

Charles University  
Faculty of Education  
Department of English Language and Literature

BACHELOR THESIS

Shakespearean Intertextuality in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*

Shakespearovská intertextovost v díle *Konec civilizace* Aldouse Huxleyho

Author: Hana Fišerová  
Supervisor: Doc. PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D.  
Study Programme: Specialization in Education  
Study Subjects: English Language – French Language

Prague 2019

## **Declaration**

I hereby declare that I worked on this thesis, entitled “Shakespearean Intertextuality in Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World*”, on my own and that I used only the cited sources. I also declare that this thesis was not used in order to gain any other academic degree than the one applied for.

Prague, 18<sup>th</sup> of April 2019

.....

Hana Fišerová

## **Acknowledgement**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Doc. PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D. for his time, patience and valuable advice which were essential for the completion of this thesis.

## **Abstract**

The aim of this thesis is to present intertextuality as a literary device and to offer a description of its function based on the ideas of the most prominent theorists, who are concerned with this very topic. The thesis describes the employment of intertextuality in literature and its influence on reader's interpretation of a text. The practical part analyses the use of intertextuality in Aldous Huxley's novel *Brave New World*, concentrating in particular on chosen theatre plays by William Shakespeare.

**Key Words:** intertextuality, allusion, interconnection, fiction, modernism

## **Abstrakt**

Cílem této práce je představit intertextovost jakožto literární prostředek a vylíčit její funkci na základě idejí a myšlenek nejvýznamnějších teoretiků, kteří se tímto tématem zabývají. Práce popisuje funkci intertextovosti v literatuře a její vliv na čtenářovu interpretaci textu. Praktická část zkoumá užití intertextovosti v díle Aldouse Huxleyho *Konec civilizace*, zabývající se konkrétně vybranými divadelními hrami Williama Shakespeara.

**Klíčová slova:** intertextovost, aluze, propojení, fikce, modernismus

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Theoretical Part</b> .....	<b>7</b>
	2.1 Intertextuality .....	7
	2.2 Intertextuality in Modernist Literature .....	19
	2.3 Aldous Huxley and Intertextuality .....	21
<b>3</b>	<b>Practical Part</b> .....	<b>23</b>
	3.1 Literary Context and Summary of Brave New World .....	23
	3.2 Historical intertextuality in Characters' Names .....	26
	3.3 Shakespearean Intertextuality in Brave New World .....	28
	3.3.1 The Tempest .....	29
	3.3.2 Hamlet .....	33
	3.3.3 Othello .....	35
	3.3.4 Romeo and Juliet .....	36
	3.3.5 Macbeth .....	38
	3.3.6 Other plays .....	39
<b>4</b>	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>42</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Works Cited</b> .....	<b>45</b>

# 1 Introduction

As the title suggests, the aim of this thesis is to present the concept of intertextuality and analyse its use and significance in Aldous Huxley's novel *Brave New World* (1932). As for the explanation of the choice of this topic, I find myself quite fascinated with Huxley's style of writing as well as with his sense of satire which allowed him to create a perfect dystopian world that mirrors certain issues as well as prophesies possible consequences of modern society. Also, I believe that the novel possesses rather an interesting employment of allusions to William Shakespeare's plays, although their knowledge is not vital for the reader to understand the story. Huxley uses intertextuality in order to emphasize the background and values of the main character John the Savage, yet he often alters the tone of the original lines. What is more, the novel contains a large amount of intertextual references and thus is suitable for my analysis. However, *Brave New World* is not the only work in which Huxley employs intertextual practices.

The theoretical part is divided into three chapters. The first one introduces the origins of intertextuality – describes the practices of linguists and theorists who were aware of possible existence of the phenomenon, yet they did not give the term a definition. This is followed by an outline of several theories of chosen linguists and an explanation of the differences between their approaches. The second chapter focuses on the approach to the use of intertextuality in the period of modernism – an era during which intertextuality was conceptualised and used systematically. The third chapter offers a brief description of Huxley's employment of intertextuality, as well as some basic information about the author, which I also regard as relevant to mention in order to understand the background of his works.

The practical part aims to offer a hypothesis of the relation between the names of the characters and the personages they might refer to and comment on the similarities and differences between them. Mainly, it aims to find and present the most important references to Shakespeare's plays, both direct and indirect, and analyse their influence on the novel.

## **2 Theoretical part**

### **2.1 Intertextuality**

As this thesis focuses on intertextuality as a literary device and its employment in works of literature, it is crucial to explain the meaning of the term itself. In order to present intertextuality as a whole concept, we can start by defining it as the creation of a text (literary or non-literary) while completing its meaning by referring to other texts and works. In a literary text, the reader attempts to find its primary meaning, we call such process reading. Once they absorb the meaning, they begin processing it until they create their own interpretation of the text. As obvious as the idea seems, this process has undergone numerous analyses and debates by literary and cultural theorists.

All literary texts can be regarded as systems of linguistics, history, culture and traditions of mankind. Therefore, according to Graham Allen, “texts, whether they be literary or non-literary, are viewed by modern theorists as lacking in any kind of independent meaning. They are what theorists now call intertextual” (1). In other words, to truly understand the meaning of a text, it is necessary to understand the connections with the original texts that are being referred to, and, thus, we can say that the reader is sent on a quest of exploring the space between a text and the texts it relates to and gradually understand its meaning dependent on them.

Even though intertextuality is a term very commonly used nowadays, it is often being misused, as one often assumes that it consists of a simple set of rules and of critical procedures and thus is easy to be understood and interpreted correctly. Unfortunately, this assumption is rather incorrect. Intertextuality is a term defined quite variously and therefore may become complicated to understand properly. It is not “a transparent term and so, despite its confident utilization by many theorists and critics, cannot be evoked in an uncomplicated manner. Such a term is in danger of meaning nothing more than whatever each particular critic wishes it to mean” (Allen 2). Therefore, it is probably not possible to present one particular definition that everyone would accept without any objections.

Although the term as such was first defined and introduced into literary theory in the 1960s by Julia Kristeva, a poststructuralist linguist, and has been broadly

accepted by postmodern theoreticians and literary critics, the origin of the concept tracks even further back, to theorists whose concepts helped shape her concept of intertextuality. Intertextuality, as a part of modern literary theory, can be traced back to the twentieth century; as the origin of this notion was anticipated by Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1939), a Swiss linguist and structuralist, and M. M. Bakhtin, a Russian literary critic and theorist. Both of them focus their studies on the language, yet their theories differ in some aspects. Kristeva manages to meet certain balance between the two, which results in the establishment of the term intertextuality as such.

Allen suggests starting with de Saussure, since “beginning with the linguistic theories of Saussure has the added advantage of establishing some of the basic principles of modern literary theory” (2). Not only that, his “emphasis on the systematic features of language establishes the relational nature of meaning and thus of texts” (2). De Saussure presents a whole new idea of regarding language as a system of linguistic signs. In semiotics, a sign is basically anything that communicates a meaning, either intentional or unintentional. In his work *Cours de Linguistique Générale* (1916), de Saussure manages to describe how signs acquire the capability of transferring information. According to his theory, the sign relation is dyadic, in other words, every linguistic sign consists of two basic elements - *signifiant* (signifier) and *signifié* (signified). These elements do not exist independently as separate entities but rather as one concept, since de Saussure defines the relation between them as essentially arbitrary. “The meanings we produce and find within language, then, are relational; they depend upon processes of combination and association within the differential system of language itself. This relational aspect of language cannot be avoided or overcome” (Allen, 10). That is to say, outside the linguistic system, a sign cannot have an independent meaning, it is obtained only through the relation with other signs.

It is de Saussure who presents the difference between *synchronic* and *diachronic* study of language. Synchronic study of language, the one Saussure conducts, denotes the study of a language at an exact point in time, whereas diachronic study analyses the language with consideration of its historical evolution throughout times. What is more, if a linguistic sign is genuinely arbitrary, it is also differential. As de Saussure puts it, “in language there are only differences. Even more important: a

difference generally implies positive terms between which the difference is set up; but in language there are only differences *without positive terms*. Whether we take the signified or the signifier, language has neither the ideas nor sounds that existed before the linguistic system, but only conceptual and phonic differences that have issued from the system” (Saussure 120). This confirms what was already mentioned, that signs do not have a meaning of their own, they are not referential, they only obtain their meaning thanks to the relation with other signs. The Saussurean linguistic theory revolutionized the study of language and helped form new, structuralist and later post-structuralist theories of textuality and intertextuality.

As mentioned above, the other of the two theorists who strongly influenced Kristeva's concept of language and text is Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1895-1975). In fact, Kristeva is the one to introduce Bakhtin's work to the French-speaking readers in her *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (1980). Like Saussure, Bakhtin also studies language but does not agree with his synchronic point of view, what is more, in works that he co-worked at with other Russian theorists, he proposes an alternative to the Saussurean theory of language. This alternative can be found in *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics* (1978) by Bakhtin and P. N. Medvedev and *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (1986) by Bakhtin and V. N. Volosinov. Bakhtin and Medvedev acknowledge the importance of the formalist method and so they underline the importance of the social specificity of language disregarded by Saussure: “Not only the meaning of the utterance but also the very fact of its performance is of historical and social significance” (Bakhtin/Medvedev 120). In other words, they believe that meaning is closely connected to specific individuals (or groups of individuals) who interact within specific social contexts. Therefore, they consider the synchronic approach deficient as it “loses sight of the social specificity of language and confines it to something as abstract as a lexicon or dictionary” (Allen 17).

Although Bakhtin's theory is founded on the diachronic approach to the study of language, meaning that it observes language as it evolves through time, it respects the Saussurean belief in the established system and from his perspective, “the most important aspect of language is that all language responds to previous utterances and

to preexistent patterns of meaning and evaluation, but also promotes and seeks to promote further responses” (Allen 18). In other words, Bakhtin believes that the meaning and logic of all utterances is double, as it is conditioned by what has already been said or written, and also on the social context (i.e. the relation between the addresser and the addressee). In one of his essays from *Speech and Other Late Essays* (1986), he claims that “any utterance, in addition to its own theme, always responds (in the broad sense of the word) in one form or another to others' utterances that precede it. The utterance is addressed not only to its object, but also to others' speech about it” (93-94). Here, Bakhtin emphasizes that every utterance is marked by previous speakers and contexts.

For Bakhtin, each word retains its history and cannot become completely independent of the contexts in which it has been used, as it “always finds the objects, to which it refers, already overlaid by previous utterances, disputes and evaluations” (Plett 211). He calls this double feature of language dialogism and with this theory he supports the notion of intertextual language which is only later named and defined by Kristeva. This means that he is already aware of the of the double dimension of language.

Moreover, within his study of literary works (mainly Dostoevsky's), Bakhtin notices that certain kinds of novels actually correspond with the idea of dialogism and calls them polyphonic. In such novels, instead of using only an omnipotent narrator, the author creates “a microcosm of the plurality of voices” (Plett 211), in which his voice is only one of many. Analysing some of those novels, he realizes the existence of two other phenomena, which he labels as heteroglossia and double-voiced discourse. Heteroglossia is defined as “language's ability to contain within it many voices, one's own *and* other voices” (Allen 28). Given that, we can say that language somehow embodies the fusion of differences between the past and the present and between various socio-ideological groups. In addition, Bakhtin claims that “all utterances are heteroglot in that they are functions of a matrix of forces practically impossible to recoup” (Bakhtin 1981: 428). In polyphonic novels, what Bakhtin means by 'double-voiced discourse' is the interaction between two different voices within one discourse. The speech of individual characters is always heteroglot and double-voiced, as “it serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different

intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author. In such discourse there are two voices, two meanings and two expressions” (Allen 29). In other words, we may say that such discourse contains the dialogic and intertextual nature of language since it serves two speakers, two intentions and two ideological positions, only within one utterance.

What should be mentioned, Bakhtin’s focus on language is primarily social, therefore, his position differs from that of the Formalists and of the Saussurean theorists. Also, for him, the only truly dialogic literary genre is the novel, as he views the other genres as monologic and single-voiced. This attitude may seem rather strict because in his theories regarding dialogism, he discusses language in general. That is to say, Bakhtin’s approach does not exactly correlate with the concept of intertextuality in general, although, of course, he has never used this very term himself.

The Bakhtinian perception of language certainly contributed to Kristeva’s theory of intertextuality and to the formulation of the term. In the 1960s, during the period of transition between Saussurean structuralism and post-structuralism that opposes his theories, Julia Kristeva, a Bulgarian-French philosopher, literary critic and linguist, was the first to use intertextuality as a term, by merging the theories of Saussure and Bakhtin. At this time, she was a member of editorial group in Paris called *Tel Quel*, with theorists such as Jacques Derrida, Roland Barthes and Philippe Sollers as its members, and together they focused mainly on literary language and its connection to philosophy and politics. In 1996, when she coined the term in an essay for one of Barthes’ seminars, she did not give the notion a strict frame of use in literary studies. However, she made a statement that “*all* texts are intertextual, not only modernist or postmodernist texts, and her concept, therefore, aims at characterizing the ontological status of texts in general” (Plett 210). This was met with immediate success, the concept in general, however, has been quite misunderstood, as “it has nothing to do with matters of influence by one writer upon other, or with the sources of a literary work; it does, on the other hand, involve the components of textual system such as the novel for instance” (Leon Samuel Roudiez in his Introduction to Kristeva’s *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*). In the essay, called *Le Mot, le dialogue et le roman (Word, Dialogue, Novel)*, she explains that “what

allows a dynamic dimension to structuralism is [Bakhtin's] conception of the 'literary word' as an *intersection of textual surfaces* rather than a *point* (a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character) and the contemporary or earlier cultural context” (Kristeva 36). Therefore, the structure of a literary text exists only in relation to another structure, a three-dimensional space consisting of the author, the reader and the past texts. This can be considered a gradual shift from Bakhtin's dialogism to intertextuality. What is more, she views a literary text as blending and transformation of texts, arguing that “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of *intertextuality* replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least *double*” (37).

As mentioned above, her theory stems significantly from Bakhtin's conception of intertextuality. Bakhtin believes that a literary text is a representation of discourses, where every word “is directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer-word: it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction” (Bakhtin 1981: 280). Unlike Bakhtin, Kristeva believes that intertextuality develops in every literary text. Although Kristeva focuses on text and textuality mainly in abstract terms, she acknowledges that texts develop from social and cultural background. As Allen puts it, “if intertextuality stands as the ultimate term for the kind of poetic language Kristeva is attempting to describe, then we can see that from its beginning the concept of intertextuality is meant to designate a kind of language which, because of its embodiment of otherness, is against, beyond and resistant to (mono) logic. Such language is socially disruptive, revolutionary even.” (44-45). Also, Bakhtin's emphasis on the social aspect of language is integrated in Kristeva's semiotic approach; what Bakhtin refers to as 'double-voiced', is concluded as 'double' by Kristeva, since she states that within a text as well as in between texts, poetic language is 'double'. Therefore, the Bakhtinian concept of language has been accepted by Kristeva, only with focus on intertextuality. Her theory includes the term transposition, which later replaces the term intertextuality. In *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1984) Kristeva defines transposition as “the signifying process' ability to pass from one sign system to another, to exchange and permutate them” (60). Overall, in Kristeva's theory,

intertextuality, as well as transposition, is a semiotic concept that proves that meaning of a text is not created by the author but by social, cultural and historical context.

When it comes to intertextual theory, it is Roland Barthes (1915-1980), a French literary theorist and semiotician, who is considered not only an important contributor to this theory but even one of the dominant figures in the field. Given that, we can say that his theory is too vast to be only shortly introduced and thus I will limit it to his notions that are vital for shaping his theory of intertextuality. Barthes' concept of text and textuality shows quite a large resemblance with Kristeva's concept of intertextuality. What is more, even though Kristeva is the one who is recognized for coining the term intertextuality, some critics and authors argue that “it was he [Barthes], not Kristeva, who wrote the definition for intertextuality in the *Encyclopaedia Universalis* in 1973” (Orr 20). They argue that Kristeva did not offer a systematic definition and thus they attribute it to Barthes.

Barthes, as well as Kristeva, believes that “the intertext means both the text itself and the space between all texts, in which we move, and cannot but move, all the time” (Plett 213). In his essay, *Theory of the Text*, Barthes defines text as “the fabric of the words which are arranged in such a way as to impose a meaning which is stable and as far as possible unique” (32). Claiming that, he intentionally affirms the traditional viewpoint in order to introduce it in a new way of semiotic approach to language. Moreover, in *Theory of Text* and *From Work to Text* (1971), Barthes makes a precise distinction between 'work' in the traditional sense and 'text' in the post-structuralist sense. To him, work is an objective, physical item, while text is a collection of signifiers in the work. As he writes, “a work is a finished object, something computable, which can occupy a physical space (take its place, for example, on the shelves of a library); the text is a methodological field. [...] The work is held in the hand, the text in language” (Barthes 39). Therefore, text is closely linked with the linguistic system of signs, it is understood as the act of writing, and thus functions as a device that constitutes work.

Barthes also describes the role of the reader and the author within a text. He emphasizes the role of the reader as it is crucial for the production of meaning, and he also distinguishes two kinds of readers - consumers and readers/writers. Consumers,

on the one hand, read the work for a stable meaning (in the work). On the other hand, readers are those “who are productive in their reading, or, to put it in his [Barthes'] terms, are themselves 'writers' of the text” (Allen 67). Readers involved in the latter category are, in Barthes' words, conducting 'textual analysis', as opposed to more traditional 'criticism'. What is important to mention is that this attitude to reading, also called rewriting, is at the basis of his theory of intertextuality.

One of the most important notions associated with Barthes' theory of intertextuality is his claim of the 'death of the author'. To explain the notion, he posits that the origin of the text is not the result of author's consciousness, but a plurality of other utterances and texts. In other words, the meaning of the text originates from words within the linguistic and socio-cultural system and it is the author's role to combine and compile their work from pre-existent possibilities within the system. Allen concludes this by saying that “the modern sriptor, when s/he writes, is always already in a process of reading and re-writing. Meaning comes not from the author but from language viewed intertextually” (72). Barthes thus declares the death of the author and celebrates the liberation of the reader. This view of language presented by Barthes is what theorists term as intertextual.

Although Kristeva's and Barthes' theories of intertextuality as a concept are profound, they do not really provide us with any instructions of how to put it into critical practice. However, moving on from the poststructuralism of the 1960s and 1970s onward, there are some theorists who devote their work to such a critical application of the term. As Allen puts it, “structuralists retain a belief in criticism's ability to locate, describe and thus stabilize a text's significance, even if that significance concerns an intertextual relation between a text and other texts” (94). For structuralist theorists, the signification of a text can be obtained and explained by description of elementary units and their relations. Two of such structuralists are Gérard Genette and Michael Riffaterre, who oppose Kristeva's and Barthes' untraceability of meaning. They do not target their attention on the details of individual works, but on the systems that have constructed them; rather than on individual symbols and works, they focus on the way signs and texts function within.

Genette focuses his theoretical studies on the nature of narrative discourse and especially narrative fiction. In his three major works *The Architext* (1992), *Palimpsests* (1997) and *Paratexts* (1997), Genette presents his structuralist approach to intertextuality, which he terms 'transtextuality' or 'textual transcendence'. He creates this term so to distinguish his approach from poststructural ones and defines it as “all that sets the text in relationship, whether obvious or concealed with other texts” (Genette 1992: 83-84). He uses this concept to show how texts can be systematically interpreted and understood. To do so, he subdivides the term into five categories - intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality and architextuality. In comparison to Kristeva's notion of the term, he defines intertextuality in a more restricted way, his concept is reduced to “a relationship of co-presence between two texts or among several texts” and as “the actual presence of one text within another” (Allen 98). Its most literal forms are quotations, plagiarism and allusions, and it thus provides an intertextual relationship between two or more texts, noting that, unlike some other theorists, he views quotations and allusions on the same level in the textual space.

Paratextuality, further explored in Genette's *Paratexts*, is the parallel between a text and its paratext - surrounding the main body of text. Or, as Allen puts it, “paratext marks those elements which lie on the threshold on the text and which help to direct and control the reception of a text by its readers” (100). Furthermore, Genette subdivides paratext into peritext and epitext. Peritext involves elements like titles, prefaces, notes, dedications and epigraphs, all that have a dominant effect on the interpretation of the text, as they are genuinely integrated in it. Epitext includes elements positioned outside of the text, such as interviews, reviews, publicity announcements, and other kinds of external discourse. The main function of paratext is to help readers understand when the text was published, for what purpose, by whom, and what should be their attitude to reading it. What is more, Genette distinguishes between autographic paratexts, the ones by the author, and allographic, by someone else than the author, for example a publisher. The main function of all paratexts is to instruct the reader of the text and, in particular, “to ensure for the text a destiny consistent with the author's purpose” (Genette qtd. In Allen 104). With this notion of

paratextuality, Genette opposes to post-structuralists, who dismiss the authorial intention, as he reasserts the importance of author's power in writing.

Metatextuality designates explicit or implicit commentary of one text to another. Genette suggests that “it unites a given text to another, of which it speaks without necessarily citing it (without summoning it), in fact sometimes even without naming it” (Genette 1997: 4). The best example of metatextuality are critical literary essays.

Hypertextuality denotes any connection between a text (hypertext) and a previously written text or genre on which it is based (hypotext). However, hypertext always modifies, elaborates on or extends hypotext; Genette calls such relationship a transformation. Although Genette supposes that all texts are hypertextual, the existence of a hypotext is sometimes too uncertain to serve as the basis of a hypertext. Examples of hypertextuality are parody, pastiche, translation or sequel.

Architextuality, the fifth type of transtextuality, is defined by Genette as “the entire set of general or transcendent categories - types of discourse, modes of enunciation, literary genres - from which emerges each singular text” (Allen 98). Moreover, he believes that a very important factor of architextuality is “the reader's expectations, and thus their reception of the work” (Genette 1997: 5). With his theory, Genette further develops Kristeva's study of intertextuality and defines transtextuality, consisting of five subtypes that cannot be completely separated from each other, because of their inevitable overlapping.

Although Michael Riffaterre's view of textual meaning is defined as rather stable and accurate, he conducts a theory of intertextual relations that is considered structuralist. According to this theory, he believes that texts are always connected to other texts, but from his structuralist view he terms intertextuality non-referential, as he posits that “the text refers not to objects outside of itself, but to an intertext. The words of the text signify not by referring to things, but by presupposing other texts” (Riffaterre 1981: 228). Moreover, Riffaterre distinguishes between intertextuality and what he entitles an intertext. In his words, an intertext “is a corpus of texts, textual fragments, or text-like segments of the sociolect that shares a lexicon and, to a lesser extent, a syntax with the text we are reading (directly or indirectly) in the form of

synonyms, or even conversely, in the form of antonyms” (Riffaterre 1984: 142). He believes that it is sociolect that is the most important for a proper interpretation of a text, not a specific previous text.

As his key interest lays in the process of reading which leads to deciphering the meaning of a text, rather than the text itself, he distinguishes two stages of reading - referential and semiotic. The former seeks external referents in order to decode the meaning of the text, yet a reader on this level may not be able to do so, as it might not make sense. Thus, the reader progresses to the latter stage, “in which apparently ambiguous images and phrases are connected on a deeper, non-referential level” (Allen 115). Only when the reader passes to the semiotic level of reading, within which they uncover the codes and descriptive systems, does the text become thoroughly understandable. Intertextuality (or intertextual reading), on the other hand, “is the web of functions that constitutes and regulates the relationship between text and intertext” (Riffaterre qtd. in Allen 117). In other words, intertextual reading is conducted when there is the assumption that there is no intertext at hand and thus the search for comparabilities between texts, needed for comparing, is necessary for proper semiotic interpretation of a text. Moreover, Riffaterre offers two instruments that are supposed to help the reader in finding the meaning, syllepsis, a “word which means something in one context and has an opposed or clashing meaning in another context” (Allen 115) and an interpretant, meaning “a sign which explains the relation between one sign and another sign” (115), in order to unite his theory.

Ultimately, the reader does not necessarily need to locate the specific intertext, what they need to do is the presupposition of its existence and the process of its transformation into the analysed text. Moreover, Riffaterre posits that “not only texts give us clear clues to their decoding, but also that readers have the capacity, the knowledge of the sociolect and of literary traditions, which will allow them to perform such a successful decoding” (Allen 121). Considering a reader's literary competence, Riffaterre is therefore not referring to knowledge of texts, but rather to a sufficient amount of sociolect. Such competence thus comprises of the reader's awareness of language that is used in communication. This theory might be undermined by the fact that the reference to a single sociolect is too much of a generalization, since different readers have different backgrounds, so in consequence they do not share the same

sociolect and thus it is highly improbable for them to reach the same meaning. And what is more, according to Riffaterre's theory, not all genres can be decoded in the same way.

Another theorist who is closely connected with the concept of intertextuality is poststructuralist Harold Bloom. His theory develops from his interest in Romantic poetry which he views as intertextual. Although Bloom endorses the uniqueness of poetry (texts), he points out the intertextual relations with other poems (texts). As he observes, one “cannot write or teach or think or even read without imitation” and thus what one imitates “is what another person has done, that person's writing or teaching or what informs that persons is tradition” (Bloom 32). Therefore, he claims that poems do not have their own meanings but only relations to other poems. Or, as Allen puts it, “poets write by misinterpreting and misreading the poems of specific precursor poets” (132). Further, he argues that most Romantic poets, in their works, point to John Milton, either directly or indirectly, and inquires why. To answer this question, he creates the term 'belatedness', which he defines as a state of coming after an event. Bloom sees Milton's poetry as that event which thus makes the Romantic (among other) poets belated. For this occasion, he adopts the notion of a 'poetic father' (based on vocabulary from Freud's theory of the Oedipus complex) who cannot die or be murdered. Also, he borrows Greek words for father - precursor, and son - ephebe, to demonstrate the relationship between Milton and the poets who come after him. He asserts that while a precursor too weak for a strong ephebe might have only mere effects, a precursor too strong on a weak ephebe, on the other hand, might result in rather a pathetic imitation. As the result of the latter case, the ephebe gives the impression that the precursor was the author and such situation Bloom terms Apophrades, meaning 'the return of the dead'.

Bloom's principal contribution to this topic is “the combination of a rhetorical and a psychoanalytical approach to intertextuality” (Allen 133). Bloom employs the Freudian theory of defence mechanisms in his work *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973), in which he suggests that new poets should do two things, “they must rewrite the precursor's poems, and in that very act they must defend themselves against the knowledge that they are merely involved in the process of rewriting, or what Bloom

calls misreading” (Allen 132). Bloom associates each of the stages of the map of misreading with various defence mechanisms based on Freud’s psychoanalytic theory. These mechanisms describe the ways of defending oneself from the information for that they wish to remain repressed in the unconscious; such repression is essential for the above-mentioned literature of belatedness. Furthermore, he states that poets are motivated by two desires: a desire to imitate their predecessor and a desire to remain original. The latter, however, is rather difficult to fulfil, as they are believed to be only the imitators of the precursors, although not necessarily intentionally. What is more, Bloom believes that poets transform and reinterpret the already written figures in new ways and thus create an illusion of their poetry not being influenced by the precursor poems. For Bloom, intertextuality is a result of 'the anxiety of influence', a phenomenon which “not only concerns the inability to avoid what Barthes styles the 'already written and read', but also concerns writers' and readers' refusal to accept this state of affairs” (Allen 134).

Within his theory, what Bloom also examines is the motivation of people to keep writing once they are aware of the fact that their works would be only an imitation of the previously written texts. In his opinion, for both poets and critical readers, the only aim of producing writing is “to persuade others to read their work, to become themselves an influence” (Allen 136). To oppose the theories of Barthes and Kristeva, Bloom posits that “literary texts can only have other specific literary texts as intertexts” (Allen 137), as he agrees with Riffaterre's belief that cultural and social background is not of any importance in the process of decoding the meaning of a literary text.

## **2.2 Intertextuality in Modernist Literature**

As mentioned in the theoretical part, intertextuality as such existed before, but it was only during the period of modernism that it was conceptualised and used systematically. When it comes to literature, modernist writing not only presents literary innovations such as juxtaposition or stream of consciousness, but also the engagement of intertextuality. As modernist writers believe that by rejecting tradition they may discover new, fundamental ways of writing, they focus on technical

experimentation, which leads to the use of rewriting and recapitulation of previous texts and thus the hints of intertextuality can be observed. As stated by Peter Childs, there are “paradoxical if not opposed trends towards revolutionary and reactionary positions, fear of the new and delight at the disappearance of the old, nihilism and fanatical enthusiasm, creativity and despair” (Childs 17). The first modernist texts are regarded as a reaction to the realist ones and they then become the major literary style as the times are radically changing. As modernism reaches the broader social structures of that time, it also becomes interweaved with popular culture, the need of writing more complex texts emerges, and therefore modernists decide to enrich their works by both direct and indirect references to previously written texts. It is believed that those references are very much influenced by the nostalgia for the past times. Furthermore, modernists focus on the liberation from the already established system of codes and modes of representation, which is achieved by the use of intertextuality.

Although the modernist authors may base the intertextual dialogue on pretexts from rather a wide range of epochs and cultures, “even within this range it is always the canonized and ‘classical’ texts that are dearly privileged. If contemporary popular culture is referred to at all, it tends to be with a derogatory or denigrating tone” (Plett 218). That is to say that the pretexts of the modernist works are rather normative, yet, the authors also refer to the current culture, but with the intention of somehow degrading it. And therefore, the modernists do not only focus on their audience, but more on the selection of the referenced texts. It should be also mentioned that modernist writers, as for example T. S. Eliot or James Joyce, deliberately engage very complex allusions in their works, even though they are aware of the fact that very few readers would have enough knowledge to fully understand them. For example, Joyce’s *Ulysses* shows the extraordinary nature of his intertextual writing, as there are more quotations and allusions than in works of other major authors. While Joyce can be read as a response to the epic tradition, Eliot’s poetry, on the other hand, features certain allusions that are used rather ironically. In his poems, however, the number of allusions is so large that it would require an extended work to treat such topic. What is more, it is believed that some of Kristeva’s principles of intertextuality were in fact anticipated by Eliot, even though he never used the term himself.

The allusions used in modernist literature can be classified into two categories – either those woven into the text or those composing the whole structure of a work. The former works with references to a known pretext which serve to add a depth to a writing, the latter results in inseparability of a work from the allusion. As for modernist authors, the latter is used more frequently and becomes characteristic for their writings. When it comes to the modernist practices, intertextuality might be considered rather problematic for the reader, since they get “lost in the text during finding a context or meaning for the title or the words in the text as long as the modernist experimentation is laden with richly allusive and ambiguous prose” (Childs 93). This, however, leads to the plentiful usage of intertextuality in postmodernist literature. Allen adds that “Modernism can never simply be opposed to Postmodernism, since the latter movement continually relies on and exploits the former’s styles, codes and approaches” (Allen 183).

### **2.3 Aldous Huxley and Intertextuality**

Aldous Huxley (1894-1963) was a British writer, philosopher, social reformer and humanist. During his noticeably prolific career, he authored a large amount of works, including novels, essays, poems and narratives. Huxley himself, however, repeatedly claimed that “he was not a 'congenital' novelist” (Krishnan 15). He was raised in a family that followed England's literary and scientific tradition; his mother was related to Matthew Arnold, a 19th century poet, and his grandfather was a biologist, well-known for following Darwin's ideas. Owing to the fact that he came from such a prominent family, Huxley received an excellent education and, as a result, he mastered the use of English language and what is more, he managed to combine the scientific findings with his art of writing (mostly in novels and essays). In order to understand the themes of his works, there are several facts that need to be mentioned first. In his young age, an eye disease left Huxley almost blind, therefore vision and blindness became recurring themes. Later, he started growing interest in mysticism, hypnotism and séances; and even experimented with hallucinogenic drugs, which influenced several of his books. Finally, much of his works contain the theme of the clash between the interest of an individual and the interest of society.

Considering intertextuality, in the novel *Island*, Huxley himself posits that “every writer needs a literature as his frame of reference; a set of models to conform to or to depart from” (159). He uses intertextuality willingly, in order to develop his themes; in *Brave New World*, for example, there are around 50 allusions to William Shakespeare and his plays. It is not only in *Brave New World* but also in his *Point Counter Point* and *Island*, where Huxley offers new ways of interpretation as he engages the references to literature, history, politics and culture. All of these novels thus require rather an educated reader having knowledge of the texts and situations being referred to in order to understand the novel properly and thus appreciate it. However, what distinguishes Huxley from other modernist authors is the fact that he employs intertextuality in his works to create a deeper background to the stories – although knowledge of the referred texts is an advantage, the reader is still able to understand and follow the story without further studies of the allusions.

In *Brave New World*, Huxley creates an “extensive intertextuality with the great literature of the past” (Grushow 42) to show how literature, in particular, serves as the source of understanding certain aspects of life such as emotions. Although there are certain readers who may have accuse Huxley of plagiarizing within his works, most of the literary critics, perceptive of his utilization of intertextuality, regard his allusions as an evidence of creative richness. In his novels, Huxley aims to prove the ultimate power of language and to teach his audience, by reading literature, to express their thoughts and emotions in a language.

## 3 Practical part

### 3.1 Literary Context and Summary of *Brave New World*

*Brave New World* is a dystopian novel written in 1931 and published in the following year. Although most people in the World State may seem content with their lives, there are several vital dystopian features of the novel, such as lack of individuality, the government's control over the citizens, or ban on all kinds of classic art. Also, it follows the tradition of what is called science fiction, meaning a genre which sets novels in the future, bases the plot on current science and technology, but exaggerates the consequences of the developing science and technology. As mentioned above, Huxley combined the brilliant use of satire with his fascination with science and created a futuristic World State, in which a totalitarian government controls the society with the use of science and technology. He adopts the elements of control in order to capture "the birth of a scientific dictatorship in which the last traces of individuality have been ruthlessly stamped out" (Bowering 98). Following the characteristics of science fiction, although the plot of the novel takes place in a future society, it actually refers to certain scientific theories of Huxley's time.

What infuriated Huxley during his travelling through the United States was the culture of youth, the omnipresent hints of consumerism, and sexual promiscuity, and he engaged (and emphasized) those aspects in the novel. Also, on the way to America, he encountered the book *My Life and Work* by Henry Ford, "and he saw the book's principles applied in everything he encountered after leaving San Francisco" (Bradshaw 8), which is reflected in the novel as well. Another influence on *Brave New World* is H. G. Wells' novel *Men Like Gods* (1923), as it provoked Huxley to write a parody and critique of its utopian ideas. Furthermore, some of the authors, such as George Orwell and Kurt Vonnegut, believe that Huxley was inspired by Yevgeny Zamyatin's dystopian novel *We* (1920-1921). Vonnegut states that in writing his first novel entitled *Player Piano* (1952), he "cheerfully ripped off the plot of *Brave New World*, whose plot had been cheerfully ripped off from Zamyatin's novel *We*" (Staff, 1973). However, this has been denied by Huxley, as he claims that he only wrote *Brave New World* as a reaction to H. G. Wells and that he was not aware of the existence of *We* at that time.

The novel begins in the Central London Hatching and Conditioning Centre in AF (After Ford) 632 - the year AD 2540 in the Gregorian calendar. The Director of the Hatchery and Henry Foster, one of his assistants, teach a group of students about artificial processes (Bokanovsky and Podsnap) which the Hatchery employs to produce a large number of practically identical human embryos, each of them destined to be a part of one of the five castes: Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon. While the Alphas are meant to be the World State leaders, with the succession of the casts the quality of physical and intellectual characteristics of human beings descends. Starting in the early childhood, kids are undergoing a practice called 'hypnopaedia' or 'sleep-teaching', which instructs them to believe in the importance of society over the value of individual. In order to ensure that everyone obeys the World State's rules and agrees with them, people regularly consume a drug called *soma*, which basically brainwashes them and thus lets them escape from the reality and deprives them of certain human emotions. Not only the intercourse between adults is regular and purely casual (without any romantic feelings), as they are taught that everyone does belong to everyone, even little children often engage in sexually-based games while being completely naked. Mustapha Mond, one of the ten World leaders, comments on it by explaining the importance of removing human relationships and strong emotions from society, from the very low age.

Lenina Crowne, one of the main characters of the novel and an employee in the factory, has been meeting Henry Foster almost exclusively for four months, which is quite unusual, yet she is aware of herself being attracted to Bernard Marx, another central figure of the novel, who is described as too small and weak for his caste and thus dissatisfied with the World State. Huxley creates a social contrast when he sends Lenina and Bernard to the Savage Reservation in New Mexico. Considering Bernard's unusual behaviour, the Director plans to exile him to Iceland as soon as he returns, aware of this fact, Bernard decides to visit the Reservation anyway. What shocks Lenina and Bernard right upon their arrival is the appearance of the inhabitants, unlike in the World State, they age and fall ill. To their horror, they observe a religious ritual, during which a young man is being whipped - something highly unimaginable for them. The two meet John, a young man isolated from the others in the village. He tells them about his childhood and his mother Linda, who, Bernard realizes, might be the

woman lost in a storm during a trip to the Reservation with the Director twenty years ago. John informs Bernard that he learned how to read by browsing a book called *The Chemical and Bacteriological Conditioning of the Embryo* and also *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. John agrees to visit London and is enthusiastic about it, as Linda has told him so much about it, but only if she can accompany him, which is agreed upon.

After their return, the Director is about to exile Bernard, but his decision is changed when Bernard introduces John and Linda, since he is embarrassed by his secret of being John's father (words 'father' and 'mother' are rather amusing in the World State). John and Bernard immediately become quite popular, the former due to his completely different way of life which gains him an attribute of the "Savage", the latter for discovering him. John grows more and more disturbed by the society of the World State, yet his sexual attraction to Lenina grows as well. Both of them are confused, as their ideas of physical relationship are based on different social conventions. John is introduced to Helmholtz Watson, who is, as a contrast to Bernard, too strong for his caste. They gradually become close, as they share the passion for Shakespeare, although Helmholtz finds the passages about love and marriage rather comical.

Lenina becomes almost obsessed with John and one day, after taking her dosage of soma, she tries to seduce him, to which he angrily reacts with lines from Shakespeare degrading certain traits of women. Towards the end of the novel, John learns that Linda is diagnosed with a terminal illness and stays by her side while she dies. Some of the boys in the hospital comment on Linda's unattractiveness, which enrages John who now becomes fully disgusted by the society. Following this, he tries to convince a group of Delta workers to stop taking soma, throwing it out of the window and causing a riot, which is overheard by Bernard and Helmholtz who hurry to help John. As a consequence, the three of them are arrested and brought to Mond's office. John and Mond argue about which values should be essential for a functioning society, Bernard and Helmholtz are sentenced to exile.

At the very end, John leaves the office for the countryside to deprive himself of feelings of anger by self-flagellation, which attracts many observers and reporters. More people arrive to beg John to whip himself so that they could watch it, and this

scene results in an orgy in which John also participates. In the morning, John cannot bear all the sadness and anger caused by himself surrendering to the World State and commits suicide.

### **3.2 Historical Intertextuality in Characters' Names**

Considering both the major and the minor characters in *Brave New World*, Huxley's choice of their names is interesting. Most of the first as well as last names allude to important people in history who made a certain influence on society, politics, religion, or industry. As mentioned in the section about the novel's context, Huxley refers to the situation within the society of his time, therefore, most of the names evoke personages who lived during his lifetime, other, however, are connected to those who had have influence in previous centuries. Although none of the names is connected with William Shakespeare in particular, a brief overview of the origin of the names will be offered, in order to present yet another type of intertextuality than Shakespearean. What is more, some of the names are chosen logically (i.e. the character share the same or similar character traits with the famous personages) such as John the Savage, Henry Ford and Mustafa Mond, some are chosen for the purpose of irony (Lenina Crowne), and some unite both purposes (Bernard Marx, Helmholtz Watson). However, most of these connections are only speculative and not confirmed officially by Huxley.

The name of John, the protagonist of the second part of the novel, is thought to be based on John the Baptist from the New Testament, who baptized Jesus Christ. The reason may be that they share comparable beliefs and values, as well as the way of clothing and feeding (both based on natural products). Huxley refers to John as Savage, as he attempts to create a satirical contrast between a pure, humane person, and the manufactured lives of people in the World State. The term 'noble savage' is most commonly associated with Jean Jacques Rousseau, an 18<sup>th</sup> century philosopher, who believed that those considered 'savages' were not brutal but noble. In literature, 'a noble savage' impersonates the concept of a wild human who has not been corrupted by the civilization.

When it comes to the character of Henry Foster, Huxley probably refers to Henry Ford, an American industrialist and magnate, who revolutionized industry with

the invention of the assembly line and whom the people of the World State perceive as a deity. Furthermore, Henry's last name connotes John Foster, a British essayist, who asserted the necessity of disciplined education, which Henry mirrors perfectly.

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was the founder of the Republic of Turkey and was in function of its president at the time Huxley was writing *Brave New World*. Thus, he is a perfect inspiration for the character Mustapha Mond, one of the ten World leaders, whose last name means "world" in French. What is more, the last name is inspired by Alfred and Ludwig Mond, representatives of a period of the great industrial development between the early Victorian prosperity (also called the "golden age") and the Great Depression of 1929-1933.

Lenina's first name is associated with Vladimir Lenin, the leader of the Russian Revolution who then became the communist leader of the Soviet Union. Quite paradoxically, Lenina is far from the thought of rebelling against the totalitarian government of the World State, as she obeys all of its rules. Her last name might be a reference to John Crowne, a 17<sup>th</sup> century dramatist whose play often contain a theme of romantic love, which is ironical considering her attitude to love.

Bernard Marx's first name might be a reference to the playwright George Bernard Shaw, as he lived in London when Huxley was working on *Brave New World*. Shaw actively encouraged equal political rights for women, which correlates with Bernard's revulsion at the acts of treating Lenina as a sexual object. Karl Marx was a German philosopher and revolutionary whose class theory defines a class as a group with interior interests and common worldview. This makes Bernard's last name rather ironic, as he is dissatisfied with his own cast, since he feels physically too weak to belong among the Alphas.

Helmholtz Watson probably takes his first name after a German physician Hermann von Helmholtz as they both believe in the importance of senses. The last name evokes John B. Watson, an American psychologist, who was an advocate of conditioning, Helmholtz, on the other hand, is strictly against it and believes that people should be permitted to keep their genuine feelings and thoughts.

Other characters whose names might be an allusion to famous personas are Polly Trotsky, Sarojini Engels, Darwin Bonaparte, Benito Hoover, Dr. Shaw, or Dr. Wells.

### **3.3 Shakespearean Intertextuality in Brave New World**

As this chapter focuses on allusions to the works of William Shakespeare in *Brave New World*, on the parallels between the characters as well as on the direct quotes from Shakespeare's plays, it should be clarified what Shakespeare really represents in the novel first. Not only is he the symbol of all the art and other beautiful things that have been prohibited by the World State government in order to maintain order and stability, but he and his works also serve as the embodiment of the noble values of humanity, such as emotion, love and passion, which have been suppressed by the World State to prevent its citizens from perceiving the reality, by forcing everyone to feel content.

Shakespeare's words play a great role in the novel, not only for John, who expresses the feelings of happiness, sadness and anger by quoting them, but also for the development of the story, climaxing rapidly at the end. Most of what John has learned in the Reservation comes from his reading of Shakespeare. Later, as he spends some time in the World State, his Shakespearean quotations draw a notable contrast with the utterances, often really just hypnopædic phrases, of its citizens. However, there is also an obvious similarity between them; by juxtapositioning John's quotations and the World State citizens' "brainwashing" lines, Huxley adds a significantly sarcastic tone to the novel in order to intensify the dystopian sentiment of the novel. What is more, he manages brilliantly to engage a great number of parallels to Shakespeare's plays; parallels with a depth so immense that if one reads between the lines, the stories and their characters mirror (as well as alter) each other perfectly.

### 3.3.1 *The Tempest*

*The Tempest*, written between 1610 and 1611, was Shakespeare's final play, or to put it more precisely, the last play that he wrote entirely by himself. It is therefore regarded as one in which the playwright retires from the theatre. He does so with the use of words of Prospero, the Duke of Milan, who renounces his magic:

“Now my charms are all o'erthrown,  
And what strength I have's mine own,  
Which is most faint. Now, 'tis true  
I must be here confined by you” (Shakespeare 42).

What is more, not only *The Tempest* has been adapted many times ever since its publication, but it is also a source of inspiration for authors who use allusions to the play and its characters – for example T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land*, Alexander Pope's *Rape of the Lock* or George Lamming's *The Pleasures of Exile*. As mentioned above, in *Brave New World*, Huxley alludes to several Shakespeare's plays; the most prominent one, considering the themes and characters, is *The Tempest*.

In the original play, Prospero, the Duke of Milan, and his daughter Miranda live on a deserted island where they have been stranded for twelve years, with only one other human being – Caliban, a native of the island who had been enslaved by Prospero. One day, Prospero induces a great storm (or tempest) which causes a shipwreck during which Ferdinand, the son of the king of Naples, and other men are washed ashore. Aside from her father and Caliban, Miranda has never seen any other men before and thus she is dazzled by the sight of them. Prospero, on the other hand, knows the nature of men very well and thus holds rather a sceptic point of view towards them. In her monologue, Miranda delivers the three words that Huxley adopts for the title of the novel.

“Oh wonder!  
How many goodly Creatures are there here!  
How beauteous mankind is!  
O brave new World that has such people in't!” (Shakespeare 181).

What is crucial to mention is that in the Renaissance period, the word 'brave' does not only connote one's courage, but the meaning was shifted to describe the physical and moral ideals of Renaissance nobility. In *Brave New World*, the fourth line of this monologue is repeated throughout the novel by John the Savage; he utters it for the first time after being transported from the Reservation to the World State. All the literature from the time 'Before Ford' is banned and thus not read, which is a crucial fact that John, a passionate Shakespeare reader (and the only one who is known to have read his works), is not aware of yet. Therefore, he is quite enthusiastic about the vision of visiting a "new world". Right at this point, there is a connection between the original play and the novel's title: Shakespeare's *Miranda* has spent her entire life on a desolate island with only her father and two spirits, so she has never experienced any kind of a romantic relationship with a man. One day, a shipwreck on the shore occurs and apart from Ferdinand, a nobleman and the son of the King of Naples, she eventually gets a sight of all the other men accompanying him. This vision is followed by her pure excitement and a realization of new feelings, which lead to her enunciating those lines profoundly. Even though John repeats the locution as the plot evolves, each time he does so in a slightly different tone, as his view of the civilized World State gradually changes.

For John, Shakespeare provides the language through which he sees and understands the world. Also, it is through this very language that the novel alludes to the great themes of *The Tempest*, and what is more, by referring to the play, Huxley manages to demonstrate the contrast between the civilized and uncivilized world, although he does so with a significant amount of irony. Since John is accustomed to the values of the Elizabethan Age, he is quite astonished as he gradually learns about the social and political system of the World State. He is depicted as a Shakespearean nobleman, due to his values and behaviour, so the only resemblance with the character of Shakespeare's Caliban, the only inhabitant of the island who is depicted as half human and half monster, is that they were both born outside the society and thus are not like the civilized men and do not even know the rules and the laws to obey. At this point, Shakespeare's original characters of Ferdinand (the nobleman) and Caliban (the Savage) seem to merge together and become one. John is able to give words to all of his repressed emotions thanks to the works of Shakespeare, can quote every passage

by heart. Once John arrives to the World State with Bernard and Lenina, he refers to *The Tempest* with a vision of a new adventure: “O wonder! [...] How many goodly creatures there are here! How beauteous mankind is! [...] O brave new world [...]. O brave new world that has such people in it!” (Huxley 107). These words bear the very amazement and excitement of Miranda's original utterance. As the story evolves, Bernard decides to show John 'the civilized life in all the aspects', which leads to taking him to the T-Tower, where they watch a huge Green Rocket in the sky. John is asked about his opinion about it, as he observes it steadily. He finds it “very nice. 'Still,' he says, 'Ariel could put a girdle round the earth in forty minutes’” (Huxley 121). In *The Tempest*, Ariel is one of the mentioned spirits who plays the role of a servant while performing tasks for Prospero. With this quotation, John expresses only a little astonishment at civilized inventions. In contrast, when John is informed about the assembling room as well as the Bokanovsky groups, his reaction is much stronger, yet he uses Miranda's words about the brave new world again. But this time he utters the words with an amount of anger and disgust, which is brilliantly accentuated by Huxley's sense of satirical writing.

One of the great themes of the novel, sexuality, is engaged in the story from the very beginning. As explained in the plot section of the practical part, in the World State, the concepts of parents and couples do not exist, and as one of the hypnopædic lines claims - everyone belongs to everyone else. When John and Lenina discover their strong feelings for each other, only of different nature, John still cannot accept the idea of engaging in an intercourse only for pleasure, without getting married first. As a result, John regards Lenina as less pure, due to her promiscuous behaviour, and that causes him a lot of anger.

However, he still wishes to win her affection and so he starts complimenting her, saying “Oh, you so perfect [...] so perfect and so peerless are created [...] of every creature's best” (Huxley 145). Here, John recites to Lenina the very same words that Ferdinand recites to Miranda on the island. He is declaring that all the women he has known until that moment have been, in fact, flawed but she is just perfect. To his surprise, this only results in Lenina feeling slightly irritated, yet John proceeds. This time he considers winning her heart by accomplishing a burdensome task. Again, he tries to persuade her by quoting Shakespeare's lines: “But some kinds of baseness are

nobly undergone” (Huxley 146). That is to say that he would very much like to undergo something noble for her, although he knows that Lenina would still not understand him. The original line belongs to Ferdinand, as he carries big amounts of wood in order to prove himself worthy of Miranda.

As John is no longer able to suppress his feelings for her, he finally declares his love for her; Lenina seems pleased, but as soon as John mentions marriage, she becomes irritated again, nevertheless, he keeps persuading her, arguing “If thou dost break her virgin knot before all sanctimonious ceremonies may with full and holy rite...” (Huxley 147). This line originally belongs to Prospero who is telling Ferdinand that he can marry Miranda but is warning him that he shall not steal her virginity before they officially become husband and wife. Since John doubtlessly agrees with Prospero's values, he chooses to quote this very line. Lenina's desperation, combined with a hint of anger, lead her to seducing John, who, unfortunately for her, still stays true to his moral ethics and thus exclaims loudly: “The murkiest den, the most opportune place [...] the strongest suggestion our worser genius can, shall never melt mine honour into lust. Never, never!” (Huxley 147-148). This, except for the final “Never, never!”, is Ferdinand's response to Prospero's request about Miranda remaining a virgin until the marriage. With these lines, John insists on not having sex with Lenina, even though meanwhile she declares her love for him and undresses herself. Nevertheless, she continues in seducing him, until John releases his anger, violently pushes her away, calls her a 'whore' and the two part in separate rooms.

With a phone call interrupting their argument, John leaves the apartment and rushes to the Hospital for the Dying to see Linda. Wounded by her death, he exits the room, encounters a group of Bokanovsky twins who are about to take their soma rations. One last time, he recalls the line “O brave new world, O brave new world!”, this time with bitter irony, as he realizes that his perception of these words has changed. After throwing the soma rations out of the window, John finds himself at Mond's office and they talk about modern civilization. One of the few things that John seems to like about it is the constant sound of music. To his surprise, Mond responds with a quote from *The Tempest*: “Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments will hum about my ears and sometimes voices” (Huxley 168). John is truly pleased and in addition, he learns why Shakespeare, other literature and all the beautiful things are

banned in the World State. In the original play, Caliban utters these words as he discusses the mysterious music caused by Prospero's magic, constantly playing on the island.

### 3.3.2 *Hamlet*

Huxley created a number of parallels between *Brave New World* and *Hamlet*, mainly between the protagonists. The most considerable connection is between John and Hamlet: John is Huxley's Hamlet. At the beginning, it seems that Bernard would adopt the role of Hamlet, but with the introduction of John, his character becomes more similar to that of Laertes (son of Polonius, the chief counsellor of the king), as they both kill the protagonist in the end; Bernard does not do so intentionally, but he is the one who brought John to the World State. Hamlet and John both experience the alienation from their mothers, either mental or physical, and they also resent the men their mothers engage with – Claudius and Popé. While Hamlet believes that Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are truly his friends, they are just using him to gather information they intend to use to gain the affection of the King. Similarly, John regards Bernard as a friend, who introduces him a brave new world, yet he does not know that it is only for the purpose of career and fame.

Lenina's character evokes Shakespeare's Ophelia, mostly because they both have certain feelings for men that are impossible for them to attain (Ophelia for Hamlet and Lenina for John) and neither of the two women is treated nicely by them. Also, with the aim of suppressing their problems at difficult times, they both use medicaments (i.e. drugs) in order to sustain their sanity – Ophelia gives herself rue, an herb that is used to treat pain, and Lenina takes her soma doses.

Another comparable relation is between Claudius and the World State, as they take away the happiness from Hamlet and John's lives, Claudius by killing Hamlet's father and the World State by destroying John's values and beliefs.

Within *Brave New World*, John quotes or contemplates Hamlet's words several times, although sometimes altering the tone or the meaning. It is around his twelfth birthday that John is given *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* by Linda,

who thinks it would be good enough for him to practise reading, even though she views it as full of nonsense. He randomly opens the book at a page from Hamlet and the words start circulating in his mind like a thunder. Hamlet, in his monologue, utters: “Nay, but to live / In the rank sweat of an enseamed bed, / Stew’d in corruption, honeying and making love / Over the nasty sty...” (Huxley 101). Hamlet speaks these lines to Gertrude in berating her for marrying Claudius, as he is the brother of his father. Reading this, John links the words with his feelings towards Linda, because he is not glad knowing that she has a close relationship with other man than himself (Popé) which evokes Freud’s Oedipus complex. His dislike of Popé gradually escalates, but only after he reads Hamlet’s words, addressed to Claudius, saying “a man can smile and smile and be a villain. Remorseless, treacherous, lecherous, kindless villain” (Huxley 101), he realizes how strong his hate is. Although he does not understand all of the words properly, John feels that they are so powerful that he is finally able to express his hate towards Popé. One day, he sees Linda and Popé lying on the bed together, drunk, and at this moment, he is filled with anger and keeps repeating that he will kill Popé. Suddenly, he recalls the words “when he is drunk asleep, or in his rage / Or in the incestuous pleasure of his bed...” (Huxley 102), lines in which Hamlet ponders what would be the best way to kill Claudius. Interestingly enough, not only does Shakespeare illustrate John’s emotions, but he is also the one to influence his actions, as he attempts to kill Popé.

Many years later, when John has already spent some time in the World State, he causes a riot and finds himself in Mond’s office, where they talk about Shakespeare, while Mond explains to John why the civilization has developed the way it has. As John disagrees with the World State’s abolition of everything unpleasant, instead of learning to accept it, he adds: “whether ‘tis better in the mind to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, or to take arms against a sea of troubles and by opposing end them...” (Huxley 183). John uses lines from Hamlet’s “To be or not to be” speech, in which he ponders whether it is better to suffer while being alive or to kill himself, in order to make his point. Therefore, in this very speech Hamlet debates suicide, which might be Huxley’s subtle foreshadowing of John’s destruction by the society. One day, after Linda’s unfortunate death, John is working in the garden, while speculating why Linda had died, become less than a human and finally, as he

remembers the sight of her dead body, “a good kissing carrion” (Huxley 195). These words originate from Hamlet, when he is furious at the fact that everybody lies to him and loses faith in the world. John, having lost his mother – the only thing he had left from his previous life, finds himself in a similar situation, hence the expression. Furthermore, John starts thinking about death in general, wondering what one dreams of after it comes, and he asks himself “for in that sleep of death, what dreams?” (Huxley 195). This quotation is also from Hamlet’s monologue about suicide, where he compares death to a long sleep; both Hamlet and John contemplate suicide, yet they are not sure what is to come after death.

### **3.3.3 *Othello***

*The Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice* is Shakespeare’s tragedy believed to have been written a few years after *Hamlet*. It tells the story of Othello, a Moorish general in the Venetian army, his wife Desdemona, and his trusted but jealous and treacherous ensign Iago. As the play is presented with the themes of racism, love, jealousy, and betrayal, it has been a source of plentiful literary and film adaptations. John first starts reading *Othello* after he returns to his room from the feely (a movie experienced not only through sight and sound, but also touch) called *Three Weeks in a Helicopter*. Not only *Othello* reminds him of the hero of the movie, a man of a dark-coloured skin abused for his race, but also of himself, as he was raised among people of a different race. As he struggles with the clash between his desire for Lenina and a conviction not to succumb to temptation, there are several instances when John calls her an “impudent strumpet”, for the first time when she undresses herself in front of him. He is disgusted by Lenina for attempting to lay with him without them being married, this disgust, however, stems from his own anger for desiring her that much. Here, Huxley makes an allusion to *Othello*, who is convinced by Iago that Desdemona is being unfaithful to him. Neither of the women are really to blame, as Lenina has been conditioned to such behaviour and Desdemona is loyal to her husband. When it comes to physical contact, another thing that disgusts John is the common attraction to the new things, mainly feelies, during which, as he claims, he even feels the people kissing. He is able

to express his hatred towards feelies only through Othello's exclamation "Goats and monkeys!" (Huxley 168). These exact words are Othello's reaction to Iago informing him about Desdemona being unfaithful, as he compared her and her supposed lover to those animals. Later on, when John has a conversation with Mond in his office, Mond attempts to persuade him about the positive effects of soma; John replies with Othello's lines: "If after every tempest came such calms, may the winds blow till they have wakened death" (Huxley 183), suggesting that the suffering caused by storms is worth the calm that comes after. Othello's meaning of the word is literal, as he endures a huge tempest, followed by the experience of a calm that he has never felt before. Mond also informs him about the Violent Passion Surrogate (V.P.S.) treatments which are regular and during which the human organism is filled with adrenaline in order to create a psychological equivalent of fear and rage. Noticing the disapproval in John's face, he compares it to "all the tonic effects of murdering Desdemona and being murdered by Othello, without any of the inconveniences" (Huxley 184), as he hopes to persuade him with the power of Othello's words. Mond creates this comparison so that John can understand the concept.

### **3.3.4 *Romeo and Juliet***

The tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet* is among Shakespeare's most popular plays, with the theme of love so strong that even today, the two main characters are viewed as archetypes of love. Set in Verona, the story revolves around Juliet Capulet and Romeo Montague, whose love is forbidden due to a conflict between their powerful families. The play's origin can be traced back to antiquity, yet Shakespeare enhanced the plot and developed new characters, particularly Mercutio (a friend of Romeo) and Paris (a kinsman who longs marrying Juliet). Other characters mentioned in the following analysis are Julia's parents and her cousin Tybalt.

Although the kind of love between Romeo and Juliet is not exactly reflected in *Brave New World*, there are, however, certain similarities in the two stories, the main being the fact that John and Lenina come from different backgrounds and thus the society does not provide a suitable opportunity for a love they could share and,

eventually, their relationships result in a tragedy. The first time John quotes Romeo is when he observes Lenina as she sleeps in her bed after consuming an amount of soma. It is a fly buzzing round her that makes John recall Romeo's lines: "On the white wonder of dear Juliet's hand, may seize / And steal immortal blessing from her lips, / Who, even in pure and vestal modesty, / Still blush, as thinking their own kisses sin" (Huxley 111). In this monologue, Romeo laments that even the flies will have the opportunity to spend more time with his beautiful Juliet than him, as he has just been banished from Verona. Similarly, John uses these words in order to describe the beauty of Lenina, although she does not bare the innocence and purity of Juliet. Hesitatingly, John reaches his hand towards sleeping Lenina, as if he were to stroke a shy bird, yet, he does not allow himself to touch her. "Did he dare? Dare to profane with his unworthiest hand that... No, he didn't" (Huxley 111). These are Romeo's words to Juliet when he meets her for the first time, wondering whether he should kiss her hand which might be offensive towards her virginal purity. Coming from John, this is rather ironic since Lenina has lost her virginity a long time ago.

As for another reference, Huxley sets a scene in which "the Savage [is] reading *Romeo and Juliet* aloud – reading (for all the time he was seeing himself as Romeo and Lenina as Juliet) with an intense and quivering passion" (Huxley 141). Reading Juliet's lines about her refusal of marrying Paris (which she was demanded to do by her parents) is overheard by Helmholtz, who, on the one hand, is somehow attracted by the language, yet, on the other hand, he is more than amused by both the word "parents" and the idea of forced marriage. John proceeds to read the rest of Juliet's lines to Helmholtz: "Is there no pity sitting in the clouds, / That sees into the bottom of my grief? / O sweet my mother, cast me not away: / Delay this marriage for a month, a week; / Or, if you do not, make the bridal bed / In that dim monument where Tybalt lies..." (Huxley 141). At this moment, Helmholtz starts laughing loudly at the whole concept of Shakespearean love, which is rather offending for John who was raised on such concept and identifies himself with Romeo.

### 3.3.5. *Macbeth*

As some scholars believe, in *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, Shakespeare reflects his own relationship with James I, the King of England at that time and also the patron of Shakespeare's playing company the King's Men (Glynne 231). What is interesting, there is a superstition in the world of theatre that *Macbeth* is a cursed play and that quoting from it before performances might cause a disaster. *Macbeth* is a general in the army who is delivered a prophecy by the Three Witches, saying that one day he will become the King of Scotland. Encouraged by his wife, Lady *Macbeth*, he murders King Duncan and claims the throne for himself. Not only this action results in profound feelings of guilt, but also, he is then enforced to perform even more murder acts in order to protect himself from the suspicion. His tyrannical reign together with the launching civil war gradually bring both him and Lady *Macbeth* to the edge of madness, followed by death.

In *Brave New World*, Huxley creates a parallel with *Macbeth* by employing the themes of freedom and individualism, or, more particularly, the loss of these essential human rights. After the religious ritual in the Savage Reservation, mentioned in the plot section, after greeting Lenina and Bernard, John points to the blood stains on the ground (the result of him whipping himself) and asks, "Do you see that damned spot?" (Huxley 89). Here, Huxley uses an alternation of Lady *Macbeth*'s line, "Out, damned spot! Out, I say!" when she recalls the vision of the blood on her hands after helping her husband murder the king. Moreover, Lenina's mechanical response to John, "A gramme is better than a damn," creates an excellent contrast between the hypnopaedic chants and the beautiful language of Shakespeare. John is quite proud of himself as he is able to sacrifice more blood than the rest of the men, describing the amount as if "the multitudinous seas incarnadine" (Huxley 89). *Macbeth* says this line when he is overwhelmed with guilt of murdering the king, John, on the contrary, says it with obvious satisfaction in his voice, since he knows that he would have been able to sacrifice even more blood – so much blood that it would incarnadine the ocean. John proceeds to tell Bernard and Lenina about his life in the Reservation, particularly about the ritual in which all the boys must participate in order to become men. Unfortunately

for John, because of his roots, the other boys started abusing him verbally and physically before it was his turn to make a sacrifice, so that he was forced to run away, wounded. It was not the pain from the wounds that then made him contemplate suicide, but the unbearable feeling of loneliness. As John is thinking about the time and the death, the words “To-morrow and to-morrow and to-morrow” cross his mind. (Huxley 105) These are quoted by Macbeth in the scene where Lady Macbeth dies and where he ponders the significance of life. This line foreshadows the death of Macbeth as well as John’s future separation from the Indian society. However, this is not the only quote from *Macbeth* considering the inevitability of death. At the end of the novel, when John is in the garden thinking about Linda’s death, the very thought of death leads John to remember Macbeth’s line, “And all our yesterdays have lighted fools the way to dusty death” (Huxley 195). John realizes that every day, in fact, brings people closer to death, even himself to his own. As the previous one, this quote also originates from Macbeth’s speech about life and death.

### 3.3.6 Other plays

Considering the number of Shakespearean quotes in *Brave New World*, the plays above were assigned their own chapters. However, there are several other plays that influenced Huxley’s writing and thus should be also mentioned. One of the longest quotes in the novel is a part of King Lear’s monologue; John adopts his lines after he refuses to sleep with Lenina who has just undressed herself and attempted to seduce him, and he shouts: “The wren goes to’t and the small glided fly does lecher in my sight.” [...] “The fitchew nor the soiled horse goes to’t with a more riotous appetite. Down from the waist they are Centaurs, though women all above. But to the gridle do the gods inherit. Beneath is all the fiend’s. There’s hell, there’s darkness, there is the sulphurous pit, burning scalding, stench, consumption; fie, fie, fie, pain, pain! Give me an ounce of civet, good apothecary, to sweeten my imagination” (Huxley 150). Originally, Lear addresses these words to all women for being prurient. Later, in Mond’s office, John comments on the ways in which people in the ‘new world’ are being punished, calls them “pleasant vices” within his speech, as he says: “Do you remember that bit in King Lear?” [...] “The gods are just and of our pleasant vices

make instruments to plague us; the dark and vicious place where thee he got cost him his eyes, and Edmund answers – you remember, he’s wounded, he’s dying – ‘Thou has spoken right; ‘tis true. The wheel has come full circle; I am here’ (Huxley 181). These lines belong to Edmund who criticizes his father, Gloucester, for an illegitimate sexual relationship (making thus Edmund a bastard), asserting that he is being punished for this indiscretion by having his eyes tore out. Finally, when John is pondering Linda’s death as well as death in general, he recalls Gloucester’s lines about the cruelty of gods, saying that “As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods; they kill us for their sport. Thunder again; words that proclaimed themselves true – truer somehow than truth itself. And yet that same Gloucester had called them ever-gentle gods” (Huxley 195). While quoting this, John is wondering why life has been so cruel to him.

The relationship between John and Lenina has been already elaborated on above; John’s feelings are of a pure love, Lenina’s, on the other hand, are more of a physical nature. To express his feelings, John quotes from Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida*. In the Reservation, when he gazes at her sleeping during her ‘soma-holiday’, he uses Troilus’s words to describe her. “Her eyes, her hair, her cheek, her gait, her voice; / Handlest in thy discourse O! that her hand, / In whose comparison all whites are ink / Writing their own reproach; to whose soft seizure / The cygnet’s down is harsh...” (Huxley 111). These lines are originally to describe the beauty of Cressida. During John and Lenina’s conversation about the values connected to the romantic relationships, John quotes Troilus’s words again, this time in order to convince her about the advantages of marriage. “Outliving beauty’s outward with a mind that doth renew swifter than blood decays” (Huxley 147). Not only that Lenina does not agree, his words irritate her, as she finds the act of marriage rather amusing.

When Dr. Shaw informs John about soma for the first time, he mentions the immeasurable durations out of time (‘soma-holiday’) one can experience, and he adds that it is what their ancestors called eternity. To this, John replies with a line from *Anthony and Cleopatra*, saying that “Eternity was in our lips and eyes” (Huxley 118). This line belongs to Cleopatra being angry at Anthony for informing her about leaving Egypt and returning to Rome. John uses this line one more time when he is thinking about Lenina and cannot stop envisaging her (Huxley 193).

At the very end of the novel, when John contemplates sleep and death, he remembers the play *Measure for Measure*, particularly the Duke's line stating that "Thy best of rest is sleep and that thou oft provok'st; yet grossly fear'st thy death which in no more" (Huxley 195). That is to say that people usually enter sleep willingly and since death might be considered a kind of sleep, there should not be a reason to fear it.

## 4 Conclusion

The main objective of this thesis was to introduce and further present the role of intertextuality in Aldous Huxley's novel *Brave New World*. The intertextual practice is employed in the novel in order to create a deeper dimension of the story; the allusions bare important meanings, yet the knowledge of the original texts (hypotexts) is not essential for understanding the plot.

Huxley's employment of intertextuality is coherent; every Shakespearean quote is used systematically to fit the particular situation, and once the reader is familiar with Shakespeare's works, they obtain a special insight into the characters' minds. What is more, some quotes even serve as elements of foreshadowing further course of the plot. In *Brave New World*, there are approximately fifty allusions to Shakespeare which help develop the theme of the novel (though not all of them were analysed within the practical part of the thesis, due to economical reasons). Some of the allusions are quite clear and obvious, others require a reader who is rather familiar with the hypotext. There are several parallels with each of the chosen Shakespeare's plays and, what is more, Huxley's use of allusions provides him with the ability to modify and elaborate on the hypotext and thus emphasize the contrast between two completely different societies.

As mentioned above, Huxley employs intertextual practices in the novel in a way that it is not necessarily required from the reader to be aware of all the alluded texts. Such awareness, however, enriches the reader with another layer of narration and offers the possibility to find new meanings within the story. Moreover, a reader familiar with Shakespeare's plays on a deeper level has the advantage of fully understanding the satire in the novel, as some of the quotations are accompanied by rather an ironic undertone. But again, this layer may be separated from the story and the reader is still able to understand and follow the plot without any confusion.

Huxley uses intertextuality to enrich the story with the allusions to monologues and dialogues of Shakespeare's characters in order to create a certain background for the story and also to provide a well-read reader with a certain feeling or emotion while reading the novel. This is to say that the intertextual practice helps Huxley present new dimensions of communication between his characters. John's constant quoting

Shakespeare helps the reader better understand his current state of mind as well as the gradual change in his view on Lenina and the World State.

As for the approaches to the intertextual practise that were analysed in the theoretical part, it is Bakhtin, who believes that the meaning and logic of all utterances is double, as it is conditioned by what has already been said or written. This aspect of language is visible in *Brave New World*, since the allusions respond to previous utterances, yet their meaning is slightly changed in certain cases (for satirical and ironical purposes mostly). That is to confirm his notion of dialogism, as each quoted word retains its history and also cannot become completely independent of the context in which it has been used. Also, the 'double-voiced discourse' is present in the novel and expresses the direct intention of the character who is quoting Shakespeare (mostly John) as well as the refracted intention of the author.

Kristeva observes that a literary text exists in a three-dimensional space consisting of the author, the reader and the past texts. Such relationship lets the reader of the novel discover the connections with Shakespeare and ponder them. The exact meaning of such connections, however, is not created by the author but by social, cultural and historical background.

Similarly, within his examination of the role of the reader and the author within a text, Barthes emphasizes the role of the reader as it is crucial for the production of meaning. Although the reader of *Brave New World* does not necessarily need to be familiar with all Shakespeare's plays in order to understand the story, such knowledge is a notable advantage, since it adds an extra dimension to the overall meaning. A well-read reader of Shakespeare is thus productive in the reading of the novel and becomes what Barthes labels a 'writer of the text' and has the ability to conduct a proper 'textual analysis'.

The intertextuality in *Brave New World* also correlates with Riffaterre's theory of intertextuality, as he posits that the text refers not to objects outside of itself, but to an intertext. That is to confirm that the allusions created by Huxley certainly obtain their meanings by presupposing other texts (in this case, Shakespeare's texts). What is more, Riffaterre's two stages of reading can be reached while reading the novel. The reader starts on the referential stage, where they seek the external referents in order to decode the meaning of the text, and then may proceed to the semiotic stage, in which

all the quotes and other allusions become connected on a deeper level. Again, only a well-read Shakespeare reader is able to perform a successful decoding of the text.

Within his theory, Bloom claims that a literary precursor too strong on an ephebe may result in rather a pathetic imitation. Although Shakespeare's plays are an enormously strong precursor for any subsequent literary text, Huxley's engagement of intertextuality does not create such case, since the allusions are not used as an attempt to imitate. What is more, by writing *Brave New World*, Huxley supports Bloom's argument that a literary text can only have other specific text as an intertext, as the origin of all the quoted lines is clearly traceable within the works of one author – Shakespeare.

Finally, Huxley's employment of intertextuality provides the reader with the choice of an approach to reading the novel – they can read it either as a one-dimensional story, disregarding the intertextual layer and focusing 'only' on its dystopian and science fiction aspects, or they can engage in it on a deeper level and uncover all the hidden meanings. What is more, the greatest advantage of the latter approach is that the reader can read *Brave New World* several times and each time there are more allusions to be revealed.

This thesis focuses only on particularly chosen intertextual relations, as it is not possible to state the overall number within a literary work with definiteness. The author's use of intertextuality is clearly subjective and thus readers from different backgrounds and with different knowledge of works of literature would not interpret the hypertext in the same way nor exactly in the way the author intends to.

## 5 Works cited

### Primary sources

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1965.

Huxley, Aldous. *Island*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics, first edition, 2009.

Shakespeare, William. *Anthony and Cleopatra*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.

Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004.

Shakespeare, William. *Macbeth*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003.

Shakespeare, William. *Measure for Measure*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Shakespeare, William. *Othello*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. New York: Signet Classics, 1998.

Shakespeare, William. *Troilus and Cressida*. London: Penguin Classics, 2000.

### Secondary sources

Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. New York: Routledge, second edition, 2011.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Translated by C. Emerson. Minneapolis MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Translated by V. W. McGee. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1986.

Bakhtin, Mikhail / Medvedev, Pavel. *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*. Translated by Albert J. Wehrle. Baltimore MD and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Bakhtin, Mikhail / Volosinov, Valentin. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by L. Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Barthes, Roland. "Theory of the Text" in *Untying the Text: A Post-structuralist Reader*. Translated by Ian McLeod. London: Routledge, 1981.

Bloom, Harold. *A Map of Misreading*. New York: Oxford UP, 1975.

Bowering, Peter. *Aldous Huxley: A Study of the Major Novels*. University of London: The Athlone Press, 1968.

- Bradshaw, David. Introduction to *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley. London: Vintage, 2004.
- Childs, Peter. *Modernism*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- De Saussure, Ferdinand. *Course in General Linguistics*. Translated by Wade Baskin. London: Fontana, 1974.
- Genette, Gérard. *The Architext: An Introduction*. Translated by E. Lewin. Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 1992.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by C. Newman and C. Doubinsky. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Grushow, Ira. *Brave New World and the Tempest*. *College English*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 1962.
- Krishnan, Bharathi. *Aspects of Structure, Technique and Quest in Aldous Huxley's Major Novels*. Stockholm: LiberTryck Stockholm, 1977.
- Kristeva, Julia. *The Kristeva Reader*. Translated by S. Hand and L. S. Roudiez. London: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1990.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality: debates and contexts*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.
- Plett, Heinrich. *Intertextuality*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1991.
- Riffaterre, Michael. "Interpretation and Undecidability" in *New Literary History* Vol. 12 No. 2, 1981.
- Riffaterre, Michael. "Intertextual Representation: On Mimesis as Interpretive Discourse" in *Critical Inquiry* Vol. 11 No. 1, 1984.
- Staff (1973). "Kurt Vonnegut, Jr. Playboy Interview" in *Playboy Magazine*, June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2011 at the Wayback Machine.
- Wickham, Glynne. *Shakespeare's Dramatic Heritage: Collected Studies in Mediaeval, Tudor and Shakespearean Drama*. United Kingdom: Routledge, 1969.