

## KAMILA SHAMSIE'S BURNT SHADOWS AS AN INTERTEXTUAL RE-WRITING OF FORSTER'S A PASSAGE TO INDIA

**Saira Shafique**  
Department of English,  
International Islamic University,  
Islamabad, PAKISTAN.  
[sairashafiq@hotmail.com](mailto:sairashafiq@hotmail.com),

**Dr. Munazza Yaqoob**  
Department of English  
International Islamic University,  
Islamabad, PAKISTAN.  
[munnazayaqoob@yahoo.com](mailto:munnazayaqoob@yahoo.com)

### ABSTRACT

*The present paper attempts to analyze Kamila Shamsie's use of intertextuality in her novel Burnt Shadows. The term intertextuality was coined by Julia Kristeva which refers to the presence of a text within some other text. The term being derived from the concept of dialogicality or dialogism propounded by Mikhail Bakhtin rejects the idea of the closure of meaning and accentuates the dialogicality of texts. It explains how literary texts are always in a state of continuous dialogues with other texts. Literary texts, in this dialogic process can question, alter and even modify the previous texts and can also anticipate response from the future texts. The postcolonial writers, being influenced by the colonial oppression and marginalization take an interrogational stance in their writings. They show resistance in their literature by re-reading and re-writing the colonial texts. This re-reading and re-writing, being important tools of intertextuality, is found to be very helpful for postcolonial purposes. This study attempts to analyze the use of intertextuality by a Pakistani postcolonial writer Kamila Shamsie and explains how her appropriation of A Passage to India, which is a canonical intertext exposes the colonial tactics of controlling the colonies.*

*Keywords: Intertextuality; appropriation; postcolonial literature; dialogism*

### INTRODUCTION

The present research attempts to analyze Kamila Shamsie's novel Burnt Shadows as an intertextual re-writing of E.M Forster's novel A Passage to India. Shamsie has written five novels, and all of them deal with the history and culture of sub-continent in general, and Pakistan in particular. Like other postcolonial writers she tends to write back to the centre. Her Burnt Shadows as this study attempts to explain, is also a deliberate and self-conscious reply to a colonial text A Passage to India.

Intertextuality reveals the inter-connectedness of one text with other texts. It refers to the ways in which the production and reception of a given text depends upon the participant's knowledge of other texts. It reveals the presence of one text within the other and highlights the fact that no text can have an independent meaning. Every text takes something from the previous texts, and lends something to the future texts. Graham Allen describes the concept of intertextuality as one of the central ideas in contemporary literary history, as he argues:

Texts, whether they are literary or non-literary, as viewed by modern theorists, as lacking in any kind of independent meaning. They are what theorists now call intertextual. The act of reading plunges us

into a network of textual relations. To interpret a text, to discover its meaning, or meanings, is to trace those relation [ . . . ] Meaning becomes something which exists between a text and all other texts to which it refers and relates (1).

The term intertextuality was coined by the poststructuralist theorist Julia Kristeva in her article *Word Dialogue and Novel*, which was published in 1966. Kristeva's coinage and development of the concept of intertextuality owes much to the achievement of Mikhail Bakhtin. Her familiarity with the Russian language and culture helped her to develop the theoretical foundations of intertextuality. She derived the idea for her definition of the term from the works of Bakhtin.

Bakhtin introduced the concept of dialogism in his collection of four essays concerning language and the novel. He describes dialogism as an unrestricted, backward and forward play between the source text and the dialogic text. This open-ended notion of dialogism exhibits a challenge to closed structure and single authorial meaning of the text. He emphasizes that a word, whether written or spoken, is no longer to be considered as a point of fixed meaning, but as a place where textual surfaces and networks cross. The language we use is never our own, and no interpretation is ever complete because every word is a response to previous words and elicits further responses. "The word in language", asserts Bakhtin, "is half someone else's" (293).

Roland Barthes has also contributed to the development of intertextuality by emphasizing the importance of textuality. He emphasizes that the literary works should be called as literary texts. In his essay *From Work to Text* he emphasizes that text should replace the conventional notion of literary work as a text is a non-definite object, but the work implies something concrete. The text resists any kind of classification and closure. On the other hand, the idea of literary work implies that something is complete, non-contaminated and autonomously authored. In this approach text is described as a stratified object, containing echoes and references to other texts (Hale 235-39). In this way, intertextuality connotes that the literary text is weaved of numerous fibers of other texts.

Julia Kristeva also argues against the notions of text as a site of stable significations. She establishes a new mode of semiotics, which she calls *semianalysis*. In this approach, she attempts to capture a vision of texts that are always in a state of production. For her it is not merely the object of study that is undergoing the process of being produced, but the subject, author, reader or analysts also become a part of this continual process of production. In this way, ideas are not presented as finished, consumable products. They are presented in such a way, that they encourage readers to step into the production of meaning (83-87). This approach towards literary works that they are always in a process of production worked as a formula for the theory of intertextuality.

Intertextuality signifies the fact that the literary works are not a closed network and are not autonomous in nature. Allen argues that many of the major theories of intertextuality have been developed on the basis of Saussure's notion of the differential sign. The linguistic sign is non-unitary, non-stable, relational unit, the understanding of which leads us out into a vast network of relations, of similarity and difference, which constitutes the synchronic system of language. Likewise all these characteristics are applicable to a literary sign. Authors of literary works do not just select words from a language system, they select plots, generic features, aspects of characters, ways of narrating, even phrases and sentences from previous literary texts and from the literary traditions. In reading literature, a reader becomes intensely aware that the signs deployed in any particular text refer not to the object in the world but to the literary system out of which the text is produced. As Allen explains, "If a modern author, for example, presents a characterization of Satan in his text they are far more likely to have in mind John Milton's representation of Satan in his epic poem *Paradise Lost* than any literal notion of the Christian Devil" (11-12). Such recognition about the linguistic and literary signs led to the reconsideration of the nature of literary works themselves. A literary text is viewed no longer as the product of an author's original thought, as referential in nature, and as the container of meaning but a space in which potentially vast number of relations coalesce.

Bakhtin's intellectual development displays a diversity of insights that cannot be easily integrated or accurately described in terms of a single overriding concern. He outlines his own theory of language somewhat differently in different studies, depending on the problem immediately before him. In his

Speech Genres he makes the distinction between sentence and utterance. The sentence is a unit of language in traditional sense while the utterance is a unit of speech communication. Even when an utterance is one sentence long, something must be added to the sentence's linguistic composition to make it an utterance. Some must say it to someone, must respond to something and anticipate a response. One can respond to an utterance, but one cannot respond to a sentence. Each utterance is by its very nature unrepeatable because its context and reason for being is different from other utterances. Bakhtin further explains that Addressivity is a constituent and necessary feature of an utterance so utterances require both speakers and listeners. The utterance counts on and is shaped by the second person's responsive understanding. In addition to the second person, he explains, there can also be a third person, a superaddressee, for every utterance (125-127).

Morson and Emerson explaining Bakhtin's ideas, propound that every time we speak, we respond to something spoken before and we take a stand in relation to earlier utterances related to the topic. The way we detect those earlier utterances as hostile or sympathetic, authoritative or feeble, socially or temporally close or distant, it shapes the content and style of what we say. Consequently, our speech becomes extremely complex. In this agitated realm of alien words and value judgments, the speaker's words "merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group; and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile" (137). So in this way, our words and utterance become double-voiced. Every utterance has a task, aim or project. The words of all utterances, with the right sort of analysis, can be shown to be cited or reported from other contexts.

The theory of intertextuality, developed by poststructuralist and postmodern theorists, has become an effective appropriation strategy for postcolonial writers. Postcolonialism is chiefly characterized by questioning and subverting the authority. Pramod K. Nayyar defines postcolonial literature as:

Postcolonial literatures seek to address the ways in which non-European (Asian, African, South American, but also settler colony) literatures and cultures have been marginalized as an effect of colonial rule, and to find, if possible, modes of resistance, retrieval and reversal of their 'own' pre-colonial pasts (1).

Postcolonialism, is actively engaged in a process of questioning colonial discourses. It tries to dismantle the Eurocentric binaries of centre and margin, the self and the other and the west and the east. Language was one of the main features of colonial oppression, and the medium through which hierarchical structures of power were perpetuated. This power is rejected and subverted in postcolonial writings by seizing the language of the centre and replacing it in a discourse fully adapted to the colonized place.

Postcolonial writers use intertextuality as a strategy. Their use of language is in full accordance with Bakhtin's ideas about dialogism. Their works come in a hostile dialogue with the previous canonical works of literature. They can use the previous text and re-contextualize them according to their indigenous demand. According to Norman Fairclough intertextuality is a matter of re-contextualization. Framing is also very important in intertextuality, when the voice of another is incorporated in a text, there are always choices about how to frame it, how to contextualize it in terms of other parts of the text. He has pointed out that for any particular text or type of text there are a set of other texts and a set of voices which are potentially relevant, and potentially incorporated in the text (47-48).

Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin present a review of the textual strategies that postcolonial writers employ. They explicate that there are two distinct processes to subvert the language of the centre. One is abrogation, which entails the rejection of using the language of the centre and refusing the metropolitan power over the means of communication. Second is appropriation and reconstitution of the language of the centre. One of the strategies with which abrogation takes place is by using allusions from native culture. Allusions perform the function of registering cultural distance. Postcolonial writing abrogates the privilege centrality of English by using language to signify difference while employing sameness which allows it to be understood. It does this by employing language variance, the 'part' of the wider cultural whole which assists in the work of language seizure

whilst being neither transmuted nor overwhelmed by its adopted culture. The overlap of language occurs when texture, sound, rhythm and words are carried from the mother tongue to the adopted literary form or adapted for a new situation (50-52).

There are many ways through which a text shows intertextual affiliations with other texts. Either a text completely transforms the previous text or appropriates and adapts few portions. One way of completely transforming a prior text is to make its parody. Another way through which a writer can completely transform a previous text is to re-write the storyline in a new context, or to re-elaborate the previous text by writing its sequel. John McLeod in this regards, notes that, "The re-interpretation of 'classic' English literary works has become an important area of postcolonialism" (139). He analyzes some postcolonial literary works that re-read and re-write the received literary texts in a new light. He concludes that the postcolonial re-writing does much more than merely filling in the gaps perceived in the source texts. Rather it enters into a productive critical dialogue with the source text. The re-writing can take the source-text as a point of inspiration and departure, but its meanings are not fully determined by it. A re-writing can also be done to resist or challenge colonialist misrepresentation of the colonized peoples and cultures. Thus re-writing implicates the reader as an active agent in determining the meanings made possible by the dialogue between the source text and its re-writing (168). The other way is that the text does not completely transform a prior text; rather it takes some direct quotations, allusions, concepts etc from other texts. As Julie Sanders argues that the employment of allusions, adaptations and collages encourage the readers to seek out precursor texts and to consider the inter-relationship between the original and the adapted texts (19).

In an attempt to expose the misrepresentation of the native countries, culture and people in the colonial texts, the postcolonial writers re-read and re-interpret the canonical European texts. This practice has taken to the forefront the widespread stereotypical representation of the non-white nations. This practice of re-writing has produced a huge bulk of the native works that celebrate the native geography, culture, people and languages. They use canonical works as source texts of their writings, but here these intertexts, unlike the previous use of intertextuality, are employed not to get influenced by them, but to have a critical dialogue with them.

The present research is a qualitative study, which attempts to closely scrutinize the use of intertextuality by Kamila Shamsie in her *Burnt Shadows*. The study focuses on Shamsie's use of intertextuality specifically in the postcolonial context, and investigates how Forster's intertext has been reframed and recontextualized in this novel. This trope of intertextuality falls under the rubrics of Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of dialogism. Bakhtin though introduced this dialogic concept of language, but he did not give any proper model to identify and categorize dialogic discourse types. Morson and Emerson after a comprehensive study of all Bakhtin's major works and concepts have prepared a compact model of all diverse types of Bakhtinian dialogic discourses. This model draws upon various works of Bakhtin on dialogism, and organizes all the discourse types that Bakhtin has discussed in his different works and in different contexts. This model has been taken to identify, categorize and analyze intertextualities in Shamsie's *Burnt Shadows*. According to Morson and Emerson model there are two basic types of discourses:

1. Single-Voiced that is without quotation marks
2. Double-Voiced that is with quotation marks

Single-Voiced words are those which are not in quotation marks. Here quotation mark means that the writer does not make the connection very explicit. Rather it is the readers who can guess the presence of someone else's words in the given text. On the other hand, in the second category that is the double-voiced words, the writer makes the connection very explicit, and enables the reader to detect the presence of some previous text.

Double-voiced words in this model are further divided into two types, uni-directional passive double-voiced, or vari-directional passive double-voiced. In uni-directional passive double-voiced words, the source text is not treated in a harsh manner; rather the writer adapts it for a new setting, or positively extends its ideas. But the vari-directional passive double-voiced words are used in such a way, that the

writer enables the reader to detect the presence of other's words. Then these words are interrogated and are subjected to critical and harsh treatment. The re-interpretation and re-writing of the canonical English literary works has become an important area of postcolonialism. The postcolonial writers enter into a productive critical dialogue with the literary classics. In this way, these literary classics become the varidirectional passive double voiced intertexts.

Shamsie's *Burnt Shadows* comprises four sections, and every section deals with a different time-period. The first part deals with 1945, the atomic bombing; the second with 1947, the immediate pre partition scenario; third with 1982 Pakistan and fourth with 2001-2, the post 9/11 time period. *Burnt Shadows*' second part *Veiled Birds: Delhi 1947* is a vivid intertextual re-elaboration of E.M Forster's *A Passage to India*, which was published in 1924. Shamsie has re-written its every bit: the plot, the setting, the storyline and the characters. The setting of *A Passage to India* is in the British-controlled India, in 1920s, the time when British government was officially ruling India. It examines the national and racial barriers that characterize the complex interactions between the Indians and the English. Shamsie has employed Forster's intertext as a vari-directional passive double-voiced intertext.

Forster opens his novel with the description of the city of Chandrapore, a typical Indian town that symbolizes the rest of India. Shamsie opens her novel by giving the description of Delhi. The difference is that, in the former novel, the description of the Chandrapore is given by an omniscient narrator, who sees nothing extraordinary in the city, except the Marabar Caves, in which later in the novel main tragic incident happens. The omniscient narrator explains that Chandrapore appears misleadingly beautiful at first glance, thus it gives an illusionary image to the newcomers. The only beauty that is found in this town is due to the few fine houses from the imperial period of upper India. On the other hand, Shamsie does not mention an imaginary prototypical Indian town. She specifically highlights the city of Delhi. Furthermore, the description of Delhi is given by the native, an Indian character, not by a detached omniscient observer. The detached, alien and most likely the non-native omniscient narrator of Forster's novel does not find anything beautiful in the novel other than the imperial buildings. Shamsie's main Indian character, Sajjad Ali Ashraf, while cycling parallel to the Yamuna River, considers the city to be the rhythmically beating heart of cultural India. He not only mentions the historical importance of the city but also shows the sense the close belongingness to the city by repeatedly calling it as his city. He describes the city by giving a direct quotation from Ahmed Ali's *Twilight in Delhi*, as a city warren of "by-lanes and alleys, insidious as a game of chess" (Shamsie 33; Ahmed 4). Here Kamila Shamsie has used this intertext in quotation marks, to highlight and acknowledge the importance of Ahmed Ali's intertext from *A Twilight in Delhi*, a novel which is famous for celebrating the native Indian culture. Ali's intertext, being an example of uni-directional passive double-voiced words, is not subjected to harsh treatment, rather she completely agrees with his portrayal of Delhi. So the first re-interpretation of the canonical text is given in the description of the landscape. The locale is not an imaginary and dull town of India, rather the city, which is famous for its culture. It's not the imperial buildings which make the city look beautiful, rather the centuries old culture.

But one fact that is common in these two descriptions is the division created by the British Raj. Forster's Chandrapore city consists of two towns, the native section and the English civil station. The Anglo-Indian section of the town has shown to be a totally different place. It shares nothing with native section of the city except the overarching sky. Here the overarching sky implies the generous British patronage of the city. The English imperial buildings are shown to be positioned on the higher grounds of the city. Their positioning on the higher ground implies their higher status.

Shamsie also mentions this division in the city as Sajjad Ali Ashraf ponders about the need "to locate the exact celestial point at which Dilli became Delhi" (33). Just like Chandrapore, Sajjad divides Delhi into two parts. Dilli, is the native section of the city, a place to which his ancestors had come from Turkey over seven centuries earlier to join the armies of the Mamluk King, Qutb-ud-din Aibak. On the other hand, Delhi is the city of British Raj. He identifies the boundary of Dilli and Delhi as, "... where the sky emptied – no kites dipping towards each other, strings lined with glass; and only the occasional pigeon from amidst the flocks released to whirl in the air above the rooftops of the old city where Sajjad's family had lived for generations" (33-4).

This description of British-controlled Delhi is marked with the theme of separation and demarcation. Sajjad notices that every Englishman's bungalow has lush gardens, lined with red flower pots, and these flower pots set the barrier between the British people and the native Indians. For Shamsie, this division is created and marked by the British, unlike Forster who considers and presents India as a very place of division; the unhappy continent where separations are felt more profoundly than in other places.

Shamsie by using the same theme of separation in her novel treats Forster's theme in an antagonistic manner. She starts the action of the part II of her novel by showing her Indian character bicycling to meet someone. This start hints to the start of the action of Forster's novel. But here Shamsie taking control of this double-voiced passive intertext takes it to a different direction. She shows nothing clumsy about her character. Her character is bicycling to meet his English employer, James Burton to do some legal work with him. James Burton is shown to be very friendly towards Sajjad. But Shamsie clearly highlights the invisible social, national and racial barriers that exist between the two. Shamsie's text makes it clear that it is Burton who is in a controlling position because he occupies the privileged position of colonizer. So what Aziz and his friends are shown to be discussing by Forster, is very subtly shown to be enacted by Shamsie's characters.

In the first section of Forster's novel, every event, every character and every detail is a variation on this theme of barriers. The gulf between the Indian and the English is shown from both points of view: at the dinner in Hamidullah's home, in the English club and at the Bridge Party which meant to bridge the gulf between the English and the Indians, but only serves to emphasize it. The story takes a turn when Aziz meets the newly-arrived English people, the ones who are not yet influenced by the hostile and mysterious India. They are the two ladies who arrive from England, Mrs. Moore, the old mother of the City magistrate, Ronny Heaslop, and Miss Quested, his prospective wife. These English newcomers in India wish to communicate, to bridge the gap, offer genuine good-will and kindness, and distrust the official Anglo-Indian attitude towards natives.

Likewise, in *Burnt Shadows* a newcomer, Hiroko Tanaka, a girl from Japan, from an all together different country, comes and attempts to defy all barriers. She believes in the words of her deceased fiancé, who told her that Sajjad Ali Ashraf is the only person in Delhi worth seeing. So after reaching Delhi, when she finds out who Sajjad is, she tries to talk to him. But Sajjad at once realizes that she is going to speak to him as an equal, so he avoids her because he knows that his British masters will never like this.

But Forster's Indian character Aziz, though not having a very good experience with the English before, still greets the newcomers with hospitality. He is unlike Shamsie's Sajjad, who let the newcomer know about the invisible boundaries and stops her from flouting them. Forster's English characters take a step ahead, as Adela Quested desires to know "the real India" (38). Similarly Shamsie's foreign character Hiroko Tanaka tries to take a step ahead, and shows the desire to learn the native language. James Burton immediately disapproves it as he feels that it is not required at all. Hiroko does not agree with Burton and asserts that she has to learn how to read and write in the native language. Elizabeth Burton, James Burton's wife, suggests her to take help from Sajjad in learning Urdu. Mr. Burton does not approve this, but Sajjad manages to persuade him. So a step forward taken by Forster's characters to bridge the gap by organizing the bridge party ends up pathetically, but Hiroko succeeds despite Burton's disapproval at first and largely due to Sajjad's presence of mind and wit.

But Forster's not-yet-influenced British characters do not stop at the failure of the first step to bridge the gap and to see the real India. They first themselves suggest and then happily accept when Aziz offers to take them to the Marabar. Similarly after the language-lesson, Hiroko asks Sajjad that "I'd like to see your Delhi" (Shamsie 79). This remark echoes Adela's desire to see the real India, meaning the native section of Chandrapore, and this very desire leads her to the tragic incident of the Marabar Caves. So Hiroko's desire to see Sajjad's Delhi, making an actual attempt to trespass the border, may prove to be an ill omen, since the whole novel has been re-writing the canonical novel

The expedition of Shamsie's characters to the Qutb Minar does not end up in a tragic experience, rather here for the first time in the novel, Elizabeth Burton, the most typical Anglo-Indian character in the novel, shows cordial behavior to Sajjad. Unlike Aziz, who has never visited the Marabar ever in his life before, and does not know anything about the historical place, Sajjad narrates the history of Qutb Minar to the Anglo-Indian representative Elizabeth. He tells about his family history that his ancestors were soldiers in the armies of Mamluks. They are the first dynasty of the Delhi Sultanate, Qutb-uk-din Aibak after whom the minaret has been named. While doing this, he thinks that, "... this is how things should be – he an Indian, introducing the English to the history of India, which was his history and not theirs" (80). Forster's Marabar expedition ends up as a shattering experience, calamitous to everyone. On the other hand, in Shamsie's expedition to the Qutb Minar, Sajjad, the Indian character, gives his the most enlightening, eloquent and patriotic speech of the novel. During this trip, he stops being submissive, rather attempts to reverse the role, and takes the charge of the situation, and dominates. He informs the English about his history and mocks them for treating his history as their picnic ground. Hiroko admires Sajjad for his self-assertive action and starts believing that now he comes to mean so much to her. But just like Forster's characters, Shamsie's Anglo-Indian character Elizabeth does not like this violation of boundaries by Sajjad. She sees Hiroko drifting away from her towards Sajjad, as her husband and son have already done. So she tactically asks Sajjad about his marital plans. This proves to be shocking and shattering news for Hiroko, who always has been very open to Sajjad about her past and life, and has expected him to be the same. She leaves the place immediately. Hence one thing that is common in both expeditions is shattering of friendship and faith.

The accusation episode comes next in *A Passage to India* and similarly in *Burnt Shadows*. Forster's Adela does not know what exactly happened in the cave, but the Anglo-Indian prejudice and racist ideas in that muddled and hostile environment influence her. Her accusation makes all the Anglo-Indians hysterical with rage. But in *Burnt Shadows*, it is not Hiroko who accuses Sajjad but the Anglo-Indian representative Elizabeth. When she sees Hiroko showing Sajjad her scars on her back, she leaps at the worst possible conclusion. She orders Sajjad to leave her house. Even Mr. Burton does not give this matter a second thought, and acts on what Elizabeth asks him to do. When Hiroko explains the truth, Elizabeth realizes that she has made some terrible mistake. Hiroko admits that she does not want to go to London with the Burtons, she does not even want to go back to Nagasaki, but desires to be with Sajjad.

The section III, 'Temple' of *A Passage to India* shows that Aziz is no longer in British India. The spell of camaraderie following the trial is quickly replaced by the ancient distrust between Muslims and Hindus, while the breach between English and Indian grows wider than ever. But Aziz resolves to have no more to do with the invader, and starts to work as a physician to the raja of a Hindu state. Similarly, in *Burnt Shadows* Sajjad thinks about the unexpected pain and resentment that came from Burtons' dismissal of him. When Lala Buksh, Burton's servant, comes to Sajjad with money and an offer of a reference, he understands that Hiroko has told them that he is not an animal or a rapist. He realizes that he would never ever receive any form of apology beyond this, though James Burton and he are apparently friends. Burtons despite their differences still function in many ways as a unit. He thinks, "I am done with the English" (105). He starts to consider what he might want to make of his life now. He has been lifted from the sense of obligation that has kept him tied to Burton for so long.

The last paragraph of Forster's novel presents the scene of reconciliation between Dr. Aziz and Fielding, the Englishman who supported Aziz when he was wrongly accused by Adela Quested and with whom Aziz subsequently quarreled. In this last paragraph, Forster symbolically implies that the sky approves the parting of Aziz and Fielding and the very earth also requires this break up. The very spirit of the Indian earth, Forster believes, tries to keep men in compartments, and in the final sentence of the novel the sky and earth together are pictured as conspiring against mutual understanding (210). The novel, as Malcolm Bradbury points out, "... ends on a discouragement to the human relationships" (19). Shamsie has also re-written this Forster's very famous last scene of reconciliation. When Burton is shown walking around the house and missing Sajjad's company, Sajjad enters his house and calls his name. Burton turns around and sees Sajjad walking through mist

and coming towards him. Burton steps forward and calls him as dear fellow and enquires why he has not brought a chessboard with him. Sajjad pulls away and says he has not come to return to his duties. In response Burton says, "I just read *A Passage to India* . . . Ridiculous book. What a disgrace of an ending. The Englishman and the Indian want to embrace, but the earth and the sky and the horses don't want it, so they kept apart" (111).

Sajjad talks to James Burton very formally by calling him Mr. Burton throughout the conversation. Burton does not like it and asks since when he and Sajjad has become Englishman and Indian rather than James and Sajjad. Sajjad replies, "You are right. It's not a question of nation. It's one of class. You would have apologized if I'd been to Oxford" (Shamsie 111). This remark also echoes opinions of Forster's character. One of the Anglo-Indian characters Mrs. Turton announces at the Bridge Party that she would not shake hand with any of the men there, unless it is the Nawab Bahadur. She believes, "You are superior to everyone in India except one or two of the ranis, and they're on equality." (Forster 66). Shamsie's James Burton gets embarrassed after listening to what Sajjad has just said. He asks him why he has come then. Sajjad tells him that he wants to meet Hiroko. Elizabeth and Hiroko, who are already standing behind them, come forward. Hiroko stays with Sajjad and talks to him in Urdu while both Burton and Elizabeth move away. So in Forster's final reconciliatory scene, the novel ends, but Shamsie's novel here takes a new beginning. Sajjad proposes to Hiroko, and she agrees, and even converts to Islam. They go to the mosque and get married.

All efforts of reconciliation fail in *A Passage to India*. The novel refuses all bids for passage through the national barriers it defines; the more earnest the gesture of good will, the more thoroughly they are resented and misconstrued on both sides. Indian and Englishmen must remain apart, not only because Indians are venal and shifty, as Ronny and his friends believe, but because of the fundamental differences in temperament, social structure and religious outlook. While *A Passage to India* refuses all bids for passage through the national barriers it defines, *Burnt Shadows' Veiled Birds* shows transcendence from all these national and racial barriers.

Hence, Shamsie's novel re-writes the whole canonical novel which presents a very wrong picture of Indians and India to the readers. The country has been shown in a negative light. The Indian are shown to be clumsy, irrational, illogical, ungrateful and paranoid. While on the other hand, the British characters and actions are shown in positive light, thereby reinforcing the colonial stereotypes.

Shamsie follows the same plot as given in Forster's novel. She has re-written the opening, the conversations, the planned trip to some native place, the accusation, the breaking of relations and the famous reconciliatory scene. In the last scene, the explicit reference to Forster's novel is given, which further proves the intertextual intention, and clearly makes the intertext as vari-directional passive double-voiced. But she has fleshed out all these scenes by giving the perspective of the colonized, and re-interpreting the biased colonial text from, as Meenakshi Mukherjee states, "the perspective of our specific historical and geographical location" (3-4). But Forster mainly focuses on colonizers perspective and for the colonized he only dwells on the stereotypes.

Since the coinage of the term intertextuality by the poststructuralist theorist Julia Kristeva, it has been used differently in different eras for different purposes. The modern writers emphasize its use to establish hierarchies, and declare some texts as the Canon to be followed and taken as models by all the coming generation of the writers in their texts. Postmodernists tend to use intertexts to play with their meaning and to render inconsistencies and fragmentations in their texts. As they attempt to de-establish all hierarchies, so their use of intertextuality leads to deferral of meaning. The postcolonialists having drawn upon many literary devices handed down to them by their pre-cursors, use this technique of intertextuality for an altogether different purpose. It is no longer merely a mechanical technique to embellish their works; rather their use of intertextuality is conscious and is always directed to some specific purpose. Questioning the previously endorsed misrepresentation and then resisting it by answering them back is what postcolonial writers emphasize. The colonizers, in order to perpetuate their superior status, used their literature as a tool to brainwash the colonized nations about the non-existent and still-in-the-process-of-evolution existence of the inferior colonized races. The colonized intellectuals, philosophers and writers, in order to raise the self-esteem of their



people took a stand, and used different writing techniques to expose the false hierarchies of the colonial enterprise. Shamsie's *Burnt Shadows* as discussed in this study is a brilliant attempt in this regard.

Shamsie has written back to the centre, thereby has come into dialogic process of answering. She has answered back in Bakhtinian terms to Forster's text. The colonized nations have undergone the humiliating experience of colonialism, where they were tortured not only physically but also psychologically. So when they find an opportunity to be heard, their first intention seems to be writing something that can answer back all those misrepresentations and stereotypes of colonial texts that the world takes as reality.

## CONCLUSION

The study has shown that Shamsie has used intertextuality to re-write the pre-cursor text *A Passage to India*. She has used double-voiced intertexts, which make the connection very explicit. Her main purpose for employing intertextuality is to enable the reader to detect the presence of some previous text, so for this, single-voiced intertext, which are without quotation marks, does not serve the purpose. Her main intention is to re-write and re-interpret the previous text, so she focuses mainly on vari-directional passive double-voiced. She has used only one uni-directional intertext of Ahmed Ali to highlight the importance of the Indian city Delhi. Postcolonial writers mostly use vari-directional passive double-voiced intertexts to re-interpret some canonical text, which silenced their part of the story that they intend to narrate now. So these intertexts are basically employed to counter their misrepresentation in the first place and secondly to give voice to their side of the story. Shamsie has answered back and counteracted to the Forster's novel *A Passage to India* by re-writing the whole storyline, the setting and the characters by following the exact plot. But her story does not end where Forster ends rather she has only discussed his novel in one portion of her novel, and the point where Forster's novel ends, she takes a new beginning. Therefore, this intertext makes use of all the aspect of the dialogism, as it not only re-writes but answers, comments, criticizes and even extends the text in contention.

The study shows that for the postcolonial writers, the use of intertextuality is not mechanical. It is not a matter of influence as well. The intertexts are reframed as double-voiced intertexts. These intertexts basically provide sequel and extension to the source texts and question the words of the predecessor. The writer comes in dispute with the previous works. Shamsie has re-written almost every bit of Forster's novel. Forster's novel, written in the colonial times, misrepresents the natives of India, and the country. Shamsie answers back to every mis-portrayal, and re-writes Forster's novel with a new insight. Shamsie's use of intertextuality enables the reader to become active producers of meaning. The intertexts, undergoing the dialogical process, help the reader to understand, question and re-interpret them in a new light. The reader becomes able to disrupt and change the fixed meaning of numerous ideas and then comes up with new outlooks and insights. Consciously employed intertexts in Shamsie's text enable the readers to question the assumptions regarding the colonizers and the colonized.

## REFERENCES

- Ali, Ahmed (2000). *Twilight in Delhi*. Karachi: Shahkar Publications.
- Allen, Graham (2000). *Intertextuality: New Critical Idiom Series*. London: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Griffiths, Gareth, and Tiffin, Helen(1989). *The Empire Writes Back*. London: Routledge.

Barthes, Roland (2006). *From Work to Text.*” *The Novel: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory 1900-2000*. Ed. Dorothy J. Hale. London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp 235-241.

Bakhtin, Mikhail (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. V. W. McGee, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.

Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.. Ed. Michael Holquist*. USA: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bradbury, Malcolm (1970). *Ed. Case Book Series E.M Forster: A Passage to India*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd. \

Fairclough, Norman (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.

Forster, E. M. (1984). *A Passage to India. 1924*. London: Harcourt.

Kristeva, Julia (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.

McLeod, John (2000). *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Morson, Gary and Emerson, Caryl (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Nayyar K, Pramod (2008). *Postcolonial Literature: an Introduction*. Delhi: Dorling Kindersley.

Said, Edward (1983). “On Originality.” *The World, the Text and the Critic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press 135-142pp.

Sanders, Julie (2006). *Adaptation and Appropriation*. USA: Routledge.

Shamsie, Kamila (2009). *Burnt Shadows*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Trivedi, Harish and Mukherjee, Meenakhshi (1996). Ed. *Interrogational Post-colonialism: Theory, Text and Context*. New Delhi: Indian Institute of Advanced Studies.

When worlds collide. Kamila Shamsie's epic new novel will challenge and enlighten its readers, writes Maya Jaggi. Maya Jaggi. Published on Sat 7 Mar 2009 00.01 GMT. T. After Hiroko decamps to New York, disgusted by nuclear posturing between India and Pakistan, and encounters Abdullah as a taxi driver, the final section alternates between an apartment she shares with Kim, overlooking the smouldering fires of Ground Zero, and Afghanistan, where Harry and his interpreter Raza have joined forces in a private security firm. CIA backing for the mujahideen's resistance war, and abandonment of them once the Soviet army withdrew, is seen as a grim policy failure whose legacy is being reaped in "Jihadi blowback". Key words: Kamila Shamsie, *Burnt Shadows*, Postcolonialism, Feminism, Politics, history, Pakistan, 9/11, Nagasaki, x. Muneeza Shamsie sees that "Pakistani writers employ English as a creative language live between the East and the West, literally or figuratively, and had to struggle to be heard. They write from the extreme edges of both English and Pakistani literature." A passing look at the number of reviews, interviews held with her and the seminars and events she continuously holds testifies to the fact that she has achieved a firm position in the western literary scene as well as the Pakistani one. In addition to fiction writing, Shamsie herself is a successful reviewer and columnist-primarily for the Guardian- in addition to many other Pakistani newspapers.