





AN INTERTEXTUAL APPROACH TO COETZEE'S *FOE* AND KULİN'S *HANDAN*

COETZEE'NİN *FOE* VE KULİN'İN *HANDAN* ROMANLARINA METİNLERARASI BİR YAKLAŞIM

Yusuf Ziyaettin TURAN*

| ARTICLE INFO | ABSTRACT |
|---|---|
|  Received: 15.04.2021 | <p>Though the history of intertextuality goes back to ancient times, it was officially coined in 1967 by Bulgarian-French literary critic Julia Kristeva. Intertextuality is a postmodern literary tool and asserts that there is no unique and independent text. Every text is connected to each other through some intertextual relations particularly in the form of allusion, quotation, plagiarism, pastiche and parody. For this paper, the methodological approaches of three literary critics, namely Gerard Genette, Kubilay Aktulum and Gonca Alpaslan on intertextuality, set up the basis of the study. Accordingly, J. M. Coetzee's novel <i>Foe</i> and Ayşe Kulin's novel <i>Handan</i> are evaluated through their intertextual relations with the previous works that inspire them. It has been put forward that though both novels of the present study are the re-working of previous novels, Coetzee's <i>Foe</i> is an allusive and indirect intertextual form of Daniel Defoe's <i>Robinson Crusoe</i>. However, there is a direct and overt intertextual relationship between Halide Edib Adivar's <i>Handan</i> and Kulin's novel that have the identical title and name of heroine with Adivar's. As a last remark, through postmodern intertextuality, both Coetzee's <i>Foe</i> and Kulin's <i>Handan</i> revisit and question the ontological bases of Defoe's <i>Robinson Crusoe</i> and Adivar's <i>Handan</i>.</p> |
|  Accepted: 19.08.2021 | |
| Keywords: <i>Intertextuality,</i> <i>Handan,</i> <i>Foe,</i> <i>J. M. Coetzee,</i> <i>Ayşe Kulin.</i> | |
| Research Article | |

| MAKALE BİLGİSİ | ÖZET |
|---|---|
|  Geliş: 15.04.2021 | <p>Metinlerarasılığın geçmişi antik zamana kadar uzansa da, resmi olarak terim ilk defa Bulgar-Fransız edebiyat eleştirmeni Julia Kristeva tarafından 1967 yılında kullanılmıştır. Metinlerarasılık bir postmodern edebi terim olup eşsiz ve bağımsız bir metnin olamayacağını iddia eder. Her bir metin başka bir metne özellikle alıntı, plejirizm, pastiş ve parodi gibi yollarla bir şekilde metinlerarası olarak bağlantılıdır. Bu çalışmada üç edebi eleştirmen olarak Gerard Genette, Kubilay Aktulum ve Gonca Alpaslan'ın metodolojik olarak geliştirmiş oldukları metinlerarasılık yaklaşımlarından faydalanılmaktadır. Buna bağlı olarak J.M. Coetzee'nin <i>Foe</i> ve Ayşe Kulin'in <i>Handan</i> romanları, onlara ilham olan eserlerle metinlerarası ilişkileri yönünden ele alınmaktadır. Bu çalışmada konu edinilen her iki roman kendisinden önceki eserlerin yeniden ele alınması şeklinde olsa da, Coetzee'nin <i>Foe</i>'su Daniel Defoe'nun <i>Robinson Crusoe</i>'nun anıştırmalı ve endirekt metinlerarası formu olduğu ortaya konurken, Kulin'in <i>Handan</i>'ı ve Halide Edib Adivar'ın <i>Handan</i>'ı arasında direkt ve açık bir metinlerarası ilişki olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Son olarak, postmodern metinlerarasılık yoluyla hem Coetzee'nin <i>Foe</i>'su hem de Kulin'in <i>Handan</i>'ı, Defoe'nun <i>Robinson Crusoe</i>'unu ve Adivar'ın <i>Handan</i>'ını yeniden gündeme getirmekle birlikte onların varlıksal temellerini sorgulamaktadırlar.</p> |
|  Kabul: 19.08.2021 | |
| Anahtar Kelimeler: <i>Metinlerarasılık,</i> <i>Handan,</i> <i>Foe,</i> <i>J. M. Coetzee,</i> <i>Ayşe Kulin.</i> | |
| Araştırma Makalesi | |

* Asst. Prof. Dr., Uşak University, Department of Western Languages and Literatures, Uşak / Türkiye, E-mail: yusufz.turan@usak.edu.tr.

ORCID  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9551-3594>.

Bu makaleyi şu şekilde kaynak gösterebilirsiniz / To cite this article (APA):

Turan, Yusuf Ziyaettin (2021). "An Intertextual Approach to Coetzee's *Foe* and Kulin's *Handan*". *Uluslararası Dil, Edebiyat ve Kültür Araştırmaları Dergisi (UDEKAD)*, 4 (2): 209-219. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.37999/udekad.916178>.

Introduction

Historically intertextuality has been known and used from ancient times in the literary world. However, it didn't have a formal definition until the twentieth century. So, now as a postmodern term, intertextuality is coined by Bulgarian originated French literary critic, Julia Kristeva. Though possible originators of the term were Saussure, Bakhtin, or Kristeva, the majority of critics accept that Kristeva first used it in 1967 (Mason 2019: 2). By translating Bakhtin's works from Russian into English, Kristeva introduced Bakhtin to the Western World. On the other hand, due to her studies on Bakhtin, particularly on dialogism which is asserted as the conceptual origin of the field, Kristeva focused on the interconnectivity of texts. According to Kristeva, any text is not an isolated phenomenon but is made up of a mosaic of quotations, and that any text is the absorption and transformation of another (1980: 66). Thus, intertextuality refers to "the interdependence of literary texts, the interdependence of any one literary text with all those that have gone before it" (Cuddon & Habib 2013: 367). In the same vein, Allen states that:

Works of literature, after all, are built from systems, codes, and traditions established by previous works of literature. The systems, codes and traditions of other art forms and of culture in general are also crucial to the meaning of a work of literature. Texts, whether they be literary or non-literary, are viewed by modern theorists as lacking in any kind of independent meaning. They are what theorists now call intertextual (2006: 1).

In addition to the above definition of intertextuality made by Allen, including its relation to literary works in general, in a similar way Roland Barthes, one of the major critics who contributed to the development of the term, emphasizes the relationship between intertextuality and culture in his *Image Music Text*. He states that "the text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centers of culture" (1977: 146). Barthes also comments on intertextuality as the quotations without inverted commas (1977: 160). By this definition, Barthes underlines the common property feature of intertextuality.

To Linda Hutcheon, one of the leading critics of postmodernism, both Roland Barthes and Michael Riffaterre claim that the role and importance of the author are replaced by reader and text relationship through intertextuality. This shift also changes the way of interpreting the textual meaning. Textual meaning is embedded inside of the discourse itself. Besides "a literary work can actually no longer be considered original; if it were, it could have no meaning for its reader. It is only as part of prior discourses that any text derives meaning and significance" (Hutcheon 1989: 7). So, the postmodern texts are like puzzles with many pieces to be associated.

In fact, all above stated definitions and explanations summarize the postmodern outlook to literary works. According to postmodern approach, it is impossible to produce unique literary works and there aren't any original ones. In general, every literary work borrows from and gives each other quotations. In this sense, while doing this the author doesn't have to cite the work that s/he quotes.

Postmodern authors and readers accept the whole literary world as a common pool; so, they don't have to fulfill this necessity. Furthermore, since the aim of the author isn't to teach something or give a message to the reader, playfulness is foregrounded. In this sense literary works can be seen as a puzzle. The author, in a general sense, doesn't look for a complete subject matter and a single literary kind. So, it can be claimed that intertextuality makes a literary twist among the postmodern literary works. In this sense, intertextuality comes closer to pastiche, another postmodern literary tool. Generally, the difference between them is that pastiche is mainly related to generic kinds of literary forms like letter writing, poetry, and novel writing. On the other hand, intertextuality is mainly related to the allusion in a work to other works, namely in the level of titles and names of the previous works. However, on some occasions as in this paper, it is clear that pastiche can take part in the intertextual mission. In this sense, the use of pastiche as an intertextual tool will be discussed in Kulin's novel *Handan* below.

For this postmodern standing, Linda Hutcheon also evaluates the textual side and plural possibilities of historicity in her article "Historiographic Metafiction: Parody and the Intertextuality of History". Hutcheon claims that the postmodern approach to historicity is ironic and parodic, which is different from the classical historical understanding of the nineteenth century. She further states that "the intertexts of history and fiction take on parallel (though not equal) status in the parodic reworking of the textual past of both the 'world' and literature" (1989: 4). Therefore, historiographic metafiction novels interlace both literary and historical texts in fiction. However, this is not an ordinary return to reality, "the 'world' in which the text situates itself is the 'world' of discourse, the 'world' of texts and intertexts" (Hutcheon 1989: 6). Hence, it's clear that postmodern novels in general and historiographic metafiction in particular use intertextuality for ironic and parodic purposes in literary and historic discourses.

A Methodological Approach to Intertextuality

Mevlûde Zengin presents the originators and primary contributors to the history of intertextuality as Ferdinand de Saussure, Mikhail M. Bakhtin, Julia Kristeva, and Roland Barthes. According to her, Saussure's linguistic theories in general and his theories of sign, signifier and signified in particular; Bakhtin's theories of polyphony, dialogism and heteroglossia; Kristeva's coinage of intertextuality, her efforts to carry Saussure's theory of language to the area of literature and her recognition of intertextuality as 'transposition'; and Barthes's theories of 'readerly' and 'writerly' text and 'the death of the author' set up the conceptual foundations of intertextuality (2016: 321). Zengin further states that Umberto Eco, Jacques Derrida, Harold Bloom, Michael Riffaterre, and Gérard Genette are the practitioner of the term who also have their own intertextual theories (2016: 301). As the present study focuses on the practical side of intertextuality, after this point, French Gerard Genette's and Turkish Aktulum and Alpaslan's methodological approaches on intertextuality will be discussed below.

French literary critic Gerard Genette used a much broader term 'transtextuality' instead of intertextuality for inter-textual relations among the texts. He claims a "textual transcendence - namely, everything that brings it into relation (manifest or hidden) with other texts" (1997a: XV). Besides, Genette's approach to intertextuality is a poetical and structural one and he aims

at giving a methodological order to this very flexible concept. He reveals his structural methodologically in his *Palimpsests* (1982). In fact, palimpsest means “‘a parchment, etc., which has been written upon twice, the original writing having been rubbed out’. [...] It indicates literature’s existence in ‘the second degree’, its non-original rewriting of what has already been written (Allen 2006: 108). In *Palimpsests*, Genette suggests five transtextual categories (1997b: 1). In this paper, Genette’s transtextual approach will be used as a primary methodological basis. So, some short definitions of his transtextual categories will be helpful here. Genette names the first one as *intertextuality*. Though Kristeva used it for the first time previously in a broader sense, his approach is different and narrower than hers. Genette limits the scope of ‘intertextuality’ with a relationship of co-presence between two texts or among several texts and divides it into three subcategories as quoting, plagiarism and allusion (1997b: 2). Particularly, the subcategories that Genette put under ‘intertextuality’ can be identified in every kind of classical and postmodern text because they are the most abundant and evident among the others.

The second maxim that Genette defined for his transtextuality is ‘paratext’. He defines paratext as all inclusive parts related to the main body of the text and introductory materials both inside and outside of the book: a title, a subtitle, intertitles; prefaces, postfaces, notices, forewords, etc.; marginal, infrapaginal, terminal notes; epigraphs; illustrations; blurbs, book covers, dust jackets, and many other kinds of secondary signals, whether allographic or autographic. For paratext, Genette gives Joyce’s *Ulysses* as an example. When *Ulysses* was first published in an installment form, it “was provided with chapter headings evoking the relationship of each of its chapters to an episode from the *Odyssey*: “Sirens,” “Nausicaa,” “Penelope,” etc.” (1997b: 3). So, here each title of the newspaper chapters becomes a paratext of *Ulysses*.

‘Metatextuality’, which is mostly labeled as commentary, is the third type of textual transcendence that Genette suggests for intertextual relations. This approach particularly includes when a text involved in a commentary relationship with one another: “It unites a given text to another, of which it speaks without necessarily citing it (without summoning it), in fact sometimes even without naming it” (Genette 1997b: 4). The best example of metatextuality is the critical reading of literary texts.

The next maxim is ‘architextuality’ which is put in the fourth order of *Palimpsests* but Genette defines it as the fifth type. Genette means by architextuality, “the entire set of general or transcendent categories—types of discourse, modes of enunciation, literary genres— from which emerges each singular text” (1997b: 1). It can be both titular as *Poems*, *Essays* and *The Romance of the Rose* and sub-titular as when the indication *A Novel*, or *A Story*, or *Poems* is appended to the title on the cover (Genette 1997b: 4). For example, sometimes just under the heading of the book, its generic kind is stated as novel, biography, poems and etc.

The last transtextual maxim that Genette covers firstly in the beginning and later through entire *Palimpsests* is ‘hypertextuality’. By hypertextuality he means any relationship uniting a text B (which I shall call the *hypertext*) to an earlier text A (I shall, of course, call it the *hypotext*), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary. For instance,

Joyce's *Ulysses* is the hypertext of the same hypotext, Homer's *Odyssey* (Genette 1997b: 5). In this sense, the both novels that are covered in this study are hypertexts of the previous works.

Apart from Genette's theory above, at first Kubilay Aktulum's and then Gonca Alpaslan's methodological approaches to intertextuality will be mentioned briefly below. Aktulum is one of the major literary critics in Turkish literary world with his studies on intertextuality. In his book *Metinlerarası İlişkiler* (1999), Aktulum gives firstly a historical account on intertextuality including Bakhtin, Kristeva, Barthes, Riffaterre, Jenny, and Genette and that he states in the second chapter, intertextual methods. In this part, Aktulum divides intertextual relations under two main titles. The first one is 'Co-associational Relations' and the subsequent subtitles in this section are as the following respectively: I. 'Quotation and reference', II. 'Implied citation and Plagiarism', III. 'Allusion'. The second main title in Aktulum's methodological section is 'Derivative Relations' and 'Parody', 'Burlesque Transformation', and 'Pastiche' are the subtitles of this section.

Like Aktulum, Alpaslan first gives a brief historical and theoretical information about intertextuality in the introduction of her book *Metinlerarası İlişkiler ve Gilgamiş Destanının Çağdaş Yorumları* (2007). In the introduction section, then she mentions the forms of intertextuality. According to Alpaslan, there are two main types of intertextual relations between/among texts: Open intertextual relations and closed intertextual relations. In open intertextual relations, readers can easily grasp the intertextual relation(s) between/among the texts; for example with a surface reading. On the other hand, for closed intertextual relations, readers should have a good knowledge/background on the texts that intertext each other usually with an intensive reading. Alpaslan also states that there are eight kinds of intertextuality forms which are: Quotation, citation, allusion, parody, pastiche, collage, montage, and rewriting.

In the present paper, the intertextual analysis will depend on mainly Genette's and then Aktulum and Alpaslan's methodological approaches will support the research. In the next section of the present paper, firstly J. M. Coetzee's novel *Foe* will be discussed with Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* from intertextual aspects.

An Intertextual Approaches to J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*

J.M. Coetzee is a South African born novelist and academic¹. Initially, the name of the Coetzee's novel *Foe* (1986) alludes directly to Daniel Defoe who is the author of one of the world famous novel *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). According to Genette, allusion is one the three points of intertextuality. For Aktulum, allusion is one of the co-associational relations. And lastly, for Alpaslan, allusion is one of the eight intertextual forms. *Foe*'s allusive transtextuality to *Robinson Crusoe* is not only limited to the authorial level, but also with the subject matter. However, there are some deviations from the original *Crusoe* in Coetzee's novel. For example, at the beginning of *Foe*, the female main character, Susan introduces herself as a lone woman. Her father is French and his name Berton was inflected into English as different from the original one (Coetzee 2010: 10). Here, the allusion to the inflectional transformation of Crusoe's original Germanic surname 'Kreutznaer' to Crusoe stated at the beginning of

¹ See Head 2009: 1-2.

Robinson Crusoe is further striking (Defoe 2007: 5). Then, Susan explains that she seeks her lost girl on the way to Jamaica and falls a castaway to Robinson Crusoe's (here original Crusoe's 'e' is deleted) deserted island. There she meets master Cruso and his slave Friday as the sole dwellers of the whole island: "I sat on the bare earth with my sore foot between my hands and rocked back and forth and sobbed like a child, while the stranger (who was of course the Cruso I told you of) gazed at me more as if I were a fish cast up by the waves than an unfortunate fellow-creature" (Coetzee 2010: 9). Here, it is clear that the allusive mode of names in *Foe* transcends its scope and turns into a direct reference to the original one.

Therefore, Coetzee's *Foe* is a postcolonial literary work which is a reworking of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and also contains some allusions to his other works (Head 2009: 62). So, there are certain intertextual allusions in Coetzee's *Foe* to some of Defoe's works but particularly to *Robinson Crusoe* (Head 2009: 62). However, considering the scope and unity of the present paper, the research for the intertextual relations of Coetzee's *Foe* will be limited only to Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. Apart from intertextual allusion discussed above, the other intertextual relations between *Foe* and *Crusoe* will be evaluated below. For this purpose, Genette's Intertextuality, Aktulum's co-associational relations and Alpaslan's open intertextual relations will be used as a guide.

It's clear that *Foe* is a postcolonial rewriting of *Robinson Crusoe*. However, this returning is not as innocent and direct as it is expected from a realist novel. On the one hand, Coetzee's choice of *Crusoe* as a referent text underlies the fact that he invites us to question the place of Robinson Crusoe as the father of novel genre (Head 2009: 63). On the other hand, Coetzee's postmodern *Foe* is also ironic and parodic in accordance with Hutcheon's views on novels of historiographic metafiction above. Yet, in this paper the aspects of historiographic metafiction will not be mentioned, since it will be a convenient subject matter for another study. The parodic picturing the life of Coetzee's Cruso is very different from Defoe's. If Defoe's Crusoe represents a colonial and imperial figure, "Coetzee's Cruso is emblematic of exhausted imperialism" (Head 2009: 63). This postcolonial Cruso's inertia is depicted in the novel as this: "It seemed a great pity that from the wreck Cruso should have brought away no more than a knife. For had he rescued even the simplest of carpenter's tools, and some spikes and bars and suchlike, he might have fashioned better tools, and with better tools contrived a less laborious life, or even built a boat and escaped to civilization" (Coetzee 2010: 15-6). As clearly seen in the above, Cruso's inapt situation on the island is not similar to the original Crusoe. Different from his literary model, this Cruso is not skilled on making tables, chairs, lamps or candles. He even does not keep a diary, build any canoes or deal with farming (Head 2009: 63). Therefore, postmodernist elements related to Cruso's life style and the living environment above have double function. In addition to the historiographic metafictional elements in these lines, there are intertextual implications as well.

Above stated parodic relation between *Foe* and *Crusoe* is also compatible with Aktulum's 'Derivate Relations' in his intertextual approach stated above. According to Aktulum, parody is an intertextual tool that changes the subject matter of the story of the main text in the referent text without changing the literary kind of the main text (2000: 118). Hence, while the story in

Foe totally differs from the original *Crusoe*, the literary genre of both works, which is an adventure novel, do not change.

Lastly in this part, as stated above, *Foe* is a rewriting of *Crusoe*. So, it can be further claimed that *Foe* is grafted from *Crusoe* in accordance with Genette's hypertextuality approach. As stated previously, hypertextuality relates a latter work (hypertext) to a previous one (hypotext). In accordance with Genette's approach, since *Foe* is a re-written version of *Crusoe*, *Foe* is the hypertext and *Crusoe* is the hypotext. In this context, as a last remark, it can be claimed that Coetzee's postmodern intertextual hypertext *Foe* is not only imitating or creating a new version of hypotext *Crusoe*. By rewriting, Coetzee further questions the canonical stance of *Crusoe* in Western literature and criticizes some issues related to gender and ethnics as well².

An Intertextual Approaches to Ayşe Kulin's *Handan*

Different from Coetzee's *Foe* discussed above, Kulin's *Handan* (2014) is not a rewriting of a previous work. However, it has the same name of a previous novel *Handan* (1912) written by Halide Edib Adivar. Hence, similar to *Foe*, at the first sight, Kulin's *Handan* evokes directly to Adivar's novel. Like Adivar's novel, Kulin's *Handan* has the main character carrying the identical name with the novel, which is Handan. So, like the relationship between *Crusoe* and *Foe*, beginning from the title of the novels, the similarities and intertextual relations between both novels are striking. The intertextual relationship between two works is so apparent that in the blurb on the back cover of Kulin's *Handan*, it is stated that the story in the book is a quest accompanied with Halide Edib Adivar's everlasting work *Handan*. The direct mentioning of Adivar in Kulin's novel is not limited only with the blurb, in the preface Kulin thanks to Halide Edib because of her contributions to Turkish women in their freedom and egalitarianism campaign.

The direct stating of Adivar and her novel *Handan* in the blurb and preface of Kulin's *Handan* are directly related to Genette's intertextual theories stated in *Palimpsests*. As stated previously, to Genette, these kinds of intertextual mentions are called paratext (1997b: 3). In addition to the paratextual elements in blurb and preface sections of Kulin's *Handan*, there is also a striking intertextual subtitle 'Novel' on the front cover of the book. To Genette, these kinds of generic statements stated mostly as a subtitular information is called architextuality (1997b: 4). At this point, it can be claimed that there is also an intertextual relationship called hypertextuality between Adivar's and Kulin's *Handan* as it is between *Crusoe* and *Foe* discussed above. Genette names it any uniting intertextual relationship of a latter text (hypertext) to a previous text (hypotext). In this relation, the latter text is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary (1997b: 5). Hence, in this situation, Adivar's *Handan* is the hypotext and Kulin's *Handan* is the hypertext according to Genette's hypertextuality concept.

After stating above Genette's paratextual approach to the cover design of Kulin's *Handan*, its intertextual relations with Adivar's *Handan* will be evaluated below. Firstly, different from intertextual relations between *Foe* & *Crusoe* discussed above, at the beginning of Kulin's *Handan*, the main character Handan directly encounters a novel under her bed named

² See Head 2009: 65.

as *Handan* by Halide Edib Adivar and then she explains how her own name Handan was given her:

My feet slipped, I fell back to my bed. I gathered, bent and took the thing on the floor. A book! On its cover there is an imperceptible face of a young woman. The book is in my hand, I searched for the toilet sleepy. I turned on the light and read the title of the book: Handan. [...] I can almost remember that I read the whole book which is withered and left inside the drawer. [...] I don't know what the time is. I don't want to learn either. I won't leave the bed till I finish the book. [...] Even my name wasn't given me randomly. Handan was given me by my grandmother: [...] 'I'm reading a book at the moment. Its heroine is so beautiful and smart that she fascinates everybody. The great Halide Edip, among many names, chose that name for her heroine, I looked at the dictionary, handan means merry and cheerful. If you have a daughter, Handan is a convenient name, isn't it? What do you say my daughter?'³ (Kulin 2014: 10-11).

The quotation above introduces a previous novel (Adivar's *Handan*) in Kulin's novel *Handan*. On the one hand, this feature is called 'mise-en-abyme'. It's "a term coined by the French writer Andre Gide [...], to refer to an internal reduplication of a literary work or part of a work" (Baldick 2001: 158). On the other hand, mentioning the direct name of the previous book as an intertext in a latter one can be evaluated through Genette's 'quoting' approach that he put under intertextuality. Here, though there is no direct quotation from Adivar's novel, its name is specifically referenced in Kulin's *Handan*. Besides, Adivar's own name is particularly stated in that part as well. Therefore, it's clear that both names of the main character and Kulin's novel *Handan* come from Adivar's novel, *Handan*. The direct reference to Adivar and her novel are also stated by the main character Handan in Kulin's *Handan* as follows: "Now, I can see, while reading this book in my hand, that the sweeping away of my happiness is not only related to my temperament but also my name. To my life, *Handan*'s shadow, the creation of the author whose name is Halide, shades. What a surprise that my grandmother's name is Halide too" (Kulin 2014: 13). Apart from Genette, Aktulum and Alpaslan evaluate direct referencing as an intertextual phenomenon under the title of 'citation-reference' (Aktulum 2000: 101; Alpaslan 2007: 17). So, the direct referencing to the original work is very clear in the name of Kulin's *Handan* above.

The next step of intertextual relations between Kulin's *Handan* and Adivar's *Handan* is direct quoting. In Kulin's *Handan*, the speeches of Adivar's *Handan* are quoted three times⁴ with quotation marks. In other words, they are the excerpts taken from the referent book; Adivar's *Handan* and embedded into Kulin's *Handan*:

"A long fair haired head that I can see only the back side is doubtlessly mixed with the silvery smoke I watched in the morning" she wrote.

³ The translations from Turkish to English are made by the author of this study.

⁴ Here, only the first quotation will be discussed for the sake of finiteness of the present paper.

“That time a supreme and beautiful body raised from the armchair. On his wide shoulders with dark, big, blue eyes on his long blond face with delicate and some cynic and smiling eyes appeared Nazım. Mr. Selim hastily wanted to introduce us with a trembling voice:

-This is Handan, Nazım, said he.

At first Nazım’s face was likely as hesitant. But after laying his eyes on me, he came towards me with a whole face covering smile waves... ”⁵ (Kulin 2014: 45-46).

This direct quoting is stated under intertextuality in Genette’s intertextual theory stated above as “quoting (with quotation marks, with or without specific references)” (1997b: 2). The same method is discussed by Aktulum under the title of ‘citation and reference’ (2000: 94). Lastly, Alpaslan deals with the same technique stating that “the expectation of the author in quoting is to support his own text on the levels of sensation, thought and the effect it creates thorough that quotation” (2007: 17). As seen in the example above, in Kulin’s *Handan* there are direct quotations with quotation marks from Adivar’s *Handan* as an indicator of direct intertextual relation between two novels.

The last intertextual relation between Kulin’s *Handan* and Adivar’s *Handan* lies in the form of letter writing which is also an example of pastiche. As stated previously, pastiche is a modernist/postmodernist literary technique, in which a generic kind of a previous form is re-used by the latter. However, the example of pastiche in Kulin’s novel is bilateral. Adivar’s *Handan* is an epistolary novel and the main character Handan, in Kulin’s *Handan*, states that “Because how Handan has Neriman as a confidant I have Oya” (2014: 18). After this statement, a full letter from Handan to her friend Oya is given as an example of pastiche on the next two pages. So, pastiche is used as a modernist/postmodernist technique as well as an intertextual tool as stated in both Aktulum and Alpaslan’s intertextual theories above.

Conclusion

The titles of both novels, Coetzee’s *Foe* and Kulin’s *Handan*, give away intertextual relations to the previous works that happen to be a source of inspiration for them. On the one hand, the name of Coetzee’s novel alludes to the novel *Robinson Crusoe* through its author’s name. *Foe* evokes somehow to Daniel Defoe. In fact, this allusion is not coincidental. Daniel Defoe’s original family name was Foe. Defoe himself transforms it to ‘Defoe’ adding an aristocratic and French sound prefix to his family’s name. On the other hand, the name of Kulin’s novel *Handan* has an identical name to Adivar’s novel. Hence, different from the allusive style of Coetzee’s book title, Kulin’s *Handan* directly recalls its intertextual ancestor. Though, as stated above, *Foe* is defined as a rewriting of Defoe’s *Crusoe*, the allusive style of the novel goes on from beginning to ending. For example, in the beginning, beside the new invented character Susan Barton, Cruso and Friday stand on the deserted island as it is in Defoe’s original one. Later, when they are saved from the island, Cruso dies and Susan wants her story to get published. She finds the novelist Daniel Foe to write down her story to paper. On the other hand, unlike *Foe*’s indirect evocative rewriting style of Defoe’s *Crusoe*, Kulin’s *Handan* is linked to Adivar’s *Handan* straightforwardly. Their direct connection begins with

⁵ For the original version, see Adivar 2017: 53-54.

their identical titles and then goes on with direct mentions and later with direct quotations. Finally, in the light of findings and the discussions above it is clear that though both novels of the present study are the re-working of previous novels, there is an allusive and indirect intertextual relationship between Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Coetzee's *Foe*. On the contrary, the intertextual relationship between Kulin's *Handan* and Adıvar's *Handan* is direct and overt. Hence, through intertextuality both Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* from English literature and Adıvar's *Handan* from Turkish literature form a source of inspiration for the latter postmodern novels of both kinds of literatures. Besides, postmodern intertextuality helps both Coetzee's *Foe* and Kulin's *Handan* in revisiting and questioning the previous novels ontologically.

Ethical Statement

According to the author's statement; scientific, ethical and quotation rules were followed in the writing process of the study named "An Intertextual Approach to Coetzee's *Foe* and Kulin's *Handan*"; according to ULAKBİM TR DİZİN criteria, there was no need for data collection in the study requiring ethics committee approval.

References

- Adıvar, Halide Edib (2017). *Handan*. İstanbul: Can Yayınları.
- Aktulum, Kubilay (2000). *Metinlerarası İlişkiler*. Ankara: Öteki Yayınevi.
- Allen, Graham (2006). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Alpaslan, Gonca Gökcalp (2007). *Metinlerarası İlişkiler ve Gilgamiş Destanı'nın Çağdaş Yorumları*. İstanbul: Multilingual.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baldick, Chris (2001). *A Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barthes, Roland (1977). *Image, Music, Text*. London: Fontana.
- Coetzee, John Maxwell (2010). *Foe*. London: Penguin Books.
- Cuddon, John Anthony & Habib, Rafey (2013). *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Defoe, Daniel (2007). *Robinson Crusoe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Genette, Gerard (1997a). *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. J.E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Genette, Gerard (1997b). *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. C. Newman & C. Doubinsky. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Head, Dominic (2009). *The Cambridge Introduction to J.M. Coetzee*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-
- Hutcheon, Linda (1989). "Historiographic Metafiction Parody and the Intertextuality of History". *Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction*. Ed. O'Donnell, P., & Robert Con Davis. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. <http://yunus.hacettepe.edu.tr/~jason.ward/ied485britnovel4/LindHutchHistiographicMetafiction.pdf> [20.02.2021].
- Kristeva, Julia (1980). *Desire in Language: Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kulin, Ayşe (2014). *Handan*. İstanbul: Everest.
- Mason, Jessica (2019). *Intertextuality in Practice*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Rata, Irina (2015). "The Role of Intertextuality in Neil Gaiman's American Gods". *Cultural Intertexts*, 2 (3): 103-112.
- Richetti, John (2005). *The Life of Daniel Defoe: A critical biography*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zengin, Mevlüde (2016). "An Introduction to Intertextuality as a Literary Theory: Definitions, Axioms and the Originators". *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 25 (1): 299-326.