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Abstract

Spaces constructed in Salman Rushdie’s novels have become a special focus for critics to contextualize the representations of space as an important dimension of perceiving and understanding the contemporary world and of creating new meanings in social life, as an echo to the spatial turn in literary and cultural studies, and in particular to the deterioration of the living space of human beings in the modern world. Interrogating the significances of space and spatiality in Rushdie’s novels can be carried out based on such formulations of spatial concepts as social space by Henri Lefebvre, Thirdspace by Edward W. Soja, heterotopia by Michel Foucault, walking as a means of resistance by Michel de Certeau, spaces as scapes by Arjun Appadurai, liminal space and hybridity by Homi K. Bhabha, chronotope by Mikhail M. Bakhtin, etc. This interdisciplinary approach to spatial inquiry, combined with insightful spatial theories, helps better understand how imperative it is to read space in Salman Rushdie’s novels, and helps expand spatial thinking more broadly and intensively to embrace sociopolitical, sociocultural, sociohistorical, sociolinguistic or more diversified perspectives, specifically to connect space with the workings of power, ideology and discipline, and in relation to phenomena such as social exclusion, marginalization, alienation, hybridization, resistance, etc., paradigms taken into consideration in colonial and postcolonial critiques. This paper aims to bring forth some constructive insights in its own ways to look into the spatial configurations of contemporary world, hoping to shed light on the tensions of competing for spaces that currently prevalent across the globe.
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Epistemologically, space and time have been known as two essential dimensions for humans to perceive knowledge and to acquire a picture of the world. Philosophically, space and time are the two fundamental existing forms of matter, the coordinates of objects. However, with the rise of historicism under modern capitalism, space was compelled to steadily make way for time in the modern consciousness, a phenomenon that brings out the notion of time-space compression during the industrial revolution. Historical thought linearized time and peripheralized space by positing the existence of degrees of temporal progress, an attempt to define the past as a chain of progressive, inexorable events advancing to the present. Yet, since the late twentieth century, human geography has undergone a profound transformation conceptually and methodologically and gradually developed into one of the most influential, innovative and dynamic fields of the humanities and social sciences. With the revival of scholarship in geography, the
reassertion of space has increasingly become a tendency in modern consciousness and scholars in several disciplines tend to take space as a dramatic new means to analyse their own areas, a phenomenon that corresponds to the concomitant recognition that space is every bit as important as time in the construction and transformation of social life. A seminal essay by Michel Foucault declares that, “In any case I believe that the anxiety of our era has to do fundamentally with space, no doubt a great deal more than with time.” (Foucault and Miskowiec) Increasingly, the shift has come to embrace much broader transformations in the economy, politics and culture of the contemporary world and also entails a profound transformation in human identity and subjectivity, all of which helps to offer a richer and more contextualized understanding of the different histories of human subjects, the construction of human relations, the production of cultural phenomena, etc. The spatial turn in literature and cultural studies was advanced by Michel Foucault who pointed out that while space had been substituted for time as an emerging category of analysis, thinking space has to become the primary category for critical analysis in the areas of literary and cultural studies.

As an important contemporary British Indian writer and a representative figure in post-colonial literature, Salman Rushdie sets themes of his writings on nationalism, multiculturalism, dualism, migration, exile, diaspora, etc., and the formulations of motifs on the immigration experience, cultural clash, identity crisis and hybridity reflects Rushdie’s own experience of and contemplation on the identity problems of South Asian immigrants in the West. Rushdie represents a variety of places to dramatically map human living conditions in the contemporary world in his fiction – places like Jahilia, Sikri, Florence, Bombay, Karachi, London, New York, Los Angeles, etc. These places function as essential elements in Rushdie’s artistic oeuvre and have recently attracted critical attention from some scholars who have taken in new sources drawing from the emerging interdisciplinary scholarship on space. Building on the new insights provided by the spatial turn in the humanities, this paper proposes a ‘spatial imperative’, the absolute need to look at various kinds of spaces constructed in Rushdie’s novels, especially in *Midnight’s Children* (1981), *The Satanic Verses* (1988), *The Moor’s Last Sigh* (1995), and *The Enchantress of Florence* (2008).

Taking an interdisciplinary approach and building upon theories brought forth by spatial thinkers like Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, Edward Soja, Michel de Certeau and Arjun Appadurai, Homi K. Bhabha, Mikhail M. Bakhtin, etc., this paper seeks to make new understandings of the construction of space in Rushdie’s fiction. Accordingly, it proposes that the following points need to be looked into to scrutinize how Salman Rushdie represents space in his novels. Firstly, how space is dealt with, not as abstraction from above, but as a lived negotiation, where through one’s own lived body, one interacts with space, lives space, experiences space to construct that space, as elaborated in Michel de Certeau’s theorization of walking in the city. Secondly, these lived spaces in Salman Rushdie’s novels are often other/othered spaces, spaces that lie outside social norms, spaces of marginalization, of incarceration, as stated in Michel Foucault’s theory of heterotopia. Thirdly, the normative space and the other/othered space are in Salman Rushdie’s novels not two spaces that do not intersect, but are spaces that have in between them interstitial spaces, liminal spaces, where there is hybridization and negotiation, much like Edward Soja’s and Homi Bhabha’s theories of Thirdspace. Fourthly, in these negotiations, in the thirspace, the immigrant subjects in Salman Rushdie’s novels generate representations of these spaces as scapes, like in Arjun Appadurai’s theorization of how immigrant diasporic communities negotiate space as scapes. Fifthly, this is how space is produced
in Salman Rushdie’s novels, not as a fixed entity, but as something that is socially produced, as in Henri Lefebvre’s theory of the same. Lastly, that how the configurations of time and space are represented in language and literature serves as a means to define genre and generic distinctions in literary criticism, as elaborated in the term chronotope by Mikhail M. Bakhtin in his seminal essay “Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel”. What’s more, in the literary artistic expressions, the chronotope also shows how different literary genres employ different configurations of time and space, which endows each genre with its particular narrative character.

To sum up these theoretical concerns, the need that this paper articulates is for an exploration into the following questions in Salman Rushdie’s novels. How is space socially produced in them, as observable in the light of Henri Lefebvre’s idea of social production of space? How is space constructed and endowed with new meanings in these novels through the characters’ interactions with the places where they carry out their own businesses, as analyzed from the perspective of Michel de Certeau’s theorization of “Walking in the City”? How is other/othered space produced in these texts, which is seen not to follow the normal social norms, but conversely transgresses the dominant rules of games, as considered in view of Michel Foucault’s theory of heterotopia? How is marginalized space produced in these novels, as opposed to dominant and central space, as drawn from Edward Soja’s and Homi Bhabha’s theoretical postulations of Thirdspace? And finally, how is liminal space produced in them to enable hybridity to flourish in immigrant diasporic communities, as echoed in Arjun Appadurai’s theoretical thinking of space in his writings?

Literary criticism has a century-long history of approaching the spatial turn as an important perspective in the investigation and exploration of literary texts. Since geography became the basis of the narrative form in the late nineteenth century, scholars have tended to focus on the social and imaginary elements of space in their studies. David Harvey and Henry Lefebvre inject social theory, specifically Marxism, into the re-evaluation of space and spatiality in social thought in their foundational works. The 1980s witnessed strong Marxist influence in literary studies of space. Edward Soja in his work Postmodern Geographies emphasized that delving into spatial relations can shed new light on the complexity and materiality which are hidden in narratives. Foucauldian and Marxist scholars argue that human experience of space is always mediated by human relations with the world, a view that emphasizes the materiality of space which was often experienced by humans temporally through a set of beliefs and practices. Edward Said’s theorizations have influenced broad fields of spatial scholarship by offering a fundamental way for scholars to think geographic otherness historically. In his theoretical conception, Said also brings forth the mapping strategy which constitutes forces of oppression on the colony, the post-colony and the so-called developing world. It was Doreen Massey who initiated the possibility of a gendered study of space. She gives definitions to time and space as masculine and feminine respectively. The way in which she thinks of space and gender and of space-time in literary studies aims to reveal that temporal experiences of humans are centrally and inescapably implicated in human understandings of space. She notes that meaning was constantly constructed and renegotiated out of the contestatory interrelationships of time-space, and places were part of those meanings. Spatial literary studies have been primarily concerned with issues related to how literature helps to understand space which is taken as setting to unfold the plot, how literature helps to shape the understanding of space, and more importantly how it helps to construct new understandings through its intervention in culture.
This paper suggests, in following this spatial turn in literary criticism, that there is a need to foreground the significance of space as playing a pivotal role in Rushdie's novels. The need is to practically interpret how Rushdie represents a plethora of varying and changing spaces in his narratives. The need is to contextualize Rushdie’s representations of different kinds of spaces and to show how he depicts the interactions between his characters and the spaces in which they play out their roles. As Rushdie represents various spaces explicitly and implicitly in his fictional writing, which act as indispensable settings for his characters to unfold their stories, by approaching an interdisciplinary spatial theoretical apparatus drawing on the key theoretical postulations on the field by different spatial thinkers from a variety of disciplines that range from geography to urban sociology, from literature to cultural studies as methodology, this paper proposes to offer the absolute necessity for a multidisciplinary and multi-dimensional overview on the social cultural construction of spaces and their special significance in Rushdie’s novels.

It may be worthwhile to first signpost some important theoretical concepts mentioned earlier in understanding space. The term ‘heterotopia’ was coined by the French thinker Michel Foucault. Etymologically, the prefix hetero- is derived from ancient Greek heteros which means other, another, different, and is combined with the Greek morpheme topos which carries the meaning of place. As such, heterotopia means ‘other place’. Foucault outlined the notion of heterotopia on three occasions between 1966-1967: first, in the preface to his book *The Order of Things*: published in 1966; second, in a radio talk functioned as part of a series on the theme of utopia and literature; and finally in a better-known lecture presented to a group of architects in Paris in March 1967, which is regarded as the most well-known explanation of the term. The published lecture, “Des Espaces Autres”, has been translated into English twice: the first is entitled “Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias”, while the second as “Different Spaces”. In Foucault’s elaboration, heterotopia refers to places such as ships, cemeteries, brothels, prisons, asylums, gardens of antiquity, holiday villages, Turkish baths, and many more. Foucault illustrates many possible types of heterotopic places or spaces, to be classified as follows: heterotopia of crisis like boarding schools or motel rooms; heterotopia of deviation, for example, institutions like hospitals, asylums, prisons, rest houses, cemeteries, within which individuals whose behaviours do not follow the normal social norms or rules are placed; heterotopia as gardens which are basically real places and juxtapose many layers of different spaces; heterotopia of ritual or purification like saunas or hammams which are isolated and penetrable yet not freely accessible; heterotopia of illusion; and heterotopia of compensation. The concept of heterotopia also appears in the research of many other scholars who use the term in a postmodernist context to understand the emergence of differences in terms of culture, society, politics and economy, and of identity and identification, which are taken as central issues in larger multicultural cities. Theorists like David Harvey convey interests in the matter of class domination as the central determinant of social heteronomy. Edward Soja focuses on the concept to examine urban spaces in writing his monumental work *Thirdspace*, through having a dialogue with the works of Henri Lefebvre.

Originally published in French in 1980 and translated into English in 1984, Michel de Certeau’s book *The Practice of Everyday Life* has played an important role in the field of cultural studies, as well as in the intersecting fields of cultural geography and urban studies. In particular, his chapter on “Walking in the City” has shed light on understanding some key terms such as power, body-subject relations, urban practices, resistance, and
the like. More importantly, the theoretical reflections concentrated around “Walking in the City” have offered new kinds of theoretical frameworks for understanding the temporal and spatial operations of popular culture in recent years. As de Certeau argues, to understand urban life is not to stand on the top of the tallest building, out of the city’s grasp, and to look down at the objective totality of the city, like the way in which cartographers use in map-making. But rather, de Certeau prefers, as he asserts, walking in the city instead of viewing it. He argues that walking in the city has its own rhetoric. As the pedestrians of the city move about and write their experience of subjective use of the urban space, walking as an act of enunciation constitutes a sort of language which speaks about the city and takes part in creating its meanings. While walking in the city in his own style as a mode of understanding the urban space, the pedestrian brings new meanings to places and streets which are not the same as those they are already imbued with.

Henri Lefebvre dedicated a great deal of his philosophical writings to discussing the importance of the production of space, in particular that of the social production of social space. His book *The Production of Space* (1974) is often cited as a blueprint for understanding key terms in the spatial studies repertoire such as spatialization, spatiality, domination, power. In this work Henri Lefebvre introduces the concept of the social production of social space. Lefebvre holds that there are different modes of production of space in what he calls spatialization. In his elaboration of the term spatialization, Lefebvre contends that from natural space to more complex spaces the meanings are produced in a social way. Lefebvre’s central argument in *The Production of Space* is about the social production of social space. Specifically, space is socially produced, a social product that is extremely a complex social construction which inevitably affects the modes of spatial practices and perceptions. It is worth noting that in the course of his analysis Lefebvre’s concerns shift from the production in the space to the production of the space. Lefebvre’s discussion encompasses a variety of and a multiplicity of spaces that are socially produced and made productive in social practices, and his focus is on the contradictory, the conflictual and ultimately the political character of the processes of production of space. Moreover, as Lefebvre suggests, space can be understood not only as a concrete, material object, but also as an ideological, lived and subjective one.

Known as one of the world’s leading spatial theorists, Edward Soja has been recognized for having made great contribution to spatial theory and to the field of cultural geography. In reading of Henri Lefebvre’s social production of social space and Michel Foucault’s concept of heterotopia, and at the same time synthesizing these theories with the work of postcolonial thinkers such as Gayatri Chakravotry Spivak, bell hooks, Edward Said and Homi K. Bhabha, Soja develops a theory of Thirdspace and conceptualizes it within the social sciences and from the perspective of critical urban theory. In addition, Soja constructs his own concept of spatial trialectics as spatiality-historicality-sociality in dialogue with Henri Lefebvre’s concept of a spatial triad which is expressed as spatial practice, representations of space and space of representations. Soja defines Thirdspace as an-Other way of understanding and acting to change the spatiality of human life. As Soja put it, in his Thirdspace everything comes together – subjectivity and objectivity, the abstract and the concrete, the real and the imagined, and much more – which reveals the binary opposition of the existence in space, and significantly, thirding is the point that Soja is dedicated to focusing on. Soja asserts that Thirdspace is a radically inclusive concept which embraces epistemology, ontology and historicity and which is in continuous movement, aiming to go beyond dualism and move toward an-Other. It is in
this light that, according to Soja, the thirdspace produces the so-called cumulative trialetics which is radically open to additional otherness, to a continuous expansion of spatial knowledge. Soja goes further to claim that thirdspace is such an extraordinary conception that it is in ceaseless expansion to include the an-Other, making possible the contention and re-negotiation of boundaries and cultural identity. In this way Soja closely resembles Homi K. Bhabha’s Third Space Theory. In Bhabha’s formulation, the Third Space Theory is a postcolonial socio-linguistic theory as related to identity and community, and achieved by means of language or education. The theory is used to expound the peculiar characteristics of every individual, actor or context which is in the state of hybridity. Bhabha explains that in the third space all forms of cultural hybridity flourish, a movement that tends to take the place of the history that constitutes it and ultimately gives rise to new structures of authority, new political forms. And more significantly, along with the flourishing of cultural hybridity, there is generated a series of things that appear to be different, new and unrecognizable, which constitute a new area for the negotiation of meaning and representation.

In his famous article “Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy”, Arjun Appadurai argues that the central problem of current globalization is the tension between homogenization and heterogenization in terms of culture. Appadurai relates the argument of homogenization caused by globalization to the argument about Americanization or commoditization, and more often than not the two arguments are closely linked to one another. Appadurai points out that what has not been taken into consideration is that the various cultural elements which have been brought into new society from different metropolises under the drive of globalization would be indigenized to the local culture in one way or another. Appadurai goes on to claim that the complexity of modern day global economy is inevitably connected with the disjuncture of these three sections: economy, culture and politics. He addresses these phenomena by theorizing them with the aid of five conceptual dimensions, in Appadurai’s word five ‘scapes’, of global culture: they are ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, financescapes and ideoscapes. Appadurai explains that the common suffix ‘scape’ is used to indicate the fluid, irregular shapes of these landscapes which deeply characterize international capital. The term ethnoscape is meant to illustrate the moving groups of peoples consisting of tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, etc., who constitute a shifting world. In the term technoscape, Appadurai means that the global configuration of technology which is in an ever fluid state, moves at radically high speeds across various previously impenetrable boundaries. By financescape, Appadurai refers to the disposition of global capital which is developing at rapid speed and becoming increasingly mysterious and a difficult landscape to follow. Mediascapes are the representations of parts of reality which tend to be image-centered and narrative-based. Ideoscapes consist of various kinds of images which go directly to the political and most often are tied with the ideologies of states and the counter-ideologies of movements intended to capture state power or parts of it. Appadurai points out that the growing movement of these scapes globally is to be carried out with the growing deep disjuncture among them. The flow of people, technology, funds, media and ideas is happening in changing and conflicting forms. According to Appadurai, one of the prominent features of this phenomenon is the state of deterritorialization.

The idea of space, as specifically articulated in Salman Rushdie’s novels, has also been studied by many scholars. The article “The Production of Alternative Spaces: Walking in the City in Salman Rushdie’s Novels” by Madhumita Roy and Anjali Gera Roy aims to
examine how alternative global spaces are produced in Rushdie’s novels. It takes de Certeau’s “Walking in the City” as its theoretical ground. Based on de Certeau’s assertion that walking should be taken as a mode of resistance, the article claims that Rushdie in his fiction also uses the trope of walking in the city as an altered act of resistance. In accordance with de Certeau’s theory, which brings forth the concept of a modified walker who obscures the distinction between the subject and the object and intensifies an inclusive approach to the construction of otherness in the pursuit of self-fashioning, the article presents walking as an exercise in Rushdie’s writings, serving to deconstruct the autonomous bodies of walkers in their encounter with new experiences of physical cities, and argues that this is in line with post-anthropocentric discourses of walking. The article ends with the argument that the fracturing of the autonomous bodies of walkers results from a modified body politics and is connected to immigrants from the Global South, instead of the walkers of the Global North.

Cristina Sandru’s paper “Words and Worlds: The Heterotopian Spaces of Rushdie’s Fiction” examines the role of art and imagination in Rushdie’s fiction as the potential and exclusive realm in which the third in-between space can be expressed and negotiated. The paper, taking as the objects of analysis three of Rushdie’s novels – Midnight’s Children, The Ground beneath Her Feet, and Fury – aims to unveil how Rushdie, in his writing of fiction, mimics fashionable and critical discourses in order either to subvert them or to surpass their trite nature to reveal the potential of a renewed imagination. The argument mainly focuses on the heterotopian spaces of contemporary production, with an attempt to trace the master trope used for suggesting new cultural conditions which function as a potent, metaphorical presence in Rushdie’s novels, helping to construct the figurative language of the urban space in different ways. It argues that the alternative imaginative space plays out a variety of forms from one novel to the other, which corresponds to Rushdie’s unconventional fictional narratives ranging from concerns about historical memory in Midnight’s Children to sinuous workings of the culture industry in The Ground beneath Her Feet and Fury. As its title hints, the paper emphasizes the figurative language pervasive in Rushdie’s fictional creations and the tropological worlds he creates by dint of his language.

Indrani Datta’s paper “About ‘Hybrid’ Identities and Interstitial Spaces: A Reading of Salman Rushdie’s The Moor’s Last Sigh and The Enchantress of Florence” takes Rushdie’s novels as case studies to explore into the possibilities of developing an alternate critical discourse relevant to post-independence Indian writing in English by diasporic authors. By quoting Rushdie’s statement “the broken mirror may actually be as valuable as the one supposedly unflawed”, the paper argues that Indian literature by diasporic writers are as real and significant as those written by Indian writers at home. It also claims that Rushdie’s viewpoint offers an interesting alternative to the existing definitions of Indian writing in English by diasporic authors. Its argument is primarily concerned with the context of displacement, dislocation and transnationalization of cultures, with a focus on Rushdie’s representative works which sketch a new world geography and re-evaluate national and cultural identity. Through an in-depth critical reading of the two novels, it observes that Rushdie’s portrayal of the self-fashioning of the protagonists of the novels contributes to the formation of hybridity and shows a new trajectory which poses a challenge to the traditional definitions of identity passed down from the nation state. The paper also points out that Rushdie’s narrative presents a unique space in which dialogues between cultures, nations and their peoples can be carried on and achieve possible outcome with a certain critical vibrancy and insight.
Based on the theory of domestic space, Sara Upstone in her article “Domesticity in Magical-Realist Postcolonial Fiction: Reversals of Representation in Salman Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children*” notes that the traditional patriarchal division of public and private spheres gives rise to the colonial discourse in contemporary critical analysis which stresses on the representation of private and public space as of intimacy and exposure respectively. Upstone continues to argue that a critical awareness helps to illustrate that colonialism cannot be understood only in terms of public structures such as the nation or the city, but must also take into consideration the functions of the private lives of both the colonizer and the colonized in its construction. Her argument mainly focuses on representation of domestic space – a concept which is associated with specific spaces such as the home. Upstone is interested in distinguishing colonial representations of the home from that in postcolonial discourses. She holds that colonial discourse analysis usually reads home as a site of power contestation, while postcolonial critics focus on home as a site of resistance with a radical political dimension. Following a comprehensive theoretical discussion, Upstone uses Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children* to indicate postcolonial authors’ concerns with the principles of spatiality, issues related to the domestic space and their implications in the colonial context. Through a close reading of Rushdie’s novels combined with the theory of domestic sphere, Upstone brings forth the idea of home metaphorically in the postcolonial novels’ focus which is at the same time distinguished from the colonial home, while also suggesting two opposing representations of domestic space: the dwelling of the postcolonial novels and the home as a force of colonization.

In his paper “Changing Spaces: Salman Rushdie’s Mapping of Post-Colonial Territories”, Frederic Tygstrup focuses on the settings of Rushdie’s novels. Tygstrup states that as a true representative of postcolonial literature, Rushdie in his fiction deals with both national and international themes, and the settings in his novels span across a variety of places ranging from his homeland in the subcontinent, such as India, Kashmir, Pakistan and Bangladesh, to locations outside Asia like England, USA or South America. As such, Tygstrup asserts that the vast space embedded in Rushdie’s writings to some extent manifests the predicaments of intensified global exchange. Based on Rushdie’s favourite themes such as multiculturalism, migration, exile, diaspora, etc., Tygstrup is interested in exploring the encounters of the immigrant figures when they are caught up in between different social and cultural settings, between the roots and the ramifications of different historical genealogies. Tygstrup attempts to map the territorial structure, human space and life form resulted by the forces of immigration which is presented as the bodily presence of the migrant characters. His argument is primarily concerned with the interactions between the immigrants’ lives and the spaces they live in. Tygstrup suggests that the lives of the immigrants which unfold in the new spaces would inevitably undergo radical change, and meanwhile the spaces in which the histories of the migrants’ lives take place would have been changed substantially as well, in the process of the self-fashioning of the immigrants.

It has been observed that Salman Rushdie involves a number of real cities in his fictional creation, such as Jahilia, Sikri, Florence, Bombay, Karachi, London, New York and Los Angeles. In so doing, Rushdie intends to unveil the contemporary urban condition so as to offer a perspective for the understanding of the contemporary global situation. This is exactly the significance of the cities in Rushdie’s artistic oeuvre. Even though cities play a critical role in Rushdie’s works, till recently they have not yet drawn sufficient attention in literary studies. To address this lacuna, Madhumita Roy, in her paper “Rethinking the
Global Urban Space in Salman Rushdie’s Novels”, takes into account the cities in Rushdie’s novels and aims to uncover an alternative global space in them, through approaching emerging interdisciplinary research on cities, and taking references from the multidisciplinary spatial turn in humanities and social sciences. Drawing on copious spatial theories from key spatial thinkers like Henri Lefebvre, Edward Soja, Dorren Massey, Pierre Nora, Michel de Certeau, Nigel Thrift, Rosi Braidotti, the paper aims at rethinking the notion of global cities as strategic territories by practically interpreting Rushdie’s texts. Accordingly, Roy presents her postulations in two ways. Firstly, building on Edward Soja’s concept of synekism and combining it with Saskia Sassen’s concept of the global city, Roy in her analysis adopts a diachronic perspective on globalization in Rushdie’s novels. Secondly, her argument, by taking reference from the criticism of twenty-first century global cities in Rushdie’s fiction, focuses on the new understanding of cities of the global south and the alternative cities constructed out of cities in the global north through unprecedented volumes of postcolonial migration, which in Roy’s own expression, is from the city to the domestic sphere – that frequently refers to the home, and even to the micro level of the body.

The paper “Enabling Spaces and the Architecture of Hybridity in Salman Rushdie’s The Enchantress of Florence” by Nicole Weickgenannt Thiara begins its analysis with an emphasis on the special significance of Mughal India, in particular the Mughal ruler Akbar’s reign, which is described in Indian historiography as an important historical period during which cultural intermingling had been in full swing. Based on the fact that Rushdie set his novel The Enchantress of Florence in Emperor Akbar’s reign in sixteenth-century India and Akbar’s city Fatehpur Sikri plays a pivotal role in the story, Thiara’s debate is associated with such concepts as hybridity, space, architecture, etc., which are implicated in Rushdie’s narrative. Her central argument actually focuses on how Rushdie portrays the mutually constituting relationship between cultural hybridity and the spaces which provide such hybridity an arena to unfold. Thiara particularly suggests that the term hybridity involved in her analysis be a malleable and open concept so that all forms of cultural intermingling can be encompassed. Her interpretation draws on elements of Mughal architecture and aesthetics which are represented in the narrative style and structure of the novel to show how these spatial models offer a perspective for Rushdie to explore a new form of hybridity which is also called Mughal hybridity in Thiara’s words and which is very different from the hybridity Rushdie proposed in his earlier works. To be specific, Thiara asserts that Mughal synthesis is ascribed as an elite endeavor to be represented as a more considered and planned hybridity while the hybridity he championed in his earlier novels is an experiment with unruly, chaotic and vibrant nature. In the final section, the paper analyzes the gendered implications of the spatial design of the novel, with a clear reference to an enabling space constructed by the female character Qara Koz. Thiara argues that Rushdie’s representations of certain places, in particular Fatehpur Sikri, transform these places into spaces which enable the encounter of cultures and the mixing and fusion of cultural traditions.

The exploration of the concept of home lies at the heart of the analysis in the article “Home as the Unhomely in Salman Rushdie’s Midnight’s Children” by Dilek Ozturk-Yagci. In the first place the author looks into the changing roles of the notion of home within contexts related to postcolonial theory, diaspora, multiculturalism and nationalism. Ozturk-Yagci’s claim indicates that over the years the word ‘home’ has undergone a number of changes and has become a term that does not respond to its traditional roles
as shelter, safety, security, support, peace, belonging, but has received more negative implications as a site of dissolution, danger, fear, exclusion, interference, etc. Drawing theoretical strengths from key theoreticians of post-colonial studies, Ozturk-Yagci explores issues related to the changes exemplified in *Midnight’s Children*, in particular the revisions that the term ‘home’ undergoes. Such variances, as she argues, indicate that the reference of the word has shifted from its traditional connotations as located, fixed, safe, shielded, stable to become open to more diverse and dynamic sense as fluid and subversive. Her assertion that the word ‘home’ in its narrowest sense refers to the private domestic sphere while in its most intrinsic engagement it is referred to in its relation to the public, the nation and the empire serves to elevate her concern of home from the interpersonal family level to the level of power struggles at the national communal stage. In this sense home is taken as a place from which the characters perform their roles while expecting to navigate with smoothness and ease around the colonial and postcolonial situation in their own ways. Considered in the light of such views, she aims to suggest that home in *Midnight’s Children* serves as a promising site challenging the colonial power, a site of resistance, a place for power manifestation, but also at times a spot for disillusionment, as what is presented as home finally turns out to be unhomely. It further becomes a place where the characters through daily practices within the domestic space assert their identity and call for the manifestation of their subjecthood while at the same time attempting to subvert both the patriarchy of the familial and the tyranny colonial at their unhomely home.

Thus, a substantial number of scholars have studied the construction of space in Rushdie’s novels, and they probe from different perspectives into the spatial representations which Rushdie embeds in his fictional writing. These analyses revolve around such key words as alternative, heterotopian, interstitial, liminal, urban, hybridity, home, unhomely, resistance, etc., to interpret the formation in the novelistic spaces spatial practices which have varying implications for acts of writing. Although such a lot of work exists in the area, or may be precisely because of that, there is a further imperative to study the construction of space in the four novels of Rushdie mentioned earlier, and let me briefly discuss them one after the other to outline that scope.

*Midnight’s Children* is set in the context of India being liberated from British colonialism and becoming an independent country. It allegorically deals with actual historical events before, and primarily after, the independence and partition of India. The story is narrated by its chief protagonist Saleem Sinai who was born precisely at midnight 15 August 1947, the exact moment when India achieved its independence, and was partitioned. Hence, a space-based analysis of this novel will have to be based on the setting of the story – India’s transition from British colonialism to independence and the partition of British India into two different national territories. The analysis has to mainly focus on how the characters of the story struggle to live on under the new living spaces, to encounter issues of assimilation, alienation, loss, longing, and so forth. Moreover, a spatial study of this novel also has to present arguments on how, under such alternating historical situations and under the tension between combating forces, the fragmented subjects who lived through these different forms of realities and were divided between their spatial longing and the new cultural environments, carry out their engagements with the compelling new world and its spatial dynamics.

*The Satanic Verses* deals with the experience of the two protagonists named Gibreel Farishta and Saladin Chamcha. The story begins with their being spatially trapped in a hijacked plane flying from India to Britain, which leads to their being dropped on to the
alien space of Britain itself, and facing problems that confront all migrants. The dilemma of mediating between the two cultures, the one they are from and the one they get involved in, and they being aware of the fact that they are unable to break with their own culture on one hand, and join the new one on the other, leads them to becoming disillusioned with both. In fact, this is the dilemma of the author himself, who struggles to acquire a sense of identity in an alienated environment. Controversies about this novel notwithstanding, Rushdie himself claimed that this story is about migration, metamorphosis, love, death, etc., rather than the depiction of Islam. The transformation undertaken by the two protagonists Gibreel and Saladin brings changes in their physical appearances in angelic and satanic forms respectively, which implicitly suggests that every person has both angelic and satanic potential and has to struggle forever in the liminal part between the two, but also suggests the liminality of the immigrant experience, as one crosses spaces. Besides, the outbreak of the protagonist’s schizophrenia can be seen as the metaphorical representation of the divided selves that the characters confront when facing their alternate reality, partly due to the failure of multicultural integration and the frustrations of the migrant experience. Settings like the hijacked plane, the English Channel, the place that the two protagonists fall into after the explosion of the place, and England itself, are all spaces, and these become important elements for a discussion of this novel.

In *The Moor’s Last Sigh*, the protagonist Moraes, who is also called “Moor” throughout the story, is the narrator. It follows the trajectory of four generations of Moor’s family which traces his family’s beginning down through time to his whole lifetime, with a focus on those impacts that his family exerts upon him in the course of ups and downs of its history. Set in real places, specifically such Indian cities as Cochin and Bombay, the use of Rushdie’s technique of magical realism renders it possible to construct impossible episodes, for example, the representation of Moor’s exceptional body which appears to be aging more faster than that of a normal person, but the novel is irrevocably hinged to real time and spaces. The story is based on numerous real historical figures and events, encompassing the portrayal of specific details associated with the last king of Granada Boabdil and his famous surrendering known as Puerto del Suspiro del Moro (in English “Pass of the Moor’s Sigh”), from which the title of the book is taken, a chain of events in the history of India like the demolition of the Babri Masjid, the 1993 Bombay bombings, the gangster Dawood Ibrahim, etc., making the novel one that has to undergo concrete spatial analyses.

*The Enchantress of Florence* is claimed to be the most researched book amongst his works by Rushdie himself. The book consists of a succession of interweaving stories given out by the relations of various narrators and set in a variety of places. The setting of the story spans across vast areas in different continents, moving from the Mughal India under the reign of Emperor Akbar the Great to the city of Florence in the Renaissance period of Italy, amongst which the city Fatehpur Sikri, which was built up under the command of the ruler Akbar and served as the capital city of Mughal Empire, plays a special significance. Particularly, the hybrid Mughal architecture in Fatehpur Sikri is represented in detail by Rushdie and the aesthetic values they exemplify have been focused on. The cultural hybridity, which lies at the heart of this novel, is brought out through the elements of Mughal architecture and Mughal aesthetics, in particular focus on the palace complex in Fatehpur Sikri which serves as one of the most important settings in the novel. Rushdie’s representations of the Mughal emperor Akbar and the fictionalization of many historical places allows one to investigate into how these historical realities and spatial models
provide a means of exploring the hybridity of all forms of cultures. Although the story moves between continents, from the court of Akbar to Renaissance Florence interlacing history with fantasy and fable, a spatial study of the novel has to particularly contextualize Fatehpur Sikri, which holds, as Rushdie argues, a special significance, as it shows how spaces enable the encountering and confrontation of cultures and the mixing and intermingling of cultural traditions.

In the final analysis, one can argue how Rushdie represents a variety of spaces in his fiction, and in particular explores the interactions between the characters and the spaces within which they play out their lives, with a focus on the possible implications that those spaces exert on them. As is presented in the foregoing analysis, in his act of writing, Rushdie constructs a variety of concepts of spaces that are richly embedded with different layers of meanings, such as material space, abstract space, concrete space, contradictory space, cultural space, different space, dominant space, central space, living space, spiritual space, imagined space, political space, bodily space, social space, repressive space, ruling space, urban space, and many more, which are metaphorically depicted most often as othered space, marginalized space and socialized space in the light of the theoretical framework for such an analysis. This imperative for a theoretical reflection on space is undoubtedly of great importance and value in the context of a globalized world, within which space has undergone radical change and the reconstructing of the global space has become a prominent and inevitable tendency. Salman Rushdie's fiction implicitly reveals a series of intricate internal interlinks between literature and space, between the production of space and the production of social relations, political power, ideology and physical discipline. His writings demonstrate the struggles of individuals in a modern world which is contradictory, transient, occasional, changing and schismatic, and in which they become dislocated, rootless, alienated, estranged, but at the same time get opportunities to resist the repressive space, to change the hegemonic space, to seek the possibilities of creating a differential and enabling space, to turn space into scapes for their own use. Hence, what I call the ‘spatial imperative’, or the absolute need to read ‘space’ in Rushdie’s novels.

Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India
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Rushdie put off writing his story of the fatwa years until September, 2012, when Joseph Anton came out. The title is a conflation of the first names of two writers, Rushdie's favourite authors: Joseph after Joseph Conrad, and Anton after Anton Chekhov. Before being a title, this used to be Rushdie's pseudonym when he had to recede into a fictional character during the period he spent in hiding. Rushdie argues that in Joseph Anton he wrote about himself novelistically in the third person, putting Shame: A Novel [Rushdie, Salman] on Amazon.com. *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. Shame: A Novel. 

There can seldom have been so robust and baroque an incarnation of the political novel as Shame. It can be read as a fable, polemic, or excoriation; as history or as fiction. This is the novel as myth and as satire. 

Shame is and is not about Pakistan, that invented, imaginary country, a failure of the dreaming mind. Rushdie shows us with what fantasy our sort of history must now be written if, that is, we are to penetrate it, and perhaps even save it. 

- -Sunday Telegraph. 

- -The Guardian. 

Swift in Gulliverâ€™s Travels, Voltaire in Candide, Sterne in Tristram Shandy...Rushdie, it see A Novel. Salman Rushdie. For Zafar Rushdie, who, contrary to all expectations, was born in the afternoon. Introduction. Still, advertising taught me discipline, forcing me to learn how to get on with whatever task needed getting on with, and ever since those days I have treated my writing simply as a job to be done, refusing myself all (well, most) luxuries of artistic temperament. And it was at my desk at Ogilvy that I remember becoming worried that I didnâ€™t know what my new novel was to be called. All novels, Midnightâ€™s Children is a product of its moment in history, touched and shaped by its time in ways that its author cannot wholly know. I am very glad that it still seems like a book worth reading in this very different time. If it can pass the test of another generation or two, it may endure.