the use of parody in the context of Salman Rushdie's magical realistic fiction. To this end, the first novel to be studied is *Midnight's Children,* the main character of which is a parody of an epic hero. However, prior to the discussion concerning the novels, what will be done is to present firstly, a survey of the historical and contemporary definitions of parody, and then, Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of the features of parodying discourse.

Margaret A. Rose's book titled *Parody: Ancient, Modern and Post-Modern* is one of the illuminating guides tracing the function of parody not only in ancient times but also at present. After informing the reader about the etymology and origins of parody, which derives from the ancient Greek word "parodia," and after pointing out the ambiguity of the prefix, "para", which suggests both nearness and opposition, Rose gives the ancient definition of the term "as a narrative poem of moderate length, in epic metre, using epic vocabulary, and treating a light, satirical, or mock-heroic subject" (20). To Rose, the definition of the term "parody" has been problematic due to either lack of attention to the historical background of the term, or the restriction of the description of parody to only one or two aspects or usages of the term. The writer gives a list of the qualities that helped define a work as parody in the past:

> In the past, parody has been defined […] in terms of either its etymology,
> (1) its comic aspects,
> (2) the attitude of the parodist to the work parodied,
> (3) the reader's reception of it,

> (4) the texts in which parody is not just a specific technique but the general mode of the work itself (one example is Cervantes' Don Quixote, where the parody of the works read by the hero is […] related to the selection of adventures and characters and provides a textual background for Cervantes' work which can also be used for meta-fictional reflections on the writing of his own fiction or on the writing of fiction in general),
> (5) its relationship to other comic or literary forms. (5-6)

Rose's detailed discussion about the ancient definitions and usages of parody is followed by what might be called a summary of a more traditional definition and application of the term:

> Parody in its broadest sense and application may be described as first imitating and then changing either, and sometimes both, the form and content, or style and subject-matter, or syntax and meaning of another work, or most simply its vocabulary. (45)

The writer then draws attention to the playful element in parody:

> […] most successful parodies may be said to produce from the comic incongruity between the original and its parody some comic, amusing, or humorous effect, which together with the changes made by the parodist to the original by the rewriting of the old text, or juxtaposition of it with the new text in which it is embedded, may act as signals of the parodic nature of the parody work for its reader. (45)

For instance, the scene in which the suffering Saleem reflects upon his punishment after his assertion that, just like Muhammad, he heard voices on a hill, foregrounds the playful nature of parody, in that Rushdie's juxtaposition of the two revelation scenes from the point of the view of the nine-year-old Saleem creates a humorous effect and diverts the reader's attention to the parodic nature of *Midnight's Children*:

> Muhammad [...] heard a voice saying, 'Recite!' and thought he was going mad; I heard, at first, a headful of gabbling tongues, like an untuned radio; and with lips sealed by maternal command, I was unable to ask for comfort.Muhammad, at forty, sought and received reassurance from wife and friends: 'Verily,' they told him, 'you are the Messenger of God'; I, suffering my punishment at nearlynine, could neither seek Brass Monkey's assistance nor solicit softening words from Mary Pereira.(*Midnight's* 163)

The representation of multiplicity and diversity, which construct the stereotypical Indian nature, can be made apprehensible to the reader through the use of a double-voiced discourse. And, as Mikhail Bakhtin states, parody *is* a double-voiced discourse, one which "becomes an arena of battle between two voices […]; the voices are not only isolated from one another, separated by a distance, but are also hostilely opposed" (193). Before dealing with Rushdie's application of a double-voiced discourse while presenting his central character in *Midnight's Children*, it might be useful to refer to Bakhtin's three types of discourse. Bakhtin defines the first type of discourse, which is also called "authorial discourse," as the "direct and unmediated object-oriented discourse – naming, informing, expressing, representing – intended for equally unmediated, object-oriented understanding" (186). The second and the most widespread form of represented objectified discourse to Bakhtin is the "direct speech of characters." Bakhtin explains the difference of this type of discourse as follows:

> Whenever we have within the author's context the direct speech of […] a certain character, we have within the limits of a single context two speech centers and two speech unities: the unity of the author's utterance and the unity of the character's utterance. But the second unity is not self-sufficient; it is subordinated to the first and incorporated into it as one of its components. (187)

According to Bakhtin, the two abovementioned types of discourse are built on the ultimate semantic authority of the author – the author's intention – and both could be realized either in the author's direct discourse, or in the discourse of a narrator. In either circumstance, for Bakhtin, the monologic context is ever present (188). Bakhtin calls both the first and the second type single-voiced discourses:

> Unmediated, direct, fully signifying discourse is directed toward its referential object and constitutes the ultimate semantic authority within the limits of a given context. Objectified discourse is likewise directed exclusively toward its object, but is at the same time the object of someone else's intention, the author's. (189)

Bakhtin explains the difference between these two and the third type of discourse, which also contains the double-voiced parodying discourse, as follows:

> […] the author may also make use of someone else's discourse for his own purposes, by inserting a new semantic intention into a discourse which already has, and which

> retains, an intention of its own. Such a discourse, in keeping with its task, must be perceived as belonging to someone else. In one discourse, two semantic intentions appear, two voices. Parodying discourse is of this type […]. (189)

As Bakhtin suggests, in parody there are two opposing, distant, even hostile, semantic intentions:

> [In parody] the author speaks in someone else's discourse, [… and] introduces into that discourse a semantic intention that is directly opposed to the original one. The second voice, once having made its home in the other's discourse, clashes hostilely with its primordial host and forces him to serve directly opposing aims. Discourse becomes an arena of battle between two voices. […]; the voices are not only isolated from one another, separated by a distance, but are also hostilely opposed. (193)

Rose's and Bakhtin's definitions of parody, and the humour which springs from it, are apparently applicable to many scenes in *Midnight's Children*. For instance, while depicting the Vale of Kashmir and introducing the main character's grandfather, Aadam Aziz, Rushdie uses the biblical Genesis as one of his subtexts. He first imitates and then changes the content of the generative imagery. At the beginning of the novel, Saleem Sinai, Rushdie's main character and narrator, expresses his desire to create a new myth of creation independent of the preestablished European discourse that has been constructed for the Indian identity. He has a strong impulse to tell not only the significance of his own identity, but also that of his nation, by the stories he narrates about both: "I must work fast, faster than Scheherazade, if I am to end up meaning – yes, meaning – something" (*Midnight's* 4). Saleem assumes the role of the legendary story-teller in *The Thousand and One Nights*, for he believes he is the chosen maker of his nation's new mythological identity. The stories within the new Indian mythology, which would give meaning to the new Indian identity, obviously need to be justified by Saleem's narrative, Rushdie's male Scheherazade in the novel. Since Saleem's personal history is "handcuffed" to that of his nation, giving meaning to his own genesis and genealogy by the stories he narrates would do the same to the Indian identity and mythology. In other words, by giving a new form, and hence, meaning to his own existence, Saleem recreates the newly ındependent Indian existence. As Indira Karamcheti suggests in the article titled "Salman Rushdie's 'Midnight's Children' and an Alternate Genesis":

> In the historical time scheme, England has already created India's mythological identity. But India, like most independent entities, wishes to create its own identity. Thus Rushdie, like other Third World authors, is in the position of needing to use the existing stories while correcting or modifying them. Saleem, like Rushdie, is engaged in creating an alternative and competitive mythology for India and its literature. This is a new genesis of India and its identity, requiring a new mythology. (82)

Thus Rushdie subverts the biblical Genesis at the beginning of *Midnight's Children*. Rushdie's alternative Garden of Eden is the Vale of Kashmir; it is the setting which cradles Saleem's ancestors, like the Garden of Eden cradling the ancestors of humanity. Nevertheless, Rushdie does not wish the biblical subtext to dominate the Indian text. Although the novel opens in spring at dawn, the narrator first draws the picture of the Kashmiri valley in winter as "[shrunk] under the ice, the mountains closed in and snarled like angry Jaws around the city on the lake" (*Midnight's* 10). This rather violent and threatening winter depiction of the valley, which is a "tiny valley circled by giant teeth" (*Midnight's* 11), precisely contradicts with that of the Garden of Eden in Genesis, which is pleasant watery, fertile, rich and peaceful. After the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the formation of man in six days, God brings into existence the Garden of Eden:

> And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. And a river went out of Eden to water the garden… (Genesis 1-3, 53)

Rushdie's depiction of the rebirth of the valley in spring, however, not only fits generative imagery but also instigates laughter:

> The world was new again. After a winter's gestation in its eggshell of ice, the valley had beaked its way out into the open, moist and yellow. The new grass bided its time underground; the mountains were retreating to their hill-stations for the warm season. (M*idnight's* 10)

According to Karamcheti, "Kashmir is described as if it were a farmyard egg or fowl rather than a paradise" (82). In Genesis, Adam is the progenitor of men into whose nostrils God breathed "the breath of life; and [… made] a living soul" (Genesis 1-3,

52), and put into the Garden of Eden; similarly in *Midnight's Children*, Rushdie puts Aadam Aziz, Saleem's grandfather/progenitor into the Edenlike Vale of Kashmir; yet, this valley rises up and punches Aadam on the nose instead of cradling and nurturing him gently. After hitting "his nose against a frost-hardened tussock of earth while attempting to pray, […] he [Aadam] resolved never again to kiss earth for any god or man" (MC, 10). Thus Aadam breaks his ties with the Islamic faith. The critic Karamcheti draws a parallel between the fall of man from heaven for having tasted the forbidden fruit, and Aadam's fall from the land of his origin because of his rejection of the Muslim faith: "Yes it is [the Vale of Kashmir], like Eden, the place of ultimate origin within this novel. It is the cradle of modern India, and the paradise lost by Saleem's progenitor, the novel's Adam" (82-3). Rushdie further parodies the biblical subtext through distortion. The biblical "Adam" has become "Aadam" in the novel. Karamcheti comments on the name and the *nose* of Saleem's grandfather as an indication of Rushdie's playful allusions to holy texts; the critic also emphasizes humour as a significant example of Rushdie's parody technique:

> Saleem's grandfather, the patriarch of the clan and so of India, is Aadam Aziz, a name which again evokes but distorts the biblical subtext. He is, not Adam, but "Aadam," and his last name continues the distortion. Aadam Aziz is, […] the patriarch – but not by divine right. Rather, his prodigiously large nose establishes that right. (83)

The most attention gathering facial feature of Aadam is his nose. In Saleem's words:

> […] the central feature of my grandfather's anatomy was […as] reflected in the water, undulating like a mad plantain in the centre of his face. […], it is what one sees first and remembers longest. 'A cyranose,' Ilse Lubin said, and Oskar added, 'A proboscissimus.' Ingrid announced, 'You could cross a river on that nose'. (*Midnight's* 13)

Rushdie plays with the nose of biblical Adam, who had received his life by means of the breath of God passing through his nostrils.In doing so, God made Adam the progenitor of all the future mankind. The parody is that in the case of Aadam Aziz, Rushdie's choice as the forefather figure, the nose is exaggerated to such gargantuan proportions that, the narrator states, those future generations could actually fit inside: "[...] a nose sheltering "dynasties waiting inside it … like snot" (*Midnight's* 14).The

link between the image of the nose and the notions of fertility and procreation is not accidental. The relationship between the nose and the phallus, as two protruding organs, symbolizes the procreation and continuity of humankind in numerous cultures. According to Chevalier and Gheerbrant's Dictionary of Symbols, "the nose is a symbol of clairvoyance, perspicacity and discernment, but intuitive rather than rational" (706). After referring to a number of cultures with respect to the symbolic significance of the nose, the dictionary explains the particular perception of the facial organ as follows:

> [...] the nose, together with the legs, sexual organs and tongue, [is regarded] as one of a band of four workers. As the organ of smell which separates the pleasant from the unpleasant, it directs desires and speech, points the legs in the right line of march and complements the activities of the three other workers responsible for the efficient or inefficient functioning of the group as a whole. (706)

In a sense, the nose acts as a maestro and directs the other members of the orchestra including sexual organs; therefore, it might be possible to claim that the efficient functioning of the phallus, which is "a symbol of the powers of procreation, the well-spring and channel of semen as representative of the active principle" (751), depends upon the nose. Rushdie's forefather figure in the novel, the Kashmiri-blue eyed, large-nosed Dr. Aadam Aziz, marries Naseem and fathers five children. Aadam's second daughter is Mümtaz. Mümtaz is later renamed Amina Sınai with her second marriage to Ahmed Sınai. Amina gives birth to Shiva who is displaced by Saleem, the blue-eyed, large-nosed illegitimate Anglo-Indian baby of Vanita and William Methwold. The Sınai family welcomes this newborn baby without any suspicion, even though both his parents are people with dark eyes and hair. The baby is immediately associated with his grandfather who has the exact same features. The shared features imply a certain, perhaps mysterious, connection between these two characters although it is not based on a blood relation. Saleem embraces this family and its history even after realising that he is not their own child. Hence it might be possible to claim that, by possessing that mighty nose, Saleem seems to be the chosen founder of the newly independent India, the new hero whose parodied epic turns out, as the novel unfolds, to be an epic of failure. Saleem humorously expresses his gratitude to this mighty nose

because to him, this nose is the unquestionable proof of his being the son of Amina and the grandson of Aadam-even though he is not through blood relations:

> I wish to place on record my gratitude to this mighty organ – if not for it, who would ever have believed me to be truly my mother's son, my grandfather's grandson? – this colossal apparatus which was to be my birthright, too. Doctor Aziz's nose – comparable only to the trunk of the elephant-headed god Ganesh … (*Midnight's* 13)

It is clear even at the very beginning of the novel that Saleem makes use of every single possibility to prove, defend, and consolidate his hereditary ties with the Aziz family. Saleem's exaggerated physical features, his innate supernatural gift, of which he will be deprived later, his unconscious identification of himself with a prophet when he is only nine, and his conscious equation of himself with an epic hero will later be investigated in detail.

Another subtext accompanying the parody of the sacred text of Genesis at the beginning of *Midnight's Children* is the fairy tale of Snow White. Among all the parallels that might be drawn between the classic fairy tale and Rushdie's text, two are particularly significant: the first one juxtaposes the good-willed hunter in "Snow White", with Mary, Saleem's ex-midwife maid in *Midnight's Children*. To recall, the hunter smears Snow White's shirt with deer blood and presents it to the evil Queen as proof of the young girl's death; that is to say, he employs deception as a form of passive resistance to injustice. However, as is well known, his simple trick does not suffice to deceive the Queen for long. Likewise, Mary decides to switch the rich born baby with the poor one in a rebellious attempt to establish social justice, or perhaps even to interfere with fate.

The second parallel involves the story of Snow White's birth. This part of the fairy tale depicts the Queen, Snow White's real mother, sitting beside a snow-covered, ebony-framed window, sewing. On pricking her finger, three drops of red blood fall and freeze upon the snow. Thus the Queen wishes that her daughter shall have skin as white as snow, hair as black as ebony, lips and cheeks as red as blood. Rushdie subverts and adapts the fairy tale of Snow White into the Edenic Vale of Kashmir through parody. He both trivializes and makes the fairy tale ludicrous. As the parodic counterpart of Snow White, Aadam Aziz is introduced, not with skin as white as snow,

with ebony-black hair and with blood-red lips and cheeks, but with red beard, dark hair, and sky-blue eyes. The three red drops of blood falling and freezing on snow also reappear in the novel, but in a different context. Aadam Aziz spreads his mat to pray at dawn; the earth rises up and strikes him on the nose. Three drops of blood fall from his nose; tears come to his eyes. Blood drops freeze and turn into "rubies and diamonds" (*Midnight's* 10). This image, despite its beauty, seems initially to lead nowhere; yet, as Karamcheti observes, the three drops of blood are soon employed again "on a white sheet, as witnesses of the virginity of Naseem, Aadam Aziz's wife" (83). This second occurence of the image suggests that Rushdie ignores the seeming innocence of the fairy tale, emphasizing instead its underlying sexuality. According to Karamcheti, Rushdie's juxtaposition of the biblical story and the fairy tale in the opening of the novel has a two-fold function:

> He [Rushdie] gives his reader a double-edged invitation: he simultaneously asks us to recall, then to reject, both subtexts. Recalling them transfers them by association to Rushdie's genesis. Their rejection is also a rejection of their hegemony over Rushdie's newly invented Indian, genesis myth. Rushdie juxtaposes these two stories [… of] the European literary hierarchy […]. Their contiguity in Rushdie's Kashmir equalizes their positions, and enables Rushdie to advance his Indian genesis on at least an equal basis.(83)

Parody through subversion allows Rushdie to challenge European literary hegemony and to legitimize his own Indian mythologies, such as the central myth in *Midnight's Childen*. As Karamcheti suggests, the novel "is a myth about India's genealogy, which includes its genesis and its identity" (83). The Indian self, marked by the diversity of selves and origins, is epitomized, for instance, in the multiplicity of the names given to Saleem's mother: she was born Mumtaz Aziz, then called Mumtaz Khan, and then finally Amina Sınai. To Karamcheti,

> Her [Saleem's mother's] multiplicity of names and identities illustrates India's diverse selves in small. This is the Indian mythology that Rushdie wishes to establish: India's self lies in its magical, inclusive multiplicity of selves and origins. Rushdie's story shows this through Saleem's genesis and genealogy. (83)

Similar instances in the novel are the Brass Monkey, Saleem's sister, who is later called Jamila Singer, or Parvati-the-witch, who is renamed Laylah Sınai after her marriage to Saleem and her conversion to Islamic religion. It might be interpreted that all these renamings, which indicate multiple identities, are allusions to Rushdie's claim that what ought to be supported for a more egalitarian regime in India, as mentioned in the theory chapter, is not a forcefully imposed unity or oneness, but diversity and multiplicity that make up the so-called all-inclusive Indian self. In this respect, parody is directed at the official Indian nationalism that aspires to gather multitudes of ethnicities and religious beliefs under one homogeneous nation, one flag. In other words, Rushdie's choice of multiple names and identities in the construction of his characters displays his wish for heterogenity instead of homogeneity in the making of "India's self".

Undoubtedly, Bakhtin's ideas on the nature of parodying discourse are applicable both to the individual story of Saleem Sınai, and to that of the creation of the newly independent India. Parody begins on the first page of *Midnight's Children* with Saleem, who narrates the story of his own birth on the eve of India's independence on August 15th, 1947. Even the exact instant of his birth matters, because that particular moment in time witnesses the birth of an epic hero whose fate is tied to that of his nation; he is the child of a nation bearing a fresh, new, identity that has been attained by tearing off all ties with the British at that very moment:

> The time matters too. […] On the stroke of midnight, as a matter of fact. Clock hands joined palms in respectful greeting as I came. Oh, spell it out, spell it out: at the precise instant of India's arrival at independence, […] I had been mysteriously handcuffed to history, my destinies indissolubly chained to those of my country (*Midnight's* 9).

Thus Saleem associates his coming into being with that of his nation. The above quotation might be interpreted within the frame of Bakhtin's third type of parodying discourse whereby "the author makes use precisely of other people's words [,generally those of Padma] for the expression of his own particular intentions" (195); that is, Rushdie expresses his own sarcastic criticism of the birth of both Saleem and India. For example, Saleem's first-person narrative casts serious doubts on the reliability of

his personal as well as his own account of India's national narrative. The absence of a third-person narrator, which is indispensable in the make-up of an epic narrative, gives the reader hints about the existence of parody within the construction of Saleem as the mock epic hero. Saleem's discourse is continually challenged, opposed, and ridiculed by its parodying double. Rushdie ingeniously plants a second voice within his main character's discourse, and, in so doing makes parody visible to the reader. In addition, Padma's - Saleem's audience in the novel - refuting and cynical comments, which accompany Saleem's first-person narration, help foreground the parody in the novel. To give an example, Saleem's narration almost sanctifies the days and incidents following his birth. In a ceremonial tone, Saleem tells how his birth was celebrated by the Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's letter sent to the Sinai family; how two journalists came to the family house for an interview with Amina and published "a charming pose of Baby Saleem Sinai, who was born last night at the exact moment of our Nation's independence-the happy child of that glorious hour!"(*Midnight's* 119), in the *Times of India*. However, Saleem's solemn tone is trivialized the moment he declares how the two journalists paid his mother the small sum of one hundred rupees to conduct this interview. While such a sum is reasonable for an ordinary interview, it inevitably appears mismatched, and hence ludicrous, in the context of the birth of a supposed national hero:

> Despite headline, text and photograph, I must accuse oır visitors of the crime of ttrivialization; mere journalists, looking no further than the next day's paper, they had no idea of the importance of the event they were covering. [...] Is it possible to imagine a more piffling, derisory sum? It is a sum by which one could, were one of a mind to do so, feel insulted. I shall, however, merely thank them for celebrating my arrival, and forgive them for their lack of a genuine historical sense. (*Midnight's* 120)

And finally, Padma's response further undermines the grandeur of Saleem's narration: "Don't be vain, [...] One hundred rupees is not so little; after all, everybody gets born, it's not such a big big thing" (*Midnight's* 120). In fact, Padma expresses a collective disbelief in the traditional idea of heroism that does not have room in the history of modern India; the residue of epic heroism, to Padma, can only be traced in the Indian

epics and folk stories of the distant past, which is by no means accessible any more. Padma's response is parodying the official discourse of Indian nationalism voiced by Jawaharlal Nehru in his celebration letter to the Sınai family:

> 'Dear Baby Saleem, My belated congratulations on the happy accident of your moment of birth! You are the newest bearer of that ancient face of India which is also eternally young. We shall be watching over your life with the closest attention; it will be, in a sense, the mirror of our own'. (*Midnight's* 122)

Nehru associates the birth of Saleem with the birth of India into postindependence period. He presumes that Saleem's life, which started at the "glorious hour" of independence, will be a mirror of the Indian nation. Unfortunately, however, the image in this national mirror will be the parodied reflection of a crooked, crippled and deprived life, as that of Saleem.

Saleem claims to have two mothers: Amina and Mary. The names of the women are too significant to be accidental, one being the name of Mohamed's mother, and the other that of Jesus. Thus, through this double maternity Saleem mingles in his person both the Christian and the Islamic religions, which are equally prevalent in India. Yet, there is more to say about Mary's name and actions at the beginning of the novel. To recall, as a midwife Mary switches the two babies, the rich Shiva with the poor Saleem, in a rebellious act executed in the name of her criminal lover Joseph, for the sake of "*His* love"(*Midnight's* 117; emphasis added). Obviously, the name of the biblical Mary's husband is also Joseph, a poor carpenter who is, in a way, discarded as a marital figure, since Mary gives birth to the son of God while still a virgin.. This could be interpreted – and, indeed, seems to be interpreted by Rushdie - as a marginalization of not only Joseph, but also of the poor human offspring that he could have begotten, had he not been replaced by an infinitely more powerful, in fact, divine son. In *Midnight's Children* this order of things is completely subverted, given that Mary offers a chance to the poor baby for the love of Joseph, instead of God. In fact, Rushdie confirms the plausibility of this interpretation by capitalizing the possessive pronoun "His" when used with reference, not to God as is conventionally done, but to Joseph. This upside-down order is a clear example of Bakhtin's theory on the carnivalesque which "brings together, unifies, weds, and combines the sacred with the profane, the lofty with the low, the great with the insignificant, the wise with the

stupid" (123). Bakhtin defines carnivalistic life as "life turned inside out," or "the reverse side of the world" (122). On entering "the reverse side of the world," one immediately realizes that in such a carnival life,

> [all] the laws, prohibitions, and restrictions that determine the structure and order of ordinary, that is noncarnival, life are suspended ... : what is suspended first of all is hierarchical structure and all the forms of terror, reverence, piety, and etiquette connected with it - that is, everything resulting from socio-hierarchical inequality or any other form of inequality among people. (122-3)

Within this reversed hierarchical structure, the mock crowning and subsequent decrowning of the carnival king, that is the primary carnivalistic act, expresses the core of the carnival sense of the world -" the pathos of shifts and changes, of death and renewal" (124). What carnival celebrates is not the precise item that is replaced – in this case, the decrowned king - but "the shift itself, the very process of replaceability" (125). To Bakhtin, the carnivalistic act of crowning\decrowning points out the infinite possibility of shifts and renewals by involving "the image of constructive death" (125).

Carnival laughter, on the other hand, is deeply ambivalent. It is closely connected with ancient forms of ritual laughter which aimed at ridiculing and putting a higher authority, such as the sun (the highest god), other gods, or the highest earthly authority, to shame so as to force them to renew themselves. Therefore, all forms of ritual laughter were linked with death and rebirth. Both in antiquity and in the Middle Ages "much was permitted in the form of laughter that was impermissible in serious form" (127). *Parodia sacra* - parody of sacred texts and rituals - veiled by the legitimized license of laughter was not rare in the Middle Ages. In this respect it might be useful to investigate the relationship between carnival and profanation, and its reflections on Rushdie's protagonist in *Midnight's Children*.

Bakhtin's explanation of carnivalistic profanation includes: "carnivalistic blasphemies, a whole system of carnivalistic debasings and bringings down to earth, carnivalistic obscenities linked with the reproductive power of the earth and the body, carnivalistic parodies on sacred texts and sayings, etc."(123). Although Rushdie's work presents numerous examples of such desecrating acts, perhaps the most telling

case is the conversation that takes place between Aadam Aziz and Tai, the ageless drunken boatman who is later identified with the poster of the fisherman on baby Saleem's wall – a man whose "right arm, fully extended, stretched out towards a watery horizon…"(*Midnight's* 122). When Aadam Aziz inquires about Tai's age, Tai points to the mountains and states that he has witnessed their birth, and has even seen Christ on a visit to Kashmir: "I saw that Isa, that Christ, when he came to Kashmir. Smile, smile, it is your history I am keeping in my head …[as] was set down in old books" (*Midnight's* 16). Tai's depiction of Christ is a pure example of carnivalistic profanation, drawing a highly subversive image of Christ in the reader's mind. Traditionally, Christ is almost always described as young and thin, with thick hair flowing down to his shoulders; his most conspicuous character traits are modesty and humility. Contrary to his traditional portrait, in Tai's narrative, Christ is pictured as an old, bald, gluttonous wanderer whose mission on earth is defined as being nothing more than enjoying life to the full. Tai's narration of Christ and his Kashmir days are as follows:

> Yara, you should've seen that Isa when he came, beard down to his balls, bald as an egg on his head. He was old and fagged-out but he knew his manners…always [with] a respectful tongue, he never called me crackpot, never called me tu either…Polite, see? And what an appetite! Such a hunger…Saint or devil, I swear he could eat a whole kid in one go… I told him eat, fill your hole, a man comes to Kashmir to enjoy life, or to end it, or both. (*Midnight's* 16)

Thus the image of Christ is subverted and parodied through physical as well as spiritual distortion; charged with one of the seven deadly sins, Christ has become a debased figure in Tai's "brandied" narrative. Furthermore, carnivalistic profanation turns out to be blasphemy, as is generally believed to be, when Saleem associates himself first with Christ, and then with Muhammad. In fact, this association is first made by a guru who suddenly comes to the Methwold estate only a few days before Saleem's birth. Just like a prophet, or a heroic figure whose existence on earth has a direct influence on the multitudes, Saleem's birth is prophesied twice; the first and more enigmatic prophesy voiced by Ramram Seth will be mentioned later; the second prophesy uttered by the guru "Purushottam" is an explicit equation of Saleem with Christ. When the guru enters the estate's garden, Musa, the old bearer, asks:

> ‘What do you want here, sadhuji?’ - Musa unable to avoid deference; to which the sadhu, calm as a lake:’ I have come to await the coming of the One. The Mubarak-He who is Blessed. It will happen very soon. (*Midnight’s* 113)

Having been brought up by *two* devoted mothers, Amina and Mary, Saleem feels the urge to fulfil the family expectations at a very early age. This urge stems from a sense of responsibility that he experiences, observing how much his two mothers, and all the rest of the family members, adore him. For instance, to his grandmother, Naseem, Saleem is a “great genius […] a gift from God” (*Midnight’s* 157). The intensity of the family affection compels Saleem, in his childhood innocence, to question the nature of greatness, and the ways of becoming a great genius:

> Was genius something utterly unconnected with wanting, or learning how, or knowing about, or being able to? Something which, at the appointed hour, would float down around my shoulders like an immaculate, delicately worked pashmina shawl? Greatness as a falling mantle…(*Midnight’s* 157)

When Saleem is nearly nine, his genius is finally unleashed, through the scattered voices that he hears within what he calls “his inner ear.” All the midnight children were born with supernatural powers ranging from transmutation, flight, and prophecy to wizardry. Yet, having been born on the exact stroke of midnight, none of those magical children could compete with Saleem and Shiva, Saleem’s alter ego:

> …to Shiva, the hour had given the gifts of war (of Rama, who could draw the undrawable bow; of Arjuna and Bhima; the ancient prowess of Kurus and Pandavas united […] in him!)… and to me, the greatest talent of all - the ability to look into the hearts and minds of men. (*Midnight’s* 200)

That is to say, at the age of nine Saleem becomes aware of his unique telepathic ability. This occurs in the chapter titled “Accident in a washing-chest”, when he suddenly realizes that his mind is functioning like a radio receiver; within multitudinous voices, he could select individual utterings, control the volume up and down, or even switch off his “newly-discovered inner ear”(*Midnight’s* 164). He is utterly convinced that his magical gift will provide him with the opportunity to repay the parental investment in him, and it is in this scene that subversion through carnivalistic profanation comes to the fore. Dying to please his parents, Saleem fails to

realize that what he hears in his mind are the thoughts flowing through "the hearts and minds" of other people; he mistakes these voices for sacred messages sent from a divine source, which leads him to associate himself with the two prophets who received divine revelations on mountaintops:

> On Mount Sinai, the prophet Musa or Moses heard disembodied commandments; on Mount Hira, the prophet Muhammed (also known as Mohammed, Mahomet, the Last-But-One, and Mahound) spoke tp the Archangel. (Gabriel or Jibreel, asy you please.) [...] like Musa or Moses, like Muhammed the Penultimate, I heard voices on a hill. (*Midnight's* 163)

In great excitement, he gathers all the family members to announce how also he, their beloved Saleem Sınai, has been granted the ultimate divine distinction, how he too has been spoken to by the Archangel. In doing so, Saleem expects nothing other than sheer joy and awe from his family, while he himself is looking forward to the satisfaction of finally meeting their expectations. To his shocking disappointment, however, the family reacts with unanimous disbelief and outrage, and the gathering thus turns out to be the farthest thing from the blessed communion where a new prophet is embraced by his soon-to-be followers. Rushdie depicts in sarcastic detail the havoc that breaks around this particularly young and unfortunate prophet. While the women scream out accusations of blasphemy, Saleem's father, Ahmed, punches his son in the ear, permanently deafening him on that side. After this incident, Saleem retreats into a defensive shell, never uttering another word about his gift, although his family's response proves useful in one way: it shatters his delusions about being the recipient of divine messages, letting him correctly understand his telepathic powers. Still, the miraculous nature of the gift persists in the plot as an undertone, since Saleem's realization constitutes a clear fulfilment of Ramram Seth's prophecy: "Voices will guide him ..." (*Midnight's* 165). In fact Ramram Seth's riddlelike prophecy is a mysterious interpretation of Saleem's ambivalent, confusing as well as parodic genesis and genealogy: "He will have sons without having sons!" (*Midnight's* 99).

To have a clear understanding of Ramram Seth's confusing prophecy and how it comes true, what might be given here is a concise summary of Saleem's birth story. The Sınai family moves to Bombay while Amina is expecting her first baby. There they buy a new house from a departing Englishman named William Methwold, a man

who is irresistibly attractive to women. Vanita, the street musician Wee Willie Winkie's wife, cannot resist Methwold's charm, and consequently conceives their illegitimate child. Amina Sınai and Vanita give birth to their sons at the same midnight instant, that is on the eve of India's independence. By the maid servant's displacing of the two boys in true legendary fashion, the illicit Anglo-Indian son of Vanita and the blue-eyed, large-nosed Englishman Methwold becomes Saleem Sınai, "the chosen child of midnight," tied to history and saluted by a new nation. Yet Shiva, the true son of Amina and Ahmed Sınai, is brought up by Wee Willie Winkie, who is a part of India's poor. According to Karamcheti, however, it is Shiva who is "the [true] progenitor of the sons of history, and a link to India's pre-colonial mythological past" (84). Karamcheti further explains the completion of Rushdie's riddlelike genealogy, the continuation of which is provided by Shiva, as follows:

> All of midnight's children are castrated by the Widow (a character [...] modeled after Indira Gandhi). But Shiva, like the Hindu god of procreation and destruction, leaves a number of bastard children all over India. The most important of these is the child of Saleem's sorceress-wife, Parvati, in Hindu mythology, Shiva's consort. This child is a son named Aadam. So Rushdie's genealogy takes us full circle: from Aadam Aziz in Kashmir through the displaced Saleem and Shiva to Aadam, the true great-grandson of his great-grandfather. (84)

As the critic suggests, the seemingly inapprehensible gaps of the prophecy are filled in towards the end of the novel leaving no doubt about the rightness of its owner:

> No one is who or what they claim to be, and yet, at the last, they are exactly where and who they should be. The new Aadam is the new epic hero, the motley and confusing embodiment of his nation:'He was the child of a father who was not his father...(84)

Thus Ramram Seth's incredible prophecy, which is heralding the coming of Amina's long-awaited son and India's new epic hero as well as his mysterious fate and ultimate failure, comes true. In fact, the baby Aadam's confusing genealogy is a symbolic reflection of India's multiplicity. Just like the new Aadam, the new India's miscellaneous nature is built upon diversity, and as Karamcheti states, "In its diversity, confusion, and eventual rightness, Rushdie's Indian genesis successfully challenges the European subtexts it subverts"(84).

A final parallel indicating the playful nature of parody might be drawn between the two seemingly unrelated acts of mythmaking and picklemaking because the novel which claims to be the new myth of India and of the newly liberated Indian identity, opens and ends in a pickle factory. Mary Pereira - one of Saleem's double mothers - owns the "Braganza pickle factory" which produces in Saleem's words, "the world's best pickles". This factory is the place where Saleem produces his thirty jars of pickles, corresponding to the thirty chapters of the novel. Saleem perceives a direct correspondence between the jar, which contains the ingredients and thus allows the pickling process to take place, and the novel itself, which contains and gives a specific form and meaning to his experiences and reflections. The act of imposing a certain form and meaning on a large number of events necessarily depends on a compromise:

> [...] I reconcile myself to the inevitable distortions of the pickling process. To pickle is to give immortality, after all: fish, vegetables, fruit hang embalmed in spice and vinegar; a certain alteration, a slight intensification of taste, is a small matter, surely? The art is to change the flavour in degree, but not in kind; and above all (in my thirty jars and a jar) to give it shape and form - that is to say, meaning. (*Midnight's* 461)

Just as the original taste of the vegetable to be pickled has to be sacrificed so that the vegetable itself could be preserved indefinitely, thus acquiring a new taste which is different "in degree not in kind", so too the detached events of Saleem's life undergo a process of adding, deleting, ignoring, exaggerating so on and so forth for the sake of a unified, coherent and "truthful" narrative to emerge; in other words, truth becomes an issue of negotiation for the sake of a narrative that aspires to last for generations:

> One day, perhaps, the world may taste the pickles of history. They may be too strong for some palates, their smell may be overpowering, tears may rise to eyes; I hope nevertheless that it will be possible to say of them that they possess the authentic taste of truth. (*Midnight's* 461)

Saleem's insistent emphasis on "thirty [full] jars and [an empty] jar" marks that his is a never-ending narrative just like *The Thousand and One Nights*. The number "thirty-one" is a direct reference to the number "a thousand and one". Andrew S. Teverson's comment on the numerical and structural significance of *A Thousand and One Nights* which is recurrent in Rushdie's fiction is as follows:

> For Rushdie, [...] the number a thousand and one is a magical number that suggests infinite complexity even as it suggests limitation. A thousand and one nights does not mean a thousand nights plus one night. It means a thousand nights and then one more night, and then one more night, and then one more night ad infinitum, where each night added will transform all the nights that have gone before and all the nights to come. The number 1001 in Rushdie's fiction thus comes to represent the insurmountable extremes of storytelling. (463)

In *Midnight's Children* Rushdie subverts the role of Scheherazade, the narrator of *A Thousand and One Nights*, telling her fantastic and didactic stories to Shahrayar, the cruel monarch, to save not only her own life but also the whole female population of her community from destruction. In *Midnight's Children*, however, Saleem, Shahrayar's parodic counterpart, assumes the role of Scheherazade and recounts his story, which the critic John J. Su calls "the epic of failure" (554), to Padma, his audience, the implicit lover and the female Shahrayar in the novel. Padma is the goddess of dung in Hindu mythology. She is a major figure in the Hindu fertility myth, and she is there in the novel to fertilize Saleem's imagination. Similar to Shahrayar's position in *A Thousand and One Nights*, Padma activates Saleem's imagination sometimes through tender encouragement and curiosity, sometimes through a cynical expression of disbelief in his narrative. Saleem calls Padma "my dung lotus"; according to Chevalier and Gheerbrant's *Dictionary of Symbols*, lotus "might be called the first of all flowers, generally blossoming on stagnant and murky waters with so sensual and imperious perfection that it is easy to imagine the lotus as the very first sign of life upon the undifferentiated vastness of the primeval waters" (DS 616). The Dictionary's explanation of the symbolic significance of the flower is as follows:

> The major writers of Hinduism make the lotus a symbol of spiritual fulfilment from its rising out of darkness to blossom in full sunlight. If the waters are taken as an image of the undifferentiated primeval state, the lotus will stand for manifestation, which emanates from them and which blooms on their surface like the hatching of the World Egg. The tight bud is the precise equivalent of that egg, and the hatching of the egg corresponds to the opening of the bud. Both are the realization of the potential contained in the first seed, as well as the potential of every individual whose heart is also a lotus bud. (DS 617)

So in the novel it is Padma who activates Saleem's potential and urges him to manifest what he hides within his heart in the form of a never-ending narrative about

his personal as well as national history. However, unlike Scheherazade's, narrative struggle of 1001 nights ending in victory on the part of womanhood, Saleem's narrative trying to equate his destiny with his nation is doomed to failure. Yet his failure to become an epic hero in the Virgilian tradition, as the critic Su suggests, would lead to a nationwide apprehension of the impossibility of depending on one single ruler's will to embrace "one of the largest and most diverse collectives in the world" (554), i.e. India. The critic interprets Saleem's failure as a narrator as preserving the promise of democratic ideals in the novel. Having been portrayed as the parodic exaggeration of the traditional epic hero, Saleem represents Rushdie's rejection of all who would equate themselves with nation. Yet the paradox at the end of the novel comes out as the success of failure. Saleem's failure is successful because for Rushdie, every failure marks the beginning of a new attempt on the way leading to success. In *Imaginary Homelands*, Rushdie quotes Samuel Beckett's proclamation: "Ever tried. Ever failed. Never mind. Try again. Fail better" (427), to show the parallel between his political ideals depending on questioning and assessing failure, and his theory of the novel, which he defines as an inherently failed project.

On the other hand, the relationship between Saleem and the female characters in the novel is vitally important in that Saleem himself confesses that he owes his existence on earth to a number of women who shape and rule his fate: "Women have made me; and also unmade [...] I have been at the mercy of the so-called (erroneously, in my opinion!) gentler sex" (*Midnight's* 404). While giving the list of women who change his life drastically, Saleem also accepts that women always make him "a little afraid": "Women have always been the ones to change my life: Mary Pereira, Evie Burns, Jamila Singer, Parvati-the-witch must answer for who I am; and the Widow, who I'm keeping for the end"(*Midnight's* 192). Saleem is keeping the Widow for the end because she is the most influential figure in his life; the Widow is the inescapable Mother India and the Enemy: [...] is not Mother India, Bharat-Mata, commonly thought of as a female? And, as you know, there is no escape from her" (*Midnight's* 404). There is really no escape from her because, in *Midnight's Children*, Saleem is the Child of the Nation, and the Widow is the Mother of the Nation. In that case,

Saleem is the child of the monstrous Widow, or Mother India. Both the child and the mother cherish the desire for centrality; both want to impose their own will on the nation, and both want to become the saviour of the nation. Consequently, the Child and the Mother become relentless rivals. The parodying discourse, which is planted within Saleem's voice, suspects and interferes in the narration: "did Saleem's dream of saving the nation leak, through the osmotic tissues of history, into the thoughts of the Prime Minister herself?" (*Midnight's* 420). Saleem continues contemplating on the subject: "Was my lifelong belief in the equation between the State and myself transmuted, in 'the Madam's' mind, into that in-those-days-famous phrase: India is Indira and Indira is India? Were we competitors for centrality-was she gripped by a lust for meaning as profound as my own [...]? (*Midnight's* 420). As the quotation indicates, the Mother is Indira Gandhi, the second Prime Minister of the independent India. Yet, Rushdie does not appear to be in a hurry to declare that the Widow, and the Mother of India are the same figures. Indeed, the writer reveals the actual identity of "the Mother of the Nation" almost near the end of the novel:

> Mrs Indira Gandhi was born in November 1917 to Kamala and Jawaharlal Nehru. Her middle name was Priyadarshini. She was not related to 'Mahatma' M.K. Gandhi; her surname was the legacy of her marriage, in 1952, to one Feroze Gandhi, who became known as 'the nation's son-in-law'. They had two sons, Rajiv and Sanjay [...] Mr Feroze Gandhi died of a heart seizure in 1960, aged forty-seven. Sanjay Gandhi, and his ex-model wife Menaka, were prominent during the Emergency. The Sanjay Youth Movement was particularly effective in the sterilization campaign. [...] I have included this somewhat elementary summary just in case you had failed to realize that the Prime Minister of India was, in 1975, fifteen years a widow. Or (because the capital letter may be of use) : a Widow. (*Midnight's* 421)

To analyse the complex relationship between Saleem, the child and Indira Gandhi, the mother, what might be done initially is to investigate the symbolic significance of mother not only in the general sense but also in terms of Hindu theology. The symbolism of the mother is connected with earth and the sea, in that all three are wombs and wells of life. As stated in the *Dictionary of Symbols*, "earth and sea are themselves symbols of the mother's body, [and] the same ambivalance existing in sea and earth symbolism recurs in the symbol of the mother" (677). The explanation of the correlative relationship between the three is as follows:

> Life and death are interdependent. To be born is to emerge from the mother's womb; to die is to return to earth. Mothers are anchors of shelter, warmth, love and nourishment. On the other hand they may run the risk of suppressing their children by limiting their horizons and of stifling them by exercising the office of nurse-maid and governess to excess. She who gave life devours what should procreate; the giver entraps and castrates. (677)

Rushdie subverts and parodies the concept of motherhood by means of Saleem's arch-enemy, Indira Gandhi, who is fleshed out as the Widow, or the Mother in the novel. In many cultures the mother goddesses stand for fertility; however, Rushdie's Mother represents, and furthermore puts into practice, sterility. The Widow entraps and castrates Saleem, who should procreate, in the chapter titled "Midnight". In India, the notion of the Divine Mother is a synthesis of mythology, theology, philosophy, and metaphysics. These four angles of vision are represented by symbols, such, for example, as that of Kali (DS 677). Saleem identifies Indira Gandhi with Kali, the great mother goddess in Hindu mythology. Kali is associated with creation, stabilization, and destruction which are the three aspects of a single experience of life. In Indian iconography Kali is drawn as a hideously ugly woman, blood dripping from her long pendulous tongue, dancing upon a corpse. In terms of its etymology, the word "kali" is the feminine form of "kala" which means "black", and a homonym of kala, "appointed time", and has become associated with "death" through folk etymology. According to Thomas Coburn, a historian of Sanskrit goddess literature, the association can be traced in a passage from the Mahabharata, depicting a female figure who carries away the spirits of slain warriors and animals. She is called "kalaratri", and Coburn translates the word as "night of death". Coburn also adds that " 'kali' can be read here either as a proper name or as a description, 'the black one'" (111). Within the context of *Midnight's Children*, it sounds to be appropriate to interpret Saleem's Kali as the "black death". Kali's association with blackness stands in contrast to her consort, Shiva, whose body is covered by the white ashes of the cremation ground in which he meditates, and with which Kali is also associated. In union with Shiva, she is believed to be creating and destroying worlds. Saleem's depiction of the hair of the Mother of the Nation, which is particoloured, indicates the unification of Indira Gandhi with Shiva, Saleem's "arch-rival", during the period of Emergency, just before the commencement of her sterilization campaign:

> [...] and if the Mother of the Nation had had a coiffure of uniform pigment, the Emergency she spawned might easily have lacked a darker side. But she had white hair on one side and black on the other; the Emergency, too, had a white part - public, visible, documented, a matter for historians - and a black part which, being macabre untold, must be a matter for us. (*Midnight's* 420-421)

The parody is that a goddess, i.e. Kali, and Shiva, who is a major god in Hinduism, unite their forces to destroy Saleem, the nation's mock-epic hero. The 1971 War between India and Pakistan turns the lives of Saleem and Shiva upside down and gives way to Shiva's rise as India's new war hero. The bloody murderer of prostitutes is now called "major Shiva": "...India's most decorated war hero, but once he led a gang of apaches in the back-streets of Bombay; once, before he discovered the legitimized violence of war, prostitutes were found throttled in gutters [...] Major Shiva now, but also Wee Willie Winkie's boy [...]"(*Midnight's* 407). The more Saleem falls the higher Shiva ascends. Major Shiva starts to serve Indira Gandhi "because of his hatred of her opponent Morarji Desai, who, [...] as Chief Minister of Bombay, had once been responsible for the banning of alcohol and the persecution of young goondas, that is to say hooligans or apaches, or, in other words, of the child Shiva himself" (*Midnight's* 408). The wheel of fortune, which was once turned by Mary Pereira at the moment of birth, is now turned by the Mother of Nation, and thus, the reversal of roles occurs again. While Saleem becomes a slum dweller in magicians' ghetto, Shiva looks down from commanding heights. In the chapter titled "Midnight", Major Shiva hurls himself into the magicians' ghetto with bulldozers, operating a governmental recreation project called "Civic Beautification Programme" organised by Sanjay Youth Committee (Sanjay is Indira Gandhi's son). The slum area, which is "a public eyesore", can no longer be tolerated; therefore, it must be broken down.In Hindu mythology, Lord Shiva is both the destroyer and the transformer. With the command of his consort, Kali, Shiva comes to the magicians' ghetto to destroy and transform it into, perhaps, a recreation area.Therefore, all the slum dwellers, the magicians, and Saleem must be evacuated as well. Gunned army troops commanded by Major Shiva violently drag the rioting magicians out of their houses. In addition, the sight of a hastily erected tent, camp beds and surgical equipment gives way to a rumour among the magicians that sterilization is being performed. Saleem thinks that behind all this

violence, Shiva, who is manipulated by Indira Gandhi, is after taking his revenge on Saleem: "Major Shiva, acting no doubt upon the explicit instructions of the Widow, came to the colony to seize me" (*Midnight's* 432). Saleem also believes that by capturing himself, the Widow will seize and destroy all the remaining midnight's children because Saleem is the only "person on earth who held the key to the location of every single one of the children of midnight"; he continues contemplating on the subject: "Did I not carry,for all time, their names addresses faces in my mind? I will answer the question: I did. And I was captured" (*Midnight's* 432).

Saleem is captured and taken to Benares, "the oldest living city in the world", the shrine to Shiva-god by hero-Shiva to face his fate. Saleem is imprisoned in a Widows' Hostel, which is an institution of modern India established to save widows from the sati tradition. Saleem is forced into treachery by the treason of Shiva, "the darkest child of midnight"; and, he tells his inquisitors everything about the midnight's children. Saleem's confessions enable the Widow and Shiva to captivate four hundred twenty children of midnight. Yet, according to Saleem, the paradox is that although the Widow, who is assisted by Shiva, brings the Midnight's children together so as to annihilate them all, her scheme, Saleem thinks, unites the children who are living in different regions of India rather than breaking them. A sudden wave of optimism surrounds Saleem: "The Widow has united us here and unity is invincibility. Children we've won!" (*Midnight's* 437). Nevertheless, this sudden wave of optimism is followed by disappointment and misery, for Saleem has already been robbed of his midnight given gift of telepathy, and all the rest of the children lose their magic gifts. Besides, all the arrested children, including Saleem, undergo vasectomy, and thus, they are deprived of the possibility of reproducing themselves. Saleem names the woman who is officially in charge of the sterilization project the "Widow's Hand", and it is through the Widow's Hand that he realizes the meaning of his imprisonment in the Widow's Hostel:

> [...] what I learned from the Widow's Hand is that those who would be gods fear no one so much as other potential deities; and that, that and that only, is why we, the magical children of midnight, were hated feared destroyed by the Widow, who was not only Prime Minister of India but also aspired to be Devi, the Mother-goddess in her most terrible aspect, possessor of the shakti of the gods, a multi-limbed divinity

> with a centre-parting and schizophrenic hair... And that was how I learned my meaning in the crumbling palace of the bruised-breasted women. (*Midnight's* 438)

The parody is that both Saleem and his enemy identify themselves with deities, and the mortal combat between them is likened to epic wars among gods and goddesses. Since the Mother-goddess cannot stand the idea of the existence of "other potential deities", who could be a threat to her ideal of being the only saviour of her nation, she disqualifies the magical children of midnight by castrating them. The act of castration denotes a subversive use of parody, if it is thought in terms of the Freudian frame of the successive stages of the Oedipus complex which concerns the male child. In *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Freud states that each of the three stages of the Oedipus complex consists of certain motives, consequences, and outcomes: the motive of the first stage is attachment to mother; the consequence is jealousy of rivals, particularly of father; and the outcome is feelings of hostility toward father.The motive of the second stage is castration fear; the consequence is fear of punishment by father for his desires to possess mother; and the outcome is intensification of rivalry with father.The motive of the third stage is the need to appease father and prevent imagined attack; the consequence is creation of a facade of meekness and love for father; the outcome of the final stage is repression of hostility and fear; relinquishment of mother; and identification with father (Freud 133). Freud's summary of the dissolution of the boy's Oedipus complex is that "In boys [...] the complex is not simply repressed, it is literally smashed to pieces by the shock of threatened castration. Its libidinal cathexes are abandoned [i.e., the attachment to mother], desexualized and in part sublimated [...] (257). In Saleem's case, the parody is that the act of castration is done not by a father figure but by the Mother, the initial of which is capitalised throughout the novel. It is also obvious that Rushdie's Mother (or Saleem's arch-enemy) replaces Freud's father figure, especially in the outcomes of all the three stages of the Oedipus complex. The outcome of the final stage, for instance, is apparently applicable to the relation between Saleem, the child, and Indira Gandhi, the Mother. In a sense, Saleem identifies himself with the Mother because both cherish the strong desire to become the sole saviour of postindependence India. In the novel it is the Mother who castrates all the children of midnight; yet, what she could not reckon and control is the spread of

many illegitimate infants who are the products of Shiva's (the darkest child of midnight) relationships with high-class and married Indian women:"And certainly there were children.The spawn of illicit midnights. Beautiful bouncing infants secure in the cradles of the rich. Strewing bastards across the map of India, the war hero went his way [...]" (*Midnight's* 409). Thus, the Mother fails to destroy the midnight's children entirely because Shiva, the procreator, spreads millions of his sperms for the coming 1001 generations of midnight's children.

According to David Quint, *Midnight's Children* is evocative of works that belong to the epic countertradition. For Quint, "[...] epics of the defeated resist the triumphalist history of the Virgilian epic by denying linear teleological narrative. Such works call into question the very possibility of ending, thereby insinuating that victors cannot dictate history any more than their victims can" (104). The ending of *Midnight's Children* can be interpreted in this respect. The paradox at the end of the novel is that although Saleem fails to become an epic hero, his failure indicates resistance and struggle as well. In the final paragraph, Saleem prophesies the suffering that he and the following 1001 generations of midnight's children will face. His prophesy, just like the number 1001, which suggests infinity, is an evidence of a neverending endurance and struggle against oppressors.

Since the whole novel is based on a supernatural premise, i.e. a large number of children born on the stroke of midnight with magical powers, it would be more useful to set aside that obvious foreground and to discuss the magical realistic elements found in the smaller details of the narrative. In *Midnight's Children*, one of the incidents that might be interpreted from the magical realistic perspective is the curing of baby Saleem's typhoid by the fatal venom of the king cobra. The one-year-old baby Saleem is on the verge of death; his grandfather, Doctor Aadam Aziz, who is a graduate of Heidelberg University, tries every course of treatment that modern medicine offers. Yet all his efforts to save his grandson remain futile. By midnight the helpless Dr. Aziz announces the grieving family that "There is nothing more I can do. He will be dead by morning" (*Midnight's* 148). It is at that moment that Dr. Schaapsteker, the mysterious tenant of the Sinai family, whose name means an African snake in Dutch, interferes in the desperate scene with a little bottle in his hand. Dr. Schaapsteker's

eccentric personality enters Saleem's life in the episode titled "Snakes and Ladders". He is introduced to the Sinai family by another neighbour named Homi Catrack, who is a well-to-do Parsee, who owns a number of race horses. Dr. Schaapsteker hires the top-floor apartment of the Sinais, and with his cash payment of the rental, contributes to the income of the family who are trying to overcome the financial crisis inflicted upon Ahmed Sinai by the young Indian state in the form of freezing all his assets. It seems that the 1948 Muslim-Hindu dissent between India and Pakistan is the reason for the blocking of Ahmed Sinai's possessions. As a wealthy Muslim businessman living in Bombay, Ahmed Sinai invested his capital in his Hindu friend, Dr. Narlikar's entrepreneurial dream to reclaim land from the sea: " 'The land beneath the sea my friend! We must manufacture these by the thousand - by tens of thousands! We must tender for reclamation contracts; a fortune is waiting; don't miss it brother, this is a chance of a lifetime!' " (*Midnight's* 134). Dr. Narlikar guarantees success on condition that Ahmed's capital and his personal contacts are conjoined. Yet the joint venture fails dramatically because the state policies of the times do not permit a Muslim soar that much higher. Dr. Narlikar's apology clearly explains the state policy concerning the wealthy Muslims of India: " 'I blame myself entirely; we made ourselves too public. These are bad times, Sinai bhai - freeze a Muslim's assets, they say, and you make him run to Pakistan, leaving all his wealth behind him. Catch the lizard's tail and he'll snap it off! This so-called secular state gets some damn clever ideas" (*Midnight's* 135). Another neighbour and family friend, Ismail Ibrahim, who is a lawyer, blames himself too, for not warning Ahmed against the discriminatory state policies: " 'It's my fault,' Ismail Ibrahim is saying, 'I should have warned you, Sinai bhai. I have heard about these freezings - only well-off Muslims are selected, naturally. You must fight ...' " (*Midnight's* 135).

Ahmed Sinai's financial crisis seems to be a digression from the discussion about the miraculous curing of Saleem's typhoid by the venom of the king cobra; however, it is through magical realism that Ruhdie binds and finds solutions to both incidents. The two incidents appear to be closely connected in that if the Sinai family had not had a serious financial crisis, Amina Sinai, probably, would not have rented the top-floor apartment to Dr. Schaapsteker. Dr. Schaapsteker is an eighty-one-year old

European expatriate who owns an institute known by his name. He also has a snake farm; the snakes of his farm are used in Schaapsteker's institute "where snake venom's medicinal functions were studied, and antivenes devised" (*Midnight's* 136). As a man who has devoted his whole life to do research on snakes, snake-bites,and finding antivenes, his physical features, especially the sight of his mouth and tongue, resemble those of a snake: "his tongue flicked constantly in and out between his papery lips" (*Midnight's* 137). The devotion of one's entire life to snakes gives way to a number of fantastic stories about the Doctor among his minor staff at the institute, in particular: "Dr. Schaapsteker was a man who engendered wild stories. The more superstitious orderlies at his Institute swore that he had the capacity of dreaming every night about being bitten by snakes, and thus remained immune to their bites. Others whispered that he was half-snake himself, the child of an unnatural union between a woman and a cobra" (*Midnight's* 137). Nevertheless, Amina does not pay attention to these stories tumbling around the Doctor's name; to her, Schaapsteker is an old gentleman who allows her family to maintain a decent living with the rent he pays.

The Doctor's specific interest, or more truly, his legendary obsession, is centered on finding an antivenene for the bite of "bungarus fasciatus": "There is no known antivenene to the bite of bungarus: but Schaapsteker had devoted his life to finding one" (*Midnight's* 137). As the quotation suggests, Schaapsteker's entire life is shaped by his desire to surpass the borders of the knowable; hence one might possibly draw a parallel between this everpresent stuggle in one's life to overflow the limits of the knowable and Zamora's comment on the nature of magical realism, that is: "Magical realism's most basic concern [is] the nature and limits of the knowable [...]. Magical realist texts ask us to look beyond the limits of the knowable" (Zamora, 498). At the end of the episode, what magically cures Saleem's typhoid is not Dr. Aziz's application of the methods of modern medicine but Dr. Schaapsteker's bottle containing the venom of the king cobra. Dr. Schaapsteker enters the desperate scene, hands the little bottle to Dr. Aziz and says:

> 'I make no bones about it: this is kill or cure. Two drops exactly; then wait and see.' My grandfather, sitting head in hands in the rubble of his medical learning, asked, 'What is it?' And Dr. Schaapsteker, nearly eighty-two, tongue flicking at the corners

> of his mouth: 'Diluted venene of the king cobra. It has been known to work.' Snakes can lead to triumph, just as ladders can be descended: my grandfather, knowing I would die anyway, administered the cobra poison. The family stood and watched while poison spread through the child's body... and six hours later, my temperature had returned to normal.(*Midnight's* 148-9)

(It is certainly ironic, to add a political note, that the Indian doctor trained in western medicine fails while the western doctor obsessed about what might easily pass as witchcraft or old-wife-remedy succeeds.)

The other magical incident is his mother Amina's unfailing luck in betting on horse-races, which defies reason and which, in the narrator's words, "if it hadn't happened it wouldn't have been credible" (*Midnight's* 140). Although for Amina gambling is a grave sin akin to the consumption of alcohol, she starts attending racecourses and placing bets with her dowry in order to finance the court proceedings undertaken by Ismail Ibrahim in the family's attempt to recover their frozen assets. While from all perspectives Amina appears to be clueless in her choices of horses and jockeys, she never stops winning. The narrator Saleem offers two explanations for her incredible luck, the first being more rational yet unlikely and the second being of a magical nature and , paradoxically, in the light of the subsequent events, plausible. One might believe that the family's neighbour Homi Catrack, who is addicted to horse races, might be providing Amina with tips about fixed races. However, Saleem indicates how Catrack's own fortune at the race-track is far less consistent than that of Amina's and how he himself is completely amazed by her unwavering success "day after racing day, month after month" (*Midnight's* 140). The second possibility is that Saleem, who is only one-year-old at that time, becomes somehow aware of his mother's unspoken desire to win and telepathically manipulates the course of events to her advantage. The magical realistic explanation of this incident from Saleem's past suggests how good or bad luck in general is a phenomenon that defies reason and that therefore, cannot be approached in rational terms:

> [...] whenever his mother goes away clutching a purse full of secrets, is baby Saleem, who has acquired an expression of the most intense concentration, whose eyes have been seized by a singleness of purpose of such enormous power that it has darkened them to deep navy blue, and whose nose is twitching strangely while he appears to be

> watching some distant event, to be guiding it from a distance, just as the moon controls the tides. (*Midnight's* 141)

Hence both incidents confirm Luis Leal's idea, as mentioned in the theory chapter, that "In magical realism key events have no logical or psychological explanation" (119).

3.2 The Moor's Last Sigh

In *The Moor's Last Sigh*, Moraes Zogoiby, or the Moor, who is the protagonist-narrator in the novel, offers the story of his family which is embedded in the history of India. The time of the novel is the twentieth century, covering the colonial and post-independence periods in India. The rise and fall of the Zogoiby family, which is central to the novel, mirrors India's rise with independence, with nationalistic ideals, with aspiration for unity that would bind a multi-cultured, multi-coloured, and many tongued population, and her fall with the ensuing religious and ethnic splits that would drag the country to social unrest, even bloody riots. The setting of the novel, as the Moor announces, is divided into four locations:

> [...] Cabral Island [is] the first of my story's four sequestered, serpented, Edenic-infernal private universes. (My mother's Malabar Hill salon was the second; my father's sky-garden, the third; and Vasco Miranda's bizzare redoubt, his 'Little Alhambra' in Benengeli, Spain, was, is, and will in this telling become, my last. (*The Moor's* 15)

The Moor, like Saleem in *Midnight's Children*, expresses his strong desire to give meaning not only to his turbulent personal story but also to the history of his nation which is no less chaotic than his family story. The Moor declares that this impulse to give meaning to his personal experiences, which will be doing the same to the experiences of his nation, is a matter of life and death. While trying to overcome an asthma attack, the narrator states that the act of giving meaning is related not to thinking but to breathing. To the Moor, breathing is the very first sign of existence. He subverts Descartes' well-known Latin statement "Cogito ergo sum" and makes it "Suspiro ergo sum:" "It is not thinking makes us so, but air. Suspiro ergo sum. I sigh, therefore I am. [...] A sigh isn't just a sigh. We inhale the world and breathe out

meaning. While we can. While we can" (*The Moor's* 53-54). Obviously, the Moor's meditation on existence, the inhaling of the world and the breathing out of meaning is an allusion to the title of the novel, making explicit the narrator's aim that he will tell his story until his last sigh.

Similar to *Midnight's Children*, here too Rushdie alludes to the biblical genesis while conveying his protagonist's determination to reject religious texts and to rely, instead, on his "family tree" in order to compose his meaningful narrative:

> -We breathe light- the trees pipe up. Here at journey's end in this place of olive trees and tombstones the vegetation has decided to strike up a conversation. We breathe light, indeed; most informative. They are 'El Greco' cultivars, these chatty oliviers; well named, [...] after that light-breathing God-ridden Greek. Henceforth I'll turn a deaf ear to prattling foliage with its arboreal metaphysics, its chlorophyllosophy. My family tree says all I need to hear. (*The Moor's* 54)

In the first chapter of the novel, the Moor introduces himself, announces his Fall, and his intention to cast light on the darkness of his personal story, which is a reflection of the history of India. In this introduction, as well as in many other instances in the novel, Rushdie parodies Adam's fall from heaven; therefore, the biblical theme of the Fall after eating the forbidden apple might be regarded as the leitmotif in the work. The author's use of the light image connects the Moor to Lucifer. The word "Lucifer" means "the bearer of light" and it once belonged to Satan, who was the most beautiful of all angels before his rebellion, and who eventually tempted Eve – and thereby also Adam - to eat the forbidden apple of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thus initiating the Fall from Heaven. The Devil, or in Rushdie's case, Lucifer, "is the centre of darkness, as God is the centre of light, blazing in the Underworld as God shines in Heaven" (DS 287). In the novel the Moor is presented as "a Modern Lucifer," the blazing Prince of darkness, who is ready to bring his familial and national truths to light by means of his narrative, though he knows from the onset that the cost will be his fall from paradise:

> Mine is the story of the fall from grace of a high-born-cross-breed: me, Moraes Zogoiby, called 'Moor', for most of my life the only male heir to the spice-trade-'n'-big-business crores of the da Gama-Zogoiby dynasty of Cochin, and my banishment from [...] my natural life by my mother Aurora da Gama, most illustrious of our modern artists, a great beauty who was also the most sharp-tongued woman of her generation, handing out the hot stuff to anybody who came within range. 'To be the

> offspring of our daemonic Aurora,' I was told when young by the Goan painter V. (for Vasco) Miranda, 'is to be truly, a modern Lucifer. You know: son of the blooming morning.' By then my family had moved to Bombay, and this was the kind of the thing that passed, in the Paradise of Aurora Zogoiby's legendary salon, for a compliment; but I remember it as a prophecy, because the day came when I was indeed hurled from that fabulous garden, and plunged towards Pandaemonium. [...] Placed beyond the Pale, would you not seek to make light of the Dark? Just so. Moraes Zogoiby, expelled from his story, tumbled towards history (*The Moor's* 5).

The first four chapters of the novel are devoted to the Moor's maternal great grandparents who claim to be descendants of Vasco da Gama, the Portuguese explorer. All these preliminary chapters are marked by a parody of Indian nationalism at the beginning of the twentieth century. The Moor's great grandparents are Francisco and Epifania da Gama. Francisco, who is a rich spice merchant living in Cochin, marries Epifania Menezes, the daughter of another trader family of Mangalore. Francisco's Quixotic character, his optimistic idealism and nationalism do not prevent him from further improving his family business, that is "[...] the age-old da Gama art of turning spice and nuts into gold. He could smell money on the wind, could sniff the weather and tell you if it was bringing in profit or loss" (*The Moor's* 17). In addition to his genius in trade, he is a philanthropist, "[...] funding orphanages, opening free health clinics, building schools for the villages [...] setting up institutes researching coco-palm blight, initiating elephant conservation schemes [...] beyond his spice fields, and sponsoring annual contests at the time of the Onam flower festival to find and crown the finest oral storytellers in the region" (*The Moor's* 17). He is a modernist disciple of Bertrand Russell, and also a patron of arts and admirer and protector of artists. Epifania's personality, on the other hand, might be epitomized as the exact opposite of her husband. She is a strictly Catholic matriarch, a misanthropist -compared to Francisco- a materialist, a vindictive mother-in-law, and unlike her libertarian husband, a supporter of the British colonial rule in India. Francisco's involvement in the Home Rule Campaign of 1916, which is held for an independent Indian parliament that would determine the country's future, results in his imprisonment for six months. The Home League is also banned. Francisco's political activism is opposed and protested by Epifania and Aires, the elder son, while supported and followed by Camoens, the younger son and future grandfather of the Moor. A quarrel between

Francisco and Epifania in the presence of the twelve-year-old Aires and the eleven-year-old Camoens mirrors the dissension and split not only between a husband and a wife, but also the whole Indian intelligentsia in 1914; on the one side there are those who cannot think of a safe and stable future without the British colonial rule, and on the other, those who are struggling for a thoroughly independent India. Francisco's outburst in the quarrel is a proof of the rightfulness of the nationalistic cause longing for independence:

> Taxes doubled! Our youngsters dying in British uniform! The nation's wealth is being shipped off, madam: at home our people starve, but British Tommy is utilising our wheat, rice, jute and coconut products. I personally am required to send out goods below cost-price. Our mines are being emptied: saltpetre, manganese, mica. I swear! Bombay-wallahs [Bombayite collaborators of the coloniser] getting rich and nation going to pot. (*The Moor's* 18)

Epifania's counterattack, however, is nothing but an expression of a meek submissiveness, defending the superiority and continuity of the colonial regime and admitting the immaturity and inefficiency of the colonised for self-determination:

> 'Too many crooks and books have filled your ears,' Epifania protested. 'What are we but Empire's children? British have given us everything, isn't it?-Civilisation, law, order, too much. Even your spices that stink up the house they buy out of their generosity, putting clothes on backs and food on children's plates. Then why speakofy such treason and filthy up my children's ears with what-all Godless bunk?' (*The Moor's* 18)

In order to convey the oppressive policies of the British, and the cowardice of Indian authorities, and to show who the true ruler of India was at the beginning of the twentieth century, the narrator talks about the first movement of liberation that took place in Mysore. Mysore, Cochin, Travancore, and Hyderabad were the four Indian States that were "technically not part of British India" (*The Moor's* 17), for they had their own princes. Officially, these four states seemed to have autonomy.Yet, "when Nehru raised the national flag in Mysore, the local (Indian) authorities destroyed not only the flag but even the flagpole the moment he had left town, lest the event annoy the true rulers..." (*The Moor's* 18). As the quotation suggests, Nehru's attempt to awaken a national spirit is demolished by his fellows who are seemingly independent

but are in fact under the indirect rule of the British. From the narrator's perspective, the local authorities in Mysore in a cowardly manner betray Nehru as soon as he leaves the town because they cannot take the risk of making the true masters angry. This cowardice, for the Moor, indicates that the natives appear to be far from understanding the meaning of liberation, of self-determination.

Within such a chaotic political environment, Francisco cherishes a lifelong dream of bridging the distance between East and West. This dream involves the combination of Eastern and Western thought systems, values and norms; furthermore, it aspires to build an enlightened future when India will be free, democratic, and consequently peaceful. Francisco's relationship with the "impossibly young and suspiciously winsome Frenchman, a certain M. Charles Jeanneret" (*The Moor's* 15), who will later become a universally acclaimed architect called "Le Corbusier," is strongly coloured by his dream. For its realisation, Francisco commissions the architect to build two symbolic houses in his gardens that will represent the possibility of a harmonious coexistence of East and West. Rushdie's parody of Francisco's utopian vision becomes tangible when this project yields two absolutely incongruous dysfunctional buildings which Epifania criticizes in a great outrage:

> [...], her gullible husband had commissioned the jackanapes to build not one but two new houses in her precious gardens. And what crazy structures they turned out to be!- The one a strange angular slabby affair in which the garden penetrated the interior space so thoroughly that it was often hard to say whether one was in or out of doors, and the furniture looked like something made for a hospital or a geometry class, you could'nt sit on it without bumping into some pointy corner; the other a wood and paper house of cards-'after the style of Japanese', [...] –a flimsy fire-trap whose walls were sliding parchment screens, and in whose rooms one was not supposed to sit, but kneel, and at night one had to sleep on a mat on the floor with one's head on a wooden block, as if one were a servant, while the absence of privacy provoked Epifania into the observation that 'at least knowledge of stomach health of household members is no problem in a house with toilet-paper instead of bathroom walls. (*The Moor's* 16)

Despite Epifania's protests, Francisco forces the whole household either to "move East" or to "go West," "where they are left no other option than to live in one or other of the Frenchman's follies ..." (*The Moor's* 16). With Epifania's strong opposition, the household moves back to the old house after a few weeks. As it is seen, Francisco's attempts to bind Eastern and Western cultures in the making of a free India fail,

because his Western - borrowed modernity, progressivism and innovations, which he regards as vital to national liberation, appear to be far from meeting the needs of the natives; in other words, they lack the touch of an authentic identity. His failure to take note of the indigenous culture while adopting and adapting the Western thought creates a kind of alienation effect which will soon result in his exhaustion.

As a result, Francisco's nationalism, which is shaped by the borrowed ideas of Western nationalism, and which attempts to create a national conscience (in the Joycean sense) in one of his two articles published in the leading journals of the time, turn him "from emerging hero into national laughing-stock ..." (*The Moor's* 20). To mention the after-effects of only one of these papers will suffice to show the extent of Francisco's disappointment. Having been influenced by Joyce's Stephen, who is trying to mould "the uncreated conscience of our [Irish] race" (*The Moor's* 20) in *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Francisco, in his article titled 'Towards a Provisional Theory of the Transformational Fields of Conscience,' writes about his notion of "an invisible network of spiritual energy similar to electromagnetic fields, [...which he calls] 'fields of conscience' [... and which] were nothing less than the repositories of the memory - both practical and moral - of the human species ..." (*The Moor's* 20). According to Francisco, these "fields of conscience" would improve the moral standards of Indian nation in theory as well as practice. Yet what the publication brings to Francisco is nothing but disgrace:

> A newspaper editorial in the Madras-based paper *The Hindu*, headed Thunderbolts of Good and Evil, lampooned him cruelly: 'Dr da Gama's fears for our ethical future are like those of a crackpot weatherman who believes our deeds control the weather, so that unless we act 'clemently', [...] there will be nothing overhead but storms.' The satirical columnist 'Waspyjee' in the *Bombay Chronicle*-[...] inquired maliciously whether the famous Fields of Conscience were for human use alone, or if other living creatures-cockroaches, for example, or poisonous snakes-might learn to benefit from them; or whether, alternatively, each species had its own such vortices swirling around the planet. 'Should we fear contamination of our values [...] by accidental field collisions? Might not praying-mantis sexual mores, baboon or gorilla aesthetics, scorpion politics fatally infect our own poor psyches? Or, Heaven forfend-perhaps they already have!!'. (*The Moor's* 21)

The ruthless criticism directed towards Francisco's articles by the Indian intellectuals of the time might be interpreted in terms of Frantz Fanon's definition of national

culture: “A national culture is the whole body of efforts made by a people in the sphere of thought to describe, justify, and praise the action through which that people has created itself and keeps itself in existence ...” (155). In Fanon’s view, the first phase of the evolution of cultural nationalism experienced by the colonised before and during the struggle for independence involves the following: “At the beginning the native intellectual used to produce his work to be read exclusively by the oppressor, whether with the intention of charming him or of denouncing him through ethnic or subjectivist means ...” (155). Parallel to Fanon’s idea, Chidi Amuta suggests that, “the first phase is the assimilationist phase in which the native intellectual gives proof that he has assimilated the culture of the occupying power. Characteristically, the literary productions of the native at this stage bear resemblance to those in the literary tradition of the colonizing country” (158). Therefore, having been drained of his own history and his own cultural legacy, Francisco inevitably writes in the line of imperial thought, and his literary productions prove that he has assimilated the culture of the colonizer fully, despite the fact that he is writing not to charm but to fight against the colonizer. As Fanon states: “Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native’s brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures, and destroys it” (154). In brief, Francisco is trying to construct a national identity which will be the product of the national culture; yet his construction is based on the exported ideas of western culture. Since the remnants of the native culture and native identity were destroyed long ago by the colonial power, his work, which is not nourished by indigenous sources, does not appeal to the needs of his people. Francisco’s case also confirms Benedict Anderson’s and Ania Loomba’s views concerning anti-colonial nationalism. As discussed in the theory chapter, Anderson’s definition of the bilingual native intellectual who had access “to modern western culture and to the models of nationalism, [...] and nation-state” (Anderson, 116) fits not only Francisco but also Camoens and, parallel to Loomba’s claim, the anti-colonial nationalism of the father and the son is “made possible and shaped by European political and intellectual history” (Loomba, 189).

Francisco commits suicide at the end of the second chapter: "[...] he dived off the island and swam away; perhaps he was trying to find some air beyond the island's enchanted rim" (*The Moor's* 24). The Moor, who is the great grandson, conveys Francisco's legacy as follows: "He should have been remembered for his part in the revolution, for his good works, for his progressivism, for his mind; but his true legacies were trouble in the business (which had been neglected these past years), sudden death and asthma" (*The Moor's* 24). According to the Moor, whose narrative parodies the discourses of both the coloniser and the colonised in the wake of Indian independence, his ancestor's true legacy is not his lofty ideals, which would be proven false and vain as the novel unfolds, but financial problems in business, sickness, and unexpected death.

Camoens da Gama is Francisco's younger son and the Moor's grandfather. The ups and downs in his life, his character, his love of English literature, which frequently allows him to recite poetry by heart from Shakespeare, Marvell, Patmore and many others, his utopian dreams related to the liberation of India as well as his tragic destiny are similar to those of his father. Foucault's power-knowledge relationship, which constitutes the basis of western colonial discourse as discussed in the theory chapter, is materialised in the British administrator's speech and treatment of Camoens and Aires da Gama (the Moor's granduncle). After a fire in the plantations, Camoens and Aires are taken to the presence of "the Englishman." The two brothers are manacled and forced to kneel down before the Englishman whose name and administrative position are not given; yet it is understood that he is a high-ranking representative of the Empire:

> [...] he was a man well known to them: a well read man with whom Camoens had enjoyed discussing Wordsworth's views on the French Revolution, Coleridge's 'Kubla Khan', and Kipling's almost schizophrenic early stories of the Indiannesses and Englishnesses that struggled within him; with whose daughters Aires had danced at the Malabar Club [...]; whom Epifania had entertained at her table; but who wore now, an oddly absent look. (*The Moor's* 39- 40)

The Englishman disregards all his former intimate friendship with the rich merchants-landowners without hesitation and gives his verdict instantaneously: the two brothers are sentenced to fifteen years of imprisonment. The Englishman's speech, which he

utters while he is staring out of the window at the Cochin harbour at "the beautiful Bolgatty Palace on the island of the same name," (*The Moor's* 38), reveals how the coloniser views the colonised; the Englishman has now become the true voice of the Western imperial discourse, and his soliloquy explains how England ruled India in the 1920s:

> No one, not even the Supreme Government, knows everything about the administration of the Empire. Year by year England sends out fresh drafts for the first fighting-line, which is officially called the Indian Civil Service. These die, or kill themselves by overwork, or are worried to death, or broken in health and hope in order that the land may be protected from death and sickness, famine and war, and may eventually become capable of standing alone. (*The Moor's* 40)

As is seen, the ruling policies are clear. The natives or the colonised are fighting and dying with the hope of independence or, as expressed by the supreme coloniser, for India to "stand alone." Yet, the following statements of the Englishman indicate that he considers such an independence, free from the protection of the Empire, to be impossible:

> It will never stand alone, but the idea is a pretty one, and men [the Indians] are willing to die for it, and yearly the work of pushing and coaxing and scolding and petting the country into good living goes forward. If an advance be made all credit is given to the native, while the Englishmen stand back and wipe their foreheads. If a failure occurs the Englishmen step forward and take the blame. Overmuch tenderness of this kind has bred a strong belief among many natives that the native is capable of administering the country, and many devout Englishmen believe this also, because the theory is stated in beautiful English with all the latest political colours. (*The Moor's* 39)

The picture of the mother country is drawn through the words of the British administrator. Rushdie's choice of words, such as "pushing," "coaxing," "scolding," and "petting" all evoke a mother, supporting and protecting her child against potential dangers and without whose custody the child will, undoubtedly, fail to survive.The British administrator's portrait of the Englishman fits that of a sacrificing mother who is ready to take the blame whenever the child acts mischievously, and who is also ready to compensate for the damage or loss caused by the child. Furthermore, if the deed done by the child is worth praising, the mother leaves the stage to the child to make him\her feel as if it were his\her own success. Thus the child enjoys the honour

of a fake success, supposing that from that moment onwards he/she can stand alone on the path to maturity opening wide before his\her immature eyes. Parallel to this idea, when Camoens shouts defiantly at the Englishman, “We shall administer the country, whatever you say now” (*The Moor’s* 39), he is slapped by a Malayali sepoy until blood trickles from his mouth. The child daring to rebel against the mother’s authority is being punished on the spot by another child who is submissive. Obviously, to the Englishman, what awaits an immature India hoping to be independent is nothing but failure; the child is condemned to err without the support and protection of the leading mother, because this time the administrator declares that he is unwilling to take the blame: “This Resident, this Englishman, at least, is disinclined on this occasion to take the blame. Your clans are guilty of arson, riot, murder and bloody affray and therefore, in my view, though you took no direct part, so are you” (*The Moor’s* 40; to note, the words of the British administrator are mostly quoted from Rudyard Kipling’s story “On the City Wall”). The verdict reveals how oppressive and stereotypical the western imperial discourse was. Any challenge against authority, i.e.power, must be punished collectively, not individually. Thus the da Gama brothers are sentenced to a fifteen-year imprisonment though they took no active role in the bloody incidents and have committed no other crime than being the members of the two rioting clans.

During the period of imprisonment, Isabella Ximena, or Belle, who is Camoens’ beloved, young, beautiful, daring, and at the same time fierce wife, handles the declining family company, and she declares war on Epifania and Carmen (Aires’ wife who is given the nickname “Aunt Sahara” for being childless due to her husband’s homosexuality) and all the other greedy opportunist businessmen and local administrators who are ready to swallow the-century-old da Gama Trading Company. Despite the heavy pressure on Belle to sell the company, she does not sell. Instead:

> She started dressing in men’s trousers, white cotton shirts and Camoens’s cream fedora. She went to every field, every orchard, every plantation under her control and won back the confidence of the terrified employees, many of whom had bolted for their lives. She found managers whom she could trust and whom the work-force would follow with respect but without fear. She charmed banks into lending her money, bullied departed clients into returning, and became a mistress of small print. And [...] she earned a respectful nickname: from Fort Cochin’s salons to the Ernakulam dockside, from the British Residency in old Bolgatty Palace to the Spice Mountains,

> there was only one Queen Isabella of Cochin. [Yet] 'Call me Belle,' she would insist. 'Plain Belle is fine for me.' But she was never plain; and, more than any local princess, had earned her royalty. (*The Moor's* 43)

Belle is the first of a line of extraordinary women in the Moor's life. Belle, who is identified with Queen Isabella of Spain in the novel, gives birth to Aurora, the goddess of dawn; in other words, the Moor is the grandson of a queen and the son of a goddess. Nevertheless, this extraordinary grandmother of the Moor is "no angel" in his words. Belle's deep love for the jailed Camoens, and Aurora, the couple's only child, does not prevent her from becoming a man-eater during her husband's absence. What might be regarded as paradoxical is that Belle's betrayals never diminish her love for her husband. After Camoens is released, the couple resume their passionate love for three short years until the death of Belle. At the age of thirty-three Belle dies of lung cancer, leaving behind a grieving husband and a motherless child in great despair.

One instance of Rushdie's multi-faceted parody of nationalistic discourse becoming especially visible to the reader can be traced in the utopian consolation speech whispered by Camoens to the ear of the terminally ill Belle, a decade before India's independence:

> [...] the dawning of a new world, Belle, a free country, Belle, above religion because secular, above class because socialist, above caste because enlightened, above hatred because loving, above vengeance because forgiving, above tribe because unifying, above language because many-tongued, above colour because multi-coloured, above poverty because victorious over it, above ignorance because literate, above stupidity because brilliant, freedom Belle, the freedom express, soon soon we will stand upon that platform and cheer the coming of the train [...]. (*The Moor's* 51)

This speech successfully predicts the declaration of India's independence; yet it fails to forecast the consequences of this declaration. In fact, as the novel unfolds, everything turns out to be the exact opposite of Camoens's expectations. The anti-colonial struggle and independence bring India nothing but corruption. Corruption among those who are in power contaminates the whole country; the rotten policies of the ruling ones affect and taint everyone down to the lowest spheres of society. To draw a picture of the situation, Rushdie subverts Einstein's Theory of Relativity and playfully parodies the plight of Indian politicians by giving the leading roles, as in *Midnight's*

Children, to Mrs. Indira Gandhi and her son, Sanjay. It is noteworthy that in both *Midnight's Children* and *The Moor's Last Sigh* Mrs. Indira Gandhi and her sons, especially Sanjay, represent the corrupt politicians' ever dissatisfied lust for power and the abuse of this power for self-interest. According to the Moor, along with Mrs. Gandhi's reassuming of power, India enters a period of darkness and suffering:

> Silence in Paradise: silence, and an ache. Mrs. Gandhi returned to power, with Sanjay at her right hand, so it turned out that there was no final morality in affairs of state, only Relativity. I remembered Vasco Miranda's 'Indian variation' upon the theme of Einstein's General Theory: Everything is for relative. Not only light bends, but everything. For relative we can bend a point, bend the truth, bend employment criteria, bend the law. D equals mc squared, where D is for dynasty, m is for mass of relatives, and c of course is for corruption, which is the only constant in the universe - because in India even speed of light is dependent on load shedding and vagaries of power supply. (*The Moor's* 272)

Rushdie's picture of India after the departure of the coloniser is not a unified but rather a divided country; ethnic, religious, and class-related struggles, and bloody language riots prevail throughout the country. Camoens, in his utopian India, defeats class problems through socialism; however the novel evolves around only two classes: the incredibly rich, dark bosses of the underworld, who replaced the former masters as the new bourgeois class, and the very poor who can never be put into any of the class categories; the poor's means for survival is limited to theft, begging and smuggling. And even involvement in those illegal affairs necessitates working as the servant of some merciless master. Obviously, and contrary to Camoens's expectations, independence does not change the poor's inevitable destiny, i.e. more poverty, deprivation, ignorance, and despair. Yet, in a bittersweet mood, the Moor, with a heavy irony, connects the bloodshed that occured after the withdrawal of the coloniser to "[...] the historical generosity of [the Indian] spirit, which is one of the true wonders of India. When empire's sun set, we didn't slaughter our erstwhile masters, saving that privilege for one another ..." (*The Moor's* 33).

After Isabella's death, an air of despair and helplessness broods on Camoens and Aurora. The situation is much more difficult for Camoens because he is unable to accustom himself to the loss of his beloved wife. His daughter's existence tortures him greatly because the thirteen-year-old Aurora is the exact copy of her mother: "there

were days and nights when he could not bear to look at his daughter, because her mother's presence in her was so strong. He even felt, at times, a kind of anger towards her, for possessing more of Belle than he would ever have again" (*The Moor's* 66). As for Aurora, she starts to destroy all the elephant items of different sizes in the house. The elephant-themed items were Belle's most hated objects. Even her last wish on her death bed was a final expression of her hatred of elephants: "Then tie my body to a bloody rickshaw or whatever damn mode of transport you can find, camel-cart donkey-cart bullock-cart bike, but for godsake not a bloody elephant ..." (*The Moor's* 52). Whatever the reason for Belle's hatred of elephants might be remains concealed, but what matters is that it passes onto Aurora for she is "a reincarnation, her mother's living ghost" (*The Moor's* 58). Hence Aurora deliberately, and of course secretly, destroys all the elephant-related items in the house as a tribute to her mother. Yet, when Aurora sees the servants assembled under Aires's cruel interrogation to find out who the culprit is, she confesses her crime "in a high ascending shriek [...] 'Stop bullying them,' Aurora howled. 'They did nothing; they didn't touch your something something elephants and their blankety blank teeth. I did it all.' [...] 'It is what my mother always wanted to do. You will see: from now I am in her place'" (*The Moor's* 58). As a result, Aurora is grounded for a week. The verdict is given by the merciless judge Epifania. This period of punishment witnesses the outburst of Aurora's unequalled artistic genius in painting. The Moor's comment on even the early years of his mother's work is marked by adoration: "It was said of her, in awe, that even as a child she never drew childishly; that her figures and landscapes were adult from the first" (*The Moor's* 45). Motivated by, not only the deep pain of Belle's death, but also the rage against her family -except her father- Aurora sets out to produce the master work of her childhood. Her secret weapons to take Belle's as well as her own revenge on Epifania, Aires and Carmen are: "crayons and papers and calligraphy pens and China ink and children's watercolour sets [... and] wood-charcoal from the kitchen, [...]"(*The Moor's* 45). Painting had been the only medium for Aurora to defeat the sense of being a lonely child. She had been lonely because her father was in jail for a long time and her mother was dealing with business in day time and with "wild life" at

nights. Nevertheless, the Moor states that she never accused her beloved parents of leaving their only child in isolation:

> What absorbs me when I contemplate the after-image of the little, lonely girl who grew up to be my immortal mother, my Nemesis, my foe beyond the grave, is that she never seemed to hold her isolation against [...her parents]; she worshipped them both, and refused to hear a word of criticism, for example from me, about their skill as parents. (But she kept her true nature secret from them. She hugged it to herself; until it burst out of her, as such truth always will: because it must). (*The Moor's* 46)

In fact, painting is Aurora's lifelong medium to express all her secret nature; her ideas, truths, love, hatred, happiness, pain, the way she perceives the world and existence, her conflicts and reconciliations, her freedom and enslavement, her wars and peace, her Heaven and Hell all find expression not in words but in lines and colours. After the end of her grounding, Aurora invites her father to her room to show her enormous wall-painting. Aurora silently asks Camoens's assessment of her art. Stricken with admiration and pride, Camoens "[finds] himself saying, 'But it is the great swarm of being'" (*The Moor's* 59).

It is not verbal but visual parody that dominates Aurora's wall-painting. The work might be interpreted as a parody of European religious frescoes, mainly that of the magnificent vault of the Sistine Chapel painted by Michelangelo Buanorotti between 1508-1511. As Sonia Gallico states:

> The vault's iconography is linked to themes chosen for the side walls, representing humanity's long wait for Christ, the prophecies foreseeing his coming and scenes from the Genesis. All the figures are set in a massive monochromatic, architectural background, with no central focal point, which emphasises their plasticity and compositional qualities. (99)

Unlike Michelangelo, who painted the Christian Genesis, Aurora paints her original Indian genesis. Michelangelo's fresco is based on the biblical history before and after Christ. In Aurora's wall-painting, however, the history of the Indian nation -both ancient and modern- and the past, the present, and even the future of Aurora's family history are intertwined. Gallico's interpretation of the first part of Michelangelo's fresco is as follows:

> The first part: Christ's ancestors according to Matthew's Gospel (1:1-17) are in the triangular spaces and lunettes above the windows. Men and women representing humanity in general and generations succeeding one-another, are crowded into a narrow, shallow space, awaiting the great event of Revelation in different poses and attitudes: they look tired, exhausted, prostrated and often in great pain caused by their inactivity, exasperated by the interminably slow passage of time before the birth of Christ. (99)

The first impression that Michelangelo's work leaves on the viewer is a sense of listless waiting stemming from anguished crowds of humanity. What might be deemed the first part of Aurora's work depicts a period of the Indian history of civilisation ranging from the mythical origins up to the earliest visits by Vasco da Gama, which triggered the colonial invasion. In Aurora's composition, the same feeling of restlessness is reflected through the mass of human figures whose bodies are distorted deliberately and turned into hybrid creatures of the young painter's imagination: "[...] and beyond history were the creatures of her fancy, the hybrids, half-woman half-tiger, half-man half-snake, there were sea-monsters and mountain ghouls" (*The Moor's* 59). The work, in general, mingles the ancient with the modern, the fantastic, mythical, and fabulous with the real. The following section presents what is referred to in Rushdie's own words as a parody of the famous Last Supper scene. To recall, Michelangelo's fresco portrays in triangular niches all the ancestors of Jesus Christ observing the great crowds of humanity awaiting the Apocalypse. Likewise in Aurora's work, her father discerns numerous portraits of their ancestors casting -disapproving- glances upon the family members in the subverted Last Supper scene:

> [...Camoens was] shaken by the parody of the Last Supper in which the family servants caroused wildly at the dining-table while their raggedy ancestors stared down from the portraits on the wall and the da Gamas served as waiters, bringing food and pouring wine and being treated badly, Carmen having her bottom pinched, Epifania's rump being kicked by a drunken gardener; [...]. (*The Moor's* 60)

A carnivalesque reversal of the hierarchical order is apparent in Aurora's subverted version of the Last Supper. The reversal is twofold in that Aurora turns upside down not only the master-servant relationship, but also the relationship between the divine and the mundane by drawing the da Gama servants seated at the dining-table. Thus the servants replace both the masters and the apostles, who are portrayed by many other

artists in their versions of the Last Supper as companions of Jesus. While the family servants are drawn as revellers eating, drinking, and having fun around the table, the da Gamas are depicted as helpless servants trying to bear the harassments and insults of their masters. Furthermore, in another scene, Aurora follows Michelangelo's steps to immortalise her revenge through art. Michelangelo took his revenge from Biagio da Cesena who was a well-known papal master of ceremonies of the period. Cesena criticised Michelangelo's work, saying that "it was worthy of a bath or tavern" (Gallico 126). In return, in the famous Last Judgement fresco "Michelangelo took his revenge by using Biagio to represent Minos, one of the three underworld judges in Greek and Roman mythology, wrapped in serpents' coils that indicate to what circle of Hell the damned are destined" (Gallico 126). Similarly, in one of the scenes Aurora draws Epifania as a monstrous "worm with a long scaly neck rising from the sea" (*The Moor's* 61).

A striking difference between Michelangelo's fresco and that of Aurora is the absence of any kind of divinities. Though Camoens detects the work inch by inch, "he was unable to find the figure of Christ, on or off the cross, or indeed any other representation of any other divinity, tree-sprite, water-sprite, angel, devil or saint, [...except for] the figure of Mother India in the very centre of the ceiling with Belle's face. Queen Isabella was the only mother-goddess ..." (*The Moor's* 61) in Aurora's wall-painting. Belle's face at the centre of the ceiling might be regarded as another instance of carnivalesque parody realised through subversion. The scene is again reminiscent of Michelangelo's fresco, in which the depiction of "the Eternal Father appears for the first time in art history" (Gallico 114). On the vault of the Sistine Chapel, God is pictured as a patriarchal figure, wrapped in pink drapery. Aurora, however, implements the carnivalesque reversal by replacing the patriarchal order with a matriarchal one; thus, Belle remains the only creator figure in her work.

In another episode one finds, again, a parodic representation of Snow White. The years following Belle's death add much to Camoens's incurable sense of loneliness and despair. During a ball held in the house on Cabral Island, a young woman in Snow White frock approaches Camoens indiscretely; the intoxicated Snow White appears to be driven by Camoens' aloofness:

> A young woman, more than slightly drunk, with her hair in black ringlets and too much scarlet lipstick on her mouth, came leaning towards him in a billowing puff-sleeved frock. 'Snow White!' she declared tipsily. [...] 'I can name the seven dwarfs.[...] Sneezysleepyhappydopeygrumpybashfuldoc. You are which one, please?' [...] 'I am guessing. Sleepy no, Dopey don't think so, Grumpy maybe, but Bashful yes. Hi-ho, Bashful! (*The Moor's* 66)

Camoens' silence provokes the drunken Snow White further; she blatantly states that Camoens has been a cuckolded fool all along, that his wife's constant unfaithfulness while he was serving his time was known to the whole Island. Naturally, this cruel declaration drives Camoens to commit suicide by drowning like his father: "Water claims us. It claimed Francisco and Camoens, father and son. They dove into black night-harbour and swam out to the mother-ocean. Her rip-tide bore them away" (*The Moor's* 67). Compared to the old fairy tale, one gets the impression that the Snow White whom Camoens confronts resembles more the villainous stepmother than the innocent, kind-hearted heroine; that is, the evil stepmother, who tries to kill Snow White with a poisonous apple, is replaced by the drunken Snow White herself, who injects Camoens with the poisonous knowledge about Belle. In addition, this catastrophic knowledge that replaces the tale's well-known fatal apple brings the reader back to the biblical scene of Eve's seduction of Adam with the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil -through Satan's temptation - and their resulting Fall from Heaven. Thus it may be argued that the episode unites and subverts within itself two subtexts.

Another parodic relationship might be established between Shakespeare's characters in *The Merchand of Venice* and the love-hate triangle between Flory Zogoiby, her son Abraham and her most hated daughter-in-law Aurora. Flory is the caretaker of the synagogue in Cochin's Jewish quarter since her husband, Solomon Castile, forsook her. Solomon Castile "at nightfall on his fiftieth birthday walked over to the water's edge, hopped into a rowing-boat with half a dozen drunken Portuguese sailors, and ran away to sea" (*The Moor's* 75); the difference between the Moor's maternal and paternal grandparents is that while Francisco and Camoens dive into the sea to die, Solomon does the same not to die but to live.

After Solomon's departure never to return again, the seven-year-old Abraham is obliged to use his mother's family name, i.e. Zogoiby, which means "unlucky" in

Arabic. One day in the synagogue, Abraham finds out his mother's secret trunk hidden under the altar. He opens the trunk out of childhood curiosity and detects its contents. The trunk contains an old book in Spanish, "made up of handwritten parchment pages crudely sewn together" (*The Moor's* 79), a silver dagger and an ancient golden crown with huge emeralds. To unveil the mystery of the trunk, Abraham learns Spanish and frequently converses with Moshe Cohen, the old chandler who is the head of the Jewish community at that time, about the ancient history of his race. Abraham is mainly interested in the story of the fifteenth century Jewish exile from Spain, which coincided with the end of the Moorish domination of Andalusia. The result of Abraham's inquisition is that, "[the crown] was four and a half centuries old, the last crown to fall from the head of the last prince of al-Andalus; nothing less than the crown of Granada, as worn by Abu Abdullah, last of the Nasrids, known as 'Boabdil'" (*The Moor's* 79). The process of investigation, concerning the dismissal of the last Moorish Sultan of Granada by the all-conquering Catholic king and queen Fernando and Isabella, takes considerable time, and Abraham, who has become the most handsome man of his community, starts working as the duty manager of the da Gama company. At the age of thirty-six Abraham falls in, what the Moor calls 'mad love' with the fifteen-year-old Aurora, the only heiress of the da Gamas. Nevertheless, Abraham never gives up his attempts to decipher the old pages written in Spanish and to understand the relationship between the Moorish crown and his Jewish mother, and why the ancient crown has been so secretly kept by his mother. When Abraham announces his decision to marry Aurora, Flory boils over with rage because for her, Abraham's marriage to a Roman Catholic means treason not only to herself, but also to his race. To Flory, this marital bond will taint the purity of their race. A fierce quarrel takes place between Abraham and Flory in the synagogue before the presence of Moshe Cohen and his spinster daughter Sara, who grows very bitter when Abraham declares his love for Aurora against his mother, against tradition -for the idea of intermarriage is intolerable in the Jewish community-, and against her dreams of receiving Abraham's hand one day; therefore she takes her side by Flory without hesitation. Having fully digested his own share of the poisonous fruit of knowledge, Abraham ruthlessly delivers the last blow to his mother by waving the old papers in his

hand. Through his "cathecism" Abraham unveils the mystery on the old papers, and the treasure trunk guarded by his mother, and the secret royal link between the last of the Moorish kings of the Spanish Arabs, and Flory and himself. The tragic story of Sultan Boabdil after his banishment from Andalusia is as follows:"He departed into exile with his mother and retainers, bringing to a close the centuries of Moorish Spain; and reining in his horse upon the Hill of Tears he turned to look for one last time upon his loss, upon the palace [Alhambra] and the fertile plains and all the concluded glory of al-Andalus... at which sight the Sultan sighed, and hotly wept" (*The Moor's* 80). According to Abraham's deciphering of the old papers, which were written by a Jewish woman, Boabdil was accompanied by a Jewish woman "who took shelter beneath the roof of the exiled Sultan; beneath his roof, and then between his sheets. 'Miscegenation,' Abraham baldly stated, 'occured' [...] between the dispossessed Spanish Arab and the ejected Spanish Jew" (*The Moor's* 82). Abraham further tortures his mother by narrating the double treachery which brought Boabdil to his disastrous end:

> 'His courtiers sold his lands, and his lover stole his crown.' After years by his side, this anonymous ancestor crept away from crumbling Boabdil, and took ship for India, with a great treasure in her baggage, and a male child in her belly; from whom, after many begats, came Abraham himself. My mother who insists on the purity of our race, what say you to your forefather the Moor? (*The Moor's* 82)

Motivated by the two contradictory feelings of pride -for the royal link- and shame -for the royal theft- Flory has kept her treasure in strict confidentiality. Abraham's rhetorical question defending his love shatters all the stratagem developed by Flory. Abraham asks, " 'Mother, who is worse? My Aurora who does not hide the Vasco connection, but takes delight; or myself, born of the fat old Moor of Granada's last sighs in the arms of his thieving mistress-Boabdil's bastard Jew?'" (*The Moor's* 83). While the helpless Flory tries to refute her son's charges by accusing him of relying on suppositions rather than facts, Abraham directs his final question which will be answered, and thus confirmed, not by his inarticulate mother, but by Moshe Cohen, one of the two witnesses of the quarrel between the mother and the son:

> ‘Mother, what is your family name?’ When she heard this, Flory knew the coup-de-grace was near. Dumbly, she shook her head. To Moshe Cohen, whose old frienship he would, that day, forsake for ever, Abraham threw down a challenge. ‘The Sultan Boabdil after his fall was known by one sobriquet, and she who took his crown and jewels in a dark irony took the nickname also. Boabdil the Misfortunate: [...] Anyone here can say that in the Moor’s own tongue?’ And the old chandler was obliged to complete the proof. ‘El-Zogoybi.’ (*The Moor’s* 83)

Thus Abraham not only proves his illegitimate linkage with the fallen Moorish dynasty of Granada and that he himself is no more than a bastard Jew of Moorish descent, but he also irrevocably rips all his filial ties with his mother, as well as his race.

This is the bulk of the version narrated by Abraham to his son, the Moor; yet the Moor himself comes up with his own version of the story of the mysterious trunk:

> You want family shame, I’ll tell you its true name:[...] my granny, Flory Zogoiby, was a crook. For many years she was a valued member of a successful gang of emerald smugglers; for who would ever look under the synagogue altar for boodle? She took her cut of the proceeds, kept it safe, and was not so foolish as to spend spend spend. Nobody ever suspected her; and the time came when her son Abraham came to claim his illegal inheritance... (*The Moor’s* 85)

In a way, this alternative story-line told by the Moor corresponds to an alternative lineage as well: that is to say, there is a difference between defining oneself as the descendant of a dethroned and exiled king, and as the descendant of a thieving concubine. The Moor rewrites his own identity in producing an alternative family history, which is embedded in the history of his nation, and thus reflecting the highly subjective nature of any history writing.

This long and complex chain of events concerning Flory, Abraham, Aurora and the trunk is closely related to the characters and events of *The Merchant of Venice* by Shakespeare:

> Mad love! It drove Abraham back to confront Flory Zogoiby, and then it made him walk away from his race, looking back only once. That for this favour, He presently become a Christian, the Merchant of Venice insisted in his moment of victory over Shylock, showing only a limited understanding of the quality of mercy; and the Duke agreed, He shall do this, or else I do recant The pardon that I late pronounced here... What was forced upon Shylock would have been freely chosen by Abraham, who preferred my mother’s love to God’s.He was prepared to marry her according to the laws of Rome. (*The Moor’s* 89-90)

As the above quotation suggests, at first Abraham appears on stage as Shylock, the parodic counterpart of the merchant of Venice. In *The Merchant of Venice*, conversion into Christianity is forcefully imposed on Shylock by the grudging Antonio. In *The Moor*, however, the Cochin version of Shylock is willing to convert to catholicism for Aurora's love. Nevertheless, Abraham and Aurora fail to sanctify their wedlock, because neither the Bishop of Cochin nor Moshe Cohen, the rabbi of the "Mattancherri synagogue," agrees to perform a wedding rite for the scandalous couple. Yet this, in the Moor's words, "irreligious" couple appears to be indifferent to the absence of religious consent on their marriage. And the Moor's narration does not judge but hails his parents' "unmarried" challenge: "I salute their unmarried defiance [...] When they [Abraham and Aurora] went to Bombay, they would call themselves Mr and Mrs, and Aurora took the name Zogoiby and made it famous; but, ladies and gents, there were no wedding bells" (*The Moor's* 104).

Hence, having cut all his ties with his past, Abraham vows to take care of Aurora for ever and devotes himself to increasing the da Gama fortune through spice export. However, the outbreak of World War II endangers Abraham's investments seriously. When the German cruiser "*Medea*" destroys the three cargo ships owned by the da Gama company, sailing in the ocean en route for England, Abraham is severely trapped by the threat of ruining his wife's family fortune. Here Abraham initially becomes Antonio, Shylock's enemy, who risks all his fortune on overseas trading ventures, and subsequently Bassanio, who immediately has to find money to court and win the heart of Portia, the wealthy heiress of Belmont. In Shakespeare's play, Antonio and Bassanio visit Shylock, the Venetian usurer, to ask for a loan. Shylock is furious with Antonio for Antonio's habit of humiliating all Jewish people, Shylock himself included, especially on account of their practices of lending money at prohibitive interest rates; yet surprisingly, Shylock agrees to lend Bassanio the requested sum, on the sole condition that he be entitled to a pound of Antonio's own flesh, should the loan remain unpaid. Procuring a certain amount of money to be able to court Portia is not the only obstacle that Bassanio has to overcome; he also has to choose the right casket, containing Portia's picture, out of three, in accordance with the will of Portia's father. In fact, the two lovers unite in marriage only after Bassanio

chooses the correct casket; whereas the Prince of Morocco, one of Portia's earlier suitors, fails to obtain her hand by making an incorrect choice. In the case of Abraham, however, the reader finds the figure of the Moor mingled with that of the Jew - this embodiment of numerous characters within a single individual being a common example of Rushdie's multi-faceted parody technique; what is more, in *The Moor* Abraham encounters only one treasure trunk, instead of three, and by that time he has already consummated his love with Aurora. It is when three of the da Gama ships are wrecked by the German cruiser "*Medea*," and the family encounters grave financial problems that Abraham seeks his mother's help for the first and last time. In other words, the figure of Shylock now manifests itself in Flory. For Abraham, Flory's treasure trunk containing the emeralds, appears to be the only way for survival. Flory agrees to lend her emeralds and, just like Shylock, she too demands human flesh rather than money for the repayment of her loan: "'Return of loan I do not doubt. But for so risky an investment only the greatest jewel can be my prize. You must give me your firstborn son'" (*The Moor's* 111). Flory also insists that a written contract signed and sealed must be given to her. Naturally, Aurora is not at all informed about this agreement between her husband and her mother-in-law.

There are a number of similarities and differences between Shakespeare's Portia and Rushdie's Aurora. While both women are young, beautiful, intelligent and wealthy, and while they both prove instrumental in the establishment of justice, Portia, unlike Aurora, is the kind of woman who would never marry a Jew; furthermore, Aurora also differs in choosing her spouse by her own free will. Finally, when Flory rudely commands her to read the document two years later, Aurora appears to be far more resourceful and determined in preventing this vile and unjust contract from being fulfilled; to be more specific, she strictly denies her husband any sexual contact with herself: " 'Tell your mother', Aurora commanded Abraham that night, 'that there will be no children born in this house while she remains alive.' She moved him out of her bedroom" (*The Moor's* 115).

Abraham desperately tries to compensate for his loss, which was inflicted upon him by a Pontic sorceress of sorts (i.e. *Medea*, the German gunboat), through the invaluable possessions of another sorceress, i.e. his mother, to whom the Moor

attributes all the evil traits peculiar to the wicked female characters of fairy tales. In fact, the construction of Flory as a character projects, yet again, one of Rushdie's multi-faceted parody techniques, since Flory is not only the parodic female counterpart of Shylock, who is the enemy of Antonio and the main hindrance before the love of Portia and Bassanio, but also the embodiment of all the "shadows [fallen] across the lovers' path" (*The Moor's* 110); in Rushdie's work, the lovers are Abraham and Aurora, and the "shadow" on their way is Flory, who reminds the Moor of a "poisoned apple, bewitched spindle, Black Queen, wicked witch, baby-stealing goblins, [...]" (*The Moor's* 110).

The idea of giving one's firstborn child to an evil character in return for a vital favour is a common theme in fairy tales. In this scene, Rushdie explicitly alludes to Rumpelstiltskin, a fairy tale where a dwarf with magical abilities obtains a future queen's promise that she will give him her firstborn child, in exchange for his spinning gold out of straw. Thus the Moor's narration subverts the grandmother whom he has never seen, and turns Flory into another Rumpelstiltskin who demands Abraham's firstborn male child in return for her treasure trunk:

> ... [Abraham] had entered darker waters than he knew, and beyond them lay a black forest in which, in a clearing, a little mannikin danced, singing *Rumpelstiltskin is my name* [...] *Bring me your firstborn* ... A line from legends hung between this mother and this son. Abraham, aghast, told her it was out of the question, it was evil, unthinkable [...] You need my stones? Give me your eldest boy; his flesh'n'skin'n'bones ... (*The Moor's* 85)

As has been amply illustrated herein, Rushdie's parodic techniques are consistently multi-layered; it is always possible to take a character such as Flory Zogoiby, to strip a layer from her and discover the face of Shylock, and then remove yet another layer to find the figure of Rumpelstiltskin, and beneath that even Penelope, so on and so forth. The epitomy of such a stratification of layers beneath layers is found in the notion of the palimpsest, which, probably by no accident, plays a major role in the final chapter of the novel, involving Aurora, Abraham and the Moor on the one hand, and Vasco Miranda, a Goan painter, on the other.

Vasco first appears as the Moor's beloved childhood hero and then, towards the end of the novel, he becomes the Moor's arch-enemy to be annihilated. In a similar

way, Vasco initially falls madly in love with, and gains, in return, the pitying –and occasionally mocking- friendship of Aurora; this relationship causes him to spend thirty-two years with the Zogoibys as a somewhat clownish figure; furthermore, despite his commercial success as a painter, he invariably remains inferior to Aurora's true artistic genius, thus invoking in the reader's mind other famous artistic partnerships and/or rivalries, such as that between Picasso and Braque - or even that between Mozart and Salieri, since Vasco's professional envy does not prevent him from admiring Aurora's art most passionately. Nevertheless, his unrequited love finally turns into a bitter hatred, driving him completely insane; in the narrator's words "the wine of love spoiled in him long ago, and turned into the vinegar of hate ..." (*The Moor's* 155).

In his folly, Vasco focuses his entire energy on the singular effort of destroying all the remnants of the Zogoiby family: the Moor himself in flesh and blood, as well as Aurora's last paintings. To be more accurate, Vasco wishes to bring to daylight the bare-breasted portrait of Aurora, which he himself had made long ago; to recall, Abraham grows furious upon seeing this nude depiction of his wife, and as a result Vasco covers it up with another painting depicting Sultan Boabdil, entitled "The Moor's Last Sigh." One might speculate that Vasco now wants not only to look upon, but also, at a subconscious level, to punish the woman he loved in vain. For this purpose he imprisons, in the tower of his Little Alhambra, the distinguished Japanese restorer Aoi Uë, and soon the Moor himself falls into Vasco's trap to join this strong and composed lady. Here Vasco shows to the Moor not only his own painting, but also Aurora's last and unfinished work, which is again entitled "The Moor's Last Sigh." Vasco explains how Aurora, fearful for her life, contacted him as a last resource, and told him that, should she be killed, she wished her murderer to be brought to justice; to this end, Aurora "had concealed his [the murderer's] portrait under her work in progress ..." (*The Moor's* 416) Upon looking at the X-ray images of this painting, the Moor discovers "that the canvas was a palimpsest; a full-length portrait could be made out in negative-image segments beneath the surface work." However, to his dismal shock the Moor sees, not the face of Mainduck, the man he himself killed to avenge his mother, but rather that of his own father, Abraham.

After this shattering revelation, the Moor and Aoi turn into prison-mates who struggle to survive by sticking to a daily routine; Vasco forces Aoi to unearth the portrait of Aurora laboriously, bit by bit, while at the same time he pushes the Moor into writing the story of his family, thereby allowing him to live as long as his work remains in progress. In the Moor's own words: "He had made a Scheherazade of me. As long as my tale held his interest, he would let me live" (*The Moor's* 421). In this respect, the Moor bears a strong resemblance to Saleem, the protagonist of *Midnight's Children*; the Moor too, in a truly Scheherazade-like spirit, not only tells the tales of the past, but also sows the seeds of future stories involving Aoi and himself, thus nourishing the possibility of a never-ending narration.

The success of this narrative effort depends upon the Moor's ability to delve into the mysteries of two paintings: one, made by Vasco, concealing Aurora, and through her person, all the earlier da Gamas; the other, made by Aurora, concealing her murderer Abraham, and through his person, all the earlier Zogoibys. And it is certainly by no accident that the topmost layers of both palimpsests present a portrait of Sultan Boabdil, the last of moorish kings; for the Moor of the novel himself, as the last living member of the Zogoibys and the da Gamas, is a palimpsest, where the layers of his parents, grandparents and even older ancestors manifest themselves. It is the Moor's most crucial mission to disentangle all these layers of love, hatred, failures and crimes, in order to decipher them, to reach a final truth, a self-consistent and illuminated historical narrative where the good and the evil, the innocent and the guilty could be distinguished with clear-cut lines.

There is no doubt, however, that the Moor ultimately fails in his mission; till the very end, he cannot decide whether his mother was guilty, and whether his father was indeed cruel and cold-blooded enough to manipulate his own son into believing that another man had killed his mother, so to be able to eliminate that man; he likewise remains in doubt as to the characters and motivations of his other ancestors like Flory or Carmen or Aires. Like another Mona Lisa, the smile on Aurora's portrait remains permanently ambiguous and unyielding: "... I interrogated my mother's portrait, silently, for answers to the great questions of my life. I asked her if she had truly been

Miranda's lover, or Raman Fielding's, or anyone's; I asked her for a proof of her love. She smiled, and did not reply" (*The Moor's* 429-30).

Paradoxically, although the Moor realizes that he has no insight into the secrets of any of his family members, he is the one who ends up telling their story; in other words, where the historical narrative fails, fiction succeeds. It is, in fact, from this perspective that the novel fulfils its initial promise of offering not only "[a] last sigh for a lost world," but also "a last hurrah" (*The Moor's* 4); for the failure of history allows the novel to be concluded with a full-blown story, which has the power to be told and retold, and thus to regenerate itself, just like the image of the worm Ouroboros biting its own tail, invoked by the Moor at the end. The Moor dies as if falling asleep, optimistic that all sleepers eventually awake into a new beginning. One should note, last but not least, that the first and the last chapters of the novel begin with identical words: "I have lost count of the days since I ..." (*The Moor's* 3-419), hence suggesting that there is a beginning at the end, as much as there is an end at the beginning. Here Rushdie employs a cyclical structure that has been also used by Joyce in writing both *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*; to recall, the first and the very last sentences of *Ulysses* are identical, while *Finnegans Wake* opens with the second half of a sentence and concludes with its first half, thus reasserting the notion that all beginnings entail an ending, and all ends a beginning.

The conclusion of the novel continues the same idea of cyclical time:

> The world is full of sleepers waiting for their moment of return: Arthur sleeps in Avalon, Barbarossa in his cave. Finn MacCool lies in the Irish hillsides and the worm Ouroboros on the bed of the Sundering Sea. [...] a beauty in a glass coffin awaits a prince's kiss. See: here is my flask. I'll drink some wine; and then, like a latter-day Van Winkle, I'll lay me down upon this graven stone, lay my head beneath these letters RIP, and close my eyes, according to our family's old practice of falling asleep in times of trouble, and hope to awaken, renewed and joyful, into a better time. (*The Moor's* 433-4)

This conclusion is optimistic at an even deeper level, which comes to surface if one focuses on the character of Vasco, who, changing from slender artist into obese old man, and from ardent lover into insane murderer, embodies in himself all the dualities, conflicts and contradictions that remain unresolved in the novel. That is to say, the

Moor's story does not offer a unifiying or totalizing meaning, but rather a vessel, where all such multiplicities coexist without blending into one single colour, tone or truth. In a highly Blakean fashion, the novel presents the good and the evil as two indispensable and complementing counterparts, each making possible and justifying the existence of the other; [to think, despite all his insanity and crimes, it is thanks only to Vasco that the Moor undertakes to write his story, and it is through his being able to write that story that the Moor manages to return to the Eden that he had initially declared to have lost – the reader might recall the Moor's following words in the opening chapter: "Moraes Zogoiby, expelled from his story, tumbled towards history" (*The Moor's* 5)]. In other words, the Moor ultimately reverses this Lucifer-like downfall motion to reclaim his eternal paradise of fiction, through the apparently evil actions of his enemy Vasco. One might even go so far as to suggest that Vasco, having painted several "anti-pietàs" depicting Judas crucified (*The Moor's* 415), becomes another Judas himself: an ostensibly treacherous figure without whose wickedness, nonetheless, Jesus Christ would never have been crucified to save all mankind. If it is possible to detect some redeeming quality in this act of utmost betrayal, it is also possible to think that Vasco redeems himself by forcing the Moor to write his story, and thus to return to the many-faceted, multi-coloured paradise of fiction that Rushdie himself celebrates in his works, and sets as a model for the reality of the Indian nation.

Rushdie's use of magical realism in *The Moor's Last Sigh* might be investigated in the blue Chinese tiles of the Mattancherri synagogue in the Jewtown of Cochin. The tiles, which cover the floors, walls and ceiling of the synagogue, manifest their magic to Abraham during his childhood and adolescence, and to his mother Flory Zogoiby in her bitter years as a woman who has been forsaken by her husband and betrayed by her only son. The Moor's description of the tiles includes their ancient history as well as the legends that are attributed to them:

> No two are identical. The tiles ftom Canton, 12 x 12 approx., imported by Ezekiel Rabhi in the year 1100 CE, covered the floors, walls and ceiling of the little synagogue. Legends had begun to stick them. Some said that if you explored for long enough you'd find your own story in one of the blue-and-white squares, because the pictures on the tiles could change, were changing, generation by generation, to tell the story of the Cochin Jews. Still others were convinced that the tiles were prophecies, the keys to whose meanings had been lost with the passing years.(*The Moor's* 75-6)

When Abraham is only seven years old, his father, Solomon Castile, who is the caretaker of the synagogue, suddenly abandons his family, without any apparent reason, and sets out for an odyssey of his own. The difference between Odysseus and Solomon is that while it takes Odysseus twenty years to return to his wife, Penelope, and his son, Telemachus, Solomon never turns back to Abraham and Flory, although she waits for his return just as patiently as Penelope waiting for Odysseus.

One day, the seven-year-old Abraham surprisingly notices that he can follow the blue adventures of his father by means of the blue "metamorphic" Chinese tiles which function as if they were a magical 12x12 television screen projecting the corporeal existence of an absent father; nevertheless, Abraham keeps the vision of his father to himself: "He never told his mother that his father had reappeared in ceramic form on the synagogue floor a year after he decamped, in a little blue rowing-boat with blue-skinned foreign-looking types by his side, heading off towards an equally blue horizon" (*The Moor's* 76). The blue magical tiles provide Abraham with his father's visual news continually; he follows the sad and happy moments in Solomon's life, the rise and decline of his fortune, the physical changes his father's body undergoes in the course of time, the merriments he enjoys and the impediments he confronts. It is noteworthy that the colour blue is foregrounded in the narration of Solomon's adventures. Chevalier and Gheerbrant's explanation concerning the symbolic significance of the colour blue is as follows:

> Blue is the deepest colour; unimpeded, the gaze plumbs infinity, the colour forever escaping it. Blue is the most insubstantial of colours; it seldom occurs in the natural world except as a translucency, that is to say as an accumulation of emptiness, the void of the Heavens, of the depths of the sea, of crystal or diamond. [...] Apply the colour blue to an object and it will reduce, cut open and destroy its shape. [...] Movement and sound, like shapes, disappear into blue, sink and vanish like a bird in the sky. Insubstantial in itself, blue disembodies whatever becomes caught in it. It is the road to infinity on which the real is changed to imaginary. [...] The realm, or rather climate, of the unreal-or of the surreal-blue stands still and resolves within itself those contradictions and alternations of fortune - day following night-which modulate human life. Indifferent and unafraid, centered solely upon itself, blue is not of this world: it evokes the idea of eternity, calm, lofty, superhuman, inhuman even.(*DS* 102-3)

The blue tiles replace the actual plane with an imaginary one; and, in so doing, they allow the child Abraham, who is deprived of fatherly affection at a very early age, to commune with his physically non-existing father. Thus, the narrative overflows physical boundaries by means of the magical tiles and enables Abraham to be in constant contact with his fugitive father. Abraham's close scrutiny of Solomon's maritime adventures makes him understand that his father's departure was an intentional one, a choice of his own free will so as to release himself from the restraints of both his profession and his wife and to live his life to the full.

At the beginning of adolescence, the magical tiles mislead Abraham to assume that Solomon is about to return. He runs to the harbour to meet and, perhaps, embrace his long awaited adventurous father; on seeing that there is no one waiting for him by the waterfront, Abraham surrenders himself to absolute disappointment; he comes back to the synagogue to find out why the magic tiles have deceived him so cruelly: "When he returned in despondency to the synagogue all the tiles depicting his father's odyssey had changed, and showed scenes both anonymous and banal. Abraham in a feverish rage spent hours crawling across the floor in search of magic. To no avail: for the second time in his life his unwise father Solomon Castile had vanished into the blue" (*The Moor's* 77). It seems that the magic of the tiles has been reclaimed by the colour blue to be carried into another (surreal) plane; and one might speculate that since Abraham has left his childhood behind and entered adolescence, the blue magic will stimulate and enrich another child's imagination.

As for Flory, the blue Chinese tiles in the synagogue have shown her no magic although she has been charged with taking care of them since the departure of her husband: "[...] they [the tiles] had not spoken to her, she had found there neither missing husbands nor future admirers, neither prophesies of the future nor explanations of the past. Guidance, meaning, fortune, friendship, love had all been withheld" (*The Moor's* 84). Yet the magic denied to Flory is bestowed upon her at the instant of her deep sorrow, that is when her only son, Abraham, turns his back not only on his mother but also on his race for the love of Aurora. It is exactly at that moment of anguish that the Chinese tiles reveal a secret to Flory for the first time in her life; they spread a full vision of the world wide before her eyes; it is the vision of the world

which has swallowed both her husband and her son. Within this vision, Flory's eyes helplessly search for a divine consolation that will relieve her pain. In other words, what Flory wishes to find in the blue magic is a sign that will confirm the existence of God:

> On the walls floor ceiling of the little synagogue, and now in Flory Zogoiby's mind's eye, marched the ceramic encyclopedia of the material world that was also a bestiary, a travelogue, a synthesis and a song, and for the first time in all her years of caretaking Flory saw what was missing from the hyperabundant cavalcade. 'Not so much what as who,' she thought, and the tears dried in her eyes. 'In the whole place, no trace.' [...] Eight hundred and thirty-nine years after the tiles came to Cochin, [...] they delivered their message to a woman in pain. 'What you see is what there is,' Flory mumbled under her breath. 'There is no world but the world.' (*The Moor's* 84)

It is the traces of a divine presence that Flory longs to perceive in this total vision of the material world and to her disappointment, she fails to find any: "There is no God. Hocus-pocus! Mumbo-jumbo! There is no spiritual life' (*The Moor's* 84). However, the magical manner in which she has been granted this vision belies the validity of the gloomy conclusion she has drawn; that is to say, the tiles, by their very presence and influence upon Abraham and Flory, suggest a world teeming with supernatural forces beyond reason, which, leave the perennial question about the existence of god open and unanswered. In other words, despite the negative answer given by a character of the narrative, the narrative itself directs the reader to continue to consider the plausibility of a spiritual life and of a divine creator.

Apart from the depiction of the world as it is, the tiles also have the capacity to generate prophecies about the future; they enable Flory, for instance, to predict the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by atomic bombs: "... [S]he could see the future in the blue Chinese tiles, and prophesying that very soon a country not far from China would be eaten up by giant, cannibal mushrooms" (*The Moor's* 118). And true to the tradition of cursed prophetesses, such as Cassandra in the *Iliad*, Flory too fails to convince her audience to believe in her predictions; in fact, both Moshe Cohen and his daughter, Sara, take her for insane when she mentions the gigantic mushrooms. Yet only a few days after Flory's death, there comes the news about the atomic explosion in Hiroshima; that is, her prophecy proves ultimately correct, just like the prophecy of

Ramram Seth in *Midnight's Children*, or Nazarebaddoor's predictions in *Shalimar The Clown* to be studied in the following chapter.

3.3 *Shalimar The Clown*

This chapter of the present study is dedicated to the analysis of Rushdie's parodying discourse and use of magical realistic elements in *Shalimar the Clown*, with frequent references both to *Midnight's Children* and to *The Moor's Last Sigh*. In *Shalimar the Clown*, Rushdie cultivates the themes of love, hatred and revenge in the form of an epic narrative. Rushdie's setting in the novel fits the epic convention in that its scope is vast, extending from California to Kashmir, from France to England and finally back to California again. The variety of the locations of the novel might be interpreted as an indication of Rushdie's desire to overflow geographic boundaries. The time of the novel is also free from chronological restrictions; Rushdie moves backward and forward in time while presenting a story which includes the ancient as well as present history, culture and politics in India and the perennial western manipulations on the subcontinent.

Rushdie's themes of love, hatred and revenge, which involve the four main characters in the novel, does more than mingle east and west, by carrying the issue to a personal and intimate rather than political plane. This plane is cleansed of racial, national, religious and class-based prejudices and boundaries. The first love, hatred and revenge triangle in the novel is set between Bhoomi Kaul, Noman Sher Noman, and Maximilian Ophuls; the fourth figure who is directly influenced by this annihilating relationship is India.

The novel is divided into five parts titled "India", "Boonyi", "Max", "Shalimar the Clown", and "Kashmira"; the title of the first part does not refer to the country of India, but rather to the illegitimate daughter of Maximilian Ophuls and Bhoomi Kaul, who, on account of her dislike for her own name that means "earth", renames herself "Boonyi" after "... the local word for the celestial Kashmiri chinar tree" (*Shalimar* 46), and is thereby called "Boonyi" in the novel. The first part of the novel narrates the assassination of Maximilian Ophuls, who "had been America's best-loved, and then

most scandalous, ambassador to India" (*Shalimar* 5), by Noman Sher Noman, alias Shalimar the Clown, at the entrance of India's apartment in California. Thus the ultimate revenge theme in the novel is fulfilled at the very beginning; Shalimar murders Max who, years ago, had seduced and begotten a child from Shalimar's most beloved young wife, taking her away from him. By murdering Max, Shalimar fulfils the first part of his oath which he made after his first sexual encounter with Boonyi: "Don't you leave me now, or I'll never forgive you, and I'll have my revenge. I'll kill you and if you have any children by another man I'll kill the children also" (*Shalimar* 61); yet, he fails to fulfil the second part of his oath and cannot kill the child-India and, instead, is killed by India at the end of the novel. Actually, the opening section presents the ending of the novel and this constructional pattern is exactly the same as those of *Midnight's Children* and *The Moor's Last Sigh*. The cyclical structure of the three novels suggests the notion that every beginning has an end and every end has a beginning. The beginning of all three novels is marked by an ending note. In *Midnight's Children* the natural, inevitable cycle of life, of birth and death, or what might be called of beginning and ending are emphasised on the very first page of the novel. While the first sentence of the first paragraph announces the birth of Saleem Sinai, the protagonist-narrator in the novel: " I was born in the city of Bombay ..." (*Midnight's* 9), the third paragraph says that his time is up and he is on the verge of death: "Now, however, time (having no further use for me) is running out. I will soon be thirty-one years old. Perhaps. If my crumbling, over-used body permits. But I have no hope of saving my life, nor can I count on having even a thousand nights and a night" (*Midnight's* 9). A similar "premature death", as Rushdie calls it, also awaits the protagonist-narrator of *The Moor's Last Sigh*, and just like Saleem, the Moor foretells his death at the beginning of the novel:

> (...In this dark wood - that is, upon this mount of olives, within this clump of trees, observed by the quizzically tilting stone crosses of a small, overgrown graveyard, and a little down the track from the Ultimo Suspiro gas station-without benefit or need of Virgils, in what ought to be the middle pathway of my life, but has become, for complicated reasons, the end of the road. I bloody well collapse with exhaustion. (*The Moor's* 3-4)

Another common feature of the three novels is the allusion to the figure of Scheherazade; references to the legendary stoyteller occur on the first pages of *Midnight's Children* and *Shalimar the Clown*, while in *The Moor's Last Sigh* she is alluded to in the last chapter. Yet, all the three novels explore the possibility and the thematic as well as stylistic consequences of a neverending process of storytelling.

Coming to subtexts that are particularly parodic, the epic of the *Ramayana*, which has also been extensively referred to in *The Moor's Last Sigh*, comes to the fore. In *The Moor's Last Sigh*, the Moor ends his inquiry into the unexpected and highly suspicious death of Aurora, and sets out to take his revenge on Mainduck when he is infected by Abraham's poisonous disinformation that it was Mainduck who killed Aurora. Abraham also adds that the motive behind the murder was sexual; being a spurned lover, Mainduck had Aurora murdered with "a small hypodermic dart in the neck" (*The Moor's* 362). The extent of Abraham's jealousy of Aurora is so boundless that he does not hesitate, not for a moment, to turn his own son into a killing machine even though there is no evidence that Aurora had betrayed him; nor does he hesitate to taint the memory of his deceased and, paradoxically, most beloved wife by accusing Aurora of having sexual affairs not only with Mainduck but also with several other men:

> 'But why?' I [Moor] cried. Abraham's eyes glittered. 'I told you about your Mummyji, boy. Have a taste and then discard unfinished, was her policy in men as well as food. But with Mainduck she bit the wrong fruit. Motive was sexual. Sexual. Sexual... revenge.' I had never heard him sound so cruel. Obviously, the pain of Aurora's infidelity still twisted in his gut. The barbarising pain of having to talk about it to their son. (*The Moor's* 362)

This is the twofold, merciless way in which the diabolic Abraham chooses to eliminate Mainduck, his political rival: the Moor, misled about the true murderer of his mother kills Mainduck to avenge her. In doing so he also unwittingly helps the real murderer, Abraham, in concealing his crime. Thus the Moor becomes the parodic counterpart of the two epic heroes from two different epics: the *Ramayana* and the *Iliad*. The Moor assumes the role of both Lord Ram, who slays the demon king, Ravan, for abducting his wife, the fair Sita, and Achilles, who slaughters Hector for killing his comrade, Patroclus. What is also noteworthy is that Rushdie directly quotes from the respective

revenge scenes of both epics, one after the other, to heighten the parodic effect on the reader:

> *Still the dubious battle lasted, until Rama in his ire*
> *Wielded Brahma's deathful weapon flaming with*
> *celestial fire! Weapon which the Saint Agastya had unto*
> *the hero given, Winged as lightning dart of Indra, fatal*
> *as the bolt of heaven, Wrapped in smoke and flaming*
> *flashes, speeding from the circled bow, Pierced the iron*
> *heart of Ravan, laid the lifeless hero low... Voice of*
> *blessing from the bright sky fell on Raghu's valiant son,*
> *Champion of the true and righteous! Now thy noble task is done!*
>
> [And] How Achilles slew Hector, Patroclus' killer:
>
> *Then answered Hector of the flashing helm,*
> *His strength all gone: 'I beg thee by thy life,*
> *Thy knees, thy parents, leave me not for dogs*
> *Of the Achaeans by the ships to eat...'*
> *But scowling at him swift Achilles said:*
> *'Do not entreat me, dog, by knees or parents,*
> *I only wish I had the heart and will*
> *To hack the flesh off thee and eat it raw,*
> *For all that thou hast done to me! there lives*
> *None who shall keep the dogs away from thee...*
> *...but dogs and birds shall eat thee utterly'.* (*The Moor's* 368)

While Lord Ram kills Ravan with a divine arrow, and Achilles with the supernatural weapons brought to him by his mother, the Moor smashes Mainduck's face with a green frog-shaped telephone. A frog-shaped telephone becoming the medium for killing a man whose epithet is "frog" also adds to the mock-epic elements in the revenge scene. The Moor's comment comparing the fulfilment of his noble task to those of Lord Ram and Achilles lays bare the parody in the scene:

> You see the difference. Where Ram had the use of a heavenly doomsday-machine, I had to make do with a telecommunicative frog. And, afterwards, [unlike Lord Ram] received no heavenly words of congratulation for my deed. As for Achilles: I had neither his innard-munching savagery (so reminiscent, [...] of Hind of Mecca, who gobbled the dead hero Hamza's heart) nor his poetic turn of phrase. The Achaeans' dogs, however, did have their local counterparts (*The Moor's* 368).

Parody is continued further with the Moor's comparison of the deeds done by Lord Ram, Achilles and himself after all three of them fulfil their revenge:

> After Ram killed Ravan he chivalrously arranged a lavish funeral for his fallen foe. Achilles, much the less gallant of these high heroes, tied Hector's corpse to his 'chariot-tail' and dragged him thrice round dead Patroclus's grave. As for me: not living in heroic times, I neither honoured nor descrated my victim's body; my thoughts were for myself, my chances of survival and escape. (*The Moor's* 368-9)

In *Shalimar the Clown* the first parodic reference to the *Ramayana* occurs before the first love-making scene between the fourteen-year-old Boonyi and Shalimar. Nevertheless, prior to further discussion of the relationship between the epics and the lovers, what might be done is to dwell on the setting of the second part of the novel, that is the Kashmiri village of Pachigam, meaning "birdville", which cradles the initially epic-scale love between the Hindu Boonyi and the Muslim Shalimar. Pachigam, which is located in Rushdie's Edenic valley of Kashmir, seems to inhabit a timeless zone at the beginning. The whole region and the village in particular are depicted as locations where Hindus, Muslims and a small Jewish family live in peace, harmony and bliss. As the third-person narrator of the novel states, the valley of Kashmir in those times, to give a specific time, before the partition of India and Pakistan in 1947 which dragged the Hindu and Muslim population of Kashmir into bloody religious conflict, is the place where one might transcend all religious and ethnic boundaries: "The words *Hindu* and *Muslim* had no place in their [Boonyi and Shalimar] story, [...]. In the valley these words were mere descriptions, not divisions. The frontiers between the words, their hard edges, had grown smudged and blurred. This was how things had to be. This was Kashmir" (*Shalimar* 57). Kashmiris are also drawn as highly tolerant, democratic, cooperative, sensitive and loving people. It is within this setting that the love between Boonyi and Shalimar starts.

Boonyi is the only child of the pandit Pyarelal Kaul, who is a philosopher-teacher and a gifted cook, and his wife, Pamposh, who dies in childbirth. Boonyi contacts the mother she has never seen by means of her dreams. Pamposh and Firdaus Noman, Shalimar's mother, are best friends, and the two women give birth to Boonyi and Shalimar at the same instant on the same night; yet, while Pamposh dies, Firdaus survives and together with the whole village, she decides to take care of the orphaned Boonyi and to support the pandit Pyarelal who is ruined by the unexpected death of his beloved young wife. What, probably, lies behind this extraordinary loving bond and

collaboration among the residents of Pachigam village is their profession. The villagers are traveling actors managed by Abdullah Sher Noman, Shalimar's father and the "sarpanch", that is the headman of the village; they work as the professional members of a well-organised entertainment and catering company to be hired by the present Raj and other high dignitaries of Kashmir for several occasions like festivities and wedding ceremonies. The troupe includes cooks, who are specialised in the preparation of the "Thirty-Six-Courses-Minimum banquet" with their full culinary equipment, actors performing ancient dramas on stage, storytellers, musicians, singers, dancers - Boonyi being the best - acrobats and tightrope walkers - Shalimar being the most talented. There is absolute harmony among the members of the troupe; all of them happily obey the authority of Abdullah. This is the way they earn their living with great satisfaction. In addition, the two locally great families of Pachigam, the Nomans and Kauls enjoy a particular abundance of possessions:

> Pachigam was a blessed village, and its two great families, the Nomans and Kauls, had inherited much of the natural bounty of the region. Pandit Pyarelal had the apple orchard and Abdullah Noman had the peach trees. Abdullah had the honeybees and the mountain ponies and the pandit owned the saffron field, as well as the larger flocks of sheep and goats. That summer the weather was kind and the fruit hung heavy on the trees, the honey dripped sweetly from the combs, the saffron crop was rich, the meat animals fattened nicely and the breeding mares gave birth to their valuable young. (*Shalimar* 68-9)

It is in such an Edenic and bountiful environment that Boonyi and Shalimar make love for the first time at the tender age of fourteen.

While getting prepared for the meeting with her lover at the meadow of Khelmarg, Boonyi contemplates the epic characters of the *Ramayana*; she puts herself into Sita's place to understand the motive behind her free choice of stepping beyond the magic line which is drawn by Lakshman to protect Sita against all possible dangers while he and Lord Ram are hunting for demons in distant places. During their absence, Ravan, the demon king, suddenly appears before Sita disguised as a beggar. In words that are far too eloquent for a simple beggar, he starts to praise the beauty of Sita's figure. One of the significant points Boonyi questions is whether Sita is enticed by the content of the lascivious flattering speech given by Ravan or not. One possibility is

that, since Ravan is a demon, he could have cast a spell to break the power of the magic line and thus the willpower of the revered Sita. But what if, Boonyi wonders, it is the willing choice of a woman who wishes to surpass the restrictive lines drawn by men even though she knows quite well that the result will be fatal. Whether out of folly or because of possessing a free spirit, Sita's permission for Ravan to cross the magic line, Boonyi reflects, gives way to a number of disasters: among them her instant abduction by Ravan whose true lustful nature is revealed as soon as he passes the magic line, Ravan's cutting off of the wings of the great eagle Jatayu who is trying to rescue Sita from the flying chariot of the demon king, the countrywide search for the abducted princess, the consequent war against Ravan, bloodshed and countless dead. So, is it possible to relate all these disastrous incidents to the folly, or weakness, or looseness of the nature of one single woman? Boonyi asks herself, and immediately eliminates the options of folly and moral weakness, for "the dignity, the moral strength, the intelligence of Sita was beyond doubt and could not so trivially be set aside" (*Shalimar* 50). Boonyi analyses the problem from a different perspective and manages to interpret the epic conflict in the light of a fresh new vision:

> However much Sita's family members sought to protect her, Boonyi thought, the demon king still existed, was hopelessly besotted by her, and would have to be faced sooner or later. A woman's demons were out there, like her lovers, and she could only be coddled for so long. It was better to be done with magic lines and to confront your destiny. Lines in the dirt were all very well but they only delayed matters. What had to happen should be allowed to happen or it could never be overcome. (*Shalimar* 50)

The conclusion that Boonyi draws is that one must face his\her fate no matter how dangerous or even deadly the results will be. Drawing lines or constructing walls in the name of protecting a human being, especially a woman, from either a definite or a possible threat will not destroy but only delay the problem. In that case, what ought to be done is not to incarcerate the individual behind so-called protective lines but to leave him\her alone to make his\her free choice and thus either to compromise with or to fight against his\her own destiny. In brief, on the threshold of womanhood Boonyi vaguely realizes the importance of self-determination. The other significant question Boonyi searches for an answer to is whether Shalimar will be an epic hero to her like Lord Ram, or a demon king like Ravan, or both. As the novel unfolds, it is seen that

Shalimar will be both. Before meeting her lover, Boonyi thinks about the nature of Shalimar; she uses such adjectives as “handsome”, “funny”, “pure”, “graceful”, “gentle”, and “sweet” to describe her beloved. Also “Shalimar” is the name which Noman takes as a way of both honoring Boonyi’s deceased mother-Pamposh died in the Shalimar garden while giving birth to Boonyi-and to celebrate the identical moment of their birth which ties himself with Boonyi permanently.

There also occurs a carnivalesque lowering of the elevated love scene with the interference of Gopinath Razdan who videotapes and captures pictures of the young lovers during their intercourse. Gopinath is a distant cousin of Pyarelal Kaul who has recently come to Pachigam from Srinagar. He starts to work as the village teacher, for the pandit Pyarelal decides to retire from his teaching profession and to dedicate himself to his much preferred field of cooking. Gopinath, who is immediately disliked by all the villagers, is, in fact, a secret agent of Colonel Kachhwaha, the commanding officer of the Indian army camp which is located in the region on the pretext of defending the Kashmiri land against the “kabaili marauders” and Pakistani attacks and to preserve Kashmir’s position as an “integral part of India”. Since the partition of 1947, Kashmir has been a source of dissension between India and Pakistan because both countries claim Kashmir to be an integral part of their land. The Colonel is continually complaining about the ingratitude of Kashmiris who disregard the hardships faced by the Indian soldiers at the border. What further displeases the Colonel is the spread of liberation movements among the Kashmiri nationalists.Therefore, as a precaution, the Colonel sends Gopinath to Pachigam to spy on the villagers, “to sniff out certain subversive elements in this village of artists-for artists were natural subversives, after all. His orders were to report his findings covertly and in the first instance to Colonel H. S. Kachhwaha ...” (*Shalimar* 104). The problem is that both Gopinath and the Colonel are almost intoxicated by Boonyi’s beauty, and both are disgraced by her sharp tongue in return. It is for Gopinath’s deep attraction to Boonyi that he prefers spying on her liaison with Shalimar to reporting on the deeds of “subversives” in the village. The sneaky Gopinath lays before the panchayat (the assembly of the notables that take the village’s key decisions) his evidence, that is an “Eight-millimeter movie film” and a number of photographs

revealing the scandalous relationship between the young lovers. While the panchayat, the members of which include the fathers of the lovers, considers the evidence and the decision to be taken to sort out this highly immoral problem, Gopinath goes straight to Boonyi to blackmail her. He is sure of his victory that the sinful, disgraced Boonyi will be his own forever, because he imagines that she will be left with no other option than marrying him. Gopinath's blackmailing speech is the expression of the traditional, patriarchal restrictive lines drawn to keep women under strict control, leaving them no space to exert their free will:

> 'The panchayat is meeting at this moment in emergency session, to consider the evidence I have laid before it,'said Gopinath. 'The sarpanch [Abdullah], your father and the others will soon decide your fate.You are disgraced, [...] your face is blackened and your good name is dirt, and that is your own doing; but I have informed them that I am prepared to restore your honor by taking you as my wife. What choice does your father have? What other man would be so generous toward a fallen woman? Repent now and thank me later. (*Shalimar* 107-8)

So the verdict given by the panchayat of "this village of artists" that "the lovers [are] their children and must be supported", shocks Gopinath as well as Boonyi who is expecting to be "packed off to that bastard [Gopinath] sitting like a cold fish by the river, waiting to have me handed over on a plate-me, Boonyi Kaul, whom he could never otherwise have won" (*Shalimar* 110). Abdullah's explanatory speech on the nature of Kashmiriness, which rejects religious and ethnic discrimination, and defends brotherhood, concludes with the declaration that the young couple will be united in marriage. However, although this news is supposed to make Boonyi ecstatically happy, it does not escape her notice that Shalimar bears on his face a ferocious and murderous expression full of thoughts of revenge towards Gopinath; it is the first time that Boonyi has seen such a demonic look upon Shalimar's face and one might suppose that her recent fears about whether her lover will be like Lord Ram, or like Ravan, or like both are justified. In fact on the eve of her wedding day she fully realizes that she has been rescued from Gopinath's trap only to be captured in another in the form of a protected marital existence:

> Boonyi remained wide awake, staring furiously at the nocturnal ceiling, willing the walls of the house to dissolve so that she could rise up into the night sky and escape. For at the very moment in which the village had decided to protect her and Shalimar the clown, to stand by them by forcing them to marry, thus condemning them to a lifetime jail sentence, Boonyi had been overwhelmed by claustrophobia and had seen clearly what she had been too deeply in love with Shalimar the clown to understand before, namely that this life, married life, village life, [...] life with all the people amongst whom she had spent every one of her days, was not remotely enough for her, didn't begin to satisfy her hunger, her ravenous longing for something she could not yet name, and that as she grew older her life's insufficiency would only grow harder and more painful to bear. (*Shalimar* 114)

And with such thoughts she swears to run away from her life in Pachigam at the earliest opportunity:

> She knew then that she would do anything to get out of Pachigam, that she would spend every moment of every day waiting for her chance, and when it came she would not fail to pounce upon it, she would move faster than fortune, [...] because if you spotted a magic force - a fairy, a djinni, a piece of once-in-a-lifetime luck - and if you pinned it to the ground, it would grant you your heart's desire; and she would make her wish, *get me away from here, away from my father, away from this slow death and slower life, away from Shalimar the clown.* (*Shalimar* 114-5)

The second love, hatred and revenge triangle is set between Boonyi Kaul, Max Ophuls and-Max's wife, Margaret Rhodes Ophuls, in the third part of the novel entitled "Max". Within this triangle one might follow the subversive and parodic use of two stories: the first of the two stories is from eastern lore and is titled *Anarkali*; the second one is a European fairy-tale, *Rumpelstiltskin*, which is also mentioned in *The Moor*.

Boonyi seizes the long awaited opportunity of her life when Max Ophuls, America's newly appointed ambassador to India falls in love with her. At the instant Boonyi performs her seductive Anarkali dance in the presence of the ambassador on his first visit to the Kashmiri borderline, Max realizes that "his Indian destiny would have little to do with politics, diplomacy or arms sales, and everything to do with the far more ancient imperatives of desire" (*Shalimar* 181). Since both parties involved in this love theme are married, it turns out to be not only an adulterous but also a lethal love. What is also noteworthy is that this love is not a mutual one, for Boonyi sees Max, "the man of power" in the novel, as a medium whose endless capabilities will

enable her to flee her captive life in Pachigam and to step into a free world where she may have the chance to make her dream of becoming a great dancer come true.

As a character, Max Ophuls, who becomes Boonyi's "American Ravan in the course of their scandalous liaison, is the embodiment of all the features that make up the western perception of the ideal man in the postwar period. He is introduced as "a French man with a German name". He was born in Strasbourg into a wealthy, cultured, conservative and cosmopolitan Jewish family. Max owes his excellent command of French and German languages and cultures to his father who has raised his son with the notion that civilisation does not have borderlines. Yet the painful experience of World War II teaches Max that barbarism, which is the exact opposite of civilisation, does not have borderlines either. The list of Max's outstanding qualities and qualifications is as follows: he is a war hero, a member of the Resistance who fought against the Nazi invasion of Europe; he was the "master forger" who rescued many Jewish families from Nazi persecution and execution by printing false identity cards and documents of all sorts. He is also considered to be a genius in the field of economics where, for some time, he has been working as a teaching professor. Added to these, his mastery of international relations places Max among the elite few who shape world politics in the postwar period. What is more, his memoirs of World War II make Max a best-selling author; his other works on economics and politics are regarded as the products of a revolutionary mind. All these features make Max an irresistable man in the eyes of women with whom he never hesitates, not even for a moment, to have random affairs. In brief, this charming man has become a womanizer in the course of his brilliant career. Although he has initially sworn never to betray his, once beloved wife, Margaret, he eventually comes to break his vow at every opportunity he finds. A newspaper editorialist's depiction of Max as possessing "dangerous, possibly even lethal quantities of charm" (*Shalimar* 138), is very much reminiscent of another charming and equally dangerous Jewish character, namely Abraham in *The Moor's Last Sigh*. The most striking common point between Max and Abraham is that both characters destroy the women they love: their love might be defined not as all conquering but as all destroying.

The third corner of this triangle of passion is occupied by Margaret Rhodes Ophuls. Margaret and Max fell in love with each other in wartime. In the war years, Margaret was a secret agent serving the British army. The nickname "Grey Rat" was given to her by the Germans due to her elusiveness.She is said "to have killed a man with her bare hands" (*Shalimar* 168). She is an English war heroine who marched down the Champs-Elysees with de Gaulle and representatives of the Free French movement and members of Resistance on August 26, the day after the liberation of Paris (*Shalimar* 174). Like Max, she is brave, brilliant, intelligent and charming; unlike Max, however, she is faithful and tolerant.

On the way to India Margaret reflects on her twenty –one years of marriage, on how "the fiction of undying romance was kept up, impeccably by her, extremely peccably by him" (*Shalimar* 176). The couple's present alienated lives together and Margaret's retrospective thoughts about their joyous earlier days might be interpreted as a requiem to fictional romance:

> Max's memoir had made their wartime love story public property, had it not, and the book had remained on the bestseller lists for two and a half years, so how could they not continue to be the thing that had given them their shot at immortality? For they were, and had been for two decades, "Rattey and Moley," the golden couple whose New York kiss at the mighty battle's end had become for a generation an image, *the* iconic image of love conquering all, of the slaying of monsters and blessings of fate, of the triumph of virtue over evil and the victory of the best in human nature over the worst. (*Shalimar* 176)

Margaret's love for Max never diminishes despite his numberless infidelities. She prefers to disregard all his illicit love affairs. At the same time she does not neglect to collect every single detail about Max's lovers through her secret information net, though everything she learns increases her torments. Boonyi's appearance on stage puts an end to Margaret's tolerance because she realizes that this time Max is seriously infatuated. He surrenders to desire and becomes obssessed with possessing Boonyi when she performs her Anarkali dance before the ambassador and significant figures of the Indian government; in her turn, Boonyi fully understands, from the lustful expression on the ambassador's face, the extent of his desire for her and that he will be the key person to lay open to her the liberated future which she longs for:

> Just as Anarkali dancing her sorceress's dance in the Sheesh Mahal, the hall of mirrors at the Mughal court, had captured Prince Salim's heart, just as Madhubala dancing in the hit movie had bewitched millions of gaping men, so Boonyi in the hunting lodge at Dachigam understood that her dance was changing her life, that what was being born in the eyes of the moonstruck American ambassador was nothing less than her own future. By the time he got to his feet and applauded loudly and long, she knew that he would find a way to bring her to him, and all that was left for her to do was to make a single choice, a single act of will, yes or no. Then her eyes met his and blazed their answer and the point of no return was passed.(*Shalimar* 181)

In the novel, it is sometimes Max and sometimes Shalimar who interchangeably acts as the parodic counterpart of Prince Salim; nevertheless, it is always Boonyi who is given the Anarkali role. According to the story, Anarkali was a dancer, a courtesan who dared to love Prince Salim, the son of the Mughal emperor Akbar. Salim, a Muslim prince, fell in love with the Hindu dancer at first sight. Here, obviously, it is not Shalimar but Max who falls in love with Boonyi at first sight. As in the love between the Muslim Shalimar and the Hindu Boonyi, religious difference is not a barrier peventing Prince Salim and Anarkali from cherishing the desire to be united in marriage; it is class difference that separates the Prince and Anarkali. In the case of Boonyi and Shalimar, however, class distinction is not a problem because both are the members of the same class. Swaran Singh, the Indian foreign minister, with whom Max is watching the *Anarkali* performance, explains to him that Indian people tolerated and continue to tolerate different religious beliefs; however, what they were and are still highly attentive to is class difference. As the Minister states, Indian social order is defined by strict lines between classes. In the Minister's opinion, it is not possible to think about the merging of classes. Singh also likens the Indian class-based social structure, which by no means permits access to a higher class, to that of the English and asks for Max's approval: "'You see, Akbar was remarkably tolerant of Hinduism,' he said. 'Indeed his own wife Jodhabai, Salim's mother, remained a practicing Hindu throughout their marriage. Interesting that class difference was where he drew the line. Suggests that as a people social order matters more to us than religious belief. Just like the English, eh?" (*Shalimar* 183). In the traditional story, Anarkali's punishment for falling in love with a royal figure is "to be bricked up in a wall" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anarkali). In a recent film version, which Boonyi has also seen, the filmmakers allowed the Emperor Akbar to show Anarkali some

mercy; Akbar sends Anarkali into a lifelong exile with her mother instead of having her immured. Having Anarkali's film version punishment in her mind, Boonyi contemplates the condition of the tragic heroine; she identifies herself with Anarkali whose role she plays on stage: "A lifetime's exile wasn't much better than death, [...]. It was the same as being bricked up, only in a larger grave. But times had changed. Maybe in the second half of the twentieth century it was permissible for a dancing girl to bag herself a prince" (*Shalimar* 181-2). Boonyi appears to be too immersed in her role; it is Max's deep admiration for and interest in her beauty that make Boonyi perceive herself as Anarkali and the ambassador as Prince Salim. She immediately discards and replaces Shalimar with Max, to be her new and, unlike Shalimar the clown, omnipotent Prince Salim. The conversation between Max and the Indian foreign minister is marked by a parodic and allegorical representation of Boonyi's body. The two outstanding diplomats' chat also parodies the formal discourse of international relations. Obviously, Singh immediately notices Max's interest in Boonyi. Swaran Singh, who is famous not only for his strict moral conduct but also for his effective shock tactics, suddenly asks Max in order to catch him unawares:

> 'Did you by any chance notice that young woman's breasts?' He let out a loud guffaw, which Max, for the sake of Indo-American relations, felt the need to emulate. 'National treasures,' he replied seriously, using much self-control to conceal his deeper feelings, but fearing that Swaran had noted the powerful involuntary reaction he had gone fishing for. 'Integral parts of India,' he added, for good measure. This set Swaran Singh off again. 'Ambassador,' the foreign minister chuckled, 'I can see that with you as our guide, the new India will become more pro-West than ever before'. (*Shalimar* 183)

After a brief visit to Pachigam and inviting the Pachigam troupe to the U.S ambassadorial residence in Delhi, with the aid of Edgar Wood, the ambassador negotiates with Boonyi to make her a modern day concubine. The language used to narrate the love negotiation and the following agreement, which the parties involved preferred to call an 'Understanding', parodies, yet again, the jargon of international treaties. The details of the unwritten contract between Boonyi and Max are supposed to meet and guarantee all the needs and expectations of both sides in the long term:

> The negotiation was also pleasing in itself. The details of the 'Understanding,' as they both elected to call it-though Max privately preferred the term BKN\MO\JSA(C), which more fully summarized the joint statement of accord (classified) between Boonyi Kaul Noman and himself-were quickly agreed. Just as mutual self-interest was the only real guarantee of a durable accord between nations, so Boonyi's perception that this liaison was her best chance of furthering her own purposes constituted a reliable guarantee of her future seriousness and discretion. (*Shalimar* 192).

What is parodied in the above quotation is Max's acronymial definition of the love agreement between himself and Boonyi. As the narrator states, the common subcontinent habit of naming every sort of political figure, institution, organization, and treaty with acronyms has rapidly been adopted by the West as well. It is noteworthy that two full pages preceding the love agreement are devoted to Max's efforts to persuade the Indian and Pakistan governments to take part in joint projects so as to sort out the highly problematic issues between the two countries. All the titles of these international projects, in which Max is involved as the mediator are conveyed through acronyms; hence Max defining his love treaty through an acronymial term similar to the ones he uses in his political manoeuvres is parodic.

According to the agreement, Boonyi puts her body at Max's disposal on the condition that she will be provided with a secure and high standard of living, and educated by a great dance master: " 'In that case I will do anything you want, whenever you want it. [...] My body will be yours to command and it will be my joy to obey" (*Shalimar* 192). In this scene Boonyi (whose actual name, we recall, is Bhoomi, meaning "earth") appears to be the allegorical representation of the Kashmiri lands, and it is worth keeping in mind that the domination of the Kashmiri state, especially in the second half of the twentieth century, has been a matter of clashes, even war between India and Pakistan; as is seen in the novel, the problem concerning Kashmir and Kashmiris has become more complex with the direct or indirect interferences of countries other than India and Pakistan. Being the allegorical representation of Kashmir, Boonyi offers her naked and defenceless body, i.e. her private territory, to the mercy of the alien commander who is ready to raid and invade her lands. The tone of Max's speech while stating his requirements echoes that of a victorious conquerer expecting absolute obedience from his submissive subject. Max commands "not only discretion and seriousness but also complete docility, absolute compliance, maximum

attentiveness, exceptional eagerness to please [himself]" (*Shalimar* 192). Thus begins the days of what Boonyi calls her "liberated captivity". She has longed to break free of the patriarchal lines that surrounded her restricted life in Pachigam; first she was trapped by the evil spy Gopinath, then rescued and trapped by the scheme of a group of, this time well-meaning men, namely her own father, Shalimar's father, Abdullah, and the rest of the members of the panchayat; the last of the lines she has recently overcome to become a liberated great dancer are those of married life defined by Shalimar the clown. Yet now the inflaming desire of another man traps her in a two-room Delhi apartment; Boonyi immediately realizes that this last one is the worst of her entrapments because she has turned her back on and walked away from her potential saviours. Boonyi's treason breaks all ties with those whom she once loved. In her Delhi days, it is Pandit Mudgal's bitter words that accelerate the process of Boonyi's self-disgust and ultimately self-destruction. Pandit Mudgal is Boonyi's old and famous dance master who is hired by Edgar Woods, Max's secret right-hand man, to improve her dancing techniques and make a star out of her. The dance master's contemptuous thoughts about Boonyi, which he expresses overtly, create the effect of a hard slap on her face. Pandit Mudgal detests himself both for receiving money in return for his service and, in doing so, in being part of this illicit love affair. He believes he is tainting the memory of his brilliant career, his fame as the "great Odissi master", by the humiliating task of teaching this fallen woman: "And now in his mottled old age came this raw, lazy village girl, this kept woman, this nothing. She was a rich American's toy, and he despised her for that; somewhat he despised himself for taking the Yankee dollars and becoming party to the arrangement, and this, too, he held against her" (*Shalimar* 199). Pandit Mudgal's assessment of Boonyi's dance and personality is quite remorseless. He frankly declares what he thinks about Boonyi's dancing skills and her present status in his eyes: "Yes, madam, sex appeal you have, that we can all see. You move and men watch you. That is only one thing. Great mastery requires a great soul and your soul, madam, is damned" (*Shalimar* 199).

Obviously, the feeling of regret fills Boonyi's heart as soon as she realizes that "what she [thinks] of as her former imprisonment [has been] freedom, while this so-called liberation [is] no more than a gilded cage" (*Shalimar* 195), and that the

fulfilment of her dreams will be utterly meaningless without the love and intimacy of her beloved father and fellow villagers. In fact, the motive lying behind Boonyi's treason is her attraction to power; in her eyes, Max represents power, and Shalimar powerlessness. Therefore, she keeps her heart to herself and victimizes her body on the Max-made altar of power. It is her deliberate choice of power that makes Boonyi open her private lands to the occupation of the omnipotent alien commander. As for Shalimar, he starts sending Boonyi love letters begging her to return, and reminding her of the unbreakable metaphysical contact between them. These letters, which Boonyi tears into bits, further deepen her anger at Shalimar's impotence because to Boonyi, his "trust letters" are no more than the expression of a weak, helpless, and forsaken loser: "*I reach out to you and touch you without touching you as on the riverbank in the old days. I know you are following your dream but that dream will always bring you back to me. If the Amrikan is of assistance well and good. People always talk lies but I know your heart is true. I sit with folded hands and await your loving return*" (*Shalimar* 195). Unfortunately, Boonyi fails to decipher the hidden threat lying behind these words, which is that Shalimar's love which has now turned into a lethal hatred cannot be avoided by physical barriers of any sort, and that his revenge will follow not only Boonyi but also Max; Shalimar's mentioning of the old days by the riverbank should not be regarded as the lamenting words of a loser; they are, in fact, intended to make Boonyi understand that he is keeping his oath that he will kill her, her potential lover and any children she may have by this potential lover. Boonyi despises the begging tone of Shalimar's letters, for she sees in them the futile efforts of a man in disgrace. Thus, in a mood of desperate anger, Boonyi contemplates Shalimar's personality and her former married life. Boonyi's questioning of her husband's passivity foregrounds Rushdie's use of carnivalesque parody once more; Boonyi, the traitress dancer, reassumes her role of the abducted Sita; and she imagines her cuckolded husband as the mighty Lord Ram. Boonyi's present condition as the ambassador's "kept woman" is so pathetic that she expects to be rescued from the claws of the "American Ravan" by her impotent clown husband. Boonyi's sarcastic assessment of Shalimar's (in)capabilities against power, which is identified with Max, is full of contempt:

> What kind of husband was he anyway, this clown? Was he storming the capital in his wrath like a Muslim conqueror of old, a Tughlaq or Khilji at least if not a Mughal, or, like Lord Ram, was he at least sending the monkey-god Hanuman to find her before he launched his lethal attack on her abductor, the American Ravan? No, he was mooning over her picture and weeping into the waters of the stupid Muskadoon like an impotent goof, accepting his fate like a true Kashmiri coward, content to be trampled over by anyone who felt like doing a bit of trampling, a wrong-headed duffer [...] . He was behaving like the performing dog he was, a creature who imitated life to make people laugh but who had not the slightest understanding of how a man should live. (*Shalimar* 196)

Surprisingly, this questioning leads Boonyi to the conclusion that Shalimar was, is, and will always be her only true love and that she cannot stop thinking of him, not even for a moment. Since the Kashmir issue is the only serious topic which Boonyi can fervently discuss with her American lover, even during love making, she encodes Shalimar as Kashmir. This trick allows Boonyi not only to refer to the beauty and richness of the Kashmiri nature which, in fact, is a reference to her longing for Shalimar, but also to criticise the Kashmiri refusal to fight against the Indian occupiers which is an allusion to her anger at Shalimar's meek submissiveness before the powerful man who has stolen his wife:

> More and more often she spoke of her love for this encoded "Kashmir," arousing no suspicion, even when her pronouns occasionally slipped, so that she referred to his mountains, his valleys, his gardens, his flowing streams, his flowers, his stags, his fish. Her American lover was obviously too stupid to crack the code, [...] However he, the ambassador, took careful note of her passion, and was plainly moved when she was at her angriest, when she castigated "Kashmir" for his cowardice, for his passivity in the face of the horrible crimes committed against him. (*Shalimar* 197)

Thus the first layer of allegory presents Shalimar as Kashmir; on the second allegorical layer, however, Boonyi herself becomes the representation of Kashmir while Max stands for the Indian army occupying the lands of Kashmir unjustly:

> At that moment she decided that the term "Indian armed forces" would secretly refer to the ambassador himself, she would use the Indian presence in the valley as a surrogate for the American occupation of her body, so, 'Yes, that's it' she cried, 'the Indian armed forces,' raping and pillaging. How can you not know it? How can you not comprehend the humiliation of it, the shame of having your boots march all over my private fields?' (*Shalimar* 197).

Consequently, the unbearable state of being the secret concubine of the American ambassador drags Boonyi to self-destruction. She chooses to destroy herself or, more accurately her body through eating excessively: “Chocolates and sweets, which would be her downfall, entered her life in quantity for the first time” (*Shalimar* 193). In addition, she takes shelter in drug addiction so as to free her mind and soul from her incarcerated body. While the sneaky Edgar Wood generously provides Boonyi with food of all kinds for he is fully aware of the fact that Boonyi chooses to destroy herself through eating, the dancing teacher’s household boy brings Boonyi various kinds of narcotics which change her painful perception of the world, of life, and of reality. Nevertheless, drug addiction is of secondary importance when compared to the giant portions of food she consumes daily. In other words, excessive eating becomes her most preferred tool for self-punishment. She believes she will break down the walls of her Delhi prison with the expanding limbs of her body; she cherishes the conviction that the more she eats the faster she will attain her freedom. In doing so, Boonyi not only punishes herself by destroying her beautiful body which she sees as the source of her catastrophe, but also takes revenge on Max by turning her body, that is the object of desire in Max’s eyes, into a gigantic, grotesque figure:

> But her narcotic of choice turned out to be food. At a certain point early in the second year of her liberated captivity, she began, with great seriousness and a capacity for excess learned from the devil-city itself, to eat. If her world would not expand, her body could. She took to gluttony with the same bottomless enthusiasm she had once had for sex, diverting the immense force of her erotic requirements from her bed to her table. She ate seven times a day, [...].Yes, she was a whore, she admitted to herself with a twist of the heart, but she would at least be an extremely well-fed one. (*Shalimar* 201-2)

Once more Boonyi transgresses the lines that hold her captive, this time by means of gluttony; thus gluttony replaces lust in her life. Parallel to the growth of Boonyi’s apetite, her expanding limbs forcefully push Max, the invader commander, out of her frontiers: “Her appetite had grown to subcontinental size. It crossed all frontiers of language and custom. She was vegetarian and nonvegetarian, fish-and meat-eating, Hindu, Christian and Muslim, a democratic, secularist omnivore” (*Shalimar* 202). As is seen, even her all inclusive appetite is an allusion to the peaceful, tolerant,

cosmopolitan Kashmiri nature which is now tainted by the occupation of the Indian army under the pretext of defending the valley against the attacks of various terrorist groups, especially those of the Pakistan supported Islami-jihadists. And Boonyi's once beautiful but now ruined body becomes another layer of allegory presenting the recent state of the Kashmir Valley suffering under the boots of both legal and illegal powers. Here it might be possible to equate the legal powers, that is the Indian army, with Shalimar the clown, for he is Boonyi's legal husband, and Max with the militant groups because he is Boonyi's illicit lover. Both India and Pakistan claim Kashmir to be their own; according to Indian official policy, Kashmir is an integral part of India; Pakistan, however, asserts that what binds Kashmir to the Land of the Pure (Pakistan) is the Islamic religion; nevertheless, Kashmir's desire to preserve its own secular and independent status is epitomized in the slogan of the liberation front that is "Kashmir for the Kashmiris" (*Shalimar* 291). According to the narrator, the sole concern of the Kashmiri nationalists is freedom; they are struggling for self-determination, and naturally, they refuse to be an integral part of either India or Pakistan. The narrator's depiction of Kashmir and the nationalist spirit that prevailed throughout the valley in the early days of the liberation front is as follows:

> In those days before the crazies got into the act of the liberation front was reasonably popular and *azadi* was the universal cry. Freedom! A tiny valley of no more than five million souls, landlocked, preindustrial, resource rich but cash poor, perched thousands of feet up in the mountains like a tasty green sweetmeat caught in a giant's teeth, wanted to be free. Its inhabitants had come to the conclusion that they didn't much like India and didn't care for the sound of Pakistan. So: freedom! (*Shalimar* 253)

Yet, Rushdie's parodying discourse, which is voiced by Colonel Kachhwaha of the Indian army, mocks the Kashmiri liberation movement contemptuously:

> Kashmir for the Kashmiris, a moronic idea. This tiny landlocked valley [...] wanted to control its own fate? Where did that kind of thinking get you? If Kashmir, why not also Assam for the Assamese, Nagaland for the Nagas? And why stop there? Why shouldn't towns or villages declare independence, or city streets, or even individual houses? Why not demand freedom for one's bedroom, or call one's toilet a republic? Why not stand still and draw a circle round your feet and name that Selfistan? (*Shalimar* 101-2)

As these contrasting passages show, the dialogic structure of the narrative provides the reader with the opportunity to see the two entirely different approaches to the same subject.

Before the interference of India and Pakistan, Kashmir was an earthly paradise which provided all its inhabitants with peace, harmony, and bliss because there was no room for discrimination of any sort. Religious and ethnic differences were tolerated and respected sincerely, and the Kashmiris knew quite well that such tolerance and respect for minority rights could be found neither in India nor in Pakistan. This is why liberation meant much to the people of Kashmir:

> Freedom to be meat-eating Brahmins or saint-worshipping Muslims, to make pilgrimages to the ice-lingam high in the unmelting snows or to bow down before the prophet's hair in a lakeside mosque, to listen to the santoor and drink salty tea, to dream of Alexander's army and to choose never to see an army again, to make honey and carve walnut into animal and boat shapes and to watch the mountains push their way, inch by inch, century by century, further up into the sky. Freedom to choose folly over greatness but to be nobody's fools. *Azadi!* Paradise wanted to be free. (*Shalimar* 253)

In Boonyi's case, rebellion against the alien intruder is no surprise, for she is a true Kashmiri spirit; hence to regain her freedom, she does not hesitate to destroy her beautiful body which was once equated with that of Anarkali. Furthermore, beneath her deformed body, under intense layers of fat, Boonyi grows the seed of revenge. She outwits her guard, Edgar Wood, by not taking the daily contraceptive pills. Consequently, she gets pregnant. Here, the narrator interferes in the scene by telling one of the versions of the *Anakali* story. On hearing about the love affair between the Prince and the dancer, "[...] the Emperor Akbar himself spoke to the young beauty and persuaded her that Prince Salim's love affair with her must end, that she must trick him into believing she no longer loved him so that he could go away from her and return to the path of destiny that would lead him eventually to the throne; and, [...] she agreed" (*Shalimar* 204). Yet, the carnivalesque parody immediately distorts the traditional story by pointing out the grieving difference between real life and the world of fiction:

> But Boonyi was no longer Anarkali, she had lost her beauty and could no longer dance, and the ambassador was nobody's son but the man of power himself. And Anarkali didn't get pregnant. Stories were stories and real life was real life, naked, ugly, and finally impossible to cosmeticize in the greasepaint of a tale (*Shalimar* 204).

Boonyi defeats her American Ravan with her pregnancy. In addition, Max's catastrophe is doubled when an unknown source leaks information to the papers about the American ambassador and his Kashmiri mistress. The inevitable scandal breaks out; Max has to resign from his post: "He was no longer the well-beloved lover of India, but her heartless ravisher" (*Shalimar* 206). Margaret divorces Max immediately. In fact, after this moment, Margaret begins to dominate the scene by arranging for Boonyi to give birth to her child in a secure place, on condition that her newborn (to be eventually named India Ophuls) be given to her. In other words, Margaret, too, assumes the role of Rumplestiltskin, like Flory Zogoiby in *The Moor's Last Sigh*, to demand a firstborn. In return, she promises Boonyi that she will be granted a safe passage back to Pachigam, which is Boonyi's only desire, even if it means being instantly killed at the hands of her husband. In fact, Margaret is so aware of the resemblance between herself and Rumplestiltskin that she narrates the story to Boonyi, while making some significant remarks on the figure of the whimsical king who first threatens to decapitate a young defenseless girl and then marries her:

> You know the type of fellow I mean, dear.-They'll screw you or chop off your head, those killer princes, love and death being the same sort of thing to them. They'll screw you and chop off your head. They'll screw you *while your head is being chopped off...* Well!-Scheherazade married her murderous Shahryar, too.-Can't beat women for stupidity, what?-Take me, for example. I married my whimsical prince as well, the murderer of my love.-But you know all about him, of course...(*Shalimar* 211)

It is as if the lives of multitudes unfold within one and the same story where anyone can play the role of the archetypal characters. Thus the whimsical king is at first Shahryar and then Shalimar as much as Max Ophuls, and the young defenseless girl is Boonyi, Margaret, eventually also India, and last but not the least, Scheherazade as well. Margaret takes her revenge from the murderer of her love by erasing Max from her life forever; she completes her chain of revenge by forcing Boonyi to give the baby girl to her. Despite Boonyi's tears and oppositions, Margaret also does not neglect to

change the baby girl's name from Kashmira Noman to India Ophuls before adopting the child. According to Mircea Eliade, the practice of sacrificing the firstborn has its roots in the "Paleo-Oriental world":

> Morphologically considered, Abraham's sacrifice is nothing but the sacrifice of the firstborn, a frequent practice in this Paleo-Oriental world which the Hebrews evolved down to the period of the prophets. The first child was often regarded as the child of a god; indeed, throughout the archaic East, unmarried girls customarily spent a night in the temple and thus conceived by the god (by his representative, the priest, or by his envoy, the 'stranger'). The sacrifice of this first child restored to the divinity what belonged to him. Thus the young blood increased the exhausted energy of the god (for the so-called fertility gods exhausted their own substance in the effort expended in maintaining the world and ensuring its abundance; hence they themselves needed to be periodically regenerated. (109)

Obviously, Boonyi's child will provide Margaret with the energy she has exhausted in her struggles with Max's numberless liaisons. It seems that the baby girl is given to her as a sacrifice to regenerate her powers. After stealing Boonyi's baby just like another Rumpelstiltskin, Margaret sends Boonyi back to Pachigam. It seems that Margaret is doing a favour to the helpless Boonyi whose last desire is to be with her beloved ones once more. Yet, Margaret knows quite well that what awaits Boonyi in Pachigam is nothing more than death.

When Boonyi arrives at the Pachigam bus stop in the middle of a snowstorm, her confused thoughts cherish the very slight hope of being forgiven by her loved ones. However, the extent of shock and indignation Boonyi sees on the face of the first person she confronts at the bus stop, that is her best friend Zoon Misri, shatters all her hopes about earning the forgiveness of her family. In fact, the expression on Zoon's face is something more than shock and indignation; Zoon stands before Boonyi as if she were looking at a ghost. From her friend, Boonyi learns that the Pachigamis, including her father, Pyarelal Kaul, and father-in-law, Abdullah Noman, declared her officially dead. They turned Boonyi into a living dead woman because to them, "the bureaucratic killing of Boonyi" was the only way to protect Boonyi from the murderous hatred of Shalimar. Zoon's explanation concerning Boonyi's recent unnatural status as a living dead woman draws attention to the close connection between love and hatred, or love and death in the novel: " 'They killed you,' Zoon

Misri told Boonyi in the snowstorm. 'They killed you because they loved you and you were gone" (*Shalimar* 235). The moment Shalimar realised his wife's infidelity, vengeful hatred replaced love in his heart. The treachery of his wife created a bottomless pit within his soul to be filled with an immense hatred: "[...] Shalimar the clown had stopped loving Boonyi the instant he learned of her infidelity, stopped like an unplugged automaton, and the immense crater left behind by the destruction of that love had at once been filled by a sea of bile-yellow hatred" (*Shalimar* 236). It is obvious that Shalimar's listless soul, which is burning in the flames of hatred, can never find relief unless he takes his revenge. One of the reasons that delays the decapitation of Boonyi the moment she returns to Pachigam is that the two fathers, Abdullah Noman and Pyarelal Kaul, have made Shalimar swear that he will not kill Boonyi as long as the two remain alive. On hearing that Boonyi is back in Pachigam, Shalimar grabs his knife to chop off her treacherous head; nevertheless, on the way to the bus stop he is blocked by the two fathers and is reminded of his vow. Although Shalimar stops at that specific moment, his speech to the fathers reveals that he will never give up chasing Boonyi, and the oath he has made can stop him only temporarily:

> 'In the first place,' he said, 'the oath I made to the two of you was my personal promise to you, and so I will respect it as long as even one of you is alive. But the oath I made to myself was a personal promise as well, and when you are both dead you will no longer be able to hold me back. And in the second place,' he concluded, turning to go without so much as a nod in the direction of his dead wife, 'keep the whore out of my sight.' The snow kept falling, thickly falling, upon all the living and the dead. (*Shalimar* 237-8)

The last sentence of the above quotation, which Rushdie directly quotes from "The Dead" by James Joyce, implies that for Boonyi, there is no difference between being alive or dead because she has already been sent to Shalimar's hell. She is made a living ghost who is obliged to await the inevitable moment of her second death that will come in the figure of her husband. Thus, in order to save his beloved daughter from the murderous rage of Shalimar, Pyarelal Kaul sends Boonyi into exile to let her live her remaining years in the deserted forest hut of the deceased prophetess Nazarebaddoor. The Emperor Akbar also sent Anakali into exile; nevertheless, the

difference between the two cases is that while the former is planned to block hatred and revenge, the latter was put into practice to obstruct love. In the early days of Boonyi's forest exile, she surrenders to a sort of fatalism. She reflects upon her own condition, and upon her tormented soul which is suffering from the deepest grief one might encounter, Boonyi thinks, only in hell; she also believes that she deserves to be buried alive; therefore, she must endure the worst of punishments without complaint. Now, as a living ghost, her sole dream is to escape from the hell into which she has been hurled by the vengeful Shalimar; she knows that she can cherish the hope of attaining her lost paradise only after being tortured in hell. Either out of searching for consolation, or trying to stand the unbearable state of waiting for her actual physical death in isolation, Boonyi likens the forest to purgatory: "One could not expect to jump back into paradise from hell, she told herself. A purgative period in a middle place was required" (*Shalimar* 229).

As Boonyi starts her days of exile, the narrator interferes by comparing and contrasting the epic love between Lord Ram and Sita and the outcomes of Sita's abduction by Ravan to those of the love between Boonyi and Shalimar and the incidents that take place after Boonyi's adulterous escape to Max. In the narrator's point of view, which one might also reasonably attribute to Rushdie, the modern version of this love story is nothing more than a carnivalesque subversion of the mythical one, where every form of human purity and dignity has become corrupt:

> In the old story Sita the pure was kidnapped and Ram fought a war to win her back. In the modern world everything had been turned upside down and inside out. Sita, or rather Boonyi in the Sita role, had freely chosen to run off with her American Ravan and willingly became his mistress and bore him a child; and Ram-the Muslim clown, Shalimar, misplaying the part of Ram-fought no war to rescue her. In the old story, Ravan had died rather than surrender Sita. In the contemporary bowdlerization of the tale, the American had turned away from Sita and allowed his queen to steal her daughter and send her home in shame.(*Shalimar* 263)

What is worth noting about the comparisons is that the carnivalesque subversion is not a stylistic effect imposed upon a series of events by a whimsical author; it is rather a result of the author's observation of the actual state of events in their decline.

In the *Ramayana*, Lord Ram himself sends Sita into forest exile; yet, his motive is to protect Sita from the rumours of "common people who suspect Sita's chastity due to her long residence under Ravan's roof" (*Shalimar* 263); in Rushdie's novel, however, it is not Shalimar, the modern subverted version of Lord Ram, but Boonyi's father, her father-in-law, and her friend who send Boonyi into forest exile so as to save her from being killed by Shalimar. In the *Ramayana*, Sita in the forest exile successfully passes all epic tests given by the gods to reexamine her innocence; she steps into fire and emerges from it unharmed; Sita's still preseved innocence, which she thinks is not enough for this world, allows her even to descend to the darkness of the underworld. The narrator speculates that had the same tests been imposed upon Boonyi, the result would have undoubtedly been as follows: "If she, Boonyi, set fire to herself no god would protect her. She would burn and the forest would burn with her. Accordingly, she lit no fire. Once in despair she did ask the gates of hell to open in the earth below her feet, but no cavity yawned. She was already in hell" (*Shalimar* 264).

While Boonyi serves her time in the forest exile, Shalimar leaves the village and joins the Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front which is a reactionary group fighting against the presence of the Indian army in the valley. Later, he gets involved with much more radical Islamic militant groups. Thereafter he sets out on a journey to become one of the most dangerous assassins. Shalimar is trained by a number of desperate terrorists. However, his trainers' attempts to make a suicide bomber out of Shalimar have proven futile because it is understood that he cannot be brainwashed; since Shalimar's mind has already been filled with the obsessive desire to take his personal revenge, he cannot surrender his self as he is required to do: "*I am ready to kill but I am not ready to stop being myself*, he repeated many times in his heart. *I will kill readily but I will not give myself up*" (*Shalimar* 271). Consequently, Shalimar's acting abilities remain inadequate to deceive two of his trainers: Talib the Afghan and Abdurajak Janjalani, a Filipino Muslim. Talib the Afghan's reaction to Shalimar's refusal to devote his entire self to the Muslim cause is not only remorseless but also reveals the absolute intolerance of the radical Islamist movements towards all the possible activities of the human intellect, whether they be aesthetic, scientific, commercial, or even recreational:

> 'You were an actor,' Talib the Afghan said scornfully in bad, heavily accented Urdu. 'God spits on actors. God spits on dancing and singing. Maybe you are acting now. Maybe you are a traitor and a spy. You are fortunate I am not the one in charge of this camp. I would immediately order the execution of all entertainers. God spits on entertainment. I would also order the execution of dentists, professors, sportsmen and whores. God spits on intellectualism and licentiousness and games. If you hold the rocket launcher like that it will break your shoulder. This is the way to do it'. (*Shalimar* 271-2)

Shalimar's other trainer, Janjalani, however, will be the one who will help him trap his prey, and kill Max in the U.S. Until the time of the assassination, Salimar patiently learns all he needs to fulfil his oath:

> He [Shalimar] became a person of value and consequence, as assassins are. Also, his secret purpose was achieved. He had passports in five names and had learned good Arabic, ordinary French and bad English, and had opened routes for himself, routes in the real world, the invisible world, that would take him where he needed to go when the time for the ambassador came. (*Shalimar* 275)

Thus, instead of becoming a warrior of God, Shalimar has become death itself. Through the non-physical channel of contact between himself and Boonyi, Shalimar frequently haunts Boonyi to remind her of the approaching steps of her inevitable death: "He said: *Everything I do prepares me for you and for him. Every blow I strike, strikes you or him. The people leading us up here are fighting for God or for Pakistan but I am killing because it is what I have become. I have become death. I'll be there soon enough*. (*Shalimar* 298). When both fathers die, Shalimar comes to the forest hut to kill Boonyi. She is waiting for her murderer naked, for she wants not her words but her body to tell him the story of her love, of her treason and repentance, and of her painful years in the forest exile. Through the non-verbal communication between the two, Boonyi conveys the story of her repentance for the last time:

> *If she showed him her body he would see it all there, just as he would see the marks of another man's hands, the marks that would force him to commit murder. She wanted him to see it all, her fall, and her survival of the fall. Her years of exile were written on her body and he should know their tale. She wanted him to know that at the end of the story of her body she loved him still, or again, or still. She wore no clothes...(Shalimar 318)*

Obviously, no tragic story of love on earth can divert Shalimar from fulfilling his oath; he decapitates Boonyi and shed tears after the murder.

The last chapter of the novel titled "Kashmira" bears a structural resemblance to the last chapters of *The Moor's Last Sigh* and *Midnight's Children* in that here too, the narrative returns to the beginning; this circular structure underlines Rushdie's overarching idea that every beginning entails an end and every end entails a beginning. At the final moment of the novel, as India avenges the death of her parents by killing Shalimar in the fashion of an empowered Diana, with a bow and arrow, she reclaims the name that her mother Boonyi had wished to give her; she leaves behind the name "India" which was Margaret's choice and returns to call herself "Kashmira":

> The golden bow was drawn back as far as it would go. She felt the taut bowstring pressing against her parted lips, felt the foot of the arrow's shaft against her gritted teeth, allowed the last seconds to tick away, exhaled and left fly. There was no possibility that she would miss. There was no second chance. There was no India. There was only Kashmira, and Shalimar the clown. (*Shalimar* 398)

Upon visiting her mother's grave, Kashmira senses her mother's supernatural influence, and, as it were, inherits the metaphysical connection that her mother Boonyi once had first with her dead mother, Pamposh, and later with Shalimar. And while Shalimar expects the day of his execution in prison, she bombards him both telepathically and through threatening letters:

> I am your black Scheherazade, she wrote. I will write to you without missing a day without missing a night not to save my life but to take yours to wind around you the poisonous snakes of my words until their fangs stab your neck. Or I am Prince Shahryar and you are my helpless virgin bride. I will write to you and my voice will haunt your dreams. Every night I tell the story of your death. [...] Every day I will write to you. Every night for however many nights it takes I will whisper in your ear until the story's done. (*Shalimar* 374)

In *Midnight's Children* and *The Moor's Last Sigh* the act of writing functions as a vital thread connecting both Saleem and the Moor to life; it is through writing that both protagonists succeed in giving meaning to their personal as well as national histories both of which are chaotic. Both Saleem and the Moor have become the male versions of the legendary storyteller Scheherazade who saves not only her life but also the female population of her community with the stories she tells. Similarly, the act of writing enables the protagonists of the previous two novels to arrange their turbulent

experiences, to fill in the missing parts that are necessary to reassess their past and present, and thus to give meaning to their existence. In other words, the act of writing is represented as a sort of life-giving power in *Midnight's Children* and *The Moor's Last Sigh*; in *Shalimar The Clown*, however, writing turns out to be a mortal weapon in the hands of Kashmira. She assumes the role of, this time, a dark Scheherazade who is intent on taking the revenge of her parents by the power of her "poisonous" words that load her letters to Shalimar with a relentless hatred. Thus, in *Shalimar The Clown* writing becomes a life-taking power:

> A woman, my mother, died for the crime of leaving you, Kashmira wrote. A man, my father, died for taking her in. You murdered two human beings because of your egotism your amazing egotism that valued your honor more highly than their lives. You bathed your honor in their blood but you did not wash it clean it's bloody now. You wanted to wipe them out but you failed, you killed nobody. Here I stand. I am my mother and my father I am Maximilian Ophuls and Boonyi Kaul. You achieved nothing. They are not dead not gone not forgotten. They live on in me. (*Shalimar* 379)

Kashmira considers herself to be a palimpsest of her murdered parents just like the Moor. She believes that Shalimar ultimately failed in destroying his sworn enemies since both Boonyi and Max continue to live in their daughter. Indeed, the final scene of the novel indicates that there is only one who fulfils the revenge theme; and it is not Shalimar but Kashmira who takes the revenge of her slaughtered parents by killing their murderer in a deadly combat.

Rushdie's use of magical realism in *Shalimar The Clown* might be traced in the seemingly impossible relationship between the dead mothers and their living daughters. In the novel, it is through magical realism that Rushdie makes, in David Danow's words, "the improbable seem possible" (Danow 307). The author's treatment of the invisible, intangible, and seemingly impossible communication between the dead and the living, as in the case of Pamposh, the mother whom Boonyi had never seen, and Boonyi, or the one between Kashmira and her dead mother, displays the function of magical realism as "[making] the extraordinary or magical as viable a possibility as the ordinary or real, [...]" (Danow 3). In the novel, Pamposh dies during childbirth; yet, she continues to commune with Boonyi though she no more possesses a corporeal existence: " a girl's mother is her mother even if she existed without

actually existing, in the noncorporeal form of a dream, even if her existence could only be proved by her effect on the one human being whose fate she still cared to influence" (*Shalimar* 51). Although she is dead, Pamposh keeps loving, caressing, advising, and guiding Boonyi throughout her life except for her Delhi days with Max; and Pamposh's absence in her daughter's Delhi days is later interpreted by Boonyi as a sign of her disapproval. However, this disapproval should not be confused with the typical small-minded outrage and embarrassment that the members of the society display when confronting a woman who has sexual relations outside of, and in violation of the marital bond. Pamposh rather seems to be firmly against the notion of a woman dedicating herself fully to the pleasure of a man, instead of attending to that which pleases herself; and needless to say this is exactly what Boonyi reduces herself to do when she reaches the aforementioned agreement with Max. In other words, Pamposh is angry with Boonyi for losing her freedom rather than her chastity. Pamposh's own reflections on women's rights, which are ahead of her time, confirm this interpretation: "A woman can make every choice she pleases just because it pleases her, and pleasing a man comes a poor second, a long way behind, [...]. Also, if a woman's heart is true then what the world thinks doesn't matter a good goddamn" (*Shalimar* 53).

At the age of fourteen, Boonyi converses with her deceased mother as if she were a speaking ghost. When Boonyi cannot decide what to do before her first intercourse with Shalimar, she takes her non-existent mother's advice; Boonyi is in need of learning her mother's ideas concerning her newly awakening womanhood, for she is in-between her arising desire for Shalimar and the traditional restrictions imposed on Kashmiri women which will never tolerate an illegitimate affair between two youngsters. However, this conversation between the daughter and the deceased mother bears a number of hints at the possibility that Pamposh is not a ghost at all; that she is, in fact, no more than a projection of Boonyi's own mind giving her an "external" authorization to do what she wants to do: "I'm not a ghost, [...]. I'm a dream of the mother you want me to be. I'm telling you what's already in your heart, what you want me to confirm" (*Shalimar* 53-4). While this observation might seem to be taking away the magical element out of a magical realistic fiction, it should be noted

that magical realism does not really involve the creation of a variety of fantastic beings or events; to recall the words of Luis Leal, in magical realism "the principle thing is not the creation of imaginary beings or worlds but the discovery of the mysterious relationship between man and his circumstances" (Leal 119).

As for the magical connection between the dead Boonyi and her daughter Kashmira, one might assert that the bond becomes most tangible when Kashmira visits Boonyi's grave and learns the details of how she was killed by Shalimar. It is at this point that Kashmira finds herself imbued with the courage and determination to kill Shalimar:

> She [Kashmira] stood by her mother's grave and something got into her. [...] The thing had no name but it had a force and it made her capable of anything. She thought about the number of times her mother had died or been killed. She had heard the whole story now, a tale told by an old woman shrouded in black cloth about a younger woman sewn into a white shroud who lay below the ground. [...] the thing that got inside her chest, the thing that made her capable of whatever was necessary, of doing what had to be done. (*Shalimar* 366-7-8)

However, assuming that this new force is a gift from Boonyi to her daughter, it is necessary to recognise that it is not really a drive for revenge. For Boonyi, who had come to the point of desiring her death at the hands of Shalimar, would not demand her daughter to avenge her murder now, in the fashion of Hamlet's father. The desire for revenge is Kashmira's own. Yet, Boonyi would know that the only way for her daughter to remain alive is to kill Shalimar, since he had sworn to kill not only Boonyi and Max but also their offspring. Boonyi's intangible presence flows into Kashmira and enables her to survive though at the cost of destroying Shalimar, which is what Kashmira herself desires to do to avenge both her parents.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of the dissertation initially attempts to lay bare the interdependent relationship between Rushdie's use of parody and magical realism as a rich source which enables the author to enhance, stratify, and diversify the fictional characters and worlds depicted in *Midnight's Children*, *The Moor's Last Sigh*, and *Shalimar The Clown.* The second issue to be discussed in this last chapter is that the whole body of Rushdie's work investigated in this dissertation succeeds in the creation of what Bhabha calls an "international culture". The last section of the conclusion presents new ideas about Rushdie's defense of heterogeneity in the making of individual and communal identity- especially of those whose past is marked by the experience of colonialism-against homogeneity in the so-called "Third World". This part of the conclusion makes reference to the work entitled *Kimlik İnşası* (*Identity Construction*) by Nuri Bilgin in order to draw attention to the conflicting western policies concerning the issue. This last issue is included in the conclusion with the intention to add another perspective to the future Rushdie studies.

As an aesthetic form, parody, and carnivalesque parody in particular, is based on turning the present state of things upside down by transgressing the predetermined borders. Similarly, the magical realistic style, as another aesthetic form, enables its exponents to overflow the chronological, spatial, and rational borders that restrict truth the relativity of which was proven in the twentieth century. As Shirley Neuman and Robert Wilson suggest, magical realism "breaks down certain very strongly established boundaries between imagination and so-called reality which probably aren't there" (11). Also Beata Gesicka puts emphasis on the power of magical realism as a style leading the readers "to question the validity of all worldviews" (394). In fact, Gesicka's definition of the nature of the carnival and its impact on literature, which Rushdie employs as an inseparable part of his parody techniques, indicates that it is the spirit of the carnival that shatters the perception of reality as a single unchanging truth:

> [...] the carnivalesque spirit signifies a time of transformation, exchange and reversal, and reveals the character of reality to be completely ambivalent, violating and degrading any official world-view. The carnival spirit and energy do violence to the laws of genre: boundaries are blurred, and oppositions are constantly configured to produce a multiplicity of meanings, although none of them can avoid further dissolution. The carnivalesque spirit is thus a liberating force that, when applied to literature, promises its refreshment, and renewal by destruction (396)

The carnivalesque parody and magical realistic style bear structural affinities. Gesicka's comments on the resemblance between the two concepts are as follows: "the carnivalesque spirit gives magic realism its unique capacity of relativizing every single truth or world-view by degrading, mocking and undermining its validity" (397). It is obvious that the notion of the carnival is an essential element in the make up of Rushdie's magical realistic style, for the former supports and enriches the latter continually in the three novels analysed in this dissertation. Danow's interpretation of the function of the language of carnivalization further supports the idea that the carnival consolidates magical realism by every means: "[the spirt of the carnival] supports the unsupportable, assails the unassailable, at times regards the supernatural as natural, takes fiction as truth, and makes the extraordinary or magical as viable a possibility as the ordinary or real, so that no true distinction is perceived or acknowledged between the two" (3). As previously mentioned, Danow's definition of magical realism as a style making "the improbable seem possible" (307) also emphasizes the similarities between the spirit of the carnival and magical realism. Rushdie makes use of both concepts in his work, for both have unlimited revolutionary, and creative powers. In other words, what allows Rushdie to travel beyond the boundaries of the visible physical world in the three novels explored in this dissertation is the magical realism supported and ripened by the carnivalesque parody. The link between the two concepts becomes particularly manifest in the manner in which Rushdie develops his characters; for, indeed, his characters are not formed and finished with one single identity, but they rather undergo a constant becoming, which is even reflected by the repeated changing of their names, so, for instance, have been the cases of Amina in *Midnight's Children* and Boonyi in *Shalimar The Clown*. Perhaps the best example to the constant becoming of Rushdie's characters is found in Flory Zogoiby in *The Moor's Last Sigh*. She is, as it were, repeatedly turned inside out,

in a carnivalesque fashion, to reveal now the face of Shylock from the *Merchant of Venice*, and now that of Rumpelstiltskin, or all the evil witches of fairy tales, that of Penelope, patiently waiting for her husband, and now even that of Cassandra, foretelling the future without convincing anybody. The multi-layered character of Flory mirrors the production of multiplicities both by the agencies of carnivalesque parody and magical realism.

It seems that Rushdie's fiction realizes the construction of what Bhabha calls an "international culture" which is "based on the articulation and inscription of culture's hybridity" (209). Rushdie's work comes to the fore as the materialization of Bhabha's unrestrained, hybrid "Third Space" which is mentioned in the second subchapter of the theory chapter. Bhabha defines his idea of "Third Space" as the medium through which cultural difference is expressed. Although Bhabha defines the "Third Space" as "unrepresentable in itself", Rushdie succeeds in making this "Third Space" a heterogeneous, polyphonic platform where multiple visions and diversities enunciate themselves freely against a homogeneous and monologic national discourse which treats all cultural differences as though the same. Rushdie's prevailing idea which is noted in *Midnight's Children*, *The Moor's Last Sigh*, and *Shalimar The Clown* is that Indian national discourse is as oppressive as that of the British imperial discourse. The dialogic nature of Rushdie's work, which he owes to his ingenious use of parody techniques, his multi-layered character formations with multiple names, the multiplicity of his sources which the author draws, as Sharma states "not just from east and west but from all corners of the world..." all indicate his desire for heterogeneity in the make up and articulation of an authentic cultural identity.

In *Midnight's Chidren,* Saleem Sınai, Rushdie's parodied epic hero, associates his personal story with the history of his nation. Saleem is drawn as a mock epic hero whose fate is intertwined with that of India which declared independence at the exact moment of Saleem's birth. It is by means of writing that Saleem gives meaning to his turbulent experiences which are directly connected to the equally chaotic and traumatic experiences of the newly independent Indian nation. Similarly, in *The Moor's Last Sigh* the Moor narrates his familial as well as national history. Like Saleem, the Moor gives meaning to his turbulent personal story which is related to the history of India

through the act of writing. While Saleem and the Moor set their stories within the contemporary history of India, the story of the character of Boonyi in *Shalimar The Clown* is associated with the history of Kashmir. In other words, Boonyi is the representation of Kashmir. Both Boonyi and Kashmir rebel against authority, and struggle for independence. Yet both rebellions end in disaster in that while Boonyi is decapitated by her husband, Shalimar, the Kashmiris who fight for an independent future are violently subdued by the Indian army forces.

Rushdie's ideal recipe for the construction of the so-called Third World cultural identity suggests heterogeneity, multiplicity, and the foregrounding of cultural differences. Nevertheless, the work of a non-western scholar, Nuri Bilgin, entitled *Kimlik İnşası*[1] (*Identity Construction*) presents a challenging counter argument on the same issue. According to Bilgin, a survey of the critical studies on the subject of identity reveals two main veins; the first vein of publications focuses on individuation, modernity, problems of the modern man, relations between the individual and society, the image and representation of the self, homosexuals, AIDS patients, the disabled, victims of domestic abuse and family harassment, adaptation problems of immigrants and foreigners, identity problems of the unemployed, the homeless and various other marginal groups etc.; the second vein of publications, however, is concerned with the relationship between the majority groups and minorites, ethnicity, ethnic identity, minority rights, community rights, cultural multiplicity etc. (300). To Bilgin, what is noteworthy is that almost all of the identity literature is western originated, only the first vein is related to the west, while the second vein focuses on the non-western societies. Bilgin claims that while the publications in the first vein argue for the adaptation, the integration, or even the assimilation of the problematic individuals or groups into the society, the other vein of publications support the opposite. In other words, there appears to be a tendency to advocate for unity and homogeneity within [the western world], and differentiation and heterogeneity for the non-western world. What is common to these publications, according to Bilgin, is that all the proposals, precautions, recipes, political solutions directed at the non-western world bear the mark of a politics of differentiation (301). In the light of Bilgin's insights, therefore, it

[1] All trasnslations from the said work are mine.

is possible to speculate that Rushdie's persistent celebration of multiplicity and heterogeneity might still be serving the political interests of the western cultural imperialism, which perhaps continues to follow its timeless dictum of *Separa et Impera* (i.e. divide and rule). At any rate, this would not be the first nor the last case where the imaginative genious of an author exploring humanity in all its complex and colorful dimensions is subjected to political manipulation or even oppression, and one might only hope that such external impositions fail to overshadow the worth and innumerable virtues of creative efforts, literary or otherwise.

REFERENCES

Abrams, M. H. 1993. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Fort Lauderdale: Harcourt.

Ahmad, Aijaz. 1987. "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness and the 'National Allegory'", Social Text 17: 3-25.

Amuta, Chidi. 1995. "Fanon, Cabral and Ngugi on National Liberation" in *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader.* Eds. Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge. 158-163.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London and New York: Verso.

Ashcroft, Bill et al. 1994. *The Empire Writes Back.* London: Routledge.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 2003. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* Ed. and Trans. Carly Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

_____1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Mikhael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Mikhael Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. Great Britain: Routledge.

Bilgin, Nuri. 2007. *Kimlik İnşası*. Ankara: Aşina Kitaplar-Turmaks Yayıncılık Ltd.Şti.

Boehmer, Elleke. 2005. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Carpentier, Alejo. 1995. *The Baroque and the Marvelous Real. Magical Realism*. Ed. L. P. Zamora and W. B. Faris, Durham: Duke UP.

Carter, Erwin Dale. 1969. *Magical Realism in Contemporary Argentine Fiction.* An Arbor: U. Microfilms.

Chanady, Amaryll. 1995. *The Territorialization of the Imaginary in Latin America: Self-Affirmation and Resistane to Metropolitan Paradigms. Magical Realism.* Ed. L. P. Zamora and W. B. Faris, Durham: Duke UP.

Chatterjee, Partha. 1993. *The Nations and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chevalier, Jean. and Alain Gheerbrant. 1996. *The Penguin Dictionary of Symbols*. Trans.John Buchanan – Brown. London: Penguin Books.

Coburn, Thomas. 1984. *Crystallization of the Goddess Tradition*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Danow, K. David. 2003. "Magical Realism: Mosaic of Excess". Ed. Marisa Bortolussi, Canadian Review of Comparative Literature, Volume 30.2.

Danow, K. David. 1995. *The Spirit of Carnival. Magical Realism and the Grotesque*. Kentucky: The UP of Kentucky.

During, Simon. 1987. "Postmodernism or Post-colonialism Today", Textual Practice 1(1). 32-47.

Eliade, Mircea. 1954. *The Myth of the Eternal Return: Cosmos and History*. Trans. Willard R. Trask, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Fanon, Frantz. 1995. "National Culture" in *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge. 153-157.

Fletcher, M. D. 1994. *Reading Rushdie: Perspectives on the fiction of Salman Rushdie*.Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Foreman, P. Gabrielle. 1995. *Past on Stories: History and the Magically Real, Morrison and Allende on Call. Magical Realism.* Ed. L. P. Zamora and W. B. Faris, Durham: Duke UP, 1995.

Foucalt, Michel. 1988. *Discipline and Punish*: "The Birth of the Prison", Literary Theory: An Anthology. Eds. Rivkin, Julie and Michael Ryan, Blackwell.

Freud, Sigmund. 1964. *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. Volume 12 (1932-1936. London: Hogarth.

Gallico, Sonia. 2004. *Vatican*. Padova: Edizioni Musei Vaticani & ATS Italia Editrice.

Gesicka, Beata. 2003. "On the Carnivalesque in Magical Realism". Ed. Marisa Bortolussi, Canadian Review of Comparative Literature, Volume 30.2.

Jameson, Frederick. 1986. "Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capital". Social Text 15, Fall. 85-86.

Karamcheti, Indira. 1986. "Salman Rushdie's Midnight's Children and an Alternate Genesis". Pasific Coast Philology, Vol.21, No. ½ (Nov, 1986). 81-84.

Leal, Luis. 1995. *Magical Realism in Spanish American Literature. Magical Realism.* Ed. L.P. Zamora and W. B. Faris, Durham: Duke UP.

Loomba, Ania. 1988. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism.* London: Routledge.

Merivale, Patricia. 1995. "Saleem Fathered by Oskar: *Midnight's Children, Magic Realism and The Tin Drum. Magical Realism*. Ed. Zamora and Faris. Durhan: Duke UP. 331-333

Mohamed, Abdul Jan. 1985. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature". Critical Inquiry 12. 59-87.

Neuman, Shirley and Robert Wilson. 1982. *Labyrinths of Voice. Conversations with Robert Kroetsch*. Edmonton: NeWest Press.

Quint, David. 1993. *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic from Virgil to Milton*. Princeton: Princeton U. P.

Randall, Don. 2000. *Kipling's Imperial Boy: Adolescence and Cultural Hybridity*. New York: Palgrave.

Roh, Franz.1995. *Magic Realism: Post-Expressionism (1925). Magical Realism.* Ed. L. P. Zamora and W. B. Faris. Durham: Duke UP.

Rose, A. Margaret. 1993. *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-Modern*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Rushdie, Salman. 1997. *Midnight's Children*. London: Vintage.

_____2006. *Salimar the Clown*. London: Vintage

_____2006. *The Moor's Last Sigh*. London: Vintage.

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge.

Sharma, Shailja. 2001. "Salman Rushdie: The Ambivalence of Migrancy", Twentieth Century Literature, Vol. 47, No. 4, (Winter, 2001). 596-618.

Sharpe, Jenny. 1953. *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*. London and Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Simon, Peter Ed. 1999. *The Norton Anthology World Masterpieces*. Seventh Edition, Volume 1, New York, W.W Norton&Company.

Su, J. John.2001."Epic of Failure: Disappointment as Utopian Fantasy in *Midnight's Children*", Twentieth Century Literature, Vol. 47, No. 4, Salman Rushdie. (Winter, 2001). 545-568.

Teverson, S. Andrew. 2001. "Fairy Tale Politics: Free Speech and Multiculturalism in 'Haroun and the Sea of Stories'" Twentieth Century Literature, Vol. 47, No. 4, Salman Rushdie. (Winter, 2001). 444-446.

Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., Wikipedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anarkali, 8 December 2009.

Zamora, Lois P. and Wendy B. Faris. 1995. *Inroduction: Daiquiri Birds and Flaubertian Parrot(ies), Magical Realism*. Ed. L. P. Zamora and W. B. Faris, Durhan: Duke UP.

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Tekin, Kuğu

Nationality: Turkish (TC)

Date and Place of Birth: 11 September 1964 , Ankara

Marital Status: Married

Phone: +90 312 496 27 42

Mobile Phone: +90 533 715 84 95

email: tekinkugu@yahoo.com

EDUCATION

Degree	**Institution**	**Year of Graduation**
MA	Atılım University English Language and Literature	2003
BA	Atılım University English Language and Literature	2001
High School	TED Ankara College	1982

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	**Place**	**Enrollment**
2001- Present	Atılım University Dept. of Eng. Lang. and Literature	Lecturer

Courses Taught (offered at Atılım University, Dept. of Eng. Language and Literature from 2001 to date)

ELIT 103 Literary Terms and Movements
ELIT 105 Research Techniques and Academic Writing
ELIT 106 Cultural History of Britain
ELIT 110 Spoken English and Presentation Skills
ELIT 202 Selections from 17th and 18th c. English Literature
ELIT 412 Postcolonial Literature
ELIT 429 Literature and the City
ELIT 205 Translation I
ELIT 206 Translation II
ELIT 212 Short Fiction
ELIT 333 American Drama

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English

PUBLICATIONS

Tekin, Kuğu. 2006. Çileli, "Joyce's Dublin: the Character, the Mirror, the Prison", James Joyce and His Work: The 13th Middle East Technical University Novelists Seminar Proceedings. Eds. Çileli, Meral and Mustafa Kırca. Ankara: Polat.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

2008, (with Özlem Şahin, Gökşen Aras and Bengü Aksu Ataç) **"**The Importance of Focusıng on Culture of Peace in the Curricula of the Departments of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences**"** WCCI 13th World Conference in Education, 2nd Biennial World Conference. Antalya, Turkey**.**

2008, "Salman Rushdie: The Placeless Migrant and Mediator Meditating between East and West", The Extraordinary International Migrancy of English Language, English Language and Literature Department, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

2007, “Brechtian Influences on Caryl Churchill's *Mad Forest*”, 5th Annual Hawaii International Conference on Arts and Humanities, Honolulu, Hawaii.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY

Salman Rushdie'nin *Midnight's Children, The Moor's Last Sigh* ve *Shalimar The Clown* Başlıklı Romanlarında Kurguladığı Parodinin Büyülü Gerçekçilik Bağlamında İncelenmesi

Bu tezin amacı Salman Rushdie'nin *Midnight's Children*, *The Moor's Last Sigh* ve *Shalimar The Clown* başlıklı romanlarında kurguladığı parodinin büyülü gerçekçilikle olan ilişkisini incelemektir. Rushdie'nin romanlarındaki büyülü gerçekçilik üçüncü dünyalının, batı kültürünün yaratıp biçimlendirdiği Avrupa merkeziyetçiliğine meydan okuyan deneyimlerini aktarmaktadır. Rushdie'nin romanları biçim ve içerik açısından o kadar yoğun ve zengindir ki ortaya çıkan sonuç doğu ve batı olarak ayrılan iki uygarlığın çatışması değil, bu iki kültürün eşsiz bir karışımıdır. Rushdie romanlarında *Genesis*, *A Thousand and One Nights*, *Iliad*, *Ramayana* gibi büyük anlatıları, Hint, Pers, Yunan ve Kuzey mitlerini, yerel kültürel gelenekleri, modern siyasi oluşumları ve yaklaşımları geniş bir tarihsel perspektif içinde kurgu ve gerçekliği harmanlayarak farklı olanın kendini özgürce ifade edebildiği çok katmanlı, çok boyutlu edebi ve sanatsal bir platform, uluslararası bir kültür yaratmıştır.

Tez bir giriş bölümü, iki alt bölümden oluşan bir kuram bölümü, yukarıda belirtilen üç romanı inceleyen ve üç alt bölümden oluşan bir analiz bölümü ve sonuç bölümünden oluşmuştur. Giriş bölümü tezin amacını, sınırlarını ve incelenen konuları genel olarak tanıtmıştır. Giriş bölümü ayrıca yukarıda başlıkları verilen üç romanın tez inceleme konusu olarak seçilme nedenlerini ayrıntılı bir biçimde ele almıştır. Buna

göre Rushdie'nin *Midnight's Children*, *The Moor's Last Sigh* ve *Shalimar The Clown* başlıklı üç romanı bir dizi tematik ve yapısal benzerlikler taşımaktadır. Romanların üçüde yazarın kültürel farklılıkları özgürce öne çıkardığı bir platform işlevine sahiptir. Kültürel farklılıkların baskı altında kalmadan ifade edilebilmesi Rushdie için öncelik taşımaktadır çünkü yazar bu romanlarda kültürel farklılıkları dile getirerek Bhabha'nın "uluslararası kültür" olarak tanımladığı kavramı gerçekleştirmiştir. Tezde incelenen romanların üçüde tek sesli, farklılıkları yok sayan, kısıtlayıcı milliyetçi söylemlere meydan okuyan çok sesli bir yapıya sahip eserler olarak kurgulanmışlardır. Yazarın bir yapımlılığa (homogeneity) karşı savunduğu çok yapımlılık (heterogeneity) kavramı her üç romanda da varolan önemli bir ortak noktadır. Romanların üçünde de yazar mevcut hiyerarşik düzeni altüst etmek için parodiyi, özellikle karnaval parodisini kullanmıştır. Rushdie'nin parodi tekniğiyle yarattığı çok katmanlı karakterleri okuyucuya çok yönlü bakış açılarını alternatif olarak sunmaktadır. Yazarın bu tezde incelenen üç romanında yarattığı çok katmanlı parodik karakterler içlerinde doğu ve batı edebiyat geleneklerinden seçilmiş pek çok farklı kişilği barındırırlar. *The Moor's Last Sigh* başlıklı romandaki Flory Zogoiby karakteri yazarın çok katmanlı parodik karakterlerinin çarpıcı bir örneğidir. Flory Cochin'deki yahudi sinagogunun bakıcısı ve bekçisidir. Kocası Solomon bir gün aniden artık sadece kendisi için yaşamaya karar verir, Flory ve tek çocuğu Abraham'ı terk eder ve limandaki bir Portekiz gemisine binerek bir daha dönmemek üzere gider. Romanın akışı içinde Flory öncelikle kocasını sabırla bekleyen Penelope'dir. Tek oğlu Abraham katolik Aurora ile evlenerek kendisine ihanet ettiğinde Shakespeare'in *Merchant of Venice* adlı oyunundaki Shylock karakteri olarak okuyucunun karşısına çıkar. Flory bekçiliğini yaptığı mücevher sandığını dara düşen oğlu Abraham'a vermeyi tek bir şartla kabul eder: Abraham ilk doğacak erkek çocuğunu annesi Flory'e verecektir. Flory bu sahnede okuyucunun karşısına acımasız, kötü huylu masal karakteri Rumpelstitskin olarak çıkar. Anlatıcıya göre, oğlu Abraham ile Aurora'nın evlenmesine karşı çıkan Flory masallarda sevenlerin kavuşmasına engel olan bütün büyücülerin, cadıların, kötü kalpli üvey annelerin karakter özelliklerini kişiliğinde barındırmaktadır. Flory en sonunda geleceği gören fakat kehanetlerine kimsenin

inanmadığı Cassandra karakterine bürünür ve ölür. Örnekte görüldüğü gibi Rushdie'nin üç romanının bütün önemli karakterleri sürekli bir değişim ve gelişim içindedir. Yazar bu çok katmanlı karakter zenginliğini ustalıkla kullandığı parodi tekniği ile gerçekleştirir. Bu çok katmanlı karakterler aynı zamanda yazarın doğu ve batı edebiyatları konusundaki engin bilgisi ve hakimiyetinin bir göstergesidir.

Her üç romanda da bulunan dikkat çekici başka bir özellik ise Rushdie'nin bireysel bir yaşam öyküsü ile bir ülkenin, yani Hindistan'ın ve/veya Kaşmir eyaletinin tarihsel gelişimi ve çalkantıları arasında devamlı paralellikler kurması ve hatta zaman zaman kişisel tarihçe ile toplumsal tarihi parodik tekniklerle birbirine karıştırmasıdır. Örneğin, *Midnight's Children*'da Saleem Sinai'nin *The Moor's Last Sigh*'da ise Moor'un fırtınalı öz yaşam öyküleri yirminci yüzyıl Hindistan'ının kaotik tarihçesi ile içiçe geçmiştir. *Shalimar The Clown*'da ise yazar, Boonyi karakterini Kaşmir ile özdeşleştirmiştir. Karakterin bağımsız bir birey olma çabalarını Kaşmir'in yirminci yüzyılda verdiği özgürlük mücadeleleriyle paralel bir biçimde aktarmıştır. Bundan başka her üç romanında sonu en başta verilmiştir. Yazarın düşüncesine göre her başlangıç içinde bir son, her son da yeni bir başlangıç barındırmaktadır. Rushdie romanlarını bu düşünceye göre kurguladığı için her üç roman da ölümle bitmesine rağmen yeni ve umut dolu başka bir başlangıca işaret etmektedir. Yazar bu metaforu sonsuz bir süreç olan doğal yaşam döngüsünü anlatmak için kullanmıştır. Her üç romanda da efsanevi hikaye anlatıcısı Şehrazat'a yapılan göndermeler başka bir sonsuz süreç olan hikaye anlatımına işaret etmektedir. *Midnight's Children* ve *Shalimar The Clown* adlı romanların başlangıçlarında, *The Moor's Last Sigh* adlı romanın ise son bölümünde Şehrazat'a açık göndermeler yapılmaktadır. Rushdie'nin Şehrazat figürüne olan ilgisinin arkasında, Şehrazat'ın sonu gelmeyen ve de sadece hayatı içinde barındırmayıp, hayat kurtarıcı ve hatta hayat verici özellikleri bulunan döngünün en iyi örneklerinden birisi oluşunun yattığı düşünülebilir.

Tezde incelenmek üzere bu üç romanın seçilmesindeki son önemli etken ise Rushdie'nin bu romanlarda parodi tekniği ile büyülü gerçekçilik ögelerini birbirini besleyen unsurlar olarak kullanmasıdır. Parodi, özellikle karnaval parodisi, varolan düzenin ters yüz edilmesine ya da çizilmiş olan sınırların aşılmasına yol açan bir

estetik formdur. Parodi gibi büyülü gerçekçilikte, gerçekliğin sınırlarının zamansal, mekansal, rasyonel ve bunun gibi daha birçok bakımdan aşılmasına yol açan bir formdur. Parodi teknikleri ile büyülü gerçekçilik ögeleri yapısal olarak benzerlikler taşıdıkları için birbirlerini beslemektedirler. Başka bir deyişle her üç romanda da büyülü gerçekçilik parodinin daha güçlü bir biçimde ortaya çıkmasına olanak sağlamaktadır.

Tezin kuram bölümü iki alt başlıktan oluşmaktadır. İngiliz sömürgeciliğinin 18. yüzyıl sonu ve 19. yüzyıldaki genişlemesi konulu ilk alt başlık koloni terimini tanımladıktan sonra kolonileşme sürecinin kısa bir tarihçesini vermiştir. Kolonileşmenin nedenleri, uygulamaları, kurumları ve sonuçları üzerinde durulmuştur. Kolonileşme süreci ve coğrafi boyutları çok geniş kapsamlı olduğu için konuyu daraltmak adına İngiliz sömürgeciliğinin 18.yy. sonu ve 19.yy. da özellikle Hindistan'daki uygulamalarına odaklanılmıştır.Bu bölümde Elleke Boehmer, Ania Loomba, Don Randall, M. H. Abrams gibi yazarların görüşlerine yer verilmiştir. Ayrıca bu bölüm bilgi ve güç arasındaki ilişkinin kolonileştirme sürecindeki etkisini Michel Foucault, Edward Said, Abdul Jan Mohamed ve Ania Loomba gibi önde gelen kuramcılardan alıntılar yaparak incelemiştir. Kolonileştirme uygulamalarının Hint-İngiliz edebiyatı üzerindeki etkileri yine bu bölümde ele alınmıştır. Kuram bölümünün kolonyel milliyetçilik, anti-kolonyel direniş, kolonileşme sonrası ve kolonileşme sonrası söylem konulu ikinci alt başlığı ise öncelikle Hindistan'daki ilk bağımsızlık hareketlerinin kısa bir tarihçesini vermiştir. Daha sonra "kolonileşme-sonrası" terimi açıklanmış, çeşitli kuramcıların moden ulus-devlet kavramı ile ilgili görüşleri, eski kolonilerin ulusal bir bilinç yaratma mücadeleleri ve kolonileştirmeye karşı milliyetçilik akımları üzerinde durmuştur. Bu bölümün tartıştığı başka bir önemli konu ise birbirinden çok farklı kavramlarmış gibi görünen sömürgeci söylem (baskıcı) ile milliyetçi söylemin (özgürlükçü) aslında aynı şekilde baskıcı olduğu görüşüdür. Kuramcılara göre her iki söylemde tek seslidir; her ikiside farklı olanı yok sayarak hükmetmek istemektedir. Bu bakımdan ele alındığında görülmüştür ki çok sayıda etnisiteyi ve farklı dini inançları bünyesinde barındıran çok yapımlı (heterojen) Hindistan'da bağımsızlık kazanımıyla güçlenen milliyetçi söylem topluma, birliği ve

bütünlüğü sağlama, ulus-devletin üniter yapısını korumak adına zorla homojen (bir yapımlı) bir yapı kazandırmak için baskı aracı olarak kullanılmıştır. Homojen bir toplumda gerçek anlamda çok-kültürlü, çoğulcu bir sistem oluşturmanın olası görünmediği yine bu bölümde tartışılmıştır. Kolonileşme-sonrası edebiyatının önde gelen kuramcılarından Bhabha'nın "kültürel farklılık" ve "Üçüncü Boyut" ("Third Space") kavramları ile uluslararası bir kültür yaratmanın olası tek yolunun kültürel farklılıkların özgürce ifade edilebileceği bir platform oluşturulmasıyla gerçekleşebileceğine dair görüşlerine yer verilmiştir. Rushdie'nin kolonileşme-sonrası edebiyatındaki yeri ve esin kaynaklarının çeşitliliği tartışıldıktan sonra yazarın sadece doğu ve batı edebiyatlarından değil dünyanın pek çok köşesinden beslenerek eserlerindeki çok-kültürlü dokuyu ve zengin içeriği oluşturduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. Bu bölümde yine Elleke Boehmer ve Ania Loomba, Jenny Sharpe, Simon During, Benedict Anderson, Partha Chatterjee, Mikhail Bakhtin, Andrew S. Teverson, Frederic Jameson, Aijaz Ahmad ve Shailja Sharma gibi kuramcıların görüşlerinden yararlanılmıştır. Kuram bölümünün ikinci alt başlığının sonu büyülü gerçekçiliği Erwin Dale Carter, Franz Roh, Alejo Carpentier, Amaryll Chanady, Lois Parkinson Zamora ve Wendy B. Faris, P. Gabrielle Foreman ve Patricia Merivale gibi çeşitli yazarların tanımlarıyla açıklamıştır.

Tezin analiz bölümü *Midnight's Children*, *The Moor's Last Sigh* ve *Shalimar The Clown* başlıklı üç alt bölümden oluşmuştur. İlk alt bölüm öncelikle Rose ve Bakhtin'den alıntılarla "parodi" ve "karnaval parodisi" terimlerini geniş bir şekilde açıklamıştır. Analiz bölümlerinin tamamı Rushdie'nin tez konusu üç romanında kurguladığı parodinin tematik ve yapısal işlevini örneklerle açıklamıştır. Her üç bölümde çeşitli yazarların görüşlerine de yer verilmiştir; Sigmund Freud, Indira Karamcheti, Thomas Coburn, John J. Su, Andrew S. Teverson, David Quint, Frantz Fanon, Chidi Amuta, Sonia Gallico, Mircea Eliade ve David Danow kitaplarından alıntılar yapılan yazarlardır. *Shalimar The Clown* başlıklı son analiz bölümünün girişinde her üç romanda da görülen birtakım ortak özellikler verilmiştir. Bundan başka her üç bölümün sonunda yazarın kullandığı parodi teknikleri ve romandaki büyülü gerçekçilik unsurları arasındaki bağlantı incelenmiştir. Örneğin, *Midnight's*

Children'ın analiz bölümünün sonunda eserden alınan ve içinde büyülü gerçekçilik ögeleri taşıyan bir bölüm tartışılmıştır. Bu bölümde bebek Saleem tifoya yakalanmıştır. Saleem'in Heidelberg üniversitesinden mezun bir doktor olan büyükbabası Aadam Aziz torununu kurtarmak için modern tıbbın bütün olanaklarını seferber eder. Ne yazık ki çabaları sonuçsuz kalır. Üzüntüden perişan olan aile bireylerine Saleem'in sabaha çıkmayacağını söylediği anda kapı çalar. Kapıda elinde küçük bir cam şişeyle duran kişi ailenin kiracısı, batılı bir bilim adamı olan doktor Schaapsteker'dir. Doktor Schaapsteker yılan zehirleri ve panzehirleri ile ilgili araştırmalar yapan bir enstitünün sahibidir; kapıyı açan doktor Aziz'e elindeki şişeyi uzatır. Yaptığı açıklamaya göre şişenin içinde dünyanın en tehlikeli yılanlarından kral kobranın zehiri vardır. Bu zehirden Saleem'e verilecek iki damla bebeği ya öldürecek ya da kurtaracaktır. Son çareye başvurulur ve bebek Saleem kurtulur. Bu sahnede görülüyor ki yazar rasyonel olanın sınırlarını aşmada büyülü gerçekçilik tekniğini kullanmıştır. Ayrıca ilginç olan irrasyonel olanın, yani bebeği modern tıbbın değilde son derece öldürücü olan bir yılanın zehiriyle tedavi edilmesi önerisinin, her zaman rasyonalite ile ödeşleştirilen bir batılı tarafından yapılmasıdır. *The Moor's Last Sigh*'ın analizinin son bölümünde tartışılan ve büyülü gerçekçilik ögelerini içeren bölüm ise Mattancherri sinagogunu kaplayan, çok eski, mavi çiniler ile ilgilidir. Babası tarafından terk edilen Abraham, yedi yaşında sinagogda oynarken aniden fark eder ki çiniler adeta bir televizyon ekranı gibi babasının bütün maceralarını göstermektedir. Küçük Abraham çinilerde gördüklerini kendisine saklar, annesi Flory'e anlatmaz. Sihirli çinilerde babası Solomon'un üzüntüleri, sevinçleri, coşkuları, karşılaştığı zorlukları, kurduğu ilişkileri kısacası tüm yaşamını izler. Ancak çiniler Abraham ergenlik çağına girdiğinde ona bir oyun oynar ve babasının geri döneceği sanrısını yaratır. Abraham büyük bir heyecanla babasını karşılamaya limana koşar. Ne yazık ki ne gelen vardır ne de giden. Abraham çok üzülür ve bir daha çiniler kendisine hiçbirşey göstermez. Ancak çinilerdeki görüntüler babası Solomon'un, annesi ve kendisini herhangi bir zorunlulukla değil bilerek ve isteyerek, bundan sonra sadece kendisi için yaşamak istediğinden terk ettiğini Abraham'a öğretir. Babasının bu seçimi yaptığı için mutlu olduğunu görmek Abrahaham'ı bir nebze olsun rahatlatır. Bu

bağlamda görülüyor ki Rushdie burada gerçekliğin sınırlarını büyülü çiniler aracılığı ile aşıyor. Büyülü çiniler henüz küçük bir çocukken terk edilen Abraham'ın sevgi ve şefkatine ihtiyaç duyduğu babası ile, her ne kadar babası fiziksel olarak yanında olmasa bile, iletişim kurmasını sağlıyor. Yazar *Shalimar The Clown* başlıklı romanında da büyülü gerçekçilik tekniğini kullanarak fiziksel gerçekliğin sınırlarını aşmıştır. Kocası Shalimar'a ihanet eden Boonyi pişmanlık içinde Kaşmir'deki köyüne dönmüş, ormanda terkedilmiş bir kulübede yaşamaya başlamıştır. Boonyi dışlanmıış, adeta yaşayan bir ölüye dönmüştür. Sadece çok sevdiği babası zaman zaman gelip Boonyi'yi görmektedir. Boonyi aslında çok sevdiği kocasının bir gün mutlaka gelip kendisini öldüreceğini bilmektedir. İhanetin bedelinin ölüm olacağını daha iki sevgili on dört yaşlarındayken ettiği yeminle ilan eden Shalimar geçen yıllar içinde acımasız bir teröriste, bir ölüm makinasına dönüşmüştür. Boonyi ve Shalimar fiziksel olarak birbirlerinden uzaktadırlar. Biri Kaşmir'de, diğeri Afganistan'da terörist kamplarında veya dünyanın herhangi bir ülkesindedir. Ancak iki eski sevgili adeta yanyanaymışcasına sürekli iletişim halindedirler. Aşk, ihanet, pişmanlık, öfke, intikam, kaderine razı olma, yaşamak, ölmek ve öldürmek ile ilgili duygu ve düşünceler Boonyi ve Shalimar arasında fizikötesi, görünmez bir kanal aracılığı ile akmaktadır. Boonyi Shalimar'ın öldürdüğü her kişiyi, sonsuz nefretini, içinde yanan intikam ateşini, kendisine doğru attığı her adımı hissetmekte, bilmekte ve görmektedir. Burada da görülüyor ki Rushdie rasyonel ve fiziksel gerçekliğin sınırlarını büyülü gerçekçilik tekniği ile aşmıştır.

Tezin sonuç bölümü yazarın birbiriyle bağlantılı olarak ustalıkla kullandığı parodi ve büyülü gerçekçilik ögelerinin üç romanda kurguladığı karakterleri ve dünyaları nasıl çeşitlendirdiğini, nasıl çok-katmanlı bir hale getirip zenginleştirdiğini vurgulamıştır. Sonuç bölümü ayrıca karnaval parodisi ve büyülü gerçekçilik arasındaki tematik ve yapısal benzerliklere tekrar dikkat çekmiş, bu iki tekniğin, yazarın önceden kesinleştirilmiş tarihi, siyasi, zamansal, mekansal ve rasyonel sınırların ötesine geçme amacına hizmet ettiğini göstermiştir. Bu bölümde Beata Gesicka, Shirley Neuman ve Robert Wilson ve David Danow'un görüşlerine yer verilmiştir. Bundan sonra sonuç bölümü kuram bölümünde anlatılan Bhabha'nın "Üçüncü Boyut" (Third Space)

kavramını tekrar etmiştir. Bhabha'ya göre "Third Space" kültürel farklılıkların özgürce ifade edildiği, somut bir varlığı olmayan melez bir iletişim kanalıdır; ve yine Bhabha'ya göre bu betimlenemez soyut kanal aracılığı ile uluslararası bir kültür yaratmak mümkündür. Rushdie'nin tezde incelenen romanlarının özelliklerine bakıldığında uluslararası bir kültür inşa etmek için gereken bütün ön koşullara sahip oldukları görülmüştür. Her üç roman da kültürel farklılıkların özgürce ifade edildiği çok-sesli, çok-kültürlü ve çok-yapımlı bir edebi platform oluşturmuştur. Başka bir deyişle Rushdie, Bhabha'nın soyut "Third Space" kavramını romanlarıyla somutlaştırmış ve böylece uluslararası bir kültür yaratmıştır. Tez son olarak Rushdie'nin bireysel ve toplumsal kimliğin oluşturulmasında her zaman tutkuyla savunduğu çok yapımlılık (heterogeneity) kavramına karşı bir yapımlılık (homogeneity) kavramını, batı dünyasının bu bağlamdaki çelişkili uygulamalarını Bilgin'in *Kimlik İnşası* adlı kitabından alıntılarla tartışmıştır. Bilgin'e göre, batı kaynaklı kimlik araştırmaları incelendiğinde iki ana grup ortaya çıkmaktadır. Birinci grup bireyleşme, modernlik, modern insanın sıkıntıları, birey ve toplum ilişkileri, benlik imajı ve sunumu, homoseksüeller, AIDS'liler, özürlüler, aile içi şiddet ve taciz kurbanları, yabancı ve göçmenlerin uyumu, işsizler, evsizler ve çeşitli marjinal grupların kimlik sorunları ile ilgiliyken, ikinci grup azınlık çoğunluk ilişkileri, etnisite, etnik kimlik, azınlık hakları, cemaat hakları, kültürel çoğulculuk gibi konuları ele almıştır. Bilgin'e göre, birinci grup batı toplumlarına, ikinci grup ise batı dışı dünyanın toplumlarına odaklanmıştır. Yine Bilgin'e göre, birinci grupta yer alan yayınlar problemli kişi veya grupların topluma uyumu, entegrasyonu ve asimilasyonu doğrultusunda öneriler getirirken, ikinci grup yayınlar aksi yönde etkide bulunmaktadır. Başka bir deyişle içerisi için bütünleşme önerilirken dışarıda farklılaşma ve ayrışma kavramları yerleştirilmek istenmektedir. Konu bu bağlamda ele alındığında görülüyor ki, "batı dışına yönelik öneriler, önlemler, reçeteler, formüller, siyasal politikalar, farkçılık siyasetinin ögeleri olarak beliriyor" (Bilgin, 300-1). Bilgin'in toplumsal ve bireysel kimlik oluşturulması ile ilgili yorumu batı ülkelerinin çelişkili uygulamalarına dikkat çekmiştir. Bu karşıt argüman ileride yapılacak kolonileşme-sonrası edebiyatı ve Rushdie çalışmalarına farklı bir bakış açısı

getirebilmek için sunulmuştur. Bilgin'in görüşleri ışığında, Rushdie'nin eserlerinde ısrarla savunduğu çoğulculuk (plurality) ve çok yapımlılık (heterogeneity) kavramlarının bir yerde hala batı kültürel emperyalizminin siyasi çıkarlarına hizmet ettikleri söylenebilir; batının kültürel emperyalizminin halen "böl ve yönet" ("divide and rule") prensibini takip etmekte olduğu düşünülebilir. Her durumda bu, bir yazarın insanlığı bütün renkli ve karmaşık boyutlarıyla keşfeden yaratıcı dehasının siyasi manipülasyona ve hatta baskıya maruz kalışının ne ilk ne de son örneği olacaktır. Bu durumda sadece, bu tip dış etkenlerin, edebi veya diğer her türlü yaratıcı çabaların sayısız değerlerine gölge etmeyecekleri umulabilir.