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ABSTRACT

Thesis Title: A CRITICAL STUDY OF INTER-DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF LANGUAGE IN NOVEL TEXTS

This qualitative research aims to explore how language use constructs identity, gender and power relations inter-discursively in the two novel texts – ‘Foucault’s Pendulum by Umberto Eco and ‘Trespassing’ by Uzma Aslam Khan. It also examines implications of inter-discursivity and its effects upon meaning making. Chapter 1 critically unfolds the inter-discursivity as deeply linked with interdisciplinarity and intertextuality. It also illustrates assumptions concerning discourses of the texts and research questions. Chapter 2 carefully builds a theoretical framework basing on analytical perspectives of Cultural Studies (CS) and Critical Feminism Discourse Studies (CFDS) and inter-discursive notions of Foucault, Bakhtin, Kristeva, Fairclough, Wodak, Mills, Blommaert, Jorgensen and Phillips, Cixous, Pecheux, van Dijk, Nietzsche, Hutcheon, etc. In Literature Review, specific and relevant views have been critically examined to assess the scope for further research and understanding of perspectives and positions from which the novel texts under study can be explored. Chapter 3 presents the research design that is based on analytical strategy of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), epistemological bearings of analytical perspectives of CS and CFDS and the multidirectional and interdisciplinary model, Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) of Ruth Wodak. The novel texts are extensively analysed and interpreted in chapters 4 and 5 respectively to explore the research questions using Wodak’s DHA that mainly focuses on the contexts and the important five discursive strategies used generally in the discourses to affect specific meanings for the construction of identity, gender and power relations. Based on the intensively carried out analysis and interpretations of the two texts, insights and understandings about inter-discursivity and certain issues of language use are noted and discussed in Chapter 6. Limitations of this study are also discussed in this chapter with the view that inter-discursivity does not stop making further connections, hence the readers of this research can go further to explore and enrich the field of inter-discursivity.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This qualitative study focuses upon the construction of meaning related to identity, gender and power relations through investigation of inter-discursive features of the selected two novel texts namely, ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ by Umberto Eco (1988) and ‘Trespassing’ by Uzma Aslam Khan (2006). It is a study about the inter-connections of the discourses so as to analyse and understand the complex meaning-making process through multiple relations that also help to generate new discourses.

This introductory chapter aims to provide necessary knowledge about the inter-discursive constructions as an object of study and related aspects; background knowledge concerning novels under study; motivation, purpose and significance of the study; research questions; investigative methodology employed; delimitation, etc. The purpose is to investigate the inter-discursive strategies and the dialogic relationing of discourses/disciplines and implicit/explicit attempts to create new discourses of identity, gender and power relations.

The texts under study are assumed not as closed, silent, objective and monologic accounts of meaning; rather, a combination of multiple explicit and implicit contesting discourses that interact with no clear demarcation. This study seeks to trace the social positioning of identity, gender and power relations as linguistic constructions that appear integrally connected to significant relationship between discourses. However, it is not without the involvement of the authorial intention that helps to shape these texts as social sites of contest and construction of discourses. Thus, the novels as social texts have their inner tensions and dialogic relations which need to be addressed for analysing and understanding the underlying processes that construct and shape them.

The interwoven terms such as interdisciplinarity, intertextuality and inter-discursive/inter-discursivity are invariably used in this study. Though they have their independent use, meanings and knowledge dimensions; however, their interchangeable
use in this study is due to their proximity in the ontological notions of texts, which is a diversified phenomenon, rather than a coherent discourse. They also serve as guides and models of reading of the texts under study. However, they cannot be accepted without understanding their knowledge claims that emanate from discourse dimensions and might be socially, politically, historically, culturally and psychologically positioned in a way that allows certain ways of thinking and interpretation. These are discussed below.

**Interdisciplinarity.** Before going into the details of interdisciplinarity it is to be understood that each discipline is a discursive construction (Khan, 2009) due to its dependence upon semiotic aspect of language. It is a way of speaking about the world constructed by human beings and a system of meaning by which we make sense of the past and present (Hutcheon, 2006). Joe Moran (2003) has highlighted the academic significance of interdisciplinary study, what it consists of and the challenges it poses to the researcher. Starting with the prefix ‘inter’ he suggests that it “can mean forming a communication between and joining together”. It is evident that, like Bakhtin’s ‘dialogism’ its basic ontological assumption is that the inter-disciplinary study establishes a dialogic communication between disciplines in order to create knowledge. However, Moran associates ‘ambiguity and slipperiness’ to interdisciplinarity. He argues, “it can suggest forging connections across the different disciplines but it can also mean establishing a kind of undisciplined space in the interstices between disciplines altogether” (2002, p. 15). This argument suggests two things: one is that the disciplines have their restricted boundaries, and the second is that the gaps between those boundaries are filled to the extent of blurring them which Moran calls “establishing a kind of undisciplined space”. He also believes that there is a kind of integration between disciplines in interdisciplinarity. However, the inter-disciplinary approach to study a text is not without its problem areas. Barthes (1979) argues in his ‘From Work to Text’:

Inter-disciplinary activity, valued today as an important aspect of research, cannot be accomplished by simple confrontations between various specialized branches of knowledge. Inter-disciplinary work is not a peaceful operation. It begins effectively when the solidarity of the old disciplines breaks down . . . to the benefit of a new object and a new language, neither of which is in the domain of those branches of knowledge that one calmly sought to confront. It is precisely
this uneasiness with classification that allows for the diagnosis of a certain mutation.

According to Barthes, interdisciplinarity has the potential to create new knowledge while engaging different disciplines that may posit problem of classificatory breakdown. The potentiality reflects that interdisciplinarity is transformative but political and politicized in its approach.

Professor Rowland (2002), drawing on Foucault’s concept of “regime of truth” or “essential structures”, argues that interdisciplinarity might be called critical interdisciplinarity because “It presupposes a strong sense of the discipline while contesting the boundaries and structures that form particular disciplines”. While defining interdisciplinarity, he argues, “interdisciplinarity, far from collapsing the boundaries between disciplines, represents sites of contestation between different ‘regimes of truths’ or ‘essential structures’ which are attempting integrate knowledge” (p. 3). Going further he takes the concept of site of contestation from interdisciplinarity into disciplinarity and contends that “contestation about the ‘regimes of truth’ and ‘systematizing of structures’ embodied in knowledge is fundamental to all university intellectual work” (p. 4). For Rowland the ontological question, ‘what is it?’ about a discipline, text or discourse necessitates staying there for the critical awareness of the sites of contestation within and between disciplines. Thus, inter-disciplinarity suggests an approach and perspective for reading and analysing texts which is also part of broader assumption of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and has the potential to enhance knowledge in a dialogical and creative way.

Leeuwan (2005) dilates upon interdisciplinarity by focusing on three models of interdisciplinarity: first, the Centralist Model; second, the Pluralist Model and third, the Integrationist Model. The first two models, the Centralist and the Pluralist, focus on interdisciplinarity; however, these have their drawbacks in view of the current study. The Centralist Model is more method-oriented and holds disciplines as autonomous and of unequal value. Methods cannot be integrated to investigate the issues concerning language and social complexities because disciplinary boundaries cannot be intervened due to their autonomous rigidity and unequal status. On the other hand, the Pluralist Model is problem-oriented and holds disciplines equally valued; however, its drawback lies in holding disciplines as autonomous. The more important and useful model for CDA
based study is the ‘Integrationist Model’. It is different from the other two. It focuses on problems and issues holding disciplines as interdependent and of equal value. Leeuwan argues, “no single discipline can satisfactorily address any given problem on its own. As a result, disciplines are seen as interdependent” (p. 8). Leeuwan does not accept that a social problem can be solved independently or by applying a well-defined single approach. Rather, it needs an integrated approach suggested by different disciplines.

Similarly, Barenreuter (2005) gives a very interesting logic of interdisciplinarity assuming it as an approach of study: “Interdisciplinarity is understood as a way of integrating different theoretical approaches and thereby, creating new holistic approaches” (p. 198). Interdisciplinarity helps “to generate a common understanding of analytical concepts such as ‘identity’ that are used in different disciplines . . . Studying the discursive construction of these collective identities adds a level of analytical accuracy which cannot be achieved when using classical political scientific methods” (p. 198), and I argue that a level of rationality and comprehensibility cannot be achieved through single and exclusive methods. Thus, keeping in view the multidimensional phenomenon of a discourse/social problem, the use of interdisciplinary approach provides useful knowledge and method of interpretation of an inter-discursive construction.

**Intertextuality.** Intertextuality refers to the position and location of a text in the ever expanding and open field of textuality where it is understood by its interdependence with other texts. This is a wider field of intertextuality wherein each text tends to lose its autonomous status and distinguished value. Eco says, “Books always speak of other books and every story tells a story that has already been told” (cited in Allen, 2000, p. 194). No discourse says something pure, original and traditionally normative. It is intertextual, already written and already said. It is Bakhtin and Kristeva who are considered to promote this concept of text (Shevtsova, 1992; Allen, 2000; Vargova, 2007). Blommaert (2005) also acknowledges this, and contends that “whenever we speak we produce the words of others we constantly cite and recite expressions and recycle meanings that are already available. Thus, every utterance has a history of (ab)use, interpretation and evaluation” (p. 46). Thus, no text is universally original in its meanings and truth claims, it is relational, plural and diverse and therefore, tenable to diversified interpretation.
Fairclough (1992) also explains intertextuality from the perspective of social change while referring to Kristeva’s observation that intertextuality implies “the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history”. Fairclough argues, it means that the text absorbs and is built out of texts from the past. Moreover, the text also responds to, reaccentuates and reworks past texts and helps to create social practices, contribute to wider social changes and shape new texts/discourses. This is clear that intertextuality suggests that every discourse exists in its relational worlds of past and present and to understand this web of relations, the wider contextual meanings matter most. For the researchers, Blommaert argues that intertextuality suggests a methodological pattern. It suggests looking beyond the boundaries of the given discourse: “Intertextuality grounds discourse analysis firmly into histories of use - histories that are social, cultural and political” (p. 46). It suggests that to understand the invisible effects of other texts, it is pertinent to go to the other texts of social, cultural, political and historical significance. It also suggests that every interpretation and evaluative act is creative as it leads to histories that are the context of gender, race, power and identity relations.

Similarly, Fuery and Mansfield (2000) argue about intertextuality from its creative aspect. To them, this concept suggests engaging with other fields of life as “this leads us to question of each text’s location in a broader, ever expanding and mobile field, where it is defined by its interdependence on and correspondence to other texts, in the broadest possible sense” (p. 65). This view-point is closer to Bakhtin’s dialogism/dialogic heteroglossia which claims that there are contending voices in a discourse. It is creative and dynamic but at the same time it is not original. It reflects the ability of language to contain within it many voices, ideologies and perspectives. Internally and externally, every utterance and even individual word is a reflection of heteroglossia. Internally, the textual space carries a plurality of meanings expressing social pluralism in society. Externally, its textual space is open and unbound having an active relationship with other public and social texts through dialogue.

Barthes’ concept of intertextuality is also dynamic and fluid that claims the plural nature of texts. He considers text as an interwoven fabric that is:

woven entirely with citations, references, echoes, cultural languages (what language is not?), antecedent or contemporary which cut across it through and through in a vast stereophony. The intertextual in which every text is held, it itself
being the text between of another text is not to be confused with some origin of
the text to try to find the sources, the influence of a work is to fall in with the myth
of filiations, the citations which go to make up a text are anonymous, untraceable
and yet already read. They are quotations without inverted commas. (Cited in
Fuery & Mansfield, 2000, p. 66)

For Barthes, there is no trace of originality in a text. All references are discursive, used
and reused. The utterances of a text are never original. They have been in use since time
immemorial. They have many associations and meanings in different contexts and times –
associations of socio-economic, ethnic, religious, cultural and national natures. Here,
intertextuality suggests that the act of reading and interpretation of the texts should not be
confined to given meanings forgetting its unknown and implicit associations. Thus, to
follow the intertextual model of reading, analysis and interpretation involves complex
processes in a world which is full of references, comparisons, experiences, interpretations
and desires. It demands an approach to study which is highly conscious of multiple social
practices, fully aware with investigative methods and methodologies and justifiably
reflexive.

Closer to Bakhtin’s and Barthes’ concept of intertextuality is Julia Kristeva’s
concept of ‘intertextuality’ for which she owes her debt to Bakhtin. She says “... in fact
an insight first introduced into literary theory by Bakhtin: any text is constructed as a
mosaic of quotations: any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (cited in
Allen, 2000). She contends that a text exists in its relation to previous texts and no text
can claim to be original in contents and universal in meaning-making. All these concepts
converge to disclose that a text/discourse is not an original, pure and coherent and closed;
rather, it is a mosaic of quotations, references, texts, discourses, etc., prompting the reader
to discover the layers of meaning lying embedded in each quotation, reference, text,
discourse and the multiple and inter-relational meanings implicit in the mosaic.

Fairclough (2003) also claims that “for any particular text or type of text, there is a
set of other texts and a set of voices which are potentially relevant and potentially
incorporated into the text. It may not be possible to identify these sets with great
precision, and they may be rather extensive and complex” (p. 47). It is significant to
investigate “which texts and voices are included, which are excluded and what significant
absences are there” (p. 42). Fairclough guides a reader to explore a text at wider level: its
power to construct and reconstruct the very ‘realities’ it describes and under what conditions certain social practices are enacted in ways of acting and interacting, who is included or excluded, etc. Fairclough contends, like Barthes, that intertextuality is a very complex idea and it may not be possible to precisely identify the elements of other texts/discourses. However, the conditionality of intertextuality is unavoidable.

Another theorist Vargova (2007) argues about intertextuality in a way that suggests an analytically useful insight. She says that:

the notion of intertextuality presupposes that all texts are in a constant state of productivity and always in a state of change and transformation. Even the author of a text, the speaking or writing subject is no core, fixed, unified self, but is a differentiated, complex heterogeneous force. (p. 425)

Vargova argues that a text remains in constant change and ever ready to produce new texts/discourses and in this amorphous flow, the author also moves heterogeneously and produces heterogeneous text.

Thus, intertextuality offers a way to look at textual and interpretative features of fiction texts under study. The arguments reflect that a text has no fixed meanings; rather, there are notions of openness, pluralism and change associated with it. It also reveals that all socio-cultural texts existing within a context are bound in a dialogic relationship to ongoing social, economic, cultural, political and historical changes. Moreover, as a model for reading and analysis, intertextuality suggests a way which involves or can involve frequent questioning of the given forms of discourse and the given modes of knowledge within the text.

**Inter-discursivity.** Some theorists/practitioners of CDA do not make much difference between the two positions of intertextuality and inter-discursivity; rather, they are integrated in certain ways. For example, Fairclough (1992) argues that there are two types of intertextuality. One is ‘manifest intertextuality’ which holds that “other texts are explicitly present in the text under analysis. They are manifestly marked or cued by features on the surface of the text such as quotation marks” (p. 104), while the second one is constitutive intertextuality that appears in hidden forms as “a text may incorporate another text without the latter being explicitly cued”. It is the “configuration of discourse conventions that go into its production” (p. 104). Fairclough calls constitutive
intertextuality as inter-discursivity because it helps to analyse other social, historical and cultural texts/discourses that have not been manifestly mentioned and cued but referred circuitously. Similarly, Wodak and Weiss (2005), while discussing the complexities of “text in context”, argue that texts and discourses are, of course, not isolated in space. It is rather, the case that the individual texts always relate to past or even present texts. This may be characterised as “intertextuality”. Discourses behave in a similar way. They also overlap and are interconnected. This is known as “inter-discursivity”.

Wodak and Weiss consider these two similar concepts central to the CDA project which helps to investigate situated contexts and the relevant cultural texts/discourses for the critical interpretations and understanding of the texts/discourses. For them, discourses cannot be separated from the larger cultural and historical discursivity out of which they are constructed. Discourses are not mere linguistic constructions of socio-cultural phenomena; rather, they are the direct influences of the contexts. No discourse is independent of wider and larger social structures. They do not present any unambiguous and established meanings; rather, they represent society’s dialogic conflicts over the meanings of language. This complexity makes discourses potentially numerous and conflicting. The discussion on inter-discursivity limited here is further theorized in second chapter so as to provide a relational base for making connections more clearly with the perspectives evaluated in the review of literature.

The value of these terms rests in their flexibility and indeterminacy and the mode in which they address the texts under study that may have potentially numerous discourses.

**Novels under Study**

For the purpose of study of inter-discursive constructions of language from the perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies, two novel texts have been selected: ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ by Umberto Eco (1988) and ‘Trespassing’ by Uzma Aslam Khan (2006). These texts are the sources to be explored for the inter-discursive relations that underpin social contexts. A brief of the two novels is provided below.
**Foucault’s Pendulum.** Foucault’s Pendulum is written by an Italian writer/linguist Umberto Eco and was published in 1988. This novel is named after a real instrument ‘pendulum’ that was invented by French physicist Jean Bernard Leon Foucault (1819-68) in 1851 to demonstrate the rotation of the Earth. It is a simple pendulum of 28 kg brass-coated lead hanging by 67 meter long wire from a fixed point in the ceiling. It is not clear why Eco resorted to Physics for his literary attempt. However, inter-discursive analysis may reveal something new about this connection between positivist scientific instrument known for its accuracy and the multi-dimensional literary novel text that is known for its instability, inaccuracy and divergent discourses as claimed by the theorists of inter-discursivity. Initial reading of the text reveals that it is full of esoteric references, secret societies, hermetic traditions and conspiracy plans that contribute to form the inter-discursive features of the text.

There are three major characters: Belbo, Diotallevi and Casaubon in the text. The story is mainly narrated by Casaubon, a student in 1970 in Milan (Italy) working on a thesis on the history of the Knights Templar - a military religious Order founded in the 12th century after the first Crusade to protect the Christian pilgrims in the Holy Lands of Jerusalem (Knights Templar, 2009). He meets Belbo who is an editor in a publishing house. Casaubon also gets a chance to meet Belbo’s friend Diotallevi, who is a cabalist. All three also work for a common publisher in Milan. In their search for a book ‘The History of Metals’, these three get a chance to read many manuscripts about occult conspiracy theories. They are so absorbed in these theories that they develop an interest to synthesize all the secret stories. During this time they also meet Colonel Ardenti – the fourth major character who gives them a book which contains information about a coded manuscript. That manuscript was about a secret plan of the medieval Templars to take over the world. This plan was meant to take revenge for the deaths of their Templar leaders when their Order was disbanded by the King of France. Three editors’ interest in the secret societies grows deeper and they start developing their own conspiracy which they call ‘the Plan’. The significant instruments involved in their ‘Plan’ are a special map and Foucault’s Pendulum. The text ends with the comments and tragic fates of the characters.

The story of the novel is spread over many years at different locations and is situated in different discourses of life which involve magic, secrecy, religious doctrines,
hermetic system, and pseudo historical conspiracy theories. The text goes a long way to talk about activities of the Knights Templar and expresses a great deal of appreciation for this Order. The text also employs a wide range of discourses that juxtapose the religious and the mundane, the recent and the ancient, the supernatural and the scientific human experiences, etc. The text also refers to several secret groups and agencies of the European world, namely The Knights Templar, The Rosicrucian’s, The Gnostics, The Freemasons, The Bavarian Illuminate, The Elders of Zion, The Assassins of Alamut, The Cabalists, The Bogomils, The Cathars, The Jesuits, etc.

Keeping in view the diverse aspects of the text, the novel will be explored for the issues guided by the research questions of this study provided in the ‘Analysis and Interpretation Model’ discussion in this chapter.

**Trespassing.** ‘Trespassing’ is written by a Pakistani novelist, Uzma Aslam Khan (2006). The novel talks about the life in 1990s representing the social/political environment of Karachi city in particular and of Pakistan in general. It provides an opportunity to look critically into the sources of subordination of women and the evils which are being perpetuated by the invisible power groups. The text opens into the wide expanse of complex discourses of poverty, social chaos, crime and repression of women, load-shedding of electricity, hapless and helpless class-based society and indifference of government administration that provides glimpses of changed and changing identities and the never-ending power games. Politics reigns predominantly in this ontologically heterogeneous novel.

The major characters in this novel are Dia, her mother Riffat, their farm-servant Sumbul, Dia’s friend Nini and Daanish’s mother Anu. On the other hand, there is Daanish, his father Shafqat and Sumbul’s brother Salaamat. There are some minor characters and their contribution to the overall meaning-making of the text is significant. Dia is imaginative, creative and a bit passionate in her approach to life. She has the habit to fantasize about many things. Her mother also contributes to her passion for life as she persuades her to marry a person out of love, not out of obligation. Her mother has had bitter experiences of life as she knows that in Pakistani social set-up, women are defined as ‘others’ and ‘inferior’ by men who follow their own masculine standards to oppress women. However, due to her personal exceptional characteristics, Riffat was able to establish her silk business in Thattha. Dia was able to attract Daanish’s attention from
Nini to herself. Daanish, a young student journalist, comes to Pakistan from America to attend his father’s funeral. Daanish and his father Shafqat share a relationship which excludes his mother Anu. After her husband’s death, Anu wants to win her son through an arranged marriage with Nini; however, she fails as ultimately Daanish finds himself attached to Dia.

The farm-servant Sumbul, is a significant character who brings a web of discourses to the text - discourses of those who are dispossessed and marginalized due to their social class, lack of education and resources. Sumbul’s brother Salamat also seems to be a lonely person who moves through the working communities of Pathans, Muhajirs and Punjabis, and finds that they have their ethnic and regional rivalries. The socio-cultural aspects of life in Pakistan are reflected through competition of the world politics, strikes and restless life of the people who have compromised over no-response policy of the government toward issues of public welfare. There are discourses of colonial culture, women’s subordination at the hands of men, suppressed passions, love and jealousy, criminal activities and hypocritical attitudes of men, class conflicts and corruption in bureaucracy. Salamat has plans to join some revolutionary gang to fight against the ineffective government system but he is more disillusioned as he witnesses the corrupt inner working of the groups. He is called as an “ajnabi” (outsider). Thus, he finds himself in the same isolation which he plans to destroy forever.

This novel is a well-constructed cultural mosaic, weaving variety of discourses emanating from different cultural sources of Pakistani society. This is a text with multiple perspectives/ discourses providing open space for interpretation in relation to the issues of identity, gender and power relations. Another important aspect of this text is that its author is a woman who is well aware of the local and regional socio-cultural, ethical and ethnic issues concerning women. In view of the Critical Feminist Discourse Studies and ontological position of inter-discursive constructions, analysis of this text may provide some fresh knowledge about life of women in the Pakistani society. It is relevant to quote Derrida (2003) here: “why do I insist on the fact that there is no pure presence?” (p. 9). For Derrida, a written text is not a model to understand life in a transparent and sequential way; rather, it serves as a cultural model to read, understand and analyse how discourses function in constructing life. A text is therefore, not a transparent reflection of what life is; rather, it is a situated process of life.
Purpose and Significance of the Study

This study contests that language is not only a discursive practice; rather, it is an inter-discursive practice wherein multiple discourses function dialogically and dialectically in the meaning-making process. This study goes deeper into the investigation of orders of discourse focusing on interactive strategies of different social practices that indicate how borders of specific discourses are being crossed, demolished and extended to other/new discourses for recontextualisation and restructuring. The purpose is to explore how different social practices interact linguistically/dialogically/dialectically, and function as orders of discourse. In this way, an order can instruct and possibly implement processes and functioning of these processes and thus, it can become an exploration of heterogeneity of the given discourse.

Inter-discursivity views a discourse “constituted as configurations of diverse elements of discourse” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 124). Fairclough (1992) further views orders of discourse as unstable equilibria, “the boundaries between which are constantly open to being drawn as orders of discourse are disarticulated and rearticulated in the course of hegemonic struggle” (p. 124). Fairclough emphasises that it is difficult to discriminate and clearly articulate the limits of an order of discourse. As Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) argue, “the order of discourse can be taken to denote different discourses that partly cover the same terrain, a terrain that each discourse competes to fill with meaning in its own way” (p. 114). Taking this as point of departure, exploration of ‘orders of discourse’ will help understand the meaning-making of contesting discourses in the novel texts. However, it is important to identify the relationships between discourses within the novel texts on the one hand, and on the other hand, throw light on why and how people draw on some discourses than others in specific situations for the construction of their meanings. In this way, it is not just a study of language use but the effects of language use, and the effects on processes, discourses, people and their inter-relationships that become controlled and are not free as they appear to be.

The key terms/aspects of this study discussed earlier are interdisciplinarity, intertextuality and inter-discursivity. Viewing a text through the lens of inter-discursivity is to look into how language creates meanings through its placement of linguistic items and it’s intermeshing with socio-cultural rules, norms and practices. Halliday (1973) argues in this regard that linguistic and functional choices made by an author are the
result of his/her socio-cultural context and their influences upon the author’s perception. However, the choice is not an “abstract objectivism” (Holquist, 1990); rather a mediated one. Fairclough (2003) says that inter-discursivity occurs when new discourses emerge through combining existing discourses together in particular ways like articulating political and economic discourses in a specific pattern to create a new discourse of national unity, etc. So, it is the dialogical and dialectical interaction of discourses that indicates the mixing up of different vocabularies, leading to new semantic relationships, processes of language use and modalities of representations, etc.

Gender differences and power relations have been referred to in the previous paragraphs and are being highlighted further as focal points. Gender issues as they appear in the texts under study are investigated using perspectives of Cultural studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies. The exploration of gender differences in a discourse may also be done easily using feminist approaches which broadly concentrate on how and why women are exploited in male writings and language use. As Robbins (2000) refers to Helene Cixous:

Her fundamental arguments are based on the premise that the Enlightenment tradition of Western philosophy, with its emphasis on gendered binary oppositions, has profoundly influenced the ways in which knowledge can circulate in the world, and by extension, has limited the possible meanings of woman who is particularly disadvantaged by the closed system of binary logic. (p. 169)

Cixous expresses her absolute distrust about men due to their biased writings. She urges women to write themselves. Instead of using such straightforward stance to investigate gender differences, by using perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies, focus of the study will be on more complex interaction of discourses and social orders and their interdependence in formulating gendered identities for specific aims. In this regard, Wodak (n.d.) expresses:

On top of explaining why certain events, experiences, utterances and so forth were perceived and reproduced in specific prejudiced ways, I was and am concerned to date to explain how much meanings become widely accessible and why and how they are tied to specific ideologies in certain periods of time in specific socio-political contexts. (p. 184)
For this reason, investigation will focus on how different discourses tied to specific ideologies are appropriated to create new discourses/knowledge and specific socio-political contexts that influence texts under study in the meaning-making process.

Similarly, investigation of power relations in the texts under study, in terms of inter-discursive constructions, is significant in highlighting the hegemonic struggle between discourses – imposition of a single dominant meaning (Griffin, 2005, p. 101) - hidden in the orders of discourse. Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) contend, “No discourse can be fully established, it is always in conflict with other discourses that define reality differently and set other guidelines for social action” (p. 47). In this way, discursive practices contribute to the creation and reproduction of unequal power relations. Fairclough (1992) argues, “The dialectical view of the relationship between discursive structures and events . . . an order of discourse can be seen as the discursive facet of the contradictory and unstable equilibrium which constitutes hegemony” (p. 93). Therefore, dialectical relationship in the orders of discourse of social dimensions like economic, political and socio-cultural structures will be investigated. Indeed, discourse is viewed as functioning as a site of struggle over meaning, with particular instance of discursive use seeking temporarily to fix meaning in a specific way (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 29).

And for Foucault (cited in Mills, 1997), power relations in a discourse make a discursive practice part of larger social practices of power games:

Truth is of the world; it is produced there by virtue of multiple constraints . . . Each society has its regime of truth, its general politics of truth: that is the type of discourse it harbours and causes to function as true: the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true from false statements. (p. 18)

Thus, power is not a concrete commodity to be possessed physically; rather, a kind of thinking produced as an effect of a process of discourse politics articulated through multiple constraints. Thus, inter-discursive analysis of power relations will reveal the effects of fiction discourse.

Assumptions

The analysis and interpretation of the texts under study will, of course, go beyond the given discourses as the focus of inter-discursivity suggests. Assumptions are relevant
to the ontological concept of discourse. This qualitative study is based on the following assumptions:

i. Social life presented in the texts under study is open with emphasis on social differences and diverse social identities. The social differences and diversity in social identities are associated in postmodern theories like Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies with the concept of discourse which, with the aid of other discourses implicitly and explicitly, believes in social constructivism.

ii. Inter-discursive constructions of the texts are not based on perceptions of essentialism, foundationalism and taken for granted views of social life. However, whatever specific attributes of a person, situation or social order are articulated, they are viewed from the specific contextual position and the context is also assumed to be relational and constructed inter-discursively.

iii. Inter-discursivity indicates a route towards analysis of interconnections between the broader context of cultural dimensions and language use for exploration into identity, gender and power issues. The focus is to be on contexts and interconnections of dominance and socio-cultural practices.

iv. Inter-discursivity means interaction of discourses which represent multiple worlds that intersect and clash, compete and contest, construct and reconstruct realities, etc. Moreover, origins of discourses are not known; therefore, the social effects associated with the discourses will be focused.

Thus, there is no clear and precise start or end of the analysis and interpretation of the texts under study. However, the guiding principle will be the focus upon inter-discursive construction of values, identities, beliefs, assumptions, dispositions, and human practices concerning gender and power relations as they emerge from the texts and are based around assumptions outlined above.

Analysis and Interpretation Model

For analysis and interpretation purpose, there is need of a suitable model for which there are two simple questions: (i) what are the ways in which inter-discursive constructions are represented in the texts? And (ii) how can inter-discursive constructions
be analysed for the purpose of understanding of identity, gender and power issues in the texts? As discourses intermesh in different ways in the texts emanating from different sources; therefore, it asks for a framework which provides diversified analytical strategies/insights to investigate the texts from all possible angles to produce convincing interpretations which are plausible, reflexive and comprehensive (Griffin, 2005). It is important to know the critical insights produced through interpretation about diverse representations of social life in the texts.

The model for analysis and interpretation being used in this study is interdisciplinary, problem-oriented and multidimensional approach known as Discourse Historical Approach. This model is suggested by Wodak that enables to focus upon text, relational contexts, inter-discursive dimensions and socio-cultural aspects and is developed with the capability of reconciling sociological aspects and linguistic categories. The significant aspect of Wodak’s approach is that she combines together both theoretical aspects and analytical framework as part of Critical Discourse Analysis, setting up a dialogue between them. The dialogue between discourse and social practices takes place at different levels like social activity and its representation in discourse, etc. Fairclough (2002) also contends, “CDA is analysis of the dialectical relationship between discourse . . . and other elements of social practices” (p. 1).

Wodak’s approach draws upon the works of “Jurgen Habermas, Basil Bernstein and Aron Cicourel” (2007). These theorists take interest in linguistic and social aspects of a discourse. Habermas contends, “Language is also a medium of domination and social force. It serves to legitimize relations of organized power . . . Language is also ideological” (cited in Wodak, 1995, p. 1). Bernstein states, “I am required to consider the relationship between language and socialization . . . I am not concerned with language, but with speech, and concerned more specifically with the contextual constraints upon speech” (2000, p. 448). Thus, the social context gains significant place in the theory of discourse.

It is important to understand why Wodak gives more significance to the historical aspect in her analytical approach. Actually she continued focusing on the study of discourses of “discrimination, racism, anti-Semitism and identity politics as well as the narratives of the past” (2007). As these aspects usually grow through ages and are not creation of momentary developments, thus, Wodak made it an essential part of her
analytical model to study discourses. Historical context provides a comparative view of meaning construction at various levels of history because it involves opposition, struggle and maintenance of power and domination. Wodak gives much weightage to evaluations and judgments that are parts of historical knowledge vested in discourse but in order to understand that, context is required and “it makes little sense to propose general norms which might not be adequate for specific cultural and institutional contexts” (2007). However, historical aspect will not be used here in its literal sense; rather, in the sense of situatedness because the novels under study do not pertain to any kind of racism or anti-Semitism. This aspect is suitable for my study because the selected texts offer discourses of situated significance; however, the formal objective is not to fix interpretation in the solid situated historical facts; rather, to see dialogically the inter-discursive constructions of meaning of different socio-cultural practices at different moments of life.

These arguments indicate the epistemological difference of Wodak’s approach from Fairclough’s analytical model. Fairclough, under influence of Halliday, emphasises more upon linguistic/situational and social context while Wodak believes that situational context provides little knowledge about a discourse. Going beyond situational context, historically situated context provides wider, reflexive and multidimensional knowledge to understand transitions and changes: how it was done and who was involved in it. Wodak argues, “Fairclough applies functional systemic grammar, and I use argumentation theory and rhetoric when analysing texts and discourses” (2007). Thus, there is an essential difference between Fairclough’s model and Wodak’s model in use of procedural tools. She contends that all CDA approaches take different theoretical positions along with their use of methodological procedures (2001).

Wodak’s approach, on the one hand, emphasises that there is a multidimensional process associated with discourse which leads to inter-discursive study focusing on orders of discourse and on the other hand, discourse representation gets closer to perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies which consider heterogeneity and plurality as essential aspects in meaning-making. “The forces that shape how we read them, position them and make sense of them lie in part within the texts, in part through cultural contexts, in part within our own reading praxis” (Fuery & Mansfield, 2000, p. 35). For this, Wodak’s approach also draws upon diversified disciplinary areas like media studies, social and cultural studies, discourses of politics, discrimination, racism, and
gender and identity construction through historical periods. She believes that a single
discourse is never so pure in its meaning-making. There are many crossings into other
disciplines. According to her, “Every theoretical approach in CDA is inherently
interdisciplinary because it aims at investigating complex social phenomena which are
inherently inter- or transdisciplinary and certainly not to be studied by linguistics alone”
(2007). For analysing interdisciplinary discourse, she suggests combining approaches like
argumentation theory, rhetoric, etc. Wodak’s suggestion to combine approaches is useful
for inter-discursive study as it enables a researcher to engage dialogically with different
disciplines/discourses at different times and helps avoid limited, parochial and biased
interpretation. The purpose of this theorizing is to enrich the methodological approach
towards inter-discursive study which starts by looking at language use to its context of
use - moving from orders of discourse to socio-cultural orders and vice versa.

Wodak’s approach is basically grounded in sociolinguistics and contextual
situated knowledge as she aims to focus not only on discursive practices, “but also a wide
range of material and semiotic practices. Thus, research in CDA must be multitheoretical
and multimethodical, critical and self-reflexive” (2001, p. 64). It is a social research
through focus on discourse strategies and socio-cultural contexts without reducing each
other. Wodak assumes social practices as “orders of discourse”, which can be identified
in the analysis of genres in text. She also refers to social structures which are abstract
entities such as economic structure, kinship system, etc. Wodak’s stance is helpful in
analyzing and understanding orders of discourse which form the basis of inter-discursive
constructions in the texts.

Research Questions

The above methodological approach has been selected for this study considering
appropriate to answer the following research questions elaborately:

1. What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and
   identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses
   within the novel texts under study?

2. How are different conventions, practices and cultures exploited linguistically and
appropriated to create a new form of discourse/knowledge?

3. What language issues emerge from the study and what is their effect upon the meaning-making process?

The selection of methodological strategies is discussed (in Chapter 3 - Methods and Methodology) in view of their ontological and epistemological consistency as they enable this study to explore texts inter-discursively in line with the theoretical perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies that are based on social and gender aspects of language use. Their relevance to the study of relationship between orders of discourse and orders of society is significant as inter-discursivity controls discourses which emanate from various social orders/structures and social perceptions.

My Positionality as Researcher

It is important to clarify my research position. As a researcher, I examine the discourses of the novel texts in their cross socio-cultural dimensions. Socio-cultural aspects are viewed not mere static entities; rather, vigorously appearing through discourses of the texts and constantly affecting, transforming and shaping identity, gender and power relations. I will explore the inner conflicts of the discourses caused by competition, opposition and compromise - and how they dispute with their ideological positions and exclusive stances. About authoring Ph.D., Dunleavy (2003) argues, “the authoring process involves all the component parts of producing a finished piece of text, that is envisaging what to write . . . writing the whole thing, revising and rewriting it and finishing it in an appropriate way” (p. 1). Dunleavy’s remarks are appropriate in terms of my dynamic position as a qualitative researcher because it is all a study of and an investigation about disparate and complex discourses presented in the form of two novel texts. My primary concern is to wrestle with the inter-discursive constructions of the texts created by the authors.

My aim in this study is, with the help of relevant theorists of inter-discursivity, to analyse and understand the issues of identity, gender and power relations as constructed through specific inter-discursive socio-cultural manifestations in the two novel texts. Analysing inter-discursivity is not a smooth and easy going task; rather, it places the
researcher in a complex situation with a variety of complexities in the form of: i) linguistic and socio-cultural aspects forming internal and external contexts of the discourses; ii) expanded, fluid and hybridized discourses/knowledge as suggested by Bakhtin, Foucault and other poststructuralists against any stable cultural and historical discourses/knowledge suggested by theorists of structuralism and iii) mediating/mediated positions of the author, the reader and the text itself.

These and such other complex issues pose challenge when taking position for analysis and interpretation; however, these also serve as useful cues as my task here is not to provide any definite answer to these issues; rather, to engage with these issues critically and analytically for the purpose of understanding. My positionality is part of this analytical process. It is not a position of a detached observer of the phenomena under focus. I situate myself into the relations between discourse and society, dialectical connections, inter-disciplinary dialogues and inter-discursive contexts. In this regard, Bellier (2005) contends on ‘Researcher in or out’ while looking at interdisciplinarity:

without considering the actual personality of the individuals who are engaged in the production of the discourse without observing the kind of emotions that lay behind the wording of a particular sentence, without knowing the arguments which have been exchanged before the final text is agreed upon, the researcher is not allowed to qualify the constitutive character of the assembly and of the text it produces. (p. 252)

Thus, what accounts for understanding of my positionality as researcher is the enlargement process through which analytical interpretation takes place and through which analytical choices are expressed.

Being reader and investigator of the inter-discursive constructions, the researcher of the text is part of the research engagement. Barthes’ viewpoint is significant here. He specifically discusses the reader’s role in view of intertextual and inter-discursive nature of a text:

a text is made of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody contestation but there is one place where this multiplicity is focused and that place is the reader . . . the reader is the space on
which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost.  

(Cited in Allen, 2000, p. 75)

An important aspect of researcher as reader is that ‘what kind of reading position is offered by the text to be explored’. Fuery and Mansfield (2000) bring forth this aspect while theorizing the concept of ‘Gaze’. Very insightfully, they propose a reading situation of a text with a probing question:

This site is neither mechanical nor impotent. There are cultural/ideological and psychological agendas attached to such sites. By this we mean that the position from which the reader enters and subsequently reads the text has cultural, political, and historical frames of reference. Part of the analysis of such sites is to ask what position is being offered when we read the text.  

(p. 78)

The discussion on different aspects concerning positionality suggests taking a supple position so to adopt a reflective and reflexive approach for a critical look at the texts, their contexts and discourses and examine the selected perspectives and methodology. It is a position that offers dialogical approach for deeper understanding and analysis of the inter-discursive constructions beyond what comes from the surface meaning. Thus, my positionality as researcher is constructed around the constantly transforming process of my analytical engagement and reflective interpretation. In this regard Maranhao argues:

interpretation implies that there are no self-evident, simple or unambiguous rules or procedures, and that crucial ingredients are the researcher’s judgment, intuition, ability to see and point something out, as well as the consideration of a more or less explicit dialogue with the research subject with aspects of the researcher herself that are not entrenched behind a research position, and with the reader.  

(Cited in Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000, p. 248)

**Delimitation**

Having outlined the broad parameters of this study of inter-discursive constructions, the focus of study pertains to the areas as identified by the literature review, methodology and research questions. This research is delimited to the inter-
discursive investigation of the two texts chosen with specific focus upon identity, gender and power issues. Though it is highlighted in the ‘Assumptions’ part of this chapter that there are no origins or ends of an analysis, however, for practical purpose there is a need to go by those aspects as discussed/highlighted in the following chapters of Literature Review and Methodology. Because it can be a comprehensive analysis in metaphorical sense, however, it cannot be a complete analysis in terms of quantitatively established limits. Thus, the delimitation of my study is not to be taken as closure; rather, it is an opening with the limits required by the aspects of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies perspectives (connection between linguistic and social aspects, etc.), research strategy of CDA (focusing upon discourse as dimension of power, ideologies and social practices, etc.), inter-relationships of the discourses as highlighted in Literature Review and methodological stance that discourses are socio-culturally embedded and contextualized in time and space.

It also means that the ‘complete’ analysis and interpretation is not possible in this qualitative study. This study is only a situated part of an ongoing process of interpretation. Significance of delimitation in making choices in interpretation is for better, closer and deeper analysis and understanding of language use and the social issues highlighted by the discussed aspects of the study. Moreover, this study is not about the formal linguistic features of the text; rather, it is about discourses and why and how of the orders of discourse making contextual and inter-discursive links. It will be an analysis of not the entire texts; rather, selected language use (paragraphs) which directly pertains to the socio-cultural construction of identity, gender and power aspects as specified for this study. It would be impossible to cover the entire volume of the texts because all discourses in the texts are not concerned with the social issues of identity, gender and power relations.

**Thesis Breakdown**

After this initial introductory discussion, I now move on to chapter 2 to discuss the theoretical frame work and theorists’ views about inter-discursivity. It also includes study of relevant literature for reviewing what already has been written about the texts under study to decide and shape my own study parameters. Next, in chapter 3 the
methodological framework is discussed including the analytical model to be used for analysis and interpretation. Chapters 4 and 5 are the main components of this study as they contain the analysis and interpretation of the texts under study. Chapter 6 will be a closing part of this study with the research insights and conclusions drawn from the whole study and recommendations for the reader. This study draws upon the American Psychological Association (APA) style of publication.
CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

The aim of this chapter is to provide a critical view of dimensions of the theoretical framework and literature review related to inter-discursive constructions that emerge as a result of language use and implicit and explicit discourses in their contexts and what they produce in return as they are seen manifested prominently in the texts under study.

Conceptualising Inter-discursive Constructions. This qualitative study examines specific inter-discursive constructions of language concerning identity, gender and power relations in the text of two novels, and is guided by the discourse theory of Michael Foucault and theorists and linguists who support his concept of discourse, underpinned by the analytical perspectives of Cultural Studies (CS) and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies (CFDS) and methodological approaches suggested by Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). By treating the novel texts in question as a site for the dialogic interactive mediation and production of inter-discursive constructions of language, this study aims to explore orders of discourse (Fairclough, 1989, 1992, 2003; Mills, 1997) which indicate heterogeneity of a given discourse and its embeddedness in socio-cultural contexts. It provides space to evaluate inter-discursive strategies and linguistic devices (Wodak et al., 1999) for the exploration of identity, gender and power relations/issues.

This is a complex study because the phenomenon of orders of discourse is not a smooth affair as identity, gender and power relations are constructed through inter-discursive mediation of orders of discourse. I attempt to merge Foucault’s discourse theory with more workable insights from Fairclough’s writings (1989, 1992, 1999, and 2003) on discourse theory and discourse analysis to explore inter-discursive constructions in the novel texts. Exploration of inter-discursive strategies and linguistic devices is similar to Griffin’s proposal (2005) of: analysis of patterns of language use and patterns
in language use. Adopting perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies (see Chapter 3), this study seeks to focus on how various discourses interact in their struggle to determine and influence and be determined and influenced by various contexts and their social practices.

Discourse is a social use of language and; therefore, it presents different perspectives on the world, and also reflects people’s relation to the world, their social positions and behaviours which constitute their identities beyond their biological appearances (Fairclough, 2003). Therefore, the constitutive role of language is quite significant in this study. Maclaren (1994) claims that “discourses shape how we operate in the world as human agents, construct our unconsciousness and what we consider true”. Moreover, social realities such as identity, gender differences, power relations, events, economic disparities, etc., as they form part of inter-discursive constructions of the novels, will be investigated as an effect of language use.

The study attempts not a mere thematic or linguistic analysis of the novel texts; rather devoting particular attention to inter-discursive language use, it will present an analysis of orders of discourse, to show how language is used and is governed by those orders, rules, practices and perspectives in the novel texts, hence become inter-discursive and systemic, thus controlling and sometimes, constraining the use of language.

**Theorising Inter-discursivity.** So far as theorizing of the inter-discursivity is concerned, its traces are found in Bakhtin’s dialogism, wherein an utterance is interpreted in a “discursive context”. This premise depends on the relation manifested by an utterance and that is of a differential nature. In a conversation, for example, two speakers are always different from each other and even if an utterance is repeated, the meaning given to it is based on each individual’s “shared social experience” (Holquist, 1990). Similarly, for Foucault (1972) too, inter-discursivity is part of his discourse context and there is no one objective way of identity formation around a single axis of gender, economic or sexual orientation; rather, there is multiplicity of positionings and discourses which struggle to position subjects as particular kind of individuals. They shape identity and invite attention to the active role of language which is the central constitutive entity within an inter-mix of discourses. Moreover, the concept of inter-discursive constructions makes this study different from any positivist study where it is possible to isolate particular aspects of a
problem for precise analysis. Here, texts understudy are being seen in their socio-cultural contexts to explore how truth is constructed inter-discursively.

With its focus upon inter-discursive language use and how different discourses interact in the novel texts to shape identities and gender and power relations, this study looks at the systems and forces which function as support mechanism of those discourses (Foucault, 1972). It also looks at the social positions from which a discourse emerges and those which it refers to because social positions help in generating specific effects of discourses. About the relationship between social positioning and specific effects of a discourse, Macdonnell (cited in Mills, 1997, p. 11) expresses his view, “The position does not exist itself; however, indeed, it may be understood as a standpoint taken up by a discourse through its relation to another ultimately opposing”. For Macdonnell, position of a speaker/discourse is a production of ongoing process. Similarly, Blommaert (2005), while referring to the theory of voice, suggests that we need to examine the way in which language actually works in societies because sociolinguistic systems are usually based on “fashions/ways of speaking”. Fashions and ways of speaking suggest that no discourse exists in isolation; rather, its constitution is predominantly dependent upon other competing social and institutional positionings/discourses in terms of differing and conflicting standpoints.

The point is not so much to look at inter-discursivity per se but how language is used to effect inter-discursivity – in the sense of perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies – and how it constructs individuals and identity, gender and power relations. The potential of inter-discursive constructions as conflicting sets of meanings in the texts and as to how they lead to markedly different identities and social practices than perceived usually is the focus of the study. A discourse therefore, is dialogic and dialectical wherein language use and researcher (through analysis and interpretation) continue to negotiate and create new meanings.

It is important here to understand first about the constituent aspects of discourse, generally known as structures of discourse and secondly, the orders of discourse and its effects. Foucault’s contribution (cited in Mills, 1997) to identifying structures and orders of discourse is of great significance. Identification and analysis of those structures and orders in the texts will make this study an inter-discursive analysis as those structures and orders are not as conclusive finished objects in the texts; rather, they are formed
discursively within the contexts under the pressure of other discourses or drawing upon other discourses. Structures are actually constraints which are the partial or complete result of social and institutional discourses. These structures are meant to set the boundaries which include certain things and exclude others. Similarly, order of discourse is a moment of social networking wherein social structures and practices come in dialectical relationship. Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) argue that an order of discourse denotes a group of discourses that operate in a same social terrain, both in conflict and in concordance with one another (p. 57). Thus, the concept of orders of discourse provides an insight to investigate relationship between different discourses within a context as indicated by the “same social terrain”. In this regard Fairclough (2004) also suggests:

   different elements of social practices, including forms of activity, social relations and their institutional forms; persons with beliefs, values, emotions, histories, and so on . . . they cannot be reduced to each other, and therefore demand different social scientific theories and methodologies i.e., they are not discrete. They flow to one another; they internalize one another.  

(p. 112)

In this study, the flow and internalization process of social practices as elements of orders of discourse will be analysed in terms of inter-discursive constructions. To identify those structures and orders of discourse, the focus will be on the ways [as suggested by Fairclough (2003) & Mills (1997)] they support in carrying out the inter-discursive study of the texts, by signaling to which, discourses are drawn and articulated together. Fairclough (cited in Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002) contends that, within an order of discourse, there are specific discursive practices through which text and talk are produced, consumed and interpreted. Fairclough (2003) also suggests ways to identify different structures and orders in a discourse through its genres (ways of interacting), discourses (ways of representing) and style (individual ways of language use). Mills also suggests a way to identify structures and orders of a discourse by putting it in opposition to other discourses. She talks of the pressures of other discourses in the context of feminist discourse and contends that inter-discursivity of a discourse is analysed in its “conflictual relations rather than in isolation” (Mills, 1997, p. 99). Thus, discourse takes place not out of nothing but it takes place in a process of pressures from other discourses. The space where these pressures or tensions collide or conflate are the actual transformational sites that allow for change or otherwise.
With these ways of identifying elements of orders of discourse, it is also appropriate to understand how they can get constructed in the texts. The following aspects may contribute to the construction of orders of a discourse in a text:

a. Need for making a discourse acceptable to the audience/readers because of change in their perception due to the circulated discourses.

b. Recognizable positioning of the genders in view of the socio-economic changes in taken for granted gender discourses.

c. Several visible opposing discourses at work in the milieu.

In the inter-discursive environment, and with the increasing complexities of life, language use has also grown complex. It is characterized by different dimensions of issues in language use like representation (gender, power, subjectivity, identity, agency, etc.), multivocality, inter-discursivity, “legitimation” (Habermas quoted in Fairclough, 2003), “equivalence and difference” (Laclau & Mouffe, cited in Fairclough, 2003), “appearance and reality” (Fairclough, 2003) and dimensions of semantic and grammatical relations which cut across different contexts of disciplines. Their analysis can lead to better understanding of human motives and agency, identities and gender and power relations. A narrative is never without a network of these structures and they are not natural or universal; rather, constructed inter-discursively. Foucault claims that “those discursive structures are what make objects and events appear to us to be real or material” (cited in Mills, 1997). Similarly, about constitutive aspects of discourses, Foucault (1981) says, “we must not imagine that the world turns towards us a legible face which we would have only to decipher. The world is not accomplice of our knowledge; there is no discursive providence which disposes the world in our favour” (p. 67). For Foucault, there is no order already imposed upon the world. Rather, we impose order on the world through our linguistic descriptions under the influence of institutional forces like family/clan traditions, religion, historicity, departmental authorities, economic rules/pressures, etc.

Continuing this epistemological stance argued by Foucault on different and varying ordered discourses within the novel texts, Blommaert (2005) contends, “Narratives are never ‘flat’ but always structured into units, segments, episodes. Relations within and between such units are patterned and structured, and such forms of patterning reflect cultural ways of organizing knowledge, orientations to knowledge and effect into
discourse” (p. 84). Blommaert considers that the relationship between the narrative form, linguistic patterns and social context is a created one and hence subject to various value judgments. Similarly, this arrangement of discourses does not fail to create its effects, but generates such social and political thinking and interpretations which are compelling in their ways.

According to Foucault’s theory of discourse, perception of even natural objects is formed within the discourse structures and boundaries. His emphasis is upon the structures and orders of discourse and their forming effect as they form our sense of reality. However, it is not necessary that the effects of discursive structures and order of discourse in forming our sense of reality are similar as suggested by Foucault. One can perceive a given discourse as a threat to one’s identity and existence, so one can reject it bringing one’s own discourse with its own ways of language use, linguistic patterns and social context. For example, Robbins refers to (2000) Cixous’ refusal to agree to patriarchal discourses because, they draw on binary oppositions and, thus, have “violence and death at heart”. Robbins (2000) offers interesting arguments about how Cixous perceives a discourse drawing on binary oppositions:

(Binary oppositions) are structured on the underlying opposition of ‘Man/Woman’. Because these oppositions take place in language, because language forms what it is possible for us to think . . . In this schema, woman is defined by passivity and rendered non-existent as a subject . . . Binary thought is a war zone in which a struggle for mastery is ceaselessly played out. Challenging this oppressive binary system she proposes that there is a need to rewrite the system in such a way that the conflict between the two terms could be replaced by something else. (pp. 170-171)

In view of Cixous’ subversive stance, it can be argued that a given discourse with its specific order and boundaries may be rewritten to evoke a challenge leading to another sense of reality, creating another world and another possibility. Robbins (2000) also contends that there is always another side of a given discourse which may widen the view. This insight also highlights Foucault’s concept of power, which is exercised through the use of language. It is an acceptance of ideological reflection of power relationship in human society hidden in the meanings of language use. As Foucault expresses, “Discourses can be both an instrument and an effect of power but also a
hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy” (cited in Mills, 1997). When discourses attempt to display their powers within patterns and ways of language use, they come into conflict and form an inter-discursive construction wherein people attempt to negotiate a powerful position for themselves in relation to others. Foucault’s concept of power within the competing discourses is an essential element of social relations and hence reason for varying effects. Pechux (cited in Mills, 1997, p. 14) also supports this ceaseless struggle of discourses. He describes the “conflicting nature of discourses” and “the ideological struggle” as essential elements of discourses within a text. Some other theorists have also theorized the ideological aspects of discourses which are helpful in understanding the inter-discursive relationship of discourses.

van Dijk’s research (1991, 2001) on media studies provides insights about ideological struggle of discourses and language use. He views ideologies as “interpretive frameworks” which provide cognitive foundation for the understanding of attitudes of different groups existing in different societies. Language is not representative of status quo; rather, it is a framework wherein the relationship between meaning and context is established through decoding and interpretation. Similarly, Kress (cited in Dellinger, 1995) contends that the ideological attempts through language use are: “the defined and the delimited set of statements that constitute discourses are themselves expressive of and organized by a specific ideology”. Thus, the language use in context is not natural and logical; rather, its order takes place under the influence of some designed activity and intention which indicate other diverse discourses.

Fairclough (1989) also believes that it is possible to find such assumptions as embedded in the forms of language use and that existing conventions can be explained as outcomes of power relations and power struggle. He argues, “The exercise of power in modern society is increasingly achieved through ideology and more particularly through the ideological workings of language” (p. 2). For Fairclough, language becomes a primary source of social control and power and it is used to serve the required purposes. Acknowledging the ideological struggle in the inter-discursive constructions of language, it is an acceptance that there is a world of knowledge/discourses existing beyond a text.

However, the theorists, as argued above, do not accept this world as a concrete reality or objective truth as defended by Marxism; rather, a world covered up by a host of
varying forms of language which Nietzsche (1971) calls a “mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, anthropomorphisms” (p. 636). Nietzsche claims that we construct truth (discourse) by relations of time, space and number in the realm of metaphors. He argues:

What is, for us in general, a law of nature? It is not known in itself but only in its effects, that is to say, in its relation to other laws of nature, which again are known to us only as sums of relations. Therefore, all these relations refer only one to another and are absolutely incomprehensible to us in their essence; only that which we add: time, space, i.e., relations of sequence and numbers are really known to us in them. (p. 638)

If this analogy of Nietzsche is applied to a narrative discourse, it is easy to assess that there are a host of relations having varying contextual time and space working in the orders of discourse. Though it is not possible to unearth all the essential sources and origins of those relationships; however, it will reveal that meaning-making in the narrative texts is not a given and natural thing; rather, a product of arbitrary and unstable connections of socio-cultural and institutional practices.

In view of the epistemological premise of the relational nature of discourses and the ideological struggle within and between discourses, and focus of study upon the inter-discursive constructions of language, it is also important to theorise inter-discursive constructions in terms of their linguistic strategies. The novel texts under study have not been explored so far with these epistemological underpinnings with specific focus upon inter-discursive constructions through analysis of linguistic and discursive strategies. However, some research has been attempted in other areas and the explorations provide useful insights about the use of linguistic and discursive strategies that show how a discourse takes (in)effective position in opposition to other discourse(s) based on its use of language. For example, Arlene Harvey (2004) explores discourse interaction on two leadership styles: ‘Transaction and Transformation’ with analytical focus on linguistic strategies like process type, agency, metaphor, personal pronouns, etc. It provides an understanding about the contesting nature and relationship of discourses of two leadership styles and their different effects upon the employees. Similarly, Debora de Carvalho Figueiredo (2004) explores “Representation of Rape in the Discourse of Legal Decisions” in England during the years 1996-1998. It is an interesting study of vocabulary of legal language which reveals that the severity of the assault in rape depends upon how that
assault is labeled and categorized. Conflict and ideological struggle lie in the attempt to include or exclude certain labels and categories. In inter-discursive terms, this research reveals how investigation of linguistic strategies and discursive structures of one discourse that is British Judicial Discourse, leads to another discourse like gender-biased treatment given to victims of rape.

The distinguishing character of my study is its deeper exploration into use of language to know how the available discourse is constituted through different discursive strategies drawing upon other discourses on the one hand, and on the other hand; specially develop understanding about the constant contestation of implicit and explicit discourse(s) and their possible contexts, which provide specific orders of the discourse concerning identity, gender and power relations in the novel texts.

Structures and orders of discourse - as discussed earlier being central to discourse theory - is primarily a theoretical view of Foucault. Theorists like Fairclough and Wodak have made this concept more useful and viable by actually providing guidelines for analysis of language strategies to know about the inter-mix of discourses and their structures and orders. Thus, the orders of discourse in terms of social realities in the novel texts effectively constructed through the operations of discourses (language use) will be focus of this study. Inter-discursive analysis takes socio-cultural stance towards the texts with the view that discourses are ways of representing the world. In this regard Fairclough (2003) contends, “Discourses do not just reflect or represent social realities and relations, they construct and constitute them”. Discourses represent the “processes, relations and structures of the material world, the mental world of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth”. They represent not only the material world; rather, the imaginary world as well which is an attempt of discourses to give a new direction to the world. It reveals that the relationships, the processes and the structures of the world are the relationships, processes and structures of the discourses. Some aspects of inter-discursive constructions as suggested by Fairclough (1992), Pechux (1982), Wodak and Weiss, (2005) and van Dijk (2001) are as follow:

i. There is a dialectical relationship between discourse and social structures, between social structures and social practices and vice versa.
ii. Discourse is shaped and constrained by social structures – class, institutions, systems of classification, norms, customs, conventions, etc., which shape orders of discourse.

iii. Inter-discourse manifests too many discursive events and configuration of discursive and social practices.

iv. Inter-discursivity allows primacy to orders of discourse which function at various levels like societal, institutional, discourse type, etc.

v. Domination of the subject and its speaking positions.

vi. Hybrid forms of discourse characterized by relationship between discourse, politics and identity.

vii. Discourses are like icebergs expressing some specific forms of knowledge and containing vast presupposed knowledge with shared socio-cultural common ground.

This is how discourses interact and give rise to different assumptions. These assumptions play crucial and significant role in determining how discourses come into conflict, what identity and power relations are shaped and what specific vision is constructed. My study focuses on these inter-discursive features and explores how socio-cultural events are represented, and actually work upon the construction and functioning of identity, gender and power relations.

**Which Inter-discursivity.** The focus of this study of inter-discursive constructions is mainly upon the constitutive role of language use as to how the texts of novels are shaped of multiple discourses with competing perspectives of socio-cultural events. It is appropriate to assess views of theorists as to what exactly constitutes inter-discursivity, though there is a close similarity among different views of inter-discursivity due to the main focus on language use and orders of discourse with specific perspectives. For this purpose, Holquist (1990) argues about Bakhtin’s dialogism with reference to novel that it opens doors through a discourse to a world in which variety of social languages can be perceived. The idea of variety of social languages is drawn from Bakhtin’s philosophy of language concerning heteroglossia, also called social heteroglossia. According to Bakhtin, as translated by Holquist and Emerson (1986) “Language is perceived as . . . multiple social discourses each representing a special ideological belief system, a way of seeing the world: heteroglossia”. He contends further:
Indeed any concrete discourse (utterance) finds the object at which it was directed already as it were overlain with qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value, already enveloped in an obscuring mist . . . The word, directed towards its object, enters dialogically agitated and tension filled environment of alien words, value judgments and accounts, weaves in and out of complex interrelationships, merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group.

If “word” is taken analogous to a discourse, then it can easily be suggested that there are a variety of discourses at work in the novel text. Bakhtin’s view of language in its social atmosphere makes it distinctive from any unified and unidirectional view of language. Bakhtin liberates language from any fixity and suggests the creative aspect (dialogically agitated and tension filled environment) which makes any language use a living force. Taking insight from Bakhtin’s view, a text can be explored to gain knowledge why and how different discourses with their distinctive disciplines and cultural identities inter-mix and compete with each other for their social meanings.

Fairclough also contributes to Bakhtin’s concept of social languages with specific stance of “discourses, systems for constructing, organizing and expressing meaning” (cited in Warwick, 2005). Fairclough (2003) contends that he refers to media’s deliberate attempt to mix up various discourses to construct specific worldview. He argues that “the analysis of inter-discursive hybridity in texts provides valuable resource for enhancing research based upon these perspectives” (p. 35). It reveals that a text is never without its inter-mixing of discourses and it is a specific strategy to assert specific meanings.

Laclou and Mouffe (cited in Young and Harrison, 2004) cast light upon inter-discursivity from another angle. They see a continuous struggle for domination between discourses. They suggest that political process works with two different logics: a logic of difference which subverts equivalence and creates differences and divisions, and logic of equivalence which creates equivalences by subverting differences and divisions. It can be assumed thereof that this is a general characteristic of a text to be continuously in the process of producing and subverting differences and divisions. In the context of this study, the analysis will focus on how linguistic strategies have been textured into relations of equivalence and relations of difference, and how prior equivalences and differences are constantly being subverted. As discourse is ever context-dependent, therefore the
linguistic process of producing, creating and subverting equivalence, differences and divisions reflect a similar process going on in the social and cultural life.

I now move on to review literature on and about the novel texts under study to assess how other researchers and theorists have approached these texts.

**Literature Review**

There are certain commonalities shared by all inter-discursive language use (Fairclough, 2004; Hutcheon, 2002; Foucault, 1972). To keep the study focused about inter-discursive constructions of language in the two novel texts under study, I begin with mention of those commonalities:

i. Almost all the texts are inter-discursive. Fairclough (2004) argues in this regard: “. . . relations textured by texts constitute discourses in relation to other discourses” (p. 111). He also contends that “texts hybridize discourses in constituting discourses” (p. 112). Thus, a single text hardly draws on only one specific discourse rather on network of discourses which constitute relations, cultures and social practices and vice versa.

ii. We might look for deeper metaphysical–epistemological and ontological-relations among the discourses, but the visible structural elements of a discourse are often extendable to most basic assumptions- the nature and possibilities of certain phenomena.

iii. Fairclough (2004) suggests that a discourse is a representation of some area of social life from a particular perspective. This may be an authorial attempt to perspectivise some area of social life but Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies assume that all domains of social life and language use are multi-perspectival. In a way, every discourse is potentially extendable to other discourses. Different domains of life are represented implicitly through different linguistic strategies, thus, providing a chance to explore essential interconnection of discourses.

iv. Investigation of inter-discursive constructions of language leads our understanding to the politics of language use (Hutcheon, 2002).

v. Discourses draw strength from their relations to institutions and institutional practices. Institutions function as “support mechanism” (Foucault, 1972) to the
positioning of discourses and determining their power to win in the contest of meaning-making and meaning construction. Location of a discourse within an institution affects its position in the process of creating (in)effective meanings.

vi. Investigation of inter-discursive constructions can lead us to understand various strategies of language used to construct superiority of meanings and voice.

To extend knowledge about how to engage with inter-discursive constructions in a productive way, the main directions while reviewing the literature are:

i. To have an understanding of positions/perspectives from which the novel texts under study can be explored.

ii. Why and how discourses interact with each other to effect specific identity, gender and power relations.

iii. What are the ways of discourse interaction at linguistic level?

iv. How inter-discursivity functions explicitly through obvious dialogue with other texts/disciplines and implicitly through intermeshing of discourses in the language use.

v. What knowledge about language use is produced through the study of inter-discursivity?

The novels selected for study are specific representations of identity, gender and power relations. Umberto Eco’s “Foucault’s Pendulum” (1988) is a specific representation of identity and power struggle textured in heterogeneous discourses whereas, Uzma Aslam’s “Trespassing” represents gender and identity issues in the socio-cultural and economic contexts of city of Karachi (Pakistan). Both novels belong to the postmodern era wherein as Charles Russel (cited in Hutcheon, 2002) contends that world can be known only through “a network of socially established meaning systems, the discourses of our culture” (p. 7). Hutcheon incorporates this view in her discussion of postmodern fiction which is not a mere coherent representation of social structures and social practices; rather, a site of contesting discourses with diverse situated social and political contextual support mechanism. Meaning systems developed in the form of discourses have strong relationship with socio-cultural practices which have no fixed boundaries. In this regard, Hutcheon suggests that the postmodern fiction “deploy(s) hybrid forms and seemingly mutually contradictory strategies” (p. 35). It indicates that a
reality (identity, gender and power relations) purported by a postmodern fiction text is not predetermined and pre-ordained; rather, as Foucault (1970) argues in “The Order of Things”, they are “a historically conditioned and historically determined construct”. It suggests situated mediation of meaning systems functioning in a hybrid fiction text. Due to this mediated form of meaning systems, Foucault also adds institutional laws which make discourse a “regulated practice”. Thus, a discourse (text) is not an isolated and neutral practice, rather regulated through social and institutional orders/practices.

Drawing upon Foucault’s theory of discourse as a “regulated practice”, Fairclough (2003) views discourse as “ways of representing aspects of the world” (p. 124). He argues that:

(discourses) are associated with the different relations people have to the world, which in turn depends on their positions in the world, their social and personal identities and the social relationships in which they stand to other people and tied into projects to change the world in particular directions. The relationship between different discourses is one element of the relationships between different people. They may complement one another, compete with one another, one can dominate others and so forth. Discourses constitute part of the resources which people deploy in relating to one another - keeping separate from one another, cooperating, competing, dominating - and in seeking to change the ways in which they relate to one another.

(p. 124)

Keeping in view the guiding thread provided by the research questions, this passage from Fairclough indicates how to assume the texts under study, and the relationship between discourses and the people. One important aspect to which Fairclough also refers is: (i) there are more discourses than one discourse in a text, (ii) they attempt to bring a particular effect and (iii) they are as variable as changing relations of the people represented. Investigation of a text is actually an investigation of relationship between discourses which construct reality sometimes in cooperation, sometimes by competition and sometime overpowering each other. The text of the novels is not a uniform and coherent representation of the social practices and social relations rather, an inter-discursive construction wherein the researcher has to fare dialogically. Fairclough’s view of an inter-discursive form of a novel is further elaborated by Bakhtin’s arguments in his “Discourse in the Novel”. He talks about social languages and
speech representation as constructing images of language. He contends, “All languages of heteroglossia . . . are specific points of view on the world . . . They all may be juxtaposed to one another, mutually supplement one another, contradict one another and be interrelated dialogically” (Bakhtin Reader, 1986, p. 115). He also argues that the social languages enter into the “unitary plane of the novel” through the creative consciousness of the author. Bakhtin’s views are helpful for my study particularly his reference to the social aspect of languages, their dialogicality and role of author as creative consciousness. A text takes a specific order because the social languages are “period bound” and belong to “particular generation” (p. 115) on the one hand, and on the other hand they establish special order upon entering the novel which “orchestrates the intentional theme of the author” (p. 115).

Orchestration and special order of a novel text, therefore, indicate the constructivist viewpoint around which a novel text revolves. An order of discourse poses a particular way of representing gender, power and identity issues affected by a “network of social practices in its language aspect” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 24). Thus, a text is not only a construction of linguistic variation; rather, multiple layers of social practices and social structures affect the order of a discourse which problematises the investigation. Similarly, van Dijk (1983, 1998, 2000 & 2001) presents a “schema” of relations between ideology, cognition, society and discourse within a text. This problem implies the complexity of novel text because “It becomes difficult to separate out the factors shaping texts” (p. 25). Thus, the texts have to be investigated within the complex relationships shaping the inter-discursivity and multiple layers of meanings.

Review of Literature on and about Umberto Eco’s ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’

The principal aim of my study is to explore identity, gender and power relation issues through the study of inter-discursive constructions of language in the texts of two novels. Though there is no detailed research work available on these specific texts, however, some material is available in the form of book reviews and critical comments and observations about these novels and their authors’ theoretical approaches.
Just to recall Foucault’s Pendulum, the text contains discourses about esotericism, secret societies of early centuries, hermetic traditions and conspiracy plans in the Christian world. Major portion of the text is about the development of the Order of the Knights Templar and appreciation of their activities. Eco calls them as “friends of Christ”, “champions of the faith, last glimmer of the chivalry’ twilight”, etc. The text also refers to a wide range of historical events that spread over recent times to ancient centuries. Overall, this text is a thick study of spatial, temporal and conceptual discourses concerning the religious and the mundane, the recent and the ancient, the supernatural and the scientific human experiences, etc.

A Novel of enough Elements and elaborate Structures. Ted Gioia argues about Eco that he is “obsessed with conspiracy theories . . . it (Foucault’s Pendulum) is ostensibly about books and the troubles they cause . . . Eco finds opportunities to incorporate enough elements of traditional mystery and adventure stories to keep his readers deeply engaged”. Gioia is of the view that Eco is not a traditional novelist and his novel is not a smooth and coherent text; rather, it is constructed through varied discourses which come from diverse dimensions. It is a fluid kind of text which is, according to Hutcheon (1997), “the result of typically postmodern transgressing of previously accepted limits: those of particular arts, of genres” (p. 275). The transgressing of Foucault’s Pendulum may be referred to alien discourses. There is no central community or limited sphere of life whose identity can be asserted; rather, it is a decentralized text which revolves around different other texts leading to no specific meaning which is “another postmodern paradox” (Hutcheon, 1997, p. 278). However, it is perceived that Foucault’s Pendulum, as viewed by Gioia, poses a challenge for the researcher taking specific theoretical position while engaging with linguistic, historical, cultural, political, theological, geographical and host of other aspects of the novel. Besides this challenging area of theoretical positioning, it is not without its vantage point as this kind of text offers opportunity of opening new doors to different discourses and a researcher can come up with a flexible approach to study the inter-relations of socio-cultural, political and other varied constructs.

Another important observation by Gioia is about Eco’s opposition to the postmodernist understanding of ‘truth/reality’. Gioia argues, “Eco builds up elaborate structures of interpretation only to allow them (postmodernists) to come crashing to the ground, while the real and tangible ultimately reveal their primacy over that which is
merely conceptual”. Gioia argues that, in Foucault’s Pendulum, Eco builds supremacy of tangibility and precision over what is conceptual and postmodern divergence. Perhaps, Gioia does not value the political and inter-discursive aspects of the postmodern novel and the culture in which a novel text takes place and interpreted. In this regard, Cox (cited in Hutcheon, 2002) argues, “It would be a matter of reading literature through its surrounding theoretical discourses” (p. 280). In case of Foucault’s Pendulum, the issue of surrounding theoretical discourses has gone too far. There is an endless network of interconnections and inter-discursivity. The text, in constructing its own discourse of power plan to control the whole earth, indulges in contradictory and multidimensional discourses. Each discourse may have its own connections and theories as Lyotard contends:

A postmodern artist or writer is in the position of a philosopher: the text he writes, the work he produces are not in principle governed by pre-established rules, and they cannot be judged according to a determining judgment, by applying familiar categories to the text or to the work, those rules and categories are what the work of art itself is looking for. (Cited in Hutcheon, 2002, p. 281)

In the light of Lyotard’s contention, Foucault’s Pendulum poses problem for theoretical and methodological positioning: how to challenge the extended linguistic and rhetorical strategies of the text and how to operate methodological tools for intervening into and unmasking dense inter-discursive constructions to arrive at some possible contextual meaning. Gioia’s review of Foucault’s Pendulum is not based on any given specific theoretical framework except general prevailing concepts of/against postmodern theories. His critical comments are limited purely to the status of the author who is, for Gioia, more intellectual than novelist. Gioia views Foucault’s Pendulum as a book full of information, rather than an academic reflection of a novelist. Gioia views the text through his own concept of author which is contradictory to some postmodern theories like Barthes’s theory of text wherein authorial control is negated. Text has its own unstable connections indicating rich and expansive energy of the text. Barthes reminds us (cited in Fuery & Mansfield, 2000) that words never simply transmit a single indisputable meaning . . . words themselves have an unstable relationship with meaning” (p. 63). In their discussion of ‘reader as an active and creative agent’, Fuery and Mansfield argue that “text is no longer seen as a single voice (of the author), but as a complex matrix of polylogue – that
is, of competing voices, contradictory voices, and, ultimately, creative voices” (p. 40). Thus, Gioia’s review invites more questions than answering about the text of Foucault’s Pendulum.

**A Text of different Discourses where Worlds are both Made and Subverted.** Robin Usher (1997), in his “Telling a Story about Research and Research as Story-telling: Postmodern Approaches to Social Research” looks at ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ as a text which manifests ontological notion of constructed world as to “what is this world and what is to be done in it?” (p. 29). Usher’s focus on its ontological aspects has certain reasons as Eco’s text is full of disjointed references and unusual linguistic strategies. Referring to both of the well known novels of Eco (The name of the Rose and Foucault’s Pendulum), Usher (1997) argues that “Both texts embody the very postmodernist notion that different languages, different registers of the same language, different discourses each constructs the world differently, in effect, different worlds are knowledged or languaged into being” (p. 29). Though Usher’s analysis of Eco’s text is limited to its ontological aspect which highlights the form of text constructed through different discursive and linguistic aspects, however it indicates the complexity, ambiguity and unpredictability of the interpretation which a researcher undertakes. Moreover, it also reflects the inter-discursive construction of identity and power relations in the text which serve the purpose of postmodern cultural stance of “shifts and transformations” (Usher, 1997). Usher also provides certain cues at epistemological level which may facilitate a researcher to take a reflexive positioning. He argues:

> In Eco’s text there are spaces where worlds are both made and subverted. Like postmodern structures, we become aware of complexity, are plunged into uncertainty and disoriented. Yet this in itself is productive because it draws our attention to the process of world making and directs us towards a reflexive stance. (p. 30)

Usher’s understanding of Eco’s text emerges from his cultural awareness of the text which perpetually remains in the process of being. Spaces of the texts are filled not with well-formed social structures; rather, with perspectives, desires and plans of those individuals, groups who have certain ideological and political forces (Lincoln & Denzin, 2000).
**A Text of Connections where Everything is Connected.** Umberto Eco’s ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ is a text full of references which cut across the disciplinary boundaries so frequently that a reader hardly finds any well-formed meaning except connections. Peter Bondanella (1997) has taken a critical view of Eco’s philosophy of author expressed in his lectures delivered at Cambridge University and the same philosophy, according to Bondanella, prevails in his fictions. According to Bondanella (1997), there is a deep relationship between Eco’s theoretical and critical writings especially his views of author’s role in understanding a thick text like ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’. According to Bondanella, the key to understand ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ is Eco’s French phrase ‘Tout se tient’, which means everything is connected (p. 132), and this represents Eco’s view of reality. Another significant aspect of Eco to which Bondanella refers is his concept of “hermetic drift”, that means “uncontrolled ability to shift from meaning to meaning, from similarity to similarity, from a connection to another” (p. 132).

Eco’s view of text is similar to the views of Kristeva, Barthes and Bakhtin, according to which a reader comes across plural and polyvocal arguments predominantly. Robbins (2000), in her ‘Kristeva’s view of a ‘Split Subject’ argues that “Kristeva’s concept of the split speaking subject, maps onto her insight that any text is polyvalent, polylogical, plural, unfixed. It is the obligation of the analyst to read the pluralities of both text and speaking subject (p. 127). Kristeva’s view of text enhances the dimensions of a text. A reader is also encouraged to enhance her/his role and focus should go beyond the words to worlds to which the words refer and where more stories and more languages interact. Moreover, it also encompasses Eco’s view as well that everything is connected. The attention of the analyst should not move to the immediate reality - identity, power and gender relations; rather, to the processes of interaction where everything is connected. Reality does not emerge as a concrete subject; rather, it always remains on trial amongst the inter-discursive constructions and processes of narrative. Similarly, Barthes presents his view of a plural text which may be very helpful in understanding Eco’s fiction ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’, which has nothing concrete to offer except overlapping loose ends. Barthes argues:

The plural of the text depends . . . not on the ambiguity of its contents, but on what might be called the stereographic plurality of its weave of signifiers.
(etymologically, the text is a tissue, a woven fabric). The reader of the text may be compared to someone at a loose end. 

(Cited in Allen, 2000, p. 67)

According to Barthes, text is woven of multiple discourses and it produces plurality of meaning. This makes the text multilayered which cuts across the boundaries of disciplines, historical periods and cultures. Moreover, Allen (2000) highlights another characteristic of such text that, text is not a unified whole that ‘inside’ or ‘outside’ or plurality be fixed upon it. Though this expansive view of text liberates it from any fixed boundaries or norms of rationality; however, this unbounded text can create problem for interpretation.

In Bakhtin’s view of multilayered and multidimensional discourse, we can find relation between Eco’s “Everything is connected” and Baktin’s “social heteroglosia”, which stresses that meaning remains in process and unfinished. In “Dialogic Imagination”, Bakhtin (1986) contends:

The living utterance (discourse) having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance, it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all, the utterance arises out of this dialogue as a continuation of it and as a rejoinder to it - it does not approach the object from the sidelines. 

(Bakhtin Reader, 1986, p. 76)

As with Barthes, the reader (researcher) finds oneself “at a loose end” in a text because of its infinite process of shifting of meaning, similarly with Bakhtin, one finds thousands of living dialogic threads. Thus, researcher as interpreter cannot come to a final meaning; rather, through exploration; one follows a string of meanings leading from one to another and so on. This construction and reconstruction of meaning through multiple interior and exterior discourses/reference is further highlighted by Bondanella’s (1972) quote from Foucault’s Pendulum. This statement is also a reflection of Eco’s theory of interpretation. Belbo, one of the characters, expresses in this way:

Any fact becomes important when it is connected to another. The connection changes the perspective; it leads you to think that every detail of the world, every
voice, every word written or spoken has more than its literal meaning, that it tells us of a secret. The rule is simple; suspect, only suspect. (p. 145)

The emerging picture of ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ is what Bondanella has initially suggested, that there is a connection between Eco’s theoretical and critical writings. Eco, as a semiotics theorist, reflects the effective role of every sign/discourse in determining and changing the perspective. It seems to be purposeful inclusion of enormous number of references, allusions, voices and echoes from other works, places, times and disciplines in ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’. Authorial role has been highlighted in the presence of predominant constitutive role of diverse discourses in Foucault’s Pendulum. Bondanella’s critical views are quite useful in providing a leading thread to inter-discursive connections of the text.

**Eco as Author helps in Interpretation.** Another exploration of Eco’s “Foucault’s Pendulum” is by Rocco Cappozi (1997). Cappozi explores the role of author in the creation of meaning and interpretation of text with reference to expanded and illustrative structures of Foucault’s Pendulum. He is of the view that the author does play a role in understanding the given text and helps in avoiding unlikely and improbable interpretations of the text. He aligns himself with Eco who is author as well as a semiotics theorist. Referring to Eco, Cappozi quotes:

> Eco argues that while the intention of the Empirical Author (there by agreeing with both New Critics and Deconstructionists), an understanding of this empirical author’s intention never the less may serve to assist the model reader (that reader posited by the intention of the text) in excluding or discarding certain unlikely, improbable, or even impossible interpretations of a text. (p. 286)

Cappozi further proffers his arguments that Eco does not take empirical author as “privileged interpreter”; however, he/she may offer possible explanations against “paranoid over interpretations”. Cappozi’s analysis based on Eco’s view of author, to great extent, runs counter to postmodern theories that devalue authorial role in meaning-making. Cappozi’s arguments about author and text come to save the reader from being caught in the trap of bewilderment of unending interpretations. Cappozi (1997) seems to be influenced also by the theory of author of Foucault who held this view of author in the
beginning of 1970. In one of his lectures delivered in the United States in 1970, Foucault argues:

The author allows a limitation of the cancerous and dangerous proliferation of signification within a world where one is thrifty not only with one’s discourses and their significations . . . he is a certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses, in short, by which one impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition and re-composition of fiction.

In Foucault’s and Cappozi’s views of author, there is an attempt to delimit the “free play of signs within language” as given by Delta (2002). Foucault also indicates some ethical considerations in the interpretation of a text wherein “author allows a limitation of the cancerous and dangerous proliferation of significations”, while late deconstructionists transgress all such limitations. Barthes contends against any role of the “Author god” in a text. Derrida proclaims “difference” wherein “meaning perpetually slips away from word to word within the linguistic chain” (Delta, 2002, p. 19). It is a useful argument about the authorial role in the context of ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ which is a broad reading with limitless connections in a network of multiple discourses.

Avoiding both the extremes of the authorial role in a text or interpretation, Foucault (1970) highlights a workable role of author. Author “does not develop spontaneously as the attribution of a discourse to an individual. It is, rather, the result of a complex cooperation that constructs a certain being of reason that we call author”. So, it emphasises the importance of another significant link to understand the complex relationship of discourses within a text. Eco (cited in Cappozi, 1997) himself supports this role of the author that a novel is not just a linguistic phenomenon . . . it is the universe the author has built (p. 14). Thus, Cappozi’s comments provide an insight about the author’s role in the meaning-making process; however, it will be evaluated in the light of perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies so that the text opens up its linguistic as well as socio-cultural inter-discursive connections for our understanding.

**Contextual Knowledge is Necessary for Understanding the Text.** Mitrik (2009) carries out useful research on literary semiotics as a philosophy of language in Eco’s
Mitrik highlights Eco’s resistance to limitless and arbitrary interpretations as suggested by deconstruction theory identified with Jacques Derrida. He quotes Eco’s own remarks delivered in USA during his lectures to Idaho State University students: “I accept the statement that a text can have many senses. I refuse the statement that a text can have every sense” (103). Mitrik supports Eco’s viewpoint because Eco’s writings especially ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ cannot be easily understood without the contextual understanding provided by Eco as author of the novel. The issue of epistemological understanding is very prominent. Derrida’s deconstruction and its practitioners view a text as free from control of empirical author. A text is a piece of knowledge realized through free play of linguistic items. Everything is viewed within the text, not beyond it. Deconstruction attempts to establish direct relationship between the reader and text sans empirical author. Contrary to it, Mitrik is influenced by Eco’s conviction that interpretation has its boundaries. For him, text of ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ is bounded by the contextual knowledge provided by the author wherein multitude stories are embedded within other stories throughout the novel. Mitrik may also be convinced of Eco’s view of interpretation because Eco’s theory of nature of narrative is immensely complex. It makes the narrative a complex mess with limitless loose ends. It can be assumed that Foucault’s Pendulum as narrative is a multi-directional text, however, Eco does not agree with its open interpretation. Lois Parkinson Zamora’s (cited in Mitrik, 2009) comments on Eco are very useful to understand Eco’s problem:

Eco strains to create an open work which he describes as a work where “an ordered world based on ambiguity, both in the negative sense in that directional centres are missing and in a positive sense because values and dogmas are constantly placed in question”.

Eco’s attempt to create this open text and refusal of open interpretation of inter-discursive constructions concerning power, gender and identity relations in Foucault’s Pendulum will pose a challenge at interpretation level which will be addressed in the light of research questions and the analytical perspective of Cultural Studies. It reflects Eco’s own epistemological problems because of his belief in ‘limited interpretation’ and opposition to “the syndrome of the secret” as he calls it in his lectures. Sollars contends in this regard:
This syndrome was based on Eco’s disdain of the idea of hidden meanings that consistently resist interpretation . . . In many ways this was an offshoot of his interest in the limits of interpretation, but for Eco there was a wider significance to this obsession with hidden meaning. (Cited in Mitrik, 2009, p. 245)

It is a dilemma of Eco that his theory of interpretation runs counter to the nature of his narrative - Foucault’s Pendulum - which, due to its wide ranging subjects cuts across the disciplinary boundaries offering critical insights to investigate the inter-discursive constructions of language concerning power and identity issues. The dilemma of Eco is that, on the one hand, he disbelieves the positivist theoretical aspects and, on the other hand, he is not ready to accept the epistemological stance that there is no true or legitimate interpretation. He believes in many interpretations but does not believe in open interpretation which he calls paranoid over-interpretation. Thus, Mitrik’s view of Eco’s interpretation guides to analyse and interpret the text within the contextual aspects.

Review of Literature on and about Uzma Aslam Khan’s ‘Trespassing’

The other novel selected for this study is Uzma Aslam Khan’s ‘Trespassing’. ‘Trespassing’ is a work of fiction consisting of multiple stories and each story is embedded in the social issues of gender, identity, ethnicity, sexuality, subjectivity, etc. It is interesting to note the way language is used and stories are textured in order to structure various truths, identities and relationships. ‘Trespassing’ starts with mention of silk production and silk becomes a leading metaphor in the story when the text is seen woven with the silky threads of interlocking discourses gathered around social structures and in the words of Fuery and Mansfield (2000) “about individuals and their economic, social and sexual behaviour as the domain in which recognizable and legitimate subjectivity – a subjectivity (un)acceptable to power – is available to us” (p. xvii). Similarly, ‘Trespassing’ also becomes a meaningful emblem of new knowledge and reawakening when the text focuses on the problems and issues which are taken for granted or seen outside their domain. Trespassing occurs when discourses of masculine obligations and feminine emancipation contest and clash within the socio-cultural norms of Pakistani society, when the manly discourse/behavior of Shafqat is juxtaposed against voice of Riffat that is raised for equality, and when sexual taboos embedded in behaviour but disallowed in the daily discourses, are brought to surface, etc.
There is no detailed study done on this specific text but only book reviews and readers’ comments are available on different websites. However, it is useful to take stock of those book reviews and readers’ comments as they provide insightful cues to understand how language is used to construct the individual subjectivities, their social positions and values. They also help to understand how human behaviour is represented either determined or mediated by the collective social practices especially gender issues as textured in language use which is “saturated with implications, associations, and dynamics that individual language users can neither recognize nor control” (Fuery & Mansfield, 2000, p. xx).

**A Text with Representation of determined Behaviours and institutional Forces.** The first such comments to be reviewed are from Susan Muaddi Darraj (2006) published in ‘The Pedestal Magazine’. Darraj’s main focus is upon the representation of characters as specific identities, gender aspects and institutional power issues. She highlights the issue “The father and son shared a very special relationship which often made Daanish’s mother, Anu, feel excluded. Now that her husband is gone, Anu is determined to “reclaim” as she sees it, the affection and attention of her only child”. Women’s dependence upon men and men’s superiority even in extending their love and affection are presented as hallmarks of the social environment in which the text has been produced. There is a contest and constant attempt of social structures through respective discourses to claim and reclaim feelings and relationships as commodity. Identity issue is raised through a significant character named Salaamat (means ‘peace’). He is presented as an individual who “wanders through life trying to find an attachment to something definitive and fulfilling” without realizing that even his own subjectivity takes shape through a process of multitude of events. Individual identities taken for granted and their systems of working are so strict and exclusive that Salaamat is called as “ajnabi” or “foreigner” in one of the organizations he joins. This is an example of institutionalized discourse. This aspect of “exclusion” in institutional discourse does not stop here. It is further reflected in the disillusionment of Daanish when he approaches administration headquarters for water supply problem and gets no positive response. He is helpless before the unheeding institutional power.

The overall picture appearing through the analysis of Darraj is that there are exclusive and determined relationships, sacred entities in the form of institutions and
subjectivities which have not been questioned so far, and determined human behaviours, etc. The dividing line between ‘you and me’ is so strong that it does not allow any possible space from which one can take one’s position to speak. Darraj’s review provides clues that careful analysis of the text may reveal rich socio-cultural and language knowledge enmeshed in the inter-discursive constructions of the novel.

**Multidimensional World with Struggle for Life.** In another book review, Pamela Seth (2009) refers to all the major characters as contesting for life and life’s opportunities. Referring to the events of the text, she argues that “they (events) fashion a multidimensional world in which these characters must struggle in an altogether believable way. With its blend of the personal and the political, the social and the individual, Khan succeeds in creating a fictional world quite unlike any other”. These comments of Pamela Seth provide useful insights when this text is considered for investigation through the prism of Critical Feminist Discourse Studies. It suggests a changed way to look at a text and the way meaning is produced. Moreover, the interpretation of a text also has become a contested subject wherein the interpreter faces an unprecedented range of gendered social, economic and power relations constructed inter-discursively. This is how changes in textual forms are connected with changes in social forms. Seth’s view that “they fashion a multidimensional world in which these characters must struggle” indicates that it is not only the truth constructed through the text that matters, rather, there is a need to analyse those methods and means which generate the multidimensional world. Fuery and Mansfield argue in this regard, “The grounds of these practices of truth formation are fundamentally textual. Through an analysis of such textual formulations, a new access to the structures and politics of the distribution of the materials and meanings in societies can be made available” (p. xxi).

Thus, the analysis of textual formulations framed as inter-discursive constructions in this study may help advance knowledge about Pakistani social values and the challenges of our changing environment. Lyotard (1979) has remarked that “it is unwise to put too much faith in futurology” because “the status of knowledge is altered as societies enter what is known as the post-industrial age and cultures enter what is known as the postmodern age”. Therefore, looking at the text through the perspective of Critical Feminist Discourse Studies and interpreting it in terms of inter-discursive constructions
unravel it as a multidimensional world, rather than a monolithic and all encompassing representation of human behaviour and meaning.

**Relationship between Dia and Daanish as a Discourse of Identity.** Read’s (2004) comments on the inter-discursive constructions of the novel are insightful. Read refers to the main relationship that is between two youths, Dia and Daanish. He argues, “Daanish is taken by Dia’s strong willed femininity. Dia is fascinated with Daanish’s experiences abroad, experiences he is loath to discuss. He desperately wants to keep his American existence separate from his life in Pakistan”. It provides critical insight into the idea of text. Ricoeur explains that social action can be read like a written text and Derrida holds that everything (life experiences, relationships, events, activities, practices cultural artifacts and so on) is a text (cited in Schwandet, 1997). Relationship between Dia and Daanish can not merely be analysed or interpreted as an amorous relationship of youth, rather expanding this relationship on textual paradigm especially Daanish’s attempt to hide his American identity may bring new awareness about the gendered social practices of the two social backgrounds that both Dia and Daanish come from. Their relationship is taking place through a process of present and previous social practices and values.

Read’s remarks also highlight how to look at the interaction between Dia and Daanish. Fairclough (1992), contends in this regard: “Inter-discourse has come to be seen as a process of constant restructuring in which the delimitation of a discourse form is fundamentally unstable being not a permanent boundary separating an interior and exterior” (p. 34). Chauliaraki and Fairclough (1999), argue that “We should be sensitive to the particularity and specificity of communicative interactions, to what in particular is going on within them, without losing sight of the ways in which they work within social structures, social relations and social process which transcend their local character” (p. 74). Hence, Read’s comments and observations about the ‘Trespassing’ enhance the vision of the fiction text from existing discourse to the gendered discourses of masculinity and femininity prevailing in social domains.

**New breed of Strong and Resourceful Women.** Another book review published in a newspaper, ‘Daily Star’ (2003), offers useful comments indicating the discourse formulation, identity and gender issues that predominantly exist in multifarious forms in Pakistani Society: “Dia, whose mother is a successful Pakistani silk farmer, belongs to a new breed of strong, resourceful women and enjoys the freedom it provides. Meanwhile,
Daanish has come back to Karachi for his father’s funeral, as he has been living in America, the land of the free but bound by its own rules”. At another place, the comments are as “Cocoons are not the only things that explode in this novel. The silken prose emphasizes the conflict between the tender subject and a world where violence of every sort has become institutionalized”.

Three aspects highlighted are significant in these comments: first, issue of gender-biased society wherein discourses of feminism – the new breed of strong and resourceful women and the old breed of weak, suppressed and resourceless women have been brought to a contesting place. Formulation of discourse within norms wherein women are shown independent and strong-willed is a result of feminist discourse theory which positions “women actively work out their subject positions and roles in the process of negotiating discursive constraints” (Mills, 1997). Moreover, she argues that “drawing on the notion of discourse is a significant improvement from earlier feminist theorizing, which saw femininity simply as an imposed ideological category and which these tended to cast women as passive victims of oppression” (p. 86). It is a tribute to the postmodern woman writers as well as the Critical Feminist Discourse Studies which has liberated the textual practices of women representation. Khan’s fiction attempts to create its social effects by representing women through discourse which challenges the underpinning discourses of elders, education, economics, family, decision-making authority, etc., in Pakistani socio-cultural life. Discourses of male dominance are challenged by taking up role which is traditionally viewed as essentially male.

The second aspect is of bringing in discourses of socio-cultural and institutional spheres of America and Pakistan closer to each other in terms of dialogic theory of Bakhtin. Moreover, it also provides access to the knowledge/discourses - discourses of social and institutional freedom and its limits in Pakistan and America. There are references to certain discourses which are contradictory and not accessible to the common readers. Yaeger argues that “Theorists of women’s creativity must address the intersections of different kinds of discourse in women’s writing, since the best feminocentric writing will be not only in conflict but also in dialogue with the dominant ideologies it is trying to dislodge” (cited in Allen, 2000, p. 162).

In the light of these remarks, the creative aspect of Khan’s fiction text will also be analysed to know what ideologies it intends to dislodge and what discourses it has
brought in dialogue with each other in the conflicting linguistic environment of Pakistani society. The third aspect raised is about discourse formulation in the text of ‘Trespassing’. Discourse of the novel reflects complex society of Pakistan where social and institutional practices have made it a legitimate practice against women, against aliens, against powerless, etc. It suggests analysing the structuring elements like norms, rules, traditions and social practices – of those discourses which have made this society violence governed. It suggests a deep link between the discourse of this novel text and other discourses - family, language, geography, governance, social status of women, etc., - of the society. This relationship of discourses leads to Foucault’s (1972), idea of “discourse formation” which is the underpinning theory of his “The Archeology of Knowledge”. Foucault says that Archeology:

> designates the general theme of a description that questions the already said at the level of its existence, of the enunciative function that operates within it, of the discursive formations, and the general archive systems . . . discourses as practices specified in the element of the archive. (Foucault, 1972, p. 131)

Discursive formation here refers to the discursive structures. Foucault’s concept of discursive formation has been further elaborated by various theorists. Pecheux (cited in Fairclough, 1992, p. 31), argues that a discursive formation is “that which in a given ideological formation determines what can and should be said”. The same leads to “inter-discourse” where different discursive formations are positioned within domains of related discursive formations. To Mills (1997), “Foucault is simply trying to stress that the main reason for conducting an analysis of the structures of discourse is not to uncover the truth of the origin of a statement but rather to discover the support mechanism which keeps it in place” (p. 49). Thus, this particular view, presented in The Daily Star, emphasizes that Khan’s narrative is not simply a description of a social life; rather, it is a multilayered text indicating identity, gender and power relations interwoven through the deployment of inter-discursive constructions and need to investigate at various levels.

**Complex Portrayal of Pakistani Woman**. There is a short article by Kezia Poole (n.d.): “Is the Woman in Pakistani Fiction a Survivor or a Victim – A Discussion of the Nature of Womanhood in Uzma Aslam Khan’s Trespassing”. She focuses on the daring step of the novelist to portray Pakistani woman as a tapestry too intricate to define because of multiple factors that shape her identity – sexuality, marriage, mobility, work, class, dress.
It provides a picture of society that emerges from colonialism and bound by patriarchal socio-cultural and religious traditions. Women are more affected by these traditions rooted in universal implications of past and future, place, space, class and family. In view of educated Nissrine and Dia and a generation old working woman Riffat and tradition oriented Anu and poor Sumbul, Poole is of the view that ‘choices are afforded to women of certain class or station’. Moreover, Sumbul’s position indicates a cultural place where ‘women marry and work not because they choose but because they need’. Thus poor women’s necessity takes precedence over their choices and desires. This disparity of female experiences exists in the society due to wealth, class and gender pressures at domestic and social level. Another aspect highlighted by Poole is ‘gendering of space’. That in historical record Pakistani woman’s voice is absent and Riffat through her silk farm attempts to record her name in the history of development of silk industry.

An overall impression of Poole is that Pakistani society is predominantly shaped by the patriarchy that appears in the novel in form of Shafaqat who is dual in personality. That duality perpetuates in his son Daanish, who desires to exploit women sexually in the name of freedom. Poole concludes that modern Pakistani woman is shaped by many conflicting factors and she is still not an emancipated self with simple choice of linking back or moving forward, submitting or resisting. Poole’s review of the novel is anthropocentric based on what appears in the discriminatory utterances of the text. She suggests that Pakistani woman must investigate paradoxes of gender identity for discarding of “traditions of oppression that restrict their mobility, autonomy and sexuality while remaining close to their community and culture, developing a feminism that is indigenous and taking care not to fall into the trap of cultural relativism.” However, she doesn’t touch upon the linguistic constructionism or inter-discursivity domain this study is focusing upon.

**How this Study is Different from the Works Reviewed**

It is significant to highlight the difference of the current study from the works on ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ and ‘Trespassing’ reviewed here. This review of literature reveals that none of the works has specifically indicated the inter-discursive aspects of the texts under study, though indirect cues are there in terms of narratives aspects like, authorial status’, ‘connections’, ‘making and subverting of worlds’ and ‘enough elements’,
‘representation of determined behaviours, social identities and feminine willpower’,
‘complex narrative to portray women’, etc. However, they do not aim to focus
specifically on areas like orders of discourse or linguistic devices and discursive strategies
that shape identity, gender and power relations dialogically and dialectically. The cues do
not expose the complex relationship of inter-discursive strategies of the text that may
reveal something new on a careful and exhaustive analysis and interpretation. The
reviewed texts refer to inter-discursivity only indirectly while my study explores the
whys, hows and whats of the inter-discursivity and their effects in meaning-making from
the specific perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies.

The book reviews are the personal evaluations, perceptions and creations of
individual minds and not supported by well researched evidences of primary, historical or
linguistic resources. Except for Eco’s view of authorial role in meaning-making process,
there is no pertinent information related to methodological aspects or any contrastive
approach of analysis towards the specific function of the texts under study where research
work can be evaluated in view of the author’s objectivity, bias, reflexivity, persuasive
arguments, etc. However, it is not out of context to acknowledge the significance of the
comments of book reviews and marginal references in different books. They provide
some understanding of the topic, the form of narratives, the line of argumentation of inter-
discursive constructions in the novel texts, type of issues and linguistic environment,
consideration for contextual aspects and limits and limitations of interpretations, etc.

In the light of insights drawn from the review of literature, I go further to chapter
3 concerning Methods and Methodology. This chapter contains discussion on theoretical
perspectives pertaining to the novel texts under study and a detailed discussion on
analytical and interpretative framework for investigation of inter-discursive constructions
concerning identity, gender and power relations as assumed in the novel texts.
Methodology is based on the analytical perspectives of Cultural Studies (for Foucault’s
Pendulum) and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies (for Trespassing), with Critical
Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a method of analysis as suggested by various theorists and
practitioners along with its analytical model suggested by Ruth Wodak for investigating
written texts in socio-cultural environments.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND METHOD(S) OF ANALYSIS
AND INTERPRETATION

For the analytical study of inter-discursive constructions of language in the two novel texts, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as analytical strategy is taken up under the analytical perspective of Cultural Studies (CS) and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies (CFDS) respectively. Following the theoretical and methodological directions provided by CDA and Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies, the procedural model suggested by Ruth Wodak (2001) is banked upon for exploring identity, gender and power relations as they emerge through the investigation of inter-discursive strategies which Fairclough (1992), calls “constitutive intertextuality”. It is not a mere linguistic analysis, rather a deep investigation starting from orders of discourse into relationships with social orders wherein multiple discourses with diverse disciplinary directions function as constituting and transforming phenomena.

Discourses are not rigid spaces but exist with flexible borders and boundaries. Wodak agrees that there may be boundaries and limitations between and within orders of discourse that may serve as points of conflict and contestation and open to being weakened or strengthened as a part of wider social conflicts and struggles. Objects of discourse like identity, gender and power relations “are constituted and transformed in discourse according to the rules of some particular discourse formation, rather than existing independently and simply being referred to or talked about in a particular discourse” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 41). Fairclough follows Foucault’s concept of “discursive formation” (see p. 52) suggesting that ways of formation of objects are highly regulated and constrained. Fairclough’s view of “order of discourse” and Foucault’s “discursive formation” are closer to Bakhtin’s “dialogism” offering “a vast web of interconnections each and all of which are linked as participants in an event whose totality is so immense that no single one of us can ever know it” (Holquist, 1990, p. 41). It is like Eco’s theory of semiotics discussed earlier (p. 42) that everything is connected
with everything. It points towards knowable discourses/worlds lying beyond the immediate text.

The purpose of this brief view of inter-discursive constructions is to highlight the kind of texts (discourses) under study. The picture of texts emerging from literature review in the previous chapter is that the texts are not smooth, coherent and neutral pictures; rather, there are heterogeneous discourses which help to constitute the available pictures. Their production has taken place in environments of historical and socio-cultural experiences that shape complex inter-discursivity. Every inter-discursive construction is an event and a process which cannot be analysed and interpreted merely by a singular rationalistic/linguistic method/model. It demands a diversified methodological approach “informed by particular social positions and historical moments and their agendas” (Saukko, 2003, p. 3) which engages the texts on linguistic and socio-cultural levels. Thus, by employing a relevant methodological approach, I attempt to investigate language use to open the complexities that control the construction of identity, gender and power relations for specific purposes.

**Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of Cultural Studies (CS)**

In view of preceding discussion on the inter-discursive form of a text, it requires a qualitative analytical perspective for investigating complex linguistic games in the multiplicity of discourses and understanding those complex circumstances and processes that entail an inter-mix of discourses. It requires an approach which is not unidirectional or monological; rather, multidimensional, critical, reflective and dialogical; an approach which can converse critically with various dimensions of linguistic strategies.

For this, I draw upon Cultural Studies’ perspective for analysis of Foucault’s Pendulum which views language use as inextricably mediated by cultural forms and that is well-grounded in its cultural dimensions. It renders a text incoherent and challenges its continuity and autonomous status of subject positions. According to Barker, it invites a researcher to focus upon how linguistic discursive dimensions function in the construction of cultural processes especially identities (cited in Godeo, 2006). Cultural Studies acknowledges the central position of language and discourse in creating heterogeneity, difference, fragmentation and indeterminacy. Language is performative of
cultural practices in its use and multiple in its meanings. Barker suggests that “language is the primary means and mediation through we form knowledge about ourselves and the social world”. The application of Cultural Studies’ perspective to the study of inter-discursive constructions takes language use away from its literal academic spheres, and places it in the political arena wherein a discourse as a form of social practice is socially constitutive as well as socially shaped (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). The significant role of language in the inter-discursive constructions as cultural practices is of specific interest for Cultural Studies. As Barker and Galasinski (2001), argue, “Contemporary Cultural Studies has a distinguishing take on culture; it is one which stresses the intersection of language, meaning and power”.

Cultural Studies has its relationship with cultural activities, social practices and values. As analytical approach, it views a text emerging and sustaining in “changing historical, political and social context” (Saukko, 2003, p. 99). Moreover, its focus in investigation of a text is not on its aesthetic and linguistic features, rather upon those diverse strands/discourses that frame a text in its context and help to consider how we can critically position texts within cultural contexts. The interest of Cultural Studies also lies in the connections of power relations with the language use. Moreover, the focus goes beyond even the power relations to the texts in larger parameters where discourses struggle and compete. Saukko (2003) contends in this regard, “it (Cultural Studies) views them (discourses) as a site of contestation over meaning, where different groups compete to set forth their understandings of the state of the affairs in the world” (p. 100). Thus, Cultural Studies demands its practitioners to investigate discourses critically in essential relation to social conventions and values.

In this context Foucault, Barthes, Kristeva, Cixous, Bakhtin, Hutcheon, Nietzsche, van Dijk, etc., view the discourses constructing the objects through language use within the social groups. Foucault (1972) used the term, “episteme” which suggests a set of discursive structures as a whole within which a culture thinks. Foucault sets a line of the direction for analysis of discursive structures. Mills (1997) contends “The main reason for conducting an analysis of the structures of discourse is not to uncover the truth of the origin of a statement but rather to discover the support mechanism which keeps it in place (p. 49). Foucault suggests a relation of language and discourses to the social world which is the main aim of Cultural Studies. It is further corroborated by Bakhtin that discourse
has deep relation with socio-cultural aspects of human life. Bakhtin’s concepts such as “utterance”, “heteroglossia”, “double voiced discourse”, “polyphony”, etc., are the fundamentals of his dialogism which is very much rooted in the socio-cultural experiences of humans. Bakhtin focuses on the social ground and suggests, “Every utterance is the product of the interaction between speakers and the product of the broader context of the whole complex social situation in which the utterance emerges” (Bakhtin, 1987, 41). Thus, an utterance is never so original in terms of its interaction; rather, it is an answer to the previous utterances and hence restricted and regulated by the prior utterances to some degree. Similarly, talking about heterogeneity of speech genres, Bakhtin says, “Secondary (Complex) speech genres – novels, dramas, all kinds of scientific research, major genres of commentary, and so forth – arise in more complex and comparatively highly developed and organized cultural communication (primarily written) that is artistic, scientific, sociopolitical and so on” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 82).

Bakhtin’s argument about speech genre provides an insight as how to investigate critically the novel texts while positioning them within the perspective of Cultural Studies. It sheds light on its socio-cultural character and presents discursive position each discourse holds in a novel text. Allen (2000) argues on Bakhtin’s line of direction in the novel, “There is no objective narratorial voice to guide us through the vast array of voices, interpretations, world-views, opinions and responses presented in the novel”. Thus, it reflects the polyphonic aspect of novel where utterances have their socially mediated position without any neutrality attached to them.

In view of the theoretical positions offered by Wodak, Fairclough, Barker, Saukko, Foucault, Bakhtin, Kristeva, Hutcheon, Mills and van Dijkit, it seems pertinent to investigate the discourses of the given texts under the analytical perspective of CS.

**Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of Critical Feminist Discourse Studies (CFDS)**

The second novel ‘Trespassing’ will be analysed and interpreted from the analytical perspective of Critical Feminist Discourse Studies; however, the perspective of Cultural Studies will stay as part of it, where it is required, because issues of women dealt
by CFDS are highly embedded in socio-cultural aspects as well. Specific application of CFDS in the analysis of second novel is due to two reasons. Firstly, the major portion of the text deals with issues of identity and identification concerning women who are represented in multiple shades like young, old, educated, uneducated, working as labourers and as factory running owner, etc. Secondly, the author of the novel is a woman and the whole text - with multiple issues of women, family norms, patriarchal behaviours, pains of labourers, politics of power, public administration, public welfare and other ethical and ethnic problems - mediates the relations from a woman’s point of view questioning, subverting and constructing them in typical social contexts. From an inter-discursive Critical Feminist Discourse Studies perspective, being “obviously interdisciplinary in nature” (Lazar, 2007, p. 142), the purpose is to focus on utterances of resistance and emancipation and uncover unequal distribution of power relations that shape male female identities in typical Pakistani society drawing upon multiple discourses. According to Wodak (1996, p. 18), a text by representing and constructing social relations advocates ideological designs. Lazar (2007), also expresses that it aims to show up complex and subtle “ways in which frequently taken for granted gendered assumptions and hegemonic power relations are discursively produced, sustained, negotiated and challenged in different contexts and communities” (p. 142). Thus, viewing the discourse from the perspective of critical feminist discourse is to analyse and understand diverse mediated relations encompassing feelings, desires, opinions and dreams of women, and how the text using linguistic devices, as Weedon (1987) argues, reveals language as a site of cultural production that helps to constitute identities discursively.

It is significant to understand the connections, as highlighted by Fairclough (1995, p. 9), between the discourse context and the social context, thus, exploring linguistic and social aspects of discourse involving inter-discursivity that is achieved through different discursive devices like journey, combining different ethnic and linguistic communities, manifestation of their work place and products, involving social actions like “authorities”, establishing inter-discursive connection between love, mundane and religious discourses.

While theorizing Critical Feminist Discourse Studies perspective, it is also relevant to integrate three development stages of critical feminist discourse. According to Gills et al. (2004), the first stage was 19th century women’s movement that was a
response “to a shared exclusion from political, social and economic life. This was a time when efforts were on extending political citizenship for women. Second stage (1960 – 1970) was more forceful concerning political emancipation of women and issues like “reproduction, mothering, sexual violence, expression of sexuality and domestic labour”. Moreover, there were questions and contestations about the nature of identity, unity and collectivity because of certain essentialist definitions of femininity that over-emphasised the experience of upper middle class white woman only. Third wave of feminism has emerged out of these questions and contestations. According to Gills et al, it is not possible to define it in a definite way because of its multipolarity, polyphonous and unending issues and interests of women addressed by it. Its focus is on micro-politics, binary oppositions and social practices that are, far from being neutral and gendered. It opens up discourses that sustain relations of power and systematically privilege men as social group and disadvantage, exclude and disempower women as social group (Lazar, 2007). In another way, author’s intended meaning is challenged by the perceived meaning of the reader. Authorial meaning is challenged on the basis of language use, representational designs, and inter-discursivity. Third wave also includes race-related subjects, class-difference roles and construction of sex/gender well connected with social conditioning and voice issues in the discourses. As Wodak argues:

I would like to propose that a context sensitive approach which regards gender as a social construct would lead to more fruitful results . . . I would like to suggest a look at gender in connection with a socio-cultural and ethnic background of the interlocutors, and in connection with their age, their level of education, their socio-economic status, their emotions and the specific power-dynamics of the discourse investigated.

(p. 2)

Thus, Wodak’s approach to explore gender is highly dynamic and diversified that suits to inter-discursive constructions of language. In this regard, Kristeva’s theory of ‘marginality’ (cited in Fuery & Mansfield, 2000, pp. 130-131) is also significant that informs about politics of transgression and morality and how repressive devices of masculinity affect different ways to desire and sites of subjectivity. Other important aspects of Critical Feminist Discourse Studies are highlighted as reflected by Sanna Lehtonen (2007) in her ‘CDA and Children fiction’ are:
i. It is interested not only in exposing discourses of power relations and oppression but also in forms of empowerment through discourses especially of fiction discourses that are a form of social and discursive practice. Thus, dominant discourses can also be resisted.

ii. It suggests multiple readings of a fiction text, several possible positions for readers in view of inter-discursive aspects of texts representing different assumptions of gender.

There are certain ideas from post-feminism which focus upon women’s life. In this regard, Gill (2009) argues that there is an emphasis upon choice, freedom and individual empowerment; a pre-occupation with the body and sexuality as the locus of femininity; a reassertion of natural sexual difference grounded in hetero normative ideas about gender complementarity; the importance placed upon self-surveillance and monitoring as modes of power; and a thoroughgoing commitment to ideas of self-transformation, that is, a makeover.

Foucault’s discourse theory of constructing humanity as discussed by McNay (1992) is also relevant here. According to Foucault, the latest discourses construct humanity not as a naturally occurring phenomenon; rather, power struggle and cultural orders and systems are represented shaping humanity in different hues. Foucault’s theory of “arts of existence” as cited in McNay is also important (1992). Foucault’s theory of “art of existence” as cited in McNay (1992) is:

I am refining to what might be called the art of existence. What I mean by the phrase are those intentional and voluntary actions by which men not only set themselves rules of conduct, but also seek to transform themselves, to change themselves in their singular being, and to make their life into an oeuvre that carries certain aesthetic values and meets certain stylistic criteria. (pp. 52-53)

Significance of social relations in shaping identities and exploring discourses integrating complex social process is also supported by Dorothy Smith (1990). In this regard, she says:

Analysis of the extended social relations of complex social processes requires that our concepts embrace properties and processes which cannot be attributed to or reduced to individual utterances or speech acts. (pp. 161-162)
Thus, meaning-making in discourses must be extended to outer social relations and processes to explore identities and identification process.

**Discussion on Theoretical Perspectives**

After this reflection on both perspectives, it is necessary to build their relationship with other significant aspects discussed earlier for reflexive analysis and interpretation purpose.

**Social Constructivism and Perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies.** To highlight perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies regarding inter-discursive stance of novel texts and furthering Fairclough’s view of discourses as ways of representing and constructing the world inter-discursively, it is relevant to draw upon the social constructivist view of discourse(s). The relevance of constructivism to perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies is very deep and close. For analysis and research purpose, the focus of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies is human not in its biological form with universal characteristics; rather, human in its co-being and model representations as an effect of language use (Fuery & Mansfield, 2000; Threadgold, 2003). Fuery and Mansfield argue, “The human being of the human sciences organizes life around a set of representations of greater or lesser significance and authority” (p. 178). Further, they present Foucault’s view of humanity as explained in “The Order of Things”:

> The nineteenth century saw the rise of a certain construction of humanity as an object of analysis and research. . . . The human being that is the object of this analysis is not a naturally occurring phenomenon, but something that has been constructed by, in broad terms, culture, more specifically, by the maneuverings of power and the methods of systematic research. (p. 175)

Issues of women, particularly, are always inextricably linked to other social aspects, such as gender, race, sexuality, and social class. Issues explored within Critical Feminist Discourse Studies perspective are wide-ranging and span over diverse disciplinary and interdisciplinary locations. The relationship between Social Constructivism and Cultural
Studies is also potentially very close as the object of study is narrative construction. Threadgold (2003) suggests a social constructionist view of language in this way:

Realities and subject activities are constructed in and by language; that subjects construct themselves and the worlds they inhabit in their everyday uses of language . . . the social and culture are similarly constructed and deconstructed; that this activity is characterized by narrativity . . . what Eco (1979) would have called a semiotic labour on and with texts.

(p. 1)

Thus, it can be assumed that the texts under study involve discursive forms and human activities constructed through socio-cultural processes.

Continuing the social constructivism arguments, I review Kincheloe’s remarks about critical social constructivism and its role in cultural representation of reality. His views carry substantial influence of Foucault in assuming language as a social substance because it constructs social environment as well as is constructed through it. Kincheloe (1997) suggests that discourses merely not only represent, rather they constitute, modify and reshape identities, events, objects and social positions of the subjects. He argues “Linguistic descriptions are not much about society as they are constituted of social cosmos – that is they create reality” (p. 61). He does not deny the existing realities and facts; however, he takes a different stance about how those realities and facts are framed through language, what methods are deployed for representation and what type of relationships are created under what circumstances.

Social Constructivist perspective influenced by the linguistic turn is a useful insight to deeply analyze inter-discursive constructions in the texts of novels. It provides critical reflection on multiple aspects in inter-discursive analysis. Starting from the assumption that there is no neutral way of representation, it emphasises that all ideological frames and narrative formulas in a discourse are linguistic constructions as a result of human activity. Through the predominant role of language, each discourse attempts to create its own impact in opposition to other discourses in a text. Kincheloe argues in this regard, “power wielders attempt to establish one correct meaning among listeners or readers in an effort to implant a particular ideological message into their consciousness” (p. 62). To counter this one correct meaning, Kincheloe refers to “heteroglossia of textual reading, that is, the multiple representations possible in regard to
any social expression”. Especially about including of women’s voice in a qualitative research he argues that it is “valuable not only for purposes of inclusivity and gender justice but also for new modes of representation and narrative construction” (p. 63). Thus, discourses take position of an active constitutive force and struggle to create and recreate realities based on the discursive and inter-discursive aspects of language construction and language use.

**Subject Position and Perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies.** In the study of inter-discursive constructions, attention to subject position is also quite revealing because of its diversity. Foucault (1970) argues in “The Order of Things” that a subject is always historically conditioned and determined linguistic construct. It points to the significance of context and involvement of authorial role in the construction of specific social processes juxtaposed with their socio-cultural constraints. However, an author is not to be taken as a final authority that has produced an objective text. No text is taken as mere an exhibition of the author’s perspective; rather, the author’s contribution will be analysed in the inter-discursive constructions as Fuery and Mansfield (1997) state, “The nature and identity of the author is constructed within the text” (p. 145). Ruth Robbins (2000) extends this idea of subject referring to plurality of text. She contends, “Like the text, then, the subject cannot be fixed. The subject is not only split, but is also a ‘subject in process’ . . . The idea of processive subjectivity is attractive to feminist thinkers because of its inherent resistance of the fixity of sexual or gendered identity which can trap women in feminine mode”. Thus, analysing the subject positions in inter-discursive textual reading with the view of ‘processive subjectivity’ will enable to see through textual spaces those contradictions which may involve diverse linguistic, political, gendered and socio-cultural discourses.

**Connection between Linguistic and Social Aspects from the Perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies.** It is significant for inter-discursive analysis of the texts to see the way Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies hold relationship between linguistic, gender and socio-cultural aspects represented in a text. About postmodern text and its analysis, Saukko (2003) argues, for interpretation from Cultural Studies’ perspective as a text can only be understood in relation to the wider cultural and social phenomena, consisting of other texts (p. 103). It underlines that a text looks different when investigated from Cultural Studies
perspectives. Difference lies in the act of interpretation that instead of reproducing the represented ideologies in a text, Cultural Studies takes text into the network of relations where subjectivities compete in a tension filled environment. Investigation of text through socio-cultural manifestations brings new twists and appeals to the text. Application of Cultural Studies’ perspective to novel texts is to assume the inter-discursive constructions of human relations as they exist in the diverse activities of their socio-cultural life. Similarly, feminist theorists also claim that there is a deep relationship between language and sex, race, politics, identity and class constructed in the writings. Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000), while arguing about poststructural feminism emphasize, “Genders are seen as social and linguistic constructions, limited in time and space, that is, determined by existing ideas and conceptions about what ‘man’ and ‘woman’ mean and by the social and discursive practices which create gender” (p. 213). Thus, human representation in a text is very contradictory and delicate issue due to ambiguous character of language use.

Viewing from perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies, inter-discursive constructions do not remain only linguistic descriptions; rather, language becomes a metaphor of life as Nietzsche (1971) considers all language as metaphor. Questions of relationship between discourses and their authors, between one discourse and the other, between discourses and their production environment, etc., come to the forefront. Language comes out of its “enclosed interior” to form these relationships (Fuery & Mansfield, 2000). Foucault’s theory of discourse also indicates that how discourses are brought together by the institutional forces to form subjectivities. Foucault is not interested in the truth or falsity of a discourse, rather in how it comes into force and how it constitutes objects. Ted Palys (1997) argues about Foucault’s concept of power, “Having power influences the choice of whether something is relevant to know and the terms in and through which it will be constructed . . . Foucault, therefore, aims to scrutinize the ways in which power is both exercised and exorcised” (p. 32). Similarly Lazar (2007) argues that in feminist CDA perspective, the focus is on how gender ideology and gendered relations of power are (re)produced, negotiated and contested in representations of social practices, in social relationships between people, and in people’s social and personal identities in texts and talk.

Thus, the focus goes to those circumstances which are responsible for the production of a text. An understanding of an inter-discursive text under perspectives of
Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies means that attention to language use (discourses) and the underlying social interests and ideologies bring knowledge about individuals and their economic, socio-cultural and political conditions which constitute their subjectivities, gender and power relations. Fuery and Mansfield (2000) explain in this regard:

To many academic teachers in the new humanities it is the conditions of the production of knowledge that provide a greater insight into the operations of human society and culture than any specific knowledge itself. These ‘conditions’ of knowledge are to be understood in the broadest possible terms from the institutional structures of knowledge, with its ethnic and gender inequities at one end, to the way knowledge is formulated in language, texts and subjects at the other. (p. xvii)

According to Fuery and Mansfield, there is an enormous influence of the context upon a truth claim about human beings. Moreover, that influence is not a well-formulated dividing line to judge a truth claim; rather, it is so mediated that a researcher needs to place that truth claim into those ways, means and methods through which it is generated/produced and communicated.

Both the perspectives are so dynamic and laden with diverse aspects that to provide definite position is next to impossible. No dividing line can be drawn about/between issues conveyed in an inter-discursive text and the ways those issues appear. Thus, analytical discussion in this study will not be a totalizing explanation of the texts; rather, it will be one of the possibilities. However, attempt will be made to be critical and reflexive. About this characteristic of dynamism and plurality of the selected perspectives, an insight is also provided by Alvesson and Scoldberg’s (2000, p. 170) brief description of Clifford’s four conditions which prevent an ethnographic work or any social science work from depicting valid and logical social phenomena. Those four conditions are:

i. Representation of reality is dependent upon linguistic tools and metaphorical character of language and the local, contextual character of meanings.
ii. Ethnographic writings cannot be objective as they are determined contextually, rhetorically, institutionally, politically and historically.

iii. An ethnographic writing is usually an author’s voice and that can hardly represent a culture which consists of multiple voices.

iv. Cultures perpetually change, thus, it is difficult to go for static descriptions.

If an ethnographic work, which takes place amid the lived experiences of humans, is so rhetorical, tentative, and subject to alternative interpretations, then a fiction text cannot be transcendental truth; rather, it is a site of contestation wherein truth/reality/knowledge is produced, renewed, and changed under personal stance, institutional norms and socio-cultural practices. It imposes great responsibility upon the researcher to be reflexive in his/her analysis and interpretation of the texts. Moreover, the text is not closed, rather a site of multiple voices and open to many interpretations.

In the whole discussion of applying perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies to the investigation of inter-discursive constructions of novel texts, it is very important and particularly relevant to understand the mediated link between the linguistic and social levels of text (Fairclough, 1989, 1992, Wodak & Weiss, 2005; van Dijk 2001, Lazar 2007). Wodak and Weiss (2005) recognize that it is a problematic area as the sociological and linguistic categories are not compatible in terms of such aspects as identity, gender, power, institution, representation, etc. They suggest a way to reconcile these two different areas for the purpose of analyzing a text. They suggest a need to develop a “synthesis of conceptual tools developed in different theoretical schools” like Foucault’s discursive formations, Bordieu’s “habitas”, Halliday’s “register” and Bernstein’s “code”, etc. This list can be extended by adding Fairclough’s “order of discourse”, van Dijk’s “mental modsals”, Bakhtin’s “social heteroglossia”, Wodak’s ‘discourse historical perspective’, etc. Discourses do not exist in isolation. They are produced, maintained and reshaped in relation to other discourses, historical periods and social practices hailing from different disciplines. This is called “inter-discursivity” (Wodak & Weiss, 2005; Fairclough 1989, 2003).

The connection between discourses (language use) and socio-cultural aspects as suggested by Fairclough’s concept of ‘Member’s Resources (MR)’ and van Dijk’s ‘Mental Model’ depends upon cognitive knowledge which draws upon the social context
in which human beings live. Fairclough’s (1989) MR is an important integral part of his CDA model. He suggests that comprehension is the result of interaction between the utterance and MR. MR is that knowledge, which is stored in long term memory, including “knowledge of language, representation of the natural and social worlds they inhabit values, beliefs, assumption, and so on (p. 24). Significant aspect of MR, according to Fairclough, is its social origins, “They are socially generated and their nature is dependent on the social relations and struggles out of which they were generated” (p. 24). People draw upon their MR when engaged in social practices like producing and interpreting discourses. MR is not only constituted socially; rather, it also constitutes social practices, being social both in nature as well as condition of use. The social conditions which shape MR are societal, institutional and situational which affect not only the productions and interpretation of discourses, rather the ways discourses are produced and interpreted.

Fairclough goes further to clarify that MR is normative if the social conditions are problematic. Keeping in view the aspects of being constituted and constitutive, Fairclough argues, “social structures shape MR, which in turn shape discourses, and discourses sustain or change MR, Which in turn sustain or change structures” (p. 163). Thus, by developing this triangular relationship between social structures, MR and discourses, Fairclough highlights a mediated connection between linguistic features of a discourse and the socio-cultural aspects in which the discourse takes place. In this way, MR is also helpful in comprehending the inter-discursive aspects of a discourse disclosing identity, gender and power relation. Fairclough (2013) also asserts about this connection in another way, “different discourses are different perspectives on the world and they are associated with the different relations people have to the world, which in turn depends on their positions in the world, their social and personal identities and social relationships in which they stand to other people” (p. 124).

Similar to Fairclough’s MR, van Dijk also offers his theory about cognitive knowledge which is known as “mental model”. van Dijk (1988, 2001) calls discourse as a complex “communicative event”, because it involves social context as well as production and reception processes. He basically concerns with journalistic discourses. It is significant to note that journalistic discourse has deep roots in social context as it goes through the processes of production and reception on daily basis as per need of the social communities. Moreover, van Dijk takes discourse as an expression of ideology, thus
discourse analysis is ideology analysis (2000). van Dijk suggests three parts to analyse ideologies: i) social analysis, ii) cognitive analysis and iii) discourse analysis. He relates social analysis as analysis of the social context and textual features. However, the distinctive feature of van Dijk’s CDA is cognitive analysis that he also calls socio-cognitive discourse analysis (2001, 97-98) and it plays a vital mediating role between social and discourse analyses. Cognition is both social cognition and personal cognitions - beliefs, goals, evaluations, emotions, mental or memory structures or processes involved in discourse and interaction. By establishing relationship between discourse, cognition and society he defines it as, “the system of mental representations and processes of group members” (p. 18). Ideologies “indirectly influence the personal cognition of group members” in their interactions and discourse comprehension which he calls “mental models” and “models control how people act, speak or write or how they understand the social practices of others” (p. 2).

This aspect is also emphasized by Lazar (2007, p. 148) that modern power is effective because it is mostly cognitive, based on as an internalization of gendered norms and acted out routinely in the texts and talk of everyday. van Dijk (2001) further contends that “adequate discourse analysis at the same time requires detailed cognitive and social analysis . . . that may reach descriptive, explanatory and especially critical adequacy of social problems” (p. 98). He also terms mental model as context and establishes connection between discourse and mental models. He (2001) argues, “a conclusion of a theory of text-context relations, in which specific discourse structures are related to specific context structures such as socially shared beliefs of speakers” (p. 99). Here is an attempt by van Dijk to connect discourse with society or language use with social practices, thus making it possible to use perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies to analyse a written discourse for gender and social purposes. It is also significant that “context” is used by van Dijk in very broad terms ranging from immediate situation to global circumstances. It opens up different avenues for the researcher to contextualize the interpretation so that meaning-making process may not be restrained to limited facts and figures.

Above all, Hallidays’ Systemic Functional Linguistics, which serves as significant base in the development of CDA tools (Sheyholislami, 2001), takes language as a “social act”. Moreover, according to Fowler et al (cited in Sheyholislami), “there are strong and
pervasive connections between linguistic structure and social structure”. Perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies draw upon poststructuralist concepts that also reflect a relationship between language and social aspects such as “the social construction of reality, the discursive construction of society”, “gender as ideology structure”, etc., (Rowe, 2001, p.107; Lazar 2007, p. 146). In the light of this discussion, it is possible to use perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies to investigate the novel texts for the purpose of gender investigation and social gains.

**Justification of Perspectives of Cultural Studies (CS) and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies (CFDS) for this Study**

Some critics have highlighted certain limitations of these perspectives. Cultural Studies is discussed first.

**Perspective of Cultural Studies.** First is its historical ignorance and lack of seriousness as it is found in Rowe’s article (2001) on “The Resistance to Cultural Studies”. In response to this objection, Rowe tries to justify the stance of Cultural Studies that Cultural Studies respects critical theory whose trans-historical perspective enables it to deal satisfactorily with historical and cultural claims. Keeping in view the trans-historical perspective, it can be argued that the historical aspect of Cultural Studies is not linear and traditional; rather, it is embedded in small/large cultural activities and socio-academic practices like novel texts. Though novel texts have the limitation that they cannot be treated as authenticated historical and cultural record of specific social settings, however, they cannot be rejected as mere “superficial” phenomena (Rowe, p. 108). Novel texts have their own historical and cultural sense reflecting on not only what is there, rather, on what might be there and which is not included. Wodak (1995) suggests in this regard, “every discourse is historically produced and interpreted (i.e., situated in time and space) . . . Every discourse and every text are connected to others synchronically and diachronically, and have to be seen in relationship to other discourse practices”. Thus, bringing unknown contexts to the fold of analysis makes the study under Cultural Studies’ perspective more difficult and open ended.
Second objection raised against Cultural Studies, as highlighted by Rowe, is its reliance on formulaic “consideration of race, class, gender and sexual orientation” (p. 111). It is also relevant, in case of present study, as I have focused my attention on exploring identity, gender and power issues through inter-discursive constructions of language. Rowe’s reply to this objection is quite illuminating that these categories provide “useful points of reference for comparative interpretations and understanding” with advantage of bringing together economic status and social affiliations (p. 111). It can be added that the categories of race, class, gender and sexual orientation are formulaic in the sense of over determination of Marxist economic factors or any other structuralist notion. In Cultural Studies’ perspective, they are assumed as discursive constructions which defy any rationalistic interpretation.

Unlike the positivist approach in natural sciences, Cultural Studies tends to adopt textual paradigm especially when a novel text is being studied as “a particular cultural practice and related to other discourses” (Culler, 1995, p. 46). Frow and Morris (2003) also contend that Cultural Studies uses the concept of the text as a fundamental model. They argue that “text involves practices, institutional structures and the complex forms of agency they entail, legal political and financial conditions of existence, and particular flows of power and knowledge, as well as particular multi-layered semantic organization” (p. 509). Thus, ontologically, Cultural Studies is a perspective characterized by network of relations and its approach to investigate a text looks for heterogeneous political dimensions of knowledge and constitution and working of systems of relations” (Frow & Morrison, 2003, p. 513).

**Perspective of Critical Feminist Discourse Studies.** Similarly certain questions can be raised about the dependability and validity of Critical Feminist Discourse Studies as perspective for analysis of ‘Trespassing’. Specifically when perspective of Cultural Studies is there, there is no requirement to add perspective of Feminism to it. Point of argument is that the text ‘Trespassing’ is a discourse of sexism and feminist stories from the author who is a woman of social set-up that still attempts to perpetuate gendered norms to oppress women in their multiple roles. It is a subtle discourse that portrays masculine ways of behavior that denies empowerment of women. As this text specifically focuses on social norms and allied discourses embedded in patriarchy that aim to
subordinate women so the Critical Feminist Discourse Studies perspective is suitable for its critical interpretation.

This approach combines insights from CDA and poststructuralist third wave feminist theorizations of gender (Lazar as cited in Lehtonen, 2007). Lazar provides very useful insight in this regard:

Feminist CDA as political perspective, concerned with demystifying the inter-relationship of gender, power and ideology in discourse, is applicable to the study of texts and talk equally, which offers a corrective to approaches that favour one linguistic mode over another. (p. 144)

Thus, it is more useful to apply CFDS combined with simple CDA that supports analysis of specific linguistic modes. In this regard Chilton (2005) also affirms this viewpoint concerning analysis of discourse: “the nature of social action can be elucidated, even unmasked, by various kinds of linguistic analysis” (p. 20). CFDS combined with CDA is able to generate more powerful critique for deeper analysis and understanding of the political maneuverings of the text for social transformation and emancipation of women. Emancipation is a term nested in the semantic and rhetorical traditions of feminism in which it acquires a distinct social and power orientation (Blommaert, 2005). Moreover, keeping in view the portrayal of discriminatory power structures in the ‘Trespassing’ for the purpose of resistance and social emancipation, Lazar (2007) argues that critical feminist “analysis of discourse which shows up workings of power that sustains oppressive social structures/relations contributes to on-going struggle of contestation and change through what may be termed ‘analytical activism’” (p. 145). Thus, the purpose of employing Critical Feminist Discourse Studies as an analytical perspective for analysis of ‘Trespassing’ is to have a deeper view of gendered identities, practices and discourses and possible multiple ways of empowerment of women.

Keeping in view the foregoing deliberations upon the concept of discourse and perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies - central to my study of inter-discursive constructions - and supportive theoretical views of other theorists/linguists, the study of novel texts mainly focuses on:

i. Dominant role of language use in the written discourse, as Foucault argues “a silent, cautious deposition of the word upon the whiteness of piece of paper,
where it can neither possess neither sound, nor interlocutor, where it has nothing to say but itself, nothing to do but shine in the brightness of its being” (cited in Mills, 1997).

ii. Inter-discursive analysis of discourses in the novels using Foucault’s concept of discourse that how discourses refer to different structuring areas of knowledge, how they are a form of social practices and how do they construct and reconstruct realities in the form of identities, events, objects, gender and power relations, etc. Thus, making Foucault’s concept more workable, it will be a study of “higher level organizational properties of dialogue” (Fairclough, 1992) or orders of discourse rendering the texts as multi-dimensional discourse.

iii. As discourse analysis concerns with language use, its focus is not only upon the different forms of discourses; rather, it is more interested in the functions of particular ways discourses are intertwined and language use within the contextual dimensions at larger level of society. The main interest in this study is not merely describing inter-discursive constructions per se; rather, analyzing those linguistic strategies concerning norms, interests, standpoints, preoccupations and cultural rules, etc., which are responsible for the production of multiple discourses and their orders within the text. As van Dijk shows, “Discourse for instance is part of society and so are the socially shared ideas of group members” (2000, p. 10). Thus, analysis will go beyond individual words and isolated phrases to their contextual use.

Addressing the aspects of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies, their relationships with study of discourses, justification and concerns, these perspectives help reflexively to investigate the inter-discursive constructions in the two novel texts. As Saukko (2003) argues, “Cultural Studies has emphasized that textual analysis needs to be context sensitive and that purely formal analysis does little to help us understand the politics of a particular cultural product” (p. 113). Thus, keeping in view the context sensitivity of the’ perspectives, this study adopts CDA as an overall methodological position that pays equal attention to contextual use of language for analysis and interpretation purpose.
CDA as Methodological Approach

It is imperative to highlight here that the texts to be evaluated are imaginative and creative material produced by two different writers and it is not possible to discover, prove or define these discourses within these texts by any positivistic methodology. The research commitment is not to find any absolutely final answers to the issues raised in the texts, rather these need to be interpreted and analysed in their contexts. There is a need of a method which can help understand the meaning-making processes and tell analytically about the texts that are produced in different times and locations as method provides guidelines and assumptions about one’s “ontological or epistemological views” (Wisker, 2008).

This study aims to explore critical questions related to identity, gender and power issues as they appear in the inter-discursive constructions of the novel texts. However, the novel texts are not, like an ethnographic text, directly related to the cultural representation nor situated and grounded in the real world. As these are imaginative texts; therefore, it requires more critical and analytical involvement in the research engagement. Keeping in view the nature of texts which tend to be amorphous, I take up Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a methodological approach consisting of wide range of theoretical assumptions and approaches (Wodak, 2005) which allows having a multidirectional view of a research project. Owing to significant place of methodological approach in the whole research engagement, it is important to identify, discuss and understand the strengths and limitations of CDA.

Defining CDA is an uphill task because no theorist or researcher has categorically attempted to do it. It is not because of its difficulty level rather to define it is to confine it. CDA is not one definite methodology; rather, it is a combination of approaches which makes it flexible, trans-disciplinary and critical. There is plurality of theories and methodologies that can be combined in CDA and according to Wodak and Weiss (2005), this is the strength of CDA “to which this paradigm owes its creative dynamics” (p. 124). The critical aspect of CDA makes discourse analysis linguistically revealing and “socially transformative (Locke, 2004). It allows the analysis of the naturalized discourses to unearth the hidden features like gender, power and identity relations. First of all, I go to the theorists and practitioners who attempt to define it, so that I can highlight the aspects which form part of this study.
Foucault attempts to define discourse with reference to constraints and effects of limits and forms of a discourse. It cannot be called definition of CDA; rather it is just about discourse. However, one can infer the epistemological stance which CDA takes on drawing upon Foucault’s interest in socio-cultural aspects of a discourse. For Foucault, a discourse is a set of “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (1972, p. 49). Discourse is not mere a piece of language or a stretch of text; rather, it is a form of practices that work systematically, putting certain limits on the objects. The objects are constituted within those limits and forms of ideas and concepts and ways of language use within a particular context of the discourse. Moreover, Foucault terms producing the objects through discourse as truth productions. That truth is produced within a society. For Foucault significant aspect of truth is that it is not a given reality that appears in a specific form; rather, it is produced and constructed. A discourse is a form of truth which is produced as an alternative form of some other truth/discourse. There are inclusions as well as exclusions. There are specific boundaries around it and it crosses boundaries of disciplines, professions, traditions, truth claims, etc.

van Dijk attempts to define CDA in a different way by suggesting first what CDA is not. He contends, “It is not a method, nor a theory that simply can be applied to social problems. CDA can be conducted in, and combined with any approach and sub disciplines in the humanities and the social sciences” (2001, p. 96). van Dijk highlighted two important things: one, that it is not a well formed method or theory like the positivist scientific method, that can be applied in a transcendental form to a social problem, two, it is flexible, open and without any definite limits. He associates discourse with cognition and society. Assigning fundamental importance to cognition in the study of “discourse, communication and interaction” (p. 97), he suggests that discourse is both cognitive and social phenomenon. This relationship ranges from “communicative event” to “social cognition, beliefs and goals” to “local micro structures” of situated interactions and “global, social and political structures” (p. 98). Closer to van Dijk, is Fairclough’s definition of CDA. It is practicable and suggests certain directions for the analysis of an inter-discursive text. According to Fairclough (1993):

discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationship of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate
how such practices, events, texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony. (p. 135)

Fairclough is of the view that CDA has a contribution to make by exploring relationship between discourse structures and the social structures which are shaped by power relations and contesting struggles. He (2003) contends, “I see discourse analysis as oscillating between a focus on specific texts and a focus on what I call the order of discourse” (p. 3). For Fairclough, Member Resources (MR), is personal knowledge of the participant which van Dijk calls cognition, plays significant role in determining and locating orders of discourse. Thus, doing Critical Discourse Analysis is to focus upon social orders and problems via the orders of discourse. Fairclough’s (1992, 2003) CDA also includes “inter-discursive analysis’ that is seeing texts in terms of various discourses - hybridity of a text.

Ruth Wodak is another important figure whose contribution towards CDA as an analytical approach is quite useful. She calls her way of analysis as Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) which situates discourse in the historical perspective for analysis purpose and allows “to integrate systematically all available background information in the analysis and interpretation of the many layers of a written or spoken text” (1995, p. 209). She terms historical background as context which has deep impact upon the form and function of a discourse. Wodak and Weiss (2005) contend, “We understand “discourse” as “text in context” and this suggests an interdisciplinary approach where “the structural and cognitively perceived context is investigated by experts from neighboring disciplines” (p. 127). Thus, for Ruth Wodak, neither the discourse occurs in isolation, nor it is out of its historical context. It has deep relation with its context and there is overlapping of discourses within a given discourse which she calls “intertextuality” –“different cultures relate to each other” (p. 127). There are discourses of difference which are analysised as strategic communicative action embedded in different contextual background as opposed to ideal communication (Tenorio, 2013, p. 9).

Having outlined some of the relevant definitions from theorists which will help in applying analytical tools effectively for interpretation of inter-discursive constructions of language, I now move to the assumptions of CDA which, according to Fairclough (2003),
help to understand a discourse well. He argues, “No form of social communication or interaction is conceivable without some such common ground” (p. 55).


1. Language is a social practice through which the world is represented.

2. Discourse as a form of social practice represents not only social practices rather constitutes them as well.

3. Discourses acquire their meanings through dialectical relationship with other discourses, texts, authors and readers.

4. CDA is analysis of the dialectical relationship between discourse and other elements of social practices.

5. Linguistic features of a discourse are not arbitrary; rather, mediated and purposeful in their meaning making.

6. Power relations are produced, reproduced and exercised and restrained through discourses.

7. Authors’ positionalities operate from specific discursive practices which involve inclusions and exclusions.

8. Discourse is historical in the sense that it gets meaning as situated in the historical socio-political and ideological context, time and space.

9. CDA is a shared perspective in terms of heterogeneity of methodological and theoretical approaches on doing linguistic, semiotic or discourse analysis.

10. CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signaled, constituted, and legitimized by discourses.

11. Not only individuals, but also institutions and social groupings have specific meanings and values that are expressed in language in systematic ways.

12. Readers and hearers are not passive recipients in their relationship to texts.
13. CDA mainly concerns with power as a central condition in social life and it develops a theory of language to attend to the notion of power pervading the intertextual and inter-discursive constructions in a text in terms of social hierarchical structures.

14. CDA works eclectically; the whole range from grand theories to linguistic theories is touched, although each individual approach emphasizes upon different levels.

15. CDA aims to untangle the intertwined discourses which remain in constant motion forming a ‘discursive milling mass’ which also results in the ‘constant rampant growth of discourses’.

16. CDA is an analysis of dialectical relationship between semiosis (including language) and other elements of social practices with focus upon radical changes taking place in social life.

17. CDA is a programme of social analysis which critically analyses discourse as a means of addressing problems of social change.

18. CDA takes a particular interest in the ways in which language mediates ideology in a variety of social institutions.

19. One of the aims of CDA is to “demystify” discourses by deciphering ideologies.

20. CDA emphasizes need for interdisciplinary work in order to gain a proper understanding of how language functions in constituting and transmitting knowledge, in organizing social institutions or in exercising power.

21. CDA, rather than merely to describe discourse structure, tries to explain them in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structure.

22. CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimise, reproduce or challenge relations of power and dominance in society.

It is evident from the assumptions that CDA views discourse not in its isolation rather all discourses are situated in the socio-cultural, political, historical and institutional contexts. As CDA attends to various components in a discourse like social, political, psychological, ideological, identity, gender and power relations, “therefore (it) postulates an interdisciplinary procedure” (Meyer, 2001, p. 15). As all disciplines bank upon language
and discursive practices, therefore interdisciplinary analysis of CDA becomes inter-discursive analysis. As Meyer (2001) contends:

CDA, using the concepts of intertextuality and inter-discursivity, analyses relationships with other texts and this is not pursued in other methods. From its basic understanding of the notion of discourse, it may be concluded that CDA is open to the broadest range of factors that exert an influence on texts. (p. 15)

Thus, CDA being all encompassing is helpful to investigate the given discourses in relation to all other discourses and social structures that exert or can exert influence directly or indirectly.

**Argumentation on CDA.** With the theorists of CDA and its practitioners, it is known as a diversified approach suitable for carrying out a critical analysis of a text (van Dijk 2001; Fairclough & Chauliaraki 1999, Ruth Wodak & Meyer 2001 and Blommaert 2005). Wodak (n.d.) contends in her article ‘Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis’, “the subjects under investigation differ for the various departments and scholars who apply CDA. Gender issues, issues of racism, media discourses, political discourses, organizational discourses or dimensions of identity research have become very prominent” (p. 2). Scholars, interested in investigating language use in texts draw upon CDA which has established its own academic principles to deal effectively with various issues as mentioned above as textually constructed relation (Birch, 2005, p. 33). Meaning is not placed into the discourse structures of a text; rather, it takes place in the mediation of a process involving reader, writer, language use, context, etc. Belsey argues that “analyzing text is an activity which is concerned with understanding how a text means, not with what a text means” (cited in Birch 2005, p. 20).

Keeping this in mind, CDA, due to its diversity, enables a researcher to investigate deeply the ways in which different realities are constructed through language use in a text. CDA provides ways and means to deal effectively with the shifting positionalities, discursive realities and inter-discursive constructions of language because according to Wodak (n.d.) in her “Aspects of CDA” (p. 7) “CDA has never attempted to be or to provide one single and specific theory”. Contrary to it, CDA provides different theoretical backgrounds, variety of grammatical approaches and set of principles and analytical tools for understanding that it establishes a relationship of reader with the text, context, writer
and the socio-cultural contexts in which the meaning making process takes place. Discourse structures are explained and interpreted in terms of social structures and social interaction.

**Limitations of CDA.** Despite its flexible approach and holistic vision, certain limitations of CDA need to be addressed for our understanding and to avoid any compromise on the comprehensive awareness of the methodological approach. Bearing the assumptions in mind, predominant view of CDA is that it is interested only in analyzing dominance and power relations as manifested in language use. There is no doubt that CDA attempts to challenge opaque structures of the discourse to analyze who is exercising power, upon whom and for what purpose, however, its basic intention is to highlight the social aspect of inequality as it is “expressed, constituted and legitimized” (Wodak, n.d., p. 7) by language use. Thus, the objective of CDA is to challenge and expose the hidden/discursive means of power for the emancipation of dominated groups. Its approach is problem-oriented where social issues of power, ideology, gender, identity racism and so on are focused as research objects. And its focus is on the formation of individual human being as a social individual associated with different discourses and institutions.

Going further on the limitation aspect of CDA, I take help from Wodak and Meyer (2009) who have applied as well theorised CDA. They have written extensively about and on CDA. Wodak has developed her own analytical method known as Discourse Historical Approach. Wodak and Meyer (2009, p. 28) have highlighted certain aspects of CDA which need further elaboration for better understanding of CDA and inter-discursive structures of text. Wodak claims that:

i. There is a problem of operationalizing theories and relating the linguistic dimensions with the social dimensions (problem of mediation).

ii. The linguistic theory to be applied: often enough, a whole mixed bag of linguistic indicators and variables were used to analyse texts with no theoretical notions or grammar theory in the back ground.

iii. The notion of context, which is often defined either very broadly or very narrowly, how much extra-textual information do we need to
analyse texts, how many and which theories have what kind of impact on the concrete analysis and interpretation of texts.

iv. The accusation of being biased that how certain readings of text are justified to justify certain interpretations, the decisions for a particular analysis should be made more explicit.

v. Inter or trans-disciplinarity has not yet been truly integrated into text analysis.

The first issue raised is the mediation problem of how to relate linguistic dimension that is discourse structures with social dimensions. Prominent theorists and practitioners of CDA claim that language is representative of social realities; language is a social act (Halliday as cited in Sheyholislami, 2001, p. 1). But how can it be proved that the linguistic structures are the social structures and vice versa. This issue is more important in the context of novel texts under study as it is all language used to construct and recontextualize the social aspects of life. It is important to escape the “textual positivism” a narrow focus on statements, argues Geertz (cited in Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000, p. 241). This problem is the problem of language and its solution also lies in the language. Language is not a transparent medium to represent reality; rather, “an interactive, cultural phenomenon” (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). Gergen and Gergen attempt to come out of this locked position of textual positivism by saying, “The reflexive attempt is thus relational, emphasizing the expansion of the languages of understanding. The aim is to realize more fully the linguistic implications of preferred positions and to invite the expression of alternative voices or perspectives into one’s activities (cited in Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000, p. 243). It is pertinent to see whether CDA adopts this reflexive approach or not. Fairclough’s (2003) view of CDA on this aspect is:

My approach to discourse analysis (a version of critical discourse analysis) is based upon the assumption that language is an irreducible part of social life, dialectically interconnected with other elements of social life, so that social analysis and research always has to take account of language. (p. 2)

Fairclough attempts to remove this confusion of mediation between language and social life by arguing that language is a part of social life without any reduction, dialectically connected and there is no question to ignore analysis of language in a critical discourse analysis. Another important aspect is that discourse analysis can be combined with other
forms of social analyses like conversation analysis, institutional analysis, ethnography, etc.

Similarly, van Dijk does not consider this issue of mediation between language and social life so important that needs separate mention. For him, critical discourse analysis is essentially analysis of ideologies which are expressed and reproduced in discourse and communication. He combines social analysis, cognitive analysis and discourse analysis in his critical discourse analysis.

Chilton (2005) has written extensively on discourse related aspects. He is also of the view that it is not possible to answer in simple words and in straightforward way that language is representative of social realities. However, the association of the two can be explored through CDA. He contends:

CDA draws attention to the existence of stereotyped categorisations in daily talk, elite talk and texts. CDA also shows how language users categorise behaviour, actions and attributes - all of which may be observable facts. It is also good at identifying interactive verbal devices for the implication and presupposition of assertions about social and ethnic groups, and pin pointing mitigation devices such as “apparent denial”.

(p. 24)

It reflects that CDA is able to detect the relationship between language use and social practices. Though it is not asserted that this relationship exists without any problem, however, CDA with its diversified theoretical background and effective strategies can detect the inclusions, exclusion and selective use of language which indicates the close relation of linguistic dimensions and social dimensions. CDA practitioners try to solve the problem of mediation by using such terms as ‘construct’ or ‘constitute’ like Fairclough and Wodak (1997); “discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially shaped” (Cited in Chilton, 2005).

The second issue raised by Wodak and Meyer is about using linguistic indicators and variables to analyse texts without any theory of grammar. It is significant to mention here that CDA does allow investigation of those theoretical and analytical notions which may help explore the inter-discursive dimensions of a discourse. However, it is not without problem if some notion is applied for analysis without its theoretical background.
This issue is also related to the first one in the sense that grammar enables to expand an analysis of language from its syntactic, semantic and lexical boundaries to socio-cultural aspects and human behaviour. Expanding discourse analysis by using linguistic variables without well informed theoretical background of grammar is problematic. In this regard, Fairclough is one of the major theorists and practitioners who have used linguistic variables for discourse analysis. In his analytical model (1989, 1992), he combines the cultural insights of discourse analysis provided by Foucault like social conditions, rules, concept of knowledge, order of discourse, etc., and the insights of linguistic analysis of Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics. Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995 & 2003) accepts the debt of both Foucault and Halliday in developing his analytical model in which he commits to the view that “language use is socially determined” (1989, p. 21). It is similar to Halliday’s theory of language that language is a “social act”. Banking upon this, Fairclough (1989) has mainly focused upon the analysis of vocabulary and grammar in his analytical model and the same model I have used in my study at M.Phil level (2009) to analyse novel texts which has produced significantly useful and sufficient analytical details for the purpose of analysis of a discourse. The significant aspect of Fairclough’s model is to analyse the dialectical and constitutive role of language towards social practices and the vice versa - an effect upon language as well (Fairclough, 1989, 1992, 1995, 2003).

The third issue raised about CDA by Wodak and Meyer is about the context. They talk about the limits of the context and the extra-textual information and theories that are required for concrete analysis and interpretation of texts. Wodak’s issue raised about CDA is not without its problems. She asks: “how much extra textual information do we need” and second, what about “concrete analysis and interpretation of texts”. Wodak’s language use reveals requirement of a precise and quantified research conclusions which is, perhaps, not the aim of CDA. It is only a natural science model/approach which can produce “how much” and “concrete analysis and interpretation”. But CDA attempts to produce understanding from a wide range of positions and opposes and undermines any kind of quantified and concrete analysis of a text. CDA draws upon the qualitative paradigms of interpretation which take into consideration all possible information as suggested by the context because, according to CDA practitioners and theorists, “the world does not exist independently of our knowledge of it” (Grix, 2004, p. 83). Moreover, ‘context’ is not something to be defined precisely. It is also a part of inter-discursive
constructions which take place in the ‘dialogical’ interaction between discourse and the researcher whose positionality is not detached from the situations of the text and “versions of reality” being offered (Morgan cited in Locke, 2004, p. 35). Especially, in view of the texts under study, the concept of text is very tentative and subject to many assumptions as the texts are imaginative discourses. Following the stance of inter-discursive constructions, Muerer (2004) contends that there may be “chains of practices” and CDA needs to explore “the way every social practice interacts with other social practices within larger social structures” (p. 89). Thus, defining context with precise information and boundaries may not be possible as questioned by Wodak. However, one needs to be self reflexive, and well aware of the ontological and epistemological “presuppositions that inform their research context as well as their own subjective and normative reference claims (Kincheloe & Meclaren cited in Locke, 2004, pp. 35-36).

The fourth issue raised by Wodak and Meyer about CDA is its element of bias that decision be made explicitly for particular analysis and interpretation. This issue is important because due to the hybrid nature of discourse for CDA, it may not be possible to maintain a singular approach, thus its dependence upon diverse theories and perspectives is perhaps the reason of its bias in certain instances. This aspect is inter-related with all the issues raised by Wodak, because every issue is linked with multiple relations like multiplicity of linguistic and social dimensions, multiplicity of contexts, multiplicity of theories and multiplicity of disciplines. However, there are certain arguments which go in favour of certain readings, certain interpretations and analysis which need to be taken as a unique solution to the problem instead of a problem itself. Rowe (2001) argues that it is not possible to justify studying a fiction basing on any universal truth value. The only solution she suggests is to offer arguments which are “profoundly, irreducibly historical” (p. 109). Do historical arguments help reduce the bias if it is there? Wodak herself adopts Discourse Historical Approach for analysis and interpretation purpose. She suggests two aspects: first is interdisciplinary study because of the inter-discursive nature of all discourses and second, is by gathering maximum background information and both these strategies help to uncover “many layers of a written or spoken text”. Thus, the element of bias can be reduced to minimum by using the interdisciplinary approach and historical/ contextual information.
The fifth issue raised is about integration of inter or transdisciplinarity into text analysis. Though there are no such references in the early versions of CDA in the seventies and early eighties, however, its traces are there even in the writings of Bakhtin in the form of intertextuality. Holquist (1990), who has a deep study and research on Bakhtin, writes about Bakhtin’s views of novel which are essentially interdisciplinary and inter-discursive. He says that novels:

simultaneously manifest intertextuality in their display of the enormous variety of discourses used in different historical periods and by disparate social classes. . . . It is also true that genres other than the novel characteristically contain explicit references to works outside themselves. However, none of these is so completely dependent as the novel on intertextuality for its very existence. The manifold strategies by which the novel demonstrates and deploys the complexities of relations - social, historical, personal, discursive, textual - are its essence. (p. 89)

It is significant here that Bakhtin’s view of intertextuality is about the novel text which manifests openly or implicitly that its existence is interdisciplinary, and inter-discursive. But Wodak’s concern is epistemological. Prominent CDA theorists and practitioners advocate conveniently that CDA is able to carry out trans-disciplinary and inter-discursive analysis. They claim that it is able to locate and analyse the multifarious discourses, references and disciplines. Fairclough (2003) talks about his version of CDA that, “Methodologically, this approach entails working in a trans-disciplinary way through dialogue with other disciplines and theories” (p. 1). And to him, it is through dialogue “between structure and agency and of the relationship between discourse and other elements or moments of social practices and social events”. Fairclough is of the view that despite a hybrid and mixed form of discourse from various disciplines, social practices, events and situations, CDA is able to engage in dialogue with each discrete form. However, Fairclough (1992) is also cautious to conduct trans-disciplinary/inter-discursive research through CDA. It is not without its problematic areas, because disciplines do not have clean and transparent relationship with concepts, ideas, and situations in a text because “disciplines are of course internally diverse”.

As the problems of inter-discursivity and transdisciplinarity exist, Wodak herself is very cautious to give her independent view. She argues, “In agreement with its critical theory predecessors, CDA emphasizes the need for inter-disciplinary work in order to
gain a proper understanding of how language functions in constituting and transmitting knowledge, in organizing social intuitions or exercising power” (p. 6). Thus, CDA works with shared perspectives, theories and methods to address the problem of interdiscursivity/inter-disciplinarity. Ruqaiya Hassan (2004) remarks on it while arguing about “Analysing Discursive Variation”:

> Within any instance of a discourse type, different kinds of variation co-occur, and are unobtrusively interwoven into the text’s fabric, with the implication that without an understanding of what one is looking for, it is in many cases problematic to even see the various kinds of discursive variation within one and the same instance; disentangling them one from the other is harder still. (p. 19)

She is of the view similar to Wodak that despite having wide range of analytical strategies of CDA, its limitation is not over due to the discursive aspect involved in every small discourse element and the problems of time, norm, situation, subject intention, etc.

How to overcome these limitations? van Dijk (2001) suggests, “Its (CDA) multidisciplinary theories must account for the complexities of the relationship between discourse structures and social structures”. Thus, despite these limitations, the diversity and multidisciplinary approach of CDA provides an open space to investigate the complex relationships constructed through the discourses of the novel texts.

**Analytical Model – Discourse Historical Approach (DHA)**

Going by the literature review aspects (with prominent issues of taking position to challenge the inter-discursivity wherein texts cut across boundaries of disciplines, historical periods, cultures and discourses; authorial role in meaning-making; plurality of the texts on the cultural stance of ‘shifts and transformations’; connecting linguistic words to the social worlds; deterministic stance of discourses; etc.), research questions and discussion on the theoretical dimensions of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies (with prominent issues of CS, like relationship of text/language with socio-cultural phenomenon, conditions of productions of knowledge, authorial voice and cultural representation, constant change in cultural activities and their representation, social construction of reality, discursive construction of society, formulaic orientation of
Cultural Studies, link of Cultural Studies with historical periods; and issues of Critical Feminism like interdisciplinarity, hegemonic power relations and maneuverings, gender identity, sexuality, processive subjectivity, analytical activism, binary oppositions, forms of empowerment, etc.) and methodological issues of Critical Discourse Analysis, I perceive that analyzing the inter-discursive constructions in the novel texts is like going into a rich, complex and diversified field of interrelated concepts. To explore the inter-discursive constructions, there is a need to look into interrelated concepts by investigating and distinguishing the discourses and the relevant activities people are engaged in. It is highlighted that the texts to be explored are a conceptual web of discourses and not a transparent record of any particularly observed work setting. Therefore, the research model adequate to address the issues and questions raised in literature review, and subsequent discussion on theoretical perspectives of Cultural Studies, Critical Feminist Discourse Studies and CDA as an overall methodology is based on the research questions.

Prominent models which can help appropriately in the investigation of the novel texts are offered by Fairclough (1989, 1992); van Dijk (2001) and Wodak (2001). Fairclough following Foucault’s theory of orders of discourse (1989) and Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics emphasizes more on linguistic features in connection with what is going on socially, investigates how both shape and influence each other (Chauliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). Second significant theorist is van Dijk, whose analytical model is known as “Socio-Cognitive Model” (2001). It focuses on mental representations that all written and spoken language use is essentially a mediation of social cognition. He perceives discourse as an ideology and analysis of ideologies involves analysis of social, cognitive and discourse aspects. Third theorist is Wodak. Wodak’s (2005, 2001) analytical model is called Discourse Historical Approach. This model has distinction due to its focus upon situated contextual information related to the discourses. She focuses more deeply upon context of a discourse that has an impact upon structure, function and context of the utterances of a discourse (Wodak, 1995, 2001).

The aim in this study is to analyse inter-discursive constructions of language with special emphasis upon identity, gender and power relations that are not without their socio-cultural and situated contexts, therefore, I prefer the Discourse Historical Approach of Wodak for analysis and interpretation of texts. Assuming text as a “complex communicative event” and a diversified phenomena (van Dijk, 2001), suggests to analyse
specific structures of a discourse for adequate interpretation of ideologies constructed through discourse strategies. Wodak’s analytical model is not restricted to study of linguistic devices only; rather, it goes further to establish relationship between language use and the context involving background information wherein previous knowledge, facts, figures and values and beliefs play significant role. I have selected Wodak’s analytical framework (DHA) due to its interdisciplinary focus which characterizes CDA as a diversified and wide-ranged analytical academic programme providing adequate opportunity for critical and reflexive research.

Following are the research procedures of Discourse Historical Approach as suggested by Wodak. Wodak’s research model (DHA) is of particular interest for an analytical approach to the study of inter-discursive constructions of identity, gender and power relations that how social conventions, practices, sexualities and cultures associated with different discourses attempt to create new discourses and how language use affect meaning making process in the inter-discourse constructions. The analytical model proposed by Wodak is actually a shared perspective in which six scholars contributed (Wodak, Nowak, Pelikan, Gruber, Decillia and Mitten). Wodak argues in her article “Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis” that,

The research team, consisting of six researchers from three different fields (linguistics, psychology and history) decided in favour of a triangular approach, which made it possible to focus on the many different genres that were situated in the different political fields of action (recontextualization). Obviously, these different fields had an impact on the analytical methods used and the interpretation of the data. Ultimately the team developed its own categories that led to the “discourse historical approach”.

(p. 14)

Diversified and interdisciplinary thought of DHA has made it suitable for the study of various discursive constructions. The most important procedures to be used in the analysis of specific texts as suggested by Wodak (2001, p. 93) are:

1. Sample information about the context (social, political, historical, psychological and so on).
2. Once the genre and discourse to which the text belongs have been established, sample more ethnographic information, establish inter-discursivity and intertextuality.

3. From the problem under investigation, formulate precise research questions and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories and theoretical aspects.

4. Operationalise the research questions into linguistic categories.

5. Apply these categories sequentially on the text while using theoretical approaches to interpret the meanings resulting from the research questions.

6. Draw up the context diagram for the specific text and the fields of action.

7. Take an extensive interpretation while returning to the research questions and to the problem under investigation.

This analytical model emerges from discourse sociolinguistics associated with Vienna School of Discourse Analysis (Wodak & Weiss, 2005). According to Wodak (1996):

"Discourse sociolinguistics . . . is a sociolinguistics which not only is explicitly dedicated to the study of the text in context, but also accords both factors equal importance. It is an approach capable of identifying and describing the underlying mechanisms that contribute to these disorders in discourse which are embedded in a particular context . . . And inevitably affect communication. (Cited in Sheyholislami, 2001, p. 5)"

Wodak highlights the key aspects of socio-linguistics which is context and appears as historical context in Wodak’s DHA. Wodak argues in support of her model of analysis which is capable of identifying the relevant context synchronically and diachronically. To evaluate the suitability of this Analytical model for my study, I situate it in the group of assumptions of CDA as highlighted earlier (see pp. 77-78) on the one hand, and on the other hand connect it with the texts under study. To understand it thoroughly, it is necessary to see the connection between the exceptional aspects of this model and the overall methodology of CDA and the texts. Basic connection between this model and the CDA is centrality of the context in analyzing a discourse. Both CDA and DHA locate the
discourses of a text in socio-cultural, political, historical and institutional contexts to expose the veiled inter-discursive meanings, dimensions and contradictions.

**Discussion on DHA.** As regards the first step of this Analytical model, I assume that the texts under study, with their varied discourses, do not unfold themselves unless they are viewed as negotiation between identity, gender and power issues and the contexts of their happenings. Inter-discursive constructions in the novel texts are in a dialectical (Marx and Engels 1966; Fairclough 1992, 2003) and dialogical (Bakhtin, 1982) relationship. Apparently, the novel texts construct ‘reality’ without perceptible references to personal, social, institutional, and historical aspects, however both CDA and Wodak’s Analytical model suggest that a text intrinsically creates exclusions, inclusions and oppositions through discursive strategies. Thus, the texts under study are not to be analysed in isolation, rather going through the texts and the contexts I find how CDA and Wodak’s Analytical model help to move from linguistic utterances to those discourses lying beyond the texts but interwoven and engaged dialogically, having an impact upon the formulation of the texts. It is highlighted that historical aspect of this model will not be focused in its literal sense as Wodak does because she applied this model on study of racial existing discourses like anti-Semitism which involves semantic significance of language/discourses over the period of times. Contrary to this, focus of this study is fiction discourses that are not historical record in literal sense due to metaphorical language use. However, historical aspects will be negotiated as inter-discursive situatedness.

The second step of Wodak’s Analytical model is to first establish the specific genre/discourse to which the text belongs, then go further to investigate the relationship of the given discourse with other discourses and texts. The similar line of action is suggested by CDA assumptions 3rd, 4th, 9th and 15th (pp. 77-78) which suggest, on ontological and epistemological levels, that not only the discourses stay in dialectical relationship with other discourses and texts, rather their analysis and interpretation need to be conducted with the aim to investigate the heterogeneous relationships involving great variety of other disciplines, genres, texts and discourses. It suits to this study because there are a number of implicit and explicit references in the texts under study.

In step three, two aspects are suggested. First, the focus of investigation is to be on some problem in the discourse and secondly formulation of research questions. Moreover,
to focus on the problem and investigate research questions, help can be sought from other
neighbouring fields of inquiry. It reflects flexibility of the approach following the
paradigm of Critical Theory. In this regard Kincheloe and Mclaren (1994) contend that
“Qualitative researchers . . . build bridges between reader and text, text and its producer,
historical context and present, and one particular social circumstance and another” (p.
445). They further argue that the researchers are well aware that the interpretive
frameworks brought forward for analysis are “historically situated, ever changing, ever
evolving in relationship to the cultural and ideological climate” (p. 446). To focus on
‘problem under investigation’ is a significant aspect which allows examining and
understanding a social problem from different angles. Investigating mere language is not
adequate to address a problem; rather, there is a requirement of going to the boundaries
between text and other modes and ways of articulation (Kress et al, 1997).

The aim of this study is also to focus on inter-discursive constructions of the novel
texts to examine how they impede or advance complex issues of identity, gender and
power. In this connection, CDA assumptions (10th, 13th, 14th, 17th) also suggest to analyse
and investigate how language use contributes to “power imbalances” (Fairclough, 1989)
in society and how analysis of this might contribute towards positive change. Moreover,
CDA assumptions 9th, 14th, 15th, 16th & 20th (pp.77-78) also guide to neighbouring fields
as suggested by Wodak. It reflects that Wodak’s DHA, despite its exceptional orientation
towards problem investigation while negotiating with the historical aspects, is well
grounded in CDA conventions and assumptions.

Steps four and five are about operationalising the formulated research questions
into linguistic categories and apply those categories sequentially. However, there is an
ambiguity about these linguistic categories. Wodak has not clearly delineated those
linguistic categories like that of Fairclough’s model of analysis. However, she has
specified certain “discursive strategies” that provide some clues to linguistic categories
for analytical purpose. Keeping in view the overall orientation and direction of Wodak’s
model, it can be assumed that the linguistic categories are not for the descriptive or pure
linguistic analysis only because the overall stance of Wodak’s model is not deterministic
and objectivist; rather, reflexive and subjective (see My Positionality as Researcher, p.
19) wherein the texts are to reveal how their interpersonal and social relations are inter-
discursive and negotiated.
Wodak (2001) suggests five “linguistic or rhetorical means” which she calls “discourse analytical tools”. These tools are useful to investigate discursive elements and strategies concerning socio-political, cultural, identity, gender and power and ethnic issues. It is given as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referential/Nomination</td>
<td>Construction of in-groups and out-groups</td>
<td>Membership categorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors and metonymies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Synechdoche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predication</td>
<td>Labelling social actors more or less positively</td>
<td>Stereotypical, evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or negatively, deprecatorily or appreciatively</td>
<td>Implicit and explicit predicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation</td>
<td>Justification of positive or negative attributions</td>
<td>Topoi used to justify political inclusion or exclusion, discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or preferential treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectivation, framing or discourse representation</td>
<td>Expressing involvement, positioning speaker’s point of view</td>
<td>Reporting, description, narration or quotation of events and utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensification, mitigation</td>
<td>Modifying the epistemic status of a proposition</td>
<td>Intensifying or mitigating the illocutionary force of utterances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These discursive strategies are the systematic ways of language use that involve particular social, political and linguistic aims. It seems that like Fairclough and many other practitioners of CDA, Wodak carries the earlier influences of Halliday. Halliday is of the view that micro linguistic and discursive structures and macro socio-historical structures cannot be separated for study of a text (1995). Wodak contends that Halliday’s
interconnected meta-functions of language: (1) the ideational, (2) the interpersonal and (3) the textual are useful for description, analyzing and theorizing discourses. She (1995) argues that “ideally, linguistic theory and methodology should integrate language and the social” (p. 207). While integrating theory and methodology, Wodak directs that these linguistic categories should not be applied in isolation; rather, must be used along with the formulated research questions which serve as the guiding thread to integrate linguistic and social structures. Assumption 19 of CDA also highlights that it takes a particular interest in the ways in which language mediates ideology in a variety of social institutions.

The sixth step related to the ‘context’ is a common step and much argued and emphasized in this analytical model and CDA in general. However Wodak’s emphasis on drawing up the “context diagram” is a peculiar suggestion. There is a connection between the given seven steps of the model. This connection exists between first, third and sixth steps. Reference goes to the social, political and historical contexts and neighboring fields so that the text is to be grounded in the specific contexts for specific meanings and purpose-oriented interpretation.

Similarly, the seventh step takes a recursive stance and connects itself to all six steps with explicit emphasis upon extensive interpretation. Thus, Wodak’s model suggests analysis to be purposeful but reflexive, context based but extensive.

Context in terms of historical information needs to be emphasized in Wodak’s Discourse Historical Approach. Context is always to be analysed in historical terms, though there are not well defined procedures for this task. I perceive that historical information does not mean here search for any concrete facts or truths held by some community or institution; rather, it is an exploration into those discursive contexts which have been constructed differently during different times and spaces. As Fairclough suggests in his article ‘Global Capitalism and Critical Awareness of Language’, that “discourses are not evaluated in terms of some impossible absolute truths but in terms of ‘epistemic gain’”. It reflects that DHA adopts a dialogic approach which believes in competition and well informed interpretation and analysis. It opens up doors to previous discourses for addressing the problem under investigation and creation of new knowledge. It is also a way to connect macrostructures of the social formation with the micro discursive structures, as Sarangi and Roberts (1999) argue, “... the institutional
order is held together not by particular forms of social organization but by regulating discourses” (p. 16). Thus, it informs us why some discourses take specific form providing view into specific orders of discourse.

**Significant Characteristics of Analytical Model.** Wodak (2001, pp. 69-70) highlights significant characteristics of DHA which also fully support and help to understand and apply the seven steps of analysis mentioned earlier (p. 88-89) critically, to the texts understudy:

i. The approach is interdisciplinary located at different levels i.e., in theory, in the work itself, in terms and in practice.

ii. The approach is problem oriented, not focused on specific linguistic items.

iii. Theory and method are combined together in understanding and explaining the object under investigation.

iv. The approach is abductive: a constant movement back and forth between theory and data.

v. Multiple genres and public spaces are studied and inter-textual and inter-discursive relationships are investigated. Recontextualization is a significant process.

vi. The historical context is always analysed and integrated into the interpretation of discourses and texts.

vii. Results should be made available to experts in different fields and be applied to bring change in certain discursive and social practices.

These features explain DHA making it clear that analysis and interpretation is not just confined to one specific text, rather being an interdisciplinary approach it demands inclusion of great variety of other disciplines, genres, texts, etc. This interdisciplinary, inter-textual and inter-discursive study becomes a “differentiated examination” (Wodak, 2001, p. 71) of the discourses understudy.

Thus, this inter-discursive approach is suitable at the level of texts under study as they are texts with multiple discourses of identity, gender and sexuality issues,
nationalism, war, ethnicity, conspiracies, power and domination and marginalization, etc. These ideas will be discussed more fully in the chapters that follow in the context of pertinent theories. To proceed on to the next chapter for investigating the inner tensions and antagonisms and external links and inter-discursive cultural practices of the texts, DHA as part of CDA with the perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies is the most suitable model.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
OF FOUCAULT’S PENDULUM

Introduction to Chapters 4 and 5

Owing to the similar title and focus of the two chapters it is pertinent to highlight the main considerations. Both chapters contain analysis and interpretation of the selected passages from the two novel texts separately. Each chapter begins with brief introduction (synopsis) of the novel text including significant issues to be interpreted. It is followed by discussion of the contextual aspects and the interpretative procedures. Data of this qualitative study are the excerpts selected from the two novel texts. Rationale of selecting the passages in this way is to collect a reasonable number of examples that, through the interpretative research process, help to understand the concept of inter-discursivity and the authorial attempt to effect specific meanings of identity, gender and power relations for the reader through the appropriation of different discourses. With focus on the selected passages, natural flow of the texts affected by the authors is targeted to explore how identity, gender and power issues are worded explicitly/implicitly.

Selected passages are captioned in view of the focus of the contained discourse(s) and also to develop an understanding about the texts to be interpreted. These passages are also numbered for the facility of backward and forward references in the study and also for the facility of readers. Moreover, the selected passages, within this study, are textured in italics and so are the examples associated with the events/personalities taken from these passages to exemplify the subsequent arguments for foregrounding the processes of the text.

Following research questions have been explored thoroughly through these two chapters:

1. What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses
within the novel texts under study?

2. How are different conventions, practices and cultures exploited linguistically and appropriated to create a new form of discourse/knowledge?

3. What language issues emerge from the study and what is their effect upon the meaning-making process?

It is highlighted that first and second research questions are investigated in the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh procedures on relevance basis after their mention in the third procedure. Third research question, being directly related to language issues emerging from the texts and their effect upon meaning-making processes, is investigated in each passage at the end of discussion on five discursive strategies of fifth procedure of the analytical model and also throughout the interpretation concerning language use. Though the five discursive strategies of analytical model suggested by Wodak also focus on language aspects; however, it seems very pertinent considering the aim of this study and inter-discursive constructions of identity, gender and power relations that discussion on language aspects of third research question should be the ending part of five discursive strategies. It focuses on the overall impact of the language use discussed emphatically in the form of five discursive strategies that how the given discourses seek to define the socio-cultural issues of identity, gender and power relations and how they attempt to position the reader through inter-discursive meaning-making processes. To orient the study, synopsis of each novel text is provided in the beginning of analysis and interpretation.

Chapter 4 comprises the analysis and interpretation of Foucault’s Pendulum in the context of inter-discursive strategies used in the discourses of identity, gender and power relations.

**Foucault’s Pendulum (Synopsis)**

This text is a medley of discourses. Number of discourses forming the text are countless, like of pendulum, religion, mystery, myths, secret agencies, conspiracies, religious and military orders, socio-cultural practices, historical events, geographical
expanses, ancient communities, underworld tunnels, etc. These discourses are appropriated by the author dexterously to create specific meanings.

There are three major characters: Belbo, Diotallevi and Casaubon in the text. The story is mainly narrated by Casaubon, a student in 1970 in Milan (Italy) working on a thesis on the history of the Knights Templar - a military religious Order founded in 12th century after the first Crusade to protect the Christian pilgrims in the Holy Lands of Jerusalem (“Knights Templar”, 2009). He meets Belbo who is an editor in a publishing house. Casaubon also gets a chance to meet Belbo’s friend Diotallevi, who is a cabalist. All three also work for a common publisher in Milan. In their search for a book ‘The History of Metals’, these three get a chance to read many manuscripts about occult conspiracy theories. They are so absorbed in these theories that they develop an interest to synthesize all the secret stories. During this time they also meet Colonel Ardenti – the fourth major character who gives them a book which contains information about a coded manuscript. That manuscript was about a secret plan of the medieval Templars to take over the world. This plan was meant to take revenge for the deaths of their Templar leaders when their Order was disbanded by the King of France. Three editors’ interest in the secret societies grows deeper and they start developing their own conspiracy which they call ‘the Plan’. The significant instruments involved in their ‘Plan’ are a special map and Foucault’s Pendulum. The text ends with the comments and tragic fates of the characters.

In the sense of language use and inter-discursivity, the text offers a variety of discourses taking into consideration the fields of logic, cultural and occult practices, religious systems, historical events, knowledge spheres, circular missions of Knights Templar, conundrum of tunnels and underworld - Agarttha - amusing games, and overlapping praise of Knights Templar, etc. There is less mention of women. Though gender is not the main focus of the text; however, male representation gains ascendency and women’s entries in the text are marginal and subordinated. In the sense of gender, identity and power relations, it is more related to identity construction of the Knights Templar positively and their adversaries and opponents are constructed in negative terms creating a challenge for the reader and space for intervention. It will be explored through the ensuing discussion of analysis and interpretation.
In view of the complex network of discourses of the text, it is not possible to tie this text with one specific context. The text seems to be written by the author for the reader. One of the major contexts, if it is to be determined from the textual orientation, seems to be authority or authorial power. Principal position is taken by the author as owner of the text who has the authority and power to write for the reader to read and acknowledge it. He is the one to facilitate the reader to the source of information contained in the text; rather, he constructs source of information by connecting different discourses and putting it before the reader for his/her facility. The author invites the reader to join him for a sojourn through his text for knowing about the sources of knowledge which are hidden in the discourses of past times.

The most obvious references of the ancient events/persons in the beginning of the text give a different colour to the semantic effect that carries a strong authorial intent and appeal for the reader. The author gives careful attention in numbering the chapters and keeping the length short. Each chapter starts with relevant quote from distant past as a strategy to orient the reader’s mind, thus setting tone of the new discourses. Moreover, mixing dialogue and explanation and frequent use of first person ‘I’, taking exhorting and guiding role, etc., are prominent features of the text serving as evidence of authorial control to engage the reader through specific discourses.

There is no clear background knowledge provided by Eco himself even in his interviews. The only specific contextual knowledge gathered from the reviewers of Foucault’s Pendulum is that he was inspired by the success of his first best seller ‘The Name of the Rose’ (1980). Perhaps, for this purpose he filled Foucault’s Pendulum by interconnecting ancient historical and philosophical speculative discourses with multiple dimensions and layers of meanings that will be interpreted using seven procedures including five discursive strategies of the analytical model. And these are: pendulum, religion, mystery, myths, secret agencies, conspiracies, religious and military orders, socio-cultural practices, historical events, geographical expanses, ancient communities, underworld tunnels, etc. It is clarified that the historical aspects/issues will not be referred to and analysesd in their literal sense (also see Discussion on the Analytical Model, p. 90) because the text under analysis is a fiction discourse constructed with other discourses which may or may not have direct connection with the given discourses.
Analysis and Interpretation of Selected Passages

Following discussion is analysis and interpretation of the selected passages from the text, ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’.

**Social Identity of Pendulum.** This passage is about the movements of Pendulum within a sphere that gradually transform into multiple discourses of socio-cultural aspects of human beings across the globe:

(1) *The copper sphere gave off pale, shifting glints as it was struck by the last rays of the sun that came through the great stained-glass windows. Were its tip to graze, as it had in the past, a layer of damp sand spread on the floor of the choir, each swing would make a light furrow, and the furrows, changing direction imperceptibly, would widen to form a breach, a groove with radial symmetry – like the outline of a mandala or pentacular, a star, a mystic rose. No, more a tale recorded on an expanse of desert in tracks left by countless caravans of nomads, a story of slow, millennial migrations, like those of the people of Atlantis, when they left the continent of Mu and roamed, stubbornly, compactly, from Tasmania to Greenland, from Capricorn to Cancer, from Prince Edward Island to the Svalbards. The tip retraced, narrated anew in compressed time what they had done between one ice age and another, and perhaps were doing still, those countries of the Masters. Perhaps the tip grazed Agarttha, the centre of the world, as it journeyed from Samoa to Novaya Zemlya. And I sensed that a single pattern united Avalon, beyond the north wind, to the southern desert where lies the enigma of Ayers Rock.*  

(pp. 3-4)

This passage taken from the text is about the Pendulum and its whole sphere which makes a unique world for Casaubon, the main character in the text who tells the story of the pendulum in the mix of variety of discourses. Casaubon himself is part of the strategy of language use. Eco constructs identity of the Pendulum through different inter-discursive strategies. Going sequentially to apply the procedures suggested by Ruth Wodak, *(see Analytical Model, pp. 88-89)*, the first procedure is to sample information about the context of social, political, psychological and historical nature. The context of the issue is that the specific Pendulum which forms the title of the text is a device invented by French physicist Leon Foucault to demonstrate the rotation of the earth in 1851, first displayed in the Meridian of the Paris Observatory. Pendulum was a 28 KG brass-coated lead bob, with a 67 meter long wire from the dome of the Pantheon, Paris.
The plane of the Pendulum’s swing rotated clockwise 11 degrees per hour, making a full circle in 32.7 hours (Foucault Pendulum, n.d.).

This is the context of the passage under investigation. It is clear that the text of the passage emanates from the scientific device which must have more mechanical bearing than socio-cultural or psychological one. However, in the light of second procedure of the analytical model, the description of the Pendulum is not a mere scientific discourse; rather, it is an inter-discursive construction that crosses the disciplinary boundaries of science and geography, and involves human movement and relocation, mysticism, etc., to the extent that the scientific nature of the Pendulum is compromised. This scientific device does not stay as a precisely located instrument; rather, its identity transforms into a fluid phenomenon moving from one corner of the globe to the other corner. The first move to construct the Pendulum and its sphere is going into the discourse of farming and farming into mysticism. The pendulum sheds its aerial symmetry for the swinging plough to make furrows in the damp sand which takes shape of the outline of a mandala (circle), which in Buddhist or Hindu mysticism, is a geometric or pictorial design usually enclosed in a circle representing the entire universe and used in meditation and rituals. In Jungian psychology, mandala refers to a symbol representing the self and inner harmony (Crozier et al., 2005; “Mandala”, 2009). To emphasize the sacred significance of the Pendulum, the author gradually uses more direct language like “mandala or pentacular, a star, a mystic rose”, thus, symbolising the direct intuitive experience of the divine.

The author does not stop here at the construction of the Pendulum. He suddenly moves into another discourse by ignoring the physical significance of the pendulum. He uses ‘No’ to nullify its physical characteristic and shifts from smaller to bigger and from bigger to global experiences, locations and cultures. He terms the movement of the Pendulum across the globe like those of nomads who moved from one corner of the globe to the other. Eco constructs identity of the Pendulum by creating similarity between the pendulum and the people of Atlantis who left the continent of Mu and moved from Tasmania (Australia) to Greenland (Denmark), from Tropic of Capricorn to Tropic of Cancer (across the Equator), from Prince Edward Island (Canada) to Svalbards (Norway). Eco continues to bring more discourses to the construction of identity of Pendulum. He brings another discourse of geography from another angle. The tip of the Pendulum is termed like an animal grazing from the fields of Agarttha (a secret city believed to exist in
earth’s core) journeying from Samoa (island near New Zealand) to Novaya Zemlya - an archipelago in the Arctic Ocean between Barents Sea and Kara Sea, off the North East coast of Russia (Times, World Atlas, 2005, pp. 82-83). There is another crossing from the gazing of the whole world to the discourse of uniting separate lands. Pendulum’s movement becomes a uniting force bringing close together legendary island of Avalon (in the North) and the Southern desert of Australia where a large sand stone rock formation exists with all its secrets known as Ayers Rock. Thus, the given text is not simply a discourse of pendulum and its scientific function; rather, a fusion of discourses - of farming, mysticism, migrations/movements, geographical locations, etc – framed dialectically and dialogically.

Third procedure is to formulate precise research questions and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories. For this purpose, the second research question of this study is drawn upon: ‘How are different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a new form of discourse/knowledge?’ And another question is, ‘what is the cultural significance of inter-discursive construction of the Pendulum?’ For explanatory theory, Barthes’ view of plurality of text that depends upon the understanding that words never transmit single indisputable meaning (see Literature Review, pp. 42-43) along with Cultural Studies’ perspective, will be drawn upon for further interpretation of the discourse. Interpretation of the passage according to the given research questions and explanatory theory is carried out in the following procedures.

Fourth and fifth procedures guide to operationalise research questions into linguistic categories and apply those categories sequentially on the text using theoretical approach to interpret the meanings resulting from the research questions. Accordingly, this passage is interpreted using five discursive strategies as provided by the analytical model. First discursive strategy is ‘referential or nomination’ that uses devices of biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors, metonymies and synecdoche for constructing in-groups and out-groups. In this passage, there are no human beings constructed into groups. However, this passage reflects an inter-discursive contest between scientific reality/discourse and constructed discourse/reality. Scientific reality is a moving pendulum fixed at its top and part of a device representing sphere and rotation of the earth. The discourse discloses that the text is interested in constructing the social
reality as emanating from the movements of the pendulum. Scientific reality is linguistically referred to as “the copper sphere”, “tip” of the pendulum that “swings”. Opposite to it comes the constructed reality that is associated with each swing of tip of the pendulum. These movements are referred to linguistically in metaphors of grazing, farming, moving (countless caravans), religious symbols (mandala or mystic rose), geographical width and locations (Atlantis, Mu, Tasmania, Greenland, Prince Edward Islands, Samoa, Novaya Zemlya, Avalon), expansion of time and period (millennial migrations) and imaginary figures/locations (Capricorn, Cancer, Agarttha, Ayers Rock), etc. Constructing reality in this form of language has nothing to do with the precise and measured reality of the physical movements of the pendulum. Thus, pendulum movement is not merely named and referred to linguistically in a different way; rather, the text weaves different signifiers/discourses that have socio-cultural, geographical, religious, historical and invented and mythical disciplinary boundaries that stand against any scientific and rational linguistic description. A broad expanse of diverse and varying intermix of discourses are tangled together to create a borderless universe merging with the tip of the pendulum.

Second discursive strategy is ‘predication’ that uses stereotypical or evaluative attributions of positive or negative traits to label the objectives/persons/social groups in a discourse positively or negatively. In view of scientific and constructed realities, constructed reality linguistically reflects immensity, vastness and limitlessness against the measured and calculated reality of movements of pendulum. Gigantic vastness is articulated in evaluative terms because movements of pendulum are reflected with similes (like) and conjunctions (as). Constructed reality is labeled with positive traits of its vastness and vastness is articulated in evaluative attributions of positivity like: “each swing would make a light furrow and the furrows . . . would widen to form a breach, a groove”, “No, more a tale recorded on an expanse of desert”, “in tracks left by countless caravans of nomads”. It is further predicated in the semantic vastness of the extreme geographical points, “Tasmania to Greenland, from Capricorn to Cancer, from Prince Edward Island to the Svalbards”, “between one ice age and another”, “Samoa to Novaya Zemlya”, “united Avalon, beyond the north wind, to the southern desert”, etc. Predication of vastness seems to aim at extolling its positivity poised at inclusion against the negativity of scientific closure and its precision/inadequacies/limitations.
Third discursive strategy is ‘argumentation’ that uses different argumentation schemes called topoi (Wodak, 2001) to justify the discriminatory or preferential treatment. This is an important strategy in discriminatory discourses. But this discourse is not discriminatory in terms of racism or human relationships. It is a complex mess of discourses that is, as Usher says, productive in itself and draws our attention to the processes of world making (see Literature Review, p. 41). If the given discourse is viewed as discourse of power relationship – scientific versus constructed in the sense of constructionism, a discourse is always open, tentative and one of the many possibilities, therefore, the discourse stress on its justification is quite plausible and approximated. In this regard, Kinchloe (1997) emphasizes that the researcher, in critical constructivism’s term, “upsets stable notions of the subject as it unsettles narrative flow” (p. 71) (see Social Constructivism and Perspectives of CS & CFDS, p. 63). Thus, justifying arguments are loose and estimated rather than precise and calculated. The discourse attempts to justify its constructed meaning using adverbs of time and place (“the people of Atlantis when they left the continent”, “to the southern desert where lies the enigma of Ayers of Rock”) and simile (like the outlines of a mandala . . .) but soon these arguments become tentative when the discourse also uses adverbs expressing uncertainty (“and perhaps were doing still”, “perhaps the tip grazed Agarrtha”) and verb that refers more to inferences and assumptions than to correct discovery (And I sensed that . . .). Thus, through this uncertainty, the argumentation scheme to justify the correctness of the constructed meaning provides a chance to the reader for a broader and unbiased space in which he/she can go for many possible interpretations as Eco himself suggests in his view of possible interpretations (see Literature Review, pp. 44-45).

Fourth discursive strategy is perspectivation or discourse representation that uses devices of reporting, description, narration or quotation of events or utterances. The use of these devices or either of them indicates speaker’s/author’s point of view. In other words, it is a point of view with which labels, attributes and arguments are expressed. It reflects Eco’s own theory of literature/interpretation that “everything is connected with everything” as discussed earlier (see Literature Review, p. 42), and that when things are connected, they serve multiple purposes. Here representation of a scientific instrument is reframed in a new perspective that reality of this universe does not stand in isolation or closure. It is open for interpretation and can be interpreted in many connections that are loaded with multiple shades of meanings. It is a challenge to orthodoxy and fixed notions
and in CDA terms investigating different realities constructed through language use in a text (see Argumentation on CDA, p. 79). Thus, by borrowing and intertwining metaphors of movement and expansion like “millennial migrations” and “from Tasmania to Greenland, from Capricorn to Cancer, from Prince Edward Island to the Svalbards” this discourse creates moments of struggle and divergence.

Fifth discursive strategy is intensification or mitigation. It is a device that intensifies or mitigates the illocutionary force of an utterance to modify the knowledge status of a proposition. According to this strategy, proposition of the movement of a scientific instrument is represented in a socio-cultural discourse that negates its precision and definitive posture. Construction of pendulum movements in terms of socio-cultural discourse is so heightened and intensified that the movements of scientific instrument and associated scientific discourse lose their familiar and recognized tangible form and status. The discourse begins with the tip of the pendulum just “grazing” the sand spread on the floor of the choir and this grazing of sand is intensified into making “furrows”, into widening to “form a breach, a groove”, into “expanse of desert”, into “tracks left by countless caravans”, into movement stretching across the globe “from Tasmania to Greenland . . . to Svalbards”, etc. This intensification does not stop here. It connects the movement of the pendulum to the imaginary phenomena: “what they had done between one ice age and another”, “Perhaps the tip grazed Agarttha (imaginary central point of the earth)”, “single pattern united Avalon, beyond the North wind, to the southern desert where lies the enigma of Ayers Rock”. With the enigma of Ayers Rock, the moving tip of the copper sphere also transforms into an enigma from a scientific point to multiple points, angles and locations. Thus, it is a deliberate build-up of movement of a scientific instrument into socio-cultural and geographical forms that collectively change it from definite instrument into a loose figure hanging in a landscape that speaks of existing and imaginary tales of human relationships. Scientific knowledge/discourse that defines movement of a pendulum as a measured and calculated phenomenon has been cast aside and mitigated to the minimum. It attempts to replace it with social discourses known for their fluidity and uncertainty. The order of scientific discourse is challenged and mitigated to nothingness. On the other hand, the socio-cultural discourse is intensified extravagantly that it becomes contemplative and instinctively creates its own impressions leading to the contexts of intangibility of things and liquid thoughts that the discourse producer might have experienced. There is no
natural flow of meaning, it is all impurity. Here lies the possible answer to the research question as indicated in the third procedure.

In the light of third research question concerning language issues emerging from the study and their effect upon meaning-making, identity construction of Pendulum is explored under Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia (p. 58) that refers to multiple, diverse and heterogeneous voices and, in meaning-making, help to articulate and understand the pluralistic view of an object or cultural identity. Its central thesis is that an utterance is never original and pure; rather, in interaction, it arises in cultural communication. In this passage, the pendulum is a scientific object and constructed as open as possible with no disciplinary constraint. Through linguistic diversity, the isolated scientific nature of pendulum is transformed to a significant extent into social nature by associating pendulum’s linear movements with the “outline of mandala or pentaculum, a star, a mystic rose.” Eco seems to be conscious of pendulum’s objectivity when he uses, “a groove with radical symmetry” but soon he fractures this symmetry when he says, “No, more a tale recorded on the expanse of desert.” The scientifically domesticated identity of pendulum is transformed through the socio-cultural shaping and constitutive diversity of inter-discursive language use. Thus, a scientific object is constructed with an alternative identity which is otherwise precluded and restricted in a scientific monological discourse. This heteroglossia and inter-discursive construction of pendulum reflects a significant aspect of language use that one can find and draw upon this interdisciplinarity, diversity and heteroglossia to understand and articulate the ideals, values, interests and social experiences and cultural associations in any discourse, text, object, identity, etc.

Sixth procedure guides to draw up context diagram for the specific text. It is already done under first procedure.

Seventh procedure directs to take an extensive interpretation while returning to research questions and problem under investigation. In the line of theoretical perspective of Cultural Studies and methodological approach of CDA, it is important to understand the cultural significance of inter-discursive construction of the Pendulum. It is imperative here to know (i) the relationship of a fiction text to society, (ii) authorial design behind the text and (iii) use of language independent of authorial design(s). It is clarified that the text selected for the research purpose is an ideological creation of the author. However, the ideological discourses within the text do not have a direct mechanical relationship;
rather, a conceptual, ideological and instructive one. As Bakhtin and Medvedev (1986) argue:

All the products of ideological creation, works of art, scientific works, religious symbols and rites, etc - are material things, part of the special reality that surrounds man. It is true that these are things of a special nature, having significance, meaning, inner value. They become ideological reality only by being realized in words, actions, clothing, manners and organizations of people and things - in a word in some definite semiotic material. (Bakhtin Reader, 1986, p. 125)

On this analogy, though the text under consideration is about a specific scientific object – Pendulum; however, it has its affiliations with human/cultural experiences that are intertwined, embedded and interwoven with great many other things. By bringing different practices, conventions and cultures associated with various discourses into the fold of Pendulum, the cultural value of the Pendulum has been enriched and it is emphasized that the identity of Pendulum is not proved as a precise scientific device. Rather, the Pendulum is constructed as a space which is larger, expansive and entails a “region unexplored, the world of futurity” (Henry Miller as cited in Jardine, 2001, p. 127). Second aspect of cultural significance constructed through inter-discursive construction is highlighted if authorial attempt is viewed critically. The author himself constructed it as Eco says that it is “a novel of ideas, an adventure of ideas”. Further, he says, “It’s like the movement of the pendulum as the characters in the book pursue this search for meaning, as the reader is gradually drawn into doing the same” (Newsweek, 1989). But here, instead of providing a stabilized position to the agency of the author and the pendulum, I focus upon the text from the perspective of CS to examine how scientific identity of the Pendulum is transformed while circulating within various interlocking discourses appropriated by the author. Through inter-discursive construction of the Pendulum, its scientific foundations have been subverted and destabilised that give way to the alternative cultural manifestations as Robin Usher refers to it as discussed in literature review (p. 41). Its mechanical reality and presumed positivist identity has been rearticulated inter-discursively and thus it becomes intelligible on cultural level.

Followed by the perspective of Cultural Studies, the inter-discursive relationship of the passage is formed with the help of different discourses but having semantic
connections joined by the constant movement of the Pendulum. It is important to ask why Eco is appropriating various discourses to create identity of pendulum which reveals order of the given discourse in geographical, cultural, mystical and social dimensions of human beings (see Conceptualising Inter-discursive Constructions, pp. 24-25). Is it not suitable for Eco to rely upon an order of discourse which helps to define clearly the accuracy and precision of the pendulum’s movement? Perhaps, a fiction is an element of social event and particularly from an author like Eco who is a philosopher; historian and professor of literature and semiotics, a text cannot be a mere straightforward representation of scientific instrument. Thus, the effects of different practices and conventions associated with various discourses are visible upon the text. Pendulum’s identity stands not in isolation of scientific terminologies; rather, there is an inter-discursive construction of the pendulum where different discourses enter in a dialogue. It is not a mere adding of concepts and discourses from different disciplines; rather, there is a crucial mediating link between language use and the social aspects included in the construction of Pendulum’s identity.

Thus, in view of the analytical perspective of Cultural Studies, Foucault’s Pendulum is a fictional/cultural text. Its focus is not only the given reality of the Pendulum; rather, it is a site of contestation over meaning-making wherein the scientific position of the Pendulum has been politicized through cultural manifestations and inter-discursivity. Pendulum, instead of appearing as a reality ‘out there’, becomes a symbol of mediated nature of reality, as complex as cultural processes involved in the migration of Atlantis people, in arrangement of prayers and symbols of mysticism and in unification of two different geographical locations metaphorically pushing the frontiers of identity of pendulum away into strange cultures and locations.

**Inter-discursive Construction of Order of Knights Templar.** This passage provides view into the initiation of Order of Knights Templar that was basically a secret society with religious colour. This discourse is constructed drawing upon different discourses.

(2) *I sipped my drink (wasn’t that how Sam Spade did it? Or was it Philip Marlowe?) and looked around. The books were too far away; I could not read the titles on their spines.*
I finished the whisky, shut my eyes, opened them again. Facing me was the seventeenth-century engraving, a typical Rosicrucian allegory of the period rich in coded messages addressed to the members of the Fraternity. Obviously it depicted the Temple of the Rosy Cross, a tower surmounted by a dome in accordance with a Renaissance iconographic model, both Christian and Jewish, of the Temple of Jerusalem, reconstructed on the pattern of the Mosque of Omar.

The landscape around the tower was incongruous, and inhabited incongruously, like one of those rebus where you see a palace, a frog in the foreground, a mule with its pack, and a king receiving a gift from a page. In the lower left, was a gentleman emerging, from a well, clinging to a pulley that was attached, through ridiculous winch, to some point inside the tower, the rope passing through a circular window. In the centre were a horseman and a wayfarer. On the right, a kneeling pilgrim held a heavy anchor as though it were his staff. Along the right margin, almost opposite the tower, was a precipice from which a character with a sword was falling and on the other side, foreshortened, stood Mount Ararat, the Ark aground on its summit. In each of the upper corners was a cloud illuminated by a star that cast oblique rays along which two figures floated, a nude man in the coils of a serpent, and a swan. At the top centre, a nimbus was surmounted by the word “Oriens” and bore Hebrew letters from which the hand of God emerged to hold the tower by a string.

First procedure of the analytical model requires establishing context of the given discourse drawing upon social, political, historical and psychological aspects. The passage taken from Foucault’s Pendulum provides initial information about the order of Knights Templar that started in early period of 12th century as order of Rosicrucian. Under the garb of various discourses and secret societies it is, actually, the Order of Knights Templar and their activities that is under focus in Foucault’s Pendulum. Eco provides inter-discursive information, besides their armed activities, about the cultural foundations laid down by the Knights Templar that later on facilitated modern Christian culture to establish and flourish well. This passage is about the vision, imagination and ideas of Casaubon which are engendered by his looking at a seventeen-century engraving. He is trying to open the Diotellavi’s computer, known as Abulafia, for reading of a file related to the efforts to assess conspiracy plan, however its password was not available. It is important to note that the novel was written in 1989 when computer was not
completely incorporated as a source of knowledge in the field of literature. In this passage, it seems that Eco is interested in traditional source of knowledge that is art instead of computer that may present a mere linguistic record of something while art provides visual themes besides inspiring mind to neighbouring fields and discourses. Frustrated by the repeated attempts, he took few sips of whisky like fictional characters (Sam Spade or Philip Marlowe) of detective and crime stories. In the room there were many books, paintings, engravings, etc. Under the effect of whisky, he stared at the 17th century engraving that contains Rosicrucian allegory, Temple of the Rosy-Cross, Temple of Jerusalem, Mount of Ararat with Noah’s Ark, a halo of light around and hand of God to hold the tower. Obviously, it is a discourse of personal vision of the discourse producer about a piece of art that is created textually. This piece of art is not a monolithic whole; rather a tapestry that is rich in inter-discursivity and discoursal elements of different religions and spirituality.

According to second procedure, there is to establish inter-discursivity and intertextuality. This passage is rich in hybridizing multiple discourses that, as Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) say (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 27), operate in the same social terrain, both in conflict and in concordance with one another to form knowledge about a Christian Order known as Rosicrucian. Casaubon and his friends are in search of the conspiracy plan. The author takes them back in time to secret groups which were not pure conspiracies; rather, they were embedded in rich socio-cultural norms and practices as well. In the text, discourses of religion, art and spirituality are brought together to construct new meanings. Casaubon is in search of password of computer to know about secret societies, which is purely a digital rationalistic aspect, but the text constructs a situation that involves discourses of ancient times on religion, art and spirituality to provide an insight about the secret societies to the person living in the computer age of 20th century. Different discourses with varied cultural backgrounds are hybridized to construct this passage.

Third procedure guides to formulate precise research questions from the problem under investigation and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories. For research question, I draw upon second research question of this study that is: “How are different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a new form of discourse/knowledge?” Besides this, there is another question: “Why does
Eco bring ancient piece of art with ancient order in the search of conspiracy theories?”

For explanatory theory, Fairclough’s (2003) view abides that while discourses represent social realities and relations they also construct and constitute them (see *Theorising Inter-discursivity*, p. 32). These questions with explanatory theory will be explored in the following procedures that entail analysis and interpretation of discursive strategies of language use and extensive interpretation of the entire passage.

Fourth and Fifth procedures are about operationalising research questions into linguistic categories and applying those categories sequentially on the text using theoretical approaches to interpret the meaning resulting from the research questions. For this purpose, Wodak’s five discursive strategies are applied as discussed here. First discursive strategy is ‘referential/nomination’ that how persons and objects are referred to linguistically. This discursive strategy usually uses linguistic devices like biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors and metonymies or synecdoche to construct in-groups and out-groups of persons or objects. Taking the lead from the previous passage in which movement of the pendulum as out-group was brought against the socio-cultural movement as in-group, in this passage, source of knowledge, computer as an out-group is brought against an engraving constructed as an in-group. Through the construction of this in-group, focus is upon the connection between art and human mind that can bring richer knowledge than mere reading files in a computer. Considering art and specifically representation of Rosicrucian Order as an in-group, linguistically they are referred to in cognitive and intimate terms. It carries the support of the discourse producer as it is evident from the adjective “a typical Rosicrucian allegory”. It expresses emphasis that the engraving has all or most of the characteristics/traits shared by the Rosicrucian Order. The art per se has less focus than the represented subject. There is more construction in this discourse than reflection and representation. There is an attempt to refer to the Rosicrucian Order in naturalizing metaphors. Because Rosicrucians had their own missions and way of working, so it is referred to as “rich in coded messages addressed to the members of Fraternity”. It reflects their well-organized communication system and internal connectivity.

Eco attempts to reify it using naturalizing metaphors that it is depiction of “Temple of Rosy-Cross” and further through metonymy “surmounted by a dome in accordance with the Renaissance iconographic model” meaning by that it was accepted
by all as it has specific significance for the Fraternity. Then the landscape of the tower is referred to as “incongruous” and “inhabited incongruously” to indicate that it was the most visited and frequented place due to its significance and reverence. The incongruity of the landscape of the Temple is further referred to as having “a king receiving a gift from a page”, “a gentleman emerging from a well”, “a horseman and a wayfarer”, “a kneeling pilgrim”, “a character with a sword”, “Mount Ararat, the Ark aground on its summit”, “a nude man . . . and a swan”, and “the hand of God emerged to hold the tower by a string”. To make his in-group more significant and logically acceptable, the author uses a powerful metaphor that the tower of Rosicrucian Order has heavenly support to be accepted as a reality against any other reality that promoted Christian culture more effectively.

Second strategy is ‘predication’ that is to use certain characteristics, traits, qualities and features for labeling the constructed groups positively or negatively. These attributes may be stereotypical and evaluative in their nature of positive or negative traits. In-group is Rosicrucian Order and Temple (tower) of the Rosy Cross. They are predicated in positive terms like “rich in coded message”, “surmounted by a dome in accordance with the Renaissance iconographic model” acceptable to all Christians, Jews and Muslims and above all, the tower is held “by the hand of God”. These are stereotypical attributes that implicitly is an attempt to label the Rosicrucian Order and the Temple of the Rosy-Cross in positive terms to attract the readers.

Third discursive strategy is ‘argumentation’ that refers to a scheme of argumentation used in a discourse to justify positive or negative attributions, discriminatory or preferential treatment. Ruth Wodak has suggested different topoi (conclusion rules) for argumentation. One of those topoi is ‘topos of reality’ that means something presented as a reality so we should accept it as it is. The discourse uses this scheme of argumentation to convince the reader to accept that Rosicrucian Order and Temple of the Rosy-Cross is a reality. They need to be accepted as authentic source of knowledge and guidance opposite to computer as an out-group on which Casaubon is searching the files. The discourse producer uses an adverb “Obviously it depicted the temple of the Rosy-Cross”. “Obviously” indicates that it is a clear and doubtless fact that the engraving depicts the temple of Rosy-Cross that was an accepted reality during Renaissance both to Christians and Jews, hence need to be accepted as authentic source of
reality. Another expression that indicates this reality in the last utterance: “At the top centre . . . from which the hand of God emerged to hold the tower by a string”. The “top centre” reflects that the discourse producer is trying to justify that Rosicrucian Order is a blessed Fraternity as it has the protection of God. Thus, it should be held as a leader association that may lead Casaubon and his friends in their efforts to understand the activities of secret societies and develop their own plan. Another connection that indicates to this fact is the initial utterance of the chapter from which the passage is taken - a quote of 17th century physician and alchemist Michael Maier that reads, “He who attempts to penetrate into the Rose Garden of the Philosophers without the key resembles a man who would walk without feet” (p. 28). So, implicitly, right in the beginning of chapter 4 of the text, the author refers to it to imply that the key to “Rose Garden of the Philosophers” is Rosicrucian Order, so it should be accepted as a reality. Thus, the discourse constructs and constitutes more that its representation.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation or framing or discourse representation’ by using devices like reporting, description, narration or quotation of events and utterances. It indicates the involvement and positioning of the speaker’s/author’s point of view. The connection between the initial quote of Michael Maier, the mention of Rosicrucian allegory and the hand of God holding the Temple tower from the top centre reflects the reason why this discourse is framed in a way that indicates preferential treatment given to the Rosicrucian Order. It is, perhaps an attempt to make the reader realize the extraordinary significance of the Rosicrucian Order. Further detail of Rosicrucian Order is discussed in the discussion of seventh procedure.

The fifth discursive strategy is intensification or mitigation. This discursive strategy itself is a device that intensifies or mitigates the illocutionary force (contextual/intentional meaning) of the utterance to modify the epistemic (knowledge) status of a proposition. The proposition here is the discourse that talks about the Rosicrucian Order. Due to its intensifying utterances, it attempts to extol the significance of the Rosicrucian Order. Significance of this Order is mainly due to its role in developing symbolic mystic knowledge and practices. Significant aspect of this Order is the Temple tower as it is found in the history of this Order that as a fraternity and source of learning it was also started in the chambers of magnificent old temples in ancient Egypt. It is depicted not only in its literal sense; rather, also intensified through the use of positive adjectives, noun
and adverbs like “a typical Rosicrucian allegory”, “Obviously it depicted”, “in accordance with the Renaissance iconographic model”. Then the discourse producer further intensifies the depiction intermingled with the semantic force of the significant elements of the Order covering all sides explicitly in literal sense and implicitly in figurative sense: “The landscape around the tower was incongruous”, “In the lower left was a gentleman . . . to some point inside the tower, the rope passing through a circular window”, “In the centre were a horseman”, “On the right, a kneeling pilgrim held a heavy anchor”, “Along the right margin . . . a character with a sword . . . on the other side stood Mount Ararat”, “In each of the upper corners was a cloud illuminated by star”, “At the top centre . . . from which the hand of God emerged to hold the tower by a string”.

Thus, mentioning of sides and corners of the objects is an intensification of the contextual force of the discourse that impacts the knowledge status of the existence of the Rosicrucian Order. It reflects that with this preferential treatment, the discourse producer attempts to impress the reader and manifests the attempt to modify the knowledge status about the existence of the Rosicrucian Order.

Language issue (third research question) emerging from this passage and its effect upon meaning-making is interpreted in the light of illocutionary force and locutionary context as discussed by Medina (2005) with reference to Austin’s concept of performatives that perform actions than merely stating the contents. All utterances are termed as performative utterances because they carry contextual/intentional meaning (illocutionary force) as well contents/stating (locutionary contents) and the third aspect is perlocutionary that concerns with the effect or what is achieved through the contents and the acts of utterances. The whole passage is locutionary content as Casaubon states what he observes in the hanging engraving after taking whisky. There is an attempt to achieve perlocutionary effect through interrogative utterance: “wasn’t that how Sam Spade did? or was it Philip Marlowe” and the illocutionary force appears implicitly in the last utterance where, “the hand of God emerged to hold the tower by a string”. The performative aspect of the language use appears implicitly in the last utterance that it does not matter much that whatever the activities Rosicrucians undertake and in what way they are depicted or stated but it is a matter of serious attention that they have protection of God’s hand as ultimate power of this world. It is certainly an attempt to achieve illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect through locutionary contents.
Sixth and seventh procedures guide to draw up context diagram of the specific text and take an extensive interpretation while returning to the research questions and the problem under investigation. So far as the context is concerned, it is already done in the first procedure. Here the passage is further interpreted in the light of inter-discursivity and constitutive aspect of discourse representation as guided by the research questions and perspective of Cultural Studies. First discourse incorporated in the passage is related to fictional detective characters Sam Spade and Philip Marlowe. Sam Spade is a private detective and protagonist of Dashiell Hammett’s 1930 novel ‘The Maltese Falcon’. Sam Spade was well-built, blond and a mischievous character that combines features of detectives like detached demeanor, stylish way of designing and smoking, keen eye for details and strong will-power to achieve his objectives (“Sam Spade”, n.d.; Hammett, 2009). Similarly, under the influence of Sam Spade, Ramond Chandler created his character Philip Marlowe in his novels including the ‘Big Sleep’ and the ‘Long Goodbye’ in 1939. Philip Marlowe was characterized by wisecracking, hard drinking, tough private eye, contemplation, physical endurance and moral uprightness. (“Philip Marlowe”, n.d.; Chandler, 2009). Thus, by bringing this discourse of fictional private detectives into the text, Eco attempts to construct his Casaubon as a combination of both fictional detective characters that had great influence upon social life of the people of thirties and forties. Eco seems to be much influenced by the wisdom, style, contemplation of the earlier decades: “I sipped my drink (wasn’t that how Sam Spade did it? Or was it Philip Marlowe, says Casaubon, “and looked around”. Thus, Casaubon is constructed as a hardboiled private detective who, after taking whisky in a Spadian or Marlowian style, develops a keen eye and philosophical mind for a piece of art.

Next discourse is the engraving of 17th century that is “typical Rosicrucian allegory”, hence the discourse of a secret society. The contextual background of the Rosicrucian Order is that it is also known as Ancient Mystical Order of the Rosy Cross (AMORC). According to information explored about the Rosicrucian Order, the order has no religious connection. The cross is not a symbol of Christianity; rather, it represents the human body, and the rose represents the individual’s unfolding consciousness. Both, the rose and cross represent the experiences and challenges of a thoughtful life. The traditional history of this Order consists of mystical allegories and legends passed down for centuries by mouth. The Rosicrucian Order has its roots in the mystery traditions, philosophy and myths of ancient Egypt dating back to about 1500 BC. Mystery was
known as special knowledge or secret wisdom. In ancient Egypt, school students were initiated into the Order and mystical studies were held exclusively in temples built for that purpose. (“Our Traditional & Chronological Hist”, 2005; “Rosicrucians”, 2009). In short, the mention of Rosicrucian Order aims to convince the reader that this order provides secret knowledge, wisdom, harmony of inner self and harmony among the various religions. In this context, this passage has relationship with mystery, knowledge, harmony and mandala referred to and interpreted in the previous passage.

Another discourse with reference to the engraving is “Mount Ararat, the Ark aground on its summit”. It brings customs and conventions related to Armenian mythology. Mount Ararat is a snow-capped, dormant volcanic cone in Turkey. Mount Ararat has great significance in Judeo-Christian tradition where according to the book of Genesis, Prophet Noah’s ark came to rest after the great flood. According to Armenian mythology, Armenian being close in the North, Mount Ararat is the home of the gods, perhaps like Mount Olympics as in Greek mythology (“Mount Ararat”, n.d.). Thus, implicitly it leads to other discourses of mystic beliefs that involve their own socio-cultural customs and practices, hence construction and constitution of new meanings going on.

It is also important to understand the hidden meanings that can be revealed through the investigation of inter-discursive construction with critical approach of Cultural Studies’ perspective that views language use mediated by cultural practices and inextricably embedded in socio-cultural dimensions (see Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CS, p. 56). It may be that by intermingling of discourses of the ancient mysteries and sources of secret knowledge Eco wants to provide illumination to the rationalistic mind of the present time when computer was fully ready to enter human life with all embracing effects in the last decade of the 20th century. He attempts to construct the identity of Rosicrucian Order by teaching Casaubon’s rational mind through the rich secret wisdom perpetuated by the Rosicrucian Order. Eco feels strongly that these teachings of Rosicrucian Order are still able to play an increasingly important role in teaching humanity. Against the search for secret knowledge through fast-paced technological instrument, abulafia (computer), Eco attempts to convey to his reader that the Rosicrucian Order is still an ever-reliable source of secret knowledge, wisdom and mystical illumination. Through its unique instructional system of coded messages (rich in
(coded messages addressed to the members of the Fraternity) the Rosicrucian Order holds a beacon of light to all who seek knowledge and wisdom about secret aspects of life.

Then, at the closing of the passage, Eco brings the Mount Ararat with Noah’s Ark atop which is supposedly revered for its association with heavenly power. Then a surrounding light and hand of God dominate the vision of Casaubon in the engraving. It all reflects Eco’s attempt to construct the identity of Rosicrucian Order as having fulfillment of knowledge with ancient wisdom and universal truth. Though, Eco attempts to take his reader to an established source of secret knowledge but on the other hand, he rejects other source of knowledge – computer. Order of the discourse takes a specific form that includes source of knowledge of the author’s interest, and excludes all other sources.

Continuing Fairclough’s view of constituting effect of discourses referred to in the third procedure, it is also important to view this passage on cultural aspect of constructivism as suggested by Kincheloe who argues that the discourses not only represent but also constitute, modify and reshape identities and create new realities (see Social Constructivism and Perspectives of CS & CFDS, p. 63). This is to be explored through the inter-discursive construction of the discourses as given by Eco. Casaubon is not merely in search of password. He is a protagonist of the text and represents the authorial voice and intention. However, the discourses brought into the text are not there only to help Casaubon to arrive at the correct password. Rather, implicitly he is trying to construct the superiority of his faith - ideology generated by him over the other ideologies. He is working out this superiority by bringing into discussion the discourses of Christianity, Judaism and Islam as he refers to the Rosicrucian temple of Rosy Cross “a tower surmounted by a dome in accordance with the Renaissance iconographic model, both Christian and Jewish, of the temple of Jerusalem reconstructed on the pattern of the mosque of Omer”. Both the discourses of Judaism and Islam are gradually marginalized and at the end of this passage, frequent reference to three figures and at the last three letters word “God”. Eco attempts to establish the superiority of the knowledge propagated by the Rosicrucian institutions established in the ancient times where only male of the society used to study the mysteries or hidden wisdom of life. Eco seems not to believe that true knowledge and secret wisdom can be acquired from visible and transcendental aspects of life. Rather, he creates an enigmatic situation for Casaubon to see and observe
an ancient piece of art under the effect of whisky, the seventeenth century engraving - a typical Rosicrucian allegory which also has a dome of Renaissance iconographic model. Eco keeps Casaubon busy in search of the password by looking at the engraving in detail. Other ways of arriving at the password are excluded. Through this specific behavior of the inter-discursive text, Eco attempts to create a kind of thinking about knowledge acquisition through esoteric ways of Rosicrucian Order. He attempts to assert that there is no direct way to wisdom; it is only through allegoric ways even in the present times, as he makes Casaubon to find unknown pass word for the computer through watching the seventeenth century engraving which is also an “allegory of the period”. As Foucault suggests (1972) that through different techniques and procedures certain statements are sanctioned and others are restricted, similarly Eco is pressing hard through different orders, practices and perspectives of discourses (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 25-26) that valid knowledge acquisition is through esoteric ways only and not through direct ways. His drive to achieve power is constructed as an obsession through discourses leading to ancient social, historical and cultural aspects.

Another aspect of this inter-discursive construction is gender issue wherein male style, male behavior and male mindset are presented from which women are excluded. The tone of this maleness is set right in the beginning of the passage through the inter-discursive construction of Casaubon’s position as a thinker philosopher after taking whisky sips. Casaubon is compared with Sam Spade and Philip Marlowe who are two fictional male characters of thirties and forties. Both were detectives, drinkers, smokers and used to investigate enigmatic cases facing all kinds of dangers and ultimately triumphant against all odds. Women in those novels are presented either as in trouble seeking their help against criminals or just marginal characters used to provide support to the bravery, wisdom, fearlessness and investigative skills. Their appearance is just incidental. Similarly intimacy of Casaubon’s behavior leaves no significant space for female figures to occupy. This discourse is governed by the order of masculinity, and particularly about masculinity in fulfillment and self actualization. It leaves a question unanswered what a female can say about this discourse which can be useful to the political and cultural projects of the males. Constructing the indivisible maleness of Casaubon as bearer of serene investigative mind to read cultural significance for furthering of his knowledge, Eco heightens it constantly in this passage using the language of male dominance as “members of the Fraternity”. (Which were used to be all
male), “Mosque of Omar”, “a king receiving a gift”, “In the centre were a horseman and a wayfarer”, “a character with a sword”, “a nude man in the coils of a serpent”, and above all in the end “God”. The ideology of separate spheres for men and women is the irresistible feeling after reading this passage.

**Identity Construction of Purity/Impurity.** This passage integrates multidirectional discourses to construct identity of pure and impure persons gradually leading to the purity of Templars.

(3) At the demonstrations, I would fall in behind one banner or another, drawn by a girl who had aroused my interest, so I came to the conclusion that for many of my companions, political activism was a sexual thing. But sex was a passion. I wanted only curiosity. True, in the course of my reading about the Templars and the various atrocities attributed to them, I had come across Carpocrates’s assertion that to escape the tyranny of the angels, the masters of the cosmos, every possible ignominy should be perpetrated, that you should discharge all debts to the world and to your own body, for only by committing every act can the soul be freed of its passions and return to its original purity. When we were inventing the Plan, I found that many addicts of the occult pursued that path in their search for enlightenment. According to his biographers, Aleister Crowley, who has been called the most perverted man of all time and who did everything that could be done with his worshippers, both men and women, chose only the ugliest partners of either sex. I have the nagging suspicion, however, that his lovemaking was incomplete.

There must be a connection between the lust for power and impotentia coeundi (impotence). I liked Marx, I was sure that he and his Jenny had made love merrily. You can feel it in the easy pace of his prose and in his humour. On the other hand, I remember remarking one day in the corridors of the university that if you screwed Krupskaya all the time, you would end up writing a lousy book like Materialism and Empiriocriticism. I was almost clubbed. A tall guy with a Tartar mustache said I was a fascist. I’ll never forget him. He later shaved his head and now belongs to a commune where they weave baskets.

I evoke the mood of those days only to reconstruct my state of mind when I began to visit Garamond Press and made friends with Jacopo Belbo. I was the type who looked at discussions of What Is Truth only with a view toward correcting the manuscript. (p. 51)
The above passage is about the problem of acquiring revered status in life with purity of soul and clarity of mind. Contrary to it, obsessive sex-desire, according to this discourse, blocks way to gaining ascendancy. It is interesting that ascendancy and sexual desire are represented here as problems of men only, thus, generating identity and gender issues. Following the first procedure, context of this passage is that Casaubon, with the help of his friends Belbo and Deotallevi, intends to develop own conspiracy theory (the Plan) to control the world with clear mind and elevated thought process. But he is afraid of his being unsuccessful due to his sex desire that may have a detrimental effect upon his clear-headed attempt for work on the Plan. He goes back to the memory lane of his university days. It is indicated at the end of the given passage when Casaubon says that he evoked the memories of his early life in which he learnt that excessive sex desire was dangerous for mental process and positive creativity.

It is highlighted that the context includes the possible contextual knowledge of the event as it takes place in the socio-political activities of late sixties in Italy. Men and women are constructed through the lens of a young male – Casaubon, when he was a university student. He was a young boy and used to participate in the demonstrations against fascism in Italy. Casaubon tells about this part of his life when he was a student in 1968 at Milan. He was working on a thesis related to history of Knights Templar – a military religious Order founded in the beginning of 12th century after the first Crusade to protect the Christian pilgrims in the Holy Land of Jerusalem (Knights Templar, 2009). Those were the formative years of Casaubon when he was sometimes credulous and sometimes incredulous. He also used to participate in the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary activities of the students in the university. Those were the days when feminist movement had no or little influence and generally men were dominant in the social activities and thus, language use was not free of that influence. Casaubon refers to his “interest” to participate in the demonstrations. His interest was aroused by a girl and he makes a conclusion that for many of his companions “all political activism was a sexual thing”. But, for Casaubon, sex is a negative passion. Based on this assumption, he goes further to construct a relationship between sexual impurity of men and low standards of their work. Keeping in view the socio-political, historical and psychological aspects of the context, the passage under consideration seems to be a discourse on gender and power relations where men rule and women are mere subjects and used as a link in the process of male domination.
Second Procedure guides to establish inter-discursivity. Casaubon is of the view that “original purity” is achieved after man gets rid of the spiteful passion of sex. This assumption is constructed inter-discursively that carries different psychological, institutional and social meanings. The case becomes a mediating event as there is mixing of discourses concerning Knights Templar, masters of the cosmos, philosophy, literature, politics, etc. Casaubon wants to achieve and maintain curiosity, instead of passion of sex and for this purpose Eco produces a hybrid text wherein inter-discursive relations exhibit an interesting situation of order of discourse, negotiation and linguistic strategies. Inter-discursivity is created implicitly through the combination of discourses and language conventions which involves different ways to enlightenment and purity, socio-cultural aspects of man-woman relationship, (un)acceptable standards of work, duality of attitude, discourses of superiority and temperance. Those discourses concern Carpocrates's philosophy of achieving original purity, especially Aleister Crowley's way of achieving purity and enlightenment, connection between lust for power and impotency through Marx and his wife Jenny, connection between excessive sexual behaviour and its negative impacts upon life and life’s activities through relationship of Lenin and his wife Krupskaya, etc.

Third procedure demands to formulate precise research questions from the problem under investigation and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories, here the focus is on inter-discursive relationships of this passage in the light of first research question of this study: ‘What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses within the text of the novel under study?’ For explanatory theory, Blommaert’s view of ‘fashions/ways of speaking’ (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 26) is being drawn upon that refers to other competing social and institutional discourses in terms of differing and conflicting standpoints. With focus upon research question and Blommaert’s theory, analysis is carried out in the following procedures.

Fourth and fifth procedures demand to operationalise the research question into linguistic categories and apply those categories sequentially on the text while using theoretical approaches to interpret the meanings. To explore the fashions and ways of speaking/representing of this discourse, five discursive strategies of the fifth procedure are applied. First discursive strategy is ‘referential or nomination’ that is how persons and
objects are named and referred to linguistically. This way of speaking/representing is adopted to construct the identity of in-group (me) and out-group (others) by using devices of biological, naturalizing or depersonalizing metaphors, metonyms or synecdoche. In this passage, in-group is pure self that is free from excessive passion of sex. According to this discourse, excessive passion of sex muddles up the things. So it is referred to linguistically with disapproving metaphors like: “You should discharge all debts to the world” and “by committing every act can the soul be freed of its passion” and metonyms like: “Aleister Crowley, who has been called the most perverted man of all time”, “chose only the ugliest partners of either sex” and “If you screwed Krupskaaya all the time”. On the other side, this discourse uses naturalizing metaphors and metonyms to construct pure self (in-group) that is not spoiled by passion of sex like: “But sex was a passion. I wanted only curiosity”, “the soul can be freed of its passions and return to its original purity”, “in their search for enlightenment”, etc. Referring sex in depersonalizing metaphors and metonyms like “debt”, “passion”, “perverted man”, “ugliest partner” and “screwed” is to construct identity of out-group through a way of texturing that socially may not be acceptable. Opposite to it is a ‘self’ constructed that is not overrun by excessive sex passion in naturalizing metaphors and metonyms like: “curiosity”, “original purity”, “love-making”, “merrily”, etc. It reflects that the discourse constructs in-group as a natural and universal truth, so that is readily accepted by the reader.

Second discursive strategy is ‘predication’. In this strategy the discourse uses stereotypical and evaluative attributions of positive or negative traits to label the social groups positively or negatively. In this discourse, out-group consists of sex-ridden men and in their social relations, they are labeled negatively. Out-group is labeled in evaluative terms of implicit as well as explicit negative traits like: “to escape the tyranny of the angles . . . every possible ignominy should be perpetrated”, “for only by committing every act”, “who has been called the most perverted man”, “If you screwed Krupskaaya all the time, You’d end up writing a lousy book”. These attributes are evaluative and indicate that obsession of sex brings wrath (tyranny) of angels, disgrace and dishonor (ignominy). Such actions are considered as criminal and morally wrong acts (perpetrate usually collocated with socially negative and morally wrong acts). “Commit” is collocated with “every act” that also carries meaning of negativity in one sense. It indicates that “every act” includes implicitly negative acts. “Perverted” is also used as an adjective that indicates socially unusual and unacceptable sexual activity and “lousy” as an adjective
indicates something inferior and unacceptable. As these are evaluative attributions of negative traits, its opposite in-group or purified self is labeled in likable terms. A temperate person has the support of angels and his actions are loved. Due to temperance, his soul enjoys original purity with enlightenment. Discourse associates love with in-group and sex with out-group. An in-group person’s sexual activity is termed as making love merrily against the out-group’s sexual activity as “perversion, ignominy, screwing”, etc. By including Marx in this in-group of temperate behaviour the discourse labels his literary work as “easy pace of his prose” against the “lousy book” of sexually obsessed Lenin. In view of the research question, implicit and explicit language struggle in this discourse is to construct the sexually obsessed and temperate groups differently. Thus, the character traits associated with the two different groups evoke the two different ways/fashions of speaking/language use and representing positivity and negativity. It seems that the text presupposes something like extolling the identity of the Knights Templar as an originally pure Order that may be asserted later on. Thus, the character traits, positive as well as negative, associated with the socio-cultural elements like processes, people, objects, means, etc., are grammatical as well as lexical.

Third discursive strategy is ‘argumentation’. This strategy adopts certain argumentation schemes known as topoi (Wodak, 2001) to justify positive or negative attributions and discriminatory or preferential treatment. Eco in this discourse attempts to justify the noble status of the Order of Knights Templar that the members of this Order had souls of “original purity”. On the other hand, he justifies that those who are sexually obsessed are unable to elevate themselves to be part of this Order because they cannot perform noble acts; rather, the results of their acts also speak of the ‘reality’ of their behaviour. For this purpose, Eco adopts a scheme of argumentation that is topos of reality. It indicates towards a reality that excessive sexual desire and indulgence in excessive sex activity is detrimental socially, morally and spiritually. Therefore, Templars were neither tarnished people themselves, nor, sexually degraded people can become Templars because of their inherent incapacity to behave in a noble way. Casaubon justifies this aspect in terms of reality. As the story is told retrospectively, therefore past tense is used. He goes declaratively: “... political activism was a sexual thing. But sex was a passion. I wanted only curiosity”. “But” is used here as an element of argument to justify that sex is an unacceptable passion and he wanted only curiosity. Semantic relation between ‘but’ and adverb ‘only’ makes clear that ‘but’ is used to construct his
disagreement with ‘sex’ considered as a negative attribute. The author further justifies his topos of reality that sex is a negative trait by saying: “True, in the course of my reading . . . I had come across Carpocrates’s assertion” that to gain “original purity” of soul “every possible ignominy should be perpetrated, that you should discharge all debts to the world and to your own body”. The way of justifying the negativity of sex passion is not a mere assumption; rather, it is a claim and assertion through the adjective “true”, noun “assertion” and model verb “should” that expresses desirability as well as rightness. This argumentation scheme continues in the statements, “I found that . . . pursued that path in their search for enlightenment”, “There must be a connection . . .”, “I liked Marx, I was sure that . . .” Besides this claim and assertion, there is a backing of this reality with evidence: “You can feel it in the easy pace of his (Marx) prose”, “If you screwed Krupskaya all the time, you’d end up writing a lousy book”. This justification of negativity of sex is done not only by grammatical words and nouns like ‘but, if, must, sure, can, etc.,’ but also with process nouns like “easy pace”, “lousy book”, etc. The analysis of this discourse strategy reflects that, by incorporating different discourses (fashions/ways of speaking/representing), the author implicitly constructs identity of Knights Templar as an Order of originally pure people, who carry no stigma of perversion and he also attempts to justify it as a reality and universal fact, hence be accepted.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation or framing or discourse representation’. This strategy adopts different devices like reporting, description, narration or quotation of events and utterances that expresses author’s/narrator’s viewpoint. Perspective of this discourse is highly implicit. Though Casaubon, at the end of this passage, expresses that the purpose of looking at the discussion of whether sexual excess is right or wrong is only to correct his manuscript that he is going to develop a secret ‘Plan’. However, the mentioning of Templars as a specific agency in this discourse and association of certain processes with them like: “original purity”, “enlightenment” and reference to Marx’s making love merrily and “easy pace of his prose” indicate that the author, through Casaubon, expresses his desirability and claim that the Order of Knights Templar was a pure Order of highly respected people. They were absolved of any ignoble passions like excessive sex. Moreover, as the author describes the phenomena in his own words so he tailors it according to his designs of inter-discursivity. The author indirectly aligns himself with the Order when he says, “But sex was a passion. I wanted only curiosity”. He excludes himself from the band of his companions who take interest in
politics only because it is “sexual activism”. And also by using adverb “only” the author asserts his exclusion from the sexual activism. Thus, by using language in different fashion/way (I wanted only curiosity), he changes the semantic sense of passion of sex and implicitly associates himself with the Templars who believed in curiosity but not in sexual activism, thus was seeking original purity.

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’. This strategy intensifies or mitigates the illocutionary force of respective utterances concerning ‘me’ and ‘you’ or in-groups and out-groups with the aim to modify the epistemic status of a proposition. Proposition here is to represent the Order of Knights Templar as an Order of purity and nobility and associating the author himself with this Order. In other words this discourse admires Knights Templar Order as pure of any perversion and unjustified sexual activity. Thus, it intensifies the respective utterances. It deprecates and disapproves those people who indulged in excessive sexual activity to gain qualities and attributes of Knights Templar, thus, it mitigates the contextual meaning of respective utterances. For example construction of out-group is attributed with their excessive indulgence in sexual activity. This proposition is intensified with such verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbials of varied discourses that carry semantic sense of social disapproving like: “every possible ignominy (N) should be perpetrated (V)”, “only (Adv) by committing (V) every act (Adj & N)”, “who has been called the most perverted man (Adj & N) of all time and who did everything”, “chose only the ugliest (Adj) person of either sex”, “If you screwed (V) Krupskaya all the time”. Besides using these vocabulary and metaphors to intensify the negativity of obsessive sex, the author attempts to make it obscenely more severe. He uses nouns like “all time” twice and “everything” to indicate the perpetuity and infinity of time of their act of ignominy and entirety of breaking all socio-cultural, ethical and moral rules. Thus, this discourse intensifies the illocutionary force of negativity of the act and, on the other hand, mitigates the significance of any assertion they made like “Carpocrate’s assertion” and “who did everything that could be done” to achieve enlightenment.

Taking identity issue further it is significant to analyse the predominant use of pronoun ‘I’ in the inter-discursivity of this passage specifically in the light of third research question concerning language issues and their effects upon meaning-making. Barker also guides to analyse linguistic discursive dimensions of a discourse (see
"Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CS, p. 56)" that constructs cultural processes especially identities. ‘I’ is used, in this passage, for a number of times for various actions. For example:

i. At the demonstrations I would fall in behind . . .
ii. So, I came to the conclusion that for many of my companions . . .
iii. I wanted only curiosity.
iv. True, in the course of my reading . . . I had come across Carpocrates’s assertion.
v. When we were inventing the Plan, I found that many addicts . . .
vi. I have the nagging suspicion . . .
vii. I liked Marx, I was sure that he . . .
viii. On the other hand I remember . . .
ix. I was almost clubbed.
x. I’ll never forget him . . .
xi. I evoke the mood of those days . . .
xii. I was the type who looked at discussions . . .

Who is there behind this use of “I” that participates in demonstrations, likes, wants, reads, remembers, finds, suspects, evokes, looks, etc? Is it Casaubon or Eco himself who attempts to construct his identity as emphatically as an author par excellence through the contestation of discourses with a focused desire to help the reader? If it is the author, through Casaubon he retains leadership role to make his inter-discursive language use appealing to the reader through its assertions as grammatically it is a declarative language use. Role of ‘I’ is more than to mere assert the authority of Eco. It helps to promote Eco’s identity as author who is well learned, committed to benefit the reader with global forgotten knowledges and able to develop potential talent of readers through their interaction with hybridized form of text that contains mix of discourses. Thus, Eco himself becomes a leading figure who attempts to involve the reader into his vision of weaving the conflicting discourses to implicitly establish the dignified status of Order of Knights Templar. Besides Eco, according to Allen (2000), there can be no other objective narratorial voice (see Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CS, p. 58) to guide the reader through the vast array of conflicting discourses, like tyranny of angels, perpetration of possible ignominies, original purity, occult of enlightenment, submission of
worshippers to Crowley’s perversion, love-making of Marx and Jenny and Marx’s easy pace of prose, Lenin’s screwing his wife and his lousy book, etc. Thus, through this enlarged inter-discursive construction, perhaps, the author attempts to inform his reader about the significance of the old Christian military religious Order and also to appeal reader through his authorial scholarship.

Next, sixth procedure demands to draw up context diagram for the specific text. Context discussed in second procedure will serve the purpose and will also be explored with extensive interpretation that is focus of seventh procedure. Question arises that what support mechanism lies behind choosing this inter-discursivity and what effects can be achieved through this kind of language use. To have knowledge about the support mechanism behind choosing this inter-discursivity, it is necessary to understand the connection between Casaubon's assumption that all political activism is a sexual thing and the discourses brought into the text. Background knowledge of these discourses is discussed here.

**Carpocrates’s Assertion (1st half of 2nd Century).** Carpocrates developed a philosophy of life based upon his personal experiences, thinking and mysticism. He suggests that freedom of human soul is possible only through putting oneself into all experiences of life steadfastly. Life opens up when human beings come to understand all its eccentricities by gaining experiences of all these. It paves way for the original divine purity which unites humans with the mighty and power of the unbegotten fire - the authority of the unknown God. The essence of Carpocrates's (Carpocrates and the Libertine Companions of Antinous, n.d.) doctrine is:

> So unbridled is their madness, that they declare they have in their power all things which are irreligious and impious, and are at liberty to practice them; for they maintain that things are evil or good, simply in virtue of human opinion. They deem it necessary, therefore, that by means of transmigration from body to body, soul should have experience of every kind of life as well as every kind of action. (Carpocrates & the Libertine Companions, n.d.)

It is a policy of ‘might is right’ because after throwing away all restraints of evil and virtue one is at liberty to indulge in all experiences, feelings and undesirable deeds, etc. Carpocrates’s doctrine advances the concept of binary oppositions where purity/impurity,
good/evil, restrain/ freedom, man/woman exist. Thus, by creating the binary oppositions, Carpocrates is advancing the idea of gaining divine purity/power and freedom at the cost of others. Carpocrates suggests to look into oneself and commit all deeds (sins, crimes, unbridled sex and whatever one likes) which one feels within oneself.

**Aleister Crowley's Philosophy of Sex (1875 - 1947).** Crowley has been presented as one of the wickedest persons of history as he committed sex with his followers including both men and women. He is also identified as ‘great beast’ that is otherwise a biblical reference in Book of Revelations to an evil creature (“Great Beast”, 2009). Crowley was an English occultist, ceremonial magician, poet and mountaineer and founder of religious philosophy known as Thelema. He was a self-acclaimed prophet who grew under the influence of an esoteric society, "the Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn". In the given text, he is referred to as an addict Carpocrates’s philosophy of life. He is known to follow the free philosophy of Carpocrates with the concept "DO AS THOU WILT". Crowley was a known bisexual, homosexual and a drug experimenter. He is termed as "The wickedest man in the world" because “he was in revolt against the moral and religious values of his time". According to David J. Stewart "The self proclaimed "World's Most Wicked Man” ate the feces (body discharge/waste) of women during bizarre sexual acts involving Luciferian worship and Satanism”. Crowley also had association with freemasonry. Freemasonry was a secret society started in 16th century and continued through ages with main participation of men only with a belief in supreme ‘Being’ however, in 21st century women are also allowed, having their separate fraternity ceremonies (“Freemasonry and Women”, n.d.). Stewart further argues "Mason Aleister Crowley would definitely get some votes as the most wicked man" and is obviously favoured for the title of “the Father of modern Satanism". “Crowley's wicked life and his intimate association with free masonry are both well known”. Thus, Crowley indulged in every act of sense and rapture without any fear or restraint from God or society (Stewart, n.d.).

**Marx and Jenny.** Casaubon seems to be convinced of the purgation philosophy of Corpocrates and Aleister Crowley, and he says that there must be some connection between lust for power and the impotency or the purity achieved through getting rid of sensual desires. Opposite to occultism of Corpocrates and Aleister Crowley, Karl Marx is placed who appears to Casaubon as an emblem of serene original purity who has
produced quality literature as the result of being not obsessed by the human desire of sex. Karl Marx was also a great philosopher and emancipator who wrote and struggled against the capitalist restrictions upon the working class, and he was able to do so because he was not having obsessive sex passion for women. But Capocrates and Crowley were addicted to excessive sex and wanted to get rid of it through exercising maximum sex practice with both men and women but could not get that purgation and purity which could have made them powerful philosophers. It also indicates that they perceived sex as passion of impurity is a separate entity which can be detached neatly. Here the text itself suggests the interconnectivity of even the biological elements. Hence, Marx’s writing like Das Capital is much better than any of the writings and philosophies proposed by Corpocrates and Crowley. Eco’s stress is still upon the superior position of men excluding women.

**Lenin and Krupskaya and Lenin’s Book.** To further the case of connection between power and purity, Casaubon refers to Lenin's writing Materialism and Empiriocriticism, which is supposed to be a lousy book. The rationale for its lousiness is Lenin's excessive sex with his wife Krupskaya. ‘Materialism and Empiriocriticism’ is a major philosophical work published by Valdimir Lenin in 1909, wherein Lenin argues that "human perceptions correctly and accurately reflect the objective external world". This is a positivist kind of philosophy which takes into consideration no processual complexities and inter-discursivity. However, the book has been regarded as lousy stuff by Casaubon due to Lenin’s impure soul (Spartacus Educational, n.d.).

Now keeping in view the context of the passage (first & sixth procedures) drawn through the inter-discursive references made to Corpocrates, Crowley, Marx and Lenin, research question indicated in third procedure mentioned earlier and perspective of Cultural Studies, language use of the passage will be further analysed and interpreted.

From Cultural Studies’ perspective, this passage is constructed through a number of discourses to mark the dominance of masculine romance and fascination, hence construction of identity and gender relations. This discourse seems to be a “tale about men, for men, told to men by a man” (Robbins 2000, p. 232). The author is not excluded from this web of men. It radically establishes the authoritative superiority of men upon women in this “political activism”. Through this inter-discursive support mechanism, (see Theorising inter-discursivity, p. 26) Casaubon attempts to produce a totalizing version of masculinity. The language use produces this effect of cultural importance. Totalizing
effect is achieved through such language forms which produce position of mastery of man. Such kind of language as: "so I came to the conclusion", "True . . . I had come across Carpocrates's assertion", "there must be a connection between the lust for power and impotentia coeundi". Moreover, women have been represented only as objects of sex. Though having sex is a biological phenomenon, however cultural meanings of identity, gender and power relations associated with the discourse are not out of context. It is what Fairclough says that discourse represents people’s relations to the world; their social positions that constitute their identities beyond their biological appearances (see Conceptualising Inter-discursive Constructions, p. 25). Women are represented here as an object of gaze and desire, property of men, inferior party and a subjectivity which provides support to the masculine position of power, intellectual superiority and essential position from where they have a rightful access to use women for their desires. This is affected through the body of the text which is related to the linguistic constructs like.”I would fall in behind one banner or another, drawn by a girl who had aroused my interest”, “for many of my companions political activism was a sexual thing”, “I liked Marx. I was sure that he and his Jenny had made love merrily”, "if you screwed Krupskaya all the time", etc. For Casaubon "a girl" is an object of gaze, interest and desire. The utterance “For many of my companions” includes only men leaving no space and position for women. "He and his Jenny” reflects Jenny as property of Marx associated with the possessive pronoun "his". “If you screwed Krupskaya" carries "screw" as a verb which is usually used as an offensive term for sexual intercourse, thus making women as an inferior object used by men.

Thus, constructing this relationship of men and women is not mere a matter of biological sex; rather, it constructs contesting position in relation to culture where men are independent, superior, intellectual and powerful to "screw" a woman and woman is a passive object of desire, dependent and ready for use by man. It is a discourse written by man (Eco) in second last decade of 20th century which shows women having no social stakes in that culture.

It is highlighted that the discourse under investigation is not a real life tale; rather, a fictional world created by a male writer. To mitigate the effect of masculine dominance, there is an attempt to doubt the essentialist and approved superiority of man, like Casaubon's expression at later stage. He articulates "I was the type who looked at
discussions of WHAT IS TRUTH only with a view toward correcting the manuscript". Though, in the end there is an attempt not to maintain the meaning of dominant masculinity but it is implicit in its way of articulating discourses of masculine way in which "I" as subject (Casaubon) is a male thinking. Casaubon is such a man who, according to Ruth (2000) "subscribes to the hegemonic ideal of masculinity" because he believes in "Truth" as a positivist entity as he refers to the "original purity" of man. But it is evident that the knowledge of facts, identities and relations produced within the given discourse by Eco is a result of hybridizing of various discourses having different sociocultural bearings at different times of human history.

Identity and Power aspects – Knights Templar. This passage explicitly expresses author's ideological designs implicit in the construction of Order of Knights Templar:

(4) I felt a little guilty. After all, I had been living with the Templars for two years, and I loved them. Yet now catering to the snobbery of my audience, I had made them sound like characters out of a cartoon. May be it was William of Tyre’s fault, treacherous historiographer that he was. I could almost see my Knights of the Temple, bearded and blazing, the bright red crosses on their snow white cloaks, their mounts wheeling in the shadow of Beauceant, their black and white banner. They had been so dazzlingly intent on their feast of death and daring. Perhaps the sweat Saint Bernard talked about was a bronze glow that lent a sarcastic nobility to their fearsome smiles as they celebrated their farewell to life . . . Loins in war, Jacques de Vitry called them, but sweet lambs in times of peace; harsh in battle, devout in prayer; ferocious to their enemies, but full of kindness toward their brothers. The white and black of their banner were so apposite: to the friends of Christ they were pure; to His adversaries they were grim and terrible.

Pathetic champions of the faith, last glimmer of chivalry’s twilight. Why play any old Ariosto to them when I could be their Joinville? The author of the Histoire de Saint Louis had accompanied the sainted king to the Holy land, acting as both scribe and soldier. I recalled now what he had written about the Templars. This was more than a hundred and eighty years after the order was founded, and it had been through enough crusades to undermine anyone’s ideals. The heroic figures of Queen Melisande and Baudouin the leper-king had vanished like ghosts; factional fighting in Lebanon – blood-soaked even then – had drawn to a close; Jerusalem had already fallen once; Barbarossa had drowned in Cilicia; Richard the Loin-Heart, defeated and humiliated, had gone home
disguised as, of all things, a Templar; Christianity had lost the battle. The Moors’ view of the confederation of autonomous potentates united in the defense of their civilization was very different. They had read Avicenna, and they were not ignorant, like the Europeans. How could you live alongside a tolerant, mystical, libertine culture for two centuries without succumbing to its allure, particularly when you compared it to Western culture, which was crude, vulgar, barbaric and Germanic? Then in 1244, came the final, definitive fall of Jerusalem. The war, begun a hundred and fifty years earlier, was lost. The Christians had to lay down their arms in a land now devoted to peace and the scent of the cedars of Lebanon. Poor Templars. Your epic, all in vain.

(pp. 88-89)

According to the first procedure, context of the passage entails aspects related to Order of Knights Templar established in 1119 and later on endorsed by Catholoic Church in 1129. All three characters of the Novel are sitting together to discuss different documents related to secret organizations from which they are planning to develop their own secret master plan of controlling the world. They are joined by a girl named Dolores. They talk about the Templars who were famous for their countless activities especially their military missions against the occupying forces of the Holy lands of Jerusalem. Despite all their attempts, they were not very successful against their adversaries present in the Holy Lands except for short duration. However, the damaging blow came from King of France, Philip IV (1268-1314), who, in 1312, arranged to disband the Order of Knights Templar through Pope Clemet V. King Philip ordered arrest of all Templars throughout Europe, tortured them to confess that they were against Christianity and burnt them on stake. Contrary to this, it is believed that King Philip was under heavy debt of the Templars due to his excessive loans taken from them for his military campaigns and was unable to return them. Under the umbrella to provide protection to the Christian pilgrims to Holy Lands, Templars had evolved a secret money exchange system that gradually generated a lot of money and they started offering loans to the needy. So the King had taken loans from them and was not able or didn’t want to return it.

The activities of the Templars are mouthed by Casaubon in a way that the text here becomes a genre of military history. It took a start as “Poor Fellow soldiers of Christ and of the temple of Solomon commonly known as Knights Templar, the Order of the Temple or Templars in early year of 12th century. The Order started as a charity organization endorsed by Catholic Church in 1129 and later turned into a powerful
military order. The initial objective was to provide protection to the pilgrims travelling to the Holy places in Jerusalem after recapturing it in 1099 after first crusade. The Templars used to wear white mantle with Red Cross. Non combatant members used to run economic infrastructure which spread throughout the Europe. After listening to the story of Templars narrated by Casaubon, the remarks of audience are not suitable to the taste of Casaubon. Belbo, Deotellavi and Dolores all term the Templars as crazy like children, like Tom and Jerry, etc. Casaubon being unable to restrain himself and feeling guilty, he tries to vindicate the Templars and comes out with his own remarks as the author deems appropriate for the discourse. It is a rich inter-discursive construction of the Templars.

The language use reflects construction of positive us, and negative others (Wodak, 2001). The context of the passage establishes that the passage is a genre of military history which is an attempt to over praise the military might and staunch association with avowed order of the Templars. It is also an attempt to hide the negative aspects of the Templars like their homosexuality, misappropriation of money and obeying no laws they were free to enter any land crossing the demarcated borders of the states (“Knights Templar”, 2009; “Templar History”, 2010).

Second procedure requires establishing inter-discursivity. The passage is interwoven with the discourses of faith, spirituality, love, courage, history, literature, etc. The discourse of faith, love and spirituality is incorporated as: “Knights of the Temple, bearded and blazing, the bright red crosses on their snow white cloaks,” “sweet lambs in times of peace”, “devout in prayer”, “full of kindness toward their brothers”, “to the friends of Christ they were pure”, etc. The discourse of courage is dovetailed as “they had been so dazzlingly intent on their feast of death and daring”, “loins in war”, “harsh in battle”, “ferocious to their enemies”, “last glimmer of chivalry’s twilight”. The entire passage is an historical discourse in terms of the Templars’ activities. It also entails the discourse of literature as the passage contains solid references to Ariosto and Joinville. Ariosto (1474-1533) is well known for his romantic epic Orlando Furioso. Similarly Joinville (1224-1317) is known for his historical book: Life of Saint Louis. (“Jean de Joinville”, n.d.). Thus, the discourse appears to be rich in inter-discursivity.

Third procedure guides to formulate precise research question and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories. For this, I draw upon the first research question of this study that: “What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle
over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses within the novel texts under study? For explanatory theory, I use Fairclough’s view of constitutive intertextuality (see pp. 7-8, 55) which he also calls inter-discursivity. According to Fairclough, it helps to analyse other discourses of socio-cultural significance that are not mentioned manifestly but referred circuitously in a text. Based on the research question, Fairclough’s explanatory theory and perspective of Cultural Studies, it will help investigate that socio-cultural significance of giving importance to the Templars who have been praised outright with no negative and depreciating attribute. According to the research question and Fairclough’s theory, analysis and interpretation is carried out in the following procedures.

Fourth and fifth procedures demand to operationalise the research question into linguistic categories and apply those categories sequentially on the text using theoretical approach to interpret the meanings. For this purpose five discursive strategies of Wodak are sequentially applied to investigate several inter-discursive strategies and linguistic elements which will reveal the preferential treatment given to the Knights Templar by the author. According to first strategy, (referential/nomination) it is to be investigated that how are persons/objects named and referred to linguistically. This strategy uses biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors, metonymies and synecdoche to construct in-groups and out-groups. The Templars are constructed as in-group and referred to in naturalizing metaphors that portray them as glorious figures of all times. On the other hand, those who wrote or thought to write against the Templars are referred linguistically in disparaging terms. Casaubon is very offensive against William of Tyre who was unable to portray the Templars as eminent figures of all times. William of Tyre has been referred to as a blunderer, a disloyal and a deceitful person: “May be it was William of Tyre’s fault, treacherous historiographer he was”. Opposite to it, he constructs his in-group that is referred as “my knights of the Temple”. Casaubon uses such metaphors and metonymies which reflect an attempt to naturalize their biological, conventional and abstract attributes. They seem to be the specific and precious asset as Casaubon uses attributive pronoun “their” and definite article “the” time and again: “the bright red crosses on their snow-white cloaks, “their mounts”, “the shadow of the Beauceant”, “their black and white banner”, “dazzlingly intent on their feast of death and daring”, “their fearsome smiles”, “their farewell to life”, etc. Besides this reflection of specificity, the semantic relationship is constructed through adjectives and adverbials like: “bearded
and blazing”, “bright red crosses on their snow-white cloaks”, “black-and-white banner”, “dazzlingly intent”, “sarcastic nobility to their fearsome smiles”. Naturalising metaphors come directly like: *Loins in war*, “sweet lambs in times of peace; harsh in battle, devout in prayer; ferocious to their enemies, but full of kindness toward their brothers. The white and black of their banner were so apposite: to the friends of Christ they were pure; to His adversaries they were grim and terrible”. This semantic relationship indicates their solid existence, love among themselves, bravery and ferocity toward enemy and their distinguished posture. Thus, Templars are referred to linguistically in likable terms that represent them as naturally gifted people.

Second strategy is ‘predication’ that uses stereotypical or evaluative attributes of positive or negative traits to label the constructed social groups positively or negatively. It is to be investigated that how the Templars and their opponents are attributed. The given discourse reflects that the Templars are labeled more positively and appreciatively. These are stereotypical and standardized attributes associated with the Knights as it is found in the mediaeval romantic literature. Interesting aspect of Eco’s construction of the Templars is that he includes others to make his positive predication more compelling and convincing. He adds to his backing the name of Jacques de Vitry. Templars are predicated as: “*Lions in war . . . sweet lambs in times of peace; harsh in battle, devout in prayer; furious to their enemies, but full of kindness toward their brothers*”, “to the friends of Christ they were pure; to His adversaries they were grim and terrible”, “champions of the faith, last glimmer of chivalry’s twilight”. They are constructed as superior figures in their every act of life. It reflects their nobility, bravery, high ideals, excellent moral character, magnificence, decency and dignified social status. Thus, by using explicit predicates Templars are labeled positively and constructed as noble figures in all life activities.

According to third linguistic strategy (argumentation), it is to be investigated that what argumentation schemes are used to justify discriminatory or preferential treatment given to the groups/persons - Templars and criticism of the detractors who attempted to devalue the Templars’ activates. Argumentation schemes are called topoi. Under the topos of definition or name interpretation, Eco justifies his preferential treatment given to the Templars. This scheme of argumentation concludes that the very name is sufficient to justify the positive or negative traits of persons or objects. So the mention of this expression “Knights Templar” is sufficient to justify their grandeur and nobility of their
acts. However, in this passage the author seems determined to justify the Templars as indicated by the feeling of the narrator: “I felt a little guilty. After all, I had been living with the Templars . . . and I loved them”. He continues further through such linguistic construction which reflects qualities, traits and attributes specific to the Templars. Eco uses such terms as “lions”, “sweet lambs”, “harsh”, “devout”, “ferocious”, “full of kindness”, “pure”, “grim and terrible”, “champions” “last glimmer”, etc. These terms indicate that the Templars are kind brothers in their own group and ferocious and terrible against the enemies - other group of faith. Thus, the Templars must be respected and admired. By putting himself along with the historians and those who have written about the Templars, Eco justifies his viewpoint about the detractors because they failed to perceive the significance of the ideals behind the initiation of the Order. Perhaps the long time involved since its inception and the later failures in certain war missions that the historians and writhers could not give the due credit to the Templars. Eco validates his stance about the detractor Joinville, “I recalled now what he had written about the Templars. This was more than a hundred and eighty years after the order was funded and it had been through enough crusades to undermine any one’s ideals”. According to this explicit language use, the narrator feels dishonoured if he fails to give more than due credit to the Templars. He is humbled to see the failure of their mission; otherwise they were human beings par excellence: “Poor Templars. Your epic all in vain”.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation or discourse representation’. It is quite explicit that the authorial voice in the form of Casaubon is not neutral and transcendental; rather, it carries a discriminatory stance favouring the Templars and demeaning others who were against them. This is evident from the aggressive tone when Casaubon says: “May be it was William Tyre’s fault, treacherous historiographer that he was”. Then change in tone that expresses admiration and approval of good qualities and dignified posture of “my Knights of the Temple” speaks itself of discourse representation that is all admiration of the Templars because they were supporters of specific faith: “to the friends of Christ they were pure; to His adversaries they were grim and terrible”, “The Christians had to lay down their arms . . .” Moreover, this discourse is politicized which is also visible from the authorial stance that the discourse does not touch upon their human follies. The Templars are represented as human beings of distinction. Rather, Casaubon expresses his sympathy for their failure: “Poor Templars”. Thus, in the framework of the inter-discursive construction, this discourse is not a neutral and
objective representation; rather, it reflects author’s explicit bent of mind in favour of Christianity.

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’. In this strategy illocutionary force of utterances is intensified or mitigated to modify the knowledge status of a proposition. Proposition here is that Casaubon, Belbo, Deotellavi and a girl named Dolres are discussing their plan related to secret societies of the world. Order of Knights Templar is under discussion. Discussion takes a turn from Templars’ activities to the nature of their mission, character and socio-cultural status. Casaubon supports them with all their glories and weaknesses while others call them crazy people. Casaubon becomes emotional (a discursive strategy of the discourse producer to praise the Templars) and praises them to the extent that they appear an extraordinary team members of universal character traits that no one else can claim. Thus, epistemic status of the proposition, existence of the Knights Templar, is modified to great deal of work. Casaubon, while glorifying the Templars, attempts to intensify the illocutionary force of the utterances, however mitigates it in the end to compensate the Templars’ defeats. Intensification is achieved through intensifiers like: “I could almost see my knights”, “Sweet lambs in times of peace”, “ferocious to their enemies”, “full of kindness toward their brothers”, “to the friends of Christ they were pure; to his adversaries they were grim and terrible”, “pathetic champions”, “last glimmer of chivalry’s twilight”, “this was more than a hundred and eighty years”, “it had been through enough crusades”, “heroic figures of Queen Melisande and Baudouin the leper king”, etc. The intensification is at its peak when the Templars are termed as “pure” and “last glimmer of chivalry’s twilight”. Casaubon attempts to reify their character traits as matchless. By the use of adjectives “pure” and “last”, it is an attempt to make them appear everlasting in their mission, belief, character and secret activities carried out against the adversaries of Christ. However, to mitigate the shame, humiliation and embarrassment associated with the Templars’ defeat, the author uses such terms as, “the Moors’ view . . . in the defense of their civilization was very different”, (means the adversaries were never united before this time), “How could you live alongside . . . when you compared it to western culture, which was crude, vulgar, barbaric, Germanic”, “then, . . . definitive fall of Jerusalem”, etc. The use of these terms to intensify or mitigate the illocutionary force of certain utterances, reflects that the epic of the Templars is constructed inter-discursively to gain the reader’s
sympathies for the Templars who are represented as their Christian brothers and who fought for the glory of their faith.

In the light of third research question and the first discursive strategy this passage adopts a system of categorization of Templars and others with focus upon Templars’ martial bravery, loyalty and commitment to their mission of protection of holy lands in Jerusalem. The effect of this language use based on this system of categorization for meaning-making is that Knights Templar appear luminously and distinctively mythical characters against those who were their adversaries and their critics. Knights of the Temple are categorized in layered abstractions as: “bearded and blazing”, “dazzlingly intent”, “sweet lambs”, “ferocious to their enemies”, “full of kindness”, “pathetic champions of the faith”, “last glimmer of chivalry”, etc. On the other side William of Tyre, who did not depict them in likable terms is categorized as “treacherous historiographer”. Eco uses this categorization as a cognitive device for the reader to gain his/her sympathies for them against the irrelevant views of other writers. But as per CDA notions and perspective of CS, this is not a natural way of division and categorization. It reflects the perspectivation of Eco who constructs Templars in expressions of distinction. Moreover, Eco makes use of prototypes of military life to create semantically a specific environment so that the reader easily perceives them as a special class. It also reflects sympathetic view of the discourse producer for the Templars who lost their battle ultimately and could not maintain their control upon the holy lands.

It is significant to critically view this passage specifically in the light of research question and perspective of Cultural Studies that position a text within cultural contexts and guide to investigate implicit and explicit inter-discursive strategies of the text to view as to how different relations are constructed. In view of the cultural meanings, it seems that the author, Eco, uses Casaubon as a discursive strategy to express his association with the Templars. Eco adopts different discursive strategies to construct identity of Templars as Foucault points out that there is multiplicity of positionings and discourses which struggle to position objects or particular kind of individuals (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 25). He has deep reverence for the Templars being “champions of the faith” and Eco constructs their identity in a way hoping to be revered by everyone. When Casaubon’s friends make fun of the Templars, he says, “I felt a little guilty. After all, I had been living with the Templars for two years”. Just to vindicate his association with
the Templars Casaubon constructs them in glorious terms. Though they lost their battles against their adversaries but Casaubon still favours them and constructs them as unique figures/identities. Nature of language struggle is quite explicit in semantic relations and in constructing identities of Templars. On the one hand, it is very assertive as language takes declarative stance in the construction of Templars’ identity and on the other hand, the discourse producer strengthens his view point by creating intertextual relationship between his stance and Jacques de Vitry’s. Moreover, Eco’s sympathy is very lucid even when he articulates about the defeated figures of the Templars whom he calls heroic figures without reference to the circumstances of their defeat that have their own discursive strands. He constructs it like: “The heroic figures of Queen Melisande and Baudouin the leper-king had vanished like ghosts . . . Barbarossa had drowned in Cilicia; Richard the Loin-Heart, defeated and humiliated, had gone home disguised as, of all things, a Templar; Christianity had lost the battle”. Thus, the identity construction of the discourse is deeply situated in the cultural context of Christianity and language struggle is tailored to extol the Templars at all costs. He intends to gain sympathies of the readers.

Viewing this passage in terms of Fairclough’s constitutive intertextuality/interdiscursivity (see pp. 7-8, 25, 32, 55), Eco attempts to create an inter-discursive epistemic environment within which the reader mustn’t forget the initial objective of the Order which was meant to protect the Christian pilgrims travelling to the Holy lands, though under the protection umbrella they developed a number of other welfare oriented systems. Inter-discursivity of this passage is set right in the beginning when Casaubon rearticulates the Knights of the Temple after rejecting the discourse of William of Tyre on this subject. Instead of highlighting their welfare activities, Eco coined such forms of address, which constitute the Templars as pure warriors only. As Judith Butler emphasizes (cited in Medina, 2005, p. 172) that names constitute one socially in particular ways. According to Butler, names are the social identities and social spaces. Thus, Eco uses evaluative nouns for the Templars and by weaving different discourses constitutes special space for the Templars to occupy and constructs a specific social positionality for them. Eco has constituted their social identity as noble warriors and champions of faith in a way that a reader may not resist to accept. Eco constructs their positive socio-cultural identity not only using adjectival terms once or twice; rather, he uses different discursive strategies repeatedly. An attempt is made to sustain the effect through constant reinforcement that creates easy space for the reader for the intelligibility of the Templars. Casaubon’s
personal involvement in the inter-discursive strategies takes the shape of the grandeur associated with the Cross, dress, banner and horse, including other writers who favoured Templars, criticizing those who are their detractors. Thus, this passage reflects both ‘manifest intertextuality’ and ‘constitutive intertextuality’.

**Identity Construction of Templars’ Location – Provins.** This passage constructs a place known as ‘Provins’ which the author calls “redolent of secrets”. This passage posits multiple other discourses appropriated to construct Provins.

(5) “Why Provins?”

“Have you ever been to Provins? A magic place: you can feel it even today. Go there. A magic place, still redolent of secrets. In the eleventh century it was the seat of Comte de Champagne, a free zone, where the central government couldn’t come snooping. The Templars were at home there; even today a street is named after them. There were churches, palaces, a castle overlooking the whole plain. And a lot of money, merchants doing business, fairs, confusion, where it was easy to pass unnoticed. But most important, something that has been there since prehistoric times: tunnels. A network of Tunnels – real catacombs – extends beneath the hill. Some tunnels are open to the public today. They were places where people could meet in secret, and if their enemies got in, the conspirators could disperse in a matter of seconds, disappearing into nowhere. And if they were really familiar with the passages, they could exit in one direction and appear in the opposite, on padded feet, like cats. They could sneak up behind the intruders and cut them down in the dark. As God is my witness, gentlemen, those tunnels are tailor-made for commandos. Quick and invisible, you slip in at night, knife between your teeth, a couple of grenades in hand, and your enemies die like rats!”

(p. 125)

Following the first procedure, the overall context of the novel consists of the political and socio-cultural environment which surrounds the secret societies and the discourse patterns of the text are designed on the analogy of the Pendulum moving from one extreme to another extreme. However, the entire text is not so smooth; rather, it is riddled with varying linguistic, situational, social, psychological moods constructed inter-discursively. The contextual information gathered from previous pages of F’s P (pp. 97-98) indicates that Casaubon, in the presence of his friends, talks about the Templars who were not in the good books of the King of France, Phillip IV. The Templars used to
conduct their secret activities hidden at different places. The Templars had established themselves as an effective network to run and manage business activities along with serving as a solid fighting outfit to provide support to the army of the King of France. The King had financed his military campaigns from the loans offered by this network. As that debt had multiplied into a huge amount and the King, finding him unable to return the loans, accused the Order of the Knights Templar of conducting anti-state activities, of having heresy, etc. The troops of the King of France arrested all the masters of the Order and burned them at stake. They were arrested in the city of Provins and were burned at the stake ("Philip IV (of France)", 2009; "Knights Templar", 2009). Linguistic and inter-discursive construction of the city of Provins reflects that the author intends to influence the reader for the support of the Order who stood as an independent and fair voice against any unjustified Kingdom.

Second procedure demands to establish inter-discursivity and intertextuality. In its surface meaning it appears to be a complex and entertaining text with information about secret societies. However, a careful and reflexive investigation of inter-discursivity and the linguistic strategies exposes the ideological dimensions and offers the possibility of conceiving of the world in some alternative way concerning identity, gender and power relations. The major part of the text concerns with the impressive activities of the Templars who are represented as positive in-group. There seems to be an attempt on the part of the author to construct the Templars’ existence in categorical terms, as it is evident from the description of the city of Provins, which ensures the identity of the Knights Templar as an institution demanding respect and sympathies of the readers. However, it is not a smooth description. It is constructed through incorporating different discourses which work effectively in psychological domains. Construction of Provins is not a single dimensional discourse rather it is an intersection of different discourses that can produce different contextual meanings and picture of the situation. This inter-discursivity can be observed at interactional as well as structural levels. At interactional level the subject position of the Templars is constructed through the discourses of freedom (a free zone, where the central Government could not come snooping. The Templars were at home there), business (a lot of money, merchants doing business) and secret activities (they were places where people could meet in secret). At structural level, discourses of intimacy (if they were really familiar with the passages, they could exit in one direction and reappear in the opposite) and universal truth (as God is my witness) are incorporated
to affirm the veracity of the narrative by Eco. The city of Provins is constructed to look like a real place surrounded by extraordinary inbuilt structures that is an attempt to represent the supremacy and superiority of the Templars and the place where they could abode themselves comfortably and dexterously.

Third procedure guides to formulate precise research question from the problem under investigation and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories. First research question of this study will be investigated in this passage. This is: “What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses within the texts of the novel under study?” For explanatory theory, Robbins (2000) view that there is always another side which widens the view will be drawn upon (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 29). Analysis and interpretation according to the given research question and explanatory theory is carried out in the following procedures.

Fourth and fifth procedures demand to operationalise the research question into linguistic categories and apply those categories sequentially on the text using theoretical approach to interpret the meanings. For this purpose, five discursive strategies of Wodak are sequentially applied to investigate several inter-discursive strategies and linguistic elements. First discursive strategy is ‘referential/nomination’, that is how persons/objects are named or referred to linguistically using different devices like biological, naturalizing or depersonalizing metaphors, metonymies and synecdoche. This strategy attempts to construct in-groups and out-groups. According to this discursive strategy, the place that was under utilization of the Templars is referred to with naturalising metaphors to represent it as in-group. The place is constructed as a different natural phenomenon that is differentiated from a normal place. Provins is referred to as a “magic place” and “free zone”. A kind of feeling is created that the abode of Templars was not a normal place. It was an extraordinary place as were the Templars. Provins is also referred to as “it was the seat of the Comte de Champagne”. Standard historical belief places the origin of Templars in Jerusalem in the year 1118 or 1119. This, however, is not the case. According to another historical record (“Templars Now”, 2013), the cradle of the Knights Templar stood at the court of the Earl of Champagne in the French town of Troye. The court of the Earl of Champagne (in French, Comte de Champagne and his Earldom is indicated as Comté de Champagne) was strongly related to the reformed Benedictine
monasteries founded in 1075. It is also associated with churches, palaces, castles, business, fairs, tunnels, etc. So this place is given extraordinary representative prominence.

Second discursive strategy is ‘predication’, that what traits, qualities and features are attributed to the constructed groups to label them negatively or positively. Provins is labeled very positively and appreciatively. It reflects the close association between Provins and Templars. As the Templars were the fighting outfit, the Provins is also given such attributes which reflect its battle worthiness and heroic status. There are direct attributes of positive traits. It reflects author's deep love and association with the Templars and everything that had been under their use. Provins was such a place where Templars were able to move freely because "the central government could not come snooping". Templars were "at home there" and then using superlative degree he says, "But most important . . . tunnels". It was such a place where, in case of enemy penetration, Templars were able to “disperse in matter of seconds, disappearing into nowhere . . . and appear in the opposite”, “They could sneak up behind the intruder and cut them down in the dark”. Thus, Provins is constructed with attributes that have positive traits which also suits to the Templars such as protection, secrecy, agility, freedom, dodging and defeating enemy, etc.

Third strategy is ‘argumentation’, that what argumentation schemes, which Wodak calls topoi, are used to justify negative or positive traits. The author has used different devices to give preferential treatment to the Provins and implicitly to the Templars. Here the topos of definition is appropriate to interpret the construction of Provins. This argumentation scheme is a conclusion that name of a person or thing carries the qualities of that thing or person. Thus, name of Provins is enough to take it as a place of unique significance - “a magic place”. It is expected from the readers to believe that the Templars, who used 'Provins' as a hiding place to defeat their enemies, are also magical personalities. As he says at the end of the passage, "Quick and invisible, you slip in at night, knife between your teeth, a couple of grenades in hand and your enemies die like rats". Templars are as unique as the "Povins" is. The author justifies the positive attributes of the location in different ways like questioning (Have you ever been to Provins?), inviting people to visit it (you can feel it even today. Go there.), affirming its fairy tale status (A magic place, still redolent of secrets.), eulogizing (There were
churches, palaces, a castle overlooking the whole plain. And a lot of money, merchants doing business). Thus, the arguments are arranged inter-discursively - hybridizing discourses of religion, royal dignity, military grace and business, etc. To make it a convincing argument the author makes God his witness: "As God is my witness". Nature of language struggle here is to construct both Templars and their hiding place in positive traits as to be accepted by all.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation’ that from what perspective attributes are expressed. It reflects authorial involvement or speaker’s point of view. The discursive construction of 'Provins' is tinged with an ideological bent of mind wherein the author is determined to position the Templars at high pedestal and is not ready to compromise on their dignified status. It is what Robbins says that there is always the other side that widens the view. Thus, here the other side is that the dignity and grace of the Provins become the dignity and grace of the Templars and vice versa. Authorial perspective is evident from different utterances and the way they are incorporated in the discourse like: "magic place", “free zone”, "the seat of Comte de Champagne", etc. It is clear that the appearance of Provins, does not arise as function of independent nature as Eco makes the "tunnels" of the 'Provins' as something a living force that helped the Templars to overcome their enemies in a magical way: “Quick and invisible”. They could disappear secretly like a "cat" and got hold of their enemies who die like "rats". The author makes it explicit that the grace and dignity are specific attributes of "Provins" and it is constructed out of material conditions and it is not a naturally occurring phenomenon. So, the identity of "Provins" by Eco is questionable that if he describes it a magical place, it can be described as a trap for the Templars which proved later on when the forces of King Phillip arrested them from the same place "Provins".

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’ that refers to the use of those words, adjectives and adverbs that modify the knowledge about something like enhancing the status of something and making it larger, sharper, stronger, etc., or mitigating the status by making it smaller, weaker, repulsive, helpless and unprotected. Here Eco attempts to intensify the illocutionary force of the utterances related to superior and magical status of the "Provins". He uses different adverbs and adjectives like "Have you ever been to Provins? A magic place", “you can feel it even today”, "still redolent of secrets", "overlooking the whole plain. And a lot of money . . .", "But most important",
“real catacombs”, "disperse in a matter of seconds”, and here comes the climax of intensification when Eco says "As God is my witness".

In the light of language issues and their effects upon meaning-making of third research question, the discourse producer attempts to create an interest through combined discursive strategies of invitation, appeal and suspense. Through a kind of rhetoric, Eco attempts to create these feelings and effects in his discourse. Through these rhetorical skills of inviting, appealing and arousing curiosity of the reader he promotes an ideology based on normative values that knowledge about Templars is enhancing element of respect for their activities, bravery and ingenuity of mind in the pursuance of their mission. How invitation, appeal and suspense work in this discourse. Eco attempts to achieve the effects of his discourse by challenging his/her awareness, “Have you ever been to Provins”. Then he appeals to the reader by challenging his/her self control, “Go there, a magic place, still redolent of secrets” and then, Eco creates suspense, “They were places where people could meet in secrets, and their enemies got in, the conspirators could disperse in a matter of seconds disappearing into nowhere.” Eco strengthens his appeal to the reader by articulating ‘Provins’ as a desirable object. This inspiration and appeal grows serious, “As God is my witness, gentlemen”. By addressing in this way Eco attempts to establish a relationship with his reader in the context of activities of Templars.

Another aspect of this inter-discursive language use and meaning-making is complexity. It lies in the support mechanism of the given discourse (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 26). The discourse emerges from geographical location of Provins and refers to the regal position of the Templars while going through the corridors of churches, palaces, castle, confusions of money-making business and dark tunnels. It also reflects what Nietzsche points out (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 31) that the relations referring to one another are not comprehensible except through what we add in shape of time and space. Thus, our discourses and our social life exist in understanding of what we add in the form of context to a situation.

Sixth and seventh procedures require to draw up contextual diagram for the specific text and to take an extensive interpretation while returning to the research question and to the problem under investigation. Context is already critically discussed in first procedure. However, it is further interpreted as guided by seventh procedure. Analysis of the passage through discursive strategies reveals the ideological objectives of
the discourse producer. In words of Robbins (2000), author's comments are very useful for thinking about the ways in which texts call their reader into unquestioning allegiance to particular points of view (p. 43). Thus, it is not a plain discourse; rather, a politicised one.

So far its extensive interpretation under the research question (what is the nature of implicit or explicit struggle of language over identity issue) is concerned, it is important to ask ‘why Provins is articulated in appreciative terms?’ In this regard, Rosemary Hennessy's arguments are discussed as presented in ‘Materialist Feminism and the Politics of Discourse’ (1993). She is of the view that the literary sphere is connected to the economic conditions because literature is very often a representation of reality. Eco's text is also not out of economic sphere. Eco's earlier novel ‘The Name of the Rose’ became the bestseller throughout the world. Moreover, being a novelist, philosopher, historian and literary figure his bread and butter is largely associated with producing appealing and absorbing texts. Perhaps, this economic aspect is the reason that Eco attempts to construct identity of the ‘Provins’ in every detail and language use portrays it as a sensational and thrilling place, Thus, by intermingling different discourses. ‘Provins' is constructed as an adventure place that is more an intellectual adventure than a real one, as Robbins (2000) says that the literary text with its claims to transcendence likes to pretend that it has no real touch with capitalism. So, this is how the other side of the language use widens the view at socio-cultural level.

This passage can also be interpreted as construction of subject position in a unique way as Foucault said, referred earlier, that a subject is always historically conditioned and determined linguistic construct (see Subject Position and Perspectives of CS and CFDS p. 64). In case of ‘Provins’ it is visible that the author attempts to associate the position of 'Provins' with the position of the Templars. Thus, by connecting position of the 'Provins' of 11th century with the current times, Eco attempts to construct an all time respected position of the Tempars. Inter-discursively this connection is implicit and explicit in linguistic devices like: “A magic place: you can feel it even today”, “even today a street is named after them”, “Some tunnels are open to the public today”. The problem to be addressed here is Eco's attempt to make the evidence of the Templars specific subject position as evidence for universal law. Inter-connected to it is Robbins' view that there is always another side that widens view. Eco gives only one side of the Templars’ life and
tries to construct linguistically as an ever-lasting brilliance of life. Eco wants to restrict life which is against life itself. Thus, it is an inter-discursive construction by Eco to impose his meaning of the Tempars’ existence upon the reader presented as figures worthy of reader’s sympathy. It is not the only ‘authorized’ version of the 'Provins' and the Templars, or the natural and universal one. It is an attempt to stop the reader seeing the other side - personal gains, power designs, exploitations, etc., of the Templars. Thus, there is a sense in which 'Provins' is neither quite "a magic place" nor a “free zone”. In this passage, it seems that the nature of language struggle is dangerously perspectivised and blurred.

Keeping in view the inter-discursive construction of the passage and the ‘other side’ aspect of the perspective of Cultural Studies, it is clear that there are more networks of social, economic and cultural relations hybridized than the only ‘magical’ identity of the 'Provins' and the 'Templars' constructed by Eco. Understanding of these networks as ‘other side’ widens the view and reveals many discourses of social, economic and cultural dimensions that intersect in the making of ‘Provins’ as a magic place.

**Knowledge/Reality is Inter-discursive.** This passage is inter-discursive not only in its form; rather, it talks about knowledge and ‘reality’ as inter-discursive and diffused phenomena.

(6) “What treasures of knowledge?”

“Do you realize how great the second and third centuries after Christ were?” Not because of the pomp of the empire in its sunset, but because of what was burgeoning in the Mediterranean basin then. In Rome, the Praetorians were slaughtering their emperors, but in the Mediterranean area, there flourished the epoch of Apuleius, the mysteries of Isis, and that great return to spirituality: Neoplatonism, gnosis. Blissful times, before the Christians seized power and began to put heretics to death. A splendid epoch, in which dwelled the nous, a time dazzled by ecstasies, and peopled with presences, emanations, demons and angelic hosts. The knowledge I am talking about is diffuse and disjointed; it is as ancient as the world itself, reaching back beyond Pythagoras, to the Brahmans of India, the Hebrews, the mages, the gymnosophists, and even the barbarians of the far north, the Druids of Gaul and the British Isles. The Greeks called the barbarians by that name because to overeducated Greek ears, their languages
sounded like barking, and the Greeks therefore, assumed that they were unable to express themselves. In fact, the barbarians knew much more than the Hellenes at the time, precisely because their language was impenetrable. Do you believe the people who will dance tonight know the meaning of all the chants and magic names they will utter? Fortunately, they do not, and each unknown name will be a kind of breathing exercise, a mystical vocalization.

(p. 184)

Though Eco frames his own discourse to represent his view about secret societies and spiritual and mystical aspects, this passage reflects that Eco's book does not contain a unidirectional discourse which informs only about the Foucault's Pendulum or Knights Templar. Eco's text is highly hybridized and inter-discursive. The main character of this text, Casaubon also serves as a source of inter-discursive strategy. He does not stay at one place to tell the Templars’ story only; rather, he moves from one continent to another continent. He articulates such discourses which are not limited to France or Italy only; rather, the text contains discourses that carry interest for the readers beyond the boundaries of Europe. As Casaubon crosses the boundaries of countries and continents, so does the text with its varied discourses. It crosses the boundaries of social practices, institution, disciplines, geographical locations, etc. Casaubon having love affair with a Brazilian woman, Amparo, leaves Italy to spend some time with her in Brazil.

In search of occult knowledge in Brazil, Casaubon meets an elderly man Aglie who presumes himself a mystical figure. Dialogue between Casaubon and Aglie reveals that Aglie has infinite knowledge about the occult practices especially related to Europe and Africa. It is a matter of attraction for Casaubon who, along with his friends, has been reading and searching about occult conspiracy theories to develop their own 'Plan'. Aglie talks about different occult practices without any logical connection as there is no logical base of mystical knowledge and practices. He tells Casaubon that syncretism is a very subtle process; however it has its political version as well. Comparing Europe and Africa, he says that in the last years of Roman Empire, “Europe was corrupted by Christianity as a state religion, but Africa preserved the treasures of knowledge” (p. 124). This is the context of the passage within the text of "Foucault's Pendulum". However, talk about the occult knowledge involving varied aspects of political and religious nature at such a large scale also has other contexts as well. It has connection with the authorial designs and author’s intellectual and academic background. Novel is a commodity to be sold to the
general public of specific interest. To make it an interesting one, discourse producer exploits linguistic and knowledge resources in such a way that brings something new, surprising, amazement and new disclosures. Through different discursive strategies (moving Casaubon from Italy to Brazil, his meeting with a mystical figure, Aglie, who has infinite sources of knowledge about occult conspiracy theories, his talk about the golden centauries of the Roman Empire, reference to the exceptional literary and political figures, etc.) Eco attempts to make his commodity alluring and inescapable.

Second procedure guides to establish inter-discursively. As Aglie was talking about African knowledge, Casaubon wants to know about those "treasures of knowledge" in detail which Aglie constructs inter-discursively. Eco has formed his text in a highly complex way that every time reader asks ‘what is it?’ This ontological aspect has also been highlighted by Usher (1997), (see Literature Review, p. 41). Perhaps, the treasure of knowledge to which Aglie refers is also very complex. The passage is organized in different linguistic strategies that encompass "Treasure of knowledge” spreading across great distances of time and space, for example splendor of second and third centuries after Christ, what was flourishing in the entire Mediterranean basin in the form of writings of Latin prose writer Apuleius (C.125-C.180) in several cults or mysteries (“Apuleius”, n.d.) - the mysteries of “Isis” being mother goddess of fertility and nature was the most prominent deity of the Mediterranean basis (“Abydos Triad”, n.d.); great return to spirituality of “Neoplatonism” focusing on the ‘spiritual and cosmological aspects of platonic thought, synthesizing Platonism with Egyptian and Jewish theology’ (“Neoplatonism”, n.d.), glorious time filled with nous (intelligence, intuition, understanding, mind, reason, thought), ecstasies, ”presences, emotions, demons and angelic hosts” (“Nous”, n.d.), etc. Eco tries to make this discourse exceptionally distinctive by framing and representing it as ancient as the world itself and it refers to those figures that were not preceded by the known history. This knowledge goes beyond the Greek philosopher and mathematician Pythagoras (570-500 B.C.), the Indian Brahmins who are known in Vedic religion ‘the initial manifestation of the material universe and all therein arose’ (“Brahman”, n.d.), the Hebrews who are ‘mostly taken as synonymous with the Semitic Israelites especially in the pre-monarchic period when they were still nomadic’, or groups on the eve of the collapse of Bronze age (“Hebrews”, n.d.); the naked sages of India who were questioned by Alexander the great when arrived in Punjab and Indus valley in 327-325 B.C. They replied in a mysterious way with stamping
their feet indicating that he would get this much piece of land after death, so his campaign was useless (Lendering, n.d.); the barbarians of the far north and the druids who were members of the priestly class and used to believe in astrology, magic and mysterious powers of plants. They lived in Britain, Ireland and Gaul (France) whose record is available only in the few descriptions left by Greek and Roman authors (“Druid”, n.d.; “Druidism”, 2009). After this construction of story about the expansive knowledge of occults and mysteries, Aglie tells about why the people of far north were called barbarians by the Greeks. Greeks’ lack of understanding of languages of other people was a great hurdle for them. So the problem lies with the Greeks not with the barbarians who were more knowledgeable than the Greeks.

The above discussion reveals that the passage is an academic discourse which draws upon a wide range of discourses like that of history, kingship, mythical sphere, spirituality, ancient human existence, social understandings, etc. This passage is a fine example of a hybrid text which is an essential feature of all texts (Fairclough, 1992, 2003).

Third procedure requires formulating precise research question from the discourse/proposition under investigation and exploring neighbouring fields for explanatory theory. In this regard, the second research question of this study will be explored through this discourse. It is “How are different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a form of discourse/knowledge”. For analysis and interpretation of this discourse, Fairclough’s view of interdiscursivity as an essential feature of a text proposed by Fairclough (1992, 2003) is being applied. Interpretation of the passage according to the given research question and explanatory theory is carried out in the following procedures.

In view of these aspects, language use of the text will be analyzed through the discursive strategies as suggested by fourth and fifth procedures. First strategy is ‘referential/nominalization’ that is how in-groups and out-groups are constructed by using biological, naturalizing or depersonalizing metaphors, metonymies and synecdoche. Here the issue is constructing "treasure of knowledge". Though the entire book is a treasure of knowledge but here it refers specifically to this aspect. Therefore, there are special linguistic devices used to justify that what sort of treasure of knowledge Africans have. "Treasure of knowledge" is represented through different knowledge positions.
taken in relation to the treasure of it. There is a use of metaphorical language and metonymies. Eco uses adjectives of quality, nominalization and verbs which work to enhance the attraction of the discourse/text. Treasure of knowledge is constructed with such references and nominalization: "Do you realize how great the second and third centuries after Christ were?", “what was burgeoning in the Mediterranean basin”, “there flourished the epoch of Apuleius, the mysteries of Isis and the great return to spirituality". “Spirituality” as form of knowledge is nominalized using nouns which have exceptional and distinctive academic, socio-cultural, historical and religious significance such as "Neoplatonism, gnosis", "A splendid epoch in which dwelled the nous, a time dazzled by ecstasies and peopled with presences, emanations, demons and angelic hosts".

Eco constructs knowledge not only in an unusual way but its sources are also constructed by referring to time not counting of centuries; rather, time and space are merged together. Time is referred to as a relationship and experiences by the devices of turning processes and relations involving people of specific time-frame, for example "reaching back beyond Pythagoras to the Brahmans of India, the Hebrews, the mages, the gymnosophists and even the barbarians of the north, the Druids of Gaul and the British Isles". Although these people are known in history for their own different characteristics, and the text does not incorporate their own voices and experiences of their existence on the earth; however, they are merged by Eco into one loop known as "Treasure of knowledge". Their differences are normalized into uniformity which seems to be a specific design of the text producer for the commercial purpose.

Second strategy is ‘predication’ that demands to investigate the characteristics and features attributed to the constructed groups. These characteristics are usually stereotypical or evaluative of positive or negative traits used to label the social positively or negatively. In-groups are all those, except the Roman Christian Empire. In-groups are labeled with evaluative attributes of positive trait like "Do you realize how great the second and third centuries", “but because of what was burgeoning in the Mediterranean basin”, “but in Mediterranean area, there flourished the epoch", “great return to spirituality”, "Blissful times before the Christians seized power", "A splendid epoch", "In fact the barbarians know much more than the Hellenes", etc. Those who are excluded from the treasure of knowledge are the Christians and the Greeks and are labeled negatively and deprecatorily, like "Not because of the Pomp of the empire", "In Rome,
the Praetorians were slaughtering their emperors”, “Blissful times, before the Christians seized power and began to put heretics to death”, etc. Through explicit and implicit predicates, Eco tries to establish his distinctive authorial identity. Though Eco does not come overtly to the forefront to assert his intellectual and authorial identity; rather, through the process of nominalization and inter-discursive language use he asserts his presence. As Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) argue while talking about discourse in late modernity:

This gives us an indication of how in general terms particular collectivities and particular individuals can assert their particularity and individuality and establish distinctive identities for themselves in the face of language practices which are increasingly homogenized and increasingly unavoidable.

Thus, it seems that Eco hides his identity under the use of language practices as sources of rearticulating creatively and producing a hybrid text for the interest of the readers.

Third discursive strategy is argumentation that requires investigating the discourse justification of positive or negative attributions. Argumentation schemes, known as topoi, are conclusion rules. In this discourse Aglie justifies the status of "treasures of knowledge", the knowledge which comes from the mystical practices of certain communities against any rational and realistic forms of knowledge. For this purpose, Eco applauds the knowledge emanating from mystical and occult practices and condemns other sources of knowledge. The justification is based on evaluative and comparative behaviour of the opposite sources of knowledge. Referring to the greatness of the 2nd and 3rd centuries after Christ, Aglie says "not because of the Pomp of the empire in its sunset but because of what was burgeoning in the Mediterranean basin". Justification based on comparison "Not because of" is replaced by "but because of”. Grammatically, use of noun "pomp" indicates stagnation and stasis but use of verb “burgeoning” in second part of the sentence reflects ongoing process of growth and expansion. Another comparison to justify treasure of knowledge between the Praetorians "Slaughtering their emperors" is “there flourished the epoch of Apuleius". Eco reversed the use of vocabulary to justify his arguments. "Epoch" is usually used with the empires. Eco represents Roman Empire as a slaughtering house which may not be actually and on the other hand, he associates "epoch" with an "author" of the same period which flourished like a life-giving and living phenomenon.
Eco, by applying 'topos of reality’, constructs his comparative representation as a reality and hopes to be accepted without challenge, thus, making for the reader to accept it compulsorily and creating a favourable space for his identity as a distinguished writer. In commonly understood historical evolution, Greeks are taken to be the early sources of knowledge and against them barbarians are not given too much credit as sources of knowledge and language. Here again Eco reverses the order of discourse and resets it in the favour of barbarians. Greeks are represented as having myopic view of language and knowledge. It was inability of Greeks to understand barbarians' language; otherwise barbarians would have made rich contribution to the "Treasures of knowledge"- "In fact, the barbarians knew much more than the Hellenes, at the time precisely because their language was impenetrable". Thus, Eco's justification is made to appear as a reality which otherwise may be a false shadow.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation’ that is with what perspective characteristics, traits and argumentations are expressed in a discourse. How a discourse attempts to construct a specific point of view, the ideological stance or the positioning of author’s/speaker's point of view? In this passage, the visible perspective of the author is to create a discourse which may attract larger readership due to its unusual use of language and unusual contents. Because the discursive strategies created here in the text like use of “epoch” and “barbarians knew much more than the Hellenes” are highly of unusual character. The ‘treasure of knowledge’ of the text does not hold any significance in the present day Europe that attributes its material progress with the treasure of knowledge which is of different kind as Breton (2007) argues:

Opinion (spiritual, mysterious knowledge, etc.) would be a degraded version of knowledge, which could achieve a higher level of accuracy through the use of scientific method. In this conception, one might believe that opinion, such an impure approach of reality, would be thrown out of the scope of knowledge and would not even deserve attention. (p. 120)

This is how the kind of knowledge advocated by Eco is considered in the circle of natural sciences. Somehow, this is Eco’s attempt to create interest for the readers. There are many references of France and surrounding areas in Eco’s text. In this regard, while discussing the possibility of mutual interaction between scientific and spiritual knowledge, Breton expresses:
The problem precisely lies there. The objectivist point of view has long been dominant – and it is probably still the case today – and so much emphasis on opinion, even locally, is negatively connotated and is faced with the depreciation carried by this notion . . . the inferior status of opinion, whatever its field of application is perhaps more strongly felt in countries like France and its severe Cartesian tradition of absolute distinction between science and opinion. (p. 122)

So this is the stance of scientific knowledge against which Eco is advocating his ‘treasure of knowledge’ that is based on his appropriation of different discourses and opinions.

The perspective of the author to create this unusual ‘treasure of knowledge’ through inter-discursivity is one which discriminates the material, scientific and quantitative knowledge as worthless and trivial. The ‘knowledge’, to which Eco refers, is able to make an effect of greatness for longer time: “Do you realize how great the second and third centuries after Christ were?” The significance of this knowledge was forgotten which is being revisited, “that great return to spirituality”, “A splendid epoch”. The exploitation of different discourses for unusual meaning-making also takes place in the placement of opposing forces like that of ancient and spiritual knowledge versus “overeducated knowledge”. The Greeks due to their prolific knowledge were blind to the significance of the “much more” knowledge of the barbarians.

The fifth strategy is also closer in effect to the fourth strategy, that whether the illocutionary force of the utterances of the text is intensified or mitigated. It also displays the perspective because the objective of this discursive strategy in a text is to modify the prevailing knowledge status of a proposition. It is evident from the text that the author attempts to reverse the order of knowledge status of some propositions through intermingling of various discourses. Here the author aligns himself with the mysterious, spiritual and enigmatic knowledge against rationalistic knowledge. Therefore, Eco intensifies the meaning-making of utterance that reflects mystery. This is done through the use of adjectives, binary oppositions and sometimes with argumentation, etc. He made use of adjectives as, “how great the second and third centuries after Christ were?”, “great return to spirituality”, “Blissful times”, “splendid epoch”, “time dazzled by ecstasies and peopled with presences”, etc. The author also makes use of binary oppositions to intensify the contextual meaning in favour of in-group and to mitigate illocutionary force of
utterances of out-group like “burgeoning/sunset”, “flourished/slaughtering”, “blissful/death”, “barbarians knew much more/ than the Hellene”, etc.

Keeping in view the third research question, the language issues and their effects upon meaning-making, the text is being used by Eco to illustrate treasure of knowledge through different rhetorical skills and then presenting his own book that contains treasure of knowledge. Two rhetorical questions are significant here: (i) “What treasure of knowledge? (ii) Do you realize how great the second and third centuries after Christ were?” These questions do not require reply from the reader; it is only a tactics to appeal the mental faculties of the reader. Eco’s own text is an abstract discourse, a source of knowledge that can be read and argued about. Thus, he persuades the reader through his persuasive skills to fulfill his personal interests. Then it is followed by negation and explanation through: “Not because of . . . but because of . . .” The text is constructed and represented as characterized by high urgency. It is an attempt to create a need and then offer to fulfill that need. This language use refers to another aspect of meaning-making in this discourse. While constructing in-groups and out-groups, it is how to adopt a position as discourse producer vis-à-vis the reader who has come in the middle of the text by evaluating and constructing the negative or positive attitudes of the people and existence of certain objects. By mixing up discourses of norms of personal knowledge and feeling of naturally occurring phenomenon and of the institutionalized practices and carefully positioning as writer, the discourse becomes a crucial factor in maintaining or spoiling the interest of the reader. In terms of orders of discourse as pointed out by Jorgensen and Phillips (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 27) Eco creates an interest for reader through a social terrain of treasure of knowledge where different discourses are hybridized.

Sixth and seventh procedures require to draw up contextual diagram for the specific text and to take an extensive interpretation while returning to the research question and to the problem under investigation. Context is already critically discussed in first procedure; however, , for further interpretation, what comes to surface, in view of overall meaning-making of the passage, is the reversal of the order of discourses (spiritual knowledge is given preference to the rationalistic knowledge) and second is profuse inter-discursivity as Fairclough (1992) calls configuration of text types and discourse conventions. Purpose of producing this inter-discursivity and “disjointed” text is, perhaps,
to gain readership. Inter-discursivity is realized through discourses of time and space ("second and third centuries after Christ", "as ancient as the world"), of empires (In Rome, the Praetorians were slaughtering their emperors), of knowledge and languages ("there flourished the epoch of Apuleius, the mysteries of Isis and that great return to spirituality", ‘nous, ecstasies, presences, emanations, demons and angelic hosts”, “overeducated Greeks”, “their languages sounded like barking”, “barbarians knew much more than the Hellenes”), of communities of different cultures (Brahmans of India, the Hebrews, the mages, the gymnosophists, barbarians of the north, the Druids of Gaul and the British Isles), of relationship of hatred and enmity created by Greeks between Greeks and barbarians of the north, etc.

Thus in view of the research question, it is clear after this investigation that the author attempts to create specific effects of his text through inter-discursivity that is realized through his choice of language use and negotiation between discourses emanating from different social backgrounds, institutions and geographical locations. Communicative function of this passage seems to be constructing author’s own identity and identification as a unique author and scholar par excellence. He attempts to create different textual structures by specific ways of meaning-making, hybridizing discourses of emperors, knowledge, spirituality, mystery, social communities, etc, having different contexts and locations as Jiangao Wu (2011) says that “inter-discursivity can be understood as the outcome of producer’s choice-making, dynamic negotiation and linguistic adaptation”.

**Inter-discursive construction of Religion.** This passage mainly concerns about the concept of ‘God’. For Eco, even ‘God’ does not have a solitary existence; rather, it is a constructed though different proponents.

(7)  “The Rosicrucians were everywhere aided by the fact that they didn’t exist”, says Casaubon.

“Like God”, (says Amparo).

“Now that you mention it, let’s see. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are a bunch of practical jokers who meet somewhere and decide to have a contest. They invent a character, agree on a few basic facts, and then each one’s free to take it and run with it. At the end, they’ll see who’s done the best job. The four stories are picked up by some
friends who act as critics: Matthew is fairly realistic, but insists on that Messiah business too much; Mark is not bad, just a little sloppy; Luke is elegant, no denying that; and John takes the philosophy a little too far. Actually, though, the books have an appeal, they circulate, and when the four realize what’s happening, it is too late. Paul has already met Jesus on the road to Damascus, Pliny begins his investigation ordered by the worried emperor, and a legion of apocryphal writers pretends also to know plenty . . . Toi, apocryphe lecteur, mon semblable, mon frère. It all goes to Peter’s head; he takes himself seriously. John threatens to tell the truth, Peter and Paul have him chained up on the island of Patmos. Soon the poor man is seeing things; help there are locusts all over my bed, make those trumpets stop, where’s all this blood coming from? The others say he’s drunk, or maybe it’s arteriosclerosis. . . . Who knows, maybe it really happened that way”, says Casaubon.

First procedure demands to establish context entailing socio-cultural, political, psychological, etc., aspects. This passage is an exemplary reflection of inter-discursivity. For Eco even God does not have a unified existence or it is a creation of certain texts coming from different sources marked by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John who were also not serious when they forwarded their propositions. The text comes in 1st person of Casaubon who narrates the entire text in flashback. Casaubon the narrator has a love affair with a Brazilian woman, Amparo. To see her beloved, Casaubon leaves Italy for Brazil and stays there for few years. During his stay there in Brazil, he comes to know about South American and Caribbean spiritualism. During his search for spiritualism and mystery knowledge he also meets an elderly person named Aglie who considers himself very knowledgeable in the field of occult theories and secret knowledge of the universe. Casaubon and Amparo occasionally discuss the activities of occultists. Though Amparo was not much convinced of the conundrum around these occult stories but Casaubon often talks about them. He talks about the Rosicrucian that was a fraternity organized by the Templars who fled from France when their Order was disbanded by the King of France in 11th century. There are a lot of mystical subtractions and additions when Casaubon says that the members of Rosicrucian do not appear in the society to claim that they are Rosicrucians but those who appear to claim, they are not Rosicrucians. Amparo interrupts and says that their existence is just “like God.” Here Casaubon diverts his discourse from Rosicrucian to God and constructs identity of God not as a single existing authority; rather, it is made through the discourses of different so called religious persons.
The socio-political context of the passage is that Eco, being already known novelist/scholar produces this text for the general masses. His previous novel ‘The Name of the Rose’ was the best seller (50 million copies were sold) in European countries and America, so he attempts to produce another similar text. His approach in this text is very wide and expansive in which everything is found mobile, fragmented and internalized into each other and leading nowhere. The political aspect of the passage that no God exists actually is made through the discourses of certain individuals. It reflects Eco’s own philosophy. Eco was initially a Catholic Christian however, according to his own claim; he stopped believing in God after his Doctoral studies. “You could say he miraculously cured me of my faith (Dedalus, 2008). Johnson (2012) writes about Eco, “Eco found his pseudo-religion in the pseudo science of semiotics which he has taught for many years. His novels are case studies in post modernism, which elide all categories of truth, beauty, morality and politics into an esoteric game”. The perspective of non-belief is also confirmed by his own words that he does not believe even in his own writings, that his library consists entirely of “books whose contents I don’t believe” (cited in Johnson, 2012). Perhaps, reason is to maintain the popularity gained by publishing of ‘The Name of the Rose’ that he believes in nothing and everything is constructed as it suits to his authorial designs to attract readers. The psychological context may be to impress the readers by inverting the order of prevailing discourses on religion.

According to the second procedure that is to establish its inter-discursivity, this passage is rich in inter-discursivity. First one is that the two individuals, Casaubon and Amparo, belong to two different cultural and geographical backgrounds i.e., Casaubon from Italy and Amparo from Brazil. Thus, it becomes an inter-cultural dialogue, the cultures which carry their respective socio-political and religious ideologies, as CDA assumptions indicate that discourses involve social interaction, ideologies, time and space, etc. Second aspect of inter-discursivity is inclusion of four religious persons who actively participated in coining their respective concepts of God. The constitution of the passage does not rest upon one line of thought; rather, it is constituted dialectically involving four different persons and their critics and so on. CDA assumption (4) (see Assumptions of CDA, p. 77) indicates that an author’s positionality operates from specific discursive practices which involve exclusions and inclusions. Thus, to construct this text Eco includes four other authors to talk dialectically the concept of God.
Third procedure guides to formulate precise research questions from the proposition under investigation and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories. For research question, second research question of this study will be explored. This question is: “How are different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a new form of discourse/knowledge?” It can be asked what forced Eco to take a turn from Rosicrucians to God. Does he equate Rosicrucians to the status of God or he introduces just another discourse to create interest for his multidimensional text. It is a highly skillful task to take a twist and introduce another discourse that opens way to more discourses and ultimately reader finds in the web of discourses of social relations. For interpretation of this aspect I draw upon Fairclough’s (1989) theory of ‘Member’s Resources’ that a discourse producer has in his mind that includes “knowledge of language representations of the natural and social worlds they inhabit; values, beliefs, assumption, and so on (p. 24), (also see Connection Between Linguistic and Social Aspects from the Perspectives of CS and CFDS, pp. 67-68). The important aspect of this member’s resources is that they are socially determined thus, bringing our interpretation and analysis of language use to language as a social practice wherein multiple social relations and social conditions affect the production of a discourse (see Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CS, pp. 56-58). Those social relations and social conditions which affect the members’ resources, according to Fairclough (1989) are situational, institutional and societal, thus broadening the base from immediate social conditions to large social structures. Further discussion on this aspect is in sixth and seventh procedures. Interpretation of the passage according to the given research question and explanatory theory is carried out in the following procedures.

Keeping in view these aspects the passage will be analyzed operationalizing linguistically (fourth procedure) through the discursive strategies as suggested by fifth procedure. Keeping in view the research question, conventions, practices and cultures of different discourses are explored in terms of language use. Baseline is that Eco does not agree with the concept that there is a God rather he makes fun of those who propagated it in Christianity. Here focus is on how the denial of God is constructed inter-discursively. Operationalising the given research question into linguistic categories I draw upon Wodak’s five discursive strategies which are used by discourse authors for particular social, political, psychological and linguistic aims (Wodak, 2001, p. 73).
First strategy is ‘referential/nominalization’ that is how in-groups and out-groups are constructed by using biological, naturalizing or depersonalizing metaphors, metonymies and synecdoche. In this passage author’s whole stress is on negative construction of God. It is visible from the language use that both God and those who have written about God are named and referred to linguistically very negatively and in pronouns that reflects no value of God and the writers on God. God is named as “it”, “character”, “Messiah business”. It is quite clear that God is constructed / represented here as having no identity. It can be called anything but not a respectable identity. By using depersonalizing pronouns/metaphors like “character” and “messiah business”, Eco is of the view that God does not exist; rather, only through the discourses of those people who were not serious in life.

Second strategy is ‘predication’ that what characteristics, qualities and features of positive or negative traits are attributed to the constructed groups to label them positively or negatively. God and those who write about or on God have been labeled more negatively and depreciatively. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John who wrote about God have been attributed as “bunch of practical Jokers”. Implicitly they are attributed as conspirators: “who meet somewhere and decide to a contest”. Then use of noun “somewhere” reflects no specific place; rather, indicates something suspicious, conspiratorial, bad intention and misleading as they decide intentionally to have a “contest”. Their lack of seriousness is further solidified by using such verbs that reflect that it is just a game, a fun. Eco says, “They invent a character, agree on a few basic facts . . . free to take it and run with it”. All four verbs reflect free will, bound to nothing except “few basic facts”. Their negative character is further constructed implicitly that they were aided by their friends who acted as critics and above all their foolishness created by Eco is returned at the end towards Matthew, Mark, Luke and John by saying that when they “realize what is happening, it’s too late”. It means that their negative character is an established fact and it is also an established fact that what they have written is baseless and leading to nowhere.

Third strategy is ‘argumentation’. It requires investigating what argumentation schemes or topoi are used by specific persons or social groups to justly discriminatory or preferential treatment and positive and negative attributions. Here it is to explore how author justifies that God is represented in negative terms. According to Wodak (2001),
this type of arguments can be covered under topos of definition (p. 75), meaning of name is reflected in the actions/attributes. For example, if an action is named and designed as misleading, ambiguous and confusing, the same traits and attributes are contained in the person who performs the action. Eco is represented through Casaubon who has a dialogue with his girlfriend Amparo. She is represented as a mere figurehead who is meant to listen to Casaubon. Casaubon, considering him all-knowing tries to justify his arguments that there is no God and those people who talk about God are not serious. Right in the beginning he forcefully terms four religious persons as mere “bunch of practical jokers”. Then he comes up with grammatically loaded argument like “Actually, though, the books have an appeal, they circulate, and when the four realize what’s happening, it’s too late”. Both adverbs “Actually” and “though” express opinion/argument. In his argumentation, Eco uses both the adverbs most effectively when they contrast with what is apparent. Though in formal writing it is a poor style to make use of such kind of grammatical devices, however, in informal arguments it is used. Both “actually” and “though” are adverbs of quality and they are contrasted with the adverb of time “when” and a factual situation depicted by a noun “too late”. Eco continues to strengthen his arguments forcefully by giving the effects of mentioning “too late”.

By the time they realize their folly, a lot many useless things have happened. First is Paul’s (the apostle) conversion from Judaism to Christianity who met some vision on road to Damascus and took it as vision of Christ. The second incident is of Pliny, an imperial magistrate, who on the orders of Roman ruler Trajan (78-117), carried out inquiry of Christians and sentenced a lot of people to death. Actually King was afraid of any political and fanatical cult in his Kingdom which resulted in inquiry and endangered people’s life (“Pliny on Vesuvius”, 2009). Third is that it also led to misunderstanding between Peter and John. Peter with the help of Paul chained up John on the Island of Patmos which resulted in his mental illness, etc. In view of topos of definition, Eco argues that there is no sanity in holding the concept of God.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation or discourse representation’ in which author’s/ speaker’s personal involvement is explored in which the author may use devices of reporting, description, narration or quotation of events and utterances. Here in this passage author’s personal involvement is there as the author uses Casaubon to describe the events related to God and God’s Kingdom. Casaubon gives twists and turns in his
own way and tells all messy details to a lady who is least interested in his unconvincing arguments. Amparo rejects all his arguments: “You should read some Feuerbach instead of those junk books of yours”. Negative representation of God is there in each utterance and Eco’s personal involvement is there like: “At the end, they’ll see who’s done the best job”. It is also depicted in the following cynical use of adjectives/adverbs like: “Matthew is fairly realistic; Mark is not bad, just a little sloppy; Luke is elegant” etc. It is clear that all attributions, labels and arguments are expressed with a perspective to construct a negative concept of God.

Fifth discursive strategy, according to Wodak (2001), is ‘intensification/mitigation’. Ilocutionary force of utterances is intensified or mitigated with the objective to modify the epistemic/knowledge status of a proposition. In this passage it is evident that the author constructs concept of God negatively through different adverbs, adjectives and nouns. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John all four are respected figures due to their gospels, however, Eco attempts to change this status by saying that they are “a bunch of practical jokers”. Negative intensification about the religious figures is visible in these utterances: “Matthew is fairly realistic, but insists on that Messiah business too much; Mark is not bad, just a little sloppy; Luke is elegant, no denying that; and John takes the philosophy a little too far”. Moreover, in the middle of the passage with little appreciation, Eco makes use of mitigating devices to change the status of religious stance: “Actually, though the books have an appeal, they circulate, and when the four realize what’s happening, it is too late”. By using “too late” Eco creates an alarming situation that these four religious persons were busy in an insignificant activity and by the time they realized their mistake it already had had its effects in which things have gone out of control.

In the light of language issues and their effect upon meaning-making of the text (third research question), it is highlighted that Eco’s concept of religion and God is quite vague and conflicting. For Eco, perhaps it is only Rosicrucians who have a kind of heavenly existence. They “were everywhere, aided by the fact that they didn’t exist”. Like God they are present everywhere but they cannot be observed by the naked eye. For Eco only Rosicrucians did service to God and others like Matthew, Mark, Luke and John instead of doing any service to religion, caused loss to a great extent. In this language use, by bringing Rosicrucians against Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, Eco is creating a kind
of vagueness of and about religion and concept of God. Eco uses this vagueness as a strategy to allow different readers to different meanings. But there is a dialogical process involved in it. The discourse and social process interact here. Eco uses his discourse to dislodge the effect of religion propagated by the four religious figures. It becomes a contestation of discourses. Eco attempts to weaken the four discourses of religion by declaring in affirmative tone: “Matthew, Mark, Luke and John are a bunch of practical jokers”. Eco expresses their weakness through their own discourses by twisting their claim of religion as mere fun. About their attitude towards God, Eco says, “They invent a character, agree on a few basic facts, and then each one’s is free to take it and run with it”. They are further exposed in the light of their realization of their folly, “Actually, though the books have an appeal they circulate, and when the four realize what’s happening, it’s too late”. Thus, by appreciating discourses of past history, Eco is constructing his own discourse to colonize the mind of the reader. Here order of discourse, as Fairclough argues (see Theorisng Inter-discursivity, p. 35), is formed of different elements of social practices, activities, social relations and their institutional norms, persons with their beliefs, values, emotions, etc. This is a discourse strategy of Eco to attract readership for his text.

Sixth procedure requires the context diagram of specific text which is already discussed in the first procedure. Seventh procedure requires taking the interpretation further extensively. Focus will be upon two aspects. First is the dialogue between Casaubon and Amparo. Viewing it through device of turn-taking and who takes more time to talk, it is clear that Casaubon is used here as an instrument to represent the author. Amparo is also used as an instrument, represented as a docile figure that does little challenge to the views of Casaubon. Casaubon is as free to express and affirm his view point as he refers to four gospel writers “each one’s free to take it and run with it”. And there is possibility that Eco is also free so far in advocating his ideology of atheism. As discussed in literature review and CDA assumptions that the discourses also attempt to convey the ideology of the discourse producer, so, here the ideology of “No God” is being dictated by Eco, which one may accept or reject.

Second aspect I focus upon is inter-discursivity through the second research question of this study that how are different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a form of discourse /knowledge. To
explore this kind of question, Fairclough (2013) suggests that one can see ways of interacting, ways of representing and ways of language use. In this passage first thing is that both Casaubon and Amparo belong to two different conventions and practices discussed earlier. Then Eco brings different conventions and practices related to different gospels through the introduction of Mathew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, etc. Though the gospels of first three Matthew, Mark and Luke are called Synoptic gospels (“Gospel”, n.d.) due to their certain common characteristics and teachings like “Jesus’ humble birth in Bethlehem, the sermon on the Mount, the Beatitudes, the last supper and the Great Commission”. The other gospels of John, Peter and Paul represent a “different picture of Jesus and his ministry from the Synoptics”. So, it is clear that these different gospels are exploited linguistically by the author to constitute his discourse. These are the constitutive elements of the ‘no God discourse’ of Eco.

**Inter-discursive Construction of Agarttha.** This passage is about the legendry city Agarttha that exists in under world. The city is constructed in its attributes that make this passage a rich source of inter-discursivity:

(8)  
_In his Mission de l’Inde en Europe, a work that, incidentally, has influenced a great deal of contemporary political thought. In Agarttha there are underground cities, and below them, closer to the center, live the five thousand sages that govern it. The number five thousand suggests, of course, the hermetic roots of the Vedic language, as you gentlemen know. And each root is a magic hierogram connected to a celestial power and sanctioned by an infernal power. The central dome of Agarttha is lighted from above by something like mirrors, which allow the light from the planet’s surface to arrive only through the enharmonic spectrum of colors, as opposed to the solar spectrum of our physics books, which is merely diatonic. The wise ones of Agarttha study all languages in order to arrive at the universal language, which is Vattan. When they come upon mysteries too profound, they levitate, and would crack their skulls against the vault of the dome if their brothers did not restrain them. They forge the lightning bolts, they guide the cyclic currents of the interpolar and intertropical fluids, the interferential extensions in the different zones of the earth’s latitude and longitude. They select species and have created small animals with extraordinary psychic powers, animals which have a tortoise shell with a yellow cross, a single eye and a mouth at either end. And polypod animals which can move in all directions. Agarttha is probably where the Templars found refuge_
after their dispersion, and where they perform custodial duties. Anything else? (pp. 310-311)

First procedure demands to establish context of a discourse exploring socio-political, psychological, etc., aspects. Eco takes a start of this text with the mention of pendulum and then turns to different discourses ranging from Templars’ activities to the knowledge and to the mysterious knowledge of the underworld. As this passage is about a legendary city of Agarttha “that is said to reside in the earth’s core. It is related to the belief in hollow earth and is a popular subject in esotericism” (Agarttha, n.d.). Though this passage is a discourse that does not relate to the “processes, relations and structures of the material world” (Fairclough; 2013), however, it relates to the mental world of “thoughts, feelings and beliefs” (Fairclough, 2013).

Casaubon is discussing about his experiences of mysterious knowledge in Munich, Germany with Belbo and Deotallevi while the knowledgeable man, Mr. Aglie appears there as master in mysterious knowledges of the world. Mr. Aglie informs the trio that there is a person known as Saint-Yves d’ Alveydre who has written a lot about mysterious underground world known as Agarttha. Eco’s text never runs smooth. In a roundabout way he constructs the ‘reality’ and stress is ever upon the mystery. According to Aglie, it was not Saint-Yves who narrated the story in his book “Mission de l’Inde en Europe”, actually there was another person Hadji Schariph, either Afghan or Albanian, who told this story to Saint-Yves. He called the “place Agarttha, the place that cannot be found”. Eco constructs ‘reality’ in this complex way, perhaps to create a psychological impact upon the reader, as Bakhtin (see Which Inter-discursivity, p. 34) highlights that dialogically agitated and tension filled environment in which it becomes difficult to separate out the factors shaping texts. Here lies the inter-discursivity that works in multiple relations representing gender, power and identity issues. This passage does not discuss identity issue of anyone except that of the author who presents himself as a distinguished person able to create a marvelous reality - a legendary city of Agarttha.

Second procedure guides to establish inter-discursivity. Inter-discursively this is a very rich discourse. On the one hand, it leads from one mystery discourse to another mysterious underground world and on the other hand, to the world of human beings. There is mention of an actual work of Saint – Yves that according to Aglie has influenced the political thought of the age. There is mention of the underground cities and five
thousand sages living there to govern those cities, thus, establishing relationship between the political world of human beings and the world of Agarttha. Dialogically, this relationship is extended, in an unusual way from figure of five thousand to hermetic roots of the Vedic language, from hermetic roots to celestial power and infernal power. Another relationship that exists between Agarttha and the human world is that Agarttha is lit by the sunlight coming in through the “enharmonic spectrum of colours opposite to the solar spectrum of this world”. Another prominent relationship that comes to surface is between Agarttha and the Templars who took refuge there after their dispersion. Though this relationship carries no logical support, however it reflects the position of the discourse producer who attempts to create a relationship of varied discourses that may appeal his reader.

Third procedure demands to formulate precise research question and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories. First research question of this study will be explored through this passage. This question is “what is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses within the novel texts under study?” My focus in this research question is upon implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, that how Eco, as discourse producer, attempts to establish his identity of a unique discourse producer and promoting his ideology of Templar power. To investigate this question, the neighbouring theory of Fairclough, as referred next, will be banked upon. Fairclough says that “different discourses are different perspectives on the world and they are associated with the different relations people have to the world, which in turn depends on their positions in the world, their social and personal identities and social relationships in which they stand to other people” (see Connection Between Linguistic and Social Aspects from the Perspectives of CS & CFDS, p. 68). Fairclough’s view of discourse and its relationship with the discourse producer and his social positions and identity forms part of Cultural Studies’ perspective. It means that despite the fact that the discourse is an imaginative fictional attempt of Eco, however it reflects Eco’s social position, identity and the perspective he bears to this world. Interpretation of the passage according to the given research question and explanatory theory is carried out in the following procedures.
Following the fourth and fifth procedures, the discourse is to be analysed in view of implicit and explicit language struggle in the light of five discursive strategies suggested by Wodak. First strategy is ‘referential/nomination’ with the objective to construct in-groups and out-groups using different discursive devices like biological, depersonalizing and naturalizing metaphors, metonymies and synecdoche. The analysis and interpretation of the previous passage have revealed that Eco implicitly and explicitly has favour for the Knights of the Temple as an in-group. Here in this passage again according to referential strategy Eco refers implicitly to the Templars as “sages”. But to distinguish those sages the author puts an obscurity upon them by saying that figure “five thousand” suggests the “hermetic roots” of Vedic language. As the initial origins of the Vedic language is obscure, protected and secured from the outside interference or influence, similarly the wisdom of those five thousand sages is not to be understood by the outsiders. Thus, by this reference, the author makes the Templars unique, wise and distinguished figures of the universe. The aspect of their sagacity is further enhanced by assigning “each root”, the status of sacred religious symbol that has connection with “celestial power”. In this way the author attempts to inspire a strong feeling of admiration and fear by making the Templars impressive and overwhelming. By associating Knights Templar with the religious significance of Vedic language, the author indirectly accords an enthusiastic approval of the status of excellence. They are represented as figures par excellence. Moreover, Templars are nominated as “wise ones” and referred to as avaricious readers of all holy languages to develop their own language known as “Vattan”. This language is as enigmatic to the outsiders as the hermetic roots of the Vedic language. They are also referred to as unique celestial figures that control the earth in its latitude and longitude. They are also referred to as creatures or animals with extraordinary psychic powers.

Next strategy used by the discourse producer is ‘prediction’. According to this strategy an author labels social actors more or less positively or negatively, appreciatively or depreciatively through the devices of stereotypical or evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits. There are implicit and explicit predicates. Evaluative statements also reflect level of desirability and undesirability. In this passage, level of desirability predominates implicitly. Implicitly the author attempts to establish superiority of the Templars in matters of knowledge, wisdom, statesmanship and dedication to their mission and order. First is the positive attribute of the book that contains information
about the place where the Templars took refuge: “a work that incidentally has influenced a great deal of contemporary political thought”. They are termed as “sages” who are beyond understanding of the people of this world. The living place is lit by light that reach underground “through the enharmonic spectrum of colours”. Their positive attributions are not shown through static noun or adjectives rather through verbs that reflect the process of the desirable activity. It extends moves and enhances the desirability. Perhaps, these attributions are discourse relative. Only Eco has given this importance to the Templars in this discourse. Eco adopts way of representing more through process verbs and by establishing relationship to processes which are specific to Templars only, like “the wise ones of Agarttha study all holy languages in order to arrive at the universal language”, “when they come upon mysteries too profound, they levitate”, “they forge the lightning bolts”, “they guide the cyclic currents of the interpolar and intertropical fluids”, “they select species and have created small animals”, etc. At the end of the passage, Eco comes explicitly with declarative mode that “Agarttha is probably where the Templars found refuge after their dispersion”. It is clear that the assumptions in terms of the positive attributes of the Templars are not popular social practices; rather, these are “discourse specific and discourse relative” (Faircloug, 2013). There are assumed values that create a semantic relationship which make the Templars positive figures; thus, Eco constructs them in appreciative ways.

Next strategy is ‘argumentation’ that a discourse producer adopts usually to justify positive or negative attributes or used to justify or legitimise exclusion or suppression of others. The author uses arguments that take a dialogical form in an intimate way. Eco is constructing the underground-world life of Templars with an argument that takes form of an intimate dialogue as topos of reality. By adding adverbs the author attempts to strengthen his arguments by introducing new information such as “a work that, incidentally, has influenced a great deal of contemporary political thought” “the number five thousand suggests, of course, the hermetic roots of the Vedic language, as you gentlemen know”, etc. By using these adverbial devices in an intimate way the author attempts to convince the reader indirectly about the veracity of the events he is telling about. This argument is carried out in dialogical term. Though it is not a traditional dialogue but when Aglie uses “as you know gentlemen” it reflects co-presence of voices of the individuals who support each other. According to Giddens, (1993) discursive production of interaction has three basic elements (i) its constitution is its
meaningfulness, (ii) its moral order and (iii) operation of relations of power (p. 104). Orientation to difference is also part of all three elements. The meaningfulness of the interaction is brought about by active negotiation of difference of meanings. In this passage, it is clear that Aglie, being a useful device of the author, attempts to negotiate those differences of meaning by using such argumentative expressions like “of course” and “as you know gentlemen”. Aglie is not thrusting his arguments upon the audience; rather, is gradually creating a feeling of their silent support for his arguments. The moral order or truthfulness of the event, he is describing, is also not being challenged by anyone. Thus, Aglie is constructing a situation by using his knowledge/negotiations. It is an element of power which Giddens (1984) calls the transformative capacity of human action to intervene in a series of events to alter their course depends upon their resources and facilities. Here in this passage, Aglie proves his capacity of unlimited knowledge of the underworld and has facility to orchestrate the information into a coherent whole. Those who listen to him also know something about the various mysteries; however, they seem to be not resilient to what Aglie says. Aglie is attempting to bracket those differences of power with forces upon commonality of opinion, meaning and norms. And that commonality is to accord preferential treatment to the Templars and justify their positive attributes.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation or discourse representation’. This strategy helps discourse producer to position his personal point of view. Different devices are used for the purpose like reporting, description, narration or quotation of events or utterances. Identification and analysis of this strategy is very useful for the understanding of hidden orientation of the discourse. The author’s point of view in this passage is to create information for the reader that is not available in day to day interaction or ordinary books. Through creating such kind of unusual information of a life that is totally different from the life of human beings in this earth, the author attempts to attract reader to purchase the book benefitting the author economically and secondly presenting himself as a distinct person. Thus, the discourse becomes a process of author’s identification. In this regard Fairclough (2003) identifies three types of meanings of text, like Halliday’s ideational, interpersonal and textual functions related to physical, social and mental worlds. They are representation, action and identification. Fairclough (2003) corresponds to his representation with Halliday’s ideational function. His action and identification with Halliday’s interpersonal function is a way of interacting in social events. In the
perspective of Cultural Studies, it is evident that despite talking about mysterious underworld life, it also represents attitudes, desires and values of the discourse producer connecting it with the contexts.

It is visible in the passage that representation and identification go simultaneously. For example, use of “of course”, “as you gentlemen know” and “anything else” all represent a relation between two entities: the one who knows better than the one who knows nothing or knows less. Identification issue is included in the representation. It implies a social relation - relationship between the one who knows and gives unique information about a unique aspect of life and the one (reader) who receives it without much effort. Declarative mode of grammar the author uses to infer is a way of acting, representing and identification. It is identification because the straightforward declarative mode is also a judgment like: “the central dome of Agarththa is lighted from above”, “The wise ones of Agarththa study all languages”, “They forge the lightning bolts, they guide the cyclic currents . . .”, “They select species and have created small animals”. There is a small doubt expressed by using “probably”; however, this doubt is removed immediately when Aglie talks in definite terms “where they perform custodial duties”.

Thus, inter-discursive forging of representation and identification reflects the cultural and social perspective of the text and the specific objective of the text producer whose bread and butter are associated with the production of appealing texts for the readers.

Fifth discursive strategy used by a discourse producer is ‘intensification or mitigation’. This is done to create specific impact about an event; situation or proposition. Contextual meaning of an utterance is greatly affected by this strategy. It is clear from the beginning that the author favours the Templars and constructs everything positively that is associated with them. Here to maintain the intensity of his arguments and the dignified stature of the Templars, the author makes use of racy style to maintain energy and spirit of the group of people i.e., Templars. Grammatically he attempts to maintain the impact of the structure of Templars he has built through his text. He shows little doubt about what he has already talked about them. He is so convinced and confident about what he has said about the Templars that the author is audacious to mix up the mundane with the mystery. There is no hesitation on the part of the author to say that there are underground cities which are managed more skillfully and correctly than what we see here on earth. So
much so that information he provides “has influenced a great deal of contemporary political thought”. Moreover, use of declarative style with present tense reflects the authenticity of the proposition he is offering. There is no use of modals that may mitigate the illocutionary force of the utterances. For example “there are underground cities and below them . . . live the five thousand sages that govern it”, “The number five thousand suggests, of course, the hermetic roots”, “each root is a magic hierogram, connected to a celestial power and sanctioned by an infernal power”, etc. Same case is with the subsequent utterances that are textured in a grammatical mode that reflects the factual position of the situation.

In the light of third research question, language issues and their effects upon meaning-making, this passage attempts to harmonise the discourses of human world with the discourses of some imaginary world Agarthha. It is an attempt to create an emotional need by introducing something new: “as you gentlemen know”. Though identities created in this passage are kept separate initially with one connection: “a work that incidentally has influenced a great deal of contemporary political thought”, but at the end it attempts to harmonise the polyphony of this world and the magical world of sages – Agarthha – with an adverb of possibility “probably”. It reflects how language use starting from connecting ‘pendulum’ with human life it has travelled through discourses of vague identities and communities to establishing the intriguing inter-cultural relationship between the Templars of holy lands and the sages of Agarthha, “hermetic roots of Vedic language” and “mysteries too profound”. It attempts to affect a note of harmony when the discourse moves from doubtful possibility “probably” to declaration about Templars “when they perform custodial duties”. Another effect of this language use upon meaning-making is that it goes beyond harmony; it establishes the superiority of the Templars who govern an imaginary world superior in commanding the world. That is why it “has influenced a great deal of contemporary political thought”. Here the issue of appearance and reality as pointed out by Fairclough (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 28) is mediated through inter-discursive construction of Agarthha. The reality of this ‘real world’ is recontextualised in the constructed reality of Agarthha which appears unreal.

According to sixth and seventh procedures, context of the text is already explored in first procedure and further interpretation is carried out. In the light of research question, focus is on inter-discursivity that how information is constructed inter-discursively
connecting it to socio-cultural aspects of life. According to this question focus is on how different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a form a discourse/knowledge. The form of discourse/knowledge created in this passage is information about the life activities of the Templars. Right from the beginning, this has been the process of this novel text. From the gradual progress of the text it is visible that Eco has soft corner for them and whatever information he constructs, he intends to represent them as standing on the highest moral pedestal.

In this passage, Eco represents Templars as custodians of a world that was a valuable place. It is to be seen here in terms of Cultural Studies’ perspective related to constructivism (see Social Constructivism and Perspectives of CS & CFDS, p. 62) that what methods are deployed for representation and what type of relationships are created under what circumstances. Focus of research question and constructionism is almost similar. Eco represents the world of Templars by adopting a method of intertextual and inter-discursive relationship. Eco associates Templars’ world with the world ruled by mystery that is created by Saint-Yves. Rather, by intermixing that Aghartha is the place where Templars found refuge, Eco rearticulates and constitutes a new discourse of his own choice and interest. Though the world Saint-Yves represented in his book “Mission de l’Inde en Europe” is an underground imaginary world inhabited by creatures that have their own culture of extreme excellence and ultimate quality. They are shown having biological abilities to control the earth in its latitude and longitude whereas human beings on this earth can control through their mechanical devices. They are able to select and create animals having extra ordinary psychic powers, while human beings can create robots with fixed movements. But here Eco represents a world that was looked after by the Templars when they joined it after their dispersion when their order was abolished by the King of France.

The element of inter-discursivity does not stop here. The whole passage is constituted in a complex way as in the start of the passage, the issue of five thousand sages that govern Agarttha and the association of number five thousand with the hermetic roots of Vedic language indicates. The logical connection may not be very clear. Following information and possibilities are there. Agarttha (“Alexander Saint Yves”, n.d.), according to Saint-Yves, is a secret world full of wisdom and wealth and will be accessible to all mankind when Christianity lives up to the commandments of Moses and
Jesus meaning that when anarchy is replaced by synergy in this world. Agarthha is situated in Himlayas in Tibt. This knowledge is based on Saint-Yves’ personal intuition and instinctive knowledge. The association of number five thousand with the roots is not clear. According to Witzel, (1989), (“Vedic Sanskrit”, n.d.) five distinct strata can be found within the Vedic language: (i) Rigvedic that contains many Indo-Iranian elements coupled around 12th century BC, (ii) Mantra language that contains mainly impacts of Rigveda and additional 75 mantras. This period corresponds with early Iron age in the north-western India dating from 12th century BC, (iii) Samhita Prose (roughly 1111 BC – 800 BC) period marks beginning of collection and codification of a Vedic Canon, iv) Brahmana Prose (roughly 900 BC to 600 BC) is known for the Brahmans proper of the four Vedas and v) Sutra Language being last stratum of Vedic Sanskrit leads up to 500 BC. After 500 BC, different cultural, political and linguistic factors contributed to the end of the Vedic language. Four Vedas, referred above are Rig Veda (Divine Speech), Yajur Veda (Divine Practice, Sama Veda (Divine Mind) and the Atharva Veda (Mantras for personal matters). All four Vedas reflect deeper cosmic wisdom inherently woven in all aspects of life. Shashtri (2011) argues in his “The four Vedas – Hindu History” that the Vedas are the great mantric scriptures set forth by Himalayan rishis, Yogis and who lived many thousands of years ago at the reputed beginning of this World age or Yuga, at the dawn of human history. They are said to manifest the wisdom of the cosmic mind that is the origin and support of the universe and the foundation of natural law. The four Vedas are passed down through long oral or written traditions dating from before the time of Krishna, four or five thousand years ago”.

Perhaps, this is the source for the different discourses Eco draws upon to articulate his own discourse – perhaps Eco has chosen the words “sages”, “hermetic roots of Vedic language” from the study of his Vedas and Vedic language. Association of number five thousand with five periods of Vedic language also leads to this source. Thus, the circumstance in which the discourse is produced is that Eco wants to sell his book that demands something appealing contained in it. The method Eco adopts to create his appealing discourse in association of life pattern of Templars with the life pattern of sages who lived in an enigmatic world of Agarthha. The relationship of discourse represented is a relationship of association. However it is clear from the study that the knowledge about five Vedic languages is not very authenticated; rather, ambiguous. Same case is with the five thousand sages who govern the city of Agarthha. As both the five thousand sages and
Vedic language are respected and given dignified status even without their clear background, perhaps Eco wants to impress upon the reader to accept the respectability of the Templars despite ambiguity about their initial start and activities. They need to be respected and taken as dignified persons. Thus, the inclusion of sages of Agarttha and Vedic language reveals that it is the author’s own choice reflecting author’s own position. Moreover, the discourse situated in early history is given a new meaning as mentioned in the CDA assumption 8 (see Assumption of CDA, p. 77) that discourse is historical in the socio-political and ideological context, time and space.

In view of inter-discursivity, the discourse of imaginary world is brought into the discourse of human beings. It is important to note here the relationship which the author establishes between the mysterious world of Agarttha and the Templars. As Agarttha is not understood, similarly Templars are also enigmatic. It is also important here that the Templars are, by association with the mystery world, represented as unique, superior and missionaries par excellence.

**Inter-discursive construction of the Worlds of ‘Fact’ and Magic/Mysticism.** This is an interesting aspect of this text that it is constructed not only inter-discursively; rather, it presents that the scientific world of facts is adequately preceded by magic/assumptive knowleges, hence nothing is pure in this world; all is inter-discursive.

(9) *It was becoming harder for me to keep apart the world of magic and what today we call the world of facts. Men I had studied in school as bearers of mathematical and physical enlightenment now turned up amid the murk of superstition, for I discovered they had worked with one foot in cabala and the other in the laboratory. Or was I rereading all history through the eyes of our Diabolicals? But then I would find texts of all suspicion that told how in the time of positivism physicists barely out of the university dabbled in séances and astrological cenacles, and how Newton had arrived at the law of gravity because he believed in the existence of occult forces, which recalled his investigations into Rosicrucian cosmology.*

*I had always thought that doubting was a scientific duty, but now I came to distrust the very masters who had taught me to doubt.*

*I said to myself: I’m like Amparo; I don’t believe in it, yet I surrender to it. I caught myself marveling over the fact that the height of the Great Pyramid really was*
one-billionth of the distance between the earth and the sun, and that you really could
draw striking parallels between Celtic and Amerind mythologies. And I began to question
everything around me: the houses, the shop signs, the clouds in the sky, and the
engravings in the library, asking them to tell me not their superficial story but another,
deeper story, which they surely were hiding – but finally would reveal thanks to the
principle of mystic resemblances. (p. 360-361)

Going by the analytical model of Ruth Wodak, the first procedure is to sample
information about the context that may include political, historical, and psychological or
any other aspect helping the text existing in its current form and shape. This passage tells
experiences of Casaubon with factual metallic things and the mystical knowledges and
beliefs. There are two prominent contextual aspects of the passage. First is the immediate
situational and second relates to the overall design of the novel in which the author
invades: giving title to the book of mathematical and physical nature and the inside
discourse arguing occult, kabala, mystery, secret societies, trances, secret knowledges and
secret treasures, etc. Casaubon returns from Brazil after having learnt something about
South American spiritualism. He also met there mysterious person Aglie known for his
limitless knowledge about occultism. Casaubon also had a good time there with his girl
friend Amparo and once they both visited an occult event in Brazil known as Umbanda
rite. Amparo, being a Marxist by ideology, always expressed doubt about the spiritual and
occult experiences that led to falling apart of their relationship and Casaubon returned to
Milan, Italy.

As the story is told in back flash by Casaubon, so past tense is used. On his return
to Milan he starts working as a freelance researcher and gets a job in Garamond
publishing house, owned by Belbo’s friend Mr. Garamond. The publishing company was
preparing a book concerning history of metals and Mr. Casaubon was given the task to
research illustrations for a history of metals. Casaubon gets the chance to study books on
metals as well as on occults as the Garamond publishing House used to publish occult
books as well. Due to implausible connections between historical events of the occult
manuscripts, their authors were called “Diabolicals” by Belbo, Diotallevi and Casaubon.
Against this backdrop of the study of mystery books, Casaubon comes up with his
discourse that he does not find much difference between the world of facts and the world
of magic. However, it is all part of the textual design of the author to create interest and
attraction for the readers by incorporating elements of traditional mystery and adventure stories (see Literature Review, p. 35). The second contextual aspect will be discussed in sixth procedure as it will be more appropriate to discuss it there keeping in view the socio-cultural and psychological concerns of the discourse before commencing extensive interpretation.

The second procedure refers to establishing inter-discursivity of the given discourse. The given discourse is not only rich in inter-discursivity; rather, it also talks of inter-discursivity. Its inter-discursivity lies in its bringing together the conflicting worlds of magic/facts, mathematical and physical enlightenment/superstition, cabala/laboratories, history referring to the world of actual events/the world of Diabolicals (authors of occult manuscripts), university dabbled in séances/astrological cenacles, law of gravity/occult forces and Rosicrucian cosmology, Marxism/occultism, Great pyramid and Celtic mythology/Amerind mythology, everything around/principle of mystic resemblances, etc. This is not a mere descriptive view of this world of magic and facts; rather, to convince the reader the discourse producer rearticulates and recontextualizes many aspects having different cosmology and ideological perspectives. These inter-discursive aspects will be further analysed and interpreted in the interplay between the discourse and its inter-discursive dimensions.

Third procedure is to formulate precise research question from the proposition under investigation and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theory. The proposition under investigation in this passage is that there is no much difference between the two worlds of spiritual knowledge and scientific knowledge. Rather, author’s attempt is to justify the supremacy and legitimacy of the spiritualism over the world of facts. It seems to be a continuity of the previous discourses of Foucault’s Pendulum particularly passages 7 and 8 in which world of magic and mystery is constructed as superior to the world of facts and scientific reality (see Passages 7 & 8, pp. 156-174). In this regard I’ll draw upon second research question of this study that directly asks ‘how different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited to create a new form of discourse/knowledge. To interpret the passage, the neighbouring explanatory theory of inter-discursivity and theoretical aspect of Cultural Studies is Stephen Rowland’s (2002) interdisciplinarity as a site of struggle (see Interdisciplinarity, p. 3). Using this explanatory theory, the research question will be explored in rest of the procedures.
Fourth procedure demands to operationalize the research questions into linguistic categories: that is to adopt some linguistic operations and interpretative procedures to investigate the text. In this regard fifth procedure helps applying framework of five discursive strategies for analysis and interpretation of the passage to investigate the attempt of constructing legitimate identity of occultism over the world of facts. First discursive strategy is ‘referential/nomination’ that is how persons/objects are named or referred to linguistically to construct in-groups and out-groups. Keeping in view the stance of the text from the beginning, the discourse producer implicitly seems to be in favour of spiritualism and occultism but in this passage, this aspect comes to surface explicitly. He places both, in other words, the social sciences and physical sciences on the same pedestal. Placement of social science before physical science suggests his attempt to make social science superior and source of all other sciences and positivism. However, in this passage the referential and nomination strategy does not matter significantly as the last three discursive strategies do. World of spiritualism is referred to and nominated as *magic, superstition, cabala, suspicion, cenacles, occult force*, etc. Contrary to it, the world of facts is referred to and nominated as *mathematical and physical enlightenment, laboratory, positivism physicists, séances*, etc. This strategy does not indicate the negativity or positivity of any group except spiritualism/occultism is placed before positivism if they are binary oppositions.

Next strategy is ‘predication’ that what characteristics, qualities and features of positive or negative traits are attributed to the social groups implicitly or explicitly. The author uses Casaubon as a strategy to convey his conviction and learning / experiences to the reader of the text that the physical science is not as definite and clear as it usually poses itself. Its growth comes through suspicion and occult forces. Physical science is labeled depreciatively to represent it as mere another side of social sciences. Even Newton, who is known for his scientific discovery of “law of gravity”, is labeled as staunch believer in the “existence of occult forces”. Eco labels science as “superstitious” a phenomenon that works astride with one foot in “cabala” and the other in “laboratory”. Another explicit example of labeling physical science and positivism negatively and depreciatively is as mere “superficial story” that is hiding deeper stories of suspicions, mysticism and occultism. The physical appearance of science is not precise and clear; rather, it is surely “hiding”. Thus, positivism is characterized as concealing, secretive and covered as mystic and occult forces.
Third discursive strategy is about using argumentation schemes (topoi) that provide justification of positive or negative attributions, discriminatory or preferential treatment. Wodak (2001) suggests that in this discursive strategy authors make use of different “topoi” or “loci” which Wodak calls as conclusion rules that justify positive or negative attributes of something. The argumentation scheme used here is ‘topos of justice’ that is based on the ‘principle and claim of equal rights for all’. Basing on this argumentation scheme Eco places both social sciences and physical sciences on equal footing. He argues “it was becoming harder for me to keep apart the world of magic and what today we call the world of facts”. He further argues that scientific “enlightenment” exists in the “murk of superstition”. The principle of equality continues as Eco argues that the scientists work astride with one foot in “cabala” and the other in the “laboratory”. This argumentation scheme gradually becomes forceful when he further contends that it is not only the our “Diabolicals” (writers of books on mysticism and occultism); rather, “the texts above all suspicion” also tell that the physicists, in time of positivism, did not face the occult practices-“séances” - and astrological cenacles not only outside the university; rather, it was very much in the university. Referring to Newton’s discovery of law of gravity and his belief in occult practices, and early “investigations into Rosicrucian cosmology”, Eco comes to the conclusion that all scientific productions are apparently carrying “superficial story” and hiding the sure “deeper story” of occult and mystic practices. Thus, it is an attempt on the part of the author to convince the reader of the veracity of his arguments and above all his text containing story of occultism under the title of scientific instrument.

Fourth discursive strategy relates to the perspective of the author that encompasses all first three discursive strategies: that from what perspective these attributions, labels and arguments are expressed. It refers to involvement and positioning of speaker’s point of view. In this passage, speaker’s point of view is clear that he is attempting to establish a recognizable position of social sciences vis-à-vis physical science. Moreover, he wants to convey to the reader that physical science is not superior to social science; rather, its existence in the form of different productions is very doubtful, suspicious and ambiguous. He accepts the given position of physical sciences with a feeling that expresses his doubt. It is not a “world of facts” itself; rather, “what today we call the world of facts” Author’s positionality is to teach to the reader that doubling is not scientific duty; rather, it is more of a social scientist characteristic. That is why Casaubon
says that “I began to question everything around me”. Thus, author’s perspective is to argue with the firm position of positivism and constructing it as a controversial phenomenon.

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’ intended to modify the epistemic status of a proposition. This strategy of a discourse intensifies or modifies the contextual meaning of utterances. In this passage, it is done through directly involving the person who speaks. If it is authorial voice, then Eco refers to his own education career and experiences. As it is clear in this passage that identity of spiritualism is constructed in appreciative, elevated and acknowledged terms that represents it as the basis of all knowledge. Eco attempts to intensify the illocutionary force of utterances that refer to spiritualism and magic. This attempt is made by constructing opposite scientific knowledge in negative terms. For example: “harder for me to keep apart the world of magic and what today we call the world of facts”. To mitigate the meaning of significance attached to scientific knowledge, the author uses “what we call the world of facts”. This is an interesting linguistic construction that implicitly says that otherwise it is not a world of facts; only “we” call it. This implicitness in the very next sentence comes clearly when he says that the “physical enlightenment” turns up in “murk of superstition”. The knowledge status of science is further modified to lower grades when he says that the scientists are more confused than the spiritualists and mystic people because scientists work with one foot in cabala and the other in laboratory. First he mentions cabala to strengthen the epistemic position of spiritualism and modifies the status of scientific knowledge. The scientists first place them in cabala then in laboratory. This intensification of negative meanings of utterances pertaining to science continues when he refers to Newton studying Rosicrucian cosmology that is a supreme source of spiritualism and mysticism. He extends this opposition further when he says that one should be thankful to mysticism that facilitates to understand scientific knowledge. At the end of the passage, the author comes forth in a challenging way when he argues that “asking them to tell me not their superficial story but another, deeper story, which they surely were hiding”. Thus, scientific knowledge is termed as superficial and shallow and spiritualism is called as deeper story.

In the light of third research question concerning language issues emerging from the study and their effect upon the meaning-making of the text, this passage sheds light on
a new aspect in the context of inter-discursivity. Eco interweaves different discourses to construct not only his discourse of ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’ but also attempts to justify this medley through many different interactions of discourses: discourses of magic and world of facts; physical enlightenment and work of superstition; cabala laboratory; time of positivism and astrological cenacles; Newton’s law of gravity and occult practices of Rosicrucian cosmology; etc. In the sense of inter-discursivity and the discussion on five discursive strategies, this discourse reveals:

(i) An attempt to convince the reader of the veracity of his textual representations and constructions.

(ii) This novel text is not a simple and semantically linear reading; rather, it is complex discourse that has integrated many other discourses.

(iii) It is a discursive strategy that by delegating authorial role to a character in a novel, the author gives free hand to enjoy the possibility of bringing in variety of discourses from infinite directions.

(iv) Relationship of these discourses to each other is constructed one, not logical one because Eco warns in explicit terms, “It was becoming harder for me to keep apart the world of . . .”

Thus, due to this inter-discursive construction, it is inherently a complex text that does not unfold itself in the conflicting aspects of integrated discourses; rather, it unfolds in the relationship of appropriated discourses that are homogenized by Eco to construct likable meanings. This is how meanings are affected, in words of Fairclough (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 30), through the ideological workings of language. Eco is making use of language as a primary source of meaning-making to achieve desired effects. He offers his text as better than any supposed authenticated source of knowledge.

According to sixth procedure there is a need to draw up the context diagram for the specific text and fields of action. Specific context of this specific passage is the context of the entire text of Foucault’s Pendulum. Eco provides a title to his novel that is entirely different from the text/discourses constructed inside. Possible context is to create a psychological impact where Eco is able to surprise his readers thoroughly: presenting scientific title and demonstrating unscientific knowledge in its entirety. Generally, a book with title and having similar contents becomes a routine generic book meant for specific reading community. Against this common cultural background Eco attempts to bring
forth a novel text that can appeal to all readers having scientific as well as unscientific knowledge background. This is a psychological attempt to attract maximum readership, hence earn money by selling to the people. Though this book, due to its dense inter-discursive constructions, is not to be digested easily by a common reader; however, it has an immense interest and appeal with its intermingled discourses of science and mystery. Eco, being an eminent scholar, has the ability to construct this text by exploiting different conventions, practices and cultures associated with various opposing discourses to create this novel not only its genre but also in its literal sense of the word.

Moreover, Eco himself is not a man of science; rather, a social writer and professor in semiotics. His attempt to intermix social aspects of mystery, cabala, occultism, etc., with science is not to provide awareness about accuracy of scientific instrument “Pendulum”; rather, to construct awareness that scientific productions and scientific knowledge do not have clean, objective and entirely accurate face. They always hide “deeper story” of errors, doubts, mysteries, etc. In a way he attempts to put across his view point inter-discursively. It is mystery that is a source of scientific knowledge. Social knowledge is superior and is available in diversified socio-cultural forms and practices like magic, superstition, cabala, diabolical, occultism, astrology, Rosicrucian cosmology, mythologies, mystic appearances, etc.

Now following seventh procedure, proposition under investigation is to prove the false projection of scientific production, tools, etc, and at the same time prove the essential significance of social knowledge against the scientific knowledge. Here in this passage inter-discursive constructions are determined not only by the intentions of the author but also by the social and linguistic conventions. It is opposite to what Culler says in his argument over performative utterances that “for what act I perform with my words is not determined by my intention but by social and linguistic conventions” (1995, p. 97). However, it is not like this, the way Culler suggests. Perhaps Culler’s point of view falls into “abstract objectivism” (Holquist, 1990, p. 42) where language meaning happens entirely out of human beings. Opposite to it, there is a dialogic happening of the event where the discourse is constructed inter-discursively with involvement of author’s intention and social and linguistic conventions. Author’s intention is to sell his product and social aspect is that people want to read something extraordinarily different and surprising and Eco linguistically exploited different conventions, practices and cultures
associated with different discourses of science and mystery. Thus, Eco’s text carries a political aim that our all knowledge has impact in some form of socio-cultural factors.

This passage is dense in inter-discursivity. Keeping in view the Cultural Studies perspective, texts are neither to be seen isolated from one another nor to be read as separate entities, because there is an attempt to integrate different “regimes of truth” (Foucault, 1972). Those regimes of truth emanate from world of facts and world of magic, mystery and mystic resemblances. It can also be said that as discussed in interdisciplinarity in first chapter (p. 3), that two disciplines are placed in contestation. Though, they are separate and independent disciplines and regimes of truth, however Eco attempts to resolve the disputes, as Roland says, “while contesting the boundaries and structures that form particular disciplines” (see Interdiscipnarity, p. 3). In the passage under investigation, there is a struggle, actions and reactions between two disciplinary knowledges. It is also important, in inter-discursive sense, that the structures of both the disciplines are dialogically placed in a relational form. For example, physical enlightenment, laboratory, law of gravity, doubt, etc., are not only the structures of scientific discipline; rather, they are essential features of science and are brought up here closer to the world of magic that is characterized by superstition, mystery and mystic resemblances. Thus, two disciplines are exploited for his own discourse for the text of novel making it a commodity to be sold out.

According to third research question of this study, the language issue here is that Eco does not adopt straightforward fact-giving method; rather, adopts a complex dialogic style of discourse construction to have some common ground to achieve an understanding of divergent knowledges. Effect of this dialogic use of language is that scientific knowledge and mystery and occult knowledges do not appear as oppositional forces; rather, forming same base and having same socio-cultural status. Rather he constructs superior position of the mystery knowledge by saying that it is through “mystic resemblances” that unfolds the deeper story of the scientific objects. It means that social knowledge enables to understand scientific knowledge. Thus, it is science that wears false look not the mystery and social knowledge. In this regards Weber (2004) argues while debating on rhetoric of Positivism versus Interpretivism:

I no longer want to be labeled as a positivist researcher or an interpretive researcher. It is time for us to move beyond labels and to see the underlying unity
in what we are trying to achieve via our research methods. The commonalities in my view are compelling and paramount. We ought to celebrate them because they underpin the value of our role as scholars. The differences on the other hand, are ancillary. We should understand them, but they should not divide us. (p. xii)

Perhaps, this is an attempt to eliminate difference between the two approaches to life world. An interesting aspect is that Eco not only constructs his text through mysterious dialogic connections but attempts to justify the same through its meaning-making as well: “It was becoming harder for me to keep apart the world of magic and what today we call the world of facts”. It brings Eco’s own subjectivity to the focus of the reader that Eco attempts to create an intense appeal that his own text is endowed with what he describes: “Men I had studied in school…”

**Conclusion to Analysis and Interpretation of F’s P**

Within the analysis and interpretation of the selected passages of F’s P, I have not been able to offer any more than an attempt to unlock and formulate connections of discourses and processes of meaning-making. With the help of research questions and methodological guidelines, this chapter has explored bridges between disparate discourses which are, perhaps, not known to the common reader. This investigation illustrates not only the implicit and explicit connections and meaning-making dimensions of the text/discourses; rather, with the help of five discursive strategies and third research question there is an attempt to examine extra dimensions added by the linguistic aspects. This wrestling with the circular exhibit of the text reflects the ambiguous nature of the connectivity of the discourses and textual and the material nature of identity and power relations.

Next is analysis and interpretation of ‘Trespassing’ in chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TRESPASSING

This chapter consists of the brief view of the text ‘Trespassing’ highlighting its aspects to be focused in the analysis and interpretation, overall context of the novel, the analytical procedures and methodological techniques as guided by the research questions, perspectives of Critical Feminist Discourse Studies (CFDS) and Cultural Studies (CS) and delimitation of this study as discussed in the first chapter.

Trespassing (Synopsis)

‘Trespassing’ by Uzma Aslam Khan (2006) is a fiction text that reflects a woman’s view on multiple aspects of the socio-cultural life of the people of Pakistan especially of women. In this text, it is found that the author, being a woman, articulates difficulties and problems that every segment of Pakistani society, especially women, faces which are merely far-fetched demands of society. Those restrictions and norms of society shape certain type of positions, identity and behaviours of women that lead to their dependence upon men. The text opens into the wide expanse of complex discourses of poverty, social disorders, dependence of women upon men, load-shedding of electricity, hapless and helpless class-based society and indifference of government administration that provides glimpses of changed and changing identities and the never-ending power games.

The major characters in this novel are Dia, her mother Riffat, their farm-servant Sumbul, Dia’s friend Nini and Daanish’s mother Anu. On the other hand, there is Daanish, his father Shafqat and Sumbul’s brother Salaamat. Different positions of women in Pakistani society are constructed in the form of Dia and Nini who feel oppressed being confined within four walls of homes/cars due to their parents, brothers and uncles. Riffat, mother of Dia, owns a silk-worms factory but has an indifferent husband who was later
on killed by a gang of armed robbers. In her youth, Riffat had a relationship with Dr. Shafqat as her class fellow. Anu, mother of Daanish, has accepted her position as domesticated being with acquiescent mind. Daanish, a young student journalist, comes to Pakistan from America to attend his father’s funeral. Daanish and his father Shafqat share a relationship which excludes his mother Anu. After her husband’s death, Anu wants to win her son through an arranged marriage with Nini; however, she fails as ultimately Daanish finds himself attached to Dia.

It indicates that the problems, emotional outbursts and substandard life of people of Pakistan in general and women in specific are not the difficulties due to their own faults; rather, they may be caused by larger social structures, institutional forces (which are corrupt and have united to exploit their people under the cover of institutional laws) and groups. People’s behaviour and their identity as constructed in the text will be explored to find the effects of multiple discourses and societal forces which serve as context. As the author is a woman, it will also be focused that how the author, through her constructions of identities, creates spaces for resistance to the unjust social forces.

**Context and Procedures**

Text of ‘Trespassing’ is assumed as an inter-discursive articulation of relationships between genders and gender based socio-cultural structures and behaviours. The issue of context is a very complex aspect in view of inter-discursivity. Each passage, as per second procedure, is provided a contextual background. The overall spacial and temporal context of the novel revolves around the past/prevailing discourses of patriarchy as they instruct through socio-cultural discourses and shape lives of men and women differently within four walls and at public places. There are multiple micro and macro contextual aspects that generate and affect specific patterns of behaviours. Keeping in view women’s tension against subordinated status as represented in the text, the author seems to be aware of hegemonic discourses prevailing in Pakistan. Ahmad (2012) discusses such kind of contextual aspects in her discussion on multiple locations and competing narratives of Pakistani women. She says that activities of Pakistani women take place “in a larger context in which women’s respectability is largely dependent upon
their confinement to the private sphere where their decision making power is limited” (p. 4).

She further argues that, in Pakistani society, a woman’s honour is honour of the entire family and it is located in her body and closely tied to her ‘sexual purity’. And control of women’s sexuality is necessary for the patriarchal family lineage. The ideas of good and bad are categorized and associated with women and men in a way that women are supposed to be “demure, passive, dressed in a manner that the culture deems modest and keep men at a distance” and men are supposed to be “assertive, mobile” and free to interact with men, justified to have control upon their women and need not to conform to the central definition of modest dress, etc (p. 6). According to Ahmad, the hegemonic discourses that characterize the narratives of women’s locations in Pakistani society, on the one hand, are visible in material form that women stay at home and on the other hand, conceptually exist in the minds of people in general that men must safeguard the honour of their women by protecting them, hiding them from other men and taking responsibility of all works outside home. Thus, reason is created to perpetuate hegemonic discourse that men are stronger, harder and protectors and women are weak, naturally designed not to take up difficult tasks outside home and culturally supposed to stay at home to protect their family’s honour.

In this regard, it is pertinent to assess author’s own view-point. In her interview to Dawn Books and Authors (2013), she expresses her theory of novel:

I have never mapped out a novel. I don’t really trust maps, because the lines change as soon as you find them. As if the form of a novel itself demands that you stay open to change, open to surprises. All my novels have begun either with an image and/or a voice . . . All threads of a novel, at least for me come together through sensory cues, through acts of faith. There is no plan to feel my way through it.

For the author, there is no specific background or context of her novel except her feelings about the situation. It can be assumed that the context is authorial feeling based on her experiences of the socio-cultural aspects of Pakistani society.

Against this contextual background heavily reigned by powerful authority of men and specific textual context, the selected passages of ‘Trespassing’ will be interpreted and
analysed through the procedures delineated in the discussion of analytical model, research questions, under the perspective of CFDS and CS with the overall directions of CDA as discussed in the third chapter.

**Analysis and Interpretation of Selected Passages**

Following is the analysis and interpretation of the selected passages from the text ‘Trespassing’.

**Socio-cultural Identity of ‘elders’ and its Impacts.** This is a significant passage that constructs identity of ‘elders’ in Pakistani society and their specific stance of life towards women. It reflects patriarchal attempt to tailor women’s minds to keep them under control of men.

(1) *The elders tried to teach her that fate could be postponed - may be by a year or several hundred, by his naughty sister Chance – but could not be altered. How one’s destiny unfurled was not to be second-guessed. Perhaps it would take a longer story, with unexpected players, but eventually, it followed the course that it was meant to take.*

*Eventually. The timing nagged. Who could tell actual time from postponed time? If all detours lead to a predetermined outcome, it hardly mattered, then, if one was early or late, if a meeting was held today or tomorrow, if a letter was couriered or the stamps pocketed. People talked of how the country was in a state of transition. Soon the dust would settle, and miraculously, the violence in Sindh that had claimed her father, among others, would vanish. But they couldn’t say when, how or who would bring about the course that was ordained. In fact, they liked to add, come to think of it, the dust had not settled anywhere – even the industrialized West had problems. In fact, it had never settled. What else had history shown? The river always flowed into the sea. Which branch entered first was irrelevant. Leave tomorrow, they advised, in God’s hands.*

*Only her mother believed otherwise. She said the elders wanted to saturate the world in indifference, to wrap a bandage around it that would hold back all the things that could move the country forward. It was all a ploy to keep things working in their own favor. Take marriage, for instance. They wanted it to remain a union that suited them, not the couple. She told Dia the worst thing she could do was listen to that, and perhaps was*
the only mother in the country to repeatedly warn her to marry only out of love, not obligation.

First procedure is to sample information about the context involving socio-political, historical, psychological, etc., aspects. This passage is taken from the beginning of the text. The text starts with the discourse of discovery and production of silk in ancient China by Empress Hsi - Ling - Shih. Dia, after reading the fable of silk, was just pondering upon how things are inter-linked. She is thinking with this stance that things are predetermined and if one thing has happened, the other is bound to happen. Dia inter-links (i) the death of Persian sailors who lost their lives when trying to smuggle silk from China, (ii) kidnapping and death of Greek weavers by the Sicilians who, trying to make silk from spider’s web, tortured Greek weavers to elicit their knowledge, and torture of Bengali and Benarsi weavers at the hands of British rulers in India who wanted to sell their substandard silk by damaging the hand-made fine silk of the Bengali and Benarsi weavers.

Dia is thinking on these lines that reflects a positivist notion. Such kind of thinking or approach to life does not take into consideration the ongoing invisible processes and motives that shape a particular action. It takes into consideration the visible cause and jumps to conclusion. Durkheim argues about knowledge-based observable causes and effects: “We must, therefore consider social phenomena in themselves as distinct from the consciously formed representations of them in the mind. We must study them objectively as external things, for it is this character that they present to us” (cited in Palys, 1997, p. 14).

Similarly, Dia is forming conclusions deduced from premises. The author, while constructing the character of Dia, brings into the text discourses of “fate” and the role of family as an institutional force to shape Dia’s thinking. In Pakistani culture under the burden of various social norms, those people tend to develop this kind of thinking who lack education and do not want to see deeply the shaping motives of an activity. So this kind of fated thinking is based on the view that the specific occurrence of an accident can be delayed but cannot be avoided. Against this backdrop, the author gives her view-point in the given passage. In this way this passage becomes a discourse of exposition of social life and definite thinking that helps to shape specific patterns of life, especially of women, at individual and community level.
Second procedure pertains to establish inter-discursivity and intertextuality. According to Mills (1997), discourses exist in opposition to each other (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 27). Overall, there are two main discourses at opposition: Discourse of pre-determined thinking and its effects (Cartesian philosophy that is traditional, oppressive and silencing) and discourse of self conviction and open thinking (it is fluid, open and different). In the perspective of Critical Feminist Discourse Studies, it is a clash of patriarchal discourse and feminist discourse. The latter one attempts to break silence imposed by the former to awaken the energies of women to articulate their own experiences and realize their dormant powers and energies otherwise shaped to rest due to silencing and controlling patriarchal discourse of “elders”. Thus, gender discourses are at opposition to each other. It has a political framework that demands to read and interpret it while looking at patriarchal and liberating stances of discourses. It also involves the discourse of social life in Pakistani society that depicts people satisfied with the problem-ridden arrangement of their social life and their facing complex problems silently and unquestioningly. Another discourse that is brought to the conflicting regime is the discourse of religion: “Leave tomorrow, they advised, in God’s hands”. Thus, there are host of discourses in this passage. However, the main focus of analysis and interpretation will be on conflict between patriarchal discourse and feminist discourse created through inter-discursivity.

Third procedure relates to formulating research questions and exploring neighbouring fields for explanatory theories and theoretical aspects. The research question under consideration is “What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses within the novel texts under study?” and the newly formed research question “how the author challenges the discourse of predetermined course of life suggested by ‘elders’”? For explanatory theory, Foucault’s claim that each society has its “regime of truth” (p. 14) with Sara Mills’ arguments that discourses exist in opposition to each other (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 27) suggest the investigation. Interpretation of the passage, according to the given research questions and explanatory theory, is carried out in the following procedures.

Drawing upon fourth and fifth procedures, research questions are to be investigated applying five discursive strategies that give clue to the use of language in the
passage. In this regard, first discursive strategy is ‘referential/nomination’, that how are persons or objects referred to linguistically and focus of investigation are biological, depersonalizing or naturalizing metaphors, metonymies and synecdoche used to construct in-group and out-group. Linguistically, two words “elders” and “fate” are used to exercise silencing effect upon the individuals in Pakistani society especially on women and more precisely upon daughters/sisters of teenage. Anything related to the “elders” or associated with “fate” is not supposed to be challenged. “Elders” usually are male elders of family, society or tribe. Based on this ‘common sense’ it is generally believed that whatever they say and recommend for youngsters, especially women of the family, the society and tribe is not to be challenged, rather to be accepted silently. The voice, individuality, and independent position of an individual disappear in the presence of “regime of truth” of the “elders”. Why elders are male because, in the context of this passage, opposite to it, the author brings Dia’s mother who despite her all wisdom is not part of the circle of the “elders”, because they are only males. Similarly, in the patriarchal discourse “fate” is usually associated with “God” as the ultimate controlling power and perceived as the ultimate arbitrator leaving no free choice for human beings. In the given passage the author brings into contest the discourses of (masculinity) “elders” and “fate” and opposite to it is the discourse of (femininity) Dia’s mother. In this inter-discursive construction of contest, two groups are formed. One group gets author’s support and the other does not.

The in-group (in Wodak’s language) is constructed positively and out-group is constructed negatively. In the sequential application of discursive strategies to the passage, it will be investigated how the author constructs these two groups by integrating discourses. The first discursive strategy, as referred earlier, is ‘referential/nomination’ with the objective to construct in-groups and out-groups. Two opposite groups are constructed in this passage. First group is “elders” with their teachings and belief in predetermined fate. Linguistically, they are referred to as the hard core and fixed-minded group opposing change and progress. They are constructed through naturalizing metaphors and metonymies with focus upon their belief in ‘unchanging’ fate. It is referred like: fate can be “delayed” but not “altered”, fate follows the “course” it is meant to take, therefore, life should be lived passively leaving the future in “God’s hands”, etc. Members of this group are indifferent and oppose the forward movement of the country. They are self-centered and want to keep powers in their hands. This group is constructed through the reference of their characteristics as they attempt to assure that these are natural courses of life. In the sense of inter-discursivity, these are not only character traits
of life claimed by “elders”; rather, these are different discourses having their own epistemological stances and positioning.

On the other hand, there is another group that is against the “elders”. This is in-group supported by a woman and, perhaps, by the author as well because the author is also a woman. This group believes in way forward against the group of male “elders” who want to “saturate the world in indifference” and “wrap a bandage around it” to stop it moving forward. The in-group is referred to as that “believed otherwise” and instructs Dia to “marry only out of love, not obligation”; thus, two opposing discourses stand in contest with each other. This is a discourse of open-mindedness, of progress, of challenge to stagnation and resistance to pre-determined fate.

Second discursive strategy is ‘predication’ that is labeling social groups with characteristics of positive or negative traits. It focuses upon traits, characteristics and qualities and features attributed to them. It is actually their belief and thinking that characterize them. Group of “elders” with predetermined fate is attributed as:

i. They think firmly that human being is helpless in his/her endeavours as “fate could be postponed but not altered”. Lack of alteration in fate suggests pessimism. It demands silent submission to pre-determined end that has to come sooner or later.

ii. No fight against surging violent forces that may play havoc with life of any one. This is a discourse of passive acceptance of power circles that play with life with impunity. They propagate “soon the dust would settle and the violence would vanish”.

iii. There is no choice in life; one has to accept life as it is. They claim life is like a sea and “The river always flowed into the sea. Which branch entered first, was irrelevant. Leave, they advised, tomorrow in God’s hand”.

iv. They are against any progress. “The elders wanted to saturate the world in indifference, to wrap a bandage around it that would hold back all the things. It was all a ploy to keep things working in their favour”.

The second group (in-group) is labeled as that “believed otherwise”. This group is predicated as:
i. Having opposite thinking to group of elders. This group believes in open thinking and way forward.

ii. Having regrets and complaints against first group of elders like first group is indifferent, hurdle in the progress and exploits things in its favour.

iii. This group is attributed as having the courage to raise their voice against the subjugating social norms like forced marriage. This group raises its voice against the “elders” that “They wanted it (marriage) to remain a union that suited them, not the couple. She told Dia the worst thing (in terms of patriarchal social norms) . . . to marry only out of love, not obligation”.

Thus, the two groups have been attributed with traits and characteristics that represent them differently. Out-group of “elders” is fixed in belief, normative, patriarchal and exploiter. In-group (Dia’s mother – female) is open-minded with belief in personal autonomy, identity and way of life that suits to the concerned individuals.

Third discursive strategy, as suggested by Wodak, is ‘argumentation’ that how positive or negative attributes of a group are justified or groups try to justify and legitimize the exclusion, discrimination, suppression or exploitation of others. In this passage, group of “elders” is characterized as hurdle in progress, exploiters and believers in predetermined fate. Their identity is constructed and represented with negative attributes and discourse producer uses here topos of definition (an individual named who carries the same characteristics in action/belief), as point of view of “elders”, to justify the pre-determined course of fate, hence silent submission to what elders say basing on their experience. Life is defined by the “elders” on the paradigm of sea where all rivers and channels fall into. Similarly, life is a pre-determined course, therefore young ones especially teenager girls and women must accept what their patriarchal “elders” say.

Using the argumentation scheme of topos of definition, the author represents elders’ view point with conclusions as follow:-

i. Fate follows the course it is “meant to take”.

ii. “If all detours lead to a predetermined outcome” it does not matter whether somebody is late or early, or a meeting is held today or tomorrow, etc.

iii. History also shows the same determination that river always flowed into the sea.
iv. Without doing anything or planning for it, leave everything in God’s hand.

In the context of this discourse, this is, actually, a patriarchal attempt of the elders to keep women under their control. They justify their stance by a paradigm of sea where thinking of human being is not involved. Rather resistance is deliberately excluded from the justification because elders want to maintain their regimes of reason/truth walled by these ploys.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation’ that expresses involvement and positioning of author/speaker’s point of view. I take author as the speaker here who constructs two groups of patriarchal elders and resistant mother of Dia. This is not a representation of these groups through dialogues; rather, a construction through reporting, describing and commenting. Comments of the author are quite evident from the very first sentence that “the elders tried to teach her”. The author’s perspective is based on her comments. She is very critical of the view point of the “elders” and questions repeatedly the usefulness and social impacts of this view point. “Elders” believe in pre-determined fate, hence demand that silent submission to it from all is mandatory. Author questions it like:

i. “How one’s destiny unfurled was not to be second-guessed”.

ii. “Who could tell actual time from postponed time?”

iii. “But they could not say when, how or who would bring about the course that was ordained”.

iv. “Only her (Dia’s) mother believed otherwise”.

These comments reflect that the author is not satisfied with the belief and consequent actions of elders and their effects upon general life of people specifically of women. It is visible that the author constructs identity of “elders” from a specific discursive point of view. It is an attack on old fashioned ideas meant to keep a circle of power well intact by the elders. On the other hand, it gives awareness to the youngsters that there is no way out of problems except by taking action and resisting philosophy of inactiveness and silence. Patriarchal designs are being challenged and reproduced through inter-discursive construction of language.

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’ of the utterances that refer to specific groups. It is a modifying practice of the knowledge status of a proposition
wherein the author’s attempt is reflected to intensify or mitigate the illocutionary force of utterances of a given discourse to generate specific psychological effects upon the reader. The author attempts to modify the knowledge status of the proposition that ‘elders are ever right and fate is ever predetermined’ that demand unquestioning submission of women. Here attempt is to mitigate the illocutionary force of those utterances that are related to “elders” in a way that carries a tinge of taunt. For example, making an attack on the social philosophy of elders, the author questions “who could tell actual time from postponed time?” Elders as family institution claim that “soon the dust would settle, and miraculously, the violence . . . would vanish.” To mitigate this claim, the author condemns the philosophy of this passive fate: “But they could not say when, how or who would bring about the course that was ordained.” She challenges the institutionalized philosophy of fate by exposing elders’ inability of foresight, lack of planning and action. Rather, this practice is exposed as subjugating and oppressing the youth especially women. Another attempt to mitigate is very explicit where the author, through a woman, challenges and blames the elders that “Elders, wanted to saturate the world in indifference . . . hold back all things that could move the country forward” with a pen challenge at the end that “It was all a ploy to keep things working in their own favor”.

Thus, it is clear from exploring these five discursive strategies used by the author that she constructs two groups to attack and challenge specific mind set called “elders”. It has special methods to oppress and subjugate women. Thus, women are suppressed in the interests of men. It is type of society which is oppressive for women on the one hand, and on the other hand, a hurdle in the way to progress.

In the light of the third research question concerning language issues and their effect upon meaning-making, this passage reflects the identity formation of Dia as a female in the process. In the words of Butler, “woman itself is a term in process, a becoming, a constructing that cannot rightfully be said to originate or to end. As an ongoing discursive process, it is open to intervention and resignification” (cited in Silah, 2000, pp. 45-46). According to Butler, women are not biologically and psychologically born as women as perceived through her gendered roles; rather, they have neither beginning nor an end. It is social practices and social forces that try to determine the gender. This passage reveals how the patriarchal forces in the form of “elders” try to teach her. It is not her inevitable natural existence that she accepts the predetermined
status of life, rather it is through the certain social forces that she develops this thinking. The author represents the “becoming” of Dia as a result of elders’ discourse in the form of teaching – a strategy to influence and control the young female. The author uses the same strategy to counter the hegemonic discourse (teaching) of the elders and brings in mother of Dia whose discourse attempts not only to withhold the discourse of elders but also fights back by attacking their indifference and their attempts to stop onward progress. Thus, by investigating discourses of male elders and female mother the author constructs her own discourse of gender and identity. Gender and identity are processual and not inevitably natural and biological givens. Stability of female identity ratified by patriarchal genders is shaken by the discourse producer: “perhaps the only mother in the country to repeatedly warn her to marry only out of love (free will, liberated) not obligation (elders’ teaching)”. So, this is the perception of the author of social arrangement about elders and women in Pakistani society as expressed through this language use. This is what Fairclough (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 32) points out that the discourse represents processes, relations and structures of the material world and the mental world of thoughts, feelings and beliefs. Khan constructs her feelings and beliefs in a resisting language use.

Sixth procedure is about drawing up context diagram for the specific text and field of action. It is evident from the analysis of discursive strategies that it is a text that is constructed around the feminist point of view attacking oppressive forces. Dia is a young girl reading a paper of beginning / discovery of silk production. She is thinking about happening of certain event as result of silk trade and from it the author picks a new line that Dia is thinking on these lines because elders, in general terms, have taught her wrong lesson about the scheme of things in this world especially of women. The author positions her voice in the process of dialogue with the elders. Perhaps she is of the view that simple telling of the own positions may not be an effective strategy to challenge the “regime of truth” established by the “elders” and to attract readers. She places her discourse of resistance against the oppressive discourse of elders. Because, in the words of Janet Miller (as cited in Pinar, 1997), “finding voices is not a definitive event but rather a continuous and relational process” (p. 8). Thus, the implicit and explicit language struggle is to construct identity of women in comparative relational process to challenge multiple discourses of elders like discourse of fate and chance, discourse of planning of future life
(as in meetings), discourse of politics (country was in transition), comparing Pakistan with the developed West, discourse of marriage as union of convenience, etc.

Seventh procedure concerns about extensive interpretation referring to research questions and proposition/problem under investigation. The proposition under investigation is a discourse that constructs varying perspectives on life. It serves as a site of contestation of discourses where the author positions her discourse of “believing otherwise” against host of traditional discourses like: the discourse of predetermined fate with a “course that it was meant to take”, discourse of violence that will miraculously “vanish”, the discourse of “indifference”, etc. Taking into consideration the initial discussion on connection between linguistic and social aspects (see *Connection between Linguistic and Social aspects from the Perspectives of CS and CFDS in Chap 3, p. 64-65*) it is possible to investigate the given passage that how language is used to effect specific meaning to the text (third research question). Discourse of male domination and oppression of women is formulated in a language that is an implicit way of resistance, as Lazar (2007) says, to hegemonic power relations of patriarchy and an attempt to create awareness in the young ladies how to take their lives in the socio-cultural regimes of reasons and truths (see *Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CFDS, p. 59*). Khan uses the word “elders” for males and “fate” for their philosophy to establish rigid and rational social boundaries that are purely based on the desire to exploit for their own favour. The author attempts to break down the social structure based on the advice and obligations imposed from the “elders”. In opposition, the author brings the discourse of mother of Dia who “believed otherwise”. She is of the view that elders want to saturate the world in indifference and to stop everything that “could move the country forward”. Moreover, the author says that perhaps Dia’s mother was the “only mother in the country to repeatedly warn her to marry only out of love, not obligation”. It is an attempt to destabilize and destroy the so-called “right reason” and obligations (Doll Jr. cited in Pinar, 1997) embodied in the discourse of fate.

But it is questionable whether all elders are blind to the course of fate and position themselves to be as rigid and self-centered as constructed by the author. Do all men position their discourse as a reason or truth claim outside of which nothing exists to which one can appeal for alternative truth claims? Moreover, it seems that the author does not see any possibility that a woman can also be an “elder”. “Elder” is constructed here as
dominant and restrictive organizing principle in the modernist paradigm that has implication of belief in which change is not possible due to pre-determined course of happening. According to this discourse, for every happening there is a predetermined course, hence we live in a mechanistic society and individual position of a person is nothing except to accept that future is not in our hands. It seems a biased approach of the author who associates male elders with rigid circles of rationality. However, it is also reflexive in its attack and resistance to a way of life that is based on regimes of reason of family elders that still prevails in Pakistan as a powerful and dominant social institution.

The effect of using language in an implicit way, for example, “elder” for males is that, from the perspective of CFDS, the discourse attempts to take a liberating form for the young lady readers and it may create a discouraging feeling among the aged readers. However, use of “elders” as semantically highly rigid noun and teachings of elders as highly indifferent, may develop thinking that all the elders are a hurdle in the way of progress. It is failure of their reason that is the main cause of the failure of society, country and women. Point of consideration is the language use that intends to develop a thinking opposing norms, structures and forms associated with a rigid regime of reason that believes in mechanistic fate and indifferent approach to life. There is a danger that, by bringing her discourse of “believing otherwise” opposite to the discourse of “fate that can be postponed but not altered”, the author is going to create another indifferent “regime of reason” and “truth claim” that believes in that the elders and their philosophy are the sole course of our social problems. So, one regime of reason is going to be replaced by another regime of reason.

So far as the inter-discursive construction of this discourse is concerned, Mills (1997) argues that discourses do not exist in vacuum; rather, they stay in constant conflict with discourses which “inform them over questions of truth and authority”. Here the discourse of “elders” and their belief in mechanistic “fate”, as constructed by the author, attempts to inform us as reader that the “truth and authority” of elders is very myopic, self-centered, cruel and blocking. On the other hand, the discourse of “believing otherwise” of a woman attempts to inform us as reader that the truth, and authority do not lie in the discourses of advice and obligation as suggested by “elders”; rather, they are within the independent thinking that may or may not tally with the prevailing social structures, norms, orders and discourse. Thus, there is an attempt to transform a discourse
of obligation, pressure and oppression into a discourse which suggests options, selection, decisions, opportunity and alternation.

In the light of CDA assumptions 21 and 22 (p. 78) that how discourse structures function socially to legitimize or challenge the relations of power and dominance, there is an element of implicit bias in challenging the indifference of elders. Rationally, ‘elders’ in person are not be blamed; rather, the static systems and indifferent social structures created by the ‘elders’ are to be blamed. It is their way of mythological looking at things to be blamed and not their existence as elders because all elders may not be of the same stock.

**Multifaceted Identity of Pakistani Men and Women.** This passage constructs identity of Pakistani men and women that manifests class structure of the society and also stagnation and formation of thought process of men and women under the influence of colonialism, Islamisation and caste system.

Anu looked around the table, remarking the pedigree of each. Some had two drops Persian, others half a drop Turk. There was one who claimed his ancestors had sprung from Alexander the Great, and another had roughly one tea spoon Arab. But none had descended from Mahmud of Ghazni, as she had. She bore the stamp of the tribe: the clear, fair complexion and the bloom on her cheeks.

(2) *She was momentarily taken aback when the Iranian began bemoaning the very activity that consumed her, and one which the doctor (Anu’s husband) often resented her for. The cigar-puffing gentleman said, ‘We’ll always be divided. We’ll always be Punjabi, Pathan, Pukhtoon, Muhajir, Sindhi, or what have you. But we will never be united. The Quaid’s dream is slipping from our fingers. Our children won’t even know he had a dream. They won’t know why they’re here. They will be rootless.’ He peeled open a napkin and arranged it over a heavy heart.*

‘It’s your weak morale that will tear us apart, Ghulam,’ said another, a Hyderabadi with dark, pockmarked cheeks. ‘You mustn’t let your sons see you this way.’

‘But Ghulam is right,’ said a third, from UP. ‘Things are only getting worse. At least once we had a great university in Aligarh. Now what is there? Will we be forced to send our children away from us?’
'We have nothing to fear,' declared a Punjabi. ‘Islam unites us.’

‘That’s exactly what the Prime Minister wants us to believe,’ cautioned the doctor. ‘Why else is he suddenly supporting the Islamic groups? Why else are all the liberals in exile or in jail?’ He pointed to the waiter circling them with a tray of drinks and demanded, ‘Is this to be my last public beer?’ While the waiter poured, an argument erupted.

Amongst the women, the topic ranged from births to beauty parlors to who had been seen at the last grand luncheon where exactly the same three subjects were discussed with equal zeal.

‘You should try Nicky’s instead of Moon Palace, darling,’ said the Hyderabadi wife to the Iranian wife. ‘She gets the curls just right.’ Looking disdainfully at Anu, who wore her hair in a frizzy bun, she sniffed, ‘That is, if you want to stay in touch with things.’

‘Mah Beauty Parlor is far superior,’ said the wife of the Punjabi. She was from Bangalore, and in the past, had confessed her husband couldn’t stand her for it. She was pregnant with their third child. ‘I had my hair set there just yesterday. And you won’t believe who was having hers done beside me!’ She looked around expectantly. ‘Barbara!’ While gasps and exclamations issued, the woman continued, ‘And I found out that her grandmother was my grandmother’s neighbour’s khala’s mother-in-law’s best friend’s sister!’ More gasps and exclamations.

The wife from Delhi, whose husband had taken the doctor’s warning to heart and was on his third beer, piped, ‘I believe it’s her daughter who recently had twins.’ She was not a popular woman. In her absence, the others declared she always overdid it. Anu had to concede they had a point. Today her hair had taken coils to new limits. (pp. 71-72)

First procedure requires establishing context of a discourse. Context of this passage revolves around a social meeting on a dining table in a hotel. Danish’s father known as Doctor is in hospital due to heart attack and his mother Anu was just sitting and waiting for his recovery and discharge from hospital. Meanwhile, she is also thinking about the certain memorable moments in their lives. Once, in Karachi city she and the Doctor were sitting at dining table with ten male and their sophisticated wives in an old
British club. This passage is purely a discourse of individual voices of men and women who, in their free time, express their opinions about their areas of interest; however, their voices reflect how their thinking/lives have been shaped by the socio-cultural aspects of Pakistani society and vice versa. Men talk about the general problems of unity and division at social and national level and women, taking this opportunity of free time, talk about their personal matters of beauty and their hair styles, etc. The context of the passage is embedded in social web that involves discourses of free time chat of grown up men and women as members of society and discourse of gender interests, etc.

Second procedure demands to establish inter-discursivity and intertextuality. Accordingly, the focus here will be mainly on inter-discursivity. Keeping in view the gendered culture of Pakistani society, in this passage men and women are telling about things and issues that reflect different discourses of masculinity and femininity affecting Pakistani society as a whole. Men usually take interest in holding positions of status and talking about such things that relate to politics and social life of the society. On the other hand, women take interest and talk about personal issues. In this passage, the discourse of unity and division of Pakistani society refers to further discourses of tribal life, joint family systems and unity for certain slogans and discourse of constitution and laws that should otherwise be the uniting force for social cohesion. Similarly, women being other gender, usually take less prominent roles and their focus of talk is also on such matters that may have no attraction for men but great interest for women. So, there is a discourse concerning beauty parlors that leads to other discourses entailing women’s interest excluding men like: discourse of personal identity, discourse of appearance, discourse of women’s communication in the parlor, etc. Thus, author’s discourse of exposing men and women, in their free time in club interlocks host of other discourses. Bringing together men and women becomes an inter-discursive construction of Pakistani society of social aspects and gendered identities of men and women.

Third procedure demands to formulate precise research questions and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories and theoretical aspects. For this purpose, the focus is on the second research question of this study that “How are different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a new form of discourse/ knowledge?” For explanatory theory Lehtonen’s (2007) views will be relied upon that critical feminist discourse is interested in exposing discourses of
empowerment through discourses especially of fiction discourses that are a form of social and discursive practice (see *Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CFDS*, pp. 60-61). Interpretation of the passage according to the given research question and explanatory theory is carried out in the following procedures.

Fourth procedure demands to operationalise the research question into linguistic categories and fifth procedure is to apply those categories sequentially while using theoretical approach to interpret meanings. It will be investigated linguistically as guided by Lehtonen’s theory of fiction discourse as social and discursive practice that what conventions, practices and cultures associated with discourses of politics and beauty parlors are exploited by the author to create her discourse of social life in Pakistan at clubs and hotels. The analysis of two different discourses may also reflect that there are specific social expressions of masculinity and femininity. Men’s interest and talk of politics and women’s talk of beauty parlors provide insight into the way men and women construct their gender identities in Pakistani society. In a social constructionist’s point of view like Kincheloe (1997), a fiction is viewed as a set of linguistic strategies for negotiating social positions and for the purpose of new modes of representation and narration construction (see *Social Constructivism and Perspectives of CS and CFDS*, p. 63). Weedon (1987) also argues about the discursive construction of identities through language as a site of cultural production. So, it will be explored that how men and women construct their gender identities within the social contexts they select for their talk/discourse.

The linguistic categories that are to be applied on the text are the five discursive strategies (Wodak, 2001) that help to explore social, political, psychological and linguistic aims and systemic ways of language use in the text. First discursive strategy is ‘referential/nomination’ that uses devices like membership categorization, biological and naturalizing metaphors and metonymies that help in construction of in-groups and out-groups. In the given passage, there is no out-group or in-group but only masculine group and feminine group. Men are referred and named linguistically as “the cigar-puffing gentleman” and “Ghulam” (semantically it reflects subjugated person in local language). Ghulam talks of Pakistani nation as still defeated and suppressed who have not come out of the subjugation of the foreign British rule. Another person is referred to as “a Hyderabadi with dark, pockmarked cheeks”. A third person is referred to as “a third, from
A fourth person is referred to as “a Punjabi”. Anu’s husband is referred to as “the doctor”. Though referring to or naming a man in this way does not indicate construction of a special group; however, within a social context of a club in Pakistan, it is not odd to indicate a masculine circle by referring to their castes because people feel proud named after their castes, cities, regions and provinces, even if their names are not announced. This culture is prevalent in this region ever since before independence as Poet Allama Iqbal also highlights this division of society based on caste system, geography and language in his famous poem Jawab-e Shikwa. In this regard Rehman (2012) expresses, “The very existence of caste system, dating back to some 3500 years (if we estimate that the Hindu holy scripture of the Vedas are from 1500 BC), is itself evidence of the relatively unchanging nature of the social division of labour of pre-colonial India” (p. 238).

Similarly women are also referred to and named after regions and husbands “the Hyderabadi wife”, “Iranian wife”, “wife of the Punjabi”, “wife from Delhi”, etc. It reflects that the author, by referring to their regions and husbands, has created a subject position within the discourse, and that women will operate within those subject positions. It also indicates what men and women mean in their situated utterances and how their gendered identities are constructed in their social practice of language use. It also reflects their gendered interests and the social structures, they produce, reproduce and their desires to change.

Second discursive strategy is ‘predication’ that what attributes and character traits are attached to the groups to label them positively or negatively. The “cigar-puffing gentleman”, “Ghulam” and person “from UP” are shown as bit hopeless who neither see any possibility of unity in Pakistani nation nor any sign of Quaid’s dream (Pakistan’s founding father) of unity in the coming generation like: “But we will never be united. Quaid’s dream is slipping from our fingers”, and person from UP also supports him that “things are only getting worse”. On the other hand, Hyderabadi is represented as a bit sarcastic and opposite to what Ghulam believes in. Being male he displays his masculine force by saying that “it is your weak morale that will tear us apart”. The Hyderabadi chastises “Ghulam” for showing weakness that is not a manly quality. Besides it, the Punjabi and the Doctor seek support of ‘Islam’ as a uniting force and the Doctor refers to Prime minister who, for his nation’s satisfaction, also banks upon Islam. Thus, they
construct their identities around varying philosophies and reflect in their situated utterances that they do not have one logical concept of unity. They are not sticking to any logical solution; rather, rumors, whims and ploys are used as a patchwork policy and no one knows what all it is. Similarly, the author does not explicitly use any language that directly represents qualities and character traits of the ladies. The author only constructs their personal desires and interests to show their identities as having their specific way of life that may or may not have any significance for men. It is their access to better and the best beauty parlor that is a measure of their superiority and source of pleasure. There is nothing special negative or positive attributions except that men are constructed by a female author to be identified as players of larger games like uniting of nation as dreamed by the male founder of Pakistan - Quaid-e-Azam. They occupy separate positions wherein they feel that space is occupied by unknown forces that have divided us.

Third strategy is argumentation that is about the sorts of argumentation schemes that are used to justify certain exclusion, inclusion or exploitation of others. In this passage gents are represented as busy in arguments to justify their viewpoint about the circumstances of the country. Overall circumstances of the country indicate law and order situation and violence. Using the causal argumentation scheme, men suggest that as Pakistani they should reject and avoid what is useless and disadvantageous. For example, one person says, “We’ll always be divided. We’ll always be Punjabi, Pathan, Pukhtun, mohajirs, Sindhi or what have you . . . the Quaid’s dream is slipping from our fingers. Our children won’t even know he had a dream”. Thus, he is justifying the uselessness of being regional identities that we need to avoid. Another person argues that we need to keep a high morale that unites us. Another person says, “we have nothing to fear, Islam unites us”. Thus, men try to condemn these forces in the form of violence and division that have occupied the space in which they could enjoy their liberties. Their argument is an attempt to regain their lost space of peace and security, to regain the centre from where they are gradually being marginalized. Similarly, women have their own arguments to justify their claim to their access to better beauty parlors. One of the ladies justifies the superiority of Nicky’s . . . Moon Palace because Nicky’s “gets the curls just right”. On the other hand, the Punjabi woman argues that “Mah’s beauty parlor is far superior” because that brings more physical attraction to women’s appearance for men. The proof was that “She was pregnant with their third child” as her husband could not stand her for
it. So by using these causal argumentation schemes, the author makes her discourse very convincing for the reader especially for women.

Fourth discursive strategy is about ‘perspectivation’ of the author. What perspective or point of view prevails in the labels, attributions and arguments expressed? Actually, the text is not directly through the mouth of characters. It is through reporting and describing the utterances of speakers through the author. So it is visible from the text that the author is not an isolated figure here. She is visible through the comments that reflect her point of view. In the given discourse the author places men and women in a mixed set-up of dining table in a club. However, they are engaged in discoursing their separate areas. Men have their interest in politics and political arrangement of the country and women are represented as free and independent who are engaged in discoursing their own areas of interest that provide them pleasure. From critical feminist point of view, men and women are engaged by the author to construct their own gender identities. It reflects Pakistan’s social set-up as well wherein this societal gender division is visible in day-to-day life. It also reflects the conservative aspects of the society because usually men in this type of set up do not show themselves talking of topics that relate to women and of feminine significance; rather, they assume that talking about politics is worth manly quality. But, on the other hand, women do not challenge the men’s role; rather, they like to stick to field that is purely feminine and excludes men.

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’ of contextual meaning of utterances. Objective is to modify the knowledge status of a proposition or situation. As the author is directly involving herself in the construction of the discourse, it is interesting to note that this intensification and mitigation is done to achieve varying effects like, irony, amusement, teaching, etc. In the context of the novel, the writer has produced this text for the purpose of entertainment and education of the reader. Through the use of these devices, the text attempts to expose the problems of Pakistani society. To achieve this purpose, the author has drawn upon certain intensifiers that create effects and interest for the reader. Those intensifiers enhance the normal epistemic status of the situation or persons. For example, Anu takes interest in tribal and regional identities and when a person having an Iranian root started talking against it, she was taken aback. To create an interest in the text, the author intensifies this: ‘She was momentariliy taken aback . . . bemoaning the very activity . . . the doctor often resented her for”. These adverbs and
adjectives are used to create surprise and to gain effect of the utterances of the cigar-puffing Iranian gentleman that Pakistani nation is divided. The author uses following adverbs and adjectives: “we will always be divided”, “But we will never be united”, “our children won’t even know he had a dream”, “. . . arranged it over heavy heart”, etc. Similarly, in women’s talk the author also attempts to create interest for the reader intensifying the normal situation. The interest is also created by modifying the epistemic status of proposition like: “She gets the cuts just right”, “Looking disdainfully at Anu”, “Mah’s beauty parlor is far superior”. These adjectives and adverbs have intensifying effect for the parlors and beautification activities for some ladies but mitigating effect for the opposition. There is another attempt of the author to intensify the contextual meaning of the utterance just to create interest for the reader. The intensifying scheme has a socio-cultural taste where we feel proud by associating ourselves with superior others: “And I found out that her grandmother was my grandmother’s neighbour’s khala’s mother-in-law’s best friend’s sister!” This intensifying effect is not due to its semantic force; rather, due to the complexity of the utterance whereas the relations involved in it are socially placed far away from each other.

In the light of language issues emerging from the study and their effect upon meaning-making of the discourse, it represents how Pakistani men and women feel proud of their regional identities that connect them to their locations, provinces, their regional languages, their parents/forefathers. The discourse producer constructs sense of identity based on belongingness of Pakistani men and women which, indirectly, creates an impression of negating Pakistani nationhood as a whole. In terms of inter-discursivity at another level, this language use creates confusion about selfhood and identity. Conflicting and shifting discourses of belongingness and division based on region, religion and ideology of Pakistan provided by Quaid-e-Azam indicate more serious questions and concerns of identity, self perception and Pakistani nation. It also reflects dearth of leadership in Pakistani system of government that no one so far could provide sense of identity, unity and nationhood that both male and female sections of society are at loss to identify themselves as Pakistani: they shift their identities from local to national, from national to religion, etc. No leader has welded their differences; rather, their internal dissensions have been widened by the politicians. Women are represented as least bothered about their identities as Pakistani. Perhaps this is an effect of patriarchal discourses that they leave this issue to be decided by men as they themselves are
identified by the identities of their husbands. It also indicates another serious issue that women are more alienated than men because their identity exists nowhere except with their husbands – a patriarchal social structure with multiple shifting layers of identity for men and a kind of alienation for women. In this regard, Rubina Saigol (2010) expresses her views about sense of identity and nationhood of Pakistani Mohajir Woman: “She stands at the cross-roads of multiple and layered identities . . . Her identity seems to be forged not only by her own sense of who she is but also by what others say” (p. 196).

Thus, being alienated in the male dominated discourses of identity women try to locate their identity formation in the beautification where they find satisfaction of their sense of selfhood and not in the patriarchal discourses of Pakistani ideology or regional ethnical discourses in which they are dependent upon men with no space of articulating their belongingness. This passage presents discourses that, in words of Fairclough (see Literature Review, p. 37), reflect people having relations with the world, their social positions, relationships and personal identities and how do they try to change world in particular directions. Thus, the socio-cultural aspects cannot be separated from the language use in novel texts.

Sixth procedure demands to draw up context diagram for the specific context and the fields of action. The specific context of this text is that married men and women are sitting at a table in a club. They belong to a middle upper class. They are presented here as talking: men with men on politics and women with women about beauty parlors and the art of beautifying. And as they talk, they engage in different discourses. Discourses, being a form of social order, reflect their identities as they belong to middle upper class of the urban areas of Pakistan. Their identities are constructed inter-discursively and the intermingled discourses carry the effects of social class, norms, customs and conventions and practices. It is the writer’s attempt to represent, create and educate by creating such environment that reflects gender equality and non interference attitude in each other’s domain; however, there is linguistic competition within the respective gender groups.

Seventh procedure of the analytical model demands extensive interpretation while returning to the research question and proposition/problems under investigation. The context interpreted in the first and sixth procedures indicates that married men and women are shown in their talk of personal interest. They are placed in a hostile linguistic environment where they attempt to dominate each other and that reflects the social make
up of their identities. Moreover, men and women are engaged in discourses that reflect their independent identities, certain social norms and respective behaviors that differentiate masculine and feminine expressions. Their discourses also indicate that how men and women construct their identities like:

i. Men’s discourse is about others with no specific language use. There is use of ambiguous pronouns like “We will always be divided” and “We’ll always be Punjabi . . .” But women’s discourse is about their individual persons – their physical beauty. They use direct pronouns “you”, and “I” indicating their interest in their personal identities.

ii. Men are bit aggressive and pacifying in their discourses like when Hyderabadi person replies “It is your weak morale that will tear us apart”; “You must not tell your son to see you this way”. Similarly, a Punjabi person attempts to pacify both the Iranian and the Hyderabadi by arguing that “We have nothing to fear, Islam unites us”, etc. On the other hand, women are competitive and seen enjoying their conversation like: “You should try Nicky’s instead of moon palace”; “Mah beauty parlor is far superior”. Then there were “gasps and exclamations”, etc.

iii. Men’s discourse even in informal gathering leads to seriousness in language use and certain fright like: “He peeled open a napkin and arranged it over a heavy heart”; “Things are only getting worse”, etc. While women’s discourse reflects that they are relaxed and like to live in light mood in informal situations like “her husband could not stand her for it”; “While gasps and exclamations issued”, etc.

In view of these expressions by women in the company of women as constructed by a woman is a significant aspect of this text. This inter-discursive construction expresses how women feel pleased in their relaxed chat, wherein they contest among themselves, have support, appreciation, respect and understanding from each other. The author, Uzma Aslam Khan has been a teacher of English literature teaching female students. Perhaps, having this understanding of the sources of pleasure of women, she has taken the opportunity to represent as well as teach that how women can also enjoy their free time in Pakistani society. Though in daily routine, women face a host of socio-cultural restrictions in availing free time opportunities and expressing themselves about
their area of interest. Kincheloe (1997) argues while focusing on critical constructivism and representation of reality:

As critical researchers come to understand the historical/social nature of representational form and content, they are better prepared to represent their own subjectivities and contexts outside the orbit of hegemonic representational formats. Here they are able to rescue both their scholarship and their “selves” from the structuring of dominant modes of representation. (p. 67)

It is clear that the author represents women in their social contexts where they do not have any fear of being deleted or marginalized by any hegemonic group. In view of historical and social nature of representation, the construction of women’s discourse in this fiction text involves the cultural and educational value for the reader.

**Discourse of Exhortation and Awakening.** Dia and Nini are positioned as having opposing discourses. Nini seems to have accepted her subordinated position in the patriarchal society; however, Dia resists it vehemently and attempts to awaken her sense of self-perception against the dominant discourse of superiority.

(3) (Nini says to Dia) . . . ‘After all, you seem to think you’re different. Face it Dia, you need a man in your life too, and you won’t ever know if the one you pick is better than the one I do.’

Dia was stunned. It was not simple the hateful tone that stung like a physical blow. It was the knowledge that so many women fell into just this trap: arguing or just this plain fretting, about men. On the other hand, there was an unspoken agreement between men: woman was not a topic worth mentioning, unless she aroused them sexually. But man was a topic women devoured from every angle. Dia was certain this was the most obvious yet neglected reason for their disparate positions in society: time. Women spent it on men; men spent it on men.

And now here she was, spending close to two hours today, and several hours yesterday, cogitating emptily about one of them. Didn’t Nini see how silly this was? How typical? How dangerous?

She longed to stop the clock right here. ‘Please let’s not fight.’ (p. 94)
First procedure demands to explore socio-political, historical, psychological, and other aspects forming the contextual base of this discourse/passage. The context is Pakistan and its specific religious ideology and according to this text, religious ideology has been affected by social relations and interactions and become a culturally constructed behaviour. By adopting religious discourse, people attempt to reflect that their behaviour is determined by the religious ideology without any self-interest and political objectives. By taking the cover of religious ideological discourse, people, particularly men, try to relate the consequences of certain events/happenings with power that is beyond the control of any individual. Through this constitutive power of discourse, men attempt to influence women and others for control by showing their helplessness. Women specifically face a difficult situation in this regard while choosing a man as partner of life. It is the general tone of the passage that women love the presence of man as father, brother, husband, son, etc., but man is indifferent towards women. His physical presence as well as the social structures and discourses shaped under his influence pose severe hurdles in way of women’s emancipation and autonomy. In the given passage, Dia and Nini are arguing on this difficult behavior of men. Both agree that all men with minor degree of variation are similar in their behavior towards women. This is a discourse strategy of the author. Nini wants to have a change in life by getting married to Daanish without knowing what kind of person he is, while Dia attempts to persuade her that without knowing the person, she should not throw herself in this trap. She tells Nini that “You don’t know the boy” (p. 93). In this context, the given passage is a representation of religious and cultural behavior in Pakistan.

Second procedure directs to establish inter-discursivity of the given discourse. It is the basic assumption of this analytical model that no discourse is linear; rather, it is always inter-discursive and intertextual. Internally this discourse draws upon other discourses which include (i) discourse of marriage, (ii) discourse of sexuality and (iii) Women’s awareness about men’s behavior. Externally this discourse represents Austin’s (1813) 19th century novel “Pride and Prejudice” in which Eliza Bennet undervalues herself while making choice of husband. Nini is behaving in a similar way which is being reshaped by Dia. Through this inter-discursive strategy, the author produces her discourse intermingling knowledge how women can negotiate their need of having a man in life without compromising their autonomous status. About this inter-discursive aspect of the text, Pamela Seth (2009) contends, that the events of the text “fashion a multidimensional
world in which these characters must struggle in an altogether believable way. With its blend of personal and the political, the social and the individual, Khan succeeds in creating a fictional world quite unlike any other” (see Literature Review, p. 49).

Third procedure directs to formulate precise research question, and explore neighboring fields for explanatory theories. In view of inter-discursive construction of the given passage, first research question of this study will be explored. This question is: “What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses within the text of the novel under study”. For explanatory theory Foucault’s discourse theory is used. He contends that humanity is not a naturally occurring biological phenomenon; rather, power struggle and cultural orders and systems shape humanity in different hues (see Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CFDS, p. 61). The focus of investigation is how text constructs Dia and Nini out of their biological frames and what particular language struggle works over identity and identification process. Accordingly, investigation is carried out in the next procedures.

Fourth procedure demands to operationalise the research question into linguistic categories and fifth procedure guides to apply those categories sequentially using theoretical approach to interpret meanings resulting from the research questions. Linguistic categories are the five discursive strategies, provided by Wodak, that usually constitute a discourse. Analysis of discursive strategies opens up the meanings forming connection with other discourses as indicated earlier and highlighted in theoretical and analytical perspective of CFDS (p. 59).

First discursive strategy is referential /nomination that guides to focus upon how are persons/objects named and referred to linguistically?’ Naming and reference devices may include biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors and metonymies to construct in-groups or out-groups. Dia is representative of more critical and independent females. Nini is representative of a traditional group of women, whose mind is much influenced by the traditional patriarchal discourses, according to which, a woman needs a man as partner in life and it does not matter who is chosen because all men are almost same in their behaviour towards women. It seems that Dia forms part of in-group against the out-group of men and the traditional women. There is Nini, with a traditional discourse of womanly subjugation before man, and Dia, conflicting with discourse of lack
of awareness on the part of women regarding men’s behavior. Among them, third group is man whose authority is under discussion with criticism, suspicion and sense of self-assurance. There is no use of plain nouns to refer to the girls; rather, they are linguistically constructed through the reactive and assumptive words. Metaphorically, Dia is referred to as knowledgeable and too sensitive to man-woman relationship. She is convinced of her identity as an equal partner in the matrimonial relationship. She is referred to as “Dia was stunned”. It was the knowledge of Dia that “Dia was certain”. On the other hand, Nini is docile and convinced of her domesticated identity. She is referred to linguistically on the basis of her traditional arguments to accept men as husband at their face value to fulfill her need. The first sentence in ‘Pride and Prejudice’ says, “It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune must be in want of a wife” (1813, p. 1). Nini, used as a discursive strategy, is also of the similar opinion. But her passive acceptance to have a man because “you need a man in your life” is not digested by Dia and also perhaps by the author who intervenes to comment and refers to Nini’s subject position, “Did not Nini see how silly this was? How typical? How dangerous?” So Nini’s approach to life and way of thinking are referred to as foolish, silly and impracticable and above all dangerous. Here is explicit struggle of language to make the female readers aware of dangers of offering yourselves blindly to masculinity that entails grave perils for women’s freedom. There is a question whether you want to carry yourself as a knowledgeable and self amused woman or identified as foolish and traditional. Third group is ‘man’. Men are referred to as sexually obsessive.

Second discursive strategy is ‘predication’ that what stereotypical and evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits are attributed to in-group and/or out-group. It guides to analyze what attributions are there to label them positively or negatively. In this discourse, there are three groups “Nini”, “Dia” and “men”. Nini’s way of thinking is labeled in this discourse as “silly”, “typical”, and “dangerous” due to her ill-informed approach towards men that supports asserting the already prevailing masculinity in Pakistani society. It is an attempt to represent Nini to be identified as a domesticated woman – a location where men reign unquestionably. So it is termed as “How typical? How dangerous?” It is not an appreciation; rather, it is a negative labeling that is disliked by the discourse producer. Nini’s stance is represented negatively because it subjugates women and gives women in the hands of men who use them for their sexual satisfaction only. Men are attributed as sexually obsessive that is of course a taboo in Pakistani
culture especially in circles of women. Dia is another group that seems to carry support of the discourse producer. Dia is predicated positively and her stance is represented appreciatively because of her being different and not typical, as Nini says, “After all, you seem to think you’re different”. Dia is represented as a culturally and socially enlightened girl who has the knowledge of women’s traditional approach towards men. Such women accept men at their face value or accept the values of masculinity sometime with argumentation and sometimes with “plain fretting, about men”. Dia is also attributed as “certain” because she is convinced that women’s lack of knowledge about the traps of masculinity is the major cause of maltreatment of women at the hands of men. Their acquiescence just for the need of men in life is replete with dangers. Thus, Dia is predicated appreciatively as “different”, “knowledgeable”, “certain” and “cogitating” because she behaves in a productive way.

Third discursive strategy is ‘argumentation’ and argumentation schemes that are used to justify and legitimize the exclusion, difference, suppression and exploitation of others. It guides to analyze those topoi that are used for justification of positive and negative attribution, for discriminatory or preferential treatment. Here comes the topos of threat or danger that is based on the proposition that if there is some danger/threat, one should do something against it. Based on this proposition, in the given discourse, the argumentation scheme is that in Pakistani society meeting of men and women takes place in the form of marriage. However, women should not submit to marriage union acquiescently; rather, they should know men in general and to be-partners in particular. They should not accept it reservedly or passively otherwise dangers lie ahead in terms of loss of freedom, stay at home, economic dependence upon man, etc. The discourse utterances attempt to justify this resistance against masculinity and hegemonic social discourses such as “you need a man in your life”, “You won’t ever know if the one you pick is better than what I do”. The author also encourages women to resist and take a different course of action against the exploitation of men who are not interested in a woman “unless she aroused them sexually”. On the other hand, women are responsible for their sexploitation and victimization who accept passively the marriage proposal on the basis of the discourse that “you need a man in your life”. Dia regrets that “so many women fell into just this trap: arguing, or just plain fretting, about men . . . But man was topic women devoured from every angle”. The argumentation advocates turning the status of victims/women into liberated women. Dia says, “Please let's not fight. You do what
you want”. It also indicates that instead of fighting among themselves they should fight against the exploitation of men. Their own fight will strengthen the masculine and hegemonic designs that trap and subjugate women by attributing various misnomers to women like quarrelsome, talkative, easy going, pliant, etc.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation’ or discourse representation. It guides to analyze the language use focusing on its specific objective with which the author produces the discourse by reporting, describing or narrating, etc. The author describes here a situation in which Nini and Dia argue on men’s behavior towards women and women’s lack of knowledge and putting themselves in a situation where men exploit them. The author, through Dia, frets about this trapping of women wherein patriarchal prejudices like unfounded hatred and sexual violence harm them. They treat women as worthless objects. Thus, offering themselves to men in marriage without knowing is providing an opportunity to men exercise their full power and control upon women’s existential rights. It gives immense pain to the author who expresses her dissatisfaction over the matrimonial contract. It is not only a dissatisfaction; rather, there is a fear that there is no escape from this trap; “Didn’t Nini see how silly this was? How typical and how dangerous?” It is a discourse of protest against this social arrangement of marriage and the discourse “typical” with majority of women is that their choice does not matter, ultimately they have to live a fated life and eventually they will be silenced. Nini, being out-group, is exponent of this discourse, “Face it Dia, you need a man in your life too and you won’t ever know if the one you pick is better than the one I do”. In protest “Dia is stunned” and longs “to stop the clock right here”. Thus, the author constructs this discourse as a contesting site where conflicting discourses interact over gender and power relations. It is a warning to women that they should not squeeze their own space for the need of a man in life.

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’. It guides to analyze the language use aiming at intensifying or mitigating illocutionary force of utterances to modify the knowledge status of a proposition. Are the utterances articulated clearly? Are they intensified or mitigated to change the knowledge status of the given proposition? Nini’s discourse of “need of a man in a woman’s life” is mitigated in a highly emotive tone and contest. This is done through verbs, showing Dia’s reactions, adjectives and the utterances that modify the knowledge status of this simple proposition that it does not
matter whether she picks a better and different man, she needs a man in her life, because the different man may not be party to oppressive masculine prejudices and structures. The significance and force of Nini’s proposition is mitigated through verbs; “Dia was stunned”. On the one hand, it mitigates Nini’s proposition and on the other hand, it intensifies meaning and practice of Dia’s proposition that you need to know a man before marriage. Frequent use of adverbs and adjectives in the following utterances indicates the difference between Dia and Nini and modifies the epistemic status of what Nini says. The author does it like this: “It was not simply the hateful tone”, “It was knowledge that so many women fell into just this trap”, “there was an unspoken agreement between men”, “But man was a topic women devoured from every angle”, “Dia was certain this was the most obvious yet neglected reason”, etc. To make the tone highly emotive and charged, the author puts series of questions with and without helping verbs; “Didn’t Nini see how silly this was? How typical? How dangerous?” This is to reduce the significance of Nini’s proposition and to modify it into something horrible, repulsive and potentially highly dangerous. Above all, Dia herself wants to use her physical power to “stop the clock right here”. Thus, there is an obvious attempt to intensify the illocutionary force of utterances to differentiate Nini’s and Dia’s propositions/discourses.

In the light of third research question, the language issue involves the vital aspect of this discourse of constructing female in-group being victimized and alienated by the male out-group within a male dominated social framework of Pakistani society: “so your assumptions are just as unfounded as mine. Yes many men are like that . . . you need a man in your life too”. This construction of in-group/out-group is based on notions of dependence need and lack of consciousness of women and domination, independence and men’s disinterest in women except for sex. Feelings of these two opposing binaries are represented to cement solidarity among women and especially to teach female reader about this dichotomy existing within Pakistani society: “Dia was stunned” by the Nini’s assertion of women’s dependency upon men due to their need of men and women’s falling into men’s trap. In-group is constructed as preoccupied by the presence/existence of men and ignorant of their personal strengths and self identity against the disinterested and subduing men who take interest in women only to satisfy their sexual desire. “Woman was not a topic . . . their disparate positions in society; time” indicates very serious undertones of patriarchy and biased picture of society based on binary oppositions. Discourse producer exclusively constructs men as sexually driven, thus dangerous for
women: “Dia was certain the most obvious yet neglected reason for their disparate positions in society; time”. Similarly use of warnings like “How silly this was? How typical? How dangerous?” creates not only differentiating effect between men as dominant and victimizer and women as marginalized and victimized but also denotes concern of the author for women’s safety and security. It is an attempt to awaken and position women as conscious beings who through their knowing about the clever behavior of men can ensure their respectability and create a reliable and trustworthy relationship based on mutual respect.

Through the axis of in-group/out-group – “Women spent it on men; men spent it on men” – the discourse producer attempts to strengthen the bond and solidarity among women as in-group while men as out-group are described as self-interested who believe only in self-aggrandizement in their relationship with women. By constructing polar positions this discourse also suggests feeling of dislike towards men and feeling of concern and sympathy for women. The last sentence of the passage – “She longed to . . . let’s not fight” – is a significant language use that refers to a cognitive aspect of women who are fed up with the existing arrangement. In words of Foucault (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, pp. 29-30), discourse is being used here as a point of resistance and a starting point of an opposing strategy. This opposing strategy is visible in the patterns of language use where Dia longs to resist. Pecheux and van Dijk (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 30) also refer to this ideological struggle represented through language use as the essential aspects of discourses within a text.

Sixth procedure is about drawing a context diagram for the specific text and field of action. Adding to the contextual background given in first procedure is that Dia and Nini are fast friends and college mates. Nini belongs to a family that is educated but believes in a traditional and normative approach to life. Dia also belongs to an educated family. Her mother is a business lady and due to her experience of life practical believes in an approach that may go against the normative practice of the society. She taught Dia to marry only for love, not out of obligation. These family backgrounds play significant role in shaping their perception and identity. Daanish’s return from America creates disturbance in their life as both are interested in Daanish. However, Nini’s mother has approached Daanish’s mother for their arranged marriage. Nini is ready to accept Daanish in marriage without knowing him whether he’ll suit to her or not: “I’m sick of being stuck
in this house doing what I’ve always done. I want something different” (p. 93). On the other hand, Dia insists that Nini should not go plainly into the marriage union with Daanish. In most of such cases women have to compromise their life because men do not provide any space to women in the highly patriarchal social set up of Pakistan. She contends, “Oh. Nini. Is any change better than none? What makes you think marrying a stranger will give you the kind you need” (p. 93). Thus, both the girls indulge in pros and cons of the issue. The given passage begins with the pros by Nini which is complicated by the authorial voice that represents Dia’s reaction to it in authorial voice. Here comes the issue of gender relations in Pakistani society and this discourse becomes a politicized contesting place that implicitly intends to create a gender balanced environment by emphasizing upon the repressive and exploiting behavior of men in an explicit language struggle.

Seventh procedure is about extensive interpretation while returning to the research questions and to the proposition under investigation. The discussion about discursive strategies and especially perspectivation indicates of a discourse having political engagement that raises the gender agenda. It is an attempt to create awareness among the female readership that marriage is not simply a matter of religious or social obligation; rather, it is a negative dimension that women are trapped where men reign providing no space to women to live a liberated life: “so many women fell into just this trap: arguing or just this plain fretting, about men”. This discourse attempts to represent married life as a toiling place for women where they live an oppressed life. The authority lies with men and patriarchal structure of marriage / married life that turns most of the women into an identity of serf. Marriage is an identification process through which women transform from an independent status to a toiling status: “Dia was certain this was the most obvious yet neglected reason for their disparate positions in society; Time”. It is women’s ignorance, and their uninformed involvement in men and acceptance of marriage as a matter of obligation and necessity that empowers men to exploit women. Women put themselves in a dangerous situation by accepting marriage union unquestionably. Once it is not challenged before it takes place, then discourses (like family, social prestige, social relations, religious ideology, etc.) related to married life do not allow or make highly complex to challenge their sanctity and taken for granted status. The same discourses gradually turn this union into a form of oppressive structure through the subsequent time.
This is the reason for women’s “disparate (unequal) positions in society, time”. In this discourse men are portrayed negatively where feminist politics and gendered disparity is the main focus: “Women spent it on men; men spent it on men”. Perhaps, it is unwillingness on the part of women to bring their own discourse of assertion to power and challenge the oppressive forms: “So many women fell into just trap or going, or just plain fretting, about men”. “How silly was that? How typical? How dangerous?” thinks Dia. Implicit struggle of language is to empower women in the same territory. This discourse does not recommend against marrying; however, emphasis is on consciousness and knowing. The discourse criticizes the submissive attitude of women and not seeing the situation critically. “Didn’t Nini see” is actually an invitation to the reader that women should become aware of the consequences before they make decision for marriage. It is an attempt to empower women within the territory and space of marriage as Fury and Mansfield argue in “Feminism and Fluidity of Noir”: “By positioning the woman against the same wall of map she becomes part of the territory”. In the given text, the clash between discourse of knowing and discourse of accepting men in marriage for the sake of it takes place. This inter-discursive construction attempts to enlighten the female readers that neither they are biologically condemned to be exploited by men in the bond of marriage nor men are given any right that they should keep women repressed and make them stay within four walls. Rather, these are the patriarchal structures which women have accepted as natural given either through society, education system or through the elders as later on Nini’s expression indicates: “My mother needs me to acquiesce” (p. 95) and “Dia bitterly wondered how many parents had shrunk their daughters’ worlds to fill their own” (p. 95).

In terms of language use and contextual terrain, this discourse may not be too appealing for the traditional minded female readers. On the one side, there is the discourse of women who devour “Man” from every angle - man in the form of husband, son, brother, uncle, etc. On the other side, there is the discourse of “Man” who is represented as hungry for sex only: “Woman was not a topic worth mentioning, unless she aroused them sexually”. However, in this discourse, man’s role as father and brother has been entirely ignored in the context of Pakistani social set-up. Exclusion of these roles of men in the contextual reference is an attempt of the discourse to construct man as a ‘real’ horrible being. Somehow, it is a knowledge/discourse created by a woman that attempts to empower women by providing them this consciousness through this inter-discursive
context. Discourses of masculinity, female autonomy, marriage, etc., clash and contest and the reader is also positioned to read actively exploring intensified illocutionary force of utterances. The inter-discursivity of this passage is extended. It refers to larger implicit discourses of masculinity and texts that have produced and are producing similar meaning effects. Severe negative portrayal of men in this passage may not be the negative attitude of the author but refers to and resists those discourses that have produced similar meanings (sexist discourses) in social set up and through history. It is also possible that by defining the assumptions, experiences and practices and conventions with sexist discourse the author is constructing her own regime of truth – creating another binary opposition.

**Socio-cultural Identity of Pakistani Women.** This passage constructs identity of Pakistani women especially girls who live under multiple restrictions imposed by family and society; however, they are not happy with the normative arrangement. They desire to break the yoke of patriarchal forces.

*She had her answer when Nini said, ‘You and I know nothing about freedom, Dia. Look at us. Always stuck behind walls and in cars. If we step out, what is there? If it’s not physical danger, it’s gossip. Did you see Tasleem’s daughter Nissrine, romping around so boldly on her own? How many times I have been warned never to provoke that? My parents’ image is my headache. You call that freedom? Come on!*

(4) "My point,’ Dia insisted, ‘is that you’ll have the same headache plus many others."

*You haven’t mentioned the ones whose marriages work,’ countered Nini. ‘Some women have more flexibility around their husbands than their fathers. Look at your mother. She blossomed after marrying a man she didn’t know and had been an inspiration to so many other women. Karachi’s becoming a city of entrepreneurial mothers. They get what they want. They just have to give in first. It’s simple mechanics.’

*Dia turned away. Yes, her mother had thrived, and yet her warning echoed in the grove. Marry out of love. Not obligation. Dia pictured her parents sauntering between the trees. Strangers, not friends. ‘If that’s as good as you think it can get, it’ll never get any better. We’re more than simple mechanics. It’s okay to aim higher, or have dreams.’* (p. 114)
First procedure guides to establish context of the discourse to be interpreted. Context includes aspects like socio-cultural, political, historical and psychological nature, and exploration of the contextual aspects leads into the inter-discursive world of context. This passage is taken from the chapter of the novel named as ‘Choice’. In Pakistani social set-up, despite having a relaxed atmosphere for women, it is still felt that there are certain restrictions caused by family traditions, role of elders and discursive socio-political norms that position women dependent upon male members of their family restricting their choices in life. Making choice in significant matters like marriage is a mere dream. It reflects gendered make-up of Pakistani society. Though, at present, due to women’s participation in law, judiciary, parliament, media, banking, etc., Pakistani women are far empowered than what they were in the seventies and eighties. A lot of advancement has occurred in perception of women’s role and status in Pakistan and they have acquired public voice in institutions and political processes. In this regard, Lewis (n.d.) argues about women’s movement in Pakistan:

The women’s movement has shifted from reacting to government legislation . . . working to raise women’s consciousness, particularly about family planning and countering suppression of women’s rights by defining and articulating positions in events as they occur in order to raise public awareness.

Despite this freedom, there are certain discourses that relate to socio-political and family life where women still find restrictions. These discourses concern about general problems of Pakistani society that affect, to great extent both men and women. Somehow, the author attempts to develop a kind of thinking through her discourse that women need to be proactive than to receive things passively under the discourses of predetermined fate wherein “God decides”. Both Dia and Nini are in college and manage to avail free time by escaping classes. They talk about restrictions upon women that are also general social evils but they have no clear idea how to ensure better future arrangement of their life. It reflects their identities as teenage women in relation to their aspirations. Thus, this passage is embedded in the context of social relations and social structures that attempt to control personal freedom of women through their discourses of fate, chance, obligation and respect to elders, men, etc.

Second procedure of the analytical model requires establishing inter-discursivity. The essence of this novel as well as of the passage is to indicate the nature of those social
rules and norms that attempt to control women’s freedom and their existence. For inter-
discursive purpose I do not go out of this text. This text is replete with discourses that
further draw on different sources of knowledge, and combined here to construct specific
situation in which Dia and Nini feel arrested; however, trying to come out of it. The
discourses forming this text are discourse of freedom, discourse of parentage, discourse of
marriage, etc. These discourses contextually work in social hierarchy that is highly
regulated and gender-biased. Discourse of freedom, particularly in Pakistani society is not
taken without question in majority of the families. Dia and Nini belong to such families
wherein the very word “freedom” entails host of problems like permission of elders,
challenge to family traditions/honour, whispering of neighbors, masculine gazing/gossips
and physical violence, etc. Similarly, discourse of parentage is not a reflection of blood
relation only; rather, it involves issues of provision of food, accommodation, education,
care, security, religious and social obligations, family and tribal norms, etc. Thus, it leads
to other issues that form the basis of discourse of parentage. Discourse of marriage also
draws on a number of other discourses and aspects of socio-cultural significance like
family line, economic status of spouses, joint family system, etc.

Going beyond the specific utterances of the text to social practices and structures
for contextual purpose and inter-discursivity is requirement of the research design and
strongly supported by CDA and analytical perspective of Feminism. As Smith (1990)
argues that the concept of discourse itself displaces the analysis from the text as
originating in the writer only to the discourse itself as an ongoing process. She says that
for analysis of identities and processes involved, we need to move away from individual
utterances (see Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CFDS, pp. 61-62). So, the
discourse reflects how subjects are constructed through multiple discourses.

Third procedure is to formulate precise research questions and exploring
neighbouring fields for explanatory theories and theoretical aspects. For this purpose the
first research question of this study will be explored through interpretation of this
passage. This question is: “What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle
over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different
discourses within the text of the novel under study?” For explanatory theory,
neighbouring field is the “subject position” - two young girls orchestrate for themselves
working actively through different discourses as suggested by Smith (1990).
Interpretation of the passage according to the given research question and explanatory theory is carried out in the following procedures.

Fourth and fifth procedures demand to operationalise the research question into linguistic categories and apply those linguistic categories sequentially to interpret the meanings resulting from research questions. For linguistic categories, five discursive strategies of Wodak are applied to explore implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations. First discursive strategy is ‘referential/nomination’ that how are persons/objects named and referred to linguistically. It demands to analyse language use and linguistic devices such as membership categorization, biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors and metonymies and synecdoche that are used to construct in-groups and out-groups. The overall direction of the text is to highlight and create awareness about the gender polarity in Pakistani society and exploitation and hegemonic control exercised by power groups. In this passage two groups are constructed as: group one consists of two young girls, who feeling oppressed and restricted, wish to enjoy a life of freedom and equal rights. Second group consists of invisible male control of social set up and parents especially fathers who exercise control upon their female children by restricting them and teaching them to stay at home through religious, moral, family/social discourses. Group one is referred to as “You”, “I”, “Us”, “We”, etc to generalize it for almost all teenage girls. The other group is referred to as “parents”, “husbands”, “fathers”, etc. This group is also constructed implicitly where its presence is felt but not clearly mentioned. For example, when Nini says to Dia, “You and I know nothing about freedom”. Who denies this freedom is implicit, “Always stuck behind walls and in cars”. Who is responsible making them sit in cars is implied only, “If not physical danger, it’s gossip”. Who hurls gossip upon them is again invisible. It indicates the repressive behaviour of second group leading to the awareness of androcentric culture in Pakistani society. Thus, group one is referred to as oppressed, marginalized and wishing to come out of this circle of androcentric norms.

Second strategy is ‘predication’ that what traits, characteristics and qualities and features are attributed to in-groups and out-groups. This strategy demands to analyse linguistic devices like stereotypical, evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits used to label the groups negatively or positively. In-group is constructed as oppressed, lacking power, denied access to facilities of life, cannot roam around without being
subjected to male gaze and gossips. They are reflected as marginalized because they “know nothing about freedom”; they are “always stuck behind walls and in cars”; they face “gossips” in bazaars; they are warned for not provoking any deviant action; they are simple “mechanics”, etc. On the other hand, out-group that is masculine practices, men in general, fathers, husbands, etc, is labeled negatively and depreciatively. The evaluative attributes of this group are of negative nature. There are certain implicit and explicit predicates, drawing upon different discourses, construct this group as: they deny freedom to girls/women (freedom of speech, of physical movement, of marriage, of friendship, of education, etc); they make girls/women stay at homes “behind walls and in cars”; they hurl “gossips” upon girls/women; they warn girls/women not roam about boldly in bazaars; as parents cause “headache” and many other difficulties for girls that they cannot marry out of love; rather, their will is obligatory in the execution of marriage; as husbands they are not good friends, etc. Thus, in-group is constructed as subjugated and oppressed while the out-group is constructed negatively as oppressor, dominating, harsh, subjugating and tormenting.

Third strategy is ‘argumentation’ that is what arguments and argumentation schemes are used by specific persons and social groups to justify and legitimize the exclusion, discrimination, suppression and exploitation of others. It guides to analyse those topoi that are used to justify discrimination and preferential treatment, etc. In this passage the author adopts specific argumentation scheme (topos of threat/danger) that justifies that masculine behavior towards women is threatening and dangerous: “How many times I have been warned never to provoke that? My parents’ image is my headache”, “... You’ll have the same headache plus many others”, etc. Girls/women are discriminated by masculine behavior and structures by forcing them face humiliation, torture and confinement to four walls in the name of family traditions, honour, security, obligation, etc. It invites a question “what should women do against this discriminatory treatment?” Thus, arguments of the discourse leads to the conclusion that because girls/women are not leading a comfortable life; rather, they are facing danger and threats, so there is a need to do something against these challenges. Implicitly it suggests to take some bold steps like rebelling against this repressive order and norms introduced by parents. However, explicitly girls agree to minimum reaction only - that is to “aim higher or have dreams”.
Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation’ that is about the perspective working behind labels, attributions and argumentation. It demands to explore the ways the text is textured like reporting, description, narration or quotation of events and utterances. It concerns positioning speaker’s point of view. I add to it authorial point of view because it is the author behind the text who constructs the form of discourse under study. In the given discourse, language use, taking as a cultural practice of contesting discourses, reflects that teenage girls find themselves suffocated in the ordered system of life created by male dominated society. Dia is made to come forward to make a generalized statement, “If that’s as good as you think it can get, it’ll never get any better. We are more than simple mechanics. It is okay to aim higher or have dream”. Before it Nini also utters similar moan expressing her pain and misery: “My parents’ image is my headache. You call that freedom? Come on!” Besides an expression of gloom and wretchedness, it is also an appeal to others to realize and acknowledge it and come forward to transform it. The discourse is an attempt to create transformative effect upon the reader when Dia tells Nini that mere thinking of others cannot create a better situation. Thus, both Nini and Dia try to negotiate their positions in an honourable way while wishing to come out from walled position. It is an attempt to make reader realize and understand the situation and, implicitly, it invites to conflict with the given freedom to win actual freedom, the way they think appropriate. Dia attempts to put up minimum resistance to change women’s status and identity by saying that “It is okay to aim higher or have dreams”. Barker and Galasinsky (2001) call it cultural politics of language and identity: “Social change becomes possible through re-thinking and re-describing the social order and possibilities for the future”. It is an attempt to create a discourse of freedom that the author thinks appropriate for women that stands in contradiction and conflict with the discourse of ‘walled freedom’ advocated by elders/parents.

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification/mitigation’ of the illocutionary force of utterances. It demands analysis of those intensifiers or mitigating words that attempt to change the knowledge status of a proposition/situation. To earn her view-point, the author creates identity of women especially teenage girls as oppressed. They are denied freedom of movement. But to intensify the situation and raising her complaint against it she attempts to use words that modify it into a kind of crisis like situation: “You and I know nothing about freedom”. Use of this indefinite pronoun “nothing” reflects that the teenagers even denied all sort of freedom but they know not even part of it. Use of adverb
“always” in “always stuck behind walls and in cars” also intensifies the miserable condition of women. “Always” being adverb of time indicates here that as long as they remember or foresee there is no freedom for them. Denial of freedom has been intensified to all time phenomena. It is an attempt to intensify the contextual meaning of misery and pain continues with assertions like, “If it is not physical danger, it is gossip” and “My parents’ image is my headache”. Nini tries to favour men in some way by saying that some women have more freedom with their husbands than with their parents as she refers to Dia’s mother and father. But Dia mitigates it semantically that her parents were “strangers and were not friends”. Thus, the political aspect of the discourse is clear that the author intends to construct the identity of men - parents or husbands, brothers - as all time oppressors wanting to keep women as inferiors, weak and not worth even friendship. Women’s identity is constructed as marginalized by men, however, willing to change it to be humans than mere mechanics.

In the light of language issues (third research question) emerging from the study and their effect upon meaning-making of the text, this passage, through the appropriation of different discourses of family as an institution and home as base of this institution and the bazaars/market spaces occupied by men attempts to highlight significant role played by family and the four walls in the formation of femininity of women in Pakistani society. Both family and home act as patriarchal subduing locations which provide an opportunity to elders/parents (men) to exercise their control upon their women especially young ones. It reflects two things: one is that women should observe ‘purdha (cover)’ which necessitates separation of men and women specifically in the bazaars and open market, “Always stuck behind walls and in cars”; second is this separation of men and women is used as device by men to enjoy freedom at home and outside home to the extent of making fun of women who dare come outside the four walls. Thus, the social system is designed to take the form of stumbling block for women. It reflects them psychologically shy and those who dare defy it are mentally perturbed: “My parents’ image is my headache”, “You’ll have the headache plus many others”. This confinement within four walls also affects the productive activities and skills of women: “Karachi is becoming a city of entrepreneurial mothers. They get what they want. They just have to give in first. It’s simple mechanics”. But Dia corrects this notion of Nini, “We’re more than simple mechanics”.

This discourse implicitly indicates to other discourses and meanings at social level that this social constraint of four walls deprives women of their urge to contribute to the society through their productive skills. Moreover, men working in the open, acknowledge that women even working within four walls have no social recognition and their contribution to family well-being is ignored owing to the traditional norms – of taking women as caretakers within four walls. This discourse attempts to inculcate awareness of their isolation due to men and open ways to multidimensional world as indicated by Seth, discussed in literature review section (p. 58). There is a strong feeling against the institution of parenthood that imposes restrictions of movements upon young girls. This aspect has also been highlighted by Darraj (see Literature Review, p. 48) that the discourses of the text reflect typical social environment of Pakistani society defined by a contest and constant attempt of social structures through respective discourses to claim and reclaim feelings and relationships as commodity. This discourse constructs a situation and its gravity is itself a statement and a discourse. Thus, the meaning-making effect is that psychologically it is traumatic for the young girls to live in this social environment which continues to be defined by patriarchal discourses generating restrictions and anxiety for them.

Sixth procedure demands to draw up context diagram for specific text and seventh procedure demands extensive interpretation returning to research questions (probe into the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issue, gender and power relations between different discourses) and the proposition/problem. It is highlighted that the passage is part of a novel through which author, drawing upon different discourses, attempts to create awareness about the personal rights of women within their families. Though she targets many issues and every utterance indicates to some other discourse/problem, two characters Dia and Nini, who are friends, express their suppressed discourse of urge for freedom from the bondage imposed by parents and husbands to make their way through the world. They express themselves from a position which is highly powerless and subordinated. It is a contest and conflict of discourses. Their discourse of freedom conflicts with the discourse of parents and husbands (patriarchal discourse) who ask women to stay at home within the boundary walls, or closed cars and forbidding them to expose in the open world. One discourse is discourse of women who are subordinated and marginalized and not in a position to withstand the other discourse - the discourse of powerful masculinity that occupies central place to
dictate and order. Men assume that their discourse has natural and legitimate authority and it is not supposed to be challenged because they are fathers and husbands. Association of this legitimacy to their discourse is a very complex issue. It is embedded in the socio-cultural and religious contexts. Socio-culturally they are heads of family and the family members, especially women, are known as daughters of this gentleman or wife of this gentleman. From religious point of view, he is responsible to feed his family. Women are supposed to be caretakers of home affairs and not responsible to deal with external matters, hence, women’s exposure to outside world is bound to the permission of fathers and husbands.

Taking the feminist view of this discourse, it is not a mere refined arrangement of this domination of male power through its discourse over the silent females. As Smith (1990) contends that “to explore femininity as discourse means a shift away from viewing it as a normative order . . .; rather, femininity is addressed as a complex of actual relations vested in texts” (p. 163). In view of Smith’s words, there is a need to reinterpret it. Instead of looking at it as a kind of oppression of women, it also reflects the social problem in which women are taught to resist ending the male domination in all of its manifestations. It leads to a complex socio-cultural situation in which gender norms come into conflict. As Boler (1999), while expressing her views on value of feelings, argues that, “Education is an environment governed by rules of power and authority”. Ironically, one may discover that students may resist educator’s suggestions, no matter what that suggestion is. The parental cliché ‘Do what I say because I know what’s best for you’ is in part an invitation to the young people to rebel and say ‘No I’ll decide what’s best for me’. Thus, resistance takes a more complex way where there is an attempt to bring another discourse of personal way of freedom against imposed discourse of parents and husbands. Women are represented and forced to identify themselves with norms that are pleasing and non offensive for parents and husbands. Parental ties with their children are challenged and reinterpreted to create their own identity associated with their own notions of freedom of social life.

“It is okay to aim higher” is an attempt to distort the so-called dignified status of male discourse of honour through which they warn “not to provoke that?” Thus, it is obvious that this passage has its value contained in the specific way of language use representing a longing for peaceful and tranquil world not disturbed by hegemonic concerns of patriarchy. Women’s identity in a resisting stance is constructed inter-discursively through an arrangement of conflicting discourses of social significance,
specially, in the context of Pakistani social set-up, where men do not like to have such bossy and confrontational discourse from daughters and wives.

**Mockery of Women by Patriarchy.** This passage presents patriarchal behavior towards women. It is totally a mockery of dressing, way of talk and way of beautification of women. It reflects inherent patriarchal disrespect towards women.

(Daanish said), ‘She (his mother Anu) keeps dropping hints about settling down, whatever that means, and a few days ago I heard her discussing “the girl” with my aunts. I came into the kitchen and Anu was saying, “I still think she’s right for him despite what happened.” I never got to know who she was, or what happened, before my chachi started coughing wildly.’

(5) **Khurram slapped his knee.** ‘It’s sounding like marriage all right!’ ‘It’s absurd. My father would have vetoed her plans immediately.’ (Daanish said).

*Khurram shrugged. ‘Maybe you’ll like her.’*

‘Have you ever noticed how women here walk?’ Khurram grinned. ‘That’s usually what I’m looking at.’

‘Sweeping dupattas,’ Daanish began to mimic the cumbersome cloth with his arms, dramatizing as he continues, ‘kurtas catching in chairs, shalwar cuffs slipping over stilettos, hair in saalan, saalin in nails. And let’s not even talk about hairspray!’

*Khurram laughed while Daanish took mincing steps around the rock, tripping, puffing out an imaginary coif, spraying it. ‘Yaar,’ said Khurram, ‘I love it when they do such things! It’s so,’ he smacked his lips, ‘so tasty!’*

‘Mind you,’ said Daanish, ‘I learned American women spend just as much time in the toilet.’

*Khurram covered his mouth with pudgy fingers and giggled. ‘How many did you know?’* (p. 173)

According to first procedure, the context of this passage reveals masculine thinking of two young men who are in their twenties and are able to go for marriage as per socio-cultural requirement of Pakistani society. Daanish and Khurram are two young
men who have returned from America. They both understand the women’s social behavior and their social activities in American society as well as in Pakistan. However, Pakistani women seem to them more ill mannered and ludicrous due to their social behavior and lack of elegance. Khurram and Daanish are sitting on a rock on the beach of Karachi sea area. Salaamat is also sitting aside apparently having no understanding of what they speak however, they are cautious of his presence. They are just enjoying their leisure time and marriage of Daanish comes under discussion. Now both are free and there is no socio-cultural hurdle in front of them. It reflects thinking of youngsters about women in a society that is gender sensitive. It indicates how men construct their own identity and identity of women using linguistic strategies that suit to them. Psychologically, they feel justified to construct their own subject position as rightful persons to make fun of women. It indicates marriage as a social contract serving as a sight of domination of men over women. As Siddiqui (2012) argues that like many stereotypes:

Jokes are targeted against the marginalized groups. Most of such jokes lead to laughter at the cost of hurting the marginalized groups. Stereotypes, in the form of jokes, gain their strength through their repeated use by the masses and by the legitimizing effect of social institutions in general and in media in particular. One such marginalized group that becomes the focus of jokes is women. (p. 86)

Against this socio-cultural and psychological context, passage will be analysed and interpreted according to the procedures and research questions.

Second procedure requires establishing inter-discursivity. Within this passage there are a number of discourses at work that construct man-woman relationship interdiscursively. Marriage discourse serves as a site of struggle between men and women. Another discourse is social behavior of men and women and their positionalities as if they were binary oppositions. The text comes through writer’s pen and she places two young men to discuss women. They develop a discourse that constructs masculine identity and feminine identity differently, putting men in the centre and women in the margin. There is a repeated attempt of sexist language use, making fun of traditional female behavior and representing conservative female identity.

Third procedure demands to formulate precise research questions and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories. To analyse and interpret this passage, the
focus is the first and second research questions of this study. First question is: “What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses within the text of the novel under study?” and the second is: “How are different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a new form of discourse/knowledge?” For theoretical purpose, Wodak’s context-based approach that advocates “gender as a social construct” (see Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CFDS, p. 60) will be applied and analysis and interpretation of the passage according to the given research question and explanatory theory is carried out in the following procedures.

Fourth and fifth procedures guide to operationalise the research questions into linguistic categories. It is to go ahead with analysis to do what we want to do. Linguistic categories are the five discursive strategies provided by Wodak. First discursive strategy is ‘referential/ nomination’ that helps to understand that how persons are named and referred to linguistically using biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors and metonymies. This strategy of discourse determines that how discrimination is affected by creating in-groups and out-groups. Though from the beginning of this text the author’s implicit and explicit line of thinking is based on social injustices and discriminations of genders wherein masculinity is constructed as exploiting out-group and women as oppressed however resisting in-group. Here in this passage the author constructs the out-group placed in a socially privileged position and let them lose their ingrained beliefs and experiences. Masculine group is constructed as assuming themselves superior in thinking, manners, decision-making and choice of objects. It is visible from what Daanish says about women in general and about her mother in particular: “It’s absurd. My father would have vetoed her plans”, “Have you ever noticed how women here walk?” Men’s self-assumed privileged position is also noticeable from Khurram’s supportive behavior who “laughed”, “grinned”, “covered his mouth with pudgy fingers and giggled”. Women are indirectly referred to as ignoble with low thinking and indecent behaviour.

Second strategy is ‘predication’ in which it is investigated that how discursive devices like stereotypical or evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits are used to label social groups positively or negatively, etc. In this passage masculine attitude is represented as, assuming superior, asserting that all women are ill-mannered, naturally
prone to carelessness and impropriety. Daanish makes fun of women by drawing upon the social stereotypes of women like, their dressing, walk, their daily domestic activities, etc. He attempts to affirm that women waste their time in silly things and they dress, walk and work in silly ways. Women are represented here, however, through the desire of male, as mere voiceless objects of fun and objects of desire. On the other hand, men are given voice and privileged position to speak and they speak derogatory language just to satisfy their desire.

Third discursive strategy is ‘argumentation’. It refers to the conclusion rules that are used by some group to justify positive or negative characteristics. It is an attempt to justify discrimination or professional treatment. The author has set this discourse as masculine domination and their discriminatory behavior towards women who are derided as objects of fun and desire. Topos of definition is used to justify their articulation against women, that the very name of woman is synonymous with “Sweeping dupatta”, “kurtas catching in chairs, shalwar cuffs slipping over stilettos, hair in saalan, saalin in nails. And let’s not even talk about hairspray!” Daanish is voicing that women are ill-mannered and justifies it by expressing their odd physical movements. Utterances of Daanish and Khurram are very conspicuous in justifying their discriminatory stance regarding women’s mannerism like: “Have you ever noticed how women here walk”, “That is usually what I’m looking at”, “Mind you I learned American women spend just as much time in the toilet” Ill-mannered behaviour of the women articulated by Daanish is justified by Khurram’s gestures who “grinned” “laughed”, “smacked his lips”, “covered his mouth with pudgy fingers and giggled”. Through this scheme of argumentation, men attempt to indicate lack of propriety and elegance in women.

Fourth strategy is ‘perspactivation’ that demands to investigate reporting, description, narration or quotation of events or utterances that express involvement of the speaker/author. It reflects the political aspect of language use. It is a representation of struggle for identity and power. The negativity attributed to women’s domestic and beautification activities is not without its perspective. However, this is very tactful use of language wherein a female author places young men, being representative of “elders” and masculine power, to express their mind and approaches towards women. Young men flaunt themselves and make fun of women. The prospective behind this is to expose male “elders” and male “young”. Male young are not less than “elders” in having their
derogatory discourses regarding women. For them women are just domestic workers who like sub-humans appear as object of fun to men who assume themselves self composed, civilized, good mannered and refined. Thus, the discourses of masculinity and femininity come into clash. However female author at the back exposes men in their attempt, through discourse of marriage/women, to legitimize themselves superior to women. Through their discourse they try to confine women to their traditional spheres of domesticity and toil where in they are articulated having: “Sweeping dupattas, kurtas catching in chairs, shalwar cuffs slipping over stilettos, hair in saalan, saalan in nails. And let’s not even talk about hairspray!” Perhaps putting men in this identity and power projection and constructing women as mere pretty objects of fun, the author exploits this language to create awareness in women. She is inviting women to reconstruct their view of men. It also raises certain questions: Are their fashion clothes a hindrance in their appearance as human being? Do they need to wear what men wear? Is their adornment always wastage of time? Perhaps the objective of the author is not to mock at the female identity; rather, to reflect the low thinking that men carry along about women and then try to naturalize and universalize it for their own advantage and enjoyment.

Fifth strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’ of contextual force of utterances. It is usually done to modify the knowledge status of a proposition. Here the proposition is women’s dressing, and adornment. Instead of taking this discourse further into charm, delicacy and women’s own view of their identity in their distinctive and body flattering dresses and luscious locks of hair, the author places so-called knowledgeable men to articulate their discourse of women. Thus, the discourse of exquisite delicacies comes into clash with conservative male discourse that takes woman in her own identity process as a source of fun and an object of male gaze. This is intensified time and again through adverbial and adjective clauses and certain verbs that have deep rooted semantic effects. It is intensified through adverbial clauses like “Have you ever noticed, how women here walk?” making way of walk of women as something unusual as an everlasting phenomenon. Then “That is usually what I am looking at”, “Let’s not even talk about hairspray”, etc. Mockery of women’s identity is further intensified through adjective clauses like “mimicking steps”, “sweeping dupattas” and “cumbersome cloth”. The mockery of women’s identity in their walk, dressing and adornment is further intensified in the scorn and ridicule of verbs like, “Khurram grinned”, “Khurram laughed”, “he smacked his lips”, “Khurram giggled”, etc. Thus, it is an attempt to construct negative
image of masculine power through the intensification of negativity of women’s identities. Men’s attempt to ridicule women also indicates that they regard them not only as objects of fun; rather, they attempt to mitigate significance of their routine activities that are part of their personality identification.

In the light of third research question, language issues emerging from the studies and their effect upon the meaning-making, this passage is important. It is important also due to the fact that it is written by a female writer who seems to be fully aware of patriarchal attitude towards women in Pakistani society. Though in routine reading it is a humorous discourse but while looked at through the lens of five discursive strategies and CFDS, this passage lays bare its political layers. This discourse is not mere a stereotypical hurling of jokes upon women rather it is a naked fun made through very plain language. But implicitly it is aimed at exposing negative behavior and thinking of men towards women. The peak of negative behavior appears when Daanish confirms inevitability and attempts to universalize the beautification activities of women as comical and strange: “‘Mind you’, said Daanish, ‘I believe American women spend just as much time in the toilet’”. While Daanish and Khurram are happy to joke about the very existence of women, the author represents men’s negative behavior using very sharp words: “absurd”, “grinned”, “cumbersome cloth”, “Khurram laughed”, “he smacked his lips”, “Khurram covered his mouth with pudgy fingers and giggled”. It reflects how men feel happy in ridiculing the activities of women. This is a sheer flaunting of what women do, wear and think about themselves. It is an attempt to narrowing the women’s talent, their faculties and their consciousness by limiting their lives to extra domestic and toiletry activities, thus, it renders their lives worthless.

Effect upon meaning-making is the political aspect that is intertwined in this game of mockery that it is actually men who are debased when thinking low and not women. Pamela Seth also highlights (see Literature Review, p. 49) that with its blend of personal and political, the social and the individual, Khan has successfully created her world of fiction. Thus, the comedy becomes a serious discourse of social and gender issues. This language use intertwined with political activism has also gained relevance to protest to disrupt and reshape the world as it is known. It becomes politically inflected discourse to attack the specter of gender in Pakistani society.
Sixth procedure of the analytical model demands drawing up the context diagram for the specific text and fields of action. Elaborating further the contextual information of first procedure, the author of the text/discourse is a female who supports female freedom and female existence in its self-constructed identities. She has already dismissed the idea of “elders” in family who are usually men. Here in this discourse, she exposes that even young men are not better than follow suit of their “elders” in their views and behavior towards women. The authorial strategy here is that women are absent from this discourse, hence there is no female voice to speak about herself as women are spoken about. Field of action here is to investigate this text as language struggle over identity, gender and power relations and how inter-discursivity creates this form of discourse wherein men laugh at women. Women are present through their identity discourse only and physically they are absent.

Seventh procedure guides to have an extensive interpretation while returning to the research questions and to the problems under investigation. There is an implicit and explicit language struggle to create awareness among the Pakistani women in general and women readers in specific about the socio-cultural, religious, political and patriarchal restrictions that have limiting effect upon their freedom and extent of their thinking. Daanish, who has come from free world of America, does not spare even his mother when it comes to the issues of masculine power. “Shit! I come back here to find my father dead and mother scheming” (p. 174). Here Daanish, is not ready to accord that status to his mother which religious ideology provides to a mother in Pakistani Muslim society. It is a representation of patriarchal forces in Pakistani society that they exploit women in the name of religion when it suits to them: “Leave tomorrow, they advised, in God’s hands” (p. 13), otherwise they have no respect for religion and no respect for women. Discourses of overpowering patriarchal forces in Pakistani society come to clash with discourses of religion and freedom of women and their social status in Pakistan. Through this inter-discursivity and linguistic appropriation of different discourses, the author is successful in creating this form of discourse where men feel free to ridicule women.

This passage has ideological premises as well that it defines woman through a masculine perspective and targeting her for awareness of the readers. This raises ontological question about the world being constructed by the author – masculine or the feminine. More important is how this relationship is constructed representing relations
between the male and female gender identities. Much is to be interpreted by the researcher. Women are defined not in terms of their independent selves but by the dominant male selves as inferior version of human being. Inter-discursive attempt to create this awareness about the orthodox social fabric, which has chained women, is more evident if this passage is compared with third passage (p. 208). In this passage there are Dia and Nini who are alone to discuss their marriage issues and their social status, freedom space for them and the role of “elders” in their life. They do not indulge in making fun of men; rather, they express their woes upon the socio-cultural norms controlled by men. This discourse becomes a contesting place wherein men are identified with offensive social system and women as victim of this system, because they have “stuck behind the walls and in cars”. If they come out of the walls and cars, they face “gossip”. The social fabric constructed in current passage is similar wherein two young men, Daanish and Khurram, become part of that system which keeps women within “walls” and “stuck in cars”. Here men’s identity is constructed of a typical normative masculine force that comes loudly to make women butt of their gossips and ridicules. They are dehumanized and ridiculed to the extent of creating “laughter”, “giggle” and shameless “smacking of lips”.

Linguistically, it is a highly gendered discourse wherein fun, laughter and refinement is associated with men and ill-mannered behavior, silence (deafness) and adorning activities termed as time wasting are associated with women. However, this construction of dominant male identity and awkward and inelegant female identity is not the whole story. Men, despite holding the centre, voicing them as educated superiors, are also afraid of the uneducated community sitting silently at the margins. Salaamat, who is sitting on one side, where Daanish and Khurram make fun of women, is a discourse strategy and metaphor that represents uneducated community on the one hand and silenced women on the other hand who are taught to reconcile with the fate that has to happen sooner or later. Fear of Dannish is visible while during ridiculing women he looks towards Salaamat and says, “I wonder what he’s thinking?” Kurram says, “You can say anything in front of him. He’s deaf” (p. 173). Indirectly and implicitly this is a message for the uneducated community and silenced women to put up resistance to the dominating patriarchy that exploit them for their control and hegemonic power. Thus, discourses of deafness of uneducated marginalized community, awareness of the exploiting dominating group and derogatory view of men of women’s personal activities and dressing are
linguistically appropriated by the author to create this form of discourse/knowledge that reveals how patriarchy and its normative social system attempt to fix meaning/identity in its own way.

**Construction of Free Woman or a Wilful Daughter/Sister.** This passage illustrates how various highly gendereed discourses construct women’s private and public life. Dia is represented here as a gendered self but ready to challenge the traditional site that is control by men – woman’s sexuality.

(6) At the cove, she bit her lip, recalling reports of beach huts being raided and women raped. This hideout didn’t even offer a hut to duck into. Dia’s mind swam with newspaper accounts of women being killed by their uncles and brothers for doing less than she already had. She looked around with trepidation, she, the product of a country where self-consciousness was basic survival. Where a woman’s reputation was the currency that measured her worth.

Would being discovered here be the end of her? What would her brother Hassan turn into? She barely knew him after all. And did she know her mother? In their last argument, Riffat had toed the party line. She’d told Dia that she too would have to think about these things someday. You have no idea how hostile society gets if you challenge it. She’d pledged loyalty to Dia and yet, at last, imposed her own will on her. Nini’s plaint – my parents’ image is my headache – tormented Dia now. What if Riffat was the same?

But Daanish began massaging the knot that had been building inside her ever since their first tryst. The pain of lying to those she loved, doubts about Daanish, terror of becoming the thing Khurram or Salaamat chuckled over with their friends - some of that slowly left her. It was like shedding half her skin. The old half looked quickly around, wondering if they were being watched. She didn’t think she could ever completely slough this layer off.

Or maybe she could. Daanish’s fingers probed expertly. She was twenty years old and ready to be something more than the repository of her family’s honor. She was twenty years old and ready to be loved. (pp. 289-290)

According to first procedure, the contextual information entails social, political, historical, psychological, etc., aspects. The passage taken as discourse is part of the novel
text that mainly relates to socio-political, cultural and psychological issues concerning women in Pakistan. It mainly focuses upon discourses related to social structures such as family, parents restrictions upon the children especially women, market places controlled by men, religion used by men as a ploy to subdue women and marriage as a social bond in which women are bound to obey orders of men and consume their life and life energies in the domestic chores, etc. Women’s life is influenced massively by these structures that they feel secure in the presence of their family members especially men. For example author constructs Anu’s feelings once she was alone at home after the death of her husband, Dr. Shafqat: “She was his sparrow”, “She stood at the sink, cleaning a chicken, feeling his presence still” (p. 273). There is issue of power that is primarily controlled by men and restricts women within four walls of homes or doors of cars. “Look at us. Always stuck behind walls and in cars. If we step out, what is there?” (p. 114). In the given passage, Dia and Daanish are alone in a grove on Karachi sea beach. Human desire dominates but feelings of Dia and Daanish are exceptionally different. Their feelings are visibly shaped by the effects of discourses prevailing in Pakistani society.

Second procedure guides to establish inter-discursivity that concerns relationship between this discourse and those discourses that are implicitly or explicitly interrelated within the text or from outside. It is clear from the contextual information that the discourse relates to feminine issues in Pakistani society. This discourse draws upon many other discourses that implicitly function actively in this discourse. There are discourses of honour killing (Dia’s mind swam with newspaper accounts of women being killed by their uncles and brothers for doing less than she already had); of women’s social position (she the product of the country where a woman’s reputation was the currency that measured her worth); of family restrictions (what would her brother Hassan turn into? She barely knew him after all); of unrestricted masculine desire (But Daanish began massaging the knot that had been building inside her ever since their first tryst), etc. Thus, the given discourse is constructed drawing upon different other discourses.

Third procedure demands to formulate precise research questions and explore neighboring fields for explanatory theories. For this purpose, the second research question of this study that “How are different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a form of discourse / knowledge?” Second research question that will be explored is “how external discursive structures are constructed and
in what way Dia accepts or rejects the effects of those structures?’. And for explanatory theory, Funcault’s theory of “art of existence” as cited in McNay (1992) is being applied. This art of existence has intentional actions of men to transform their life into a symbolic system that has certain (power) values to exploit women (see Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CFDS, p. 61). Analysis and interpretation of the passage, according to the given research questions and explanatory theory, is carried out in the following procedures.

Fourth and fifth procedures demand to operationalise the research questions into linguistic categories and apply these categories sequentially on the text using theoretical approaches to interpret the meanings. Linguistic categories, according to the analytical model, are the five discursive strategies that allow investigating the linguistic devices used to construct certain objects. Given research question is also to be investigated through investigation of the discursive strategies.

First discursive strategy is ‘referential/nomination’ that is how persons/objects are named and referred to linguistically by using biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors and metonymies to construct in-groups or out-groups. Here it is gender opposition that leads to construct two groups: a self-satisfied male (Daanish) and severely perturbed young female (Dia); both occupying their cultural spaces heavily controlled by norms and traditions. Dia is more visible here not through any specific name rather through certain attributes that emerge from social practices and cultural norms of the Pakistani society and have grave effect upon Dia. Instead of her physical form, she appears in the attributive effects. Dia appears perturbed, fearful, confused and troubled by her knowledge of newspaper reports of rapes and consequent killing of women (she bit her lips . . . Dia’s mind swam with newspaper accounts . . . she looked around with trepidation), by the traditional behavior of her brother (what would her brother Hassan, turn into?) and by the warning of her mother (And did she know her mother?), etc. On the other side, Daanish is represented as self-composed and self-controlled prince of the situation with no fear of being dishonoured, of killing, of warning, etc. Socially he is positioned as having no fear and also able to remove the fear of Dia, who herself is trapped within the walls of media, society and family. Daanish is oblivious of any restrictions imposed by society, family, etc. (“Daanish began massaging the knot that had been building inside her ever since”, “Daanish’s fingers probed expertly”).
Second discursive strategy is ‘predication’ that allows investigating the devices like stereotypes and evaluative attributes of positive or negative traits and how social actions are labeled positively or negatively. Here in the given discourse the issue is not of positive or negative labeling, it is a degree of dependence and independence. Dia is dependent upon patriarchal forces and hence feels threat to her life and Daanish, being part of patriarchal structures, is independent, feels happy, secure and self confident. Dia’s dependence and related fear is represented as “Dia’s mind swam with newspaper accounts of women being killed”, “She looked around with trepidation”, “She, the product of a country where self consciousness was basic survival” (Dia’s self consciousness is her dependence). Explicitly Dia is labeled as trespasser because she is “ready to be something more than the repository of her family’s honour”. Opposite to it, Daanish is labeled as an active participant in the social phenomenon; he is expert, confident and autonomous in his behavior: “Daanish’s fingers probed expertly”. His autonomous position and active participation is implicitly visible from Dia’s readiness “to be loved”. Dia’s position is represented here as passive object of man’s active desire. Daanish is master of the situation as he is free to love with no fear to be trespassed or being killed by brothers and uncles, though implicitly he is equally responsible to trespass the social norms. It reflects that the social, societal and family relations and norms are highly gendered in Pakistan.

Third discursive strategy is ‘argumentation’ that allows investigating linguistic devices that are different topoi which are used to justify certain discrimination or preferential treatment. Here in this discourse, it is to be investigated that by what arguments or argumentation schemes the author tries to justify the biased existence and formation of social institutions that cause curtailment of women’s autonomy and forced dependence of women upon men in Pakistani society. The author on the one hand represents the socially constructed situation where women are insecure, on the other hand it is a lesson of awareness for the female readers that there is a need to equip themselves with this knowledge and awareness that they are not by birth fated to be victims of patriarchal oppressions. In case of rape, it is not only women who are to be accused and made responsible and punished; rather, the rapists also share the same degree of accusation/responsibility. This argumentation scheme is called the topos of threat or danger that if there are specific dangers and threats, one could do something against them (p. 75). This argumentation scheme, associated with different social practices and conventions of discourses, is articulated like this: “She looked around . . . the product of a
country where self consciousness was basic survival. Where a woman’s reputation was the currency that measured her worth”. The author uses arguments through this representation that women can transform their self-consciousness from being dependent to independent, from being threatened to self-confident. Thus, the author further agrees that women need to know more about their family members and also to make them understand about your position, space and feelings: “Would being discovered here be the end of her?”, “She barely knew him (her brother) after all”, “Did she know her mother?” Moreover, when Daanish tries to comfort her, she is able to shed her some fears but there are some old, ingrained fears due to highly masculine society, she cannot remove. Author invites women, young and teenagers, to do it by changing the concepts of being something more than being just the repository of family honour.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation’ or discourse representation that refers to the political aspect of the discourse. It demands to focus on the point of view and involvement with which the labels, attributions and arguments are expressed. Here it is a fiction discourse written by a female author and it is not without its call upon the subjects positioned to represent a social problem. Thus, the focus is upon all those social positions from which a discourse emerges and those which it refers to (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 26). CDA assumption 17 of this study (p. 78) also points to this aspect of addressing problems of social change. Apparently, the given discourse seems to be a sexist discourse in which woman is represented as a given with powerless position and man is constructed with a powerful position; however, within language there is a tension that puts a challenge to men’s control over women and systematic nature of social set-up and patriarchal and oppressive constitution of the society. The author, through her own entry by describing and narrating, attempts to expose the sexist social structures like media, the country as an entity, family and men beyond family (as Daanish here is a representation of masculinity in general).

Media plays its patriarchal part when it reports rape stories wherein women are ultimately dishonoured, stigmatized and killed by their brothers and uncles. Rapists are neither arrested nor punished: “Dia’s mind swarm with newspaper accounts of women being killed by their uncles and brothers”. About country as a sexist and patriarchal structure the author says: “She, the product of the country . . . where a women’s reputation was the currency that measured here worth”. About family as an oppressive
patriarchal force the author directly narrates: “What would her brother Hassan turn into? . . . And did she know her mother” who have warned her about the society “You have no idea how hostile society gets if you challenge it”. And above all the representative of masculinity, Daanish is busy in gratifying his desire (Daanish’s fingers probed expertly) without any fear of hostile society, damage of reputation and killing by uncles and brothers. Thus, the perspective of the author is clear that through the discourse utterances, there is a struggle to expose the underlying beliefs of media, country, family, society, and men, as group intentionally formed with values that make unnecessary and irrational distinction between the genders and particularly women are discriminated, dishonored, dehumanized and punished for the reasons defined only by these social sexist structures.

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’ that is used by the discourses to affect the illocutionary force (contextual meaning) of the utterances. This is done to modify the epistemic (knowledge) status of a proposition. The contextual situation within the given language use is that a woman is positioned against the social structures with practices and norms of patriarchal oppression in Pakistani society, though, the objective is to expose the negativity associated with these social structures. She desires to resist and challenge these oppressive social structures; however, she is in a critical condition of ‘to be or not to be’: “She didn’t think she could ever completely slough this layer off. Or maybe she could”. However, the social structures are represented as very powerful that add to Dia’s disbelief and uncertainty and make her feel insecure. This aspect of powerful threatening position of social structures and helplessness of a woman is intensified through adverbials, adjectives, metaphors, interrogative utterances and emphatic statements. Dia wants to hide herself while trespassing the legitimacy of the socio-cultural restrictions but the patriarchal place provides no safe guard: “This hide out didn’t even offer a hut to duck into”. The use of adverb “even” indicates the unexpected, annoying and disappointing situation in which Dia realizes her existence.

Similarly, in “women being killed by their uncles and brothers for doing less than she already had” use of adverb “less than” reflects the smaller degree or reduced amount of something. Thus, Dia feels the severity of clutching grip of the social structures that come to effect in no time. It is further intensified with reference to family reaction particularly of her brother. “She barely knew him after all”. There is a double intensification through adverb “barely” and then “after all”. “After all” is used here to
emphasise the fear of Dia that on the one hand, she knows very less about the actual reaction of her brother. On the other hand, through “after all” the sexist status of family structure is intensified that even she comes to have complete knowledge of her brother’s reaction that will not stop him from reacting damagingly against Dia. She is represented as helpless against the overpowering family structure that has been building a knot “inside her even since their first tryst”. “Ever since” is an adverb of time here that indicates that these hurdles are there since the time she planned to seek her own way of life. Or it may be other way round that whenever women try to attempt something defined negative in the social norms, they will face gendered forces coming forward to exploit them or force them into an acceptance of the status quo. The powerful status of the social structures is further intensified through metaphorical use of language: “Where a woman’s reputation was the currency that measured her worth”, “She didn’t think she could ever completely slough this layer off”, etc. Illocutionary force of the situation is further intensified through the interrogative utterances: “Would being discovered here be the end of her? What would her brother Hassan turn into? . . . And did she know her mother? . . . What if Riffat was the same?” Thus, there is a lot of linguistic attempt to intensify the illocutionary force of underlying discourse representation related to oppressive patriarchal social structures; however, it is also an attempt to expose them inviting women to reconstruct their ‘art of living’ to negotiate better position for them.

In the light of third research question – language issue and their effect upon meaning-making of the text – this discourse constructs Dia as representative of youth in patriarchal society of Pakistan. Dia is positioned here with society and family and the discourse brings in different discourses to construct her identity as a member of society and a conscious daughter who is a “repository of her family’s honour”. This language use constructs Dia’s gendered identity that becomes a site of conflict. The honour bond of social norms that gives control of Dia’s sexual autonomy in the hands of male members of her family is significantly visible. Honour is a loaded word for femininity in the context of this text as well as in the context of Pakistani society and Dia is constructed as well aware of the definition of honour in Pakistani society where, for the sake of honour, women are humiliated and killed with impunity. This bond constructs women’s identity as subordinated and subdued identities in Pakistani society. Here honour kills. Love kills. If women assert their sexual autonomy and sexual agency like Dia does, it is a serious challenge to the social orders of family and society that is predominantly controlled by
men: “Dia’s mind swam with newspaper accounts of women being killed by their uncles and brothers for doing less than she already had”. This complex positioning of Dia within society, family and her personal “trepidations” indicates what constitutes feminist and patriarchal discourses in Pakistani society. She cannot swim in this swamp without getting muddy. The issue of femininity expressed in language use that indicates the existence of women with Pakistani society is to keep the social boundaries intact and stable by maintaining their reputation as loyal and faithful daughters, sisters, wives and mothers, etc. If they assert their sexual autonomy, it is tantamount to challenging the stability of the society and socio-cultural discourses of honour. Sexual autonomy of women in Pakistani patriarchal society is a sign of worthlessness, irresponsibility and undoing of the socio-cultural bonds hence inviting danger to their lives. Here women are victims as Poole expresses about Pakistani women (see Literature Review, pp. 52-53).

The discourse does not eschew highlighting this trouble: “You have no idea how hostile society gets if you challenge it”. Thus, this discourse represents and constructs Dia as a girl whose existence is dependent upon male protection and obedience to patriarchy.

This language use has also effects of resistance upon meaning-making. What Daanish is doing without any social apprehensions is also highlighted by Read (see Literature Review, p. 50) to some extent that Daanish wants to keep his American existence separate from his life in Pakistan. But he is represented as maintaining his duality of behavior and patriarchal characteristics like his father. This inter-discursive language use works as a strategy of rupture that simultaneously exposes patriarchal duality of behavior, questions their oppression committed in the name of protection and resists their control upon women.

Sixth procedure suggests drawing up the context diagram for the specific text and the field of action. For the specific discourse, the context involves the author, who is a female, well aware of the social, cultural, political, family, tribal and institutional norms and practices, and she writes about the social problems of Pakistani society which affect women more negatively than men. Dia and Daanish, two young people, belonging to two different families, are representative of female and male in general in Pakistani Society. They fall in love and plan to meet at a cove near sea of Karachi. Dia’s mind is crossed by various consequences she has to face in the wake of this meeting/trespassing. She thinks about the media’s reports, social, family and other reactions towards her planned meeting
with Daanish. Against this back drop, discourses interact to construct a knowledge wherein Dia and Daanish meet.

Seventh procedure suggests going for extensive interpretation while returning to the research question and the proposition/problem under investigation. Addressing the research question that how different conventions, practices and cultures are linguistically exploited. It is evident that from the discourse under investigation that despite its unity imposed by the authorship of Uzma Aslam, it is produced linguistically by exploiting the discourses of media, Pakistani culture, family traditions and masculinity in Pakistani society and host of other ideas connected to these discourses like level of religious instructions, level of education, media contestation with each other and the role of constitution and court, etc. Sara Mills (1997), while referring to Foucault’s idea of author, argues that literary texts, despite categorized as authored texts, are, perhaps, the most inter-discursive of all texts, referring to other discourses in terms of literary illusions, underlying beliefs, and other factors that are interacted to form a discourse. Media report is a form of discourse wherein rapes are articulated and portrayed with specific vocabulary of the readers and perhaps with no negative consequences for the perpetrators. It is another form of sexual aggression against women (Malamuth & Briere, 1986).

Thus, the author has exploited practices related to rape cases in media, on the paradigm of court cases that once a woman is raped by her assailant and then by the court system. Media also plays similar role in reporting the rape cases and their consequences (Figueiredo, 2004). Similarly, “she is a product of a country . . .”) is another discourse that entails media, constitution, police, judiciary, etc., that entails issues of pressure and influence exercised on police and attitude of police and the text of the registered case, etc. As Khaliq (2012), in her report on Pakistan Women’s Day expresses, “When women rape victims report the crime, they usually face hostility from the law enforcement personnel and courts as well”. She further says, “Pakistan is already a harsh and patriarchal environment for women and this is no different with the court. The laws are made by men, courts are run by men, police are all male and judiciary with few women judges”. Thus the overall cultural hostility involving police, judiciary, legal proceedings, etc., form another discourse exploited linguistically by Khan to produce her discourse in the text.
Third discourse that has been exploited heuristically by Khan is the family system of Pakistan including fathers, uncles, brothers and above all mothers (Riffat had toed the party line). Zakariya (2013) argues:

One of the most successful products of the patriarchal society, one that enables its persistence and the rough the ages, is the self hating women, ready and willing always in the destruction of her own kind. Oppression continues because no one identifies with the victim and everyone with the oppressor. (p. 7)

Zakariya is of the view that this victimization of the victim continues and in certain cases it makes the matter worst when a woman makes party to an oppressor. A woman victim has to pay dearly for this defilement and “sometimes she is forced to marry the perpetrator”.

Fourth discourse is masculinity. Related practices and norms of masculinity have been exploited linguistically by the author to produce her knowledge in the fiction text. This masculinity pervades everywhere like. “reports of beach huts being raided and women raped”, “newspaper accounts of women being killed by their uncles and brothers”, “she, the product of a country . . . where a woman’s reputation was the currency that measured her worth”; “You have no idea how hostile society gets if you challenge it”, etc. This masculine and patriarchal attitude is always found lacking support for women despite their fidelity. This attitude has become a norm with police and judiciary. In this regard a Dawn report (Shocking Figures) on Parliament of Pakistan proceedings conveys that during the last five (2009-2013) years, 103 rape cases were registered with the police and so far no conviction has taken place. This is a glaring example of abuse of women’s rights where masculinity in the form of law enforcement agencies and judicial authorities found exercising no effort to bring the culprits to punishment. It is a gender biased culture formed by the masculinity. Thus, appropriation of these discourses shapes the given discourse as an inter-discursive construction.

Next research question is how external discourse structures are constructed and in what way Dia accepts or rejects the effects of these structures. To explore this question beside Foucault’s “art of existence”, Kristeva’s ‘theory of marginality’ (see Theoretical and Analytical Perspective of CFDS, p. 60) provides insights into subjectivity, language and socio-cultural aspects of love, marriage and humiliation. It helps understand the
policies of transpiring the moral codes set up by the patriarchal social structures that attempt to impede the way of women’s life. Here in this discourse Dia has been marginalized to stay within walls by the newspaper discourse of rapes and masculine behavior towards victims of rape. She is also marginalized by the socio-cultural discourse of women’s reputation as currency “that measured her worth” and she being “repository of her family’s honour” has to behave in a specific way. A discourse of advice from her mother, who is also represented playing a role of patriarchal elders, is also attempt to marginalize her: “You have no idea how hostile society gets if you challenge it”. She is marginalized to the extent that she is feeling guilty and her own action and talk become an act of trespassing in her own eyes. Her own talk now seems to her “lying to those she loved” and her behavior as her “terror of becoming the thing”, as something abnormal, etc. Through this fiction discourse Dia is constructed as positioned in a situation due to effects of other discourse of advice and terror. It is represented that the effect of these discourses upon Dia is that she should be a subject that is denied access to a way of life. She is being oppressed by these discourses so much so that it is going to affect her way of desire that she can stay within four walls and should not come out to express her desire. The discourses of advice are encouraging a behavior that is oppressed and implicitly discouraging a behavior that is normal.

The given discourse under investigation is a description by the author. The author’s language use is not going to make her an oppressed subjectivity merely shaped by the bureaucratic discourses of masculinity: “she didn’t think she could ever completely slough this layer off. Or maybe she could”. Dia is not going to be subjugated and marginalized by the patriarchal discourses/structures wherein her will and pleasures are repressed, controlled and denied; rather, she is going “to be something more than the repository of her family’s honour”. There is a repetition of “she was twenty years old”. It is perhaps an attempt to position the reader/researcher to accept this that a woman of twenty years old may be allowed to make decisions in her life. She should not be repressed to the extent that her desires become reactive instead of positively tailored by her self confidence and self assurance. Dia’s position is shaky not due to her biological or natural traits; rather, owing to strong repressive socio-cultural discourses. Under the effect of these discourses she is unable to make her independent decision in Pakistani society. She is going to be exploited, to be loved again by patriarchal force. It is opposite to what happens in an independent society where women are bit independent to decide
and have their way of life like Thomas’s (2007) woman ‘Ariel’ in her novel ‘The End of Mr. Y’. Ariel is with her colleague/boyfriend who succumbs to desire for sex but Ariel does not submit to be loved passively but at her own will: “I allow him to remove my jumper and pull down my jeans and knickers. . .” (p. 125). So, here lie the effects of socio-cultural discourses that attempt to shape Dia in a different way to think, desire and speak.

As discussed while reviewing Darraj’s comments (see Literature Review, p. 48) that within the text a contest of social structures through the discourses is in process to shape Dia’s feelings and relationships. However, Dia does not accept the pressure of interlocking social discourses blocking her way, though it is exploitation by patriarchal representative - Daanish. It reflects that Pakistani new generation of females has the courage to challenge; however, there is a bit immaturity. They need to develop an understanding of different discourses that while escaping one suppressive discourse they should not be trapped by another discourse. This discourse carries undertones of serious issues of gender attitudes where vulnerabilities for women are galore. Thus, Khan’s fiction discourse and presented knowledge exists within the contest of discourses.

**Public Spaces are Gendered.** Women’s presence outside the home is severely objected to by the patriarchal forces under the pretext of men’s gazing attitude. This passage draws upon multiple discourses like social, institutional, national and moral aspects that are based on gender division for the construction of inner and outer spaces of home and society.

(7)  *It happened at last many weeks later, as they sat on the pavement outside a kebab shop . . . She (Riffat) took another bite. ‘This is our cuisine, after all. A shame half our population can’t enjoy it like this.’*

*He (Shafqat) pushed his plate back. ‘You sound so immature when you talk that way.’*

‘*Immature?’*

*Irrational then, It’s not done, Riffat. You can’t transport something that exists here to another place.*

She blinked, genuinely confused. ‘*Something? Like what?’*
'Like another system. You know perfectly well it doesn't look good for a woman to eat in those cafes. Men ogle. And if she is with a man, they want to know why he can't shield her from their lust. He looks even worse.'

She put down her sandwich. It was slowly making sense. 'Democracy, health care, and education can come from within our system?'

'Of course.'

'But when women appear in public as frequently and comfortably as men, that's an import? An evil outside influence?'

He shrugged. 'Some things will take longer.'

'Because some people want them to? Could it be the same people who speak so eloquently of new wheels turning?'

He raised a brow and looked around . . . . Maybe we should hurry up so they can sit down.'

She grabbed his hand. 'No. This time you're going to answer me. You want efficiency, hygiene, and a free press-but not that modernity should benefit women. You want one you can keep putting to the test, just like your mother?'

He snatched his hand away. 'Don't start on my parents again.'

'Are you speaking for me? Do you even know how like our very own general you sound?'

He walked away but she came to his hostel later in the evening, and they argued more. She hounded him for days, hating what she was becoming, she, whose strength was grace and elegance, who was regal as an empress. She was driven to teary stridency, begging him to give her what should have been hers, forced to sink to the degradation of demanding it. At last, he snapped: No, he wouldn't be the one to stay home with the children, or attend to her phone calls or arrange her meetings. Never. That was her job. His was to fight for freedom.

The first procedure demands information about the context of the given discourse. Context of the given passage is full of various socio-cultural and political factors that
have shaped the thinking of people specially men who do not intend to change their mind about women’s autonomy and restrictions imposed upon women, about Pakistani women’s social position as oppressed and powerless individuals burdened by society, religion, politics and patriarchy. Sadaf Ahmed (2010, pp. 1-2) expresses her views that the reality of Pakistani women’s lives is much more complicated whose positions are simultaneously subordinate, powerful, marginal, central or otherwise, particularly against the social and power networks that work in conflict with women’s autonomy. Sadaf Ahmed carries out a critical view of restrictions of Pakistani women that those restrictions are not simply caused by patriarchy, rather in inter-discursive terms, the patriarchy itself is shaped by number of other factors such as religion, gender, class, culture, ethnicity and modernity. Ahmed also highlights the historical factor behind the development of hegemonic discourses in the subcontinent that travelled from pre-independence period to post-independence Pakistan. When Muslim rule ended in the subcontinent (1857) and it came under the British colonialists, the Muslims themselves developed such discourses that allowed men to participate with the colonialists in the public life and men agreed to keep their women at home hidden from colonialists. That gradually turned into discourse of Muslim women’s identity in the subcontinent. Then, women “became symbols of the authentic and sacred community of the families/believers”. Uzma Aslam also refers to this aspect when Shafqat and Riffat were studying in England in 1968. About Shafqat, she says, “He, the son of rowdy journalist whose pen had fought the colonialists, was learning through how to treat the wounded” (p. 415). Gradually, it became the cardinal value of the cultural authenticity and still prevails in Pakistani society. This discourse of honour and protection in the form of women’s stay within four walls has given social control of women into the hands of men. It has also shaped women’s thinking that their modesty and honour associated with families and socio-cultural values lies in behaving and dressing in a way that men/society deems appropriate.

The given passage is a conversation between Riffat and Shafqat while they were studying in England in sixties. Shafqat, despite living in open society and learning how to treat the wounds of society caused by the colonial rule is not ready to discard his hegemonic discourse of forcing women to take up practical roles of staying at home and rearing children. “Boundaries existed even here, in this vocal city, after all” (p. 418). When Riffat insisted on to reply him whether Shafqat is also ready to take up the same role, instead of replying her he left the room laughing and saying: “No one can hold me
hostage. I speak willingly or I don’t speak at all (p. 419). Thus the given passage takes place in a context characterized by gendered factors that are further shaped by the hegemonic discourses of ideal (suppressed) Pakistani women even after independence from the colonial rulers and the role she should play to safeguard the norms of society and family. Shafqat and Riffat were sitting on the pavement outside a Kebab shop in London and enjoying free environment without any fear of gazing men and social stigmatization of sitting in the open as goes in Pakistani society. Here is a conversation between Shafqat and Riffat. Riffat is serious and insistent while Shafqat feels irritated at her insistence and attempts to force her accept the authenticity of patriarchal discourse. For him demand of women’s freedom in Pakistani society is immature and irrational. Thus, the context of the given passage is shaped by the discourses that reflect male supremacy and female subordination.

Second procedure requires establishing inter-discursivity involving texts on similar topics, with similar arguments, macro topics, fields of action, genre, etc. Those discourses are highlighted and interpreted that form interconnections to create this discourse of resistance and awareness by Riffat and power assertion by Shafqat. There are different discourses belonging to different disciplines thus making it an inter-disciplinary discourse. First is discourse of cuisine having meal outside home - that is associated with autonomy and enjoyment by Riffat and with shame and honour of women/family by Shafqat. Riffat says, “This is our cuisine. A shame half our population can’t enjoy it like this”. Contrary to it Shafqat says, “It does not look good for a woman to eat in those cafes. Men ogle”. Inter-discursivity takes place between discourse of women’s desire to leave four walls territory and patriarchal norms of shame and honour associated with women’s moving outside. Therefore, Riffat’s desire of going outside the four walls is termed by masculinity as “immature” and “irrational”. Third discourse drawn upon is duality of male behavior towards benefits of democracy, health care, education and women’s public appearance. Men allow first three things to emerge from own culture/system but women’s appearance in public is considered something evil and alien to Pakistani culture. Thus, this discourse of women’ honour and sanctity is made a trap for them. Fourth discourse is modernity that men allow to happen to the extent it benefits them and disallow where it benefits women. Women’s job is to stay at home and rear children and men’s job is to stay outside, enjoy free life in the name of fighting for freedom of women. Through this inter-discursivity and networking of discourses the
novelist constructs her discourse of ‘Trespassing’ which will be investigated through its inter-connections as CDA assumption 20 (p. 78) emphasizes the need for inter-disciplinary analysis in order to gain a proper understanding of language functioning in constituting and transmitting knowledge, in organizing social institutions or in exercising power. Wodak, (2008) contends in this regard that researchers need to examine the layers of cultural and interpersonal contexts and privileges and links between each.

Third procedure is to formulate precise research questions from the proposition under investigation and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories. The second research question of this study will be focused upon: “how are different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a new form of discourse/knowledge?” This research question leads to analyse this discourse through the lens of networking of discourses as they are inter-linked with different conventions, practices and cultures. For explanatory theory Robbins’ theory of ‘processive subjectivity’ will be applied because of its inherent resistance to fixed and gendered identity (see Subject Position and Perspectives of CS and CFDS, p. 64). For further understanding of inter-discursivity, Fairclough’s view (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 30) that the exercise of power in modern society is achieved “through the ideological workings of language” is most appropriate. Analysis and interpretation of the passage, according to the given research questions and explanatory theory, is carried out in the following procedures.

Fourth and fifth procedures demand to operationalise the research questions into linguistic categories and apply those categories on the text while using theoretical approaches to interpret the meanings. For this purpose, Wodak’s five discursive strategies are to be applied. First discursive strategy is ‘referential/nomination’ that how persons are named and referred to linguistically. This strategy helps analysing linguistic devices such as member categorisation, biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors and metonymies that a discourse producer uses to construct in-groups and out-groups. This clue to construct in-groups and out-groups is a useful strategy as it reveals the construction of men and women and also which group gets the support of the discourse producer. The ideological struggle of discourse construction of men and women is just a strategy to communicate one’s point of view. In the given passage, man is referred to as a proponent of prevailing system that gives freedom of movement to men but stop women
to appear in public places. Linguistically, man is referred to as visibly assertive and willful in his actions and hesitant to support the emancipation of women in Pakistani social circles. He is attempting to impose the power of the patriarchal system and there is consistent “No” in his utterances like “You cannot transport something”, You know perfectly well it doesn’t look good for a woman . . .”, “If she’s with a man, they want to know why he can’t shield her from their lust”, “Something will take longer”, “Don’t start on my parents again”, “He walked away”, “No, he wouldn’t be the one to stay at home . . .”, etc. Shafqat, as representative of power circles and patriarchal activism, is constructed as willful, inflexible, hesitant and violent under the influence of oppressive patriarchy.

Contrary to it, the other group is represented by Riffat who is socially isolated due to hostile patriarchal social structures and circumstances in Pakistani society that impede her way physically and mentally. Shafqat attempts to snub her like, “You sound so immature when you talk that way”, “Irrational then” but she attempts to emerge from every impediment. Her sole attempt is to challenge and dismantle the dominance of patriarchal structures over women. She is ready to go to any extent to liberate her and makes all out efforts to force Shafqat to accept equal hierarchical positions for men and women. Her heroic attempts are linguistically referred to as she challenges in questioning tone: “She blinked, genuinely confused. ‘Something? Like what?’”; “Democracy, health care, and education can come from within our system. But women appear in public as frequently and comfortably as men that’s an import? An evil outside influence?”, “Because some people want them to?” From this challenging position she becomes a bit aggressive, “She grabbed his hand. ‘No, this time you’re going to answer me.’”, “You want one you keep putting to the test?”, “Are you speaking for me? Do you even know how like our own very general you sound?” She is determined to make Shafqat reply her questions and show his willingness to occupy equal position in social aspects. She is ready to abandon her own strengths (grace, elegance, regality) within her charted territory of four walls. Thus, linguistically, she is constructed as member of an oppressed class but she has the imagination, will-power, determination and understanding of the power that impedes her way to emancipation but men take it as a naturalized phenomenon and attempt to fix her gender and sexuality bound to stay at home. Patriarchy attempts to maintain it: “That was her job. His was to fight for freedom.”
Second strategy is ‘predication’ that concerns about kind of traits, characteristics, qualities and features attributed to the constructed in-groups and out-groups. This strategy indicates to analyse stereotypical or evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits that label the groups positively or negatively. The situation of interaction is resistance to masculine stereotypes through Riffat. Through this contest Shafqat labels Riffat as “immature” and “irrational” which boomerang and it is actually Shafqat or patriarchal structures that are immature and irrational as Shafqat says at the end, “that was her job. His was to fight for freedom.” Men are labeled as rigid and oppressor, “You can’t transport something that exists here to other place”. Men are labeled as manipulators. Shafqat attempts to control Riffat’s resistance to patriarchy by appropriating the discourse of sexuality: “It doesn’t look good for a woman to eat in those cafes. Men ogle”. Men are represented as oppressors and manipulators because they determine women’s identity/subjectivity through their own discourses/presence. If men are present somewhere, women are denied to be there. In this relationship and presence of men in cafes, women are reduced to an object of desire as well as an object to be shielded by family men who should “shield her from their (men’s) lust.” In this relationship men are labeled negatively as a power structure that intends to perpetuate its control over women by exploiting different discourses and asserting their authority through irrational arguments like, “Some things will take longer”. Irrationality of this utterance is that women and their life as emancipated human beings are termed as “some things”. It is an attempt by the patriarchy to reduce women to non living dead objects. On the other hand Riffat represents female group. She is represented as a strong resistance to the manipulative patriarchy. She sheds her shackles of ‘grace and elegance’ – discourse of beautiful female that has served as an exploiting tool with the patriarchal forces to restrict women within four walls.

Third discursive strategy is ‘argumentation’ that by what arguments or argumentation schemes do specific persons or social groups try to justify or legitimize the exclusion, discrimination, suppression and exploitation of others. This strategy leads to analyse the topoi used to discriminate or give preferential treatment to someone. Wodak suggests that to analyse this strategy one should analyse what kind of topoi are used. Here in this passage topos of reality is used along with topos of culture to justify the arguments that women can’t walk freely or can dine openly in cafes in Pakistan because it is reality that Pakistani culture doesn’t allow it. Through this argumentation there is a clash of
discourses of women’s emancipation and of patriarchal structures that intend to keep women away from public places and from life outside the four walls, or the doors of cars. How are reality and culture imposed? At a café in London Riffat and Shafqat enjoy kebabs. Riffat expresses her desire of emancipation that it is a shame for them that “half our population can’t enjoy it like this”. Shafqat brings forward his discourse of culture and reality to discriminate and exclude women from this enjoyment of life. He terms Riffat’s discourse as “immature” and “irrational”: “It’s not done, Riffat you can’t transport something that exists here to another place.” Within this cultural barricade, masculinity doesn’t allow changing the identity of Pakistani women. Men are not ready to allow her equal status in the public life. Cultural aspect of family honour is here in the form of masculine structure and doesn’t allow women to come to public gatherings like cafes where “Men ogle. And if she is with a man, they want to know why he can’t shield her from their lust.” Mr. Shafqat attempts to justify women’s stay at home – a negative attribute of patriarchal structures. They want to use women as an object of gaze only. Riffat is demanding and begging her right of freedom but Shafqat’s argumentation of cultural reality is not ready to show flexibility: “He shrugged. ‘Some things will take longer’”. Moreover, to rear children and stay at home is her job.

In fact, the sole interest behind this argumentation scheme is that as men are in power so they do not want any displacement of status which might destabilize them. So it is a patriarchal attempt to fix her gender meant to behave and exist in a fixed way as desired by men but it is not possible because woman of Pakistani society is aware of these discursive traps circulating in different forms to exploit woman through the rhetoric of culture.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation or discourse representation’ that seeks to analyze the point of view behind the labels, attribution and arguments expressed. Keeping in view the critical feminist discourse perspective of this study and ideological framing of Robbins’ theory of ‘processive subjectivity’ as discussed in third procedure this discourse provides a view into not only the existing and existed relationships between masculinity and femininity in Pakistani society, rather into the possibilities for which Riffat is competing. This discourse represents a project, through the competing discourses of Riffat and Shafqat that intends to change the world benifitting women in Pakistani society in terms of freedom of movement and putting men to accept and perform those
roles which women do within four walls. As Riffat says, “You want efficiency, hygiene and a free press but not that modernity should benefit women. You want one you can keep putting to the test, just like your mother?” Previously, Shafqat has told Riffat that his mother was a brave lady and could stand up successfully in any challenging situation if put up to the test. Here Riffat argues why is he not ready to give women their right without putting them to test. This questioning tone of Riffat in addressing Shafqat also represents the strong social positioning of male in Pakistani society and their strategy to exclude women from that position where they could come equal to men. This discourse represents the desire of women to challenge the discourse of masculine relation with women in which woman’s strength lies only in her grace, elegance and regality within four walls. This discourse is still dominating and Shafqat is assertive and declares in authoritative tone: “No he wouldn’t be the one to stay at home with the children or attend to her phone calls or arrange her meetings. Never, that was her job”. Shafqat is not ready to accept that his authoritative position be challenged using the adverb of time. He sounds definite that not even in the future time he is going to accept that women should abandon their given role or, he should assume that role “Never”.

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’ of utterances involving their contextual meaning. This strategy leads to analyze the utterances keeping in view the attempts to alter the knowledge status of a proposition that is done either intensifying or mitigating the contextual meaning. Here in this passage the proposition is interaction between man and woman in a street of London where there is no cultural binding to sit and enjoy eating. Riffat desires to have similar open and free atmosphere for entire Pakistani people but Shafqat rejects her proposal of freedom especially women. Discourse orientation is that man is represented here as a particular masculine and conservative cultural product and woman as representation of culturally awakened female who expresses her discourse to break those cultural masculine shackles that have chained them within four walls. Man’s discourse of rejection of women’s discourse of freedom is intensified in order to represent patriarchal designs towards women as horrible and secondly to teach female readers for her future struggle against the false notions of social structures to end the sexist oppression. Shafqat’s discourse of rejection intensifies the negative image of masculinity and also oppression of women that of course, modifies the epistemic status of social position occupied by men and women in Pakistani society in sixties and seventies. Negative image of masculinity is intensified through not a straight
forward rejection of ‘No’, rather with such adjectives like “you sound so immature”, “Irrational then”. It is a very derogatory way of rejection that expresses women as childish and mentally not fully grown. This discourse of disparaging rejection continues. “You can’t transport something that exists here”. Her existence as an emancipated being is termed as insignificant “something”. Moreover “You know perfectly well it does not look good for a woman . . .”. His rejection is intensified in multiple ways. Now he is using persuasive rhetoric that “You know perfectly well”, meaning by that there is no requirement of teaching you further that woman will become ‘bad’ if she exposes in front of other men, who “ogle”. The oppression of women is intensified reflecting that socially men want to have absolute control upon women’s body. This is further intensified through patriarchal discourse of honour’ “And if she is with a man, they want to know why he can’t shield her from their lust. He looks even worse”. Shafqat wants to maintain status quo providing privileges and facilities to him.

Therefore, male-female relationship in which women’s social position as repressed being is intensified as Weiss (2010) explains, “Men’s power within the family, however, is absolute in its control over women’s actions and mobility because women are considered the repository of their family’s respectability”. (p. 13). Women’s social position is already sunk to isolation, it is further intensified that to ask her right a woman is further sunk to the degree of disrespect, “Begging him to give her what should have been hers, forced to sink to the degradation of demanding it”. But on the other side, the rejection is heightened to the absolute dismissal and denial of her right of freedom: “No”, “Never”, “That was her job. His was to fight for freedom”. Thus, it is clear that different discourses are brought into the text to reject Riffat’s demand of free social environment for women and attempt is to construct the discriminatory treatment that women face in the society at the hands of men who hold them hostages and do not allow speaking willingly.

In the light of third research question concerning language issues and their effect upon the meaning-making processes in collaboration with CFDS, the prominent aspect of language use appears here through the patriarchal insistence to subdue and fix the society and social meaning of existence of women. Contrary to it, Riffat, as representative of women, resists Shafqat’s restraining discourse. Patriarchy uses restraining language, not ready to accept resistance from women, takes it for granted to have authority to call someone/something “irrational”, “an evil outside influence”. In Pakistani society truth,
good, reality is what men guarantee. For them, society and social reality is stable and fixed, there is no shifting of practices and fluidity of meaning. They strictly follow philosophy of binary oppositions to keep women under their authority. Riffat’s belief in fluidity of socio-cultural practices is “irrational”; social values transported from one place to another; men ogle so women should stay at home - men’s gaze and women’s honour are poised oppositions, etc. Language use by Shafqat and Riffat simultaneously reflects one struggle to establish rational and superior knower of what is bad for Pakistani society especially for women and another to resist the conventional homogenous discourse. The resistance believes in, in words of Fairclough (1995), “fluid, unstable and shifting” nature of socio-cultural practices that will facilitate women’s liberation from the rigid and subduing notions of patriarchy. This language use reflects the troubled relations based on gendered notions of society in sixties and still continues in some form to contribute towards an attempt to correct the inappropriate behaviours of patriarchy. Thus, it reflects history of struggles among discourses of patriarchy and resistance to it.

Taking inspiration from Cixous (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 29) to challenge the binary opposition and need for rewriting the system, Riffat is attempting to replace the patriarchal linguistic division of society. Through this she attempts to assert that home keeping and fighting for women’s freedom should not be taken as a gendered fields; rather, common for both men and women. The dialogic contest between Shafqat and Riffat is what Laclou and Mouffe (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 34) refer to logic of difference which subverts equivalence and creates differences and divisions and logic of equivalence which creates equivalence by subverting division and differences. In this passage Shafqat is textured into a discourse strategy of logic of difference that creates division and differences and through this division places women under the control of men while Riffat attempts to create equivalence by resisting the gendered divisions.

Sixth procedure guides to draw up the context diagram for the specific context and the fields of action. Basing on the contextual information given in first procedure it is clarified that the text presented here is about male female relationship in Pakistan in sixties and seventies when there was not much struggle against conservative and anti-liberal ideas. Men did not want to change; rather, they used to support old and dated values to secure their own social positions, privileges and benefits. The specific context is that Shafqat and Riffat both are in London for their study and enjoy local cultural
freedom to move around without much fear of hurdles created back at home by the conservative patriarchal structures. Riffat expresses her feelings to have similar kind of freedom for all in Pakistan but Shafqat is not ready to accept her discourse of emancipation. He carries that masculine mind even there in England that is shaped by the discourses of hegemony that draw boundaries around women and keep them fixed under male supremacy. Shafqat wants to take Riffat in marriage as a passive and docile girl who does not challenge his supremacy. He is of the view that women should not be allowed to act independently. About his mother he says, “My mother is brave”, “A woman doesn’t know what resources she has till she is put to the test”. Further he says, “She (his mother) is proud to have a husband who fights for a freer environment. He speaks for all of us. Including her” (p. 419).

Riffat, as a discourse strategy, attempts to flatten patriarchal pride of self-made struggle for freedom of women. She attempts to create a space of free environment for herself/women, “But what if she (his mother) preferred to speak for herself.”, “Would he (his father) live to the test” (p. 419). Riffat’s discourse is very assertive and challenges the masculine right and authority to put women to test and not allowing them to speak for their own rights. Will his father be able to live up if he is put to the test? This is a gigantic challenge to masculinity and its authority to define gender roles that only women will stay at home and men will speak for their freedom. She comes up with her discourse of freedom to challenge: “Would he (his father) be the one to stay at home with the children, to feed and nurse them, to attend to her phone calls, arrange her meetings . . .” (p. 419). Against this challenging discourse Shafqat has nothing to reply and Riffat says, “Am I not allowed to ask you that? So much for a freer environment!” (p. 419). So it is clear that masculinity is constructed with a complex network of social practices and there are multiple discursive layers of men’s sole right to speak for women and women will perform only when allowed by men, when they are put to test. Thus, the contextual background is that men’s discourse of supremacy is nothing except a hegemonic discourse constructed ignoring cultural processes. It is linguistically constructed by drawing upon different cultural practices and binary oppositions like family relationship of wife-husband, son-mother, man-woman, stay at home-fighting outside for freedom, etc.
Seventh procedure allows going for extensive interpretation while returning to research questions and to proposition/problem under investigation. In third procedure there are references to Robbins’ ‘processive subjectivity’ and also to Fairclough’s theory that the power is achieved through the ideological working of language. The discourse produced by Khan is ideological one that aims to dismantle fixed power positions held by men in Pakistani society. This challenging discourse is constructed linguistically by exploiting different conventions and practices and processes of different discourses as highlighted in second procedure. Discursive strategy is negative portrayal of masculinity through its repressive and oppressive discourses to control women who desire to obtain emancipation and free environment the way they like, not the way men like. Negativity is that men are determinedly against women. For example, when Riffat mentions in general terms that, “A shame half our population can’t enjoy it like this” but it is Shafqat who shifts meaning of “population” to “woman” that “it doesn’t look good for a woman to eat in those cafes”. This is how by creating “semantic relationship” (Fairclough, 2003) between “population” and “woman”, the authorial attempt to texture her discourse in a specific way to create her meanings/discourse. By transforming discourse of “population” into discourse of femininity through a man is an attempt to create new meaning of men’s behavior towards segregation of population on gender basis.

This discourse is constructed linguistically in a way that gives voice to those concerns that have negative impact upon women. There is a relational difference between men and women in their public appearance. Adverbs “frequently” and “comfortably” are the process words which are collocated with women’s public appearance that doesn’t suit to the discourse of femininity because these words are part of domain that men enjoy. They can appear in public places frequently and comfortably but women can’t. The author intends to include this vocabulary in the discourse of femininity of Pakistani culture and attempts to remove the taboo related to these processes. She questions this taboo, “that is an import? An evil outside influence?” Here language is mediating ideology. By using “frequently” and “comfortably” the discourse is attempting to reject the distinction made on the grounds of sexes/genders. If men appear in public frequently and comfortably they are good, if women do so “it is import” and “evil outside influence”. Inequality in social positions of men and women is challenged. Within an ideological frame, gender discrimination made by masculinity is contested. Shafqat discriminates women from men in social arena as something very natural: “It doesn’t look good for a
woman to eat in those cafes. Men ogle. And if she’s with a man they want to know why he can’t shield her from their lust.” Then he says about women’s public appearance, “Some things will take longer” and at the end, “No, he wouldn’t be the one . . . That was her job. His was to fight for freedom”. From feminist perspective this is a false consciousness on the part of men who want to fix the gender of women and their identify associating with discourses ‘of honour’, ‘of fight for freedom’, ‘of import outside influence’, etc. Riffat is represented as not ready to accept her domesticated subject position as an inferior being in the hierarchical system of gendered differentiation.

By accepting discourse of sexism, “. . . that was her job. His was to fight for freedom” Riffat doesn’t want to render herself as a sex object at home and child rearing machine within four walls. That gives wider control to men over women. Riffat attempts to alter this false consciousness prevailing in cultural structures of Pakistani society: Shafqat says, “Some things will take longer.” Riffat retorts, “Because some people want them, to? Could it be the same people who speak so eloquently of new wheels turning?” Through the thick layers of gendered system of patriarchal discourse Riffat doesn’t come outside; rather, within the same territory she attempts to intervene in the process of oppression and women’s inferior subjective positions: “You want efficiency, hygiene and a free press – but not that modernity should benefit women. You want one you can keep putting to the test, just like your mother?” Riffat questions the legitimacy of this gendered modernity and the right to define it. It is a question and challenge to men’s authority who have excluded women as a wider group from benefits of modernity. She wants to fight for her own freedom and not to be dependent upon Shafqat to fight for her freedom. She wants freedom the way she likes not the way masculinity wants. In this discourse there are tensions and conflicts due to multiple contesting discourses like of women’s emancipation and patriarchal attempt to control them, etc.

This discourse is multi-dimensional and escapes any established viewing position. It is a representation of socio-cultural gender practices; it is a critique of gendered discrimination of women and it is an offer to the reader for his/her interpretation. Riffat followed Shafqat in his hostel to seek his reply about her insistence on women’s freedom. The ideological view of the discourse producer is intense when this discourse is constructed drawing upon conventions of women’s struggle against patriarchy and her past position as an empress within four walls: “She hounded him for days, hating what
she was becoming, she, whose strength was grace and elegance, who was regal as an empress.” Khan constructs her woman not as an illiterate, ignorant and passive empress who is jailed within four walls terming it her grace and elegance; rather, she is an awakened lady who wants to have her grace and elegance within and outside four walls with equal social position with men. Realizing her position within four walls as a weakened and oppressed being now understands the designs of patriarchal strategy to make her sit on the fence as a silenced subject. To get rid of the silenced grace and elegance, sensing patriarchal design, Riffat is ready to go to the “degradation of demanding” her right of equality. On Riffat’s insistence that women should also enjoy same benefits of modernity in the manner men enjoy Shafqat feels his patriarchal superior position threatened. If he accepts the legitimacy of Riffat’s discourse of equality for women, he finds, it will curtail his own freedom. He immediately comes up with his extremely sexist and gendered discourse, “No, he wouldn’t be the one to stay at home with the children, or to attend her phone calls or arrangement her meetings. Never. That was her job. His was to fight for freedom.” Thus, the linguistic construction of this discourse is obvious that patriarchy is represented that never wants to allow freedom to women to cap its own freedom. Moreover, implicit attempt is to discredit the notion of freedom as a matter of winning or losing as a concrete phenomenon; rather, it is a matter of practice and let others to practice it.

Therefore, within an ideological point of view this discourse is an attempt to offer a view to the reader of the past (1960 – 70) gendered discourse that has been used as a strategy by men to oppress and control women and strengthen their own positions as husbands, family heads, café goers, fighters for women’s freedom, etc. Drawing upon this sexist and gendered discourse men want to maintain status quo already in vogue and women are represented as struggling and contesting for the identity and respectability that emanate from equal social positions. Issue is not only of gender concern but of women whose status of respectability is compromised in the name of gender. Moreover, issue is not only of independence but it is independence of women.

**Gender Concerns intertwined with Poverty and Affluence.** This passage represents varied experiences of women in the hub of their social relations. Social structures in the form of family relations, neighbours and household activities do not allow women to live free life of their choice.
Riffat looked at Sumbul’s child staunchly refusing to die. He whimpered and wheezed, and Sumbul told Riffat she wished the end would come quickly now. Riffat was about to tell her again that she could take a few days off, but she knew why Sumbul came to the farm. Home meant a mother-in-law working her from dawn till midnight, a belligerent husband who sometimes beat her, three other children, countless neighbours pouring in for gossip and meals bought with her money, an open sewer outside the kitchen, and absolutely nowhere for her to sit quietly for two minutes and sip her very own cup of tea. If she tried, the other women would snap, ‘we never had such luxuries at your age.’

Yet, Sumbul found it in her to care for Riffat, though surely in Sumbul’s eyes she lived like an empress. The contrast pained more because it highlighted the limits of each. What would it take to make Sumbul cross over to Riffat’s? What would it have taken for Riffat to cross over to Shafqat’s or for him to leap past his own confines? He, who’d traveled and ruminated more than anyone she knew, could never overcome them. (p. 427)

First procedure allows establishing context of the given discourse. The context discussion involves socio-political, historical and psychological information, etc. This passage constructs the experiences of women in their respective conditions. Sumbal is Riffat’s servant and is spending life as a poverty ridden woman but on the other hand Riffat is living her life as working woman with confidence of having her own farm of silk worms. Socio-politically, a poor woman has no respectable position in Pakistani culture. 
She stays at the margins with very fragile position; however, her marginal position has helped strengthen the position of those at the centre. Her worse condition is due to the domination of gendered discourses that constitute Pakistani social set-up, particularly poor families. These discourses plead for women to stay within four walls and men free to work outside. There is another social practice with certain Pakistani poor families residing in rural areas that they send their daughters and ladies to the houses of rich people in the urban areas that shape their positions and identities in a different way - demand of money from parents or father side and her vulnerability and insecurity at job location. Chaudhry’s research (2010) on women from poor families in Punjab and Sindh argues on definite roles of women:

Women are primarily interpellated through their sexual and mothering roles. The domestic sphere is deemed their ideal realm of activity . . . still women from poor
or low caste households who venture outside the home more than other women in
the village for livelihood purposes or to undertake errands for the household are
seen as less respectable women. Norms of mobility restrict / limit women’s
access to healthcare, education, and rule of law mechanism as well as their
involvement in bids for social change.

Chaudhry’s research finding is that the ideal place for a poor woman is her house;
however, if she steps out willingly due to poor household circumstances, she loses her
status of a respectable woman. Moreover, she has less access to essential aspects of life
like health care and education, etc.

Sumbul faces similar circumstances while working at the farm of Riffat. Her
contextual ground brings into focus host of discourses that who forced her to marry “to a
forty years old at fourteen” (p. 393). Already she has three children; fourth one is in her
hand and fifth one is in her womb. Being a woman her trouble is multidimensional. Her
construction as a poor working woman at farms sheds light not only on the poor working
women’s experiences and the social space they occupy but also on the socio-cultural and
political forces that place them in a gendered position where they toil patiently with
experiences of exploitation at the hands of people back at home, etc. Exploiting people
are not mere individuals; rather, they represent different dimensions of social structures
for household survival. For understanding of poor woman’s public space and
opportunities for better future, relationship between Sumbul and those
dimensions/structures need to be explored.

Second procedure demands to establish inter-discursivity and intertextuality of the
discourse that leads to other similar texts, topics and aspects presented in other
discourses. My stress hare is on different discourses this text draws upon in its
constitution. In order to understand the social positions held by Sumbul and Riffat and
their agencies within the household and work place spaces, the discourses of relations at
house ‘work place linked to the social structures working at societal level need to be
explored. Sumbul’s dying son is a discourse linked with discourse of her survival aspects
inside her household . . . relation and concerns of her husband, back at home, her struggle
for survival while rearing children along with daily work at Riffat’s farm. Discourse of a
poor working woman’s space within her household also comes in the forefront when her
own space is constrained to nothingness by her belligerent husband, pouring neighbors,
dirty smell of open sewerage and three other children at home. Then there are discourses of individual spaces that linked dynamically work conditions and internal feelings and thought processes of the occupants. Each of these discourses highlights processes linked with individual, household, family, societal, economic and identity dimensions. Thus, there is a complex inter-discursivity that constructs the gender based poverty of Sumbul and hardened life of her employer Riffat. This enmeshing of discourses provides certain analytical categories like gender behaviors, household, joint family system, early marriage of girls in poor families and survival dynamics at home, etc. The focus will be upon the sites of context emerging from the intersecting of these discourses and relations in multiple ways.

Third procedure is to formulate precise research questions and explore neighboring fields for explanatory theories and theoretical aspects. Here focus is on the following research question of this study: ‘What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses within the text?’ For theoretical aspects, theories of Alvesson and Scoldberg that ‘genders are social and linguistic constructions determined by existing social and discursive conceptions and practices (see Connection between Linguistic and Social Aspects from the Perspectives of CS and CFDS, p. 64-65) and Mills theory of inter-discursivity (see Theorising Inter-discursivity, p. 27) will be applied. While contending about identifying other discourses within a given discourse for analysis purpose, Mills argues in the context of feminist discourse that within a discourse there are always pressures of other oppositional discourses. A discourse needs to be analyzed in its “confictual relations; rather, than in isolation”. Thus, the given discourse has been constructed in opposition to and by combining several explicit opposing discourses at work in the social set-up in which Riffat and Sumbul survive as discriminated gender and have their experience. Analysis and interpretation of the passage, according to the given research questions and explanatory theory, is carried out in the following procedures.

Fourth and fifth procedures demand to operationalise research questions in linguistic categories and apply those categories sequentially on the text while using theoretical approaches to interpret the meanings resulting from the research questions. Accordingly, research question concerning explicit and implicit struggle of language over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses
is to be operationalised into five discursive strategies of Wodak. These strategies help to analyze systematic ways of language use at different levels of linguistic organization and complexity. The given discourse is articulated directly by the text producer and not through the complex arrangement of character dialogue. However, presence of characters and their experiences are articulated in opposition to explicit powerful discourses that take part in process of shaping their social space and their identities as working women – one poor and the other rich - making two extremes.

First discursive strategy is ‘Referential/nomination’ that how persons are named and referred to linguistically. This is done by the use of biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors and metonymies to construct in-groups and out-groups. In-group gets support of the discourse producer, and the out-group gets negative representation. First one is Sumbul, who works at the farm of Riffat. She is constructed as a victimized group. She is a victim in the eye of the discourse producer but it is a natural phenomenon in the eyes of exploiting forces. She is poor and her son is dying due to poverty. The discourse of poverty, which constructs Sumbul, is caused by the malignant and indifferent existing social practices and structures/discourses that considered Sumbul’s poverty as a natural phenomenon, thus she is bound to live like this as visible from her sipping of tea at home: “The other women would snap, ‘We never had such luxuries at your age’”. Being a victim she is positioned against host of hostile people who have their own discourses to control Sumbul and exploit her in a way that squeezes physical and social space for her. Her life is associated with home on the one side, and with farm on the other side. Farm and employer Riffat are the metaphors of peace and security for poverty ridden Sumbul but home is a patriarchal structure that denies her freedom, comfort and even her existence. Home is presented as naturalized phenomenon in Pakistani society wherein mother-in-law, being elder is a discourse of authority, who can make her toil from dawn to dusk; husband is an ultimate authority who have all control upon her speech, physique and actions; rearing of children along with their noise and petty demands; dealing with kitchen activities; with dirty smell of sewerage outside and the teasing neighbors. Sumbul is a woman facing extreme poverty with hostile groups gnawing away at her mental peace. On the other extreme, there is Riffat, Sumbul’s employer. Riffat has wealth and comfortable home but with its own constraints and confines she had faced in the company of Shafqat before marriage but continued to pester her throughout her life. Thus women are constructed as victims but they desire and
attempt to survive an emancipated life; however, the oppositional groups along with their power and so called legitimate discourses are so strong and determined that women, living with any social space, are forced to acquiesce the legitimacy and control of existing power structures.

Second discursive strategy is ‘predication’. It is labeling of social actions/groups more or less negatively or positively. This strategy guides to analyze certain stereotypical and evaluative attributions and characteristic of negative or positive trails that represent the social actors in appreciative terms or in terms of disapproval. Riffat, being an experienced woman of life, is represented considerate. Despite being an employer and owner of a silk – producing farm, she is constructed as a kind-hearted and magnanimous lady who does not believe in exploitation; rather, in fair game within relations: “Riffat was about to tell her (Sumbul) again that she could take a few days off”. Use of adverb of time “again” indicates that Riffat’s approach to her woman employee is quite helpful and encouraging. In evaluative terms she has been through such experiences that chained her freedom of life. She had faced such discourses that denied her right of speech, movement and actions: “What would it have taken for Riffat to cross over to Shafqat’s.” Similarly Sumbul’s representation is an identity of poor Pakistani woman whose existence is displaced everywhere. She survives silently and toils stoically. Sumbul is forced to be submissive and finds no option for her dying son except wishing “the end would come quickly now”. She does not find a place where she can feel her presence and where she could voice her personal concerns. Home is usually considered a place of woman’s domain in Pakistani society but for a poor Pakistani lady like Sumbul that is even worse - a major patriarchal structure to add pain to her life. Home for Sumbul is a space dominated by mother in law whose orders, according to joint family discourse, are sacred enough to be denied; by violent husband who feels no restraint from beating her; by Children and nagging neighbors who pour in “for gossip and meals bought with her money”. The opposing factors for both Riffat and specially Sumbul are not universally stationed; rather, in inter-discursive terms, they are characterized by allied discourses of misunderstood and misappropriated religion (being respect to mother in law, husband, neighbor and rearing of Children); of illiteracy and race for social superiority, etc., “We never had such luxuries at your age.”
In this regard, Poole (n.d.) remarks on women in ‘Trespassing’: “Characters show that being a woman in modern Pakistan is not a simple choice of looking back or moving forward, of submitting or resisting, but an experience shaped by the many unique and conflicting factors that make up a person’s life” (see Literature Review, pp. 52-53). In the text there is a realization that freedom has its own bounds especially within a cultural set up. If you attempt to cross those bounds there are discourses that impede trespassing. If you do, you invite discourses that allow the anger of power structures.

Third discursive strategy is ‘argumentation’ about the arguments or argumentation schemes used in a discourse to justify the exclusion, discrimination, preferential treatment or exploitation of others. It may also be a justification of positive or negative attributions. In the given discourse, Sumbul’s poverty is constructed in relation to socio-cultural factors. As this passage is a part of text that has recognized the ethnic, religious, gender and other differences in the context of Pakistani culture. So this discourse using the ‘topos of humanitarianism’ as suggested by Wodak (2001), represents and agrees that there is no option with Sumbul except to accept her position as a deprived woman and Riffat as a bounded woman. The unequal treatment and discrimination that Sumbul gets at the hands of socio-cultural structures in shape of: “mother in law” that makes her work from dawn to dusk; “a belligerent husband” who feels no hesitation in beating her; “three other children” under her responsibility to rear them; “countless neighbors” who like to cherish meal bought with her money and group of women who tease her out of their jealousy “we never had such luxuries at your age”. At this exploitation, Sumbul is pushed to the wall due to gender and social differences where she has no other option concerning her dying son except “She wished the end would come quickly now”. This discourse further argues to justify the discriminatory treatment with women that the social norms and power structures are so dominant that do not allow to move easily out of the patriarchal spaces like Sumbul’s poverty and Riffat’s constraints “the contrast pained more because it highlighted the limits of each.” Thus, the discourse itself justifies that women’s limited space of existence within Pakistani culture is not their biological or essential truth; rather, existing social injustice and the discriminatory structures cause them to acquiesce.

Fourth discursive strategy is ‘perspectivation or discourse representation’. It is the point of view with which labels, attributions and arguments are expressed. This discursive strategy invites to investigate events and utterances that are reported, described, narrated
or quoted to express involvement and positioning of speaker’s point of view. Taking the lead from Mill’s theoretical view of discourse that within a discourse there are pressures of other discourses and it should be analyzed in its conflictual relations. In the given passage the conflict of discourses is quite explicit. Sumbul, differentiated due to her poor social background and gender positionality, is pushed to the wall, and marginalized to live silently. Perspective is very clear that hierarchical space/position and poverty are not universal, born or taken for granted realities; rather, they are constituted through the social discourses that are dominant and do not allow to come to the centre and disturb their superiority. The difference is made, not given. It is evident when Riffat’s farm and Sumbul’s home are brought in conflictual relationship: “Rifat was about to tell her (Sumbul) again that she could take a few days off but she knew why Sumbul came to the farm”. Farm - Sumbul’s workplace - is a source of comfort and security, while her home is a source of aching melancholy. Home here is a metaphor of negativity, an oppositional social structure in which, as the discourse represents, Sumbul faces indifference of her mother in law, cruelty of her husband, she is a lonely and unlovable creature and exploited both by her three small children and nasty neighbours. Her home offers her a survival of victim and oppression and her presence at home perpetuates this oppression as she is unable to afford such a luxury like taking “sip her very own cup of tea”. Use of adjectives of emphasis and possession “very own” reflects that a poor woman in Pakistani society is denied even the fruit of her own effort. She is a victim of her own right. Having suffered humiliation and physical violence within the four walls of her home, she has no desire to live: “absolutely no where for her to sit quietly for two minutes and sip her own cup of tea”. This is an explicit language struggle to represent how gender and power relations shape Sumbul’s identity as a poor working girl, as Barker and Christopher argue, “the language of cultural politics brings oppression ‘into view’ and expands the logical space for moral and political deliberation.” (p. 57). Thus, home becomes a humble space for Sumbul from which she hardly escapes and she has carved a small corner of life - a life space in the farm of Riffat that provides a little relief and healing for her survival.

Fifth discursive strategy is ‘intensification or mitigation’. This discursive strategy invites to investigate the language use for intensifying or mitigating the illocutionary force of (discriminatory) utterances. Intensification or mitigation is an attempt to modify the epistemic status of a proposition. It is an attempt to transform the existence state of knowledge. Epistemic status of proposition here is that Sumbul - representing poor
working-class - is a poor girl, married at fourteen years with forty years old man, feels comfortable at her work place. Farm owner, being an educated lady, believes in fair and considerate dealing. Opposite to it Sumbul shuns four walls of her own home. Does the discourse intensify or mitigate through language use to modify the knowledge status of Sumbul’s poverty? Yes it is there with intention as discussed in perspectivation strategy. Victimized, marginalized and isolated positionality of Sumbul is intensified in the utterance, “Sumbul told Riffat she wished the end would come quickly now”. Usually in child-mother relationship love of child predominates and a mother hardly stops exerting from saving her child from death. This utterance reflects Sumbul’s frustration and loss of her interest in life due to maltreatment at home. Sumbul’s condition is portrayed emotively that she gets mistreatment from every corner of home and from every relation that constitutes home.

Surprisingly this intensification is shaped consistently in utterances that indicates the extremity of the misbehavior and nasty face of relations: “a mother-in-law working her from dawn till mid night, a belligerent husband who sometimes beat her”, “countless neighbors pouring in for gossip and meals bought with her money, an open sewer outside the kitchen, and absolutely nowhere for her to sit quietly for two minutes and sip her very own cup of tea”. Over her cup of tea other women would say, “We never had such luxuries at your age”. Against this intensification of venom-spewing home and no comfort and no space “absolutely nowhere” it is not a wonder that Sumbul loses her interest in life and she simply finds it impossible to live with this scheme of things.

In the light of third research question, language issues emerging from the study and their effect upon meaning-making, this passage constructs the identity of Sumbul as a poor working woman and unconcerned mother through the discourses which socially and dialectically reflect different experiences of life. Physical pain may be experienced by the body of Sumbul but this discourse provides social meanings to her identity as a poor working girl – who is a girl due to her age of twenty years but a woman due to her four children and expecting fifth. Sumbul’s wish that “the end would come quickly now” adds an emblematic depth to the meaning-making that is tied with her social position, circumstances/limitations. It reflects immensity of her fatigued body and ravaged soul. Sumbul’s hopelessness and disinterestedness in life constructed through a language use indicates complex connections between her physical existence, social relations and the
socially recognized meanings of her life as a wife, mother, daughter-in-law and neighbor. In terms of processive identity, this discourse constructs Sumbul’s existence in Pakistani society as a human being transformed and transforming by the interconnected social identities. It is not only Sumbul but Riffat’s identity as employer, owner of factory and woman is negotiated through the interconnected discourses having specific socio-cultural meanings. Their identities and their existence illuminate how socio-cultural relations and conditions shape meanings to their life: “The contrast pained more because it highlighted the limits of each”. Thus, their identities are tied to the politics of socio-cultural interactions and power factions that determine their gendered limits and ways of negotiating their lives. It also highlights an interaction between the discourse of femininity and the prevailing social discourses that put limits upon women. It is like Yeager’s view as discussed in Literature Review (p. 61) that there is a need to develop dialogue with the dominant ideologies instead of developing conflicts with them. Perhaps the author feels that women in Pakistani society cannot escape limits as even men cannot. This language use also reflects what Mills points out (see Literature Review, p. 51) about the earlier feminist theorizing which saw femininity as an imposed ideological category that rendered women as passive victims of oppression. This passage reflects Khan’s discourse as socially aware tool with an eye upon earlier theorizing of women which still exists in Pakistani society where poor women are identified as taken for granted gender category to be exploited by men.

Sixth procedure is to draw the context diagram for the specific text and fields of action. The given passage mainly revolves around Sumbul’s work at Riffat’s farm along with her two brothers, a cousin and old father (Zaman Gul). It also focuses upon her subjectivity as the most oppressed girl/woman and the cultural norms that have pushed Sumbul to the position where her existence as social being is endangered. Being a mother she has no desire to save life of her son; rather, it is her wish that her son should die quickly now. Sumbul is the most valuable worker at Riffat’s farm, who works at the farm and also serves the owner’s family, She is of Dia’s age (20 years) but married at 14 and within few years she had four children and fifth “on the way” (p. 104). Being illiterate and due to cultural taboo, she does not take contraceptive pills, because her husband, mother-in-law and neighbors in her community will not accept it. Her discourse is contested by hostile discourses of husband, mother-in-law and neighbors. At home she is more silent. At farm she can express her feelings with Dia or her mother. She always
served Dia and her mother Riffat with a motherly attitude. Even at her own home she was everything for her home mates. Her brother Salaamat once came to meet her at the farm and due to some small conflict he could not afford Sumbul’s wrath because “Sumbul was mother, father and home” (p. 393). Due to Sumbul’s motherly attitude, Riffat is of all praise for Sumbul and has soft corner for her. On poor health of Sumbul’s son Riffat wants to allow Sumbul to go on leave for few days but discourse producer makes the situation clear as her relations at home are the hostile discourses of society that have marginalized and reduced her to an object of child bearing, of work and of venting husband’s anger and frustration and neighbors’ gossips and jealousies.

Seventh procedure demands to take extensive interpretation while returning to the research questions and to the proposition/problem under investigation. The discourse is constructed inter-discursively drawing upon social aspects of Pakistani society from different angles and picking up from different discourses that reflect the social barriers as very cruel and impenetrable. “Sumbul’s child staunchly refusing to die”, child’s whimpering and wheezing, Sumbul’s wish “the end would come quickly now” and Riffat’s knowledge “why Sumbul came to the farm” is an implicit as well as an explicit language use that reflects how poor woman’s identity is shaped by the pressures of social structures and conflicting discourses in Pakistani society. Discourses of Sumbul’s social class and social standing have detrimental effect upon her thinking and functioning to the extent that she does not care that her son is dying. It is because no one at home takes care of her health and comfort and her functioning that she abstains from stay at home and she prefers farm to home because home is a social space that “absolutely nowhere for her to sit quietly for two minutes”. Similarly last six lines of the passage - “The contrast pained more . . . could never overcome them” - is an explicit language use that indicates the deeply segregated society in which poor women like Sumbul and Rich women like Riffat and libertines like Shafqat live and are bound to live within limits imposed by the gender, class, creed, religion and other social barriers. Despite their wish they cannot cross their limits because conflicting discourses will not accord legitimacy. Rather, there is no discourse that contains language of acceptance of crossing the cultural gaps, “The limits of each”.

Same aspect has been highlighted by Darraj (see Literature Review, p. 48) that in ‘Trespassing’, dividing line between ‘you and me, is strong and determined that it
provides no flexibility and space from which, specially, women can take position to speak. Their voice is excluded. Can Sumbul become rich like Riffat? She may not do so because she has no knowledge, no capital, no skills, and no support at home and above all she belongs to a poor class that is marginalized to strengthen and serve the centre but not to become part of it. So, “what would it take to make Sumbul cross over to Riffat?” After Sumbul, can Riffat cross her limits to join Shafqat, a patriarchal block in Pakistani society who keeps women stay at home, enjoys freedom of life by appearing in public places comfortably and terms women’s public appearance as “an outside evil influence” (p. 422). Riffat, despite being rich, may not be in a position to travel abroad and go out in the society at anytime without family members’ knowledge or if she visits public places independently, there is no guarantee that she will not be harassed because men “ogle” everywhere. If she is sexually assaulted, will she be able to live an honorable life. So she may not be able to live a life of Shafqat’s freedom because of her limits within the culture she is living. Now Shafqat, even an authoritative man, is not without his limits in Pakistani society and he is well aware of it that crossing those limits openly will be dangerous for him. Shafqat confesses this aspect in front of Riffat at a Darbar place after the death of Riffat’s husband Mansoor. He meets Riffat in Aug 1992 and confesses secretly about Dia that, “I know she is my child” (p. 428). Probably, they had been having love making even after Riffat’s marriage as Riffat tells him that “she had slept with her husband the same night” (p. 429). Shafqat suspected she might get pregnant after having sex. Now accepting Dia openly as his daughter is a limit that he finds difficult “to leap past his own confines?” He is also trapped. Will his open confession be accepted by society, religion and the life set-up in which Riffat and Shafqat live? Will society accept meeting of Dia and Daanish (Shafqat’s son from Anu) without being cruel to them? Inflexibility in the social norms will not allow Sumbul, Riffat and Shafqat to cross their limits and here is the aching cry of the discourse producer for transforming of the discourses of inflexibility: “the contrast pained more because it highlighted the limits of each”. If this passage is seen in the context of previous passage (7) where Riffat is represented as resisting the patriarchal clutches in Pakistani society of seventies, author’s cry is more audible. Now the question is not whether there is discriminatory treatment against women but why it still continues. For these kinds of limits Hayat (2013) expresses her view:
The question is how to ensure that the tall, ugly fences built by class and the perceptions that go with it do not stop people from reaching their potential . . . we need to find ways to allow within it more fluidity, so that the segments can intermingle, work together and act in harmony.

But how is it possible. Barriers built by the social discourses in minds of people are so strong and deep embedded that Riffat can sympathise with Sumbul, she can give money and love to Sumbul but she may not offer Sumbul to sit in her chair and take over the ownership of the farm. Riffat’s empathy with Sumbul is not equality. This is a painful contrast for discourse producer and this social contrast caused by respective social discourses will never allow Sumbul as poor working woman, Riffat as an ‘entrepreneurial’ lady and Shafqat as libertine in thought and action to cross their limits without breaking strong cultural norms and discourses.

Cultural norms also attempt to naturalise the existing social practices and relations that provide opportunities for exploitation. Mother-in-law, three children at home and neighbours are separate independent entities. However, due to cultural rules they are part of the home, particularly mother-in-law and children who feel justified to make their excessive demands and it is taken for granted that Sumbul will not object to it. So, they are supposed to be natural part of home and here in this discourse they are represented as having naturalizing impact upon Sumbul. However, due to the psychological and natural effects upon Sumbul they are represented as independent social groups having their patriarchal discourses putting continuous demands upon Sumbul to serve them silently. At home, Sumbul’s identity is sexed and gendered because both mother-in-law and her husband, who also beats her, makes her as a differentiated being and their authority as authorized part of home because existing cultural norms allow it. Language use “Home meant a mother-in-law . . . we never had such luxuries at your age” is a representation of concept of home that is a deep part of Pakistani society and interwoven into the fabric of society to the extent that it seems to be a natural phenomenon. In this made natural environment women, like Sumbul, are victimized but they are made to feel at fault because they are supposed weaker part of the gender system. Those who exploit and perpetuate violence feel strong and justified by strong social discourses that making women work for longer times, beating and rearing of children are acceptable forms. Thus,
women, being unable to seek justice, either accept it silently or choose not resisting it due to social pressures.

**Conclusion of Analysis and Interpretation of ‘Trespassing’**

The analysis and interpretation of ‘Trespassing’ carried out with the help of given research design and research questions reveals awakening knowledge. The analysis expresses women’s experiences of life that are shaped by the multiple discourses created for them by the intertwined gender concerns and gender hierarchies. These discourses render women as potentially insecure, subdued, oppressed and silenced. Both home and public spaces are gendered that stop women raising their voices, lock their potentials and deny their demand of change. It is also revealed that stress of the text discourses is less on the class or caste system but more on the positions and locations to which women are confined. While constructing gendered positions, thinking and division of society, patriarchal domination is presented in negative terms and subdued positions of women are presented as an attempt to survive within their limits and make their survival better by offering limited resistance to the patriarchal traditions and norms. The investigation also reveals that gendered locations/positions of society make women vulnerable to physical pains, confinement and mental shocks. Due to patriarchal domination, socio-cultural, institutional and informal processes have taken such a hegemonic form that women as young, old, married, unmarried, factory owners, poor workers, colleagues and friends are silenced, oppressed and subdued, thus, perpetuating the oppression of women against the prototypical idiosyncrasies of patriarchy.

After this analysis and interpretation of the novel texts, in the next and final chapter discussion concerning language use and inter-discursivity and other research aspects will be carried out as critical discussion as conclusion and suggestions.
CHAPTER 6

CRITICAL DISCUSSION AS CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This qualitative study is based on analysis and interpretation of the discourses of the two novel texts which further draw upon multiple other discourses of socio-cultural, political, religious, psychological, historical, geographical, and scientific and war history significance. The inter-discursive relationship of language use is very subtle phenomenon and not easily noticeable but analysis and interpretation reveals that, at times, these multifarious discourses have no logical connection. This is an interesting aspect of inter-discursivity that through the use of discursive strategies it establishes connections and relations to generate new discourses. In the process of analysis and interpretation of discourses of the novel texts, this study takes into consideration ways relations are established between different discourses and appropriated to create specific effects upon meaning-making in the light of the assumptions discussed in Chapter 1 (p. 15) and research questions. While the aim of this study is to assume and analyse the inter-discursive constructions of language as revealed in the two novel texts, this study also contextualizes these constructions in the possible larger socio-cultural, political, psychological, historical and ideological circumstances within which identity, gender and power relations take place. Thus, different discursive strategies used to construct fiction discourses have been analysed and interpreted with focus on inter-discursive constructions of identity, gender and power relations.

To recapitulate the guiding threads, this study started with the key assumptions concerning ontological view of discourse (p. 15). It is assumed in terms of inter-discursivity that the fictions discourses are potential tools that construct social identities in diverse ways, embedded in social contexts that are also relational and inter-discursive. Interconnectivity works significantly in creating diverse forms of gender and power relations and origin of discourses is unknown leading to unending complex connections
of contexts. Analysis and interpretation of the texts under study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the nature of implicit and explicit language struggle over identity and identification issues, gender and power relations between different discourses within the novel texts under study?
2. How are different conventions, practices and cultures linguistically exploited and appropriated to create a new form of discourse/knowledge?
3. What language issues emerge from the study and what is their effect upon the meaning-making process?

**Constitution of Discourses**

Inter-discursive analysis and interpretation of the discourses of the texts, in the light of research questions and the perspectives of CS and CFDS, furnishes useful but limited insights about the two fiction texts that how they are constituted in the wider relations of discursive strategies and social relations. Some of the most enduring observations about the constitution of discourses resulting from analysis and interpretation are as follow:

1. **Subtle Ways of Inter-discursivity.** Against the positivist stance where constitutive elements prominently maintain their distinctive individuality, in inter-discursive language use appropriation of diverse discourses as constitutive elements is affected so smoothly that the fusion predominates and the individuality of discourses is appropriated to merge into each in a subtle way for constitution of a new discourse. The discourse producers (authors) inter-mingle discourses in a systematic, consistent and coherent ways and create coherence by fusing cognitive aspects with socio-cultural and religious dimensions. In Foucault’s Pendulum (F’s P), reference to Rosicrucian allegory illustrates that the discourse producer has fused together Temple of Rosy-Cross and its “Renaissance iconographic” recognition, incongruous landscape, the tower and the “hand of God”. All these elements have been fused intimately to create homogeneous effect – an attempt to create lens for the reader’s meaning-making. The merging effect is to represent a discourse as a common sense piece of communication to be accepted by the reader;
though, it hides its political, socio-cultural and ideological premises that come to surface through inter-discursive analysis and interpretations.

2. **Inter-discursivity – An Expansive View of Language Use.** Along the various moods of discourses, inter-discursivity also reflects the expansive view of language use. Inter-discursivity is not a view of language use based on containment; rather, it is a way to collaborate with other disciplines, discourses and areas of knowledge as illustrated by Bakhtin’s heteroglossia (*pp. 5, 106*), Fairclough’s configuration and hybridization of diverse elements of discourses (*pp. 7, 12, 155*), Fuery and Mansfield’s matrix of polylogue (*p. 40*), Eco’s ‘Tout se tient’ (*p. 42*) and Kristeva’s view of text as polyvalent and polylogical (*p. 42*), etc. All these theoretical views represent language use expanding out of its given textual discourses, establishing connections across the disciplines and discourses, breaking limits of time and space and challenging the premises of socio-cultural bounds. Thus, inter-discursivity semantically explores uncharted areas bringing plurality of their meanings and unending hybrid discourses and unrestricted language use.

3. **Dialogicality of Language.** Inter-discursivity reflects not only the constitutive and expansive dimensions of language use but also invites the reader to explore the interconnectivity of discourses and be part of the construction of new discourses, rearticulating and recontextualising processes of discourses. For this purpose, Eco makes use of different discursive strategies, like very intimate tone of conversation, challenge to the reader’s knowledge and understanding and, in inter-discursive terms, juxtaposing own discourses and reader’s discourses. Similarly, Khan’s intimate conversation style seemingly makes the reader feel sitting close to the discourse producer and actively participating in the discourse articulation. Reader is addressed inviting his/her dialogue. An attempt is made to arouse curiosity of female reader by using such pronouns as ‘you’. In terms of inter-discursive construction, it reflects that the meaning-making in fiction text is not worthwhile if constructed in isolation. It reflects the negation of monologicality and asserts existence of inter-discursivity. This relationship of text discourses and reader’s discourse emphasizing upon sharing of socio-cultural contextual knowledge, social experiences, gender and sexual orientation, multiple positioning, conflicting and concordant discourses and ways of speaking reveals the inter-discursive practices through which the fiction discourses have been produced.
4. **Various Modes of Language use.** Language use, in words of Wells (2000), in various modes of engagement plays an epistemic role where the discourse producer positions himself/herself to engage with tentative areas of knowledge and constructs new discourse. Particularly, in Foucault’s Pendulum all passages selected for analysis and interpretation reflect the different modes of engagement like religion, philosophy, mythology, history, geography, conspiracy, fright in underground tunnels, magic shows, etc., that create thrill, awful feeling of mystery and suspense. In this language use, there is a lot of twisting and turning that semantically moves the text through the discourses concerning oceans, planets, geographical locations, historical periods, global cultures and migrations across the globe and linguistically through the paradoxical metaphors reflecting mythical, religious, cultural, epistemic and geographical dimensions, etc. Thus, if seen in totality through the given methodological approaches, inter-discursivity does not lead to unity in the texts; rather, to multiple entities with their own embraced diversity.

**Critical Insights**

Along with observations about constitution of discourses there are certain critical insights as a result of this study. This qualitative study explores the ways in which the inter-discursive constructions of language take place especially with reference to identity, gender and power relations. Through the analysis and interpretation of the two fiction texts it is revealed that inter-discursivity is a multidimensional phenomenon which promotes different ways of language use that, on the one hand, draws upon recounting of events, interchange of degrees of comparison, affirmative, negative and exclamatory discourses, etc. On the other hand, it draws upon reinterpretation and appropriation of historical events, religious and socio-cultural practices, philosophical ideas and ideologies, known personalities and places, ingrained habits and attitudes and personal authorial involvement, etc. The combined effect reshapes discourse(s) emerging in the two fiction texts. The existence of overwhelming inter-discursivity tells about dispersed meaning systems within the institutional relations thus, making the mediation process focal point of research instead of the structures per se. Following are the study insights:

1. **Awareness about the Contradictions.** Analysis and interpretation of the texts reveals that the text discourses are produced by appropriation of other discourses and
disciplines that semantically do not have any logical connections with the produced meanings. Inter-discursive analysis exposes the contradictory aspects that hold no relationship with the intended discourse. Establishing relationship is to increase the intractability of discourses. What appears to be smooth text within a discipline from the outside, it becomes a volume of contradictions and miscellany of discourses when approached from and explored through inter-discursive perspectives of Cultural Studies and Critical Feminist Discourse Studies. Through the application of five inter-discursive strategies the text reveals how different contradictory devices are employed especially by Eco to construct his discourse concerning Foucault’s Pendulum. This medley of contradictory elements is found throughout the text of F’s P wherein an attempt is to construct a discourse of purity through the discourses of impurity. But it is questionable what authority Eco has to call something pure/impure and just and unjust by using the discourses produced by other writers like Marx and Lenin. There is an attempt to construct a discourse of the author’s personal desire that otherwise contains such contradictory gestures of argumentation schemes that accept one thing and reject the other. These contradictions also reveal the rejection of values attached to the appropriated discourses and discourse producers attempts to incorporate own values and contextual meanings. Similarly, contradictory gestures are also found in Khan’s ‘Trespassing’ when she attempts to highlight the patriarchal hegemonic behaviours in Pakistani society. Appropriating contradictory discourses to construct own discourse is a new knowledge revealed through this inter-discursive analysis and interpretation.

2. **Interest of Critical Feminist Discourse Studies (CFDS)**. Sanna Lehtonen (see p. 60) expresses about CFDS that it exposes not only the discourses of power relations and oppression but also helps to understand the forms of empowerment through discourses especially of fiction discourses. Investigation of Khan’s ‘Trespassing’ under this perspective reveals that this fiction text uses discursive strategies to expose oppression on the one hand and on the other hand, to educate the female reader about the forms of empowerment. Khan’s discourses grapple with the contemporary issues emerging from man-woman relationship especially of girls who are impervious to the patriarchal controls of the past. In the ordinary lifestyle, with the use of discursive strategies as sounding tools for gender concerns, the author constructs different forms of empowerment of women and resistance of women to patriarchy and oppression. For this purpose, Khan places Dia and her mother Riffat against ‘elders’, Dia against traditionalist
Nini, Riffat against Shafqat’s self assumed struggle for women’s freedom, etc. These are the incisive forms of resistance and empowerment embedded in different strategies. In this regard, ‘elders’ is a metaphor which stands out. The struggle for women’s freedom is delinked from the ‘elders’ and obligations towards patriarchal controls and protection and the author, by virtue of inter-discursivity, brings together notion of freedom and way forward by resisting patriarchy. In terms of inter-discursivity, Riffat and Dia serve as potent forms of empowerment. There is Riffat as an old woman who unites all ebbs and flows of freedom/oppression that social structures have thrown in her way through different stages of life. On the other hand, Dia is represented as a metaphor of dream or lost opportunity representing a notion of freedom at all stages of existence. Thus, CFDS is a socially conscious approach inspired by rapidly changing socio-cultural and socio-political patterns.

3. **Complexity of the Context.** Aspect of the context is quite significant in this study of inter-discursivity that guides to establish relationship between text discourses and the reader. Issue of context has also been discussed as part of inter-discursive construction in ‘Argumentation on CDA’ (p. 79) as raised by Wodak and highlighted in Analytical Model – DHA (p. 86) - in words of Kincheloe and McLaren. Qualitative researchers build bridges between reader and text, text and its producer, historical and present contexts and one particular social circumstance and another. After investigation of discourses of the two novel texts, it is revealed that context is very subtle and illusive phenomenon and building bridges between text and text producers and the historical contexts is absolutely complex, politicized and unbounded phenomenon. It is based on close possibilities of the constructed issues. In this study what makes the context problematic is the personal intention of the text producers which is evidenced by the inter-discursive constructions of the context. Recontextualisation of issues, such as sweeping statements, by mere imagination without undergoing the intensity of experience associated with the occurrence of incidents or without indicating source of inspiration is highly enigmatic. With this problem of the context I see analysis and interpretation itself as part of the problem, thus, it makes the whole process of research problematic and difficult. The encouraging aspect is that it provides understanding of the flexibility and unstable nature of the text discourses and the processes from which they emerge and to which they refer. The notion of inter-discursivity is not without its divergent profundity. Schwandt (1997) says:
These different ways of speaking form something more like a constellation of contested practices than an integrated, readily surveyable order. There are multiple sources and kinds of disputes, but generally they involve different ways of conceiving of the aim of qualitative inquiry stemming from different traditions of thought.

(p. xiv)

Thus, there is a challenge for the researcher. It is limitation of the researcher that it is, perhaps, not possible to touch upon the contextual details of the multifarious openings of the discourses because all referred and assumed aspects contribute to generate new contexts and new disputes.

4. **Inter-discursivity is a Source of Creativity.** As this study reveals the complexity of the context owing to its inter-discursive relations, at the same time this study reflects that inter-discursivity helps to enhance the vision of the given ‘reality’. Inter-discursivity, being fluid area of language use and meaning-making, constantly seeks to extend the borders to other disciplines, histories, geographies, relations, forms of knowledge, etc. For it, no form of knowledge is too exclusive to be negotiated and transformed. Due to this aspect of creativity, interpretation task finds it difficult to state the attitudinal character of the discourses, values and relationships being realized, direction of the meaning-making which is attached with context, co-texts and socio-cultural positions and interactions with the readers. This association is creatively diverse not only in its relationships but also in attitude and meaning effects like challenging, collaborating, inviting, appealing, exhortation, educating, encouraging, reasoning, entertaining, etc. For this purpose, Eco adopts entertaining attitude of inter-discursivity, illustrating self knowledge while looking at a piece of engraving of 17th century, debating between discourses, enlightening the reader through inter-discursivity and explaining while inter-discouring with Agarttha. Similarly, in ‘Trespassing’ there is a challenging attitude towards discourse of ‘elders’ as ‘elders’ itself becomes a metaphor/discourse. It illustrates that inter-discursivity by creating new discourses/knowledge follows no specific principles. Each new relationship discovers and follows its own principle in order to explain, assert or justify its own position just in the moment of interaction in which it exists; however, ready to be negotiated in further interactions and creativities. In this regard Fairclough (1995b) says, “In very general terms a conventional discourse practice is realized in a text which is relatively homogeneous in its forms and meanings, whereas a
creative discourse practice is realized in a text which is relatively heterogeneous in its forms and meanings” (p. 61). Thus, inter-discursivity is creative because it is heterogeneous in its form and meaning. This creativity is also earlier indicated by Robbins in Chapter 2 (p. 29), when she says that there is always another side of a discourse that widens the view. The other side always connects to other discourses and ‘realities’ hence, works creatively.

5. **Role of Author.** It is significant to note that Barthes denounced the role of author focusing solely on discourses and language use. Barthes (1997) announces death of the author in following words, “We know now that a text is not a line of words releasing a single ‘theological’ meaning (the ‘message’ of the Author-God) but a multidimensional space in which a variety of writing, none of them original, blend and clash” (p. 122). Against this view, while researching the inter-discursive language use, it is revealed that the given discourses attempt to establish relationship with reader not only through describing and narrating things but also through certain textual and discursive features that seem breathing because of the authorial attempt to construct the appropriate socio-cultural relations. Writers’ authority is evident where text directly attempts to establish close interaction by appealing, inviting and challenging the reader. For this purpose, authors make use of strategies like proclamation, assertion for interrogation, negative way to snub and to reprimand and imperative mode, etc. Sometimes emphasis words and tag questions are used. These discursive features manifestly emphasise and assert authority for providing knowledge and appeal, inform, attract and remind the reader that author is the sole source of this knowledge/discourse, knowledge of social structures, women’s social positions, reactions, etc.

This arrangement of discourses reflects the patterns of authorial passion and involvement with the subject position foregrounded. Moreover, the forms of the discourses set by the authors exhibit the authorial keenness dominant caused by frequent interpolation. It reflects the ironical inversion of what Barthes says “death of the Author-God”. Authorial character is alive. It is the authorial life/presence, not the death/absence, which is the revelation from interpretation of inter-discursive constructions of language.

6. **Critical View of Criticism.** This study of inter-discursive relationships constructed through language use reveals that postmodern fiction is itself a criticism of life. The texts under study construct life and life’s activities in severe and several
conflicts and present humanity in trans-cultural and trans-human perspectives. They offer not only view of life but also represent conflicts and fractured relations and suggest solutions, implicitly and explicitly. The texts are not scholarly representations of life with focus of only one centre; rather, as many centres as the discourses are intertwined and every centre is politicized. In words of Edward W. Said (1997), there are ‘overlapping territories and intertwined histories’ within the discourses. This study itself becomes critical view of criticism. It is interesting to note how life is criticized through the discourses of F’s P by intertwining different discourses of geographical locations, of people and their moods, of life protected by the hand of God, of truths at the specific stage of historical period, of Order of Knights Templar as eulogized and romanticized through discourses of war and peace, of treasures of knowledge, of religion and religious persons as severely criticized to the extent of rendering them as jokers, of political life in the world of Agarttha (under world) represented as alternative to life on earth, of discourses of magic/mystery and factual life placed in contest to accord ascendency to discourse of mystery, etc. Similarly, ‘Trespassing’ presents criticism of life in its inter-discursive constructions of undesirable and depressing effects of closure of elders’ thinking in Pakistani society, of discourse of desire for emancipation of women, of Pakistani men as represented in moods of fear, seriousness and aggression and women in relaxed, happy and delightful moods, of young women amid the worries of their life associated with men and men’s regimes of truth, of men with their discourses to make fun of women to the extent of dehumanization, of powerful entrapping discourses of patriarchy as highlighted through oppressed Dia who has the wish and will for emancipation but full of trepidations of social reactions, of traditional contest between men and women in typical Pakistani gendered environment, of life of poor and rich Pakistani women along with their confinements, etc. Thus, these are the aspects of life criticized through the discourses of the texts which are further critically investigated through this study.

7. **Inter-discursivity and Issue of Assumptions.** Fairclough (2003) argues about ideologies and assumptions, “Implicitness is a pervasive property of texts and a property of considerable social importance” (p. 55). In the backdrop of inter-discursivity the issue of implicitness or assumptions gains importance especially when the texts under study are fiction discourses - all personal production of the authors. What can be more implicit and assumptive than the fiction texts? Fairclough (2003) distinguishes three main
assumptions: (i) existential assumptions about what exists, (ii) propositional assumptions about what is or can or will be the case and (iii) value assumptions about what is good or desirable. In this regard, discourses drawn upon become assumptions. It is not important that how these assumptions are integrated but their social significance is important. Here the social significance of the assumed discourses for the reader is that the texts attempt to extend their constructed meanings to convince the reader. The ideological significance of the assumed discourses is that they entertain, present resistance and attempt to convince the reader of the veracity of the proposed meaning-making. For example in F’s P, the assumed discourses are more entertaining and interesting. They are expressing more of personal liking of the author as the author attempts to appeal the reader by glorifying and romanticizing the Christian military Order, Knights Templar. To make his discourse more attractive and engaging Eco draws upon discourses that are propositional assumptions like millennial migrations of people of Atlantis, eulogizing Order of Knights Templar, associating Templars with the mysterious tunnels of Provins and under-world Agarttha, establishing superiority of mystery knowledge over factual science knowledge and criticizing four religious figures assuming them as jokers.

In ‘Trespassing’ more stress is on discourses concerning value assumptions – assumptions about what is good or desirable. Here ideological aspect is more dominant like desirable arrangement for women in Pakistani society. In this desirability, patriarchal social structures and relations are criticized severely for their unjust attempts to subordinate women. Contrary to it, women, especially young ones, are represented as oppressed and confined owing to the imposing will of the males in Pakistani society. It is assumed that ‘elders’ especially men of Pakistani society not only oppress women but also block the progress of the country; men take no interest in women except for sexual purpose; thus, women should choose their partners with deliberation; young girls are bound to spend their lives within four walls due to restriction from parents; hence, women should aim higher for personal freedom. Family’s honour is assumed as tied with the sexual and physical existence of women and men assume their responsibility to protect women being objects of honour. They do not hesitate to cut off this object of honour by killing if it is spoiled; hence it is desirable that men should be tolerant and flexible in their behavior and in concept of honour. It is also desired that women should have the opportunities to create comfortable environment for themselves both at home and at work.
place. Moreover, it is desired that early age marriage, like that of Sumbul, creates problem not only in rearing children but also physically for women.

Thus, the ideological aspect is embedded in the inter-discursive constructions for making the text more appealing in case of F’s P and for improvement of social behaviours and for positive social change of women’s conditions and educating men the lesson of tolerance in case of ‘Trespassing’.

8. **Aspects of Bias.** Authorial role asserts its presence in varied ways. Inter-discursive analysis and interpretation of the two novel texts reveal that, at times, in bringing together different discourses for construction of specific meanings/situations, the texts seem to be determined to include and exclude certain discourses that can be associated with authorial bias. But, it is not simply enough to call it bias because it is a domain constructed by the author in view of his/her personal intentions, socio-cultural environments and the discourses drawn upon. There are no specific methods to draw boundaries between bias and inter-connections of discourses; however, the textual stance reflected by discursive strategies of perspectivation and intensification/mitigation indicate meaning-making leading to one direction. The texts either attempt to include or exclude certain discourses; thus, creating feelings of love, hatred, attachment, realization, logic, emotions, etc. F’s P draws upon various discourses to assert the glory and magnificence of Knights Templar. Author intensifies the status of Templars as noble people by introducing intertextual and inter-discursive relationships of the given discourse with the discourses of Saint Bernard, Jacques de Vitry and Joinville; whereas, discourse of William of Tyre is excluded by defaming him as faulty and treacherous historiographer. Author’s determination to glorify Templars is also visible from the humble cry of the author: “*Poor Templars. Your epic, all in vain*” - intensification of the Templars from humble positions. Similarly, in ‘Trespassing’ the given discourses seem to be determined to stigmatize men in Pakistani society as ‘elders’, brothers, uncles, fathers, husbands, etc. Men are constructed as inherently oppressive beings and they are the sole reason of women’s worries as revealed through five discursive strategies. Is it a bias or just an inter-discursive construction of a social situation?

One can find that in drawing upon other discourses, both in ‘F’s P’ and ‘Trespassing’, the authors take specific positions exclusively to construct specific meanings that may be called bias of the text or part of inter-discursivity.
9. **Inter-discursivity forms Specific Image of the World to target Reader.** As practice goes, novel texts are meant for reading during free time and sometimes for academic purposes. Novel texts mainly entertain but also attempt to form a specific image of the reader about the world. In this regard, different discourses with different structures and strategies drawn upon in the texts under study serve different purposes. By appropriating different discourses of earlier history and constructing them at global scale, F’s P attempts to reproduce the ideological platform for establishing glory of the Knights Templar as CDA assumption 6 (p. 77) goes that power relations are produced, reproduced and exercised and restrained through discourses. Through circuity of inter-discursivity, F’s P attempts to perpetuate a kind of historical and religious naturalization and established hegemony of the Order of Knights Templar. It is discussed earlier that through different discourses, ultimately it is Knights Templar that are foregrounded as heroic figures whose significance has not been realized by the present times readers but the author attempts to promote the glory of the Order of Knights Templar by praising their mission, introducing them as knowledge predecessors of Newton, fighters par excellence in Provins and managers of an ideal/peaceful world like Agarttha, etc. The text can be categorized as eulogy discourse like Spenser’s unfinished Faerie Queene of 16th century.

Contrary to it, ‘Trespassing’ seems to expose a kind of patriarchal naturalization through the employment of different discourses, of different structures and strategies. There is an attempt to convince the reader through her ideological platform of feminist discourses aiming to redirect the course of action for transformation of society and thinking of people living there. Khan employs different discursive strategies/discourses like young girls as friends (Dia and Nini), daughters, fiancés; old experienced working women (Riffat); poor working girl/woman (Sumbul), etc., to counter the long established hegemonic discourses of patriarchy being very narrow-minded and intolerant and confines young girls and women in the form of family – father, brother, uncle, etc. This text becomes counter arguments to the patriarchal discourses of ‘fate/obligation taught by elders’, silent acceptance of men in marriage by women/girls, making young girls stay at home by parent especially by fathers, men’s hatred against women’s stereotypes, women’s reputation as currency and repository of family’s honour, women’s duty to stay at home with children and men’s duty to fight for women’s freedom outside and early age
marriage of girls. This text is a kind of discourse of rebuttal to the discourses of patriarchy.

Thus, there is a constant endeavour to attract the reader with agility towards intended aims of the texts. The discursive strategies used in the texts demand from the reader to have certain amount of trust in the constructed ‘realities’ that speak on several levels ranging from individual to socio-cultural and mystical, physical to deeply emotional.

10. **Issues of Gender and Identity: Construction and Inter-discursivity.**

Exploration of gender and identity through the inter-discursive constructions is one of the aims of this study. Focus of F’s P is more on identity construction of Knights Templar as unique personalities of the forgotten times than gender aspects involving men and women. However, where there is focus upon man-woman relationship, there is a heightened consciousness that woman is focused not as an empowered member of a socio-political group; rather, as a commodity within a situation structured by male traditions and practices of maleness. Women have no independent/private identity where they can assert their existence and voice their concerns. They are voiced through the authorial strategies of sex and love discourses.

Contrary to it ‘Trespassing’ constructs gender and identity aspects prominently as there is contest of discourses in which patriarchal discourses are resisted showing that the text aims to attack the public and private places that have been gendered by patriarchy. Patriarchal discourses have constructed identity of women as dependent upon men. But this dependence is resisted inter-discursively through the counter discourses that reflect women as having multiple identities. Gendered thinking, gendered places, gendered family systems, gendered social structures, etc., are attacked through resisting discourses questioning the universality of patriarchal discourses. Wodak’s view (see CFDS, p. 60) to study gender as a social construct in a view of context – socio-cultural, ethnic background, age, education, socio-economic status, emotions and specific power dynamics, etc., is appropriate to apply here. One of the central powerful influencing gender structures is family where men reign and have their control upon women through different discourses. Dia is represented as central figure to display femininity reacting under oppression of patriarchal discourses. She has grown up amid discourses taught by the family and societal ‘elders’ that attempt to silence her against any kind of
oppression/control, convince her to submit to the fate and social structure of marriage because it has been the practice in families that girls accept the choice silently given by the parents, teach her, though an extreme view, that men have no consideration for women except to satisfy their sexual desire, so no need to bother about good or bad husband, make her understand her dependence upon men while going to the public places, educate her that she will be worthless in Pakistani society if her body is touched by someone who is not authorized through marriage with the willingness of father, brother and uncle. It reflects that the patriarchal discourses in Pakistani middle class society develop a sense of fixed identity of young girls. In this regard, Dia’s identity as female gender is not without influences of political and socio-cultural discourses. To break this notion of feminine identity produced and sustained by the discourse power dynamics of patriarchy, the text brings counter discourses that question the veracity of those discourses and associated power circles to control her. Resisting discourse that empowers Dia to challenge patriarchal attempt of oppression comes through her mother Riffat that she should “Marry only out of love, not obligation”. But discourse of her mother is not without the serious risks owing to the powerful social structures. Both the discourses suggested by Riffat are products of higher level contexts because it involves socio-historical and religious backgrounds and challenge to those powers may result in her elimination. Due to Riffat’s encouragement Dia is going ahead to assert her identity and raise her voice against the oppression and fixed notions of identity.

Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) versus other Methods

Inter-discursive analysis and interpretation of the texts using analytical model of DHA reveals that there are unending inter-discursive positions within the theories and perspectives of the novel texts under study. Wide-ranging dimensions emerge as a result of the knowing of the presence of diverse connections. It is significant to look back and review this study in the light of already discussed ‘Significant Characteristics of Analytical Model (DHA)’ (p. 94) versus other methods. It is important to know that CDA is a wide-ranged methodological approach supported by shared perspectives of socio-cultural life, historical and political concerns and psychological, cognitive and linguistic dimensions. What makes it critical is going beyond the given discourses and contexts to see and investigate the implicit and explicit relations with other discourses and disciplines.
and their related purposes and ideologies. Within the ambit of this study and discussion of CDA methods, like Wodak’s analytical model of DHA, there are certain other methods with CDA considerations that could help to analyse the given texts for the study insights. Analytical methods which are closer to DHA for study of discourses are Semiotics, van Dijk’s Socio-cognitive Model and Fairclough’s CDA. Though, their focus of investigation is also verbal and written texts but these methods have not been used for this study due to their slightly different directions which do not fulfill the research requirements as per theoretical and analytical base of this study concerning inter-discursive constructions of language.

van Dijk’s (2001) Socio-cognitive Model or Socio-cognitive Discourse Analysis is a popular and useful method used for the discourse studies due to its diverse and multidisciplinary approach. It provides varied perspectives and guidelines to analyse discourse structures in relation to social structures especially ethnic groups. This method guides to analyse discourse at the production and reception/comprehension levels as van Dijk says, “the complex real world problems CDA deals with also need a historical, cultural, socio-economic, philosophical, logical or neurological approach, depending on what one wants to know” (2001, p. 97). Moreover, it allows to examine context of discourse at all levels to analyse groups, power relations and conflicts, to analyse opinions about ‘us versus them’, to identify and examine assumptions and formal structures – including lexical choices and syntactic structures. In this method van Dijk accords significant position to socio-cognition (social and personal cognitions) that plays considerable role in meaning-making while mediating between society and discourse. Despite all these positive traits, this model is not applied for analysis and interpretation in this study because of its more stress on cognitive aspects – ideologies and abstract mental systems which he also calls ‘models’ that control how people act, speak, write and understand the social practices of others. To understand the cognition of the characters involved in a discourse is problematic. The texts under study are the imaginative discourses; hence, the cognition involved in the texts/discourses is of the authors who do not even provide clear contexts to their texts as highlighted in the discussion of respective contexts in the start of chapters four and five. More important is that, this method does not directly guide to establish and analyse the inter-discursive aspects as does the DHA.
Next is Fairclough’s model of CDA. This model is also very close to Wodak’s DHA due to its combination of social science and linguistics. Fairclough’s CDA is based on Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics, Foucault’s concept of ‘Orders of Discourse’ and Gramsci’s concept of hegemony, etc. This model takes deep interest in investigation of transformations in language use and discourses occurring due to global socio-economic changes. Chauliaraichi and Fairclough argue, “CDA of a communicative interaction sets out to show that the semiotic and linguistic features of the interaction are systematically connected with what is going on socially” (p. 113). Fairclough’s model can generate sufficient interpretation of discourses due to its intertextual character for the understanding of implicit and explicit issues. However, this model is not used for the present study because of its more focus on linguistic aspects than on inter-discursivity. Aspects of Fairclough’s CDA found in his writings (1989, 1995, 1999, 2003) mainly focus experiential, relational and expressive values of vocabulary, grammar and textual structures. Though he also talks about inter-discursivity (2003, 1995) which he calls constitutive intertextuality but he does not clearly incorporate this aspect in his model of CDA. Contrary to it, Wodak’s DHA manifestly focuses on inter-discursive and linguistic aspects of a discourse – that meets theoretical and analytical demands of this study.

Another important analytical method that could be used for analysis of the texts under study is semiotics. Eco (1996) says about semiotics that every cultural phenomenon may be studied as communication. Chandler (n.d.) also says that semiotics can be applied to anything which can be seen as signifying something. A text is in itself a complex sign containing other signs. Semiotics, though fundamentally concerns about investigation of sign language; however, capable to provide a detailed framework for analysis of a text like its focus on kind of text, modality (reality claims made), paradigmatic analysis (choice of signifiers from different paradigms), syntagmatic analysis (structural relation of signifiers), rhetorical tropes, intertextuality, semiotic codes (single, double, etc), social aspects (who created sign, whose reality is represented?), etc. Different aspect of semiotics is its stress upon finding structural relationship between the various signifiers and issue of modality that seeks to locate the ‘reality claims’ made by the texts. Issues of structural aspects and ‘reality claims’ do not fit into the concept of hybridity and inter-discursivity and methodological design based on CDA which believes in mediated and discursive form of meaning-making instead of ‘reality claims’. Moreover, semiotics focuses keenly upon the linguistic aspects and their symbolic significance while
terminologically DHA focuses mainly on the different aspects that are: use of discursive strategies, ways for specific meaning effects and mediation of ideology in a variety of social institutions.

Aim of this study as illustrated in the first chapter is to investigate the identity, gender and power relations as constructed through the inter-discursive features of the given texts. The direct focus of investigation is the aspects of inter-discursivity that what and how different discourses are drawn upon and appropriated in the novel texts to construct specific discourses of identity, gender and power relations. The persuasiveness and appeal of the analysis and interpretation generated by this study can be clearly asserted because the research design particularly analytical model (DHA) has generated comprehensive interpretation. The methodological procedures of DHA have helped to disclose the inter-discursive closures of the texts with their possible contextual background emerging from the explicit/implicit clues of the given texts. This study deals with the linguistic constructions of the social realities as relative and relevant not to produce an empirically tested and absolutely objective conclusions. It is a knowing of the inter-discursivity coming from the interpretation and also a knowing of the self uncovering the peculiarities of the preconceived dispositions and perceptions. In this regard Gadamar says (cited in Schwandt, 1997, p. xxi), “everything understanding mediates is mediated along with ourselves”. Specifically understanding about the concepts of gender and identity as social constructs is a unique one against the prevailing concepts in Pakistani society wherein attempt is made to fix the identity and gender roles by integrating different discourses of social, religious and linguistic significance.

**Limitations of the Study**

In this part, some limitations of this study are expressed. It does not mean deficiencies of the study; rather, in terms of inter-discursivity, they are also the facets and positions of my understanding that may serve as guiding threads for the future reader to bring in more connections to enhance inter-discursivity. According to Bellier (2005), interdisciplinarity masks more than it opens doors to. To understand the profundity and variety of functions of a language use masked by the discourses, a researcher’s task becomes very challenging where he/she has to take very active and dynamic position and,
at the same time, not ignoring the actual personality of the individuals engaged in the production of the discourses, the kind of emotions behind the wording of particular sentences, the arguments which might have been exchanged before the final text is agreed upon, etc. Though, I as researcher have followed similar cognizant line for analysis and interpretation, but still find, in my humble capacity, that some aspects need more attention for detailed interpretation independently which I could not do owing to constraint of space and my study objectives based on theoretical plan. Moreover, it is suggested that these limitations be studied in the light of delimitation as discussed in chapter One (p. 21-22). Those aspects/limitations are discussed below.

1. **Inter-discursivity is an endless Practice.** Uzma Aslam Khan says in passage 8, “The contrast pained more because it highlighted the limits of each. What would it take to make Sumbul cross over to Riffat’s? What would it have taken for Riffat to cross over to Shafqat’s or for him to leap past his own confines? He, who’d traveled and ruminated more than anyone she knew, could never overcome them (p. 261). Khan’s language use in ‘Trespassing’ becomes a powerful metaphor if viewed through the lens of limits and limitations. Similarly, this study, despite exhaustive attempts for extensive interpretation of the selected passages of the texts under study, is not without its limits and limitations. Inter-discursivity is quite fluid and unstable area of the language use and meaning-making. Building dialogic connections in language use is an endless and unending process and keeps the meanings ever ready to be negotiated, reconstructed and reshaped in new contexts. Particularly, F’s P emphasizes this aspect conspicuously: movements of pendulum are connected with human movements and migrations across the globe that holds no logical and ethical justifications. Then connecting author’s narrator, Casaubon, with one of the behavioural patterns of early 20th century fiction detective characters like Sam Spade or Phillip Marlowe gives a feeling of private eye and detective posture while Casaubon is just a student and works at a publishing house. What is the objective of creating this connection between a publishing house worker who is looking at a 17th century engraving and the detective entertainer of the earlier decades? The limitation lies in exploring all possible connections and their contexts. Discourses do not simply exist; rather, intermingle without logical connections. I may not have touched upon every connection with all contextual directions because it is a very complex issue. It also demands adequate space while this study is of a limited scale. Discontinuity of connections is inconceivable in the study of inter-discursivity. It also reflects the notion of
free connections what Eco calls everything is connected with everything (tout se tient), that is something frustrating as well. The context may or may not be inter-discursive but it is evident from the study that it is difficult to ignore inter-discursive nature of a text. However, it is a human limitation that despite having this understanding that inter-discursivity is an endless practice of connections and meanings I have to put a limit somewhere which becomes the limitation of this study as well. This is the message of this study that inter-discursivity takes into its sphere things/discourses lying beyond human perception.

2. **Aims of Inter-discursivity.** Another significant aspect of this study is that, perhaps, what has been pointed out as the objectives of inter-discursivity may not cover the entire range of intended aims. Why inter-discursivity becomes style of a text? It raises certain questions like what produces inter-discursivity and what inter-discursivity aims to produce? Does it aim to produce social change? What kind and degree of social change it intends? To say simply that understanding of a language use is possible within the context is highly misleading. This limitation is not due to the deficiency of methodological approaches or the analytical perspectives; rather, it is an ontological issue because the texts under study, in terms of postmodernism, do not remain focused to specific norms. They are discourses produced while drawing upon other discourses found in newspapers, books of history, engravings, films and the personal observations and interpretations of the authors. The scope of inter-discursivity can be extended by increasing co-textual and contextual aspects as allowed by CDA assumptions (pp. 77-78) and analytical model (p. 86). But postmodern positioning of inter-discursivity reveals how and why it is difficult to discover all aims and moods of language use. While theorizing and defining inter-discursivity Fairclough’s views of discourse within the context (p. 27) are:

“different elements of social practices, including forms of activity, social relations and their institutional forms, persons with beliefs, values, emotions, histories, and so on . . . they cannot be reduced to each other, and therefore demand different social scientific theories and methodologies, i.e., they are not discrete. They flow to one another; they internalize one another”.

According to Fairclough, in the process of internalization, it is impossible to separate the discourses. Why they cannot be separated because the context of culture drawn upon, context of the situation, values, beliefs, etc., problematise the access to all intended aims.
Even the ‘intended aims’ is misleading. According to Hutcheon, the teasing question is, “From what position can one theorise (even self-consciously) a disparate, contradictory, multivalent current cultural phenomenon?” It reflects that it is not possible to catch all moods of discourses, all spheres of identities and all moorings of ideological constructions. This limitation is also identified when the authorial position is negotiated especially with reference to the texts under study. As Leotard (1979) argues:

A postmodern artist or a writer is in position of a philosopher: the text he writes, the work he produces are not in principle governed by pre-established rules, and they cannot be judged according to a determining judgment by applying familiar categories to the text or to the work. Those rules and categories are what the work of art itself is looking for.

Thus, perhaps, this limitation is inherent in inter-discursivity itself which is enigmatic for both authors as well as for readers.

3. **Time and Historical Aspect.** The analytical model employed in this study is DHA, initially developed by a team of sociolinguists with primary focus upon discourses to explore “anti-Semitic stereotyped image” (Wodak, 2001, p. 70; also see Discussion on DHA, p. 90). Their focus was to analyse “the linguistic manifestations of prejudice in discourses embedded in the linguistic and social contexts” in which they also used to compare and contrast the language use of the discourses with the historical knowledge and its compulsory integration in the interpretation seems to be a binding factor. It is highlighted that this aspect is also made part of the first procedure of the analytical model – DHA: “Sample information about the context (social, political, historical, psychological and so on)”. The term ‘historical’ positions significantly in this model. In its application for interpretation, this term is not followed mechanically or in the spirit initially envisaged by Wodak to find the shifting and changed linguistic manifestations from the earlier historical ‘facts’. Without undermining the significance of ‘historical’ as discipline I have applied this term in the meaning of double codedness as argued by Hutcheon (1989), who acknowledges as well as questions the ways of historical representation in the fiction. Postmodern fiction, according to Hutcheon, is more intertextual (inter-discursive) due to its investigation of historically diverse texts, references and different codes and the historical events are merged into diverse other discourses of fiction. Hutcheon doubts the clarity and impartiality of historical ‘facts’ because writers and
compilers of history also depend upon discourses of other sub texts like reports, letters, diaries, prior texts, etc., influenced by the prejudices of their writers. In this context, a fiction becomes a complex web of intertextual and inter-discursive references. About historiographic metafiction Hutcheon says:

If the past is only known to us today through its textualised traces (which, like all texts, are always open to interpretation) then the writing of both history and historiographic metafiction becomes a form of complex intertextual cross-referencing that operates within (and does not deny) its unavoidability discursive context. (p. 81)

It is evident from the interpretation of the discourses of the novels under study that the authorial subjective perspectives influence the representation of historical events and what first procedure of the analytical model calls contexts of social, political, historical and psychological aspects, they do not stand crystalised; rather, they merge into each other with all their conflicts, mediations, colours, and divisions in the inter-discursive constructions of the fictions. The ‘historical realisms’ if present, are disturbed and disrupted by the frequent inter-discursive references. The reader is offered an area of shifting positions as in F’s P movements of pendulum are juxtaposed against ‘outline of mandala, people of Atlantis moving from Tasmania to Greenland, from Capricorn to Cancer and from Prince Edward Island to the Svalbards. It also integrates discourses concerning Agarttha, Samoa, Nova Zemlya, Avalon and Ayers of Rock, Sam Spade, Phillip Marlowe, engraving of the 17th century with many historical references, Knights Templar (Christian military Order that started in 12th century), philosophies of Corpocrates and Aleister Crowley, references to Marx and Lenin through the lens of sex and purity, names of historians and historical personalities like William of Tyre, Jaques de Vitry, Saint Barnard, Joinville, Queen Melisand, Bedouin the Leper King, Barbadosa, Richard the Loin Heart, Provins – a city in Italy, Mediterranean Basin (geographical location), Apuleius (author), Neo-platonism (literary/art movement), Pythagoras (mathematician), Brahmans of India with reference to Alexander the Great, Druids of Gual and the British Isles, Greeks and Barbarian, the Rosicrucians (a secret society), Matthew, Mark, Luke and John (religious figures), Paul and incident of road to Damascus, Pliny (an imperial magistrate under the Roman ruler Trajan who ordered killing of Christians in initial period of Christianity), Peter, Agarttha (a mythical underground city), etc. F’s P starting with movements of pendulum shifts to the
discourses concerning mystery stories mainly focusing on discourses of Knights Templar with lot of other concealed discourses and texts. In F’s P, the movements of pendulum become a potent metaphor that the reader also moves from one historical name, event, etc., to another like the moving pendulum.

Similarly, in ‘Trespassing’ there are references regarding Pakistani society which have certain historical significance like: violence in Sindh (due to specific political and military conflicts), issues of being Punjabi, Pathan, Pukhtoon, Muhajir, Sindhi, etc., and Quaid’s dream (reflecting/disintegration) of Pakistan as a country, Karachi being a city of entrepreneurial mothers (freedom of women in Karachi city), etc., and many other events of historical significance have been constituted inter-discursively in the text.

The novel texts have the historical references as F’s P frequently goes back to the middle ages and ‘Trespassing’ to the historically conflicting and socially complex set-up of Pakistan. Historical references from both the texts reflect that the historical events, names, locations and occasions have been incorporated/constructed in the texts inter-discursively. These have not been analysesd and interpreted with the accuracy of historical timeframe and significance; rather, interpreted with their inter-discursive significance in the formation of the texts. Thus, despite having the references of historical ‘reality’ in the texts, analysis and interpretation could not maintain the precise historical ‘reality’ owing to the principal problem of inter-discursivity that considers historical ‘facts’ as the constructed ‘facts’.

4. **Selected passages and Length of the texts.** Though I have clearly indicated in the beginning of chapter 4 (p. 96) about the analysis and interpretation of the selected passages from the books is to analyse and understand the concept of inter-discursivity and main focus of authorial attempt to effect specific meanings of identity, gender and power relations. However, I consider going for analysis and interpretation of few passages (9 from F’s P and 8 from Trespassing) from the extended volumes of the texts is a small scale activity. But the requirement of this qualitative study is to provide sample of analysis and interpretation to develop an understanding of how diverse discourses interact and integrate to construct a new discourse/knowledge as indicated in second research question with different meaning dimensions. After thorough reading, those passages have been selected which reflect significant relations and dimensions of inter-discursivity and the major focus of the texts. There is no denying the fact that more examples can be
collected from the texts for further analysis and interpretation; however, mere expansion in shape of interpretation or proving/disproving of data is not the underlying goal of this study. The purpose is to develop an understanding about implicit and explicit language use through different conventions, practices and cultures and discourses that attempt to construct identities in specific ways affecting meaning-making process. This objective has been accessed and explored to greater extent as research insights discussed above are indicative of it. However, field of interpretation is open and future reader/researcher can attempt to add to it more exploration and academic insights.

These are the limitations; however, it should not be perceived as weaknesses, faults, errors, etc., of this study; rather, these are my observations articulated after the thorough analysis and interpretation. However, future researcher/reader may explore these limitations to enhance the knowledge further leading to more insights concerning language use and social betterment.

**Recommendations**

In view of the limitations discussed above and third research question, (What language issues emerge from the study and what is their effect upon the meaning-making process?), it provides an opportunity to recommend for further enhancement of this qualitative study. Limitations of this study are based on analysis and interpretation of the discourses presented in the two novel texts and these recommendations are based on the discussed limitations.

1. **Exploration into Process of Inter-discursivity.** As discussed in limitations of this study (*pp. 290-296*) that inter-discursivity is an endless practice but in view of small scale of this study, this process is limited to the interpretation of the given passages exploring mainly ontological aspects and relationships of discourses. Future researcher/reader can contribute to this study by exploring deeply the reasons of inter-connections of entities that lie separate in time, space and contextual aspects especially in ‘F’s P’. The immediate benefit of this recommendation concerning language use may be to explore further the meanings that are ever ready to be reconstructed and recontextualised. In case of ‘Trespassing’ this further exploration in connections of discourses may reveal new ways where sanctioned gender roles can find flexibility from
being tied to certain ethos of honour and respectability. This may help to transform those
gendered norms which have impacted women’s ways of thinking and utilisation of their
abilities negatively.

2. **Exploration into Aims of Inter-discursivity.** It is highlighted in second
limitation that this study cannot catch all moods of discourses to understand meaning-
making of inter-discursivity. It is recommended for the researchers/readers to explore the
respective areas from which the discourses are drawn upon and areas which they refer to
for specific purposes. This will further knowledge about spheres of language
use/discourses that how and why different discourses with their different aims are taken
up to construct specific meanings either to attract the readers or to control certain
community and legitimise ways of hegemony. Especially exploration of aims of inter-
discursivity in ‘Trespassing’ may reveal further the intricate behaviours combined with
self-made norms and codes/discourses of Pakistani society that delimit the women’s lives,
undermine their abilities and determine gender norms.

3. **Exploration into Historical Aspects of Discourses.** If fiction discourses are
imaginative creations then why historical references should be taken as ‘realities’.
Interpretation of discourses of both the texts referring to historical events is not a mere
repetition of the past discourses and texts; rather, it is an exploration deep into the
multiple relations of discourses of secret societies, mysteries of the past, mysterious
tunnels, romances of middle ages, quotations and allusions to philosophical and political
writings, churches, palaces, engravings, detectives, geographical locations across the
globe in ‘F’ s P’ and allusions to man - woman relations, women’s reputation versus
society, women’s freedom and men’s control over women, etc., in ‘Trespassing’. It is not
possible to maintain any specific historical track of things and events. In this complex
inter-discursive environment the interpretation and analysis go beyond the available codes
and language use to the rhetoric of inter-discursivity and connections. The historical
‘reality’ is interpreted in terms of inter-discursivity. However, one can explore the
historical events and references in their (original) contexts and the reasons of their
(il)logical connections within the given (con)texts.

4. **Exploration into the Entire Length of the Texts.** This study revolves around
analysis and interpretation of few passages selected from each text. Work on selected
passages instead of the entire text(s) is due to constraint of space and limited objectives of the study. Secondly, the purpose of study is to understand nature of inter-discursivity which is fulfilled, to greater extent, through the carried out research of the selected passages. However, instead of going for more novel texts, one can carry a detailed critical study of one novel text which may create more comprehensive knowledge about inter-discursivity and language use in a novel text.

5. **Study and Exploration into Pakistani English Novel.** Based on inter-discursive analysis and interpretation of ‘Trespassing’, it is recommended that local English novels written by Pakistani female authors must be studied and explored to understand local socio-cultural practices especially gender-based practices in the perspectives of feminism and cultural discourses. This study reflects about Uzma Aslam Khan as a socially and politically aware and conscious female author who constructs her resisting discourses through diverse strategies to respond to the old and new discourses of patriarchy that divide Pakistani society on gender basis. One of the powerful strategies is metaphorical use of “elders” as symbol of oppression and exploitation. “Elders” always look for opportunities to trap women as their personal belongings to “keep things working in their favour”. Discourses constructed by Khan derive inspiration from events of local origin having gender biased culture and cultural heritage. There is an attempt to educate and empower women and influence the way they think and feel about their lives. It encourages women to take conscious look at themselves, their behaviours and social values for taking strong position for vibrant culture against the sorely crippling discourses and narratives of oppression. It gives local effect to language use leading to varied interpretations.

**Concluding Remarks**

This study, rooted in linguistic and socio-cultural theories and the insights drawn, reveals that the texts under study are not mere individual discourses; rather, by establishing unending connections they become part of and refer to larger discourses of linguistic and socio-cultural importance that produce specific meanings. This inter-discursivity and inter-connectivity are to be found more in language use, rather than in actual socio-political structures and circumstances. Thus, language use is more expressive than materiality of life. Validity of language being expressive is seen through its implicit
and explicit references and connections transcending the relatively more durable forms of socio-cultural and historical events and behaviours. The value of the texts under study is more based on the vast relations with other intersecting discourses wherein host of further linguistic, social and cultural conventions, practices and notions clash and blend and the reader has to take a dynamic position to understand the volatile nature of life and life’s activities represented through the discourses. The forms of all human activities, intentions, representations, etc., representing socio-cultural life seen through the prism of inter-discursivity on the paradigm of text, as interpreted in the chapters 4 and 5, is a readable discourse. Their naturally given positions are destabilized due to overflow of connections, relations and associations of acceptance as well as resistance, thus, rendering the meaning and meaning-making practice very fluid.

Meanings concerning identity, gender and power relations are constructed and reconstructed in the texts by dialogic connections to diverse discourses of life. Inter-discursivity is responsible for creating and masking diverse socio-cultural and political effects/shades and, at the same time, posing challenging positions for the researcher. I have confronted substantial aspects of discourses as objects and sources of study. Their meanings vary in inter-discursive spaces rendering values and representation of socio-cultural norms as constructed facts. This all is investigated in the particular form of communication – two novel texts. Thus, language use, in terms of inter-discursivity, instead of existing as a neutral, passive and predetermined phenomenon, appears as a highly political, socio-cultural and creative tool for communication that takes turns and twists making connections with multiple discourses/disciplines/texts hiding something and expressing something else. For my personal knowledge, previously, it was always the text that was focus of attention but now it is my learning that more significant is how (position) I approach the text to understand it.

To conclude this study, keeping in view the detailed discussion on inter-discursivity with the help of theorists (Chapters 1, 2 & 3), assumptions about inter-discursivity and CDA and research questions (Chapters 1 & 3), Literature Review (Chapter 2), analytical perspectives and methodological directions (Chapter 3), analysis and interpretation (Chapters 4 & 5) and the research insights (Chapter 6) I, as researcher, have attained this understanding that identity, gender and power relations in general and specifically in the two novel texts are inter-discursive social and linguistic constructions.
The analysis and interpretation of the selected passages of the texts reveal that, in the implicit inter-discursive environment, the reader is drawn into the complex relations constructed by the discourse contents and their inter-discursive contexts with diverse concerns and perspectives on issues of identity, gender and power relations. The application of the concept of inter-discursivity with methodological approach of CDA unearths the complex mix of discourses with a wide range of voices and ambiguities of meanings, their profound effects and the fluid positions and processes of the narratives. It is not a smooth study, as the texts discourses, through the process of analysis and interpretation, also pose certain limitations.

Thus, this study illustrates that inter-discursivity is a dynamic field and the two texts are rich in inter-discursivity. But their exploration of connections is not limited because aim is to make explicit and extend connections of discourses as connections inherently are to be extended. This study comes to an end with the hope that it stimulates further exploration and interpretations of interconnectivity of discourses with deeper interest and appreciation for understanding of linguistic, socio-cultural and political changes and transformations.
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