2.1 Discourse

The study of discourse has emerged as a distinct and established branch of linguistics since 1970s. The term ‘discourse’ is of Latin origin, which means ‘to run to and fro, to speak at length’. It is used in different ways by different scholars. In *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*, Martin Gray (2008:90) defines discourse in the following words: *it (discourse) is a conversation or a serious discussion or examination of a learned topic*. Discourse is concerned with every discipline but whatever the discourse, it has basically to do with language, context and meaning. Many different definitions focus on its linguistic primacy. *The World Book Dictionary* (1996) describes discourse as ‘a long written or spoken discussion of some subject’. The dictionary terms lectures and sermons as discourses. It also treats discourse as ‘talk, conversation’; ‘process or the faculty of reasoning’; ‘the faculty of conversing to speak or to write formally or at length on some subject.’

According to Stubbs (1983a:1), *discourse is language above the sentence or above the clause* whereas, R. Fasold (1990:65) believes that the study of discourse is ‘the study of any aspect of language use’. Brown and Yule (1983), claim that the analysis of discourse is the analysis of language in use. It is important to note that discourse cannot be restricted to the description of language. It cannot be isolated from the purposes or functions which language forms are designed to serve. For Norman Fairclough (1992:28), *discourse is more than just language use: it is the language use whether speech or writing*. D. Lee (1992) asserts that discourse is used to cover a wide range of phenomena. It is concerned with the language use relative to ideological, social, political and cultural formations, and reflecting and shaping an individual’s interaction with society. The present study deals with critical
discourse that is theoretical analysis of specific issues in literary theory and criticism. The established practice of discourse analysis enquires into the ‘how’ of a text, as opposed to its ‘what’. In linguistics, the term is used to refer to utterances longer than a sentence. It is concerned with language beyond the limits of syntax. Both text and discourse refer to units of language above syntax. In literary criticism, there are various theoretical approaches to ‘discourse’ that define it diverse context and mostly discuss its theoretical associations. Literary criticism, therefore, offers different meanings and emphases of discourse.

Broadly, the term discourse implies ‘language use’ for ‘expression of thought’. As a result, it touches upon various disciplines like linguistics, literary criticism, critical theories, communication science, pragmatics and philosophy. More specifically, discourse represents expression of thought in orderly and structured manner. From the reader’s point of view, on the other hand, every discourse is procedural. A reader reconstructs a discourse by processing it. This processing involves reader’s interpretation and arrival at meaning with the help of the textual, linguistic and pragmatic tools available to him. It depends on the kind of interaction that takes place between the text, reader and a variety of contextual dimensions related to both of them. This discourse process can generate a lot of meaning. The interactions lead to the interpretation and generation of many different texts. The contextual properties of the discourse become active as the reader tries to interpret the text. This leads to the fact that any interpretative attempt involves the decisive role of context/s. So, the contextual study of discourse becomes not only important but insightful.

### 2.1.1 Text and Textual Dynamics

A careful linguistic inquiry reveals that a text is a stretch of language with some meaning or message. An advertisement, a news item, a letter, a recipe, a story, a poem, an essay, etc. can be treated as text. A unit of language is defined as a sentence consisting of one or many clauses; a clause consisting of
one or many phrases and a phrase consisting of one or many words. A sentence having many clauses running into a single paragraph is a text (as in fiction or critical text). A single word, a phrase or a clause can be treated as a text because it contains meaning complete in itself. Typical examples of such small scale texts are public notices, warnings, etc. Quirk and Greenbaum (2006:217) term such expressions as ‘block language’. For example, ‘keep off the lawn’ (sentence) ‘keep left’ (clause), ‘danger ahead’ (phrase), ‘in’ (word), etc. These texts have a particular structural pattern and they are complete in terms of communication. Meanings of such sentences or utterances can be generated depending on their contexts. A piece of language is recognized as a text not because of its length but because of its location in a particular context and the meaning that it generates.

The traditional critics consider literary artifacts as ‘works’ with the implication that they are human made and that they are concerned with human issues. On the contrary to this notion, the modern and postmodern critics depersonalize a literary product and consider it as an impersonal ‘text’ rather than a ‘work’. They look at ‘text’ as manifestation of social institution called ‘écriture’ (writing). The poststructuralists, discourse analysts and pragmatic scientists reinforce this view and base their interpretive methods on it. For these critics and theorists any written work as a text is a system of signs. Such depersonalized and socially informing idea of text achieves further dimension in the field of intertextuality. The idea of ‘text’ made up of other texts is central to the theory of intertextuality. For example, Julia Kristeva (1986) looks at every text as ‘intertext’. It is the site of an intersection of numberless other texts having relationship with one another. Another theorist Roland Barthes defines text in a very different way so as to emphasize its intertextual form. ‘Text’, according to him (1997a:159), is ‘a tissue, a woven fabric’. It is a network of ideas and issues. A writer weaves the fabric of a text using variety of ideas in numerous ways. Barthes treats writer as the ‘orchestrator’ instead of ‘originator’. For him, a text is a multidimensional space in which a variety of
writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations...the writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original. His power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others,... (1977:146). In this way, Barthes locates meaning of every text in relation to other texts.

2.1.2 Text as Discourse

It may be stated that a text is a linguistic record. A ‘spoken text’ is spoken linguistic record or data whereas ‘written text’ is written record. The textual study deals primarily with linguistic features and thematic study and discourse imply the study of ideas that run over the same and the other texts. There are various ways to organize ideas in a text. Intertextuality is one of such important ways to effectively organize and present ideas in a text. The present study deals with written critical discourse. A critical essay can be studied from textual as well as discourse points of view. Like a creative writer, a critical writer also goes through the process of careful selection, permutation and combination of ideas and issues in a discourse. Communication in a discourse depends on the type of discourse, its structural organization, amalgamation of ideas, contextual ties etc. A critical discourse is an interaction between the writer and the reader as well as between the text and the reader.

2.1.3 Kinds of Discourse

A discourse can be spoken or written. It is meant for communication of some message through recognizable codes. It varies as per the field, purpose and participants involved in it. One of the broad classifications of discourse is: a) non-literary discourse and b) literary discourse. There can be a variety of domain oriented non-literary discourses such as i) legal discourse, ii) journalistic discourse, iii) scientific discourse, iv) parliamentary discourse, v) religious discourse, vi) ethnic discourse, vii) cultural discourse, etc. There can be political discourse, ideological discourse, economic discourse, media discourse as well as institutional discourse.
Within literature again, there are varying categories of discourse: i) poetic discourse, ii) dramatic discourse, iii) fictional discourse, iv) linguistic discourse and v) literary critical discourse. Within genre study, there can be ethical discourse, religious discourse as in poetry, social-political and multicultural discourse as in fiction or in drama, etc. One of the major discourse practices that deals with all the genres is Literary Critical Discourse. According to Martin Gray (2008:91), a student’s essay, a work of literary criticism, and a play by Shakespeare are all discourses. A critical essay is or can be a proposition, assertion, justification, illustration, endorsement, commendation, refusal and counterargument of an issue or issues by a critic or host of critics or theorists. The present research deals with ‘critical discourse’.

2.2 Critical Discourse

The term criticism comes from Greek ‘kritikos’ which means ability to discern or judge. In broad terms, literary criticism consists of the activities like interpretation, analysis, judgment and evaluation of literary works. Literary criticism is a manifold activity and therefore there are different types of critical approaches and methods. Theoretical criticism offers broad framework of analysis and lays norms and methods to conduct analysis of literary works. Practical criticism on the other hand focuses on the assessment of individual texts. Descriptive criticism attempts to describe literature and prescriptive criticism argues how literature ought to be. M. H. Abrams, in opening chapter of Mirror and the Lamp (1953), explores diverse critical approaches. Ancient mimetic theory of Aristotle sees works of art as reflection of life. A pragmatic theory of art sees the work as a means to achieve the aim of teaching and instructing. Within traditional English criticism, Neo-classical criticism from Sir Philip Sidney to Dr. Samuel Johnson considers literature to serve the purpose of teaching by delighting. Expressive theories put the artist at core. Romantic and Victorian English criticism treats art as an expression of poet’s
feeling or psychology. New or modern criticism of twentieth century envisages many theories as they are 'objective' and focus on text and its meaning.

In many of these critical approaches, the critic thinks aloud, engages with a topic or point and carries enquiry into a literary work or comments on the nature of literary activities. This thinking aloud envelops the reader and interacts with him/her. It is a sort of conversation intended to persuade or influence the reader. The interaction between critic and his/her readers and other critics may be technically termed as discourse. It is in this context that the spoken/conversational features of language are utilized. The following diagram may help to explain how a critical text becomes a discourse and the varieties involved in it:

As a critic's intention (i.e. whether he/she is writing for explanation, proposition of new theory or something else) varies, so the configuration, design and direction of his critical text vary.
2.2.1 Critical Text as Discourse

There are necessary differences in language, style and nature of a literary text and a critical text. The primary purpose of literary text is to entertain whereas that of critical text is to judge a work of art and generate ideas related to literary art. Such difference in intention of the design of work separates literary from critical text. A critical text apart from providing value judgment gives reader knowledge of art and helps reader derive a different kind of pleasure based on ideological and stylistic peculiarities. In order to enjoy the language and propositions made by critics, it is necessary to have the knowledge of literary texts concerned, a vast body of literature, principles, approaches and theories in literary criticism.

Criticism as an important branch of study cultivates literary tastes and propagates ideas. Critics offer fascinating, elaborate discussions and provocative views. Language plays an important role in this context. The language of critics and the language of criticism as a discipline are organized on principles parallel to any kind of discourse. This is because a critic is a member of a speech community, speaking to the other members of the same community who are interested in knowing the contents. This activates the process of discourse where sharing initiates. It is the shared language /code between the critic and the other members of his community (critic or reader) that makes communication possible.

Literary criticism is a network of ideas and views. As a discourse, it is an interaction between ‘the critic’ as an author and ‘the reader’. It is also an interaction between ‘the text’ and ‘the reader’. In spite of the apparent resemblances with other discourses, the critical discourse is regulated by certain peculiar principles. It is a discourse within a text or sometimes over text/s. This may briefly be stated as: 1) Most of the critics pass judgment on concerned work of art and artist. 2) Critics who take theoretical stance lay rules
for works of art and for the interpretation (i.e. act of writing and reading). 3) Apart from the interaction between a critic as an author and the reader, there can be interaction between one critic and another critic, e.g. the interaction between Stephen Gosson and Philip Sidney in *An Apology for Poetry*, or the interaction between Peacock and Shelley in *A Defence of Poetry*, or the interaction between T.S. Eliot and Middleton Murray in *The Function of Criticism* or the interaction between F. R. Leavis and Rene Wellek in *Literary Criticism and Philosophy*. These interactions are across the texts. Other interactions may be the examples of refutation of charges by critics. For example, Philip Sidney’s *An Apology for Poetry* is a response to Stephen Gosson’s charges on poetry or W. Wordsworth’s *Preface to Lyrical Ballads* is a reaction to the attack on his poetry. Every reader tries to interpret the text and the views expressed in it. Many a time, readers are taken aback or confused by the critics’ views and implications and find it difficult to comprehend. The difficulty is due to the nature of the critical discourse and inappropriate methods used by readers and inability to correlate ideas. The concern of the present research is to study intertextuality as an important feature of discourse that may assist readers to engage into effective communication with the critical texts and thus engage into the discourse procedure.

### 2.2.2 Approaches and Trends in Literary Theory

Literary critical discourse consists of various trends, approaches, schools and isms. Thousands of critics and theorists from the ancient times to the modern and in the West as well as in the East have been writing critical essays to throw light on literary artifacts and to propound literary theories. Through innumerable essays critics judge, evaluate, criticize literary texts and literary authors and their practices. Teachers and students are trained to react to every literary text by reading on critical issues and theoretical perspectives through reference books as well as through theoretical essays.

The spectrum of critical discourse is quite wide. There are numerous literary
theories. Beginning with ancient critical theories, coming down to early English critical dogmas as Classical, Romantic, Victorian, Modern, Postmodern till the contemporary Postglobal issues, theory has always activated, challenged and excited the minds of the learners. Various theories and approaches in critical discourses are biographical, historical, sociological, psychological, archetypal, formalist, linguistic approach, structuralism, poststructuralism, psychoanalytical approach, feminism, deconstruction, neohistoricism, marxism, reader response, post colonialism, ethnocriticism, marginalism, ecocriticism, technocriticism, etc. The recent issues in theory are gender politics, gay theory, queer theory, masculinity studies, culture studies, etc. The study of critical discourses covers such vast range of approaches.

One can adopt a linguistic approach to critical theory. A critical text can be described as having a formal structure. It is an object having a definite syntactic and phonological shape. This approach is propounded by Roman Jakobson and is commonly adopted by many analysts for analyzing the literary texts. It is also insightful to apply interactional dimensions to critical texts. Critical texts are discourses and they can be seen as mediating relationships between and among theorists, critics and their views. As a reader looks at a critical text as a discourse, it ceases to be a text and becomes an action or process. As Thorat (2002) argues, the moment we look at texts from discourse orientation, the texts become 'procedural'. A reader processes text by interpreting, reconstructing it and arrives at meaning with the assistance of the textual, linguistic and pragmatic tools available to him.

2.3 Nature of Discourse Analysis and its Dimensions
There are various ways of making discourse analysis. According to Roger Fowler (1981), discourse analysis is careful, analytic interrogation of the ideological categories. Discourse analysis studies the links between sentences, paragraphs, and texts and defines rules that govern these links. Discourse refers to any self-contained body of ideas, opinions, approaches, methods and the
language which contains them. It is the framework of references which is commonly used in relation to a particular topic. Literature, literary criticism and literary theory contain many different ‘discourses’ of this kind in which particular kind of language and textual strategy is employed in a particular way. Critical text aims at objectivity, normality and factuality and the aim of discourse analysis of critical texts is to probe into the ‘what’ of the text and the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of its objectivity. A critical text, during its formation stage, draws ideas and experiences from other texts and it turns into a discourse when number of external features and intertexts become functional. This occurs when the reader tries to interpret the text.

Discourse analysts try to find out the answer to ‘who’ says to ‘whom’, ‘what’, ‘when’ ‘why’ and ‘how’. These are the important issues in approaches to discourses. In making discourse analysis of critical texts these questions are to be attempted at length. It is a critic who communicates to his/her ‘specialized’ reader interested in reading critical works. The question ‘what’ implies the theoretical implications and personal critical views. ‘When’ refers to the ideological, temporal sequencing, the preceding and following context. It also pertains to primacy of a theory or ideas or issues to the other. Every critical text of theoretical issue has a purpose. Various intentions of authors, purposes, correlate to the ‘why’ of theory. The ‘how’ deals with linguistic and discourse strategies. All these constitute the dimensions of critical discourse. Since intertextuality is one of the features of discourse, all these questions can be focused to the use and interpretation of intertextual borrowings in a critical discourse.

2.3.1 Plurality of Approaches to Discourse

Discourse is approached in many different ways. Such heterogeneity of approaches shows tendency towards using varied data in varied ways. For example there is a strong tendency to examine language use in the natural
occurrence that is the conversational/spoken use. However, the researcher is concerned in the present study with the written texts.

A critical writer makes use of variety of linguistic resources. There are logical, chronological, ideological and psychological links. If there is no linkage it affects the reader’s comprehension. Every good critic as a writer links and organizes the text effectively. For this purpose he uses intertextual and intratextual strategies and markers. A reader has to find out markers in order to identify and classify the type of discourse and analyze it further. This leads to better comprehension of a critical text as discourse.

2.3.2 Discourse Markers: Intratextual and Intertextual

A text as a discourse is cohesive and coherent entity. It is characterized by the cohesive and coherent markers and these markers are important to readers for the sake of better understanding. The markers can be intratextual or intertextual. Intratextual markers are of language orientation. They are vocabulary items, phrases, sentence linkers, paragraph or text linkers, deictic expressions including discourse deictic expressions and syntactic markers. These markers bind the text cohesively so that the text achieves coherence. The intratextual markers work within the text and are a primary tool for the writer to express his views. These markers give unity and order to the discourse. The intertextual markers are markers that cross the fringe of a text and relate to extra-textual things. They establish ideological links between two or many texts or discourses. They are borrowings and adaptations from other discourses in the form of quotations, citations, allusions, references and metaphors. They can range from a word, a phrase, a sentence and certain lines to stanzas or paragraphs from other texts. These intertextual adaptations work as markers for coherent presentation of ideas. The present study focuses on intertextual adaptations as discourse markers, their sources, their features and functional value in discourse organization.
2.3.3 Critical Essays: Non-narrative Discourse

Majority of discourse analysts analyze narrative and spoken discourse in narrative literature. A story or a fictional work has structure, direction, narrative and point of view. However, it is noticeable that essays or articles are different from all other forms of writing. This is because they do not contain stories. They are prose works and have precise structure, direction and point of view. They are primarily non-narrative, yet, some articles/essays are found to have narrative structure. They are directed at specific important issue and so they have a theme as well as a point of view. Authors adopt various points of views while developing ideas. Articles are best examples of all kinds of language use. The role of an article writer is important since majority of them have didactic value and they are targeted at some social purpose. The target may be moral, educative, propagandist or otherwise.

The critic as an article writer makes use of non-narrative resources of language. The critic’s work is focused on evaluation or to pass important remarks on a certain art work. This is reflected in stretches of language used in the forms of phrases, clauses and structural nuances. Structure of such a discourse is much more complex than a story or a fictional writing. Critics in their essays exploit all possible linguistic tools and strategies including intertextuality.

2.4 Intertextuality

Intertextuality works as a decisive element of textual design. It offers necessary scope and space to the author to integrate his ideas and present them effectively. As a part of structural and semantic design of discourse the author borrows from previous texts and transforms it as per his need. He uses various quotations, citations, allusions and references in order to propound ideas. These come from numerous other texts of the past, referring to diverse authors, their works and their critical dogmas. Each text exists in relation to other texts. Therefore, interpretation of any text inevitably involves the study of the
intertexts adopted in that text. During interpretation it is necessary to discover
the source text and target text and the purpose of borrowing. Intertextual study
leads to authentication of meaning. Intertextuality is a common, prevalent,
significant, ideological and textual practice that presumes various possibilities
of articulation. It is a very common discourse constructional phenomenon.
Therefore the study of intertextual adaptations is quite helpful to know both the
organization structure of a discourse and its meaning.

2.4.1 Historical Perspective
The term “intertextuality” was coined and used in its present theoretical sense
by French poststructuralist Julia Kristeva in 1966, in her doctoral thesis on
Russian literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin’s dialogism. Kristeva explains
Mikhail Bakhtin’s multivoicedness and dialogism as intertextuality. She argued
that every text is a mosaic that consists of varied references to other texts,
genres and discourses. A text is a set of signs that presupposes a network of
relationships to other signs. According to Kristeva, intertextuality is a mosaic
of quotations, any text is the absorption and transformation of another.
(Kristeva: 1980:66) Julia Kristeva’s concept of intertextuality is based on
Bakhtin’s idea of dialogism. In her The Kristeva Reader (1986), she talks of the
idea of three dimensional textual space – the writer, the reader and exterior
text. Within this textual space, the horizontal and vertical axes intersect.
According to her, each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where ..... [every] text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; .... Any text is the
absorption of and transformation of another. The union of intertextuality
replaces that of inter-subjectivity and poetic language is read as at least double
(The Kristeva Reader 1986:37).

Kristeva defines intertextuality as transpositions suggesting that the manner in
which each word in a text is a translation into a new context of a word [that
was] . . . previously used in another prior context (Allen 2007:5). In Revolution
in Poetic Language, Kristeva speaks of ‘the passage from one system to
another’ a transposition that allows scholar-readers to create meaning. For Kristeva, *meaning is not transferred directly from writer to reader but instead is mediated through or filtered by ‘codes’ imparted to the writer and reader by other texts* (1980:69).

The term ‘Intertextuality’, as propounded by Julia Kristeva, is based on the following assumptions:

1) A text cannot exist as a hermetic or self-defined entity, it is not a closed system and is open to any number of influences.

2) It develops as a system of referentiality, a polysemic network of references, citations, quotations and influences.

3) It is a meeting place / confluence of diverse thoughts, ideas.

4) Critics appeal to consider intertextuality as a mode of cultural existence.

Intertextuality requires an understanding of ‘texts’ which, as John Frow (1986) believes, are not ‘self-contained structures, but differential and historical’ and not shaped by ‘immanent time but by the play of divergent temporalities’. Texts are therefore ‘tracings of otherness’ and largely shaped by ‘the repetition and transformation of other textual structures’. Julia Kristeva’s transformational method is a combination of a) tracings of otherness, and b) repetition and transformation of other textual structures. These two figurations bring experiments in genres and discursive formations.

Another post-structuralist Roland Barthes’ view complies with Kristeva’s concept of intertextuality. He argues that a text is a multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash, the text is a tissue of quotations drawn from innumerable centres of culture (1977:146).

In *Of Grammatology* (1967), Jacques Derrida talks of the idea that neither book nor the author exists as an absolutely independent entity. All writing is linked with other forms of literature. Such linkages are unified with basic textual mass. In other words, no text is and can claim to be original. In reality it is a
conglomeration of many intertexts. Thus the traditional disciplinary boundaries make no sense and they are interdependent and exist on mutual borrowings. For example, a poem consists of intertextual references from past dramatic or narrative texts. This is applicable to critical texts as well. Critical texts are based on literary texts. It is quite obvious that critical texts draw from various literary genres, other critical texts and authors. Derrida considers text as a meeting place of several non-textual elements and thus flouts the disciplinary boundary of text. He privileges non-text over text and thus brings in the element yet not considered.

An opposite view of intertextuality may be seen in William Irwin’s consideration. Derrida speaks of the intertextual nature of texts but emphasizes determination of meaning whereas Irwin speaks of the plurality of meaning that intertexts bring to texts. According to William Irwin, intertextuality has ‘as many meanings as users’ (Irwin 2004:228). While reading a text the reader encounters a variety of codes constructed together into a new code. These intertextual codes help the reader to comprehend and interpret the text in a better possible way. It may be argued that in the light of intertexts - adaptations and borrowings - that a text can be studied and its meaning can be discovered. Intertextuality is an exercise in finding out sources. It is related to the concept of interdependency of texts and ideas. The study in intertextuality will help to find the core interdependencies and absolute claims and foundations.

2.4.2 Kristeva’s Vision of Two Axes: Interplay between the Past and the Present

Kristeva (1980) sees the relationship between texts and intertexts on two axes: a) the Horizontal axis - connecting the writer and reader and b) the Vertical axis - connecting one text to another. Codes in a text are shared by uniting these two axes codes are shared. Every text and every reading depends on prior codes. For her, every text is under the jurisdiction of other discourses which
impose universe on it. The following diagram illustrates Kristeva’s vision of two axes - vertical and horizontal:

Key: S = Section/s  P = Paragraph/s,  I = Intertext/s

On horizontal plane on the left side, the writer, the scripter, the orchestrator creates the new text with the help of different texts (intertexts). On the right, the reader recreates the text as he/she reads. As the reader moves ahead on the horizontal plane, he/she moves into past and then into the present with the help of the writer’s vertical use of intertexts. This helps the reader to know the movement and message of the text.

In above diagram, ‘text’ represents the text that the author writes and reader reads. Temporality indicates the time frame where the present text deals with the present moment of creation and the intertexts refer to specific time, place and person, of a definite past invoking a peculiar meaning. While interpreting the discourse, intertextual adaptation in the present text takes the reader to the
past, reader locates its original meaning and again refers it back to the present text. In this way, there is a continuous interplay between the past and the present. The interplay is ideological that takes the reader into the ideas of the past and back to the present. S1, S2, S3... indicate the sections/parts of the text. (They may be sections in a critical discourse or chapters in a fiction, acts and scenes in a drama, etc.) P1, P2, P3 .... are the paragraphs and Q1, Q2, Q3, ....are the quotations, citations, linkages, references (intertextual borrowings).

The study of intertexts can help to find out how the structurization of a discourse takes place. An intertext shifts the reader to prior text that may be immediate or distant in temporal perspective. Generally, a writer transforms previous texts or ideas in previous texts to the making of new discourses.

2.4.3 Context, Discourse and Intertextuality

An analysis of critical discourse depends on the knowing of intertext. This pertains to the fact that location into relevant contexts determines the examination of text. So, discourse study deals with contextual study and plays an important role in interpreting any text or discourse.

Intertextual linkages are context bound. They are not haphazardly or casually planned by the author. They are well planned and appropriate. The contexts in which texts are read influence the act of reading. Intertexts open a variety of contexts for the basic text and the ideas within. It is important to know key ideas of thinkers, their contexts and evolutions of ideas and how they affect the reception or perception of the basic discourse and their functional value. Since intertextual citations are used in specific contexts they answer the following questions:

‘Who’ uses the intertextual quotations or linkages? (authorial stance),
‘What’ sources are used? (origin or source of the citation),
‘When’ are they used? (preceding and following context),
‘Why’ are they used? (functional value of the intertextual linkage) and
‘How’ are they used? (to what extent it is used or the scale of adoption)

A text is made of references to other writers, critics, their texts or their views which are contextually or situationally appropriate in discourse. It can be claimed that critical discourse is a single system of formation and ideologically the statements in a discourse belong to the same register or the same system. Intertexts do not go out of the system in general. A system of genres carries an idea that an individual text is read in a manner determined by its relations with other texts.

The act of reading a text leads us to take into account intertextuality and its functional value. The intertexts give us real meaning of the former and basic text. Intertexts bring unity and coherence to text and provide several contexts as well. Intertexts are contextualized in time, place, person, ideology, knowledge, etc. The notion of intertextuality emphasizes that texts have contexts. Within a discourse, intertextual links are dynamic and they help to generate ample and varied meaning. While reading, the reader comes across any/many intertextual reference/s of quotation/s and he/she is transported into a new realm of discourse, tries to interpret and look into contextual link and meaning of the current discourse. It has either cataphoric reference i.e. it refers to something ahead or later in the text or points forward; or has anaphoric reference i.e. it refers to something in the preceding context. It can be used to open a discourse, for example, M. H. Abrams’ critical essay *The Deconstructive Angel* (1978) opens with a quotation of three lines from Shelley’s *Prometheus Unbound*. I. A Richards’ critical essay *The Four Kinds of Meaning* (1935) opens with a quotation from *Leviathan*. Intertextual citations can be used to close a discourse, for example, George Lukacs ends his critical essay *The Ideology of Modernism* (1957) with reference to Kafka’s *Angst*. The act of knowing critical discourse depends on what and how the reader reads and to what extent processes text to interpret with the help of the intertexts in new contexts.
2.4.4 Features of Intertextuality

Intertextuality is a dominant mode of producing a text therefore it is necessary to consider some of the features of intertextuality. Daniel Chandler (1995) in *Semiotics for Beginners* (online version - http://aber.ac.uk) considers reflexivity as the most important feature of intertextuality. The other features are:

1) Reflexivity: how reflexive the use of intertextuality seems to be
2) Alteration: the alteration of sources
3) Explicitness: the specificity and explicitness of reference/s to other text/s
4) Criticality of comprehension: how important it would be for the reader to recognize the intertextuality involved
5) Scale of adoption: the overall scale of allusion/incorporation within the text
6) Structural boundedness: to what extent the text is presented as part of or tied to a larger structure, factors which are often not under control of the author of the text

The present study deals with the analysis of the use of intertextuality in the selected traditional and modern critical texts, their features, types and functional value. It attempts to show how critical texts are constructed using intertextual references, quotations, citations and allusions in appropriate contexts and give rise to meaning.

2.4.5 Kinds of Intertextuality

Gerard Genette in *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (1997a) identifies several types/categories of intertextuality or what he calls them as transtextuality.

a) Intertext: Use of quotations from scriptures or other texts by an author in a text. All the quotations that an author uses within his discourse are
intertexts. These quotations can be drawn from creative writers as well as critical writers.

b) Paratext: Whatever surrounds the main body of the text: titles, headings, prefaces, epigraphs, dedications, acknowledgements, footnotes, illustrations, etc. For example, Footnotes in T. S. Eliot’s *The Function of Criticism* or Ernest Jones’ essay *Hamlet: the Psychoanalytical Solution*. In *The Four Kinds of Meaning* I. A. Richards uses headings as paratexts. Some critics use footnotes for providing source or explanation or specific information. Thus, titles, chapter headings, sub-divisions and sub-headings, footnotes, etc. indicate the reader how the author intends his arguments to be chunked. Paratexts lead the reader to create concepts and perceive them in the way the author intends or as the reader conceives.

c) Architext: Designation of a text as part of a genre or type or text category. For example, Samuel Johnson is biographical, William Wordsworth and P. B. Shelley’s essays fall within Romantic criticism, Arnold’s essay is an example of Victorian criticism and T. S. Eliot is a formalist. These different sub-categories within the category of criticism are architexts.

d) Metatext: Explicit or implicit critical commentary of one text on the other text. Critical texts primarily judge literary texts, so, they are commentaries on poems, novels and dramas and other concerned genres. In this way, critical texts are metatexts. For example, Samuel Johnson in *The Life of Milton* passes judgement on Milton’s works, Wordsworth value judges his own as well as other poems and Matthew Arnold in *The Study of Poetry* comments on various texts and these become metatexts. Critics value judge other texts or other critics and their ideological adhesions, for example, in *Tradition and Individual Talent* Eliot rejects Wordsworth’s theory and in *The Function of Criticism* rejects Murray’s views.
e) Hypertext: Links to different articles, individuals etc. For example, Philip Sidney, Samuel Johnson, Matthew Arnold, T. S. Eliot, Ernest Jones refer to various critics and their articles. In *Hamlet: the Psychoanalytical Solution*, there are references to as many as forty four critics and their judgment about the problem of Hamlet. In Brooks’ essay there are links to different poems and authors.

Norman Fairclough distinguishes between ‘manifest intertextuality’ and ‘constitutive intertextuality’ (1992:117). Manifest intertextuality signifies the interrelationship of discursive form or genre having elements such as presupposition, negation, parody, irony, etc. Constitutive intertextuality is relations between larger formations of texts such as structure, form, etc.

### 2.4.6 Explicitness of Intertexts

Intertexts can be Explicit and Implicit: The quotations used by critics become explicit so they can be treated as explicit intertexts. In *The Study of Poetry*, Matthew Arnold uses quotations from Shakespeare’s *Henry the Fourth*, *Hamlet*; Milton’s *Paradise Lost* and from many other writers to justify his views on poetry and touchstone method. When a critic uses an idea from other critic and develops it or uses it to support his thought such intertextual reference becomes implicit. In *The Life of Milton*, Samuel Johnson refers to French critic Bossu, English critics Dryden and Pope and comments on them in relation to his views about Milton’s works.

Intertexts are highly marked features of any text. Critical essays become more critical due to density of intertexts. They enhance meaning and bring depth to the basic text and ideas presented therein. One can become familiar with various disciplines and gain knowledge of varied issues by making in depth interpretation of all the intertexts. Intertexts widen the universe of knowledge. A critic opens access to a variety of related texts (intertexts) and authors and their ideas for a reader. In the essay *Hamlet: the Psychoanalytical Solution*
(1949), while finding out Freudian solution to the problem of Hamlet, Ernest Jones refers to as many as forty four critics and their relevant essays and views about the problem. This helps the reader to make a comprehensive study of the concerned issue.

Intertexts can cross the boundaries of language code. A critic can refer to other critics and writers from various language backgrounds. *A Defence of Poetry* by Shelley and *The Study of Poetry* by Arnold are fine examples of 'transcoded intertextuality'. Both Shelley and Arnold refer to writers and critics from different language backgrounds. They use intertexts from English, French and Latin writers and critics to propound their views on concerned issues in poetry. This helps the reader to get an idea of what the thinkers from other countries think about the concerned issues. The borrowings in the form of quotations from other languages can be seen as linguistic strategy of code switching. Trudgill (1980:82) considers code switching as 'switching from one language variety to another when the situation demands.' Critics exploit this tool of code switching for effective presentation of ideas by the way of intertextuality.

Some of the commonly used intertexts become part of shared beliefs/values of a certain language community. They can be universal or become universal and their meaning/interpretation is dependent on spatial, temporal factors. They are precious, invaluable contributions to critical theory. Intertextual quotations are like axiomatic expressions and are catchy and charged with plenty of meaning. They have varying functional values. They function in the limited as well as larger contexts. Intertextual adaptations are logically relevant and contextually appropriate. They are means of manipulation and generation of meaning. They are attention calling devices and are sometimes used with this purpose. Intertexts can be seen as strategies of discourse and their marked feature. Intertexts are targeted at a universe of discourse. Key statements can be seen as a judgment, conclusion and author’s intention. They are used to present key
ideas in the universe of critical discourse. Intertexts help to sum up collectively the views, a set of ideas, ideology, etc.

2.4.7 Intertextuality in Critical Discourses

It is worthwhile to note some of the features of intertextual styles of critics. In the essays selected the critics and theorists use a variety of intertexts. Some essays open with quotations from past discourses. It becomes essential for the reader to go back into the past and try to understand the meanings of the intertexts and their context in the present text. The author takes the reader back to the earlier discourse/text and invokes the issues raised in the concerned discourse/text. These borrowed texts assume the role of a prologue. The critic prepares the background for the essay through the intertextual reference. He elucidates his views on impersonality of an artist.

Critics quote other critics and literary writers and their works and ideas for illustrating, justifying, commenting, commending, supporting, strengthening or for explanation. Sometimes they express gratitude for them in order to trigger the contentious issues in criticism. Poetry has frequently been attacked by critics and scholars like Plato, Gosson, Peacock, Murry, etc. In turn critics like Aristotle, Sidney, Arnold and Eliot refute their charges respectively. Critical discourses of these writers are heavily dependent on the earlier critics and refer to them frequently by way of quotations. Critics comment and categorically deny all the charges. For example, Eliot quotes important charges from Murry’s essay and comments on them and in this way it becomes a dialogue between the two. This becomes a style of the critic. It gives the text a dialogic nature. Critics make it obligatory to readers to know the earlier texts and ideas through the intertextual borrowings. Reading of a text implies reading of other texts. Intertextual adaptations make it necessary to read the concerned intertexts to interpret the discourse in which they are used. No one can read any critical work or a poem, a novel, a drama in isolation and without being conscious of the contexts in which the text had been produced or drawn upon.
Such contexts constitute a primary frame which the reader cannot avoid while interpreting the discourses.

Some critics borrow from other languages. They use transliterated or translated intertexts. The transliterated intertexts are from Greek, Latin or Italian or French repertoire. Some critics offer English translations of the quotations. It becomes obligatory to readers to have knowledge of these languages but some readers find them to be unintelligible due to lack of knowledge of the different codes.

Some critics like Wordsworth in Preface to Lyrical Ballads, T. S. Eliot in The Function of Criticism or I. A. Richards in The Four Kinds of Meaning refer to their own ideas in their earlier works. So, present text draws from their previous text. This type of intertextuality can be termed as auto or self intertextuality.

2.4.8 Functional Value of Intertextuality

The role of intertextuality can be seen as follows:

1) **Generation of ideas:** Intertexts are used as a strategy by critics and theorists to propound and generate ideas and to give shape to the new text. Critics borrow and transform prior text and harness them in new context to open an issue or propound an idea. The critical texts under study and their meanings are shaped by intertexts used after careful selection. Every quotation, every reference and citation is context bound and has specific value. They are borrowed from their own universe of discourse and put together into a new universe of discourse. For example, the quotation of 11 lines at the beginning of The Study of Poetry by Arnold works as generative principle for the ideas on poetry to follow in the entire essay.

2) **Organizing principle:** Intertextual quotations, adaptations, allusions, citations, references perform the role of binding a text and textual ideas.
It works as unifying force for a discourse. Since ideas and concepts are borrowed from various universe of discourse they are harnessed together to give a total effect of single discourse. For example, reference to the concept of ‘labyrinth’ and ‘perambulation’ from the first part of Practical Criticism in I. A. Richards’ The Four Kinds of Meaning serves the purpose of organizational principle that helps to give total unifying effect.

3) **Value judgement:** Critical discourse, by nature, is value judgement of creative works. Critics refer to authors, their works and quote from them in order to pass judgement. Without intertextual borrowing the act of judging is incomplete. Intertextuality is essential and mandatory for every critical activity. For example, In The Study of Poetry Arnold refers to the work of Shakespeare and Milton and passes judgement on them as classic writers.

4) **Illustration and justification:** The major concern of a critic is to value judge art work, artist and make specific or general statements about the concerned work, author or an art form. While expressing their views by the way of defending or replying or attacking they provide ample examples in the form of intertextual borrowing for illustrations and justification. For example, the significance of intertextual reference to the ancient classical and neo classical poets in Wordsworth’s Preface to Lyrical Ballads is to give illustration and to justify how the poems of these writers are metrical compositions.

5) **Reinforcement, support, or strengthen:** Intertextual borrowings are primarily used to support critic’s view. Similar parallel examples or illustrations are generally cited to strengthen and to reinforce the views expressed. They are borrowed from past relevant authors and works. For example, in Tradition and Individual Talent Eliot refers to voyage of Ulysses and murder of Agamemnon and compares the emotions in the real act and emotions as projected in the artistic creations to support and strengthen his views.
6) **Contradiction:** Sometimes in a context while judging a work or propounding theory a critic prefers to use intertextual citations for contradiction through which he brings home the point. For example, In *The Life of Milton*, Samuel Johnson refers to Dryden’s opinion about Adam and contradicts his view.

7) **Paradox, irony:** Irony plays an important role in every discourse. In critical discourse critics take the recourse to paradox and irony. Intertexts are used to express irony and paradox over an issue.

8) **Modification:** Critics express their views and tend to modify them. For this purpose they make use of intertexts. Views expressed by other writers or critics on an issue are modified by critics. In this way intertextuality performs the role of modification.

9) **Feedback:** Critics while passing value judgement offer valuable advice, suggestion, pass information or criticize as to how the art work is good, bad or useful. They refer to other critic’s opinion and support it when necessary.

10) **Commendation:** Critical discourse is targeted at value judgment. Critics prefer to commend works of good artists. They refer to authors and their works and quote or cite or refer to lines, ideas from them and pass judgement. In order to praise a quality in a work critics use concrete illustrations.

11) **Comment:** Critics criticize some negative quality or lacuna in a work of art or the style of an author. Intertextual quotations or linkages are used for showing ineffectiveness, fault in writing, wrong use of language, imagery, symbolism etc. or any other such quality. Theorists belonging to a set of principles or schools usually make use of intertextuality for criticizing the other critics or their dogmas or qualities in them.

12) **Explanation, information:** Some critics make use of footnotes. They are provided for a word, expression, term, author, work, etc. at the bottom of the same page in a text. Through footnote author provides
explanation or passes on information about the concerned reference for a better understanding of the reader.

Following are some of the important features of intertextuality as a structural and semantic device of critical discourse. These features are used as guidelines in the present study:

2.4.9 Intertextuality as a Marked Feature
Intertextuality is a marked feature of every critical text. Intertextual adaptations are quite obvious. They are indispensable in a text. A new text cannot take shape without the presence of some other text. In fact, every critical discourse has origin in some other text of the past.

2.4.10 Intertextuality as a Cohesive Device
Intertexsts can be seen as the cohesive devices. They give the text coherence and unity. They are not haphazardly selected and not randomly put together by the author. Instead, they are well planned according to the meanings they emanate and need in the new context for generation of peculiar, precise and definite meaning. Cohesive devices can be intertextual and intratextual. Linguistic markers such as sentence initials, adverbials, deictic expressions, cardinals, ordinals etc. are intratextual. They link the text coherently connecting within the sentences, paragraphs and chapters. Whereas quotations, citations, references are intertextual cohesive devices. They establish semantic links among different intertexts coherently and again unite them with the main text. Every author uses these strategies to propound his/her ideas.

2.5 Difference between Intertextuality in Critical Texts and other Discourses
Intertextual adaptations in non-critical discourses such as literary, social, political discourses cross boundaries of domains and ideas. For example, in W. B. Yeats' complex modern poems or in Joyce's novels the intertextual
adaptations are from history, sociology, politics, religion, literature, philosophy etc. T. S. Eliot in his play *Murder in the Cathedral* (1935) borrows religious ideas from the Bible. Girish Kranard in *Tughlaq* (1964) and *Hayavadana* (1971) uses intertexts from disciplines like education, religion, politics, history, international relations, economy, business, modern technology, psychology, etc. In critical discourses there are limitations on critics in use of references to other texts. Critical texts predominantly refer to literary authors (from different language backgrounds, different ages, and different times), critics and critical texts. Very rarely they cross these boundaries. The very nature of literary criticism restricts critic to cut across the boundaries of discipline of literature and criticism. Very rarely critics refer to other disciplines depending on need of the context such as history, religion, philosophy, etc. Most intertexts are intra-disciplinary in the sense that they are borrowed from the disciplines of literature and criticism. Thus, the critical discourses become intersection of other literary and critical discourses.

2.6 Intertextuality in Traditional and Modern Critical Discourses
There is a high degree of intertextuality in critical discourses as compared to the literary texts. There are more and varied linkages in critical texts than literary texts. Further synchronically texts or discourses of earlier times reflect lower degree of intertextuality. It has been observed that early English critical texts exhibit restricted intertextual references than the later. For example, Johnson uses limited number of linkages compared to P. B. Shelley or Matthew Arnold and all these use restricted intertexts as compared to the twentieth century critics like Brooks or Frye. One of the reasons is that the earlier writers have a limited access to the body of knowledge in the contexts. The other reason is the author’s choice. Certain modern critics use restricted references or linkages in order to asset their individuality, for example, Richards and Eliot. The modern and postmodern critical discourses are examples of complex networks of intertextuality. Deconstructionist critics have more access to a variety of disciplines and modes of interpretation.
Intertextuality refers to influence of writers on one another. Wordsworth, Shelley, Peacock, Arnold, Eliot and Murry influence one another in the contexts of the texts under study. Peacock influences Arnold through his essay *Four Ages of Poetry* and Arnold replies to the charges through *The Study of Poetry*. Wordsworth's views on poetry influence Eliot so he modifies them in relation to the definition of poetry and concept of personality. Eliot rejects the formula of poetry by Wordsworth.

Since ‘a text’s unity lies not in the author but in its destination’ (Barthes, 1977:148) the reader’s role is very crucial. Framing texts by other texts has implication not for writers but for readers. No one can read a poem, a novel, a drama or any critical work without being conscious of the contexts in which the text had been written, drawn upon, alluded to, and parodied and so on. Such contexts constitute a primary frame which the reader cannot avoid while interpreting the texts. Barthes says that all these writers become in a sense orchestrators of the texts and not the originators.

2.7 Model for the Study

The present study deals with the analysis of intertextual adaptations as a feature of discourse organization of critical texts. The theory of intertextuality is a postmodern concept propounded by Julia Kristeva and developed by other theorists and scholars like Gerard Genette, Graham Allen and many others. For any study and analysis a model is required. For the present study of intertextuality as an organizing principle of critical discourse, no model of analysis is available. The researcher, therefore, has planned to use eclectic model. Yet, it is based on the intertextual theories of Kristeva, Genette, Barthes, Derrida, Riffateire and Allen.

It is evidently clear from the above discussion about nature and features of intertextuality that it is a complex and comprehensive strategic device of
discourse construction. It covers a huge range of other devices and approaches and therefore it can be applied to any particular area. It is very important to note that the term intertextuality acquired its theoretical status only after 1950s at the hands of poststructural theorists. It underwent subsequent changes in its configuration and functional mode. In their treatment of the term, the post-structuralist theorists like Kristeva, Barthes and Derrida did not elaborate it in terms of interpretation. They explained how structurally well-knit, united and ordered texts are, in fact, assemblages of intertexts. Obviously, they dismissed any interpretative study of texts because texts, according to them, are incapable of any determinate meaning due to the unstable nature of language.

In the case of the present study of discourse analysis, the critical texts selected are from the period before reconsideration of intertextuality. The theoretical model of intertextuality proposed by the poststructural theorists is not applicable to the texts selected for the present study. Following are some of the major differences between the critical texts selected for the present study and poststructural theory of intertextuality:

1) The selected critical texts are designed to communicate certain ideas or points of view.
2) The selected texts purport some ideology or the other.
3) The selected critics derive intertexts to reinforce, justify and/or illustrate their viewpoints.
4) The selected texts have functional and pragmatic value.
5) The selected critics do not write with any express intention of text as an assemblage of intertexts or a reversing strategy of ideology.
6) The poststructural theorists reject any idea of integrity, unity and originality of text. They do not look for meaning in text. On the contrary, they show how text betrays the author.

It is due to these differences that the poststructural theory of intertextuality cannot be applied to the selected critical texts. The researcher, therefore, has
proposed to formulate an eclectic model that covers relevant ideas from both structural and poststructural approaches with a focus on the functional value of intertexts. The model of analysis includes ideas from the following theories:

1) Julia Kristeva's concept of vertical and horizontal axis where twofold interaction between the critic and reader and between the critic and the other critic is taken for the examination of the selected texts.

2) Gerard Genette's types of intertexts are borrowed to identify types of the selected texts.

3) The point of functional value is added to reveal the semantic/interpretative function of the selected texts.

This eclectic model may be synoptically stated as follows:

1) **Example of Intertextuality**: Whether the intertext is a quotation, citation, reference, allusion, metaphor etc.

2) **Source**: Source of the borrowing i.e. whether it is from ancient or classical or contemporary literary or critical author or from work/s or from any other discipline.

3) **Kind of Intertextuality**: Whether it is intertext, paratext, metatext, hypertext or architext. Whether the used quotation or citation is in English, English translation from other languages or transliterations.

4) **The Functional Value**: The purpose of the use of the intertextual adaptation or the role of the intertextual adaptations in the concerned discourse. The intertextual linkages can have following various functions. They can be used as: generation of ideas, organizing principle, illustration, justification, reinforcement / support, contradiction, paradox/irony, modification, feedback, commendation, comment, explanation, information, etc.

5) After the analysis of every critical discourse a brief account of the analysis is projected in tabular form as follows:
Tabular Analysis of Intertextual Adaptations in Selected Critical Discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of Intertextuality</th>
<th>Reference/Linkage/Source</th>
<th>Type of Intertextuality and Reference</th>
<th>Functional Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quotation; Citation; Allusion; Reference; Footnote, etc.</td>
<td>Source of the concerned intertextual adaptation</td>
<td>Whether it is: Intertext, Paratext, Metatext, Hypertext or Architext and whether the reference is cataphoric or anaphoric or both cataphoric and anaphoric</td>
<td>Whether intertextuality is used for Generation, Organization of ideas, Illustration, Justification, judgement, Reinforcement, Support, Contradiction, Paradox, Irony, Modification, Feedback, Commendation, Comment, Demonstration, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following is an example of a tabular analysis of intertexts used in Cleanth Brooks’ *Irony as a Principle of Structure*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference/Linkage</th>
<th>Source of Intertextuality</th>
<th>Type of Intertextuality and context</th>
<th>Functional Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… Consider, for example, one of Shakespeare’s songs: Who is Silvia?: what is she…</td>
<td>Intertextual adaptation of a song <em>Who is Sylvia?</em> by W. Shakespeare (1564–1616)</td>
<td>Metatext Anaphoric Cataphoric</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 Conclusion

Intertextuality is a strategy that a writer employs in constructing a text. It can be seen as a cohesive link for coherent writing. The beauty or complexity of a text depends on how beautifully or intellectually the author or the orchestrator employs different texts signifying different meanings together into a new text.
A critical discourse is a network of variety of intertexts. The researcher tries to show how it is possible to look into, study and analyze the use of cohesive linkages in a discourse by the way of intertextuality. It opens a vast field of study for scholars to deal with all the texts and analyze types of intertextuality, and their significance.