

## I. Revision of History in *The Satanic Verses*

This research on Salman Rushdie's most controversial novel *The Satanic Verses* (1988), aim to analyze fallible narration or unreliable narration as postmodern narrative tool to reconstructing history to blur the boundaries between history and fiction.

Rushdie, an Anglo-Indian, post-colonial writer born in Bombay and educated in Britain, especially renowned his fictional writing. In 1990, Salman Rushdie astounded the literary world when his, first post-fatwa novel, *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*, turned out to be a light, immensely funny postmodern spin on the children's classic *The wizard of OZ*. After gaining the international fame by winning the Booker prize award through his novel *Midnight's Children*, he once again stands as remarkable writer. His fourth novel *The Satanic Verses* come forth as its commentary on Islam, at the center of its thematic agenda. *The Satanic Verses* is first and for most about how human has been developing and practicing the notion of good and evil especially, how this notion are determine by religion.

The novel *The Satanic Verses* has been read and interpreted from various perspectives. However, the approach of the present study is to look at Rushdie's attitude towards 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 ways of looking at older historical forms makes *The Satanic Verses*, a prime example that explores new views of history. Rushdie believes history and fiction as human construction and always touched by the writer's prejudices and preoccupation.

For Rushdie, fiction is produced only through the medium of narration which is inadequate to narrate the factual event. The domination of memory and imagination in narration plays a vital role to construct the historical event which ultimately turns out to be fictional. In his collection of essays *Imagery Homeland* Rushdie says “how unreliable narration usually works in novels. Conventionally unreliable narrations are often a little stupid, less able to work out what’s going on around them than the reader. In such narrative technique, one can decipher the true meaning of events by ‘seeing through’ the narrator’s faulty vision” (23). Rushdie’s consciousness over narration in fiction marks the metafictional quality is inevitable in any fictional work. For him, in process of searching real lost time and to narrate it in fiction “we remark the past to suit our present purpose, using memory as our tool” (24). But the truth about any set of memory is that many of them will be false.

Rushdie found memory is not a reliable tool to narrate history so he says, “I was interested to find that even after I found out that my memory was playing tricks my brain simply refuse to unscramble itself” (23). In any narration there is a politics of memory that one always insists on his own memory’s truth and only the madman would prefer someone else’s version of memory. However, Rushdie relies on remember version of truth rather than the literal truth because memory’s truth is only truth version to his own history. So one personal story is not history but this personal story always plays with historical shape. Even, history, however, is subordinated in the novel to the playful and irresistible power of imagination. History then is always ambiguous. So any claim of fact in history is hard to establish and remains in multiple meaning. Therefore, Rushdie’s

fictional work brings historiographic metafiction in narration that is relies only is fallible memory.

For Rushdie, history is no longer a set of fixed, objective facts. The facts do not exist unless they are interpreted. So history, like fiction needs to be interpreted and reinterpreted. History interpreted the events of history, presents them coherently, and makes the history intelligible to us. Historians are those who give pattern to history using their imagination. Thus, the historian play a vital role in the making of history, and, in this sense, history is, like fiction, a subjective phenomenon.

Since, history is a subjective phenomenon; there can be many versions of history. For Rushdie, history is no longer a homogeneous and final version. It has heterogeneous and multiple meaning like literature. By history, we generally understand the official version of history because it is the only version of history available to us. However, Rushdie interrogates the validity of the official history by providing an alternative version of Muslim's sacred theological book Qur'an, through the novel *The Satanic Verses*.

He views the official historical discourse as one of the many version of history and it is not necessarily absolute and final version of history. It is rater artificial which is affected by a vast web of economical, social and political factor of the era. Moreover, Rushdie views it as an ideological product and which, in turn, always supports that ideology. Thus, the approach of the present study is to show how the historiographic metafiction resists the official history and reveals the real nature of history.

As in *Midnight's Children* (1981) and *Shame* (1983), Rushdie resorts to a variety of narrative techniques to present his story. *The Satanic Verses* opens with two characters, Gibreel and Saladin, miraculously surviving a 29,000-foot fall from an

exploding plane onto an English beach but the two are magically saved. The unknown narrator narrates these events dramatically and seems in comprehensive manner shows the fictional quality of fiction is always metafiction and guided by the unreliable narration through the medium of fallible memory. The narrative structure of the novel is based on a series of events narrated in various forms thus forming a web of reference: dreams and film-like scenes. Through this techniques of narration Rushdie hints his reader that other reading are possible, will be possible and indeed, necessary in future. At times he parodies the excessive, artificial, melodramatic, and garish aspects of popular Indian films; on other occasions he adopts the self reflexive strategies of the metafictionist.

Epic in scope, Rushdie novel moves fluidly amongst multiple narratives set in variety of time frames. Gibreel's visions are presented as parables or allegories and have the feel of dreams, while the frame story of the Indian star and Saladin is presented with a mixture of fantasy and realism.

The novel consists of a frame narrative, using elements of magical realism, interlaced with a series of sub-plots that are narrated as dream visions experienced by the protagonists. Salman Rushdie takes his cue from the literary style of magic realism by transforming his characters into mystical creatures in an otherwise ordinary, non-magical setting. The transformations of Gibreel Farishta and Saladin Chamcha are not only magical, they are symbolic as well. This novel opposes the Euro-centric master discourse by the use of the magic realist genre. Its central features are characterized by a juxtaposition of realistic historical and detailed everyday events on the one hand, and fantastic or magical events, and material from fairy-tales and myth on the other. The techniques of magic-realism regarded as one of the conjunction of post-modernism and

post-colonialism. It negotiates the tyrannical weight of colonial history. Magic realism is a tool that even fictionalizes the reality itself.

This research tries to show how Salman Rushdie uses narrative technique and the concept of history in a very new way in order to place his story in *The Satanic Verses*. One of these sequences contains most of the elements that have been criticized as offensive to Muslims. It is a transformed re-narration of the life of the prophet Muhammad. At its centre is the episode of *the Satanic Verses*, in which the prophet first proclaims a revelation in favor of the old polytheistic deities, but later renounces this as an error induced by Shaitan. This is the reason that the former Iranian spiritual leader, Ayatollah Khomeini declares the sixth anniversary of the “Fatwa” upon Salman Rushdie. Rushdie’s narration of *The Satanic Verses* becomes perhaps the text most powerful strategy for questioning the authority and transmission of revealed words. Literary subversion is most clearly demonstrated in the novel’s *The Satanic Verses* that challenge the sacredness of the Qur’ran. The alteration of the Sacred Words concretizes the act of literary transgression, of challenging the hegemony of closed discourses with the sinful language of literature. Rushdie attempts to subvert the uncreated word of god by re-historicizing the origin of Islam. He does this by turning to a distinctive characteristic of literary discourse in order to subvert the claim to truth of Islamic discourse. As it is language that creates meaning and power rather than the other way round, it is the Prophet who has created Allah and not Allah who has created the Prophet.

A linguistic and stylistic analysis of the book shows how Rushdie mixes different kinds of style and language to create narrative within the oral traditional of western book.

With the use of different kind of narrative, a mixture of oral narrative style with colloquialism, Rushdie success to break the binary of center and margin.

In of his key essay *Is Nothing Sacred?*, Rushdie claims that one way in which his use of literary language can undermine the monologic discourse of religion. But religion seeks to privilege one language, one text, one set of values above all other. He compares the polyglossic nature of novel and heteroglossiac discourse of Islam and nationalism. By doing this, Rushdie attempts to use fictional discourse to undermine the totalizing discourse of religion and nationalism. Rushdie repeatedly exploits the poly-semantic nature of language to make us conscious about the possibility of alternative reading and the present discourse of Islamic privileged one of them for its own use.

*The Satanic Verses*, even though a major theme of that novel is the dangerous nature of closed, absolutist belief systems. The bricolage of historical and fictional components is not available to the discourse of religion for which condition of discourse is that the truth is not available to the divine origin. This novel intended to show the superiority of plural fictional discourse to the unitary discourse of Islamic.

Another feature of the novel is the use of 'black comic' element to present a comic tone to serious. He skillfully uses this mode to undercut the serious tone or religion and political discourse. So he changes the name Mahound in place of Muhammad in order to transform the heroic image into burlesque image.

Rushdie contribution in literary milieu left great impact in the postmodern and postcolonial era of resent time. He applied different narrative techniques in relation lo memory politics able to bring metafiction dimension that nourished New Historicist idea of 'end of history'. He also uses the fable to negotiate postmodernism's problem with

techno-science, authority, and homogeneity. As a postcolonial writer, Rushdie influenced by Bhabha, shifted his attention from the ambivalent colonial space, to explore the creative, unstable hybrid position in *The Satanic Verses*. His concept of this *third space* describes postmodernism as celebration of cultural diversity. By rejecting the line of least resistance, by sacrificing the possibility of absolute certainty, by accepting the metafiction quality of every narration without being trapped into a sterile skepticism, Rushdie stepping-stone towards a new beginning and a deeper, more progressive understanding of our reality.

To put it differently, Rushdie, through *The Satanic Verses* provides an alternative version to the official history of Qur'an. And by doing so, Rushdie puts the official historical records in question and undermines the claims of absolute truth in the official version of history. This novel itself the question about textual authority that is raised on sacred scripture within the narrative strand created on Muhammad. Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* has received host of criticism. Since its publication various critics have tried to analyze the novel from different perspectives like, post-colonialism, post-modernism, Diaspora writing, migrant ambivalent position.

One of the critics, Dick Hebdige sees *The Satanic Verses* contains decolonizing power against the ever spreading colonization. According to him, the novel contains diverse characters of different social origins who speak non-standard English through which Rushdie parodies the subtle mode of resistance. He writes:

[T]he clotted language of Rastafarianism was deliberately opaque. It had grown out of patois, and patois itself had been spoken for centuries beneath the Master's comprehension. This was a language capable of

piercing the most respectfully inclined white ear . . . made no concessions to the sensibilities of a white audience. It was an alien essence, a foreign body which implicitly threatened mainstream British culture from within. (64)

Similarly, Homi K. Bhabha in his *Nation and Narration* views *The Satanic Verses* celebrates the hybrid condition as ability of self-creation for Diaspora people in postcolonial scenario. He says:

[*The Satanic Verses*] attempts to redefine the boundaries of the western nation, so that the 'the foreignness of language' becomes the inescapable cultural condition for the enunciation of the mother-tongue . . . Rushdie seems to suggest that it is only through the process of dissemination of meaning, time, peoples, cultural boundaries and historical traditions that the radical alterity of the nation culture will create new forms of living and writing. (317)

Likewise, another critic, Marlena Corcoran sees Salman Rushdie as a postmodernist. In *The Satanic Verses* he finds the elements of postmodern uncertainty that boldly subvert the nature of good and evil. He writes:

At a time when we have all but lost our faith in definitive origins, Rushdie writes us into a world of versions that is nevertheless not a trivial world, but a world suffused with the sacred. In its questioning of both the transmission of sacred text, and contemporary representation of writing, *The satanic verses* may well be the first postmodern Islamic novel. (158)

Similarly, another critic Christine Cavanaugh views *Satanic Verses* in relation to the issue of prophecy and prophets that leads to the violence in orthodox religion discourse. He regards this novel not only success to reveal the relation between power and violence in the tradition of Qur'ran but also boldly confronts the violence that now surrounds prophesy. He says, "Rushdie portrays prophecy and prophets with myriad variation on present and past tradition or revelation speaking . . . so that the reader can examine their relation to violence" (2).

Thus, it received lot of criticism, which shows the richness the novel itself. A novel can have multiple interpretations. However, the present study aims to analyze how Rushdie uses the technique of fallible narration through the medium of unreliable memory to show metafiction dimension both in factual history and fiction.

This present work has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter presents Rushdie idea of narration in relation to the one memory and how it applicable to the novel *The Satanic Verses*. The second chapter discusses the theories which are applied in this research. It consist the debate on history and fiction, the idea of Hutcheon, Hayden White and Jameson, new historicism, post-colonialism, Foucault's power to prove historical metafiction as inevitable quality in any text and any claim of factuality in any text has its political discourse. The third chapter is the analysis of text with the application of the theories which leads the research work to the conclusion; fourth chapter which proves *The Satanic Verses* full of historical reference that exist in the form of uncertain narration.

## II. Historiographic Metafiction

Literature is multifarious phenomenon, so is history and the entire literary genre. Though literature and history treated as two different discipline but they share same medium of expression, a narration. From the very beginning of western writing, history is regarded as objective and based on fact. The historians are compelled to choose narration as only mean through which they could write history. But this narration as a mean of expression is always subjective and unreliable to factual event. Narration is ultimately limited to human artifact so it is unable to carry the actual event, in any case. When historian tries to bring past events in text of present time they only narrate those events which they kept in their mind as remembrance, what we called 'memory'. The very memory has its own politics and finally restricted on authorial possession. No genre is, therefore, free from subjective ideology. In this case, 'Historiographic Metafiction' is postmodernist narrative technique, applicable to give existence to literary genres, which intermixes fact with fiction.

Historiographic metafiction is a term Linda Hutcheon uses to define such type of novel that flourished in postmodern era. They use the plot structure and characterization technique of popular fiction. They analyze to challenge those existing techniques from the text by using parody and irony. This type of postmodern fiction is marked by a concern with "whose truth gets told" in history and fictional narrative (Hutcheon 123). Writers of this narrative technique tries to narrate the events and characters of story in such a way that it could make the reader conscious. They don't try to hide provisional and fictional quality of every narration that leads reader to singular version of truth. In

this postmodern period fiction is regarded as a verbal magic[al] aim to deceive us. This deceptive quality weighted consciously. Rather than deceive their reader by pretending to tell them what is true, these writers hope to make their readers aware of the truth and above the deception that is fiction. We call such writing about fiction in the form of fiction “metafiction”. So the fictional quality is inevitable to every narration. History also uses the same narrative tools to bring the past event in the present. So, All historical recorded by men becomes fictional. Thus, historiographic metafiction enables reader to decipher the fiction entity in historical fact.

In recent time, historiographic metafiction spread in every human artifact and keeps the literature away from those ‘formal auto-representation and its historical context’ (Hutcheon 106). Naturally enough, the technique historiographic metafiction brings history in problematic condition. For history has to give up the vary possibility of historical knowledge that from the time being claims to be objective truth. The claim of objective truth in history in relation to other type of discourse (especially fiction) was a matter of doubt from the beginning of western metaphysics.

In the time of middle age theology was the interest that serves to form other discipline. Likewise, in seventeenth century it was replaced by physical sciences. But after the time of Descartes and Kant, mankind has acquired a new habit of thinking historically. Because of excessive valorization of history, historical books have enormously increased. But most of them turn into relatively unimportant in present context. Though historical relevance and its importance had been doubted from the time of Aristotle but this battle against historical domination and its objective truth get blur only after the term “historiographic metafiction” intervene in every human artifact.

Before this unique narrative technique been widely accepted as one of the effective postmodern literary tool, history seems to engage constantly and continuously creating its own grand-narrative. But the history of historical relevance and its vale of objective truth dismissed successively only with the help of some recent postmodern thinkers and writers. Those postmodernist work usually challenge “ received versions of history”(Alexander 16) and remind us that history itself is an unreliable narrative construction.

Hutcheon, as D’haen writers, plays a major role in this narrative technique since she published her book *A Poetics of Postmodernism Theory, History, Fiction* in 1988. Hutcheon in this book regards historiographic metafiction as technique exercise to have deliberate contrast with hierarchal notion of history with other genre especially fiction. This postmodern narrative technique historiographic metafiction disregards every centric totality and attempt to demarginalized literature in contrast with history, intermixes fact with fiction or public with private. Hutcheon resists the received history and redeems the real history. She says it reveals the real nature of historical reference or the politics behind the received histories. Hutcheon, in this book, purpose to make reader aware of the particular nature of the historical representation.

Postmodernism has made a great impact on historiographic. It has focuses on its own genre of historical writing with mere denunciation of conventional history. It rejects the master narrative as hegemonic stories told by those in power. Moreover, rejecting faith in reason and progress, postmodernist historiography has directed much of its attention towards the irrational, the odd and the magical in human life. Postmodern historiography has, however, promoted good writing as a normal historical practice.

Linda Hutcheon as postmodernist theorist has contributed a lot for the notion of historiographic metafiction. Hutcheon in her book, *Poetics of Postmodernism* challenged generic boundary between literary text and historical fact. She focuses on the two different mode of writing that is share by both historicist and literary writers and at the same times how they are different in that mode. Though, history like other genre identified as linguistic construction and depends on the same convention of writing, same narrative forms, claims that their construction is objective one and true in its recorded past events. Hutcheon in this regard implied the technique of historiographic metafiction that helps to reveal the true nature of every human artifact as noting like objective and factual rather represented in multiple versions. This makes historical claim for its factual records became its stubborn and regarded as subjective orthodox and literature regarded as more objective than history. As literature acknowledge the historiographic metafiction as inevitable quality of every genre and contributes for the true nature of every human artifact, it seems more objective then other discipline because it helps us to mark the inescapable flaws that every discourse carries within it and can never be a objective true in its representation. In *Poetics of Postmodernism* Hutcheon further highlights the postmodern quality of metafiction in both history and literature while she writes:

Historiographic metafiction suggests that truth and falsity may indeed not be the right terms in which to discuss fiction . . . Fiction and history are narratives distinguished by their frames which historiographic metafiction first establishes and then crosses, both the generic contracts of fiction and of history. The postmodern paradoxes here are complex. The interaction of the historiographic and the metafictional foregrounds the rejection of the

claims of both “authentic” representation and “inauthentic” copy alike, and the very meaning of artistic originality is as forcefully challenged as the transparency of historical referentially. (110)

Hence, Hutcheon is exception in “the emphasis she places on the role played by history in postmodernism” (208) while highlighting the role metafictional technique in term of the authenticity of every representation in postmodern scenario.

Hayden white, postmodernist philosopher and historian, has consistently examined the historical authenticity and its relevance in term of its metahistorical narrative form. Highlighting the insertion of fiction white writes “There is something in a historical master piece that can not be negated, and this nonnegotiable element is its form which is its fiction” (401). In the essay “The Historical Text as Literary Artifact” he views historical narrative as verbal fiction with invented contexts. Histories gain their explanatory power by processing data into stories. Those stories take the shape from what White calls “ emplotment the process through which the fact contained in chronicles are enclosed as components of plots are not immanent in events themselves but exists in the mind of tragic or ironic”(397).

White describes metahistory as a critical enterprise where in the history addresses reflective question about the writing of history itself. Historical writing is always in the form of narration that depends on a “ non-negatable item,”(White 12). The narrative form itself creates a stories of history are understandable by virtue of their reliance on fictive forms. By using the materials like simple chronicle, a series of events, set of fact and provides the explanation, history can only produced the story that can never reflects any fact as objective one but only produced those facts which is created. White further

highlights the distinction that historian creates between literature and history itself while he writes:

. . . distinction between fiction and history, in which fiction is conceived as the representation of the imaginable and history as the representation of the actual, must give place to the recognition that we can only know the *actual* by contrasting it with or likening it to the *imaginable*. As thus conceived, historical narratives are complex structures in which a world of experience is imagined to exist under at least two modes, one of which is encoded as “real,” the other of which is “revealed” to have been illusory in the course of the narrative. (406)

Hence, white’s view in history as a discipline, is exceptional that he point out the history in postmodern world is in bad shape because it has lost sight of its origins in the literary imagination.

Keith Jenkins, a historical theorist provides the startlingly clear and thought-provoking idea to central debates in history and historiography. In his book *Re-thinking History* he views history as one series of discourse about the world which can not create the world itself. Jenkins put his critical eyes on the relation between history and the past. He finds past and history not stitched into each other rather float free to each other in miles apart. Yet historian still “trying to raise the specter of the real past, and objective past about which their accounts are accurate and even true” (Jenkins 12). While history refer to the past and reflects the past on their account the factual account of past events could no longer access to the historian. And history remains only on the subjective dimension of historians account. So no account can re-cover the past as it was because

the past was not an account but events, situation ,etc. So for him, history is like other discipline is theory and theory is always ideological and ideology just is material interest. When he view objective claim of facts he finds all fact itself to be meaningful needed interpretation then how historian can claim that any past thing that historian bring are factually correct. When history becomes interpretation and history is historian works then historiographic metafiction is a proper study of history is actually about Therefore, historiographic metafiction as critical tools that referring here to the historian way of writing history.

R.G Collingwood is also a postmodern thinker and philosopher, has questioning on the authority made by historian to claim their genre and factual and truth based. In his book *The Idea of History* he views history is not other then perception and opinion. Though the historian resembles themselves as science because both are based on reasoned and inferential but Collingwood views that science itself lives in a world of abstract universal than how the history become concrete in its reason. History, then not universal rather individual, not indifferent to space and time and its “criterion of historical truth can not be the fact that a statement is made by an authority” (237).

In this postmodern era history seems to lose its authority as it claims to be factual and reflectively truth then literature(other discipline). As the term ‘historiographic metafiction’ spreads in this era as effective theoretical tools that successively blur the boundary between subjective and objective dichotomy. This reveal the true nature of history as subjective and interpretative one that could no longer stick towards it factual claim of past events. The claim of “pure” historian is impossible to human cognition only superhuman can records past without distorting or omitting. But this superhuman is only

exist in believe not in reality. One the one hand historicist claim of their history as true account of past event become notoriously dismissed and on the other hand literature seems more objective then history because it reveals it own fictional dimension as its narrative technique. Literature brings light on its inevitable fictional quality that makes every discipline away from its objective claim. This inaccessible claim of history is revel because of the historiographic metafiction gets its essence through the literary analysis. Therefore, literature seems more objective in its quarry and more trustworthy in its revelation.

### **Narration**

Narration is one process of communication in which the narrative as message is transmitted. It is verbal nature of the medium used to transmit the message. In an Aristotelian sense narration is a work by using plot or in narrower sense presence of narrator in a work. The basic elements of narration are a story and storyteller. Narration is not only a work with plot but it is also the way people describe the events by recollecting their past experience. But the event that one experience and the way he narrates the events by memorizing it will not be the same. Narration is different from story itself it is built around a special event or situation that has existed in time and space and it is presented as a kind of record of that event or situation. Mike Bal, a theorist, define narration in the book *Narratology*, she says:

Narratology is the theory of narratives, narrative text, images, spectacles, events; cultural artifacts that ‘tell a story.’ Such a theory helps to understand, analyse, and evaluate narratives. A theory is a systematic set of generalized statements about particular segment about a particular

segment of reality. That segment of reality, the corpus, about which narratology attempts to make its pronouncements consists of 'narrative text' of all kinds, made for a variety of purpose and serving many different functions. One should not expect to actually be able to say that the corpus consists of all narrative texts and only those texts which are narrative.(3)

Narration depends on the way narrator narrates. For her, the narrator is the narrative agent, 'the linguistic subject, a function and not a person, which expresses itself in the language that constitutes the text'. (*Narratology*, 119) In every novel narrator hold the authoritative position and the reader heavily relies on the narrator's way of perceiving the events as truth which regarded as mouthpiece of author. But after the 19<sup>th</sup> century with the raise of novel, it creates the doubt towards the narrator position in relation to its reliability. Multiple narrative and different novel put the narrator reliable position into critical condition. We ordinary accept what a narrator tells us as authoritative. The fallible or unreliable narrator, on the other hand, is one whose perception, interpretation, and evaluation of the matters he or she narrates do not coincide with the opinions and norms implied by the author, where the author expects the alter reader to share. Henry James, a writer famous for his use fallible narrator in his short stories "The Aspern Paper" and "The Liar." His repeated uses of narrator whose excessive innocence, or over sophistication, or moral obtuseness turns him into flawed and distorted character. Narrator, who is regarded as author's 'center of consciousness' astonishingly converted into a weak perceiver. Narrator who is taken to be a factual perceiver within story (history) makes the author's evaluation into the problematic position.

The concept of the fallible narration becomes more important with the raise of novel in 19<sup>th</sup> century. Before novel gets it's heightened, poem did not have a narrator distinct from the author but novel with their immersive fictional worlds, creates a problem, especially when the narrator's views differed significantly from that of the author. A writer may choose to let several narrators tell the story from different points of view. Then it is up to the reader to decide which narrator seems most reliable for each part of the story. An unreliable narrator is a force behind the power of first narrator. To some extent all narrator are unreliable, varying in degree from trust-worthy Ishmael in *Moby dick* to the mentally disabled Benjy in *The Sound and the Fury* and the criminal Humbert in *Lolita*. Other notable example of unreliable narrator including the Bottler Steven in *The Remains of the Day*, Holden Caulfield in *The Catcher in the Rye* and Verbal Kint in the film *The Usual Suspects*. One of the famous examples of an unreliable narrator in American literature is Nick Carraway in *The Great Gatsby*. All of Henry James's fiction is based on the narrator's point of view and the limitations of their narrations and motivation behind what they reveal. Unreliable narrators aren't limited to fiction. Memories, autobiographies and autobiographical fiction have the author as narrator and character. Sometimes the author purposely makes his narrator persona unreliable such as Jim Carroll in *The Basketball Dairies*.

The unreliable of fallible narrator brought into the major critical analysis of the text in postmodern period. Historiographic metafiction is emerging discipline for narrative techniques in this present era, analyze this fallible narrator is not only lose its reliability but also a new mode of technique in the field of literature.

Narrator point of view not becomes the authentic factual reliable sources to reflect the events of situation. Whenever events are presented, they are always presented within a certain vision. A point of view is chosen, a certain way of seeing things, a certain angle whether for historical text or in fiction. This point of view is determined by how narrator views the event. The possibility of 'objective' picture of fact becomes dim. It remains only in an attempt to present only what is seen or perceived in some other way. The restricted perception of narrator over certain event is what we called 'focalization'. The relation between the element presented and the vision through which they are presented is lies within the term focalization. Mieke Bal in her book *Narratology* study the relation between narrator and focalization. She says:

Focalization is the relation between the 'vision,' the agent that sees, and that which is seen. The relationship is the component of the story part, of the concept of the narrative text: A say that B sees what C is doing. Sometimes the different is void, e.g. when the reader is presented with a vision as directly as possible. The different agents then cannot be isolated, they coincide. That is the form of 'stream of consciousness.' But the speech act of narrating is still different from the vision, the memories, the sense perception, thoughts that are being told. (114)

The narrator may be one of the character or omnipotent descriptor in the story. Roland Barthes describes such character as 'paper being' and fiction comprises their narratives of personal experience as created by the author. When their thoughts are included, this is termed internal focalization, i.e. when each character's mind focuses on a particular event; the text reflects his or her reaction:

The fact that 'narration' has always implied focalization is related to the notion that language shapes vision and world-view, rather than the other way round. As far as it implies that language can be isolated from its object only artificially, for the duration of the analysis that idea may very well squared with the practice endorsed here. (Bal 19)

Narrative technique can be divided into two subgenres the traditional narrative and the modern narrative. Traditional narrative focuses on chronological order of history. In other words the traditional narrative could not recount it with focalization and its limitation in term of its perceptive validity over the events. In the traditional form of narration event derives and tend to centered upon individual action and intention.

Conversely, modern narrative typically focuses on structures and general trends. A modern narrative would break from rigid chronology. If the historian felt it explained the concept better. In terms of the French Revolution, a historian working with the modern narrative might show general traits that were shared by the revolutionaries across France but would also illustrate regional variations from those general trends (many confluent revolutions). Also these types of historian might use different sociological factors to show why different types of people supported the general revolution.

Historian who uses the modern narrative might say that the traditional narrative focuses too much on what happened and not enough on causation. This form of narrative reduces history into neat boxes and thereby does an injustice to history:

Historian who utilizes the traditional narrative might say that the modern narrative overburdens the reader with trivial data that had no significant effect on the progression of history. That it is the historian's duty to take out what is inconsequential from history

otherwise might commit an injustice to the reader, whom may end up believing that minor trivial events were actually important.

History then always tries to save authentic validity by hiding the narrative discourse, focalization which has direct contact of the linguistic signifier. In both case, as in literary stories or historical records, focalization is always and already exist as a form of interpretation, and deserves to be interpret again. Thus, the same event (object) can be differently interpret according to different focalizes. The way in which these different interpretations are suggested to the reader is medium bound, but the principle of meaning production is the same for any verbal art. So every human artifact relies heavily on narrator; is evolve on focalization. Because of focalization phenomena of untrustworthy and fallible narration function within fictional text. Counter-focalization is thus, is to turn reliable omnipotent narrator into untrustworthy and medium bound narrator. Narrator then the subject of counter-focalization as a result factual and truth presence can no longer sustain its authority. The entire narrators ideologically fall under fictional mark. That's why historiographic metafiction carry counter-focalization in order to disclose the false report or mistake perception of narrator paved the way for alternative reading of the text.

Fallible narration and counter focalization both serves for the techniques of narration. In recent year, 'Magic Realism' has become the most popularly used term to refer to a particular narrative mode. This narrative mode also offers in a way to discuss alternative approach of reality to the western philosophy, expressed in many postcolonial and non-western works of contemporary fiction, by most famous writer such as Gabriel Garcia Marquez, V.S. Naipaul and Salman Rushdie.

Magic Realism was first used by a German art critic Franz Roh in 1925. He used it in the sense of representing and responding to authentic and pictorially depicting the enigmas of reality. During the decade of 1940s, in Latin America magic realism became a popular way to express the realistic American mentality and create an autonomous style of literature. There is an imaginative blending of history, politics, social realism and fantasy in magic realism. These imaginative style combines realistic every day details with elements of fantasy, blurring the reader's usual distinction between reality and magic. In this regard M.H. Abrams writes in *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, "The writers interweave, in an ever shifting pattern, sharply etched realism in representing ordinary events and descriptive details together with fantastic and dreamlike elements, as well as with materials derived from myth and tales" (196).

The term magic realism is used to describe the prose of Jorge Luis Borges in Argentina, as well as the work of writers such as Gabriel Garcia Marquez in Columbia, Isabel Allende in Chile, Gunter Grass in Germany, Italo Calvino in Italy, and John Fowles in England. In this context of magic realism, Jorge Borges writes:

The writer confronts reality and tries to reveal it by looking for what can be mysterious in life, object, and even human action. A magical realist narrator creates the illusion of unreality, faking the escape from the natural, and tell on action that if appears as explainable it comes across as stranger. In the strange narrators, the writer instead of presenting something as real, the reality becomes magical. (203)

Magic Realism as a narrative tool, best known for its meta-fictional narrative technique that challenges the reader perspective of what an author and a book are. It makes us

aware that fact has created for own self. However, the fact that the reader knows that the extracts are deceptive as they are not by the author to whom they are ascribes, diminishes the realist element of the tale upon which the magic realism relies.

In postmodern view magic (al) realists have not forgotten how to think historically, we need to think historically, we need to examine the way in which historical references and attempts at historical revision occur in magical realist works in order to gain an understanding of the relationship between magical realism and postmodernism. Magical realism not only situate their texts in particular context, but also to bring into question already existing historical assumptions. Fredric Jameson in his *Postmodernism or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, he claims that postmodernism is the ‘attempt to think the present historically in an age that has forgotten how to think historically in the first place’ (1991: 3). In his Marxist stance, it is understood that versions of history that claim to be the only truth are usually created by people in power in order to justify their position and maintain it. For this reason, such an approach to history and postmodernism is frequently adopted by postcolonial magical realist writer. Salman Rushdie’s writing, and in particular *The Midnight’s Children*, provides us with perfectly illustrative examples of how magical realism can works within this form of historical postmodernism. In his essay *Imaginary Homeland*, Rushdie reflects the view of Jameson by starting that ‘history is always ambiguous. Facts are hard to establish, and capable of being given many meaning. Reality is built on prejudices, misconception and ignorance as well as on our perceptiveness and knowledge’ (25).

Postcolonial and postmodernist writer uses magic realism as new form of narrative mode. A few theorist such as Linda Hutcheon and Walter Pache, have noted

magic realism flourished in order to question for traditional opposition between realism and fiction, subject and object, accomplishes the postmodern task of challenging the notion of genre and questioning the convention of realism. Magic realism further strengthens the notion of historiographic metafiction by disrupting and defines the authoritative assumption about reality truth and objective history. Magic realism in postcolonial scenario regard history is an attempt by colonial rulers to define the colonize people and their nation from the colonizers perspective and to impose a homogeneous, authoritative historical and cultural identity on the colonized nation.

Historiographic metafiction, thus, brings post colonial writer who exploits magic realism aim to build an alternative history so is the historiographic metafiction aim for. A postcolonial writer Hodgkin, use magic realism in his novel *The Invention of the World*. It is a story of a common unity built as a replica of colonialism on Vancouver Island. In this novel, Hodgkin attempts to reconstruct history from the remains of what is known of the people's history from their own perspective. In this regard, many postcolonial text use oral tale when alternative version of event did not agree with those written as authoritative historical survived. Magical realism serves historiographic metafiction analysis because it reveals its attitude to history and concludes that conclude that reality, absolute truth and history are unknowable.

### **Memory**

In every genre, weather history or literature need to be restricted on narration for the description of the events. In every narration, there is past event or situation. Those bygone past can only be possible to bring into present only through the narration. Every discipline exploits narration diversely for its own pursuits. History uses its own narrative

technique for its factual presentation of past events. Likewise, literature handle different narrative mode for its different pursuits so as other discipline. Whatever, the narrative technique suits to achieve any goal, all of them inevitably relies upon its own memory. Remembering is only a source to bring past events in present context. But could this medium 'memory' capable enough to bring past events objectively? If not then how the history could claim the factual reflection of past events by using same fragile 'memory' or 'remembering'? R.G. Collingwood in his book *The Idea of History* describes history as discipline plays always in past. History essentially uses 'memory' and 'authority' as a basic tools to narrate past events. History, thus, stands in a weak ground of believe someone who has his memory as evidences and his authority for believed. Collingwood says:

. . . the essential things in history are memory and authority. If an event or state of things is to be historically known, first of all one must be acquainted with it; then he must remember it; then he must state his recollection of it in terms intelligible to another; and finally that other must accept the statement as true. History is thus the believing some one else when he says that he remembers something. (235)

When memory put into the ground of suspicious, it needed to examine critically about its authenticity. So we uses 'memory' whenever we need to know about past. In other words, to remember now is to know now what we knew in the past. And to know is to believe something to be true. Memory, then, works as knowledge, knowledge from the past though it is not necessarily knowledge about past itself.

The concept of memory is like the concept of will and believes, applied primarily to the individual. The memory provides interpretative priority to individual sense of the concept. Memory, thus varies to individual senses of perception though in single past events. That individual remembering of certain past episode is not reliable. History is always connected to remembering or memorizing the past event in order to bring unexcited past into the existence. But the objective imprint of past is out of the cognitive access of memory. Memory now, limited to the individual perception and individual memorize only those events which is essential factor for his story (history). In this sense, history is weak to presents objective truth because its narration is formed through the individual memory, memory that psychologically doing politics to self. Avishi Margalit explains past as undoable factor and the ‘memory’ in relation to history is inappropriate to internalize its objective truth. In his book *The Ethics of Memory* Margalit says:

We cannot effect the past; we cannot undo the past, resurrect the past, or revivify the past. Only description of the past can be altered, improved or animated. The past itself, unlike the description, cannot be brought back either in form or in essence. (66)

Memory of individual is neither in control of his own nor did authentic alleged to the past memories of other. Though, memory reaches alleged memory of the past but not necessarily past event. Jenkins says “still historian trying to raise before us the spectra of real past, and objective past about which their account are accurate and even true”( *Re-thinking History* 13). But after considering the politics of memory it is clear that no account can recover the past as it was because past is only and events or situation not an account as historian treated it for their claim.

In term of memory, even autobiography itself could not handle the politic played by his memory then how historian handles the other's past by collective memory. Most of the personal experience had been unmemorable. They do not add up to a story but they add up to make his past time rather good. David Hume, a empiricist philosopher intriguing through experiment and says "ask yourself, ask any of your acquaintances, weather they would live over again the last ten or twenty year of their life" ("A Dialogue Concerning Natural Religion"197). So, ever changing perception of human being could no longer account the past as it was. Our epistemological range can never really know the past because the gap between history and past is ontological one and because of the nature of every thing makes no account of epistemological effort can bridge it. While memorizing the past, weather of own or the historical account the personal emotion and his imagination hinder to present the past events objectively. That's why every present has its own past and any construction of past is reconstruction. So, no history is official and single version rather varies and must fit it to the present requirement.

. . . every new generation must rewrite history in its own; every new historian, not content with giving new answer to old question, must revise the question themselves; and –since historical thought is a river into which none can step twice. (Collingwood 248)

The fabric of history in the name of discipline as a science; a factual and truth reflection of past events is now rapture by the postmodernist thinker, philosopher and the writer. Salman Rushdie, taken to be one of the leading postmodernist writer, foster the idea of historiographic metafiction by stressing upon 'personal history' as guiding version in the

novel *The Midnight's Children*. His novel contributes a lot to reveal the lopes hole in any official version of history.

In *The Satanic Verses* he once again enforces the alternative reading of Islamic sacred book 'Qur'ran'. Rushdie's universal doubting concerns his allegedly blasphemous attitude towards 'Qur'ran' and Islam is the most controversial aspects of this novel. The major theme of the novel is the dangerous nature of closed, absolute belief systems. *The Satanic Verses* offers the another version of the 'grand narrative' of the birth of word religion yet this version does not have to be historically accurate, because it is after all, a work of fiction. Rushdie says, "unable to accept the unarguable absolute of religion, I have tried to fill the hole with literature"( *Imaginary Homeland* 234).

As historiographic metafiction explores, Rushdie too, in his novel altered the Koran episode. Center in the episode of the satanic verses in which the prophet first proclaim revelation in favor of the old polytheistic deities, but later renounce this as an error induced by 'shitan'. Rushdie through the eye's of migrant character explores how migration highlights one's awareness that perception of reality are relative and fragile, and of the nature of religion faith and revelation, not to mention the political manipulation of religion. Thus, novel also seeks to negotiate a relationship with such as idea of sacred. On the other hands, sacred as a space that resists both history and textuality - the indeterminacy of meaning. So, it questions the idea of every notion of absolutism by suggesting that such tropes might itself be historical and literary creation.

Rushdie narration of *The Satanic Verses* incident become perhaps the text's most powerful strategy of questioning authority and transmission of reveled world. His use of

magic realism as a narrative techniques aim to subvert the authority of history. The purpose of fusing the two opposing aspects of the oxymoron i.e. is fiction and reality together to form one new perspective. He offers that his book can be read as an allegory concerning its call for a new interpretation of Islam.

Historiographic metafiction encloses the entire notion that stands against singular version of speculation. The exploitation of magic realism, fallible narration, fragile memory and counter focalization make the novel is applicable to use historiographic metafiction as appropriate tools.

### III. Blurring the Boundary between History and Fiction in Salman Rushdie's

#### *The Satanic Verses.*

Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* is strong indictment of politicized religion and arbitrary officialdom. In the novel, he stands against every notion of orthodoxy and absolutism, and views any human artifact like religion book can no more stick towards its authority, so as historical fact. So he provides an alternative version of Qur'anic historical fact in the novel *The Satanic Verses*. By giving entry to a fictional and unreliable character Gibreel Farishta and Saladin Chamcha, Rushdie brings every narrative text into critical stand point. The anonymous narrator presents protagonist Gibreel Farishta and Saladin Chamcha to intermixes the fact and fiction in such a way that it compelled reader to orient even religion sacred book Qur'an under suspicious.

Gibreel has a talent for serial dreaming on an epic scale, and it his theological dreams that provide the script of his own movies and Rushdie's pretext for paradoxically rewrite the history of Muhammad's founding of Islamic and satirizing the contemporary politics of Islamic nationalism. In novel, protagonist dares to draw the history of Islamic religious book in a parallel relation to the fictional history of Muhammad and Qur'an through his abnormal dream like experience. The strict and absolute story of origin of Islamic creed and his prophet Muhammad are smashes with lose and unreliable story of Gibreel own role of god messenger. Both leading character has been narrated by eyes of unknown narrator; about their experiences and event in very magical realistic tone in order to portrayed disturbed migrant mentality which itself socking and unreliable. Novel's narrator seems to be omnipresent and omnipotent can be coincide with Allah, Islamic god but anonymous in its presentation hints to challenge the existence of god in

any religious treatise thus, put every human artifact as narrative construction and deserves to be write again. As 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, weather to god or a men”( *Imaginary Homeland* 394)

At the beginning of the novel, both are trapped in a hijacked plane during a flight from India to Britain. The plane explodes over the English Channel, but they are magically saved. In a miraculous transformation, Farishta takes on the personality of the archangel Gibreel and Chamcha that of a devil. In realistic level, Farishta transformation can be read as the symptom of the protagonist's developing Dissociative identity disorder. Writer uses the magical realistic technique in order to present the never presented reality of any event. Unknown narrator narrates:

Just before dawn one winter's morning, New Year's Day or thereabout, two real, full-grown, living men fell from a great height, twenty-nine thousand and two feet, towards the English Channel, without benefit of parachutes or wings, out of clear sky. (1)

Rushdie uses this technique in order to parallel the way religion text presets its grand narrative so that authority and superiority of god immenseness could maintain up to the level of unchangeable and unchallengeable. On the other hand, this technique is also paved the way to doubt on the authenticity of narrator and left the reader to think and tried to describe the event in their own version because the version the narrator narrates is not reliable. Hence, the author provides the lopes hole to turn the reader attention over the authenticity and factual accuracy of event provided by other. This metafictional quality of every artifact is the main thrust of historiographic metafiction.

Through out the novel, Rushdie's fiction problematizes the very historical fact of Muhammad's life and the Qur'anic verse. He allows his character, Gibreel Farishta to enter into the prime time of Islamic origin and mixed it with different alternative consequence. As Gibreel lost in his dream and found out himself as archangel, a messenger of god happen to encounter the incident where Mahound seems to engage in politicize the religious root and convert pre-existing polytheism system into monotheism in order to furnish his own desire to rule. The novel through its interpretative process and rhetorical strategies for reading and rewriting history argued "about who should have power over grand narrative, the story of Islam, and that that power must belong to every one. . . . who do not have power over story that dominates their lives, power to retell it . . ." (*Imaginary Homeland* 432). Gibreel's unwanted dreams or nightmare leads him paradoxically in 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 occurrence of the life of Muhammad. (108)

This dream becomes troubling dream for Gibreel that he unwillingly doubting over the Muhammad and Qur'anic history. His 'blasphemous dream' makes him "the division is [of] spiritual, a rift in the soul. He has lost his faith and is strung out between his immense need to believe and his new inability to do so" (98). Narrator describes Gibreel doubt:

The human condition, but what of the angelic? Halfway between Allahgod and homosap, did they ever doubt? They did: challenging god's will one day they hid muttering beneath the Throne, daring to ask forbidden things: antiquation. Is it right that. Could it not be argued.

Freedom, the old antiquest. (92)

Rushdie's book *The Satanic Verses* can be seen as a 'parody of Mohammed's life' (144). Since its publication, it has been witness in relation to the *fatwa* imposed by the Ayatollah Khomeini on Salman Rushdie for insulting Islam, because a book emphasizes its fictionality by using magical realism and can thus be exonerated from political control is dangerous. In one hand, it has been read both as a blasphemous, obscene travesty of Islamic history and scripture and as a biting satire on a contemporary England that demonizes Muslim immigrants and mercilessly punishes any dissent from its secular-capitalist world-view but on the other hand, this book regarding as postmodernist writing for its use of ironic and self-parodic mode, which resists any attempts to locale an authorial point of view, to frame its author with any political intention, any religion belief or disbelief. Likewise, western politician choose to represent this conflict as a battle between democratic freedom of speech and autocratic censorship or even terrorism. But Rushdie insists that he has "never seen this controversy as a struggle between west freedom and eastern unfreedom," (*Imaginary Homeland* 389) rather he asserts his novel is only about "doubt, uncertainties. It dissent from the end of debate of dispute, of dissent" (*Imaginary Homeland*, 396). Though, this novel is regarded as fictional discourse as he himself asserts "the novel does not seeks to establish a privileged language but it insists upon the freedom to portray and analysis the struggle between the different contestants for such privileges" (*Imaginary Homeland*, 420).

As both protagonists happened to survive, they experienced same consequence differently. Soon after landing on the Dover Cost, Saladin Chamcha is arrested by trio of Britain immigrant officers who subject him to the obscene resist taunts and vicious

hungry, reserved for the dark-skinned Asian immigrant. These two protagonists interpreted their salvation differently and also given very different reception. Saladin “finds himself transformed into the goatish, horned and hoofy demon, in a bizarre sanatorium full of other monstrous” (*Imaginary Homeland*, 402). He is demonizing by the host culture’s fear and contempt of otherness, he grown horns, a tail, and monstrous phallus. But Gibreel transforms physically into angel and experience extended dreams about Muslim prophet. While, Saladin is taken away by police and Gibreel get protection from eighty-year old women Rosa Diamond. Rushdie in this incident focuses the two Characters are twinned in the plot as interchangeable opposites who define their differences by exchanging the role and signifiers of good and evil, angel and devil. By presenting the ordinary event in magical admixture, Rushdie tries to hint how human develop and practice the notion of good and evil especially how these notion are determine by religion.

Unlike history, literature plays the role to find new angel 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 same role to reveal alternative angel by choosing one frame of reference of Qur’ran verses to another, which itself in the form of unreliable narrator. Rushdie’s preference of genealogical line in place of archeological description in the novel added energy and vivacity to his text is such that his protagonist doubt over religion and creates his own history of Qur’ran. Gibreel enter into the history of Islam and intervene it by assuming himself as messenger of god in his own dream.

Rushdie exploits different narrative strategies in order to reflect the

unauthenticated of any claim made by human artifact. Unknown narrator focalized every event experienced by Gibreel seems to be radically unreliable to the reader. The focalization of Gibreel turns into defocalization when the narrator provides first hints of Gibreel's abnormal behavior. When he heard the voice of Rekha Merchand, a former girlfriend of him, Chamcha did not find any think happened. Gibreel experience hallucinations expose his experience as fallible, he says:

‘you don’t see her?’ Gibreel shouted. ‘you don’t see her goddamn Bokhara rug?’

No, no Gibbo, her voice whispered in his ear, don’t expect him to confirm.

I am strictly for your eyes only, may be u r going crazy . . . (7)

Novel from the very out set, exploits the narrative technique to break the absolute claim of history in relation to religion treatise. Narrator of the novel repeatedly describes the same event of the miraculous save in plane crash. These events provide alternative way to evaluate the coincident and magical rescue to the reader in one hand, but on the other hand he attached it with idea of ‘reincarnation’ as religion book always hyperbolically describers in order to exercise the ruthless meaning in origin. In the same way Gibreel time and again remember his miraculously saved event and regarded himself as an angel.

Rushdie, here, aims to mock at those ‘grand narrative’ which is only suitable to one who is the experience of that event. His use of understatement as narrative technique helps to devocalize the narrator precipitance and paved the way to alternative focalization. In the novel, Defocalization work as a tool to blur the hierarchy between miraculous and mundane.

When the narrative structure of the novel coincides with its thematic analysis shows writer's idea of unattainable of any authorial reliability. Rushdie seems to compare absolutism of religion verses unreliable mode of fiction. In order to point out the unreliable and unauthentic voice of any religious treatise, Rushdie introduce anonymous narrator. Gibreel Farishta is leading focalization of narrator who himself has no certain idea over him. Thus, narrator can maintain no authority or belief in terms of focalization. Narrator narrates Farishta:

A man who invents himself needs someone to believe in him, to prove he's managed it. Playing God again, you could say. Or you could come down a few notches, and think of Tinkerbell fairies don't exist if child don't clap their hand. Or you might simply say: it's just like being a man.

(49)

By means of various narrative technique, novel intermixes private fictional dreams vision of religion history with Islamic sacred book Qur'an in parallel way. Rushdie shows the unavoidable link between historical event and the individual admixture of his imagination in history. Rushdie shows the unavoidable link between historical event and the individual admixture. He makes Gibreel to "reconstruction the boundary wall between dreams and reality, and [be] on the road to recovery" (340). Gibreel interferes each and every moment of Muhammad's life and origin of Qur'anic verses through his use of dream, memory and imagination. In the novel, Gibreel assuming himself Archangel, a messenger of god but he convert the Qur'anic unknowingly with his semi-dream imagination. Though he is not intended to challenge the god message but his unrestraint dream turns the Qur'anic verses into satanic verses. In his semi-dream experience, he

happened to doubt on every historical sequences paved the way to alternative version of Qur'an. By plunging into the schizophrenic world of dream, Gibreel seems to "revolt not only against a [religion] tyrant, but against history" (210). This unwilling schizophrenic dream of Gibreel makes "history, the intoxicated, the creation, the possession of the devil" (210). Rushdie with the power of imagination mixes historical fact with literary fiction, thus subvert the traditional form of history. The dream-like distorted form of narration about the dream of Gibreel not only distorted the official version of Qur'an but also bring every historical fact into doubt.

The first person demonic narrator of the novel, presents Gibreel in a dream like sequences as he says "every time I go to sleep the dream starts up from where it stopped same dream in same place" (83). By going back and forth of his fictional dream, protagonist not only find himself play the role of messengers but also subvert the chronological narration of official history about Muhammad life and origin of Qur'an. This narrative technique not only deconstruct the Islamic creed of Qur'an but also provides different perspective through which reader can evaluate the possible construction of power possessed by the religious person. The book can be read as an allegorical concern, its call for new interpretation of Islam. Rushdie illustrates it by identifying the main characters Gibreel and Saladin as the equivalent of the angel Gabriel and Satan. He also reinforces the religion allegory by placing himself in the text in the guise of Salman the Persian who note down the new scripture. In the novel Salman the Persian, a professional scribe, initially a disciple of the prophet Mahound, whose role is to take dictation of the prophet's revelation of holy writ and law transmitted in god's words by the archangel Gibreel. Salman soon notices the political motives behind the

prophet's revelation and he began to lose faith in their authenticity, he says "your God certainly jumps to it when you need him to fix things up for you" (368). To test his suspicions, he introduces deliberate corruption into the verses which is unnoticed by the prophet. His contaminated of scripture with fiction are eventually detached then he turn his talent to another kind of 'profit'. The abrupt sift of the events from chapter to chapter make the plot complicated. The mixture of narrated event and Gibreel dream confuse the reader to separate the dream and reality clearly. The second chapter of the novel is whole about the Gibreel dream; a story of Muhammad; more or less closely based on the tradition surrounding Muhammad and the founding of Islam in seventh century. Gibreel vision of semi-dream and his angelic figure altered when he begin to interfere the history.

Mahound, in the chapter coincide with Islamic founder Muhammad who surveying the city of Jahilia," in this city, the businessman-turned-prophet, Mahound, is founding one of the world's great religion" (95). The fictional mark up of Gibreel dream corresponds historically to the early days of Muhammad's preaching in Mecca, when he had not widely been accepted. Hind, wife of Abu Simbel protest against Mahound.

Narrator says:

There can be no compromise with Mahound, she shouts, he is not to be trusted, the people must repudiate. Abu Simbel and prepared to fight besides them and for the freedom of Jahilia ' will you merely lie down before the false prophet . . . (371)

The imaginative admixture of Gibreel story shows the moral system of Islam is nothing more than the extremely effective method through which individual and group can gain absolute power and authority without need to justify themselves rationally. In this story,

poet, scribes, and shape-sifting actor Baal, Salman Farsi and Chamcha are contemptible to Islam, and therefore demonize because they are constantly quibbling, satirizing and questioning the moral tyranny.

When Abu Simbel, a ruler of Jahilia recognize Mahound as a threat to his power, he offer a deal to Mahound if his Allah will accept “upon Lat, Uzza and Manat, the third the other? ۞ After the first verse”. Mahound decided to compromise and return to Jahilia to announce new verses as “they are the exalted birds and their intercession” (114). One can draw the implication that religion was “the triumph of the businessman in the tent of unbelievers” (115), founded by rationalizing good and evil and its founder was both a sincere mystic and power-hunger entrepreneur. Gibreel, an actor who specializes in impersonating ditties who unknowingly lose himself on his dream world that challenges the unchanged history or Islamic world. In revising process of history, Gibreel finds himself against moral codes and he finds his unrestraint imagination is the cause for his habit of doubt over the religion, he monologue:

. . . if I was God I'd cut the imagination right out of people and then maybe poor bastard like me could get a good night's rest. Fighting against sleep, he forces his eyes to stay open, unblinking, until the visual purple fades . . . he diminishes me to his own size and pulls me in towards him, his gravitation fields is unbelievable . . . (122)

Novel depicts Mahound as a business person who maintain his power by made “this world into which [Mahound] has brought his message: one one one. Amid such multiplicity . . . a dangerous world” (103). Mahound compromise with Abu Simbel for polytheist but as he found his power in hand he changed religion in same monotheist

system. His politics of religion lies under his power of absolutism. Other character's seems to challenge the absolutism with their power of language. Both Baal and Salman scribes to alter the received text demonstrating the impossibility of monologism and the inevitability of dialogism. Revolutionary character Baal question to Abu Simbel " why do I fear Mahound? For that: one one one, his terrifying" (102). Likewise, Salman's desire to text the authenticity of Mahound pronouncement make him as if he is the alter ego of writer in the novel. When Mahound did not notice even substantive changes he made in divine revelation. He understands the importance of re-writing and inevitable fallible nature of human being. Salman says:

I'd say Oops, O God, bit of a slip, how could I, and correct myself. But it didn't happen; and now I was writing the revelation and nobody was noticing, and I didn't have the courage to own up. I was sacred silly, I can tell you. Also: I was sadder than I have ever been. So I had to go on doing it. Maybe he'd just missed out once, I thought, anybody can make mistake. So the next time I change a bigger thing. (368)

After Salman disclose Mahound politics of religion, he becomes enemy to new religion. Mahound achieved his power to be the one and only prophet of one God Al-lah. Mahound with his power defeat his protestant. Hind submits herself as follower of Mahound and says" there is no god but Al-lah, and Mahound is her prophet"(374). Salman falsely blames Baal as Mahound true enemy so that he could save himself from the death punishment. Baal remains unchanged in his revolution and stands against Mahound play of power politics in the name of religion. Baal says:

Gibreel had recited verses giving him full divine support. God's own permission to fuck as many women as he liked. So there: what could poor Ayesha say against the verses of God? You know what she did say? This: "Your God certainly jumps to it when you need him to fix things up for you." well! if it hadn't been Ayehsa, who knows what he'd have done, but none of the others would have dared in the first place. (386)

In the chapter, narrator through the Gibreel dream vision put the veil off of religion discourse.

Rushdie projects the power of hegemonic religion discourse is the foundation of suppression, murder and exclusion. So he celebrates the fictional work of Baal as well as his fictional work though the rigid fundamentalist religious verses regarded it as satanic verses. in against of hollow religious verses, Baal presents his poetic verses which does not exploits other and never stick around will to rule. Narrator says:

every evening after that, the strange fellow would reappear and recite a new poem, and each set of verses sounded lovelier than last. it was perhaps this surfeit of loveliness which prevented anybody from noticing, untill the twelfth evening, when he completed his twelfth and final set of verses, eachof which were dedicated to a different women. (391)

Baal poetic activities hindered Mahound's religious foundation. In contrast of holy profound language, Baal uses 'simplest language, concealing nothing' (391). But his revolutionary road leads him to be beheaded. He rebels till last hour of his death. Before punished, he says "whore and writer, Mahound. we are the people you can't forgive" (392). As soon as Ball died narrator says' Gibreel dream the death of Mahound:'

(393).

Narrator narrates the Gibreel dream of ancient Islamic world in such a way that it invites the reader to participate in the debate of historical authenticity. Writer allows different character to engage in the heteroglossic platform and provides alternative angel to speculate over suppressed group. Those who had been demonizing as blasphemous in religion treatise are turn into be a heroic figure in the fictional world of Gibreel dream. By replacing polyglossic discourse of fiction in place of monologic discourse of Islam, Rushdie uses some tools of language to disclose their orthodoxy which is exploited by religious and historical narration. The novel shows prophet Mahound died of fatal illness, writer uses understatement technique. Narrator says:

since no prophet may die before he has been shown Paradise, and afterwards asked to choose between this world and the next: so that as he lay with his head in his beloved Ayesha's lap, he close his eyes, and life seemed to depart from him; but after a time he returned: and he said unto Ayesha.'i have been offered and make my choise, and i have chosen the kingdom of god.' (393)

Rushdie's technique enforces of thematic equilibrium between any discourses of human artifact. Instead of fabricate the event and glorified it with magical power as religious narrative describe the death of their prophet in very supernatural mode, Rushdie mock at those 'grand narrative' story to maintain its power and privileged. Rushdie shows the power of literature that resists every singular version of narrative language play and advocate the reader to participate on the 'perpetual revolution' as dynamic representation to drive the history forward. as Tim wood says " retelling history raise a social

obligation[...]out of this obligation steams wonder at the past, a sense that the hidden past can produce awe" (Mending the Skin of Memory 314), Rushdie's character Gibreel come out from the religious obligation and dig the past out to produce awe.

The novel certainly portrayed the postmodernist hybrid multicultural situation where single truth fails to preserves it status-quo. Both leading character Faristha and Chamcha desperately lose their identity in foreign land and compelled to return home. Chamcha in the foreign land adopt the quality of mimicry as adjustment device in a diasporic situation but could not stick around and finally realizes the essence of root. But in the case of Gibreel could stick neither to his root nor adjust himself to the hybrid condition. Gibreel as reluctant dream visitor indicate the human quality of imagination and dreaming who is obliged by religious rigidity and turn into a demonic figure. His dream world make him understand the historical and religious world is not away from the fictional world but those religious and historical fundamentalist creates the deadly situation of individual to exercise his own imagination. Rushdie says "when Salman the Persian, Gibreel 's dream figment, fulminates against the dream religion's aim of providing 'rule of every dam thing, he is not only tormenting the dreamer but asking reader to think about the validity of religion's rule"( *Imaginary Homeland* 400)

Rushdie's use of technique open wide rang of critical debate on history and religious discourse. On the one hand, narrator intervene the event and come in front of reader with his strong indictment over history and theology. On the other hand, plot jumps to wide range of epoch and place its eyes on origin. Rushdie decontextualizes the places and brings the cause of historical past that affects the present people and their reluctant to live deadly life. Narrator says:

i'm saying nothing. don't ask me to clear things up one way or the other;  
 the time of revelation is long gone. the rules of creation are pretty clear:  
 you set things up, you make them thus and so , and then you let them roll.  
 where's the pleasure if you're always intervenig to give hints, change the  
 rule, fix the fights? (408)

The last chapter of the novel discussed openly on the different analytical level of history and religion operation up to the level of present context. Writer rather push the final incident of the novel where Gibreel shoot himself out and brings the intellectual speculation of history and theology by bringing new character Sawatileka, a occasional art lectures at the university. Narrator narrates her theoretical idea:

society was orchestrated by what she called grand narrative: history, economics, ethics . . . as a result, they sought ethical satisfaction in the oldest of the grandnarrative, this is, religious faith.'but these narrative are being manipulated by the theocracy and various political elements in an entire retrogressive way'. (537)

The book basically focuses on the migrant disjunction condition therefore could not stick to singularity of any idea. So, Gibreel dreams as the self tormenting faith and divided against himself because of his nature of doubt over Islamic treatise. This is the cause that immigrant postcolonial world remain undistinguishable between fact and fiction. Gibreel gradually fall under the maze as he tries to distinguish his dream from his walking states. He loses his authorial individuality when his divide personage with diabolical ones become increasingly difficult to decipher. By uses magical realism for historical references Rushdie, not only situate his text in a particular context, but also to bring

already existing historical assumption into question.

Rushdie uses fictional genre of literature to reveal the Qur'an is by no means the infallible word of god and that good and evil are, in fact, 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 religion 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.

Rushdie has uses 'remember' or 'memory' as suitable device to present events. 'Memory' is only things to present past in present time. As Avishai Margalit says in his book *The Ethics of memory* "memory is constrained by the reality of the past . . . Revision if our past history asks us to look for that which is absent . . ." (140). So, this novel, introduce strange narrator, pervasively narrates the whole event in very imaginative mark up in order to allow our doubt visits on the past history for revision. . . Narrator jumps from one event to the next randomly and subjectively as person's memory memorize the past event. Events in the novel lose the chronological sequences. The narrative slips from one event to the next often leave the formal incident in order to make room for a central memory. Moreover, narrator presence and character's role grows more complicated as novel move ahead. At first, narrator seems to take total authorial position as it occupy omnipotent and omnipresent point of view but as we began to

believe his subjectivity narrator lose his position when he mixes the 7<sup>th</sup> century of Mecca with present English city to describe the imaginative city Jahilia.

The narrator's memory and imaginative experience of Gibreel aim to provide alternative form in place of convention form of history. This novel is revolves around the text, the text that is divided between the form of story-telling and history-making, between its art and its politics are unsustainable. Narrator indulges in telling story while Gibreel engaged in history making. In the novel, Rushdie not only appeal to revision the official history but also provide a way to doubt on narrator's reliability. Narrator has his own perception and reality has multiple realities. Whatever, one perceive is his source of making history. Hence, history should be in continuous making, altering, rewriting and disrupting form its existing version. So, it shows that the history is a construction of human subjectivity. History is an account of past events, then, the historian uses his memory for presenting in the text. But as narrator is unreliable in his perception, historian too has no authority towards the past event. Just as Gibreel uses his imagination to alter the verses Mahound has also use his imagination to found the verses. To turn his imagination into reality, Mahound "form the beginning [men] uses God to justify the unjustifiable" (95). Thus, selection and narration of past events depends not in fact rather fall upon individual interest.

The individual history of Gibreel to intervene in Qur'anic origin is relies upon narrator memory and his imagination. But, Rushdie intentionally bring error in the text to show reality created out of person's memory may or may not meet historical fact

Rushdie believe in the subjective history. Since history is subjective, there can be multiple versions of history and plural truth. So this novel is "selected discontinuity, a

willing re-invention; his proffered revolt against history...That is truth, the door that was opened..." (427). Gibreel finds his imagination as a art and if he lose it his reversionary dream of Qur'anic history, "his story which was also the end of many story" (543).

The novel, in its pure form a fiction and the language of fiction is literature. By bringing history, religion and politics in literary zone, it intersects religion belief in sacred truth with profane doubt; blasphemous and material realism is crossed with magic and fantastic events. The language of literature serves to undermine any discourse that seeks to exclude alternative version of truth and reality. Its function "to name the unnamable, to point at fraud, to take side, start argument, shape the world and stop it from going to sleep"(97).

The subversion of literature in the novel is clearly demonstrated when novel challenged the sacredness of the Qur'an. Salman the Persian is not entirely convinced follower of Mahound (Muhammad) as his skepticism towards their divine source grown. Eventually, he decides to test the sanctity of the reaction by violating its border of divine purity with his own secular language. He starts replacing minor word like 'all-hearing' with 'all-knowing' when he transcribes Mahound God-given verses:

If Mahound recited a verse in which God was described as *all-hearing*, *all-knowing*, I would write, *all-knowing*, *all-wise*. Here's the point: Mahound did not notice the alteration. So there I was, actually writing the book, or re-writing, any way, polluting the word of God with my own profane language. But, good heaven, if my poor words could not be distinguished from the Revelation by God's own messenger, then what did that mean? What did that say about quality of the divine poetry? (367)

Salman intrudes the sacred discourse, through the medium of literary invention, and tested it by disregarding the holy mysticism that authorizes it. The alteration of the sacred words concretizes the act of literary transgression, of challenging the hegemony of closed discourse with sinful language of literature. When Salman corruption of the divine poetry proves itself to be possible, the Islamic discourse loses the source of its authorization and its claim to authority. His intervene demystify Qur'ran to be a text like any other text which has no more right to determine the nature of reality.

Rushdie novel is regarded as a sort of metafictional where the author is highly conscious of himself about the process on every narration. The writing about the past history of Islamic foundation is like Historiographic Metafiction that foregrounds the problematic and intricate relationship between the secular religion and profane imagination. It mean that writer of this type “are capable of writing from a kind of double perspective, because they, we, are at one and the same time inside and outside in the society” (19). In one perspective, novel carries the postmodern entities in its writing, in its validity of uncertainty principle, including the area of religion belief. In another perspective, novel through the migrant eyes exposes the termination of absolutism in multi-cultural world. Thus, this postmodern fiction helps to suspects on those past of religious history which might flourished from personal motives. The traditional fundamentalism or politicians take any alternative version as blasphemous act, for they may contradict with their version of truth, they may expose their politics behind their ‘grand narratives’. He once again target to the absolutism of religion as he targeted earlier on the official version of Indian history in his novel *The Midnight's Children*. He stands against “the political and priestly power structure that presently dominates and stifles

Muslim society” what he call “actually exiting Islam” (*Imaginary Homeland* 436). His aim to disclose the hidden discourses that are not found in existing version of religion treatise leads him to apply those narrative tools which intermixes fact with fiction. This technique is what Linda Hutcheon calls Historiographic Metafiction. This narrative technique encourages fiction as only genre to subvert the uncreated world of god by re-historicizing the origin of Islam. This mode of writing also offers to exercise the reader consciousness in order to make them reconsider the so called unchanged interpretation of religious text function as a kind of writing that constructed by ideological discourse in certain period. At the same times, his use of self-reflexive technique stirs us to question on its own credibility of interpretation of the religion from a particular socio-political context. So, this tool works as both resistive and redemptive tools.

To reveals the fallible aspects of human artifact that hide its lopes hole in order to get power of truth is possible only through the Rushdie’s postmodern historiographic metafiction as narrative tools. As Hutcheon says Rushdie states that fiction is “one way of denying the official, politician version of truth” (*Imaginary Homeland* 14). The notion of Hutcheon historiographic metafiction has great impact on the novel 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 Homeland* 15) Therefore, *The Satanic Verses* is a satire on those human artifact which sought to establish its own regimes of truth, those artifact inevitably have a potential of intermixing fact with fiction and provides new angel of study the existing history.

#### IV. Conclusion

Rushdie's novel *The Satanic Verses* inter-mixes history and fictional literature to rupture the factual claim of absolute religion history and motives behind its narrative construction. Rushdie exploits the notion of historiographic metafiction by Linda Hutcheon, as a postmodern narrative technique.

As for the Hutcheon "postmodern is a consciousness raising machine, exposing rather than abetting society's power discourse mechanism" (113), *The Satanic Verses* accomplished it. Novel aims to provide the historical reference of Islamic origin in fictional mark up to raise our conscious towards their religion and historical origin. While doing so he acknowledged the idea of historiographic metafiction, memory play and magical realism in its narrative technique. The blend of secular person in Qur'anic history with fictional character throw the light on other hidden motives in its political and power oriented fact in religion discourse.

Rushdie views history and literature as human artifact as Hayden White says "there is something in a historical masterpiece that cannot be negated and this nonnegatable elements is its form, the form which is its fiction" (401). Literary fiction is as important as history is. No objective history is possible to write since the historical prejudice and preoccupation are unavoidable and inseparable. As Collingwood says "historian reason are not abstract but concrete, not universal but individual, not different to space and time" (234), Rushdie in the novel attacked on the vary claim of traditional history in the form of religion treatise. Religion text regarded itself as unchangeable, unchallengeable, and absolute but postmodernism denies that single version of truth.

Keith Jenkins has also said in his book *Re-thinking History* that “the wake of those absent center and collapsed metanarrative, the condition of postmodernism have produced the multiplicity of histories that can be met everywhere . . .” (78). He said single version of history cease to exist in absence of centrality therefore postmodernism replace it by multiple histories.

The postmodernist believe history is the story of winner. As Peter Widowson regards “ historiographic study to examine how pervious and current [he]stories have been constructed both in term of method and their content”(78), Rushdie also used historiographic metafiction to explorers on the religion narrative formation in his fictional work *The Satanic Verses*. Rushdie opines the possibility of alternative version of Qur’ranic study though it is defining as ‘satanic verses’ by the power possessor. Drawing Gibreel to the fictional Islamic world parallel to existing Islamic history, Rushdie exposes the unreliability of one liner history. Therefore, there is no compulsion to stick around single narrative. In many places the narrator leaves the reader to open their susceptible faculty to look at any fundamentalist notion of knowledge, as Gibreel does by using his fragile but creative imagination. The setting of the novel puzzling the reader in a way that it intermixes past history of Islam to the present context. This mixture is one way to alteration of existing ideology to fit it into present context which is the job of literary fiction. Most of the important events in novel, happened only in the Gibreel dreams while real story moves sordidly unremarkable hints reader to trigger their imagination because whatever presented in glorious manner mixes more imagination than fact.

Rushdie also presents the issue of hybridity as unavoidable form of multicultural scenario. And in this present immigrant world people could not stick towards any

orthodoxy. Rushdie provides the only way to overcome from this 'mélange, hotchpotch' circumstance is individual power of imagination or dream. To convert the world into live worthy one has to modify, intermixes and rewrite all the official version of history into multiple version in a way it suits the present world. Official version select only those events which serves their authority as Mahound excludes three pagan ditties form Qur'ran by declaring them as 'satanic verses'. The radical revolution of two main character Gibreel and Saladin shows the complicated situation of individual identity in society. And this situation is the effect of singular dogma that exists in history in religion.

Rushdie in the novel, shows the Gibreel emphasizes the dreamy nature of history by presenting him through the memory of unknown narrator. Gibreel's dream is his potential though destructive but revolutionary to challenge all homogenous dogmas. His uncontrolled imagination drives him mad and suicidal in the end but it also provides the power of radical imagination to liberate oneself from the historical burden. Religion become strong official history that needs ardent desire to challenge it as Gibreel does. Human artifact could never goes beyond the ideology in which it is written. As Gibreel encounter himself on the situation where he finds Mahound less prophet and more businessman. As Hutcheon remarks historiographic metafiction is not to deny history but to find the fictional entities from it, the novel carry both historical as well as political one. In a sense, it is a version of Qur'ranic history which itself unreliable. By mixing fact with fiction Rushdie takes out such fictional incident from the Islamic history which is worthwhile to probe in. novel seems nothing to do with the creed of any community but only to show imagination as unrestrained energy of human being that cannot be excluded from any incident.

As Linda Hutcheon claim the postmodern literature tries to rewrite or represent the past in history and in fiction so that it can open it to the present, salman Rushdie does the same thing in *The Satanic Verses*. All the ideological formation, imaginative indulgence and narrative focalization exposed and expressed well through out the novel. Novel, once again proved literature as creative genre; strip out all the motives behind the existing artifact that other genre still hide. Every artifact has its own ideological centrality so history and literature both tries to fulfill its own motives. So, novel by intermixes fact with fiction blurring the boundary between history and fiction.

### Works Cited

- Abrams, M .H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Hartcourt, Inc, 2000.
- Adams, Hazard, ed. *Critical Theory since Plato*. Rev ed. New York: Hartcourt, 1992.
- Appignanesi, Lisa Maitland, eds. *The Rushdie File*. London: Fourth Estate, 1989.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*. Trans. S. H. Butcher. Adams, 55-66.
- Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to The Theory of Narration*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press,1997.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. *A Universal History of Inamy*. Trans. Norman Thomas di Giovanni, Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1975.
- Collingwood. R.G. *The Idea of History*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York : Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Hume, David. *A Dialogue Concerning Natural Religion*. London: penguin,1983.
- Hungerford, Amy. "Memorizing Memory." *The Yale Journal of Criticism* Vol 14. New York: Yale University and John Hopkins University Press, 2001: 67-92.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *The Politics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. London: Ruthledge, 1998.
- . *Histriographic Metafiction:Parody and the Intertextuality and Contemorary American Fiction*. eds. Patric O' Donnel and Robert Con Davis. Beltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1989.
- James, Henry. 'The Turn of the Screw' *The Aspern Paper and The Turn of The Screw*. London: Penguin, 1998: 145-262.

- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London: Verso, 1991.
- Jenkins, Keith. *Re-thinking History*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- . *Postmodern History Reader and Why History*. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Margalit, Avishai. *The Ethics of Memory*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- . *The Decent Society*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Massachusetts : Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Midnight's Children*. London: Vintage, 1995.
- . *Imaginary Homelands: Essay and Criticism 1981-1991*. New York: Granta Books, 1991.
- Ruthven, Malise. *A Satanic Affair: Salman Rushdie and the Rage of Islam*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1990.
- Taine, Hippolyte, "History of English Literature." Trans. Henry Van Laun. Adams: 608-620.
- White, Hayden. "Historical Text as Literary Artifact." *Critical Theory since 1965*. Tallaharraeee: Florida University Press, 1966: 398-401.
- Wood, Tim. "Mending the Skin of Memory." *Ethics and History in Contemporary Narrative*. London: University of Wales Press, 1998: 339-348.