

Kasdi Merbah University-Ouargla
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English Language



**ACADEMIC MASTER
Dissertation**

Domain: Letters and Foreign Languages
Filed: English Languages and Literature
Specialty: Anglo-Saxon Literature

Submitted by: Chabha Ben Ali Amer
Title

**DEATH OF THE AUTHOR AND BIRTH
OF THE READER IN THOMAS HARDY'S
*JUDE THE OBSCURE***

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Master Degree in Anglo-Saxon Literature**

Publically defended On: 21 /05/2016

Members of the jury:

Dr. Med Seghir Halimi
Mrs. Farida Sadoune
Mr. Djelloul Bourahla

President UKM Ouargla
Supervisor UKM Ouargla
Examiner UKM Ouargla

Academic Year : 2015 / 2016

Abstract

This study is conducted to introduce the concept of the Death of the Author developed by the French theorist Roland Barthes, and to propose a model applied to Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* according to the Barthian Reading of a text. In addition to that, we aim to determine to what extent a reader can grasp the meaning without referring constantly to the author's biography having the "text" as a basis. Yet, this paper will discuss Barthes' approach to analyse a literary text, which is considered as a reading technique employed to deduce specific meanings lying beneath the deep structure of the anonymous sentences in a piece of writing, disregarding the authorial background. Therefore, the reader's intention becomes the focus of our investigation. Accordingly, we are required to yield to the five codes and the lexical analysis proposed by Barthes in *S/Z* in order to exclude the constant reference to the *Author*, and to enhance it with the Reader-Response Theory. Thus, to encourage the readers to stimulate their own understanding and trust their intentions.

Résumé

Cette étude est menée pour introduire le concept de la mort de l'auteur développé par le théoricien français Roland Barthes, et de proposer un modèle appliqué à *Jude l'Obscure* de Thomas Hardy selon la barthienne lecture d'un texte. De plus, nous cherchons à déterminer dans quelle mesure un lecteur peut saisir le sens sans se référer constamment à la biographie de l'auteur ayant le *texte* comme base. Cependant, ce document examinera l'approche de Barthes pour analyser un texte littéraire, qui est notamment considéré comme une technique de lecture utilisée pour en déduire des significations particulières se trouvant sous la structure profonde des phrases anonymes dans un texte littéraire, sans tenir compte du contexte de l'auteur. Par conséquent, l'intention du lecteur devient l'objet de notre enquête. Donc, nous sommes tenus de céder aux cinq codes et l'analyse lexicale proposés par Barthes dans *S/Z* afin d'exclure la référence constante à l'*Auteur*, et de l'amender en subvenant à la théorie de la réception et de la lecture. Ainsi, pour encourager les lecteurs à stimuler leur propre compréhension et faire confiance à leurs intentions.

Dedications

To mom and dad

To Salah, Louisa, Amel

To Ouhamou Family

To Ben Ali Amer Family

Chabha Ben Ali Amer

Acknowledgments

*All our dream-worlds may come true.
Fairy lands are fearsome too.
As I wander far from view
Read, and bring me home to you.*

I dedicate this warm and cheering poem to those whom without their help and assistance I would succumb to the demons of my head, and probably would not finish this humble work.

To my Supervisor, Mrs. Sadoune, all the words of the world would not perhaps suffice to thank you for your guidance and helpful advice, for being patient with me, for being there and believed in me, for your warm hugs and kisses, and for being part of the family.

To my family, who has and will always be here for me, and love me and cherish no matter how I am. To mom specially, who is more than a mom: my friend, my black box, my strength, my protector, my psychologist... my WORLD. To dad particularly, my intellectual light, my source of force, I am sorry you had to listen to my blasphemed philosophies and to my inexperienced point of view. Thank you for all the books you have bought to me.

I am forever thankful, and indebted to *Mr. Bourahla* who has always been there, and had to bear my constant demands for papers. To *Dr. Halimi* as well, for clarifying ambiguities, and the priceless guidance, Barthes doesn't make it easy. I am thankful for *Dr. Bensalah Baya*, *Miss Benzoukh*, *Miss Yahiaoui*, *Mr. Kouted*. A special thank for *Mrs. Hamdi* for being a model of sweetness and kindness, and for *Mr. Kantaoui* for having forever influenced me.

To *Chahba Abir Korichi*, to *Fouzi Belouad*, to *Bakhouch Farida*, to *Amine Makhoulouf*, to *Amine Allaoua*, to *Rabhallah Abdelwahab*, to *Zegai Youcef*, I owe you my everlasting gratitude, and for the support and offer in hard times, especially when I was heart-broken.

To *Mehani Mohamed Charaf El dine*, the most wonderful person I have ever met, whom without this dissertation would never be as beautiful as it is now. Thank you for illuminating the path when I thought it will never end, thank you for staying up late at night to give me back confidence.

To all those who have always been there for me, when I was in need.

List of abbreviations

ACT: Proairetic code

DOTA: Death of the Author

HER: Hermeneutic code

JTO: *Jude the Obscure*

REF : Cultural code

RRT: Reader-Response Theory

SEM: Semic code

SYM : Symbolic code

Table Of Content

Abstract.....	I
Résumé	II
Dedication	III
Acknowledgement	IV
List Of Abbreviations	V
General Introduction.....	1

Chapter One: The Author, the Reader and the Text in the light of Barthes Theory

1- Introduction.....	8
2- Part one: Barthes' theory	8
2.1- General background.....	8
2.2- Barthes five codes to approaching meaning.....	15
2.3- Criticism of the theory.....	18
3- Part two: The reader as the new author of the text.....	20
3.1- Reader-Response Theory.....	20
3.2- Criticism of the theory.....	22
4- Conclusion.....	25

Chapter two: Towards Reader-Response in *Jude the Obscure*

1- Introduction.....	28
2- The conflict between the ideal and the social.....	30
2.1- Class division and education.....	31
2.2- Marriage and the wo-man.....	32
2.3- The wo-man and the new ideas.....	33
3- Science versus religion.....	37
4- Conclusion	39

Chapter three: “Inside-the-text” Barthesian Reading of *Jude the Obscure*

1. Introduction.....	43
2. Methodology.....	43
3. The Lexias.....	44
4. Barthesian reading of <i>Jude the Obscure</i>	46
4.1- The title Text.....	47
4.2- At Marygreen.....	47
4.3- Text 2: At Christminster.....	52
4.4- Text 3: At Melchester.....	57
4.5- Results.....	59
5. Conclusion.....	60
General Conclusion.....	61
Glossary.....	66
Bibliography.....	69
Webography.....	69

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

We tend to explain everything referring back to the creator, yet, what if that creator uses a combination of multiple, often complex, sequence of items to create something original? Something from everything? This a text according to Barthes and Barthesian followers such De Man and Foucault.

A text for Barthes is a fusion of networks of world knowledge, ascertaining that there is no genius in writing, however, to be a reader is grandiose. When a writer composes, he brings forth all what he has as a previous knowledge, culture and life experience, melts them in a pot and comes up with a masterpiece, yet for the Barthesians, it does not demand an effort, even the words are ready-made, and some narratives are just alike but carry different words.

Such decrees of the twentieth century, brought about a revolution in the world of literature, but also in art and cinema. Barthes declared the Author dead, and by his death the reader resuscitates, after he was put in sleeping mode, now he is no more condemned to read and to try to decipher what was the author thinking about when he wrote this novel, or this story, for no matter how much effort is done to make a research about a writer's life, it would be impossible to guess his reasons and attentions and even his feelings toward this novel.

In the theory of Barthes, the reader is the protagonist, therefore, the author is eliminated to the extent that the reader does not need an authorial background in order to demist the meaning. Thus, the bibliophile will use the content of the novel and his/her own interpretation based on their social, cultural and personal experience in order to manipulate the sense derived from the previously mentioned elements using a Barthian way of approaching a text.

Hardy is considered as a modernist since he is influenced by Charles Darwin theory of evolution, which drove him away from religious constraints. His education in Greek language and biblical views appear highly in *Jude the Obscure*. Consequently, Hardy's life is extremely

present in his writings, which raises a reader's challenge to find passages where Hardy does not manifest his presence. Accordingly, based on Barthes's concept of Death of the Author (DOTA) and Reader-Response theory (RRT), this inquiry is conducted to explain how a reader can interpret the meaning in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* by isolating the notion of the author (Hardy) as the only source of meaning, and hurling the reader to investigate other sources of significance including the text components as a primary one and the personal concept of the self, based on Barthes's five codes of interpretation.

This enquiry is motivated by three research questions:

- To what extent a reader excludes the author as a source of meaning in Hardy's *Jude the obscure*?
- How does a text depend on the reader's own interpretation?
- How do the components of the text help develop the meaning?

In order to deduce hypotheses, we need to proceed to the analysis of *Jude the obscure* according to the five codes (Hermeneutic, proairatic, semantic, cultural, and symbolic) set by Barthes, thus to go through the analysis of *lexias* (textual analysis). These codes will generate hypotheses. Therefore, it hypothesised that:

- 1- The main three characters (Jude Fawley, Susanna (Sue) Bridehead and Richard Phillotson) are different representations of Jude, which results in a hermeneutic study (HER code).
 - Who is *Jude*? Is he an allusion to Jesus' brother? Is he a replication of the religious man? Is he a sort of sarcasm? (HER)
 - Who is *Sue*? Is she a controverted representation of *Jude*? *Is she a reference to Susannah of the Book of Tobit*?

- Who is *Mr. Phillotson*? Does he represent the future dreams of *Jude*? Is he an impossible image that *Jude wants to imitate*?
- 2- The existence of rhetorical lines, a series of antitheses: life and death, cold and heat, outside and interior etc. (the lexia foregrounds a vast *symbolic structure* (SYM code)) in order to demonstrate that Jude is trapped between two worlds
 - 3- Statements that are made in a collective and anonymous voice originating in traditional human experience. Thus the anonymous replications are the fruit of the *cultural background* (REF code). Jude is a representation of all human beings with his goodness, sins and all imperfections. (intertextuality points at that).
 - 4- Jude is very familiar with the Greek and Latin languages, which allowed him to be acquainted with the Bible. Yet he does not follow any of the Biblical rules. Religion does not define one's attitudes and behaviours. *Jude the Obscure* is a religious text used for irony and playfulness, and to mock the future of religious people defined as unhappy and miserable, yet a refuge for the feeble beings (the case of Sue), a disappointing world as well (Christminster that was perceived as a haven and a lieu of cognizance, but turned to be the inverse).

This study will have a threefold organization. In the first chapter, to which we have attributed the title "*The Author, the Reader and the Text in the light of Barthes Theory*", we will be having two parts: the first part will tackle the theory of Barthes "*Death of the Author*", with a general background, followed by its principles and a criticism of the theory. The second part would be about the *Reader-Response Theory* (RRT). While the first chapter is merely theoretical, the second chapter will extend to a deep analysis of the novel under study, *Jude the Obscure*, and we will talk about its literary context. Chapter three will consist of analysis of the corpus and we will endeavour to consider it according to the theories DOTA & RRT, stated in the first chapter, which will help us locating passages where the author cannot interfere, cannot respond to his authority over reading, and thus cannot exist.

Conclusion

Consequently, we conducted a text-based (corpus-driven study) and reader-centred study. It is built upon Barthes' concept of DOTA, which leads to an application of the Barthesian five codes and the analysis of lexias maintained by the Reader-Response theory (RRT). The Barthesian technique and the RRT helped developing hypotheses. The RRT suggests that the reader, unlike the author, is active vis-à-vis the text, and is a meaning-generator, thus a crucial element towards scrutinising the meaning. The Barthesian reading technique overlaps five codes and a deep analysis of lexias. Each code is applied on an element of the text (literary and linguistic elements). Yet, these techniques will be applied on *Jude the Obscure* and we will observe whether they are pertinent to the obtainment of meaning.

Chapter one

**The Author, the Reader and the Text in the light of
Barthes' Theory**

Chapter one: The Author, the Reader and the Text in the light of Barthes' Theory

1- Introduction.....	8
2- Part one: Barthes' theory	8
2.1- General background.....	8
2.2- Barthes five codes to approaching meaning.....	15
2.3- Criticism of the theory.....	18
3- Part two: The reader as the new author of the text.....	20
3.1- Reader-Response Theory.....	20
3.2- Criticism of the theory.....	22
4- Conclusion.....	25

1- Introduction

The idea of excluding the authorial background from a text takes its attributes from Mallarmé's idea in "*Crisis in Poetry*" (*Crise de vers*) where he claims that language substitutes for the author "The pure work implicates the thorough desertion of the poet, who yields the ingenuity to words" (1945). Foucault (1969), later produced an essay in which he questions the state of the author vis-à-vis his/her work, and vis-à-vis the reader, by imposing a set of interrogations followed by critics debating the "*What's an Author?*".

In a likely similar essay, Barthes also wrote about the author-reader regarding the textual frame work. In his essay "*The Death of the Author*", he omits the author from his own text, as if he/she did not really produce a given artistic work, presenting several arguments to fortify his theory. The essay opposes to the traditional literary criticism in which critics involve the writer's life to demystify the meaning lying behind the eloquent words of a text, and thus break the idea of the authorial tyranny. Death of the Author implies two distinct meanings in order to understand what Barthes means by "*death*", whether literal or metaphorical, death of the author is approached from both literary criticism and literary writing.

2- Part one: Barthes' theory

2.1. General Background

Barthes advances the idea that referring constantly to the author's background in order to get meaning is considered as a tyranny over the meaning of a text. Thus, a real author does not exist; instead a set of endless ideas replaces his/her existence. Thus, when we remove the author from our heads, as if he/she never existed, or never produced such a work, we develop a reader-response critical competence:

The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up [a] writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination.(Barthes, 1970)

However, we still notice the contrary, as we tend usually to refer to the author's life, whether for curiosity, or because it's a habit studies and critical techniques grew in us:

Criticism still consists for the most part in saying that Baudelaire's work is the failure of Baudelaire the man, Van Gogh's his madness, Tchaikovsky's his vice. The explanation of a work is always sought in the man or woman who produced it, as if it were always in the end, through more or less transparent allegory of the fiction, the voice of a single person, the author 'confiding' in us. (ibid)

Gallop, J (2011) argues that the notion of the author's death could not but make the reader think more or less about the author. On contrary, Barthes argues against referring constantly to an author whom he believed the ideas he/she puts in their book or novel, have no originality, especially when they use others ideas to convey a distinct meaning (intertextuality).

Death of the author is nonetheless a linguistic theory that launches the quest about the real author of a text. It can include anything inferred by another person even if it is a photograph or a piece of music. Barthes in his essay gives a significant definition to the text and states that it is anything created by a conscious mind, and it is interpreted or judged by another person. It overlaps a multifaceted manifestation of different cultures, ideas, languages, theologies, philosophies .etc. so when the author believes the idea is his/her own, and claim to be the "*Auteur*" of that creation, he is actually not, because all the flow of ideas that have

fallen in a particular piece of writing are merely the prerequisite thoughts they have borrowed from a pre-existing knowledge that he/she becomes aware of : every word used by a writer is already existent, and probably belong to none in particular, but it is a world's knowledge.

If it is not the author we should be looking towards to understand a text, then where should we turn? If the author is irrelevant to decipher the meaning, what gives such power to the text? What allows it to have such incredible purpose when we read or gaze upon it? When there is Zero author, it doesn't mean the author is completely dissolved, there is actually an author, and this author is the reader. Barthes believes that we should look inside ourselves to find the ultimate author, as we author the world through our own interpretation and belief systems. When reading, we unconsciously decide what a text means, therefore creating new ideas and meanings: the meaning of a text can only exist when we interpret it in different ways. For instance, the name "*Jude*" is just a name, a meaningless name, a signifier which has its concept signified as a boy in our mind, but if we come to explain the word regarding the story, it may carry several interpretations. We are the authors of all texts.

Barthes essay "*Death of The Author*" talks radically about "*Death*", but does he mean the real and physical death of the author, or his death as an idea, a creator of a piece of work, that he has no more an authority upon? This essay can be viewed from two angles: literary criticism and literary writing.

In literary criticism, the death of the Author is regarded as the "death" of the physical real-life author of the work: For example, Baudelaire's "*The Flowers of Evil*" should not be analyzed in the context of Baudelaire's life. I.e. it doesn't mean that Baudelaire has composed poems in which he expresses pessimism, sad love stories and prizing Satan instead of God, that it really reflects his ideas. We may eventually analyze the poem basing on our

prerequisite thoughts and previous knowledge, but we must exclude Baudelaire from deciphering the meaning.

In literary writing, the death of the Author is mainly directed to the omniscient narrator and the author who brings attention to his existence in the text. For example, the use of “I” from the point of view of the author, or when the author addresses the reader directly.

To write one needs language, thus the latter is the vessel to communicate one’s world. Barthes(ibid) says that the author endeavours to represent the self linguistically, this representation translates into “I” which becomes in the view of Gagnier (1991) the “subject ‘subjected’ to the symbolic order of the language in which [he]is writing”. Though the authors’ incredible effort to approach the ‘I’ as the absolute self (authorial self), Barthes ends this issue by declaring that the *subject* “I” cannot accommodate the person ‘I’. Thus this self (author’s self) is deprived of the privilege to be an indubitable representation of the *subject* ‘I’ by the linguistic order. So, linguistically, the author “is nothing more than the instance writing”.

We have to differentiate between the *author* and the *writer*. Barthes substitutes the word “*author*” for “*scriptor*” and this is because, on one hand critics think Barthes does not want to make allusion to God, a conception that has similarities with creation:

We know now that a text is not a line of words releasing a single ‘theological’ meaning (the ‘message’ of the Author-God), but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centers of culture. [...] (ibid, p 146)

“The Author is always in the past of the text; whereas the Writer is simultaneous with it. Writing always occurs now, in the act of reading it, enunciating it, unpacking its structure.” Consequently, the author exists just at the moment of writing. Once he delivers the product, he announces his own death. Writing thus makes of the author a neuter element and forces him to bow at the power of the text which takes from him the licence of existence because he is unable to write himself into that text. Barthes argues that the modern scriptor is born simultaneously with the text; that is the process of writing allows him to exist (temporarily through the language that prepares the ground for his *subject* ‘I’. And thus, this inability to express the *person* ‘I’ limits the presence of the author, which halts the development of his existence.

In some critics we may find two different interpretations to Barthes’ essay *“The Death of the Author”*. It claims that his ultimate death is seen differently in the theoretical and the application framework. In theory the *“Auteur”* does not exist. However, in application, the author cannot be completely destroyed. Since Barthes argues in the favour of *“the reader”*, the meaning of the text belongs to the reader and writing exists for the purpose to be read.

The author, as Foucault writes (1969), is ‘the dead man in the game of writing’. Writing kills, the writer/ author, but somehow a certain ‘voice’ is there, or else as Barthes makes allusion to. If we take the concept of writing which is ‘the destruction of every voice’ (Barthes, 1970), then the voice itself can still be considered as a ‘point of origin’. In this distinction between writing, as absence and negativity, and speech, as a form of authentic self-presence, the essay thus offers at least some reassurance to a common sense view of language and communication, which means between speech and writing, the author can still be resurrected if the reader wishes. However, in Derrida’s deconstruction, in speech as in writing, neither open access to the truth, thus the speaker like the writer meets the fate of death as soon as their text is divulged to the public.

Barthes makes two main points as why the author should be separated from his writings. First, the author is only a way to tell what has been told before. He does not bring something new, thus his writings are neither created nor formed. For example, folk tales or modern fairy tales, these latter are just adaptations for the old ones, maybe two or three elements would change, but the plot and the arrangement of sequence of events remain the same. Another example is the 'recycling' ideas about music, fashion and movies which keep the same form in the current period.

The second point is about the reader. If he/she tries to analyse a literary work from the author's eye, then they will gain no benefits. And if the text is related to the author, a certain limit is drawn. For this reason, the reader should activate his/her imagination, and instead of trying to guess what the author wants to say, they should put the text in their social and personal context in order to get the meaning.

However, the death of the author, as it is mentioned previously, is not always necessary, because his presence is needed in some cases to achieve a greater understanding. For instance, in Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse 5*, Vonnegut tried hard to introduce himself to the reader by telling the story from the first point of view, and the whole chapter went on describing the Bombing of Dresden and how he survived. But then he took himself out and talked about Billy Pilgrim, another survivor from the Dresden bombing. In this story, if one does not read about the writers' life, it would be impossible to understand the story and make a link between the events which were a bit crazy as they swing between the past and the present (flash back and forth technique).

Referring back to the same story, the author should be present because the reader does not share the same experience with the writer. Nonetheless, if the reader had a similar or close experience with the events of the story, then his birth should be at the cost of the author's

death. That being said, the author should appear only if it helps the reader to find a meaning to the text.

If we were to take Barthes avowal, the author has no tribute to his work, because on one hand, the work is never original and on the other hand the origin does not matter; only the destination does. Consequently, an issue comes up. All authors claim credit to their work, but if the thoughts are not genuine, it is considered as plagiarism and intellectual theft. The author in this case, has no credit to claim for he has not done much than rewriting the same thoughts in different way. Yet, if the author seeks attribute to his work, it rather for the arrangement of words that tell the story, but not the story itself.

Gallop, J (2011) says, in the introduction of "*Death of The Author: Reading and Writing in Time*", that the death of the author makes the reader more curious about the writer of the book. It is like 'watching a movie without knowing what the rating or the plot summary of the movie is?' declares Jacquelyn Atchison. Since the author cannot be excluded completely from the literary work, and since he is still dominant in our culture, Barthes' essay is seen as an anti-political and anti-theological activity as 'to refuse to fix meaning is, in the end, to refuse God and his hypostases: reason, science, law' (p. 171).

Barthes radical concluding statement "*the birth of the reader must come at the cost of the death of the Author,*" argues for the favour of the reader. He gives credit to the reader to work out his imagination and bring about his talented background to demystify the meaning of the text without referring back to its writer. He, nevertheless, allows the reader to refer to the writer to some extent, in order to understand certain unshared notions that remain ambiguous and not clear.

The author, according to Barthes, can never write himself in the story since the 'I' in the text is unknown to the reader (who is speaking?), which transforms him into an incapable

origin, which is led by his language, social background, multifaceted of cultures and ideas he heard from here and there. The author would take credit for his unique style and arrangement of words which is considered individual, but the writing can never be his, but a general knowledge put together to form a piece of text seen as a story that has a purpose as soon as it lies in the hand of the reader, who becomes himself the new author of that orphaned literary work, because he will construct a new meaning to it based upon his own experience and his social context.

2.2. Barthes' codes to approach meaning

In *S/Z* (1974), concentrating on Balzac's text "Sarasin", Barthes explains how we interpret the meaning by reducing the text into degree zero, in other words to render it to blank meaning, and therefore to use the components of the text without having to bring up the writer's background. He calls this style "starring" of a text, and it divides the text into blocks of signification (Robinson, 2011) where the surface and the natural appearance are ruptured. The flow of the text is interrupted to release the perspectives, thus each block is treated as a zone, in which we trace the movement of meanings (ibid). According to Barthes, this technique aims to discover one of the voices of the text.

Every narrative is interwoven and any text is marked by the diverse meanings suggested by the Barthian codes, although a temporal and generic structures are imposed by their polysemy. Because most of modern writings display distorted narratives, loose ends and misleading diegeses, readers feel frustrated toward such events disorder. Barthes gave four terms describing the condition of enigmas: "snares" (deliberate evasions of the truth), "equivocations" (mixtures of truth and snare), "partial answers," "suspended answers," and "jammings" (acknowledgments of insolubility). Barthes explains this as "The variety of these

terms (their inventive range) attests to the considerable labor the discourse must accomplish if it hopes to arrest the enigma, to keep it open" (Barthes, 1974).

To achieve meaning through those terms, we need to call for the "hermeneutic" code or "the voice of truth". This code structures the text in an irreversible way, it refers to any element in a narrative that seems ambiguous and presents as an enigma which needs a decryptage. Those unexplained elements drive the reader to rise questions in order to explain what is not explained.

Barthes names the second code "proairetic" and referred to as (ACT). This code deals with the major structuring that drives the interest of the reader and builds a certain suspense, for instance the case of someone who stabs another, and the reader wonders what the resolution of such an action would be. Consequently, suspense is created by action rather than readers.

The semantic code or (SEM.) tends to work with the additional meaning of the text often used via connotation. In "S/Z", Barthes associates Sarrasine with "femininity" as opposed to the masculine form of Sarrazin. Nonetheless, Barthes does not point to the free-form association of ideas, but "a correlation immanent in the text, in the texts; or again, one may say that it is an association made by the "text-as-subject" within its own system". That is to say that Barthes concentrates on the semantic connotations that "have special meaning for the work at hand".

The symbolic code (SYM.), on contrary, is difficult to be distinguished from the semantic one, as Barthes is not always clear on the distinction between the two codes. But to simplify the idea, the symbolic code deals with the antitheses. A symbolic antithesis, as Barthes states, is "Every joining of two antithetical terms, every mixture, every conciliation—

in short, every passage through the wall of the Antithesis—thus constitutes a transgression". For instance, death and life, love and hate, man and woman etc.

The cultural codes (REF.) refers to any "science or a body of knowledge". It is characterized by the implication of the shared knowledge, or the general ideas that everybody can have, including assets that we can label as "physical, physiological, medical, psychological, literary, historical, etc.". In this code we find the "gnomic" code, which tackles all what has a relation with clichés, proverbs, or popular sayings of various sorts.

The proairetic and the hermeneutic codes require the temporal order, thus the reader needs to read a book temporally from the beginning to the end. Barthes aligns them with "the same tonal determination that melody and harmony have in classical music", he claims that the text is "dependent on [these] two sequential codes: the revelation of truth and the coordination of the actions represented: there is the same constraint in the gradual order of melody and in the equally gradual order of the narrative sequence". Unlike those two, the three other codes have no relation with time, thus are considered reversible, which means that the reader is not indulged to follow them in a chronological order to make sense of them in the narrative.

The five codes point to "multivalence of the text" and to "its partial reversibility", which allows the reader to perceive the text not as a single narrative, but as an assemblage of meaning working together to give multiple interpretations: "The grouping of codes, as they enter into the work, into the movement of the reading, constitute a braid (text, fabric, braid: the same thing); each thread, each code, is a voice; these braided—or braiding—voices form the writing." (Barthes, 1974)

2.3. Criticism of Barthes' Theory

Barthes has influenced literary studies, however, he denies being a literary critic arguing that he did not evaluate and provide findings on his works, as he concentrated on literature and the interpretation of their semiotic significance. In *Death of the Author*, he asserts that the origin of the text is not the author, but the language he writes with.

Language represents the voice, and is, from a structuralist perspective, the only tool of the writer, thus he is trapped in language and he is secondary to it. Compared to the presence of the author, writing, according to Barthes, is neuter or "degree zero" and is represented as a lieu of loss of subject and identity.

In *Writing Degree Zero*, Barthes suggests two types of texts: readerly text (lisible) and writerly text (scriptible). According to Barthes, a readerly text is where the events, the characters and their actions are clear and understandable, such as George Eliot's and Arnold Bennett's novels. A writerly text, however, is more complex in terms of structure, order of events and the role of characters that exhibit a difficulty in recognizing their place in the story. This kind of self-consciously literary works encourage the reader to think, develop a stand and rewrite it by bringing it into new combinations with their own meanings.

Gallop, J (2011) in *The Death of the Author: Reading and Writing in Time*, analyzes the complicated relationship between a devoted reader and the author that inspires them and she thinks that the author's death makes the reader think more not less about him. F. Scott Fitzgerald affirms that authors "aren't people exactly. Or, if they're any good, they're a whole lot of people trying so hard to be one person." Which raise the point that writers are able to become other people while producing their literary works, and therefore they include some of their personality and life experience, but Barthes rejects firmly that a writer exists

while writing, arguing that their personality is affected by their social environment, and so are their experiences, which results in a set of plagiarism put into their texts.

A writer hears, sees and experience things along his life, thus he/she would use that while writing, and their only tool to deliver their production is the language, yet it does not belong to them, for language is the production of population. Therefore, all what they come to write are a kind of intertextuality, because their ideas are not theirs.

However, in some case, the author cannot be totally excluded from his book, especially if it is an autobiographical novel, or in the case where signs of authorship are found in stories as in Vonnegut's *Catch 22*; in this situation we cannot remove the author, for the reader might not get the meaning immediately before referring back to the life of the author.

Another issue that contradicts Barthes' notion of the death of the author would possibly be the capitalist view of the writer. the latter considers the writer, and grants importance to the author's person that was part of the wider system of ownership, property and privilege (Willette, 2013). Capitalism preserves the author's rights, thus it would be impossible to use a writer's idea without citing his/ her name, claiming that his/her ideas aren't theirs but merely a social reproduction.

Moreover, readers cannot buy a book without taking a look at the cover and the writer's name, hence as soon as they buy a novel, they search for its writer and his biography and bibliography, which makes an author livelier than ever. In addition to that the classics which cannot be denied or deprived from their writers who invented their own words. For instance, Shakespeare coined around 1770 words and expressions that are attributed to him, and are recognized as his whenever located in a piece of writing. Such writers never die, although certain themes, ideas and features have been recurrent.

Yet, Barthes litigates for the cause of the reader, and instead of being tied to the writer, the reader would interpret the text according to what he/she understands. To free a text is to open doors to several interpretations. Thus, Barthes urges the reader to treat the text not as a unified image but as a decomposed component. This reading technique looks upon deviations in order to demonstrate that the structures of a text can be reversed and rearranged. Consequently, Barthes presents five notorious codes (hermeneutic, semantic, proairetic, cultural, and symbolic), the main steps to decompose a text, and then bring it back together to create another text and generate new meanings.

3- Part two: The reader as the new author of the text

3.1 Reader-Response Theory

Barthes celebrated the birth of the reader on the expense of the death of author and arose against the traditionalist view about the “Author-God”, while Derrida developed his revolutionary theory of deconstruction, which is another way to exclude the “*Auteur*” without ardour, as opposition to structuralist who believed that the sign is unchangeable. As a result, the reader transforms into the new author and the new meaning generator, which leads to an indefinite line of meanings shaped by the immense number of readers around the world.

Readers, consequently, are freed by those theorists, and they are to release their own thoughts to interpret a text. Norman Holland (1975), who trained in psychoanalysis, argues in favour of the reader, and considers interpretation of texts a way to enhance readers’ identity. In the same context, he exemplifies with William Faulkner’s “A Rose for Emily”, and claims that when readers respond to this text, they show remarkable differences. Hence, critics do not evaluate the responses, but they give a great attention to the way they inferred it, including defensiveness, indifference, aggressiveness, or vulnerability (Holland 123-24).

Accordingly, Holland asserts that as soon as the facts of a text satisfy the “ego defences” of the reader, this latter impels the fears and repressed desires onto it. Holland labels this process “DEFT” (defense, expectation, fantasy, transformation), as a result the reader experiences him/her self-defining fantasies (Holland & Sherman 217).

Similarly, Wolfgang Iser (1972-76) in *The Implied Reader*, construes the text as a multi-layered structure through which readers construct new experience and interpretations and contrast them with the pre-existing ones. However, Iser assumes that the text establishes norms guiding and limiting readers: "The process of assembling the meaning of the text . . . does not lead to daydreaming but to the fulfilment of conditions that have already been structured in the text " (Act 49–50). The reader deduces meanings which are derived from the elements of the text such as the narrator, the characters, the plot and the explicit reader; those elements guide and manipulate them while reading.

In his *"Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics"* (1970), Stanley Fish avows that reading is a temporal process, and he means that a reader generates interpretations and then he/she denies them to allow new ones to take the place of the old ones. Conversely, although readers read many literatures, and what they have first read may contradict with what they read later, that contradiction does not make any changes on their understanding, because this inconsistency enhances their reading skills, and thus experiencing several kinds of texts. According to Fish, this kind of variation in interpretation is not a sort of misunderstanding of structure or author's intention.

The text is a field where writers exhaust their ideas, however those are of one single side, sentenced to radical changes. It is as well where the reader consumes those same ideas but receives the sense otherwise. A reader cannot be obliged to accept all what is said in a piece of writing, as a result he ought to debate, reject, compare and contrast ideologies and

methods. Iser thought that the text and its elements manipulate the reader, yet, the reader is not guided neither is submitted to changes, but he/she develops through reading and grows with reading. Literary studies impose on the reader indefinite norms capable of “endless revisions”.

It is believed that implicating implicit thoughts and ideologies may shift the unprofessional reader’s way of thinking such as political, religious and societal ideas, which would impose new experience and inclinations toward a certain fact imposed by the text. Following blindly, or in some cases adopting a certain pleasant style detected in a character, and believed to be good in the mind of the reader, would expose him/her to a firm ideological threat. Nevertheless, in adopting a Deconstructive or a Barthian way of reading, the reader is no more tied to the creator. As a result, in excluding the author, the reader is found alone with the text, and thus using his own way of thinking and his personal experience in order to develop a non-biased interpretation of the script, using mainly his personality and the raw material next to him to become in his turn the father of that orphaned-text to which he/she would attribute a new life, and give a new meaning.

3.2. Criticism of the theory

Reader-Response theory (RRT) suggests that the readers’ interaction with the text is essential to understand the meaning of a piece of literature. As we create a spiritual relationship between our mind and the text, the latter becomes alive through our emotions, for instance, in reading *Jude the Obscure*, we find ourselves moving from sadness, to excitement, love and joy, but the words used in that story give hints to some gloomy and depressed situation, that of Jude.

Readers might dislike or like what they read, might sympathize or empathize with characters and the events of the novel, and these emotions released by the reader are crucial to

understand RRT. In JTO, the reader may empathize with Jude, and may hate Arabella, for example. It is possible that some man dislike Sue, because she halts man's position and allows the woman to think otherwise than to become a housewife, they may feel threatened. Some women would hate her, perhaps because they feel that society is retrograding, others would cease the opportunity and revolt against inferiority. Margaret Oliphant thinks about Arabella as '*a human pig ... quite without shame or any consciousness of any occasion for shame*'. this sentence declared by the novelist shows how a reader might feel toward a character.

However, a reader should not confuse the interpretation of a literary text with what he/she feels towards it. Thus, with RRT the reader is more likely to work on the emotional level, in other words, they must develop a certain point of view that would be personal. We may think of a literary text a musical composition to which we react; we can love or dislike, we are still moved by that artistic piece, however, we cannot define whether our feelings is tied to the piece of writing or to our previous personal experience. As a result, Rosenblatt coined two terms **efferent reading (EF)** and **aesthetic reading (AF)**. The EF is what the reader believes he should retain after reading, while AF is what the reader experience after reading.

Similar to Rosenblatt, Fish has the same interpretation for the RRT, but instead of using the same terms, he has brought **affective stylistics** is the experience the reader has while reading, which he defines as *a three-fold process*:

- *Readers surrender themselves to the text, letting the text wash over them; in fact, at this stage, readers should not be concerned with trying to understand what the work is about.*

- *Readers next concentrate on their reading responses while reading, seeing how each word, each sentence, each paragraph elicits a response.*
- *Finally, readers should describe the reading experience by structuring their reading responses, which may be in conflict with the common interpretation of a work. Stanley Fish, surprised by Sin: The Reader in Paradise Lost, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).*

Nevertheless, in contrast to our education system, and to EFL students, RRT as DATA are two methods which are hardly taken into consideration. As an EFL student encounters difficulties in contrasting the home culture with the literary text's culture. For example, an Algerian student, regarding culture, history, religion and social conditions, he would find it hard to define why an English poet evokes Muse, the goddess of art, while composing, and would feel irritated if he encounters a character that does not fit his mental experiences. Besides these, we meet the education system which does not allow the student to write one's feelings in a formal test, which obliges the reader to confront his personal views to that of a professional, in addition, the RRT is seen as an unprofessional way of reading, for it brings about subjectivity, and thus is not taken seriously.

Conclusion

Barthian theory allows readers to assess their real self, believing that a text is polygonal, and that the reader is endowed with an enormous power to comprehend and rebuild the text the way it fits their understanding and meaning perception. With the help of the five codes he introduced, the text is a multivalent unit, which can take different forms and thus multiple meaning. Hence, the meaning is not deduced according to the text or to some critique, the meaning is generated by the reader himself. Barthes suggests to read the text as if it were the first time, to erase all the previous knowledge about it, freeze the sense and start from zero, from the genesis to build something new based upon the personal culture, background and the way one perceives things. As result, viewing things from different angles, will lead to diverse points of view and a series of meanings.

Chapter Two

Towards a Reader-Response in *Jude the Obscure*

Chapter Two:Towards a Reader-Response in*Jude the Obscure*

1- Introduction.....	28
2- The conflict between the ideal and the social.....	30
2.1- Class issues and education.....	31
2.2- Marriage and the wo-man.....	32
2.3- The wo-man and the new ideas.....	33
3- Science versus religion.....	37
4- Conclusion	39

1- Introduction

Jude the Obscure is a story of a young boy who was orphaned and raised later by his aunt in a place named Christminster. Jude grows up and develops a certain interest toward studies when he first met a school teacher, Mr. Phillotson. The later nourished his love to the Latin language, and in few years he could write and recite Latin. Jude wanted to carry on his studies in Christminster, but he lacks of money, so he became a stonemason to be able to finance his studies in the well-known university of Christminster. And this the first obstacle. In adulthood, he met a girl, Arabella, who tricked him to be united with him. Jude spent all his savings on that wedding. This girl faked her pregnancy, and after marriage, he found out that she wasn't. Obviously such a lie destroyed Jude's faith in love and marriage, and hence hated women. Such a deed represents women's fear of becoming spinsters and ending up without a husband, which is pessimistically seen.

Arabella couldn't live with Jude, so she left him, leaving with her family to Australia, where she met another man. While Jude returned to his usual work, and got back his dream of accomplishing his studies in Christminster, for he has all the needed capacities. Few years later, he left for Christminster, the dream city, and there he tried to join the University, but unfortunately, he has been denied for he belongs to the low class. Another issue in this story, the class clash, where an ordinary farmer, of low class cannot merge with the upper class though he has the required aptitudes, which destroyed Jude's hopes.

Jude did not return home, however, he stayed there, he found a job near the city, and kept reading, but never gave up on his dreams. In the same city he met his cousin, Susan Bridehead (Sue) and fell in love with her, though his aunt's exclusions to develop a story by that union. Sue loved him back, but she cannot be with him, for it was forbidden in Christianity. Sue, later on, met Mr. Phillotson who helped her taking a job as a teacher trainee in some school, and then asked her for marriage. Sue accepted for the same reason as Arabella, but never loved him back.

Sue was not quiet that traditional woman, she never believed in those outdated customs which made of a woman inferior to man. She has, consequently, developed ideas, new ones. She was a freethinker, a rationalist woman, she was reckless, and does only what she believes it was right, as she has never cared about what people would think about her. These new ideas of freedom of thinking and behaving, nevertheless, were viewed as immoral, and do not represent the real and actual woman, who must always obey to the law of God, and be a good and a role model wife.

Sue ended her marriage with Richard, and moved to Jude's. The both of them lived in an intimate way. Soon they bring five children, but they suffered the societal judgments, as if what they have done was a mere mistake and a sin. As a result, they found themselves stuck in a depraved position, and their jobs were not enough to manage seven members.

Jude the Obscure does not only talk about social problems, it also deals with science versus religion, mainly with Darwinism, evolution, and questioning the existence of God. Jude has always been that religious person, even in hard times, he did not leave his faith in God, on contrary, Sue, does not believe in religion, and maintains the idea of science as the door to deliver humanity from all religious constraints. In addition to that, we encounter the state of self-awareness through reading literature. Sue, for instance, is familiar with history, science, religion, and world cultures especially the Greek and the Roman's. Jude similarly is knowledgeable, but he kept believing in God. Nevertheless, the two would have a reversed life as soon as Jude's son, Little Father Time, kills their children for the purpose to give them a salvation and live freely. It talks openly about the triangulated taboo subjects which consist of politics, religion and sex, and analyses the psychological state, which gave a future perception about whoever chooses to live likewise. All these aspects are seen in our current society.

In this chapter, we will have two parts: *the conflict between the ideal and the social* that deals with class issues, marriage and women, and the second part tackles science and religion.

Yet, this section will help us in the corpus analysis, and will lead us to detect the five codes and a pertinent study of lexias. In addition to that, the Reader-Response theory aids to locate instances where we have seen that *Jude the Obscure* environment resembles the Algerian society, and that the bible has similarities with Quran.

2- The conflict between the ideal and the social

This book is motivated by three important social points. In the beginning it spoke on a political issue, the class problem, the second point tended to talk about marriage and the role of the woman towards her husband, while the third point was about the new woman's ideas, and her rejection to social constraints.

Jude, as an enthusiastic youngster living in an isolated village, had this dream to carry on his studies in a university outside the village, thinking that it was possible even for a simple boy belonging to the low class. On the other hand, Arabella and Sue, who are two dissimilar women, one is looking for marriage and the other appears as a very smart lady with a free spirit, opposes strongly to religious views, and has interests for the Greek and Latin cultures. Both Jude and Sue got involved in a serious intimate relationship which resulted in five children (considered illegitimate). These three snapshots from the story, are a representation of the ideal that clashes with the mere reality we meet in society.

In our society (the Algerian), we encounter a similar problem, where people have the same idealistic view of the world, but as soon as they are in touch with bitter reality, they soon release a state of disappointment and thus frustration. The *wo-man*, as is pictured in the novel and represented by Arabella and Sue, are as well another figure that bears a resemblance to the state of the woman in Algerian society. While some women want to carry their studies and have a better future, others see that marriage is the safest way to cover their lives. Another issue which is religion, though both societies (the Victorian society, and the

actual Algerian society) are merely attached to their religions (Christianity & Islam), but currently some are rejecting some views that do not serve their interests. Perhaps because of an identity issue or a blind imitation to the other society (the influence of media).

2.1- Class division and education

In every society, we find the feeble and the strong, the poor and the rich, the educated and the illiterate, the villager and the civilian etc. and each one has its place in the society, as there is no equality. In *Jude the obscure*, the CLASS issue prevented Jude from following his dreams (to continue his studies), as a result he failed because he was discouraged. Education is a way to leave illiteracy, and that was the weapon to keep the working class remaining in the extremity, the reason why Jude was denied access to the university of Christminster.

This issue of refusing WC people in higher education, is a mere plan to “protect the already over-crowded middle-class professions” (Greg Buzwell, 2015). Jude, during his pursuit to continue his education, he has sent a letter asking for advice to Christminster (Bibliol College) and has emphasised on his state as being a working-man, yet he received a letter stating: *“I venture to think that you will have a much better chance of success in life by remaining in your own sphere and sticking to your trade than by adopting any other course”* (Part Second, Ch. 6). In other words, this answer was to tell that the WC should remain where it is, and it preferable for them to persist being WC.

Christminster is believed to be the fictional name for Oxford. The reason we believe so is that at that time, Oxford university requires a certain acquaintance with Greek and Latin languages, which are taught at expensive schools. Though Jude studied alone these two languages, and could talk and write them in an admirable way, he had no chance to get an access to college and to be set equal with those who graduated from those expensive schools. Yet, on a historical background, Ruskin College in Britain, provided a place in its

establishment for WC people like Jude to gain access to higher education even if their economic mobility was not sufficient.

In a likely similar way, in our society, class division is there, but is invisible. Youngsters want to follow their dreams, realize their projects and develop their competences, however, the lack of facilities, and government deterrence, are obliged to seek in another place, thus to immigrate to other European countries.

2.2- Marriage and the wo-man

While the prevailing theme of the first part was about education and the conflict of the social classes, the second part emphasised upon marriage and the quest to find an appropriate husband. In a society where marriage, though deprived of love is approved over sexual relationships out of wedlock, which is censured by the church and the society itself. In this part of the book, Arabella represented this woman who is seeking for a husband, not to satisfy her feelings, but to secure her life by providing a shelter and financial safety, especially that she has no career. For women like Arabella, to remain single is to endure social appraisals which results in an unhappy life.

Arabella Don a seductive, intelligent but uneducated, manipulative and a born survivor woman, she seduced Jude by throwing a pig's penis at him interrupting his daydream of becoming a Doctor of Divinity. This mal organ is seen as a symbol of sexuality, interpreted by Jude, who was literally diverted from his scholarly quests. To secure her life, Arabella attracts Jude to a trap, they have a sexual intercourse in a barn, and she presupposes a pregnancy (a fake pregnancy). Jude had no choice but to marry her and avoid people's talk. This deed was Arabella's way to attract men – using her sexual desirability.

Obviously, Arabella knows much more about sex than Jude and she lives her sexuality in a good way unlike Jude, which appears in their wedding night, as Jude didn't know how

to proceed and wanted her to switch off the lights, but she refused and did the job all along the night.

Arabella viewed that Jude could not actually secure her life as she desired, though in the beginning he was the perfect candidate. She leaves him, emigrating to Australia and enters in a bigamous marriage for the same reason as when she married Jude. This act is unacceptable, but society did not provide too many options for women in the case of Arabella, especially that she belongs to the working class, and has neither money nor ability to enter a school. In the view of the novelist Margaret Oliphant, Arabella is 'a human pig ... quite without shame or any consciousness of any occasion for shame'. Arabella is an outstanding and determined woman, she is not a complicated character, and her ambitions are quite simple, to find a husband. When she wanted Jude again, she had him, and when he died, she already found another.

MARRIAGE in our society (Algeria) is a crucial deed, for social conventions oblige women to find a husband and to halt social talks and questioning. In Algeria, the woman is not seen as an active producer, in terms of education, but as a housewife, to raise children and obey the male. Sue is the mere reality of the Algerian woman who wants success, but society is stopping her from achieving such an impossible dream. Arabella is the perfect image of the other part of the hypocrite women in our society, who have the same liberal views, but choose to marry for it is the most anodyne way to realize their dreams. The Arabic word "*t'hennat*" which suits perfectly the translation "*she is safe*", is the first sentence we hear when a woman gets married, and is the first path towards halting the woman from being socially dependent without the MAN.

2.3- The wo-man and the new ideas

Unlike Arabella, Sue is financially independent, and can carry her life without seeking a husband to secure it as Arabella thought. Sue is the leading figure of this part, where a woman pursues to change her society by holding upon her ideas and the rejection to every

traditional life between men and women; in other words, she is against those arranged marriages deprived from love, and against the inferiority of women vis-à-vis men, but being an “alien” woman in a masculine society did nothing but driving her to a serious defeat.

The term “New Woman” is defined in the Oxford Reference Dictionary of Literary Terms as “a new generation of active women, who believed in... equal educational opportunities for women, sexual independence, and what they called rational dress”. The fact that a woman, in a conservative society, becomes independent in thought, education, religion and sex would produce a sort of social imbalance.

Sue in the story is supposed to represent the change for the best. But at a moment of her life she had to bow to the laws of nature, that a woman must be with a man, she chooses the first who proposed Mr. Phillotson. The latter was the kind of man all women desired to be with, a perfect job, a good salary, and obviously a “secured” future. She finally marries him, but finds him physically repulsive, and their intimacy was dispossessed of every love and care feeling, it was mostly as a full time job a woman has toward her husband whenever it is night, the role she was born to play; life devoted to husband and raising children.

Sue divorces and joins Jude in an illegitimate liaison. What she has done, whether for divorce or the liaison, was unacceptable, however she persisted on the fact to live her life the way she sees it right. Sue is the only character who attacks marriage and its holiness as seen in that time (Victorian era). She believes marriage was a ‘hopelessly vulgar’ institution, and observes ‘the flowers in the bride’s hand are sadly like the garland which decked the heifers for sacrifice in old times’ (Part Fifth, Ch. 3; Ch. 4). She finds that love cannot remain forever: ‘it is foreign to a man’s nature to go on loving a person when he is told that he must and shall be a person’s lover’ (Part Fifth, Ch. 1). To wit, the vows we tell while marriage will not last forever, and people change over time, so it cannot possibly remain intact for a long time. A good example for that was Jude’s and Arabella’s vows, they promised to love each other for the best and the worst, but when they encountered the first problem, she left to

find what she has always longed for. The same happened with Sue and Phillotson, Sue desires a free life with no constraints, a sexual freedom and a life of knowledge away from the Christian belief system.

The “New Woman” ideas versus the traditional ideas

<u>S.B New Ideas</u>	<u>Traditional Ideas</u>
Freedom of sex Disapproves marriage Rejection of male’s dominance Rejection of every thought about religion Educating women is vital to their freedom Women must own their own money by getting a respectful job	No sexual activity before marriage Marriage is a crucial deed for the continuity of life Women are born to obey husbands and raise children Religion is the right way for a successful woman Women must learn housework and more important things than going to school



Figure One



Figure Two

Figure one: shows the strongly independent Sue with a cigarette, a mannish behaviour which is not tolerated at that time.

Figure two: demonstrates a traditional woman in a Victorian style with her companion, she is fixing his vest and he is looking up to her.

Many were against this outraged situation of the over-independent women, and thought they were degrading the society. Max Nordau, the social critic condemned this new image of women who seek to be detached from men, and found that it was degenerating, for women are taking men's attitudes, becoming masculine, while men were feminizing. In the *Punch* magazine, these women were badly criticized and described as "an embittered, over-educated spinster perpetually stuck on the shelf". The masculine side were not the only who denounced this radical change, women were as well against, among them the novelist Mary Augusta Ward, who wrote under her married name Mrs Humphry Ward. Mary Ward opposed the Feminist revolution, which, in her opinion, represented a threat to marriage and motherhood.

The new woman, whether was admired for being free-spirited, independent, bicycling, intelligent career-minded ideal or precluded and despised as she was a sexually degenerate, abnormal, mannish, chain-smoking, child-hating bore woman, she remained a force for change and a new power that gave birth to the new women's era.

Sexuality is another issue, whether in the Victorian society or the current Algerian society. Religion stops such acts because they challenge religious texts, and thus waiting until marriage to have sex, while this deed may frustrate people, which engenders sexual harassment and violence in the case of boys, and psychological issues as well for both sexes. Girls tend to do that secretly, for society would punish them: the issue of virginity which leads to never getting married again.

3- Science versus religion

A tremendous change occurred during this period, and we cannot deny the fact that the world was preparing to a new era where everything revolutionized, including art, politics, science and the whole society. The main scientific event at that period (late Victorian era) was Darwin's theory that questioned the existence. In 1859, he published a book entitled "*On The Origin of Species*", where he introduced a theory claiming that the species and human beings evolved over the time through the process of natural selection. This new theory shook people's faith, because it has contradicted religion (creation vs evolution), and has ended the idea of idealism and optimism, which drove people into an endless pessimism, because, according to Darwin life is a sort of competition and struggle between species, and is meaningless, therefore it has destroyed the ideal status of romanticism.

The new Darwinian Society turned the latter into an emotionless, battle-field, materialistic and passionless world. Jude, Sue, Mr. Phillotson and Arabella are the greatest example to show the conflict between those two distinct entities. *Jude* appears strongly devoted to romanticism, though life was not clement with him, and nature did not offer him gifts. Despite the fact that Jude was an orphan, and poor and was unable to attain his dreams, his faith and belief that God would never leave him, kept him strong. On the other hand, Sue opposed to religion and preferred to maintain a free-spirited life where a woman can govern her own life and not as stated in the Bible, she was mostly concerned about feminine issues. However, her faith in God was gradually decreasing until her children died, murdered by *Little Father Time*. Sue had this rebellious attitude but she was still troubled by people's thought and society, especially when she bought two pagan statues (Venus & Apollo) and wrapped them in a piece of paper, she had to lie as well to the landlady who seemed to be very Christian, and assumed that they were effigies of saints.

Mr. Phillotson and Arabella represented the materialistic and horrible world deprived of feelings and sensibility. Mr. Phillotson had an easy life, financially independent, educated

and socially approved, yet a feminine touch misses in his life, he uses his financial and sophisticated influences to attract Sue, he knows, however, he is much older than Sue, he still persists on marrying her, offering her the prestigious opportunity to become a teacher, and a wife of a respectful man. Arabella, on her part, had an animal behaviour; her only aim is to fill her animal instinct. A fearless, unvigilant and promiscuous woman, she has no consciousness and shameless, she loves money and does everything to have the easy life she has always dreamed off. Mr. Phillotson, instead of doing his best to make seduce Sue in an appropriate way, he scrupulously leaves Sue, for she carries no feelings towards him. Arabella leaves Jude because he was unable to afford the life she wants, and goes on her trip to find the suitable man, even when Jude died.

The lack of religion and the interference with science made up a chaotic, yet an aware world. Soon the churches would close their doors, and school of thought would be open to release minds. Nevertheless, it is difficult to judge whether the world under the religious reign was better than the scientific which moved deeply not only England but the entire world. The contrast of the two worlds reveals an ambivalence, it is in the same time a rapprochement and a separation of two worlds. This event is “an extraordinary chronological frontier or transit-line”. what Jude reveals between the lines of his story is an obscure world of science and religion, presented in two different and contradicted angles where a human world tries to defy the other, the most spiritual, by deciding that they were not created, questioning the beginning to understand the moment. The themes and the characters, the fictitious places and the borrowed speeches helped constructing this environment set perfectly in a geometrical design, yet we might conclude that the story does not give a choice to decide which world to choose, but gave a panorama of events to tell that this world and the other are like the train rails, working in parallel to offer harmony and perfection.

Conclusion

‘As for Sue and me when we were at our best, long ago – when our minds were clear, and our love of truth fearless – the time was not ripe for us! **Our ideas were fifty years too soon to be any good to us.** And so the resistance they met with brought reaction in her, and recklessness and ruin in me!’ (Part Sixth, Ch. 10), this quote was declared by Jude in the end of the novel, stating that their thoughts were premature and the world was not ready to accept them, as a result they both were defeated and finished by surrendering to social conjectures. They both fail in reaching their goals and the pursuit of happiness.

The issues the characters encountered in the story presupposed an imbalance in their lives, thus they had to buckle to the environment. Sue’s beliefs in the inutility of religion, will became, in the end, a religious person, believing that God punished her by destroying her life and their children’s, while Jude who was a perfect believer and whose faith never shook, ended by leaving God and his faith for it has brought nothing but misery and destruction. In other words, they preferred to blame nature and the higher powers rather than taking responsibility for their acts. On another hand, Arabella and Mr. Phillotson who have always shown compassion for reality and being pragmatic, did not much suffer about life’s inconveniences.

Finally, it is to say that having inconvenient beliefs in a cynical society that does not accept such reckless behaviour would surely end in an auto-destruction of people. Darwinism destroyed the only thing people have ever trusted in, but it has awakened spirits and allowed them to question life without having any guilt. Yet this theory inspired many including the character Jude, who understood it while observing the unfair social selection and the domination of the strongest (Darwin sees that life is a competition):

He saw that his destiny lay not with these, but among the manual toilers in the shabby purlieu which he himself occupied, unrecognized as part of the city at all by its visitors and

panegyrists, yet without whose denizens the hard readers could not read nor the high thinkers think.(139).

Though obscure was his existence and his birth, he illuminated the text by his powerful vision about the world, and became aware of the situation after he was looking upon that holy city when he was young, but appeared otherwise than he thought it was.

Chapter Three

“Inside-the-text” Barthesian Reading of *Jude the Obscure*

Chapter Three: “Inside-the-text” Barthesian Reading of *Jude the Obscure*

1. Introduction.....	43
2. Methodology.....	43
3. The Lexias.....	44
4. Barthesian reading of <i>Jude the Obscure</i>	46
4.1- The title.....	47
4.2- Text 2: At Marygreen.....	47
4.3- Text 2: At Christminster.....	52
4.4- Text 3: At Melchester.....	57
4.5- Resolution.....	59
5. Conclusion.....	60

1. Introduction

The writer died the moment he delivered the text, the reader is born the moment he rewrites that same text. In this study we will try to focus mainly on the reader's interpretation, intensifying the analysis by referring back to the Barthesian five codes and the analysis of lexias, in order to reveal the truth about the story of *Jude the Obscure*.

2. Methodology

While ongoing this section, we will try to go through Hardy's novel *Jude the Obscure*, and attempt to analyse chosen passages following the Barthesian method and the analysis of lexias. Hence, we cannot go through all the instances in which Barthesian codes occur, therefore we choose passages from distinct chapters as illustrative for each case. The objectives of this selection are made purposely as they suit the five codes.

In order to understand that the author is dead throughout the book, and to make of the reader an active co-operator, we decided to work on chapter one (At Marygreen), on chapter two (At Christminster), on Chapter Three (At Melchester), on Chapter four (At Shaston), and on chapter six (At Christminster Again).

This Chapter is divided into two parts, the first part would analyse selected chapters from the novel and practice a Barthesian reading upon it. While the second part would tackle a deep analysis of *Jude the Obscure* based on the analysis of lexias. We conducted a text-based (corpus driven study) and reader-centred study. It is built upon Barthes' concept of DOA, which leads to an application of the Barthesian five codes and the analysis of lexias maintained by the Reader-Response theory (RRT). The Barthesian technique and the RRT helped developing hypotheses. The RRT suggests that the reader, unlike the author, is active vis-à-vis the text, and is a meaning-generator, thus a crucial element towards scrutinising the meaning. The

Barthesian reading technique overlaps five codes and a deep analysis of lexias. Each code is applied on an element of the text (literary and linguistic elements). Yet, these techniques will be applied on *Jude the Obscure* and we will observe whether they are relevant to the obtainment of meaning.

3- The Lexias

Barthes describes lexias as “blocks of signification” and “units of reading” (Barthes, 1973). Lexias are the smaller sections of a larger, master text. Each lexia will contain one or more meanings corresponding to the Five Codes. We therefore cannot go through the analysis of narratives without understanding the lexias.

The text is in form of networks [réseaux], it is a combination of all what we have seen and experienced previously during our life, thus it is a hypertext. In *S/Z*, Barthes does a textual analysis, which is based upon the science of language: semiology or the science of signification. From this point, we may create divergences, which are brought under two broad tendencies: the first deals with all the narratives in the world, thus the analysis under this tendency will be based on particularly on structure or grammar of the narrative. The second minds about the space of the text and what it can bring of multiple meanings, thus when the text is constructed, it is not actually finished, but it is a work in progress rather than a closed one. As a result, we may distinguish structural analysis and textual analysis.

Textual analysis is not about structure, it does not even record a structure, but it tries to produce a “mobile structuration of the text”. If we try to determine what gathers a text together, we are bringing it into an end, and thus impose a limit, thus the textual analysis provokes the text in order to make it explode.

In doing such an analysis, we are going to work on a narrative and try to locate the meanings (not all the meanings however, because the text is an infant unit and nothing can arrest it) according to the forms and codes to which meanings are possible

to fill in. The aim behind this is not to find a correct criticism which is believed is hidden, but to attempt to create, to imagine, and to live the plurality of the text.

The textual analysis of a text must be done through following certain procedures, briefly retained to four elementary rules:

1- To part the text into very short segments, units of reading called by Barthes "lexias, which is not done based on a theoretical frame, but it is an arbitrary product in which the meaning is observed.

2- To attribute a meaning to each lexia, connotative meanings that are associations of other parts, for instance, having a fragment from one chapter and finding its completion in the other chapter and make a significant meaning related to the text. We may also find a description of the character spread all over the many sentences but are related and have one connoted signified.

3- Since the narratives or the texts are not always short stories, we shall measure their length (in theory), then pick what is seen necessary, in other words, we cannot choose blocks of the text, or try to build a plan, as we are not going to go through its explanation (except for the words in an etymological sense). What we will try to do is to picture the text in slow-motion, following its structuration rather than reconstructing it.

4- To show departure in meaning, because over this procedure we may deduce the meaning of the rest of the text, by means of linking to ideas in order to create a sign which will help us generate other signs.

Through applying these rules, and with the help of the five codes, which are part of the lexia, we are not going to mention the author, Thomas Hardy, and we will not make reference to his life or the history to which he is part. However, we will pay a strong attention to cultural transversals, to quotations, and to the effect we encounter while reading is slow motion.

4- Barthesian reading of *Jude the Obscure*

The five codes suggested by Barthes work as a "weaving of voices," however, only three of the five codes “establish permutable, reversible connections, outside the constraint of time (the semic, cultural, and symbolic codes); the other two impose their terms according to an irreversible order (the hermeneutic and proairetic codes)”. Since this text (*Jude the Obscure*) is a classic text, it follows a “tabular” order (logico-temporal), according to Barthes it is a multivalent, which challenges the reversibility of the text; it is incompletely reversible. What blocks the reversibility is the limits that are imposed on the nature of the classic texts. Barthes names the blocks: truth on one hand, and empiricism on the other. Between them comes the modern text.

Yet, we are going to depict the voices of the text that speak to the reader.

Those voices are as follow:

- The voice of Empirics (Proairetic)
- The voice of Person (Semes /Semic)
- The voice of Science (Culture)
- The voice of Truth (Hermeneutisms)
- The voice of Symbol

Each voice will be designated by a generic name, for the *hermeneutic*, it will be HER, for the *Proairetic* ACT, for the *semantic* we shall abbreviate it to SEM, while the *symbolic* would be SYM and lastly the *cultural* is REF.

Though *Jude the Obscure* is not a short story, but a classic Victorian novel, distinguished by its length and tabular system, we will try to impose a Barthesian analysis upon it. Yet, we debut from the beginning, the title of the book, which in itself represents an enigma, a set of questions, why this Jude is obscure. Then we will move further, going deeply into the text, and take some influential passages, sentences and parts of dialogues, which suit our hypotheses.

4.1- The Title

(1) *JUDE THE OBSCURE* * The title raises a question: Who is this *Jude*? Why is he “*The Obscure*”? is he a replication to the biblical *Jude* (the saint of the lost causes)? Is he a religious man? Or perhaps he is a sort of sarcasm?

*These questions have suspended answers (SA), i.e. a delayed or interrupted answer. In the story, Jude is that orphan boy, who is condemned to live in misery from the very beginning when his parents died, to his childhood where he had to work to earn money (no education for he was poor) to the adulthood where two women interrupted his life, until the end as he died. We will designate all the units that comprise an enigma and a question, to which the answer is an equivocation (mixture of truth and snares) or a jamming (acknowledgments of insolubility). Let us call it the hermeneutic code (HER).

(HER. Enigma 1- the story will contain other questions).

4.2- At Marygreen

(2) *A little boy of eleven...* * in the first chapter, paragraph four, a character has been introduced, designated as shy, appearing gentle since he offers to help the schoolmaster. Later addressed as Jude. The next action would be “...*awkwardly opened the book*”, the latter will play a significant role in the story, for the book (ACT) would be denoted with the progress of the story. If we merge the two sentences of the first pages of the book, we will resolve a part of the mysterious Jude: “*A little boy of eleven...awkwardly opened the book*” (HER), this fusion of sentence demonstrates that “*Jude the Obscure*” is concerned with education (SYM).

(3) *Jude* * has an additional meaning, a religious connotation, we believe, thus, that he might be a representation of Jude the Apostle of Jesus, who spent all his life

fighting misery, one of his sayings, *“The faithful must keep going even in difficulty”*, he is yet the saint of the lost causes. The name Jude is a signifier par excellence. Along with the story, we encounter the new character openly struggling with the new world’s concepts (Darwinism) and the religious man he is. We shall call this the symbolic code (SYM), because those two elements are contradictory. As they could be semes (SEM), since *Jude* is a semantic connotation for religion.

(4) *“Jude, my child, don't you ever marry. 'Tisn't for the Fawleys to take that step any more”* * this significant sentence brings forth what could ever happen later. Of course Jude would grow up, meet love and marry, but with such a pessimistic attitude predicted by his aunt, foretells Jude’s life, that the Fawleys can never succeed in marriages. (HER)

(5) *... He had asked who she was... she was his cousin Sue Bridehead* * (Enigma 2-HER). Who was Sue? Who is this mysterious woman introduced to us at the very beginning in a frame with a girlish face, described with a halo(SYM) around. Is she some sort of saint? Another parody which will be revealed later (delayed answer). Sue who is seen as a saint or an innocent girl, will shortly be discovered as Ms. Bridehead, mentioned afore Jude’s cousin, and later his darling. Sue is a woman with precocious ideas and thoughts. She represents the modern woman, a free-spirited lady who rejects social beliefs. Though she is educated in a religious school, she has always been against religion. She is yet the alter ego of Jude. She resembles him in so many things, but unlike Jude, she is a controversial character, and she fears not society. Jude and Sue are like the reflect in the mirror where the left hand appears as the right, though it is the same image (Solving the Enigma2).

(6) *Mr. Phillotson* * introduced in the first sentence of the book: *“The schoolmaster was leaving the village, and everybody was sorry.* * (HER) again what does the

schoolmaster represent to Jude? And to the story? In the same first page, Mr. Phillotson reveals his dreams to Jude: “*You know what a university is, and a university degree?*” (Enigma 3) another enigma in the story, what will happen after this revelation? (delayed answer). Moving forward, schooling, books and education will become significant themes to demonstrate the unfairness of the society, and the class division. For Jude while dreaming of becoming a D.D, the schoolmaster already working on his dreams. Yet, Mr. Phillotson(SYM) represents all what Jude wants to achieve; from the beginning Phillotson represented the idealistic society through education “*It (university degree) is the necessary hall-mark of a man who wants to do anything*”. This sentence gives a foreshadowing to the coming events. (a dreamy spirit will grow in Jude)

As we move further, after being introduced to Christminster by the schoolmaster, Jude has ever been influenced, and all his day, he was trying to collect information about this city.

(7) “*I wanted to know where the city Christminster is, if you please*” * this quest for the city, which is described later as “*the holly city*” or compared to “*the heavenly Jerusalem*” (SYM), is actually a quest for the lost land. (SYM: Haven). The heavenly city symbolizes the lost dreams. When Jude perceives the city on a clear day, he sees a sort of halo surrounding the city, this halo will play a role in this story (the halo is for saints) and Christminster will later appear filthy. Perhaps the halo was a misrepresentation to mislead the reader (SYM). This event will take Jude to build dreams and make plans.

(8) ... *and the one matter which really engaged him was the mental estimate of his progress thus far.* * “*I’ll be D.D before I have done*” ** when Jude finished work, he sat at a tree, thinking about his *future*, he was in a kind of daydream. Jude entered a sort of world where he and only he exists. He seemed in a stream

of consciousness, estimating his loss and gains (SYM), and what he has read and want to achieve: “*I have read the Iliad...*”, “*I have done some mathematics...*” (REF). We shall pose a proairetic reading (ACT). On this level, this code rises suspense, whether Jude is going to fulfil his dream, or not (Enigma 4. ACT: beginning of reverie). Alongside with this instance, Jude is interrupted by a girl named Arabella (SYM), she interrupts him while his daydream, by throwing a pig’s genital organ AND REPEATING constantly “Hoity-toity”. This interruption is not haphazard: it will construct the story along with rhetorical lines: idealism vs society, success vs failure, romanticism vs pragmatism, and life vs death. Arabella is a semantic connotation that represents the bitter reality to which Jude is an antithesis (being romantic) (SEM). Arabella gives a foreshadowing to what will happen to Jude (a partial answer).

(9) *Phoebe silvarumque potens Diana, Carmen Saeculare* * The sentence is proclaimed by *Jude* as he becomes sixteen and well advanced in Latin language. He repeats this sentence of Horace from the *Carmen Saeculare* or the Secular Hymen, which means in its translation “*Phoebus and mistress of the woods, Diana*”. This passage exhibits two gods’ names, Phoebus or Apollo and Diana. The use of this quotation is according to Barthes the Cultural code (REF). it a religious code, however it is a pagan literature as Jude called it. The sentence does not stop here; it foretells what will happen later. The existence of Diana and Apollo in the early chapters, though pronounced in Latin, will be mentioned by Sue in another Chapter (the statuettes). (REF. Art. Paganism)

Diana ** (SEM) is the goddess of the moon, virginity and Childbirth. Apollo is a healer and a god protector from evil. Those two figures are used twice in the story, by Jude and Sue. They represent hope.

(10) *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ* * (HER) this sentence was launched by *Jude* before he was interrupted by his thinking directed to *Arabella*. It means “*the New Testament*” in Greek. Why the reading of the new testament would be interrupted by a woman? For a religious and an ambitious man like *Jude*, it was impossible to imagine such a deed would happen with the flow of the story, but since *Jude* is an unpredictable character, we are confronted to surprises.

(11) “*I want the house to myself. He’s shy*” * (ACT) though this sentence seems direct and a normal action, it lays the ground for what will happen later. A suspense, are *Arabella* and *Jude* going to have something intimate while they are alone? In case they do, what are the consequences? This desire to be alone, and the organ she has thrown, explains why *Arabella* is seen as an animal, not just in her behaviour, but during sex too. “*I want*” has another layer, a connotation to the extreme desire, the *I* is a selfish prelude to *Arabella’s* personality, and *want* indicates how *Arabella* is determined to get what she wants regardless the circumstances.

(12) “*I am part egg-shell*” * “*why do you do such a strange thing?*” ** “*...I suppose it is natural for a woman to want to bring live things into the world*” *** WHY would *Arabella* carry an egg while she wants *Jude* to touch her? (ACT) the next sentence, again introduced by an *I* and a *want*, but most importantly is the “*to bring live*”, the latter expresses the duty of women, to bring forth a child, infancy and women’s desire is expressed through the word “*want*” and gives a hint to what will happen later. *Arabella* tricks *Jude* by deceiving him with a false pregnancy, the previous sentence removes mystery (solved enigma 5).

(13) “*Have gone to my friends. Shall not return*” * a note left by *Arabella*, leaving *Jude*. Was he happy? Released? Is she going to return? (HER: Enigma 6) this is the enigma or the delayed answer. *Jude* “*leaves the key where she can find it, in*

case she returns” (ACT) he expects she comes back, a certain hope is expressed through this action, but it gives a deeper image to Jude, that he was a person who gets attached. He was an orphan, adopted by his aunt (deprived of love and affection), that is why in the beginning he compared himself to “*the little birdies*” and felt regret when the pig was slaughtered. Though Jude regretted marrying Arabella, he somehow felt abandoned when she deserted him (SEM: care vs carelessness).

4.2- At Christminster

(14) “*Christminster*” * the name of the city Jude was dreaming to live and follow his dreams. This city was described as the *heavenly Jerusalem*, (ACT). Let us depict the name of the city: **Christ**: a representation of Christianity, and of Jesus Christ, this could be a parody (SEM: religion), followed by **minster**: a monastic church. Monastic is a place where religious people live. *Christminster* represents the religious world, governed by the church, but in this city we find ancient medieval buildings set in streets under biblical names, like **Beersheba** (SYM: contradiction). The name gives a sort of peace and holiness, but what is inside gives another image: antithesis: paganism vs religion. We shall perceive the reading to discover whether this city is as holy as its name indicates.

(15) “...took a room in a suburb nick-named ‘**Beersheba**’” * Christminster was seen in beginning as the “*Heavenly Jerusalem*”, and in the city some places take the names of the same as in Jerusalem (SEM: a religious connotation) here a passage back shadows to what is said previously, thus Beersheba, a city in Palestine, written in Hebrew, is to raise suspense upon this city (Christminster), and to ask a question about the holiness of the latter. The suburb under such a name is used sarcastically and ironically, for there is no reason to give a minor street the name of a city. However, **Beersheba** can be used to demonstrate it is not

important, because it is the cyber capital of Israel, as it can be used to diminish the importance of the capital (sarcasm) or to predict what will be discovered later about Christminster.

(16) *“It was a windy, whispering, moonless night. To guide himself he opened under a lamp a map he had brought. The breeze ruffled and fluttered it, but he could see enough to decide on the direction he should take to reach the heart of the place.”* * this passage gives a hint to how Jude was lost. The *map* is to symbolize guidance, and the *wind* that prevented him from reading the map is to foretell the obstacles Jude will meet later in Christminster. Nevertheless, the part *“but he could see enough to decide on the direction”* predicts the denouement in the end of the chapter. Jude will make a crucial decision that would shift his life and the others’. (SEM: guidance, obstacles, and resolution).

(17) *“...he came up to the first ancient mediaeval pile that he had encountered”* * this sentence solves the enigma of being lost. Jude, after many turnings, he came back to the first place he was in. (HER). The delayed answer to the question of coming back is resolved. *“the first ancient mediaeval pile”* is a wonderful connotation to return to the origin, after so many years of wandering. (Note that Jude was thought to be a representation of *Jude the Apostle*, and he somehow resembled his life: this sentence gives a good metaphor to resolve the enigma 1) (HER).

(18) *“the home of lost causes,”* * an allegory that sends us back to enigma 1, in which Jude is a replication to *Jude the Apostle*, who was the saint of the lost causes (HER). However, it can be a representation of the *Lost Land*, talking about Christminster(SYM).

(19) Later, Jude was apostrophizing upon the city, where he was a new comer:
“Beautiful city! so venerable, so lovely, so unravaged by the fierce intellectual life

of our century, so serene! ... Her ineffable charm keeps ever calling us to the true goal of all of us, to the ideal, to perfection." * another question would come up (HER: Enigma 7). Is it a misleading to the encountering of the city? Shortly before, Christminster was mourned by being described as the city of the lost causes, and after that, Jude talks about the virtues of the city.

(20) *"Sir, I may be wrong, but my impression is that my duty towards a country threatened with famine requires that that which has been the ordinary remedy under all similar circumstances should be resorted to now, namely, that there should be free access to the food of man from whatever quarter it may come...."* * an anonymous voice alleged these words, (SYM: ideal vs reality). This passage shows a contradiction and a prediction to the fake idealistic state of Christminster. what Jude was believing about the city and what the voice said about the famine people were enduring in the society which left them hopeless, presages a bad forthcoming.

(21) *"...Deprive me of office to-morrow, you can never deprive me of the consciousness that I have exercised the powers committed to me from no corrupt or interested motives, from no desire to gratify ambition, for no personal gain."* * (REF). the completing words of the anonymous voice sounds much like a proverb which symbolizes strength and tells to never give up. It is also to raise consciousness about the unfairness of the society, and the class issue which people suffer from in England.

(22) *"How shall we excuse the supine inattention of the pagan and philosophic world, to those evidences [miracles] which were presented by Omnipotence? ..."* * a question to be probed here, the speaker seems to be against pagan literature, it is believed to mislead devout minds. (ACT) why would this question be raised at this part of the story, by this poet who was previously speaking about famine?

(delayed answer). The mystery is about this question, which prophecies about the coming events. A solution to a phantom problem is under quest, as if it predicts that same problem before it happens. Who is going to sin? Or who has sinned? Jude has already read philosophies, but it did not affect him. Who is next? (HER). The other issue we encounter in this rhetorical question is about the contradiction of the society. Let us reformulate it: how can we justify the non-existence of a creator in contrast to the religious facts presented by the authority (here the church)? (SYM: science vs religion).

(23) *How the world is made for each of us!*

.

And each of the Many helps to recruit

The life of the race by a general plan. * (REF)

A poem, said to be *optimistic*, questions life and the big divine plan designed for each of us. This poem tells more than literature, for it is influenced by Darwinism (science), but it contradicts what Darwin said, that life is haphazard. The poem (written by Browning) talks about the inevitable destiny, as each event, each person we meet and each place we go to, is not arbitrary, therefore, we are not responsible for what could happen to us, but we are responsible for our actions, and what our experience could ever bring to us at the instant moment. It somehow brings faith and warmth to lost hopes, that God did not forget his creatures and has planned big things for them. (REF: religion. Absolute devotion to God)

(24) “*wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way*” * a sentence taken from Psalms 119:9. (REF) Jude is attracted by this verse from the Bible, just at the moment he enters the church. The verse is written in old English, extracted from the old testament, and means “*By what means can a young man purify his way, so*

as to keep it according to Thy word?" in fact, it was not random that Jude meets with this verse. Previously, Jude was lamenting his past life, and started regretting his acts when he met Sue, and fell in love with her. He, yet, know that he cannot marry her for he was already married to Arabella. The introductory sentence from the Psalms precedes Jude's thoughts and feeling guilty, thus it introduces the next event of his life.

(25) *"How much are these two?" she said, touching with her finger the Venus and the Apollo* * (SEM) we previously mentioned Venus (the roman representation of the Greek goddess Diana) and Apollo in the poem read by Jude when he was just sixteen. We meet those two figures again, however this time, something else will happen that leads to a question, *"What is it?"* ** asked the mistress of the house where Sue lives.

"Two saints?"

"Yes."

"What ones?"

"St. Peter and St.--St. Mary Magdalen."

The statuettes are those of Venus and Apollo, but why did Sue lie about the figures? In other words, why did she hide the truth? (HER: Enigma 8). Sue is fond of art, she loved to say they were of Greek and Roman gods, but she feared the reaction of the lady, Miss Fontover, who was a religious person. (SYM: idealism vs realism). What reality demonstrates, is different from what Sue dreams of. What this conversation hides, is that Sue has different views that contradict her society, but she is not ready to divulge them yet, for her thoughts are premature or precedes her time.

(26) *"Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Dominum et vivificantem..."** in a barn, Jude gets drunk and tells those words to a bunch of drunk, uneducated people from the working class, who were mocking him, for they have not understood his words. We will not try to explain the Latin passage, what is mostly important is the event.

The misunderstanding of the folk, and the pronunciation of such elegant and high class words in a lame place symbolizes how the society refuses to give opportunity to the working class youngsters, though they have all the required qualifications to enter a university. However, the mere reality imposes such behaviour. (SYM: class issues).

4.3- At Melchester

The third chapter is curiously prophetic, unlike the other two, this one brings about the events from the beginning of each part. Each word in the beginning of the five parts is whether a time indicator or a contemplation and it is introductive to what will happen next while the events continue. It is perhaps like the part after the headline in a newspaper.

(27) “*It was a new idea*” * the chapter opens at this sentence, a new era, it symbolizes perhaps. The key word would probably be NEW (Enigma 9) it is in a sense of an equivocation (a partial truth). What is this new idea? What does it stand for? A growing suspense upon this sentence, for bursting such words in the beginning must signify something, perhaps a start(HER). Later in the chapter, we may notice the clash of ideas between science and religion, between the growth of the working class self-consciousness and the collapse of faith, and between the NEW woman and the traditional conventions. Even Jude started to read new things

(28) “*TO-MORROW is our grand day*” * (SEM). Tomorrow is written in capital letters, separating TO from MORROW by a hyphen. First, the word is written in Middle English, and second, the capitalization of the word must be significant and important to the section. Those two remarks will later help us predict the coming events. Yet, the word *tomorrow* is to talk about a certain future, it is not necessary to say that tomorrow means the next day. Tomorrow may symbolize hope, as it

may symbolize the birth of Newness. Perhaps in the life of Jude and Sue, or in the life of people. The use of Middle English in the word to-morrow (note that tomorrow will not be used in its real meaning, we shall use its connotation: referring to hope and newness), if we go to the etymology of *tomorrow*, we encounter that the hyphenated form was introduced only in the nineteenth century and continued to the early twentieth century, while in the previous years, this word was unhyphenated. (SEM: Newness).

(29) “*JUDE’s reverie was interrupted*” * the key words in this introductory sentence of the third part are *reverie* and *interrupted*. As in the beginning his reverie were interrupted by a woman, the same event occurs again. (SYM: halt dreams)

(30) “*Now could I get out without anybody seeing me?*” * in the fifth part of the chapter, Sue wants to get out as she entered before. She spent the night in a man’s lodge, though nothing happened between them, she still fears about her reputation, though she is a careless woman, society chains her to its boundaries. This sentence sentences Jude’s and Sue’s relationship to an inevitable end. A prediction was maintained at the beginning of this part, Sue has unpredictable behaviour, she comes without asking, and she leaves the way she got in (ACT: is she going to leave).

(31) *TIDINGS* * the first word, which means news. What kind of news are going to come up this time? A single word tells about this part. Later when we read the part, we can see that Sue gets engaged, and Arabella comes back (Enigma 6: resolved), and announces to Jude that he is a father.

(32) “*Jude returned*” * these two words match with the first words at Christminster when he was looking for his way. One distinct feature and another proof that Jude

is a representation of *JUDE the Apostle*, always looking for his way, and finishes by coming back to his first place. (HER)

4.4- Results

As we have done with the first most eloquent chapters, we move to talk about the three remaining ones. The next chapter titled *At Shaston*, the following named *At Aldbrickham And Elsewhere*, and the last is *At Christminster Again*. We have arrived to construct the following events of the story based only on the significant sentences of the first three chapters, the rest is the denouement. What will happen later is already predicted through characters' words, actions and situations, proverbs, religious connotations, and places.

Conclusion

The five codes and the lexias allowed us to go through the text, picturing significant sentences that paved the way to a slow reading, and construct the end of the story when detecting the merged signs in universal quotes, poems, sayings and religious canons. The codes transcended us to a “d  j  -l  ” (the already read), or a d  j  -vu, as we go slowly in the story, we encounter passages that have already been read, or seen, which helped discover what could happen to Jude before reading the full passage, sometimes we find that hidden in a name, which we call the hermeneutic code, other times in empirics or sequences of suspense, which appear to fit our hunch or to mislead us before revealing the full truth, and the semes helped us denote the connotative meanings, as for the symbolic code, which was hardly distinguished from the semantic, because Barthes was not very clear about its definition, aided to construct the sense through antitheses. The last code, which had the privilege to be name the *cultural code*, is the science or body of knowledge, units, passages that do not belong to a single person but to the world’s knowledge, among the cultural code, we could distinguish the scientific code, the rhetorical code, and the metalinguistic code. This code reformulated the mind by making it travel through the world’s popular sayings. Nevertheless, we may find one sentence that often refers to two codes simultaneously, or more, without the ability to choose over, which was difficult and challenging in the same time.

General Conclusion

General Conclusion

All our thoughts and ideas are not merely a self-product, but a general product made of multiple combinations of cultures and life experiences. When we desire to put those words black on white, the means and the tools that lead us to chain up the voices that speak in our heads, are not personal possessions, they do not belong to us. Henceforth, our study is conducted to show that we may read a book without mentioning the author, we thus come to exclude his authority upon our story, just as Barthes intended in his "*Death of the Author*".

Writers are declared dead by this philosopher and critique the moment he avowed that the reader is more lively than ever when the event occurs. To Barthes, the writer exists to create something out of everything, but his work stops right at the point where he divulges the work. It is no more his, it is the public's. In fact, this author or as Barthes names him the *scriptor*, to avoid any divine reference, dies when writing begins.

Were the writers dead, then to whom we would attribute the writing? We are, hence, aware that readers cannot exclude the author of a certain book they prefer, furthermore, when we go to buy a book, a story or demand a novel in a store, we cannot choose randomly just by taking a look at the cover and the title. The urge to know about the writer grows even more if we LIKE the story, and we would ask to read more of HIS stories. We cannot, for instance, read *Finnegan's Wake* or *The Waste Land*, without speaking of how much the author was brilliant to put such ideas in a such genius way.

Accordingly, Barthes does not completely kill the writer; he essentially dispossesses him from the virtue to access the world of interpretation, for this asset is reserved for the reader. If we were to refer to the scriptor constantly, then why readers would be troubled to know the author's intentions, they would just ask him directly, or at least those writers would devote a section in the end of the book to talk about their intentions, feelings and what they

meant by that word or that style. Yet, do we really need the author during the process of writing? Does the absence of the author affect the reader's understanding?

The afore mentioned questions, have been hardly answered, for as readers, we are in constant worry whether our understanding fits the writer's intents. Thus by Barthes, we have been set free, as he stated that the text or the narrative is in an infinite circle of meanings, and the readers would become the new authors by adding their own personal background. The writer gives part of his experience, part of his life, a partial part of him is in the text, the reader on the other hand as he goes through the process of reading, he is surely not with the author to guide him through the lines, he would rather use his intellect, his personality and his psychological state would play games on his mind in order to understand things beyond the author's interpretation.

To have a text orphaned or deprived from its origin, let us start from zero point, freeze the meaning and start all over again. It is reader time. This process requires a set of procedures, therefore Barthes developed his own reading techniques, where he proposes five codes that are determined by lexias (units of sentences). We therefore shall briefly mention, the hermeneutic code, the voice of truth, the proairetic code, the voice of empirics, the semantic or the semes which represent the voice of the elements of the story including persons, places and time, and the most influential code would be the *cultural* code which represents science or body of knowledge, recognized by the readership population as worldwide and general, and lastly the voice of symbols that is embodied by the symbolic code.

These code work together, and are not positioned, while the analysis of *Jude the Obscure*, in an organized way, they be shifted or displaced according the interaction of the elements of the story defined by the lexias. It not as well obdurate to find two codes related to one lexia and carry the same meaning. The aim of this analysis is not to reconstruct the story,

or to rewrite it, but to present a model of reading, that may differ at a second reading at some time of our life.

Together with Barthesian technique, we used the Reader-Response Theory to add personal effects, and to go deeply into the million layers found in *Jude the Obscure*, in order to identify the sense and meaning behind the use of lexis, grammar, graphology and all what can make of a text one. Which lead us to the second chapter, where we could extract themes laying behind characters' life, characteristics, attitudes towards one another. As a result, we were able to distinguish two main parts: the conflict between the reality and the ideal, and the conflict between religion and science (Darwinism).

Thus, Barthes' codes allowed us to enter *Jude the Obscure* text which is viewed as a black hole, and could take instances to be analysed in a slow motion way, thus the lexias extracted from the first three chapters, have provided the ability to predict the three next ones, by placing the segments in a way they give us a new picture of the story. Then, we tended to apply **RRT**, in order to define meaning according to our personal understanding, using Rosenblatt and Fish's process in approaching the reader's personal feelings towards the text.

Consequently, we could exclude Hardy, the author, from our attempt to interpret meaning, though the text is a readerly (classic) and very long, for it constitutes of six parts and each part contains several chapters, which presented a challenge. We, however, could not go through all the instances in the text, for it is impossible to put every sentence and lexias under study, so we have chosen mainly the most important and influential ones.

As a final point, we would like to remind that this research presents an analysis of *Jude the Obscure* according to Barthes textual approach, in which the author finds his own death which announces the birth of the reader. We, therefore, have used approaches related to the author, the reader and the text to define meaning. Consequently, we deduced hypotheses

that have served as a basis to discover whether Barthes' textual analysis is relevant to deduce the meaning while reading all the literary works, and whether his technique of the five codes, when applied on a literary text, can be used through the analysis, or just part of the codes is relevant to analyse a story. As a result, we are likely to say that the theory under investigation was relevant on *Sarassine* (the first work on which it was applied), on *Wuthering Heights* and it has shown an effective result on *Jude the Obscure*. which would help the reader and the literature learner to be acquainted with the Barthian analysis, and expect its complete use among literature students.

Glossary

Glossary

Cultural Code: The Cultural Code refers to anything in the text which refers to an external body of knowledge such as scientific, historical, and cultural knowledge. In the starred reading, the Cultural Code is represented as REF.

Equivocation: partial or incomplete answer.

Jammings: openly acknowledge that there is no answer to a problem. (acknowledgment of insolubility)

Hermeneutic Code: The Hermeneutic Code contains anything in the text that is mysterious or unexplained, usually leading to questions which the reader needs answered. In the starred reading, the Hermeneutic Code is represented as HER.

Lexia: Barthes describes lexias as “blocks of signification” and “units of reading” (S/Z 13). Lexias are the smaller sections of a larger, master text. Each lexia will contain one or more meanings corresponding to the Five Codes.

Method: A special form of procedure adopted in any branch of mental activity, whether for the purpose of teaching and exposition, or for that of investigation and inquiry.

Plurality: The fact or condition of denoting, comprising, or consisting of more than one; plural meaning.

Proairetic Code: The Proairetic Code contains sequential elements of action in the text. Like the Hermeneutic code, Proairetic elements add suspense to the text. In the starred reading, the Proairetic Code is represented as ACT.

The Readerly Text: Barthes argues that most texts are readerly texts. Such texts are associated with classic texts that are presented in a familiar, linear, traditional manner, adhering to the status quo in style and content. Meaning is fixed and pre-determined so that

the reader is a site merely to receive information. These texts attempt, through the use of standard representations and dominant signifying practices, to hide any elements that would open up the text to multiple meaning. Readerly texts support the commercialized values of the literary establishment and uphold the view of texts as disposable commodities.

Semantic Code (semic/semes): The Semantic Code refers to elements of the text that carry referential, extra-literal meaning. Elements of the Semantic Code are called Semes. In the starred reading, the Semantic Code is represented as SEM.

Seme: A seme is an element of the Semantic Code. The seme has a connotative function in the text. It has an extra layer of meaning in addition to its literal meaning.

Sign: The sign is derived from the relationship between the signifier and the signified.

Signified: That part of a sign which is stood for by the signifier.

Signifier: The material part of a sign that stands for the signified.

Snares: this word was used by Barthes in *S/Z*, and he means by snares, the situation where the truth is deliberately avoided

The Writerly Text: By contrast, writerly texts reveal those elements that the readerly attempts to conceal. The reader, now in a position of control, takes an active role in the construction of meaning. The stable meaning, or metanarratives, of readerly texts is replaced by a proliferation of meanings and a disregard of narrative structure. There is a multiplicity of cultural and other ideological indicators (codes) for the reader to uncover. What Barthes describes as “ourselves writing” is a self-conscious expression aware of the discrepancy between artifice and reality. The writerly text destabilizes the reader’s expectations. The reader approaches the text from an external position of subjectivity. By turning the reader into the writer, writerly texts defy the commercialization and commodification of literature.

Bibliography

- Barthes, R (1967). "Death of the Author". Aspen no. 5-6. 6-6.
- (1973). "S/Z". (Miller. R, trans.). Paris : Edition du Seuil.
- (1973). "The Pleasure of the Text".(Miller, R. trans). Paris : Edition du seuil.
- Birch, D. (1989). "Language, Literature and Critical Practice". London & NY: Routledge.
- Burke, S. (1998). "The Death and Return of the Author": Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Davor Džalto. (2015). "Art: A brief history of absence (From the Conception and Birth, Life and Death, to the Living Deadness of Art)".
- Fish, S. (1970). "Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics" (Tompkins, Reader-Response Criticism).
- Ford. B. (1982). The New Pelican guide to English literature: 6. From Dickens to Hardy, England:
- Foucault, F. (1969). "What is an author?" trans. Joseph V Harari, in *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*, ed. David Lodge (London and New York: Longman 1988). All references are to this edition.
- Gallop. J. (2011). *The Deaths of the Author: Reading and Writing in Time*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Gagnier. R. (1991). (as cited in *Wolfreys' Critical Keywords in Literary and Cultural Theory*, 2004)

Goldstein. P. Reader-Response Theory: Death of The Author and Criticism. P. (2005). (Ed II). The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hardy, T. (1995). "Jude the Obscure". London: Wordsworth Classics

Lodge, D., & Wood, N. (2000). Modern criticism and theory: A reader. Harlow, U.K.: Longman.

Trimbur, J. (Spring, 2000). "Agency and the Death of the Author: A Partial Defense of Modernism". Vol. 20, No. 2 Journal of Advanced Composition.

Wolfgang. I. (1972-78). The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Webography

Buzwel. G. (2015). An introduction to Jude the Obscure. See more at:

<http://www.bl.uk/romantics-and-victorians/articles/an-introduction-to-jude-the-obscure>[13/04/2016]

Felluga, D. (2011) "Modules on Barthes: On the Five Codes." Introductory Guide to Critical Theory. Purdue U. [21/04/2016]. See more at:

[Http://www.purdue.edu/guidetotheory/narratology/modules/barthescodes.html](http://www.purdue.edu/guidetotheory/narratology/modules/barthescodes.html)

Holland. N. (1975). Reading and Identity. See more at:

<http://users.clas.ufl.edu/nholland/rdgident.htm>. [12/03/2016]

Margaret Oliphant, 'The Anti-Marriage League', Blackwood's Magazine, 159 (January 1896). - See more at: <http://www.bl.uk/romantics-and-victorians/articles/an-introduction-to-jude-the-obscure#sthash.Ci2vu7EE.dpuf>. [18/04/2016]

Robinson. A. 2011. An A to Z of Theory | Roland Barthes: Death of the Author. -see more at: <https://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-barthes-4/> . [25/12/2015]

Willette. J. (2013). Roland Barthes: "The Death of the Author". -see more at: <http://www.arthistoryunstuffed.com/roland-barthes-the-death-of-the-author/> . [15/02/2016]