Chapter 1

Introduction

There was a time in the history of literary studies when it was believed that the meaning of a work of literature/art depended on the text itself which was the space for the intentional and affective exercises of the authorial self. The creator of the work, the author was deemed the sole or ‘soul’ and final authority regarding the meaning of the work. Reading a literary work was an act of penetration into the inner dynamics of the work trying to unearth everything about it from its composition to its reception by the readers. Reading of a work also concentrated on the way the author showed influences of the previous writers on him and his style. Hence a poem by Keats was thought to have the echoes from and influence of predecessor writers like Shakespeare or Spenser. In spite of authorial supremacy with regard to the ultimate meaning that a text conveys, the influences on his thought processes or previous works with a bearing on his work were also taken into consideration. Plutarch’s Lives, for instance, was considered as the basis for Shakespeare’s Roman plays. So intertextuality in its very crude basic form was always there in practice. But the emergence of modern literary and cultural theories and their interception with literature changed this scenario and point of view. Intertextuality as a strategy ascertains that the significance of a text depends on the multifarious textual relationships a text holds with other texts and the mutual influence the texts share together. It may also rest with the plurality of meaning a single text evokes as the current theories hold the text as the site of multiple points of view instead of the single central perspective that it was thought to hold. The theory
of intertextuality is based on the belief that no text stands alone conveying a single unitary meaning. The existence of a text is “not an isolated fact” (Hudson 31). A text keeps its affiliation with its predecessors and successors, each one modifying the other in course of its evolution over time. In that case the changed view about the art of reading a text becomes a process of moving between texts as every text is thought to be interconnected with and interdependent on one another. The act of reading becomes an act of enquiry as to the voices that reverberate in the work as every text bears in it echoes of what has gone before. It also leaves gaps and fissures to be filled in by later creations. Hence the meaning of a text is never complete without unravelling the interconnectedness it has with other texts. This interdependence or interconnection among texts is known by the term intertextuality. “The concept of intertextuality requires that we understand the concept of a text not as self contained structure but as differential and historical” (Frow 45).

Celebrating ‘Otherness’ or the deployment of other voices have become the prime engagement of critical theories like modernism, postmodernism, structuralism, poststructuralism and deconstruction. These theories have completely changed the way reality is apprehended. Deconstructive strategies destroying the structure and authority of canon are employed which permit the multiple play of signs emphasizing alternate perceptions. So the postmodern, structural and poststructural epistemological realms concentrate on revisions and re enquiries dismantling the old suggesting plurality in place of singular centralities where “centre cannot hold” (Yeats, “The Second Coming”) and peripheries and margins are reallocated and located. Present day theoretical scenario has cast significant enquiry into the way in which texts are
modified by contexts in which they are read. Despite a text’s overt non-affiliation with another text that has gone before, the contexts in which it is placed necessitate rereadings leading on to their intertexts and countertexts. Reading a text becomes an act of rereading culminating in rewriting the previous text, often changing its course, conduct and representation of characters. Thus looking for the intertextual relations of a canonical work and subjecting it to rereading of a revisionary nature have been enabled by the advance of theoretical enquiries. Canonicity is no more considered as the norm. Alterities, alternate perceptions and alter egos are encouraged and sought by the theoretical enquiries challenging logocentric patterns.

Dominant discourses are deconstructed to let the marginal subaltern voices be heard and seen. Here absences and silences are as much conspicuous as presences and voices. The search for the other voices and other perceptions inherent in a text necessitates the intertexts as “texts are …not structures of presence but traces and tracings of otherness” (Frow 45). Intertexts prevent a master narrative from occupying realms of certainty and closure. They are born from the assumption that ‘truth’ may differ according to perceptions. The enquiry into the network of textual relations of every work leads to intertextuality. It refers, as the name suggests, to the relationship the work holds with other texts. But it has been much used and more misused. The word has multiple denotations and connotations. As Harold Bloom puts, ‘intertextuality is underdetermined in meaning and over determined in figuration’ (as quoted in Allen 2). It could be in the form of crude borrowing of ideas, themes, characters and plots from a text in a following one or as an open and conspicuous influence of a creation on another work or the multifarious and complex weaving of
elements of textuality which bring the text in a subtle interface with another. The term could be used to signify the multiple ways in which any one text is intimately involved with other texts either by hidden or by open allusions or by its assimilation of the formal features of an earlier text or texts. It may mean that in an apparently simple individual work many voices may be present either in the form of intended authorial meaning or as an unconscious desire. In some instances, intertextuality is maintained by the presence of characters from an earlier text who occupy challenging positions in the follower text, revising and recreating the assumptions of the old giving way to newer narratives. “…intertextuality seems to deliver us from the old controversies over the psychology of individual authors and readers, the tracing of literary origins and the relative value of imitation or originality” (O’Donnell and Con Davis 239).

The Bible holds very pertinent intertextual relations with a lot of later works where Biblical elements, stories, themes and characters are reread and ‘presented’. It is not representation alone but ‘presentation’ as well subjecting such pre-existing elements to a critical reading. Milton’s Paradise Lost holds conspicuous intertextuality with the Bible. Epics and other canonical master narratives have always been read and reread and recast in a different manner. Epics celebrate the exploits of great superheroes whose glorious tales undergo considerable changes in its reworking. Re-readings of Ramayana may celebrate the story of Ravana, the villain in the piece. The epic may be reread as a narrative of Sita, the heroine, giving her version of the master narrative. Various versions/narratives of a canonical work have been considered as intertexts of the same. Intertexts allow the celebration of pluralities, making simultaneous co-existence of multiple perspectives possible. Homer’s Odyssey
holds intertextual significance for both Tennyson’s “Ulysses” and “The Lotos Eaters” and the 20th century monumental work *Ulysses* by James Joyce. If Tennyson’s poems retain the Homerian touch in a later nineteenth century atmosphere of uncertainty, pessimism and lack of faith amidst Victorian prosperity, Joyce’s *Ulysses* is a complex mixture of personalities and perspectives, conveying twentieth century anxieties of a post world war situation, where the world is presented as “a heap of broken images” (Eliot, *The Waste Land*). So it may be inferred that a master narrative may facilitate a number of intertexts, each one different from the other often rendering revisionary perceptions.

Through rereading canonicity, centrality and authority have been shaken and broken. By these textual revisions, not only the narratives but also the dominant phallo/logocentric discursive realms are reassessed resulting in the celebration of multiplicities of perception and pluralities of voices. These intertextual enquiries challenge the value systems that facilitate dominant discourses like patriarchy, colonialism, Eurocentrism, logocentrism and so on. Intertextuality provides an arena for the prevalence and celebration of the Other- the voices from the other side of existence. Texts and their revisions modify the parent texts and its products and open up unforeseen perceptions and ways of looking at the way the discourse is formed. Interrelatedness among texts can be intertextual or countertextual. The new text could just be an extended commentary or as a sequel to the foregone text where it does not try to alter the pre-existent notions but may bring in another aspect of the text in question. Intertextual narrations may either develop the story of a marginalized character in the canonical work or provide a supplementary or
extensive commentary of an event celebrated in the master narrative. Intertextuality in its diversity offers both literary and critical means of re representation. Its literary re representation can be exemplified by the use of Biblical imagery and themes in Milton’s *Paradise Lost* where it presents the Fall of Man in the Miltonian way. In its literary aspect it may represent the theme and other aspects of a master narrative without deconstructing it, i.e. without overtly changing the assumptions of the canonical text. Almost all the adaptations of the epics especially for the children may be considered as belonging to this group. They just retell the old story to suit a different set of audience. Here the thrust is more on the side of literature than on its critical and theoretical aspect. The change it brings on the master narrative is more of a physical nature than any alteration in its spirit. But as a critical device intertextuality is far more significant. In all the modernist and postmodernist rewritings of the canonical narratives it is the critical element that dominates. Here the new text is expected to change the spirit of the parent text by engaging the earlier text in an open or subtle contention. Emma Tennant’s *Tess* (1993) and Lin Haire Sergeant’s *Heathcliff: The Sequel to Wuthering Heights* (1992) belong to this category where the intertexts simply change the way the truth is perceived in their master narratives or parent texts. As the titles make obvious *Tess* is an intertext of Thomas Hardy’s *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* while Sergeant’s work is a sequel to Emile Bronte’s *Wuthering Heights*. Both these twentieth century intertexts hold not only their parent texts in challenge and critique but also hold their writers as active intertextual presences open to criticism. They simply destabilize the assumptions of the earlier texts, altering the spirit of those texts. This is the critical means of
intertextual enquiry. In such cases the intertexts have a more subtle and intrinsic relation with the parent texts. They may keep their place in the web of textual relationships either by offering an alternate view of a voiceless character in a dominant text or by trying to tell a canonical tale from a different perspective. It may also directly challenge the plot by unearthing a hidden aspect. Moreover it could also be in the form of a strategic critique on the craft of the master writers.

As intertextuality allows the perspective of the Other, all theoretical movements have made use of this strategy to throw light on the hidden and the marginalized figures by bringing about voices and presences of the characters, relegated to the peripheries and closets prescribed by the canons. In such instances, along with the characters who are given new voices and new lives, the ideologies themselves are subjected to revision and reassessment.

Many revisionary works of canonical religious texts, epics of all languages and other master narratives throng the theoretical realm deconstructing existing ideologies and reconstructing new ideologies based on revised rereadings. Sometimes the intertextual analysis may take on a conspicuous oppositional strategy to the master narrative questioning its supposed assumptions and challenging its prescribed theoretical positions. They exhibit a kind of countertextuality. So intertextual relation between texts could be either as a commentary or as a challenge or a combination of both offering a revisionary critique as well as a counter-discourse which bring about revolutionary changes in the way truth is perceived and represented. The works under
study in this thesis Jean Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea* and J.M. Coetzee’s *Foe* are examples of such a practice.

In this thesis titled “Texts, Countertexts and Intertexts: An Analysis of Jean Rhys *Wide Sargasso Sea* and J.M. Coetzee’s *Foe*” intertextuality is not examined or employed as a theory governing the literary texts under analysis. No attempt is made to prefer and apply the theory of Kristeva, Bakhtin or Barthes onto the textual enquiry. A trajectory of intertextuality from its origin to its appropriation by various theorists indicating the flexibility and diversity of its deployment is done. But concentration is entirely directed at texts which are inter/ countertextual and how theoretical practices and discursive attempts have made use of this term to facilitate enquiry into specific texts as the intertexts and countertexts of canonical narratives and how the selected works maintain a relation of inter/countertextuality with their respective parent texts.

The term intertextuality enters into critical or theoretical parlance from the repertoire of Julia Kristeva, even though mutual influences of texts have always been commented about and touched upon earlier. This term holds a pan-theoretical appeal as theorists have used it to mean what they wanted it to mean. Hence right from looking at a text as the echo of a previous one, the term goes on to mean the inherent complexities dealing with the web of textual relations a work might unravel. Ferdinand de Saussure, the Swiss linguist and pioneer of semiotics, Mikhail Bakhtin, Roland Barthes have all been associated with the emergence of the theoretical formulation of intertextuality. But it was Kristeva’s attempt to combine Saussurean
and Bakhtinian theories of language and literature that bring out the articulation of intertextual theory in an essay “Word, Dialogue, and Novel” published in 1966 which is included in her work *Desire in Language: A semiotic approach to Literature and Art*. In this essay she says that “each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read…any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (66). The Saussurean idea of the sign as a combination of the signifier and the signified emphasizes that its meaning is non referential, arbitrary and is differential in nature. The meaning is generated by the processes of permutation and combination within the differential system of language and is relational in nature. It is this revolutionary move to describe the world in terms of sign systems which keeps its relationality that paved the seed for the theory of intertextuality. If the linguistic sign is an arbitrary, non-stable, relational unit constituted by a vast network of relations, the literary sign is more so as literature is constituted not just of words alone, but of plots, characters, images, generic features, narrative styles, sentences, echoes, usages and plot twists from a vast synchronic system of literary tradition throwing open the possibility of the multiplicity of textual relations, mutually signifying and mutually influential, thwarting possibilities of certitudes. Graham Allen opines that “no longer the product of an author’s original thoughts and no longer perceived as referential in function, the literary work is viewed not as the container of meaning but as a space in which a potentially vast number of relations coalesce” (12). As the site of words which carry pluralities of meaning and overtones from other works, a text does not make meaning
in singularity, but only in a comparative way by placing the work in relation to other texts of the same literary system.

Another key figure in the development of this concept is Roland Barthes whose phenomenal concept of the ‘Death of the Author’ employs intertextuality at the origin of the text which he considers as the site of a plurality of voices. He says:

… a text is not a line of words releasing a single theological meaning (the message of the author - God) but 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 the innumerable centres of culture…

… His (the writer’s) only power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them’’ (146-7).

The above quoted lines reveal the plural, multiple and alternate inter relatedness of literary texts even to the extent of the death of the demigod, the author. The author is just a compiler of the already existing possibilities and relations in a literary system and the meaning of a work does not arise from the way the author gives it, but from the way the text is situated in the linguistic, literary, cultural system.

Another major theorist is Bakhtin whose significance in the world of literary theory is unparalleled and his revolutionary ideas on textuality were introduced to the world by Kristeva. Bakhtin’s wide range of theoretical expositions make him an ally of almost all branches of critical enquiries. Bakhtin’s ideas on dialogism and the social
evolution of language is a conspicuous pointer towards the evolution of intertextual theory. Along with his ideas on dialogism, other related concepts like polyphony, heteroglossia, double voiced discourse and hybridization that he proposes, emphasize the multiple and plural nature of literary works which are caught in a web of relations. The double voiced discourse and its powerful place within the dialogic novel throw open a major theory of intertextuality which considers each “word already inhabited” (Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* 201). Bakhtin gives the idea that “the language is dialogic and historically evolves” (*The Dialogic Imagination* 95). Dialogism disrupts the notion of monologic premises and as Graham Allen puts it, “All utterances are dialogic, their meaning and logic dependent upon what has previously been said and on how they will be received by others” (19). Bakhtin himself was a site of intertextual practices as the concepts he propounded comprised of a multitude of theoretical positions. It is this contention about the relationality of each word as “a two sided act” (Bakhtin and Volosinov 86) along with the plurality of positions he endorses through his concepts that mark him as a precursor of the theory of intertextuality. Bakhtin suggests intertextual elements and multiplicity of perceptions through the emphasis on the Otherness of language, on its internal stratification, on what he calls polyphony, or heteroglossia, the co-existence and interplay of several types of discourses reflecting the diverse social and cultural platform of every day existence. For Bakhtin “the life of the word is contained in its transfer from one mouth to another, from one context to another context, from one social collective to another” (*Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* 201). Graham Allen opines that “At the heart of Bakhtin’s work is an argument that the dialogic, heteroglot
aspects of language are essentially threatening to any unitary, authoritarian and hierarchical conception of society, art and life” (30).

The emergence of intertextuality as a theoretical tool occurred in a transitional period between structuralism and poststructuralism in the nineteen sixties which was the heyday of theoreticians and critics, where every emerging theory in the field of the sciences was repositioned to hold literature and its signifying practices. Bakhtin’s concepts have revolutionized Kristeva’s ideas on intertextuality and this specific term is coined by Kristeva in a work which introduced Bakhtin to the world of theory in Paris. Though the term first appeared in an essay titled “Word, Dialogue and Novel” published in 1966, it was again complemented by another essay titled “The Bounded Text” and both appeared in Kristeva’s early work Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. She writes that “a text is a permutation of texts, an intertextuality in the space of a given text in which several utterances, taken from other texts intersect and neutralize one another” (Kristeva 36). She posits that writing is an act that presupposes a split between subject and object, a kind of doubling. “The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity and poetic language is read at least double” (66).

According to her the intertextual features are available even in the most minimal structural unit, the word. In her theory every utterance is deemed to be the site of intertextual relations. But there is a general criticism associated with Kristeva’s position in connection with intertextuality that there is “a vagueness in Kristeva’s work about the relation of the social text to the literary text” (Clayton and Rothstein 20).
Graham Allen quotes Duff as “attention to literary genre evaporates as we move from the work of Bakhtin to Kristeva’s and other poststructuralists’ works” (57). The kind of textuality that Kristeva tries to describe embodies Otherness and it is beyond monologic and hence socially disruptive. “Intertextuality encompasses that aspect of literary and other kind of texts which struggle against and subverts reason, the belief in the unity of meaning, of the human subject and which is therefore subversive to all ideas of the logical and the unquestionable” (Allen 45).

The poststructuralist stand about every utterance as the site of intertextual references places this concept in a self conscious level of intertextuality rather than a critical application of the term in the study of specific texts. Jonathan Culler has mentioned that “the poststructuralist theories of intertextuality reduce intertextuality, when performing specific readings, to a restricted manageable level and so undermine the claims made for that new term” (Culler 103). Specific enquiry into the intertextual elements of a text has to move this theoretical concept from the realm of poststructuralist premises to one of textual practices where the concept would be examined in its practical applications.

Thus intertextuality as a term has been ushered into theoretical parlance by theorists like Kristeva, Bakhtin and Barthes to destroy notions of stable meaning and objective interpretation. Poststructuralists like Barthes hold that literary meaning can never be fully stabilized by the reader since the intertextual nature of the literary work always leads readers on to new textual relations. If the poststructuralists employ the term to distort certainties and definitions of meaning, then the structuralists use the
term to locate and fix literary meaning. Among structuralists Gerard Genette is described as “the most intrepid and persistent explorer in our time of the relation between criticism and poetics” (Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation XII). In his three related works which is titled Architext, Palimpsests and Paratexts, Genette produces a coherent theory of what he terms as transtextuality which is “intertextuality from the view point of structural poetics” (Allen 98). According to Genette, transtextuality is “the textual transcendence of the text” (Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation 1) and “all that sets the text in a relationship whether obvious or concealed, with other texts” (1). He divides the concept of transtextuality into five types and the first kind of transtextuality is intertextuality. Genette’s intertextuality is not the same as employed by poststructuralists. To him it is “a relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts” and “the actual presence of one text within another” (Palimpsests 1). His definition of intertextuality is not concerned with the semiotic processes of cultural and textual signification. Instead it is a pragmatic intertextuality between specific elements of individual texts.

The second type of transtextuality is paratextuality which marks those elements occupying the threshold of a work and which direct and control the reception of the text by its readers. Paratext is constituted by a peritext and an epitext. Peritext deals with the elements like titles, chapter titles, preferences, dedications and notes while epitext is concerned with elements outside of the text in question. Metatextuality, the third type is like a commentary to another text. “It unites a given text to another of which it speaks without necessarily citing it, in fact sometimes even without naming it” (Palimpsests 4). The fourth type is Architextuality which “has to
do with the reader’s expectations and the reception of the work” (*Palimpsests* 5). Hyper textuality “which involves any relationship uniting a text B (the hypertext) to an earliest text A (the hypotext) upon which is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary” (5). Graham Allen opines that, “What Genette terms the hypotext is termed by most other critics, the intertext, that is a text which can be definitely located as a major source of signification for a text” (108). According to Genette a hypertext is “a text in the second degree ….. i.e. a text derived from another pre-existent text” (*Palimpsests* 5). Genette also argues that all texts are potentially hypertextual.

A further extension of the theory intertextuality is given by the French theorist Laurent Jenny in his *Strategy of Forms*. In an essay titled “Status of Intertextual Discourse” he says that, “What is characteristic of intertextuality is that it introduces a new way of reading which destroys the linearity of the text” (44-45). Another structuralist critic Riffaterre also advances his views on intertextuality. Riffaterre distinguishes between intertext and intertextuality. Intertextuality is the web of functions that constitutes and regulates the relationship between text and intertext. He also gives his definition of the intertext as “a corpus of texts, textual fragments, or text like fragments of the subject that shares lexicon” (“Compulsory Reader Response: The Intertextual Drive” 142). He goes on to add that “intertextual reading is the perception of similar comparabilities from text to text” (“Syllepsis” 626). Riffaterre holds the view that intertextuality need not be with any specific text. According to him texts presuppose intertexts which a reader must actualize within a semiotic reading of the text.
Apart from theoretical discursive movements like poststructuralism and structuralism, intertextuality as a practice and theory has been well supported by Harold Bloom who talks about ‘the Anxiety of Influence’. The combination of rhetorical and psycho analytical approach to intertextuality is Bloom’s particular contribution to contemporary literary theory. He considers all texts as intertexts. He writes, “A single text has only part of a meaning. It is itself a synecdoche for a larger whole including other texts. A text is a relational event” (*Kabbalah and Criticism* 106). For Bloom intertextuality is a product of the anxiety of influence. “For Bloom, poets employ the central figures of previous poetry but they transform, redirect, reinterpret those already written figures in new ways and hence generate the illusion that their poetry is not influenced by, and not therefore a misreading of, the precursor poem” (Allen 135). His vision refuses to accept social and cultural contexts as relevant intertextual fields of meaning for literary texts. According to Bloom literary texts can only have other specific literary texts as intertexts.

Poststructuralists observe that intertextuality is practised from the heyday of modernism since “only literature written after the emergence of modernism allows the reader to become fully active in the production of meaning” (Allen 68) and hence can be rewritten by the reader. But postmodernism puts this concept into a wide variety of nuances since postmodernism utilizes intertextuality in its celebration of possibilities. As Jencks says, “Its best works are characteristically double coded and ironic because this heterogeneity most clearly captures our pluralism” (7). Postmodernism uses intertextuality as it is a useful term for foregrounding notions of relationality, interconnectedness and interdependence in modern cultural life. Postmodern literary
and cultural theory which juxtaposes the styles and codes of different but apparently incompatible and incomparable forms of representation, question, disturb and subvert the dominance of the established forms and canons and thus make use of intertextuality more closely than other theoretical positions. Its strategies of subversion, metawritings, metafictions, the postmodern characteristics of self-reflexivity and self-consciousness, of plurality and multiplicity and its elements of parody and pastiche necessitate intertexts and countertexts abundantly. It is interesting to note that diverse discursive realms like postcolonialism and feminism have made elaborate use of the postmodern strategies in their intertextual analyses of master narratives or canonical constructions.

Intertextuality or the interrelatedness of texts is an all-inclusive term which may suit a lot of theoretical positions and reading strategies. Tracing its supposed origin as a theory in the Kristevan texts on Bakthin to its woven presence in the world of the web as hypertextuality reveals its trajectory as so wide and varied. Intertextuality as a practice is traced not between literary texts alone. It is an all pervasive reading and writing pattern observed in all walks of art like painting, music, architecture, theatrical productions, and cinema and so on. As Keith A. Reader writes, “The very concept of the ‘film star’ is an intertextual one, relying as it does on correspondences of similarity and difference from one film to the next, and sometimes too on supposed resemblances between on screen and off screen personae” (176). Intertextuality facilitates a radical challenge of and resultant changes in the established versions of the non-literary art forms like painting and photography. As all art forms are inscribed with cultural codes, intertextuality can question those cultural codes as
well. It is used in twentieth century paintings to incorporate real objects into painting. Steiner suggests that “it is only by viewing paintings in light of other paintings or works of literature, music and so forth that the ‘missing’ semiotic power of pictorial art can be augmented” (58).

The deployment of intertextuality in the World Wide Web leads to hypertextuality which is “the textuality generated through the new computer based technologies” (Allen 201). Hypertextuality makes simultaneous ‘reading’ and ‘writing’ possible in which “readers will be able to choose any of the existing paths, or define a new path, through the materials they are reading and perhaps leave that path for other readers to follow if they choose” (Bolter 23). This has added to the revolutionizing capacity of intertextuality as a hypertext “breaks down our habitual way of understanding and experiencing texts” (Delaney and Landow 30). It allows for the simultaneous co-existence of multiple voices, multiple texts, multiple genres, and multiple methodologies in a rare fusion of fantasy and technical reality in an infinite interconnectedness.

Thus, in spite of the plural ways through which intertextuality as a concept has developed, it may be analysed in its relation to other discursive fields which have used it for vastly different purposes like interrogating issues of cultural stereotyping and gender relations and to trace the intertextual field of social codes and ideological formations. Postcolonialism and feminism have lavishly made use of intertextuality and deployed it in discourses that concern them without overtly embracing the notion of plurality or the death of the author that poststructuralists have associated with the
term. As postcolonialism and feminism are essentially concerned with marginalized and subaltern voices and communities, they have concentrated on how the celebration of the Other which intertextuality positively upholds can be made use of in questioning the centralities and dominant discourses. From the point of view of this thesis, the most valid point is the interface of postcolonialism and feminism with the interrogative and disruptive strategies of intertextuality. This thesis aims to analyse two texts that hold valid intertextual relationship with their master narratives, Jean Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea* and J. M Coetzee’s *Foe* which challenge and reread Charlotte Bronte’s *Jane Eyre* and Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* respectively, both as postcolonial and feminist intertexts.

Feminism and postcolonialism made a very thorough use of intertextuality. The postcolonial and feminist preoccupations with the discourse of the marginalized and the subjectivities in the margins have given rise to various textual practices which enable the disruption of the hegemonic dominant structures and the prevalence of the voices and spaces in the suburbs of discourse. The disruptive use of intertextuality is mostly viewed in the realm of postcolonialism and feminism as both deal with rereading and rewriting the canon unearthing silences and absences in history and literature.

The revisionist reading strategies which the concept of intertextuality provides have been effectively used by the feminist discourse in problematizing the question of gender. The monologic canon has excluded women from its purview and women’s writing has always been in the margins of dominant discourses. Feminist critical
movement concentrates on analysing and enquiring into the previously overlooked traditions of female literary expressions. Intertextuality has been effectively used by feminist writers to deconstruct significant texts that offer the dominant point of view and to offer alternate meanings and readings, to the one already perceived and arrived at.

The new wave feminism active from 1960s has been noted for its two fold significance. It is noted on the political front for its intense political agitation for civil rights in the United States and in the literary arena for the women’s decision to contest the negative visual images of women perpetrated through literature. What was offered in literature was a male account of the female story shaping the so called positive female characters out of the world of hopes, expectations, desires and dreams of man while the non conformist women characters have been the result of male anxieties, fears and disillusionment.

Simone De Beauvoir has made a very interesting study of this kind of suburban treatment of women, trying to enquire into the motives behind the misrepresentation of women. In her work *The Second Sex*, Beauvoir says that man has been a positive term which stands for humanity while woman is its negative equivalent serving as the Other -the complement of man. She writes:

…humanity is male and man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him; she is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is the
incidental, the inessential as opposed to his essential. He is
the Subject; the Absolute—she is the Other” (16).

Beauvoir says that woman’s function as the Other emphasizes the positivity inherent
in the term ‘man’ and ‘woman’ is whatever man is not. Pam Morris supplements
Beauvoir’s argument by stating that “thus women are frail, not strong; emotional, not
rational; yielding, not virile; so that masculinity can be identified as those positive
qualities”(14) and man “projects upon her what he loves and what he hates”
(de Beauvoir 229).

Thus male versions of femininity, his illusions about women, and her truth as it
appears to him got perpetuated and reflected in literature and feminism offered a way
to contest these misrepresentations. M.H. Abrams says:

A major interest of feminist critics has been… to
reconstitute the ways we deal with literature in order to do
justice to female points of view, concerns, and values. One
emphasis has been to alter the way a woman reads the
literature of the past so as to make her …one who resists
the author’s intentions and designs in order …to bring to
light and to counter the covert sexual biases written into a
literary work (90).

As the master narratives have all been authored by the male word, the strictly
female, feminine experiences are found to be outside the representational world.
Female images in literature are generally consistent with male desires, aspirations and
anxieties. As Gilbert and Gubar states, “precisely because a woman is denied the autonomy - the subjectivity - that the pen represents, she is not only excluded from culture…but she also becomes herself an embodiment of just those extremes of mysterious and intransigent Otherness which culture confronts with worship or fear, love or loathing” (19). This misrepresentation of woman in literature brings in the need for rereading of the great canonical works as they express the male versions of truth and reality though the deviant representation of women in literary texts is not restricted to male authored ones. Because of the internalization of the culturally conditioned and inscribed images of women in the female psyche, even women writers tend to present stereotypical images of women in their works. Hence feminist literary criticism and gynocritic approaches strengthened by the literary and theoretical contributions of critics like Virginia Woolf, Simone De Beauvoir, Mary Ellman, Kate Millet, Elaine Showalter, Sandra Gilbert, Susan Gubar, Toril Moi, Julia Kristeva, Helene Cixous and many more like them aim at representing specifically female experiences, offering feminist challenges and contesting stereotypical images of women in literature formed by the male gaze and preconceptions in the male psyche.

Women’s representation by men and female self representation have been the central issues dominating the discourses of feminism. Hence rereading the master narratives that project and perpetrate the masculine representations of the female self is deemed imperative by the feminist theoretical and practical approaches. They offer alternate readings, give voice to the marginalized figures in the canons and write back to the logocentrist discourses. Showalter says that the subjects of feminist critique “include images and stereotypes of women in literature, the omissions and
misconceptions about women in criticism, and the fissures in male constructed literary history” (“Towards a Feminist Poetics” 128). According to her, feminism must concentrate on “woman as the producer of textual meaning, with the history, genres and structures of literature by women. Its subjects include the psychodynamics of female creativity, linguistics and the problem of female language” (128). Hence feminism enables a realm which thrives in the intertextual rendering of the hegemonic texts subjecting patriarchy and other dominant strategies to interrogation and deconstruction. Elaine Showalter describes the critical approach of gynocriticism as “the feminist study of woman’s writing, including readings of women’s texts and analyses of the intertextual relations both between women writers (a female literary tradition), and between women and men (“Feminism and Literature” 189).

Counteracting patriarchy’s culturally conditioned and fixed images of women which represent them either as angels in the house or as the dangerous Other, the intertextual discourse provides feminist intertexts which function both as commentaries and as critiques of the master narratives by legitimizing silences, providing marginalized, silenced beings with voluble discourse or converting their silences as powerful tools for interrogating practices that cause silences and marginalization. Many women writers have taken up the challenge to put the theoretical backup of feminism to practice by presenting the typical women’s experience that either go unrecorded in male produced works or get misreported. Hence along with representation, feminism as a literary and critical movement afforded the opportunity for revisionary readings of the past narratives that glorify the male world. Such feminist intertexts challenge the discursive practices of the master
narratives by giving voice to the women characters who occupy subhuman levels of existence in the hegemonic narratives. This is part of the strategy of feminist rereading and rewriting of the canons. In literature, the characters, the structural patterns and the narrative strategies are used to conform to the male oriented logocentric ideology and “in such fictions the female reader is co opted into participation in an experience from which she is explicitly excluded… she is required to identify herself” (Fetterley 12).

The women readers are forced to retain the points of view of the texts authored to emphasize the dominant ideology which is male centered. Because of this “as readers and teachers and scholars women are taught to think as men, to identify with a male point of view and to accept as normal and legitimate a male system of values one of whose central principle is misogyny” (Fetterley 20). Along with the male centred perceptions, the plot pattern also unobtrusively but emphatically underlines the dominant group’s presence. Hence the feminist writers stress on the need for subversive questioning and the reversal of the narrative points of view.

Not only male authors but mainstream women writers also get co-opted into perpetuating stereotyped male notions of women through their works. The Bronte sisters and Mary Ann Evans fall into the category. The practice of reading as women has to oppose the ideological superstructure of plot and narration of the dominant perspectives. Thus ‘reading’ becomes a process of ‘rereading’ as well. In this process of rereading women have to minutely scan the canonical texts for alternate voices and write back to the dominant points of view by subverting the previous text and forcing it to question itself resulting in intertexts which may free the narrative from the hold
of the dominant ideology by offering scathing critique to the canonical phallogocentric perceptions. Feminism used intertextuality as a counter-discursive strategy for questioning the stereotypical images of women in literary texts written by either male writers or women writers suffused in the male world view or suffering the split and the dualism of simultaneously conforming and rejecting the dominant discourses.

Feminists use the concept of intertextuality to address the questions of Othering and to explore the possibility of using women’s writing as a resistance to patriarchy. As Patricia S. Yaegar says in her “Because a Fire was in my Head”: 

_Eudora Welty and the Dialogic Imagination_, “Showalter is right to insist that theories of women’s creativity must address the intersections of different kinds of discourse in women’s writing. Since the best feminocentric writing will be not only in conflict but also in dialogue with the dominant ideologies it is trying to dislodge” (959). The feminists often appropriate the text, the language, the images of the dominant discourses and reincorporate them as new signifiers “opening the text to another point of view” (962).

The early literary and theoretical enquiries and preoccupations of feminism have been concerned with the question of gender, its inherent divide and the fissures within the canonical texts where empty, silenced spaces represent women’s subordination in society. In the feminist intertexts the women writers try to revise and subvert the canonic works by filling the gaps, by voicing the silence of the marginalized, by resisting the erasures of history and literature and also by powerfully
representing the women’s discourse. The women characters, who inhabit the periphery of the hegemonic discourses where centrality is the male prerogative, where either men or male approved women dominate narratives, are given their chance to present their points of view in the intertexts. These intertexts serve as sequels or commentaries to the previous texts. But the later developments in the field of feminism exposed its own cultural divide and unearthed the racial, material, ethnic, religious and economic biases inherent in it. The feminist affiliations with other emerging theories and ideologies like postcolonialism and Marxism address these issues of the microscopic and minute marginalizations embedded within the limits of the early wave of feminist movement which was essentially concerned with the empowered voice and self of the white woman of England or America. This new awareness necessitates new intertexts that take into consideration the other margins like race, religion and economic status resulting in counter-discursive narratives addressing these issues along with the gender question. Both *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Foe* are intertexts and countertexts because the texts simultaneously interrogate the issue of gender and race and expose the limits of not only dominant discourses but also of liberal feminism.

The challenge to the canon of logocentrism and patriarchy offered from the feminist points of view has close alliance with the theoretical position of the postcolonial trying to challenge the monologic discourse of colonialist or imperialist powers putting forth alternate voices, reinforcing alterities, multiplicities and celebrating the voice of the racially silent. In terms of questioning hegemony, the race and gender go hand in hand with their diverse objectives. Like feminism, postcolonialism as a reading and rereading practice concentrates on questioning texts that
represent the perspectives of the dominant ideology of colonialism presenting the colonized experiences as subaltern. Postcolonialism is an umbrella term and its connotations range from a chronological meaning to the current levels of cultural discourse. Spivak first uses the term ‘postcolonial’ in 1990 in the collection of interviews and recollections called *The Postcolonial Critic*. Though the term postcolonialism means the cultural interaction and effects of imperialism on the colonized society, it also signifies the political, linguistic and cultural experiences of societies that were former European colonies.

Postcolonialism covers a vast area of application. It is also concerned with the subtleties of subject construction and its resistance. Postcolonialism envisages intertexts and countertexts of the European canonical masterpieces which offer resistance through language, plot, character, interrogation of the colonial ethos and offering alternate voices and perspectives. Stephen Slemon says about postcolonialism:

> It has been used as a way of ordering a critique of totalizing forms of western historicism; as a portmanteau term for retooled notion of class; as a subset of both postmodernism and poststructuralism, …As the name for a condition of nativist longing in post independence national grouping; as a cultural marker of nonresidency for a 3rd world intellectual cadre; as the inevitable underside of a fractured
and ambivalent discourse of colonialist power; as an oppositional form of reading practice…(16-7).

It presents the other side of colonialist practice and represents the voice of the Other from the racial point of view.

Postcolonialism caters to various strategies of resisting the hegemony of the dominant ideology. Rereading the colonial canons and writing back to them through alternate intertexts has been a powerful tool of interrogation. The colonized races and culture undergo and experience the politics of oppression and repression. The figures embodying marginalization in the colonial discourses have been the enquiry of the postcolonial writer and this result in counter-discourses to the dominant ones. The postcolonial intertexts problematize the perspectives of the Other, bringing to periphery and voice the persona and silences in the margins of colonialism. Some postcolonial intertexts record their resistance through silence by employing it as a form of fighting oppression. The lives of the colonial subjects are inevitably fractured or divided. Perceived as the Other, as silent objects outside the margins of the dominant white colonial culture, they write within the system but exist in a strong resistance against the Othering process. Postcolonial intertexts also concentrate on heteroglossia and the double voiced discourses that emerge from the colonial masterpieces. The most notable themes of postcolonialism are hegemony, language, place, displacement, and the theme of domination. As a reading strategy it stresses the engagement with texts from the English and European canons to uncover the hidden layers of meaning and its marginalized representations. Rereading the canonical texts
and revising them in the light of the postcolonial discursive practices have opened up powerfully subversive accounts of textuality.

The term postcolonialism refers to a wide variety of theoretical as well as cultural notions and hence it is a loaded term. But through all its diverse connotations and contestations, it generally refers to “the effects of colonization on cultures and societies” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, Post-Colonial Studies 186). The term is used and expanded from its original meaning ‘after independence from colonial rule’ to signify “the study and analysis of European territorial conquests, the various institutions of European colonialisms, the discursive operations of the empire, the subtleties of subject construction in colonial discourse and the resistance of those subjects, and, most importantly perhaps, the differing responses to such incursions and their contemporary colonial legacies in both pre- and post-independence nations and communities” (187). Bakhtinian notions of subject hood, the struggle for identity and agency, the double voiced and intertextual nature of the speech and writing of the marginalized and Othered subject find its way into the postcolonial question. The postcolonial writers experience a clash of dominant and repressed discourses within one’s self as he is “a subject that inhabits the rim of an in between reality” (Bhabha 13). The enquiry of the postcolonial writer is “the more complex cultural and political boundaries that exist on the cusp of… often opposed political spheres” (173). Just like the women writer trying to combat forces of phallo/logocentrism the postcolonial writer is also double voiced, replete with an Otherness enabling intertextual dispositions. The master narratives of the dominant imperialist discourses are analysed for the presence of characters who speak a different language or who do
not speak at all. The colonial spaces are filled by the postcolonial counter-discourses questioning the ethos of canons and imperialism. Alternate voices require and enable alternate reading strategies.

The postcolonial discourses celebrate the silence and the absence of the racially subaltern as feminism is generally preoccupied with the gendered subaltern. Intertextuality with the possibilities of the celebration of marginality, multiplicity of voices and alternate discursive realms with numerous intertexts and countertexts acting as critiques to existing narratives field a direct link with the postcolonial point of view in its engagement with themes of location, dislocation, alienation, displacement, revision, versions, subversions, self and Otherness - racial Otherness. Bartmoore and Gilbert writes, “Postcolonial criticism has not simply enlarged the traditional field of English studies or refocused attention on neglected aspects or areas within it. It has also in association with recent critical discourses as various as feminism and deconstruction significantly altered the modes of analysis…” (8).

The intertextual rendering of the postcolonial point of view brings forth what Richard Terdiman terms as a ‘counter –discourse’ which according to Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin is a term “to characterize the theory and practice of symbolic resistance” (Post-Colonial Studies 56). They write thus:

…this term has been adopted by post-colonial critics to describe the complex ways in which challenges to a dominant or established discourse (specifically those of the imperial centre) might be mounted from the periphery…As
a practice within post-colonialism, counter-discourse has
been theorized...through challenges posed to particular
texts, and thus to imperial ideologies inculcated, stabilized
and specifically maintained through texts employed in
colonialist education systems... [It] also raises the issue of
the subversion of canonical texts and their inevitable
reinscription in this process of subversion (56).

Intertextuality facilitates the postcolonial contestations of colonial literatures
by subjecting the inherent assumptions of the colonialist discourse to thorough
revisions. Richard J. Lane suggests the term “embroiling narratives” (108) for such
counter-discursive narratives as the connotative meanings of the word ‘embroil’- to
mingle, to argue, to disorder- can be “regarded as positive strategies for postcolonial
novels interrogating the colonial canon” (Lane 19). He asserts that he uses the term
‘embroiling narratives’ for counter-discursive novels “precisely because both
possibilities –those of radical critique- and those of violent rejection and destruction-
are brought together” (Lane 19). There are two ways in which counter-discursive
narratives write back to the canonical works which they try to challenge. One is a
unidirectional approach in which “gathering critical, disruptive and deconstructive, the
new text is regarded as performing a powerful critique of the old...while in the
bidirectional group, gathering agonistic, dialectical and dialogic, the new text is in a
more dynamic relationship with that of the old... its new readings add to the
experience of reading particular canonical novels” (Lane 19). Intertextual rendering of
the master narratives enables them to be analysed from the perspectives of gender and
race, where alternate subjectivities thrive toppling the accomplished protagonists of
the hegemonic world/word, where subversions become as valid as authorized versions
putting ‘truth’ also in what is silent and dormant.

In this study more than its poststructuralist preoccupations and theoretical
affiliations, intertextuality is viewed in its practical aspect i.e. in its interrelation
between texts, in which a text is viewed as a commentary or a critique of the other. In
practice, it is generally ascertained that though all genres are the sites for the
deployment of intertextual voices, the novel is the most flexible of all. It allows the
free play of multiple selves, plurality of voices, reflections from the past and
reverberations from the world of literature. Bakhtin also holds the opinion that novel
is the most intertextual of all genres as it allows the deployment of imitation, parody,
the plurality of selves, narratives and multiple voices and all of them connote
interweaving of textual relationships. The world of fiction is so wide and varied that
all through the supposedly monologic perceptions and the voice of authority, there is a
subtle weaving of the thread of alternate voices, yearning to break free. The textual
space of a novel provides enough possibilities for the exposition and explication of
Otherness as the chosen texts for analysis would testify. Hence almost all theories of
intertextuality are intrinsically interconnected with the genre called fiction enough to
render the term ‘intertextual novel’ a redundant reality. There is a fluidity associated
with the novel as a genre that defies the restrictions of authoritative signification
processes and enables the liberation of multiple layers of meaning. Bakhtin, Kundera
and Barthes have all been alive to this feature of the novel and almost all concepts of
Bakhtin have been played upon the novelistic realm.
Bakhtin states that novel is “an open ended form which makes it a convenient vehicle for intertextuality” (The Dialogic Imagination 7). Kundera opines that “the novel is characterized (we need only recall Rabelais and Cervantes) precisely by its tendency to embrace other genres, to absorb philosophical and scientific knowledge” (64).

The realm of the novel allows generic and textual juxtapositions and “the novel makes wide and substantial use of letters, diaries, confessions…” (The Dialogic Imagination 33). This play of generic diversity that the novelistic space allows facilitates the possibility of intertextuality. The novelistic discourse also provides a realm where along with the authorial voice, the voices of the characters also prevail. Bakhtinian concepts associated with many sided discourses like polyphony, heteroglossia and dialogism characterize the discursive realm of the novel reinforcing its plurality. “Being intrinsically heteroglot, unlike poetic genres which are monologic and unilateral, the novel is a complex structure” (The Dialogic Imagination 284). It is this complexity that makes it a worthwhile tool for the analysis of intertextuality.

Along with its predilection with the genre of fiction, there are certain well known and well exercised devices through which intertextual relations of texts are communicated. Almost all of them are visible in the texts chosen for the present study. Sudha Shastri in her work on Intertextuality and Victorian Studies mentions a number of conspicuous characteristics by which the intertextuality with the master narratives are maintained. The intertexts maintain their relationships with the previous texts through certain devices like the title, proper names, quotations from the previous works, letters and journals, the biography and the autobiography, the footnote and the epigraph and these pertinent devices are fruitfully exploited in rendering a new text
in an intrinsic intertextual relationship with another. The texts under study make elaborate use of these devices in evoking their relationship with the narratives of the past.

Intertexts and countertexts of feminism and postcolonialism question the inherent hegemony of the dominant narratives. The texts taken for analysis, Jean Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea* and J.M. Coetzee’s *Foe* have been essentially noted for their counter-discursive strategies which question the ideological structures of patriarchy and colonialism. The feminist and postcolonial resistance they offer shake the very foundations of canon and the discursive realms that produce the master narratives. The texts offer rereadings of the colonial and patriarchal masterpieces by bringing to light the absences and gaps in the previous texts and also by voicing the perspectives of the marginalized and the voiceless characters. Both texts write back to the western literary canon by subverting the preconceived notions and long held assumptions inherent in the cult texts of the dominant discourses. Both *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Foe* hold critical and creative relationship with their prequels. Both offer resistant readings through the treatment of plot, character and genre and hold counter-discursive relations to their parent texts and raise the issue of the subversion of the colonial masterpieces.

This study intends to analyse the intertextual and countertextual interrelationship between the master narratives *Jane Eyre* by the Victorian woman writer Charlotte Bronte and *Wide Sargasso Sea* by the West Indian writer Jean Rhys and Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* and its textual sequel *Foe* by J. M. Coetzee,
the South African writer. Two challenging works of twentieth century, Jean Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea* and J.M Coetzee’s *Foe* which are known to question the logos of canons and offer alternate reading perceptions, giving voices to subaltern marginalized figures are analysed with a view to unravel their textual, countertextual and intertextual aspects. *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966) is considered as the rereading of Charlotte Bronte’s *Jane Eyre* (1847) while *Foe* (1986) offers the revision of Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). The inter/counter-discourses which the texts generate, inhabit multiple levels and involve plural strategies enabling their analysis from diverse points of view. Hence analysis is made of these narratives as texts, postcolonial countertexts and feminist intertexts.

The selection of these texts for the study and analysis of their textual, countertextual and intertextual aspects is done on the basis of the comparative and contrastive positions they hold and exhibit in their juxtaposition with the master narratives which the texts hope to interrogate. The selection is not a random one. Not only the texts but their authors also inhabit certain common locations from which they address the issues of race and gender.

*Wide Sargasso Sea* by Jean Rhys is a twentieth century exposition of the gaps in the narrative of the nineteenth century text, *Jane Eyre* where Bertha Mason, the former wife of Rochester is replanted as Antoinette Cosway and allowed to narrate how she ended up in the attic of Rochester’s colonial mansion Thornfield Hall. In the intertext, Bertha Mason has a story of her own as Antoinette Cosway, the Creole heiress who is given a West Indian locale and a credible past in *Wide Sargasso Sea*.
This text challenges the assumptions and inherent notions of Charlotte Bronte’s text which celebrates Rochester’s story along with Jane. This text exposes the double colonization encoded in the character Bertha in *Jane Eyre* both as a woman and as a Creole. Hence *Wide Sargasso Sea* is the celebration of double decolonization as well, both in its feminist and postcolonial content. Rochester’s duplicity and patriarchal predilections put him in jeopardy and the supposed integrity of Charlotte Bronte is also exposed to reveal a duality and politics in her treatment of the women characters in *Jane Eyre*. Jane’s triumph in the world of male domination is at the cost of jeopardizing the discourse of the Creole wife of Rochester. Hence it questions the ethos of patriarchy and colonialism along with the particular dichotomy of values exhibited by the nineteenth century women writers themselves known as practitioners of the woman’s point of view. It also reiterates the fact that there are feminisms in which the implications of liberation, freedom and self for the white colonial woman is different from the locations of marginality inhabited by the black, colonized woman or the Creole woman who are held in the locations of Otherness.

*Wide Sargasso Sea* retains its intertextual relationship with *Jane Eyre* by means of a number of devices. It retains some of the characters in the master narrative, like Rochester, the nurse Grace Poole and the location of the last part of the text in Thornfield Hall, the self same colonial mansion of Rochester. Rochester is relocated as a figure without the proper identity of a name. But it is the foregrounding of the Caribbean Antoinette on her continental self Bertha that brings about the scathing attack on the institutions of patriarchy and colonialism. There are vivid and valid dream sequences which bring *Wide Sargasso Sea* into a textual junction with the
world of *Jane Eyre*. Both Jane and Bertha are dreamers and the device of dream in its predictive capacity is exploited to the maximum in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Antoinette dreams of everything that will happen in her life including the final destruction of Thornfield Hall in the fire of her anger and hatred. Along with the replantation of Brontean characters on to the textual plane of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, there are textual occasions of *Jane Eyre* recreated in the text of Jean Rhys. Bertha’s attack on her half brother Richard Mason is placed in the last part of Jean Rhys’ text just as it is placed in the last part of Bronte’s text. As Bertha is introduced from the point of view of the ghastly glimpses that Jane gets in *Jane Eyre*, Jane appears in the textual space of *Wide Sargasso Sea* as a ghostly woman from the point of view of Bertha Antoinette.

The subtle feminism in *Jane Eyre* is transformed into an overt feminist text in *Wide Sargasso Sea* where the critique is accentuated by its postcolonial content, conveyed through the portrayal of Antoinette as a Creole woman, undergoing marginalization of the race and gender alike. The inherent intertextuality is doubled as it challenges the discursive systems that Rochester represents, both as a man and as an English man, of patriarchy and colonialism. It also critiques the ethos of nineteenth century woman’s writing that helps in the process of the Othering of the women of the colonies as exemplified by the text of Charlotte Bronte. *Wide Sargasso Sea* also interrogates the conventions of the realist narrative in this modernist rendering of the Otherside of *Jane Eyre*. *Wide Sargasso Sea* makes use of the conventions of the gothic in the subversive rendering of the story of Antoinette Cosway which challenges the realist narrative by presenting an aberrant character at its centre.
J. M Coetzee’s *Foe* is deemed as the intertext of *Robinson Crusoe*, the eighteenth century classic text by the master craftsman Daniel Defoe. *Foe* makes the Crusoe story an episode in the narrative of Susan Barton, a woman castaway who shares the island experience along with Cruso and his man servant Friday. Cruso just gets reduced into a character in a section of Susan’s story. *Foe* challenges the institution of patriarchy and colonialism from the text’s overtly postcolonial and feminist positions and also offers a textual revision of the entire world of Defoean fictional realm. The intertextual relationship of *Foe* is not only to the world of *Robinson Crusoe* but also to the world of *Roxana* and a short story “A True Revelation of the Apparition of One Mrs. Veal”, both written by Daniel Defoe. Hence the title recalls the fictional realm of Defoe deconstructed and apprehends Defoe as the foe to all kinds of truth in narration as he is the great artificer, the constructor of truth as an artifice. Along with its intertextual attack on the world of Defoe and *Robinson Crusoe* through the characters Susan Barton and the tongueless slave Friday, *Foe* offers an allegory and exposition of the art of fiction making. It enquires into the art and craft of writing fiction and thus maintains a metafictional self reflexivity throughout. But the primary intertextual gesture is the character Friday, the slave of *Robinson Crusoe*, who maintains a visibility throughout this text and finally takes the narrative to the postcolonial “home of Friday” (*Foe* 157) in spite of the ideological sway of Foe and complicity of Susan Barton and their efforts to master the narrative. Here the postcolonial intertextual element takes over the feminist one though the dominant hegemonic sounds simply lose in the play of emergent voices.
The intertextual devices begin from the title itself where *Foe* invariably brings into mind the textual world of Defoe, one of the eighteenth century pioneers of novel writing. By giving the title as *Foe*, and not as Crusoe, the message is made clear that it is not just the world of *Robinson Crusoe* that will be open to critique, but the world of Defoe, the one who shaped Crusoe. Along with the title, the relationship with the parent text is maintained through the characters Cruso and Friday. But the discursive practices that shaped Defoe’s Friday and Crusoe have become so different here that they remain Coetzee’s Friday and Cruso. Crusoe’s journal is Susan’s in *Foe*. The island story that runs into chapters in Defoe’s text is just an episode in Coetzee’s *Foe*. The intertextuality in *Foe* is overt as the attack on the dominant discursive systems is resounding. As it is essentially concerned with elements of truth, artifice and fiction writing, it is a postmodern metafiction interrogating the conventions of realism as well.

*Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Foe* have generated immense critical interest in the latter half of the twentieth century with its celebration of the theoretical enquiries and the texts’ overt intertextual relationship with the well known past narratives. Postcolonial theorists and feminists alike have gone into in depth analyses of these texts. Gayatri Spivak’s “Theory in the Margin:Coetzee’s *Foe* Reading Defoe’s *Crusoe/Roxana*” and “Three Women’s Texts and a Critique of Imperialism”, Richard J. Lane’s *The Postcolonial Novel*, Carine Madorossian’s “Double [De] colonization and Feminist Criticism of *Wide Sargasso Sea*”, Derek Attridge’s “Oppressive Silence: J.M. Coetzee’s *Foe* and the Politics of Canon” and Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar’s *The Mad Woman in the Attic*:
elaborately dealt with the various textual and intertextual aspects of

*Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Foe*. But that does not render this study redundant.

A juxtaposition of these two texts as postcolonial countertexts and feminist intertexts interrogating canons has not been done together in a study before. They are analysed as ‘texts’ that retain validity in their own uniqueness and also as postcolonial countertexts and feminist intertexts. Though the terms ‘intertext’ and ‘countertext’ are used interchangeably here in a general sense, following the definition of Terdiman, the term countertext is used for the postcolonial interrogation that the texts undertake so admirably well while the term intertext is used in connection with their feminist challenge of the hegemonic texts.

The selection of *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Foe* for this study is not an arbitrary one. The displaced self of Antoinette Cosway, buried in the attic of Thornfield Hall has been of special interest as her Other self in *Jane Eyre* has baffled and aroused curiosity with her vague grunts, momentary ghostlike appearances and the debilitating blow to the handsome Rochester and his colonial mansion. So it was thought fruitful to enquire into the various ways in which Bertha is redeemed in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. An identical revision is done in *Foe* where the man Friday of *Robinson Crusoe* carries the narrative along with Susan Barton from the hold of not only Cruso but of Defoe as well. An interest in feminism and postcolonialism also contributed to the selection of these texts for study.

Apart from these personal motives, certain theoretical causes are also behind this selection. The ‘dis’position of the authors in question is of special interest. Both
Jean Rhys and Coetzee occupy a position of an ‘outsider’ in their own cultures and also with regard to European culture. Hence their location is in the ‘median’ where they are caught between the whites and the blacks in a noman’s land. Jean Rhys’ West Indian background makes her an Other to the Europeans or the whites while her life in the continent and the Creole complicity with the white people make her the butt of distrust from the blacks. Identically Coetzee’s location as a South African white male puts him in a location of complicity with the Europeans from the blacks’ point of view while his anti Apartheid ideology and political views make him the target of the derision of the whites. As their respective dis/positions are in the middle, their reaction to the colonial discourse is also identical.

*Wide Sargasso Sea* exposes the limitations of the feminist stand which disregards the racial issue and ignores the doubly marginalized and hence the text undertakes the feminist revision of the inadequate feminist text which is supposed to be in complicity with the hegemonic discourses. Hence it is a woman’s text writing back to another woman’s text. *Foe* addresses the issue of a male rewriting of a text by another man and it illuminates the gap of the centuries where the feminist and postcolonial interrogation is done by a male writer, interweaving it with questions of textuality. *Wide Sargasso Sea* is a text which uses the conventions of modernism to write back to the realist master narrative. The textual implications and explications of *Wide Sargasso Sea* are multifold. It rewrites not only the premises inherent and inculcated through the text of Bronte, but to the narrative strategies of *Jane Eyre* with its blend of realistic details. The celebration of an aberrant heroine who will question the edifices of patriarchy and colonialism, shake and demolish it becomes the theme
for a modernist rewriting against the semblance of a realistic narrative of *Jane Eyre*. This text also makes use of the strategies of gothic as a tool of revision. As the text makes elaborate use of images, symbols and the nuances of character in rendering the narrative of Antoinette Cosway, they are also analyzed in detail in this study.

The textual space of *Foe* manifests a number of theoretical concerns. As an intertext of the textual world of Defoe, it alludes to many works of Defoe. Along with *Roxana* and *Robinson Crusoe*, *Foe* traces its relations to “A True Revelation of the Apparition of One Mrs. Veal”. This allusion is invoked to refer to issues of substantiality and of the manipulative authority of the author figure. *Foe* is noted as a text that defies the limitations of the signifying structures by facilitating multiple voices and plural selves. The text addresses the issue of the art of writing fiction as it discusses the strategies that make a story and this text serves as an effective treatise about the way texts are made. *Foe* deals with the questions of authenticity, substantiality and authority in writing. This text is a postmodern one as it celebrates multiple voices and diverse discourses and ends in a fluid self conscious realm of indefinite infinity. The supposed end of the text with its possibilities of significance thrown open makes this text a postmodern metafiction. In its textual space, *Foe* also allegorizes the strategy of reading in which Friday is the text that waits to be read but which is situated beyond the power of the readers like Foe and Susan Barton. Friday proves himself above the signifying practices of the dominant discourses and its representatives.

Both *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Foe* are nurtured in the cultural divide as colonialist ideologies bring about these postcolonial countertexts. They both
problematize the divide of the gender along with the race. Both *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Foe* speak for the silent and the marginalized and the decolonization is “a process” (Helen Tiffin 22) in them. These texts hold a unique place in the literary space with their distinct textual features and invite attention to them in a highly self conscious manner. But there are levels in which *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Foe* differ. The cultural climates in their respective nations are vastly different. West Indies retain its native glow while South Africa smells more of England. The colonial culture in the West Indies and South Africa is distinct resulting in the apprehension of the colonial experience differently by the writers. The feminist question is as dominant in *Wide Sargasso Sea* as the postcolonial one. But in *Foe* the postcolonial issue is played more significantly than the feminist one.

In short *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Foe* are analysed as texts, countertexts and intertexts in this thesis. The interweaving elements of textuality are analysed in the second chapter while chapter Three will concentrate on these texts as postcolonial counter discursive narratives. Chapter Four is an exposition of these texts as feminist intertexts. Chapter Five is the conclusion that sums up the arguments. The intricate inter relationships among texts is a vast realm offering innumerable possibilities of signification where every text becomes a site for the representation and regeneration of voices. “Just as Jamaican White Jean Rhys’ rewriting of the nineteenth century English classic cannot accept Jane Eyre as the paradigm woman, so can the South African White’s rewriting of an eighteenth century English classic not accept Crusoe as the normative man in nature, already committed to a constitutive chronometry” (Spivak, “Theory” 7). Both *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Foe* expose the limitations of the
colonial and patriarchal ideologies which create the “wholly otherness” (4) in the margins. They argue for the reassessment of the ideologies and their effectiveness against a universe engaging in a free play of signs as against the monologic authority of unitary meaning and interpretation and hence both these texts celebrate the voices and the presences from the Othersides.