
LANGUAGE IN INDIA

Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow

Volume 13:11 November 2013
ISSN 1930-2940

Managing Editor: M. S. Thirumalai, Ph.D.
Editors: B. Mallikarjun, Ph.D.
Sam Mohanlal, Ph.D.
B. A. Sharada, Ph.D.
A. R. Fatihi, Ph.D.
Lakhan Gusain, Ph.D.
Jennifer Marie Bayer, Ph.D.
S. M. Ravichandran, Ph.D.
G. Baskaran, Ph.D.
L. Ramamoorthy, Ph.D.
C. Subburaman, Ph.D. (Economics)
Assistant Managing Editor: Swarna Thirumalai, M.A.

Biotext: A New Perspective

Roghayeh Farsi, Ph.D.
Neyshabur University, Iran

Abstract

Literary criticism has always concerned itself with the triangle of text, context, and author/reader. Such triangulation has led to the emergence of a wide variety of literary approaches, each one of which has paradoxically had some limitations. The present article aims at introducing a new perspective which encompasses all other approaches without falling in the trap of their reductionism. The initiator of this new notion is J. S. Anand, the living Indian poet.

This paper not only introduces Anand's theory of biotext as the virtual realm of any literary text but it also elucidates Anand's biotext by modeling it after Gilles Deleuze's postmodern theories on time, hence interdisciplinarity between literary criticism and philosophy. Here, a parallel is drawn between the syntheses of time (past, present, future) and those of text,

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:11 November 2013

Roghayeh Farsi, Ph.D.

Biotext: A New Perspective

context, and author/reader. Calling biotext as the virtual Third Space is regarded as Anand's attempt to postcolonialize his new perspective, following Homi K. Bhabha.

Key words: biotext, synthesis, Anand, Deleuze, Bhabha

Introduction

History of literary criticism evinces critics' views have not transcended the triangle of text, context, and writer. With each approach, there has been a tilt toward either one or two of these elements. Roland Barthes's revolutionary announcement of death of the author and birth of the reader in text substituted author with reader, hence reader-response approach. The postmodern re-turn to the context and its impacts on text production and interpretation have rendered Formalists' stress on the autonomy of text outdated. Such triangulation has restricted the critics' scope of vision and made their lenses impervious to criticism. Total eradication of the author is as just reductive as the sole emphasis on text or context.

J. S. Anand, in a metacritical approach, introduces the new and conducive notion of biotext in an attempt to fill in the gaps of all such perspectives. He defines biotext as the all-inclusive, protean, and virtual Space which is shared by, but not restricted to any one of, text, context, and author/reader. Following his postcolonial predecessor, Homi K. Bhabha, Anand calls biotext as the Third Space whose synthetic structure de-colonizes the monopoly of either element in the triangle.

The present paper is a scrutiny into Anand's view of biotext and endeavors to highlight its merits in criticism. This study adopts a Deleuzian lens to shed light on the notion of biotext and see how its synthetic structure dispenses with drastic triangulation. The postmodern thinker, Gilles Deleuze, is noted for his new theories on language, time, history, art, and politics. He defines time in terms of three syntheses: the synthesis of the present, the synthesis of the past, and the synthesis of the future. Modeling biotext after this temporal scheme helps us utilize Anand's biotext to put an end to the long held strife in literary criticism, bringing them all to a kind of resolution without doing harm to any one. However, before going to the analysis, a proper definition of the elements, text, context, and writer/reader, would be pertinent.

On Defining and Characterizing Text

Generally speaking, text is any written or oral production. A discourse analyst like Raphael Salkie defines text as "a stretch of language that may be longer than one sentence" (1995, p. ix). Norman Fairclough views texts as "selective actualisations of potentials (potential discourses, genres, grammatical constructions, metaphors, vocabularies etc.)" (2010, p. 487).

In literature, text is any selective actualization which pursues the objective to give pleasure to the reader in addition to broadening his/her understanding of human life and condition. Generically, a text differs from poetry to fiction. Author is the producer/writer of the text, one in whom both text and context converge, hence a mediator but with a difference. Context is the historical and cultural setting in which the author is situated and writes the text. Malinowski aptly calls it “context of culture” and contends, “utterance and situation are bound up inextricably with each other and the context of situation is indispensable for the understanding of the words” (1923, p. 306; cited in Widdowson, 2004, p. 37).

When a literary critic such as Eagleton writes on the indefinability of literature because evaluations change over time (Olsen & Pettersson, 2005, p. 119), he is in fact implying the unavoidable syntheses of text and context.

J. S. Anand on *Text and Biotext*

Anand, also, defines context as “the empirical setting of a work of art [. . .] when it has been produced, and how, under what pressures, things which attend its creation” (2013, p. 4). This Indian critic metaphorically compares the unavoidable relation between the poet and the context to a flying kite and its string and writes: “the writer is himself the creation of certain circumstances, and he is rooted in certain societal reality” (Personal email, 2013, p. 1).

While Formalists textualize the text by setting aside the context and focusing on the aesthetic features, the reader-response critics valorize the reader over text and author. Contextualists pay the least attention to either reader or text *per se* and approach text as a political phenomenon for or against context. Therefore, they subjectify the author and politicize his/her work. Anand tries to include all these diverse dimensions in his theory of biotext without abiding by any one. He argues that biotext has a synthetic structure and for this feature it retains different dimensions.

Post-structuralist View of *Biotext*

Biotext is not the same as subtext which differs from text to text, from discourse to discourse, and thus has a limited scope of application. Besides, while subtext is a structuralist approach to text, biotext cherishes the fluidity and multiplicity of a poststructuralist view of text. What parallels Anand’s biotext with time is its triad structure which resembles the three elements of past, present, and future. For understanding the synthetic structure of biotext, one has to investigate the way Deleuze defines time in terms of its three syntheses.

In *Difference and Repetition*, time is defined through three syntheses, where each of the three syntheses is prior process in relation to the other times as dimensions. Synthesis is by nature a process; process means a transformation of events and their relations. For Deleuze, synthesis is a process of being thought together. This view is the bedrock on which biotext could be set up, since it implies the interdependence of all parts. Furthermore, the processive nature of

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:11 November 2013

Roghayeh Farsi, Ph.D.

Biotext: A New Perspective

biotext is the feature which encourages the present comparison of Anand to Deleuze. In a personal email, Anand writes,

Whatever flows into the text is actually the result of a long process, of association and dissociation, sifting and filtering, all going on at the same time. The creative process does not wait for artificial tools to be applied to a work of art. A work of art is the creation in the bio-tanical garden of life [. . .] the whole cosmos is filtered through the poet's consciousness at the time of creation. (2013, p. 5)

Time and Biotext

The processual synthesis is of vital significance insofar as Deleuze defines time not as process, but “process making multiple times. Times are made in multiple synthetic processes” (Williams, 2011, p. 3). The irreducibility of these multiple times to one another is the ground on which biotext and its irreducibility can be founded. In his theory of time, Deleuze denotes this sense of simultaneity through the verb “retain” and argues in each synthesis, the other two elements are contracted and thereby retained.

Retention denotatively means keeping the other in itself instead of discarding it. Therefore, when Deleuze argues the synthesis of the present contracts the past and the future, he takes the past and the future as “dimensions” of the present. Envisaged in the light of the contractual aspect of Deleuzian time-notion, the theory of biotext counterargues all the reductive approaches to either text, context, or author/reader.

Focus of This Paper

In order to have a better appreciation of Anand's notion of biotext, the present study models the triad of text, context, writer after Deleuze's three syntheses. In this framework, the paper takes the context as the synthesis of the past which is marked with virtuality; the writer/reader can be taken as the synthesis of the present and is thus featured by succession, multiplicity, and habit; and the text is the synthesis of the future in which the eternal return is the main characteristic. This juxtaposition does not imply that biotext is temporal; rather, it helps one understand much better the features that biotext has.

The First Synthesis of the Present: Author

The first synthesis of time is that of the present. The reason that the author can be taken as the synthesis of the present is its vital role in the triad. Literature and literary criticism begin with author exactly like time that begins as the present instead of as past or future. Author/writer is the subject who is identified as the performer of the act of writing. In Lampert's words, “Every synthesis . . . is a present and only a present” (2006, p. 16). Like the synthesis of the present, the writer has multiplicity. In Lampert's elucidation of Deleuze's first synthesis, the very synthetic structure of the present accounts for its multiplicity: “there is a schema *in the present* for the co-

presence of the multiplicity that *made up the present*. Synthesis displays the present precisely as a past-present-future array” (Lampert, 2006, p. 16). Referring to the contractual nature of the present, Lampert speaks of the future and the past as the dimensions of the present (p. 26).

Inspired by Hume, Deleuze opines that the first synthesis has the logic of succession and is marked with difference and habit. Habit is a synthesis of retention and expectation, “it is the synthesis of a variation in intensity over events, where retention is the absorption of past variations and expectation the impulse to future ones” (Williams, 2011, p. 40).

In a Deleuzian key tone, writer can be viewed as the locus where difference is drawn out from repetition. Yet, this difference is not difference qua difference or difference *per se*; rather it is a varying relation. Like Deleuzian habit which “draws out a differential variation from a repetition” (Williams, 2011, p. 40), writer creates a change or becoming in the series. One might counterargue that writer is endowed with volition and is hence a deciding agent, while Deleuze’s synthetic process is a passive one which prefigures any conscious subject. It should be noted here that by writer, we do not mean only the conscious, decision-maker agent; rather writer is the site of interface of text and context, where the past and the future converge. With an eye on the asymmetrical relation between the syntheses of text and context, biotext defines writer as the site of power struggle. This view includes both private and public dimensions of writer as an agent.

Passive and Immanent

Besides, synthesis is passive because it is immanent. Immanence, in Lampert’s words, “implies that as soon as there is something then there is everything. As soon as there is anything, there has been a contraction that has folded a multiplicity into a singular presence”, that is, it contracts without the interference of any deciding or active consciousness. In Deleuze’s own words, a synthesis is passive as it is “not carried out by the mind, but occurs *in* the mind” (as cited in Joe Hughes, 2008, p. 11). From this angle, the writer’s unconscious, embracing all cultural, mythical, and personal traits, is processive and passive, hence immanent.

The Second Synthesis of the Past: Context

The context can be mapped on Deleuze’s second synthesis, that of the past. Like this synthesis, the context is featured by memory and virtuality. On the necessity and autonomy of the synthesis of past, Deleuze writes, “We must not draw back from the necessary consequence: there must be another time in which the first synthesis of time carries itself out. The latter necessarily refers to a second synthesis” (as cited in Lampert, 2006, p. 31). This explanation justifies Deleuze’s view that the first synthesis is originary but not original and is therefore reliant on another synthesis.

Deleuze defines the second synthesis as the one in which the first synthesis operates, “carries itself out”. This point implies the (inclusive) nature of the synthesis of the past in the sense that it determines the form of all passing presents rather than causing particular ones. As

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:11 November 2013

Roghayeh Farsi, Ph.D.

Biotext: A New Perspective

Williams rightly explains, “The being of the past . . . is the condition of possibility for all the different active memories, their differences, but also their connections, above all their connections with the passing presents that came before them – all of them” (p. 58). In this sense, the second synthesis contains within itself the synthesis of the present.

Second Synthesis as Pure Memory

Following Bergson, Deleuze describes the second synthesis as “pure memory”, that is, memory in which an experience from any point in the past can pop up into present experience (Lampert, 2006, p. 35). Bergson opines the past memory belongs nowhere, not even to the brain, because the brain exists in the present. He concludes pure memories, that is memories which have not been retrieved yet by the mind, exist virtually, rather than actually. In Lampert’s words, “The status of a memory is that *if* it should get expressed in a present, then it will reveal the past, but until it does, it exists in a virtual status of its own” (2006, p. 36). Mapped on this view, the context or history is virtually present; only once the author draws upon any particular event selectively, that event represents a particular point in the past. Thus the context is present as the “past in general”. This interpretation pinpoints the limited scope of the author’s selection and simultaneously it impregnates the selection with multiple other possibilities.

A New Asymmetry

For Deleuze, the past functions like a container. Consequently, with the second synthesis, a new temporal asymmetry arises: “Whereas the passive synthesis of habit constitutes the living present in time and makes the past and the future two asymmetrical elements of that present, the passive synthesis of memory constitutes the pure past in time, and makes the former and the present present . . . two asymmetrical elements of this past as such” (as cited in Bogue, p. 38).

Therefore, just as in the first synthesis, the past and the future are its dimensions, for the second synthesis also the present and the future function as its dimensions. What this point implies is that in either synthesis, the other elements do exist as they are retained by the main synthesis, instead of being obliterated. What this point signifies in mapping literature onto Deleuze’s time-schemes is the countersigning view that in all interpretations none of the elements can be claimed to have been totally eradicated.

Anand’s Biotext with Virtuality

Modeling the context after the second synthesis accords Anand’s biotext with the important feature of virtuality. On the distinction between the real and the virtual, Anand writes, “Reality is a delusion, a highly subjective idea of something – and even that subjective is constantly under the protean urge. . . . The virtual relates to the existence of several possibilities, to which even the ‘so-called real’ can be subjected to” (2013, p. 6). Writing in details on the virtual, Bogue refers to the important characteristics of the virtual that when applied to context reveals many crucial issues about its significance as an element of biotext. For Deleuze, the

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:11 November 2013

Roghayeh Farsi, Ph.D.

Biotext: A New Perspective

virtual is “the transcendental condition of possibility of all empirical, individual entities” (as cited in Bogue, 2010 p. 21).

Individuation, Virtuality and Illusion

This transcendental condition is characterized by the model of individuation, taken from the philosopher Simondon. Individuation is a process of actualization which emerges from a metastable site which is itself marked with “a line of continuous variation”, hence multiplicity. The line of continuous variation remains immanent within each actualization; this renders the actualized entity potential of multiple other variations. In Bogue’s words, “each element of the virtual is a site of metastable, ‘impersonal and pre-individual’, metamorphic, individuating self-differentiation; each is a site of coexisting possibilities determined by a singular point whose position cannot be known before it is actualized in a given situation” (2010, p. 24). A view of reality which reduces the virtual only to the actual side is an illusion.

The virtual comprises pure difference-in-itself which becomes actualized in matter and form and yet in this actualization the pure difference-in-itself is cancelled or negated. What this implies is that in every actualization there exist multiple possibilities which, due to conditions, have not been actualized, but exist there as potentials. This justifies the fact that things can undergo process of becoming and thereby metamorphose to other things or beings.

Counter-actualization, Virtual and Actual

In this respect, Deleuze proposes the notion of counter-actualization or counter-effectuation which is immanent within any actualization. As the other side of the actual, the counter-actual serves as the way the actual can communicate with its virtual side. As Eva Aldea explains, “Even when it has been actualized, every object still has a virtual side, an ‘excess’ of the virtual that is not explicated, but ‘left unaccomplished’ in actualization” (Aldea, 2011, p. 20).

The other implication of the immanence of the virtual in the actual by way of counter-actual is the distinction that Deleuze aptly draws between the virtual and the actual. For Deleuze, virtuality is “dynamic, open, and robust, where actuality is passive, determinate, and ephemeral. The actual may be what is produced, but the virtual is what is productive” (Sherman, 2009, p. 3). As put rightly by Hallward, the virtual is creative, and the actual is created; the virtual composes, while the actual is composed (as cited in Sherman, 2009, p. 3). This new light cast on the context does away with its marginality as a dead, already finished, presence and thus accords a vital role.

Creative, Dynamic and Virtual Side of *Biotext*

What renders the biotext creative and dynamic is the virtual side that is characteristic of its second synthesis, that of the context. This perspective sheds light on the context in a new way foregrounding its creative role. The synthesis of the context comprises both the actualized virtual and the counter-actualized sides of the actual. Just as pastness is the logical capacity of events to

experience inexhaustible transformations, the virtuality of the context implies its potential for metamorphoses; and what makes metamorphoses possible is the counter-effectuated sides of the actual. For the synthesis of the past and also of the context, such metamorphoses to be actualized the third synthesis which is the synthesis of the future is needed. In this way, in the synthesis of the past, the future functions as one of its dimensions. This virtuality entails the presence of the other synthesis, the third synthesis, which brings about various transformations in the past in time and context in biotext.

Completion, Transmutation and Actualization

In her explanation of Deleuze's second synthesis, Aldea aptly refers to Deleuze's ethics and brings in a new vision of freedom as the ability and authority by which "we develop and lead the [virtual] to its completion and transmutation, and finally become masters of actualizations and causes" (2011, p. 20-21). This justifies the ethics of Anand's biotext which gives priority to author's ethical conduct.

In contrast to the actual which comprises a "plane of organization", the virtual is characterized as a "plane of consistency" (also called plane of composition, or plane of immanence; Deleuze and Guattari assign different names to this plane in different contexts like "body without organs"; "the abstract machines"; or "the line of flight"). As Aldea defines, the plane of consistency is "nothing but thought cutting through the virtual, 'capturing' a slice of it" (2011, p. 23). "Capturing a slice of" the virtual results in nothing other than becoming, or haecceity – Deleuze and Guattari's technical term for deterritorializing transformation and modifications of categories, actions, and relations. They explicate, "

there is a mode of individuation very different from that of a person, subject, thing, or substance. We reserve the name *haecceity* for it. A season, a winter, a summer, an hour, a date have a perfect individuality lacking nothing. . . .They are haecceities in the sense that they consist entirely of relations of movement and rest between molecules or particles, capacities to affect and be affected. (as cited in Bogue, 2010, p. 27; Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 261).

Multiplicity of Roles and Continuing Metamorphosis

Becoming is not only dynamic, but it also involves a pack, a multiplicity. What interlinks Deleuze's notion of becoming to art is his idea that the artist is "a becomer": "the artist, including the novelist, goes beyond the perceptual states and affective transitions of the lived. The artist is a seer [*voyant*], a becomer [*devenant*]" (Bogue, 2010, p. 17; Deleuze and Guattari, 1994, p. 171).

Such a view of the artist justifies the urge of the present study to parallel the processive nature of Anand's biotext with Deleuze's time-syntheses. Applied to biotext, the synthesis of the context provides the ground for multiple becomings and metamorphoses which occur through the

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:11 November 2013

Roghayeh Farsi, Ph.D.

Biotext: A New Perspective

present, that is, through and within the author. Rather than being a mimesis, becoming is a process of metexis, not imitation but the act of participation. In Deleuze and Guattari's words, "The painter and musician do not imitate the animal, they become the animal at the same time that the animal becomes what they willed at the deepest level of their concord with Nature" (as cited in Sherman, 2009, p. 8). Since becoming is a promise of the future, this explains the interdependence of the three syntheses of text (the future), author (the present), and context (the past).

Determination of Power

Upon the plane of consistency, things are distinguished from one another "only by speed and slowness" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 254) and by their corresponding "degree of power" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 256; cited in Bogue). Degree of power is determined by an entity's affects – its power of affecting and being affected – and "Affects are becomings" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 256). Becoming is deterritorializing as it violates subjectivity and disassembles forms: "It is a composition of speeds and affects involving entirely different individuals, a symbiosis; it makes the rat become a thought, a feverish thought in the man, at the same time as the man becomes a rat gnashing its teeth in its death throes" (as cited in Sherman, 2009, p. 8).

Put in other words, actualization is the outcome of asymmetrical relations between particles; in biotext discourse, this asymmetry opens up the issue of the political and the process of politicization. This is one of the reasons that Anand prefers to name biotext after Bhabha's Third Space, which is the site of mobilization of codes. This point needs further explanation which will be carried on later on in the paper.

Virtuality of the Synthesis - Paradoxes

Ronald Bogue refers to three paradoxes of the second synthesis of time which could be conducive in our understanding of the context in biotext. The first paradox is that the virtual past is simultaneous with the present (Bogue, 2010, p. 39). In biotext, the synthesis of the context is simultaneous with the synthesis of the text. What this implies is that in biotext the context functions as the ground necessary for the synthesis of the text. This role justifies the simultaneity of context with text.

The second paradox is, as Bogue writes, "that the past coexists with itself" (2010, p. 39). The virtuality of the synthesis of the past makes this coexistence with itself justifiable and thereby possible. In biotext, the coexistence of context with itself highlights its totality and generality which thereby makes it fit as a ground for the synthesis of the present, the author/reader. The third paradox is, in Bogue's analysis, "that the past pre-exists every present moment" (2010, p. 39).

As the present moves within the virtual realm of the past, the pre-existence of the pure past is pre-supposed. In biotext, the pre-existence of the synthesis of the context to the synthesis of the author foregrounds the inevitable groundedness of the author within the virtual realm of the context. The paradoxes of the second synthesis highlight the dimensionality of the first synthesis in the second and vice versa. This point in the biotext implies the interdependence of the three syntheses, which is the main argument of the article.

Acentricity

Some may argue that one's approach to the past and/or the context is quite selective and restrictive. It should be noted that as soon as any historical element is approached it becomes personal holding the ideology of the writer. Unlike the phenomenologists who give priority to the intending consciousness, Bergson and Deleuze argue that images are created in, and exist in, the objects perceived. As far as they are not captured by any subject, they are "ascentred" and do not exist in any particular succession. This puts under question the authority of cause-effect relationships and sets this relation as arbitrary and selective. This view of acentricity refers to the virtuality of the second synthesis; and since the virtual is multiple, multiplicity is impersonal and ahistorical. When Anand writes of the synthesis of the context, he implies the ahistoricity and impersonality of the historical background, that is, the context as a totality, which has not been yet triggered by any consciousness. Acentricity of the context helps Anand counterargue claims against ideologized versions of history, which are history-centered by a consciousness.

Importance of Context

Just as the synthesis of the past is necessary for the present, causing the present to pass, the context is necessary for the writer to situate him/herself, define and re-define his/her identity, and adopt his/her specific stance. Biotext is virtual because it comprises the synthesis of context and in this synthesis the author and the text are its dimensions. The virtuality of biotext accords it multiplicity and plurality as the virtual is dynamic, productive and creative. Besides its immanence, the acentricity of the second synthesis bestows biotext the infinite potentiality needed by the author for creating the text. The ascentered images are always present everywhere. Moreover, the virtuality of biotext renders it immanent to any actual text as a counter-text and subjects the text to constant alternations.

The Third Synthesis of the Future: Text

The third element in biotext is text which can be mapped onto Deleuze's third synthesis, that of the future. The synthesis of the future is marked with eternal return and metamorphosis. Following Nietzsche, Deleuze contends, "In its esoteric truth, the eternal return concerns, and can only concern, the third time of the series. It is only there that it can be determined. This is why it is literally said to be a belief of the future, a belief in the future" (as cited in Lampert, 2006, p. 56).

Eternal return accords the synthesis a circular structure. While conventionally circular movement means ending up where it has begun, the Deleuzian notion of the cyclic implies ending up with a transformation, a change, since for Deleuze repetition is the repetition of the different, rather than of the same. In his own words, “*The same does not return, the similar does not return, but the Same is the return of that which returns, that is, of the Different, the similar is the return of that which returns, that is, of the Dissimilar*” (as cited in Williams, p. 115). What Deleuze’s capitalization of the Same, the Different, and the Dissimilar puts stress on is the idea that nothing escapes the return of pure difference or difference in itself. Pure difference applies to all that was not represented and that which engulfed identity in earlier events, returns once more in new identities and representations in order to engulf them again (Williams p. 116).

This definition countersigns such conventional beliefs as reincarnation, rebirth, identical cycles, etc. It is the eternal return of the third synthesis that makes the present pass and replays the virtuality of the pure past in the present. What all this signifies is the interdependence of the three syntheses; without the eternal return of the third synthesis, the first two syntheses would not be processed. This notion, when applied to biotext, signals the same interdependence of syntheses of text, context, and author upon one another. The synthesis of the text is marked with the feature of the eternal return which refuels the context and reignites the author/reader. In this way, the system of biotext is rendered open and multiple characterized by pure difference.

Both Pure and Empty

For Deleuze, the third synthesis of time is both pure and empty (Williams, 2011, p. 82). As Williams explains, a pure and empty form of time is “a time that renders the new present determinable yet undetermined” (Williams, 2011, p. 86). The metamorphic feature of biotext is due to the synthesis of text as it, like the synthesis of the future, “concerns how a general past can be re-instantiated in a new, singular present” (Lampert, 2006, p. 55). For Deleuze, the future renders objects determinable; it makes events adaptable. In Lampert’s analysis, “It puts events, which had become available yet abstract in the past, back into play precisely in time” (2006, p. 55). The reason for taking the text as the future lies in this capacity; like the synthesis of the future, the text puts into play the context; therefore, the context is subject to metamorphosis as soon as it is intended by the text. It is the text that centers on the context through the author and thereby brings it into metamorphoses by putting the context and the author into play and revealing the multiple possible causes and meanings they can create together.

Present as Agent

Like the other two syntheses, in the third synthesis, the other elements function as its dimensions. In Deleuze’s words, “in this last synthesis of time, the present and the past are in turn no more than dimensions of the future: the past as condition, and the present as agent” (as cited in Lampert, 2006, p. 59). Applied to biotext, the past stands for the context which provides condition, the present as agent applies to the author, and the future which is the novelty denotes

the text. Furthermore, Deleuze believes that all three syntheses are repetitive. On this point, he explicates, “the present is the repeater, the past is the repetition itself, but the future is that which is repeated” (cited in Lampert, 2006, p. 59).

In theory of biotext, the present is the author, the agent, who repeats; the past is the context which is the repetition itself; and the text is that which is repeated. For instance, text A is the event which has been taken up and put into play by the author who is now the agent; the resultant text is the future; and the particular condition for this re-projection, that is repetition in order to change, is the context.

As Lampert elucidates, “it is the future that first attributes the present to an agent, but it is also the future that refutes that agency when it turns the future-qua-present into a future-qua-future” (2006, p. 59). Envisaged through this lens, biotext becomes paradoxical, in the sense that the text attributes the author to an agent, and simultaneously, it effaces the author’s agency when the text is approached by another consciousness, that of the reader.

Put in other words, the future-qua-present stands for text-author relationship which is displaced by future-qua-future which is the text-reader relation. However, this should not be taken as total effacement of the synthesis of the author since in the third synthesis the author always remains immanent as one of its dimension, just as the context is its other dimension. What’s more, by dividing the three repetitions in terms of agency, the future (the text) divides the context and/or the past on its own terms. (Lampert, 2006, p. 59). Deleuze states, “The first synthesis concerns only the content and foundation of time; the second, its ground; but beyond this, the third assures the order, the set, the series, and the final goal of time” (cited in Lampert, 2006, p. 59). This means nothing other than claiming that the future puts the past and the present into usage and thereby turns them into its own dimensions.

Erotic Force of Application to Mediate between Syntheses

The relationship between the third synthesis and the other two syntheses is mediated by an erotic force of exploration, interrogation and utilization of the virtual realm of the past: “every reminiscence, whether of a town or a woman, is erotic. It is always Eros, the noumenon, who allows us to penetrate this pure past in itself, this virginal repetition which is Mnemosyne” (as cited in Bogue, 2010, p. 40).

As Bogue observes, the eroticisms of the third synthesis is related to an expression of desire, “but desire in the sense of a positive affective energy”, called by Deleuze and Guattari as “desiring production” (Bogue, 2010, p. 40). Deleuze and Guattari’s view of “desiring production” is reminiscent of Roland Barthes’s notion of “jouissance” which is the erotic pleasure the reader experiences in the playground of signifiante.

When Barthes discards the author and vacates the field for the maneuver of the reader and thus initiates the rebirth of the reader, he argues that between the reader and the text there

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:11 November 2013

Roghayeh Farsi, Ph.D.

Biotext: A New Perspective

occurs a play in which the codes of the text work on the reader. Barthes calls reading as a rewriting process through which the previous senses of signification are undone. Accordingly, he calls the text actively at work within the reader as the signifiante. This site gives the reader the erotic pleasure which Barthes names *jouissance* after the master of word-play, James Joyce.

Anand on Third Synthesis

While Barthes restricts *jouissance* to the reader, Anand keeps the erotic pleasure of exploration and penetration for the text in its interrelations with the other two syntheses, context and author. Barthes believes that text, in the rewriting process held by the reader, “comes about, as soon as . . . the scriptor and/or the reader begin to play with the signifier” (1981, p. 37). Similarly, one can argue in biotext also, the text “comes about” in its processive relation with author and context. However, while Barthes restricts the “desiring production” to text-reader realm, Anand gives it a vaster scope and thus eroticizes the very totality of text as the third synthesis of biotext. In this light, for Anand any text is erotic as it penetrates the virtual past and “comes about” as the author and/or reader’s “desiring production”.

The other common point between Barthes and Anand is the virtuality of *jouissance* which renders it unsayable. Although Barthes does not refer explicitly to this virtuality, it is implied in the way Vollbrecht describes it: “A text of *jouissance* cannot be interpreted because any attempt to talk about *jouissance* is tantamount to converting *jouissance* into pleasure, which is enjoyment restricted to cultural norms and identity” (Vollbrecht, 1994, p. 77). Such a description reminds us of the ascentricity of the virtual which likewise escapes the reductionism of any approach. Applying this view to biotext, one can claim text is virtually erotic. The virtual eroticism of text can account for Freud’s attempt to regard any textual production in terms of sexuality, manifesting the author’s latent libidinal and thereby neurotic state.

Biotext - Multilateral and Dynamic

Deleuze’s account of the third synthesis rests on individual dramas, especially Hamlet from which he got the notion of caesura or cut in time. Deleuze features this synthesis with the caesura, then its assembly, its ordering into infinitely multiple series of “before” and “after” the cut, and the difference between the time before the cut and the time after the cut. In Deleuze’s notion of the third synthesis, an unclassifiable, disorienting time erupts, which Deleuze calls it “the event”. The event establishes an incommensurable “before” and “after” marked by asymmetry: “We may define the order of time as this purely formal distribution of the unequal in the function of a caesura” (as cited in Bogue, 2010, p. 41).

In biotext, the synthesis of text functions like a cut or caesura which is the event of metamorphosis or change of the context. However, this change is based on repetition. Defining repetition as “*a condition of an action before being a concept of reflection,*” Deleuze argues, “We produce something new only on condition that we repeat – once in the mode that constitutes

the past, and once more in the present of metamorphosis. And what is produced, the absolutely new itself, is in turn nothing other than repetition, the third repetition, this time by excess, the repetition of the future as eternal return” (as cited in Lampert, 2006, p. 57).

Applied to the notion of biotext, this definition renders biotext multilateral and dynamic. Text repeats context by excess, that is, it repeats context by extracting a difference from this repetition. This excess or difference is mostly picked up by socio-literary critics as the author’s response to the demands of his/her context, hence ideology-oriented textual analysis. As rightly put by Bogue, the third synthesis is “a synthesis that probes, questions and responds to the multiple, ‘polytemporal’ presents of the first synthesis and the second’s field of the past” (2010, p. 42).

The Issue of Death

Like Roland Barthes, Deleuze concerns himself with the issue of death. The third synthesis of time, the future, is featured by the eternal return, which in Deleuzian notion, is accompanied by violence and death: it is violent because it deprives the entity of its identity; and it brings death upon those who resist the change that the eternal return brings along with itself to the entity. Put in other words, for Deleuze death lies with the same and sameness, whereas life is for the different and difference. As the third synthesis of time is necessary to make the present pass and refuel the virtual past through its principle of eternal return, every entity simultaneously experiences the processual death and life.

In this light, Deleuze does not view death as opposite to life, but rather within life itself: “Death does not appear in the objective model of an indifferent inanimate matter, to which life would ‘return’; death is present in the living, as a subjective and differentiated experience endowed with a prototype” (as cited in Williams, 2011, p. 123). There are two deaths in the eternal return for Deleuze; there is an eternal death in the sense that the same eternally perishes; this is the general death, “once and for all”, of the same. A singular dying is dying through the eternal return of pure differences and thereby becoming others. This can be deployed to justify only part of Barthes’s death announcement. From a Deleuzian perspective, Barthes is right when he puts an end to the “same” authorial voice “once and for all”. But total obliteration of author at the rise of reader is not justifiable in biotext which claims author as one of the syntheses which is always contracted in the other two syntheses.

The content of eternal return is series and simulacra. Eternal return works by relating differences to each other in series (Williams, 2011, p. 127). As clarified in *The Logic of Sense*, simulacra are unidentified objects; in Williams’s words, they are “empty places and placeless occupants, that is, things working within something else, either as a place for something absent or as a thing with no assignable place” (Williams, 2011, pp. 127-8). In biotext, simulacra are the fractures or gaps in the synthesis of the text which counterargue the dominant ideology of the author (the synthesis of the present) and the context (the synthesis of the past). Such gaps

problematize the ideological stance of both the author and the context and thus render the text as a difference in relation to these two syntheses.

Third Space

The last but not the least important feature of biotextuality is the affinity that Anand accords to his notion by modeling and naming it Third Space after his postcolonial predecessor, Homi K. Bhabha. In a personal email, he talks of biotext as the Third Space which like the Bhabhalian notion, is virtual, hence unrepresentable, and protean, hence multiple.

For Bhabha, the Third Space “constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity” (Bhabha, 1995, p. 37). Similarly, biotext functions like the Third Space which disrupts with the authoritative voice of either text, context, or author/reader. Bhabha’s the Third Space “makes the structure of meaning and reference an ambivalent process, destroys this mirror of representation in which cultural knowledge is customarily revealed as an integrated, open, expanding code” (1995, p. 37).

Put in Deleuzian words, the Third Space works through difference and an on-going process of differentiation. This is quite clear in Bhabha when he posits “all cultural statements and systems are constructed in this contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation . . . [where] the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized, and read anew” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1995, p. 208).

Biotext also, for Anand, has an ambivalent Third Space in which a drastic mobilization of codes occurs. It is the process of such mobilization that renders biotext synthetic. This ambivalence accords biotext an amphibious life which freely moves in and out of the realms of the triangle of text, context, author and thereby decodes the determining codes of any one of them and sets them all in motion.

Conclusion

In this article there has been an attempt to set up the bedrock of a new approach to literary criticism, beginning from India and through J. S. Anand. The feature that singles out Anand’s biotext is its adaptability to the postmodern trends, especially philosophical inclinations, of the age in a postcolonial context. Furthermore, this evinces the critic’s response to the demands of his time which is in line with turns in the other areas of thought and criticism. Biotext opens new horizons on the freer maneuver of literary critics and besides it lacks the limitations of the other approaches. In a way, the processive and processual base of biotext renders it an eclectic lens which like the schizophrenic is always on move, on shift, and in change, hence its fluidity, flexibility and all-inclusiveness. Such fluidity helps biotext escape the clichéd or institutionalized forms of reading and at the same time leaves its footprints in every other approach. In Anand’s apt words, biotext “informs the entire body of literature” (2013, p. 2).

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:11 November 2013

Roghayeh Farsi, Ph.D.

Biotext: A New Perspective

Arguing that every text has a biotext, Anand votes for “intrinsic studies” which aims at locating and unraveling “the sources [and forces] of creation in real life of the creator” (2013, p. 4).

=====

References

Anand, J. S. (2013). The creative consciousness: The role of the text and the biotext. . Personal email to Roghayeh Farsi. 10/ Jun/ 2013.

Aldea, E. (2011). *Magical Realism and Deleuze: The indiscernibility of difference in postcolonial literature*. London and New York, Continuum.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1995). Eds. *The post-colonial studies reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Barthes, R. (1981). A Theory of the Text. In *Untying the text*. Ed. Robert Young. Boston and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp. 31-47.

Bhabha, H. K. (1995). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Bogue, R. (2010). *Deleuzian fabulation and the scars of history*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia II*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. Trans. Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: Pearson.

Lampert, J. (2006). *Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy of history*. London and New York: Continuum.

Olsen, S. H., & Pettersson, A. (2005). Eds. *From text to literature: New analytic and pragmatic approaches*. Macmillan: Palgrave.

Salkie, R. (1995). *Text and discourse analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.

Sherman, J. H. (2009). No werewolves in theology? Transcendence, immanence, and becoming-Divine in Gilles Deleuze. In *Modern Theology* 25:1. Pp. 1-20.

Vollbrecht, P. (1994). Roland Barthes' idea of the erotic text. In *Postmodernism: A discussion*. Ed. Vibha Maurya. Delhi: Kalinga Publications. Pp. 70-80.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:11 November 2013

Roghayeh Farsi, Ph.D.

Biotext: A New Perspective

Williams, J. (2011). *Gilles Deleuze's philosophy of time: A critical introduction and guide*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext: Critical issues in discourse analysis*. Malden, Oxford, Victorian: Blackwell Publishing.

=====

Roghayeh Farsi, Ph.D.
Neyshabur University
Iran
farsiroghayeh1956@gmail.com