

Södertörns högskola | Institutionen för kultur och lärande
Kandidatuppsats 15 hp | Engelska | Vårterminen 2015

The Beauty and the Beast

- Magical Realism in Salman Rushdie's *Shame*

Av: Amina Afzal
Handledare: Kerstin Shands

Abstract

Mild psychological effects, such as sleep-deprivation, on an oppressed and tortured human being can be characterized as “normal”. However, *Shame* by Salman Rushdie uses magical realist style to describe the psychological effects of shame in a patriarchal society which is based on capitalistic class values. This essay will focus on the Marxist feminist reading of the novel with a psychoanalytical perspective which is going to help analyse the effects of the oppressed female characters, Bilquis Hyder, Sufiya Zinobia and Rani Harappa. The essay focuses on different incidents in the lives of these characters with the help of critics such as Aijaz Ahmad and Timothy Brennan. Both have written critically about Rushdie. This essay will discuss the different aspects of Marxism, feminism as well as psychoanalysis and connecting them to the novel, which would give the answers as to what shame can do to a person’s psyche. The Beauty and the Beast fairy-tale gets a different perception in this story, as Sufiya Zinobia is both the characters in one.

Keywords: Salman Rushdie, Shame, Aijaz Ahmad, Judith Butler, Heidi Hartman, Marxism, Feminism, the Beauty and the Beast, Psychoanalysis.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 4 |
| Previous Research | 6 |
| Theoretical Approach | 9 |
| The Significance of Shame in Women of <i>Shame</i> | 13 |
| Bilquis Hyder and Shame | 13 |
| Sufiya Zinobia and Shame | 18 |
| Rani Harappa and Shame | 25 |
| Conclusion | 28 |
| Works Cited | 31 |

Introduction

“Sharam, that’s the word. For which this paltry ‘shame’ is a wholly inadequate translation...A short word, but one containing encyclopaedias of nuance...

(Rushdie, *Shame* 39)

“Unreality is the only weapon with which reality can be smashed, so that it may subsequently be reconstructed”

(Rushdie, *Imaginary Homelands* 122)

The beauty and the beast is a fairy-tale that is known by most western and eastern readers alike. It is a story about a beautiful girl who happens to fall in love with a handsome prince who under a spell becomes a beast. Similarly, Salman Rushdie’s *Shame*, published in 1983 is about a beautiful girl who embodies shame in becoming a beast that murders men and animals and eats their insides.

Salman Rushdie is first and foremost known as a postcolonial writer who has written award-winning novels such as *Midnight’s Children* and *The Satanic Verses*. However, although there is a lot written about *Shame*, the publication of his novel *The Satanic Verses* in 1988 diverted the attention of critics of the world from his previous novel. Since *The Satanic Verses* contains sections that have been regarded as blasphemy, it created a great deal of controversy resulting in the Iranian leader Ruhollah Khomeini issuing a fatwa (death-sentence) against Rushdie. However, with the protection and help from the British Government, Rushdie was kept safe and hidden from the public.

Salman Rushdie has been seen as an excellent and smart writer, and critics reviewing *Shame* have felt that he is able to write with “a free-ranging imagination and a coarse, strong wit. He attacks language with energy and without constraint” (*The Independent*). He has won prestigious literary awards such as Man Booker Prize as well as being Knighted by Queen Elizabeth II for his services to the literary world, which furthermore created controversy in the Muslim world. Moreover, Rushdie has been known to write in a magical realist style which some critics have seen as an unconscious will to write critically about the real life events of his own personal life. *Midnight’s Children*, *Shame* and *The Satanic Verses* are examples of such novels that include his personal rejections and consciousness. These novels have also faced scrutiny by critics, and they have been banned in Muslim countries as well as India because of their straightforward and satirical approach to

religions and political regimes. However, other critics have defended Rushdie by claiming that such novels are fictional and should not be interpreted from a derogatory perspective.

Shame is a novel about three families, one peripheral and two active political families. The story is set in Q., Peccavistan. Rushdie has taken claim for being the narrator himself of the story (Reula 99). Although the two political families move around, the peripheral family of Omar Khayyam commutes between Q. and a small town, Nishapur. The story is based on the historical events in Pakistan during and after the Partition of Pakistan and India in 1947. The character of Raza Hyder is based on the former President of Pakistan, General Zia Ul Haq, whereas another character, Iskander Harappa, is the equivalent of the executed Prime Minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. The story circles around these two politicians' careers and lives as well as their wives, Bilquis Hyder and Rani Harappa. The first pair has a strong determination to have a son who could carry on the legacy of his military father. However, when this dream is crushed with the birth of Sufiya Zinobia, it turns their lives in a direction they themselves cannot comprehend. The story then revolves around their daughter, Sufiya, the ways in which she embodies shame, and her metamorphosis into a white panther. Iskander (Isky) Harappa is climbing the ladder of a successful political career but is crushed by the traitor Raza Hyder and his cousin Little Mir.

Rushdie's story is about shame and how the characteristic is found in all characters. This essay focuses on the characters that are affected the most by shame, that is, Bilquis, Rani and, of course, Sufiya Zinobia. Since the novel has been categorized by the author as a fairy-tale thus this leads to a feminist focus in the essay. Lois Tyson, whose theories will be discussed below, has stated in her book *Critical Theory Today* that patriarchal gender roles have been applied to most of the children's fairy-tales. In the *Beauty and the Beast*, the Beast controls the thoughts of the Beauty by leaving hidden messages to her in her dreams. This creates an image of a patriarchal man who controls and manipulates his way into Beauty's life. Tyson also contends that "patriarchal ideology suggests that there are only two identities a woman can have. If she accepts her traditional gender role and obeys the patriarchal rules, she's a "good girl"; if she doesn't, she's a "bad girl" (85). For these reason, the feminist perspective of *Shame* is necessary for this essay since even though Bilquis Hyder adopts a traditional submissive wife role, she still gets shunned by her husband because of her failure to produce a son.

Meanwhile, since most feminist readings of novels focus mainly on patriarchal society as a critical stance, this essay will turn to a different branch of feminist reading, namely Marxist criticism. Heidi I. Hartman defines Marxism as "a theory of the development

of class society” (173). Relating a theory of the class system with a feminist reading will give this essay its purpose of revealing the image conveyed by Rushdie in *Shame* of a psychologically insufficient female society. It has been noted by many critics that the patriarchal society has been largely linked to the class system of the capitalist philosophy. However, this essay will also draw on a different Marxist perspective, such as ideas about alienation.

There is a specific difference between a character created by an author and a human being. A human being creates his or her own space to feel and think about certain subjects in a certain manner. However, a character is itself a representation of what a human being has created with his or her imagination, giving the characters such characteristics which employ the thoughts of the writer. The difference between a character lies not only on the fictional style rather on the magical realist style which has been adapted by Rushdie in the novel *Shame*. The characters which are going to be analysed in this essay with a psychoanalytical perspective bear a significance on their own since these character represent certain views which could probably be the authors own approach to reality. By applying magical realism in the novel, Rushdie has been able to give certain attributes to the character which might not be logically true. For instance, Sufiya Zinobia resists patriarchy by becoming a Beast who murders and eats the insides of men and animals, something that is not possible in a real world.

To be able to find out what lies beneath the surface of the characters in *Shame* further, it is important to analyse the characters with the help of psychoanalysis. Since both patriarchal and class divisions can affect a person’s psyche, it is vital to also include a psychoanalytic reading. The central critical approach in this essay is therefore to rely on Marxist feminist and psychoanalytic theories to analyse the female characters with regards to what affect the element of shame can have on their psyches. This essay will explore different sub-categories of the two ideologies which will further be analysed in the context of some of the main incidents in *Shame*.

Previous research

As Salman Rushdie is one of the leading postcolonial writers today. There is much written about him. Critics have both defended him and been very critical of his approach to writing. As a novel written after his very famous and critically acclaimed novel, *Midnight’s Children*, his third novel (the first being *Grimus*), *Shame* has faced scrutiny for its way of writing and for its storyline. One critic, Aijaz Ahmad, has written a book entitled *In Theory: Classes*,

Nations, Literatures, in which he disapproves of Rushdie's writing and argues that parts of the story are written in a manner marked by both parody and burlesque. Although Ahmad praises these themes by stating that "both the parody and burlesque are at times delicious, inventive, hilarious" (141), he also believes that the approach of Rushdie where he assembles different themes into a historical perspective seems unclear and "excessive" and gives the reader a "Laughter that laughs, unfortunately, much too often" (Ahmad 141).

Ahmad's critical stance on Rushdie then is, very clear. Claiming that the diasporic feeling that Rushdie writes about in *Shame* is not justified, he suggests that the decadent class that Rushdie has "joined by origin" (Ahmad 139) has led to his perception of Pakistani society as only consisting of a "history of the corruptions and criminalistics of Pakistani rulers" (Ahmad 138). The way that Rushdie has portrayed the characters Raza Hyder and Iskander Harappa, who really are the equivalents of former Pakistani political leader, General Zia Ul Haq and Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto respectively, according to Ahmad, is not entirely justified. Ahmad believes that in real life, both Zia and Bhutto were not in fact "buffoons, but highly capable and calculating men whose cruelties were entirely methodical" (141).

Moreover, Ahmad finds that women's capacities are undermined in the novel. In his view, women are able to resist the social and historical pressures placed on them because of their gender, but he finds that Rushdie's idea of women in *Shame* is not really in agreement of this statement. He believes that although one of the main characters in *Shame*, Sufiya Zinobia, has been given the abilities to overthrow her wrongdoers, her parents have made her believe that she is shame and nothing else, since she was not born a boy. From Ahmad's perspective, this annihilation of Sufiya by her parents is seen as a "form of *physiological* insufficiency on *her* part" (145). Basically, Ahmad is saying that Rushdie, with the use of magical realism, has given Sufiya the power to destroy her parents while at the same time diminishing this power since her illness is the source of resistance.

Similarly, another critic, Timothy Brennan, believes that while Rushdie speaks about Pakistan, he gives it characteristics that are so explicitly exotic as to make him seem like an "imposter" and a "traitor" to his Pakistani readers (86). Brennan also claims that the historical aspects of *Shame* are only bitter remembrances of the past and that the comical theme that Rushdie adapts in the novel comes across as "hopeless mockery" and "humourless parody" (119). Brennan also asserts that the character Omar Khayyam Shakil is a reflection of Muhammad Iqbal, who was one of the founders of Pakistan. However, according to Brennan, this comparison of the former leader of Muslim League with the notorious Omar

Khayyam is entirely baseless as Iqbal returned from Europe with disgust for European culture which led to the building of Pakistan. In contrast, Omar Khayyam returns from Europe with “crates of cigars and pornographic magazines” (121).

Ultimately, Brennan concludes that; “*Shame* is simply meaner, seedier, a bad joke” (123). He claims that Rushdie’s feminist description of the female characters gives a powerful yet demeaning image of women in Pakistan. For this reason, Brennan quotes Thomas Lippman who states that “there is no issue that has more unfavourably influenced the Western image of Islam ... than the status of women” (126). What Lippman suggests is that a certain portrayal of Muslim women in novels that reach the Western audience reflects a certain image of Islam and its understanding of women. To this Aijaz Ahmad would agree by arguing that there exists a system of images of Muslim women that constitutes a “generalized *structure* of representation” (Ahmad 144).

Although feminist readings of *Shame* have led to many critical articles and books by major critics of postcolonial studies, critical responses to his novel generally have not focused on the psychoanalytical aspects of *Shame*. One famous Rushdie critic, Catherine Cundy, argues that Rushdie in two different interviews confuses the reader as to whether or not the novel is realistic. She states further that “similarly the setting for the novel is both ‘slightly fantasized’, while ‘behind the fantasized or mythologized country in the book there is a real country’” (45). From a psychoanalytical perspective, this interpretation is helpful in suggesting that *Shame* could be seen as a metaphorical novel charged with double meaning whereby Rushdie’s personal thoughts are seen snake through from time to time. As stated earlier, Rushdie was born in India but migrated to Pakistan along with his family. His critical stance on Pakistan is obvious in this novel, which gives the sense of a writer who is unconsciously rather than deliberately trying to write a satirical and demeaning image of this country.

In relation to the topic of representations of countries, Sara Suleri writes in her book *The Rhetoric of English India* that “the aura of shamefulness that Rushdie’s text exudes is intimately linked to its representation of censorship on both cultural and canonical levels. As a scarcely veiled allegory of the symbolic violence of historical process, *Shame* is from its inception a text that knows it will be banished from the culture that it represents” (175). Suleri seems to suggest that Rushdie’s subconscious views might not be so subliminal after all. She argues that by portraying of both the characters and the Pakistani society as misogynist, this became a method for which Rushdie was banned from the country. This suggests that Rushdie’s writing might not only contain psychoanalytical elements, but ideological

perceptions as well, which is very common in magical realist novels. Nonetheless, this essay will combine a Marxist feminist reading with a psychoanalytical perspective on *Shame* to find out whether Rushdie's characterisation has any connection to these theories.

Theoretical Approach

In *Scenes of Shame*, Joseph Adamson and Hilary Clark discuss shame in psychoanalytical context of literary works. The authors observe that whenever a person is subjected to devaluation on the basis of gender, race or physical disability the person internalizes this as a negative judgment which is when shame occurs in them (3). They propose to say that the devaluation and the disempowerment of a person do not go without notice in a person's conscious. The negativity works into the body and mind thus coming out from the body as a form of shame. The authors quote Joseph Lichtenberg who speaks about shame in relation to gender, stating that for many girls "a central injury is the trauma of inequality, of being valued less as a female from infancy on" (3). He interprets shame as an injury to the mind because of the inequality a woman suffers starting from birth. This insight relates also to the Freudian view which they quote "shame not so much to a need to hide and protect the genital but to conceal genital deficiency. Shame thus became 'a feminine characteristic par excellence'" (3). Freud's understanding on psychoanalysis is that females at a young age develop an envy of the penis, thus he means that for women, their need to conceal their genitals is not the issue of shame but it is so in not having any penis at all. In relation to this, Lois Tyson discusses psychoanalysis in her book *Critical Theory Today* where she states that the envy Freud speaks of should not be seen as a genital envy but of the power that comes from being a man who both attracts women and makes them envious.

In her book *Blush: Faces of Shame*, Elspeth Probyn quotes the psychologist Silvan Tomkins who believes that the interest in shame is mainly because "shame strikes deepest into the heart of man. ... Shame is felt as an inner torment, a sickness of the soul" (Probyn 14). Probyn further analyses this 'sickness of the soul' is an indication of breakdown in a person, where shame can have such effects as to cause such apprehensive measures. Probyn implies that the association between shame and women is so prevalent that it is often regarded as "common sense" (81). Probyn quotes another philosopher, Ullalina Lehtinen, who believes that the location of shame in women is not in "how women are wired but in the phenomenon of 'women's enduring, historically diverse, and multidimensional experiences of subordination'" (83). The assertion made here is that women have historically been experiencing the subordination to men whereby they have been oppressed and held back in

patriarchal societies. Since women and the element of shame has been connected for so long that it now seems a trivial matter since the link has been there for such a long time.

Furthermore, from a psychoanalytical perspective, Tyson defines act of projection as “ascribing our fear, problem, or guilty desire to someone else and then condemning him or her for it, in order to deny that we have it ourselves” (Tyson 15). Tyson believes that regression is the most complex forms of the defences of a person’s unconscious since it allows the unconscious to temporarily return to a previous psychological state where a person not only imagines it but also relives the situation. In this case, regression can occur in both pleasant and painful memories that a person might relive if he or she does not have the strength to cope with the present day issue. The subconscious of a man or a woman can get trapped in the past as a part of a regression act process, something that could lead to both positive and negative effects. This idea will be explored further in the essay.

Another aspect of psychoanalysis which Tyson brings up is the analysis by Jacques Lacan about the writing process where language is used to imply something which is not clearly stated, as the use of metaphors and metonymy. Metaphors can be used in writings to indicate that an object has different angles of interpretation and metonymy can be used “when an object associated with or part of another object is used as a stand-in for the whole object” (Tyson 29). That would mean that these elements in the writing process involve the absence of something that is intentionally not described. Tyson quotes Jacques Lacan who compares the method of metaphors to the unconscious process of condensation. Since condensation is “when we substitute a person or object for several dissimilar persons or objects, which are thus “brought together”” (29). These elements mean that the process of writing in which an author has an unconscious, he or she might create an object to refer to another issue which he or she might want to conceal. Tyson claims that this process always makes a substitution of objects, where something else might get pushed to the background. These arguments by Tyson and the fellow psychoanalytical critics will give this essay the purpose of a psychoanalytical perspective on the Marxist Feminist reading of *Shame*.

In her essay “Performative Acts and Gender Constitution,” Judith Butler gives an explanation of what feminist theory really is about, that is to “bring female specificity into visibility and to rewrite the history of culture in terms which acknowledge the presence, the influence, and the oppression of women” (Butler 523). The main aim of feminist theory would then be to bring change into the lives of women who are oppressed in their homes as well as to introduce equality in their respective societies. Butler also quotes Simone de Beauvoir who claims that “one is not born, but, rather, *becomes* a woman” (Butler 519).

However, contrary to what de Beauvoir claims, in *Shame*, Sufiya is already born a woman; she is a girl who embodies shame because of her gender. This interpretation of Sufiya will be developed further below.

Lois Tyson also writes about the patriarchal society which defines the traditional gender roles that are addressed to men and women. Typically, these gender roles would “cast women as emotional (irrational), weak, nurturing, and submissive” (Tyson 81). Women in patriarchal society have only been regarded as the mothers, wives or daughters of men to whom they are expected to be submissive and inferior. Tyson regards this alleged inferiority of women as a form of biological essentialism which means that the inferiority is inborn as a biological difference that remains an unchanged principle in men and women. This presumed inferiority of women in Pakistani society is clearly rehearsed in *Shame* since the female characters, especially Sufiya, are subjected to oppression in many forms by men.

In relation to this, Tyson also proposes that Marxist theory can provide guidance for an understanding of the socio-economic status of women. She states that patriarchal laws and customs have been used to keep women economically, politically, and socially undermined. Correlating Marxist and feminist theory, this essay will combine the two ideologies to further build a psychoanalytical understanding as to how Rushdie has given a lower social status to his women characters by making them emotionally unstable, thus portraying a small axis as to where women belong in patriarchal society.

Heidi I. Hartman, a leading Marxist feminist writer has written an essay entitled “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism.” She argues that these ideologies struggle against patriarchy and capitalism and include a fight for bringing equality into a society where women and men belong to different social classes that are treated fairly economically, politically and socially. Hartman defines patriarchy “as a set of social relations between men, which have a material base, and which, though hierarchical, establish or create interdependence and solidarity among men that enable them to dominate women” (177). She suggests that even though men are divided into different social classes, they still are united by the similar force of undermining and dominating women. Since patriarchal society has a special place for women and since capitalist society asserts different social classes for people based on their economic status, Marxist feminist theory proposes that women are situated in an even lower social class than the lowest class in capitalist society. This means that if the elite class is placed highest and the poor the lowest in the hierarchy, Marxist Feminists argue that women are placed even lower than the most underprivileged.

Evidently, it could be argued that there is a connection between Marxist and Feminist theories as they both struggle for equality. Still, in Third World countries generally, it could be suggested that women belong to a much lower social. Researcher Amartya Sen has discovered that whereas gender inequality is found all around the world it is not a homogenous phenomenon, but, rather a collection of various problems. Sen's main concerns are on the mortality and natality inequalities in the Indian subcontinent in which the male-dominated society has a preference for having sons rather than daughters. In today's technologically effective society, this issue has led many pregnant women to terminate their pregnancies, something Sen claims is high-tech sexism. Since this essay will include a feminist reading of *Shame*, it is vital for the theory to include these historical and realistic views on the status of women.

Since Rushdie uses magical realism as a mode of narrative, the perspectives that have been discussed can reveal the actions of the characters, however, the narrative, something that Rushdie as an author applies, suggests that these perspectives can get overshadowed by magical realism. For instance, as it will be discussed in the essay, Sufiya Zinobia's resistance to patriarchal rule takes form as her becoming a Beast which ruins her father's career and eventually leads him to his murderers. Sufiya being degraded and called Shame by her mother shows her position on the hierarchy of classes, which is very low. However, any Marxist, feminist or psychoanalytical reading of *Shame* can be analysed the utmost important aspect which one should be aware of is that this story is a fictional story which is based mostly on the magical realist narrative style which applies any magical element to a real story.

Maggie Ann Bowers in her book *Magic (al) Realism* has written about what this narrative style really means. She writes that this type of narrative has been seen by most critics as "a tolerant and accepting type of fiction" (Bowers 3). She also contends that the unique feature of magical realism is that it allows the narrator to make its reader believe and accept whatever realistic or magical perspectives there are to the story, no matter how this perspective will affect the reader's personal opinion or judgments (Bowers 4). One could depict that though novels can be read with different approaches, as in Marxism or feminism, the narrative style which magical realist writers write in makes the reader believe of nothing extraordinary mode but the magical element of the story. This essay analyses the characters of *Shame* with a Marxist and feministic approach and sees the effects on the psyches of Bilquis Hyder, Sufiya Zinobia and Rani Harappa. However so, taking these elements into perspectives the essay will conclude that these characters are mere products of a magical

realist narrative which could predict and present any illogical thought the author may want to and the readers will believe that.

In this essay, then, *Shame* will be analysed from the theoretical aspects discussed above. Sufiya Zinobia, the daughter of Raza Hyder was supposed to be a boy, which in the male-dominated Pakistani society, is more appreciated. This preference leads to the eventual destabilizations or rather destruction of Hyder's career as a military president. The psychoanalytical reading of this novel will analyse the psyches of the three women characters, Sufiya Zinobia, Bilquis Hyder and Rani Harappa, who are oppressed in patriarchal society because they carry shame. This aspect will be discussed in this essay along with as to how and why 'shame' has been subjected to specifically female characters because of the use of a magical realist narrative. Their position in their society will be analysed from a Marxist perspective where the subordinations of these characters lead them to different paths: death, destruction and disappearance.

The Significance of Shame in Women of *Shame*

Although shame has been linked to many male characters in *Shame*, it is the significant association of shame with the female characters that will be in focus in this essay. In what follows, the effect of shame on the lives of women in the novel will be explored. In *Shame*, there are several important female characters. Bilquis Hyder, firstly, is the wife of Raza Hyder and the mother of Sufiya Zinobia and Naveed, also known as Good News. Rani Harappa, secondly, is the wife of Iskander Harappa and the mother of Arjumand Harappa. Then there is Sufiya Zinobia (Shame), who marries Omar Khayyam Shakil (Shameless), and Good News, who is arranged to marry Haroun Harappa (Arjumand's cousin) but who instead, marries Talvar Ulhaq. Arjumand remains single after being rejected by the love of her life, Haroun. *Shame* is the story about the contrasts between shame and shamelessness in general and about the marriage between Sufiya Zinobia and Omar Khayyam. Moreover, this story, with a magical realism narrative, is about how the Beauty becomes the Beast.

Bilquis Hyder and Shame

Bilquis' story begins with her living in a lavish Empire in Delhi of India where she is regarded as a princess. Her father is killed during the Partition of 1947 in a bomb explosion planted by religious extremists. This incident starts the magical realist narrative since Bilquis eyebrows and clothes blow off because of the impact of the explosion which leaves her standing naked with only her dupatta (shawl) to cover her womanly parts, her modesty. She is later rescued by her future husband, Raza Hyder, who romantically proposes to Bilquis by

saying that “it is the privilege of a husband eventually to remove [her clothes]... but in our case, the reverse procedure will be true. I must dress you, top to toe, as befits a blushing bride” (Rushdie 65). Jacques Lacan’s insights on metonymy that is related to displacement where the unconscious substitutes a person or object to another object that is somewhat related to first object, comes to play a vital role in the interpretation of this incident. In this case, Bilquis becomes the first object who is related to the second object which is the Partition of Pakistan and India, since she belongs to the latter. Her green dupatta becoming a metonymy in *Shame* can be seen as an emphasis on the significance of modesty in Islam and Pakistan since colour green is a traditional colour of Islam. As Pakistan was created because of the unity of this religion, symbolically, Bilquis becomes a representation of the new pure nation. She becomes the embodiment of the nation that has nothing on the surface but clutches Islam as a shield. This interpretation of the underlying symbolism can be linked to the event of Bilquis migrating later to Pakistan and being seen as a “mohajir,” literally meaning immigrant, by her husband’s family. Rushdie calls this new country “Allah’s new country” (61), by which he seems to suggest that religion was the single and insufficient base for creating that new country. However, as Sabrina Hassumani argues, Rushdie does not illumine the fact that the country was created by Muhammad Ali Jinnah to give the Muslims a sense of unity and nationhood. Hassumani asserts that Rushdie does not justify this unity for the independence from the British and Indian rule but sees instead a country that “lacks imagination” and that will always be ‘a wrong miracle’ for him (49). Her comment refers to the incident where the narrator seems to refer Bilquis’ shame of being dishonoured with her womanly parts on display to convey the idea of Pakistan taking form with only an Islamic shield.

The marriage of Bilquis and Raza Hyder produces a son, who unfortunately dies in the womb by being strangled by the umbilical cord. This incident comes to play a vital role in the story. After the death of her baby, Bilquis finds it hard to conceive again in the house of Bariamma (Raza’s grandmother) where forty men and women also reside. When they move out to a military residence, Bilquis gives birth to a girl, Sufiya Zinobia. The parents first refuse to accept this baby since Raza has wanted a boy to carry on his legacy. In his anger he exclaims “Genitalia! Can! Be! Obscured!” (89). Rushdie gives suggestions of a misogynist society already in the beginning of the novel with the case of Omar Khayyam’s mothers, who are oppressed and hated by their father. General Raza Hyder is a perfect example of how a misogynist man would react to the birth of his firstborn daughter. Accordingly, a son in the family means a support for the father, someone who will keep the pride of the father by

joining the same or an even better occupation than him. Firstly, having a daughter means that she needs to be kept in isolation so that no man can look at her and that the pride and honour is kept safe in the family. Secondly, a daughter becomes a burden for her father since she has to be married off with a heavy price on the dowry to a respectable husband. In the life of Bilquis Hyder, Sufiya Zinobia will come to act as a shameful girl who blushes whenever her presence is noticed. Sufiya Zinobia blushes for shame for the first time when her father refuses to accept that she indeed is a girl.

Jean-Paul Sartre is quoted in the book *Scenes of Shame* emphasising the definition of shame as “shame of self, it is the recognition of the fact that I *am* indeed that object which the Other is looking at and judging” (Adamson and Clark 9). Bilquis gives birth to the girl who is not accepted by her family something that gives the girl reasons to blush. Already in infancy Sufiya learns to blush as a reaction to of her father’s outburst in front of her. Sartre’s observation illumines the situation of Sufiya when she feels that her presence has been recognized by Others. The judgment comes in the form of her father’s irrational behaviour. Raza is irrational since he has yearned for a boy, a reincarnation of the son who died a while before. Sufiya’s unconscious starts to build up with shame which she later deals with by adapting a form of violence and destruction in herself.

Consequently, when Sufiya contracts a high brain fever, Bilquis takes her to a local Hakim (a wise man who in this case is a doctor) who gives her medicines which would, as he warns, slow down brain development. Bilquis notes that guilt and shame mixed into a potion would be a probable cause for this judgement. She feels guilt for having visited a certain Mengal Mahal cinema regularly. As Catherine Cundy contends, Bilquis sees this incident as a failure of her duty, as a wife, because she has not given birth to a son (58). Bilquis’ sense of failure continues when she gives birth to another daughter, although, this time it may not be the child of Raza. As already stated, the patriarchal system in Pakistan favours sons more than daughters. Jamil Rashid has conducted a study related to this matter and states that since daughters are seen as heavy expenditure they are less “wanted.” From a Marxist feminist perspective, Rashid also points to the evidence that women are part of a lower social class in a capitalist society. They are seen as only expenditures with no financial gains as they are not allowed to work outside of their homes. Sufiya gradually grows up on a physical level but her brain freezes from time to time and does not give her mind enough time to catch up with the body. The second daughter, Good News, is treated with love, because she was “supposed” to be born a girl as opposed to the first-born Sufiya who was “supposed” to be a boy. Rushdie makes Sufiya the shame of Bilquis who in her guilt and despair calls Rani

Harappa and lets her know that “I must accept it: she is my shame” (Rushdie 101). One can assume that since *Shame* was published in 1983 when Pakistan was under the military dictatorship rule of President Zia Ul Haq, evidently it could be presumed that Rushdie makes use of Bilquis and Raza’s situation as a representation of the patriarchal society of Pakistan under President’s strict Islamic regime.

When Bilquis is pregnant with her second daughter, Good News, the narrator suggests that the father of this child is not Raza, but rather the cinema executive, Sindbad Mengal, whom Bilquis had been visiting. From a psychoanalytical perspective, this event could be translated as a condensation process where Bilquis, an infidel wife, represents other kinds of things. For instance, the image of the infidel wife of Colonel Raza could be linked to the representation of Pakistan, the land of purity. It is a Muslim country in which people are expected to be honourable, but here they are cheaters to their country. As the narrator reminds the reader why he is not writing specifically about Pakistan, he reveals the sins committed by the Pakistani people such as “smuggling” and “the boom in heroin exports” (Rushdie 70). While the military is conquering the enemy, much like Raza who is also away in a gas field battle, Bilquis being unfaithful to her husband and becoming pregnant as a result, it could be seen as a symbolic representation of the Pakistani people becoming corrupt and betraying their country. In contrast to Bilquis’ impurity, Rushdie creates Sufiya Zinobia as an idiot who essentially is innocent. Rushdie’s sense of purity lies in Sufiya’s deranged character since to him, she is “somehow clean (pak) in the midst of a dirty//world” (120-121). Along with the Pakistani people, Bilquis is also represented as dirty, however, and one should not forget that she migrated from ‘the land of idolaters’(83) to the ‘land of pure’, does this then mean that Rushdie’s use of metonymy involving Bilquis represents both Pakistan and India?

Nonetheless, the narrator suggests that when Bilquis is pregnant with another man’s child, she tries to divert her guilt onto Raza. Earlier in the novel, Raza and Iskander are seen in at party where both are flirting with Pinkie Aurangzeb (wife of Joint Chief of Staff, Marshal Aurangzeb). However, fortunately for Bilquis, Raza loses her to Iskander. This incident is replayed by Omar Khayyam at a dinner party at the Harappa’s, where he reveals this secret to Bilquis.

Elsbeth Probyn writes about the subconscious element of feeling shame or guilt. She writes that shame and guilt are two separate feelings. While shame is deeper and connected to the body, it cannot be repaired whereas guilt is something that can be. Probyn claims that although guilt can be repaired, it may also trigger disputes of blame (46). Since Bilquis feels guilty over the early pregnancy she is quick to blame Raza for the shame that

Omar Khayyam is making her feel. However, this blame does not affect Raza as much as it affects Bilquis, who gradually becomes crazy.

Because of complications during the birth of Good News, it is said that Bilquis cannot have any more children, something that destroys her dream of becoming a perfect wife for Raza. Bilquis is shunned by her husband for not being able to give him the son he so much desires. Due to her not being able to produce a son along with the added guilt of betraying her husband, Bilquis becomes an undermined subject in patriarchal society in which she needs to hold her “good girl and good wife” standards. The pressure of these standards leads to Bilquis becoming unaware of her irrational behaviour such as fear of the Loo which causes her to psychotically close windows and scream at her children. As stated earlier in the essay, Adamson and Clark quote Freud’s theory about shame being a female characteristic. The portrayal of Bilquis has in many ways been linked to shame where she is not seen envying genitals of men, however, but where she is resentful for not being able to produce a son. A psychoanalytical perspective, then, leads to a deeper understanding of how patriarchal society can affect women, and to which extent.

Aijaz Ahmad claims that the women in the novel are the only oppressed characters and that no man is found amongst the undermined characters. For this reason, Ahmad questions Rushdie’s idea of women. He states that on the one hand women characters are the subjects of sympathy and that on the other hand these characters have “a generalized *structure* of representation” which results in the readers having second negative opinions of the characters (Ahmad 144). Bilquis is a loving and caring wife before the birth of Sufiya Zinobia; however she later becomes detested when she submits to an irrational behaviour: “Bilquis Hyder became, in those years, almost invisible, a shadow hunting the corridors for something it had lost, the body, perhaps, from which it had come unstuck” (Rushdie 209). Though the portrait of Bilquis’, there is a somewhat realist image of what a woman endures in patriarchal society, thus, her identity is at the same time a metaphor. Because of the view of Bilquis being a metaphor, one could exit the world of *Shame* and perceive the fact that the character of Bilquis is created by Salman Rushdie, a writer who known for his magical realist narrative style. Although this essay has focused on psychoanalytical perceptions of the characters, the final conclusion would then be that a character which takes form in a magical realist world could adapt any features that an author might want to give it. Bilquis becoming insane and invisible symbolizes the fact that the character is more a representation of what Rushdie wants to convey rather than a psychological being.

Sufiya Zinobia and Shame

Sufiya Zinobia Hyder, the Beauty, is a girl trapped between three identities: the idiot, the shame, and the Beast. Sufiya is born blushing for shame since she is a girl and not the hoped-for reincarnation of her dead brother. For this reason, she is resented by her parents, which could mean that her mental disorder is not merely caused by the medicine given to her. Rather, a blush on this new-born baby is enough to make a judgment for its future. The baby that blushes embodies the shame of being born a girl who later becomes the sole reason of destruction for her family. Her marriage to Omar Khayyam—the man who is not allowed to feel shame—is a union between shame and shamelessness. What happens when the two opposites meet? There is destruction, failure and death.

Furthermore, Sufiya's shame comes in the form of her being afraid of the rejection of her mother, which relates to what Adamson and Clark suggest that there lies a “doubleness of experience” in shame. The authors quote Helen Lewis who states that shame is experienced both by the self-consciousness and by self-imageries. By this she means that self-consciousness involves what a person directly thinks about him- or herself, whereas, the self-imageries involves the process where the person experiences shame as a result of what other people might think of oneself (11). Sufiya's shame could be interpreted as the doubleness of experience in shame; self-imaging because since from birth her parents have seen her as “a wrong miracle”, as she was supposed to be born a boy. Because of this view of what others have thought about her, she feels the inner self-conscious shame which later turns into violence.

The shame which Sufiya embodies turns her inside out. The shame that Sufiya embodies is none other than that of a magical realism since she, having been a Beauty, becomes a Beast. Nonetheless, Sufiya's embodiment of shame represents the shame of her father, sister, society and even the country itself. Rushdie writes in the novel that the character, more specifically the violence, of Sufiya stems from three different real-life events he experienced in London. Firstly, there was a Pakistani father who killed his daughter because she had sexual relations with her white boyfriend. Secondly, there is another Asian girl who was beaten by white teenage boys, who instead of anger felt shame. Thirdly, there was a boy who was found in a parking lot who burned himself to death. Rushdie's mixture of the three real-life events created the character of Sufiya, the Shame. From a psychoanalytical perspective, as Arthur Asa Berger writes in *Cultural Criticism*, the method of Claude Lévi-Strauss analyses myths as breaking stories down into small sentences and writing them on to a card “which is numbered and keyed to the story. Each card shows that a certain function is

linked to a certain subject” (123). Eventually these cards become bundles with numbers corresponding to functions in the story. When these cards are assembled together with their individual number (1s together, 2s together etc.), one is able to find the hidden message behind a myth. In *Shame*, Rushdie uses this method and blend it with his magical realist style to create Sufiya Zinobia and her mythical violence, the myth being the Eastern patriarchal culture of shame. Sufiya’s shame does not only represent the shame of the characters of Peccavistan, rather, it represents the shame of the East as Rushdie states that this idea needs to “breathe its favourite air” (Rushdie 116). Rushdie’s analyses of shame can be related to the card-system which Lévi-Strauss describes. Rushdie seems to draw different angles of shame, assembling them into a single character which becomes the creation of an energetically blazing creature who repents from the mythical Eastern shame in the form of violence.

In the first twelve years of Sufiya’s life, she is subjected to her mother’s ignorance and hate, something that increases her blushes of shame. Judith Butler emphasises that “the existence and facticity of the material or natural dimension of the body are not denied, but reconceived as distinct from the process by which the body comes to bear cultural meaning” (Butler 520). Sufiya is ignored and unloved by her parents and her sister because of the fact that she was born a girl, and on top of this, she is retarded. Her body then blushes shamefully for her faults and since shame has been connected largely to the Pakistani culture by Rushdie, Sufiya bears the culture of shame in her body, as a violence boiling inside of her waiting to burst. Sufiya Zinobia is not normally developed. If she were she might have been accepted by her family. But Good News destroys this dream as well since she says to Sufiya: “who would marry you with that hair, even if you had a brain?” (Rushdie 136). As claimed by Heidi Hartman, “*patriarchy is not simply hierarchical organization*, but hierarchy in which *particular* people fill *particular* places” (180). Her Marxist criticism comes forward here in relation to how Sufiya is treated by her family. Although, it has been argued in this essay that the female characters of *Shame* are placed low in the hierarchy, what is evident in Sufiya’s case is that she is placed in an even lower class. Because of her nickname shame, and being a retard, even the women in the novel degrade her, and not only men. Hartman’s assertion fits into the story since the particular group she writes about concerns the different social classes in which women are placed in, Sufiya’s illness makes her part of the society in which only retards belong to which further makes her inferior to not only men but rather women as well.

In connection to this, Berger writes about the concept of the ego. He quotes Hinsie and Campbell who state that the ego’s “prime function is the perception of reality and adaptation to it” (107). In other words, the ego is the self of a person who reacts to what

people say or do, and also to the world as a whole. Burger further analyses that “the ego defends itself, from anxieties and other attacks, by using a number of “defense mechanisms” (107). Probyn writes that shame is something that is felt inside of a body; however, this inside is indeed the ego which feels the shame and reacts to it.

In the case of Sufiya, anxieties related to shame for being born a girl, are dealt with by the defense mechanisms. Sufiya deals with this shame in the way that she finds is most effective, that is, by using violence. The way that Sufiya deals with her shame, proposes to the psychoanalytical reader that this violence can be seen as projection because she turns her anger and shame into a form of violence to be able to condemn her parents for making her feel inferior, not only as a daughter but a human being as well. Sufiya’s ego reacts to shame with violence, something that begins when she is twelve-years-old. During the night when everyone in Sufiya’s house were asleep, she sleepwalked into her neighbours house where two hundred and eighteen turkeys lived together with their owner Pinkie Aurangzeb who not long time before has been the love interest of Raza Hyder. When her family members look for her they find her sleeping in the turkey-yard. The sight before them stuns them all while they stand there looking at the ‘Sleeping Beauty’. Sufiya embodied the violent shame for the first time which started her transformation from being a Beauty to becoming a Beast. The two hundred and eighteen turkeys were not killed by the wind which had blown strongly that day, however; they were decapitated by the bare hands of Sufiya who had torn off their heads and through the hole between their necks she had drawn up the insides of them. This power which comes into the tormented Sufiya can be explained by the narrator; “twelve years of unloved humiliation take their toll” (138). Sufiya’s first official outburst can be analysed in many different ways. There are numerous possibilities discussed in the novel itself as the narrator questions whether Sufiya is being a good daughter to her mother when she kills the belongings of her father’s presumed mistress or if it is the anger of Raza who refuses to remove the birds on Bilquis’ eruption. The narrator, however, does not offer an understanding of this incident from another perspective. An innocent view of this incident would be that of psychoanalytic perspective whereby Sufiya’s inner consciousness, her ego, is troubled by the hatred from her mother which is why she takes form as shame, a violent creature who seeks to revenge. Berger writes that “the dark shadow is the dark side of the psyche, which we tend to keep hidden from consciousness, an element in our personalities that must be recognized and dealt with” (128). Sufiya’s dark side is the beast lurking inside of her, the unconscious which comes out in a violent form. The shame which Sufiya feels, the reason why she blushes whenever she is recognized by the world is the shame of being a deranged female. Her shame

is the dark shadow which she unconsciously brings out from time to time until she, because of her husband's infidelity, has had enough.

Furthermore, another perspective of her outburst would perhaps be the different symbolic embodiments of Sufiya. Firstly, Aijaz Ahmad believes that she is the "embodiment of the principle of redemption" (Ahmad 145). The reason as to why Ahmad makes this claim is because Sufiya, in a sense, is gaining possession of her freedom. Her embodiment of her mother's indictment turns her from the Beauty to the Beast which in itself is her style of a rebellious act. Nevertheless, Ahmad is committed to his argument which to a Marxist feminist reader could be seen as a pragmatic discourse. He claims that Sufiya's violence in its most potential form is linked to the imperialistic and misogynistic myth of "the image of a free –or freedom-seeking –woman as a vampire..." (Ahmad 150). A Marxist feminist reader would agree with the description of Sufiya since it marks two important figures of her identity. Firstly, she is empowered to the extent of being able to single-handedly destroy the career of her patriarchal father, while her second identity is the fact that she is a retarded child. By juxtaposing the two identities of Sufiya, Rushdie attempts to shed light upon the oppression and resistance of women in the Pakistani society which is where the magical realist style comes to play a big role. Sufiya's behaviour and actions would not be considered normal in a real world; however in Rushdie's *Shame* her reactions are all logical in a sense. Sufiya beheading the turkeys seems to be an accepted response to her mother's attitude towards her.

The beheading's of the two hundred and eighteen turkeys was only a kind of preview of what happens later in her life or rather what she does, like, for example, attacking her brother-in-law. Nonetheless, her resistance towards the Beast inside of her comes in the form of her being ill and taken to the immunologist Omar Khayyam Shakil. In the course of the treatment, the reader gets to know that the doctor has fallen in love with this girl. However, this love is seen as a selfish attempt to get closure with the Hyders, as Raza was the one who triggered the death of Omar's brother and that Omar's vertigo had been cured. The reader gets to know that while Omar Khayyam has asked for Raza Sufiya's hand in marriage, Good News is making a scandalous decision not to marry the boy her parents have chosen for her. Instead, she falls in love with a polo/police officer, Talvar Ulhaq. The unfelt shame of Good News combined with the shame of her parents whose daughter has committed such a forbidden sin generates a mix of shame and shamelessness of which Sufiya becomes the bearer. In her tormented unconscious, in the flame of shame that blazes, she attacks Talvar Ulhaq. Though the beast fails to behead her brother-in-law as the turkeys, she is successful in stiffening his neck for life.

Rushdie makes Sufiya into an epitome of shame in *Shame*. Almost every incident in the story circulates around shame, making it the most significant element in the cause of problems. Even though these problems or incidents are not Sufiya's fault in any sense, her lifelong misery of bearing shame makes her obliged to feel shame in all shameful acts. Whether it is her father's momentary infidelity or her sister's disobedience, Sufiya is not merely the epitome but she is shame herself. For this reason, Sara Suleri argues that Sufiya's subconscious is not in direct contact with her body which makes her embody the Beast of shame in occasions, such as at her sister's wedding, in which she should be the Beauty (Suleri 187). In Sufiya's thoughts, when she is the Beauty self of herself, she does not remember these memories vividly, although, she does feel an inner blush which no one notices. This inner blush, her ego, creates a sinking feeling, without the presence of an ocean, inside of her, "she feels its tide" (Rushdie 215) which then creates the Beast stirring inside of her. The Beast in Sufiya acts as a defense mechanism which comes forward as violence in which she, subliminally, tries to kill the cause of shame to her parents, Talvar Ulhaq.

The marriage between Sufiya and Omar Khayyam needs to be discussed. Why did Omar Khayyam ask for Sufiya's hand in marriage? The answer is that he fell in love and she cured his vertigo. The question is why Raza and Bilquis accept the proposal for their retarded nineteen-year-old to a fifty-year-old notorious doctor? The answer would be found in the patriarchal rules and regulations. Lois Tyson in her book quotes Colette Guillaumin who writes about women being exploited as properties. Guillaumin labels women's oppression as "direct physical appropriation" which means "the reduction of women to the state of material objects" (Tyson 95). Since Sufiya is the daughter of Raza, this makes her subconsciously his property. He may wish to do whatever he wants to do with her. From his outburst on her birth to the love and affection he feels towards her after the birds' incident, Raza has chosen his approach to her and it is his choice whether or not he wants to love her. She is his child, his property. In patriarchal society, fathers decide the future of their daughters from their education to their marriage. Sufiya is part of the same patriarchal society. Her parents believe that the match is sent from God and there will not be anyone better than Omar Khayyam. Although Raza is reluctant at first he is persuaded later by his wife who says that Sufiya has grown up in every sense that women do, however, secretly Sufiya still carries the beast of shame inside of her. However so, the marriage happens and the property of Raza Hyder now legally belongs to Omar Khayyam. Although, Sufiya's marriage is not something that will produce any babies nor will she be a proper wife who cooks, cleans, and takes care of her husband. The marriage is only conducted on the basis of property exchange terms, where

Raza gives his daughter to Omar Khayyam and feels satisfied with his “duty” as a father to marry off any daughter he has. As for Omar Khayyam, this marriage gives him the opportunity to take part in the murder of his brother’s assassin.

The narrator raises and answers the following question: “what is a saint? A saint is a person who suffer in our stead” (Rushdie 141). Raza kills Baber Shakil. Sufiya is the daughter of Raza. Omar Khayyam marries Sufiya. Sufiya becomes a beast and hunts after her family members. Omar Khayyam flees with Raza and Bilquis to his hometown Nishapur. His three mothers brutally murder the husband and wife. Sufiya then arrives to kill Omar Khayyam. After the death of her husband, the beast subsides and Sufiya is seen again, but at the same moment, she dies in an explosion. Who is a saint, then? The saint is Sufiya Zinobia Hyder, not the beast but the beauty, the brain-damaged girl who has murdered hundreds if not thousands of inhabitants of her hometown. The reasoning is simple; since Sufiya is the one who suffers because of the shameful deeds of her father (his infidelity and the murder of Iskander Harappa), her sister (the marriage scandal), her husband (who impregnates Shahbanou) and her mother who gives birth to a girl. Sufiya is the one who is transformed into a murderous beast. She is the one who suffers because of others.

Omar Khayyam is presented by the narrator as the peripheral hero of this story by the narrator; however, as this essay suggests, Sufiya is indeed is the real hero, who is not peripheral in any manner. According to Berger’s analysis, the characteristics of a hero includes having “extraordinary talents... they often are modern manifestations of ancient mythical figures,” and for most of the time they win at the end of a story (126). While Sufiya, as Aijaz Ahmad has claimed, is the epitome of the misogynist myths, the myth she embodies is not a heroic one, rather, it is what this embodiment symbolizes which is the heroic perception. Sufiya’s embodiment of shame is not only her being a retarded creature attacking men and animals, but she is also the hero fighting for the resistance of patriarchal rules. Sufiya’s talent lies in her strength, not only because of her determination but because of her physical strength by which she tears off the heads of men. Sufiya’s embodiment of shame is an enactment of her trying to break away from the stereotypical “good daughter” in patriarchal society; she does so by taking the form of a Beast which is why here she is labeled as a hero.

Finally, when Sufiya is twenty-eight-years-old with the mental capacity of a nine and a half-year-old, she acquires the name “the woman in the veil” (Rushdie 216). This identity comes to Sufiya because of the incident which changed her into a white panther. The identity comes to her on the night she disguises herself in her mother’s burkha and hunts four

men who first raped her (or maybe the Beast raped them), and she subsequently tears off their heads one by one and eats their insides. Upon arriving home, the Beast inside of her silently subsides. This incident could be interpreted as an act of revenge. Sufiya seeks to revenge Omar Khayyam and Shahbanou for betraying her. Her revenge comes in the same form as the betrayal, she allows the four men upon her. She allows the four husbands to come and go making her an even more dishonorable girl than she was before. Although this incident occurs when the Beauty is nowhere seen, the Beast of her unconscious commits this sin which in turn makes Sufiya oblivious to the arrival of the Beast. This time, Sufiya is successful in metamorphosing herself as a Beast who continues till the Judgement Day (Rushdie 286). On the last day, her last victim is Omar Khayyam. On that day, Sufiya's revenge is complete.

As discussed before, the study by Amartya Sen directs attention to the natality inequality. The preference of a boy, according to Sen, sometimes leads to the death of the daughter or as in the case of Sufiya they are neglected. Sen argues that though girls are equally "nutritionally deprived" as boys at birth, the situation for girls changes as the patriarchal society "takes over" (472). He identifies the problem as not only as a difference in nutrition but also "the neglect of healthcare of girls compared with what boys receive" (472). Though Sufiya might not be physically undernourished because of a lack of food or medicine, her mental undernourishment is what adversely affects her. If Sufiya had been a boy, would Bilquis have given the medicine of the Hakim to her child? Perhaps Bilquis made a deliberate decision to give the potion of slowing down the growth of her daughter. Perhaps the mental undernourishment of Sufiya –who received love from her father much too late in her life and never from her mother –caused the beast to erupt from the beauty.

Patriarchal society can affect women in many different ways. As already suggested, Bilquis turns herself over to the oppressive society which results in her being a woman who becomes psychologically unstable. Bilquis submits herself to patriarchal society which in turn eats her up since she dies because of her husband's sins. Sufiya Zinobia has been analyzed as a potential hero who resists patriarchal society in her own bestial ways. Her becoming a rebel against her parents is nevertheless seen as a mentally deficient on her part, as Ahmad correctly suggests. However, Rani Harappa does something different in the sense that she neither submits nor wins the fight against patriarchy. Rani is seen as becoming numb in the story without any care of the world. In the next section of the essay, there will be a discussion of her reaction and resistance to shame.

Rani Harappa and Shame

In *Shame*, Rani Harappa becomes an example of a person who is so unaware of her consciousness that the development of being emotionless comes easily to her. Although she is able to resist the effects of patriarchal society, Rushdie does not let her escape from feelings of shame which come to Rani in the shape of her shameless and ignorant playboy husband. Although Rushdie's portrayal of the female characters gives the impression of misogynist society, Rani Harappa is able to gain some measure of respect and dignity by the end of the novel. In what follows, from Marxist and psychoanalytical perspectives, there will be a discussion to which extent Rani is affected by patriarchal society.

Rani Humayun is the cousin of Raza Hyder who marries the millionaire, Iskander Harappa. Rani's oppression begins with her "first genuine wifely remark" (Rushdie 80) when she is denied by her husband to choose friends for him. Similarly, she is not seen as a woman who is able to freely rejoice her freedom in the lavish home of Iskander. The constant invasion of her privacy by the peasant girls makes her feel worthless, a passage where Marxist feminist reading can help the analysis. Although Rani is the wife of the owner of the house, she still does not have her rightful authority over the house, which in a sense makes her alienated from "her" property. The idea of alienation is, in the Marxist perspective, someone with no connection with others (Berger 50). This concept means that people who work for others do not feel satisfaction and there is a "sense of being a commodity" (50) felt by workers. Likewise, in patriarchal societies women are seen as workers of the home which in this case is evident as Rani stays at home and is seen merely as an asset. Therefore alienation affects her psyche and as she starts to talk to herself in front of her mirror. Although she does not let her psyche become unstable in any manner, shame comes to her in many forms, almost making her insane.

As stated earlier in the essay, Freud's theory of the genital envy has been seen as an envy of power rather than genital envy, by Lois Tyson and many other feminist critics. Rani, in the same way as Bilquis, is seen also seen being ashamed of her becoming "looser after having a child" (Rushdie 94). In *Shame*, the two wives are seen resenting their genitals not as an act of envy but as anger towards it because of its failure to produce sons. However, Rani's daughter does not face the similar attitude as Sufiya Zinobia was given; rather, Arjumand is loved and cared for by both her parents. Instead, what the daughter brings to Rani's life is the absence of her husband Iskander. Since the shameless playboy has won over the dashing lady, Pinkie Aurangzeb, from his cousin Little Mir and Raza Hyder, Iskander has altogether stopped keeping Rani company. If the husband does not feel shame for being

unfaithful to his wife, why does the patriarchal society make the wife feel ashamed of betrayed? Elspeth Probyn quotes Ullalina Lehtinen who states that “women feel an inner shame and that men feel it as outer. In other words, men may feel shame in a less penetrating way” (83). Indeed, in this story, men do not feel the element of shame in the same penetrating way as the female characters do. Rani believes that the fault lies in her, that her body is not something that Isky does not desire anymore. For this reason, she feels ashamed of even believing that the luxurious house is something to be thankful for after all. These reasons give the reader second thoughts on how Rushdie really created these characters. It seems as if his conscious was deliberately trying to present a demeaning image of the female characters in his novel, to give a wrongful image of the women of Pakistan.

Later in the novel, the readers find out that Raza Hyder has contributed to the imprisonment of Iskander Harappa, while locking Rani and Arjumand in their house. Prior to this, however, Little Mir pays a visit to Rani and exposes psychotically the way that Iskander stole the woman of his dreams, Pinkie Aurangzeb. During these years, before and after Iskander’s imprisonment, Rani had developed a habit which was to embroider shawls. These shawls bore significant meanings, something that would expose the filthy actions of her husband, such as corruption, murder, torture, and a debauched language.

However, indirectly, Rani is seen struggling with her core issues, her insecurity and low self-esteem. Even when Isky’s cousin raids her house, Rani is seen sitting calmly and embroidering her eighteen shawls. Later, when she tells Bilquis about the riot that destroyed her house, she says “it makes me feel too ashamed” (Rushdie 97). Her conscious is ridden with shame for a sin she has not even committed since it is Isky who has betrayed her, not the other way around, like in the case of Bilquis. She feels humiliated because of the sympathetic looks that servants give her. Her existence becomes a pathetic one which is why she loses all hope for reconciliation with her husband. It is in these types of illustrations that one can perceive Rani’s shame as her insecurity. One could say that Rani is a patriarchal submissive wife in the beginning of her story, however, the further her character develops, Rushdie’s portrayal of her changes although it remains psychoanalytically challenged.

Because of the way Rushdie has portrayed the female characters, Timothy Brennan’s assertion about Rushdie being a possible traitor to his native country seems to fit here. Brennan argues that Rushdie’s depiction of women is “the key to his political analysis in a number of interrelated ways” (Brennan 126). This means that Rani Harappa, and other female characters, were not only created for psychoanalytical purposes, but, rather one could understand these creation as both Marxist and feminist. In terms of Marxist perception, as a

woman Rani is seen more as a commodity than a wife, thus she belongs to the proletariat class. Her husband becomes the bourgeois who “controls the ideas of the proletariat” (Berger 46). Her husband subliminally points to Rani when he advises his daughter to “rise above your gender as you grow. This is no place to be a woman in” (Rushdie 126). However, Isky’s power over his wife is seen only externally as he keeps in exile, the internal danger which Rani is creating is far more effective than his power. Her embroidering eighteen shawls of her husband’s sins becomes the ultimate bourgeoisie object of the novel as these shawls act as eye-openers that uncover the myth which her daughter believes in, that is, her father’s innocence.

Hence, Rani becomes the epitome of what Heidi Hartman has called “a society in which recognition of interdependence is liberation rather than shame” (Hartman 189). Hartman suggests that women should seek independence from the capitalist society as well as from the patriarchal society. In some ways, Rani seems to follow these ideals when, instead of moving deeper into the submissiveness to patriarchy, she embodies strength by embroidering shawls. The narrator states that contrary to Bilquis who becomes insane, Rani is falling into sanity which makes her powerful (Rushdie 152). However, this power of Rani does not only derive from embroidering shawls but also her unconscious thought that because of Isky’s rise in his political career, he would at some point need Rani to stand next to him. It seems as if Rushdie intensifies the hopes for a feminist reader, who gets a powerful female character and who resist patriarchal males, while at the next moment he shatters the illusion, when Rani once again becomes a submissive patriarchal wife.

From a psychoanalytical perspective, Rani’s embroidered shawls become an act of displacement since she is able to take out her anger “on someone or something else less threatening than the person who caused our...anger” (Tyson 15). As stated earlier in the essay, Rushdie uses metaphors and metonymy so as to represent various ideas which could be interpreted in different ways. Although, Rani’s shawls represent her act of freedom of expression, a psychoanalyst critic would argue that this deed is her way of taking out Isky’s anger on the shawls since every shawl represents a different type of sin committed by “Iskander the Great” (Rushdie 191). These shawls present a seemingly patronizing image of what Isky had done in his life, before and after his political height. Since the character of Iskander Harappa is based on the real life Pakistani Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, one can acknowledge the fact that Rushdie is in some ways expressing his own feelings about this politician in the novel. Critics claim that Rushdie’s portraits of Bhutto as well as Zia Ul Haq, are mostly based on rumors and allegations which have not yet been corroborated. One could

then imagine that Rani's way of taking out her anger towards Isky is an act of displacement, and then one could also assert that Rushdie may also have gone through this process himself, taking out his anger towards the former Prime Minister in *Shame*.

Rani's departure from the story is somewhat ambiguous. The reader does not get to the end of her career as an embroidering woman. The last time that her character is seen in *Shame* is when she sends the shawls to her daughter. Therefore one could confirm the fact that Rushdie's portrayals of the female characters are incomplete and male-controlled in one way or another. Bilquis becomes an insane woman who whispers indescribable things to her surroundings, Sufiya becomes a beast and Rani disappears. With the help of a Marxist feminist reading, then, the effects of shame reveal, in these three women characters, that in a patriarchal society, men see women as humans placed beneath them. In *Shame*, the male characters control and humiliate their wives and daughter to such extents that the effect on their psyches is murderous.

Conclusion

The aim of this essay has been to explore Salman Rushdie's novel *Shame* with the help of psychoanalysis the Marxist and feminist perspectives on the story. The main focus has been the effects of shame in the lives of the three female characters, Bilquis Hyder, Sufiya Zinobia and Rani Harappa. Analysing Rushdie's novel with the help of critical theories, this essay has shown how the patriarchal society has affected the lives and psyches of these characters. With the help of previous research, this essay has examined the novel with a Marxist and feminist lens. From the psychoanalytical angle, this essay found the reasons for Sufiya's blushes. As Elspeth Probyn states "a blush is the top of the iceberg, the visible part of everything that makes us open to shame" (Probyn 55). Sufiya blushes because of the degrading attitude that her parents have towards her. She blushes because her parents have not treated her as a normal child, she blushes because the shame she is force-fed all her life affects her unconsciously to such extent that her conscious part, her face and body, heats up to a level as to leave a smell of a body burning. Her shame and blushes are the equivalent to the unconscious, preconscious and conscious division of the psyche. Berger analyses these divisions as the unconscious being a much larger and hidden element than the conscious part of the psyche. This means that what Sufiya experiences in the unconscious, her shame, is directly reflected on her face as a blush which makes her feel inferior and degraded since her mother, instead of showering her with love, calls the deranged girl as Shame.

In a magical realist perspective, the characters Bilquis and Rani are mere devices for Rushdie to, what one might say, depict patriarchal society and its different modes. Psychoanalysis on these two characters has proven that the characters are created for reasons that this essay has argued are to demean and degrade the Pakistani society, who only creates mad and crazy women like the two characters mentioned. Furthermore, magical realism has been embodied by Sufiya Zinobia because of her odd behaviours and actions. Her resistance to patriarchy comes in the form of retardation being the driving force which makes her able to metamorphose into a beast.

The first part of this essay analyses Bilquis who becomes insane and roams around in a black burkha which symbolises the patriarchal society's effects on submissive women. However, this essay has also constructed an opinion on Rushdie's somewhat ambivalent creations. His conscious demeaning portrayal of Bilquis becomes at time too boring and flat. In scene after scene, Bilquis is seen becoming seedier and duller in a way that it makes the reader want to skip the sections in the novel which describe her. The image of a submissive woman is so dragged out in the novel, that when she dies a rough and indecent death, the reader is somehow glad that this character has finally been laid to rest.

The second and largest part of this essay discussed Sufiya Zinobia and the Beast. She is the girl with three identities; analogously, she is created from three real-life events which Rushdie has experienced. Omar Khayyam marries Sufiya, and how does this marriage is conducted remains a mystery. Since according to Islamic laws, a girl needs to be able to give permission to the match, then how did Rushdie make Sufiya that intelligent? These concepts along with her sister's agitation to get married already at the age of nine, makes the reader shrug to the ignorant level which Rushdie has written the novel. The characterization of Sufiya has both rising and falling characteristics, while she is Sufiya, the Beauty; she is an unconscious, innocent girl who is subjected to the capitalistic philosophy. Subsequently, when she turns into a Beast, she becomes a powerful creature who tears the heads off of men and animals. As Aijaz Ahmad says, even though Sufiya embodies the shame of her mother, and becomes a white panther who murders men, she still is a deranged Beast. Even her power comes from being psychologically challenged. This description has created some debate in the critical world; however, one could assert that Ahmad's point of view is a correct one. It seems as if Rushdie deliberately (or maybe not) choses to write the Beast inside of Sufiya to show that this is the only way that women in patriarchal societies should react, this is, with violence. However, how much can one achieve with violence?

The third and last part of the essay discusses Rani Harappa, who luckily does not submit her unconscious to the patriarchal society, as Bilquis does. Rani is however seen keeping her sanity with embroidery, another patriarchal attribute seen as a time-consuming activity. The interesting part of Rani Harappa's character is that she never says good-bye in the story. It is as if Rushdie has more to add into her life, however when the novel ends, her character vanishes along that of her daughter. Still, one should also emphasize the fact that Rani does manage to outlive her shameless and sinful husband, the equivalent of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who is portrayed negatively in the novel while the real life politician was in many ways a hero to his country. All in all, *Shame* is successful in creating an aura of awareness to the class system in patriarchal societies and the effects of it on the psyches of the female characters. The investigation in this essay has been clearly explored many examples that point to how shame becomes the strongest element in *Shame*. This study has found that the society, whether it may be patriarchal or capitalist, females have been undermined through it all, suggesting a negative effect on the psyches of women, as seen clearly in the examples of Bilquis Hyder, Rani Harappa and Sufiya Zinobia.

Works Cited

- Adamson, Joseph, and Hilary Clark. *Scenes of Shame: Psychoanalysis, Shame and Writing*. New York: SUNY Press, 1999. *Google Book Search*. Web. 23 May 2015
- Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. New York: Verso, 2007. Print.
- Berger, Arthur Asa. *Cultural Criticism*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1995. Print.
- Brennan, Timothy. *Salman Rushdie and the Third World: myths of the nation*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1989. Print.
- Bowers, Maggie Ann. *Magic(al) Realism*. New York: Routledge, 2004. *Google Book Search*. Web. 13 May 2015
- Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." *Theatre Journal* 40.4 (1988): 519-531. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Apr. 2015
- Cundy, Catherine. *Salman Rushdie*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996. *Google Book Search*. Web. 26 Mar. 2015
- Hartmann, Heidi I. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism." *Feminist Frameworks* (1981): 172-189. *Google Scholar Search*. Web. 8 May 2015.
- Hassumani, Sabrina. *Salman Rushdie: A Postmodern Reading of His Major Works*. New Jersey: Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp, 2002. *Google Book Search*. Web. 26 Mar. 2015
- Probyn, Elspeth. *Blush: Faces of Shame*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press, 2005. Print.
- Rashid, Jamil. "Women's Struggle in Pakistan." *Economic and Political Weekly* 22.49 (1987): 2112-2114. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 May 2015.
- Reula, Galván J.F. "On Reality, Fantasy and Fiction. A Conversation with Salman Rushdie." *Atlantis* VI.1 (1984): 93-101. *Google Scholar Search*. Web. 17 Apr. 2015
- Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism*. London: Granta Books, 1992. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. *Shame*. London: Vintage Books, 1995. Print.

Sen, Amartya. "The Many Faces of Gender Inequality." *The New Republic* (2001): 466-477. *Google Scholar Search*. Web. 17 Apr. 2015

Suleri, Sara. *The Rhetoric of English India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. Print.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today*. New York: Routledge, 2015. Print.