Indian writers like Mulk Raj Anand, Bhabani Bhattacharya, Shashi Tharoor, Kamala Markandaya, R.K.Narayan, Khushwant Singh, Nirad Chaudhuri, Manohar Malgonkar, Chaman Nahal, Anita Desai, Nissim Ezekiel, Raja Rao, and Manohar Malgonkar have all contributed in giving Indian Writing in English a place in world literature. But it was only until Salman Rushdie shell-bombed the international literary scene with his postmodern trend-setter *Midnight’s Children* that Indo-English fiction became a distinctive force in world fiction. What the French Revolution was for Wordsworth, the Partition of the sub-continent was for Rushdie, and just as the horrors of the French Revolution was responsible for the birth of Romanticism, the horrors of the Partition gave birth to a new genre of Indo-English fiction, and the course of the Indian English Novel took a new turn after 50 years of having enjoyed an established form. Rushdie stands unchallenged in his treatment of the postmodern devices like ekphrasis, palimpsest, magic realism, hilarious subversion of history, intertextual allusions, and parody. This new entrant to the literary halls of fame is filled with political antagonism caused by his family’s forced migration to Pakistan which wrenched him away from his beloved Bombay. The migration along with the horrific aftermath of the Partition left an indelible mark on both his life and his works which however, became the reason behind his emergence as a major novelist delineating the contemporary scene on the Indian continent.

His migrant status is responsible for his preoccupation with migrant identity and it is a recurring theme in his novels. His protagonists are migrants adrift in search of roots who
cannot help but grapple with the problem of fragmentation, holes in the centre, and double identities. This is not to say that he was frustrated with the hybrid status, of being both the native and the Other, for in a BBC interview he talked about how it had enriched his perspective. Religious fundamentalism, as well as patriarchal and colonial authorities are targets for his sparkling satire, and he weaves his powerful fictions with spectacular new versions of history, by inserting the innovative or unexpected into the familiar. He has no equal in the ingenious demonstration of “historifying myth and fictionalizing history”.

The works of Rushdie is susceptible to speculation and interpretation due to the fact that various components were amalgamated to create a new whole. As such, it is not surprising that his works have been worked on in myriad ways like an inexhaustible mine. However, a very important element has so far gone unnoticed, which is Rushdie’s preoccupation with the fury that sleeps within man – the wild streak in human nature, the tiger caged up in every man which even a cursory reading of Salman Rushdie’s works, especially *Shame*, *Fury*, *Shalimar the Clown* and *Midnight’s Children*, reveal. Besides the postcolonial treatment as well as the diverse thematic structure of the novels, there is to be found classical as well as psychological strains, which this work purports to reveal in his treatment of rage.

This chapter shall first deal with a review of works available on Rushdie to demonstrate that such a venture has not been attempted so far (except for a brief allusion to *Grimus* by Margareta Peterson and Joel Kuortti regarding its psychic properties), and the latter half shall introduce the theoretical aspects of Greek mythology as well as Psychology to analyse elements of fury in the novels of Rushdie.

*Grimus*, Rushdie’s debut has not succeeded in attracting many critics and Margareta Peterson uses an alchemical context in interpreting this novel foregrounding the concept of the transmutation of mortality into immortality due to the presence of an alchemical pattern in
the form of the elixir of life. She states that the petrified life lived by the citizens of Calf Island represent a “stagnant utopia” (Peterson 8), whether in religious or political forms. Flapping Eagle is seen as representing the Philosopher’s Stone – the beginning and end of alchemy’s process as he is a hermaphrodite, possessing dual attributes. Peterson mentions the dimensions talked about by Virgil as a psychic one and says that Eagle while moving in an external world is searching not for his sister but for his real self in an inner world because when he suffered the attack of the dimension fever, he felt that he was plunging deep into an inferno which was himself. So his journey was a journey from self consciousness to Grimus-consciousness or a limited consciousness to an extended one. Eagle resuming his journey from the brothel is seen as adhering to the Jungian concept of a whore serving as the secret substance of alchemy in its initial phase. He is secretly followed by Media, a whore, and made love to yet another whore Liv who turned out to be the Gate to Grimus. She states that it is possible to interpret the novel by basing it on a Jungian model where he finds what he is searching for, arguing that if Calf Island is seen as Eagle’s unconscious, his state of dematerializing when he reached his goal would make sense. However, she repudiates her own interpretation of the novel as a psychological quest on the grounds that Eagle was not represented as a psychological character and did not produce any noticeable developments in his character. But even as the quest for identity is not defined clearly in the novel she talks about the many interpretations of Grimus by different scholars among them being Rushdie’s first attempt at post-coloniality. Eagle was different from the other Axona Indians because his skin was white, the petrified way of life could represent “the exile-putting down roots in memories” (Peterson 22). Grimus was the European, Eagle the native, the gorfs stood for immobility and Eagle and Grimus for gravity and migrants. But she is more interested in the alchemical attributes of the novel and uses Dota (anagram for toad) as a common symbol for prima materia (primal matter) in alchemy. The toad represented earth whereas the eagle
represented air, making the analogy to the names Dosta, Thera and eagle obvious. Joel Kuortti studies Grimus for its allegorical wealth albeit stating that the novel demands a huge amount of concentration for anyone to draw conclusions out of the many allusions in the novel and adds that lack of criticism on it is proof of its evasive and confusing nature. Kuortti examines the allegorical interpretations of the novel, stating that the Gorfs’ Endimions or Dimensions denote the democratic ideals of the French Revolution conceptualized by Calf Island, an underwater world existing simultaneously with the real world. The Gorfs with their Divine Game of Ordering playing the role of silent spectators and overseers of the events played out in the Endimions symbolize French colonizers. They could also represent novelists and the Stone Rose (which incorporates Rushdie’s initials) could represent fiction as it was capable of transforming an individual in a thousand ways. The inhabitants of K could be a reflection on the human condition of being obsessed with our daily chores. The Endimions also represent diversity which if misused would result in a total annihilation of the universe. This is also said to be a parallel to the restriction on the freedom of writers which would lead to the death of literature. Grimus (a prototype) could stand for patriarchy in all its forms and his misuse of the Stone Rose a reflection on how power can be wrenched from the colonizers to be misused once more by the native-turned-neo-colonizer. So no one should be given access to the Stone Rose to monopolize absolute power. However, the Stone Rose should also be preserved as Calf Island could not exist without it. As denoted earlier, Kuortti talks about the novel’s “proximity to psychology and the human psyche, the worms, devils and monsters being metaphors for fears, memories and suppressed desires” (Kuortti 52-3) and says that the Ion Eye could be compared to an instrument used in looking for mental patterns. P. Bayapa Reddy in his analysis of the novel relates how word play is the technique used to make the novel powerful, anagrams being one of them. Grimus is the bird simurg, Calf is the arabic letter Kaf, gorfs is an inversion of frogs, nus of sun and the galaxy Yawikilm the Milky way.
Flapping Eagle symbolises a realized soul, Calf Island is symbolic of disorder, the inhabitants of K represent passivity and monotony, the Stone Rose symbolises monotonous stagnation, and Grimus stands for rational thinking. He shows how the novel presents an apprehended mundane reality in that reality is sought for among the temporal.

*Midnight’s Children* which deals with Post independent India between 1947 and 1975 is the most ransacked novel among Rushdie’s works. It has been analysed with regard to its structure as well as its narrative technique, and studied for its satirical, allegorical, fantastic, carnivalesque and magic-realist features. Much work has been done on its fusion of history and fiction, its marginal status of women, its remythologised aspects, its theme of fragmentation and its international reception. Pushpinder Syal analyses its composite structure and calls it “a meticulously organised novel in which stylistic devices are adopted consciously for maximum effect” (Syal 129). He considers it one of the most important of post-colonial works, and discourses on the use of magic-realism, as well as how contemporary history overlapped an individual’s, thereby combining history and autobiography. He writes about how in spite of being a diasporic work it is still situated within Indian culture, dealing with historical events. The midnight’s children stand for the citizens of India, castrated and bereft of powers endowed them at birth because of their impotence to act in the present, which in turn was caused by their inability to escape the past. Methwold represents the departing coloniser while Shiva represents social tensions, brought on mainly by the horrors of the Partition followed by the Emergency. Indira Gandhi is both idolized as well as demonized, for being responsible for the dispossessed and impotent plight of Saleem, the Indian. He also points out autobiographical elements in the novel as well as resemblances with the Indian cinema and highlights the chutnification process – Saleem’s adventures chutnified with history from 1916-1980. Comparisons are made with the novels of Sterne, Dickens, G.V. Desani, and V.S. Naipaul. Ashutosh Banerjee discusses the narrative
technique and says that religious allegory is absorbed quickly into the political because religion has always been a potent weapon in the hands of those who ruled India. The perforated sheet is made to symbolise the Purdah, and Dr Aziz’s renegation of Islamic faith. Thoughout the novel, national and domestic life are synchronised and Saleem’s life is made to mirror the nation’s. Padma who cannot be impregnated by the impotent Saleem (Independent India) is Saleem’s artistic conscience and is also given other dimensions. India’s language problem is weaved into the prodigious capability of Saleem where different languages babbled in the parliament of his brain. Reena Mitra discusses the co-ordination of history and fiction saying that Rushdie differs from other novelists in his use of history in that his historical facts cover a vaster span of period and also in the way he fantasizes his depiction of history. Three major aspects of his use of history are the commingling of autobiography and narrative, the breach of chronology, and the search for identity. His use of magic realism in the portrayal of the midnight’s children enables him to expatiate upon the superhuman traits of the Hindu deities. Florence D’Souza uncovers the remythologisation of India’s contemporary history in MC by tracing the “subversive, Barthesian, remythologising gesture” (D’Souza 39) in the application of the novel. She goes about it by first examining the narrator’s attempts at appropriating history and collective memory in order to give himself a place in the general scheme of things, then his incorporation of his family and religion into his remythologised view and finally his attempts at endowing historical events at the national level with a remythologised meaning. Leon Litvak refers to Linda Hutcheon’s support of the view of many critics that the technique of magic realism is the point of conjunction of post-modernism and post-colonialism, and examines the concept of the term “post-colonialism” accepting as well as challenging Ania Loomba’s definition that it has both a temporal (a coming after) as well as an ideological (a supplanting) meaning. He discusses the cinema as Rushdie’s post-colonial cultural interface
where he deals with the magic realist preoccupation with margins and the centre. According to Mishra, the cinema “began as a colonial business, and has …never been able to shed its colonial origins” (Litvak 66). Rushdie “films” historical events where Indians act out scenes directed and conceived by the colonizer. But even in post-colonial India, the presence of western culture prevents Indian culture from asserting itself. The midnight children were themselves “a magic realist device emphasizing the continued struggle to come to terms with identity within the polarities of the post-colonial” (Litvak 69). Madan M. Sharma discusses the postmodern method of using fantasy not as an escape from reality but as a device to transcend and intensify it. He talks about how Rushdie borrows as well as subverts folk tales and epics in his novels. Ron Shepherd also writes on the aspect of fantasy, saying that it was a “radical departure from what has been written by Indian novelists in English to date” (Shepherd 33). He dwells on how MC fits into the mode of a Postmodernist fantasy, distinct from fairy tales or supernatural works. The end result to be therefore discerned in MC is a desultory style like leaps from one matter to another, constant perspectives’ change, eruptions of marginally related issues into the main narrative, ubiquitous symbols, anecdotes, drift into dream and nightmare along with deliberately blurred chronological outlines. Characters split into doubles and multiples, and the novel is more like a dream where some characters are larger and some others less than life. It is a retrospective method used by the author which Gabriel Garcia Marquez who had the greatest influence on him also used in his writing. Shyam S. Agarwala examines it as a Third Worldist national allegory referring to Frederic Jameson’s argument that all third world literature should be read as national allegories as a political dimension is projected in allegorical form which he termed a “fighting literature” (Agarwala 15) as it fought gender, race and class oppression. Mountbatten’s “tick-tock”, the colonizer’s time, strives to impose amnesia through colonial-mindedness in post-colonial India, as parodied in Saleem’s amnesia. It succeeded in Nehru who retained colonial relics
and just as Methwold transferred his assets to a selective few, the elite became the carrier pigeons who according to David Price continued the “Imperial tradition of the British Raj” (Agarwala 25). Saleem represents what Goonetilleke termed “Anglicized Indians” with his Euro-centric views (Agarwala 27) as opposed to Shiva and his endrocentric ones. Just as the map of India was redrawn on the basis of religion, the map of Bombay was redrawn on the basis of language, rendering the myth of India as Bharat Mata “naïve and spurious” (Agarwala 29). He also writes about Rushdie’s multiple conceptions of India and Indianness and about some Latin American writers (foremost among them being Gabriel Garcia Marquez) who resorted to magic realism. He confirms Richard Cronin’s view that the Indian English novel could not be written by a simple realist but only by a fantasist in liaison with the Bombay talkies. S.P. Swain discusses the theme of fragmentation and dubs MC as “the demented wanderings of a split self in quest of wholeness and an identity” (Gupta 79). The narrative technique of oscillating between the past and the present, the historical and the personal, the apocalyptic and the expansive enables Rushdie to sustain the simultaneous identities he himself had to sustain in post independent India. Several strands of reality serve to impart a fragmentary look to the novel and the theme of fragmentation is also symbolized by Saleem’s loss of different parts of his body, sanity and identity. His seeking out father-figures as well as the presence of so many mother-figures testify to his lack of roots and the fragmentation of his personality. Swain also gives the literal disintegration of Saleem’s body political nuances saying that it could underlie the “fissiparous tendencies of Indian politics” (Gupta 85). John Clement Ball analyses the satire and the Menippean Grotesque in the novel. In his post-fatwa response, Rushdie challenged the freedom to “satirize all orthodoxies, including religious orthodoxies” (Ball 88) stating that satire being yet an alien to Islamic culture was to be regarded blasphemous. MC fitted the genre of Mikhail Bakhtin’s Menippean satire “a liberating, subversive challenge to the political status quo…a positive,
future-oriented genre in which pluralism and festive laughter represent signs of renewal, hope and incipient democracy” (Ball 93), with an abundance of carnivalesque speech and the Mennipean characteristics of abnormal psychological states of being, featuring scandalous scenes, eccentricity and violation of norms/customs, all of which abound in the novel. It also makes use of Bakhtin’s concept of “grotesque realism” of grotesque body images which device Rushdie used in the form of “the literalized metaphor” (Ball 97) also known as magic realism or the Mennipean fantastic. As such, the neologism “pessoptimism” borrowed by Rushdie from Edward Said has been used to describe the novel. Nandini Bhattacharya deals with the Carnivalesque aspect of the novel discussing Mikhail Bakhtin’s concept of the special kind of language used by the post-colonial writer to deliberately subvert the language of his erstwhile master as also an attempt to forge an identity for himself. Ramesh Kumar Gupta talks about the submissive status of Padma in the story, and refers to Simone de Beauvoir’s “The second sex” where she stated that women found themselves living in a world where men compelled them to assume the status of the other. He calls her “a prey of masculine might”, (Gupta 50) “a prey of male chauvinistic society”, (Gupta 51) portrayed as making animal sounds and derided at every turn by the narrator. She slaves for Saleem, and is virtually a victim of the Indian patriarchal system. She is a Hindu in love with a sterile Muslim, without liberty, existence or identity, “a willing dupe of the sex politics of India” (Gupta 55). Pier Paolo Piciucco refers to Rushdie’s vehement statements regarding his aversion for allegorical novels and his books not operating as allegories, and states that his works including MC would lose their interest if they were to be read without their allegorical value. He also analyzed the multifacedness of Padma, revealing her split personalities. Klaus Borner writes about the sensational reception that the book received in Germany. The highly praised German translation “Mitternachtskinder” by Karin Graf published in 1983 boldly launched 30,000 copies in its first edition, which was followed by a flood of reviews, articles
and radio features on Rushdie and his new novel. The success of the novel resulted in making West Germans want to see the real India of Saleem’s world.

*Shame* is another novel that has succeeded in inviting a great deal of response and reviews on its themes of shame, margins and repressions, its comic-epic dimensions, its metaphorical significance, the blending of history and fantasy and its political allegories which have all been brilliantly critiqued. Indira Bhatt conducts a thematic study and investigates how the theme is shame at different levels as also its nature, and how it shapes the story’s actions and its consequences in the lives of the principal characters. She discusses the way in which it also affects those who can not reject their religious beliefs while also not wishing to be ruled by Islamic scriptures. Referring to Rushdie’s line from the novel: “Can it be possible that human beings are capable of discovering their nobility in their savagery?” (S 254), she investigates his suggestion that violence can free Pakistan from the shameful past. She says that to bring home the truth that everyone should feel the shame felt by Sufiya but remained indifferent to it, he caused almost all his characters to be neurotic\(^1\). She draws attention to the mystifying language used in the novels, and about how one without prior knowledge of the myths, history or geography of India would find it difficult to understand and enjoy the stories. The importance of the need to read the novel as a fantasy is stressed and she concludes that Rushdie is mischievously pandering to “the gullibility of British intellectuals” (Bhatt 70). Ashutosh Banerjee talks about the pervasive theme of the novel – shame, giving it “an introvertive movement, repetitively holding back the narrative from the centrifugal forces that threaten to cut it away from its moorings” (Banerjee 71). He discusses the manner in which shame is personified by Sufiya. S.K. Tikoo calls it a modern comic epic in prose because it deals with the history of the birth and upbringing of a bastard hero in the

\(^1\)This observation is dealt with in the 3rd chapter of the thesis.
same way that Henry Fielding did in *The History of Tom Jones, a foundling*, the first comic epic in prose. A comparison between the two protagonists – Omar Khayyam Shakil and Tom Jones is carried out. The novel possesses epic dimensions because it covers the period between the birth of Pakistan in 1947 to the post-Bhutto period in 1983 where military administration backed up Islamic fundamentalism to repress the people. He also dwells on the social function of a literary work which should inculcate “finer taste in the readers, not outraging the moral sense that the reader is possessed of” (Tikoo 45) with reference to the use of obscene language in *Shame*. He questions the cultural ethos that Rushdie draws upon for presentation of such material and comes to a rather weak conclusion that it was in keeping with his unrealistic mode of story telling, saying that Rushdie himself had said that realism could break a writer’s heart. Neluka Silva investigates the aspect of repression and resistance in the novel by delving deep into issues of speaking the unspeakable in the land of the pure, a country where an individual has to maintain decorum and propriety (known as *takallouf*) or else face the consequences of a rash remark. As a country where Maulana Dawood (the Mullahs) and General Raza Hyder (the Army) depended on each other for power, the machines for repression were installed in the form of Islamic fundamentalism as well as patriarchal tyranny. Violation of human rights run rampant and the narrator himself is

---

1 Within the context of the novel, abuse maybe the expression of a particular character’s anger and desire to degrade his enemy, but broadly speaking, it is a part of the larger strategy to liberate language from its officious and puritanical seriousness of normal usage. The use of curses, oaths and profanities is intended to degrade and destroy linguistic officiousness. Almost all of Rushdie’s novels have characters with an unlimited stock of colourful curses and profanities which inject a carnivalesque vitality in his works. Rushdie in *Shame* depicts a “not-quite Pakistan…tilted at a slight angle” saying that realism could break a writer’s heart. When he said that realism could break a writer’s heart, it had nothing to do with the use of his carnivalesque language.
a migrant, relating a satirical saga under repressive conditions. Syed Mujeebuddin discusses the marginal status of the women, especially of Sufiya Zinobia who also embodied Pakistan itself. She refused to be passive and be submissive to patriarchal values, unlike others who even chose to be subjected to subjugated roles, opting to be burdened with the sense of ‘shame’ of living otherwise. The author’s act of identification with the peripheral position of Shakil as an outsider is done through a defensive monologue which is referred to as “the chosen or enforced silence of the indigenous intellectual when confronted by the wrath of a totalitarian state” (Mujeebuddin 134). In the matter relating to violence being the child of the dialectics of Shame/shamelessness, which in turn was the “conceptual framework of the novel”, he quotes Aijaz Ahmad who found the concept a flawed one, stating thus: “violence is not in itself capable of regeneration, and it is doubtful, Fanon notwithstanding, that violence is intrinsically even a cleansing virtue” (Mujeebuddin 143). Suresh Chandra discusses the metaphors used in the novel and also shows how the novel in itself is a herald of a three-dimensional fiction. He also talks about Rushdie’s ingenious use of flashback technique and gives him credit for being the first Indian writer to employ “the dream rhetoric as the nerve centre of the story” (Chandra 83). O. P. Mathur states that Rushdie’s sensibility is democratically, secularly and humanistically Indian as he uses Indian myths and legends extensively. He discusses how the novel reveals the seamy side of Pakistan, sublimating the concept of shame “into an air of amused irony which is at the root of the fantasy in this novel, so as to ensure an objectivity necessary for a history” (Mathur 90). To this end, a “fairy-tale” mode of representation is used, that of the Shakil sisters initially playing the role of imprisoned fairies and later that of avenging furies. Examples of the lighthearted atmosphere which makes the story unreal but which helps to clarify reality are brought out which display

---

1 This statement is discussed in the last chapter of the thesis.
the reality of Pakistan, tilted “at a slight angle” (S 29). The use of religion to win popularity and retain power as an important aspect of oriental dictatorship is also reviewed. P. Bayapa Reddy discusses how the novel runs on three levels –the political, the cultural and the social. He discusses Rushdie’s art of characterization where Shakil is a comic vituperation of the murky politics of Pakistan. The use of situational and verbal irony is dealt with in detail as well as the technique of parallels and contrasts. The structural and thematic significance of the use of foul language is mentioned as well as the abundance of felicitous phrases. The use of language (with an Indian flavour) is said to have earned a place in the literary halls of fame. Santosh Chakrabarti studies it as a postmodernist political allegory discussing an important postmodern characteristic – that of “humorous parody of current and identifiable political villians” (Chakrabarti 153) as enumerated by Timothy Brennan which the novel foregrounds in an allegorical frame. He talks about Rushdie’s focus on the socio-political/politico-religious aspects of the misdeeds of the two political rulers of Pakistan as well as the gender problem that plagued the land because of its ideological Islamic root.

Roshin George examines the novel as a “fairy tale analogy where political allegory is very clear” (George 129) and cautions that *Shame* should be read as a story before jumping to conclusions. An integral part of Post-Modernism which Rushdie uses is an anti-form of the conventional mode that requires an exposition, development of plot, crisis, downfall and the final climax. Another Post-Modern element that is found in the novel in the narrative technique is the deliberate thinning of the lines of demarcation between himself and the commentator as he comments on glaring political and social ills.

Comparative critiques on *Shame* and *Midnight’s Children* by Pradip Kumar Dey and Seema Bhaduri shall be dealt with briefly. Pradip Kumar Dey critiques their postcolonial aspects by examining Rushdie’s treatment of post-colonial history subsequent to the partition in his two politico-historical novels. Saleem Sinai, fathered by a Christian (Methwold) and
mothered by a Hindu (Vinita) but with a Muslim name symbolizes the subcontinent and eventually becomes the consciousness of independent India. He becomes the witness to the events that unfold after partition in India and Pakistan, presenting them through the pickling process which makes eatables tastier than in their original form. The Emergency of India, the coup imposing Martial Law in Pakistan under the dictatorship of Ayub Khan and the liberation war in Bangladesh are linked up with the fates of Saleem, whereas Shiva is made to reflect the politicians-cum-criminals of India. He says that *Midnight’s Children* is mostly about the broken promises made by the ruling elite who lived in oblivion of the sacrifices made by the masses for the cause of freedom. It was also how the dream of a two-nation theory turned into a chilling nightmare. He deals with *Shame* as Rushdie’s more sympathetic treatment of women vis-à-vis Islam, as constituting the marginalized in Pakistani society – the other of Pakistan’s ruling class. Sufiya Zinobia’s mental retardation can be seen as a statement on the neo-colonial state of Pakistan where women are destined to feel shame for their inadequacy in a patriarchal society and her transformation into a beast is a message that women can fight for their rights. The Shakil sisters are an allegory for the Islamic women in Purdah and the private language which they weave for themselves is an indictment of Islamic fundamentalism. It is a female-centred narrative as opposed to the male-centred narrative of *Midnight’s Children*. Pakistan is a palimpsest with Indian history buried beneath its surface and its history is written by immigrants – the despised Mohajirs. Again here, the real is juxtaposed with fantasy and Raza Hyder is modeled on Hyder Ali, and Iskander Harappa on Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who is given the Persianised name of Alexander the Great. The power politics of neo-colonial Pakistan is satirized which circulates in a very narrow social stratum of the Harappas and the Hyders which renders the novel a critique of dictatorship. Seema Bhaduri studies the structural motives in the novels and discusses the complementary themes and constructive principles of both. She says that both treat all things in dual terms which
originated with colonialism like the individual’s mind and vision, the man-woman relationship etc which form the grid of the narrative. She compares the inversion of reality in the novels thus: in *Midnight’s Children* the characters are equipped with mystical powers to symbolize mystic experiences in India whereas in *Shame* the characters are identified through their physical or mental defects. She makes Saleem and Padma personify Brahma and Laxmi, and Saleem and Shiva are two halves of a single self. Shiva has formidable knees which indicates his love for power whereas Saleem has a huge nose which indicates his sensitivity and refinement. Shiva possesses the western trait of being infatuated with material things which embodies the split psyche of the Anglicized Indian, and both constitute the Post-Independence Indian elite’s love for ideals as well as power. Aadam Aziz was the first Indian to fall prey to this love for power and he was banished from paradise (Kashmir) by Tai. This dual vision is symbolized by the perforated sheet. So, the fractured self represented by Aadam Aziz has to make a spiritual journey in search of integrity. He symbolizes the elite of the Indian society who professed to possess noble ideals while turning a blind eye to the corruption in their hearts. In *Shame*, the same structural motifs are used where Omar Khayyam Shakil and Sufiya Zinobia counter the Saleem-Padma relationship, Iskander Harappa-Raza Hyder with the Saleem-Shiva relationship, Tai’s Kashmir with the hellish Nishapur, the spittoon with the dumb waiter etc. The difference between the two novels lies in that in *Shame*, the future is bleak due to an absence of political freedom and the nation’s refusal to accept its past, which is dramatized by the sterile liaison of Omar and Sufiya. Omar represents Pakistani’s elite and like Saleem, he is a hybrid having both an English father as well as his intellect and a native mother along with her sexual perversions. The man-woman relationship in *Shame* is barren whereas in *Midnight’s Children* it is lively and fertile. In *Shame* the populace is divided into the natives and the immigrants, the former unprepared for the aftermath of the partition, and the latter grabbing power without any consideration for the
consequences of their actions. The Indian natives and immigrants on the other hand, by virtue of its being “entrenched in its myths and memories”, are able to coexist harmoniously. The binary opposition that links the two novels come full circle when Saleem survives all disasters whereas Omar dies a hellish death. Tariq Rahman analyzes both as political novels to determine the evocation of politics as their major concern while relating it to the novels’ stylistic, philosophical and other aspects. However, he points out that it would be erroneous to judge them according to the criteria of realism and naturalism. He states that Rushdie’s novels are also attributed features of impressionistic plays as events are related from the author’s impression of the past, hence creating an unreal atmosphere and helping to “reinforce the impression that political forces have created a macabre world alienated from the ideal human world” (Rahman 104). His view of Rushdie as a liberal humanist is also presented, reacting to events from a non-partisan point of view and thus transcending nationality, race, creed and culture while giving us a truthful view of political events. What is ultimately defeated in both India and Pakistan is the human spirit which fills the narrator with rage and shame for the inhuman things done around him. He regards Rushdie “the most effective and stringent critic of the politics of India and Pakistan” (Rahman 116).

Critiques on *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* though few are controversial as it was the first work to be published after the *fatwa*. G.R. Taneja tries to uncover the autobiographical elements buried in the story, saying that although Rushdie denied the autobiographical element stating that he had finished writing the book before the *fatwa* and also talked of the necessity to escape autobiography in order to make a book come alive, the book reads like an allegory of his post-fatwa predicament. But he also concedes that the theme of dictatorial repression has always been Rushdie’s passion and in the novel he indicts both the enemy of speech as well as the passive spectators. He mentions Rushdie’s other preoccupation which is that of religion and fanaticism. Sushila Singh on the other hand dubs the book “Rushdie’s
flight to freedom” and takes a bold stand on the autobiographical element. She states that it is the outcome of the post-fatwa situation as the novel is a “protest novel as well as a plea for justice” (Singh 210). She concludes that the novel can be read at different levels of meaning: as a fable, fantasy, adventure, allegory or an autobiographical novel. Novy Kapadia studies it for its political allegory and makes a comparative study with Joseph Conrad’s *Nostromo*. He discusses the absence of “direct political subject matter” in the novel, but says that it is nonetheless a political novel due to its political overtones. He dwells on how the story has a real and imaginatively interwoven socio-politico basis, investigating the allegorical meanings (especially the author’s plight) and the quest for political supremacy. Joel Kuortti also gives an allegorical rendering of the book, referring also to its autobiographical connotations with regard to the importance of writers’ retention of freedom of speech in opposition to the Khattam-Shuds of the world who hated stories as stories were beyond their control. He argues that the crux of the problem was encapsulated in Haroun’s angry demand to his father “What’s the use of stories that aren’t even true?” (HSS 20) which resulted in his father losing his talent for fabricating tales and which was the question that reality put to fiction. The story itself provided an answer to it which was that it was only through lies (fiction) that the truth regarding oppression and oppressive rulers could be safely revealed. He also points out that the story warned against obsession, even the obsession for stories.

*East West* like *Grimus* also has very few takers and Elsa Linguanti undertook it for a comparative study with David Malouf’s *Antipodes*, and Wilson Harris’ *The womb of space*. Celia M. Wallhead conducted a study of its schematic disruption which is a totally technical approach.

Another magic-realist novel *The Moor’s Last Sigh* has its fair share of critiquing. Celia M. Wallhead unearths the subversive sub-text of spices beneath the surface of the main text. In another paper, she observes how Rushdie’s attention is diverted from the post-
colonial axis of Britain and the Indian subcontinent towards the powerful Mediterranean countries of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Factionalism and religious strifes of India are encapsulated in the spice war between the Lobos and Menezes. Then there is the sexual dimension of spice as when Abraham and Aurora fell in “pepper love” (MLS 90). Abraham’s new merchandise of human trafficking were labelled “Extra Hot Chilli Peppers: Green” (MLS 183) if they were virgins. She discusses how cricket and the cinema also serves as a sub-text. She also deals with the recurring image of the palimpsest regarding religion, art works as well as business. Wallhead also unearths Rushdie’s depiction of “multi-racial utopias” (Wallhead 78) through the division of Cabral Island home of the Da Gamas into East and West. She also launches into how Rushdie’s construction of identity “through non-factual factors such as memory, fantasy, narrative, and myth” (Wallhead 76) is to be seen when “The Walrus and the Carpenter” (a poem from Alice in Wonderland) about children being eaten is ascribed to Aurora in her consumption of her own four children. There is a brief reference to the Oedipus element between Aurora and her son where she threw him out of their home ‘Elephanta’ because of Uma and his struggle to have to choose either of them. In the other paper, two aspects of the Mediterranean and world history namely the historic moments of great change like dynasty change, discoveries, and secondly the cultural influences of one civilisation on another are discussed. In his treatment of Spanish historical figures, he tries to rehabilitate the marginalized like the female. She states that Rushdie in his condemnation of fanaticism of any kind shows that evil is born from the desire for wealth and for power over others. Pradeep Trikha discusses the creative and controversial aspects of the novel. Themes of miscegenation and rootlessness, originating and culminating in the Moor’s plight are discussed. He points out how Rushdie exposes linguistic snobbery among educated Indians and calls the book a satirical criticism of life. Sharmani Patricia Gabriel demonstrates how Rushdie’s plural as well as ‘partial’ tensions of diaspora has been
responsible for his rethinking of nation, nationalism, resistance and representation in the novel. She reveals how in the novel national space is rewritten as a space of complex heterogeneity in which cultural differences articulate and produce imagined ‘constructions’ of cultural and national identity. She states that the book reflects Rushdie’s loss of faith in the ability of secular nationalism to sufficiently confront and address the task of unifying India’s heterogeneous realities and goes on to show how his optimistic attitude in the earlier essays of *Imaginary homelands* changed in his later ones. She also discusses the significance of the novel’s organizing metaphor of the palimpsest and how it operates on several levels. John Clement Ball deals with the satirical features of the novel targeting Hindu nationalism which technique he calls “satire’s traditional strategies of representational violence to critique fundamentalists” (Ball 45). The Moor paintings are “allegorical embodiment of India as pluralistic, hybrid, gentle giant” (Ball 47), and the Moor in exile due to the forces of division and negativity is a reflection on Rushdie who was also exiled by the *fatwa*. He also discusses issues like cultural hybridity, merging and palimpsesting. P. Baleswamy studies Aurora Zogoiby as the polarity of the traditional Indian woman – a post-modern, provocative and metropolitan Mother India. Whereas the traditional image is that of a “kind, compassionate, rural, heroic Mother” Aurora is “metropolitan, sophisticated, noisy, angry and different” (Baleswamy 52). Baleswamy mentions “Freudian implications, overtly and covertly scattered throughout the novel” (Baleswamy 58) and relates the Oedipus element in the novel. But he concludes that “shocking though these Freudian explications are, Rushdie seems to be more amused at the parallels with Mother India movie’s stars proving the point in an ironic life-imitates-art fashion” (Baleswamy 60). She is the portrayal of the modern Indian woman who becomes a “giant public figure…marching boldly alongside Vallabhai Patel and Abdul Kalam Azad” (MLS 61), stubborn and unfaithful till the end. He also discusses the novel as an allegory of India in the 1990s, and the Moor, neither a Hindu nor a Muslim sighs over the
devastating effects of the Ayodhya events. Uma is painted as a radical, out to destroy the minorities (among them the Jewish Moraes) and personifies the destruction of pluralism in Indian politics. He states: “one evil does not justify another evil – the thesis of *The Moor’s Last Sigh* emphasizes this age-old maxim” (Baleswamy 62).

*The Ground Beneath Her Feet*, set in the world of rock music, is also controversial as observed in Christopher Rollason’s critique where he questions Rushdie’s un-Indian music in the novel. He states: “the great majority of Rushdie’s song quotations and references are to Anglo-American lyrics of the 60s and 70s” (Rollason 99). Neither Ormus nor Vina is modelled on an Indian singer who might have resembled their international recognition, the only possibility being Freddie Mercury of Zoroastrian roots who also spent his childhood in Bombay. He says that Reviewers have tended to identify Ormus with Presley, Lennon and Dylan and Vina with Laura Nyro, Linda Ronstadt and Grace Slick, drawing similarities with them rather than to any Indian singer. He also says that other than their Indian origins, there is nothing Indian about them, except for the reference to Vina’s love for Indian music like the “sitar ragas…Carnatic melodies…ghazals…qawwals” (GBF 101) which however did not play any role in the mainstream American rock music that turned her and Ormus into mega stars. He stresses the superficiality of the “un-American sounds” which are introduced in the latter part of their careers. He goes on to speculate whether Rushdie in the aftermath of the *fatwa* had also undergone a “spiritual death” (Rollason 119) for producing a “shallow” novel like *The Ground Beneath Her Feet* after producing award-winning ones. Rushdie’s heavy incorporation of the Orpheus-Euridice myth is also reviewed. S. Albertazzi after deciding to write a paper on music in the novel went though the subject written by Dr. Christopher Rollason and came to the conclusion that there was nothing new he could add to the subject. However, he discovered something which Rollason had missed which was: why Rushdie was so interested with popular music, rock and roll, and pop songs. So Albertazzi investigated why
the rock and pop scene was used as the core of the plot of the novel. The novel confirmed Nick Hornby’s opinion that pop was a way of life and the pop musicians were committed to their songs in a way that no other artist did towards his art. He says that during a session of rock music, normal life for young people seem to be suspended temporarily, the dancer dances not with a partner but with the world, the music, his own voice, with light and rain and earth, and with the ground firmly beneath his or her feet and the only way to do that was to maintain the continuity of the beat. This in turn, took one not to chronological but mythological time and thus Rushdie chose the myth of Orpheus for his novel. The message here is that Orpheus, and the creator can die, while the song and creation lives on. Elsa Linguanti launches into an interesting talk about the plurality of worlds as well as the variations on the theme of the otherworlds in the novel from theories developed by Semioticians David Lewis, Saul Kripke, and Lubomir Dolezel. In the novel, an old lady told Ormus and Rai: “We are not a part of your world”. Rai lives in different worlds, such as in a middle class ‘normality’, war fronts, etc and is aware that reality is made up of illusions. Ormus Cama goes to the West from India, coming into contact with the world of the others. She supports this theory saying that it is like the imagined world that we carry in our heads like the dream America as distinct from the real one. Carmen Concilio also analyses the double role of Rai the narrator and photographer of the novel in a postmodern and postcolonial study and as a counterpart to Aristaeus framing the myth of Orpheus and Eurydice. The name ‘Rai’ itself is an anagram of ‘Ari’ in Ariataeus, the keeper of bees. Rai like Aristaeus is the only one among his friends to save both himself as well as his photographs (bees) - his main source of sustenance just as the bees were for Aristaeus. And in keeping with Rushdie’s characters, he conjugates the double role of both narrator and photographer – an oral and visual art. The ‘postcolonial gaze’ of Rai is discussed at length and photography is compared to postcolonial writers and theorists in that they both have an
archaeological approach of digging into the past: “photography too, is a kind of digging” (GBF 155). And both narration and photography were means to salvage what was lost. The second postcolonial isotopy is the theory of outsideness which theory was brought out by Sir Darius, Ormus’s father who felt there had to be a fourth function to the Trinity of Indo-European religions which explained social order. This is analogous to the postcolonial view of the conditions of the subalterns, the silenced group. Celia M. Wallhead talks about the theme of death which figures largely in Rushdie’s works, highlighting the controversial aspects of the eschatological myth of Orpheus and Eurydice, Ormus and Vina being their late twentieth-century version. The afterlife or the underworld ruled by Hades/Pluto is equivalent to the Hindu and Buddhist Yama. The rewriting of dominant myths is a Modernist and Postmodernist trait and Wallhead examines Rushdie’s new version of the myth using tools from feminist biblical revision. In the new world order, the world is ruled not by ideology or religion but by economy where arms, drugs and music rule the roost. The hero need not even be from the West, for Ormus is born in Bombay. The theory of outsideness or otherworldliness is also discussed at length.

_Fury_ is not very popular with critics and the few critiques on it are of a desultory nature. Alice Spenser writes about how the novel has been branded a “self-indulgent, self-pitying, self-glorifying, and self-righteous autobiography” (Spenser 153). Rushdie like the protagonist also left a wife and a child behind in England and resided with a model in Manhattan but in an interview in March 2002 he expressed intense irritation at being asked about the autobiographical contents of his works on grounds that his protagonists were so dissimilar to one another. She reviews how he explores elements of control and autonomy in the relationship between the artist and his creation and how he arrives at the conclusion that creation without the work of art spiralling beyond the artist’s control is impossible. She points out that Rushdie’s creations have themselves spiralled out of control and made an
enemy of Indira Gandhi in *Midnight’s Children*, Bal Thackeray in *The Moor’s Last Sigh* and Ayotallah Khomeini in *The Satanic Verses*. Chhote Lal Khatri also opines that the book is Rushdie’s exploration of his own self. He ascribes the fury to his being an expatriate writer accompanied with the wounds of rootlessness, alienation and failure to make proper adjustments, accompanied by a disillusionment of America. So his referring to the furies of Greek mythology, the Presidential election in America, the fury of Islam and the atrocities of Bal Thackeray of Shiv Sena is his attempt to give his own fury a universal dimension. The psychoanalytical and sociological approach that is adopted by Rushdie is mentioned briefly. The autobiographical bearings sketched out by John Sutherland are also given. The author and the protagonist’s age is 55, both are born in Bombay on Methwold Estate, Warden Road, the reason Prof. Solanka left King’s College, Cambridge (Rushdie’s College) is because he despaired of the narrow infighting and ultimate provincialism of academic life, the same reason why Rushdie left England, and both are married twice. He surmises that Solanka, helpless in his rage in a foreign land is a reflection of the condition of the migrant. The fury of Rhinehart, Bronislawa and Sara and the exploration of both the destructive and constructive features of fury is discussed along with the problem of marriage as a social system in the West.

Not much work has been published so far except for some random write-ups on the Internet on Rushdie’s later novels *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) which is about terrorism-scarred Kashmir and *The Enchantress of Florence* (2008) which is a continuation of the Mediterranean side of *The Moor’s Last Sigh* not unlike Jean Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Charlotte Bronte’s *Jane Eyre*. Andrew Teverson reviews *Shalimar the Clown* as Rushdie’s

---

1 *The Satanic Verses* has not been included in the thesis as it could not be obtained.

2 Jean Rhys rewrote *Jane Eyre* (1847) in her novel *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966), filling in the gaps missing in Bronte’s work and is meant to be the life of Bertha Mason before she became known as Rochester’s mad wife.
work on his last homeland and the “the one remaining thread of his complex cultural inheritance that he has not yet given substantial novelistic treatment: the state of Kashmir”. Kashmir, the home of his maternal grandfather and the place where the family had spent their holidays is portrayed as a paradise of multi-cultural, multi-faith tolerance prior to the political dramas that transformed it in the twentieth century. Shalimar and Boonyi who were born at the moment of the Partition act as mirrors for post-Independence Kashmir. He relates the violent and opposing political interests and how Kashmiriness or the slogan “Kashmir for Kashmiris” was crushed in a three-way power struggle between US interests, the Indian army, and Islamic insurgents from Pakistan. The political conflicts are played out micro-cosmically in the lives of the characters and the American Ambassador’s seduction of Boonyi Kaul is a reflection of the seducing power of America, the corrupting power of its commodities, and its abandonment after taking what it wants. He discusses how Rushdie dwells on the atrocities of fascism and the seduction of Kashmir (Boonyi) by America (Max Ophuls) produced a bastard child and a hybrid (India Ophuls), one of the most powerful female figures that Rushdie has ever drawn. He comments on the title being one of Rushdie’s most carnivalesque of titles and yet his least carnivalesque one because he sees nothing that allows for hope in contemporary Kashmir. He sees the book as Rushdie’s statement that the problems of Kashmir lay in the Hindu-Muslim antipathy that was brought into being by political processes and historical forces. It is a demand for redress and a plea to moderate Muslims to seek to reform their religion and also to European and North American politicians to create a global political context that helps rather than hinder their progress.

R.S. Pathak analyzes some of Rushdie’s remarks in Imaginary Homelands among which was his reasons for opposing the term “Commonwealth literature”. However, he was distressed at certain “ungenerous” comments like the one on Rajiv Gandhi where he called him “a political novice” as well as “immature” and ones like the description of Pakistan as “a
nightmarish, surreal land”. He also dwells on Rushdie’s second birth into Islam which though he finds unconvincing says that his writings would be impoverished without the usual “radical innovations and reformulation” (Pathak 241). D.K. Pabby analyzes the “positive advantage” (Pabby 246) that Rushdie found in the expatriate situation of a writer. He writes of Rushdie’s “maturity” in the last essay of the book where he expressed his hope that Islam would propagate love rather than enmity as tolerance, compassion and love were at its heart. R.K. Dhawan also reviewed some of Rushdie’s statements along with his use of the historical novel, popularized by Walter Scott, highlighting various such novels. He writes of Rushdie’s six-month tour of India before embarking on his second novel *Midnight’s Children* and mentions the “second tradition” (Dhawan 265) of Indian writers in England – that of migration and displacement. The distinction between real history and the historical mode of fiction is displayed and he discusses how Rushdie wrote many things from memory which sometimes came into conflict with reality in spite of which he preferred to retain it over facts, thus deliberately toying with history. He concludes that though essentially an Indo-English novelist, he was raised in the literary tradition of the West and follows the satirical tradition of Sterne, Gogol, Gunter Grass, Melville, Garcia Marquez, Joyce and Beckett.

Michael Hensen & Mike Petry review the viability of a postmodern approach to Rushdie’s novels in the context of postcolonial literature by examining three inter-connected categories of fragmentation, mutability and identity versus alterity. Fragmentation is discussed with regard to the fragmented views of Aadam Sinai through the perforated sheet, Saleem’s physical mutilations, his psychic split emphasised by his use of both the first and the third person, and the pickling of his life in jars. Mutability is observed through the presence of alter-egos and Saleem’s different names and alter-egos, Moraes Zogoiby, Uma’s and Abraham’s double or multiple identities etc. The protagonists’ inability to give themselves a coherent self-identity is reflected in the Moor’s feeling of being shattered like
glass after being thrown out of *Elephanta*, Vina Apsara being described as a person with “her personality smashed, like a mirror” and a “rag-bag of selves, torn fragments of people she might have become” (GBF 121-22). Identity in relation to alterity concerns how migrants form their own identity according to Bhabha’s conceptualisation of a third place – the “migrant identity” in deconstructing “the boundaries between the self and the other” (Hensen, Petry 133). Saleem swallows the world and the Moor inhales it and talks about the dissolving of personal boundaries as he had to shed his identities one after the other. Ormus on his way to London also becomes a “translated man” like Rushdie, which was ‘cultural translation’ and so identity in his novels is not static but is always in the process of being ‘translated’ while retaining pieces of the original. He observed that the identity of Rushdie’s protagonists are not consistent with psycho-socialists’ views that personal identity or social identity are products of family, place or environment as they are migrants always on the move. (This observation will be contradicted in the course of the thesis). The migrant is at liberty to put down roots in his “chosen soil” (GBF 414). So, as one did not in the first place belong to any particular one culture, every individual is a hybrid and culture cannot be “easily pinned down” (Hensen 169). He states that Rushdie deconstructs the traditional approach of identity as some of his protagonists do not know their father/parents and even reject them after knowing them. Vina Apsara flits from one family to another and is always in a displaced state after which she defines herself by giving herself a new name. Moraes after his parents’ rejection of him developed an identity as a thug. Rushdie’s talk about the migrant’s identity which is in between two cultures is discussed. It is a falling in-between or the third space, which he finds a fertile ground for a writer.

Critiques on the collective works of Rushdie also abound and V.B. Salunke discusses the Indian elements in *Grimus* and *Shame* with special reference to *Midnight’s Children* which is all about Post-independent India, dealing with Indian customs, films, myths, politics,
religion, birth/death/marriage ceremonies, the Indian way of speaking, and the deceit practised by ‘saints’. The narrative technique is also Indian and an urban India is presented of the sixties and seventies. Nandini Bhattacharya discusses the authoritarian functioning as a recurring theme in Rushdie’s novels and in his personal life as a counterpoint in his novels which celebrate hybridity, pluralism and diversity. She writes about how Rushdie’s fascists “valorise aggression, achievement, control competition and power” (Bhattacharya 2), how they are personifications of unmitigated evil though with comic and grotesque touches, the range and variety of their shades and how their political fascism is saturated with religious fundamentalism. Grimus as his earliest portrait of a fascist is a migrant and when revealed, turns out to be very ordinary and unprepossessing. In Midnight’s Children the fascist figure is played out by Indira Gandhi who unleashes a reign of terror during the Emergency. Shiva is a parody of Sanjay Gandhi, a marginal man who has no choice but to obey the dictates of the fascist regime. In Shame the fascist is parodied by oppressive patriarchy as well as in the form of a military dictator Raza Hyder who abuses political power behind a religious mask. In Haroun and the Sea of Stories, the unimaginative clerk Mr Sengupta and Khattam Shud1, the dictator of Chup, are pitted against the story teller’s art and condemned severely by Rushdie. In The Moor’s Last Sigh, Raman Fielding, a parody of C.K Naidu is a mafia don, using religious fundamentalism to further political ends. He advocates sati, and is against Bombay’s immigrants, the non-Marathi section of the populace. It is an interesting work on how fascists constitute a counterpoint to the hybrid protagonists of his novels. R. S. Pathak discusses how Rushdie’s novels are seeped in history though sometimes with inaccurate chronology. He observes how in spite of Rushdie’s subject matter being neither stereotyped

1 Bhattacharya states that Khattam Shud is a thinly veiled figure of Ayatollah Khomeini in spite of Rushdie’s statement that he had written the book before the declaration of the fatwa.
nor predictable, one key idea developing in his writing is his concept of history and its interplay with the individual. He states that as Aristotle pointed out, a judicious sorting out of events and imaginative colouring is essential in order to differentiate a novelist from a historian, but this did not falsify the novelist’s vision or minimize the authencity of his creation because what was of paramount importance was the novelist’s perspective.

Satya Brat Singh discusses how Rudy Wiebe, Paul Scott and Salman Rushdie in their respective works wrote of “crisis points” (Singh 148) in a nation’s history while being distanced from the events themselves by being out of time, language and place. They didn’t even know all the historical facts which they used with which to enter reality, so he called them “historians distanced from history”. He also drew parallels among the works of the three novelists as historical novels. M. Madhusudhana Rao places time as the major preoccupation of Rushdie in his novels *Midnight’s Children* and *Shame* in their thematic detail and structural imagination. The given time order defining the historical locale of *Midnight’s Children* is midnight of August 15, 1947 to midnight of August 15,1978, while that of *Shame* is that of the 14th century to the 115th century in the Hegiran calendar. He talks about how the narrative-structure operates on both fantasy and reality while being related to time. He uses the time of fiction - timelessness in dramatizing the troubled psyche of Saleem Sinai and Omar Khayyam Shakil who both yearn for roots, and a fictional locale is also given for Pakistan. Rushdie thus succeeds in conceiving “a temporal or timeless reality in his fiction” and realizes “the world of timelessness, through the medium of history” (Rao 143).

Nandini Bhattacharya examines the theories of popular culture, situating Rushdie’s treatment of popular Hindi cinema in his novels. She sees Rushdie as “one of the foremost of postmodernists who does not reject popular cultural forms like cinema as infantile and banal, an anarchic bricolage of songs, dance, violence and sex, but as a site where national desires are expressed, examined, and re-engineered” (Bhattacharya 178). In *Midnight’s Children*,...
the film Gai-Wallah, a film where the hero commits himself to saving cows from marauding butchers, reflects an important agenda of Hindu nationalists in saving the Mother Cow from beef-eating Christians and Muslims, thereby provoking disputes, especially against Muslim butchers. Another film which is used in this novel is ‘The Lovers of Kashmir’, where the hero and heroine resorted to indirect kissing which was supposed to improve national morals but instead encouraged illicit relationships such as the “cup kissery” of Amina with her ex-husband Nadir in a dimly lighted cafe. Saleem says: “life imitated bad art ... the eroticism of the indirect kiss (was imitated in) the neon dinginess of the Pioneer Cafe” (MC 217-18). In Shame, the same film is shown alongside a Western film showing cowboys feasting on steaks by Mahmoud as an act of defiance against bigoted fundamentalism as a consequence of which his theatre hall is bombed. She observes that for Rushdie, the cinema is a site of imaginative freedom where established ideas are perpetually subverted, thus posing a threat to the ruling class. As dictators recognise the disruptive effects of cinema, they either try to control or crush it which is illustrated in Rushdie’s novels. So, she says that the cinema as “a magical and fantastic form has enormous capacity to challenge all that is official, officious and grim, and change the existing world through its sheer irreverence...” (Bhattacharya 186).

Patrick Bixby analyzes Rushdie’s later novels like The Moor’s Last Sigh and The Ground Beneath Her Feet, where he “writes back” to a postcolonial world which is now swept up into the economic, political and cultural currents of globalization. He observes that in The Moor’s Last Sigh, Aurora Zogoiby’s career as an artist parallels the historical movements of the nation as she produces a series of paintings of her son Moraes who himself is an embodiment of the ethnic and religious hybridity that characterised India long before the British imposed their own culture on it. The influence of advertisements and brand names constitute the common language of globalization, revealing the workings of capitalism in contemporary globalized society. In The Ground Beneath Her Feet, Rock ‘n’ Roll represents
the pre-eminent cultural phenomenon of the global age, and the Indian born Ormus Cama and Vina become little more than icons of the global popular culture.

Comparative studies are also to be found and K.V.S. Murti compares Rushdie and R.K.Narayan, branding them “fantasy writers” with the publication of the latter’s A Tiger of Malgudi and discusses the former’s four works – Grimus, Midnight’s Children, Shame, and The Satanic Verses as such. He calls Rushdie’s fictions ‘secular fantasy’ and R.K. Narayan’s ‘spiritual fantasy’, examining his three early novels. Martine Hennard Dutheil De La Rochere studies Rushdie’s affiliation with Dickens in his technique of “playing out fantasy elements against a realistic background” (Rochere 144). He says that Rushdie shares Dickens’ allusions to the Arabian Nights in David Copperfield to the role of Scheherazade. Rushdie’s depiction of a surrogate son is also similar to the rejected children figuring in Dickens’ novels.

Soumyajit Samanta suggests two ways in which the imperial linguistic domination can be resisted – either by rejecting the language of the colonizer or by “subverting the empire by writing back in a European language” (Samanta 172). Rushdie advocated refusal to concede to western ideas and practices and he was successful in subverting culture while writing in English. He quotes Macaulay’s description of colonised Indians as “Indian in blood and colour but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect” (Samanta 169) which Homi Bhaba said was exactly what the colonizers had set out to do, which he termed “economic, political and cultural endurance” (ibid) and V.S.Naipaul termed such colonised people “mimic men” (ibid). Bhaba said that such people tended to repeat instead of representing in the process of which originality was lost and centrality de-centred. So what was left was “the trace, the impure, the artificial, the second hand” and “the dominant culture is contaminated by the linguistic and racial differences of the native self” (ibid).

Thakur Guruprasad elaborates the secret of Rushdie’s charm which lies in his success
in conjuring up a striking new genre by mixing free-flight fairy-tale with savage political indictment. He observes that parody is at the structural centre of his novels and his protagonists are usually his alter egos representing his satirical venom to the political scenarios of the countries they live in. Famous lines of literature abound in the novels such as “Monologue of a hanged man” (Shame) recalling T.S. Eliot’s The Waste Land, “The portrait of the artist as an old crone” (Shame) in parody of Joyce’s title A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, etc. He says that the other hemisphere of his charm is in the field of gymnastics with language. He is a master manufacturer of felicitous phrases which are diffused all over his works. He also brought into his writing the first look emerging from new language rhythms, exploiting to great advantage his native experience of Indian vernacular tongues.

II

In the light of all the critiques reviewed so far, it is to be seen that Rushdie’s treatment of the rage in his novels that has its principal characters in its grip has gone either unnoticed or ignored. To name a few, Saleem Sinai and Shiva of Midnight’s Children, Omar Khayyam, Sufiya Zinobia and the Shakil sisters of Shame, Prof Malik Solanka, Mila Milo and Neela Mahendra of Fury, as well as Noman Noman and India Ophuls of Shalimar the Clown, are in the grip of an all-consuming rage. It is a fact that a man has every right to feel piqued given the appropriate stimuli for the needed provocation which can be in the form of belligerence, denigration, superciliousness, or deprivation of his or her individual rights. Anger thus provoked, is not only natural but should also be encouraged, for a man unable to rise to the occasion would be rightfully regarded a coward, and also find himself a misfit in society. The purpose of this thesis however, is to investigate the nature of the ‘furia’ or the
incomprehensible and ungovernable rage with which Rushdie is preoccupied. In *Grimus*, Flann O’Toole was described as being “...prone to fits of violent temper” (G 111) in his futile attempts to seduce any woman who entered his Elbaroom. In *Midnight’s Children*, we find the rage of Shiva, whose eyes as a child, were filled “...with an anger which could not be spoken” (MC 150), which had then to find expression in other ways. The other children would watch his fists closing around pebbles, aiming them into the empty air, his aim becoming dangerously effective as he grew up. The anger remained with him for the rest of his life. There is also the “incomprehensible rage” (MC 16) of the boatman Tai, at Dr. Aadam Aziz’s German-manufactured bag. This rage so completely consumed him that he became a changed man. The description of Major Zulfikar’s rage is out of all proportions to what caused it – his failure to arrest Nadir Khan, whom he suspected to be involved in a political assassination. Mr. Emil Zagallo, Salim’s geography and gymnastics teacher, was literally, “always in a fury” (MC 275), which eventually resulted in his expulsion from the school. In *Shame*, the protagonist, Omar Khayyam Shakil, in spite of being smothered with the love of his three mothers, grew up bitter and a silent fury resided deep within him. It rose to the surface for the first time when, as a boy, the ice-vendor informed him that Farah Zoroaster (whom he had impregnated and who had been forced to marry Mr Rodrigues the school teacher) had returned to town. He was so angry and “spoke in tones so altered by fury that the ice-vendor backed off, frightened” (S 55). In *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*, Haroun’s parents, Soraya Khalifa and her husband Rashid Khalifa are victims of this rage. While Rashid Khalifa travelled around telling stories, his wife who stayed at home became filled with rage, which culminated in her leaving her husband for another man. He himself was surprised with the bloodthirsty thoughts that suddenly seized him. When he decided to tell a sad tale as he himself had become miserable at his wife’s desertion, Snooty Buttoo became furious and started shrieking like a madman, which in turn, churned up angry
waters, while all the time Haroun became furious with Snooty. During his adventures with his father, we come across The Cultmaster, Khattam-Shud, of the Chupwala Army, who used to preach hatred, expounding his theory that the way to ruin a love story was to turn it into a tale of hate, his mission being to dry up all the stories in the Great Story Sea. He also came across Mudra, the shadow warrior, dancing “a dance of rage or hate” (HSS 126). The Prophet’s hair in East, West talks about the moneylender Hashim who fell “in a rage to end all rages” (EW 50) and beat the truth out of his only daughter when his son Atta stole the vial to return it to its rightful place. After possessing the stolen silver vial supposedly containing the Prophet Muhammad’s hair, he became a changed man, and whereas he was contained before, he now flew into violent fits of rage over trivial matters. The Moor’s Last Sigh, itself, is said to be: “A Moor’s tale, complete with sound and fury” (MLS 4), similar to the “sound and fury” (MC 357) of the midnight’s children. The Protagonist’s grandfather, Camoens da Gama witnessed the rage around him, and wherever he looked, “…he saw the rage of the women” (MLS 60). His daughter Aurora’s rage surprised him, and left him wondering how, at such a young age, “…she could have heard so much of the world’s anger and pain and disappointment” (ibid). Her rage is “…legendary – and highly artistic – rage” (MLS 136). And the Moor as a child says of Vasco Miranda, the painter: “…an aggressive fury would pour out of him, when he seemed to crackle with such a current of dark, negative electricity that we feared to touch him lest we stuck to him and burned up” (MLS 164,165). In The Ground Beneath Her Feet, what Ormus Cama’s admirer Persis discovered as the inspiration behind his success as a singer was not, as she had believed, “enchanted bliss” but “surging anger…an uncontainable rage” (GBF 90) which was “evident in every chord, every bar, every line,” (GBF 380) in his hit album ‘Quakershaker’. The love of his life, Vina Apsara, was also full of hate. She hated India with It’s heat, it’s rains, it’s food and water. She hated it’s poor people, who were “all over the place” (GBF 72), as well as it’s rich people who were “so
goddamn pleased with themselves” (ibid). She hated it’s crowds, and the way it’s people spoke and dressed, with their inquisitiveness and bossiness. She hated it’s dirt and smell and the need to squat down to shit. She hated it’s money because of it’s low currency value in the international market, and it’s stores because there was nothing worth buying. She hated it’s movies, it’s dancing, and music. She hated the languages including English, and the cars except the American ones, but she also hated them because they were outdated. She hated it’s schools because they resembled prisons and the holidays because they were no different. She hated both the old people and the young, the radio, the absence of TV but most of all, she hated “all the goddamn gods” (GBF 72). Cyrus Cama was another person full of hate. He spent his whole life hating his younger brother Ormus, writing of him: “…for hatred of whom I have ruined my life” (GBF 567). Piloo Doodhwala, the dairy-goat king of Maharashtra, in his helpless rage against the opening of a Company selling pasteurized cows’ milk, paced up and down his Bandra garden, where “he would shriek and gibber like a caged langur” (GBF 117). In Fury, the Protagonist, Professor Malik Solanka had even fled the comforts of home and family as he felt that he did not have any control over the rage that filled him. He had an unassuaged anger deep within him, which easily rose to the surface and exploded whenever he felt irritated. It was the “Little Brain anger” (F 91), the doll that he had created and made famous. In New York when Mila first attempted to make his acquaintance:

“Sudden anger rose in him. “What I’m looking for,” he barked, “is to be left in peace.” His voice trembled with a rage far bigger than her intrusion merited, the rage which shocked him whenever it coursed through his nervous system, like a flood.”

(F 5)

This rage would overpower him even in trivial matters, such as when he: “…stubbed his toe on something and burst into a three-minute tirade of invective” (F 129). Everyone around him seemed to be filled with this rage too, Mila Milo told him not to talk to her about fury, as
she said that she was well aware of what it could do, and Ray Ford is:

“...prone to violent rages, which could be triggered even in those remote altitudes by a backfiring truck in the valley below, a falling tree, or birdsong.” (F 120)

The ‘Road rage’ (F 66) of Ali Majnu, a twenty-five year old New York cab driver who swore non-stop without being aware of it at all is also a rare phenomenon. In Shalimar the Clown, the Protagonist Shalimar’s rage had been awakened for good and his friends in the acting troupe noticed “…a new ferocity in him that could easily frighten people instead of making them laugh” (SC 231). Talib the Taliban’s rage sums up this incomprehensible rage:

“Shalimar the clown thought at first that he understood one-eyed Talib’s rage, thought it was the anger of the wounded warrior deprived of war, of the doer forced to be a teacher. Later he revised his opinion. Talib’s rage was not a side effect. It was his reason for being. An age of fury was dawning and only the enraged could shape it. Talib the Afghan had become his wrath. He was a student, a scholar of rage. Of all other learning he was contemptuous but he was wise in the ways of anger. It had burned through him and now it was all that remained: the rage…” (SC 272)

In The Enchantress of Florence, the Mughal Emperor Akbar:

“…felt within him a surge of the same blind fury that had caused him to tear off the Rana of Cooch Naheen’s offensive moustache...The gathering fell into a silent terror, for Akbar in a rage was capable of anything.” (TEF 81)

Even the invisible Queen Jhodha1, the Emperor’s creation, could be “full of blood and rage” (TEF 49). She felt alive and coherent because the Emperor disliked subservience in a woman,

1 Akbar invented a Queen with whom he chose to spend most of his time while at home, confiding in her and treating her as his equal, which infuriated his wives. It is not known whether the Emperor really had an invisible wife and is possible that Rushdie fabricated it in keeping with his magic realist mode.
and she felt full of ‘rage’ because he had been away for too long while leaving her
defenseless and vulnerable to the jealous plots of his other queens. Thus it is seen that the
major novels of Rushdie are saturated with a blind, ungovernable fury.

III

The purpose intended in this chapter therefore is to introduce the theme of this
Study and lay ground for the ensuing ones in the analysis of ‘fury’. As stated earlier, O. P.
Mathur dealt with Rushdie’s sensibility as being essentially democratically, secularly and
humanistically Indian on the grounds that he used Indian myths and legends extensively in
his novels. This study also intends to show that Rushdie’s sensibility is intranational and the
abundance of classical allusions in Midnight’s Children, Shame, East West, The Moor’s Last
Sigh, The Ground Beneath Her Feet, Fury, Shalimar the Clown and The Enchantress of
Florence is a significant signifier towards this end. This remythologising of the Greek
Classics is also collaborative of his use of magic-realism in dealing with serious socio-
political issues in the “fairy-tale” analogous form. The Ground Beneath Her Feet especially,
can be read as a variation on the Orpheus Eurydice myth with rock music replacing Orpheus’
lyre. But the main allusion as also a a recurrent theme in the novels is to the winged
subterranean goddesses of destiny and revenge the Erinnyes and their role and
responsibility in the fury that possesses, stalks or hounds the characters in the novels. The
people possessed by the Furies are Saleem’s father Ahmed Sinai and his sister nicknamed
‘The Monkey’ (Midnight’s Children), the Shakil sisters and Sufiya Zinobia (Shame), Aurora
Zogoiby and Uma Sarasvati (The Moor’s Last Sigh), the VTO Band and Persis (The Ground
Beneath Her Feet), Prof. Solanka himself as well as the women in his life (Fury), Shalimar,
Boonyi and India Ophuls (Shalimar the Clown), and Princess Kara Koz (The Enchantress of
Florence). The stalking and hounding by one’s Nemesis is an all pervasive theme and Hyder is pursued by his nemesis Sufiya (Shame), Professor Solanka by the doll (Fury), Aurora by Flory Zogoiby, Abraham by Aurora (The Moor’s Last Sigh) and Shalimar by India (Shalimar the Clown). Medusan wrath is not only churned up, laying waste to whatever gets in its way but is authorially ascribed to the three-charactered triptych Furies of far-away Greece. So this study will include a brief allusion to Greek mythology for a complete review of the pattern and variation of the rage found in the novels.

The application of psychology in studying the aggressive nature of the characters however, will constitute the heart of this Study by investigating the psychological elements which are subtly buried in all the novels. A foregrounding of the need for psychology and personality analysis in the study of the rage found in the novels can best be elucidated in the query put forward by Howard S.Friedman and Miriam W.Schustack, co-authors of Personality Classic Theories and Modern Research:

“... is hate the greatest force underlying human endeavor? Why would an Adolf Hitler or a Joseph Stalin order the murders of millions of innocent people? Why would so many people cooperate in the annihilation of their fellow citizens? ...how can someone come to hate so much?” (PCM 478)

A crater to erupt has to have its interior heated at boiling point. Just as the volcanic eruption is the manifestation of the presence of boiling lava in its interior, the eruption of rage of almost volcanic proportions is the manifestation of the presence of a boiling human emotion. The emotion however, may vary, motivated by personal, religious or political reasons as such. However, the fact remains that Psychology is the systematic observations about how and why Jack or Jane behave as they do, and the question of who they are and why they have such distinct and unique personalities being psychological forces, vindicates the application of psychology in the attempt to analyse the rage found in the novels. Various psychosocial models of human nature and behavior are intended to be incorporated in the analysis of
agression in this thesis, the Psychoanalytic and the Behavioristic models in particular. The central motive in human behavior with Freud is on sex motivation, drive for power with Alfred Adler, a meaningful relationship between the conscious and the unconscious with Carl Jung, whereas it is social ramifications of non-gratification by the neo-Freudians like Karen Horney, Erich Fromm and Harry Stack Sullivan who uphold the view that a woman taught by her mother that sex is dirty becomes neurotic and the like.

Though many of the concepts formulated by Freud, the pioneer of psychology, is intended to be incorporated in the assessment of human nature and behaviour in the thesis, the application of psychology to this study with regard to the behavior of the characters will not and cannot be confined within a purely psychoanalytic theory, as it would lead to a biased and limited study, even though the very term ‘personality psychology’ was unheard of before Sigmund Freud formulated his psychoanalytical theories on the human psyche. The reason is because there is to be found in psychoanalysis a pessimistic overemphasis on early experiences and destructive inner urges. The Psychoanalytic model renders a negative view of human nature and has as its basic principles the belief that the individual’s behavior is a result of the interaction of three key subsystems known as the id, the ego and the superego within individual personalities. This implies that if behavior is determined by sheer inner drives and conflicts, the portrayal of human beings is that of an animated creature bereft of free will. As a significant criticism of Freudian theory states:

“…it tends to focus on the deviance and the problems in human development and therefore tends to view too many behaviors and reactions as sick or inappropriate or conflict-based. There are many other important motivations and experiences that shape human personality.” (PCM 81)

This implies that Freud completely ignored the individual’s identity and adaptation throughout life and interpersonal relations which are very important issues with neo-analysts and ego psycho analysts. Thus, besides the psychoanalytical model, this study will take into consideration all other psychosocial models like the Behavioristic, Humanistic, Existential,
and Interpersonal models, as well as the Socio-cultural and Interdisciplinary and General system of approaches, applying each and one to any relevant factor.

The Behavioristic model which has a neutral view of human nature states that we are ‘conditioned’ or shaped by outward forces. It places heavy emphasis on the role of the social environment in ‘conditioning’ personality development and behavior. This is similar to the socio-cultural approach of personality development which reflects the larger society like institutions, norms, values, ideas and technology, as well as the immediate family and other interpersonal relationships to which individuals are exposed. Some cases will also be based on the Humanistic model which maintains a positive view of human nature and is concerned with the uniqueness of each individual. It states that:

“...despite the myriad instances of violence, war and cruelty that have existed from ancient times, humanistically oriented psychologists conclude that under favourable circumstances, human propensities are in the direction of friendly, cooperative and constructive behavior. They regard selfishness, aggression, and cruelty as pathological behavior resulting from the denial, frustration or distortion of our basic nature.” (APM 68)

The Existential model, which represents a less optimistic view of human beings will also to a certain extent be used in our analysis of aggression. It lays more stress on the irrational tendencies in human nature and its basic theme is that we are the architects of our own lives. It places a strong emphasis on obligations so that the most important consideration is not what we can get out of life but what we can contribute to it. The Existential anxiety is the worry that we will end up in ‘nothingness’ giving rise to the desire that we should lead a meaningful life.

This study will also utilise the application of other psychosocial models like the Interpersonal model similar with Freud’s Psychoanalytic Model, which deals with the process of personality development through various stages involving different patterns of interpersonal development, and the Interdisciplinary and general systems of approaches that
use the effects of a biological, psychosocial and sociocultural determinant on either individuals or groups.

It is hoped that all of them will contribute to our understanding of the rage/fury found in the novels, though none alone will be found sufficient in itself to account for the complex types of maladaptive behavior exhibited by the characters in the novels, or for that matter, by the human race as a whole. The terms ‘fury’, ‘rage’, and ‘aggression’ will be interchangeably used in the analysis.
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