

Chapter I: Introduction

Rushdie's View on History and Fiction

Born in Mumbai, India, and educated in the U.K., multi-award-winning novelist Salman Rushdie is one of the most important and influential postcolonial writers of English language fictional writing. *The Enchantress of Florence* (2008), a romantic fantasy of 16th-century East and West, chiefly tells the story of Mughal India and Renaissance Italy. Rushdie has long been a student of history, and historical fiction is his hall mark. Rushdie did more research for *The Enchantress of Florence* than any of his previous novels, and although it is clear that this is a piece of fiction, we are left with the distinct impression that things could have happened this way. In fact a lot of the daily activities of the characters in the various locales of the novel happen this way, and through beautiful descriptions and subtle characterizations readers find themselves utterly transporting into historicism of the past.

To Rushdie history and fiction are human constructions. Historians write them as prejudices, prides and preoccupation. Rushdie combines history and fiction. If we go through the *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary 7th Edition*, we find the meaning of history as "the past events concerned in the development of a particular place, subject, etc, written or spoken account of past events (737) in the same dictionary fiction is defined as "a thing that is invented or imagined and is not true" (568), a type of literature that describes imaginary people and events, not real ones (568).

If we take recourse of *Wikipedia The Free Encyclopedia*:

Historians write in the context of their own time, and with due regard to the current dominant ideas of how to interpret the past, and sometimes write to provide lessons for their own society. In the words of [Benedetto Croce](#), "All history is contemporary history". History is facilitated by the formation of a 'true discourse of past' through the production of narrative and analysis of past events relating to the human race. The modern discipline of history is dedicated to the institutional production of this discourse. (No Page)

These definitions prove that two terms are totally different terms. Still Rushdie mixes history with fiction, it is his specialty. In the novel, Rushdie relates stories by a variety of storytellers, travelers and adventurers and of course touches on the histories and cultures of the various settings including the Mughal and Ottoman Empires, the earlier Mongols, and Renaissance Florence. The central theme of *The Enchantress of Florence* is the visit of a European to the [Mughal](#) emperor [Akbar](#)'s court and his claim that he is a long lost relative of [Akbar](#), born of an exiled Indian princess and an Italian from [Florence](#). The story moves between continents, the court of Akbar to Renaissance Florence mixing history, fantasy and fable. The history begins in Fatehpur Sikri, the capital of Mughal emperor Akbar the Great, when a stranger arrives, having stowed away on a pirate ship captained by the Scottish Lord Hauksbank, and sets the Mughal court talking and looking back into its past. In the day's last light the glowing lake, a man has "a secret which the emperor's ear may hear" (7).

The novel *The Enchantress of Florence* has been analyzed and interpreted from various perspectives. However, the approach of the present study is to look at Rushdie's attitude towards the history and fiction. Rushdie writes at the moment when new theories of history undermine recorded historical facts as the construction of individual subjectivity. The need for a new perspective of looking at historical forms makes *The Enchantress of Florence*, a prime example that explores new views of history.

The Enchantress of Florence, a historical fiction, amalgamates history and fictional literature to blur the factual claim of absolute history and motives behind the novel's narrative construction. Rushdie exploits the notion of new historicism as done by Luis Montrose, as a new historical approach. As for Montrose "New Historicism is a reciprocal concern with historicity of texts and the textuality of histories" (410), *The Enchantress of Florence* accomplishes it. Rushdie opines history and literature as official history, which is just the shadow of those who are enjoying the power. They, who are in power, modify the history according to their interests. The 'pen' of historians writes through the ink of authority/power. So, history becomes imaginative fiction, a story rather than an account of past events. We believe fiction includes the pain and suffering of those under privileged class and objective and that becomes real history. The new historicism blurs the so-called boundary between literary and non literary texts and clearly shows the interconnections. In this sense, literary fiction is as important as history. No objective history is possible to write since the historical prejudice and preoccupation are unavoidable and inseparable. Rushdie in his novel presents a young Machiavelli

learning the lessons that a prince must know to survive, the secret history of Qara Köz, a girl of dark eyes. Helen Dunmore analyzes novel as in *The Times*:

Rushdie's new novel is a hall of mirrors. They distort and flatter, and above all, they reveal what is hidden. Two great civilizations, the Mughal empire of Akbar, and the Florence of the Medicis and of Machiavellie, reflect on each other while they are linked by a series of fairytale improbabilities...It's a haul of stories, gathered with magpie glee, arranged to glitter...' (qtd. In Rushdie, 457)

Rushdie aims to provide the historical reference of the Indian emperor Akbar the great in fictional make up to raise our conscious towards the magical enchantments of Mughal Empire and its historical origin. Here Rushdie has interwoven history as fiction; we can call it history cum fiction. Rushdie deals with a tangled work of historical fiction that spans generations of Mughal Indian emperors and Florentine aristocrats. The blend of history and fiction is apparent in the sense that he creates characters based on historical figures that, in turn, imagines other characters. In this sense Rushdie acknowledges new historical approach, historicity of texts and the textuality of histories blurring of imagination and reality to fictionalize the history in *The Enchantress of Florence*.

The novel *The Enchantress of Florence* carries the new historicist entities in its writing to reveal tensions on politics, religion, war and women .Wilfred L. Guerin says,"*New Historicism* concerns itself with extra literary matters - letters, diaries, paintings, medical treatises - looking to revel opposing historical tensions in a text" (183).

Rushdie shares Guerin's view in the sense that he deals with cultures crashing as characters invent and reinvent themselves on new landscapes, from west to east and east to west. And throughout the novel, the Emperor and Niccolo and Qara Köz reflect and reveal the historicization of opposing historical tensions on politics, religion, war and woman in *The Enchantress of Florence*.

The principles of the new historicism are strongly opposed to the view that the study of literature should be done independently of social and political contexts. Instead, Rushdie and Guerin believe literature is a part of historical process and should be a part of historical process and should participate in the political management of reality. Rushdie views the transcendental historical discourse as one of the many versions of history and it is not necessarily absolute and final version of history. It is rather artificial which is affected by a vast web of social, economical, cultural and political factor of the era. Moreover, Rushdie opines it as an ideological product and which, in turn, always enhances that ideology. Thus, the approach of the present study is to show fictionalization of history resists the official as well as transcendental history and exposes the real nature of history.

Rushdie also refers to the issue of how the power and discursive practices transform and change over time. In *Nietzsche, Genealogy and History* Foucault reviews the responsibility of historians and redefines only in relation to context with other things. He acknowledges that everything is product of power and its practices. His focus of study is that how the power and discursive practices transform and change over time. His analysis is that how human beings understand themselves in their culture. Stuart Hall in

his *Text representation* talks about Foucault and says, "He was concerned with production of knowledge and meaning, not through language but through discourse" (44). Rushdie accomplishes it dismantling the old discourse about the divorce between *West and East*. Rushdie has woven a historical fiction connecting two separate worlds. His magical plot seamlessly connects the Mughal world with that of the Medicis and Florence. He has done a grand job of marrying the East and West in his signature imaginative way.

As Ross Murfin and Supriya M. Ray talk about the historical development of new historicism and write how that literature influences history and how the literature itself is influenced by history. New historicists assume the works of literature by historical reality, and they share a belief that literature and history both refers to things outside it. They are less fact and event oriented than historical critics used to be, perhaps because they have come to wonder whether the truth about what really happens can ever be purely and objectivity known, Salman Rushdie offers the same thing in *The Enchantress of Florence* dissolving the boundary between fact and fiction.

Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* confirms the validity of Ricoeur's position on the interweaving of history and fictional narratives. Saleem Sinai begins his story by drawing attention to the two modes of narration synthesized throughout the novel: "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" (Rushdie 3). We are given two beginnings for Saleem's story the archetypal fictional beginning, "once upon a time," and the archetypal historical beginning, the first

day of a nation's independence. Each beginning is dependent upon the other. From this moment onward, through his narrator, Rushdie constructs fantastic journey through the history of modern India, witnessing its victories and more often, its disappointments through the words of a single, representative voice for the nation. Ricoeur's suggestion, that "fiction resembles history" because of its quasi-historical past, attains a far more intense feeling in Rushdie. From the 1919 Amritsar massacre to the Indo-Pakistani war of 1965 and beyond Indira Gandhi's 1975 Emergency, Rushdie shows us history through fiction, from a perspective that confirms Ricoeur's merit of telling stories as most evident in "the necessity to save the history of the defeated and the lost." *Midnight's Children* is a retelling of India's story by a man "buffeted by too much history" and able only to respond to time's unceasing march by announcing "[he has] resolved to confide in paper" his, and his nation's narrative" (36). Throughout the novel, Saleem repeatedly refers to his fear of time's effects upon him and can respond only by continuing to tell his story. The narrator suffers from an anxiety that is absolutely bound up with historically charged concerns of dispossession and victimization; the author offers a poetic solution that constitutes a foundation work of postcolonial literature. From St. Augustine to Salman Rushdie: *Time and Narrative in Postcolonial and Pluralist Literatures*

History and historical fiction are necessarily not the same thing. The purpose of history is to narrate events as accurately as one can. The purpose of historical fiction is to enable a reader through the perspective of characters in the story to feel that she or he is present at the events. Such a goal obviously requires some modification of the event. In a

conversation with NPR's Robert Siegel, Rushdie talks about the blurring of imagination and reality to create the novel. Rushdie, whose subject of study is history at Cambridge University, says he creates characters based on historical figures that in turn imagines other characters. MPRNews, National Public Radio in *Rushdie's Latest Novel Blurs Imagination, History* comments as:

It comes out of the old Pygmalion idea of men who invent women to fall in love with who then escape them, Rushdie says. In the case of the Emperor Akbar, who is the character in the novel who invents the queen for himself, it came out of the fact that in India today, if you ask people who were the queen of the great emperor Akbar, they all say Jodha. If you look at the historical records, she didn't exist. (No Page)

Thus, since the novel is, after all, a fictional account of real historical events, to know historical level in connection with the extra-textual plane of reference. The book is outcome of 7 years of research, as the bibliography indicates, and therefore it demands of the reader a certain amount of historical knowledges about the periods in question, which, if acquired, leads to the surprising discovery that, despite being written in the language and the narrative mode of fantasy, the novel does not depart too much from official historical record. Apart from the constant interference of purely fictional characters in the development of historical events to which Rushdie's loyal readers are already accustomed. This is the written history of the imperial power of Mughal empire in the fictional form highlighting history is the matter of interpretation that all historical accounts are narratives.

The way Rushdie reconstructs the official recorded history of Mughal emperor Akbar the Great and the Renaissance Florence. The central theme of *The Enchantress of Florence* is a fictional account of history where Rushdie relates the historical character Akbar the Great, account of war, peace, sex and romance, love, hatred, victory and loss, women who is both magical and beautiful, turning fact into fiction, transforming clay bricks into gold. The story in the text is presented as the mixing history, fantasy and fable in a way that such things are not actually history but a product of imagination. Here Rushdie creates magic realism as that of Akbar's imaginative wife, witchcraft, so we can say him as a historical fiction writer, giving history a new look in the form of writing fiction. The tale dates back to the time of Akbar's grandfather, Babar. The enchantress of the novel is Babar's sister and the Akbar's great aunt.

Rushdie, as a migrant, leaves his native country and settles in a new environment. Rushdie may be going to be confronted with a radical act of self-questioning of what he follows and discards, what to take in and what to reject. This sort of thinking may have struck Rushdie's mind. This is the clash of the culture, history and tradition. By sending a traveler, a story teller, Rushdie compares Islamic India and Florence of enlightenment. Telling his own state of being, comparing his origin with that of European. The novel satires on people who take Jodha as the queen of the great emperor Akbar, really queen of the great emperor Akbar? Does she exist?, if we look at the historical records, she didn't exist. Rushdie here presents fantasy character in order to make history a fiction. The politics behind this Rushdie's New Historical rhetorical strategy is to display Mughal Imperial history in East and Florentine history in West are

not real rather just like real one. This is how the events and characters presented in the novel are not real rather just like real one to redraw the boundaries between history and fiction looking at the traces of imagination in the construction of official recorded history.

Rushdie, in his articles and interviews, has confessed that he is a storyteller. As a historian, he creates fictional account of the recorded historical character and hero.

Factual historical account and the historical figure is being fictionalized and presented as Rushdie's ease. Akbar the great, Jodha, storyteller, Machiavelli, Qara Koz and other number of character have been used as the puppets at the hands of Rushdie, who makes them dance at his music.

Considering the statement of problem, it is Indian culture is far more rich and better than that of western one as Rushdie, being a historian, has characterized caustically, as a reciprocal concern with historicity of texts and the textuality of histories. Though the main purpose of the research is to demonstrate the works of the Rushdie; especially *The Enchantress of Florence* is the fictionalization of the history. A real historical figure Akbar the Great and other characters have been fictionalized in the novel. This is a qualitative research fully based on secondary resource i.e. several reviews in national dailies, reputed magazines, online exploration, libraries research, instruction of guides and recent research drafts carried out on this novel will be as indispensable sources for the thesis, different interviews with the novelist by the different national & international newspapers assist me to explore full-fledged outstanding in order to prove my issued hypothesis. The whole thesis is divided in four chapters. In chapter one I give brief introduction to Rushdie's View on History and Fiction, in chapter two, Power of

storytelling, the main statement and problem is in chapter three, that talks about fictionalizing history and finally in chapter four I have summed up Rushdie's view that the History and Story live in juxtaposition.

Chapter II: Introduction: Power of Storytelling

The Enchantress of Florence is a bulk of stories, specially fictionalized version of Akbar the great, the famous 16th century Mughal emperor, the story of emperor's great aunt, who happened to be lost, the story of a imagined wife of Akbar-Jodha, story of the stranger, who is in the Akbar's regime. The story of two different cities, Mughal Empire in the east and Renaissance Florence in the west, we are glued to the power of Rushdie's power of story telling. In a sense the real enchanter of the novel is author, who binds us through the novel interweaving story and story and Meta story too, Rushdie thoroughly explores the idea of appearance versus reality through the plight of his characters, which are necessarily wrapped up in stories within the story. Since the novel is after all a fictional account of a real historical events, demands certain amount of historical knowledge about the period just to know how Rushdie has twisted and mixed realism and magic in the historical record. How he has fused imaginative story with that of history. In a recent interview with Matthew D' Ancona in *The Spectator*, Rushdie says,

We tell ourselves into being, don't we? . . . [T]here is no other creature on earth that tells itself stories in order to understand who it is." And Salman Rushdie responds "We are the storytelling animal. (No Page)

The novel is full of stories within story. It is the story of a woman attempting to command her own destiny in a man's world. It is the story of two cities, unknown to each other, at the height of their powers the hedonistic Mughal capital, in which the brilliant Akbar the Great wrestles daily with questions of belief, desire, and the treachery of his sons, and the equally sensual city of Florence during the High Renaissance, where

Niccolò Machiavelli takes a starring role as he learns, the hard way, about the true brutality of power. Vivid, gripping, irreverent, bawdy, profoundly moving, and completely absorbing, *The Enchantress of Florence* is a dazzling book full of wonders by one of the world's most important living writers. In an Interview with Tishani Doshi, *Salman and the Sea of Stories*, Rushdie has said:

The reason I became a writer was to tell stories,” he claims. “I love to read stories and I wanted to write some – that’s it. I didn’t become a writer to solve the world’s problems, and certainly not to become rich and famous.

Rushdie simply employs magic realism as the key component for unveiling otherwise improbable dimensions of story telling in historical fiction. The most important thematic consistencies in light of it being a global novel arise primarily through fore-grounded variance in identity, time, place, and realism within and amongst the characters. These themes, as magnified by the effects of magic realism enhance their face value by enhancing the temporal and spatial scales in which they exist. Rushdie uses the familiar and established art of storytelling to connect meaning between the abstract natures of themes in the novel. This most fundamental theme does not enable seamless transition between in-sequential segments, but rather it further emphasizes the feeling of disjuncture that can be attributed to the intangible and conceptual magnitude of globalization.

The Enchantress of Florence is a novel which has main theme as storytelling. The various tellers weave their tales from the Florence of the Renaissance to the capital of the Mughal empire. It is a book about the ability to bring into being events and characters simply through the power of storytelling. And conversely about how past events and characters can be changed as their stories are told and retold, shaped and then reshaped. The central character is a woman, the enchantress of the title. As her story is told at court it begins to suffuse the whole of the emperor's capital city, just as in the story itself she enchants Florence with her presence. Or perhaps the central character is the Mogol d'Amore, the mysterious teller of the tale. Or perhaps it is Akbar the Great, the person to whom the story is being told, and a man who understands the power of the imagination to create. Or perhaps it is Rushdie, who is telling everybody's story, criss-crossing expertly from East to West as has been in his other works.

Moreover, the novel *The Enchantress of Florence* is set in a time when populace literally believed in magic and was not at all shy about using their imaginations. In fiction and reality, trying to tell the truth is not always enough; sometimes it turns out that we do not actually know ourselves. *The Enchantress of Florence*, in contrast, feels fixed and lethargic, as though it had been mechanically assembled from a recipe that included lots of research, a rote sprinkling of fantasy, and some perfunctory and strained allusions to some greater politico- religious issues (like the Sunni-Shiite split and Islam's troubled role on the world stage). Although the novel gains narrative momentum in its final chapters, large portions of the book consist of tiresome free-associative digressions and

asides, heaped one on top of another in such profusion that they threaten to topple the slender frame story around which the book is constructed.

The novel has numerous story to tell, a fictionalized version of Akbar the Great, the famous 16th-century Mughal emperor, But instead of developing Akbar into a full-fledged character like the Moor in *The Moor's Last Sigh*, Rushdie allows him to become a cardboard figure, whose favorite wife, Jodha, we are to believe, is a fantasy figure he has brought to life, and who spends an inordinate amount of time musing about the porous boundaries between life and art. This is, in away we can say, the power of story teller. The novel starts with yellow-haired stranger from the West arriving at Akbar's court and tells the emperor that he has a secret story to recount, a story that the emperor alone can hear. This stranger, who goes by an assortment of names (Uccello, Mogor dell' Amore and Vespucci), reminds Akbar that he has been yearning to find a man who was his equal, whom he could meet as his brother, with whom he could speak freely, a man he could trust and perhaps even make his heir. But Vespucci is also a con man and magician and compulsive storyteller, and Akbar is suspicious of his motives, even as he finds himself falling under his spell. This is the story of Emperors lost great aunt.

Rushdie here relates history and redefines it in his own imagination, in his own ease to create story on the grounds of history.

The Persian king, in turn, was defeated by the Osmanali, or Ottoman, Sultan o,'the foreigner continued. ' And in the end the princess reached Italy in the company of a mighty warrior. Agralia and Angelica were their names. Aragalia bore enchanted weapons, and in his retinue were four

terrifying giants, and by his side rode Angelica, the princess of cathy and india, the most beautiful women in the world, and an enchantress beyond compare. (139)

As Vespucci starts his story by telling Akbar that he is his relative by blood, in point of fact: Akbars' uncle. The tale he proceeds to tell is that his mother was a princess of the true Chaghatai blood, a direct descendant of Genghis Khan, a member of the house of Timur and the sister of the First Mughal Emperor of India. His mother, whom he knew by the name Angelica, was the most beautiful woman in the world, and an enchantress beyond compare. Just how Akbar's golden-haired visitor explains his relationship to Angelica is itself another long story that involves Florentine politics, a subplot concerning Niccolò Machiavelli, assertions that Angelica is a divine enchantress and lots of talk about two mirrors: a Medici family mirror that is said to reveal to the reigning Duke the image of the most desirable woman in the known world and Angelica's personal mirror, a servant girl who looks exactly like her. On the other hand the novel is said to be seven years in the making, researching and writing, spans the worlds of the Mughal emperor Akbar the Great and Renaissance Florence. Despite the title and the publisher's description of *The Enchantress of Florence* as the story of a woman attempting to control her own destiny in a man's world, it is Akbar who dominates this story. The story of the black-eyed, long-forgotten Mughal princess Qara Köz is related by a mysterious yellow-haired chancer who turns up at Akbar's court in Sikri. Indeed Qara Köz turns out to be central to this stranger's past and future. But Qara Köz's tale is background music to the journey of thought and belief that drives this book. The pulse of

the tale is Akbar's imagination, the way it wraps itself round and pervades the teller's tale while grappling with the possibilities of belief and what it means to be human.

With Akbar, Rushdie takes us on an imaginative journey through the mind of an all-powerful man who comes to realize that the ability to create and shape the world and its stories is the fulfillment of human potential rather than of divine will. Rushdie throws down a gauntlet to those who hold that Islamic culture has always been irreconcilably antithetical to humanist thought. Florence, with its internecine wars and public burnings – the monk Savonarola roasting nicely in the middle of the Piazza Della Signoria – is barbarian compared to the enlightened tolerance of Akbar's court. Humanism's journey has taken many paths and we don't yet know how it ends. But the ending, as Rushdie shows us, is undoubtedly ours to make. We have to decide and guess what is next.

The Enchantress of Florence begins with a stranger standing astride a bullock cart as he enters the domain of the emperor of India. He is godlike in stance, yet in appearance he is as a fool with his overly pretty face and parti-colored coat. The city to which he arrives is one of the grand cities of the world in both scale and wealth. Even the nearby lake seems to be made of gold. This of course is just an illusion brought about by the setting of the sun, but is an appropriate introduction to the story since it will become difficult to separate the real from the imagined as the story progresses. This is the author's fantasy and product of imagination which he employs in this novel. The yellow-haired man is a teller of stories and he has arrived to tell a story to the Mughal of India that will either bring him fortune or cost him his life. The emperor challenges the stranger's identity, who calls himself first Uccello of Florence and then Mogor

dell'Amore (mogul of love), begins to weave the enchanting story of Qara Koz, the enchantress of Florence, who he claims is his mother. It is Rushdie, who makes Qara Koz mother to the stranger, great aunt to the Akbar. But what is the Emperor to make of the stranger's story? What are we to make of the story we are reading? Identities and reality are not always clear within this magical novel. We are left in dilemma on who is the story-telling stranger? Is Qara Koz really the stranger's mother? Even the Emperor is not sure if he is simply an 'I' like everyone else or a 'we' of divine royalty as that of Akbar the great. Reality is tenuous. Characters are imagined yet given "space" and relationship. The story-teller feels him fading away to nothingness when kept from telling his story. Is he merely defined by his story and without it has no existence? To add to the tenuous atmosphere created by questions of identity and reality, women are sometimes mere echoes and mirrors of someone or something else. They whisper and murmur and are ghostlike as they glide behind curtains and veils. The author has woven layers of story around his readers, and enchants and draws us into his creation. We come back night after night to hear the story he has to tell. Its really enchanting and power of the story .He shows us that story has power ... the power to enthrall, the power to rend apart and the power to create.

The story was completely untrue, but the untruth of untrue stories could sometime be of service in the real world, and it was tales of this sort – impoverished version of endless stream of stories he had learned from his friend Ago Vespucci – that saved title Nino Argalia's own neck after he was found hiding under a bunk in the forecastle of the flagship of

Andrea Doria's fleet. His information had been out of date – the French had been dispatched by the Band of Gold some time ago – and when he heard that Doria was about to set off to fight the Turk he knew it was time for departure....(211)

The novel is first and foremost a story. It is secondarily an affirmation of the power of story. I found that I had to let go and allow Rushdie to take me where he would in order to fully enjoy the work, really enchanted by the power of art/storytelling. The story constitutes more or less the entire book. Most of the time reader forgets that they are inside the inner stories; Rushdie has wrapped us up completely within it. The inner story is where we hear about the character in the title: the Enchantress is the most beautiful woman in the world, the most beautiful woman anyone has ever seen or ever will see. The storytelling here is without peer. Knights with skin as white as death, court intrigues, epic battles etc. this is a throwback to an earlier kind of storytelling, and unique skilled throwback it is. At the same time, it's a history piece. The grand emperor with whom we started is Akbar the Great (which, Rushdie reminds us, is redundant: "Akbar," or some part of it, means "great"). Akbar's ancestors were connected in various ways with Niccolò Machiavelli and Sandro Botticelli and Amerigo Vespucci. Did these connections actually happen? How about the court intrigues: were there any parallels to them in the real Ottoman Empire? There is material enough in the historical bits alone to fuel research for years.

Rushdie himself must have spent years just on that part. Then there's the meta part of *The Enchantress of Florence* the part that deals with the power of storytelling

itself. We learn early on, for instance, that Akbar has brought a queen into existence using only his mind. His force of will is such that she becomes real, and the city eventually sees her as well. When Akbar leaves on a military campaign, he returns to hear his queen relate what has gone on in his absence. He makes love with his imaginary queen. This idea recurs throughout *The Enchantress of Florence*, but again: never enough to get in the way of the story itself, which is magical without being fantasy. This sort of Magic realism and creating imagined story is Rushdie's specialty.

This novel, historically accurate as well as imaginatively conceived, rich in detail, opulent in style, masterfully crafted, filled with credible if often magical characters and held together by a string of recurring motives such as love and enchantment, magic power and secrets or story telling and journeying, is proof again of his many literary talents and his unceasing interest in probing into possibilities for a mutual understanding of cultures as different as those in the West and in the East. In both story lines we do not only come across historical events and personages but also encounter invented happenings, cultures and characters embellished besides with magic and fairy-tale elements, for example the magic power of water, perfume or lances. Rushdie's skilful handling of both narrative strands by alternately moving from one to the next and back again and by inserting various sub-plots raises the question as to where history ends and fiction sets in, even makes us doubt the power of language telling the truth – and attracts our attention to the meaning of story telling itself. The omniscient narrator questions the veracity of the reality he portrays as much as do several of his characters who experience their very own and differing versions of true love and

sexuality, home and abroad, dream, enchantment and reality, secret and betrayal, past and present: all interwoven in a story about the enchanting Qara K z, also called Lady Black Eyes, Angelica and the Enchantress of Florence. At the same time, the central narrative figure of Mogor dell' Amore ('Mughal of Love') is convinced that he would die without telling his story because all men needed to hear their stories told. Even Akbar, his most patient listener, believes that Mogor wants to step into the tale he is telling and begin a new life inside it.

Here it is obvious that Rushdie, in a way, telling his own story, a Indian having to stay far from homeland, having FATWA against him. He is in exile and may be feels nostalgia for the nation. He, by portraying the stranger, his grand and grand children go to the land searching his relative and the treasury. The basic motif of story telling then is our human need to establish our identity, our home with family and friends, our own city, country and world since if all our stories faded away, we would drift vaguely into the white. Even Akbar feels this need although he had, as he ruminates, until recently conceived of himself as this swallower of worlds, this many-headed monster who referred to him in the first person plural– but who had of late begun to meditate about the disturbing possibilities of the first person singular – the I.

Rushdie, we realize, has once again taken up topics and questions of his earlier writing that he pursues now and for the first time in a story where he looks far back into the past, to about 1584-85; a past that is both historically reconstructed and spun as a vastly entertaining yarn in this rich and meandering narrative. The young Florentine Mogor arrives at Fatehpur Sikri to hand over a letter from Queen Elizabeth to the Mughal

Emperor, in truth however, to reveal that he is Akbar's uncle, son of Babar's sister Qara Köz or Akbar's great aunt, who had been erased from family history. Bringing the two men together serves the omniscient narrator's purpose to introduce the courtly atmosphere at Fatehpur Sikri with Akbar and his "Nine Stars", to relate contemporary events and sum up Qara Köz's early years as remembered by Birbal and two royal ladies: all of which make up the first part of the novel. Mogor's own story is then taken up from the beginning of the second and followed through the third and last part of the book, not however without being interrupted ever so often by his listener. It spans the years 1479 to 1519 and focuses on three friends: Niccolo 'il Macchia' or Machiavelli, Agostino Vespucci and Antonio Argalia. It is not his own story, however, but what he has learned from his father Agostino who in turn had reported to his son what his friend Niccolo had told him about Antonio's years away from Florence between 1479 and 1513 and what he himself remembered of their early friendship and his friend's life till his death in 1519. Niccolo in turn had come to know about Antonio's fate from a young woman, a prostitute and slave at the Ottoman Sultan's court called memory palace. Her story, finally, included the one of Qara Köz as a young princess living with her brother Babar and family in Samarkand, thereafter at Shaibani Khan's court and after his defeat by Shah Ismail of Persia in Herat. When the Shah himself was defeated by Antonio, leader of the Sultan's army, he and Qara had fallen in love and she followed him first to Turkey and then to Florence. Here, named Angelica by her lover, she at once began to enchant the people around her, becoming all things to all people, an exemplar, a lover, an antagonist, a muse, and was soon known as the Enchantress of Florence. Mogor winds up his

narrative by retelling his father's story about the couple's final years together, her escape with her servant and Argalia from Florence to the new world, Mundus Novus, his mother's death when he was nineteen and the following ten years of his own life in Florence and the Old World. His mission, he ends, to India would be fulfilled once he had revealed the secret about his mother and received from the Emperor that was rightfully his.

The visitor's Florentine European western narrative, as can be explored further, highlights the fate of people as individuals; the Muslim-Indian-eastern narrative, on the other hand, grants insight into an historical period, which contrasts sharply with the Renaissance epoch of Florence. The city state's manifold political, social and religious upheavals cause great insecurity among people whose thoughts, hopes and actions are all directed at assuring their identities and granting them security. Akbar's military, political and administrative pursuits, on the other hand, have resulted in a period of peace and security, at least in his capital, which allows him, his household and advisors to find sufficient time and leisure for literature, music and painting, games and, above all, lively and controversial debates about religious questions and beliefs – a pastime of the greatest importance for the Emperor. In this way *The Enchantress of Florence* is, among other things (historical adventure, fairy tale, celebration of inclusiveness), a postmodern working-through of ideas around identity and storytelling. In terms of genre, *The Enchantress of Florence* is a globe-traversing prose romance about the vicissitudes of love, power, and storytelling—a romance dressed in the guise of an impeccably researched historical novel (complete with an extensive bibliography)

Rushdie has always hidden behind his narrators, giving them the not entirely contradictory views he repeats from story to story, book to book. Here, his Akbar reflects on the possibility of a world of peace and tolerance, brought about by respect for storytellers, the enchanter as poet aiding the emperor as legislator. Akbar comprehends the world's romances and their characters, including not only his own imaginary consort, but his putative aunt, the enchantress of Florence, as well, in a vision which somehow equates women, storytelling, desire and love. The book ends with him turning towards an imaginary homeland mapped by a more famous Vespucci, in a new world in the west, into which the enchantress simply vanishes; it ends with the disappearance of the murderous stranger, himself perhaps deceived; it ends, above all, with Akbar's sense that he cannot defeat the quarrel over God, and, above all, with the emperor's insistence on love's fragility. *The Enchantress of Florence* is a bravura entertainment, but one which is finally disappointing. In its attempt to encompass everything, it develops very little. Clichés are what they are because we come back to them without end, and it is – perhaps – brave and beautiful to immolate one's legendary lovers. But it amounts to not much more than itself, to evocations of feelings one can conjure up again in time for the next night's performance.

The historical novel that is also an artful parody of the genre, by a master storyteller not unlike his audacious protagonist Niccolò Vespucci, who mesmerizes the despotic Mughal emperor with his storytelling skills: the magician-artist who is “not only himself but a performance of himself as well. We believe that a good story convincingly told, magical untruths and all, because storytelling is an essentially human

thing and Rushdie is one of our best. In the description of Qara K z's lover Argalia the Turk, abandoned as a boy after a sea battle, we see what it means to be bereft of these human stories: interpolated stories bubbling up and sidetracking the narrative, that it's hard to get a handle on Rushdie's main aims. But I think this is primarily a novel about power in its different manifestations, the power of leadership, the power of love, the power of magic and the power of violence. Consuming all of them into its folds is the power of storytelling, Michiko Kakutani in *Storytelling and Deception in a Magic Kingdom* comments Rushdie as:

The fecund language and exuberant inventiveness that have distinguished Mr. Rushdie's best novels have given way here to more conventional, even academic constructions. And the capacious political analogies embedded in those earlier novels (in which a character's or family's fate became a metaphor for, say, the course of Indian history) have been replaced by musty philosophical musings about the craft of storytelling and the relationship between life and art. There are familiar Scheherazade-esque stories within stories within stories, and interminable Tristram Shandy-esque digressions that circle around and around and around. (No Page)

In this way Salman Rushdie novel is like a odd one trying to describe music to someone who has never heard it, you can drop with a plot summary but you will not be able to convey the wonder of his dazzling prose or the imaginative complexity of his vision. At it's heart, *The Enchantress of Florence* is about the power of story--whether it

is the imagined life of a Mughal queen, or the devastating secret held by a silver-tongued Florentine. He is a powerful storyteller enchanting reader go through the piling of stories. May be his own story he is telling. As he has been issued Fatwa and remains underground for decades and currently residing in Europe, far from the homeland, fears to loose his family history. He is comparing his grand children with that of the stranger who goes to the Akbar to tell his own story. Yes make no mistake; it is Rushdie who is the true enchanter of this story, conjuring readers into his gilded fairy tale from the very first sentence: "In the day's last light the glowing lake below the palace-city looked like a sea of molten gold." (1)

Chapter III : Fictionalizing History

Rushdie's *The Enchantress of Florence* is a brilliant, fascinating and generous story and has intertwined history of the two men to find new ways for old worlds to collide. In the novel, he stands against every notion of orthodoxy and absolutism, and views any human artifact like despotism and civilization can no more stick to its authority, each civilization has its fair share of beauty folly, cruelty and benevolence, so as historical fact. So he provides an alternative version of Mughal emperor Akbar's historical fact in the novel *The Enchantress of Florence*. Rushdie, introducing historical and fictional like dream girl character; Akbar and Jodha, Rushdie brings every narrative text into critical stand point. The narrator presents protagonist Akbar, Jodha and Qara Köz, the enchantress of Florence to juxtapose the fact and fiction in such a way that it compels readers to orient even official recorded history of Akbar's greatness under suspicions.

Salman Rushdie's Novel *The Enchantress of Florence* is citing 100- works of history and literature pertaining to renaissance Italy and central Asia, where the story is set. (444-51) Despite this flowery display of research, the novel is some weighty historical fiction crammed with facts and exposition. Instead it takes its cue from two titles that come near the top of that list: Ludovico Aristo's *Orlando Furioso* and Matteo Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato*, 16th century Italian romantic epics that resemble fairy tales on steroids. These are vast, action- packed yarns full of sorcerers and mythical beasts, fantastical journeys and enchanted castles, brave nights and the distressed damsels they love and rescue. Like the Italian Romances, Rushdie's novel takes place in a semi-

legendary version of the real world, where magic and history entwine. Despite its battles and its worldly ruminations on such topics as religious conflict and the proper exercise of power, the predominant theme is fictionalized version of history.

One of New Historicist critics Michel Foucault rejects to see history as evolutionary process which ultimately ends in ideological climax. Foucault builds his stand about discourse in Nietzschean base. Nietzsche argues that all knowledge is expression of the "Will to power" (100). For that language plays the role as an agent which can never speak truth. The existence of discourse can be seen in every social intuition and power is operated through this same discourse. Foucault believes that truth, morality and even the meaning of a text are created through discourse. It also offers authority to one and rejects other to do anything. About that unavoidable presence of discourse Raman Selden says, "For Foucault discourse is always inseparable from power and deviant. Discourse determines what is possible to say, that is criteria of 'truth', who is allowed to speak with authority and where such speech can be spoken?" (76). Foucault refuses to accept history as an evolutionary product and its continuous development to present.

Salman Rousdie shares the aforementioned idea in *The Enchantress of Florence* in the sense that he presents Akbar has a talent for serial dreaming on the epic scale, and it is his magical dreams that provide Rushdie to rewrite the history of Babar's founding of Mughal empire and satirizing the contemporary politics of Mughal Imperialism. In the novel, protagonist dares to draw the history of Islamic god Allah in a parallel relation to the fictional history of Allah Akbar as Akbar is god through his abnormal dream like

experience. The strict and absolute story of origin of Islamic creed and his comparison with Allah are smashed with loose and imaginable story of Akbar's own greatness like god Allah. Both leading characterization has been narrated by the eyes of narrator; about their experiences and event in very magical realistic tone in order to portray the fictionalized history of Mughal empire. Narrator describes Akbar's views:

The Almighty is not a tyrant. In the House of God all voices are free to speak as they choose, and that is the form of their devotion. We will build that house of adoration here on earth. Then with a cry- *Allahu Akbar*, God is great, or Just possibly Akbar is God he-chopped off the pompons little twerp's cheeky, didactic and therefore suddenly unnecessary, head. (44)

The novel's narrator seems to be omnipresent and omnipotent can coincide with Allah, Islamic god but anonymous in its presentation hints to challenge the existence of god in any religious treatise, thus, puts every human artifacts as narrative construction and deserves to be written again. In *Imaginary Homelands* Rushdie says, " Human beings understand themselves and shapes their futures by arguing and challenging and questioning and saying the unsayable; not by bowing the knee, whether to god or men" (394).

The Enchantress of Florence is mostly set in the fabled city of Sikri, built by the Mughal emperor Akbar the Great in northern India in 1571. Akbar presided over a Muslim civilization of exceptional intellectual and cultural sophistication in the late 1500s. Akbar's Sikri is, for Rushdie, India's parallel to Florence, the Italian city state where classical humanism was reborn and ruthless political intriguing prevailed. A

yellow haired foreigner arrives in Sikri professing to be the son of the potentate's long lost great aunt, Qara KÖz, black eyes, a hidden princess whose name was erased from Mughal history when she chose to marry the king of Persia. In his article *New Historicism* Louis Montrose further attempts to clarify his idea to reconstruct history in the following way:

By the historicity of texts, I mean to suggest the historical specificity, the social and material embedding, of all modes of writing including not only the texts that critics study but also the texts in which we study them; thus, I also mean to suggest the historical, social and material embedding of all modes of reading. By the textuality of histories, I mean to suggest, in the first place, that we can have no access to a full and authentic past to a material existence that is unmediated by the textual traces of the society in question. (410)

In this sense official history is just the shadow of authenticity of past of those who are enjoying the power. They modify the history according to their interests. The 'pen' of historians writes through one 'ink' of authority. So, history becomes imaginative fiction. But, what we say fiction includes the pain and suffering of those under privileged class are real and objective and that becomes real history. This New Historicism blurs the so called boundary and hierarchy between literary and non literary texts and clearly shows the interconnections. In same article, Montrose talks about power and its nature. He further says, "For Foucault, power is never monolithic; and power relations always imply multiple sites not only of power but also of resistance"(403).

Hence, New historicism subverts the idea the literature is purely subjective and history is totally objective. It supports the opposite view that literary text may provide factual data and history may provide imaginative and fictional events. All this idea is an influence of the Foucauldian notion of power, discourse, knowledge and truth. Thus, the text cannot escape the 'embeddings' of social practices and representation. That has contributed a lot of efforts to create heterogeneous notions of ideology rather than monolithic and homogeneous notion of thinking. On the same spirit that is why Louis Montrose says, "a shift from history to histories" (441) is essential in New Historicism.

Rushdie uses the technique in order to parallel the way historical record presets its grand narrative so that authority and superiority of power holder immenseness could maintain up to the level of inerasable. On the other hand, this technique also paved the way to doubt on the authenticity of Mughal history and left readers to think and tried to describe the event in their own version because the narrator narrates is a new historical approach. Hence, the author provides the loopholes to turn the reader's attention over the authenticity and factual accuracy of event provided by other. This new historical quality of every artifact is the main thrust of fictionalization of history. Narrator narrates the yellow haired foreigner Mogore del Amore, "He believed in this hidden truth the way other men believed in God and love, believed that truth was in fact always hidden, that the apparent, the overt, was invariably a kind of lie" (231).

Throughout the novel, Rushdie's fiction problematizes the very historical fact of Akbar's life and the generation of Mughal Empire. He allows his character Akbar many reasons for mistrusting the foreigner. For most among them is the fact that he is younger

than the emperor, yet claims to be his uncle. The stranger goes by several patently assumed names and is accused of stealing a diplomatic letter from queen Elizabeth I of England after poisoning the letter's official bearer with opium. But his story of the hidden princess checks out, and the stranger is handsome, forthright and gifted. Besides, he seems to want nothing more than to tell his mother's story, and-- like the wife-killing king in *The Arabian Nights*, beguiled into mercy by the tales of Scheherazade--the emperor soon finds himself charmed by his visitor and hooked on the yarn.

New historicists say, literature actively uses history which makes it compulsory to treat literature with its historical context and history with textuality that never let to be authentic past and which is even shaped by language and the very nature of that language is symbolic. The issue of history and text for Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh is that "history can only be narrative construction involving a dialectical relationship of past and present concern" (252). The biasness of historians are expressed through the point of view of the authors and that makes historical accounts as narratives which end with individual subjectivity as in literary texts.

This is the most assured Rushdie novel in many years, largely because it transpires entirely within the never-land of endlessly multiplying stories that he rightly regards as his imaginative home. Even the successful *Shalimar The Clown* had several dreadful sections set in Los Angeles- garish and rickety, as are most of Rushdie's attempts to write about Contemporary life. His writing is an art of lavish, brocaded surfaces and minimal psychological depth. His best books keep perhaps one toe in the novel, while otherwise wandering freely through more venerable narrative genres: Folklore, saga and romance.

Besides Ariosto and the Arabian Nights, another influence Rushdie tips his hat to in *The Enchantress of Florence* is the vast Indian oral tradition surrounding Hamza, an uncle of the prophet Mohammed and the hero of countless popular tales. Rushdie, in *Imaginary Homelands* through its interpretive process and rhetorical strategies for reading and rewriting history argues "about who should have power over grand narratives, the story of Islam, and that power must belong to everyone... who do not have power over story that dominates their lives, power to retell it ..." (432). Akbar's unwanted fantasies lead him paradoxically to his surreal world of fantasy, whose point of view is sometimes that of the camera and at other moments, spectator or participant in a series of historically authentic occurrences of the life of Mohammed.

This dream becomes a troubling dream for Akbar that he unwillingly doubts over Mogor dell Amore's history. His magical story makes him the division [of] official recorded history in the palace. He has lost his faith and is stuck out between his immense need to believe and his new inability to do so. Narrator narrates the dialogue between Akbar and Mogor dell Amore, that is not what happened; said Mogor dell Amore. 'My mother was Qara Köz, your grandfather's sister the great Enchantress, and she learned how to stop time.' 'No', said the emperor Akbar. 'No, she did not. (430) Qara Köz is the unifying element in all of this novel's tales; after running through a couple of central Asian monarchs she winds up living in Florence, under the name Angelica; a name she shares with the pagan heroine of the Orlando romances, as the consort of a Florentine mercenary who made his fortune fighting for the Ottoman Turks. Reputed to be a witch, she may simply possess immense personal charisma and a comprehensive knowledge of

toxicology. Whatever the source of her powers, her enemies have tendency to sicken precipitously and her beauty is such that all manner of hardened men are reduced to stammering school boys in her presence.

While talking about the omnipresence nature of power, in his own text *History of Sexuality* Foucault says that, " power is everywhere: not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere" (93). Rushdie apparently wants us to think of Qara K z as a woman who had forged her own life, beyond conviction, by the force of her will alone, a woman like a king, and to regard her as the novel's heroine. However, this "forging" largely consists of attaching herself to the most powerful man around the young lady had a weakness for being on the winning side, her putative son remarks, Qara K z is no Elizabeth or Joan of Arc. She is, first and foremost, an object of erotic delirium, the most resplendent in a series of imaginary women who turn the novel's male characters into besotted saps. Narrator narrates Qara K z:

When the great warrior Argelia met the immortal beauty Qara K z, Mogor dell Amore replied, 'a story began which would generate all men's belief - your belief, grand Mughal, husband of husbands lover of lovers, king of kings, man of men!- in the undying power and extraordinary capacity of the human heart for love.' (247)

Nietzsche talks about the impacts of history while it is operated badly and it is taken over dosage. He also suggests people and directs them to use history for life and action not for comfortable turning away from life and actions. He is critical towards history and suggests not to overuse of history as truth He expresses his ideas about

history as perspective. About the truthiness of truth Nietzsche says, "Truths are illusions of what one has forgotten that they are illusions" (qtd. in Adams 636). The idea blurs the traditional view of history as truth and literature as lies. Nietzsche blurs own hierarchy of humanity and the old version of our evolution.

Rushdie exploits Nietzsche in the sense that the history of Akbar the Great's conjugal life is illusion rather than Truth. Akbar is the real protagonist of the novel, a middle aged man just a shade past his peak, prone to the rueful contemplation of his life's paradoxes. This types of his complexities of life fantasizes his own official recorded history between the absurdity and seeming necessity of religious faith, the allure and menace of Florentine humanism, the ambitious son he loves and fears, and the contradictions embodied in the notion of a benign dictatorship. Part philosopher king, part horny adolescent, Akbar has dreamed up the perfect wife-despite the numerous Flesh and blood lovelies on offer in his harem-and so great is the power of his fantasy that the nonexistent beloved becomes a palpable phantom, visible to other residents of palace and capable of satisfying his every desire. The only women who can rival her is, of course, Qara K z, who becomes the obsession not only of the emperor but of the entire city of Sikri, until she, too is conjured into semi-existence. The narrator narrates Emperor Akbar:

Even the emperor succumbs to fantasy. Queens floated within his palaces like ghosts, Rajput and Turkish sultanas playing catch- me- you- can one of these royal personages did not really exist. She was an imaginary wife, dreamed up by Akbar in the way that lonely children dream up imaginary friends, and in spite of the presence of many living, if Floating, consorts,

the emperor was of the opinion that it was the real queens who were phantoms and nonexistent beloved who was real. He gave her name, Jodha and no man dared gainsay him. (33)

A prominent critic Hayden white talks about the nature of language and narrative which are full of complex set of symbols, icons, allegory and so many other literary devices. So, historical writings cannot carry the objective truth. In this context White mentions:

All historical narratives presuppose figurative characterization of the events they purport to represent and explain. And this meant that historical narratives, considered purely as verbal artifacts, can be characterized by the figurative discourse [...] language itself provided in the four principal modes of figurative representation: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony. (404)

Thus white talks about the use of rhetorical language while writing a text and that erases the possibility of the expression of objective truth and singular reality. These literary elements hide reality rather than discover it. Ultimately, subjectivity takes the place of objective reality and proves history as constructed, narrated and fabricated truth.

Rushdie shares white's view in the sense that he has long been adept at fusing fantasy and realism redrawing the boundary between subjective and objective truth, pulling off spectacular narrative flights of fancy. In *The Enchantress of Florence*, in order to wriggle out of trouble, a mysterious visitor to the Mughal court gives account of history, thereby giving the novelist a way into his own Florentine history. Despite the

ensuing tales of sorcery, superstition, imaginary lovers and a woman so beautiful and charming that "the birds from the trees" is most apt trope as bona fide day-to-day activity, the riskiest leap of all is in the form and style of the novel itself.

Rushdie and his visitor's mode of telling are littered with playful reminders of the absurdity of desire history and historical narration. The Enchantress herself, for too long not much more than a rumour in the narrative, finally metamorphoses into an emotionally powerful, genuinely seductive creation. Instead of trying to give us the past as it really was, Rushdie has tried to produce the very kind of historical personage as historical romance that dissolves the objective truth about Florentine and Mughal courtiers of the late 16th and early 17th centuries.

Unlike history, literature plays the role to find new way at which to enter reality; it paved the way for reinterpretation of every human artifact and antiquity rather regarding factual events in a text according to selected frame of reference. Rushdie in this novel plays the role to bridge as alternative way by joining two world views of history and new view of history like a bridge where people step from one corner to another. Narrator narrates, "The world is a bridge. Pass over it but build no house upon it (72).

Literary work is no more objective and it can never escape social and cultural existence of the time. The meaning of a text is not only the product of the text but also of time and place which differs from readers to readers. Lois Tyson in her book *Critical Theory Today* tries to show how new historicism advocates the equal footing by blurring the hierarchy. She says, "Traditional historicism tended to ignore or marginalize private life as subjective and irrelevant, new historicism tries to compensate for this omission by

bringing issues concerned with private life into the foreground of historical inquiry" (289). Here, she establishes New Historical notion that history is a matter of interpretation, not facts, and the interpretation always occurs within the framework of social and political conventions. And, it tries to advocate for marginalized which is historically ignored.

Imaginative as his life was, Akbar was a historical figure, and one of the young Florentines was Niccolo Machiavelli, is fictional reality. But Niccolo's friend Argalia flies off on the peacock wings of the novelist's invention to become the bosom friend of Akbar before returning to fight for a lost cause in Florence. Some characters are the inventions of other characters: Queen Jodha, and Qara Kōz, the Enchantress, are Akbar's daydreams of the perfect powerful desire and obsession. They are accepted by his people. Here, Rushdie aims at mocking the reality about Akbar's history and focuses that such occurrences being normal at that time, before the real and unreal were segregated forever and doomed to live apart under different monarchs and separate legal systems. Narrator narrates:

Greater than the king of kings who ruled Persia before the Muslims came, superior to the ancient Hindu notion of the Chakravartin- the king whose chariot wheels could roll everywhere, whose movements could not be obstructed- he was the universal Ruler, king of a world without frontiers or ideological limitations. What followed from this was that human nature, not divine will, was the great force that moved history. He, Akbar, the perfect man, was the engine of time. (387)

Rushdie, sharing with Tyson here, aims to mock at those grand narratives of historical record which is only suitable to one who is the experience of that event. He presents Akbar as a historian which himself is the creator of his own history as the one who is in power writes his greatness and erases his weaknesses and follies which ignore the marginalized site of history. So, the official recorded history about Akbar is the matter of interpretation rather than fact.

The Enchantress of Florence swarms with elegant young women both historical and imagined, beautiful queens and irresistible Enchantress, along with some whores and a few quarrelsome old wives- all stock of figures, females perceived solely in relation to male. Women are never treated unkindly by author, but they have no autonomous being. The Enchantress herself, who turns everyone into puppets of her will, has no personality at all and exists- literally by pleasing men. She is taken as woman who had forged her own life, beyond convention, by the force of her will alone, a woman like a king. But in fact she does nothing but sells herself to the highest bidder, and power is an illusion permitted by him. Here, Rushdie deals with Akbar's treatment towards women as puppets in the hands of men as mysterious being narrator narrates, "Here in this woman's body the mystery could be seen. This, apparently, inert being herself erased or buried beneath this never-ending story" (231).

Rushdie further aims at politics of mixing history with imagination to write the history of Mughal empire as creating a marvelous scene between Akbar's wife and his mother they come to show his imaginary wife Jodha how to release him from the Enchantress's spell, and in so doing are reconciled with Jodha in a moment of hilarious

feminine solidarity- but the Enchantress materializes, Jodha vanishes, the women are defeated by the man's obsession. Indeed, the men in the book are as hormone- besotted as adolescents. All their derring-do, their battling for cities and empires, comes down to little more than a desire for a bed with a young woman in it. Machiavelli becomes a disappointed middle aged lecher whose middle - aged wife waddles and quacks while he looks at her, of course, with loathing. But then suddenly, readers slip into her soul; readers feel her anger at his disloyalty, her hurt pride as a woman, her unchanged pride in his dark skeptical genius and her puzzlement at his failure to see how lessens himself by scorning what he has that is treasurable and honourable for that moment readers glimpse a very different book, almost a different author. The politics behind such type of Rushdie's narrative technique is that history is the dazzling play of fancy and the powerful dreams of men. Here, Rushdie signals Mughals are the creations of their own magical power. Narrator says:

and the family had no permanent foothold on any patch of God's earth. Maybe this was what it was to be a Mughal, to roam, to scavenge, to depend on others, to fight without success, to be lost. Despair claimed her for a moment. Then she shrugged it off. They were not the victims of history but its makers. (324)

The swash buckling Argalia's adventures, which links the Florentine and the Indian strands of the double tale, are full of Rushdian charm and extravagance descending sometimes into facetiousness, as in the case of the four giant albino Swiss

mercenaries named Otho, Botho, Clotho and D'Artagnan. But Argalia's exploits are less interesting than the misfortunes of Machiavelli or the mind of the emperor Akbar.

Rushdie's Akbar is imperial, intelligent and very likable, a marvelous spokesman for his author. Akbar tried to unite all India, all races, tribes, clans, Faiths and nations- a powerful dream indeed though doomed to perish with him. What winds were blowing in the late 15th century to waken that emperor's syncretic vision, even as Europe began to free itself from church's control of ideas. "If there had never been a God, the emperor thought it might have been easier to work out what goodness was"(391). Goodness might not lie in self abnegation before as almighty but in the slow, clumsy error- strewn working out of an individual or collective path. "Lord of a theocratic, disobedience, disagreement, irreverence, iconoclasm, impudence, even insolence might be the well spring of the good". (390-91)

Akbar is the moral centre of the book, its gravity, and provides its strongest link to the issues that have concerned Rushdie in his works and his life. It all comes down to the question of responsibility. Akbar's objection to God is that his existence deprived human beings of the right to form ethical structures by themselves. The curious notion that without religion we have no morals has seldom been dismissed with such quiet good humour. Rushdie leaves ranting to the fanatics who fear him.

In *Nietzsche, Genealogy and History* Foucault reviews the responsibility of historians and redefines everything only in relation to context with other things. He makes acknowledged to all that everything is product of power and its practices. His focus of study is that how the power and discursive practices transform and change over

time. His analysis is that how human being understood themselves in their cultures. Stuart Hall in his text *Representation* talks about Foucault and says, "He was concerned with production of knowledge and meaning not through language but through discourse." (44)

Rushdie historicizes the religious belief of Akbar sharing with Foucault's concept. Driven from his magical city when its lake goes dry, Akbar gravely foresees his defeat that all he had worked to make, his philosophy and way of being would evaporate like water. The future would not be what he hoped for, but dry hostile antagonistic place where people would hate and kill in the great quarrel he had sought to end forever, the quarrel over god. Narrator narrates Akbar's belief to the God's existence:

He would keep his promise to the dead Kathiawari princeling. In the heart of his victory city he would build a house of adoration, a place of disputation where everything could be said to everyone by anyone on any subject, including the non existence of god and the abolition of kings. (45)

Rushdie aims to mock at the historical belief in religion of the world in the sense that he emphasizes that religion could be rethought, re-examined, remade, perhaps even discarded; magic was impervious to such assaults. Akbar in his splendid city, and the Florentines in theirs, inhabited a world of magic as passionately as they inhabited the world of tangible materials. This is the great difference between them and us. We have separated the real and unreal, put them in different kingdoms with different laws.

But like all serious fantasy, Rushdie's novel erases this division by making us inhabit, for the span of our reading, the realm of imagination, which is controlled by but

not limited to observation of fact. This is the land of story: the child's world, the ancestral, pre-scientific world, where we are all emperors or Enchantress, making up the rules as we go along. Modern literary fantasy is given a paradoxical intensity, sometimes a tragic dimension, by our consciousness of the other kingdom we inhabit, daily life, where the laws of physics cannot be broken and whose government was described by Niccolo Machiavelli.

Rushdie further opines that some boast that science has ousted the incomprehensible; others cry that science has driven magic out of the world and plead for re-enchantment. But it's clear that Charles Darwin lived in as wondrous a world, as full of discoveries, amazements and profound mysteries, as that of any fantasist. The people who disenchant the world are not the scientists, but those who see it as meaningless in itself, a machine operated by a deity. Science and literary fantasy would seem to be intellectually incompatible, yet both describe the world; the imagination functions actively in both modes, seeking meaning, and wins intellectual consent through strict attention to detail and coherence of thought, whether one is describing a beetle or an Enchantress. Religion, which prescribes and proscribes, is irreconcilable with both of them, and since it demands belief, must shun their common ground, imagination. So, the true believer must condemn both Darwin and Rushdie as disobedient, irreverent iconoclastic dissidents from revealed truth. The essential compatibility of the realistic and fantastic imagination signals the success of Rushdie's sumptuous, impetuous mixture of history with fiction.

No novelist understands the possibilities and perils of globalization more acutely than Salman Rushdie. At its best, his fiction has always denied any fixed geographical vantage, there is no them and us to it. The ongoing discourse between east and west has been his biography, his obsession. In the present novel, he goes back to the first distant inklings of the cultural exchange that formed him.

The principles of the New Historicism are strongly opposed to the view that the study of literature should be done independently of social and political contexts. Instead, these historicists believe literature is a part of the historical process and should participate in the political management of reality. That has concerned a critic Roger Kimball who has attacked the cultural left in his *Tenured Radicals*. According to Kimball the New Historicists are "overtly seeking to politicize the humanities and undermine allegiance to traditional scholarly ideas" (42).

Rushdie sharing Kimball dissolves the position of God at the center. It is Rushdie's contention that there was, by the end of the 16th century of the Mughal emperor Akbar in his glorious palace complex at Fatepur Sikri. Akbar, as decided here, is made-to-measure Rushdie hero, a one-man land of contrasts. He is a Muslim vegetarian, a warrior who wanted only peace, a philosopher-king: a contradiction in terms. Akbar, crucially, has claims to being first great Indian secularist. Narrator narrates Akbar's opinion:

He wanted to be able to tell someone of his suspicion that men had made their gods and not the other way around. He wanted to be able to say, it is man at the center of things, not god. It is man at heart and bottom and top,

man at the front and back and side, man the angel and the devil, the miracle and the sin, man and always man, and let us hence forth have no other temples but those dedicated to mankind. (102-3)

The above lines historicize Akbar as a king and a philosopher on the one hand while on the other establish the supremacy of mankind over divinity.

By the time the novel opens, Akbar is a marauder who no longer wants to maraud; he did not want hordes, he dreams of a culture of dissent. 'In paradise, he suggests, speaking unadulterated Rushdie, 'the words worship and argument mean the same thing. (43) Argument duly arrives at Akbar's court in Rushdie's telling - in the person of an unlikely yellow- haired Chancer, Nicholo Vespucci, a refugee from that other Renaissance, and the self styled Mogor dell Amore the Mughal of love.

The traveler is another Rushdie archetype-a man who can dream in seven languages, who wears an inevitable coat of many colours and who trades in fictions, chief among which are these: he claims to be an ambassador of the queen of England and, even more implausibly, to be Mughal's long - lost uncle.

All he has to back up these claims are stories, and these stories are the essence of Rushdie's wild and whirling novel. Vespucci claims to be the son of the legendry Qara Kóz the Lady Black Eyes', a descent of Genghis Khan and the Mughal's great aunt. (134). Qara, the Carls Bruni of her day, was first captured by an Uzbek warlord and then through dazzling beauty and an apparent gift for sorcery, traded herself up among the world's most powerful men, eventually ending up with the commander of Sultan's armies, Argalia, Vespucci's father.

As he unfolds this tale, which grows ever more fantastical and involves all manner of digression, the emperor is willingly bewitched. Qara Kōz becomes the tangible bridge between two cultures, while remaining a distant fantasy. Akbar is grounded in the world by another imaginary queen, Jodha, the perfect wife of his day dreams. Jodha sees no sense in travelers from England and Italy - they seem too exotic to be trusted ' we are their dream, ' she tells the emperor, ' and they are ours'. (60). Rushdie's men are always dreamers, though, and the stories they tell themselves are generally more real than the fantastical bricks and mortar around them.

The apparently entwined history of the two men also allows Rushdie to indulge his primary literary compulsion- to find new ways for old worlds to collide. The overriding argument of *The Enchantress of Florence* is partly that western civilization, to borrow from Gandhi, would be a good idea. Superstition and despotism are not the preserve of mystical east here, nor are enlightenment and humanism inventions of classical west. Each civilization has its fair share of beauty and folly, cruelty and benevolence. "This may be the curse of the human race, the traveler suggests at one point, ' not that we are so different from one another, but that we are so alike" (171).

In setting this out, Rushdie is much in evidence too: he borrows and moulds all sorts of familiar tales into this one; the Arabian Nights have long since been fair game, but he also steals sleefully from Orlando Furioso and from Machiavelli. The novel offers something of a paper trail of such references in a long bibliography, mostly of scholarly histories: a few liberties have been taken with the historical record in the interests of truth, Rushdie signals, in a statement of intent.

The comparison is in many ways telling, not least because it is hard to imagine two more variant interpretations of the ideas of lightness, quickness and exactitude. Calvino prized concision; Rushdie brings to his cross-cultural exchange his expected garrulous hyperbole. The seduction of Calvino's book lies in the contrast between the modesty and minimalism of his structure and the ornate imagination it contains; all of his ironies arise from that tension. Rushdie forgoes such possibilities by creating a structure often every bit as grandiose and bewildering as the palaces and charms it describes.

He has a gift for evoking opulence. In Akbar's palace, where only noises of delight were permitted to be heard, stonemasons lay down their tools when the emperor is in residence giving him the impression that the capital is being built in silence (34). Sikri is an expression of his will and desire and in describing it, Rushdie's prose is never less than a match for Mughal's sense of his omnipotent self: silently slowly, like mind creatures in dream, the concubines circled and swayed. They stir the air around the emperor into a magic soup flavored with the spices of arousal.

By contrast with Calvino, Rushdie's rhetoric can, as a result, sometimes seem all pomp and circumstance. In this fictional world, no one is drawn at human scale and no drama resists melodrama. The emperor has all sorts of factotums; he employs a servant to compliment him a man who "proudly held the rank of Imperial Flatter First class, and was a master of the ornate, old-school style known as cumulative fawning" (47). Of all the jobs in history, it is the one of readers feel Rushdie could easily have made his own.

Foucault illustrates unwillingness to take history as an abstraction of idea and as something that begins 'in the beginning' and ends 'in the end'. The every historical event

for Foucault reflects an external reality with the traces of economic, social and political factors. Discourse is central human activity for Foucault. Writing about the contribution of Foucault's concept of discourse Roman Seldon says, "Foucault emphasizes that discourse is always rooted in social institution: He shows social and political activities through discourse" (106).

Rushdie borrowing Foucault's discourse further dissolves the old discourse of hostile relationship between East and West. The yellow - haired traveler from the city of the Medicis claims a blood relationship with the emperor of the Mughals: a literal manifestation of the connection between East and West that is the appropriation of the novel's fictionalized historical strands. Narrator narrates:

He was the ruler of the frontierless universe and he saw more clearly than they. No, he corrected himself; he did not, and was indulging in mere bigotry if he asserted it. Mogor had been right. The curse of the human race is not that we are so different from one another, but that we are so alike. (392)

The tale involves a lost princess a descendant of Genghis Khan, no less-who becomes a sort of magical mascot for Florence; the princess's look alike, maidservant called the Mirror. A Florentine soldier of fortune who sells his services to the Ottoman Empire; a pair of prostitutes named the skeleton and the mattress; and Akbar's imaginary who for some reason can walk, talk and make love in spite of not existing. It is this paradox more imagining than enchanting but for better, the novel posits a world " before the real and the unreal were segregated forever" (409). It's more than just conventional historical

novelizing, therefore, when Rushdie places his imaginary characters among such historical personages as Akbar the Great himself, Niccolo Machiavelli, assorted Medicis, Savonarola, even the nasty wallachian warlord Vlad Dracula.

As Rushdie recreates him, Akbar is an absolute monarch beset by democratic, even anarchic impulses:

Discord could be quelled, and it was his fist that could quell it. But what then, of the voice within that whispered ... that discord, difference, disobedience, disagreement, irreverence, iconoclasm, impudence, even insolence, might be wellspring of the good. These thoughts were not fit for a king. (391)

Despite the real life Akbar's reputation for religious toleration, such thoughts -like the culture of inclusion he contemplates and his notion that life is absurd are a far more plausible fit for an anti-authoritarian 21st -century novelist; Rushdie has made Akbar recite the dissenter's creed. Similarly, Rushdie's Florence is an Eden of liberation or libertine sensuality. "Imagine a pair of women's lips", says the traveler, "Puckering for kiss. That is the city of Florence, with the Arno Flowing through between" (176). And under the fictive Enchantress, the city briefly becomes the new Jerusalem. Narrator narrates:

In short, Qara Köz unveiled as angelica'- had come into the fullness of her womanly powers and was exerting the full force of those capacities upon city misting the air with a benevolent haze which filled the thoughts of Florentines with images of parental filial, carnal and divine love.

Anonymous pamph letters declared her to be the reincarnation of the goddess Venus. Subtle perfumes of reconciliation and harmony filled the air, people worked harder and more productively, the quality of family life improved, the birth rate rose and all the churches were full. (351)

Through those lines Rushdie historicizes as in New Historicism, the text is taken back into the context from which it is generated. The New Historicists conceive of literary and cultural knowledge as being co-equal, that one does not necessarily supersede the other. New Historicism does not simply reflect historical fact but participates in historical processes and it represents the diversity of ideologies present at the same time. The anti-historical formalistic motto of new critical movement, 'art for art's sake' is directly countered by *New Historicism* about the political interpretation of the literature. D.G. Myers in his essay "The New Historicism in Literary Study" says, "Indeed, at times New Historicism seemed almost designed to methodize the political interpretation of literature" (28). This evocation is itself benevolent hazy- as images of the Good tend to be in fiction- and Florence's golden ages doesn't survive an antifeminist backlash. Rushdie exploits new historical interpretation of Mayers in the sense that he fictionalizes supernatural account of political events that prefer conventional explanations for the time of golden contentment and material prosperity that Florence enjoyed in those days. He narrates golden Enchantress:

The distance between Enchantress and witch was still not so great. There were still voices that suggested that this new incarnation of the woman-wizard through whom the occult powers of all women were unleashed was

a disguise, and that the true faces of such females were still the fearsome ones of the old, the lamia, the crone. (352)

The narrator's memory and imaginative experience of Akbar aim to provide alternative form in place of convention form of history Rushdie uses Fictional genre of literature to reveal the religious history is by no means the infallible word of god that good and evil are in effect, entirely human construction. Literature has no authorial individuality which endorses a singular, unified language and discourse of truth rather it has multi-voiced, multi-style and multi-language that " is, of all the arts, the one best suited to challenging absolutes of all kinds;" (*Imaginary Homeland* 420). In Confrontation of religious text, literature is of trespassing that does not observe any rules of taboo, exclusion and prohibition exercised by existing discourse. Novel exploits a position of discursive detachment to step in and out of established regimes of truth and disturb the boundaries between holy and profane, truth and falsity, reality and fantasy. Narrator narrates, People would survive as best they could and hate their neighbors and smash their places of worship and kill one another once again in the renewed heat of the great quarrel he had sought to end forever, the quarrel over God" (440).

When a stranger from the west who calls himself Mogor dell' Amore or the Mughal of love gets his audience with the emperor, he tells a constantly changing and embellished story. It is a story right at the center of the larger narrative. Rushdie recounts of the greatness and the utter fragility of a powerful empire.

In this half - discovered world, the writer announces, every day brought news of fresh enchantments. The visionary revelatory dream poetry of the quotidian had not yet

been crushed by blinkered prose fact but actually it's fact that is allowed Rushdie to construct this great dream palace of a novel. Eight page bibliographies follow the end of the story. To build his twin tale of life in the grand city of Florence, his hero's home and Sikri, the Mughal's capital city to which he has traveled, the novelist has tried to digest a library wall of volumes.

In a world in which many readers seem to crave fact after fact, the tiresome legacy of our puritan ancestors, Rushdie miraculously turns fact into fiction transforming clay bricks into gold, he gives facts life, telling a tale of two cities teeming with what Latin American magical realists call fictional reality. And marvelous above all are the women, from prostitutes to empress, real and imaginary. And the most marvelous of all the women is our hero's supposed ancestor, Qara Köz, the beautiful sorceress who makes the reverse Journey From east to west. She becomes as Rushdie calls her new symbol of Florence, the incarnation in human form of the unsurpassable loveliness of the city itself, the dark lady of Florence.

By, politicizing the text, New Historicism refuses the separated existences of ' literature' and 'history' and 'text' and 'context'. New Historicism is even connected with post-structuralism. Both of them advocate plural meaning of a singular text which may refer and differ from readers to readers and time to time. The interpretations of text are done not according to intentions of the author but the interest of reader according to the ideology of his / her age. To reflect an age and understand the human experience and potentiality, New Historicism as cultural history deals about the problems of the text - context relationship and analysis then altogether by treating culture, ideology and power

as merely interwoven sets of symbolic systems about such interconnection. D.G. Myers remarks:

The New Historicist effort to assimilate the literary text to history is guaranteed by the post structuralist doctrine of textuality, which states that the text is not aloof from the surrounding context, that there is contiguity, an ebb and flow, between text and whatever might once have been seen as "Outside" it. Yet those ideas are obtained second hand. (31)

Rushdie's use of technique carries wide range of critical debates on history and religious discourse and literature as well. On the one hand, narrator intervenes in the event and comes in front of reader with his strong indictment over history and theology while on the other hand plot jumps to wide range of west and east portrayals. Rushdie fictionalizes the magical historical past of Mughal empire that affects the present people and their dealing with witchcrafts and enchantments. Narrator states:

..a sorcerer he had encountered on that long-ago morning after the dream of the crow. By then, however, the knowledge was of no use to him, except to remind him of what he should never have forgotten that witchcraft requires no potions, familiar spirits or magic wands. Language upon a silvered tongue affords enchantment enough. (93)

The last chapter of the novel offered openly on the different analytical level of history and magical operation up to the level of present context Rushdie presents Akbar the great who tries his best to erase Qara Kōz from Mughal's history but ultimately his

cultural witchcrafty skill gets lost under the power of sorceress ever met in his life.

Narrator narrates Akbar and Qara Köz:

In the old days, he had most often been distracted by thought of Jodha, his imaginary queen her sharp tongue, her beauty, her sexual expertise. He was not a perfect man, he know that in his heart, but for a long time he had thought of her as his perfect women.her nostalgic gravity, in which case she was indeed a dangerous sources, who would drag him backwards in time, and consequently backwards in every way, in his ideas his beliefs, his hopes. (389)

The novel, in its pure form is a fiction and the language of fiction is literature. by bringing history, religion and magic in literary zone, it intersects new historical belief in official recorded truth with the traces of fiction.

Rushdie's Novel *The Enchantress of Florence* is regarded as a sort of new historical text where the author is highly conscious of himself about the blurring of the boundaries between history and imagination in the recreation of hisrory. The novel like new historicism blurs the hierarchy between history as objective and literature as subjective. So Rushdie gives equal importance to the literary text turning towards history, culture, society, institution, class, gender, etc. He shows the linkage between the role of the author and historical circumstances and analyzes the socio-cultural and magical realistic atmosphere which is deeply rooted in the text as well as in history.

It is the major view of new Historicists that history should be regularly revisited, reread and rewritten with the wave of time. It denies the existence of absolute truth in

history. It argues that there is no possibility of universal truth as well as universal acceptance. The truth in history and meaning which is imputed to history reflects power relations at the time of writing as well as the time of the events' occurrence. It emphasizes a reading of the text with equal footing by breaking the hierarchy of high and low, good and bad, real and unreal, and subjective and objective truth.

In *New historicism* social and cultural backgrounds, historical situations and even the history of the author can't be undermined by emphasizing only what is written in the text. So, for New historicism, the text is a time and place bound to verbal construction which can never escape from politics. That the historicization of literature is as opposite to historian who focuses upon the interchange of deeds and symbols. As Wilfred L. Gurin in *A Hand Book of Critical Approaches to Literature* talks about the raw ideas for the establishment of New Historicism and its key characteristics. He opines:

Michael Warner phrases New Historicism's motto as "text is historical, and history is textual". Frederic Jameson insisted, "Always historicize (The political unconscious). As a return to historical scholarship, New Historicism concerns itself with extra literary matters letters, diaries, films, painting, medical treatises - looking to reveal opposing historical tensions in a text (283)

Likewise Rushdie in the canvass of New Historical approach treats history as text and text as history in the novel *The Enchantress of Florence*. In this way Rushdie's novel though it is in fictional form is in itself a new history of Mughal Empire depicting the toned down volume of the greatness of Akbar the Great on the one hand while on the

other hand establishes Akbar as a magic master behind his official recorded history of imperial power.

To reveal the fallible aspects of human artifact that hide its loopholes in order to get power of truth is possibly only through Rushdie's new historical approach as a narrative tool. Rushdie exploited what Nietzsche argued that all knowledge is an expression of the "will to power" (100). For that, language plays the role as an agent which can never speak truth. Rushdie states that fiction is "one way of denying the official, political version of truth" (*Imaginary Homelands* 14). The notion of Nietzschean new historical approach has great impact in the novel *The Enchantress of Florence* as it claims the impossibility of representing exact history. In Rushdie's words "literature is in part the business of finding new angels at which to enter reality" (*Imaginary Homelands* 15). Therefore *The Enchantress of Florence* is a satire on those human artifact which sought to establish its own regimes of truth, those artifacts inevitably have a potential of juxtaposing fact with fiction and offers a new way of studying the existing history.

In this way Salman Rushdie has gone long and lasting impact of historicization of Akbar the Great finding the traces of Mughal imperial power, magic, enchantments and dreamy as well as imaginative visions behind his history of greatness as a magic master in the mould of new historical approach. As a result the new historicist reading of Salman Rushdie's *The Enchantress of Florence* can be maintained. This research focuses on fictional formation of his records so that magic behind every realism could appear. By exposing how history hides its fiction and highlights its fact to meet their subjective goal. This research comes to the conclusion that so-called transcendental history is mere

construction of human imagination. The novel *The Enchantress of Florence* explores the human fantastic self in multi-cultural milieu that doesn't rely on their own cultural root. It is, therefore, historical episode suspected and triggered the human imagination in place of religious submission. The novel mixes fiction and history exuberantly so that it fits in to the present new historical context.

Chapter IV: Conclusion

Juxtaposition of History and Story

Rushdie's novel *The Enchantress of Florence* is a historical fiction which constructs history and story to blur the factual claim of absolute history and motives behind its narrative construction. Rushdie, with the help of magic realism and the imaginative power creates story on the grounds of history. He exploits the notion of new historicism by Luis Montrose, as a new historical approach. Montrose new historicism is a reciprocal concern with historicity of texts and the textuality of histories. Rushdie too, constructs his own story referencing history of Mughal Empire and the characters of the period.

The Enchantress of Florence accomplishes the historicity of the text. The novel aims to provide the historical reference of the Indian emperor Akbar the Great in fictional make up to raise our consciousness towards the magical enchantments of Mughal Empire and its historical origin. Rushdie deals with a tangles work of historical fiction that spans generations of Mughal Indian emperors and Florentine aristocrats. The blend of history and fiction is apparent in the sense that he creates characters based on historical figures who, in turn, imagines other characters. In this sense Rushdie acknowledges new historical approach, historicity of texts and the textuality of histories blurring of imagination and reality to fictionalize the history in *The Enchantress of Florence*.

Rushdie takes history and literature as Louis Montrose in his article *New Historicism* talks about official history is just the shadow of those who are enjoying the power. They modify the history according to their interests. The pen of historians writes

through one ink of authority. So, the history account of powerful one or under his influence becomes imaginative fiction dominated by the power players. But what we say fiction includes the pain and suffering of those under privilege which is real and objective and that becomes real history. The New historicism blurs the so-called boundary between literary and non literary texts and clearly shows the interconnections. Montrose deals with power and its nature. He views power is never monolithic; and power relations always imply multiple sites not only of power but also resistance. No objective history is possible to write since the historical prejudice and preoccupation are unavoidable and inseparable. Likewise, Rushdie in his novel *The Enchantress of Florence* presents a young Machiavelli learning the lessons that a prince must know to survive, the secret history of Qara Köz, a girl of dark eyes and occult powers who knows how to protect herself, an intimate servant who lives as a mirror to reflect her mistress and another woman enchanted to hold the secret memories of her master at the expense of remembering anything about herself.

The novel *The Enchantress of Florence* carries the new historicist entities in its writing to reveal tensions on politics, religion, war and women. Rushdie shares Guerin's view in the sense that he deals with cultures that collide as characters invent and reinvent themselves on new landscapes, from west to east and east to west. And throughout the novel, the emperor and Niccolo and Qara Köz reflect and reveal the historicization of opposing historical tensions on politics, religion, war and woman in *The Enchantress of Florence*.

The principles of the new historicism are strongly opposed to the view that the study of literature should be done independently of social and political contexts. Instead, these historicists believe literature is a part of historical process and should participate in the political management of reality. That has concerned a critic Roger Kimball who has attacked the cultural left in his *Tempered Radicals*. As we go through the Kimball the new historicists are overtly seeking to politicize the humanities and undermine allegiance to traditional scholarly ideas. Rushdie's *The Enchantress of Florence* maintains it in the sense that he argues the curse of the human race is not that we are so different from one another, but that we are so alike. By giving this reference Rushdie wants to portray no culture and history is superior and inferior.

Rushdie also refers to the issue of how the power and discursive practices transform and change over time. In *Nietzsche, Genealogy and History* Foucault reviews the responsibility of historians and redefines only in relation to context with other things. He makes acknowledged to all that everything is product of power and its practices. His focus of study is that how the power and discursive practices transform and change over time. His analysis is that how human beings understood themselves in their culture. Stuart Hall in his text *Representation* talks about Foucault as concerned with production of knowledge and meaning, not through language but through discourse. Rushdie accomplished it dismantling the old discourse about the divorce between west and east. Rushdie has woven a historical fiction connecting two separate worlds. His magical plot seamlessly connects the Mughal world with that of the Medicis and Florence. He has done a grand job of marrying the East and West in imaginative way.

The historical development of New historicism and write how that literature influences history and how the literature itself is influenced by history. New Historicists assume the works of literature by historical reality, and they share a belief that literature both refers and is referred to by things outside it. They are also less fact and event-oriented than historical critics used to be, perhaps because they have come to wonder whether the truth about what really happened can ever be purely and objectivity known. Salman Rushdie offers the same thing in *The Enchantress of Florence* dissolving the boundary between fact and fiction.

The Enchantress of Florence is satire on people and culture who presumed history as the real one but reality is opposite. As we see Jodha, wife of Akbar the great, who never existed in the real world still Rushdie presents historical rhetorical strategy as to display Mughal imperial history in East and Florentine history in West are imagined but it seem like real one. The character in the novel are product of Rushdie's imagination, through which he expresses dream, myths, stories, sex, fantasies, war, love, hatred, hope, enchantment etc. The stories are intertwined with this way juxtaposing fact and fiction, history and story. This is how the events and characters presented in the novel are not real rather just like real one to redraw the boundaries between history and fiction looking at the traces of imagination in the construction of official recorded history. Thus, this research aims to establish the writing of history is a matter of interpretations, not facts. So we can say histories and stories are the things yoked together to make fictionalizing the Indian history, linking it with renaissance Florence, creating fictional characters and stories within history. Thus we can say the history and story go side by side. Rusdie

believes history is not factual description of the past event but is twisted one at the power players ease. Thus history should be redefined and rewriting time and again. The old belief of history as factual account has to be changed.

Works Cited

Andrew M. Greeley & James L. Nelson *Historical fiction vs. History*

<http://www.cindyvallar.com/histfic.html>, page assed, 26 November, 2011

Dirda, Michael. "A Romance of Beauty and Power from Italy to India," *Washington Post*
25 May, 2008:4.

History, From Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History#cite_note-Whitney-11, , page assed, 29
November,2011

Matthew D'Ancona, *The Spectator*

<http://bnreview.barnesandnoble.com>, page downloaded, 25 November, 2011

..., *Midnight's Children*. London: Vintage, 1995.

MPR News, National Public Radio, *Rushdie's Latest Novel Blurs Imagination, History*

<http://minnesota.publicradio.org/features>, page downloaded, 28 November,
2011

Myers, D.G. *The New Historicism in Literary Study*. Academic Questions, May 27, 2008

<http://www.ebscohost.com>winter1988-89:27-36>, page assed, 2 December, 2011

Nath, R., *Private Life of the Mughal of India: 1526-1803*. New Delhi: Rupa and Co.,
2005.

Newyork Times, *Storytelling and Deception in a Magic Kingdom*- June 3, 2008

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/03/books/03kaku.html>, , page downloaded, 27
November, 2011

Oxford University Press, 2005, 7th edition, *Postcolonial Text*, Vol 1, No 1 (2004),

Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary 7th Edition, 2007, Oxford University Press, India

Randy Boyagoda *From St. Augustine to Salman Rushdie: Time and*

Narrative in Postcolonial and Pluralist Literatures, Postcolonial Text, Vol 1, No 1

(2004)

<http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pct/article/view/265/770>, , page downloaded, 10

December, 2011

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homlands: Essay and Criticism 1981-1991*. New York:

Granta Books, 1991.

Rushdie, Salman. *The Enchantress of Florence*. Random House, London; 2008

..., *Stanic Verses*. London: Vintage, 1988.

Tishani Doshi, *Salman and the Sea of Stories*,

<http://www.tishanidoshi.com/j-salman-rushdie.html>, page assed, 10 December

2011.

Wilfred L. Guerin, *A-Handbook-of-Critical-Approaches-to-Literature*

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/36285455>, page assed, 6 December, 2011