

Chapter- 1

Introduction

This research compares "supplement" introduced by Jacques Derrida in *Of Grammatology* and "contrapuntal reading" developed by cultural and humanist theorist Edward W. Said in his book *Culture and Imperialism*. Supplement carries the sense of other terms like *différance*, *pharmakon*, *trace*, *hymen*, *archi-writing* and others used in deconstruction. Similarly contrapuntal analysis encompasses the sense of post colonial or cultural reading.

The main aim is to examine their nature as methodological tools. What kind of similarities and differences do they offer? Can they be applied within any literary text with outcome of interpretable meaning? Do they refer to the same thing simultaneously or differently? What are the bases of their similarities and differences? These problems are the concerns of this thesis. Their concluding outcome will be brought forward by applying them in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*.

Many assumptions can be led forward for their comparison. As the methodological and analytical tools their scope and limitation might appear when applied in text. Since supplement has its trend borrowed from that of post modernism or post structuralism and contrapuntal analysis has the methodology in post colonialism or in cultural area, these theories needs merely a short introduction of its trends.

Roughly, postmodernism appeared in the humanities and philosophy after World War II. It is both the continuation as well as renunciation of modernism. Modernism advanced worry and yearning for the consequences of World Wars i.e. fragmentation, dissociation, alienation, isolation, discontinuation and so on whereas postmodernism celebrates those chaos and disorder of World Wars. Postmodernism has influenced philosophy and the analysis of culture and society, expanded the

importance of critical theory, and become the point of departure for works of literature, architecture, and design, as well as the interpretation of history, law and culture started in the late twentieth century. Largely influenced by the disillusionment of the first World War, postmodernism refers to a cultural, intellectual or artistic state lacking a clear central hierarchy and embodying extreme complexity, contradiction, ambiguity, diversity and interconnectedness or interreferentiality. So far as the reading of a text is concerned from postmodernist point of view, it goes against centre, stability, fixed meaning or any dominant structures. Rather it opens a text with flexible and temporary meaning and interpretation. Similar is the case with post-structuralism or what is also called deconstruction. Post-structuralism was originated-against the notion of structuralism developed by Saussure, Jakobson and Levi-Strauss-by Jacques Derrida in 1966. It undermines the notion of closure, totality, centre and metaphysics of presence. Jacques Derrida subverted the traditional concept of logocentrism and phonocentrism. His methodology or theory, deconstruction, longs for the marginal meaning moving beyond the central one. He and his approach don't deny the meaning. Rather, he only favors the idea that text has multiple meanings because of the slippery nature of language or ambiguous nature of any language. That means he proposed the idea of freeplay in language. So when we are talking from the methodological or analytical point of view, we can't differentiate between deconstruction and its other jargons like supplement, *différance*, *pharmakon*, trace and so on.

Jacques Derrida, the most influential figures in contemporary philosophy, has undermined the accepted rules of traditional theory and criticism, rejected its method and concepts, and disrupted its boundaries. His method is invented on the basis of

destabilizing the meaning, identity and reading of texts. Derrida established his theories destabilizing phonocentrism, logocentrism and metaphysics of presence.

The creative and critical thinking beyond the conventional sense of reading was introduced in the post modernism where textual reading was the base of every other literary praxis. Deconstruction is a methodological tool or analytical praxis which developed its theories with reading and re-reading of any other texts.

His works had a groundbreaking impact on continental philosophy and on literary theory, which is associated with post-structuralism and post modernism. He commenced a new era in the world of literature and philosophy. Collins and Mayblin in their book stated that "Jacques Derrida is a philosopher. Yet he's never written anything straightforwardly philosophical. His work has been heralded as the most significant in contemporary thinking. But it's also been denounced as a corruption of all intellectual values" (*Introducing Derrida* 3). He has ostensibly written covering the wide area across the boundaries of literature and philosophy. Metaphysics, phenomenology, structuralism, and language and linguistics were his main concerns for writing. He was the pioneer of neologism. Many new terms were coined in this area. Like *différance*, *sous rature* (under erasure), trace, hymen, *archi-writing*, *pharmakon*, iterability and supplement etc. These all are merely his tools of analysis of different people since Plato to postmodern. His writing "undermines our usual notions of texts, ideas, meanings, concepts and identities not just in philosophy but in other discipline as well" (*Introducing Derrida* 5). Nevertheless, he has been even accused of "causation, trickery and charlatanism" (*Introducing Derrida* 9).

Postcolonial theories also emerged after World Wars. The major difference between deconstruction and postcolonialism is that the former is textual while the later is contextual. Post colonialism refers to a set of theories in philosophy and

literature that grapple with the legacy of colonial rule dealing with the literature produced in countries that became the colonies of English, French and Spanish. It deals with many issues for societies undergone colonialism: the dilemma of developing national identity in the wake of colonial rule; the ways in which writers from colonized countries attempt to articulate and even celebrate their cultural identities, in some case reclaiming them from colonizers, but in many cases maintaining a strong linkage with the cultures of colonizers. Colonized people respond back to the colonial legacy by writing back to the centre since indigenous people started writing their own histories, their own legacy using the colonizers language for their own purpose. Edward Said's books *Orientalism*, and *Culture and Imperialism*, have earned the fame and name far and wide the continent, in which he developed the term contrapuntal analysis borrowing from musicology to interpret the colonial text from the perspective of both colonizer and the colonized. Albeit various other analytical terms in postcolonial discourse, contrapuntal reading is the most important which shares the features of others too.

His works made an audacious attack on western representation of the Asia, Middle East, Arab and Islam whom they called the orient. He argued that a long tradition of false and romanticized images of Asia and the Middle East in Western culture had set as an implicit justification of Europe and America's color and imperial ambitions. Just as fiercely, he denounced practice of Arab elites who internalized the American and British orientalist's ideas of Arabic culture. He thoroughly criticized the poor understanding of the Arab in the west as terrorist. He has drawn his methodology from Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault. Said contended that Europe had dominated non-west politically so completely for so long that even the most outwardly objectives western texts on the East were permeated with a bias which even

most scholars could not recognize. In the realm of culture and imperialism, he suggested that sometimes even unsaid or unintentional meaning/interpretation of a text becomes more necessary or valuable than what it says or intends to say. Though he takes a critical view of orientalist representations, he wants himself be identified as a scholar in the tradition of humanism though it's very difficult to determine his relationship to humanism.

In *Orientalism*, he stated that western writings about the orient depict the orient as an irrational, weak, feminized 'other' contrasted with the rational, strong, and masculine west. Further, he suggests that he derives it from the need to create difference between West and East that can be attributed to immutable essences in the oriental make-up. *Culture and Imperialism* is his work which can be read as a sequel to the former one, *Orientalism*. His main ideas can be summed up as the representation of orients, their culture, identity, emergence and resistance to decolonization.

I have planned to divide this research in five chapters. In the very beginning, a short introduction discusses the background of theoretical scenario and the familiarity with the trends of the theorists in chapter one. Chapter two analyses the supplement, its methodological description and its comparison with *différance*. Likewise, chapter three presents the description of contrapuntal reading, its methodological analysis and its comparison with latent and manifest orientalism. Chapter four is the application of supplement in and contrapuntal reading of *Heart of Darkness*. A comparative study of supplement and contrapuntal reading is, finally, described in chapter five. At the last, I will conclude the outcome of this research briefly in the conclusion section.

Chapter-2

Supplement

2.1 Supplement

"The sign is always the supplement of the thing itself" (*Of Grammatology* 145). The logic of the supplement is also an important aspect of *Of Grammatology*. Let us consider the definition of supplement introduced in the following dictionary.

“Supplement”: "Something which is added to complete something else in order to improve it or complete; something extra" (*Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*).

The above definition advances the idea that the supplement is an extra addition other than the thing to be supplemented. So the supplement, the extra is a whole in itself. However, to exist as a supplement, it tries to advance/improve/complete the supplemented. On the contrary, this statement also shows that the supplemented isn't complete in itself since it requires a supplement. To make it more clear, referring back to origin of the word, “supplement”, would be preferable.

As with many of the words that take on significance in Derrida's parlance, the original French term for the English translation Supplement (Supplément) Functions due to its peculiar position in French language.

"The French word suppléer means to take the place of, to substitute as well as to supplement. The noun Supplément can mean 'substitute' as well as 'addition' (*Penguin Dictionary of Literary Theory*).

Any term in deconstruction is important because of its multiple meanings which contribute to its functioning in Derrida's theory. The word's meanings as both a substitute and a replacement are crucial to Derrida's use. I.e. it's always ambiguous, or

more accurately undecidable. Supplement covers both replacement and addition, that which supplements and supplants simultaneously. In the conventional sense, supplement is an addition to something. E.g. Vitamins are supplements in the sense that they are added to a diet. Supplements are derivative with a dependent existence on that which it supplements.

These double meaning can be analyzed as follows:

A supplement, on the one hand, serves to enhance the presence of something which is already complete and self sufficient. It's an exteriority, an outside, a material signifier that is added afterwards to the inner integrity of a signified. The signifier only represents the signified. Unfortunately, however, something of the original richness of the signified always is lost in its representation. That's why, the supplement is preferably considered as an inessential, a non-required surplus that really shouldn't be a need to be added to the pure fullness of the interior. Thus, writing is the supplement of speech, Eve was the supplement of Adam, and masturbation is the supplement of natural sex. As Derrida writes;

The supplement adds itself; it is a surplus, a plentitude enriching another plentitude, the *fullest measure* of presence. It cumulates and accumulates presence. It is thus that art, techno, image, representation, convention etc. come as supplements to nature and are rich with this entire cumulating function. (*Grammatology* 144)

What is added is nothing because it is added to a full presence to which it is exterior. Speech comes to be added to intuitive presence (of the entity, of *essence*, of the *eidos*, of *ousia*, and so forth); writing comes to be added to living self present speech; masturbation comes to

be added to so called normal sexual experience; culture to nature, evil to innocence, history to origin, and so on. (*Grammatology* 167)

But simultaneously, as Derrida puts forward, the western idea of the supplement has within it the idea that a thing that has a supplement can't be truly 'complete in itself'. If it were complete without the supplement, it shouldn't need, or long-for the supplement. The fact that a thing can be added-to make it even more 'present' or 'whole' or sufficient' suggests that there should be a hole in it which Derrida called *invagination*. Supplements are called in because of the lack in what is supplemented believing that the supplement can fulfill the hole. Analyzing the supplement from this vantage perspective, the supplement doesn't enhance something's presence but rather underscores its presence. I.e. it demonstrates the inherent difficulty of thought based on the idea of presence and functions as a destabilization of structuralist modes of thinking. Derrida Writes;

But the supplement supplements. It adds only to replace. It intervenes or insinuates itself *in – the – place- of*, if it fills, it is as if one fills a void, if it represents and makes an image, it is by anterior default of a presence. Compensatory {suppleant} and vicarious the supplement is an adjust, a subaltern instance which *takes-(the) – place* {tient-lieu}. As substitute, it is not simply added to the positivity of a presence, it produces no relief, its place is assigned in the in the structure by the mark of an emptiness. (*Grammatology* 145)

The duality of supplement can best be understood by the example provided by Derrida with reference to speech and writing developed in *Of Grammatology* talking on Rousseau where he shows the strange logic of supplement.

To be an addition means to be added to something already complete. So, writing is the supplement of speech which is a complete self. Speech is complete and has an addition. Yet it can't be complete if it needs an addition. Since it needs an addition; needing an addition, speech isn't yet whole.

The supplement extends by repeating. Writing has the same function of communication with that of speech. But the supplement opposes by replacing. So, writing can take the place of speech.

So if something adds a supplement and is replaced by the same supplement means that the supplement and the thing are neither strictly opposed to one another nor equivalent to each other. If a presence needs a sign in order to appear, it follows that it is always already permeated from the inside by a shortage, a lack, an invagination. If it can't do without the supplement, then the supplement becomes the precondition for the presence of the present. The originality of the signified is only afterwards produced with and within the supplement; it appears only afterwards in and through the sign. The sign therefore becomes a prerequisite for the signified to appear. At the same time, however, the sign postpones a direct contact with the origin, with that what is represented, both temporarily and spatially. On one hand, the supplement is an exteriority, outside of the signified and outside of itself because in its quality of being a sign it represents itself something different than itself. On the other hand, however, a supplement enables interiority and produces the inside. Every supplement defers what it installs. And every signified is in fact, an effect, a trace of a signifier.

A supplement is a whole in itself. However, to exist as a supplement it must also possess a potential for integration within a pre-existing presence. The supplement is troubling and disruptive to the logocentric and self present world because it is what

"neither nature nor reason can tolerate it" (*Grammatology* 148). Culler has eloquently summed up Derrida's argument as;

The supplement is an inessential extra, added to something complete in itself, but the supplement is added in order to complete, to compensate for a lack in what was supposed to be complete in itself. These two meanings of supplement are linked in powerful logic, and in both meanings, supplement is presented as exterior, foreign to the 'essential' nature of that to which it is added or in which it is substituted. (*On Deconstruction* 103)

This analytical description of supplement comes to prove it as an undecidable or unsettled. Taking straightforwardly, supplement is a sort of undecidable in deconstruction because on the one hand, it substitutes, replace or puts off whereas it adds, imposes something new to what it replaces simultaneously on the other hand. Supplement always postpones the centre, metaphysics of presence and the dominant notion. On the same token it adds the margin, the periphery which the critic tries to avoid. Supplement, therefore, serves the function and notion of deconstruction as an analytical tool. In this process, what matters is the meaning added to a text by supplement rather than what is replaced. This process of replacement and addition is carried out to an infinite process. Anyone can't fix that this be the last one for addition. The more the minds, the more the outcomes.

Supplement akin to Derrida's other methodological tools of deconstruction, is a method of textual analysis. Derrida developed these tools with their base on the slippery nature of language or what he said that a signifier furthers a chain of signified. All his undecidable tools i.e. *différance*, supplement, hymen, pharmakon,

trace, archi-writing long for the presence of the absence. They search what a text doesn't intend to proclaim. As Derrida describes;

The supplement will always be the moving of the tongue or acting through the hands of others. In it everything is brought together: progress as the possibility of perversion, regression toward an evil that is not natural and that adheres to the power of substitution that permits us to absent others. (*Grammatology* 147)

The supplement by virtue of its own logic deconstructs its own logic and exists both within and without structures, as present and absent, as pharmakon. Through this impossible existence, the supplement advocates that the endless chain of substitution, an ineluctable exchange between presence and absence is never reconciled. Derrida clarifies that

... [t]he theme of the supplementarity is certainly no more than one theme among others. It is in a chain, carried by it. Perhaps one could substitute something else for it. But it happens that this theme describe the chain itself, the being-chain of a textual chain, the structure of substitution, the articulation of desire and of language, the logic of all conceptual oppositions(*Grammatology* 163)

Accordingly, supplement operates within a chain of textuality. I.e. there is a chain of meaning in a text. It generally tries to focus on those meanings belonging to the margins, repressed and suppressed, out of logocentrism. The supplement brings out the difference between "what an author commands and doesn't command within a text"(*Grammatology* 158). Even within this chain, something else from the same chain could be brought forward in the fore. Supplement never obliterates any

meaning. Rather it only defers like *différance* since it "itself is exorbitant" (*Grammatology* 163).

Because of the undecidability and derailed nature of supplement, it acts/ functions" here as addition, there as substitute, now as positivity and exteriority of evil, now as a happy auxiliary" (*Grammatology* 163). Whatever the supplement advances into meanings, it works limitedly remaining within the textuality since Derrida advocates that "there's nothing outside the text" (*Grammatology* 158). Derrida always favors the reading that

must always aim at a certain relationship, unperceived by the writer, between what he commands and what he doesn't command of the patterns of the language that he uses. This relationship is not a certain qualitative distribution of shadow and light, of weakness or force, but a signifying structure that critical reading should practice.

(*Grammatology* 158)

Derrida's point of interest is the difference between the represented and that which represents. Something remains hidden in every representation, something is forgotten, suppressed, or excluded which is called the others. But Derrida wants to attract our attention towards that every perspective and narrativity which makes use of language which fails to cover all aspects and to address all matters concerned. The supplement thus, represents an intermediary between exteriority and interiority. It replaces the foregrounded meaning of a text and adds a further meaning to it making the previous devalued. Again the meaning it has added becomes the central for it and gets replaced with the immediate addition of the other one. This process is unlimited in deconstruction.

Though Derrida enhanced the theme and play of supplementarity within textuality, critics borrowed this in various other fields remaining within the limitation of textual analysis like in religion, pedagogy, photography and textuality. People have introduced the various other play of supplementarity. One of the critics, Peter Trifonas, implied the ethics of pedagogy of supplement. Trifonas mentioned that the pedagogy of the supplement

would provide new insights into deconstruction that could allow us to effectively gauge the potential of its influence on educational theory, not only as a theoretical departure from classical modes of reading and writing but as the inaugural steps towards and beyond a post – structuralist theory of education that could ground an ethical praxis. (*Derrida and Rousseau...* 244)

Derrida originated the idea of supplement which always subverts and moves away from the centre and the logocentric tradition. He emphasized on margin and marginality. But emphasizing again on centre, Newton Garver elegantly criticized him in the journal *Derrida on Rousseau on Writing* stating him as "the upholder of brilliant and scholarly mischievousness" (*Derrida on Rousseau...* 673). Garver justified that;

To say that supplement is prior to the centre (That which is supplemented) is to say that the distancing, the supplementary, and the *différance* is prior to immediacy, originality, and presence. If there is no immediacy originality presence that "founds" meaning, then there is nothing from which to be at a distance (*Derrida on Rousseau...* 673)

The function of supplement is straightforwardly described in the connoted meaning of the following paragraph written in *Emile* by Rousseau.

How people will cry out against me! I hear from afar the shouts of that false wisdom which is ever dragging us onwards, counting the present as nothing, and pushing without a pause a future which flies as we pursue, that false wisdom which removes us from our place and never brings us to any other.

(Qtd. in *Grammatology* 191)

The aforementioned comment connotes three function of supplement in its very nature. On the one hand, it always tries to remove something other than itself by replacing it (dragging us onwards). Taking pun on the word present as (i) sth which exists or (ii) a moment of time, the connotation would be more clarified. When the present is any existence, it is not counted or counted as nothing by the supplement. i.e. we are dispossessed for longed-for presence in the gesture of language by which we attempt to receive it (*Grammatology* 141). This absence of the presence is the second function of supplements even if present is a moment; it is always pursued by future. The last function of supplement is that it never brings the object supplemented in its original or distanced place for any other purpose which is clearly simplified by the last line of the paragraph.

Overall, supplement is manifested by and manifests many other tools. Let us observe Garver's statement for this purpose.

The written sign is therefore called a supplement, for a natural sign (one essential connected said to lack any essential connection with its meaning, to be quite exterior' to its meaning, to be a 'substitute' or what Derrida with its meaning), and hence to differ (*Différer*) radically from

a meaning or a natural sign and to defer or to put off (Différer, in another sense) our encounter with the real thing. (*Derrida on Rousseau...* 669)

In the above remarks, Garver straightforwardly related the idea of supplementary with that of *différance*. Derrida also wrote that supplement is the other name of *différance* (*Grammatology* 150) and that dangerous *différance* for that dangerous supplement (*Grammatology* 183). Thus, supplement represents and is represented by *différance*, and other manifestations are explored in Derrida's discussion of the Greek terms 'pharmakon' and hymen in his major text *The Dissemination*. So to make supplement more clarified, its contrast with these terms i.e. *différance*, pharmakon, hymen, archi-writing and trace should be explored too. But more than any other concept Derrida introduced in many of his important texts that supplement and *différance* are related to each other. So *différance* is necessary to be explored.

1.2 Différance

Différance is the outcome of Derrida's enigmatic capability of neologism. It's also one of the undecidable in deconstruction. To bring out the mysterious of *différance*, three different French words should be considered.

La Différence = the difference (Noun).

Différer = to differ, and to defer (verb)

Différent= Differing or differing state (Verb-adj)

But there's no such an independent word *différance* in French language though it encompasses the meaning of all these three.

Différance, therefore, is a Derridian portmanteau coined as a noun-verb against the metaphysics of presence. So *différance* has been germinated from the

French verb 'différer' which means both to differ spatially and to defer, or to postpone or to put off temporally. As Derrida states in the essay entitled 'Différance' that the two apparently different values of *différance* are tied together in Freudian theory: to differ as discernibility, distinction, separation, diastem, spacing; and to defer as detour, relay, reserve, temporization (*Différance* 689).

Différance, henceforth, creates meaning in two ways. On the one hand, it states that meaning is brought on the basis of difference with other. Like cat is cat because it is different than rat, mat, hat, sat, etc. On the other hand, there's always the deferment of the final meaning i.e. cat doesn't only mean cat. This commonality and simplicity is always postponed. I.e. *différance* is the non-full, non-simple, structured and differentiating origin of differences (*Différance* 680).

But *différance* has been put under erasure by Derrida. *Différance* is rather than *différance* is. It's only crossed out not ejected. It doesn't have any existence since there's no any source from where *différance* can be originated i.e. it derives from no category of being (*Différance* 672). It can't be exposed but can only be understood. Neither can it be presented. So it's neither a word nor a concept (*Différance* 675). So, Deconstruction produces a non-concept *différance* to de-stabilize the metaphysics of presence which furthers the non-coincidence of meaning both synchronically and diachronically. Deconstruction, straightforwardly, emphasizes difference, complexity, and non-self-identity instead of commonality and simplicity. Because of *différance*, words and signs can never fully claim what they mean but can only be defined or explained on the basis of their difference with other signs and words. In deconstruction, origin and history aren't drawn to understand any meaning. Derrida writes that describing a history and narrating its stages, text by text, context by context isn't concerned even for *différance* (*Différance* 669).

Both supplement and *différance* are very much akin to each other. Derrida has brilliantly extended the nature of *différance* in supplement and other undecidables like *pharmakon*, *hymen*, *archi-trace* etc. As he mentioned;

Now if we consider the chain in which *différance* lends itself to a certain number of non-synonymous substitutions, according to the recessing of the context, why have recourse to the reserve; to *archi-writing*; to the *archi-trace*", to "spacing", that is; to the "supplement", or to the *pharmakon*, and soon to the *hymen*, to the *margin-mark-march*, etc. (*Différance* 681)

The above quote elaborates very well that *différance* can be annexed to many non synonymous all of which are undecidables, with and in recourse to supplement, *pharmakon*, *hymen*, *archi-trace*, *archi-writing* etc. Certainly *différance* does what the supplement does with any text. Let us see what this *différance* does. These undecidables are the tools of deconstructive reading of a text. So a deconstructive reading of a text, or a deconstructive interpretation of philosophy, often seeks to demonstrate how a seemingly unitary idea of concept contains different or opposing meanings within itself. The deletion of *différance* in a philosophical text is even referred to in deconstruction as a kind of violence. As M.H. Abrams puts down the function of *différance*;

The double sense of *différance* point to the phenomenon that, on the one hand, a text proffers the effect of having a significance that is the product of its differed significance can never come to rest in an actual presence or in a language-independent reality *which* Derrida calls *transcendental signified*-it's determinate specification is deferred from

one linguistic interpretation to another in a movement or play . . . in an endless regress. (*A Glossary of Literary Terms* 57)

Abrams points out that *différance* operates on the basis of freeplay, i.e. *différance* first produces difference or opposition of the present meaning then defers it to the others. So *différance* undermines the presupposition of a text and then de-stabilize it and de-centre it. So in the interpretation of a text with *différance* or supplement or any other undecidables, what is usually suppressed, i.e. the infinite possibilities, the freeplay of meaning are exposed. So every texts open themselves for further interpretation when applied these undecidable tools. As Derrida mentioned;

Différance maintains our relationship with that which we misconstrue, and which exceeds the alternative of presence and absence.... It differs from, and defers, itself; which doubtless means that it is woven of differences, and also that it sends out delegates, representatives, praxis.... (*Différance* 692)

A text can obviously, be read, be experienced, be re-read, be understood but that understanding, for all its deep feelings or lack of it is marked by a quintessential provisionality that never denies the possibility of rereading. Dr. Beerendra Pandey comments in his textbook '*Intellectual History Reader*' that to think *différance* is to "think what is simultaneously like and unlike, what is simultaneously itself and its opposite" (666). So all the undecidables whether supplement or *différance* moves along two different lines of meaning. On the one hand, it prescribes the presence or simplicity or commonality or ordinary, or immediacy on the other hand they show the loss of these presence, distancing and margins.

In this way, *différance*, supplement or *pharmakon* or the other undecidables attacks the logocentric tradition of presence, centre and origin and posits the idea of

exposition of margins, suppressed, repressed, distancing in any words or signs. That's why they are similar though they are non-synonymous because of their different introduction and meaning. They are similar in their function since they open a text for multiple interpretations because the concept is inscribed in a chain or in a system within which it refers to the other, to others concepts, by means of systematic play of differences (*Différance* 679).

Différance becomes Derrida's way of demonstrating that there is always slippage of meaning, and he claims that it is operative at all times and all places within discourse. Despite his claim that *différance* is neither a word nor a concept, it becomes contradictory since a deconstruction always summons forth the next one. Language for Derrida is web-like –interwoven and inter-related; the whole of the word equal to the sum of its interwoven parts each differing in a chain of signification and deferring presence simultaneously. Collins and Mayblin finally argue that "différance is actively disruptive. Language, thought and meaning aren't to be allowed the comforts of their daily routines. If that leaves philosophical language ruined, sick with its own instabilities, what about ordinary language and everyday communication" (*Introducing Derrida* 77)?

A text, thus, read itself, therein lies the provisionality of *différance*. Having a comparative glimpse of the two, it can be written as: *différance* differs and on the other hand defers too. Similarity, supplement replaces and on the contrary adds too. So what *différance* differs is replaced or supplemented by supplement. And supplement adds what *différance* defers or delays. So, both have the same function of replacing centre by adding a margin to the original.

Chapter – Three

Contrapuntal Reading

3.1. Contrapuntal Reading

All knowledge is assimilation to the object of knowledge. Said, like Derrida, introduced many new terms in the field of literature and culture borrowing from other area and discipline. The one that is concerned with his method of critical practice is "Contrapuntal Reading" which became the key term in post colonial analysis.

Since Said himself was the great practitioner of music like a concert pianist, he borrowed the term "contrapuntal" from the discipline of music. Let us consider the dictionary entry of "contrapuntal."

"Contrapuntal": having two or more tunes played together to form a whole (*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*).

Above entry seems much more clarified to observe its meaning. Any sort of melodious music, as Said argues, consists of many more tunes collected, arranged, organized and then played together to create the whole. I.e. a simple tune can neither form a whole nor play a whole. Rather it has a number of tunes. And that however expert pianist / musician, he mentioned, can't play all the tunes expertly or excellent. One always creates some sort of disharmony with regard to any of the tune but the practice and habit of observing the major tunes destroy the eyes to observe the disharmony produced. None of the musician has the art of playing all the tunes well simultaneously. Laden with the centre seeking (habit of hearing/observing major tunes) tradition, the audience doesn't mind the disharmony, I'd rather say they can't / don't find it, produced there. Contrapuntal in music is closely related with the other musicological term "counterpoint" which too demands the analysis for further betterment. So let us see the dictionary entry of "counterpoint".

"Counterpoint": The art or practice of combining two or more tunes to be played together according to fixed rules" (*OALD*).

As per the above entry, "contrapuntal" and "counterpoint" are comparatively synonymous to a great extent except that later denotes the method (Howness) of music while the former exposes only noun (what). So "Counterpoint" is the skill/ art / technique/method or whatever, which a musician should have for combining many more tunes to form and play a whole under the government of certain determined rules of music. Unfortunately, everyone can't have this skill. The musician is guided by his instincts rather than the rules. So they overemphasized the tune they like or they think to be important, on the other hand they undermined the rest which they don't think to be important. Therefore, somehow, somewhere we feel the play of imbalance or disharmony though we keep ourselves unmoved. Such kind of mistakes get arisen by those who think of themselves as endowed with especially fine artistic consciences and have them hurled down from the altar of art. I.e. music has inherent relation with the emotion one has at the time of being played. This is the case that moves Said to borrow the term from this discipline and apply it in other discipline. Since these two terms are heavily loaded with the ideas from musicology, it is necessary to analyze them to make much clear as a job of intellectual.

Said defines the intellectual as a person who tells the truth to power. He takes this even further, into what is sometimes more touchy and difficult terrain in insisting by his own action, that the job of the intellectual is to tell the truth to his followers and to himself. If these aesthetic experiences that he has take a particular course, his job as philologist, first of all is to try to

understand them and to faithfully record them. (*In Responses Begins Responsibility* 97)

This remark about the job of intellectual for Said puts Lindsay Waters in the journal entitled *In Responses Begins Responsibility*. So Said clearly wants the truth to be disclosed with the help of whatever experience and manners. So he seeks help from musicology for the intellectual to disclose the truth from the text because the real understanding of truth of a text comes from the interpretation the text or the author does not intend to claim. So Said always emphasized the notion of intellect over the sensual; moralization arts and devalued the role of recipient of art in artistic judgment promoting the fact that work of art can best be understood fully in terms of its internal organization (*In Responses Begins Responsibility* 98). Observing uniqueness of musical experience he argues that music possesses some sort of extendable nature which is veered off from the social arena. I.e. he confirms music is social too promoted by the experience of recollection. Through this kind of statement, Said comments that literary works like music create the illusion though music encompasses us in its illusion likewise the other artworks. Waters states that “Art works such as music offer us the illusion of unity and completeness but in fact they await completion in the response of the auditor who might respond in enthusiasm, forgetfulness, other recollections, distraction, or freedom. Artworks offer us illusion of aesthetic unity” (*In Responses Begins Responsibility* 101).

None other than Said was able to merge the relationship between literature and music despite many other great literary figure and musician as well. He clearly demystified the common functions of the two though he took help from other people such as Proust. The words written in a literary text and the melody formed by the various tunes have the similar structures veered in motion.

When Said read the words of a text, he felt as if he heard the tunes of a melody during the time. While playing a melody, he observed all the things that have been gathered to form for that style and by the listeners or the performers i.e. under the lines of the text, there's a kind of overflow of music full of emotion of the different types. The account Said gives of his musical experience is a unique model. He claims that any art works, even music and literature too, are social. They are "history – laden". Each and every works of art has the effect of its surrounding, audience, author and so on. Music and literature therefore are interdependent and overlapping in their experiences.

So Said straightforwardly argued that any work of art is the product of its past which remains hidden inside the subject unable to be found by the sense and the intellect. So we need culture and context. Some gets chance, while the other doesn't to look after the hidden. This is the real effect of music Said applied in literature which created another domain inside it. Said, therefore, combined these two terms "Contrapuntal" and "Counterpoint" and made the method or praxis of reading called contrapuntal reading or Analysis. In his text *Culture and Imperialism* he has said about it in a well made paragraph with reference to music. As he writes;

In the counterpoint of western classical music, various themes play off one another, with only a provisional privilege being given to any particular one; yet in the resulting polyphony there is concert and order, an organized interplay that derives from the themes, not from a rigorous melodic or formal principle outside the work. (*Culture and Imperialism* 51)

This is the real theme of contrapuntal reading. There are, Said argues, two sides in every text. Analyzing the both sides is to read it contrapuntally. So Said

draws on an analogy from music to explain the principle of contrapuntal reading: an attention to the suppressed traces of colonialization and of responses to it in literary texts. It is important to note that, in elaborating his model for reading, Said refers to a type of reading composition that isn't driven by any "rigorous, melodic or formal principle outside the work" or what might be called "theory". Said repeatedly voices for reservations about the dominance of theory in literary interpretation. He also emphasizes that, in literary texts as in counterpoint, different themes consist which the critic can reveal the full complexity of imperial culture by exploring the interplay of metropolitan experience and the experience of the "other" that can be discerned in the interstices of text of the colonial era. Said's notion of contrapuntal reading is akin to Bakhtin's view of dialogic interpretation since both believes that it is the task of the critic to foreground the interaction of different voices.

Contrapuntal reading offers us a vision of looking a text through the perspective of both the repressor and the repressed. Generally readers are the slave of habit of looking the provisional meaning of the text moving either beyond the suppressed meaning or remaining it unopened. But man is, however, the product of his surrounding so whatever one writes in a text has the effect of ones past and present. This condition is the general feature of the literary figures belonging to the Victorian and modern period known as the era of high colonialism. On the one hand they disliked the consequences of imperialism which they wanted to depict in the text for the representation of the orient. By the same token, they leave the marks and images supporting imperialism since they were guided by their unconscious. So the manifestations of the text on the surface belong to anti-imperial sense but underlying pattern advocates for the same imperialism they are product of. So Mustapha Marrouchi, favoring Said's idea, writes; "to my mind the condition of the writers and

what he/ she writes about go hand in hand; they suggest an unconscious desire to belong, a feeling that grows more apparent in Said's later style (*The New/Old Idiot* 42). Here the condition of the writer suggests the social, cultural political and religious scenario. Said remarks that

[w]hether we like it or not, its author is writing not just from the dominating view point of a white man in a colonial possession, but from the perspective of a massive colonial systems whose economy, functioning and history had acquired the status of a virtual fact of nature. (*Culture and Imperialism* 134)

This mode of praxis by Said leads a text in the realm of culture and imperialism; it doesn't matter whether a text is colonial or anti- colonial but this theory only accounts this system in any of the text. This liberating method of considering texts allows for both the appreciation of canonical works in which something left often has trouble doing and the necessary amplification of repressed voices within these works continued to be avoided by academic entrenched traditionalists. Said himself mentioned that

The point is that contrapuntal reading must take account of both processes, that of imperialism and that of resistance to it, which can be done by extending our reading of the texts to include what was once forcibly excluded. In reading of a text, one must open it out both to what went into it and to what its author exclude. Each cultural work is a vision of a moment, and we must juxtapose that vision with the various revisions it later provoked. (*Culture and Imperialism* 66-67)

Why does Saidian approach lead any text towards culture? Why is culture so special and unique to him that everywhere whether in *Orientalism* or in *Culture and*

Imperialism he can't stand talking about culture? Anybody doesn't follow unnecessarily anything frequently. Culture generally refers to pattern of human activity and the symbolic structures that give such activity the significance face. It, generally, denotes the whole product of an individual, group or society of intelligent beings resulted out of their interactions to each other. It includes technology, art, science, customs and tradition as well as moral systems and the characteristic behaviors and habits of the selected intelligent entities. The detailed analysis of culture encompasses the four different foundation of society; values. Which comprise ideas about what life seems important guiding the rest of the culture; norms, which consist of expectations how people will behave enforced by the methods, called sanctions of the particular culture. The third one is institution which is the structure of a society within which values and norms are transmitted. Finally artifacts e.g. things, aspects of material culture are derived from cultural values and norms. Said has elegantly included all of the various aspects of culture from both introductory and identical point of view. So to understand its importance in the post colonial discourse, we have to refer to the notion of culture according to Said which he wrote in *The World, the Text, and the Critic*.

In the first place, culture is used to designate not merely something to which one belong but something that one possesses, and along with that proprietary process, culture also designates a boundary by which the concepts of what is extrinsic or intrinsic to the culture come into forceful play. The things aren't controversial. But in the second place, there is a more interesting dimension to this idea of culture as possessing a possession. And that is the power of culture by virtue of its elevated or superior position to authorize, to dominate, to

legitimate, demote, interdict, and validate: in short the power of culture to be an agent of, and perhaps the main agency for powerful differentiation within its domain and beyond it too.

As I use the word 'culture' means two things in particular. First of all it means those practices, like the arts of description, communication and representation, that have relative autonomy from the economic, social and political realms and that often exist in aesthetic forms, one of whose principle aim is pleasure.... Second and almost imperceptibly, culture is a concept that includes a refining and elevating element, each society's reservoir of the best that has been known and thought as Matthew Arnold put it in the 1860s. (Qtd. in *Reading against Culture in Said's Culture and Imperialism* 100)

These two introductory statements are the most comprehensible ever made about culture by Said. From these remarks, one can understand why Said always used to name culture. Culture is, Said argues, the belongingness, possession and proprietary of people accelerated by surrounding which is limited within culture. It includes every sort of practices, tradition, modes of communication and description. Said, therefore, calls culture as the power of one's life to sustain. In Arnoldian sense that Said used, there's everything that is best heard, said, and thought about in culture. Culture has its special significance in post-colonial discourse. Culture creates one's identity and loses too after it gets lost. Many Diaspora writers have been produced to recover one's culture in the foreign land. Culture acts as blood in the body. The more it is described, the more it feels to be lacking. So we can't reach the depth of culture by analyzing it through a few words. Said has tried his best to define it. Non-western discourse is completely based on culture. Since the process of imperialism tries to

pounce over other's culture, Said has coined the term culture and imperialism as an interdependent. To recover the lost culture because of English, French and US imperialism Said introduced the approach of contrapuntal reading. ‘‘Culture, commented Said in *The World, the Text, and the Critic* as

is an instrument for identifying, selecting and affirming certain "good" things, forms, practices, or ideas over others and in so doing culture transmits, diffuses, partitions, teaches, presents, propagates, persuades, and above all it creates and recreates itself specialized apparatus for doing all those things (Qtd. in *Reading against Culture* 176)

In this way, Saidian approach has overemphasized to restore culture opening a text in the realm of it. That's because contrapuntal reading is also referred to as comparative literature. As Said stated that

Each text has its own particular genius, as does each geographical region of the world with its own overlapping experiences and into dependent histories of conflict. As the cultural work is concerned, a distinction between particularity and sovereignty can usefully be made. Obviously no reading should try to generate so much as to efface the identity of a particular text, author or movement. By the same token it should allow that what was, or appeared to be, certain a given work or author may have become subject to disputation. (*Culture and Imperialism* 67)

Said, thus, guaranteed any texts of having two visions, aspects; one for imperialism and the other the voices of resistance to it. That's why contrapuntal reading of a text means analyzing the suppressed meaning hidden inside the text in the area of culture and imperialism. It suggests that the surface reading of a text isn't

enough if a culture is being read as and in a text. For this purpose only semantic interpretation isn't sufficient. Rather it demands a move beyond semantic interpretation. Any text is the product of the particular time, style and authorship. So no individual culture can be reduced to a semantic analysis of a text since the framed and written culture has always been perceived from an individual, vantage point of time, work, place and ability. There should be an approach that can read back from the repressed culture. In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said has applied contrapuntal analysis for reading the text of many Victorian and modern writer. Like Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*, Jane Austen and *Mansfield Park*, Joseph Conrad and his texts *Heart of Darkness* and *Lord Jim*. As Paul A. Bove mentioned

Culture and Imperialism insists equally upon the need for alternatives to the powerful and often unsatisfactory modes of current politics and culture yet in this book Said makes a compelling case for having found that alternative he envisions it for us from the material practices of many men and women, writers and not, who resists and create. (*Hope and Reconciliation* 28)

How a text is treated by contrapuntal analysis is what we call the function of this approach. By looking at a text contrapuntally, we take into account intertwined histories and perspective. Specifically, contrapuntal analysis is used in interpreting colonial texts considering the perspectives of both the colonizer and the colonized which is not helpful but also necessary in making important connections in the text. If one doesn't read with the right background, one many miss the weight behind the presence of Antigua in *Mansfield Park*, Australia in *Great Expectations*, or India in *Vanity Fair*. As Said mentioned;

A comparative or, better a contrapuntal perspective required in order to see a connection between coronation rituals in England and the Indian durbars of the late nineteenth century. That is, we must be able to think through and interpret together experiences that are discrepant, each with its particular agenda and place of developments, its own internal formations, its internal coherence and system of external relationship, all of them coexisting and interacting with others. (*Culture and Imperialism* 32)

Thus, interpreting a novel contrapuntally is interpreting different perspectives simultaneously and seeing how the text interacts with itself as well as with historical or biographical context. It is reading with "awareness both of the metropolitan history that is narrated and of those other histories against which (and together with which) the dominated discourse acts" (*Culture and Imperialism* 51) since what isn't said may be as important as what is Said, it is important to read with an understanding of small plot lines or even phrases. So contrapuntal reading means reading a text "with an understanding of what is involved when an author shows, for instance, that a colonial sugar plantation is seen as important to the process of maintaining a particular style of life in England" (*Culture and Imperialism* 66). Contrapuntal reading takes in both accounts of an issue, it addresses both the perspective of imperialism and the resistance to it; Said argued that the origin and purpose of contrapuntal analysis or comparative literature is to;

move beyond insularity and provincialism and to see several cultures and literatures together, contrapuntally, there is an already considerable investment in precisely this kind of antidote to reductive literature were to get a perspective beyond one's own nation, to see some sort of whole

nationalism and uncritical dogma. After all, the constitution and early aims of comparative instead of the defensive little patch offered by one's own culture, literature and history. (*Culture and Imperialism* 43)

As the Empire thought it its duty to civilize the barbarians of colonized and conquered territory, the British immediately "othered" these people as inferior and in need of British assistance to show them the way. Because certain people were different, they required ruling, supervision, and order. As politicians successfully stereotyped and "othered" the colonized, the British at home had no other knowledge or agency to know otherwise. They "othered " the people of these place as well. And so did the geniuses of the time including Jane Austen, Charles Dickens, Joseph Conrad, William Thackeray and Rudyard Kipling. Born in ignorance, the civilizing mission bred and spread ignorance throughout the motherland. The ignorance as well as the traces of imperialism found in the text of this time provide and accurate gage with which to Judge society. Contrapuntal reading necessitates a vision in which imperialism and literature are viewed simultaneously. This vision provides the post-imperial intellect attitude for the expansion of overlapping cannon between metropolis and formerly colonized society (*Culture and Imperialism* 18). Contrapuntal reading or comparative literature allows the reader to interpret canonical nineteenth and twenty century works with a newly engaged interest.

Summing up, there is the possibility of multiple interpretation of any text. In these meanings contrapuntal analysis opens a text and its meaning in the domain of culture and imperialism from the perspective of the repressor and the repressed, the colonizer and the colonized, of imperialism and the resistance to it. Basically, contrapuntal analysis moves towards the marginal voice of text which seems much more important than the central and since people are fed up with returning to the same

centre every time, the application of the approach takes people in the different realm than the previous one. This implies a redefinition of term such as literary context, society, and of the relationship between literature and social form. So works of literature, particularly those whose manifest subject is empire, must be made to pass through contrapuntal analysis. Thus, this approach approves that any work of art is social so it should be interpreted within the context of its time, style and authorship

3.2. Latent and Manifest Orientalism

The basic notion of latent and manifest Orientalism developed in the text *Orientalism* and contrapuntal reading at underlying level seems synonymous to each other. Because of their similarity the concept of latent and manifest orientalism should be traced too. Let us refer to the dictionary entries of the two head terms 'latent' and manifest;

"Latent": existing but not yet very noticeable, active or well developed"

(*OALD*).

"Manifest": to show sth clearly, especially a feeling an attitude or a quality

(*OALD*).

As per the dictionary entries, manifest means the overt ideas or feelings about something i.e. appearing clearly. So manifest orientalism talks of the views of orientalists about orient which are clearly expressed whereas latent denotes the covert ideas views and feelings which exists but not in a noticeable way or developed way. This expresses the deeper or inner views of orientalists about orient throughout the century. It remains almost constant. Latent and manifest orientalism express the thought, feelings and expressions of orientalists scholars from the west about the east, Arab, Islam and so on. As Said writes:

an almost unconscious (and certain untouchable) positivity, which I shall call latent orientalism, and the various stated view about oriental society, languages, literature, history, sociology, and so forth, which I shall call manifest orientalism. Whatever the changes occurs in knowledge of the orient is found almost exclusively in manifest orientalism; the unanimity, stability, and durability of latent orientalism are more or less constant (*Orientalism* 206)

Latent orientalism is in one's unconscious which is untouchable, inaccessible whereas manifest orientalism is changeable. What happens that before eighteenth century British and French army penetrated into the east and Islam, learned their languages, knew their cultures and ruled them. On the basis of that status of the time, the west formed an idea of the east that the people in the east were irrational, depraved, child like, different, other, barbaric, spiritual and naïve, and what the east wasn't the west was i.e. civilized ,educated, self, peaceful, liberal, virtuous etc. And to civilize the uncivilized or barbaric is the mission of the civilized by occupying their land, and controlling their internal affairs. So the imperializing mission began in the name of civilizing mission. Since they were the outcome of the same culture, surrounding, environment, their view about orient and its unanimity, durability, stability remained same in the deeper level. Like running the Antigua plantation which controls the economy of the country means running the imperial tools of control. Said has stated clearly that they didn't want or intend to unveil those unconscious residue; they were happened to use somehow somewhere. But in the surface or manifest level, they have depicted the change in the nature, society, culture of the orient. That's why Said has written that whatever the changes occur about the orient is only limited to / within the texts which are stated views only not the changed

thoughts. It means to say that these writers wrote in such a style that suggests that the orient still need the care, development, and support for their sustenance. They wrote with the style that though they wrote about orient and their status, they made the orient absent and the reader felt their presence. So Said straightforwardly maintained that 'in discussions of the orient, the orient is all absent whereas one feels the orientalists and what he says as presence' (*Orientalism* 208).

Latent orientalism still sees orient as a locale requiring western attention, reconstruction, even redemption i.e. the orient exists as a place isolated from manifest of European progress in the science, arts, and the commerce. It is transmitted from one generation to another because the orientalists had translated the religious books, explaining their civilizations, portraying their lives of the orient. That's why the western have came up with the same idea about the orient. Another causes of the stability is that "the universities, the professional societies, the explorational and geographical organization the publishing industry" (*Orientalism* 221) about the orient, their land, their culture existed in the west. Whatever the texts Said has interpreted in *Culture and Imperialism*, he did so on the level of manifest and latent. In reading of Kipling and his *Kim*, Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, Austen's *Mansfield Park*, Verdi's *Aida*, and Yeats and his poetry he took help of these levels. In all of those texts, he pointed out that how the author has supported the imperialism and its consequences in their unconscious positivity in very exotic and covert way though. They have superficially manifested their worried and concern for the orients and their culture. Manifest orientalism or the interpretation of novels at this level is the voice of the repressor, or the colonizer or the orientalists which is equal to the central meaning, one aspect of contrapuntal analysis or comparative literature, which speaks from the point of the ruler positing their hegemony. On the contrary latent orientalism what we

call the interpretation of content of the texts at this level longs for the voice of repressed, colonized and imperialized which is the marginal or ignored meaning of the text which is the other or the most important aspect of contrapuntal reading. In other words, it can be said that contrapuntal reading has two aspects or sides: the manifest level and the latent level. That's because manifest and latent orientalism on the one hand and contrapuntal reading on the other hand are identical to each other. This function of double vision is well elaborated by Said even in orientalism. As Said writes that

To make explicit what is usually allowed to remain implicit; to state that which, because of professional consensus, is ordinarily not stated or questioned, to begin again rather than to take up writing dutiful at a designated point and in a way or denied by tradition; above all, to write in and as act of discovery rather than out of respectful obedience to established "truth" these add up to the production of knowledge, they summarize the method of beginning about which this book turns. (Qtd. in *The New/Old Idiot* 39)

Manifest and latent orientalism and contrapuntal analysis are the praxis of texts in the domain of culture and society. The surface or the intentional meaning or interpretation of a text is the analysis on the level of manifest whereas the deeper or underlying meaning of a text is the latent meaning of a text. These two methods are the two aspects of contrapuntal analysis.

Chapter-Four

Application of Supplement in, and Contrapuntal Reading of *Heart of Darkness*

4.1 Supplement in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*

Supplement can be applied in a text or in a work of art or literature in character, theme, technique and plot too. Characterization and theme can mainly be supplemented or what we call deconstructed. Let us see the outcome of supplement in characterization.

Supplement breaks the tradition of centre and metaphysics of presence. In terms of characters, Marlow and Kurtz are the dominant and central characters denoting metaphysics of presence or the centre of the novella attracts us toward them. The whole plot revolves round them. Let me briefly state their characterization before supplementing them.

Charles Marlow is a transtextual character that appears as the narrator in Conrad's *Youth*, *Lord Jim* and *Heart of Darkness*. Conrad introduces Marlow as the main fictional narrator in a work which uses the tale within a tale device. An anonymous character introduces Marlow, as a meditating Buddha because his experiences in the Congo have made him introspective and to a certain degree philosophic and wise, a weathered sea-captain, fluent as a story teller, romantic in sympathies, yet skeptical in opinions who proved to be a fine enabling device. He decided to follow the sea but didn't represent his class. He serves as a mediator between the pastoral world of sea man and the modern world to which his audience belongs. Marlow witnesses the whole story line from the beginning to the end. Marlow functions as the round character of the plot line. As a young man Marlow wished to explore the blank spaces on the map because he longed for adventure. All the actions at the outer, central and inner station take place in front of him. In other

words it can be said that the plot moves forward with his movement and pauses at a place with his stoppage. So the plot develops with his progress.

For Marlow, equipping oneself seems essentially by a moral affair, and the challenges of the wilderness for him are primarily to his ability to make moral judgments, to find meaning in the darkness. His search for the truth of his experience now becomes increasingly associated with the idea of redemption from the wilderness and all that the wilderness may imply. If the company people are 'absurd' and unreal and Marlow needs to be redeemed from them, the wilderness is even more disturbing because in the wilderness there is something invincible, like evil or truth from which Marlow also needs to be redeemed. Marlow is given special emphasis because he is the undertaker of the journey. He is the experiencer and realizer of the events occurred in the journey. He is assigned the role of narrator to narrate the story line.

Before applying supplement, the logocentric characterization of Kurtz is inevitable for the further development. One of the most enigmatic characters in twentieth century literature, Kurtz is a petty tyrant, a dying god, an embodiment of Europe and an assault on European values. Kurtz is a dangerous man because he gives the life to the company's humanistic intentions in the Congo. He returns more ivory than all the other stations put together and does so through the use of absolute force. Mr. Kurtz is an enigmatic, almost mythical character about whom Marlow keeps on hearing in growing terms ever since he sets foot in the company's station in the Congo. He remains a mysterious and elusive character even after Marlow has seen and met him. All Europe had contributed to the making of Mr. Kurtz who had imbibed the culture of all the countries on the continent. As Marlow commented that Mr. Kurtz was an uncommon man who had the power to charm or frighten rudimentary souls in submission. Having lived for a long time in Africa, he had

developed certain wrong belief. He reported that the whites must be regarded as the supernatural being by the savages. Spegele writes that

On the one hand, Kurtz is an incredible egocentric whose intelligence is concentrated ...upon himself with horrible intensity. He is a megalomaniac in whom vanity and the lust for power are closely intertwined. We learn that he sees financial success as the means to satisfy his ambitions; he has come to Africa to make a fortune in the ivory trade. (*Fiction as Political Theory* 330)

Kurtz has dominated the whole Africa. The manager even reported that his method was unsound. He always used to say “my ivory, my station, my intended, my river, my ...” (*Heart of Darkness* 46). He had many plans to carry out there so he didn't like to go out from there in Europe. Even in his illness, he tried to escape running from the steamer. He was both physically and mentally ill. Genius tends to promote evil as the uncommonly gifted individual surrenders to madness. That's why Kurtz is entitled as mad. Marlow describes the last dying momentous as

It was as though a veil had been sent. I saw on that ivory face the expression of somber pride, of ruthless power, of craven terror- of an intense and hopeless despair. Did he live his life again in every detail of desire, temptation, and surrender during that supreme moment of complete knowledge? He cried in a whisper at some image, at some vision – he cried out twice, a cry that was no more than a breath –the horror! The horror! (*Heart of Darkness* 67)

But supplement doesn't regard the universal things. It accepts nothing for granted. Marlow and Kurtz, therefore, aren't the only major characters by themselves

but there are different number of things that accounts for making them the central one which are titled as marginal factor which should be reconsidered too.

Both Marlow and Kurtz are approached by their aunt who had great influence on the people in the trading concern's company. In this way, their story got started by their aunt who is given very short role. Marlow gets his appointment within a few minutes by the approach of his aunt. Looking through this point, his aunt has the credit of Marlow's journey. I.e. Marlow gets into the steamboat through his aunt and starts his journey else not. Aunt seems to be more important than the centre seeking character Marlow.

As Marlow penetrated deeper and deeper into the Congo, his fascination for Kurtz grows too. It means that the development /completion of Marlow's journey and his interest in Kurtz grow simultaneously. But supplement replaces the importance of Marlow and adds other characters responsible for it. Marlow doesn't grow his interest for meeting Kurtz himself or by any events caused by him. So he doesn't have to play any role in that. Rather, he comes to hear about Kurtz by the chief accountant at the outer station. So the accountant is the first character that puts the seed of Kurtz in the heart of Marlow. Thereafter, Marlow gets informed about Kurtz by the manager of Central Station. So manager is the next person of interest for the importance of plot. Finally the Russian Seaman plays the vital role in his understanding of Kurtz. The Russian Seaman informed him much more details and description about Kurtz. The Russian had looked after Kurtz during his illness before Marlow reached there. So supplement places the importance on these three marginal characters than Marlow because Marlow stands for the metaphysics of presence while they are the absence characters of this novella but actually they form the very foundation aim of the journey of Marlow i.e. to meet Kurtz. In the same way, the binary between Marlow

and Kurtz can be created too. Though they both are from the white community, Kurtz is affected and so changed in the darkness. This change in his attitude makes him behave like the natives. He has encountered the evils and dares to face. That's why he wants to stay in the darkness. Besides, he has realized the reality too though he focuses on the appearance whereas Marlow remains unchanged but affected throughout the plot. So, he returns as soon as he has been there in the darkness without facing it. So he is unrealized and runs away without realizing it too.

On the whole, supplement finds nothing much necessary and important about Marlow. So it replaces it since the characterization of Marlow needs an addition to be the whole and brings forwards other marginal characters at the fore.

We can talk about Kurtz in the same way with the application of supplement. Black people, natives, play the vital role in upgrading Kurtz. Kurtz ruled there despite his duty of instructing, improving and humanizing as the civilizing mission. But he drowned himself in the ivory forgetting his duty in the gratification of his lusts. He ruled there in the center of Africa and there were blacks to be ruled by consent. So it is natives that devalued Kurtz. The natives affect Kurtz and turned him into black. It means a civilized went to civilize the natives is turned into barbaric. That's why he is tyrant, demi-god. Killing and death means nothing to him. As he is completely changed in his attitude, he has tried to rule over them by brute force and economical greed of ivory. In the binary of white and black, black seems to be privileged by supplement since white man is changed instead of changing the black. Marlow in his first sight express Kurtz' wilderness: "the dugout, four padding savages, and the lone white man turning his back suddenly on the headquarters, on relief, on thoughts of home...perhaps; setting his face towards the depths of the wildness, towards his empty and desolate station"(*Heart of Darkness* 53). The character of Kurtz gets

deconstructed by supplement for he carried white man's burden. While deconstructing white man's burden, it becomes as white man is (as 's stands for **is** too) burden themselves on the natives. So it's not Kurtz who was ruling with his mission rather it was the natives who let him rule by their consent. Kurtz had yet many plans to implement there. So without blacks and the darkness, Kurtz and his plans would be useless. So they are replaced by the natives.

In the same way, the binary Kurtz and his intended can be supplemented too. The Intended is the embodiment of man's denial of the truth of inner evil. In the painting of the intended, her blindfold shows her blindness to the truth, symbolized by the torch she holds. The truth of man's evil is within her grasp, but yet she allows herself to be lined so she cannot accept this to be true. She is in denial—as far as she knows, if she can't see the evil or that it holds a penetrating presence, it does not exist to her.

Ironically, however, Conrad describes the intended as having "a shade of truthfulness upon [her] features." She is an innocent—the world "halo" compounds that notion; however this too is ironic. She is only a person just as capable of malevolence as no one else, which is symbolized by the black she wears. Marlow only lies about Kurtz's life and death to spare the intended the knowledge of what Kurtz had become--a manifestation of raw human evil. Marlow is the blindfold that shields her from the truth that Kurtz fell to a natural inner compulsion towards iniquity, and that this inner evil exists every where.

Because she denies the existence of an inner evil, the intended is only as innocent as a human being can be. This innocence contrasts severely with Kurtz's own evil. This innocent girl was the fiancée of a murderer "demi-god" who decapitated people. She is the innocent side of the relationship, or the yang. She is pure, but with a

spot of darkness being the potential for evil only because she is human. Kurtz is the dark side of the relationship, the yin. He is an "animated figure of death" who once was noble and innocent, like the fiancée. He went to Africa with good intentions, but was corrupted by unadulterated freedom. With no society to tell him how to act, he fell prey to his inner darkness. The Intended is confined by society-- another reason why she cannot possibly comprehend or even want to know about the inner evil of man. Her Kurtz's health rapidly starts to deteriorate, he speaks out in delirium about this choking evil and how he feels innocents should be protected from the knowledge of it. He says "we must help [the women] stay in that beautiful world of their own, lest ours gets worse" (*Heart of Darkness* 46). He feels that the preservation of ignorance is better than the knowledge of this despotic truth. Once the presence of this natural evil is discovered, a person is nearly always committed to its path. Kurtz's feelings for his intended make him realize that not all truths should be known. The intended symbolizes man's denial and unwillingness to learn truths too awful to know. A person should be aware of his own natural malevolence yet not become evil, finding a balance in between. Conrad shows through the Intended that some truths should never be known. That's why Kurtz knows the truth, the movement he speaks the horror! The horror! He is silenced by God. On the contrary his intended even knowing the truth remains silence in the room.

Supplement deconstructs the characterization in the same process as I have shown by applying with reference to Marlow and Kurtz, the central character and how they lose their importance for the marginal one. Besides supplement plays in the plot of the novel too. In the plot of *Heart of Darkness*, many binaries can be supplemented: The Congo and the Thames, Black and White, Europe and Africa, good and evil, purity and corruption, civilization and triumphant bestiality, male and

female, light and the very heart of darkness, movement and stasis and so on. Movement and stasis can be well discussed. In this novella, movement brings knowledge and realization in Marlow whereas stasis in Kurtz as well as in his intended keeps stability. So movement develops the plot where as stasis matures the plot. Marlow remains unchanged though affected because he is in movement but Kurtz is deadly changed and affected by native since he is stative.

Now I wish to apply supplement in the theme of “exploration of the self” in *Heart of Darkness*. Applying supplement in this theme shows how Conrad deals with the theme of self discovery in this novella and so what supplement producers as an outcome in this theme seems to be explained.

Marlow has unknowingly undertaken the voyage of self discovery. The journey to the soul is to find one's self. Atmosphere pervades the mood or spirit. The atmosphere aids in revealing the journey to find one's soul. The setting, "took in the forest, the creek, the mud, the river-seemed to beckon with a dishonoring flourish before the sunlit face of land a treacherous appeal to the lurking death, to hidden evil, to the profound darkness of its heart" (*Heart of Darkness* 31). Conrad claims that the journey Marlow undertakes and the story he tells will add a new dimension to our conception of heroism. The journey will include a moral and ontological descent into the darkness of the self to discover that which is eternal and true. This novella is too in the form of journey undertaken at both physical and mental or psychological level. Marlow's way of talking about his story seems to claim that some kind of meaning is located at the inner station at the climax of Marlow's journey. Marlow says, "It was the farthest point of navigation and the culminating point of my experience" (*Heart of Darkness* 5). Marlow's commitment to find some meaning for his experience, in other words, includes at least a tentative commitment to an imaginative order, for his way

of talking about his physical journey has an explicit metaphorical structure to it: the concept of a journey provides a conventional vocabulary to evoke the discovery of some unconventional and esoteric truth revealed only within the “heart of darkness”. Conrad does not even mention their exact location which is very peculiar. The main river was described in the form of a snake. A snake can be looked at from many points of views, mythological, biblical, literal and metaphorically. The snake represents all the twists and turns and being able to find one's inner-self is very difficult and twisted. The snake represents some of the animal imagery in the novel. Perhaps this is a sign that the jungle is something living and not just an ordinary jungle.

The characters in the *Heart of Darkness* help depict the theme throughout their environment. There must be something distinctive to relate the theme and storyline too, and the characters play that role. Uniqueness in the novel is that there are only two specific names Marlow and Kurtz but others are named with their position or profession such as, the manager, the helmsman etc that follows under general names. This is very interesting because it's difficult to determine why Conrad would use this approach. Possibly Conrad takes this approach to express the theme of lost identity. This proves that the journey to find one's self is one where not everything appears to be what it seems. In long process one can change very much. Kurtz is a great example, he changed from being a painter and "essentially a great musician, "to becoming corrupt by being swept up and digested by the darkness. Kurtz went past the point of no return; as the Russian remarks, “I went a little farther, then still a little farther- till I had gone so far that I don't know how I'll ever get back” (*Heart of Darkness* 52). He was too corrupted to know that he was being assaulted by the powers of darkness. Finding one's self is a dangerous journey. There are many

distractions along the way that deal with temptation. These 'temptations' are deadly and can lead to a great deal of horror and suffering. This proves that the journey to the soul is not a pleasant journey. Marlon saw the conceivable mystery of a soul that knew no restraint, no faith, no fear, yet struggling blindly with itself. He starts with the aim of observing the implementation of white man's burden into the Dark Continent. That's why Marlow comments that he is penetrating "deeper and deeper into the darkness." His journey was to discover the usefulness of civilizing mission of humanizing, instructing and improving the blacks which he regards as the white man's burden. In this level, *Heart of Darkness* is a symbolic journey to explore the dark region of the mind, the subconscious rather than the Dark Continent of the earth. The human mind can be considered as a dark continent that has not yet fully been explored and understood. So, the exploration of human mind is even more difficult than the exploration of the evil in the Dark Continent. Marlow's journey into the Congo is, thus, a psychological and anthropological night journey, essentially a solitary journey involving a profound change in the voyager. The true night journey can occur only in sleep or in the waking dream of a profoundly intuitive mind. Marlow insists more than is necessary on the dream like quality of narrative. It is a descent into the earth, followed by a return to light, it is a mystical journey. Marlow also says indirectly at one point that, by paying close attention to the reality of the story and the external details, we would be able to arrive at the inner meaning.

Yet to understand the effect of it on me, you ought to know how I got out there. What I saw, how I went up that river to the place . . . It was the farthest point of navigation and the culminating point of my experience. It seemed somehow to throw a kind of light on everything about me and into my thoughts. It was sombre enough, too- and pitiful

not extraordinary in any way-not vary clear either. No, not very clear.

And yet it seemed to throw a kind of light. (*Heart of Darkness* 5)

Marlow is now faced with the dilemma posed by Kurtz moral victory. He knows that Kurtz lifetime denial of man's passions led him to commit unspeakable rites in the name of a humanitarian ideal, but he also realizes that to concentrate solely on man's fallen nature forecloses the possibility of human self-realization, of joy and happiness.

Now, the supplement demands the theme of exploration of self transformed into the exploration of evil. Conrad said that he didn't write with abstract ideas and notions rather he used to write using concrete symbols and imagery to express the concrete ideas. Throughout this work, he used a number of symbols and imagery of evil, darkness and nightmare. The very first thing is the title itself. Heart of darkness refers to the dark continent of Africa esp. the Belgian Congo. So it means the inmost region of the territory which at times was in the process of being explored. The natives led primitive lives and the white man took it upon himself the task of civilizing them, camouflaging his greed for trade and territory. Darkness symbolizes the home of evils and wilderness. So the title suggests that the journey is being carried out in the evil or wilderness. The journey, thus, began into the darkness to explore evil.

Before Marlow begins speaking, the sun is setting and the dark clouds hang over the river. As the first narrator describes

The sun set; the dusk fell on the stream, and lights began to appear along the shore. The Chapman lighthouse, a three legged thing erect on a mud flat, shone strongly. Lights of ships moved in the fairway- a great stir of lights going up and going down. And further west on the

upper reaches the place of the monstrous town was still marked ominously on the sky, a brooding gloom in sunshine, a lurid glare in under the stars. (*Heart of Darkness* 2/3)

This environment also suggests the darkness imagery which shows the sign of evil through the weather also. They are going into evils and for their exploration. Another symbol of darkness imagery is the knitting women in the office sitting outside whom Marlow calls the door of darkness because they were knitting black wools. Similarly, the jungle that Marlow sailed along was extremely dark and foreboding. Marlow also stresses the evil of Roman conquest and brutality, stating their acts as that of conquerors who grabbed the land by power with the weaker unlike the English colonists. So Marlow says that evil is present there in dark clouds, dark fog, dark bushes, dark foliage. Marlow finds the evils throughout the continent of Africa. The vegetation, people, and weather everything is full of evil. Marlow implies that his trip upriver into the geographical heart of ethnographically darkest Africa represents a similar experience: that his voyage is a voyage through the dark backward the abyss of time into the inner heart of darkness, the utterly savage state of being that existed before the civilization tamed the unconscious with its absolute desire for egotistic self- fulfillment by means of moral restraints.

Going up that river was like traveling back to the earliest beginnings of the world, when vegetation rioted on the earth and the big trees were kings.... You thought yourself bewitched and cut off forever from everything you had known once – some where far away in another existence perhaps. . . And this stillness of life did not in the least resemble a peace. It was the stillness of an implacable force brooding

over an inscrutable intention. It looked at you with a vengeful aspect.

(Heart of Darkness 31)

Marlow is informed by a Swede that one of his Swede friend hanged himself because the sun was too hot for him. Here heat of the sun refers to a kind of evil present there. When Marlow reaches to the outer station, he faces many forms of evils and wilderness. On a cliff, he saw that a lot of people, black and naked moved like ants. There he found the machinery decaying in the grass. This decaying made him understand that the English people got decayed in this Dark Continent. A little ahead, he saw six blacks walking in a row with basketful of earth on their heads chained in an iron collar round their neck. They were treated like animal. When he stepped into the grove, he saw the evil lying there. The scene shocked him much. Black shapes lay on the ground huddled together. They all were caught in the attitude of despair, abandonment and pain. They were dying of hunger and starvation in the grove .He states;

Black shapes crouched, lay sat between the trees, leaning against the trunks, clinging to the earth half coming out, half effaced within the dim light, in all the attitude of pain, abandonment and despair.... They were dying slowly –it was very clear. They were not enemies, they were not criminals, they were nothing earthly now- nothing but black shadows of disease and starvation lying confusedly in the greenish gloom. *(Heart of Darkness 14)*

Thus, there is ominous stillness in the atmosphere; it is something sinister and destructive when Marlow speaks of thick jungle, impenetrable forest, empty stream- they all suggest evil. Marlow believed that these evils were present in the darkest continent of Africa. But supplement defers the sense of evil too stating as the real

cause of these evils aren't the natives but someone else. But Marlow seeks truth. Before he commences his voyage he believes that he knows the truth. He knows the truth about the need to civilize the savages of Africa, he knows the truth about their good and moral intentions and finally he believes that there is no other truth to consider. So when Marlow faces white agents, the manager in particular, he is disgusted and begins to turn away from his civilized white colleagues. At the same time, jungle begins to reveal into its own truth-the drums, the wild humanity, the beginning of history and freedom. That's why the first narrator says at last that "the offering was bared by a black bank of clouds and the tranquil waterway leading to the uttermost ends of the earth flowed somber under an overcast sky-seemed to lead into the heart of an immense darkness" (*Heart of Darkness* 75).

Marlow is keen to meet a universal genius, Mr. Kurtz because of everybody's appraisal of him. Mr. Kurtz is obsessed with ivory; he is possessive of everything around him and he has brutalized and subjugated the natives in the worst manner possible. He is nothing else but an embodiment of evil caused by the surrounding he lived in. He has hung human heads and skulls on top of the posts outside the building in which he lives in a bid to terrify the natives. He participates in their midnight dances and unspeakable rites like cannibalism. He has forgotten his duty for the gratification of his lusts and desires. Manager reported that he has done more harm than good to the company. After many days walking on foot with the caravan of sixty men through muddy land, through long grass, through thickets, Marlow arrives at the central station. There he feels the greedy natures of the whites. The manager with his uncle tried to weave a conspiracy for gaining more ivory and the white stayed there for ivory. The manager is epitome of the negative effects of the institution of imperialism. He is corrupt, uncaring, and arrogant and self-centered. He symbolizes

the arrogance of Europeans as they encountered native Africans. His good health symbolizes the everlastingness of Europeans who invaded Africa and their ability to continually come to Africa and rape it of its natural resource. He is the true symbol of the evil and cold-heartedness of imperialist. The manager was an illustration of an established imperialist power. He was well settled in, as demonstrated by the fact he controls all the station. An example of his over other was when he had the black boy thrashed for the burning of a held. In addition, he is expansionist and wishes to destroy Kurtz and gain a monopoly on the ivory trade. The manager's discussion with his uncle is yet another example of his ruthlessness and amorality.

Marlow realizes that the manager is evil and has a certain dislike for him as do all of the natives. Through this, symbolizes the overall detestation of imperialized countries toward the aggressor. By assigning all the blame for the terrible condition on the manager, Conrad stresses the feelings that Europeans were not bringers of technology, but distributors of immoral corruption. Ivory seemed to sing up, invade the whole air. "The word ivory rang in the air, was whispered, was signed. You would think they were praying to it" (*Heart of Darkness* 20/21). Marlow has feeling that the world allowed one man to steal horse, while it did not allow another man even to look at a halter. When Marlow notices "a small sketch oils, on panel, representing a woman draped and blindfolded, carrying a lighted torch, the background was sombre-almost black. The movement of the woman was stately, and the effect of the torch-light on the face was sinister" (*Heart of Darkness* 22). Kurtz's oil painting of blindfolded woman carrying in lighted torch has a distinct significance. It symbolizes the blind and foolish ivory company forging its way into the jungle and enlightening the savage natives. However, they do not really realize the detrimental effect they have on

Africa. Most importantly the painting shows Kurtz's understanding of his role and position in the continent.

This painting expresses that the civilizing mission of white to the natives failed. The whites were in Africa with the purpose of insight and instruction but they got engaged in the fulfillment of their greed and lust. Their light brings darkness for them. The light remains unused by the natives. That is why the woman is blindfolded. Marlow being white from the elite class tried to uncover these barbaric effects of colonization and commercialization. Evil happens when great men do but nothing.

When asked by Marlow, the brick maker replies that Mr. Kurtz was a prodigy. He was an emissary of pity, science, and progress and devil knows what else. He means to say that Mr. Kurtz brought light, pity, peace and progress to the natives. But the process of commercialization, colonization and politics had destroyed the environment there. Now Africa hasn't her earlier charms and joy in her environment and surroundings. Marlow expressed;

Going up that river was like traveling back to the earliest beginning of the world, when vegetation rioted on the earth and the big trees were kings. An empty stream, a great silence, an impenetrable forest. The air was warm, heavy, thick, and sluggish. There was not joy in the brilliance of sunshine. The long stretches of the waterway ran on, deserted into the gloom of overshadowed distance. (*Heart of Darkness* 31)

Roger D. Spegele has written the evil effect colonialization. Spiegel stated that the colonists' actions are prompted by greed and corruption; their expressed mission is an absurdity. The humanitarians, the civilizers of the blacks, have become instead tormentors and enslavers. Even the words they use distorted beyond recognition

(*Fiction as Political Theory* 327). He was sent there for conducting the civilizing mission but seeing ivory he lost the control over his lust and greed and started gathering ivory and sending it to the company and its station. He sent as much ivory as all of other staffs of the company put together. He started to make his fortunes in Africa. He wanted to become such a prosperous man that “he desired to have kings meet him at railway-station on his return from some ghastly”. On the same token Marlow stated that he won’t be forgotten. Whatever he was, he was not common. In *Heart of Darkness*, Conrad successfully manipulates color, the imitation of color and description of color to conceal his symbolic messages to the reader. When Marlow is staring at the map on the wall of the Brussels office, he observes large section of red, which he remarks as “always good signs of civilizations”. The red denotes English territories abroad. He also recognizes yellow areas that represent his homeland's Belgium's spheres of influence. Furthermore, Conrad uses black and white repeatedly to describe good and evil. Although the “invaders” are white, Marlow describes them as having black souls, while the oppressed blacks are described as having pure and white souls. Marlow's predecessor is also killed over two black hens. In the Brussels office, Marlow sees white women weaving black cotton, while in African he sees black women with white cotton. One of the more distinctive examples of color symbolism occurs when the white men choking the people of Africa.

Conrad has used terrific animal imagery to describe the wilderness, savagery, primitive and the evil in the *Heart of Darkness*. As Samir Elbarbary writes for the use of animal imagery to signify the primitive;

A simple image brings out Kurtz Status. When left to himself, he becomes a quadruped crawling on all fours back to his station, back to his prehuman state. He must have had immense stamina (ruthless

power) required for the performance of his cannibalizing task. There are instances of man- demon equation: He looked at least seven feet long, his eyes are described as fiery, his love as diabolic and his hate as unearthly. He is represented emblematically by his grapping mouth. Initially Kurtz appears to Marlow with his mouth open wide- it gave him a weirdly voracious aspect, as though he had wanted to swallow all the air, all the earth, all the men before him. Moreover, Marlow has a vision of him on the stretcher, opening his mouth voraciously, as if to devour all the earth with all its mankind. (*Conrad and Late Victorians* 124)

Marlow, thus, finds evil throughout the continent of Africa in the darkness. While applying supplement, his vision will get replaced by the paradoxical thought. Actually, darkness is not in Africa. Rather this darkness refers to the evil practices of the colonizers of the Congo, their sordid exploitation of the natives and suggests that real darkness is not in Africa but in Europe, and that its heart is not in the breasts of black Africans but in all whites who countenance and engage in colonialistic enterprise. It can be said that certain degree of darkness lies within every person, but this darkness will not surface unless given the correct environment. The darkness, however, can emerge and ultimately destroy the person if not checked by reason. If one's inner darkness does surface, the victim then is given the opportunity to reach a point in personal growth, and to gain a sense of self-knowledge from it. That is, when one's darkness appears, one must learn from this experience how he or she can prevent similar results from occurring in the future. It is ultimately through self-knowledge that we gain the power to defeat our inner darkness, and all of its

elements. Just as everyone has the potential for evil within themselves, we too have the potential for true goodness.

In this *Heart of Darkness*, the enigmatic Mr. Kurtz who, instead of civilizing the natives has himself become a barbarian; he has become to identify himself with the savages by presiding over their midnight dances and participating in their unspeakable rites like cannibalism. He has given a free outlet to his monstrous passions and lust in the wilderness and has been experiencing abominable satisfactions. He has become a part of heart of darkness, an embodiment of the superstition and the evil that is part of the unexplored land. The natives have begun to regard him as a man god, as a sort of deity. All the animals' imagery used for him by Conrad support us for this contradictory idea that Kurtz himself became primitive.

Marlow realized this evil through the epiphany. The moment in which Marlow experiences his epiphany is right after the helmsman gets killed by natives, which are associated with Kurtz. The thing that Marlow realizes is the savagery of man and the corruption of the ivory trade. The actual change takes place when Marlow sees the helmsman die. Marlow sees the death take place and is shocked.

The side of his head hit the wheel twice, and the end of what appeared a long cane clattered round and knocked over a little campstool . . . my feet felt so very warm and wet that I had to look down. . . It was the shaft of a spear that . . . had caught him in the side just below the ribs. I had to make an effort free my eyes from his gaze and attend to the steering. . . I declared it looked as though he would presently put to us some question in an understandable language; but he died without uttering a sound, without moving a limb, without twitching a muscle.

... 'He is dead, murmured the fellow, immensely impressed. 'No doubt about it,' said I. (*Heart of Darkness* 43/44)

When this happened, Marlow realized the savagery of man, horror of death, and the corruption of the ivory trade. He realizes that in the ivory trade, that the ivory is more valuable than human life and that trades will do almost anything to get it. Marlow also realizes man's savagery in the event that man puts greater value on riches than on human life. This is the epiphany of Marlow in "*The Heart of Darkness*".

The epiphany of Marlow in "*The Heart of Darkness*" has significance in the overall story. The theme of the story is how every man has inside himself a heart of darkness and that a person, being alienated like Kurtz, will become more savage. Marlow, in his epiphany, realizes the savagery of man and how being alienated from modern civilization causes one to be savage and raw. This savagery is shown especially in the death of the helmsman, which is where Marlow's epiphany takes place, but the savagery is also shown in Kurtz. The link that Kurtz has to the natives and the death of the helmsman is that the natives work for Kurtz. This also shows how Kurtz has become more savage—that killing and death has no effect on him anymore. His savagery is shown by how the natives will kill to get what they want and Kurtz wants. This savagery shown by the natives and Kurtz in the death of the helmsman links both Marlow's epiphany and the theme of "*The Heart of Darkness*" together. When Marlow realized seeing Kurtz that the evil lies not in blacks but in white, he tried to return from Africa as fast as possible. Both Marlow and Kurtz must face the darkness within themselves. Fortunately Marlow leaves the heart of darkness as quickly as he arrives. He glimpses the edge and knows that the edge is near but the ethic of the jungle doesn't penetrate Marlow. He takes away lessons such as the humanity of black helmsman and the corruption of his colleagues but his spirit

remains in fact affected, most likely because he realizes early that the legend of Kurtz and the man Kurt both are empty. That's why Kurtz's death is Marlow's salvation.

In this way, supplement replaces the meaning of the theme "exploration of the self" and adds a new theme "exploration of evil" since the previous wasn't complete in itself needed an addition. This process of replacing previous one and adding the new theme is carried infinitely in supplementarity.

4.2 Contrapuntal Reading of *Heart of Darkness*

The two aspects of contrapuntal analysis namely the manifest and the latent can well be applied in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. Conrad was the master of the journey by the sea and the river. He has provided us with a lot of novels and novella dealing with such experiences. *Heart of Darkness* is the most complex of all at every level. The novella looks like the beloved that seems new even after the hundred times of look. Number of critics and theorists has applied a number of critical tools in this novella. Despite that the question is raised, "Is there a particular method one can use in analyzing Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*?" And the answer is brought from *Wittgenstein* that there is not any philosophical method but these are indeed methods like different therapies. Contrapuntal reading or analysis is one of those different therapies that focus on the imperialism and the resistance to it. In other words, anti-colonialism and colonialism can be brought as themes in the text.

Conrad's works are full of the modern themes. His modernity is expressed through existential theme: man's progressive psychological alienation from his fellow beings like in *Under Western Eyes*, nihilism and the need for salutatory illusions in *Victory* and *The Secret Agent*, terrorism and the middle-class regime as in *The Secret Agent*, the wages of imperialism and colonialism as in *Heart of Darkness*. The surface

reading of *Heart of Darkness* at manifest level may interpret the novella as the vindication of anti-colonialism.

Heart of Darkness, a story Conrad derived from his personal experience in the Congo in 1890, exemplifies his realization through the tale of Marlow, who confronts and reflects upon the horrible truth he witnesses in the heart of jungle *Heart of Darkness* is frequently interpreted as anti-imperialistic novella by many critics stating that Conrad actually intended to unveil and unmask the hypocrisy and barbarism of European imperialism and commercialism.

The manifest interpretation of the novella might prove the text to be anti colonial in its surfacial meaning. But at the latent level, *Heart of Darkness* is also a pure multilayered postcolonial text contrapuntally.

Now contrapuntal analysis moves towards the voice of repressed or colonized in this novella. As Said states that “this imperial attitude is beautifully captured in the complicated and rich narrative form of Conrad’s great novella *Heart of Darkness* written between 1898 and 1899” (*Culture and Imperialism* 22). The sense of imperialism can be expressed through many ways. Conrad himself was the victim of colonialism. His families got exiled from Poland to Siberia because of his father’s involvement in their revolutionary activities on behalf of Poland. Then he chose to follow the sea as a profession in his youth to recover from the loss and to feel the sense of freedom, openness and democracy he had lacked in his childhood. What he chose to remain far from colonialism brought him near and near. As he was the product of the same society, however he tried to escape from its effect, he somehow somewhere happened to advocate for it. So his novels and novella have the traces of colonialism which can be traced through symbols and imagery.

Heart of Darkness is on one level about imperialism. Understood in the early nineteenth century as primarily a political system in which powerful nations controlled other, imperialism came gradually to refer to a system of economic as well as political dominance. Conrad's novella recognizes both of these dimensions. As the French man-of-war firing into coastal Africa symbolizes, European powers are seeking to establish and maintain political control over the African continent. Law plays a vital role in both the political and economic aspects of imperialism, and in passing of law. *Heart of Darkness* reinforces this point. Marlow's trip to Africa, for starters is buoyed by law. He enters into an employment contract with the Belgian company, and this contract not only addresses salary and length of the employment but also travel to the Congo region and other matters. The company also asks Marlow to sign a document promising not to disclose trade secrets and even to undergo a formal medical examination before departing.

The colonialist trace emerged in the text when the first narrator commented the service of Thames River. "The Thames had given great and useful service to the needs of men and the needs of great nation (*Heart of Darkness* 2). The Thames is a symbol of heroic deeds of England's part. But this heroic image can no longer be sustained for it is the nature of practical activity that usefulness cannot be completely dissociated from violence and savagery. The expression well stated that all the great people of Europe did their adventures following the Thames. As the first narrator stated that "it had known and served all the men of whom the nation is proud, from sir Francis Drake to sir John Franklin . . ." (*Heart of Darkness* 2). The first statement of Marlow about Africa that "this also has been one of the dark places of the earth" (*Heart of Darkness* 2) is the key thrust of which shows that the most prominent features of man's nature "his vanity greed, lust for domination-are permanent and

cannot be eradicated by humanitarian activity" (*Fiction as Political Theory* 325).

Similarly, Marlow justifies the acts of Romans as an outcome of brute force and nature. Their conquering efforts were violent and rude against the weak one. As he remarks;

They grabbed what they could get for the sake of what was to be got. It was just robbery with violence, aggravated murder on a great scale, and men going at it blind The conquest of the earth, which mostly means taking it away from those who have a different complexion or slightly flatter noses than ourselves, is not a pretty thing when you look to it too much. (*Heart of Darkness* 4)

Marlow defends the act of Romans which was fortnightly but what about the colonialism of nineteenth century in which the conquerors justified their acts of violence, atrocities, thunder, brutality for the civilizing the future good for others. Marlow says that Romans should have thought about it. But should they have thought about it? Truly speaking, Marlow always found the gap between what is and what ought to be or between the ideal and the real. He sees a gunboat firing shells blindly into the continent at invisible enemies, the denotation of explosives on a cliff which wasn't in the way anything and black one chained together as criminals. This gap distances the reader from the external vision of Marlow. Idealism, therefore, doesn't raise man's morality but it lowers it. These experiences cause Marlow believe more clearly the true character of civilization.

The silent theme of imperialism appears in Marlow's visit to the doctor for his check up. Marlow becomes angry when the doctor asks him if any one of his parents is mad. But the real significant of his statement is very much underlying. The company is mainly penetrated into Africa for trade i.e. ivory. The greed of economic

benefit creates havoc in the continent. So the company wants to know the strength and tolerate and bearable power of employee's mind so that one couldn't get soaked or fainted seeing the evil of commercialization and imperialism in the darkest continent. So, only people with powerful, harsh and cruel heart are required to face and create the consequences of colonialism in Africa.

Similarly, the use of language plays vital role in the colonial text because novels are intelligible to those who know the language "Brussels" is likened to "a white sepulchers", "the offices of the trading company" which runs the steamers on the Congo to "a house in the city of the dead". The African natives are said to be as black shapes, shadow, and bundles of acute angles etc which show the dehumanizing effect of colonialist rule on the ruled. This sort of language is set in one's unconscious which is brought out through writing, slippery and so on. When Marlow sees the natives being happy and free, he becomes jealous of them. On the contrary, when he sees them dying, or in miserable condition, he became merciful and pitiful. Marlow states that "they were dying slowly. It was very clear. They were not enemies, they were not criminals, they were nothing earthly now, nothing but black shadows of disease and starvation, lying confusedly in the greenish gloom" (*Heart of Darkness* 14).

Again he further notices the black boys leaning hungrily against the trees. So he piteously remarks;

Near the same trees two more bundles of acute angles sat with their legs drawn up. One, with his chin propped on his keeps, stared at nothing, in an intolerable and appalling manner: his brother phantom rested its forehead, as if overcome with a great weariness; and all about

others were scattered in every pose of contorted collapse. (*Heart of Darkness* 15)

There he gives a biscuit to a boy as if one fed a dog as that it sits in a corner bowing its head. He uses such kind of language for blacks but just a little further, when he sees white accountant he uses different language. Let's observe it too.

When near the buildings I met a white man, in such an unexpected elegance of get up that in the first moment I took him for a short of vision. I saw a high starched collar, white cuffs, a light alpaca jacket, a snowy trousers, a clear necktie, and varnished boots. No hat. Hair parted, brushed, oiled, under a green-lined parasol held in a big white hand. (*Heart of Darkness* 15)

The above statement shows that Marlow had still kept the conventional discrimination between whites and blacks. These kinds of habits depend upon one's environment. However one tries, can't escape out of it. So Conrad has written this novella using the dehumanizing language for blacks and standard language for whites. Conrad expressed glory for whites but secures pity and mercy for blacks. Furthermore he uses words like *brutal, monstrous, vengeful, implacable, inscrutable, evil, accursed, hopeless, dark etc.* so constantly in talking about Africa and her people that they begin to be tinged by the qualities that these words connote. These words suggest a kind of dominating habit of people. Again, the woman who comes abreast of the steamer is described in terms of wilderness:

“She stood looking at us without a stir and like the wilderness itself, with an air of brooding over an inscrutable purpose” (*Heart of Darkness* 59). By describing the woman in terms of wilderness, Marlow transfers its evil qualities to her, and she

becomes the personification of the spirit of the jungle “the fascination of abomination” (*Heart of Darkness* 4).

Similarly, Marlow has an intense desire of exploration in his childhood. He wanted himself indulged into the sea for the exploration of unexplored places into the dark continent of the earth. He states;

Now when I was little chap I had a passion for maps. I would look for hours at South America or Africa, or Australia and lose myself in all the glories of exploration. At that time there were many blank spaces on the earth, and when I was one that looked particularly inviting on a map. I would put my finger on it and say, “When I grow up I will go there.” (*Heart of Darkness* 5)

This passion for maps and exploration hobbies in Conrad through Marlow shows the colonialistic bias inherent within his psychic residue. As a result, Conrad followed the sea, maps and explored the unexplored places growing it as his career in his adulthood. Similarly, the white penetrated into the darkness for gaining more fortunes. When Marlow asks the fat man why he had come to Africa, the man replied that his goal was to make money. Marlow himself reports to his aunt that rather than employment of mankind, profit is the main motif of company. Even the army, Fresleven had killed the village chief for two hens.

Marlow reaches Kurtz and sides him as the lesser of two evils because Kurtz recognizes his own depravity on his deathbed. What, however, did that depravity consist of? According to Marlow, Kurtz’ depravity consists of a terrible egotism which made him seek gratification for various lusts in the unlawful ways which seems to be nothing more than Kurtz adoption of customs of African tribes. So what Marlow implies is that Kurtz tribalization is symbol of his depravity. Kurtz’ tribalization,

therefore, can be seen as a rejection of the western materialization in a favor of a simpler and more honest way of life. So from African point of view Kurtz has done nothing abominable in recognizing the virtues of his way of life. But from western point of view, only by becoming part of another culture can one understand and appreciate it. Kurtz is an enlightened person, far more advanced than his contemporaries in his thinking about primitive society. But the problem with Kurtz which Marlow doesn't realize, is not that he went native but that he didn't become native enough, for Kurtz perverted the customs of the tribe, making them a means to a deplorable end namely, keeping the ivory flowing and colonialism a profitable ventures for his employers and he never assumed the positive virtues of the tribe. So Marlow implies that the seemingly noble, actually corrupt Kurtz was produced by all of Europe that he was a type of colonizer. Marlow realizes that the quest for ivory becomes more important to Kurtz than the mission to civilize the natives: He began using violence and power to get more ivory which adopt the signs of colonialization and commercialization. And Spegele has written that

He (Kurtz) becomes obsessed with the accumulation of ivory, exploiting the natives to scour the countryside to further his ambition. His method of putting down recalcitrant was to have their heads cut off, and dried and shrunken, placed on stakes around his house as a reminder to *les autres*. (*Fiction as Political Theory* 330)

This shows that Kurtz was a megalomania in whom the vanity and the lust for power are intertwined. That's why, Conrad has Marlow describe Kurtz' head as an "ivory ball" when it becomes clear that Kurtz has descended into madness and corruption himself because of ivory. The same ivory draws the white men to Africa and turns their minds from building commerce and civilization to exploitation and

madness. The significance of ivory begins to move away from avarice and takes on purely evil connotation as Marlow approaches those hearts of darkness: the inner station and Kurtz. Kurtz's relationship with ivory seems to have been reiterated by every company member through the course of the story. Of course Kurtz "harvested" more ivory than all the other stations combined, and therefore it almost seems appropriate that Conrad would use extensive ivory imagery in describing Kurtz. Earlier, during his digression on Kurtz, Marlow says, "The wilderness had patted him on the head, and behold, it was like a ball-an ivory ball". By the time that Kurtz is carried out on a stretcher the evil has so overtaken him that "I could see the cage of his ribs all astir, the bones of his arms waving. It was as though an animated image of death carved out of old ivory had been shaking its hand with menaces at a motionless crowd of men that made of dark and glittering bronze" (*Heart of Darkness* 57). Once he threatened to shoot the Russian, who was squirreling a small quantity of ivory- "because he could do so, and he had a fancy for it, and there was nothing on earth to prevent him from killing whom he jolly well pleased" (*Heart of Darkness* 54). The almost god-like power that Kurtz wields is unchecked, save for disease.

In *Heart of Darkness* ivory plays a dual role in significance. On one hand it is representative of evil and greed, and on the other, it is representative of the measures taken to acquire it in the first place (i.e. Mistreatment of blacks). Conrad's use of ivory in order to symbolize darkness is also in keeping with his occasional reversal of the colors normally associated with good and evil, white and black. Ivory as a material is one of the purest and whitest found in nature, while Kurtz's soul is purely black. That's why the Russian told Marlow that Kurtz always used to say "My ivory, my intended, my station, my river, my" (*Heart of Darkness* 46).

Kurtz last words “The horror! The horror!” for Marlow referred to the blackness of Kurtz' soul. But there is more to the blackness that meets Marlow's eyes. For Marlow the horror first refers to what he has done to the natives and only secondarily to what he has done to himself, since the later is only the effect, not the cause of the former. Consequently, the full application of Kurtz last words wouldn't only be to himself but also to men like Marlow who seemed to hate colonialism but really lived by its values and associated the practices of the blacks with the road to perdition. So the moment he speaks horror realizing the havoc he created on the natives with his greed, lust and power, God couldn't bear and silenced him.

The other famous line in the story "exterminate all the brutes" demands the similar interpretation. Marlow takes the word “brutes” to refer to Africans and interprets the face that the sentence comes at the end of a document written to suggest a better way of approaching the less developed as meaning that Kurtz become more savage than so called savages. But Marlow's interpretation is tinged by a colonialist bias. Given that Kurtz become one with an African tribe and learned to understand the meaning of their customs, his words may be taken to mean that the only way Africa could develop would be if the real brutes, or savages, the colonizers, were removed. Because once the whites penetrated into the jungle don't wish to return back. As Russian told Marlow “I went a little farther, than still a little farther-till I had gone so far that I don't know how I'll ever get back” (*Heart of Darkness* 52). Besides, a lot of evidences can be drawn out to support this colonialistic bias.

Ambivalent is probably the most important way to sum up Conrad's attitude towards colonialism. So while applying contrapuntal analysis to this great novella “*Heart of Darkness*”, the text is interpreted as both anti-colonial at the manifest levels whereas purely colonial at the latent level.

Chapter- 5

Comparison of Supplement and Contrapuntal Reading

The two previous chapters are the analytical and conceptual introduction of supplement and contrapuntal reading. Now, these two methodological terms are being studied comparatively in this chapter. A comparative study points out the similarities and differences present within the elements of study. They can be studied comparatively only as method / tool for analyzing literary works. There are many similarities and differences between them. But let the similar points be described first.

1. When these tools are compared, the very first thing that makes them similar is freeplay, a Derridean term introduced in his seminar paper "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of Human Science", though Said doesn't completely aware us about it. To take out multiple meanings freeplay is always used there whether directly, knowingly or indirectly and unknowingly. What I want to express is that contrapuntal analysis can't stand carrying out the freeplay on words whereas Derrida obviously declare the freeplay in supplement. As Derrida regards freeplay;

Freeplay is the disruption of presence. The presence of an element is always a signifying and substitutive reference inscribed in a system of differences and the movement of a chain. Freeplay is always interplay of absence and presence, but if it is to be radically conceived, freeplay must be conceived of before the alternative of presence and absence; being must be conceived of as presence or absence beginning with the possibility of freeplay and not other way around. [*Free is added to play*]. (*Structure, Sign and Play...1125*)

As per the idea of freeplay, presented by Derrida, it, first, destroys the presence. Here presence plays the role of metaphor which has its role in both Derrida's supplement and Said's contrapuntal analysis. Presence in Derrida refers to the centre, the dominant meaning of a text prevailing for generations i.e. presence refers to the prevalent meaning of the text. When we hear Browning lip touching line "my love is like a red red rose", the presence of the prevalent meaning that comes to our mind is that poet's beloved is as soft, delicate, touchy, attractive and loving like rose. But this prevalent meaning is destroyed or disrupted by both supplement and contrapuntal reading. In other words, both of the tools can be said to depart from the centre/ presence breaking it.

2. The next thing that freeplay does is the interplay between presence and absence. Now, the new thing that arrives to us is an absence. So freeplay produces the absence one, which is called the margin or the meaning that is put off which is main concern of these two. Likewise beloved may be the piercing thorn grown in the rose or the beloved may be as unbalanced as the rose. So producing an absence, freeplay interacts between the presence and the absence. This presence in Saidian approach can be called manifest or the voice of colonizer, one aspect of contrapuntal reading whereas the absence may be called latent or the voice of the colonized, the other aspect of contrapuntal analysis.

So the first and second similarities that emerged between them are that both of the analytical tools are operated on the basis of freeplay on words between the presence, centre or closure, and absence, margin and flexibility of a text. That means to say that both of the methodological tools move beyond

the centre subverting tradition called logocentrism. I.e. they are absence oriented.

3. The third similar point between them is that they open a text for multiple interpretations. Both of these tools place any text in a race of meanings possible from any point of view. Derrida argued that a signifier possesses a chain of signified or a signified itself is signifier which creates slippery, ambiguities in a language. Because of this slippery nature, ambiguities of language, multiple meaning in a text becomes possible. I.e. freeplay always defers one meaning and produces another. It doesn't mean that meaning gets denied in Derridean approach but rather it opens a text in the race of meanings. For the purpose of multiple interpretations, Derrida has well explained it as

There are thus two interpretations of interpretation. The one seeks to decipher, dreams of deciphering, a truth or an origin which is free from freeplay and from the order of the sign, and lives like an exile the necessity of interpretation. The other, which is no longer turned toward the origin, affirms freeplay and tries to pass beyond man and humanism, the name man being the name of that being who, throughout the history of the metaphysics or of ontotheology – in other words, through the history of all of his history – has dreamed of full presence, the reassuring foundation, the origin and the end of the game. (*Structure, Sing and Play...* 1125)

In the language of new criticism, these tools follow the system of close reading/analysis to some extent while reading a literary work in any work of art, the symbols, imagery, metaphors, figures of speech irony etc too are

considered by these tools. What can be said that for both of the methods textual analysis is the important factor. With the help of freeplay, trace and presence/ absence binary meaning is interpreted from the work of art. Both of these tools are forms of textual analysis combined with theoretical vision and background having their primary concern to unmark the hidden or marginalized meaning to be privileged. Both of them prioritize the suppressed meaning. Whatever the terms Derrida has proposed in deconstruction has the same vision and method. Différance, supplement, pharmakon, and hymen and so on have the same vision as well as function of undecidability. All of these terms are introduced in different ways to read different figures but with same method. In the same way, Said has also introduced many new terms borrowing from different fields and disciplines with the same method of close analysis privileging the marginal or repressed desire of unconscious in which one lives, grows and interacts i.e. manifest vs. latent forming as contrapuntal analysis.

From the similarity, it comes to be known that the point of departure or starting point of both of the tools are same i.e. freeplay or close reading or what may be called the textual analysis. " Both of them depart from the centre towards margins. That means they are placed on the same line. After describing their similarities, all of which are caused due to freeplay, the differences between them also are desirably resulted.

1. The first difference lies in their status of meaning. Supplement or différance never stops to only one marginal meaning. That is it always puts off the meaning for the further one. It defers the meaning and longs for the other one. So différance or the supplement can be said to lie in the cyclic process of longing for meaning since we can't determine that which the final meaning for

it as the stoppage is or let's say ending point or starting point. As Derrida writes;

[t]he indefinite process of supplementarity has always already infiltrated presence, always already inscribed there the space of repetition and the splitting of the self. Representation in *the abyss* of presence is not an accident of presence; the desire of presence is, on the contrary, born from the abyss (the indefinite multiplication) of representation, from the representation of the representation.

(*Grammatology* 163)

In other words, it can be said that for the first time supplement takes out the second meaning i.e. marginal regarding the first one as prevalent, dominant or centre seeking interpretation. But it doesn't stop or limit itself up to the second meaning. Now what supplement does is that regarding the second meaning, which I've called marginalized one, as the prevalent which in Derrida's word called deferral of the second meaning, it longs for the third interpretation. And this process of 'longed for meaning' is always carried out till infinite sets of meaning come out. That's why Derrida say that it always puts off or defers meaning. So it can be said that meaning is never fixed in a text because of the application of the supplementarity or *différance* "which tells us in a text what a text is, it tells us in writing what writing is"

(*Grammatology* 163).

The case is just opposite with contrapuntal analysis. The meaning in a text when applied this tool is not absolutely fixed but almost fixed which can be well described. The contrapuntal analysis longs for only two interpretations of a text as stated by Said i.e. the first interpretation form colonial perspective,

called the voice of colonizer, and the next or the last one is from colonized perspective, i.e. the voice of the ruled. In between the process of searching these two meanings, some other may be happened to come out which Said didn't mention. For example in Austen's *Mansfield Park*, the author or the colonizer interprets the Antigua plantation as the backbone of the economy for the country, the base of development which should seek the thanking to them. But in the same text, the other interpretation which we call from the perspective of the colonized is that the controlling and conducting of Antigua plantation from the white means the control and conduction of an imperial means of economy. Said stops up to here. He didn't want to mention any further marginal meaning putting off the second. In other words, the meaning through contrapuntal analysis in a text is almost fixed since Said himself said that "there are two sides to every question" (*Culture and Imperialism* 31).

2. The second and the most important difference between supplement and contrapuntal reading appears when they move a little further from the centre. Whatever the meaning is brought forward in a text with the application of supplement remains within the text or textuality. Supplement doesn't move beyond the text i.e. outside the text i.e. in social, culture and political realm. Meaning, thus, remain completely textual in deconstruction.

But the point of contrast with contrapuntal reading is that it doesn't remain within the text and discourse. It enters into the realm of culture, imperialism and post colonial discourse. Meaning, therefore, is contextual as the mixture of historicity of text and textuality of history when applied this analysis in any text. Many example can be moved forward for the support when the literary texts like Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, Austen's *Mansfield*

Park or Dickens' *Great Expectations* read with the perspective of supplement or différance, the different sorts of interpretation will be advanced but Said has read the same texts contrapuntally in *Culture and Imperialism* whose output is only in the realm of imperial and cultural domain. He didn't concern with the other meaning those texts can produce but kept himself limited within cultural or contextual meaning but from both the ruler and the ruled perspectives.

3. The third difference can be traced in their nature. Supplement establishes the play in the text in course of subverting center or breaking hierarchy. Despite this, it doesn't state the margin as the primary concern or the prior one to be noticed. For example when supplement subverts the binary the nature and culture, it tries to draw the emphasis upon the margin called culture establishing the freeplay but it doesn't fix the margin as the primary concern. Supplement keeps on playing with the play infinitely.

Unlike supplement, contrapuntal reading has the nature of alterity or the otherness. When the text is viewed from the colonizer's perspective, the colonized people and their culture are treated as the other or alterity. On the contrary, the colonizer people and their culture are treated as the other or alterity when the same text is viewed from the colonized or latent perspective. So this nature of alterity remains from the both aspects in contrapuntal reading or analysis. Being a culture and contextual term, alterity isn't in supplement.

As the outcome of this comparative study, Derrida and his methodology with whatever terms like différance or supplement or anything else happen to be the base of Said. Said hasn't mentioned that his method is textual or close reading of a text but it is through his method which ascertain about him. So Said or his approach can't exist without that of Derrida and his approach.

Conclusion

For the purpose of better explanation and clarification of these two, supplement and contrapuntal reading have been applied in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. As a result contrapuntal reading brings out the colonial and anti-colonial elements in this text whereas supplement supplements the theme of "the exploration of the self" with that of "the exploration of the evil." Having read the text *Heart of Darkness* contrapuntally, the interpretation is drawn into the arena of social, culture and imperialism on the both aspects of this reading. On the other hand, supplement replaces the first and central theme of the text i.e. exploration of the self journeying into the darkness and adds the other marginal meaning bringing it into the fore which is "the exploration of the evil into the self." The supplement analyses that white man's burden no longer remains rather white man is the burden into the Dark Continent.

The comparative study of supplement and contrapuntal analysis/reading brings out many similarities and differences between the two. As the similarities, both supplement and contrapuntal reading are based on the freeplay on words in a text to bring out multiple meanings. Both of these tools are based on textual analysis. Another similar point between them is that both of these tools move away, from the logocentrism, centre seeking tradition, and metaphysics of presence towards the margin and the periphery and the absence.

Besides these similarities, they have differences between them too. The first and foremost difference lies in the number of meaning they bring out in any text. Supplement carries out the process of replacement and addition to an infinite set of meaning. It opens any text for multiple interpretations. But contrapuntal analysis advocates for almost, not fixed, only two meanings since there are two sides to every questions. One aspect of it is the surface meaning at the manifest level which is called

the voice of repressor or colonizers. Whereas the second aspect of it is the underlying meaning at the latent level which is called the voice of the repressed or the colonized.

Another and the most important difference between them is that supplement remains any text within textuality whereas contrapuntal reading draws any text into the discourses of culture and imperialism i.e. into the realm of contextually blending the textuality and the historicity of the text. The third difference between them is that supplement establishes the play while subverting the centre or hierarchy whereas contrapuntal reading regards the viewed or analyzed culture and people as the alterity or the other.

Besides the similarities and differences lie between the two, the method of deconstruction i.e. of supplement can be said to be the foundation of contrapuntal reading because only after making the close reading it moves beyond it into the discourse.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Bangalore, Prism Books, 20004.
- Bove, Paul A. "Hope and Reconciliation: A Review of Edward W. Said." 22.2 (Summer 1993): 266-82.
- Brown, Tony C. "Cultural Psychosis on the Frontier: The Work of the Darkness in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*." *Studies in the Novel* 32.1(Spring 2000): 14-28.
- Collins, Jeff, and Bill Mayblin. *Introducing Derrida*. London: Icon Books, 1996.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness and Other Stories*. Ed. Gene M. Moore. New Delhi: Wordsworth Classics, 2002.
- "Contrapuntal." Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 7th ed. 2005.
- "Counterpoint." Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 7th ed. 2005.
- Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Différance." *Intellectual History Reader*. Ed. Beerendra Pandey. Kathmandu: M.K. Publication, 2004. 669-700
- Derrida, Jacques. "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of Human Science." *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York: HBJ College Publishers, 1992. 1117-1126.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1967.
- - -. *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. New Delhi: Continuum Books, 2004.
- Elbarbary, Samir . "*Heart of Darkness* and Late-Victorian Fascination with the Primitive and the Double." *Twentieth Century Literature* 39.1 (Spring 1993): 113-128.

Garver, Newton. "Derrida on Rousseau on Writing". *The Journal of Philosophy* 74.11
(Nov.1977): 663-673.

Hans, James S. "Derrida and Freeplay." *Perspectives in Mimesis* 94.4 (May 1979):
809-826.

"Latent." Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 7th ed. 2005.

Leithart, Peter J. "Supplement at the Origin: Trinity, Eschatology and History."

International Journal of Systematic Theology 6.4 (Oct 2004): 369-386.

"Manifest." Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 7th ed. 2005.

Marrouchi, Mustapha. "The New/ Old Idiot." *Philosophic Africana* 4.58 (Summer
2003): 35-50.

Norris, Christopher. *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books, 1995.

- - -. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

Spegele, Roger D. "Fiction as Political Theory: Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*."

British Journal of Political Science 2.3 9(July 1972): 319-337

"Supplement." Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 2nd ed. 2006.

"Supplement." Penguin Dictionary of Literary Theory. 3rd ed. 2001.

Trifonas, Peter. "Derrida and Rousseau: Deconstructing the Ethics of a Pedagogy of

the Supplement." *Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies* 22.3

(Oct.2000): 243-65

Varisco, Daniel Martin. "Reading against Culture in Edward Said's *Culture and*

Imperialism." *Culture, Theory and Critique* 45.2 (Oct 2004): 93-112.

Waters, Lindsay. "In Responses Begins Responsibility: Music and Emotion." 25.2

(Summer 1998): 95-115.

Waugh, Patricia. *Literary Theory and Criticism*. New York: OUP, 2006.