

**Forms of Relation: the Western Literary Canon and
Orhan Pamuk's The Black Book, Salman Rushdie's Midnight's Children**

Introduction

Written by Orhan Pamuk and Salman Rushdie respectively, *The Black Book* and *Midnight's Children* are undoubtedly two separate fictional novel plots set in the historically and socio-politically different 'homeland' contexts of Turkey and India. What brings these texts to the same discursive platform, however, is the fact that both are taken to be internationally recognized and acclaimed representatives of what is collectively termed 'Third World literature' – an operational, albeit problematic, concept whereby considerations and criticisms of nonwestern literary works are shaped.

The international recognition for these third world writers issues forth mainly on responses from Euro-American literary and academic institutions constituting the intellectual arena of the 'First World' – a defining concept marking the relative positions, and consequent values, of nations and national economic and cultural output in the global hierarchy of production systems¹. Within this system of comparison, the problematics behind the name and implications of the term "Third World" are self-evident; nevertheless, in lieu of the presently available usage of "World Literature", the former will be used in this paper. The term "world literature" implies a certain euphemism and universalism which is ironic considering that this corpus does not include Euro-American literature in its subject area. Furthermore, as Fredric Jameson points out the general situation, "I don't see any comparable expression that articulates, as this one does, the fundamental breaks between the capitalist first world, the socialist bloc of the second world, and a range of other countries which have suffered the experience of colonialism and imperialism" ("Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism", 317). Jameson's global categorization, however simplistic and as a matter of political-historically fact obsolete it may be, still clearly reflects not only the current economic situation but also the general layout of the production and

¹ See Aijaz Ahmad "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness" (Social Text) where he defines the concepts of First, Second and Third Worlds.

Aktar

distribution of, in this case, literature and literary criticism. In this system of definition where the unit of expression is the nation-state and the consequent mode of operation is through representative mechanisms on all levels of production, literature too acquires, or is traditionally assumed to acquire, a functional-representational role i.e. according to Madhava Prasad: "Literature, or a national culture in general, is one of the representational machineries that serve to consolidate the nation state." (*Social Text*, 72 [1992]). Literary works are thus accepted to operate on representational features, but this expectation is heightened in the case of Third World Literature: since the nations from which the works originate have undergone a history of colonialism, independence struggles, and finally a relatively late acquisition of national 'freedom' and the right to participate in the global capitalist system (Prasad, 70), it is assumed that Third World literary style in general is at the 'phase' where political ambition and national self-assertion with an acute awareness of global positioning in terms of class-consciousness are still the norm. According to an extensive description by Georg M. Gugelberger for instance,

Third World Literature... is bound to be always overtly political (all literature is covertly political but "Third World Literature" foregrounds its political message). It is always conscious not only of the present but of the past and future. It tends to be allegorical and didactic. Formal aspects are not absent but they are clearly secondary—a vital distinction from mainstream literature where formal complexity is considered more important than clarity. It is a fighting literature which speaks out against the traditional triad of oppression: gender, race, class. It clearly perceives that "independence" is merely a beautiful word, typically disguising continued dependency in a heinous paradox which has to be overcome. For "Third World Literature" the understanding of words and concepts are bound to be dialectical; for example, *freedom* and *democracy*, key terms of Western discourse, are often perceived for what they really are: their opposites ("Decolonizing the Canon" *New Literary History*, 515).

For Gugelberger, literary production continues to operate on a medium of binary opposition – the basic unit of which is West : Other (East) and in the corresponding literary domain, Aesthetic literature : Political literature. In this respect, his approach mirrors that of mainstream western postcolonial theory, particularly theories affiliated with Marxist thought. For example, this formula also applies in Fredric Jameson's conception of Third World literature, illustrated by the Hegelian depiction of West-East relationship as a Master-Slave relationship in his article "Third World Literature in the

Aktar

Era of Multinational Capitalism”. Neither theoretician disregards the formal aspects of the literature, but as Gugelberger points out in this case, “all literature is covertly political but Third World Literature foregrounds its political message” in reaction against “oppressive” external and internal mechanisms. Continuing in this vein, Gugelberger proceeds to list “Five Common Denominators” shared by the corpus of Other literature:

Janos Riesz singled out five topics of interest which “Third World Literature” has in common: (1) The political and economic present; this would have to include the frequently scolded topicality found in plays such as *No More Oil Boom*, or *No Food No Country* by the Nigerian Tunde Fatunde. (2) The colonial past: to which urgently needs to be added the neocolonial present. The theme of liberation and resistance. (3) Response to European or Western civilization: this is generally a rejection of the West including its canonized literary models but can also be a solidarity with Western progressive writers. (4) Language issues: for example, orature versus literature, often bilingual, even polyglot aspects of the Euro-American modernist tradition. (5) Formation of the canon: subversion of the present canon and emphasis on canonical revision (Gugelberger, 518).

Although Gugelberger ends the “Denominators” section by noting that some of the criteria “are more complex... [and require] significant additions and caveats” (518), it holds true for him and for others that however heterogeneous the backgrounds and compositions of the texts, Third World Literature essentially evolves around chronological exaction, political reaction – either ‘negative’ or ‘positive’ in the form of “solidarity with Western progressive writers”, and a particular relationship to the Western literary canon: through western ‘tools’ of first world literary form and imagery, Third World Literature aims to politically “subvert” a tradition which in turn excludes it in the world market.

This focus, however, on being a global player nevertheless empties third world productions of any possibility of ‘serious’ aesthetic merit based on western literary criteria. Jameson openly lays out this fact in his article “Third World Literature in an Age of Multinational Capitalism”, when he points to:

...the importance and interest of non-canonical forms of literature such as that of the third world [but rejects the notion that these texts are] as great as those of the canon...[He sees this as an] attempt to wish away all traces of that “pulp” format which is constitutive of sub-genres, and it invites immediate failure in so far as any passionate reader of Dostoyevsky will know at once, after a few pages,

Aktar

that those kinds of satisfactions [aesthetic] are not present (Jameson, 317).

In addition to the exclusionary emphasis on Canonical works: Non-canonical works, such a binary critical approach “romanticizes this literature as ‘fighting...against the traditional triad of oppression’ this trend overburdens Third World Literature with an almost impossible mission” (Adak, 21). Interestingly, nonwestern literary texts which do not fight against the traditional triad of oppression are excluded from the corpus of Third World Literature by theorists including Gugelberger, but their consequent alignment with the western literary canon remains problematic and unexplained. Therefore, it is my belief that the term Third World should also apply to those ‘marginal’ texts with primarily aesthetic concerns, and that these texts may also be considered under the light of the current premises regarding third world literature in general.

Thus, returning to the criteria Gugelberger lists as definitive of non-western literary works, besides underlining the reactionary content of the text, all five points simultaneously deal with literary form either covertly or overtly— the prime concern of the canon. For example, the first point concerns “the political and economic *present*” [italics mine], and the second ‘the colonial *past*’: the premise here is that the text will be inevitably and essentially constructed along a chronological time-line. Considered on a macro-scale, this conception of chronology is a ‘real-time’ construct which mirrors the linear “temporal logic”² governing the historical passage through pre-colonial → colonial → post-colonial states of being. Reaching the post-colonial liberated/enlightened state, however, does not necessarily entail the freedom of literary experimentation with temporality the way in which European modernism opened the linguistic dam gates in western literary tradition. For literary Modernism is the name given on account of the features of an age witnessing cultural evolution. In their joint article “The Name and Nature of Modernism”, literary theorists Malcom Bradbury and James McFarlane explain the ‘spirit of the age’ as reflective of:

² Term used by Anne McClintock in her article “The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term ‘Post-Colonialism’” (Social Text [1992] page 85). Temporal logic refers to the simplistic linear conception of third world historical chronology by post-colonial theory – a logic which foregrounds ‘time’ at the expense of depicting non-linear relations of power.

Aktar

...the pluralization of world views deriving from the evolution of new classes and communications...around 1850...classical writing therefore disintegrated, and the whole of literature, from Flaubert to the present day, became the ‘problematics of language’”(Bradbury and McFarlane, 21).

Third world literature in contrast, although very much concerned with “the problematics of language” in its dimensions of cross-cultural translation and transliteration, is not considered to be occupied with temporality in the Eurocentric modernist sense of the term: in practice, third world countries are ‘still behind’ in terms of establishing “new classes and communications” in the global arena and this struggling socioeconomic ‘state’ pushes back texts’ temporal experimentations on non-linear, individualistic “stream-of-consciousness” time-spans in favor of linear real-time for the immediacy of the collective sociopolitical issues awaiting presentation. In brief, the core argument here regarding the non-canonical nature of third world texts is based on the implications of the necessity of temporality: namely, temporal literature is regarded as utilitarian rather than aesthetic. Jameson explains the historical-political implications of using ‘real-time’ on literary content to be what is known as “national allegory”:

Third world texts, even those which are seemingly private and invested with a properly libidinal dynamic – necessarily project a political dimension in the form of national allegory: *the story of the private individual destiny is always an allegory of the embattled situation of the public third world culture and society*. Need I add that it is precisely this very different ratio of the political and the personal which makes such texts alien to us at first approach, and consequently, resistant to our conventional western habits of reading? (“Third World Literature, 320).

Accordingly, any third world attempts at formal experimentation are perceived as not aesthetic ends-in-themselves in the style of European literary modernism, but as allegorical ‘tools’ whose purpose is to to construct awareness of larger social issue(s) at stake. Jameson’s ‘addition’ to his description is also not to be taken for granted: the difference of the outcomes in third world literature, though the ‘same’ literary style may be used, creates the alienation factor which contributes to the distance of third world texts from the western literary canon. This is because although the ‘familiar’ literary tools for form and imagery construct the narratives, the ‘very different ratio of the political and the personal’ in ‘global’ narratives which use this imagery for highlighting

Aktar

that which is ‘locally’ political creates a de-familiarization effect for “conventional western habits of reading”.

Shortly setting aside the third point Gugelberger lists so as to consider it with the fifth and last denominator, the fourth criterion regards “language issues”: a locus at which further binary opposition takes place – Written tradition : Oral tradition. The underlying assumption is based on the historical production and circulation of written texts and manuscripts, a late eighteenth century phenomenon marked by capitalistic processes of evaluation operating on the availability of resources and the efficiency of communication networks. Specifically literarily speaking, the dominant medium of the canon for the past two centuries has been the novel; a prosaic but flexibly fictional or non-fictional genre. The novel, as Edward Said says, was “immensely important in the formation of imperial attitudes, references, and experiences” on account of “the power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging” (*Culture and Imperialism*, xii-xiii). True to the necessity of actualizing its power as a hegemonic genre, the structure of the novel is originally geared towards reaching public masses and not coteries. Flowering rapidly from the eighteenth century onwards, the novel form was therefore considered a ‘modern’ phenomenon which third world literary figures only later ‘learnt’ through ‘cultivated’ instruction. Otherwise, oral tradition in the form of poetry and drama— undocumented genres with limited accessibility on account of their language, their target audiences as well as due to socioeconomic circumstances restricting texts’ circulation— were the ‘norm’. Thus, late entry into the field based on historic, and linguistic ‘delay’ i.e. the ‘necessity’ of learning the language of the colonizer, followed by the efforts of the Other to master the *art* of the language, produced the subordinate position third world Anglophone literature, for example, is believed to occupy to this day. As Jameson reminds his readers, the underlying assumption is the “very different ratio of the political and the personal” in first world versus third world domains.

Finally, the added effect of these phenomena makes for the material of the third and fifth points, which engage directly with the matter of the canon: namely, third world literature’s consequent rejection of, and its aims to subvert, the existing western literary canon through the novel genre specifically. This subversion in order that revisions may be made for the construction of a ‘world’ canon where third word literary institutions (literature is a representational mechanism employed by the nation in Prasad’s article)

Aktar

may take part as active participants. Not marking any potential threat, Janos Riesz from whom Gugelberger quotes allows room for those third world writers who opt for “solidarity with Western progressive writers” and Gugelberger himself “suggests” room for “significant additions and caveats” (517).

Having elaborated on the five common denominators of third world literature as set in first world literary academies, it is possible to see the particular creation of third world literature’s non-canonic oppositional relationship to the western literary canon i.e. in a Bourdesian approach, the definition of third world literature is constructed on an oppositional relation to the definition of canonical literature, thus re-enforcing the presence and domination of the western literary canon. The resulting global situation at hand, and the point from which I will consequently offer my proposal, may be summarized in Hulya Adak’s narrative concerning Turkish and global literary studies:

Global literary analysis must interrogate its imposition of Western genres and developments to other literatures. This imposition casts Third World Literatures as “late bloomers” in a developmental paradigm that assumes Some literatures lag others in the adoption of genres and artistic movements. In overcoming the divide, one might examine *forms of relation* [italics mine] instead of transnationally studying the patterns of predominant European genres or literary currents. In her essay, “Modernity and its Fallen Languages: Tanpinar’s *Hasret* and Benjamin’s *Melancholy*”, Erturk argues that the crisis of language is not unique to Turkey but is “a structural condition of the modern,” proposing that we analyze the “comparability” of literary modernities transnationally “*in the structural possibility of representation and its crisis*” (“Exiles at Home—Questions for Turkish and Global Literary Studies”, 24).

In agreement with Adak’s suggestion of analyzing “forms of relation” between first and third world literatures, I propose to analyze the particular linguistic and aesthetic relations Pamuk’s *The Black Book* and Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children* have to the western literary canon. Aiming for textual analysis, I will not deal with the writers’ specific relations to their national literary institutions alongside their relations to the western literary canon. The reason is that those considerations open a further broad dimension which may not be simply skimmed over; instead, my analysis intends to (re-)consider “the forms of relation” these two specific texts have to the conception of western canonical works in the light of the five criteria Gugelberger provides. The choice of *Midnight’s Children* and *The Black Book* in particular, stems from my belief that their narrative structures and content carry the potential for an investigation of how

Aktar

these third world texts engage with first world literature in structure and content: an engagement which is in apparent compliance with Gugelberger's premises while actually contesting the notion of "subversion" in these premises—making "language issues" in literature the principle field of focus with "global" awareness of this concern being "a structuralist condition of the modern". Furthermore, it is significant to note that the application of these aesthetic concerns in themselves raise questions within the contexts of the two texts in terms of how formal strategies allow the texts to engage with the questions of western literary canonic expectations and terms of inclusions/exclusions. I believe that that the consideration of Pamuk's and Rushdie's books as "postcolonial" third world texts necessarily entail a serious consideration of their relations with Anglo-American literary postmodernism. These relations are significant due to postmodernism's preoccupation with language issues, established norms and the subversion of these norms, thus adding a further layer to third world literature's involvement with the western literary canon. Initially emergent as a reaction against the principles of Modernism in the field of architecture on account of the status of architectural objects as concrete representations—constructions—of modernist philosophy, literary postmodernism may be illustrated in reactionary terms against the a-historicism and universalizing structures of modernist literature. Linda Hutcheon explains this phenomenon as follows:

The architecture which first gave aesthetic forms the label "postmodern" is, interestingly, both a critique of High Modernist architecture (with its purist ahistorical embracing of what, in effect, was the modernity of capitalism) and a tribute to its technological and material advances. Extending this definition to other art forms, "postmodern" could then be used, by analogy, to describe art which is paradoxically both self-reflexive (about its technique and material) and yet grounded in historical and political actuality (Hutcheon, 150).

There is apparently a paradoxical situation in the passage when one considers it in the light of western canonic expectations: western postmodernist movements criticize art which 'ignores' historical and political issues, while what is known to be classical of Euro-American literary canonic institutions is actually the foregrounding of linguistic play over the political agenda. Though paradoxical in appearance, literary postmodernism's 'reactionary' stance against literary modernism and traditional styles of reading and writing may be accounted for by the social turmoil following World War

Aktar

Two. The dramatic auto-destruction of western cultural values and established beliefs which changed the course of literary studies may be summarized in the questions Jesse Matz asks in *The Modern Novel: A Short Introduction*:

Some people therefore think that World War II put an end to the modern novel. Did it not prove, once and for all, that its experiments were trivial, and that fiction could not abandon its responsibilities to social life, seen plainly, with fully clear critical judgment? Did it not prove that the relative detachment of the modern novel – its movement “inward” – entailed a dangerous retreat from reality? Did it not discredit the belief that fiction could make a new form for any function, since the horrors of the war were well beyond the limits of representation? Did it not prove that fiction should not cultivate chaos, or pretend to order? (Matz, 98).

This passage indicates that it is the direction of the “problematics of language” in the novel genre especially which has altered with literary postmodernism. For the question is no longer concerned with finding the forms and imagery which will most achieve literary “mimesis” and textual “intensity”, but the questions of how mimetic representation is impossible and furthermore dangerous on account of the illusion and indoctrination of reality it creates while sweeping essential historical and ideological agendas under the carpet. There is a strong parallel with third world concerns here. Following Hutcheon’s passage describing postmodernism, we infer, and in fact are told, that although the concept of postmodern essentially differs from that of the postcolonial in its choice of subject³, “there is still considerable overlap in their concerns: formal, thematic, strategic” (Hutcheon 151), as her quotation points out. Hutcheon elaborates on the formal, thematic, and strategic, exemplifying “form” with literary “magic realism”- a style of writing characterized in Rushdie’s work for example, and is a literary style which complicates the concept of linear, rational realism through the normalized textual inclusions of ‘absurd’ or ‘magical’ timelines and/or events. Thematic concerns focus on “history and marginality”, and strategies include “irony and allegory... all shared by both the postmodern and the postcolonial, even if the final uses to which each is put may differ” (151). However, the “self-reflexivity” allowing room for engaging in marginalized historical time slots and subjectivities does not necessarily entail an

³ According to Hutcheon, the object of postmodern critique is the subject of Enlightenment humanism, while that of postcolonialism is the imperial subject or the subject of hegemonic forces (Circling the Downspout of Empire, 150).

Aktar

absence of hegemonic discourse: as Hutcheon notes, "...postmodern notions of difference and positively valued marginality can themselves be used to repeat (in a more covert way) colonizing strategies of domination when used by First World Critics dealing with the Third World" (153).

Such repetition may be exemplified by the discourse of the criticism in question, where "in the case of 'commonwealth literature', they [First World literary critics] simply *let* [italics mine] the emergence of new world cultures create new forms for new realities."⁴ New realities which emerged *later*, and which were hence in need of recognition and development. Postcolonial literature is in the awareness of this postmodernist exclusionary discourse, and that is what makes the "strategies" of writing involving irony and allegory take on new overtones which "alienate" them from the 'western' examples of postmodern allegories. My elaboration of Hutcheon's approach to this co-relation between the literary postcolonial and postmodern stems from the unique operation of this co-relation in Pamuk's text. *The Black Book* is considered to exemplify the "postmodern novel" by many critical reviews (see Bernt Brendemoen in "Orhan Pamuk and His 'Black Book'" and Charlotte Innes "The Black Book" for instance) in its allegorical form, its constant play with how to write a "story" and its extensive usage of linguistic puns—the text's involvement with formal, thematic and strategic issues in the "making of story(-ies)". However, how far are these narrative strategies influenced, or derived from narrative strategies in western canonic literature; lastly, what are the manifestations of western canonic elements in *The Black Book*: what are the forms of relation between the text and the western literary canon?

* * * *

⁴ Jesse Matz "The Modern Novel: A Short Introduction" p.105

Chapter One - The Black Book

I. A Structural Form of Relation: Allegory

One of the initial structural aspects the critic of the third world novel would care to locate is the presence of allegory: the literary style based on the use of extended metaphor, presenting the text as a 'double-layered' story where the written narrative 'overtly' corresponds to another intended level of meaning. This meta-meaning is traditionally associated with moral and/or social intentions, famously exemplified by Dante's *Divine Comedy*. As in Dante's example, western allegory occurs in its most striking form within 'personal' auto/biographical accounts where individual 'characters' represent 'universal' identities in their acquisition of symbolic value i.e. Dante represents the Man in Search of his Purpose in the World, and is guided in his journey through heaven and hell by Virgil, who represents Moral Wisdom. The journey itself is marked by covert critical references to the state of civilization through short stories of characters seen residing in heaven and hell. In its postmodern-postcolonial context, awareness of meta-meaning is construed in Gugelberger's and Jameson's criteria regarding third world fiction's use of "national allegory" as an indispensable genre capable of discreetly embedding sociopolitical critique. In the article "Third World Literature in the Age of Multinational Capitalism", Jameson correspondingly described allegory in third world literature as necessarily political structures in which "the story of the private individual destiny is always an allegory of the embattled situation of the public third-world culture and society" (Jameson, 320). Third world literary response to this particular definition, most famously exemplified by Aijaz Ahmad who directly addresses Jameson's article in "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness and the 'National Allegory'", does not contain a denial of the charges, but criticizes its incomplete-ness.

Jameson's sense of national allegory may be expected to occur in the context of *The Black Book*, for hints of the political atmosphere in protagonist Galip's otherwise a-historical observations provide ample 'reason', plus 'material', for subscribing to national allegory. Given the term's essential involvement with "the embattled situation of the public third-world culture and society", the reader may be said to be invited by the novel to catch glimpses of public reactions to 'hegemonic' foreign forces. Examples

Aktar

range from Galip's sudden acknowledgement of how his wife Ruya's narrative was "Mimicking the radio announcements about free-floating mines spotted in the Black Sea but still betraying panic, she [Ruya] added..." (Pamuk, 23); the casual socioeconomic remark on the effects of the prevalence of imported goods and services stemming from the young Republic's 'extrovert' trade policy, exemplified in one instance by how pharmacists recommending medications "Turkified each product by adding a few syllables to its name" (31); to his somewhat envious memory of Ruya's past announcement that "she had married a young leftist firebrand much admired in her circle for his courage, his devotion to the cause, and his decision to publish political analyses—the first ever to appear in *Dawn of Labor*—under his own name" (52) in the sixties-seventies Istanbul setting of ideological tension and armed conflicts.

These are direct historical details in the otherwise 'timeless' novel with no supply of date nor social situation: the reader does not know which year it is other than the fact that it is the twentieth century, does not know how old Galip is, and descriptions of the physical and social landscapes do not offer many clues to these subjects. Hence, the reader will inevitably search for a meta-layer of symbolic meaning – allegory – to explain these absences, as in the case of the *Divine Comedy*. In this case, the backbone of the *The Black Book*'s plot is its allusion to the thirteenth century Anatolian Mawlawi philosopher Mevlana Rumi's search for his lost Beloved, Shams of Tabriz; similar to Rumi's realization at the 'end' of his quest that he had been on a soul-search in reality and that it was the essence of himself he sought, Galip is on a soul quest of like nature, creating an allegorical text inspired from, again, an allegory depicting the search for pure Love—which ultimately means the search for Self-Knowledge. Galip stands for Rumi, who symbolizes the search for Love and Identity, and the Beloved, Ruya, is sought as his completing half - his 'lost' identity which he can never quite reach. Such a melancholic tone is set from the book's first chapter, "The First Time Galip Saw Ruya", where in the first paragraph Galip watches his wife sleeping and dreaming:

He longed to stroll among the willows, acacias, and sun-drenched climbing roses of the walled garden where Ruya had taken refuge, shutting the doors behind her (*The Black Book*, 3).

Ruya is sought specifically through Galip's search for Celal, his journalist cousin, whom he believes she is with. This multidimensional search forms the outline of the

Aktar

plot, and opens the question of representational dimension(s) involving the novel's characters. Who does Celal stand for in the connection between Seeker and Sought, for example? Celal's figure is the point at which we must reconsider metaphoric construction in the text, as allegory in *The Black Book* is in outward compliance with its standard definition of being "a story with a second distinct meaning partially hidden behind its literal or visible meaning... [and] involves a continuous parallel between two (or more) levels of meaning, so that its persons and events correspond to their equivalents in a system of ideas or a chain of events external to the tale"⁵.

The extended definition of allegory in terms of a "second distinct meaning" and "continuous parallel" is necessary to accentuate the text's challenge to linearity and predictability. Returning to third world allegorical 'concerns', this novel's method does not serve the "overt" political manifesto Gugelberger and Jameson propose in terms of black and white criticism, and Sibel Irzik explains the Turkish version of the literary phenomenon in her article "Allegorical Lives: The Public and the Private in the Modern Turkish Novel" as follows:

Since Turkey fits Jameson's characterization of Third World countries as those "which have suffered the experience of colonialism and imperialism," since it has clearly not recovered, economically or culturally, from its contact with the capitalist West, the combination of overtly political themes with unmistakable allegorical structures in a broad range of Turkish novels should be seen as a confirmation of Jameson's theory. However, a number of major late-twentieth century Turkish novels... provide reasons to think that the notion of national allegory is not so much in need of confirmation as it is in need of complication, and even, in a certain sense, reversal and irony (Irzik, 555).

Irzik had explained previously to this passage that Jameson's conception of third world literature's allegorical structure is based on a representative mechanism offering the "possibility of grasping the social totality" (Irzik, 555) in a mode of writing which Jameson characterizes as incorporating the political – with elements of social critique – within the aesthetic. Judging by the representative 'power' it grants the text, allegory in this sense appears to oblige third world literary concerns, remembering Prasad's highlight of national literatures as "privileged units of...representational machinery" (Prasad, 71-72). However, in the passage quoted above, Irzik introduces the idea that not all late twentieth century novels 'simply' comply with national allegory's set

⁵ Oxford Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms. Oxford UP, 2004.

Aktar

standards and expectations, but instead work to “complicat[e], and even, in a certain sense, revers[e] and iron[ically]” engage with this literary form. Her subsequent illustration of this allegorical complication and irony is through the dream narrative of a protagonist in another Turkish novel, Adalet Agaoglu’s *Lying Down to Die*, in which the dream first works to build a ‘traditional’ allegorical structure where specific materials symbolize specific social phenomena and the chain of events develop in a predictable sequence, only to reverse the order of symbolic meanings and linear progression of the events in the ‘middle’ of the dream to create an overall tragicomic effect. Regarding the novel character and the substance of the dream narrative, Irzik says:

...They [novel characters] are, rather, tragicomic representations of the compulsion to allegorize. They clearly reflect the anxiety and paralysis created in the dreamers by the sense that they are dwarfed by the figures populating their unconscious and the sense that they will never be able to live up to the expectations of those figures. As such, the dreams are very much like the novels in which they occur. In many modern Turkish novels, the characters are portrayed as having been condemned to lead allegorical lives. They are haunted, frustrated, and paralyzed by the sense that they must somehow be representative of things larger than themselves, bearers of meanings and destinies imposed on them by what is referred to in *Lying Down to Die* as “the hand that has remade history” (83) (Irzik, 556).

The figures populating the unconscious of the characters and dwarfing them in this context refer to the Turkish heads of state, primarily Ataturk, who ‘created’ the modern Turkish state and set the standards for all institutions and conceptions of identity thereafter. If we adapt the concept of “allegorical lives” and the frustrating belief that “they must somehow be representative of things larger than themselves” to the situation in global literary studies, we may see the relationship between third world literature and the western literary canon: it may then be said that the third world text’s unconscious is dominated by western literary canonic “expectations”. This anxiety manifests itself in the literary forms and imagery used. In this respect, I believe *The Black Book* reflects the third world literature-western literary canon relationship in its allegorical complications.

In this allegory, the nature of Galip’s search for Ruya through Celal defines third world literature’s search for self-knowledge and self-realization relative to the western literary canon: recalling Irzik’s imagery, at the ‘beginning’ of the story Galip is an “anxious” figure “paralyzed” by the idea that he can “never live up to the expectations”

Aktar

of his beloved, and envies her interest in their cousin Celal, the renowned, experienced columnist whom the entire family, and most of Istanbul, dotes on and reads regularly, yet who remains controversial in terms of his ‘success’ as a writer. For example, the Grandfather and Grandmother question the print of a pen-name instead of his real name, and then half-remark, half-ask:

“If only they’d let him sign his real name,” Grandfather would say, “maybe he’d come to his senses.” Grandmother would sigh—“And a grown man too”—and then, her face screwed up with worry as if she were asking this question for the very first time, she’d say, “Is it because they won’t let him sign his columns that he writes so badly, or is it because he writes so badly that they won’t give him permission to write under his own name?” (7).

Celal is a columnist whom we learn has written on every topic imaginable, from secret military coups and urban myths to past mystical and Ottoman figures, the meanings written on faces (“Hurufism and the science of letters” [243]) etcetera. What connects the diverse range of topics is the motif of mysticism—the non-rational mystical, and very ‘Eastern’ attempt to discover the meanings of events past, present, future, and ultimately an attempt to re-discover one’s own meaning-identity. In this light, the passage offers an exciting inference of what Celal stands for, and the ‘concern’ of *The Black Book*’s allegory in general: Celal signifies two disparate situations. On one hand, he is the ‘known’ Third World writer whose writings are read by the ‘homeland’ with the serious mission of trying to make sense of the social chaos amidst which Ottoman, Republic and Western impositions of identity create not a mosaic embodiment but a state of amnesia; Celal’s readers thus read him to “find” themselves between the lines. On the other hand, Celal is the corpus of Third World literature in face of the western literary canon where the text is read just as obsessively for Eastern “response to European or Western civilization” (Gugelberger, 517). The most overt illustration of this obsession appears in Chapter 35 when English news crew who come to interview Celal are told that he has arrived to make “a statement of great historical import”.

Whereupon the interviewer:

Nodding knowingly...launched into an animated and far-ranging introduction that included references to the last Ottoman sultans, the clandestine Turkish Communist Party, Ataturk’s secret and unknowable legacy, the recent rise of political Islam, and the current wave of political assassinations (Pamuk, 416).

Aktar

In this relationship, Celal is published under various pseudonyms and not under his name, reflecting an overall public/cultural inferiority where the actual global question is “Is it because they won’t let him sign his columns that he writes so badly, or is it because he writes so badly that they won’t give him permission to write under his own name?” The fact of his “namelessness” is all the more telling by his complete physical absence in the novel: the reader neither sees him nor hears him till the ‘end’ when his dead body is found by the police.

So said, the relationship of Galip to Celal acquires additional significance: Galip has a particular relationship with the journalist, in which as a child he had watched the journalist writing columns; later, Galip continues to read Celal’s articles so regularly and carefully that he can remember the minutest details and the play of textual references and ‘messages’. Well trained and armed with the knowledge of both the writer and the writings, Galip proceeds with his quest by re-reading all that he thought he knew in the articles and acts on clues in the texts. In the process, Galip slowly transforms from an anxious, paralyzed figure who barely speaks to one who is set on a determined journey—all the directions and keys to unlocking the mystery before him are in Celal’s columns, he simply has to unlock them—and a person whose story-telling abilities begin to bloom. Galip thus gradually begins writing Celal’s columns in the journalist’s absence and nobody senses the difference; Galip takes over Celal’s life and writing, and becomes the one he sought throughout his journey.

Climactic is the point in the novel where Galip narrates his “perfect story” in guise of Celal to the British news crew (who came to Istanbul to interview Celal)—and that is the moment when Ruya and Celal are found dead at the corner of his apartment’s street. Given his obsession with knowing, and then becoming, the journalist’s life and works in the process of trying to find Ruya, Galip may be characterized as the corpus of contemporary third world literature in search of its lost or fragmented identity. On mastering the art of story-telling and surpassing the ‘old’ story-tellers (Celal is dead), Galip thereby narrates the “perfect story” and realizes the multitudinous journeys spent and stories told before this success could be achieved composed “the identity” sought for. In *The Black Book*, this “epiphany” is represented at the end of Chapter Thirty-five and at the beginning of Chapter Thirty-six, “But I Who Write”, where the triumphant Galip has told his story and boarded a taxi to return home after the film-shoot:

When he was telling the story the second time, he stressed sections he had

failed to notice the first time; when he told the story for the third time, it became clear to him that he could be a different person each time he told it. *Like the Prince, I tell stories to become myself*. Furiously angry at all those who had prevented him from being himself, and certain that it was only by telling stories he would come to know the mystery of the city and mystery of life itself, he brought the story to a close for the third and final time, to be met with a white silence that spoke to him of death. Quickly, Iskender [his friend] and the English journalists began clapping—and their applause was as genuine as if one of the world’s greatest actors had just given the performance of his life (417).

Yes, yes, I am myself! thought Galip, as he finished the Prince’s story. Yes, I am myself! Now that he had told the story, he was so certain he could become himself, and so pleased to be able to be himself, that he wanted nothing more than to rush right back to the City-of-Hearts Apartments and dash off new columns. He left the hotel and hailed a taxi; as they set off, the driver launched into a story. Because he now knew that it was only by telling stories that a man could be himself, Galip was happy to indulge him (Pamuk, 439).

But the novel does not end happily ever after. The matrushka structure of the allegorical symbolization creates an exemplary text of Barthesian “myth”. Here the linguistic sign is not the end in itself but the signifier for a larger system of communication. Barthes notes in *Mythologies* that:

It can be seen that to purport to discriminate among mythical objects according to their substance would be entirely illusory: since myth is a type of speech, everything can be a myth provided it is conveyed by a discourse. Myth is not defined by the object of its message, but by the way in which it utters this message: there are formal limits to myth, there are no 'substantial' ones. Everything, then, can be a myth? Yes, I believe this, for the universe is infinitely fertile in suggestions. Every object in the world can pass from a closed, silent existence to an oral state, open to appropriation by society, for there is no law, whether natural or not, which forbids talking about things. A tree is a tree. Yes, of course. But a tree as expressed by Minou Drouet is no longer quite a tree, it is a tree which is decorated, adapted to a certain type of consumption, laden with literary self-indulgence, revolt, images, in short with a type of social *usage* which is added to pure matter (“Myth Today”, *Mythologies*, 109).

Thus, the plot does not drop into a comfortable resolution following the climactic moment but opens the alleged ‘resolution’ to critical interpretation through the “mythological” dimension *The Black Book* brings to allegory. All the columns and stories constituting the novel which Celal and Galip re/produce contain a similar “message” and are “substantially” alike, but are experimentally conveyed through

Aktar

different discourses. Galip's sense of 'victory' is not substantial but formal; he is glad he found a particular method of utterance most suitable to the type of private and public "consumption" Galip desires. Through this perspective *The Black Book* illustrates that a "closed silent existence" of meaning cannot exist, and that therefore the sense of having achieved a unitary, independent identity is itself illusory.

Hence, the reader may notice that the narrative voice serves to keep the reader in question: we may see that even in Galip's moments of triumph, the narrative voice pricks this balloon with "he was so certain that he could become himself": it is not "he had become himself" or "he became himself". Multiplicity of identity, too, is highlighted through the narrative voice, which counts the "first", "second" and "third and final" times Galip-Celal told the story and "became a different person each time". Therefore we may say, by jumping back to Sibel Irzik's example, the complication of allegory in *The Black Book* occurs in the text's symbolic and temporal dimensions. This complication gradually unfolds during the course of the novel's twentieth century plot, where in addition to being the site of socio-historic critique, allegory is the site of textual interaction and thus the literary space in which to read elements of western canonic literature. At this point, it would be appropriate to open a parenthesis regarding allegorical complications and the multiplicity of meanings in the context of this study: in attempting to demonstrate this phenomenon, I am aware that my own approach relies heavily on assigning allegorical meaning to the characters and passages related. My insistence on meta-allegorization stems from the current absence of an alternative method of analyzing the compulsion to allegorize.

However, returning to the subject of temporality, the novel contests the traditional notion of a continuous parallel between the levels of meaning existent regardless of politically conscious historicism; this notion is reflective of a Eurocentric "universalist" frame of reference which geographically and epistemologically disregards the historical situation of allegorical meaning(s). To elaborate, of the five denominators Gugelberger listed, the "political and economic present" and "colonial past" make for the chronological material on which third world literary texts are composed. Namely, third world literature consciously re-constructs historical novels depicting the awareness of the transition from an oppressed past to a 'liberated' yet unsteady class-conscious present, wherein the contestation of concepts such as "liberty" in a context of ahistorical, hegemonic assumptions of meaning is the norm. According to this 'Third

Aktar

World' consciousness, western literary discourse portrays a neat arrangement assigning globally static symbolic values and arithmetic schema of cause-effect/before-after states of things, thereby excluding political-historical productions and distributions of meaning and the interplay of 'marginal' dynamics of power involved in meanings produced locally. Allegory is therefore, in its traditional Eurocentric sense, the production and reinforcement site of binary oppositions, but *The Black Book* works to deconstruct the hegemony of binary oppositions through a twist in its use of the literary form.

The text complies with western allegory in its overt ahistoricism—in its interesting absence of historical context and direct political critique of the ideologically turbulent years during which the text was written. However, while the extended metaphor of Galip's search for Ruya is taken as the equivalent of Man's search for Identity, and appears to coincide with Dante's search for Purpose, there is by definition an awareness of allegory's political macro-dimension. In the context of *The Black Book*, this macro-dimension takes the form of Third World Literature in search of lost Identity, a phenomenon that entails historical-political consideration. Rushdie's text embodies a similar concern; thus, an article by Todd M. Kutcha, "Allegorizing the Emergency: Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* and Benjamin's Theory of Allegory", explaining the nature of the allegory in terms of Walter Benjamin's theory applies as well to *The Black Book*:

For Benjamin, allegory is not "a mere mode of designation" that elaborates "a conventional relationship between an illustrative image and its abstract meaning"; rather...Benjamin distinguishes allegory from the symbol—the preferred figure of romanticism—by centering not on the relationship between part and whole but rather on "the decisive category of time." While "the measure of time for the experience of the symbol is the mystical instant," allegory involves a "corresponding dialectic" between the sign and its historical context (O, 165⁶). Thus whereas the symbolic image shelters coherent meaning from the destructive passage of time, allegory recognizes the evolving relationship between signs and their meanings.... But allegory's inevitable progression towards death is not without purpose: for the knowledge it brings, "the triumph of subjectivity and the onset of an arbitrary rule over things, is the origin of all allegorical contemplation" (O, 233) (Kutcha, 207).

⁶ Walter Benjamin. *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*. Trans. John Osborne. London: Verso, 1977.

Aktar

This is a postmodern critique wherein contemporary western fiction associated with the western literary canon establishes its awareness of “allegorical contemplation” over allegorical “determination”—opening a discursive platform for alternate systems of relation “between the sign and its historical context”. However, Hutcheon’s critique of postmodernist discourse reminds one that the discursive platforms in question may reproduce essentialist terminology and hence the system of binary oppositions in the postcolonial context of ‘Otherness’. *The Black Book*, as an example of third world literature, is in full awareness of the phenomenon and voices its critique in Celal’s column which Galip recalls: Galip, who is then living in Celal’s apartment and suddenly realizes that everything was arranged as he remembered and forgot it, causing him to quote a passage from Celal:

“Some things we don’t remember,” Celal had written in one of his last columns. “Other things we don’t even remember we don’t remember—and these are the things we need to look for” (238).

The entire allegory is founded on a loss, gain, and game of Memory, associated with identity construction and self-definition. Without time-conscious memory, “we don’t even remember we don’t remember”, and that is the point of defeat against the established sense of cultural identity central to western literary canonic works.

II. A Textual Form of Relation: Literary Allusion

Allusion in *The Black Book* is initially associated with the thirteenth century Anatolian text depicting Mevlana Rumi’s spiritual journey, the *Mathnawi*, upon which the novel constructed its allegory. The following string of Ottoman myths, legends and historical accounts provided from Celal’s columns and Galip’s stories, in addition to epigraphs from Arab and Anatolian philosophers at the head of each chapter thus set a very ‘Eastern’ tone to the novel. Bearing this in mind, can we say that other than the text’s usage of western literary forms, there is a conscious resistance against textual references to western literary canonic works in an attempt to attain ‘un-contaminated’ literary identity? Even before beginning the search, the answer would probably be no. *The Black Book*’s treatment of allegory has demonstrated the text’s opposition to “pure”

Aktar

identities and concrete meanings, stressing their impossibility: stories, not the story, make the 'unique' individual and the text. Contrary to this oppositional stance however, though the text opposes the notion of contamination in literary identity there is nevertheless an 'absence' of textual allusions to western canonic works. Thus, studying the construction of *The Black Book's* plot based on the plots of the *Mathnawi* and other Anatolian classical texts could lead one to conclude that Pamuk is consciously excluding references to the western literary canon. However, such a conclusion would be severely limiting, for the structure and operation of literary allusion in the literary form's postmodern and postcolonial context grants alternate methods of approaching Pamuk's novel.

Traditionally, literary allusion "is an indirect or passing reference to some artistic work...an economical means of calling upon the history or the literary tradition that author and reader are assumed to share" (Oxford). Considering the element of textual calls, it is important to keep in mind that literary allusion must not be confused with other forms of textual references, and this point is explained in Hulya Adak's article "Pamuk's 'Encyclopedic Novel'":

Erasmus' idea of "replication without variation" forms the first step of attempting to define literary allusion. Joseph Michael Pucci has shown the importance of differentiating between literary allusion and other forms of mimicry, such as travesty, burlesque, plagiarism, irony, parody, caricature, and allegory (Adak, 278). [translation mine]

This brief warning additionally carries the traditional conception of the term a further level, in that the cited forms of textual reference employ "indirect or passive reference" to the text in question: the reference text is mimicked and/or played around with, but there is the inherent assumption of the 'copy's' limitation in face of the text's autonomy. Adak continues to explain this postmodern absence of aura through the dynamics of contemporary literary allusion, defined by Pucci:

To realize the definition of literary allusion, Pucci makes extensive use of Ziva Ben Porat's article, "The Poetics of Literary Allusion"; here Porat defines allusion as 'the tool which simultaneously brings two texts into action'...[and thus Pucci states that] '...because literary allusion depends on the reciprocal relationship between the allusive text and the reference text, this concept [of allusion] destructs the archetype/copy paradigm defining literary mimesis.... 'Allusion is the verbal manifestation of a particular point in a former

Aktar

text in a latter text; the former not only makes possible the process of re-discovery, but also asserts the link between the two texts' (Pucci, 48)' (Adak, 278-9).

Thus, as may be seen from the explanation, the main locus of deviation of literary allusion from other forms of mimicry is its "destruction of the archetype/copy paradigm" and the notion of 'secrecy': literary allusion does not just make open reference to another text, but actively engages with specific aspects of, and challenges the relative autonomy of that text, instead developing the two narratives together in the construction of heterogeneous literary identity (-ties). Postcolonial engagement with the postmodern version of literary allusion takes the term to yet another level of consideration: Anglo-American challenge to literary autonomy, vis-à-vis the literary "aura"⁷, is a comfortable possibility stemming from an acknowledgement of secure identity in the first place i.e. there is an inherent assumption in the western literary canon that there were literary works of art, from Dante and Shakespeare for example, which set desirably 'inaccessible' distance between themselves and other 'pulp' works before the gradual but subversive arrival of post-modernity wherein technologies of imagery and reproduction nullified the notion of distance and authenticity.

However, the challenge to literary aura, and thus literary autonomy, is problematic in the third world context wherein nations realized their 'autonomous' identities through mimicry i.e. third world global players joined the game wearing the likeness of their first world predecessors and counterparts. This being the state of affairs, what happens to literary allusion in its postcolonial context? The standard definition of the literary term rests on "the history or the literary tradition that author and reader are assumed to share", and this assumption is clearly problematized in third world literature. Third world writers necessarily share colonial history and knowledge of western literary canonic works through direct and/or indirect colonial, and post-colonial education, but this is a hierarchical and exclusionary relationship in which allusion to western canonic works is not necessarily 'received' as a postmodern game of challenge. Rather, it is assumed by critical authorities including Jameson and Gugelberger that the majority of literary "response to European or Western civilization" occurs either to "reject" the West to reassert hard won national identity, or is a model copied for "solidarity with

⁷ Walter Benjamin "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction". According to the article, "we define the aura...as the unique phenomenon of a distance".

Aktar

Western progressive writers”, again aiming at favorable self-representation on the global scale (Gugelberger, 517). However, the authors of this premise allow room for editions and exceptions, so I may edge into the space provided with my perspective based on Nergis Erturk and Hulya Adak’s proposal of studying “forms of relation”, necessitated by the global situation in which:

This imposition [of Western genres and developments] casts Third World literatures as “late bloomers” in a developmental paradigm that assumes some literatures lag others in the adoption of genres and linguistic movements.... Erturk argues that the crisis of language is not unique to Turkey but is “a structural condition of the modern,” proposing that we analyze the “comparability” of literary modernities transnationally “in the structural possibility of representation and its crisis” (Adak, 24).

The explanation provides two fresh perspectives from which to consider cross-cultural inter-textuality: firstly, it argues that linguistic self-questioning and experimentation is an almost ‘universal’ structural condition of what is called the modern, and thus third world literature may be studied not for how works learn to adapt western genres but for how local styles interact with, and relate to, western styles. Secondly, the argument does not reject western influences or cultural superiority; instead there is the promise of structural possibilities stemming from literary fusion. Returning to how forms of relation applies to an important literary style – allusion – there is a postcolonial term describing the morph in perhaps its most radical situation: “Cannibalism”. Risen from its Latin American context, the critical writers Else Ribeiro and Pires Vieira basically define cannibalism as follows:

Cannibalism is a metaphor actually drawn from the natives’ ritual whereby feeding from someone or drinking someone’s blood, as they did to their totemic ‘tapir’, was a means of absorbing the other’s strength, a pointer to the very project of the Anthropophagy group: not to deny foreign influences or nourishment, but to absorb and transform them by the addition of autochthonous input (“Haroldo de Campos’ poetics of transcreation”, 98).

On the literary scale, cannibalism occurs at the level of “translation”, where dominant critical discourses are, to put it mildly, incorporated to the local linguistic construction of identity. While totally nullifying the notions of either rejecting western literary forms or any idea of solidarity with progressive western genres, allusion in its cannibalistic form may be said to swallow and digest the western reference texts so that the third

Aktar

world text gains strength. Not to be confused with a simple act of re-asserting western literary canonic dominance, the act of “absorbing and transformation” entails the very postmodern idea of closing textual distances and reconstructing textual identities. As said, cannibalism occurs in the act of translation, and this act of converting something into another through a difference of mediums unsettles the essence or ‘aura’ of the something:

Translation that unsettles the single reference, the logocentric tyranny of the original, translation that has the devilish dimension of usurpation...translation that disturbs linear flows and power hierarchies – daemonic dimensions that coexist with the a priori gesture of tribute to the other inherent in translating and the giving of one’s own vitality to the other. Transcreation – the poetics that disrupts the primacy of the one model – a rupture and a recourse...can be servitude, translation can also be freedom (111).

Thus, literary cannibalism is associated with translation, which results in an act of transcreation whereby foreign influences are not denied, but incorporated to produce strength and assert freedom. This approach to transcreation rejects the possibility of “servitude” generally expected from being under the influence of something ‘greater’ than one’s self, and is an approach which could be considered in the context of *The Black Book*.

The association between literary allusion and cannibalism has to do with the ‘absence’ of direct textual references to western literary canonic works which one may initially find surprising. The idea may be that references are indeed present, albeit in their digested forms, for the social and cultural atmosphere – the national culture – portrayed in *The Black Book* closely resembles that behind the formation of Brazilian literary cannibalism:

Rather than stressing a non-contaminated national culture, *Tropicalismo* appropriates the cultural forms generated in the international circuit of mass communication. Thus Brazilian culture emerges as a focus of tensions between the rustic and the industrialized, ...the national and the foreign; as such, history emerges as the locus of a complex and unlevelled simultaneity...this linguistic salad, evidence of cosmopolitanism, means that the linguistic sign has no nationality and that in this period of the opening up of cultural frontiers all languages are valid (Ribeiro and Vieira, 101).

Aktar

The evidence appears from the first chapter of the text where the narrative voice provides an extensive account of Galip's childhood environment. For example, the focus of tensions between the national/foreign may be viewed in the passage where Galip narrates his memory of wanting to pour a magic potion over certain inanimate articles to bring them to life:

Earlier on, if Grandfather had kept his promise, if he'd brought home that magic potion he said they sold on the streets in vials the color of pomegranates, Galip would have wanted to pour the liquid over the World War One zeppelins, canons, and muddy corpses littering the dusty pages of his old issues of *L'Illustration*, not to mention the postcards that Uncle Melih sent from Paris and Fez....(Pamuk, 5).

Alongside expressing the mingling between the mystical and mundane (the magic potion sold on the streets) and providing evidence of cosmopolitanism (Galip's issues of *L'Illustration*), this childhood wish emanates an almost hungry desire to give life through the visual image of the pomegranate. However, an ominous note edges in with Galip's description of the vial due to the emphasis on the blood-red fruit's color: familiarity with the western literary canon inevitably calls forth the image of Hades, God of Death in Greek mythology, whose symbol includes the pomegranate. This mythological allusion in the outset of the novel may be said to mark the intensity of Galip's experience both as a child and as a grown man remembering his experience, as well as preparing the reader for the nature of this multidimensional experience. Through the blood-red intensity of the desire to 'recall' the 'dead' images forming his childhood experience into life, the reader may interpret the text's following 'recalls' of past phenomena in its formal structure as a semblance to cannibalistic activity. In this respect, the most striking example of a hungry desire to strengthen one's identity with another occurs in Chapter Fifteen where Galip is recounting a story to the English news crew at a bar; this example is also significant in its direct reference to Marcel Proust's *La Recherche du Temps Perdu*—the only case in fact. The story is of an old journalist who is so impressed by Proust's text in its original French that he wishes to share his excitement with others. On finding no such person, the journalist engrosses himself alone with the text and gradually assumes Proust's identity, living the life in the book and fuming at people, especially writers, for not knowing Proust and not recognizing the journalist as Proust:

Aktar

As for all those writers and translators who managed to get work at newspapers by passing themselves off as educated, it was because they didn't read Proust, didn't know Albertine, didn't even know that the old journalist himself read Proust—that he *was* Proust, and Albertine too—they were so evil and thickheaded (175).

The story and this passage occupy a key position in the novel's structure, regarding the text's approach to the conception of literary allusion, especially when one continues to read the following paragraph where Galip continues the story, commenting that “the most striking thing” about the old journalist was that even with his belief that “they were so evil and thickheaded”, the man “decided to entrust it to another columnist” whom he liked due to the young man's appearance of Proust. The young columnist, who had “the radiant complexion of a Pakistani” (176), laughs out loud and says he must write about this story:

And write it he did. It was less a column than a story, and it described the old columnist in much the same terms as the story you heard: an old and unhappy Istanbulu who falls in love with a hero in a Western novel, eventually convincing himself that he is that hero, and his author too. Like the real journalist on whom he was based, the old journalist in the story had a tabby cat. And the old journalist in the column is also shaken when he sees his story mocked in a column. In the story inside that story, he too wants to die when he sees Proust's and Albertine's names in the paper. In the nightmares that the old journalist suffered during the last unhappy nights of his life, he saw Prousts, Albertines, and old journalists endlessly repeating one another, and bottomless wells of stories inside stories inside stories. Waking in the middle of the night, the old journalist realized that his love had vanished; no longer could he find happiness in his dreams of her, for his dreams had depended on no one else even knowing of her existence. Three days after the cruel column was published, they broke down the door to find the old columnist had died quietly in his sleep....(177).

I consider this passage to be the novel's postmodern-postcolonial manifesto on literary allusion: firstly, the old columnist's embodiment and sense of owning Proust's identity and Proust's story contains cannibalistic overtones in that the old columnist consciously 'needs' to devour Proust and “A la recherche du temps perdu” in order to strengthen his own sense of self. But literary cannibalism in its full sense is not fulfilled yet because the old columnist represses his 'other' selves in his preference to embody Proust to the letter, and believes that his existence, as Proust, is singular. However, this sense of isolated assurance is severely challenged by the following chain of events, where the depiction of the young journalist's 'violations' of an assumed privacy code and sense of

Aktar

respectable distance concerning the story ‘entrusted’ to him mirrors the destruction of “aura” through the ‘new’ act of literary allusion – overt and ‘active’ incorporation refusing any kind of repression or secrecy. The young journalist with the radiant complexion of a Pakistani laughs at the ‘old’, paranoiac struggle to remain acknowledged, but inaccessible—the youth writes his senior’s story “in much the same terms as you have heard”, but his mimicry contains something which frees the act from an ulterior motive which would have acknowledged an aura. The young journalist not only alludes to the old columnist’s story with no pretensions to concealment, but adds a further dimension to the mimicked story by engaging freely with it and supplying his prediction and interpretation of the old columnist’s reaction based on his knowledge of the man’s, or story’s, style and structure. Through this free engagement which disregards any notions of privacy or authenticity, the mimicked story is metaphorically as well as literally set in motion, and it is through this dynamism and “cruelty” associated with literary cannibalism that the old columnist’s constructed reality is irreversibly disrupted. Significantly, in the rapid process of the destruction, the old columnist experiences a sort of postmodern - postcolonial realization through his nightmares wherein “he saw Prousts, Albertines, and old journalists endlessly repeating one another, and a bottomless well of stories inside stories inside stories”. The “bottomless well” of realizations of multiplicity and consequent potential of repetition not only kills western literary canonic aura, but also paves the way for the justification of textual ‘violations’; for given the premise of postmodern multiplicity, the idea of violation is irrelevant.

Having made this border-porous structural claim, it would be interesting to reconsider the apparent absence of direct allusions to works from the western literary canon in *The Black Book*, especially when the novel’s open allusion to Rumi’s *Mathnawi* and other Anatolian texts are considered. It has been stated that the manifestations of literary cannibalism need not always be overt: *The Black Book* does not cannibalize the *Mathnawi*, but perhaps it has devoured and digested the structural principles of certain western literary canonic works so that the search should not be directed to content but to the novel’s form. As demonstrated in the example of the story, *The Black Book* does not ‘simply’ mimic the reference text but stimulates transformation on both sides. This point is repeated in the article “Meetings of East and West: Orhan Pamuk’s Istanbulite Perspective” by Aylin Bayraktar and Don Randall:

In Pamuk's staging, however, mimicry manifests neither the subversive tactics of the dominated nor, more pertinently, the ambivalent, compromised desire of the dominant—the frenetic play, in Bhabha's terms, of “the twin figures of narcissism and paranoia” (91). Clearly, Pamuk acknowledges mimicry as a key feature of identity forging in situations of cross-cultural encounter...[and] In Pamuk's scenes, mimicry unsettles power structure by presenting the site of a double transformation: both Hoja and the captive [in *The White Castle*] change; the master is no longer unambiguously master, nor is the slave simply the slave (*South Atlantic Quarterly*, 46.3 2005).

The site of a double transformation is the site of cannibalism with the intentions of identity forging, not necessarily in its negative sense of fraudulent imitation but in its act of cultivating strength and solidity through processes of melting, fusing and molding. I had acknowledged *A la recherche du temps perdu* as the single direct referential work; its significance as a locus of literary allusion does not rest at shaping the story of the old columnist: with *The Black Book's* reference to Proust's work, a chain of reactions ensue. The immediate reaction is exploring the dynamics constructing the relationship between the old columnist's story and that of the ‘original’ French work, but the next important step is to think about the structure of the French work in the structure of the novel in general. The idea for this thought was sparked by the introductory note to James Joyce's *Ulysses*, wherein it is noted that Joyce, as a writer, “could not create his own system without first enslaving himself to another man's” (Joyce, xxi). This enslavement refers to the rigorous study and reenactment of various western literary canonic works in the narrative structure of *Ulysses*, to give the work its skeletal structure, but:

For all the apparent rigor of this plan, most first-time readers of *Ulysses* remain only dimly aware of the Homeric analogies and do not find them greatly coloring their experience...Most contended that the Homeric tale was of more value to the writer than it could ever be to the reader caught up in the immediacies of an episode. Harry Levin suggested that, as a *structuring device* [italics mine], it had the same usefulness to the writer as a scaffolding does for a builder, but that in the end the frame must fall away to reveal the true magnificence of the edifice beneath (xxii).

It has been demonstrated that all the narratives and allegorical structures forming *The Black Book* are cross-referential and interwoven in particular manners, and there are ‘hints’ which mark loci of interaction – then, is there not the strong possibility that the

Aktar

mention of Proust's work cannot be a sole case but a hint for the reader to look out for its structural manifestations through the novel? One important structural aspect of *A la recherche du temps perdu* is its play with the chronological construct: the text is striking in its involvement with individual and collective memory formations, losses and recoveries, thereby illustrating the mirror image of identity—not a clear, uniform image from one single mirror, but a 'shattered' mirror composed of many irregular little mirrors reflecting multiple selves of technically one self.

The Black Book is also a text which is primarily concerned with the idea of time and memory—there is noteworthy emphasis on the subject of remembering and forgetting, certain material stimuli, like a pen in Celal's study triggering Galip's memories of things past in the family. The novel is an aesthetic and literary scrutiny of the interplay between memory, time and identity, in a style worth examining in relation to Proust's work and in the broader western literary tradition concerned with the problematics of the memory-time-identity triangle. For though *The Black Book* overtly construes its stories against an 'Eastern' Anatolian background, its methodology—Galip's observations, ideas and deductions in the process of the plot's development, even in his involvement with mystical "hurufism" in finding letters and meaning in faces—reflect a 'Western' positivist approach. This approach may be "learnt" from colonial sources, but its application does not accept any sense of "lagging behind" in an attempt to either catch up with, or subvert tenets of contemporary western literary tradition. However, it is nevertheless important to keep in mind Pamuk's overt silence on the western literary front in this particular context, for there actually may be a compliance with Gugelberger's point concerning third world literature's involvement with the western literary canon—a subject to be considered elsewhere in its full possibility. It might be asked whether the apparent weight on Anatolian 'classics' in *The Black Book* assert the presence of an Eastern literary tradition against the backdrop of the dominant western literary tradition. In the present concern of this paper however, *The Black Book* in its more 'Eastern' context mixes its local, 'authentically inauthentic' "linguistic salad, evidence of cosmopolitanism" in the awareness and defense of "the linguistic sign [with no] nationality and that in the period of the opening up of cultural frontiers all languages are valid" (de Compos, 101).

Chapter Two - Midnight's Children

I. "Problematizations of modalities of the public and private": Allegorical

Impulses

Jameson's theory that *all* third world literatures are essentially national allegories, let alone his underlying assumption that there is such a uniform category as Third World Literature, has been extensively criticized by Aijaz Ahmad in his article "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness". Arguing that the term 'Third World' itself is a "polemical one, with no theoretical status whatsoever" and that consequently there can be no Third World Literature as an "internally coherent object of theoretical knowledge" (Ahmad, 77), Ahmad nevertheless reluctantly notes this "label's" (77) current operation as a marker of counter-ethnocentric literary activity in the Anglo-American institutional context. However, he is not tolerant of Jameson's over-generalization of the 'aim' guiding texts representative of third world literature as solely being politically subversive reactions against "national oppression", this being done efficiently and neatly in the 'form' of allegory: Ahmad posits that such an approach exists due to the implications of the "Three Worlds Theory" which continues to dominate literary discourse. For the theory depicts the First and Second Worlds according to their "modes of production" and thus their roles in "the making of history", but the Third World is depicted in terms of 'its' colonial experience and hence as the subject of history:

If this 'Third World' is *constituted* by the singular 'experience of colonialism and imperialism', and if the only possible response is a nationalist one, then what else is there that is more urgent to narrate than this 'experience'? In fact, there is *nothing* else to narrate. For if societies here are defined not by relations of production but by relations of intranational domination; if they are forever suspended outside the sphere of conflict between capitalism (First World) and socialism (Second World); if the motivating force for history here is neither class formation and class struggle nor the multiplicities of intersecting conflicts based upon class, gender, nation, race, region, and so on, but the unitary 'experience' of national oppression (if one is merely the *object* of history, the Hegelian slave), then what else *can* one narrate but that national oppression? (Ahmad, 79).

Aktar

According to Ahmad, the key point of criticism on the Three Worlds Theory is its result not only in perceiving the globe in artificially disparate, internally homogenous blocks, but also on the theory's resultant analysis of 'Third World' socioeconomic developments particularly as time and space-suspended abstractions i.e. granted the presence of a Third World for "operational rather than analytical"⁸ purposes, Jameson and Gugelberger's assumptions illustrate, for example, the tendency to divide Third World 'experience' into an almost homogenous pre-capitalist Eastern subjection to colonial imposition of European capitalism. Its post-emancipation counterpart is national struggle against neocolonialism from an Eastern economic situation aspiring to capitalist (not socialist) power but eternally lagging behind established First World order. This approach focuses on a one-way relation of domination depicting 'distinctly' direct colonial and post-colonial Eastern experiences, while Ahmad argues against the neglect of this approach towards the more fluid political and economic inter-"relations of production" demonstrating the impossibility of a world-view constituted by binary oppositions—namely, West versus its Other. Ahmad directs his criticism specifically to this aspect of Jameson's argument, stating that:

In context, therefore, one is doubly surprised at Jameson's absolute insistence upon Difference and the relation of Otherness between the First World and the Third, and his equally insistent idea that the 'experience' of the 'Third World' could be contained and communicated within a single narrative form. By locating capitalism in the First World and socialism in the Second, Jameson's theory freezes and dehistoricizes the global space within which struggles between these great motivating forces actually take place. And by assimilating the enormous heterogeneities and productivities of our life into a single Hegelian metaphor of the master-slave relation, this theory reduces us to an ideal-type and demands from us that we narrate ourselves through a form commensurate with that ideal-type (Ahmad, 81).

On the literary scale, the form commensurate with the ideal-type is national allegory that Jameson proposes: an allegory which, as Ahmad cares to repeat, concentrates on abstract national conflict against First World forces at the expense of considering local dynamics governing class formations, class struggles, and the *multiplicities of intersecting* conflicts based on not only class and nation, but region, gender and other

⁸ (Gugelberger, 510) Gugelberger quotes Peter Worsely, who says "the definition and composition of the Third World, indeed, was always situational and complex, an operational rather than analytical term..."

Aktar

social phenomena. Furthermore, the multiplicities of intersecting socio-cultural conflicts in question occur between First, Second, and Third Worlds in historical relation to each other, and allegorically, this inter-worlds/nations/regions etc. historical dynamic refuses simply sterile (in both senses of the term) nationalistic representation limited to the Eastern segment of the globe. Thus, Ahmad's suggestion is that:

If we replace the idea of 'nation' with that larger, less restrictive idea of 'collectivity', and if we start thinking of the process of allegorization not in nationalistic terms but simply as a relation between private and public, personal and communal, then it also becomes possible to see that allegorization is by no means specific to the so-called Third World (Ahmad, 82).

Thus, it is not the 'allegorical impulse' itself that Ahmad is criticizing but the specific mode of allegory third world literary texts are assumed to contain. This is to say, literary allegory in third world texts problematize the relations between public and private/personal and communal in a global framework which does not deny penetration of hegemonic cultural influences but does not necessarily fight against these influences single-mindedly, either. Ahmad concludes by pointing out that contemporary allegory as the literary device to probe a larger, public atmosphere in the depiction of an 'individual' story is not a third world phenomenon but rather one which makes repeated appearances in postmodern literature on account of a first world 'return' to politics and history within the aesthetic framework of, for example, the novel.

Ahmad's argument regarding allegory in third world texts is similarly explored in Sibel Irzik's "Allegorical Lives", in which the concept of the self-conscious allegorical impulse and its specific considerations of the representation of public and private realms/relationships were used to explain allegory in *The Black Book*. Significantly, Irzik makes reference to *Midnight's Children* in the conclusion of this article:

...seeing Third World texts as not only consequences but problematizations of specific modalities of the public and the private reveals the complex ways in which these texts both fulfill and nullify the allegorical impulse. It makes greater sense of the "multiple polysemia of the dream" quoted at the beginning of this article, or of Saleem Sinai's ambivalence in Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* when he says: "I had been mysteriously handcuffed to history, my destinies indissolubly chained to those of my country" (Irzik, 565).

Aktar

Similar to Ahmad's argument, third world literary emphases are on the "problematizations of specific modalities of the public and private", and theorizing on the individual – nation relationships in these literary texts solely being allegorical examples of the "consequence" of colonial economic impositions would be severely limiting. For, as Irzik and Ahmad illustrate, while many examples of third world fiction are indeed allegorical, these self-same texts are allegorical in complex ways: there is basically an acute awareness of first world expectations regarding the narrative psychological, "private" experience of the individual in relation to its larger post-colonial nationalist context alongside the awareness of local "nightmare[s] of frustrated idealism and claustrophobic [post-colonial] national history [-ies]" (Irzik, 553). Through this awareness, third world literature acknowledges the "compulsion to allegorize" (Irzik, 556) and subverts western literary expectations of allegorical form through the interrogation and ironic involvement with this very compulsion. For example, the quotation provided from Saleem (Rushdie) embodies western canonic expectations and Ahmad's criticism in the form of irony: versed at the introduction of the novel, Saleem's statement foreshadows allegory ahead, for Saleem is in the realization that his being "handcuffed to history" makes the story of his life the story of his country. However, the effect of grand self-importance implied by the statement, coupled by the remark that he had been "mysteriously" handcuffed, and hence does not know the theoretical reason for being tied up, results in bathos: alongside the inescapable smirk at the character's exaggerated pretences to self-significance, Saleem's statement prepares the reader to question the idea of national allegory and the individual's compulsion, or in Irzik's terms "anxiety", to live up to larger "expectations" and grand narratives.

Throughout the novel, our narrator Saleem presents numerous and 'historic' national political and social events, ranging from the independence of India to the protests, coups, wars and riots which followed, connecting each event's happening and progression to his own life and actions. In this respect, Rushdie's novel differs from the allegorical mode in *The Black Book*, which eludes political-historical detail almost altogether, but for similar purposes: Pamuk's concentration and repetition of Memory and specifically memory loss (amnesia) is illustrated by the absence of history, in an attempt to demonstrate the destructive effect of literary theoretical abstraction and a-historicism on actual multiplicity of realities and intra-cultural identity mergers.

Rushdie's novel draws the contours of the text's particular allegorical contemplation from the outset of the first chapter, with its telling title "The perforated sheet". The narrative which follows is that passage quoted by Sibel Irzik in "Allegorical Lives":

I was born in the city of Bombay...once upon a time. No, that won't do, there's no getting away from the date: I was born in Doctor Narlikar's Nursing Home on August 15th, 1947. And the time? The time matters too. Well then: at night. No, it's important to be more...On the stroke of midnight, as a matter of fact. Clock-hands joined palms in respectful greeting as I came. Oh, spell it out, spell it out: at the precise instant of India's arrival at independence, I tumbled forth into the world...I had been mysteriously handcuffed to history...For the next three decades, there was to be no escape. Soothsayers had prophesied me, newspapers celebrated my arrival politicians ratified my authenticity. I was left entirely without a say in the matter (Rushdie, 3).

After his initial fear and hesitance to pronounce the exact place and time of his birth, and its corresponding macro-significance, Saleem starts getting into the spirit and in the awareness that time matters too, announces that the clock-hands joined palms in respectful greeting at his arrival. The following descriptions pronounce the absolute dependence of the description of his life and identity in the shadow of the Nation—he was not even left a say in the matter. Thus, from the onset of the narrative, Jameson's theory concerning the porous boundary between public and private lives/individual fate and national fate, in third world literature appears justified. However, the simultaneous irony applied by the narrative and the degree of exaggeration with which Saleem's account of the parallel between his fate and that of India through the novel is described, opens the door to Ahmad's criticism of Jameson. For Ahmad retorts that if the only possible response 'made' available to third world literature is through nationalist experience, "then what else is there that is more urgent to narrate than this 'experience'?" In fact, there is nothing else to narrate" (Ahmad, 79). In the autobiographical allegory of Saleem/India's physical and spiritual growth, removing the 'nationalist experience' would be the 'death' of Saleem, who cannot define himself through any other source. Furthermore, this metaphoric death and this only possible response whose urgency leaves Saleem no room for comment may be said to reflect how western canonic criticism mainly perceives 'the third world voice' through its echo of the postcolonial nation, and is 'closed' or un-accepting otherwise. Allegorical metaphor in the novel is thus set on the slow "crumbling" of Saleem and his attachment to a certain perforated sheet; with the urgency brought by his rapid fragmentation and kept on track by the

Aktar

sheet, Saleem writes the story of his life, the tragicomic story of a nation's birth and crumbling growth:

Now, however, time (having no further use for me) is running out. I will soon be thirty-one years old. Perhaps. If my crumbling, over-used body permits. But I have no hope of saving my life, nor can I count on having even a thousand nights and a night. I must work fast, faster than Scheherazade, if I am to end up meaning – yes, meaning – something. I admit it: above all things, I fear absurdity.

And there are so many stories to tell, too many, such an excess of intertwined lives events miracles places rumors, so dense a commingling of the improbable and the mundane! I have been a swallower of lives; and to know me, just the one of me, you'll have to swallow the whole lot as well. Consumed multitudes are jostling and shoving inside me; and guided only by the memory of a large white bedsheet with a roughly circular hole some seven inches in diameter cut into the centre, clutching at the dream of that holey, mutilated square of linen, which is my talisman, my open sesame, I must commence the business of remaking my life from the point at which it really began, some thirty two years before anything as obvious, as *present*, as my clock-ridden, crime stained birth.

(The sheet, incidentally, is stained too, with three drops of old, faded redness. As the Quran tells us: *Recite, in the name of the Lord thy Creator, who created Man from clots of blood*) (Rushdie, 3-4).

Allegorical necessity is demonstrated by Saleem's fret over too many stories he has to tell, the excess of intertwined lives, if one is to know him: according to Saleem, his life-story is dependant on that of India's socio-political history-stories. Furthermore, within this equation the reverse also applies: India's historic 'life'-stories are dependant on Saleem's individual experiences i.e. there are extensive commentaries by Saleem at various loci of the novel, specifically at those where he recounts key nationalist and military moves and coups, during which he repeats his personal involvement as the causative force, accidental or intended depending, behind these transformational nationalistic moves. As a matter of fact, this situation is exactly why he is spending 'extraordinary' effort to put down his experiences in ink. Saleem's fear of absurdity and his allusion to Scheherazade are both the indicators and results of his effort to keep his audience involved, and may be taken as the novel's response to western literary canonic expectations.

Saleem's belief in the 'absolute' necessity of recording the minutest detail of his experiences ironically reflects concern for meeting national allegoric expectations; for it is assumed that understanding the reasons behind Indian post-colonial history relies on accurately reading the life of the protagonist. Therefore, this tragicomic frenzy

Aktar

illustrates three things: firstly, the awareness of an inevitable allegorical compulsion in order to unilaterally define one's bewilderingly multiple selves; the third world literary allegorical compulsion in order to be listened to and included in the game⁹; and thirdly, the abstract sublimity and consequent absurdity of it all. Thus, the seeming support for national allegory is clouded by his remark that "to know me, just the one of me..." which indicates that there is no one homogenous identity, individual or national, but foreshadows the turbulent heterogeneity of private and public realities and interactions. The explanation for our narrator's simultaneous reproduction and resistance of national allegory is clearly provided in Irzik's article, albeit for Turkish examples, where she says "there is, then, a certain repressive conflation of the public and private that the political allegories in several Turkish novels parody and resist even as they self-consciously reproduce it" (Irzik, 564). In the case of *Midnight's Children*, the main metaphor embodying this form of allegorical complication is that of the perforated sheet in the quotation from Saleem.

Saleem describes the material in question to be "a large white bedsheet with a roughly circular hole some seven inches in diameter cut into the center" and that he "clutch[es] at the dream of that holey, mutilated square of linen" as a "talisman" and "open sesame". He opens a parenthesis at the end of the paragraph where he makes a conclusive note that "the sheet, incidentally, is stained too [as his crime-stained birth] with three drops of old, faded redness" (4). It is possible that through the allegory of the perforated sheet, the reader is prepared to meet the overall mode of the novel's allegorical movement, although there is inevitably the awareness of employing a more static, symbolic reading in the process. It will be remembered that, similarly, the illustration of this allegorical mode in *The Black Book* was clarified with reference to an article on *Midnight's Children* by Todd M. Kutcha, "Allegorizing the Emergency: Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* and Benjamin's Theory of Allegory", in which the author explained the nature of the allegory in terms of the logocentric symbolism versus the de-centered dialectic:

For Benjamin, allegory is not "a mere mode of designation" that elaborates

⁹ Jameson's theory that all Third World Literatures are examples of national allegory, and that this positions Third World Literature in a particular relationship to the western literary canon, implies that texts which do not comply are not Third World literature. However, they are obviously not included as examples of western literature either, and are thus left in a problematic situation which currently eludes explanation.

Aktar

“a conventional relationship between an illustrative image and its abstract meaning”; rather...Benjamin distinguishes allegory from the symbol—the preferred figure of romanticism—by centering not on the relationship between part and whole but rather on “the decisive category of time.” While “the measure of time for the experience of the symbol is the mystical instant,” allegory involves a “corresponding dialectic” between the sign and its historical context (O, 165). Thus whereas the symbolic image shelters coherent meaning from the destructive passage of time, allegory recognizes the evolving relationship between signs and their meanings.... But allegory’s inevitable progression towards death is not without purpose: for the knowledge it brings, “the triumph of subjectivity and the onset of an arbitrary rule over things, is the origin of all allegorical contemplation” (O, 233) (Kutchka 207).

I believe that Saleem’s introductory description and sentiments regarding the sheet invites a Derridian illustrative reading of literary deconstruction: if the literary symbol occurs at any point on the arc of a circle drawn on a sheet, and is taken to represent, and be drawn towards, its “Referent” situated at the center of the circle, then the case of the linen illustrates the “perforation” of this neat diagram and the violent ‘loss’ of the referent center symbolized by the three drops of blood. The contextual story of the sheet is gradually revealed in the progression of the chapter, which is framed by the historical account of his grandfather Aadam Aziz’s life, and takes place in Aadam Aziz’s youth, on his return to Kashmir after medical training in Germany in 1915— a young man instructed in western positive science and Enlightenment rationality— and the three drops of blood are paralleled by three drops of blood shed by Aziz on the day of his return.

Also constituting one of the first and most striking images offered by the narrator Saleem in the novel, the scene of ‘bloodshed’ occurs within the depiction of a small, but effectually profound event during his grandfather’s prayer outside on a crisp Kashmiri morning following his return from Germany:

One Kashmiri morning in the early spring of 1915, my grandfather Aadam Aziz hit his nose against a frost hardened tussock of earth while attempting to pray. Three drops of blood plopped out of his left nostril, hardened instantly in the brittle air and lay before his eyes on the prayer mat, transformed into rubies. Lurching back until he knelt with his head once more upright, he found that the tears which had sprung to his eyes had solidified, too; and at that moment, as he brushed diamonds contemptuously from his lashes, he resolved never again to kiss earth for any god or man. This decision, however, made a hole in him, a vacancy in a vital inner chamber, leaving him vulnerable to women and history. Unaware of this at first, despite his recently completed medical training, he stood up, rolled the prayer mat into a thick cheroot, and

Aktar

holding it under his right arm surveyed the valley through clear, diamond-free eyes (Rushdie, 4-5).

Just as the description of the sheet evokes the Derridian episteme of deconstruction, this powerful ‘first’ scene depicting the process of Aadam Aziz’s momentous rejection of religion and moral values makes room for a recollection of Nietzsche’s famous proclamation “God is dead”. If the passage is read in this light, then the scene may be considered a follow-up of the allegory of the perforated sheet, which prepares Saleem and the reader for the absence of singular universal referents and ‘misplaced’ identities: Aadam Aziz’s initial position is one of religious submission and he is on the verge of prostrating, but the second his nose is lowered, a “hardened tussock of earth” unceremoniously greets it and welcomes Aadam Aziz—who is ‘prone’ to positivist deductions—to the cold, hard, material reality of his present world. With this epiphany, Saleem’s grandfather swears to never again kiss the ground for any god or man: we witness the Birth of Modern Man into the Age of Capitalism, and the date 1915 also is significant in its suggestions not only to Britain’s colonial rule over Kashmir but to World War One, at the beginning of which:

Soldiers marched into battle with the confidence and ambition bred by nineteenth century successes. The leading nations of Europe were at the height of their power... Many Europeans entered the war with faith in modernity, in its ability to deliver not only prosperity but all the advantages of “civilization”... But by the war’s end in 1918, soldiers were not the only casualties... Those years also exposed the weaknesses of European society; divisions among classes, nations, and generations intensified under the strains of battle.... (*Western Civilizations*, 921).

A nihilistic epiphany is framed within the global historical context of the World War, the impact of which stretched infinitely farther than was originally ‘expected’ by First World political prediction, leading to the collapse of four empires and to the later but subsequent emergence of ‘liberated’ nation-states, amongst which India—vis-a-vis Saleem, take their place. Such reference to European political history and philosophies thus creates a joint discursive platform for the social, historical and literary considerations of Indian-Pakistani-Kashmiri based text Rushdie offers. As Saleem recounts Aadam Aziz’s last recollections before ironically giving up his life at a secluded temple, “he [Aadam Aziz] would try and recall his childhood springs in Paradise, the way it was before travel and tussocks and army tanks messed everything

Aktar

up” (Rushdie, 6). While the novel is certainly not founded on nihilistic or deconstructive epistemology, the invitation for these readings inevitably draws attention to the subject of literary allusion in *Midnight's Children*, in which allegory and allusion go hand in hand.

II. Saleem's anxiety of influence: Literary Allusion

Allegory and allusion were also linked in the context of *The Black Book*; it will be remembered that the allegory of third world literature in guise of Galip's spiritual journey worked on readers' knowledge of Rumi's *Mathnawi*. Knowledge, or at least awareness of the presence/content of this 'Eastern' classical text depicting Rumi's search for Shams of Tabriz, vis-a-vis, Rumi's Soul, was noted to give the reader crucial insight into Pamuk's construction of the nature and process of Galip's 'quest'. Thus, allusion to *Mathnawi* formed the backbone of the novel, in co-existence with epigraphs, references and allusions to other eastern texts. The question-mark concerning the novel's dependence on allusion came from a marked absence of literary allusion to 'Western' literary canonic texts in the term's classical form, excepting an apparently solitary reference to *A la recherche du temps perdu* in Galip's narration of the story of an old columnist. However, the incorporation of Proust's novel in *The Black Book* was illustrated by the old columnist's 'discard' of his own identity to assume that of Proust, and that of the life narrated in the novel. This depiction of influence in its excess opened the concept of literary allusion to critical consideration, and to a reflection on the effects of western literary influence on third world literature. Thus, through the critical reflection of this phenomenon, and the added 'absence' of other textual references, attention was directed to literary allusion's contemporary postmodern sense. In this sense, a text may incorporate literary forms, styles, quotes and references to established popular or classical texts directly or indirectly as in allusion's classical definition, but with an epistemological difference: the texts alluded to are stripped of aesthetic distance—aura—and consequently their inspiration of authenticity, so that textual interaction can occur at point zero. The text performing the allusion can 'own' the influences, as well as mould and work on them to produce 'new' textual connotations

Aktar

and meanings¹⁰. Such attention to the term's postmodern sense yielded awareness of the formative process of textual influences in *The Black Book*, and comparably does so in *Midnight's Children*.

It has been noted that the narrative voice of the novel, Saleem, comes forth as anxious, especially on the subject of influence—whether on his identity or by his identity. His anxiety on the external influences on his identity manifests itself in the first pages of the novel, quoted previously: “I have been a swallower of lives; and to know me, just the one of me, you’ll have to swallow the lot as well (Rushdie, 4)”. This quotation echoes the passage quoted from the story of the old columnist, who experiences unbearable anxiety of having been discovered—and stripped of his illusion of privacy with no respect by the young journalist who writes ‘his’ story: “In the nightmares that the old journalist suffered during the last unhappy nights of his life, he saw Prousts, Albertines, and old journalists endlessly repeating one another, and a bottomless well of stories inside stories inside stories” (Pamuk, 177). In the context of *The Black Book*, the suggestion for the reading of this story was to consider the phenomenon of literary “cannibalism”, wherein textual violation and literal “swallowing” of the text is a flesh and blood incorporation of influence and strength. The young journalist of whom we do not learn much, aside from the description given by his senior, allegorized contemporary third world literature’s relationship to western canonic influences. Saleem, who may tentatively be taken as the young columnist’s counterpart in *Midnight's Children*, nevertheless portrays a another perspective of this relationship of influence. Saleem’s manifestation of being “a swallower of lives” appears suitable for heading consideration of the “anxiety of influence” literary allusion entails in its postmodern/postcolonial context(s).

The phrase “anxiety of influence” comes from the title of Harold Bloom’s well-known publication, in which the poetic theorist analyzes the dynamics behind literary influence. Bloom favors Shakespeare’s usage of “influence” as another word for literary

¹⁰ Reference to my previous quotation from Hulya Adak’s article, “Pamuk’s Encyclopedic Novel”, on the nature of postmodern allusion: “...On the other hand, because literary allusion depends on the reciprocal relationship between the allusive text and the reference text, this concept [of allusion] destructs the archetype/copy paradigm defining literary mimesis.... ‘Allusion is the verbal manifestation of a particular point in a former text in a latter text; the former not only makes possible the process of re-discovery, but also asserts the link between the two texts’ (Pucci, 48)” (Adak, 279), page 23 of my chapter.

Aktar

“inspiration” (Bloom, xii) in the Preface to the second addition. This Preface is the site of Bloom’s theory regarding the process of primarily poetic influence in the literary arena, and he describes the purpose for writing this preface in the new edition as an activity to “clarify and enlarge [his] vision of the influence process, which is still a dark ground in most areas, whether in the high arts, the intellectual disciplines, or the public sphere” (xi). Accordingly, he offers a more detailed explanation for influence/Shakespearian “inspiration”, saying that:

Influence is a metaphor, one that implicates a matrix of relationships—imagistic, temporal, spiritual, psychological—all of them ultimately defensive in their nature. What matters most (and it is the central point of this book) is that the anxiety of influence *comes out of* a complex act of strong misreading, a creative interpretation I call “poetic misprision.” What writers may experience as anxiety, and what their works are compelled to manifest, are the *consequence* of poetic misprision, rather than the cause of it (Bloom, xxiii).

Hence, Bloom describes the crucial role anxiety of influence—the metaphor depicting the aesthetic, stylistic, and content-relationship between text and its canonic precursors—plays in shaping literary works and consequently, enabling the continuance of the western literary canon. According to the principles of this influence, “works are compelled to manifest [and] are the consequence of poetic misprision [a formative combination of creative misreading followed by deliberate concealment of having been inspired by the particular ‘misread’ text].” Initially, the approach may be considered exclusionary on the point of third world literature on account of a strong implication of the western literary tradition. However, in the following pages Bloom includes, if not a direct consideration of non-western literature, a reference to what he terms “multicultural” writers and texts. Continuing with his initial image of Shakespeare whom he transforms into the epitome of poetic influence, Bloom may be said to propose that the construction of non-western texts undergoes the same process of influence: third world literature experiences poetic misprision and subsequent inspirational anxiety, and for this he gives the example of Borges (xxv). To explain, Bloom states that a significant literary figure as Shakespeare, who may be said not only to symbolize the western literary canon but actually is the “world canon”, will undeniably constitute primary influence on “multiculturalists”:

Real multiculturalists, all over the globe, accept Shakespeare as the one

indispensable author, different from all others in degree, and by so much that he becomes different in kind. Shakespeare...quite simply not only is the Western canon; he is also the world canon. That his appeal is equal to audiences of all continents, races and languages (always excluding the French) seems to me an absolute refutation of our currently fashionable views, prevalent particularly in Britain and America, that insists upon a Shakespeare culture-bound by history and society (xv).

The purpose for presenting the argument regarding Shakespeare's canonicity is not about contesting the degree of the playwright's influence on, and "acceptance" by "real multiculturalists". Instead, it is significant to consider the mode of this influence and its incorporation in non-canonic literature; Rushdie's novel in this context. Bloom's argument regarding the continuity of the literary canon in world literature relies on a universalistic assumption which posits that "high literature" (xix), or "imaginative literature" (xvii) i.e. aesthetic texts which do not foreground politics and ideology, is always bred and informed on the western literary tradition—an internalization of Shakespeare's works being the most classic example. This position constitutes a problem for the definition of third world literature because the term "Third World" has essentially political-ideological connotations. Hence, one is lead to ask whether third world texts are then excluded from the universalist idea of "high/imaginative literature".

As mentioned earlier, Bloom had named Borges as a representative of imaginative world literature, and in the article "Decolonizing the Canon", Gugelberger had provided the same example in distinguishing the writer of world literature from the third world writer. However, the problem which applies to third world literature's canonic relation initially applies to 'first world' categorizations: Rushdie, like Borges, is accepted to be a world writer and not a third world writer based on aesthetic-canonic premises.

However, his novel *Midnight's Children* is received as the spokes-text for the voice of India, which silently categorizes the text in the 'Eastern' block of the world, thus creating a paradoxical situation. Third world literature therefore encompasses a broader, more fluid context than theory assigns, and in this case *The Black Book* and *Midnight's Children* refute exclusionary emphasis as do many other 'third world' literary texts on the grounds that influence is a trans-cultural metaphor that implicates a very comparable matrix of relationships—imagistic, temporal, spiritual, psychological.

The arguments presented from Ahmad, Irzik and Adak's articles explicate this comparability of the influence process, bringing particular attention to the forms of

Aktar

relation between first and third world literatures which denies stylistic ‘belatedness’. Bloom rejects the idea as well, albeit in a different manner, asserting that “cultural belatedness is never acceptable to a major writer, though Borges made a career out of exploiting his secondariness” (xxv). Returning to the subject of the literary manifestations of anxiety, Bloom states that the process of writing entails the “horror of contamination”:

In ways that need not be doctrinal, strong poems are always omens of resurrection. The dead may not return, but their voice comes alive, paradoxically never by mere imitation, but in the agnostic misprision performed upon powerful forerunners by only the most gifted of their successors. Ibsen loathed influence more perhaps than anyone else, particularly since his authentic forerunner was Shakespeare.... This horror of contamination... fortunately found its best Ibsenite expression in the multiple ways the Norse playwright discovered for evading Shakespeare (xxiv).

Saleem’s anxiety does not seem to cohere with this image of the horror of contamination. Though he indeed acknowledges the ‘horror’ of being a swallower of stories with no other alternative, it cannot be said that Saleem either “loathes” the historical figures which chained him or shows any self-exertion to “discover multiple ways for evading” these influences. This phenomenon appears more fitting to the context of Pamuk’s novel, wherein the reader discovers western literary canonic influence in the text through Pamuk’s stylistic maneuvers and textual commentaries. Other than discovering that the interplay of memory and temporality stands on Proustian foundations, there were other short stories—or columns found by Galip, illustrating the process of influence and horror of contamination: the most overt example being the chapter story “The Story of the Crown Prince” (Pamuk, 418). This is the story of the prince who tried to “be himself” by burning, erasing and nullifying all kinds of external influences ranging from the physical gestures of his French and Italian instructors to the countless books and authors he has read, including Voltaire, Shakespeare, Deltour, Morelli, *Thousand and One Nights*, Rumi etcetera. The Prince was especially desperate to get rid of these books’ and authors’ effects on his speech, and more significantly, his mode of thought—the most difficult to do as he “spent six years alone with their authors’ thoughts and voices” (424). The story ends with the Prince’s death-bed realization that this rejection is impossible and has simply led to his delirium, producing a story which may be said to reflect Bloom’s theory. On the other hand, Rushdie’s

Aktar

Saleem has never been concerned about soul-quests or the contamination of influences. He may be said to be in a very postmodern awareness of the impossibility of purity, industriously digging his dynastic nose into every element of influential contamination to smell them out and identify them. In fact, there is a scene from the novel which may be said to ironically illustrate this smelling action: in the chapter “Jamila Singer”, Saleem narrates his self-education in “a general theory of smell” (Rushdie, 441) and describes how he could flawlessly classify particular materials—especially fizzy drinks:

In the meantime, [India-Pakistan political tensions] Saleem was working towards a general theory of smell: classification procedures had begun.... to begin with, I perfected my skill at distinguishing, until I could tell apart the infinite varieties of betel-nut and (with my eyes shut) the twelve different available brands of fizzy drink. (Long before the American commentator Herbert Feldman came to Karachi to deplore the existence of a dozen aerated waters in a city which had only three suppliers of bottled milk, I could sit blindfolded and tell Pakola from Hoffman’s Mission, Citra Cola from Fanta. Feldman saw these drinks as a manifestation of capitalist imperialism; I, sniffing out which was Canada Dry and which 7-Up, unerringly separating Pepsi from Coke, was more interested in passing their subtle olfactory test. Only when I was sure of my mastery of physical scents did I move on to those other aromas which only I could smell: the perfumes of emotions and all the thousand and one drives which make us human: love and death, greed and humility, have and have not were labeled and placed in neat compartments of my mind (441).

Through this passage, one may consider the mode of literary allusion employed in Rushdie’s novel rather than focus on the specific instances of allusion and the texts alluded to. Thus, amongst possible interpretations, one may also interpret the scene as an ironic account of the relationship between first world criticism and third world internalization of influence: in the presence of western capitalistic impositions (the brands of fizzy drink), the first world critic deplores the resultant ‘oppression’ on a previously ‘uncontaminated culture’ and hints at the necessity of voicing protest against these “manifestations of capitalist imperialism”. Saleem, in the meantime, is unconcerned about the threat of contamination and more “interested in passing their olfactory test”. It can then be said that in a post-colonial awareness of historical-cultural hybridism which is not readily recognized by first world literary criticism, Saleem does not question the origins and implications of influence, but methodically works to understand and collect the compositions of various sources of influence. Furthermore, the very fact that Saleem speaks in English—the novel is written in English in contrast

Aktar

to Pamuk who writes in Turkish, adds to the significance of the mode of literary allusion in the text. In the “Introduction” to the *Vintage Book of Indian Writing, 1947-1997*, Rushdie says:

...it seems to me to rest on the false premise that English, having arrived from outside India, is and must necessarily remain an alien there. But my own mother-tongue, Urdu, the camp-argot of the country’s earlier Muslim conquerors, became a naturalized sub-continental language long ago; and by now that has happened to English, too. English has become an Indian language. Its colonial origins mean that, like Urdu and unlike all other Indian languages, it has no regional base; but in all other ways, it has emphatically come to stay (xiii).

The implication of this ‘Indianization of English, or the English-ing of Indian regional languages throughout the course of history, is that Indian writing literally shares in the western literary tradition, and hence the western literary canon. Rushdie acknowledges in the “Introduction”, for example, “the Greek god Dionysos, who was dismembered and afterwards reassembled – and who, according to the myths, was one of India’s earliest conquerors” (Rushdie, xii). Therefore, Rushdie establishes a mythological link to the western tradition that far precedes standard colonial history, and gives contemporary Indian literature a wealth of literary and cultural influences to draw the many realities of the sub-continent. In this respect, the phenomenon of literary allusion – the manifestations of poetic misprision and the anxiety of influence – partakes in a more postmodern notion than that of Bloom, which may be illustrated by Umberto Eco.

Eco’s essay, “Borges and My Anxiety of Influence”, attempts to draw a diagram of the relations of influence: this diagram takes the form of a triangle XAB, in which X denotes “culture, or the chain of previous influences”, and A, B represent two different texts/authors who are either contemporaries or precedent and present. If we specify influence as the phenomenon of allusion, then A may allude to B and vice-versa according to their temporal positions, but X forms the common foundation from which literary influence is derived. Eco also calls X the “millennial chain of culture” or “Zeitgeist” – spirit of the age (Eco, 120). The importance of Zeitgeist, which forms the “top of the triangle” (119), derives from the fact that it constitutes the political/social/artistic styles of thought through history, and is thus the primary source of influence for literary texts. In this particular shape, the diagram illustrates Bloom’s theory of the anxiety of influence, but the nuance, or rather the extension Eco brings to the relationship is the idea of ‘consciousness’. According to Eco, there are three

Aktar

possible states of being for the text/author performing the allusion: firstly, the state where A is fully conscious of the influence on, and their allusion to B. Secondly, the state where A is unconscious of their allusion to B, but that this allusion is detected by the readership. And thirdly:

...the cases where, without adopting a triangle based on preceding sources and the universe of intertextuality, we are led to consider as straight two-way influence cases of three-way influence—namely, the debts Borges owed to the universe of culture, so that we cannot attribute to Borges what he always proudly declared he took from culture. It was no accident that yesterday I called him a ‘delirious archivist’: Borges’s delirium could not exist without the archive on which he was working (Eco, 121).

Instead of using this statement to determine the instances where the three states occur in Rushdie’s novel, it may be more significant to regard Eco’s description of the third state as the marker of “the universe of culture” *Midnight’s Children* draws from. That is to say it would be a very limiting scope, and in many cases erroneous, if the instances of literary allusion in the novel were to be limited to what Eco calls “a two-way influence” (129): for example, saying that Rushdie had specific writings from Derrida and Nietzsche in mind while writing the text “is dangerous, since one loses sight of the networks of intertextuality” (129). Thus, rather than attempting to perceive Aadam Aziz’s nihilistic epiphany and Saleem’s perforated-sheet-compass as the textual manifestations of Derridian and Nietzschean influence on Rushdie, it would prove more fruitful to consider the ‘spirit’ of the text as nourished from the cultural spirit of a precedent age shaped by deconstructivist and nihilistic philosophies—which are in turn influenced by each other and by the “universe of culture” from which they both grew. For it is known that one of the major influences on Derrida’s work was Nietzsche, thus making it possible to be aware of Nietzsche without actually having read him. Drawing the links and loops which establish the inter-relations between these three contextually different writers/texts in the light of their shared global-cultural ‘heritage’ then makes it slightly easier to understand the three-way influence at work, wherein texts consciously or unconsciously (re-)produce literary styles and plots from a mental “archive” of cultural/textual awareness. As Eco quotes Borges on the matter of the third state: “And don’t let anyone tell me that I have not said anything new: *la disposition des matieres est nouvelle* [the arrangement of the subject matter is new]” (Eco, 122).

The same may be said for a more literary “intertextuality”: other than philosophical overtones, there are stylistic calls to, and echoes from various forms of literature. To focus on the presence of ‘western’ literary influences on account of viewing some forms of the text’s relation to the western literary canon, as in the case of Pamuk’s novel, it would be useful to initially note the novel’s genre. Saleem is the writer of an autobiography; being a genre of distinctly western origin in its specific treatment of self-representation, there rises the opportunity to consider Rushdie’s novel/Saleem’s narrative as under the influence of Jean Jacques Rousseau’s *Confessions*, for example. Rousseau’s autobiographical work is largely considered to be the “first modern autobiography”—a statement made by academician Patrick Coleman in the “Introduction” to the text, and his justification is that “they [the Confessions] combine for the first time two revolutionary ideas about the self.” The first of the two revolutionary ideas is “the irreducible sense of self which can be distinguished from all social, cultural, and religious identities, and which indeed is experienced most intensely in reaction against those identities.” Coleman’s second idea is the complementary yet contradictory “mobility of that self, a capacity not only to play a wide variety of roles (Rousseau boasts of having lived on every level of French society except the throne), but in addition to identify passionately and successfully with a new role to transform oneself, at least for a time, into a different person” (*Confessions*, vii). Taking the text’s cue, *Midnight’s Children* could be a postcolonial-postmodern response to these notions of the “irreducible sense of self” and its social counterpart which are so central to ‘western’ canonic literatures.

Saleem’s obsession regarding the necessity of disclosing the minutest temporal and/or personal detail in his life-narrative (“And the time? The time matters too. Well then, at night. No, it’s important to be more... On the stroke of midnight, as a matter of fact”); his extensive genealogical account which causes the event of simply his birth to take place half-way through the book; and Saleem’s paranoia regarding the absence of his “pure”, essential self as a result of his imprisonment to history and the myriad of social identities he has to comply to throughout the course of his life, all reflect and reply ironically to the concerns brought up by Rousseau and his literary manifestation of them in the *Confessions*. Thus, while Rousseau claims to define “a fundamental paradox of modern identity” (vii) through the contestation between private and public self, Saleem ‘helplessly’ experiences the impossibility of any independent private self ensured by

Aktar

genealogical assurance: Saleem's constant anguish stems from the fact that he is not the 'rightful' descendant of the Aziz family, as he is switched with Wee-Willy-Winkie's son at birth—and neither is he the socially downward-mobile Winky's rightful son as his wife conceived the baby with the English William Methwold who made his escape from India on the night of independence: an overall hard-to-trace and frightful situation. And neither does the idea of a separate, private sphere of life uncontaminated by a political, public sphere hold under the circumstances of Saleem's 'confessions'. Therefore, the central notions of authenticity and singular identity come crashing down in the manner of the Methwold Estate, but all the while Saleem retains his 'earnest', solemn anxiety to 'truthfully' relate the story of his life in order to reveal the story of the nation. However, there are occasions of lying, when Saleem confesses that:

To tell the truth, I lied about Shiva's death. My first out-and-out lie – although my presentation of the Emergency in the guise of a six-hundred-and-thirty-five day-long midnight was perhaps excessively romantic, and certainly contradicted by the available meteorological data. Still and all, whatever anyone may think, lying does not come easily to Saleem, and I'm hanging my head in shame as I confess... Why then this single bare-faced lie?... I fell victim to the temptation of every autobiographer, to the illusion that since the past exists only in one's memories and the words which strive vainly to encapsulate them, it is possible to create past events by simply saying they occurred (Rushdie, 619).

Though Saleem's confession to lying and to the "temptation of every autobiographer" does not agree with Rousseau's, Saleem's attitude and style of speech in the above quotation and throughout the text seem reflect a certain introductory passage from Rousseau:

Here is what I have done, what I have thought, what I was. I have told the good and the bad with equal frankness. I have concealed nothing that was ill, added nothing that was good, and if I have sometimes used some indifferent ornamentation, this has only ever been to fill a void occasioned by my lack of memory; I may have supposed to be true what I knew could have been so, never what I knew to be false. I have shown myself as I was, contemptible and vile when that is how I was, good, generous, sublime, when that was how I was; I have disclosed my innermost self as you [Supreme Judge] alone know it to be. Assemble about me, Eternal Being, the numberless host of my fellow-men; let them hear my confessions, let them groan at my unworthiness, let them blush at my wretchedness. Let each of them, here on the steps of your throne, in turn reveal his heart with the same sincerity; and then let one of them say to you, if he dares: *I was better than that man* (5).

Aktar

Of course, determining which reference text to include in this consideration of literary allusion in Rushdie's novel depends largely on the reader/critic's familiarity with works from the western literary canon, and own relation to zeitgeist. In this case, my familiarity with *Confessions* led me to notice the inter-textuality between Rushdie and Rousseau in the tradition of autobiographical writing. *Midnight's Children* may or may not actually be under the direct influence of this text; just as well as there can be an "unconscious" reference to Rousseau's work stemming from Rushdie's cultural awareness. The point is that Rushdie's text opens the doors for such interpretations and possibilities of cross-references with works from the western literary canon, albeit with an ironic twist. However, even this irony is significant in that as well as being the trademark of postmodern writings west and east, Rushdie's particular usage of this stylistic tool can be the indicator of intertextuality with other contemporary western canonic or postcolonial works of fiction. Hence blending in the western aesthetic ideal for the pleasure of the text.

* * * * *

Conclusion

The body of literature associated with the western literary canon but not included within its framework has been variously named over time: cold war era “Third World Literature”, the more historic and currently popular notion of “Post-colonial Literature”, to contemporary globalist terms such as “World Literature”, “classical metropolitan literature”, and even “New Literature”. My preference for using “Third World Literature” in the context of this paper does not imply a rejection or denial of the other terms, but is simply my preference on account of its implications and the series of debates the concept “Third World” brings to the literary arena. In awareness of the term’s “operational” rather than “analytic” value in the process of literary classification (Gugelberger, 517), Third World literature nevertheless more openly connotes the ideas of ‘belatedness’ and ‘experience’ of colonial imperialism which still act as markers of the subject area.

Critical theory produced on the literatures ranging from Latin America to the Middle East and Southeast Asia largely focuses on how literary texts reflect the sociopolitical violence experienced in the cultural struggle against Euro-American imperialism and the imposition of capitalist economy. In this system, the ‘peripheral’ texts which aesthetically engage with works from the western literary canon and do not necessarily foreground the politics of oppression are not considered ‘third world’ texts but are placed in the more ambiguous category of ‘world literature’. However, this ‘favorable’ exclusion does not seem to bring the particular texts in question very much closer to western literary canonic affiliation. This paper has brought two such examples of world literature to the foreground—Salman Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children* and Orhan Pamuk’s *The Black Book*—with the intentions of comparing the relations between their plots and stylistic characteristics with, basically, the formal structures denoted by the “five common denominators” (Gugelberger, 517) of Third World Literature. In doing such a comparison, the main aim has not been to show the problematics of first and third world literary categorizations as that is already an acknowledged phenomenon by western literary theorists including Gugelberger and Jameson, whose views are prioritized here. Instead, working from a set of standard denominators gradually led to a much broader critical platform exploring the aesthetic and structural forms of relation between non-western literature and the western literary canon. The methodology

Aktar

involved analysis of the two structural basics of literature in particular, allegory and allusion. By construing how the literary devices of allegory and allusion worked in the two texts by Pamuk and Rushdie, one was able to see the loci of western literary canonic influences and the unique textual responses to these influences. In addition to studying the texts' problematizations of allegory, allusion was studied using two approaches: the 'postcolonial' technique of literary cannibalism, and the more western 'postmodern' definition of allusion with its accompanying use of irony. Through these two approaches, there emerged awareness of a multidimensional anxiety of influence manifested in different forms in Pamuk and Rushdie's works.

Allusion in *The Black Book* works on two levels: while the content of the novel engages with Ottoman motifs and 'Eastern' classical texts, the framework of the novel consists of strong—but covert—formal elements representative of the 'Western' literary tradition. On the other hand, the form and content of *Midnight's Children* comes forth more as an open amalgam of influences: Hindu Buddhist mythology, Islamic scripture (Saleem's quote from the Quran) and 'western' classical and popular literary works—including references to Humpty Dumpty and a narrative structure in performative involvement with *Confessions*, for example. No doubt different historical and cultural dynamics govern the particular methods Pamuk and Rushdie deal with western literary canonic influences, but a particular phenomenon nevertheless brings the two texts to the same theoretical platform. This phenomenon derives from both texts' emanation of a general anxiety of literary representation which unabashedly shares in 'the western literary tradition': whether through a direct colonial experience or/and through historical processes of interaction, the western literary tradition is acknowledged to have become a part of the two texts' cultural inventory/archive/zeitgeist. The two novels may then be said to represent a larger 'Third World' literary historical response to 'First World' literary criticism.

This literary response is based on the argument against a notion of 'historical entry' into the global literary arena; an argument variously represented through Ahmad, Irzik, and Adak's articles in the context of this paper. The mode of multi-cultural/textual representation in the two novels demonstrates that the 'beginnings' of the loci of cultural interaction has taken place, and continues to take place, in more complex inter-relationships than linear accounts of (post-)colonial history present. Hence, contrary to insistence on the part of current western critical discourse, the notions of cultural

Aktar

belatedness and the position of passive influence are depicted to be un-operational. For although Gugelberger admits to room for theoretical “additions and caveats” regarding third world literature for example, and though Jameson has written the half-apologetic, half-explanatory “A Brief Response” to Aijaz Ahmad’s criticism of his notion of the Third World and third world literature, there continues to be what I think may be called a misunderstanding concerning multiculturalism. Taking the example of the Jameson-Ahmad debate to shortly illustrate my point, Ahmad challenges Jameson’s theory for neglecting to realize the historical dynamism shaping nations’ inter-relations and consequent cultural productions. Jameson’s response appears to misunderstand Ahmad in that Jameson claims “It seems to me much more productive to insist, as he [Ahmad] also does, on the way in which we are all *situated* and determined socially and ideologically by our multiple class positions....” (Jameson, 27). While this statement may not overtly pose any problems, it is shaped by the general tone of the response, wherein the idea of being situated, of speaking from a position, still derives from the established belief that First and Second world class positions are produced, while Third world class positions are imposed, hence the ‘experience’ from which third world literature ‘speaks out’.

Thus, from a textual analysis of two different cultural productions from the third world experience, this paper has attempted to re-state the more dynamic, more involved forms of relation between non-western literature and the western literary canon. These are structural and ‘spiritual’ relations which do not necessarily aim to subvert the literary canon for political purposes. Rather, they may be considered more experimental works situated in a ‘global’ postmodern framework wherein literature, ‘west’ and ‘east’, explore their particular “anxieties of influence”. This framework holds an inter-textually comparable consciousness of a problematic, yet common universe of culture governing literary identity representations in an age of multinational capitalism. However, closing on such a note does elude the question of how this ‘problematic’ involvement with a common universe of culture is received in its multinational capitalist context.

My analysis, though politically involved, rests on the grounds of literary academic consideration and I am aware that international academic interpretations of *The Black Book* and *Midnight’s Children* do not necessarily comply with international public interpretations of these texts. For example, it is a known fact that Pamuk and Rushdie are under death-threat due to the content of their previous novels—rather, due to the

Aktar

radical non-academic based interpretations of these novels. Thus, while my analysis of the two novels operates on a more postmodern allegorical and allusive interpretation of the plots and characters, made possible through literary study and consciousness, it does not take into account that these plots and characters may be interpreted ‘literally’ i.e. that would be taking the freakish, sterile, bastard Saleem and his nutcase, blasphemous family to ‘really’ represent modern Indian Moslem identity, for example. The strength and simultaneously the catch of postmodern fiction, especially in a postcolonial context, is the text’s physical and metaphorical ‘availability’: as well as being in wide circulation, the fact that these novels contain covert “layers of meaning” which unfold in proportion to the reader’s cultural baggage makes the postmodern-postcolonial novel prone to multiple levels of interpretation (Eco, 221). Furthermore, such a literal translation entails a belief that the novel directly reflects its author’s sociopolitical stance, and these acts of (mis-) translation are apparently what have happened. Therefore, the same texts which inspire inter/national academic debates on the multiplicity of cultural identity; reactions against cultural belatedness; relations between textual traditions and intertextual irony, can also inspire public/popular enmity on account of a representational ‘crisis’. As a result, the question of the novels’ method in dealing with the influences of ‘world’ literature and ‘local’ politics again becomes a question of textual balance between the ratio of the political and that of the aesthetic, but with the difference of a contextual reception factor.

* * * *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

Pamuk, Orhan. The Black Book. Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Vintage, 2006.

Rushdie, Salman. Midnight's Children. New York: Vintage, 1995.

Secondary Sources:

Adak, Hulya. "Introduction: Exiles at Home—Questions for Turkish and Global Literary Studies" PMLA 123.1 (2008): 20-26.

Adak, Hulya. "Pamuk's 'Encyclopedic Novel'". Essays on The Black Book. Ed. Nuket Esen. Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari, 1996.

Ahmad, Aijaz. In Theory. New York: Verso, 2008.

Ahmad, Aijaz. "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness and the 'National Allegory'." The Post-Colonial Studies Reader. London: Routledge, 1995. 77-82.

Anderson, Benedict. The Spectre of Comparisons: Politics, Culture and the Nation. London: Verso, 1998.

Barthes, Roland. Mythologies. Ed. Annette Lavers. New York: Hill and Wang, 1972.

Bayraktar, Aylin; Randall, Don. "Meetings of East and West: Orhan Pamuk's Istanbulite Perspective". South Atlantic Quarterly, 46.3 2005.

Bloom, Harold. The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Bernheimer, Charles, ed. Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Bradbury, Malcom and James McFarlane. "The Name and Nature of Modernism". Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890-1930. London: Penguin Books, 1991. pp. 19-55.

Gorra, Michael. After Empire: Scott, Naipaul, Rushdie. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Gugelberger, Georg M. "Decolonizing the Canon: Considerations of Third World Literature". New Literary History. Vol. 22 No. 3 (Summer 1991) 9 August 2007

Jameson, Fredric. "Third World Literature in the Age of Multinational Capitalism". Social Text 15 (1986): 65-88.

Aktar

Jameson, Fredric. "World Literature in an Age of Multinational Capitalism". The Current in Criticism: Essays on the Present and Future of Literary Theory. Ed. Koelb, Clayton & Lokke, Virgil. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1987. pp.139-58.

Jameson, Fredric. "A Brief Response". Social Text (1987), 17: 26-28.

Jameson, Fredric. "Postmodernism and Consumer Society". The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture. New York: The New Press, 1998. pp. 127-145.

Jusdanis, Gregory. Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

Kara Kitap Uzerine Yazilar. Ed. Nuket Esen. İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 1996.

Kiberd, Declan. "Introduction to James Joyce's *Ulysses*". Ulysses. London: Penguin, 1992.

Irzik, Sibel. "Allegorical Lives: The Public and the Private in the Turkish Novel" South Atlantic Quarterly 102.2/3 (2003): 551-566.

Matz, Jesse. "Questioning the Modern: Mid-Century Revisions". The Modern Novel: A Short Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

McClintock, Anne. "The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term Post-Colonialism." Social Text 31.32 (1992): 84-98.

Means, Laurel. "The Role of the Writer in Today's Singapore: Voice of the Nation?" Asian Survey. Vol. 34 No. 11 (November 1994) 9 August 2007

Milner, Andrew. Literature, Culture and Society. New York: New York University Press, 1996.

Navabpour, Reza. "The 'Writer' and the 'People'". British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies. Vol. 23 No.1 (May 1996) 9 August 2007

Nazareth, Peter. "The Social Responsibility of the East African Writer". Callaloo. (8 October 1980) 9 August 2007

Orhan Pamuk Edebiyatı: Sabancı Üniversitesi Sempozyum Tutanakları. Ed. Aral, Fahri. İstanbul : Agora Kitaplığı, 2006.

Prasad, Madhava. "On the Question of a Theory of (Third World) Literature". Social Text, No. 31/32, Third World and Post-Colonial Issues. (1992), pp. 57-83.

Said, Edward. Culture and Imperialism. New York: Random House, 1994.

Said, Edward. The World, the Text and the Critic. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Soysal, Mehmet. "Aydınların sesi yeteri kadar çıkmıyor..." Basbasa: Olayların ve Düşüncelerin Orgusu. İstanbul: Mehmet Soysal, 2001. pp 266-70.

Aktar

Soyinka, Wole. "Twice Bitten: The Fate of Africa's Culture Producers". PMLA. Vol.105 No.1 (January 1990) 9 August 2007.

The Postcolonial Studies Reader. Eds. Ashcroft, Bill; Griffiths, Gareth & Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995.

Transcultural Joyce. Ed. Lawrence, Karen R. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Vieira, Pires; Else Ribeiro. "Liberating Calibans: readings of Antropofagia and Haroldo de Campos' poetics of transcreation". Post-Colonial Translation. Eds. Susan Bassnett, Harish Trivedi. New York: Routledge, 1999. pp 95-114.

<http://science.jrank.org/pages/8118/Third-World-Literature.html>