

Kipling and Ondaatje's Perspective of Writing in *Kim* and *The English Patient*

(Philip) Michael Ondaatje was born in Sri-Lanka on 12th September 1943. He moved to England in 1954 and in 1962 moved to Canada where he has lived ever since. He was educated at the University of Toronto and Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario. Michael Ondaatje lives in Toronto with his wife, Linda Spalding, with whom he edits the literary journal *Brick*. He began teaching at York University in Toronto in 1971. He published a volume of memoir entitled *Running in the Family* in 1983. His collection of poetry includes *The Collected Works of Billy The Kid; Left Handed Poems* (1981), which won the Canadian Governor General Award, in 1971; *The Cinnamon Peeler: Selected Poems* (1989); and *Handwriting: Poems* (1998).

Ondaatje first attracted in poetry, with scholars noting his continuing emphasis on lyrical imagery and cultural displacement. Taking its title from a poem by French poet Charles Baudelaire, *The Dainty Monsters* juxtaposes surrealistic images and fantastical creatures drawn from classical mythology with events from everyday domestic life. The poems in the collection also include monologues spoken by a variety of mythical and historical figures, including Lilith, Prometheus, and Queen Elizabeth I. Consisting of thirty-three short lyrics and a concluding ballad, *The Man with Seven Toes* (1969) is loosely based on the real-life experiences of Eliza Fraser, a Scottish woman who was shipwrecked in 1835 in the coast of Queensland, Australia, and lived among the aborigines before she returned to civilization with the help of an escaped convict. Ondaatje's most important volume of poetry, *The Collected Works of Billy the Kid* draws upon the author's fascination with the culture of the American West and examines the nature of heroism and violence. The collection combines prose, verse, photographs, and drawings to present a fictionalized biography of the notorious outlaw William Bonney. Ondaatje has also directed a number of

independent films including *The Sons of Captain Poetry* (1970) and *The Clinton Special: A Film about "The Farm Show"* (1974).

Ondaatje's first full-length work of prose, *Coming Through Slaughter* (1976), is arguably his finest original work in fictions in which he soaks his text with actual music and photographic references. This novel is a fictional portrait the life of legendary New Orleans Jazz musician Buddy Bolden, an early twentieth century coronet player whose career ended abruptly due to his mental breakdown in 1907. Blending poetry and such prose forms as interviews and journalistic reports, Ondaatje's *Coming through Slaughter* interweaves historical accounts with imaginary stories of Buddy Bolden's tormented life.

Incorporating figurative language and poetic imagery, *The English Patient*, Ondaatje's best-known work, traces the developing relationships between three characters encamped in the ruins of an Italian villa during the last months of World War II. This novel is joint winner of the Booker Prize for fiction and adapted into an Academic Award winning film in 1996. The film adaptation of *The English Patient* was directed by filmmaker Anthony Minghella. Which was nominated for twelve Academy Awards from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, winning a total of nine awards, including best picture and best director. In the novel Ondaatje attempts to re-write the history of World War II, bringing to the foreground the positions of the colonized nations who participated in the war. *Anil's Ghost* (2000), set in Sri-Lanka, tells the story of a young female anthropologist investigating war crimes for an international human right group

Ondaatje is remembered in focusing the internal lives of his multigenerational characters and exhibiting a fascination with extraordinary personalities, the dynamics of family life, the violence of war, and the loss of narrative. He has emerged as one of

the most celebrated and versatile Canadian writers since the 1960s. In both his poetry and fiction, he presents the voices of natives and their sufferings.

Nearly all of Ondaatje's works are structured as a pastiche of textual forms interweaving elements of poetry, fiction, memoirs, travelogues, myths and photographs among other literary conventions. He is also famous for presenting a strange and imaginative writing style. His prose is marked by vivid detail, sensuous imagery, startling juxtapositions and a preoccupation with intense experiences.

Ondaatje is famous for exhibiting the surrealistic images and fantastical phenomenon of postcolonial world. In addition, in *Running in to the Family* reviewers have claimed that his portrayal of Sri Lanka (formerly Ceylon) often citing his lush descriptions of its landscape and detailed accounts of the country's rich culture. While some critics have argued that his linguistic virtuosity and manipulation of both established and personal mythology rank him as one of the most significant writers of his generation. His novel *In the Skin of a Lion* (1987) chronicles the oppressed lives of immigrant workers who helped to expand and modernize Toronto, Ontario, during 1920s and 1930s. The novel contains the feature like surrealism and a nonlinear plot, following twenty-one-year-old artist Patrick Lewis from rural Canada to a working-class immigrant neighborhood in Toronto where he struggles with racial prejudice and economic disparities.

Ondaatje's new collection of poems *Handwriting* which consists of poems focused primarily on imagery drawn from the history, geography, mythology, and cultural traditions of Sri Lanka. This new collection comes at a time when he has lent a whole area of writing that resides within the undefined areas of fiction, nonfiction, and poetry. If we take this collection as a continuation of his memoir *Running in the Family* (1982) we can see the exact graphic-plotting of the last fifteen years-his subtle

movement and blurring of lines between different genres, in spite of defining the integrity of each of them.

Handwriting takes us to Ondaatje's Sri Lankan past, a past that is very much present in his life, one that informs and colors his broader palette, scope and vision. The fact that he can present Sri Lanka realistically and unexotically lends a believable and even magical edge to his text. His observations are sharp and wry, but at the same time considered, wise, and pragmatic. Ondaatje is a prominent literary figure for presenting the voice of postcolonial world. He merely presents his views against colonization. Especially in his writings, he portrays the issue of postcolonial world and the herewith of formerly colonized people, moreover the Empire seems largely countering from Ondaatje's works. *Secular Love* (1984) comprises of four unified sequences of confessional lyrics exploring paternal love, Ondaatje's traumatic divorce, and the redemptive qualities of love.

Ondaatje's *Running in the Family* (1982) is an autobiographical novel, critics have argued it as ahistorical and too sentimentally focused on the private and familial work. For them this novel is unable to incorporate the Sri Lanka's colonial and postcolonial history. Merely this novel presents the immigrant character like Ondaatje returning to the home, intrigued about his family's past and the sources of writer's identity are perfectly presented

Another writer, Rudyard Kipling is quite distinct in his way of writing. He was born on December 30, 1865 at Bombay, to English parents. He was educated at the United Services College, Westward HO, and Biddeford. At the age of six he was sent to school in southern England, an unhappy experience that he wrote about in the story "Baa Baa Black Sheep." For five years he lived with unsympathetic guardians in a foster home Kipling called the "House of Desolation," and at the age of twelve he was

sent to boarding school in Devon. Despite being bullied and ostracized by his schoolmates during his first years there, Kipling wrote fondly of his public school experiences in the short fiction collection *Stalky & Co.* (1899). Just before his seventeenth birthday, Kipling returned to India to work as a journalist on the Lahore *Civil and Military Gazette* and the Allahabad *Pioneer*. The stories he wrote for these two newspapers, published in 1888 as the collection *Plain Tales from the Hills*, earned him widespread recognition in India. In 1882, he returned to India to pursue a literary career and worked for Anglo Indian newspapers. His literary career began with the novel *Departmental Ditties* (1886), but subsequently he became chiefly known as a writer of short stories. Creator of many of the world's most cherished short stories, Kipling is considered one of the finest writers of short fiction in international literature. Credited with popularizing the short story genre in England, Kipling is perhaps most famous for his insightful stories of Indian culture and Anglo-Indian society. Kipling is equally renowned for his masterful, widely read stories for children, which are collected in *Just So Stories for Little Children* (1902), the two *Jungle Books* (1894; 1895, respectively), *Puck of Pook's Hill* (1906), and *Reward and Fairies* (1910). Many critics consider Mowgli, the central figure in the *Jungle Books*, one of the most memorable characters in children's literature. Kipling was also a poet of British empire and its Yeoman, the common soldier, whom he glorifies in many ways in his works, particularly in *Plain Tales From The Hills* (1888) and *Soldier Three* (1888).

Kipling's *Kim* (1901) is a story of Kimball O'Hara and his adventures in the Himalayas. It is perhaps his most felicitous work for projecting his vision of empire. Empire is source to Kipling's stories. Boehmer Elleke, a famous postcolonial critic says "perhaps more than any other writer, Kipling was vitally alert to the potential for

story, and for creative cross-connections between stories, in the self absorbed world of the Empire, which for him meant first and foremost the Indian Empire” (47).

During the first decade of 20th century, Kipling was at the height of his popularity. In 1907 he was awarded with the Nobel Prize in literature. Kipling was the recipient of many honorary degrees and other awards. In 1926 he received the Gold Medal of the Royal Society of Literature.

Kipling is considered one of the most profound political poets of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Preoccupied with Britain’s general state of possession of India, much of his works were centered on the theme of political imperialism. Nonetheless, his attachment to imperialism was so strong that it necessitated his need to convey strengths through such uncompromised force, which has gained him recognition as a master of political poetry.

Kipling’s view of imperialism was one of obligation in his life. He held his regard for the political state of Britain just as one regarded the Roman Empire during its reign. To Kipling, Britain was the source of stability, order and peace in the chaos of a developing India. Kipling wrote several poems that connected this sentiment to the Roman Empire as in *A Pict Song*, the book alludes to Rome’s strength as a political force. Kipling’s *Life’s Handicap* 1991 describes a New Year’s Eve party where men from the uttermost ends of the Indian Empire foregather, and from which they will again disperse, some to annex Burma, and some tried to open up the Soudan and were opened up by Fuzzies in the cruel scrub outside Suakim.

In the nonfiction realm Kipling also became involved in the debate over the British response to the debate in German naval power, publishing a series of articles collectively entitled *A Fleeting in Being*. In regards to his political view and Britain’s control of India and other undeveloped countries, Kipling views the responsibility of

colonizing and undeveloped countries as the burden of imperialistic advancement.

The underlying sense of responsibility towards the governed is splendidly expressed in *The White Man's Burden*.

Kipling's drama *The Man Who would be King* (1987) takes western white values for the standard of success. A different way of examining Kipling's theme is imperialism which is not only important but a must. Auden takes a view that Kipling (and his writing specifically of his verse) has his main theme of defense to civilization seen as a continuous emergency, a permanent battle against the forces of darkness and barbarism.

Kipling kept on writing until the early 1930s at a slower pace and with less success than before. He died of a brain hemorrhage in early 1936 after several years of illness and is buried in the Poet's Corner of Westminster Abbey. He continued falling into critical eclipse afterwards. Today it is difficult to decide if Kipling has a rightful place in the pantheon of great writers. As the European empire collapsed in the mid twentieth century along with the influence of communism, Kipling's works fell far out of step with the times. Many critics condemn him as an imperialist, they really criticize the imperialist ideal, rather than Kipling himself.

Both Ondaatje and Kipling both are non western originated literary figures. However, they are different in their perspectives of writings. Ondaatje writes in favor of colonized people and his writing questions the authenticity, purpose and impacts of colonization upon the formerly colonized people. His works preoccupies with memory and the construction of identity-as he seeks out stories, gives multiple voices and struggles to glimpse how they are linked to their identity. Whereas Kipling's writings favor the purpose and desire of the colonizers. He opines that colonization is

necessary and a perfect means for the colonized peoples for redemption from the darkness.

The surrealistic image, current issues of colonized people, the question of identity, impact in cultures, economy and their status are the chief sources for germinating the literary writing for Ondaatje. But in the eye of Kipling the act of colonization is not primarily done for the benefit of the colonizers. His writing seem to be haunted by a sense of the mortality of the empire, so that one is forced to question the need of empire to hide his larger philosophy. Kipling feels the impact of the British Empire and the 'imperial ideal' more tangibly than any other Victorian novelist, because Kipling's imperialism is not completely synonymous with British imperialism.

In conclusion, both Michael Ondaatje and Rudyard Kipling are non western originated literary figures but they are different in viewing the issue of colonization. For Kipling, empire is the subject matter in the articulation of literature. He always believes in the positive impact of empire. He presents a white male protagonist as omnipresent and omnipotent in his writings. He tries to prove the authenticity and essentialism of colonization for the redemption of non white. On the contrary, Michael Ondaatje is opposite in dealing with the subject matter of colonization. He shows the colonial bastardy and bereavement of natives in the empire. He explores the exploitation and traumatic life of natives in the postcolonial worlds. So, in this research I am unraveling their vision regarding colonization by studying Ondaatje's *The English Patient* and Kipling's *Kim* from the perspective of intertextuality. For that, this dissertation is structured in the following orders. The succeeding chapter will be about the theoretical concepts of intertextuality. The third chapter will be an application of the concept of intertextuality in Michael Ondaatje's *The English*

Patient and Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* to prove intertextual relationship. Finally, in chapter four, it will be the summary of the main points of the entire thesis.

II. Intertextuality

Intertextuality is the shaping of a text's meaning by other text(s). It also refers to the writer's borrowing and transformation of prior text(s) or to a reader's reference of one text in reading another. This term has been borrowed and used frequently since it was coined by post structural theorist Julia Kristeva in 1966. Her coinage of intertextuality represents an attempt to synthesize Ferdinand de Saussure's structuralist semiotics with Bakhtin's dialogism or heteroglossia found in the genre like novels. In simple parlance, intertextuality is the relationship that exists between different texts. It is a literary concept where the literary texts or the reference of one text to others are intermingled from the sense they carry certain reference.

The denotative meaning of intertextuality involves two implications. First, the writer is a reader of texts before he is a creator of texts, and therefore, the work of art is inevitably infected with references, quotations and influences of every kind. Second, a text is available only through some process of reading. What is produced at the moment of reading is due to the cross-fertilization of the packaged textual material by all the texts which the reader brings to it, even his experience of some practice or theory unknown to the author. Both axes of intertextuality-texts entering via authors and texts entering via readers (co-producer)-are emotionally and politically charged. Kristeva illustrates it in her book *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*:

[. . .] the notion of intertextuality replaces the notion of subjectivity when we realize that meaning is not transferred directly from writer to readers but instead is meditated through, or filtered by, "codes" imparted to the writer and reader by other texts. [. . .] Intertextuality refers to text in terms of two axes: *a horizontal axis* connecting the author and reader of a text, and *a vertical axis*, which connects the text. (69)

She argues that uniting these two axes are shared codes: every text and every reading depends on prior codes. Kristeva declares that every text is relational from the other discourses which impose a universe in it. She also argues that rather than confusing our attention to the structure of a text we should study its structure. This involves citing it within the totality of previous or synchronic texts of which it was a transformation.

Kristeva is keen to point out that intertextuality is not simply a process of recognizing sources and influences. She develops her arguments on the work of Bakhtin, who had identified the word as the smallest textual unit, situated in three coordinates: of the writer, the text and exterior texts. For the first time in literary history, the literary text (the word) took on a spatial dimension when Bakhtin made it a function between the writer/text (on the horizontal axis) and the text/context (on the vertical axis). This idea replaced the previous, Formalist notion that the literary text is a fixed point with a fixed meaning. Bakhtin described this process as a dialogue between several writings, and as the intersection of textual surfaces. Kristeva quotes “any text is a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (Kristeva 1980).

The theory of intertextuality has also been refined and extended by Jonathan Culler and Roland Barthes, who include the reader as constituent component of intertextuality. Jonathan Culler in his book *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistic and the Study of Literature* describes intertextuality as the general discursive space in which meaning is made intelligible and possible, and Barthes invented the term “infinite intertextuality” to refer to the “mirage of citations” (Kristeva 15). They dwell equally in readers and in texts but the conventions and presuppositions cannot be traced to an original source or sources. “The “I” which approaches the texts [says Barthes] is already a plurality of other texts, of infinite, or more precisely, lost codes (whose origins are lost)” (Barthes 16).

A work exists between and among other texts through its relations to them. To quote Michael Worton and Judith Still: “Texts are shaped not by an immanent time but by the play of divergent temporalities. Texts are therefore not structures of presence but traces and tracings of otherness” (44).

The idea that texts are produced and readers make sense to them only in relation to the already embedded codes which dwell in texts and readers (and in authors too, since they are readers of texts before they are authors), has ramifications which challenge any claim to textual originality or discrete readings. The literary text, then, is just one of the many sites where several different discourses converge, are absorbed, are transformed and assume a meaning because they are situated in this circular network of interdependence which is called the intertextual space.

Works of literature, after all, are built from systems, codes and traditions established by previous works of literature. The systems, codes, and traditions of other art forms and of culture in general are also crucial to the meaning of a work of literature. Texts, whether they be literary or non literary, are viewed by modern theorists as lacking in any kind of independent meaning. They are what theorists now call intertextuality. In this context, Allen Graham says:

[. . .] the simplest utterance to the most complex work of scientific or literary discourses, no utterance exists alone. An utterance such as a scholarly work may present itself as an independent entity as monologic [. . .], yet it emerges from a complex history of previous works and addresses itself to, seeks for active response from complex institutional and social context. (19)

Indeed, all utterances are dialogic in nature, their meanings and logic depend upon what has previously been said and on how they will be received by the others. Literary or non

literary works do not justify their meanings in themselves. Rather one discourse seeks its meaning and references to the other discourses that leads the reader to jump from one network to other complex networks.

Other prominent critics, Barthes and Riffaterre view intertextuality as: “[It] replaces the challenged author text relationship with in other discourses”. (qtd. Hutcheon, *Politics* 126). A literary work can actually no longer be considered original. If it were, it could have no meaning for its reader. It is only as a part of prior discourses that any text drives meaning and significance. Hence, intertextuality evokes the deconstructive notion of postmodern reference through the critique of authenticity and meaning inherent in a text. The notion of one, single, fixed and exact idea of anything is considered as a grand narrative in post modern historiographic Meta fiction. The occurrence of the pragmatic idea of intertextuality has countered the established notion of centrality and wholeness. Hutcheon says, “Postmodern meta-Intertextuality challenges both closure and single centralized meaning [...] the typically contradictory postmodern art both provides and undermines context” (*Poetics* 27). In that sense the notion of intertextuality lies in the discourse of postmodernism as well.

When we talk about the usefulness of intertextuality, it is to make reader habitual to deal with textualized traces of other texts. It “demands the reader the recognition of textualized traces of the literary and historical past” (127). It makes the readers aware of what the texts assert or question. In Roland Barthes’s definition it is “the impossibility of living outside the finite text and makes intertextuality the very condition of textuality” (qtd. in Hutcheon’s *Politics* 128). Furthermore, Graham Allen criticizing Roland Barthes’ definition of intertextuality says:

[I]t can be the cause of a ennui or boredom [...], the intertextual viewed as the presence of these codes and clichés within culture, can cause a sense of

repetition, a saturation of cultural stereotypes, the triumph of doxa over that which would resist and disrupt it. It might see, then, in a postmodern context intertextual codes and practice predominate because of a loss of any access to reality. (183).

For him any work of literature is built from systems, codes, and traditions established by previous text or literature. Repetition for John Barthes is nothing more than replication of exhausted forms of earlier text. In this sense, postmodern fiction fails to make a new text. But, at the same time, he does not mean that contemporary art is a weakened, irrelevant parasitic phenomenon.

Intertextuality seems such a common in literary discourse. It is most often used refer to literary allusions and to direct quotation from literary and non-literary texts. The term intertextuality is so useful term because it foregrounds the notion of relationality, interconnectedness and interdependence in modern cultural life. In the postmodern epoch, theorists often claim that it is not possible any longer to speak of originality or the uniqueness of the artistic object, be it a painting or a novel, since every artistic object is so clearly assembled from bits and pieces of already existent art. Intertextuality, as a term, stands at the centre of such contemporary conception of art and cultural production generally. As Barthes says, the very word 'text' is, if we remember its original meanings, 'a tissue, a woven fabric' (49). He further says:

A text is not a line of words releasing a single 'theological' meaning but 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 only power is to mix writing, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them. (*Image-Music-Text* 146)

Barthes argues the idea of the text, and thus of intertextuality, depends on the figure of the web, the weave, the garment (text) woven from the threads of the 'already written' and the 'already read'. He opines that the writer of any text can't be the originator of the ideas, but the perfect manager who manages the raw materials which is already there in the society. Text, for him contains no original ideas but the writer simply borrows and mix-up the materials from the different sources. Further more, literary meaning can never be fully stabilized by the reader, since the literary work's intertextual nature always leads reader on to a new textual relation. Author, therefore, cannot be held responsible for the multiple meanings readers can discover within literary texts. Every text has its meaning in relation to other texts. Interconnection between texts never ends with the clear lines of where a text ends and begins. This intertextual view of literature, as shown by Roland Barthes, supports the concept that the meanings of an artistic work does not reside in that work, but in the viewers. The most recent post-structuralist theory, such as that formulated in Daniela Caselli Becket's *Intertextuality in the Fiction and Criticism*, re-examines intertextuality, as:

[...] the production within texts, rather than as a series of relationship between different texts. Some postmodern theorists like to talk about the relationship between intertextuality and hypertextuality; intertextuality makes each text a living hell on earth and part of a larger mosaic of texts, just as each hypertext can be a web of links and part of the whole world-wide web. (66)

There is also a distinction between the notion of intertext, hypertext and super text. As a hypertext it consists of links to different articles within itself and also every individual trajectory of reading it.

The theory of intertextuality introduced by Julia Kristeva (as an extension of ideas from Mikhail Bakhtin) assumes that meaning and intelligibility in discourse and texts are based on a network of prior and concurrent discourse and texts. Every text (and we can insert any cultural object here: image, film, web content, musical compositions) is a mosaic of references to other texts, genres and discourses. Every text or set of signs presupposes a network of relationship to other signs like strings of quotations that have lost their exact references. As Culler says “texts do not mean in isolation; there is a continuous interplay between them. Consciously or unconsciously, writers add to the range and depth of their work by allusion, reference, and quotations” (42). The principle of intertextuality is a ground or precondition for meaning beyond texts in the sense it includes units of meaning.

Essentially, intertextuality describes the foundational activity behind interpreting cultural meaning in any significant unit of cultural objects like a book, a film, a TV show, a Web genre. Whatever meaning we discover or posit can only occur through a network of prior "texts" that provide the context of possible meanings and our recognition of meaning at all. Expanding the theory for cross-media symbolic activity, we could call this intermediality or intersemiality (the structures of meaning presupposed or embedded in any set of signs like nodes in a network).

In linguistics and semiotics, a sign is made from ‘seme’ from the Greek word ‘semeion’, a sign is a minimal unit of meaning that can be strung together in words or images or any medium that carries meaning in a culture. The notion of intersemic describes the interdependence and implied relation of any unit of signs (like a movie) to a network of other texts, genres, artifacts, documents, and symbolic works (images, artworks) in a culture. Much remains to be done in building out a useful model of

visual and multimedia semiotics that accounts for the cultural production and reception of meaning across media forms and technologies.

Another way of getting an intuitive sense of intertextuality as a ground or condition for meaning in all our language systems (verbal, visual, sound, and all combinations) is to consider dependency and presupposition in meaning. Any text or connected series of signs, a movie, for example, presupposes a set of prior instances of the signs, which, for us in any interpretive community, function as a learned archive or encyclopedia of references, genres, background knowledge, and symbolic meaning through which we recognize meaning in what we view, reading, interpreting. The generative meaning-making process that the term "intertextuality" attempts to describe is as foundational to culture as the grammar of a language and the many uses of connected statements in all our other discourses. It names the grammar of the possibility of ongoing meaning in a culture, and allows us to see culture as living process of meaning-making.

Julia Kristeva's notion of intertextuality extends Bakhtin's idea of dialogism. In her *Kristeva Reader* she describes the idea of three-dimensional textual space with three specific coordinates of dialogue--the writer, the reader, and exterior texts. Within this textual space, horizontal and vertical axes intersect and she notes that, "each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read [. . .] any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity and poetic language is read as at least double" (37).

Kristeva stresses the importance of plurality on many levels with respect to texts when she says:

[. . .] identity may be the plurality capable of manifesting itself as the plurality of characters the author uses; but in more recent writing, in the twentieth-century novel, it may appear as fragments of character, or fragments of ideology, or fragments of representation. Moreover, such an understanding of intertextuality—one that points to a dynamics involving a destruction of the creative identity and reconstitution of a new plurality—assumes at the same time that the one who reads, the reader, participates in the same dynamics. (97)

If we are readers in the line of intertextuality, we must be capable of the same putting-into-process of our identities, capable of identifying with the different types of texts, voices, and semantic, syntactic and phonic systems at play in a given text.

The plurality and intertextuality of literature reifies the idea that all literature is in constant conversation with other forms of literature, as they are essentially unified, as a single unit, with the greater textual mass. In the context, Graham Allen summarizes Kristeva's notion of intertextuality as:

The fundamental concept of intertextuality is that no text, much as it might like to appear so, is original and unique-in-itself; rather it is a tissue of inevitable, and to an extent unwitting, references to and quotations from other texts. These in turn condition its meaning; the text is an intervention in a cultural system. Intertextuality is therefore a very useful concept – indeed some would say essential – for literary study, as it concerns the study of cultural sign systems generally. (96)

It is clear that the theory of intertextuality is applied in theories of writing, reader-response theory and the production of meaning, and intersubjectivity (the 'I' who, is reading is a network of citations). It is also a theory of language in as much as Bakhtin

had identified the word as the smallest textual link between the texts and the world, and because the reading subject, the text and the world are not only situated in language, they are also constructed by it. So we have a notion of all texts being intertextual, they become so because they are dialectically related to, and are themselves the product of, linguistic, cultural and literary practices; and so too are readers and writers.

Culler has described the urge towards integrating one discourse with another, or several others, as a process of '*vraisemblance*' (true appearance). It is the basis of intertextuality. Through this process of '*vraisemblance*' we are able to identify, for example, the set of literary norms and the salient features of a work by which to locate genre, and also to anticipate what we might expect to find in fictional worlds. Through, *vraisemblance* the reader has unconsciously to learn that the fictional worlds in literature are representations and constructions that refer to other texts that have been normalized, that is: those texts that have been absorbed in to the culture and are now regarded as 'natural'.

Intertextuality has problematized the status of 'author' and 'authorship.' Traditionally, author was treated as a historical invention. In general, it is said that authors are individuals who, by their intellectual and imaginative powers, purposefully create from their experience and writing a literary work which is distinctly their own. The work itself, as distinguished from the written or printed texts that instantiate the work, remains a product accredited to the author as its originator. And insofar as the literary works turn out to be great and original, the author who has composed that work is deservedly accorded high cultural status and achieves lasting fame. Since 1960s this way of conceiving an author has been put to a radical question by a numbers of structural and post structural theorists, who posit the human subject not as an originator and shaper of a work. The author is said to be the product rather than the producer of a text. In 1968

Roland Barthes wrote a famous essay “The Death of the Author” that describes the author as a figure invented by critical discourses in order to set limits to the meaning in reading a literary text. In such condition critiquing the role of the author Barthes says:

[. . .] the origin of the text is not a unified authorial consciousness but a plurality of voices of other words, other utterances and other texts. If we were able to look inside the head of the author something traditionally literary criticism believes is possible by interpreting the literary work. (qtd. in Allen 72)

Barthes argument implies that we would not discover original thought or even uniquely intended meaning in reading of literary text. For him a text can't be originated from the consciousness of the author, but all sources are the representations of the multiple voices and statements of other texts. All texts exist in relation to other texts, but as we re-write the text every time we re-read it, we also bring into play our own experiences, every thing we know about the text beforehand (our past readings, what other people have told us, our own preferences, and the place of a particular book or idea in our culture). Hence, the search for the original thought and unique intended meaning is doomed to be failure in the notion of intertextuality.

Michel Foucault, a new historicist in the essay “What is an Author” written in 1969, raises the question of the historical notion of author that the emergence and the evolution of the author function within the discourse of culture. In the essay, Foucault specifies the inquiries as individualization, status, and valorization of author. Which involves the author and the fundamental category of the author and his work criticism began. Foucault's essay and examples give impetus to a number of studies which reject notion that the prevailing concept of authorship. Foucault has also described that the author of the text is being a mere orchestrator and the concept of authorship as a cultural

construct that can emerge and change in accordance to changing conditions for writing and distribution of books.

Before 1500 and thereabouts people didn't attach the same importance to asserting the precise identity of the author and the book they read or quote. The shift in the course of time from manuscript culture to a print culture, the borrowing and mixing up the textual references from other texts have been found to be germinated in slow pace. Eventually, the status of 'author' and 'authorship' became widely questionable and unauthorized entity. In fact, in the postmodernist world the idea of intertextual theory has questioned the long run view of text's authenticity, authorship, author and originality. So, Michel Foucault argues that the concept of intertextuality reminds us that each text exists in relation to other. As such, text owes more to other texts than to the makers. In this context, he says:

The frontier of a book is never clear cut: beyond the title, the first lines and the last full stop, beyond its internal configuration and its autonomous form, it is caught up in a system of references to other books, other texts, other sentences: it is a node within a network [...] The book is not simply the object that one holds in one's hands [...] its unity is variable and relative. (23)

The term intertextuality is typically used in a broader way to describe the relationship between texts, some of which are more obvious while others are often very subtle. In all cases the role of the reader becomes very important in recognizing and interpreting these connections. From the appearance of the term intertextuality in 1960s, it has been adopted and explored by theorists from different frame of mind. The French theorist and critic Gerard Genette in his influential essay "Structuralism and Literary Criticism" (1997) code the term 'transtextuality' in addition of intertextuality by which he is referring to

‘everything’ that influences a text either explicitly or implicitly. In this regard he defines his coinage as:

Textual transcendence or transtextuality is precisely what poetics has been attempting to describe via the confused and misleading tools so far described. It includes issue of imitation, transformation, the classification of types of discourse, along with thematic, modal, and generic and formal categories and categorization of traditional poetics. (100)

His view of transtextuality is distinctly a bit broader and modern than that of Kristeva. For that, he defines poetics first to clear his view by revisiting the concept of poetics ranging from Aristotelian period to post-Aristotelian views. He differentiates the generic and the thematic view regarding poetics. His view is based on his decision to describe the entire field of poetics from a new perspective that is transtextuality. Transtextuality is ‘‘a relationship of presence between two texts or among several texts’ and as ‘the actual presence of one text within another’’ (101). After all, transtextual or intertextual nature of postmodern texts prove its relation with earlier texts or form from any discipline.

This dynamic model of intertextuality has peculiar implication for intertextuality of children’s literature because the writer/reader axis is positioned in an imbalanced power relationship. Adults write for each other, children the powerless recipients of what adults chose to write for them and, *de facto*, children’s literature an intertextual sub-genre of adult literature. The writer/reader relationship is also asymmetric because children’s inter subjective is, therefore, unusually preoccupied with questions about what a piece of writing (for children) presupposes. What does it assume?, what must it assume to take on significance? (Culler 101). For these reasons the interrelationship between the components of intertextuality, of writer/text/reader-text/reader/context, are quite special when we are addressing a theory of intertextuality of children’s literature.

As such, it is clear that a text has its affinity with earlier texts or other texts from any discipline that can be regarded as the interdisciplinarity nature of texts. Intertextuality and interdisciplinarity are closer concepts for their sameness in functioning.

Interdisciplinarity is a methodology justifies the awareness of the history, theory, methodology and subject matter of particular disciplines. Likewise, it aims to explore how exactly these disciplines are brought together, transform and transcended in different forms. Interdisciplinarity leads the reader or author to the complex nature of disciplines. In this regard the anthropologist Clifford Geertz has written “we are living in an age of blurred genres, a jumping of varieties of discourses; with in which disciplinary distinction are increasingly hard to call” (20). For him modern literary works are not distinctly original as all texts are patched up with different disciplines. It is an act of drawing from and integrating two or more academic disciplines, professions, technologies, their methods and insights, in the pursuit of a common goal.

Likewise, the term interdisciplinarity has the compositional nature which suggest its flexibility and in determinant in quality to question the texts’ authenticity and originality. So, here arises a question of what about the new space. In this regard Geoffrey Bennington says that “interdisciplinary suggest forging connection across the different disciplines; it can also mean establishing a kind of new space in the interstices between disciplines or even attempting to transcend disciplinary boundaries altogether” (qtd. in Moran 15). It is clear from the above view that a text has its affinity with earlier text or other texts from any discipline. It can be called interdisciplinary nature of the texts. Such interdependence between and among the texts proves the fact that texts are being interdisciplinary and intertextual. For this reason, we can find the traces of different disciplines like historical, sociological, and which we understand as interdisciplinary notion. For Moran: “Interdisciplinarity interlocks with the concerns of epistemology, the

study of knowledge and tends to be centered around problems and issues that cannot be addressed or solved within the existing disciplines, rather than the quest for an all-inclusive synthesis” (15). So, Moran criticizes on more radical nature of knowledge and suggests the reader to incorporate a comprehensive insight to analyze texts. After all, interdisciplinary or intertextual natures of texts prove their relation with earlier texts.

Parody is another related term to intertextuality. A parody in contemporary use is artistic works created to mock, comment on, or poke fun at an original work, author, style or some other target by means of humorous, satiric or ironic imitation. As the literary theorist Linda Hutcheon defines “parody is imitation, not always at the expense of parodied text. It is a form ironic rupture with the past” (31). The technique of parody is used in art, culture as well as in literature. It can occur when elements of one work are lifted and reused, to generate some kind of effect like humor. Parody is Hutcheon’s preferred term, describes an author who actively encodes a text as an imitation with critical difference. To this context Hutcheon says: “Parody—often called ironic quotation, pastiche, appropriation or intertextuality—is usually considered central to postmodernism, both by its detractors and its defenders. It signals how present representation comes from past one and what is politics behind such representation” (*Politics* 89). For Hutcheon, postmodern texts consistently use and abuse actual historical documents and documentation in such a way as to stress both the discursive nature of those representations of the past and narrativizing form we read them. Parody, as she opines, questions the assumption of artistic originality and uniqueness and our capitalistic notion of ownership and property. In this sense “the notion of original and as rare, single and valuable is called into question” (*Politics* 90). In other words, parody works to foreground the politics of representation. Postmodern parody doesn’t disregard the context of the past representation but “uses irony to acknowledge the fact that we are inevitably separated

from past today” (90). Hutcheon shows the double-codes politics of parody which “both legitimize and subverts that which is parodied” (97). This prevents “assumption about its transparency and common sense naturalness” (30). In postmodernism parody “may indeed be complicitous with the values it inscribes as well as subverts, but the subversion is still there” (106). It is often used by marginal and marginalized groups in postmodernism to attack the centre. Such parodic strategies are often used by postmodernist feminists to point history and historical power of those cultural representations and question all stereotypical positions and claim to ultimate truth, while ironically, and contextualize it in such a way to deconstruct it. Postmodern parody makes the readers aware of both the limit and power of representation.

As such, pastiche is very common and related term to intertextuality, whether applied to part of a work, or to the whole, implies that it is made up largely of phrases, motifs, images, episodes etc borrowed more or less unchanged from the work(s) of other author(s). Frederick Jameson says:

Pastiche is, like parody, the imitation of a peculiar or unique, idiosyncratic style, the wearing of a linguistic mask, speech in a dead language. But it is a neutral practice of such mimicry, without any of parody’s ulterior motives, amputated of the satiric impulse, devoid of laughter and of any conviction that alongside the abnormal. (13)

Jameson also argues that postmodern literary critiques have replaced conventional parody with a process that should rightly be defined as pastiche. By pastiche, he refers to the merged condition of earlier division of serious or popular or high and low culture production. In such situation, parody of dominant norms is impossible and gives way to what Jameson calls pastiche: “[it] is thus a blank parody, a state with blind eyes [. . .] the producer of culture has no where to turn but to the past: the imitation of dead styles,

speech through all the masks and voice stored up in the imaginary museum of a now global culture. (qtd. in Allen's 184). So, pastiche is the postmodern way of revisiting the past. In this sense it is close to intertextuality. Whereas, for Jean Baudrillard postmodern culture is dominated by the simulacrum- a copy which does not possess an original. For him, simulation or the copy comes to replace the real in this postmodern age. As such, from Roland Barthes's 'The Death of Author' to Derrida's deconstruction, Michel Foucault critique of author and authorship all have offered a new avenue to subvert the age long assumption of originality of authorship, centrality of author in this postmodern age. Borrowing and transferring the ideas, themes and so on are common and prevalent in postmodern fictions. As Linda Hutcheon finds --self-reflexivity, intertextuality, irony, parody--in every modes of production of literary art.

In short, the concept of intertextuality means that works are made possible out of other works, made possible by prior works which they take up, repeat, challenge and transform. A work exists between and among other texts through its relations from different references such as, history, theme, characterization, structure, and the like from any other works.

III. Intertextual Reading of Michael Ondaatje's *The English Patient* and Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*

Canadian novelist Michael Ondaatje's *The English Patient* (1992) shares a fascinating commonality or intertextual influence of the character, source and so on with the British literary canon Rudyard Kipling's novel *Kim* (1901). Both of these novels stand in opposition for the purpose and depiction of theme, style and motifs for the writing, however, shares some commonalities as well. The present research is based on the same shared issues and interconnectedness with both of them. Here, I am dealing this research so as to prove the intertextual grounds of Michael Ondaatje's *The English Patient* in Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* in different levels like in the state of theme, characterization, influence, symbols, and the like.

Intertextuality is the condition of the repetition of citation of earlier texts styles, techniques, subject matters, themes and so on. John Bathes calls this condition of art as 'exhaustion' which is reflected in Ondaatje's *The English Patient* and Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*. The structure is similar to Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* because of narrative in first person and putting the title of the novel with the name of the character of the novel. In this sense, it definitely questions the meaning of the text, independent from other texts and context. Bathes believes later text is nothing more than just 'exhaustion' from of earlier texts. So, all the traces of close resemblance between these two texts prove the intertextual nature.

In additional to it, intertextuality aims to fictionalize actual historical events and figures, but not always in parodic sense, *Kim* depicts the positive significance of the imperial power or imperialism. When *Kim* was published in 1901, the British Empire was still the most powerful empire in the world. The Indian subcontinent was one of the most important parts of empire in the world, which thousand of "Anglo

Indians” like Kipling himself, called home. Kipling wrote *Kim* so as to a pacify outcome of the historical events The Great Mutiny of 1857 (the great symbolic event by which the two sides, Indian and British, achieved their full and conscious opposition to each other) in which Indian soldiers who served the British government under white, British officers captured the city of Delhi. The Mutiny eventually became part of the larger Sepoy Rebellion (1857–1859) against the British government, while their efforts were eventually squelched. It was the first and one of the most violent acts of rebellion of Indians against the forced rule of Great Britain. The Indian National Congress, a party made up of western educated Indians whose aim was to acquire independence from Britain, was formed in 1855; so when *Kim* was published only fifteen years later, the political landscape of India was characterized by a tension between the Indians who wanted independence and British who struggled to remain in control. In this condition Kipling is in side the British and with the British soldiers and showed the partiality among the soldiers who involved in the The Great Mutiny of 1857, which is evident from the following lines:

The meaning of my star is war [...]. For there is always war along the border, but this shall be a great war of eight thousand redcoats. From Pindi to Peshawar they will be drawn [...]. First the great man walks thus. Then he thinks us [...]. ‘Anon he twitches his fingers thus. Anon he thrust his thrust his hat under his left armpit (52

In these lines Kim (character) pretends to be the foreseer informs about the war to the Indian soldier who has fought on the British side in The Great Mutiny of 1857. Kim the main character only informs the ex-Indian soldier who is in favor of the civil war but not to any other natives about it hence, we can say that he takes the Civil War from the eye of white.

Likewise, *The English Patient* fictionalizes the historical event of Second World War started from 1939. In the development of plot, the character named Kip, an Indian born sapper, appears to the Villa of Saint Giroloma for the purpose of disposing the bombs. He works in favor of British but the bombing in Hiroshima and Nagasaki causes dismantle his notion of saving the human being from the bomb. These lines are evident of representing the true phenomenon of Second World War:

One bomb. Then another. Hiroshima. Nagasaki. The hawk in the valley air seems to float intentionally in to the sight. If he closes his eyes he sees the streets of Asia full of fire. It rolls across cities like a burst map, the hurricane of heat withering bodies as it meets them, the shadow of human suddenly in the air. This tremor of western wisdom.
(284)

In the lines, there is the story of incident in bombing in Japan's Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but there is also a perfect indication of historical consequences of the contemporary times and issues. In the sense, both *Kim* and *The English Patient* share some common points in the plot development so as to fictionalize the true historical phenomenon.

As Kristeva says intertextuality is the shaping of text's meaning by other text(s) that refers to the writer's borrowing and transformation of a prior text or lines, Ondaatje's *the English Patient* borrows some ditto copy of lines from the novel of Kipling's *Kim*'s starting paragraph that shows its interconnectedness to the prior text.

He sat, in defiance of municipal orders, astride the gun Zam-Zammah on her brick platform opposite the old Ajaib-Gher-the Wonder House, as the natives called the Lahore Museum. Who hold Zam-Zammah,

that “fire-breathing dragon,” hold the Punjab; for great green-bronze piece is always first of the conqueror’s loot. (1)

These lines from *Kim* are reused in *The English Patient* when the character named Hana reads the novel to The English Patient (character), who chooses the novel *Kim* written by Rudyard Kipling. In this sense the two texts *Kim* and *The English Patient* foregrounds the notion of relational and interconnectedness with each other.

Graham Allen says works of literature, after all, are built from systems, codes, discourse, and tradition established by previous works of literary or nonliterary art. As such, Ondaatje’s *The English Patient* shares the common discourse with Rudyard Kipling, but Ondaatje has countered the colonial discourse maintained by Kipling in oppositional perspective. Moreover, the portrayal of the thematic grounds in their novel *Kim* and *The English Patient* differ in viewing the colonialism and its impact.

Kipling has written the novel from the perspective of white European colonizers. He has depicted the fairness and requirement of colony to the Asian country like Indian life and Indian’s native people. Modern critic like William Payne regards Kipling as “few European understand the working of oriental mind as Mr. Kipling understand them, and far fewer have his gift of imparting the understanding to their readers [...] he puts the preservation of the British empire directly in the hands of Indian’s.” (qtd.in Albert Payne) In the same manner, David H. Steward in *A comparison to the British and Irish Novel 1905-2000* opines:

Kipling’s purposefully constructed misrepresentation of the political environment of Indian thus leaves the reader, in the end, with an image of Indian not conflict, but happily united under the British empire [...] even the spiritually transcendent closing scene of the novel reflects Kipling’s aim in portraying an utterly unified India [...] Kipling

manages to make a final overreaching impression of an India not divided by strife, but unified in harmony by British.

As such, Kipling explores the theme of colonization and tries to prove its authenticity and requirements of imperialism in India through his title character Kim in the novel. He has presented Kim as the treasure chest of colonialist mentality; the boy hero is represented as occupying the middle of the various Indian's world he inhabits. He is indigenous to Indian and yet external to it because white, whether traveling in The Trunk Road or plotting as part of the Great Game, he is in command of the scene, aware of all that is happening; more awake and more excited than anyone. His Indian friends, the Pathan, horse dealer Mahbub Ali, or the Bengali Huree Chunder Mookerjee, never occupy centre stage in the same way. The novel vividly characterized the character of Kim, the novel in so far as they exist in relationship with Kim or in relation to work for the Great Game, the secret service of Indian. Kipling's Kim indeed, explores a tinge of local colonial motifs- for example, the quest beyond the frontier of civilization.

But Ondaatje's *The English Patient* explores the theme of postcolonial issue of resistance and frustration to counter Kipling's view of imperialism in India. His novel clear states that colonial bastardy in empire building and colonial state of bereavement. Likewise, the novel attempts to rewrite a history of Second World War, by foregrounding the positions of the colonized nations who participated in the war. In reality, the novel present and highlights the voice of Third World people. In general, the exploitation, resistance of formerly colonized people and discoveries of their selves are the major motifs of the novel *The English Patient* which is silenced. Ondaatje prioritizes the unspoken and unwritten histories of non western people. The structure of the novel which is dispersed, broken, and divided, presents multiplicities of stories

related to different characters and voices. Because of this structure, Ondaatje's *The English Patients* is a contemplative novel that asks questions regarding the colonization its aim, actions, and discourse. As the postmodern critic Linda Hutcheon has describes the thematic zeal of Ondaatje's work in an article on the novel called "The Empire Writes Back" that: "The constellation of themes around healing, hurt, burning, and bombing is, I suppose, not a startling one for a story of war. But it becomes more intriguing when used, as here, as a metaphor for the complex heritage of colonialism" (22). For her, Ondaatje's way of presenting the themes, styles, and structure of the novel is to define the impact of colonization. Moreover, Ondaatje's each non-English characters search their self and identity in the non native land. For her as all of them are from formerly colonized countries, Kip from India, Hana and Caravaggio from Canada ex colonized from British and Count Almasy from Hungary.

None of the characters, in the novel are English. All of them however were marred by the English in one way or another during the war. They are all "patients of the English; colonials, each in his or her way or another trying to find and identity beyond the protection of and abandonment by the empire" (Hutcheon 22). Likewise, the novel *The English Patient* is indeed written to counter the discourse of the colonial zeal of empire building and to question its authenticity on the one hand and actions on the other. Ondaatje has illustrated the motifs of white people and exploitation over non white. Moreover, the theme of loyalty and frustration in the novel *The English Patient* prove its postcolonial ground. Ondaatje's chief character Kirpal Singh (who was named as Kip by the Britishers, as masters give new names to their servants according to their choices, determined by their culture) who beings as a servant of the British empire but ends up as its radical opponents and turns against Englishness. He shows his loyalty to the English men but the contradictions he has suppressed about the

English as friends and allies during the war explodes to confront him and to ask for a resolution. When the atomic bombs were dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, its impact is Kip's breakdown. The bombing represents a huge betrayal, an attack on "the white races of the world" (286) to which he belongs. Confronting Almasy, who he thinks is English, Kip explodes:

I grew up with traditions from my country, but later, more often, from your country. [...] converted the rest of the world. You stood for precise behavior. I knew if I lifted a teacup with the wrong finger I'd be banished, if I tied the wrong kind of knot in a tie I was out. [...] my brother told me. Never turn your back on Europe. The deal makers. The contract makers. The map drawers. Never shake hands with them [...] what have I been doing these last few years? Cutting away, defusing, limbs of evil. For what? For this to happen? (285).

Ondaatje shows Kip's crisis to be necessary. It is the only resolution to the ambiguities that colonialism had thrust upon his life. He had to react in anger against the injustices done to "the brown races". Ironically, though, his reaction turns out to be a deflated climax. For all those in the Italian monastery, including the "English", becomes clear, although Ondaatje is inserting the colonized's voice into the discourse on Second World War, the thrust of his novel seems antagonistic. He vocalizes the anger of the colonized in order to initiate a process of healing. Indeed, the monologue of Ondaatje's character Kip seems to be the mouthpiece in articulation of postcolonial world and dislocation from identity. From this view, it is clear that Ondaatje presents the characters and scene so as to show his view against colonization.

Likewise, intertextuality can be seen in the state of characterization in *The English patient* and *Kim*. Readers can find relation of friendship, jealousy, mutual

help and affection among the major characters, which not only depicts the history of their ethnic heritage. Kip, the major character of Ondaatje, represents many of the aspects of Rudyard Kipling's character Kim. They share similar position in life because of their same ethnic heritage. The English Patient, Count Almásy, is a mysterious survival of a fiery plane crash, through whom much of the action in novel unfolds in the form of flashbacks techniques. There are obvious parallels between the character Kim in Rudyard Kipling and Kip, the Sikh demolitions experts in *The English Patient*. Kipling created Kim as a white, Irish boy, who grows up as an orphan on the streets of Lahore, "a poor white of the very poorest" (159). But his skin is "burned black as any native" (159) and he looks and lives like a low-caste Hindu street-urchin and is unable to read, write or speak English very well. When Kim begins, the influence on Kipling's memorable protagonist Kim comes to be almost exclusively Indian. He grows up dressing like an Indian, thinking like an Indian and feels at home among the Indian, but despite these aspects he doesn't think of himself as a native. But he is not British either, he has no real identity. Likewise the character named Kip of Ondaatje, a dark skinned Indian Sikh in the white British army, and his situation is much like Kim's. Likewise, the chief character of Ondaatje's Kip and Kim of Kipling seem almost same in naming. In this regard both the novels are connected in the state of characterization.

Intertextuality can be seen in the different levels of the novel like in character the English Patient (Count Almásy) and his work. Almásy, a Hungarian desert explorer, spy of German but passing for Englishmen is "a double then triple agent" (163) carries with him old and torn copies of Herodotus's *Histories*, Kipling's *Kim*, and Leo Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*. He has filled up the gaps between the pages with cutting from other books glued to them and with notes and sketches. This activity has

four significances. First, Almasy, the English patient, acts as an intertextual writer who revises or reconstructs the text according to his own sense of himself and the world. Second, the books with missing pages have gapes of plots, missing incidents like the landscape ravaged by storm and bombs. Third, they provide tales and situations parallel to the occurrences in the novel. Fourth, they represent the discontinuous writing in different models like the novel itself.

Herodotus's *Histories*, Kipling's *Kim*, and the Italian artist Caravaggio's painting are the major intertext representing three different forms infiltrating the novel that provides patterns for various situations for the novel *The English patient*. The novel *The English patient* is perfect in portraying the traumatized life of the character in the postcolonial worlds. This novel is awarded Booker prize in literature. Upon reading the novel British film director, Anthony Minghella took it into the media version. In its film adaptation, Minghella has silenced the motifs and charming of the novel. The film clearly marginalizes Kip, Hanna, and Caravaggio against the vision of the novel, and in doing so it has silenced its primary concerns. One of the foremost concerns in the novel that is completely evaded in the film is the issue of colonialism. Which is a topic that is expanded up on and discussed at length in the novel, is reduced to a single scene in the film. In this scene, Kip sits in the English patient's room reading to him from Kipling's *Kim*. Almasy complains that the "words stick in his throat" because Kipling was an imperialist writer. At this point, Kip recounts the story of the guns the Zam-Zammah. However, there is an air of triviality surrounding his words. He tells the story mocking Almasy's concern with commas and full stops; he says "later they were fired at my people, *comma* the nature, *full stops*" (extracted from film version). The result is humorous scene that retains none of the seriousness of the arguments on Kipling and imperialism. Other than this one scene, there is no

other mention of colonization and colonialism in the film. Ultimately, Minghella's ENGLISH PATIENT (the film version) transforms Ondaatje's literary mosaic in to an orientalist tale.

In addition to it, by incorporating the post modern element of historiographic metafiction like intertextuality, Ondaatje shapes the text by the influence of other writers. Ondaatje's in *The English Patient* provides its influences of the prior text of Kipling's *Kim*. In *The English Patient* readers can find out the influence of Rudyard Kipling in the plot development. While the main character of *The English Patient* named Hana reads for The English Patient (character). She chooses the novel *Kim* written by Rudyard Kipling, to the moment Ondaatje's title character The English Patient comments to Hana the style of her reading and recommends her to read Kipling as:

Read him slowly, dear girl, you must read Kipling slowly. Watch carefully where the commas fall so you can discover the nature pauses. He is the writer who used pen and ink. He looked up from the page a lot, I believe, stared through his window and listened to birds, as most writers who are alone do. Some do not know the names of birds, though he did. Yours eye is too quick and North American. Think about the speed of his pen. What an appalling, barnacled old first paragraph it is otherwise. (94)

These lines are evident to prove that Michel Ondaatje keeps some vision of Rudyard Kipling and his way of writing while he was writing the novel *The English Patient*.

In the same way, like Kipling, Ondaatje creates realistic fictional worlds and memorable characters that capture the reader's imagination. Like the other characters in the *The English Patient*, Kip represents many aspects of Kim, for he struggles to

deal with the consequences fate has imposed upon him. Estranged from his family by his non traditional beliefs and pursuits, he is a man without a country, he says “I am Kim. I am Kim. And what is Kim?” (Kipling 299). This shows that he experiences an epiphany of his existence and sees himself as detached and somewhat alienated from the world, likewise Kip a Sikh sapper in an English army who doesn't welcome foreigners, especially dark-skinned foreigners. A loner by nature and by circumstances, he finds respite and meaning in Hana's arms like Kim he represents everyone who feels lost alone in the world.

As such, Ondaatje's *The English Patient* reminds the reader that it is related to Kipling's *Kim*. As what Michel Foucault says that intertextuality reminds us that each text exists in relation to other, to the same view, in the level of symbolism of *The English Patient* and *Kim* both novels have focused on the significance of map. Map of Count Almasy is source to discover and explore the vast desert he says:

I am a man who can recognize an unnamed town by its skeleton shape on a map. I have always had information like a sea in me [...] I knew maps of the sea floor, maps that depict weakness in the shield of the earth, charts painted on skin that contain the various routes. (Ondaatje 18)

These lines show the importance of map to explorer like Almasy where as map for British regiments of *Kim* is the source to English soldier in India to establish colony and collect the information.

Likewise, both novels *The English Patient* and *Kim* are interconnected in the issue of self discoveries of the characters. It shows the changes in their inner lives from these discoveries parallels the re-alignments and disappearance of national borders. They surrender a little bit of their territory by sharing a journey of recovery,

and their individual stories to each other. Just as Kim comes as close as he ever does to feel that he has discovered his identity in the final chapter of Kipling's tale. Kim seems to have arrived at a sense of self discovery towards which he has been struggling, and which he has been struggling, and defining cumulatively through his experiences, "I am Kim. I am Kim" (321) he says. "His souls repeated it again and again and tears trickled down his nose" as he felt the "wheels of his being lock up a new one on the world without." (331), in this regard Kim discovers his 'self' among the British. Likewise, in the novel *The English Patient* at the end Kip finally discovers that his identity can not be found within British army and Englishmen. When atomic bombs were dropped on Japan he reacts. And he tries to kill "English" patient because agents of United States of America has massacred the people of white nation. When told that Almasy (The English Patient) wasn't English. From the incident Kip differentiates himself from the Englishman and says:

American, French, I don't care. When you start bombing the brown races of the world, you're an Englishman. You had king Leopold of Belgium and now you have fucking Harry Truman of the U.S.A. You all learned it from the English. No. Not him. Mistake of all people he is probably on your side [...] they would have never dropped such a bomb in white nation. (286)

As a Sikh, he feels powerless of his people and would have been aware that the British had committed a large number of selfish acts, and could no longer tolerate the prejudice in the British army even if he works with. At the end of the novel, Kip angrily leaves the British army in outrage when he hears the news of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, saying that the Allies would never have treated a white city

like that. In this regard both novel *Kim* and *The English Patient* share the similarity in discovering the self from their deed.

For Frederic Jameson, a Marxist literary critic, borrowing more or less, in the issue of motifs, phrases, image and episodes from the work of another author is what makes a work pastiche. The text *The English Patients* takes the image of the gun The Zam-Zammah canon from its earlier text *Kim*. But presenting the image of the gun The Zam-Zammah is distinctly oppositional in relation to the authors' motifs.

In *Kim*, Kipling has used the image of the gun Zam-Zammah from the perspective of white and shows the white domination over it. For him, the gun is nothing more than an object. As the gun has the historical importance to the Indian, it was made by Englishmen in eighteenth century by the metal used from India in the period of British Empire. Kipling being the novel introducing his title character Kim as: "he set in great defiance of municipal orders, astride the gun The Zam-Zammah [...]" (3). The gun Zam-Zammah and its image to the native Indians seem nothing but an object only to the white eye like that of Kipling. He has used such a historical object as if having no significance in the plot development. He starts the novel with his title character Kim, sitting astride as if he is the king and commands the others. Kipling has presented the gun Zam-Zammah and other Indian natives having in domination of white blooded boy Kim. Whereas, on the country to Kipling, Ondaatje has used the same gun the Zam-Zammah canon in the novel *The English Patient* with its significance to the colonized people.

As the gun Zam-Zammah has the importance to the native people because that gun reminds the colonized Indian natives their history of suppression and exploitation. It has a greater significance and image for native to view their history. Ondaatje's character Kip says:

[...] the gun-the Zam-Zammah canon-is still there outside the museum in Lahore. There were two guns, made up of metal cups and bowls taken from every Hindu household in the city-as jiza, or tax. These were melted down and made in to the guns. These were used in many battles in the eighteenth centuries against Sikhs [...] (118).

The cited excerpt narrated by Hana in the novel is evident that the story of guns which were made of Indian metal and later used to kill the Indians. This story serves as one of the most indicative and most revealing moments of the novel. Even though Kip tells the story, it is transmitted to the readers through Hana, not through Kip. The reader receives Hana's retelling of Kip's story as she writes it into the flyleaf of the last pages of Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* (Ondaatje 118). Readers this episode, the critic Pico suggest that Ondaatje makes for situation where "Kipling is eclipsed by Kip" (42). Contrarily, by having Hana writes the story of the gun Zam-Zammha and its history on the flyleaf of *Kim*, critic Anson David says "Ondaatje seeks to supplement Kipling's rendition of India, not negate it." (David 72). In this regard, Ondaatje seeks to notify through Kip's story about the true image and significance of the gun Zam-Zammah canon from the native perspective rather white eye.

As such, the title of novel *The English Patient* seems a good selection of Michael Ondaatje as to prove the significance and impacts of Englishness. The patient has two meaning one is will and another is receiver of treatment. Both the meanings are perfectly used by Ondaatje so as to show his view in presenting his notion about white English men. First, 'patient' means 'will' which is informs the ambition and desire of Englishmen. The English Patient (Count Almásy) is spy of British, who is mapping the Sahara Desert and spying in favor of Englishmen. He has patient and ambition about the adventures likewise, will to support British. As such, in the context

of 'patient's' second meaning as receiver of treatment, as well, shown relevance in the novel. In this regard, the character named Count Almásy, who is supposed to be the Englishman, receives treatment in the deserted monastery in Saint Giroloma as presented in the novel is relevant in the metaphorical level of the declining stage of English or colonialism.

Michael Ondaatje has developed the novel *The English Patient* in the intertextual form of writing to Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* to counter the discourse of colonialism. For that Ondaatje takes the elements such as them, image, characterization, symbol and excerpts from the novel *Kim*. And he reevaluates their significance. *Kim* is positioned by Kipling presents his title character Kim, (white boy) as lad of spirit, full of life energy that from an early age proves his integrity and fearlessness. *Kim* is positioned by Kipling as a dominant character in the whole novel. *Kim* is known as 'friend of all the world' who knows the castes, creed, and cultures of India. Hence, through his character *Kim*, Kipling tries to prove the irrelevance of colonialism. But to question the discourse of colonialism Ondaatje presents the title character Almásy (*The English Patient*), ugly, burned, and handicapped having help from other and waiting for death. Almásy's critical position in thematic level declares the death of the colonialism. Likewise the subplot of the novel *The English Patient*, bombing by America to Hiroshima and Nagasaki presents the cruelty of whitemen (colonizers) to none white (colonized).

IV. Conclusion

Michael Ondaatje's novel *The English Patient* shares interconnection in relation to the level of theme, characterization, symbol, image, and the like, with the Rudyard Kipling's novel *Kim*. Though, the novel is published after the nine decades later from the publication of Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*, it directly responds to the colonial discourse created by Kipling's in the novel *Kim*. Ondaatje attempts to deconstruct the age long view of authenticity and necessity of empire building with reference to the very novel written by Kipling.

Ondaatje has been successful to show cultural dislocation, search of identity of the characters in the non-native land. The novel's events take place in various places and in several countries of the world where the character's past has evolved at the given moment. However, the four characters Count Almásy (the English patient), Hana, Caravaggio, and young Indian sapper Kip all are assembled in forbidden old monastery Saint Giroloma with different purpose in the final years of Second World War. They all are attached with Englishness from different aspects. The story gets critical mode when, the allies leading by America dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Kip, who works to Englishmen, feels that he no longer could associate with Europeans, and tries to kill the English patient. It is this episode of confrontation between Kip, the English patient, and Caravaggio that becomes the climax of the novel, and one of the most powerful episodes of the novel. This confrontation of Kip with all Englishness is what Ondaatje seeks to establish in the novel *The English Patient*.

To offer the sense of self identity and injustice done by English people is the foremost thematic ground of Ondaatje. In presenting so, Ondaatje in the novel takes

some elements such as theme, symbol, and structure that are common with Rudyard Kipling's novel *Kim*.

Kipling creates a discourse that empire is essential to the Indian people. He tries to prove its authenticity and meaningfulness of imperialism through the novel *Kim*. He takes his title character Kim as the omnipresence, embodying as if the British imperial authority, and his position as European allows him the freedom to understand Indian culture in two ways, as a native, especially when in disguise, and yet as a detached observer. His eyes, like those of any European scrutinizer sweep confidently and knowingly over The Trunk Road or the Himalayas and the power to know the Indian castes and cultures.

Kipling's Kim, who is presented as the 'Friends of all the World' serving as a puppet to British colonizer over India. Whereas, Ondaatje in his novel takes the image of the gun Zam Zammah which has the historical significance to the Indian because it has been used by white to dominate revolution of natives for freedom. Moreover, Ondaatje presents the character Kip from native land (India) who is near in naming to Kipling's Kim (character). Furthermore, Ondaatje takes the non linear structures dissimilar to Kipling to show the colonial state of bereavement and question how authentic the colonization is. Ondaatje, in his novel gives justice to the colonized people like Indian opposite to Kipling. He takes Indian character Kip, a sapper working to English in World War II, is presented to be known how far his service to English is rewarded?

Ondaatje combines a variety of narratives whose impact comes essentially from the overall effect of individual stories rather than from the disjointed structures. Its non-linear structure signifies the multiplicities of voices. Through the bits and piece of past and present, of thought and dialogues, we can feel that Ondaatje's

presentation of the idea is to re-write of history of Second World War, bringing to the foreground the positions of the colonized characters who directly and indirectly involved in the war. Thus *The English Patient* is itself, a history that is re-written and a story that is re-told, containing the intertextual relationship with the novel *Kim* by Rudyard Kipling.

Works Cited

- Anson, David. "Mapping the Heart." *Newsweek*. November 11, 1996. 72-74.
- Bathes, Roland. *Elements of Semiology*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1974.
- . *Image-Music-Text*. London: Fontana, 1977.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonialism and Postcolonial Literature*. New York: Oxford, 2005.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistic and the study of Literature*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.
- . *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, and Deconstruction*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Stewart, David H. *A Comparison to the British and Irish Novel 1945-2000*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Culture*. New York: Basic Book, 1973.
- Graham, Allen. *Intertextuality*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *The Poetics of Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- . *The Politics of Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- . *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth Century Forms*. New York: Methoch, 1985.
- . *The Empire Writes Back*. The Riders Publishing International. January 4, 1993. 22-24.
- Iyre, Pico. "Magic Carpet Ride." *Times*. November 2, 1992. 42-43.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*. New York: Routledge, 1937.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Moran, Joe. *Interdisciplinarity*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

Ondaatje, Michael. *The English Patient*. London: Bloomsbury, 1991.

Mautner, Thomas. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1996.

Worton, Michael and Still. *Intertextuality* Manchester: Manchester University Press,
1990.