

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter discusses about review of related literature. The definition of intertextuality and how to analyze it will be discussed in this chapter.

2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

According to Teun van Dijk Sheyholislami (2001: 1) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a field that is concerned with studying and analyzing written and spoken texts to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias. It examines how these discursive sources are maintained and reproduced within specific social, political and historical contexts (<http://http-server.carleton.ca/~jsheyhol/articles/what%20is%20CDA.pdf>).

Fairclough (1995: 4) describes critical discourse analysis (CDA) as an interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse that sees language as a form of social practice and focuses on the ways social and political domination is reproduced in text and speech. Thus, it can be said that critical discourse analysis is an exploration of the relationship between the use of language in daily life and the social context surrounds the users of a language. One may know how such events or texts come from.

Fairclough also identified three formal features of language: experiential, relational, and expressive or connective value (Fairclough 1989: 112). Fairclough relates those three items with contents, relations, and subjects of social practice

and their associated structural effects on knowledge and beliefs, social relationship, and social identities. It is stated that the presentation procedure for critical discourse analysis deals with description, interpretation, explanation, and the position of the analyst.

Description focuses on the formal features of a text which are vocabulary, grammar and textual structures. These formal features may have three types of values that are: experiential value—a way to know the author of a text's experience of the environment or social world is portrayed, relational value—a path to the social affiliations which are confirmed through the text in a discourse, expressive value—a way to the discourse maker's assessment of the realities which is related to the discourse (Fairclough, 1989: 112). While interpretation is the discourse processes and their dependence on background assumptions. Interpretation is the dealing with the relationship between text and interaction—what is inside the interpreter—by viewing the text as the outcome of production process and as the root of interpretation (Fairclough, 1989: 26). One may not just decode an utterance easily, but will come to such an interpretation via an active process of networking some features of the uttered discourse with the knowledge that have been saved in his or her long term memory. Fairclough (1989: 11) called this prototype as 'members' resources'. By these statements, one may assume that a literal or non-literal text may accidentally push the hearer or reader to revive the knowledge which has been stored in their memory, and this situation may be seen as the act of intertextuality. The last is explanation. Fairclough defines explanation

as the apprehension of the interaction and the social context inside of the interaction.

This study concerns with the part of the presentation procedure of CDA that is interpretation. It is stated above that interpretation is the step of critical discourse analysis which includes the intertextual concept. Further discussion of intertextuality is presented in the following texts.

2.2 Intertextuality

From the process of Critical Discourse Analysis stage, interpretation, one may find a feature called intertextuality. Intertextuality is what readers may find in reading a text that consist one or more ideas that may also be found in other texts. It can also be said that intertextuality is the relation between one text and other texts. Graham Allen (2000: 8) says that intertextuality is rooted by Ferdinand de Saussure, Bakhtin, then, Julia Kristeva compounded semiotic study of Ferdinand de Saussure and dialogism of Bakhtin.

Saussure (1974) writes the following:

in language there are only differences. Even more important: a difference generally implies positive terms between which the difference is set up; but in language there are only differences without positive terms. Whether we take the signified or the signifier, language has neither ideas nor sounds that existed before the linguistic system, but only conceptual and phonic differences that have issued from the system.

(Saussure, 1974: 120)

Saussure imagines a new science which would study ‘the life of signs within society’ which he calls semiology. Signs are not ‘positive terms’; they are not referential, they only possess what meaning they do possess because of their

combinatory and associative relation to other signs. No sign has a meaning of its own. Signs exist within a system and produce meaning through their similarity to and difference from other signs (Allen, 2000: 10). This is said as the seed of 'intertextuality'. Saussure states that signs never have their own meaning and always relates to other signs, it means that the meaning of a sign somewhat can be found in other signs. If one hears word elephant, he or she will have a thought about elephant in their mind. It indicates that the information about elephant's characteristics have already existed in her or his mind. This concept of relation is understood as intertextuality.

If one remembers the work of Bakhtin "dialogism" (1981), that is, the representation of an author's thoughts through his use of a dialogue between two or more of his characters, it may be understood that all language, all thought, appears as dialogical. This means that everything anybody ever says always exists in response to things that have been said before and in anticipation of things that will be said in response. This work brings on an ongoing dialogue with other works of literature and other authors. It does not merely answer, correct, silence, or extend a previous work, but informs and is continually informed by the previous work. Allen (2000: 211) refers to dialogism as a concept that all utterances are actually perceived in relation to the previous existing utterances and are always directed to other potential speakers, rather than happening either independently or in isolation. Thus, it means that when a speaker utters some utterances, and another speaker responds to those utterances, the dialogue which occurs is related to each other.

Kristeva in Allen (2000: 46), then, compounded the study of Ferdinand de Saussure, the study of how signs derive their meaning within the structure of a text, and the study of Bakhtin's dialogism, an examination of the multiple meanings in each text and each word into a new branch of knowledge called intertextuality. Kristeva argues that authors do not create their texts from their own mind, but rather compile them from pre-existent texts. The text becomes "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: 1980: 36). As Kristeva states, "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (Kristeva 1980: 66).

Fairclough (1989: 141-152) states that intertextuality is a part of interpretation. Interpretation forces the readers to pull back the knowledge stored in their long-term memory, and bring out their point of view about what is inside the discourse. The concept of intertextual context demands the readers to see such a discourse and text from the historical perspective. On the other hand, it can be implied that intertextuality is such a reading process which drives the readers to match the features of an uttered or non-uttered discourse with the representation stored in the readers' memory. When a reader is reading such literal or non-literal text, she or he will create a network of knowledge or information by reviving her or his existing knowledge or knowledge she or he has stored in his or memory and connect this information with the new one she or he gets from her or his reading. This network helps her or him interpret the meaning of the new or latter text.

Allen (2000: 1) states, “texts are lacking in any kind of independent meaning.” This, then, is called as intertextual. When one reads such a text, the network inside his or her memories will connect into previous existed knowledge that he or she has had to gain the meaning of the texts. Meaning becomes something which exists between a text and all the other texts to which it refers and relates, moving out from the independent text not a network of textual relations. Intertextuality can be defined as the form of text which refers to the previous text. This coinage is made by Julia Kristeva in 1986. According to Allen (2000: 3), Kristeva works that signs have their own meaning based on Ferdinand de Saussure, she then relates it with Bakhtin’s dialogism which emphasize that meaning of signs refer to previous texts, where previous similar signs are found.

Furthermore there are 3 kinds of intertextual figures (Genette, 1997: 18), those are allusion, quotation, calque, plagiarism, translation, pastiche and parody.

1. Allusion is a reference of a text or non-text item.
2. Quotation is the repetition of a group of words taken from a text or speech which has already existed previously and punctuated by quotation marks.
3. Plagiarism is stealing of another author's language, thoughts, ideas, or expressions and the representation of them as one's own original work. Plagiarism is somehow different from allusion since allusion is only a reference of such existed text or speech, and will push the reader to make connection.

For the purpose of the present study, it seems that the relevant features of intertextuality to this study is allusion.

Allusion

Allusion can be said as a reference of a text or non-text item. A literary work, or other text, may refer to the previous literary work by using allusion as a tool to connect the recent literary work with the older one. As Laurence Perrine (1981: 117) stated that allusion is a reference to something in history or previous literature. Allusions are a means of reinforcing the emotion or ideas of another work or occasion.

Allusion is generally distinguished into four kinds: biblical allusion, mythological allusion, literary allusion, and historical allusion (en.wikipedia.org/Allusion). However, Thomas (1986: 171-198) distinguishes six categories of allusive reference while discussing Virgil's allusive poem *Georgic*, these categories may be applied to wider cultural sphere.

1. Casual Reference, "the use of language which recalls a specific antecedent, but only in a general sense" that is relatively unimportant to the new context;
2. Single Reference, in which the hearer or reader is intended to "recall the context of the model and apply that context to the new situation"; such a specific single reference in Virgil, according to Thomas, is a means of "making connections or conveying ideas on a level of intense subtlety";
3. Self-Reference, where the locus is in the poet's own work;
4. Corrective Allusion, where the imitation is clearly in opposition to the original source's intentions;

5. Apparent Reference "which seems clearly to recall a specific model but which on closer inspection frustrates that intention" and
6. Multiple Reference or Conflation, which refers in various ways simultaneously to several sources, fusing and transforming the cultural traditions.

This study attempts to examine the type of allusion used in Elizabeth Aston's *The Second Mrs. Darcy* in relation to its intertextual link with Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*. It may be assumed that Elizabeth Aston's *The Second Mrs. Darcy* is one of several examples of casual reference and single reference allusion since the idea of the story is similar with *Pride and Prejudice*.