Chapter – V
NARRATIVE TECHNIQUES OF THAROOOR

“The novel is the privileged vehicle of two ways of being: narrative and freedom: to be new (novel) in a speech open to all, and to be free in a speech that never concludes.”

- Carlos Fuentes

Narrative Technique is the method of telling a story effectively. It may be defined as an account of a sequence of events. Realistic fiction narrates events typical of life as it is. The novelist at times assumes the form of an omnipresent narrator there by establishing a close link with characters and situations through his point of view, consequently, while studying narrative technique of a particular novelist, one must view how form and content are intermixed. Mark Schorer in *Technique as Dictionary* says,

…Technique is means by which the writer’s experience, which in this subject matter compels him to attend to it, the technique is only means…he is discovering, exploring, developing his subject, of conveying its meaning and finally evaluating it. (387)

The art of narrative is a highly aesthetic enterprise. There are a number of aesthetic elements that typically interact in well-developed stories. Such elements include the essential idea of structure, with identifiable beginning, middle and ends, focus on temporality, namely, retention of the past, attention to present action and future anticipation: and a substantial focus on characters and characterization. The novel is often enmeshed in inter-textuality, with copious connection, references, allusions, similarities and parallels.
Narratology is one of the main features of post modernism. It is, etymologically, the science of narrative. The term was popularized, however, by such structuralist critics as Gerard Genette, Mieke Bal, Gerald Prince and others in the 1970s. As a result, the definition of narratology has usually been restricted to structural, or more specifically structuralist, analysis of narrative. The post-structuralist reaction of the 1980s and 1990s against the scientific and taxonomic pretensions of structuralist narratology has resulted in a comparative neglect of the early structuralist approaches. One positive effect of this, however, has been to open up new lines of development for narratology in gender studies, psychoanalysis, reader-response criticism and ideological critique. Narratology now appears to be reverting to its etymological sense, a multi-disciplinary study of narrative which negotiates and incorporates the insights of many other critical discourses that involve narrative forms of representation.

Postmodern literature, like postmodernism as a whole, is hard to define and there is little agreement on the exact characteristics, scope, and importance of postmodern literature. However, unifying features often coincide with Zhang Longxi concept of the “meta-narrative” and “little narrative,” (87) Jacques Derrida’s concept of “play,” and Jean Baudrillard’s “simulacra.” For example, instead of the modernist quest for meaning in a chaotic world, the postmodern author eschews, often playfully, the possibility of meaning, and the postmodern novel is often a parody of this quest.

Shashi Tharoor as a twentieth century Indian novelist in English is primarily concerned with the changing national scene in respect of the political upsurge, which compelled the British to withdraw from India. The freedom movement in India was not only a political struggle but an all-pervasive national experience for the first few decades. It changed the Indian urban life extensively, and to some extent, the rural life...
too. Since a novel’s subject is man in society, its subject matter should also be closely related to the upheavals and tribulations of the society. Hence no Indian writer writing in those decades or writing about them, could avoid reflecting this national upsurge in his novels. Some of them made this struggle the direct theme while others used it as a backdrop to their personal narrative. However, it acquired almost always a central place in their novels and whatever their subject, they basically turned towards the politics of the day, often dealing with the actions, beliefs, and experience of the people involved in the freedom struggle. As such the measure of their success depends on the extent to which they integrate the felt political reality into the fabric of fiction, thus reaching out effectively to a large section of the reading public. Thus, Faction is a device that brings a novel greater accessibility and social acceptance. In *Studying the Novel: An Introduction*, Jeremy Hawthorn aptly defines the functions of faction:

The term comes from the American author Truman Capote and is a portmanteau word (fact + fiction) to refer to novels such as his own *In Cold Blood* (1966). In this work primarily novelistic techniques are used to bring actual historical events to life for the reader. The term has thus come to denote a work that is on the borderline between fact and fiction, concerned primarily with a real event or persons, but using imagined details to increase readability and verisimilitude. (124)

Since the Political Novel is a fairly recent phenomenon, many critics have tried to define it as a literary genre. In order to be a novel at all, the political novel must contain the usual representation of human behaviour and feelings yet must also absorb into its movement, the hard insoluble pellets of modern ideology, however
abstract they may be. Zulfikar Ghose quotes Stendhal here: “Politics as a work of literature, is like a pistol shot in the middle of a concert, something loud and vulgar, and yet, a thing to which it is not possible to refuse one's attention.” (48) In modern times, the political novel has become a fascinating and popular form of novel, fitting admirably the Aristotelian concept of “Man as a political animal.” (27)

According to Shashi Tharoor, literature as an institution mediates in the power-relations between writer and reader. In this role as a site for representing power relations, especially in different contexts, literature can transform or replicate or contest the power relations existing in society. Tharoor sees the power of fiction to contain an alternative version of history. Their texts locate the transformative power of fiction in its capacity to provide alternative versions of the past and thereby question official histories. Tharoor’s acknowledgement of Naresh Fernandes is explicit, especially with reference to the conceptualization of the novel and the writer-reader relationship:

What is more, the writer is there, in all his works, in the reader's hands, utterly exposed, utterly defenseless, entirely without the benefit an alter ego to hide behind. What is forged, in the secret act of reading, is a different kind of identity, as the reader and writer merge, through the medium of the text, to become a collective being that both writes as it reads and reads as it writes, and creates, jointly that unique work, 'their' novel. This ‘secret identity’ of writer and reader is the novel form's greatest and most subversive gift. (The Times of India, www.shashitharoor.com)

Shashi Tharoor is often considered to be the Regional Novelist. He emphasizes the setting, speech, social structure and customs of a particular locality, not merely as
local colour, but as important conditions affecting the temperament of the characters and their ways of thinking, feeling and interacting.

Tharoor draws the parallel between history and myth as J. Ralph Crane observes, “History, he seems to be suggesting, as well as fiction can have its origins in myth.” (178) Moreover, as Crane suggests, “History and myth are closely linked in Midnight's Children.” (177) Tharoor does not replace history with myth. On the contrary, he employs the mythical plot of *The Mahabharata* as a structuring frame. However, he alters the mythological essence of the epic by representing historical personages from Indian history with human attributes. Moreover in place of divine births and other supernatural events in the epic, Tharoor introduces the possibility of human action. Hence as Silvia Cappello argues:

Most episodes and events in The Mahabharata show a divine and just solution made acceptable through the shapes of myth. *The Great Indian Novel*, in contrast, is freed from any mythological solution, and every single episode is deeply rooted in the ground of possibility ... The Great Indian Novel speaks words of truth like any other sacred text, but it does so without becoming part of a myth. (54-55)

Furthermore, P. Balaswamy observes, “Tharoor employs his pre-text for the purpose of parody, irony, and moreover for breaking the illusions about the past ... Tharoor questions the very validity of the myth he has subsumed.” (231) M.F. Salat insists that while in the West history and myth are disparate categories, they are not so in the ‘Indian cultural matrix.’ (211) However, Friedrich Nietzsche asserts Tharoor’s ingenious use of the mythic structure by, “obviating the distinction between the two
narratives by confusing one with the other, Tharoor contradicts the western dichotomy and asserts the unitary concept of Indian historiography.” (129)

Tharoor has employed Stream of consciousness in his work to explicate the psychological nature of the character through some metaphors. William James coined the phrase stream-of-consciousness. It is one of the delusive terms which writers and critics use. It is delusive because it sounds concrete and yet it is used as variously-and vaguely as ‘romanticism,’ ‘symbolism,’ and ‘surrealism.’ We never know whether we are startled to find the creature designated is most often a monstrous combination of the two. Stream-of-consciousness is properly a phrase for psychologists. The phrase is most clearly useful when it is applied to mental processes, for a rhetorical locution it becomes doubly metaphorical; that is, the word ‘consciousness’ as well as the word ‘stream’ is figurative. Hence, both are less precise and less stable. If, then, the term ‘stream-of-consciousness’ is reserved for indicating an approach to the presentation of psychological aspects of characters in fiction, it can be used with some precision. It is the basis from which contradictory and often meaningless commentary on the stream-of-consciousness novel can be resolved. In the opinion of Clement Hawes, the novelist may even be saying “... shocking, or provocative, or entertaining, or stimulating, or instructive things,” (147) but the stream-of-consciousness novel is identified most quickly by its subject matter, which, rather than its techniques, its purposes, or its themes, distinguishes it. Robert Humphrey says:

Hence, the novels that are said to use the stream-of-consciousness technique to a considerable degree prove, upon analysis, to be novels which have as their essential subject matter, the consciousness of one or more characters; which means, the depicted consciousness of one or
that is, the depicted consciousness serves as a screen on which the material in these novels is presented. (153)

Tharoor clearly explained the stream of consciousness techniques in his novel *Riot*. He clearly pictures the state of women in the world arena. The heroine of the novel Priscilla Hart is the Western girl, she is the victim in the hands of Lakshman. He exposes the acts of violence, which the socially legitimized code of tradition legitimizes. The violent murder of Priscilla Hart recalls less the racial factor and more the strands of transgression which lead unto the threat she posed to the code of patriarchal tradition. Tharoor states in Kanshika Chowdhury’s,

> Love, that, “My novel is not about a torrid East-West encounter in a colonial setting; it’s about today’s people in our increasingly globalizing world, where collision and influence seamlessly cross national and ethnic boundaries.” (41)

What we usually specify as the Historical Novel however, began in the 18th century with Sir Walter Scott. The historical novel not only takes its setting and some characters and events from history, but makes the historical events and issues crucial for the central character and narrative. Some of the greatest historical novels also use the protagonists and actions to reveal what the author regards as the deep forces that impel the historical process. Historical novels may often document the life of an earlier society, especially during a socio-political crisis.

Tharoor lays emphasis on the selective choice the historians bring upon the history text, “History marched on, leaving only a few foot prints on our pages. Of its deep imprints on other sands, you do not know because I do not choose to wash in the waters that have swept them away.” (TGIN 110)
The validity of the provisional, plural memory like nature of history and the limitations produced in the historian by memory are challenged:

...for every tale I have told you, every perception I have conveyed there are a hundred equally valid alternatives. I have omitted and of which you are unaware.... This is my story of India I know with its blazes, selections, omissions, distortions, all mine. (TGIN 373)

Tharoor employs Bollywood as a Metaphor to study the varied aspects of Indian life ranging from the personal lives of the actors to their public screen image that is inculcated by the masses into their personal codes. He contributes this idea in the perplexity of the actor at discovering the deceit of the experienced actress, “she must be dreaming, as millions of her countrymen do in the cinema theatres of our nation except that they dream with their eyes open.” (SB 20)

There has been a long tradition dating from Aristotle that makes fiction not only separate from but also superior to history which is the mode of writing limited to the representation of the contingent, and the particular. To Aristotle, the historian could speak only of what had happened, of the particulars of the past; the poet, on the other hand, spoke of what could or might happen and so could deal more with universals. This was not to say that historical events and personages could not appear in tragedy, nothing prevents some of the things that have actually happened from falling into the category of what might probably happen. Nevertheless, many historians have since used the techniques of fictional representation to create imaginative versions of their historical, real worlds. It is part of the postmodernist's stand to confront the paradoxes of fictive historical representation, the particular, the
general, the present and the past. But Linda Hutcheon, in her work *Inter-textuality, Parody and the Discourses of History*, posits:

History and fiction have always been notoriously porous genres, of course. At various times, both have included in their elastic boundaries, such forms as the travel tale and various versions of what we now call sociology. It is not surprising that there would be overlapping of concern and even mutual influences between the two genres. (106)

She continues to elaborate on the challenge histonographic meta-fiction offers to realism:

It is a contemporary critical truism that realism is really a set of conventions, that representation of the real is not the same as the real itself. What historiographic meta-fiction challenges is both any narrative realist concept of representation and any equally native textually or formalist assertions of the total separation of art from the world. (43)

The binary opposition between fiction and fact is no longer relevant in any differential system; it is the assertion of the space between these entities that perhaps matters. But historiographic meta-fiction suggests the continuing relevance of such an opposition, even if it be a problematic one. Some novels establish and then blur the line between fiction and history. This kind of generic blurring has been a feature of literature since the classical Epic and the Bible, but the simultaneous and overt assertion and crossing of boundaries is more postmodern. Umberto Eco has claimed that there are three ways to narrate the past: the romance, the swashbuckling tale and the historical novel. Historical novels he feels,
“not only identify in the past the causes of what came later but also trace the process through which these causes began slowly to produce their effects. The device points to a way of narrating this past historiographic meta-fiction and non historical fiction.” (97)

In short, Tharoor, through the character, has expounded his own philosophy of writing a new kind of work, rather unconventional, but interesting to the reader. He appears to have the idea of a transportation of the theme of a work to the level of making the reader wonder about the authenticity of this story. In Riot Lakshman dreams of writing a novel that can be in any order but the readers will definitely enjoy a sort of interconnectedness among different sections and also will enjoy the factual descriptions with fictional decorations. The novel is descriptive at times, emotional at times, and epistolary at other times. The dates and entries appearing in the letters, diaries, notebooks, scrapbooks, interviews and conversations do not follow strictly, the same time sequences in the book. In fact, the reader here is expected to reconstruct the scenes not only to show thematic inter-connectedness, but also to show how every fictitious event can be made to look natural and real. The sections have been arranged according to ‘text time’ or narrative time, and not according to story time. Story time ideally refers to the natural chronology whereas text time is a special dimension, the way the text has been arranged in the novel, irrespective of a natural chronology.

The manipulative use of text time can perhaps be best illustrated by a quick overview of Lakshman’s conversations with Priscilla Hart. The thematic interconnectedness of the conversations will be discernible only when the spatial arrangement of text sequences is reordered according to story time:
27 Feb. 1989 - Talks about India, its languages, its diversity and problems including the Naxal Movement. Also talks about his social relationship and marriage.

1 July 1989 - Speaks of Hindu-Muslim relationship in India. Also tries to develop his relationship with her.

22 Aug. 1989 - Lakshman tries to convince Priscilla of his deep love for her but she is not happy with his rhetoric of love, as she wants a permanent relationship with him which seems utterly unlikely in their case because of the cultural gap between them. (Shashi Tharoor was interviewed by Roy)

As a postmodern novelist Shashi Tharoor has also employed the following postmodern narrative techniques in his novels. They are, Irony, playfulness, black humour Pastiche, Inter-textuality, Meta-fiction, Temporal distortion, Paranoia, Maximalism, Faction, Magical realism and Irony.

In the 20\textsuperscript{th} century irony was often used to emphasize the multilayered, contradictory nature of modern (and postmodern) experience. For instance, Tharoor’s \textit{The Great Indian Novel} encapsulates irony in the tyrannical system of colonialism into his alternative vision of history:

[By] the simple logic of colonialism ... the rules of humanity applied only to the rules of rulers, for the rulers were people and the people were objects. Objects to be controlled, disciplined, kept in their place and taught lessons like so many animals: yes, the civilizing mission ... made savages of all of us, and all of them. (TGIN 80)
The encounter between the discourse of the nation-state, as projected by Indian cinema, and the reading community of differently placed (politically and socially) viewers of Indian cinema, has resulted in the evocation of the possibilities of the power of cinema, to create subjectivity in individuals. The ownership and control of cinema media by the nation-state works within the power fostered by power relations:

Films in India are truly the opiate of the people; by providing an outlet to their pent-up urges, the Bombay films make them forget the injustice of the oppressive Social order. Evil is personalized in the Villain rather than in the system, which makes the victims, not heroes, of us all. The ownership and control of the means of production remain unchanged. (SB 254)

Patricia Waugh notes that meta-fiction “suggests not only that writing history is a fictional act, ranging events conceptually through language to form a world model, but that history itself is invested like fiction, with interrelating plots which appear to interest independent of human design.” (48) Historiographic meta-fiction is like postmodernist architecture. It is overtly and resolutely historical-though admittedly, in an ironic and problematic way that acknowledges that history is not the transparent record of any sure truth.

In a similar vein, Tharoor permits Ved Vyas / V.V, to write the history which contains his own alternative version of history in The Great Indian Novel, “...he listened to me quietly when I told him that his task would be no less than transcribing the song of modern India in my prose ....” (TGIN 18) The self-conscious narrative technique reflects upon the lapses in both the narratives of historical discourse as well
as fictional discourse. Tharoor informs the reader, “... what is left out matters as much as what is said ....” (TGIN 415) Tharoor attempts to reveal the power of fiction in reinventing history and the power of history in representing itself as a discursive act.

As with postmodernism in general, not everyone is in love with the idea of pastiche—Fredric Jameson famously called it pointless and empty. Despite its critics, though, pastiche is a super-popular technique in postmodern texts and can be found in all areas of pop culture. Think Quentin Tarantino movies: they imitate a bunch of genres, like king of, grind house, and western movies; and dime store pulp novels.

The object of a pastiche is not to borrow externals and write a pale imitation of the original but to learn from the author. Writing pastiches gives one a practical system for doing that, and it can be fun, too.

The modern novelist uses Pastiche as a tool to explore or explicate the idea with ‘known to unknown’ method. Here Shashi Tharoor in his The Great Indian Novel explicates the current political scenario with the Epic Spoof. In his second novel Show Business, he illustrated nuances of modern government with Bollywood film industry. In his third novel Riot, Tharoor picturises communal unrest of India with his fictional story.

Postmodernism’s love of inter-textuality and meta-fiction adds to its maximalist character. It’s inevitable if you think about it: if an author is making loads of references to other texts — and to itself as a text — then we’re most likely dealing with a work of maximalist fiction. In fact, maximalism is pretty blatant about including heaps of outside information and references.

Tharoor’s multiple focalization of communalism, in a pluralistic, secular nation from the perspectives of civic and police authorities including that of a foreign
correspondent serve to intensify the opacity of secularism. Further, the conflict between various ideologies of religion, politics and history is emphasized. For instance, the levels of comprehension differs from Ram Charan Gupta, the Hindu fanatic, Prof. Sarwar a former communist turned historian who believes in religion and democracy, Fatima Bi, who entertains Priscilla’s idea of birth control and Priscilla Hart who naively attempts to impregnate “Population awareness” into a community that is too conservative to comprehend progress. In Riot, a novel like a file folder, Tharoor reveals the pervasive influences of power in each discourse which, in their multidimensional perspectives of the socio-political atmosphere of India, expose the necessity to interconnect in order to recognize the plurality of the ‘truths’ of the past:

...And they’re all interconnected, but you see the Inter-connections differently depending on the order in which you read them. It's like each bit of reading adds up to the sum total of the reader's knowledge, just like an encyclopedia. But to each new bit of reading he brings the knowledge he’s acquired upto that point - so that each chapter means more, or less, depending on how much he’s learned already. (R 136)

Tharoor asserts the power of perception and thereby the choice of perspective that controls the comprehension of any event, parody is a genre closely associated with meta-fiction. Both are central to postmodernist perception and parody developed as a reaction to the failure of the 18th century convention of satire. In the words of Rose Margaret:

“But how will any reader understand the truth, my dear, is that you can only speak of it in the plural. Doesn’t your understanding of the truth depend on how you approach it? On how much you know”. (R 137)
In the 19th century, satires served no moral purpose. . . . Some writers revived the use of the word ‘parodic’ and emphasized the ambivalence of parody as a form of literary criticism containing elements of respect for its target and spoke of it as being both dependent on and independent from its object. (33)

The term ‘Parody,’ in contemporary usage, designates a form of literary satire, distinguishable from other forms of satire, by its imitative mode, its internal dependence on the devices and conventions of its satiric target. Linda Hutcheon says, “Parody is perfect postmodern form in some sense, for it paradoxically both incorporates and challenges that which it parodies.” (227)

Barbara Johnson sees parody in a different way:

“Treating discourses as performance, parody enacts its critique of literature from within literature, foregrounding the artifice or factitiousness of its model's representation of reality, reversing the formal self-effacement on which the parodied discourse depends for its claims to mimesis or truth.” (38)

Michele Hannoosh interprets:

Parody fulfills the function attributed to it in Formalistic theory. It destroys categorically the old charge leveled against Parody, namely, its destructive effect on both individual works and in general. In rebounding upon itself, leaving room for other versions, or even suggesting the forms these might take, parody ensures that the tradition it revises will continue even beyond itself. (116)
A kind of appropriate parody is at work in Shashi Tharoor’s *The Great Indian Novel* as a major aspect of Faction. The manner in which Tharoor appropriates and parodies narratives and engages in a dialogic relationship with the reader is noteworthy. Tharoor acknowledges his indebtedness to the Mahabharata, the master-narrative that has come to play a major role in the Indian consciousness. He remarks that the *Mahabharata* has come to stand for so much in the popular consciousness and the personages in it have become household words, standing for public virtues and vices, and the issue it raises, as well as the values it seeks to promote, are central to an understanding of what makes India. To take characters and situations that are so laden with resonance, and to alter and shape them to tell a contemporary story, was a challenge that offered the author a rare opportunity to strike familiar chords while playing an unfamiliar tune. Tharoor’s experiments with Faction, in this regard, are not merely attempts to explore the thinning line between history and fiction, but also an effort to portray the national consciousness of a people embodied in the myths, legends, and the socio-political and cultural milieu of its narratives.

Apart from its parodic parallelisms with the *Mahabharata* starting with the title itself, the eighteen chapters of Tharoor’s narrative also draw upon seminal texts of the colonial and postcolonial canons, such as *The Jungle Book* (1894), *A Passage to India* (1924), *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966) and *Midnight's Children* (1981). While these texts are appropriated as chapter titles, such references also enable Tharoor to decrown the epic and, at the same time, to regenerate it, showing the blend of truth and imagination.

Tharoor’s text, in other words, activates a dialogue with other texts which are submerged or referred to, engendering a new kind of language. This kind of discourse
can be termed parodic, though the other texts are not held in ridicule. Linda Hutcheon in *A Theory of Parody* suggests that the older texts that are parodied serve as a background and as ‘an ideal’ or ‘norm’ from which come the modern parts (1985: 5). The back grounded text is thus activated, and can be seen as one sure method of dealing with the past and the present. Tharoor’s endeavour is not mere allegorizing by incorporating the political scenario of twentieth-century India. It is an attempt at a re-reading of an old story and an exploration into the relationship between the narrator, the scribe and the reader. In “The Novelist as Teacher”, Chinua Achebe makes a comment that would aptly suit Tharoor’s objective: “I would be quite satisfied if my works (especially the ones set in the past) - did teach my readers their past with all their imperfections ....” (Achebe 1988: 45)

In *The Great Indian Novel*, the very writing of the text throws up postmodern implications. As in the epic, Ganapathi is the scribe, named by the South Indian word rather than the North Indian Ganesh, and described as having "shrewd and intelligent eyes through which he is staring owlishly at me as I dictate these words" (TGIN 18). In the epic, Ganapathi lays down the condition that the narrative should not be broken in between and if it is broken, he would refuse to continue and leave. Ved Vyas in lieu lays down the condition that Ganapathi should understand the verses before taking them down. This pact is here transmuted to a lot of questions about the narrative. Ved Vyas and Ganapathi enter into a similar pact but the tone of the passage which describes this is one of cheerful irreverence:

I made my own condition: that he had to understand every word of what I said before he took it down. And I was not relying merely on my ability to articulate my memories and thoughts at length and with a
complexity which would give him pause. I knew that whenever he took a break to fill that substantial belly, or even went around the corner for a leak, I could gain time by speaking into my little Japanese tape recorder. (TGIN 18)

The idea of history as an ordered composition hints at two things. One, that we have to pay attention to the role of rhetoric in its creation; two, that the ordering may not necessarily be prompted by the historian’s disinterested obligation. By accommodating only some events, happenings, and people into their ordered versions, the historians exercise choice, which also suggests a lurking pattern or design. The happenings and events which get left out in any ordered narrative may not be of lesser significance than the ones which get included. As part of what V.V. describes unrecalled past, the things that get left out provide scope for other narratives, which can be equally interesting and valuable. V.V.’s version is based on his memory—the faltering memory of an old man; other versions could have other sources. All this implies that in historical accounts, the mode and purpose of recording the past are of utmost importance. V.V. tells Ganapathi that “History marched on, leaving only a few footprints on our pages. Of its deep imprints on other sands, you do not know because I do not choose to wash in the waters that have swept them away.” (TGIN 110)

Tharoor draws attention to the selectivity of his version. It is significant that soon after V.V. finishes his account, he feels dissatisfied with it, because he has told his story from a completely mistaken perspective, and would like to retell it. Elsewhere, V.V. refers more specifically to the role of rhetoric in historical narratives. He tells Ganapathi:
. . . the flux of life is like a continuous, interminable wave; to capture it for posterity; we have to shape it, by visualizing it with a beginning and an end. The necessity for closure, which is an arbitrary invention of the teller, in particular, separates life from art. This arbitrariness is essential if we want the account to yield knowledge, even though that may not always help shape the course of true history. (TGIN 169)

This term inter-textuality was developed by the poststructuralist Julia Kristeva, in the 1960s, and since then it has been widely accepted by postmodern literary critics and theoreticians. Her invention was a response to Ferdinand de Saussure’s theory and his claim that signs gain their meaning through structure in a particular text. She opposed his to her own, saying that readers are always influenced by other texts, sifting through their archives, when reading a new one.

Basically, when writers borrow from previous texts, their work acquires layers of meaning. In addition, when a text is read in the light of another text, all the assumptions and effects of the other text give a new meaning and influence the way of interpreting the original text. It serves as a sub theme, and reminds us of the double narrative in allegories.

A famous example of inter-textuality in literature is James Joyce’s Ulysses as a retelling of The Odyssey, set in Dublin. Ernest Hemingway used the language of the metaphysical poet John Donne in naming his novel For Whom the Bell Tolls. Even the Bible is considered an instance of inter-textuality, since the New Testament quotes passages from the Old Testament.

Similarly Shashi Tharoor has borrowed the source for his The Great Indian Novel from the classical epic The Mahabharata. It is an epic tale describing the
dynastic struggle over the throne of Hastinapur between the Kauravas and the Pandavas. In this novel, Tharoor recasts the story of Indian democracy as a struggle between groups and individuals for their personal and political gains. The novel is a blend of myth and reality. Mythology is imported through the ancient mythical figures. The reality is presented through the historical figures of modern India. The challenge before the reader is how he has to distinguish between myth and reality as there is a very thin line that separates them. In spite of the fusion of myth and reality, the message of the novel is clear. The novel satirizes the modern political set up and derives its inspiration from the mythical past of India. The same views are presented in Graham Smith’s “The Novel and Society.”

...There is no real line between myth and reality - the whole novel is like a rich tapestry with the reality of Indian politics and history woven together with the epic, mythical threads of The Mahabharata. Read between the (often) hilarious lines, and the messages will speak to you. (66)

He deviates from the verse in which the original Mahabharata was written. He invokes the help of Ganapathi rather than any muse. The story is to be read in a single sitting. Every word has to be understood well before the reader advances to the next one.

Though The Mahabharata was written about 2000 years ago, it still has relevance to the present political system of India. The politics and the challenges of political world are well defined in The Mahabharata. Still we find the same kind of people in the political set up. Still we have the binary opposition of just and unjust, good and evil that will probably continue as long as the world exists.
The concept of impersonation is a subversive factor by which characters in cinema substitute real men and women. The cinema in impersonating the nation-state becomes a threat to the real. Impersonation does not simply mask, it reveals the disguised image of national identity. Tharoor’s significant achievement lies in his use of narrative experiments, which evoke the pluralism that defines India. Tharoor applies the fantasy land Bollywood as a metaphor to study the reality bites of India. However, Bollywood impersonates the nation-state and in doing so subverts the authenticity of singular reality of the nation state. This concept of impersonation is emphasized by Chakaravarthy’s statement, faction is a coinage of fact + fiction. As a postmodernist, Tharoor employed the term very effectively in all his three novels. Tharoor has also accepted the fact that he has included different points of view in this novel as he writes in a column of *The Hindu*:

That the state in a newly independent nation establishes itself as a major actor need hardly be emphasized. (57)

The story of *Riot* was a story of various kinds of collisions – of people, of cultures, ideologies, loves, hatreds - and it could not be told from just one point of view. The challenge I set myself in writing this book was not just to imagine a dozen different characters but to try and enter their imaginations, in other words to see the world through their eyes... Similarly I sought to depict four or five different people's views of the Ramjanmabhoomi / Babri Masjid controversy; despite my own strong feelings about it, I tried honestly to empathise with each of them individually. (www.Tharoor.Blogspot.com)
A fantasy is a story based on and controlled by an overt violation of what is generally accepted as possibility; it is the narrative result of transforming the condition contrary to fact into ‘fact’ itself. Such violation of dominant assumptions threatens to subvert the norm. This is not in itself a socially subversive activity: it would be naive to equate fantasy with either anarchic or revolutionary politics. It does, however, disturb ‘rules’ of artistic representation and literature's reproduction of the ‘real.’ Fantasy fulfills and manifests our human power to transcend the human. Fantasy does not always invent supernatural regions, but presents a natural world inverted into something strange, something ‘Other’. It becomes domesticated, humanized, turning from transcendental explorations to transcriptions of a human condition. The fantastic cannot exist independently of that ‘real’ world which it seems to find so frustratingly finite. Rosemary Jackson aptly remarks:

Fantasy is that kind of extended narrative which establishes and develops an anti-fact, that is, plays the game of the impossible… a fantasy is a story based on and controlled by an overt violation of what is generally accepted as possibility. . . . The fantastic is always a break in the acknowledged order, an irruption of the inadmissible within the changeless everyday legality. (21)

In order to achieve this, the novelist has to evolve his own narrative strategies and artifices to present a segment of life in a way he desires. The narrative technique is not only beneficial in organizing and ordering the experience so lived out, but also in controlling and evaluating the material which he has set on hand. The material of the novel may be a fantasy, a realistic documentation that makes it relevant to life and art.
Novelists like Shashi Tharoor perform the greater task of handing down things and make the memory of great epics last in their distinct way. The literature or the writers, who use myth and history purposively, acquires simultaneity with the present. This is done with a will to permanence. The euphoria of independence having come to an end, people started viewing things in a different way. The end of the colonial rule led to a ‘second freedom’. The forces of social justice are gathering momentum on the part of Indian soil. Tharoor’s The Great Indian Novel caters to the needs of such audience. Tharoor records his experience in the context of contemporary socio-political conditions, exploiting the mythical patterns present in ethics like Mahabharata. The parallelism of the ancient epic with the story of modern India, provides Tharoor with an appropriately vast narrative framework for representing the variegated and complex cultural and political environment of Indian society. The re-vitalization and re-telling of the epic becomes a strategy of the retrospective interrogation of the recent past which marks many texts of the 80’s. The acerbic wit and satire of the novel is not reserved for the British alone but is aimed equally at those who allowed Gandhi’s ideal to be forgotten or trivialized, at the degeneration into autocracy of the freedom won by sacrifice and idealism, at some of the traditions of ancient India as well as the ethics of the modern society. What the novel offers is not a comforting return to an idealized past but a glimpse of complexity of modern India where the past and the present coexist and where the values and ideals for the present will have to come out of a careful examination of the cultural and historical legacy. As Dharma tells Yudhisthira on the hill top:

…No more certitude - Accept doubt and diversity - derive your standards from the world around you and not from a heritage whose
relevance must be constantly tested. Reject equally the sterility of ideologies and the passionate prescriptions of those who think themselves infallible. (TGIN 471)

At the social level also, the period has witnessed an unprecedented openness. The epic’s device of a quirky narrator’s dictation to a demanding amanuensis allows Tharoor to highlight the constructedness of narrative history, Tharoor’s novel teems with ordinary mortals as well as gods. The representation of the oral account gives an immediacy to the narratives as well as circular, digressive quirky quality with the narrator’s self-admonishments such as “…but I am-getting ahead of my story.” (TGIN 18)

In a way The Great Indian Novel exposes the wrong economic policies pursued after independence, the mismanagement of the country under Indira Gandhi and the dark days of Emergency and the later failure of the Janata politicians to provide a successful alternative, the novel becomes a document of manifest socio-political criticism. The novel ushers in a post-novelist revolution in Indian English fiction. There is postmodernism in the work in many respects: in the rendering of a multiplicity of meanings and voices, in the repudiation of the possibilities of any absolute truth, in the recognition of the basic amorphousness of reality, in the self-conscious probing into questions of the narrative art etc. But unlike Western postmodernization which excels in demystification and offers more or less a negative approach, Tharoor’s work, despite its persistent irony and tone of trivialization, reveals an underlying moral purpose and positive commitment. The historical account of India, which Tharoor presents in The Great Indian Novel, covers a much longer time period—from the nationalist movement to the assassination of Indira Gandhi in 1984. A host of imperial historical figures from the pre and post-Independence eras-
Gandhi, Nehru, Jinnah, Patel, Indira Gandhi, Krishna Menon, Sam Manekshaw, Arun Shouries as the Salt March, Jallianwallah Baugh, the assassination of Gandhi, the Emergency of the general elections of 1982, appear in Tharoor’s fictional recasting of the epic.

The novel can be called a political allegory of selected episodes from the ancient epic Mahabharata as can be inferred from the characters and situations in the Indian political, socio-economic and administrative scene in the late 19th and 20th century. An epic is a work that deals with lofty themes like war, adventure, travel, etc. The prevailing socio-political and economic situation gave him the impetus to write an epic on the lines of the Mahabharata, which he felt that the right model to transcreate fictionally in the modern-context. As in an epic like the Mahabharata, happenings in India over the last century have been extremely complex. The novel broadly deals with two main epochs in India’s history-the colonial and the post-independence. The novel begins with a cryptic remark on India as an underdeveloped country. The author exposes the opulent class of the Indian who wear expensive suits, carry the most aristocratic and sleek briefcases, but do not know the first thing about their own history and heritage. The author says that if such elite of modern India read the epics and the past glory of India - “…they would realize that India is not an underdeveloped country but a highly developed one in an advanced state of decay.” (TGIN 17)

It has displayed a mistrust of interpreting the past and has countered the crushing burden of tradition and history. The novelist has confessed in the ‘Afterword’ that he has taken too many liberties with the great epic. At the end of the novel Vyasa says to Ganapathi -
...Have I, you seem to be asking, come to the end of my story - I told you stories never end, they just continue somewhere else. In the hills and the plains, the heaths and the hearts of India. I have told you my story so far from a completely mistaken perspective. I have thought about it Ganapathi and I realize I have no choice. I must retell it. (TGIN 65)

Tharoor’s reading of the *Mahabharata* is thus open-ended, as it ought to be. There can be no finality about an event, which is still going on in form or the other.

Growing cultural interaction between the East and West; the consequently changing social ethos after Independence have given an added impetus to the writing of novels on the theme of East-West confrontation - a theme still being written on variously. The cultural conflict between the East-West and the reaction of an Indian recorded by the Indian novelist. Some recent post independence novels focus on a different aspect of East-West encounter theme. Tharoor goes beyond a more chronicling of scenario to probe into what conditions people’s political reflexes. An important component of their political consciousness is the awareness of the religion as a motivating force of action or otherwise. Tharoor wants to present the novel as one of many voices, many points of view, many perspectives and many truths. In larger mode, the novel consists of large chunks of narrative whose primary function is quite obviously to fill in social, cultural and historical gaps that may be assumed in an average American’s knowledge bank of India.

Priscilla Hart, the social worker who comes to India is killed in a riot. The parents of the dead Priscilla Hart and Randy Diggs, the reporter who comes to India to do a story on her death. In the context of, and after so much print and other media has been expended on the Ramjanamabhoomi – Babri Masjid conflict, the present black
and white stereotypes of the Hindu fundamentalism and the secularist-Hindu and Muslim is to make the mockery of the issue itself. Leave aside the mere black there is not even an effort at reconstructing the complex context within which that black and white exists.

While Tharoor begins his narrative with a first person narrative, “I can’t believe I’m doing this,” (SB 302) the reader’s unconscious investment in the narrative is sutured with the reader being addressed in the second-person, “You are not real, None of you is real.” (SB 306) But it is in the suggestion of a gendered antecedent for the pronoun that the suture creates a subjectivity in the reader and speaks for both the lack of the ‘I’ and the ‘You’.

Throughout the novel, different dramatic and poetic techniques are used, to enhance its factionality. An author during creation is not really bothered into what genre his creation would fit in. He uses consciously or non-deliberately many ‘-isms’ and formations and they in turn enhance the readability. Tharoor in this novel has taken up the difficult task of correlating and writing disjointed thoughts and actions of film people known for their quixotic temperaments and verbal battles. But the techniques and the poetic devices that he uses here enhance the factionality. Even if each technique is illustrated with different examples, we can see that the common fiction points towards an understanding of Faction. An order of pagination has been observed to do the same: “I can’t believe I’m doing this.” (SB 127) Ashok Banjara’s chapters start with this sentence. This encore or refrain is used not only to improve the sonorous effect as is usually done, but also to give a ponderous effect and credibility to the character. The ‘I’ or the first person effect is complete and the super ego of the person is also established. When the film “is perhaps a hit, and then she is getting a lot
of other parts, she doesn’t have to earn on her back.” (SB 17) An extremely loathsome idea of prostitution is treated very euphemistically here. Ashok says, “What happened? Where is the villain? He had an urgent appointment with destiny.” (SB 22) This is a master understatement about a man who had just met with a horrible death. The awesomeness is minimized.

Describing a widowed mother in a long sleeved blouse, white veiled covering most of the white hair on her head the narrator says, “She is draped in the colourlessness of chronic bereavement.” (SB 25) What better example of a metaphor can there be? Abha the great star narrates her life to the then budding star Ashok. She comments on her hands: “I hate their shortness, their stubbiness ... that is probably a genetic trait. I come from a long time of insecure, nail-biting failures.” (SB 53) There is something appealing, something pathetic in the revelation of this proud woman. Here is the description of a tie which is a magical symbol of material success:

You’ve never stumbled into a big star’s closet and found the most incredible collection of ties in the world, a real parade of ties, red and black and blue ties, ties with stripes of every known width and colour, plain ties and polka-dotted ties, ties with the badge or shield of an exclusive club on them, ties in silk and rayon and polyester and cotton, broad ties and narrow ties, ties with discreet little designs and ties with psychedelic patterns. The most pointless article of clothing in the world, devoid of purpose, an anachronism even in the climates where it’s wearable, a flagrant luxury in our country: what an advertisement for this star’s success, that he could afford to throw away so much money on so many useless foreign ties! You wouldn’t understand what
I felt, Ashok Banjara. You’ve never reached up, awestruck, to touch these ties and brought the entire rack down upon your head, so that you sat swathed in a riot of colours, held down by a dharna of textures, trapped in a gherao of ties. You’ve never bent down to pick them up, one by incredible one, and rearranged them lovingly in that remote stranger’s closet, knowing the distance that stretches between the stranger’s world and your own, even as you touch and feel the dimensions of that distance. You’ve never vowed, Ashok Banjara, that one day you, too, will possess a collection of ties like that, more times than you will ever find occasion to wear. (SB 53)

The long passages reveal the reality of interior India. Pathos strikes at the reader's heart that pulsates along with these ugly truths brought out in a work of fiction. The description of all the aspects of the tie is long and monotonous to a certain extent, but, so is life–long, descriptive and dull. “... the City is the perfect setting for the melodramatic contrasts of extremes of wealth and poverty, and the jostling of strangers in an abstract way,” says Graham Smith (190). Realism is at its peak here, a kind of down to-earthiness seen in Rajeev Srinivasan is unconscious and therefore natural. She calls a spade a spade, that is all. Colloquialism with its special adaptations is seen here and there: “Not everybody in movies was born into it, like me and all the Kapoors or lucked into it, like you” (www.redifindia.com). The character because of her background gets away with her coinage ‘lucked’ because she has been successful in her communicative skills.

On Indian women, Tharoor shares thought-provoking ideas. In the novel, he describes women who are sexy and provocative and women who send a man's libido level to zero:
There are some women you look at physically, judge them primarily by what you think they'd look like under all those yards of cloth that Indian tradition and Indian tailors conspire to ensure they're swathed in. Then there are women you can't possibly think of that way — older relatives, for instance, or some of the asexual buffaloes with hairy moles on their chins you run into at Crawford market, browbeating the butcher. (SB 58)

What a woman is and a woman should be are entirely different. Every man imagines a perfect woman, though it may be far away from practical reality. In this connection, Tharoor tells us what is the epitome of womanhood, the quintessence of femininity.

But somewhere in between, there are women whom you relate to quite differently, women who are pleasant and attractive, may be even beautiful, but whose physicality is not the first thing that strikes you about them, perhaps not even the second thing. These are women with a certain other quality, a grace, a gentleness, an inner radiance that surrounds them when they smile, or speak, or move; women you can love, or worship or hope to marry. (SB 158)

Tharoor employs the technique of parallelism in juxtaposing the ideal image of womanhood and its reality. In the above-quoted lines, the ideal image of the ‘Bharatiya Nari,’ a prototype for Mother India herself, respected by the Indians and the rest of the world, is projected. This image, however, is almost unattainable and is at odds with the image of the real but imperfect woman. Our attachment to British or foreign things even when we have these in plenty is seen in “nearly thirty years since
Independence and we still associate pink skin with healthiness,” (SB 76) which is an example of jingoism.

Tharoor has resorted to poetry occasionally to intersperse the story with a light touch. The inferior quality of the poems is purposeful:

I shall get him
He won’t escape.
I won’t let him
Stay in one shape. (SB 93)
You are my sunlight
You brighten my life
You are my sunlight
Come be my wife. (SB 168)
My heart beats for you,
I’d perform feats for you,
You are the landlord of my soul
My eyes light for you,
I’d gladly fight for you. (SB 170)

This is an example to show the use of rhyming:

You and me, locked in a room,
With only each other for comfort
You and me, locked in a room . . . . (SB 177)

This takes us to the reality of a famous Hindi song “Hum Tum ek Kamre mein Band ho” where Shaadi or wedding bells are tolling in the distance. We can see plenty of hyperboles in some of the other verses.
I am drawn to you like a moth to a candle,
Your heat is more than I can handle,
I am lost, and without shame,
I singe myself in your flame,
And fall at your feet like a sandal. (SB 109)

Another example of neologism is seen in “I realize now that cynic and I weren’t the only people to have ‘thunk’ this particular thought” (SB 201). Adaptation of the English language to suit the purpose is done ingenuously here. A lengthy dialogue takes place between Ashok and his Guru I old pal Tool. Tharoor has resorted to a mixture of philosophy and spirituality to give an impression of transcending the realm of reality. The Guru tells Ashok what sort of a framework he would give to Bollywood in general:

‘What I will give Bollywood,’ he explains, is a philosophical framework for its ills. I’m thinking of calling it Hindu Hedonism ... The idea is to let people continue doing all the venal things that they are so successful with, but teach them to feel good about them rather than guilty. Done something you feel bad about? You were only fulfilling your dharma. Was it something really terrible? Well, you'll pay for it in your next life, so continue enjoying this one. Guilt? Guilt is a Western emotion, a Judaeo-Christian construct we only feel because we are still the victims of moral colonialism. The very notion of ‘sin’ as some sort of transgression against God's divine will does not exist in the Hindu soul and should be eradicated from the Indian soil. (SB 219)
Unfortunately, Tharoor believes that ‘novels tell stories in a lineal narrative, from start to finish’ and that this is what they have done ‘for decades’ even ‘centuries’, betrays unfathomable ignorance. The Researcher says ‘unfathomable’ because his immediate reference to his own ‘innovation’, the ‘reinvented …Mahabharata’ points to an assumption of newness even for that endeavour. He brings back the political crutches of suspicion and divisiveness, the props that we have used for so long. With news of a remembrance in reminiscing over the death of an idealist, the novelist prepares the mind of the spectator for a novel that flows and ebbs like the tide; it is the raw plot of jealousy that keeps that story on the crest of an emotional wave. The story is set in 1989, the postmodern flavour is created with skill, and the reader is left with a neat etching of a women volunteer, Priscilla Hart, who loses her life for no reason. It is like a glass wall breaking into a thousand threats of deadly splinters. Emotions ferment like the curd that bubbles on a hot summer’s day and deep within the psyche of the Hindu-Muslim riots is a hot rage of revenge that is quite obvious but so mysteriously inexplicable. This is the indicator of the historian in Tharoor, as an Indian who lives abroad, gives us the observer’s penchant and also an outsider’s view of the agonizing indecisions and the sparks of hatred that we all carry within us. Tharoor highlights economic asymmetries to produce stark cultural discontinuities.

The notion of cinema as vernacular modernism has recently been proposed with regard to classical Bollywood cinema (1920s through 1950s), challenging the account of the later as a type of narrative cinema based on universal mental structures and narrative cinema based on universal mental structures and trans-historical aesthetic norms. Vernacular modernism highlights certain aspects of Bollywood previously neglected; its relation to contemporary modernist in the traditional media
as well as social and economic modernization; its ability to offer mass audiences a market based cultural horizon in which the experience of modernity including its traumatic as well liberating efforts, could be reflected and articulated, rejected or assimilated, confronted and negotiated.

Thus, the concept of vernacular modernism might provide a more historically and aesthetically specific approach to re-examining, not only the centrality of classical cinema in Indian culture, but also the vexed issue of this cinema’s worldwide hegemony, above and beyond its well-known economic and political interventions. Traditionally historians have critiqued Bollywood’s hegemony, its transnational circulation as the period’s most powerful universalizing imperial discourse, a visual-acoustic idiom alternative to, and corrosive of both official and diverse cultural heritages. The notion of cinema as the first global, modernist vernacular complicates. Critics by suggesting that Bollywood film might have translated differently in different countries. It was not only transformed in local contexts of reception and existing film cultures but also might have played an important role in mediating competing discourse on modernity and modernization. Indians have cinema under their skin. India’s cinema stars enjoy enormous celebrity status, which can be known to escalate into mighty political power. These typically Bollywood films enable viewers to escape traumatic experiences of everyday life especially for the sub-continent dwellers.

These immensely popular films are, with their predictable plots, made specifically for the masses, transporting their audience into an illusory universe. Tharoor’s satirical novel *Show Business* lampoons the Indian film business and its superficiality. It is the best example of Bollywood’s fantasy element in the novel nothing is as it first
appears, as the movie mega star Ashok Banjara finds out. He is a superstar of Bollywood, a hero of Godambo, Judai, DilEkQila, Mechanic, and his last unfinished movie Kalki. Ashok is critically ill, fighting for his life in the intensive care unit. From the various voices, like Pranay, Ashok’s long time cinema villain, who is in love with Ashok’s wife and has fathered an illegitimate child by her, Kulbhushan - Ashok’s politician father - disappointed with Ashok’s career as hero and then he joined politics, which turned out to be a disaster. Mehnaaz Elahi - Ashok’s wife for whom he has no feelings. Ashwin - Ashok’s brother, a grass root politician whose seat is snatched away by Ashok; still the latter campaigns for his brother.

Between these voices, the writer takes us to the film sets of each one of the Ashok’s stares and from these various points of view we gather Ashok. Tharoor explores the Bombay movie industry; he explains the culture of this industry. It is a satirical tale of Ashok’s hits and misses in the world of politics and cinema. Tharoor allows the complexity of India’s social fabric- economic realities, the political exigencies of an enormous entrenched system built equally of corruption and necessity- to arrange itself around his protagonist. The over arching drama concerns nothing less than free will, and Tharoor handles the big topic - the role of dharma, the belief in predestination that he suggests might also be a cosmic cop-out without crushing his fragile characters. Tharoor asks whether a society that has such deep affection for fantasy will not ultimately suffer for it; he also makes you eager to find out what happens in the end. Arriving at its apex of irony is one of the book’s great joys though it hurts. As in the larger - than - life movies it both lampoons and celebrates, pain and pleasure mix until the final fade out.
Reading various types of fiction can be assumed that one is reading about people who have really lived and about events, which really occurred. Unconsciously we separate two general categories nonfiction and fiction. The word ‘fiction’ describes characters and events, which the author has invented. A work of nonfiction has as its subject real people and real events. The writer sticks to the facts which are the result of his own experience, research or investigation and when it comes to the reader, truth is often in fiction. Similarly there is a great deal of imagination in works non-fictitious, although the facts may not alter. The author must use his imagination and judgement to interpret them because nonfiction involves interpretation of facts and not merely their presentation. Like the novelist and short story writers, the writers of nonfiction need their writing to be absorbing and colourful. He wants to create literature, which will be more than a momentary interest and will be read for many years to come.

To achieve this aim writers have made use of literary techniques commonly associated with fiction. These authors often use dialogue to make the situations they describe more realistic and alive. In order to create suspense, they often give us hints, or for shadowing of future. They present the people about whom they are writing sharply and vividly like the characters in the short story or novel. Their descriptions are precise and they avoid dry and mechanical summarization of facts. They always present their reflections, experiences and discoveries in a vivid and stimulating way. Nonfiction writers choose their words carefully with intention to perceive the reader to believe a certain idea or to act in certain way and inform the reader on a practical subject.
The novels of Tharoor reflect resistance to the oppressiveness of Eurocentric history. He uses proper indigenous methods of usage aimed at decolonizing the colonizer’s language and the value system based on it. He also chooses to question certain fundamental assumptions regarding the nature of truth. One can say Tharoor is pre-occupied with the quest for identity that is cultural rootedness. He seeks to re-interpret contemporary socio-political history through the use of mythical pre-figurations. By using epic, Tharoor evolves a radical world view to make literature meaningful to society. The epic possesses enough potential to present a common background, which permeates the political unconscious of the nation. He focuses on the politico-historical aspects of society that has political independence but not the independence of mind. People are not awakened to consciousness fully. The realization of self and the knowledge of their potentiality are wanting. The attempt for ‘order’ and attempt for the feeling of nationality is a must. He stresses the facts and reality of the idiosyncratic society and he feels anxious about it. The politicians who are really expected to educate the society and bring them necessary awareness become the part of the rotten pattern themselves. History - the world, the universe, human life, and every institution under which we live - is in a constant state of evolution. The world and everything is being created and recreated.

To sum up, this chapter clearly explains the various narrative strategies adopted by the great writer. Postmodernism is a complex concept which always gives plurality in meaning. The first chapter introduced the chosen concept elaborately. The second chapter spoke of the Paradigm of Political Discourse in Tharoor’s novels. The third chapter traced the Paradigm of Mythical Discourse in his novels. The fourth
chapter has given a detailed account of the *Paradigm of Religious Discourse* handled in his novels. The fifth chapter gives a detailed summary of the narrative techniques employed by Tharoor. The next chapter is a summation of the points discussed in all the earlier chapters.