

ISSN: 2278-9529

GALAXY

International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

May 2016 - Vol. 5, Issue- 3

Editor-In-Chief: Dr. Vishwanath Bite

www.galaxyimrj.com

About Us: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/about-us/>

Archive: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/archive/>

Contact Us: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/contact-us/>

Editorial Board: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/editorial-board/>

Submission: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/submission/>

FAQ: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/faq/>

A Survey of Intertextuality in Coetzee's *Elizabeth Costello*

Jamashed Ansari

Research Scholar,

Department of English, MEOFL H. N. B.

Garhwal (A Central University)

Srinagar (Garhwal), Uttarakhand-246174

Abstract:

The paper aims to interpret the work of J. M. Coetzee in relation to a survey of intertextuality in Coetzee's novel *Elizabeth Costello*. It also focuses about the intertextuality, narrative structure, production of meaning. In an inspection of *Elizabeth Costello*, or more specially, the linguistic system of the published work, intertextuality role as a metafictional tool throughout which Coetzee influences the story confines intrinsic in making a imaginary gap which functions to both esteem and keep the temporality of the present as the gap of political and moral interference. The novel *Elizabeth Costello* discloses a number of such metafictional moments, whereby the site of sense making rests in the reading present, as the analysis facts attach directly with the presentation of intertextuality within the narrative. *Elizabeth Costello* comes into view to require the reader to hold a willing suspension of tensual deviance. The novelist repeatedly observes to the failure of story technicalities to present a means for fictional story to successfully, get a space of programmatic obstruction in the analysis present. Though *Elizabeth Costello* shows such self-reflexivity at various steps, it does not stop the alternative of intrusion in such. The performative character of reading, which fundamentally places the reading issue within an incessant present, presents a technique by which novelist can reconcile the limitations of tensual deviance to fake a space for effective intrusion in the display of sense between reader and text. *Elizabeth Costello*, as a fictional text, deliberately illustrates its sharing into the dilemmas posed by judging the influence and transport in the apparently uncontrollably imaginary references, which each character, not just *Elizabeth Costello*, repeatedly makes use of to help make stronger and support his or her confrontational positions. As the final "lesson" within *Elizabeth Costello* discloses, intertextuality, as a lyrical tool, functions within any encounter with writing.

Keywords: Intertextuality, Story Structure, Production of Meaning.

Although the intrinsic boundaries of efficiently connecting story actions in a present temporality near with the reading border may verify automatically not possible, or at best technically unlikely, to prevent, Kristevan intertextuality—as Coetzee credibly

reveals by Elizabeth Costello— presents a textual tool by which individual reader reply to the story events essentially happens in the gap of the reading present. The structural boundaries discovered by trying to falsify a logical and simple story entirely within the present tense have drawn the notice of several writers and reviewers. Dorrit Cohn, in her essay “*I Doze and Wake: The Deviance of Simultaneous Narration*,” creates clearly the complexity of making an actually present tense within any imaginary story, despite how complexly hypothesized. Cohn inscribes: Narrative poetics, however, has as yet failed to account for the most serious challenge to the accepted truth that ‘narrative is past, always past’: the mounting trend in modernist first-person fiction to cast a distinctly narrative discourse in the present tense from first to last (97). Focusing on Coetzee’s *Waiting for the Barbarians* as one of its main resources for textual study, Cohn’s essay discovers and highlights the confines of keeping the potentially libratory temporality of the present within any imaginary story, counting stories trying to circulate and interfere within the circumstance of a postcolonial present.

However, to argue that Coetzee’s effort purposes in an insincere present tense would cancel out the effectual gap in which Elizabeth Costello works. As Cohn rightly comments, “As most grammars tell us, the present is the most plural significant of all tenses” (106). An entire cancellation of the capability for present tense telling, for Cohn, would consequence in one of the following: “either to deny that its tense is a genuine present or to deny that its discourse is genuine narrative” (102). So as to save the “plural important” capability of the present, neither selection would show to be enough. A harsh receipt of verb tense and the depictive likelihood of the present shows immature at best; however, the subject remains active, even if the present tense remains deceptive at stage of describing, then maybe the temporality of the analysis act offers a transition into the gap for interference in the analysis present. although the temporality of past telling directly tackles the reader with the information that the writer has cautiously chosen which details to present and explanation, the use of the present tense as the main chronological structure for story act distracts the reader’s notice in identification that events are not only “as they are presented” and thus read. so the reader tackles the rapidity at which present tense describing happens as if actions take place in the same temporality as the interpretation structure, which guides to sure aporias feature of any story novel, as Umberto Eco debates In his essay, “*Entering the Woods*,” Eco says: “any narrative fiction is necessarily and fatally swift because, in building a world that comprises myriad events and characters, it cannot say everything about this world. It hints at it and then asks the reader to fill in a whole series of gaps” (3). In deteriorating to talk to “all thing regarding this earth,” the essentially reduced story proceed must trust upon a sure stage of reader contribution in setting up the relations and links that contextualize and ground a work of novel in the planet of the reader. And, in so doing, the story, as an entire, go into the interpretation structure, which essentially exists in the present. Yet, Cohn in brief recounts the difficult character of preserving a classic present

tense story structure: The highlighting impact generally attributed to the use of the historical present—variously expressed in terms of enhanced vividness, dramatic effect, or presentification—is accordingly understood as being wholly dependent on its intermittence: if it were not embedded in normal tensual surroundings, its tensual deviance would not stand out. (99) in spite of the “tensual deviance” noticeable when trying to successfully carry-over the linguistic tense at effort in the story and place it directly over the present tense of the reader’s planet, a third space, as Kristeva debates for in relation to the semiotic, could role to make easy such aberration. Such understanding essentially would not have to effort to undermine and conceal the linguistic and figurative confines posed by present tense telling, but, rather, could show notice to such confines so as to offer an optional and balancing gap in the historical present whereby reader and text interrelate in a shared type of sense structure, which would permit the historical past to interrelate and power the anonymous future. Such a space, debatably the space of literature, could get an opening within an intertextual hypothesis of analysis. As developed in the opening to this learning, the Kristevan idea of intertextuality, adopting as it does from Bakhtinian hypothesis of story dialogue, allows for the past present to stay an open and practical place for analysis and interference, as it relates to the generation of sense between reader and text.

Bakhtin concentrates such a relation in his idea of the chronoscope, as he writes: “We will give the name chronoscope to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature” (*Forms of Time* 84). The chronoscope, as grew within the work of literature, does not interrelate with other chronoscopes including the real text. Rather, and significantly for the growth of Kristevan intertextuality, Bakhtin debates that the shades of sense exaggerated by the chronotrope enter into the digressive field of the reader, not the text itself. Bakhtin notes:

The general characteristic of these interactions is that they are dialogical (in the broadest sense of the word). But this dialogue cannot enter into the world represented in the work, nor into any of the chronoscopes represented in it; it is outside the world represented, although not outside the work as a whole. It (this dialogue) enters the world of the author, of the performer, and the world of the listeners and readers. (*The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* 252)

The chronotrope, as it goes into through discourse with the actual world, as different to the untrue world restricted within the real text of the work, re-inscribes the work itself as a place of sense structure and creation, as different to merely a position of sense public expose. Bakhtin further argues: “The contemporaneity from which the author observes includes, first and foremost, the realm of literature—and not just contemporary literature in the strict sense of the word, but also the literature of the past that continues to live and renew itself in the present” (*The Dialogic Imagination: Four*

Essays 255). As Kristeva intertextuality efforts to explain and clear the behavior in which texts (not just written texts, but also immaterial “social” texts) function performatively in allowing for a space in the historical present, such a gap ease the type of discourse Bakhtin endorses, which carries the historical past into communication with an anonymous and unstable future. However, if a fictional work—particularly a self-knowingly fictional work such as Elizabeth Costello—highlights and makes easy the opening of such conversation between historical past and future, to what degree does the historical present stay decorated by the work’s assumptions? Bakhtin narrates this anxiety intrinsic in the reading present, as he remarks: “Every literary work focuses outward away from itself, toward the listener-reader, and to a certain extent thus anticipates possible reactions to itself” (*The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* 257). Yet, as literature find its standard in language, Kristeva releases the likelihood for linguistic builds to perform clear control over sense structure; linguistic constructs, as such, cannot attain any necessary sense crossways the boundless reading present for Kristeva. Kristeva creates such a point directly, as she writes:

What we discover, then, within this texture, is the function of the subject caught between instinctual drives and social practice within a language that is today divided into often incommunicable, multiple systems: a Tower of Babel that literature specifically breaks open, refashions, and inscribes in a new series of perpetual contradictions. (*Desire in Language* 97)

So, the historical present remains an ever-changing and indefinable border in which to pin a perfect reader; Kristeva’s idea of intertextuality depends on such an undefined historical present. However, what of fictional works which use this gap, sketching the reader into a clear considerate of its systems of depiction and sequential positions? For Kristeva, the procedure remains unmoved: a fictional work, even if it calls notice to its contractedness and over devices of depiction, still remains a place of sense arrangement in the historical present. Though Dorrit Cohn believably debates that a work can never entirely reconcile the stalemate posed by the present tense story’s incapability to reconcile deviances rising from the temporality of telling, the temporality of the reading border remains stable: the historical present. What of a book that exhibits such a connection, actually be firm on the reader identifying her or his democratic function in the arrangement of sense? Elizabeth Costello presents several such metafictional moments, whereby the site of sense making rests in the reading present, as the reading knowledge connects directly with the performance of intertextuality within the story.

From its opening lines, Elizabeth Costello draws the reader into direct clash with his or her effort to set up a easy temporality within which to place and pace the story act, and intentionally so. Just as Dorrit Cohn says that story has yet to enlarge a plan to settle the practical limitations posed by the temporality of the present tense, Elizabeth Costello,

as a work of novel, does not attempt to conceal nor challenge such an evaluation. Rather, the third-person all knowing storyteller starts with the troubles posed by the tensual aberration of present tense telling, a passage worth quoting at length here:

There is first of all the problem of the opening, namely how to get us from where we are, which nowhere, to the far bank is, as yet, it is a simple bridging problem, a problem of knocking together a bridge. People solve such problems every day. They solve them, and having solved them push on. Let us assume that, however it may have been done, it is done. Let us take it that the bridge is built and crossed, that we can put it out of our mind. We have left behind the territory in which we were. We are in the far territory, where we want to be. (1)

Besides the willing suspension of disbelief trusted upon by imaginary stories, Elizabeth Costello appears to need the reader to support a willing suspension of tensual aberrance. Within the starting two paragraphs, the story has carried the reader into “the far country, where we want to be,” from the “country in which we were.” Not only does the story “bridge” an conceptual quantity of story space, but also efforts to influence the tensual aberrance posed by such present tense telling. Declaring the reader that “we can put it outside our brain,” however the move from “were” to “are” poses a structural difficulty that the intrinsic workings of the story emerge to have no ultimate way of solving or prevention; a “problem of banging jointly a bridge,” which does not efficiently take away the coldness between point A and point B, but changes the way in which to cross such a distance. Yet, significantly for Coetzee, the move does take place, even if drawing open notice to the difficult nature of such a shift, as the present tense, according to the storyteller, remains “where we want to be.” In another such metafictional moment, the third person narrator of Elizabeth Costello directly addresses the speed at which the narratives can visibly development. If the story present tense efforts to well directly look down on the reading present of the actual world, and then the structural confines of such a story plan present themselves as discordantly clear to the reader. The reader, as proscriptively lectured to by the writer/storyteller, does not knowledge the present of telling in the similar way as a topic within that exacting story. As Umberto Eco comments: “A story may be more or less quick—that is to say, more or less elliptic—but how elliptic it may be is determined by the sort of reader it is addressed to” (*Entering the Woods* 7). The storyteller of Elizabeth Costello creates no secret of require to choose and choose between which actions to depict and which to disregard, even as the story remains firmly within the present tense structurally. In illumination the choice to bounce one of Elizabeth Costello’s a lot prefigured lecture presentations, the storyteller speaks to the reader directly about the need of elliptic story” Breaking into the dream draws attention to the contractedness of the story, and plays havoc with the realist illusion. However,

unless certain scenes are skipped over we will be here all afternoon. The skips are not part of the text; they are part of the performance.” (16)

This apparent ambivalence in the direction of practicality not only highlights the “contractedness” of Elizabeth Costello, but debatably any story event as such, evens those emerging to take place in an easy present tense. As “the bounces are not part of the book,” but rather “part of the presentation,” such an ambiguity forces the reader to choose whether such perform relates to the address within the story or rather the presentation of reading the book Maybe, both. However, in reading, the elliptic qualities of the story does not include part of the book in sense strict; rather, the ellipsis trust on the reading work to achieve any appearance of meaning, as such spaces have no direct association to concretely signified story actions within the book itself. Here, in the space of the reading act, particularly an act of attractive Elizabeth Costello in the reading present, the elliptic nature of the story forces itself upon the reader to reveal its confines as a form of depiction. Although such metafictional moments might seem as self-overcoming and self-disparaging moves with esteem to the largely unity of the story, Coetzee does not only release the space of the reading present as a place by which to successfully produce sense between reader and text. Coetzee frequently illustrates notice to the incapability of story technicalities to present a means for imaginary story to fruitfully get a space of programmatic interference in the reading present. Although Elizabeth Costello displays such self-reflexivity at many stages, it does not prevent the option of interference in such. The performative character of reading, which essentially places the reading affair within a continuous present, offers a way by which Coetzee can reconcile the confines of tensual deviance to falsify a space for effectual interference in the arrangement of sense between reader and text. Here, in the space of the reading present, the Kristevan idea of intertextuality gives the means by which the postcolonial story can practically carry the historical past into conversation with an anonymous future.

Within the rather shortened story act, Elizabeth Costello builds up many fictional mentions, logical orientations and firm textual examinations of fictional texts flowing in the actual world. Although Elizabeth Costello has exact, and sometimes quite sturdy, views/decisions regarding the works and writer she references, never does her dialogue propose that the reader should agree with or even believe the conditions of Costello/Coetzee’s analysis. As a hypothesis of reading or textuality, Kristevan intertextuality remains mostly indifferent in only tracing textual references and building note of where they emerge within the text under study.

Elizabeth Costello, as an imaginary text, intentionally draws its distribution into the quandaries posed by judging the influence and import of the apparently nonstop fictional references, which each character, not just Elizabeth Costello, regularly utilizes to help strengthen and support his or her argumentative locations. Fascinatingly, such obvious intertextual references not only hearten connections between texts flowing in the

actual world, but also relations between the imaginary *Elizabeth Costello* and the author of the text as recognized on the dust coat, J. M. Coetzee. A number of the following contrasts, although surely not a definitive list, make clear Coetzee's treatment of such a relation: Elizabeth Costello established herself as an significant feminist, postcolonial writer by giving voice to Joyce's Marion Bloom, wife of Leopold Bloom, in her seriously highly praised fiction *The House on Eccles Street*; J. M. Coetzee, as a postcolonial writer, has got enormous critical notice for numerous his works, counting *Foe*, which gave voice to Susan Barton, the obvious story source of Robinson Crusoe, whose story Daniel Foe included into the story which accept his name as writer, not Barton's. Many of Elizabeth Costello's fictional references relate to readings of Kafka; much of J. M. Coetzee's serious work in linguistics has focused on tensual deviance and mystery in Kafka's works. Also, the central character of Coetzee's novel *Life and Times of Michael K* displays noticeably closes thematic binds with Kafka's Josef K. Costello has developed a status as a main global fictional figure, of the eight "lessons" within Elizabeth Costello—significantly the addresses Costello carries within the time of the story—Coetzee has published six in earlier places. Such a list could go on, to unreliable degrees of achievement; however, such a work out would debatably neglect the point of such textual and metatextual layering. Yet, how should the reader move toward the intertextual references carried to the head within Elizabeth Costello, although never entirely disowns? How far should the reader take the referential matter in estimating sense at the place of the text? Although such questions come out quite suitable given the difficulty of the textual plans Coetzee adjusts into play, maybe more attractive questions come out from their study. In Costello/Coetzee's address "The Philosophers and the Animals," Costello connects in a study of primate investigate published by Wolfgang Köhler, a behavioral scientist and primatologist in the actual world. Costello's comments serves as a warning fable about the difficult nature of reading by means of firmly surrounded policy and meetings. In attempting to offer an exchange, but nevertheless suitable, analysis of Sultan's replies to Köhler's series of behavioral testing, Costello/Coetzee argues:

At every turn Sultan is driven to think the less interesting thought. From the purity of speculation (Why do men behave like this?) he is relentlessly propelled towards lower, practical, instrumental reason (How does one use this to get that?) and thus towards acceptance of himself primarily as an organism with an appetite that needs to be satisfied [...] a carefully plotted psychological regimen conducts him away from ethics and metaphysics towards the humbler reaches of practical reason. (73-74)

Could a similar call up series of questions construction the way by which a reader comes near the text? Do the intertextual references serve as so many tools which the reader must use to successfully reach the essential purpose, sense for the reader, the banana for the ape? If the reader replies "yes" to either of the above questions, then

reading misplaces its potentially liberatory power as a means of direct and active meeting in the present, as the historical past of intertextual references keep a fixity of understanding and communication that Coetzee would emerge to argue against, imposing a kind of reading that moves “gone from morals and metaphysics towards the humbler arrives at of realistic reason.” Realistic reason, in such a study, appears as believe, not only in regards to the workings of the story, but debatably with esteem to its better moral and political import in the reading present. In the following “lecture” restricted within Elizabeth Costello—“The Poets and the Animals”—the limitless lyrical imagination presents a sure reprieve to necessity forms of explanation and depiction. For her/his model text, Costello/Coetzee focuses upon Ted Hughes’s poem, “The Jaguar,” to reveal such a reading. Costello/Coetzee indicates that Hughes’s work symbolizes “poetry that does not try to find an idea in the animal that is not about the animal, but is instead the record of an engagement with him” (*Lives of Animals* 51). Emphasizing “the evidence of an engagement,” Costello/Coetzee highlights the synergistic intrinsic in the production of meaning in the reading present. As Costello/Coetzee remarks, the jaguar does not represent some basic and necessary form of being; rather, the jaguar and Hughes cooperate at the imaginative site of the verse, as poetic language and form capture only the “evidence of an engagement”; it does not set the conditions on which such an engagement depends upon for its performance. Ongoing, Costello/Coetzee remarks:

When Hughes the poet stands before the jaguar cage; he looks at an individual jaguar and is possessed by that individual jaguar life. It has to be that way. Jaguars in general, the subspecies jaguar, the idea of jaguar, will fail to move him because we cannot experiences abstractions. Nevertheless, the poem that Hughes writes is about the Jaguar, about jaguariness embodied in the jaguar. (*Lives of Animals* 53)

The last “lesson” within Elizabeth Costello, “*At the Gate*,” creates most clear the degree to which formerly written texts attack and tell the site of fictional performance. Elizabeth Costello seems to find herself in some form of the beyond, but the reader never learns accurately beyond what. Does the reader have an evidence of one of Elizabeth Costello’s dreams or maybe one of the storyteller’s? Does the door stand for the banned entry point into that which comes behind life, involving that Elizabeth has died? So as to go by throughout the door, Elizabeth must first present a declaration of her attitude before an impressive and enigmatic court, in what would emerge to purpose as some form of a test. Where has the reader meted such a symbol of the ridiculous, such a disturbing meet with the neutral of practical unities? The reader, begin story details which do not essentially depend on an understanding of another text, but nevertheless open themselves unashamedly to contrast, contributes vigorously in the procedure of meaning in such an intertextual meet. Here, along with the allusions heaps upon allusions, the metafictional moments force the reader to observe the contractedness of such an imaginary world. As

the third person storyteller tells, Costello at one point believes to herself: “the whole thing put together from clichés, with not a speck of originality” (198). Who lives in such a world? Where the reader before has meets such an disturbing story result, whereby any sense of organization begins only to later fall to the uncontrollability, the impersonality, maybe even the inhumanness of some unsure, outside fate? Although Martin Amis denounces the “half-impressions subsumed by that wooly watchword ‘Kafkaesque’” (“*Nothing is deserved and everything is accepted.*” 399), however even the evocative heading of the lesson supports the reader to pay notice to Coetzee’s use of intertextuality in attaining such a story visual. In the small, anonymous and ordinary edge town in which Elizabeth Costello waits before passing throughout the door, every aspect takes the joint weight of relationship and individualize, no matter how corny the person elements appear in and of themselves.

The engagement for Costello, and debatably for the reader as well, supposes a modified fit, an individual knowledge in the face of so much impersonality. At each of her trial before the court, Costello must try to persuasively bring a declaration of faith, apparently explanatory not only her job as an author, but maybe having to description for her life in common. Costello’s first demand does not satisfy the court, when she says: “In my work belief is a resistance, an obstacle. I try to empty myself of resistances” (200), though she debates for the requirement of impersonality and impartial symbol as the prequalification to a job as an author, such an reply proves intolerable and the court supports her to rework her declaration and come back only after having done so. When the court asks her to remark upon her own humankind and how it connects to writing, Costello responds: “On my own humanity? Is that of consequence? What I offer to those who read me, what I contribute to their humanity, outweighs, I would hope, my own emptiness in that respect.” (201)

Additional, Costello debates against the dominance the court places on such an idea of faith, ongoing to try to separation herself and her work from such related ties. Costello ends her declaration by noting: “Let me add, for your edification: beliefs are not the only ethical supports we have. We can rely on our hearts as well. That is all; I have nothing more to say” (203). Yet, Costello does not gain admittance to what lies behind the door, as her capability to influence the court fails and the likelihood of some shape of flee or superiority remains deferred indefinitely. The reader, repeatedly taking note not only of Costello’s arguments, but also of the textual structure in which they emerge, tries to draw upon the intertextual hints flowing through the chapter, as the obvious textual workings of the story give no direct hints as to how to get some appearance of declaration. At these stages, Costello starts once again to take clearer observe of her environments in her try to position herself within the present through a starting of conversation with past knowledge. Costello examines the following, as the storyteller offers access to Costello’s inner soliloquy. “Exactly, she thinks to herself, what one

would expect in an obscure Italian or Austro Italian border town in the year 1912. Out of a book, just as the bunkhouse with its straw mattresses and forty-watt bulb is out of a book and the whole courtroom business too, down to the dozy bailiff” (206). The fictional allusions mount, not just for the reader, but also for Elizabeth Costello, and emerge to influence the dynamics of her subjectivity as character. Do the increasingly overt intertextual references offer necessary information essential for the reader to expose and understand correctly so as to successfully arrive at the sense of such an upsetting text? And, really, unsettling emerges an suitable explanation of the result attains both inside and outside of the text, as Costello asks herself: “why does the simulation fail so consistently, not just by a hair’s breadth—one could forgive that—but by a hand’s breath” (209)? Once more, Coetzee presents no reply to this question; but the reader recognizes that, in writing, the hand holds the pen: Coetzee’s textual organizing does not function chaotically within his novel. Coetzee does, however, make clear the intertextual references bombarding the reader within the work’s last “lesson,” as Costello surmises:

It is the same with the Kafka business. The wall, the gate, the sentry, is straight out of Kafka. So is the demand for a confession, so is the courtroom with the dozing bailiff and the panel of old men in their crows’ robes pretending to pay attention while she thrashes about in the toils of her own words. Kafka, but only the superficialities of Kafka; Kafka reduced and flattened to a parody. (209)

As the last “lesson” within Elizabeth Costello reveals, intertextuality, as a lyrical device, functions within any encounter with literature, therefore the equal would clearly relate to the act of reading in the circumstance of a visibly postcolonial present. Reader capability, which Michael Riffaterre debates remains necessary to the suitable thoughtful of an exacting work’s sense, comes out to have no place in Coetzee’s attention in a Kristevan model of intertextual practice. Riffaterre writes:

It should be clear by now that the intertext of the narrative acts as the unconscious of fiction and that readers recover or discover that intertext because the narrative itself contains clues leading back to it...It must also be clear that the narrative is produced by repressing and displacing the intertext, and that the visible sign of the repression or displacement at the surface of the fictional text is the loss of narrativity. (*Fictional Truth* 91)

By positioning forthright the “intertext,” which “acts as the insensible of novel” for Riffaterre, Coetzee forces the reader to query the import of an essentially enclosed text, which tries to hide an exacting sense. Though Coetzee does not have an curiosity in novel that needs no attempt on behalf of the reader, an intertextual reading that essentially trust upon the discovery of the intertext misses the point and the politically release possibilities which intertextuality creates likely in the semantically open-ended present.

Such hermeneutic notice shows necessary to satisfy Riffaterre's necessity for reader capability, whereas Kristeva—and debatably Coetzee—would view such a programmatic come near to reading as intertextuality “in the banal sense” as a facile “study of sources” (*Revolution in Poetic Language* 60), in the end of small political import in the historical present of the reading border.

Just as Köhler's tests with Sultan force the ape to “think the less interesting thought” (*Lives of Animals* 29), a hypothesis of intertextual reading dependent upon reader capability forces the reader to continually pay mind to the small particulars at work in the text, hopeful little, if any, direct engagement with the background in which reading happens. In stopping an engagement with “the cleanliness of conjecture,” the reader must refer larger questions such as—what does it mean to read in a postcolonial context? How does one set up story power? Does the text in question hide as much as it discloses? How else could one understand this text, given a dissimilar contextual background?—to the setting and pay notice to “hints” within the story that forever point elsewhere to the loss of the here and now of reading. Within Elizabeth Costello, as the above conversation tries to emphasize, J. M. Coetzee faces a form of reader capability as it be relevant to a postcolonial reading in the historical present, as such a form human rights and honored definite readings to the loss of other, debatably suitable shades of sense. So, speak to the “easy linking difficulty” set onward in the first paragraph of Elizabeth Costello, Coetzee highlights the unfaithfulness that come out from any reading that relies firmly on the text of an exacting work as different to performance as a site of engagement between text and context.

Works Cited:

- Amis, Martin. “Nothing is Deserved and Everything is Accepted.” *In The War Against Cliché: Essays and Reviews, 1971-2000*. New York: Vintage, 2003. Print.
- Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001. Print.
- Coetzee, J. M. *Elizabeth Costello*. New York: Viking, 2003. Print.
- Cohn, Dorrit. “I Doze and Wake: The Deviance of Simultaneous Narration.” *In The Distinction of Fiction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1999. Print.
- Eco, Umberto. “Entering the Woods.” *In Six Walks in the Fictional Woods*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995. Print.

Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Ed.

Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1980. Print.

--- *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia UP,
1984. Print.

Riffaterre, Michael. *Fictional Truth*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990. Print.