UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

From national allegory to cosmopolitanism: Transformations in contemporary Anglo-Indian and Turkish novels

Doğangün, S.A.

Publication date
2014

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Doğangün, S. A. (2014). *From national allegory to cosmopolitanism: Transformations in contemporary Anglo-Indian and Turkish novels*.

Chapter One

Introduction: World-System and World Literature

In this study, I explore the transformation of contemporary Turkish and Anglo-Indian novels from national allegories to sites of multiple belongings by way of a comparative analysis. I analyseten novels by Turkish and Anglo-Indian novelists that were published between 1973 and 2010:Adalet Agaoglu's *Lying Down to Die*(1973), Orhan Pamuk's *Snow (2004)*, Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*(1981), Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*(1997), Aravind Adiga's *The White Tiger*(2008), Latife Tekin's *Berji Kristin: Tales from the Garbage Hills*(1996), Elif Shafak's *The Thirty Rules of Love*(2010), and *The Saint of Incipient Insanities*(2004), Kiran Desai's *The Inheritance of Loss*(2006), and Hari Kunzru's *Transmission*(2005).Departing from the relationship between individual and nation, I extend the scopes ofthe selected works of fiction. As examples of contemporary Anglo-Indian and Turkish novels, the selected novels are actually, I wish to argue, world texts whose thematic reference is not exclusively the nation-state, but a broader entity, that is, the world-system as a whole.

I have selected *Midnight's Children*, *The God of Small Things*, *The White Tiger*, *The Inheritance of Loss* and *Transmission* as my objects of analysis for two main reasons. The first reason is that the selected novels are widely acclaimed international novels that are read, studied, scrutinised and criticised in the context of postcolonial literatures. The second reason is related to the first: these novels are literary-cultural products of a "third-world" nation, marked by hundreds of years of colonial rule. I have also chosen *Lying Down to Die*, *Snow*, *Berji Kristin: Tales from the Garbage Hills*, *The Forty Rules of Love*, and *The Saint of Incipient Insanities* for similar reasons: they are all international award winners. As a nation-state without a history of colonial rule, Turkey is unique; hence, Turkish literature may not fit

the triadic developmental paradigm of most third-world literatures. Nevertheless, the selected novels thematically address similar cultural issues as their Indian counterparts. As to the question why I have opted for Turkey and India, I did because they are both located as the semi-periphery, but different at the same time, which allows me to compare and contrast. Finally, the reason why I chose the above-mentioned novels is related to the fact that most of the selected novels circulate outside their national contexts. Taking into account the thematic aspects, the selected novels are relevant for a discussion of literary worldliness: with their diverse modes of belonging, both Anglo-Indian and Turkish cultural products claim to be members of world literature.

The main title of this study is "From National Allegory to Cosmopolitanism." The main reason why I deploy these two concepts is related to the way in which I have approached this topic. During my preliminary readings, I realised that the more I analysed the relationship between the individual and the nation in the novels, the more convinced I became that there is a wider reality to which these works of fiction respond, albeit sometimes very subtly, from their respective contexts.Thus I decided to analyse the novels by taking into consideration the way they depict the individual characters and their stories with regards to the larger world around them. Three points need further clarification at this point. The first is that I use "nation" here as a cultural object of analysis. I draw on Homi K. Bhabha's perspective of the nation "as a form of cultural *elaboration*" and as "an agency of *ambivalent* narration that holds culture at its most productive position" ("Introduction" 3). I am particularly interested in the ways in which national identity as a cultural construct is deployed and criticised in the novels I have chosen. The second point is about the notion of "cosmopolitanism" which, throughout this study, I use in the general sense of belonging to the world, reconsidering one's attachments to the nation.As Bruce Robbins writes, "we are connected to all sorts of places, causally if not always consciously, including many that we

have never travelled to" (3). With the proliferation of unconscious connections, the necessity for thinking ourselves as active citizens of a global *polis* has grown exponentially (Johansen and Kim 5). Finally, the prepositional phrase "from… to" that I use in the main title is intended to denote neither a lineardirection nor a chronology that marks a point of beginning and that of an end, but to underline a sense of flow that indicates a constant state of becoming and a refusal of being categorised exclusively as one thing or another.

The prepositional phrase "from… to" also anticipates the subtitle of this study: "Transformations in Contemporary Anglo-Indian and Turkish Novels."In the Merriam Webster Dictionary, the verb"to transform" is defined as "to change in composition or structure," and its noun form transformation, as "an act, process, or instance of transforming or being transformed."Theword is chosen to imply the importance of changing processes of belonging. I try to inquire into the ways in which the novel characters react to certain forms of belonging (national or supranational) and try to develop their own sense of those.The conjunction "and" signifies a relationship between contemporary Anglo-Indian and Turkish novels,signalling commonality as well as a difference. Neither of the two contexts has a privilege over the other; my aim is to situate them as in relation to one another non-hierarchically.

Two aspects of my subtitle need to be explained further. First of all, although I write about Anglo-Indian and Turkish novels, my focus is more narrowly defined: I examine only a specific selection of contemporary Anglo-Indian and Turkish texts. I consider these novels specifically relevant to the topic of this study, which is about the way they, as literary works, represent global processes of interconnectedness thematically. I do not aim to make comprehensive claims about the two countries. Instead, I take the two countries as my focus of study insofar as the historical contexts of the selected novels allow me to do so. Secondly, the dash in my subtitle "Anglo-Indian" is intended to signify my aim to limit the scope of my

study with regards to Indian fiction. While India consists of different peoples, languages and religions, I specifically selected Anglophone novelists of Indian origin as my objects of analysis.

A vast literature already exists on Turkish and Indian literatures individually. With respect to Anglo-Indian fiction, studies rooted in postcolonial, feminist, (anti-) orientalist, deconstructionist, modernist, postmodernist, as well as cosmopolitan theories inform the literary analyses written so far. With regards to Turkish fiction, similar theories in addition to modernisation-related discussionshold the literary domain. The fact that the two literatures have not so far become objects of comparative analysis renders this study unique.The word "comparison", as defined by Merriam Webster Online Dictionary, is "an examination of two or more items to establish similarities and dissimilarities." While comparing two or more things, a theoretical framework is needed to make the act of examination possible.

There are manystudies comparing India and Turkeyin the fields of politics and economics, focusing on political and economic advancements in the framework of theories of development and third-world studies. However, there are other aspects, such as literature, that are in need of comparative analysis, as the two countries have both similar and different characteristics with regards to economics and politics. In this study, I aim to compare the selected novels as world-cultural productions by situating them in the world-system. In what follows, I begin by surveying important contemporary paradigms for thinking about literature in global terms to test their usefulness for "locating" Turkish and Anglo-Indian literature in a world-literary context.The theory of modernisation forms the backbone of the so-called "world system" theory. The present chapter intends to lead to a clearer understanding of the link between the aim to locate the novels as members of the "world-system" and the background of the "world-system" theory.

Modernisation theory and alternative modernity

According to Anthony Giddens, modernisation means the appearance of "modes of social life or organisation which emerged in Europe from about the seventeenth century onwards and which subsequently became more or less worldwide in their influence" (1). The period Giddens refers to comprises Europe's Great Transition, which is associated with Enlightenment industrialisation, capitalism, and urbanisation. Several social science theorists of the nineteenth century endeavoured to map and conceptualize this transition, which all share the Enlightenment depiction of social evolution as a succession of stages: primitivism, savagery, barbarism and civilization (Pieterse *Development Theory*, 20).[1] Central to the comprehension of social change is the unilinearity of social evolution, proceeding in the same direction for societies all over the world. It propounds that "history as a process has a direction and its goal is modernity" (Hunt 107), at which all societies will inevitably arrive. In this context, social evolution produces "an imperial panorama that dehistoricise[s] non-western peoples, or, rather, grants them a history only from the perspective of the imperial lighthouse" (Pieterse *Development Theory*, 20). The idea of evolution informed by the imperialist perspective presents Europe as the only really contemporary place, the sole representative of modernity. The linearity underlined by the idea of evolutionalso creates a time sequence that suggests either a backward or a forward movement along the axis of progress. This Eurocentric perception functions as a "manual for the imperial management of societies at different evolutionary stages" (Pieterse *Development Theory*, 21).

The concept of modernisation is based on the dichotomy between "modern" and "traditional". Viewed in this manner, societies have to follow a linear path from the primitive

---

[1]Among these theories, Pieterse mentions Auguste Comte's social dynamics, Karl Marx's 'economic law of motion of modern society', Lewis H Morgan's reflections on the development of kinship systems, Henri Maine's views on the family and property, and Edward Burnett Tylor's ideas about culture (*Development Theory*20).

to the modern. In Talcott Parson's words, this view of modernity embraces "a uniform, unambiguously structured pattern in progress towards harmonious integration" (Kaya 36). In this frame, the idea of movement from the particular to the universal is underlined. This view portrays traditional society as a stage that must be replaced by the stage of modern society, which regards tradition as the opposite of modernity. Modern societies are those that have somehow liberated themselves from the hold of the past to create rational institutions; traditional societies are those that remain attached to the past both culturally and institutionally and are unable, therefore, to break into modernity (Dirlik "Formations of Globality", 150). In this distinction, backward and traditional are almost synonymous while development is associated with progress toward the norms that are embodied by European societies. Also, the emphasis on the past and present that is implied in the contrast between the traditional and the modern falls flat in terms of explaining the massive differences among "traditional" societies as well as the way they shape *their own* modernities. In this context, modernisation theory fails to account for historical differences along the way to becoming "modern".

There are numerous thinkers on modernisation from various disciplines who have influencedmy theoretical background as well as elucidated its implementations. I have restricted my deployment of those theoreticians' ideasinsofar as they enable the critical view that is intended in the following chapters. I have so far mentioned some of the problems inherent in the theory of modernisation in order to draw attention to the idea of multiple paths of modernisation. In the chapters to follow, my literary analyses of the two different geographies are motivated by the idea that all societies create their own modernity. Western modernism, which is fundamentally marked by the Industrial Revolution and the premises of the Enlightenment, has transformed communitarian relations that have been moulded by religious and traditional beliefs, and eventually has produced a pluralistic social structure that

has contributed to the formation of rationalist, pluralist as well as liberal values (Gole, *The Forbidden Modern: Civilization and Veiling* 132).

Modernisation theory has been subject to criticism originating among socialist and free-market ideologies, world-systems theorists, globalisation theory and dependency theory, among others. In this study, I use Immanuel Wallerstein's perspective to open up space for a discussion of Anglo-Indian and Turkish literary texts. The idea of "alternative modernity" is necessary for describing an increasingly integrated cultural world without resorting to teleological narratives of modernisation. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar defines an "alternative modernity" as one that rejects an either/or logic and fashions a way of "thinking through and against Western modernity," expanding the angle of vision globally, going beyond the West, and articulating a "difference that would destabilize the universalist idioms [of Western modernity], historicise the contexts, and pluralize the experience of modernity" (15). When adopted as an analytical framework for literature, it is my contention that "alternative modernity" proves productive in pointing attention to the versatility and creativity of peripheral narratives. I argue that an in-depth analysis of selected Anglo-Indian and Turkish novels providesa fertile ground for such an investigation in that both India and Turkey are countries that are moulded by sets of "home-grown practices and idioms" as a consequence of the differential historical legacies of postcolonial transition in India and "top-down modernisation" in Turkey (Gole, "Islam in Public: New Visibilities and New Imaginaries" 174). For the sake of clarity, I will briefly mention Wallerstein's alternative explanation to modernisation theory before I explicate the link between world-system and world literature.

Wallerstein and the modern world-system

Dating back to the 1970s, Wallerstein's ideas are based on "a clear conceptual break with theories of 'modernisation' and thus provide a new theoretical paradigm to guide our investigations of the emergence and development of capitalism, industrialism, and national states" (Skocpol 1075). Wallerstein's criticisms of modernisation include: the reification of the nation-state as the sole unit of analysis; the assumption that all countries can follow only a single path of evolutionary development; the disregard of the world-historical development of transnational structures that constrain local and national development; explaining progress in terms of ahistorical ideal types of "tradition" versus "modernity", which are then elaborated and applied to national cases.

In Wallerstein's own words, a world-system is a "spatial/temporal zone, which cuts across many political and cultural units, one that represents an integrated zone of activity and institutions which obey certain systemic rules" (*World-Systems Analysis*, 17). Thus "the integrated zone" underlines the economic interconnectedness of the world, a world economy that is integrated through the market rather than in relation to a political centre. The world-system Wallerstein introduces is "a multicultural territorial division of labour in which the production and exchange of basic goods and raw materials is necessary for the everyday life of its inhabitants" (Chase-Dunn and Grimes 388). This division of labour signifies the forces and relations of production of the world economy as a whole.

In his seminal work, *The Capitalist World Economy*, Wallerstein conceptualises the structure of the capitalist world-economy as a hierarchy consisting of a core, periphery and semi-periphery (100).Core regions with strong states enforce unequal exchange relations favourable to themselves; they appropriate surplus value from the periphery, the second component, made up of exploited regions characterized by mono-agriculture and a

dependence on the export of low-wage products. Within this tripartite design, however, the world system as a whole is sustained by the semi-periphery, an intermediate category that acts as a buffer, separating the core and the periphery and disguising the tensions between peripheral societies and their cores. Wallerstein inserts Turkey and India in his list of semi-peripheral countries. [2] In Wallerstein's approach, the division of labour is necessarily geographical and international, so that different geographical regions and different countries occupy different positions within the world division of labour. In a world-system, "there is extensive division of labour. This division is not merely functional – that is, occupational – but geographical. That is to say, the range of economic tasks is not evenly distributed throughout the world-system" (*The Modern World-System I* 349).

Wallerstein's insights into developmentcan be briefly summarized in two points: the first is that the actual unit of development is the world-system, that is, the zone integrated by a division of labour in the production of goods necessary for reproduction. The core, periphery and semi-periphery countries allfunction according to the logic of this system. The second is that, in this system, inequality persists as the core countries exploit the periphery. How does this altered view of development reflect on the field of literature? What does Wallerstein's theory imply with regards to the role of literature in the world?

World-system,world literature

To consider the status of the concept of the world in literary criticism, one should first ask what connotations the word involves as well as its links to literature.In *The Creation of the World*(2007), Jean-Luc Nancy writes that "a world is only a world for those who inhabit it" and that a world is "an ethos, a habitus and an inhabiting: it is what holds to itself and in

---

[2] Dietmar Rothermund notes his concern over the definitions of periphery and semi-periphery, which Wallerstein, apparently, changes in every subsequent volume of his work *The Modern World-System* ("The Evolution of the Center-Periphery Concept, 77").

itself" (42-43). Thus, in its philosophical sense, a world encloses and presupposes itself as the container, identical with its contents and what it includes, as a ground for itself that does not reach outside itself. World is "the common place of a totality of places, of presences and dispositions for possible events" (Nancy 42-43). However, as Eric Hayot claims, world also means

> this world, the natural, actual living world of human history and geologic time. World is thus both a philosophical concept and an example of that concept; a concept that is in the deepest possible way an instance of itself. What we idealize when we speak of "world" as a ground is the world's material role as a ground. There is no "world" without the world; the world, as it has been defined, understood, and named by a wide variety of human societies, is the ground of the concept of world that appears, philosophically, to precede it. (25)

The material existence of the world heralds its philosophical existence, functioning as both the ground and the expression of a philosophical concept. Hayot's view might be taken to imply that the philosophical concept of the world does not necessarily encompass the history of the world of the literary work.[3] Here Hayot differentiates two aspects of a literary work: the world-content (history, but also the idealised expression of the world in the work's preconscious) and the world-form (philosophy, but also the material self-organisation of the work as act). Hayot underscores the importance of the literary work's world-content vis-a-vis its world-form. However, as he states, focusing on the world-content of the work might mean that the world-forming quality of the work is neglected (25). The relationship between the world and the work can be best analysed through an examination of both world-content and world-form. Thus the consideration of the two ways reflects the work in its worldedness. In this way, a work can embody the historical and the philosophical understanding of the material world. What Hayot's view of the world of the work as material and philosophical suggests is that recognizing the history of the world concept is not simply the history of a

---

[3]Hayot actually calls it the "artwork". For the purposes of this study, I have adapted this term to literature.

philosophical concept, but rather a history of the intersection between such a concept and its practical appearance in the actual world (Hayot 26). Such a perspective helps to view the literary works in view of global processes of economic, cultural, and social transformation; in other words, globalisation.

With these implications of the word "world", Wallerstein's world-system analysiscan contribute to the debates on world literature significantly. Commenting on the influence of world-systems analysis on literary history, Franco Moretti claims that the first important contribution was that "it allowed us to 'see' a new literary genre—and not just any genre, but the one trying to represent *the world as a totality*: a possibility that our discipline had never even envisioned, because it lacked the concepts to do so" ("World-Systems Analysis" 67). The use of italics in the sentence hints at Moretti's understanding of the world as not the actual world but the total enworldedness (similar to Nancy's view), or world-constituting force, of a system. According to Moretti, the second positive influence of world-system analysis is that it "threw light on a geographical peculiarity" and that "a common ground emerged" in which the literary works of the core countries were replaced by those of the semi-periphery, written in a similar vein by writers "who were probably encouraged by their intermediate and dynamic position to grapple with the world as a whole" (68). [4] In this context, as representatives of the literatures of the semi-periphery, Turkish and Indian writers deserve further attention. As I try to demonstrate in this study, they should be considered as particularly "worldy" in their capacity to comprehend and reflect on the reality around them. The works I analyse in the subsequent chapters provide ample evidence to Moretti's observation.

---

[4]Moretti considers French and English literatures between 1650 and 1950 as the core of the world literary system. He claims that those literatures are replaced by German, American, Irish, and Latin American writers. (*World-Systems Analysis* 68). He coins the authors of those works as coming from the semi-periphery. Following Wallerstein's analysis (although Moretti does not explicate it), I have decided to insert Turkish and Indian literatures in this category.

How to study world literature

For the purposes of this study, I discuss three different theories on thinking about literature in the context of the world. I do so with the aim to situate selected works of fiction as part and parcel of world historical processes. I commence by discussing Franco Moretti's model of reading world literature. As I have mentioned above, Moretti opts for analysing literary works (mainly the novel) in terms of Wallerstein's world-system analysis. Moretti compares and contrasts Darwin's evolutionary theory with Wallerstein's. As Moretti explains

> A theory that takes its central problem the *multiplicity of forms* existing in the world; that explains them as the result of *historical divergence*; and that bases their divergence on a process of *spatial separation*: here is what evolutionary theory has to offer to literary history.
>
> In world-systems analysis the coordinates change, as the onset of capitalism brusquely reduces the many independent spaces needed for the origin of species (or of languages) to just three positions: core, periphery, semi-periphery. The world becomes *one* and *unequal*: one because capitalism constrains production everywhere on the planet; and unequal, because its network of exchanges requires, and reinforces, a marked power unevenness between the three areas. ("World-Systems Analysis" 70)

Whereas evolutionary theory as an idea of world literature offers many different forms, the appeal of world-systems theory is that we can comprehend the unity of world literature—as in Goethe's *Weltliteratur*—as well as its differentiation, the asymmetry of capitalism, one but unequal. In Moretti's account, the point in comparing the two theories with regards to literature is not to side with either of them. Moretti speaks of the two opposite theories to distinguish literary works written before the eighteenth century, and those written after it. He concludes that to speak of *Weltliteratur* in the singular sense is erroneous: "there are two distinct world literatures. One precedes the eighteenth century and is characterized by strong internal diversity" and "produces new forms mostly by divergence; and is best explained by evolutionary theory" ("World-Systems Analysis" 75). In this evolutionary logic, "the

development of all national and local literatures is profoundly constrained by their position within the system" (70) in that the novel as a form of fiction has its origins in the core (the West) and travels to the periphery (the East). The second *Weltliteratur* that Moretti calls the world literary system "is the product of a unified market; it shows a growing, and at times shocking degree of sameness; it produces new forms mostly by convergence; and is best explained by world-systems analysis" (75).

Although Moretti thinks that the two world literatures offer us the opportunity to rethink the importance of history in literary studies, his theory is subject to criticism in two ways. The first criticism is that his mapping of world literature, though inclusive of much of the world, remains Eurocentric insofar as he claims that the world literary system is unified but unequal, in other words, inevitably hierarchical. The second criticism is that his relegating of the world literary system to "sameness" overlooks the vast historical differences that inform different works of literature from distinctive localities. Indeed, throughout this study, I seek to emphasise the significance of difference with regards to history in the selected Anglo-Indian and Turkish novels.

The second theory I wish to discuss briefly comes fromPascale Casanova, whose work is also greatly influenced by the world-systems perspective of Wallerstein. Perceiving "world" as referring to that total enworldedness but not the actual world, Casanova presents

> another world, whose divisions and frontiers are relatively independent of political and linguistic borders. And with its own laws, its own history, its specific revolts and revolutions; a market where non-market values are traded, within a non-economic economy; and measured, as we shall see, by an aesthetic scale of time. This World of Letters functions invisibly for the most part, save to those most distant from its great centres or most deprived of its resources, who can see more clearly than others the forms of violence and domination that operate within it. ("Literature as a World" 72)

The world Casanova describes is "world literary space," which refers to the world-constituting force of a system. As a system, this space is understood as the acknowledgement

of the cultural distance between'our' world and our object, the core and the periphery. The "visibility" of this system to the most underprivileged writers shows Casanova's emphasis ondomination that works with the system of colonization.It implies that Casanova's theory works with the logic of binaries, presenting us with the core and the periphery but excludingthe semi-periphery, which occupies the middleposition and therefore is the most worldy in contrast with the most global. Casanova exposes an emerging regime of inequality in the world of letters, where minor languages and literatures are subject to the invisible but implacable violence of their dominant counterparts. However, this model of Casanova takes into account the history of colonisation only to reaffirm France (Central Europe) as the centre of the world of letters. It is "a system that permanently accords the work of European authors acentral position while relegating to the periphery everything that comes from other parts ofthe world" (*World Republic of Letters* 151).In this context, Casanova's system of literature as a world also remainsstubbornly Eurocentric. Commenting on the commonalities of Moretti's and Casanova's theories, Theo D'Haen traces in both of the theorists' attempts a refashioning of the literatures of Europe into a coherent system, transcending national literature paradigms, and finally emerging as "European" literature within world literature (36).

The third perspective on world literature comes from David Damrosch, who focuses on the inclusion of peripheral literatures into the system of world literature in the twenty-first century, and who frames world literature as "an essay in definition, celebration of new opportunities" (*What is World Literature?* 36).Damrosch is particularly interested in the ways that make possible the insertion of these narratives into the realm of world literature. Granting world-literature status only to those texts that have "circulated beyond their culture of origin through modes of circulation as translation, publication and reading," Damrosch's study of world literature is thus partly about identifying which texts are translated into and

read in which languages (4). In *How to Read World Literature*(2009), Damrosch claims, "translation paved the way for [the novelist] Orhan Pamuk to win the 2006 Nobel Prize in Literature" (65). However, as I argue in this study, one selected novel, *Lying Down to Die* (*Olmeye Yatmak)* has not been translated into English (other than by certain theorists who examine the text in Anglophone journals); yet as I intend to show, the novel is a member of literary world-system, precisely for the reason that the novel thematically resists being tagged as a national allegory exclusively. I have included novels with English translations, novels originally written in English, as well as original works (such as *Lying Down to Die*), with my own added translation.

Furthermore, Damrosch's motive to expand the field of inquiry in world literature proves to be problematic in that he proposes elsewhere a "global world literature," which would target both the "narrowly bounded nationalism" and "the boundless, breathless globalism" that characterize contemporary thinking about literary history ("Toward a History of World Literature", 483, 490). The study of world literature should be global since world literature appears and is perceived differently from different parts of the globe. Thus in the three works by Damrosch, his approach to the "world" in world literature transforms from an expansive form of "world" to a "global" world literature, which, as Hayot claims, is contradictory because"it seems to appear only to announce its transformation into something other than what it means, its capacity to assure the very spatial range it seems to promise" (*On Literary Worlds* 36). On the one hand, Damrosch proposes the possibility of a single world literature. On the other hand, he rules out this possibility by adding the adjective "global," which suggests a perspective made possible through a consideration of multiple perspectives. Although Damrosch's perspective entails a significantmove towards including peripheral texts into world-literary space, it cuts off from consideration the literatures of many small nations and minor languages that are nonetheless also touched by world historical

processes. After all, not all literatures are written: there are a variety of collectivities that produce oral literature.

The three theoriesand their criticisms I have discussed are all relevant for this study: drawing from Wallerstein's centre-periphery model, these approaches underline the unequal interconnectedness of all literatures. Nonetheless, they also tend to ignore the specificities of particularlocalities and how these particularities are reflected in their relationship with the world. They pave the way for the following question: is it possible to consider a model of world literature that, instead of discreet national literatures, sees all literatures as participating in a network of power-inflected relations, with the task of the worldliterature scholar to analyse these relations through deep attention to the texts in question in the context of world history? How can we analyse and compare unequal peripheral literatures in terms of their relative location to the centre without homogenising them under the heading of globalisation? The chapters in this study focus on these questions.

To sum up: world-systems analysis is based on an alternative explanation to the theory of modernisation. The concept of alternative modernity allows one to observe the different experiences of modernisations that different countries experience. In terms of Wallerstein's world-system analysis based on the tripartite model of centre, periphery and semi-periphery, the two countries from which I selected the novels are both situated in the semi-periphery. The specificity of this position allows room for viewing the literatures of these nations as members of world literature, in their capability of interpreting the tensions between the core and the periphery.However, as this study accentuates, the more nation system as a unit of development is questioned, so is the term semi-periphery. As I intend to argue, it is not possible to speak of a single semi-peripheral position. The literaryperspectives of Moretti, Casanova and Damrosch help us view literature as a world-system, in which a degree of inequality exists in the interaction between the centre and the periphery. The

concept of world literature arises as a Eurocentric approach explaining the system as "one" and "uneven". I intend to show that the selected works of literature arefully part of this system. Yet they are so while retaining their emphasis on their own agency in resisting to be tagged as representatives of "national" or "Third World" literatures. Furthermore, highly relevant differences emerge between the selected texts with regards to their status in the system of world literature. This study focuses on those differences, the specificities (in line with the idea of alternative modernities) in the way the texts approach the world. But, then, how can one compare those specificities?

Why comparison?

Comparative thinking is a mode of thought central to everyday experience, literary expression, and disciplinary as well as interdisciplinary knowledge. It lies at the heart of the act of making connections across traditions, boundaries and identities. However, as RajagopalanRadhakrishnan claims, "the epistemology of comparison is willed into existence by a certain will to power / knowledge. Such a will is never innocent of history and its burden" (16). A comparison is never neutral: it hierarchises or compartmentalises dissimilarity on behalf of a "superior" essence. Moretti proposes a model for reading world literatures in terms of the novel (he is primarily interested in the novel as a dominant Western literary form), tracing how that form moves around the world, changing shape and significance as it comes into contact with local cultures and with the political and economic conditions that affect the production and consumption of books. Moretti claims,

> World literature is not an object; it is a problem, and a problem that asks for a new critical method: and no one has ever found a method by just reading more texts. That is not how theories come into being; they need a leap, a wager −a hypothesis, to get started. We need to come up with generalizations, perhaps even "laws" that might

reveal a system, a system of world literature made up of variations. ("Conjectures", 64)

Jale Parla claims that Moretti's "wager" consists of two components, which are "distant reading" and "generalizations" ("The Object of Comparison" 117). The first part is the sociological comparative method Moretti chooses for reading world literature, called "distant reading". Since it is not possible to read all literary works, Franco Moretti proposes that we should depend on the readings and criticisms of those who have solid background in non-Western literatures and therefore serve as our guide. Reading this observation in light of Radhakrishnan's critical take on comparisonreveals the prescriptive, even didactic tone in "distant reading".The second part of the wager is to come up with generalizations: "laws" (117). Although it is a giant step towards reading world texts within an analytical framework, setting rules through readings of others may pose some problems. For instance, Jonathan Arac objects to the idea of "distant reading," claiming that establishing laws through generalizations sacrifices close scrutiny of the particular and are, therefore, uncritical (35-45). Gayatri C. Spivak insists language-based "close reading" is essential for comparison in response to Moretti's sociological comparative method of "distant reading" (106-107). These observations are very relevant to my methodology in this study. As I have suggested in the question posed earlier, paying "deep attention to the texts" requires a sensitivity to the interconnection between the semi-peripheral texts and the world as well as for pinpointing their similarities and differences with regards to the ways they get articulated into the realm of world literature. It is my contention that this is possible only through close readings of the texts as opposed to Moretti's "distant reading". Needless to say, the impulse to compare and contrast the texts in terms of their specificities looms large.

Another method for comparative reading is suggested in Moretti's *Signs Taken for Wonders*(1997), in which

> Literary texts are historical products organized according to rhetorical criteria. The main problem of a literary criticism that aims to be in all respects a historical discipline is to do justice to both aspects of its objects: to work out a system of concepts which are both historical and rhetorical. These would enable one to perform a dual operation: to slice into segments the diachronic continuum constituted by the whole set of literary texts (the strictly historical task), but to slice it according to formal criteria pertaining to that continuum and no others (the strictly rhetorical task). (9)

Thus the choice for the comparatist is between the two approaches to world literature, the formal and the historicist. As Parla explains, the formalists opt for the well-known formalist tools, namely, myths, archetypes motifs and themes, whereas the historicists venture to compare content and context: the ideal is to find the analytic frame that justifies both ("The Object of Comparison" 120). According to Parla, the writings of Mikhail Bakhtin, Fredric Jameson, Terry Eagleton and Franco Moretti represent a big step in the realisation of this ideal.

As this study does not claim to survey larger literary trends or focus on the formation of genres and styles over long periods of time and across wide geographic spaces, I have chosen to analyse selected works of India and Turkey and take the novels as my "cultural" objects of analysis. In line with Mieke Bal's proposal in terms of comparative reading, I examine the novels in order to make possible what she describes as "an analysis of literature in its agency as cultural force, but on its own terms, so that the cultural object can be emancipated from its historical burdens of being either a mirror of society or an instrument of manipulation, either an object of formalist aesthetics or a mere repository of ideas" ("Meanwhile" 192). Bal's proposition to see texts as cultural informants facilitates resistance to the Western literary tradition as the hegemonic mode for reading all of world literature. Furthermore, it also makes it possible to relocate the selected contemporary texts in a world of literature whose boundaries extend beyond those of the modern nation-state.

According to Walter Mignolo, comparison is a triangular business including at least two objects to be compared plus the subject performing the comparison. As the subject who compares in this study is myself, I follow Parla's views on the tasks of the comparatists:

> As comparatists … we may concern ourselves, for example, with what infiltrates into literature from culture, especially from a hegemonous culture. Supposing we placed our filter in the right spots, can we guarantee that only the good and the pure and the beautiful and the correct will sieve through it? I think not. But what we can do is expose the scum that collects on the sieve. (Parla, "The Object of Comparison" 118)

Parla's views are very much in line with my concerns in this study. As far as the link between the hegemonous culture and literature is concerned, I am especially interested in the ways the selected novels both influence and are informed by the omnipresence of globalisation. Reading the texts with a critical lens ("the sieve") allows me to unmask and emphasise the inequality ("the scum") that is engendered by that hegemony.

A question that then concerns me is how to establish my comparative outlook theoretically. I have deployed various theories of Homi K. Bhabha, Arif Dirlik, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Robert J. Young, Aijaz Ahmad, Jan Nederveen Pieterse, Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, Arjun Appadurai, Ulrich Beck, Kwame Anthony Appiah and Bruce Robbins. What these theories have in common is that they ground their viewpoints on the periphery rather than the centre. Enabled by but not limited to the ideas generating from this space, they all conceptualise global processes of interconnectedness with a critical outlook that focuses on historically situated differences of the countries of the semi-periphery.

Although Wallerstein originally sees the semi-periphery as a stabilising force depolarising the world-system, Chase-Dunn depicts the semi-periphery later as a source of social change and a fruitful location for movements to resist and transform capitalism (quoted in Johnston and Biro 65). This is the specific positionality of the semi-periphery as having awareness of exploitation plusthe means to resist, or in Chase-Dunn's words, a space with

"both motivation and opportunity" (26). However, according to Johnston and Biro, although this position is identified as the locus of transformation, it is important recognize that a 'single', universal time or space of semi-peripherality, particularly one demarcated by the boundaries of the state, should be rejected (65).This viewpoint enables the prospect of historical and spatial variations, and makes possible to underline the dynamic state of this position as I have earlier referred to in Moretti's application of the term. In this way, the term can be used as a "constructed analytic category" (66), allowing room for a comparison of diverse and similar semi-peripheral positions such as India and Turkey.

A significant point in this regard is related to the aspects that determine the act of comparison. In other words, what aspects form the basis of comparison with regards to Anglo-Indian and Turkish novels?In order to discuss similarities and differences among the novels, I have selected four aspects that are also the chapter titles of this study,shaping the connection between the novels and the world as well as the possibility of showing points of resistance against global culture.

The first aspect comprises both allegory and theatricality. Both concepts are pertinent to this study and the selected novels in specific ways. Allegory is an important part of third-world fiction: in the eyes of comparatists such as Jameson and Moretti, it is a means of revealing the content and context of the third-world text (see Chapter Two). The term "third world" is a problematic category of analysis, though not obsolete because of the persistence of the assumptions of modernisation discourse. I discuss the relevance of this term particularly in Chapter Two in order to question the idea that allegory collapses nation and individual, so that literature is always ultimately about the nation. The concept of semi-periphery becomes useful as it enables us to zero in on the relationship between the individual and the world, rather then on the collapse of the individual and the nation. In light of this observation, Wallerstein's critique of modernisation theory should be considered as

appropriate in that the theory of modernisation privileges the nation-state. At the same time, theatricality establishes an alternative for reading the resistance against the allegorical aspects of the texts. Josette Féral recognizes that theatricality applies totheatreas well as to processes in culture and in everyday life (quoted in Reinelt 207). For Féral, theatricality is a condition in which a certain cleavage in space opens up where the spectator looks to engage and to create the theatrical. Outside of the everyday, or rather a breach in it, this space of theatricality requires both the gaze of the spectator and the act of the other, but the initiative lies with the spectator. This theatricality is an experience, then, that is not limited to the theatre, but is an aspect of life that appears whenever its minimum conditions are met. In terms of fiction, this concept can be used to think critically and to oppose the allegorical mode in the selected novels. The national allegory is exposed as theatrical performance.

The second aspect is the concept of subalternity.As I focus, especially in Chapter Three, on the connection between the texts and the world, the stories of the subaltern groups in the selected novels help me to locate the dramas ofthose subordinated by hegemonyand excluded from a meaningful role in a regime of power as well as to expose the re-articulation of these marginal groups into the world-system. In that sense, the subaltern groups do not quite belong to the nation, which makes them especially and specifically *worldy*, both informing and informed by contemporary forces of globalisation. Considering the link between subaltern collectivities and the history of the capital, Wallerstein's concept of semi-periphery becomes an apt point for discussion. While accounting for subalternity, however, it is also important to uncover historical and cultural differences that inform the concept by placing diverse literary reflections, which makes it possible to enlarge the scope of subaltern epistemology. With these implications the concept of subalternity acquires significance as a point of connection between the text and the world.

Hybridity is the third aspect I have selected. I use the term as a mechanism for resistance in line with Bhabha's idiom (see Chapter Four). Unsettling categorizations, hybridity serves as a bridging concept, "extending the parameters of analysis and highlighting a mode of explanation which is alert to the role of difference and contingency in contemporary society" (Papastergiadis 5). As it offers a syncretic cultural flexibility and a challenging in-between-ness, it expands our understanding of identity and culture in societies. Nevertheless, it is also a deeply problematic term in that it has been co-opted by global capitalism and rendered spectacular and devoid of power. If it is considered a concept lacking historicity, it runs the risk of homogenising differences. These two opposing claims are both implicated in the selected novels. Therefore, there is a need for a critical analysis of hybridity.Considering Hardt's and Negri'sviews onthe politicisation of love, I argue in the fourth chapter that love as a theme is an appropriate metaphor that demonstrates what kinds of hybridity criticise globalisation and what forms affirm it. As Ahmad points out, such an effort necessitates a historicisation of hybridity in different settings.

The final aspect is cosmopolitanism, central in Chapter Five. As the buzzword of twenty-first century forms of belonging, the concept of cosmopolitanism is championed for its ability to imagine social difference within the shared life-worlds of multicultural societies in today's world. Literature is one site where these processes might take shape (McCallum 2).Kwame Anthony Appiah contends, "the novel [is] a testing ground for a distinction between cosmopolitanism, with its emphasis on a dialogue among differences" (207). However, within the framework of globalisation, cosmopolitanism needs to be re-examined to afford a multiply linked and layered vision, resisting Eurocentric approaches. This necessitates a multiply situated subjectivity that has its origins in the non-West.Since globalisation is very frequently associated with Americanisation, the ramifications of this equation necessitates further analysis as to what extent this view informs cosmopolitanism

and whether this impedes a genuine cosmopolitan stance or gives way to a novel form of it. Equally important is the need to emphasise the differences in the perception of cosmopolitan belongings and how this dissimilarity is reflected upon from various contexts. The specific positionality of Indian and Turkish contexts as semi-peripheral locations supports my aim to locate the novels as capable of imagining the world in its diversity.

The chapters

I have structured my study as follows. In the next chapter (Chapter Two), I discuss novels (*Midnight's Children*, *Lying Down to Die*, and *Snow*) that emphasise the possibilities and limitations of the national allegorical mode in contrast to instances of heightened theatricality. I demonstrate the ways in which theatricality offers ways of stylistic resistance to national narratives.Allegory has been a form of interpretation for third-world novels for some time now, depicting the narrative of the nation through the story of the individual. Viewing the novels in this manner exposes the idea that the thematic horizon for them is the nation, and so inevitably limits their scope and potential. The texts deliberately rework the principle of national allegory through distinct theatrical instances. Seen from this perspective the selected novels 'are out of sight' with regards to world-systems theory, as they do not offer a vision beyond the nation. However, the parody that is generated from the constant iteration of allegory evokes a theatricality that allows us to see the refusal to be regarded as allegorical per se. In view of Bhabha's, Bal's and Butler's theories, I analyse the performative potential of the selected novels. While addressing these points, I examine the modernisation projects of both Turkey and India in the novels in order to situate them as historically different, yet culturally similar at the same time.As I argue in this chapter, viewing the countries as representatives of alternative modernities makes it possible to not

only emphasise Wallerstein's critical view towards modernisation, but also compare the two contexts between themselves.

I begin in Chapter Three by examining three novels (*Berji Kristin*, *The White Tiger*, and *The God of Small Things*) in the context of global capitalism and frame the texts as stories of specific subaltern experiences. In order to read them in this way, I first consider the changing meaning of the term subaltern in the writings of Subaltern Studies Group. As the study of caste system is an integral component of this group, I investigate the ways in which this social reality is marked by colonialism and global capitalism in India. Through a comparative analysis of *The God of Small Things* and *The White Tiger*, I seek to zoom in on the marginalization of disenfranchised groups by both British colonialism and neoliberal capitalism respectively. I then move onto a different context to analyse other new subaltern positions in *Berji Kristen*. In Wallerstein's world-system, the importance attributed to the semi-periphery stems from its distinct middle position in the international division of labour. In this system, the subaltern as the most productive yet at the same timethe most marginalized acquires further significance for this study. As the countries of the semi-periphery are experiencing both constant inclusion and exclusion due to globalisation, so are the subaltern groups. Their affiliation with the world-system is more explicit as in today's post-national/colonial era, the role of the nation-state has been diminished and the urban underclass has been struggling with the effects of capitalist globalisation more than it does with those of living in a nation-state. The novels supply the context for a detailed scrutiny of different as well as overlapping subaltern positions in the face of distinct historical backgrounds of India and Turkey.

In Chapter Four, I look at *The Forty Rules of Love* and *The Inheritance of Loss* to examine to what extent the two novels play out the theme of love strategically in order to produce a hybridity politics that would effectively respond to globalisation. Although it has

been widely deployed as a concept in association with the idea of the fuzziness of boundaries, implying the need to move beyond these, it is possible that the use of the term hybriditydenotes the very boundaries it is intended to surpass in the context of global capitalism. Hybridity needs to be reconsidered critically. Love may either imply a celebration of differences or the confirmation of their existence. In Franco Moretti's words, this is because hybrid texts "are a microcosm of the world literary system, and of its spiral of hegemony and resistance ("World-Systems Analysis" 75). Furthermore, the hybridity at stake in the novels needs to be differentiated in two contexts that are provided by the novels in question. Through comparison, I explore various types of love and their implications on different hybridities in order to understand to what extent the selected novels display a critical hybridity politics in relation toglobalisation.

In Chapter Five I focus on *The Saint of Incipient Insanities* and *Transmission* in order to try open up possibilities for new forms of belonging. Since globalisation generates new meanings about what it means for different localities to live with its effects, it also brings up the question of what it also means to be a citizen of the world. After I detail the theoretical background of cosmopolitanism as an impulse for one to detach oneself from local origins, I analyse two significant points that are pertinent to the critical view I intend to highlight. Firstly, I analyse the importance of class stratifications: not every citizen of this world can take equal advantage of being rootless. Secondly, I explore to what extent the equalisation of globalisation with Americanisation has implications with regards to the idea of multiple belongings that is implicit in the concept of globalisation. Considering these two points of criticism, I, then focus on the inquiry whether these criticisms impedeor make possible a new form of cosmopolitanism, that is to say, cosmopolitan belongings that are not reinforced by universalist assumptions. Both Wallerstein's and Moretti's views on the relevance of the semi-periphery as having the capability of seeing the outer reality from the middle renders

such a critical cosmopolitan view possible. In my analysis of the characters, I investigate the potential of cosmopolitan vision to see if it is enhanced once it is vernacularly inflected. Comparing and contrasting the characters in their capabilities of multiple belongings I try to answer the question whether the two texts are able to reimagine the world around us.

The novels I examine in this study emphasise the literary relationship between the core and the (semi-)periphery. They are to be read as world texts that address the world at large. This testifies to the idea that in "Third World" novel writing there has been a shift towards the core. Yet core is a problematic term whose relationship to the (semi-) periphery has the potential of being interpreted as margin at the service of the centre. However, as this project will foreground, a shift towards the core may entail a critical engagement as well. Also, as the diverse historical experiences of Turkey and India suggest, the selected novels show distinctexperiences of modernity and speak from their distinct locations to the alleged centre.