

**Ideology As a Social Process in Hamlet .(CDA)**

مروة عبید علي

جامعة كربلاء / كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية

قسم اللغة الانكليزية



## Section One

### 1.1. Introduction

Karl Heinrich Marx (1818–1883), was a famous German political, philosophical, and economic theorist. His theories and ideas influenced the modern world history and he was known as the founder of the Marxist tradition which has strongly criticized capitalism. Marx, with the collaboration of Friedrich Engels (1820–1895), tried to “produce a critique of capitalist society based on a materialistic conception of history”. He examined history to discover the main forces for all exploitation, oppression, and injustice that he saw in the modern capitalist system. Finally, he concluded that “the dialectic of history was motivated by material forces”. Through surveying history in search of truth, Marx noticed William Shakespeare’s plays. “The period from 1848 to 1852 saw Marx engaged both in a detailed analysis of French politics and the rise of Louis Bonaparte and in intense reading of Shakespeare”. He read Shakespeare’s plays to create his own philosophy and criticism and wanted to show the negative effects of modern capitalism and its false ideologies through representation of commodification. According to Christian Smith, Marx, in his writings, quoted from or alluded to Shakespeare’s plays frequently. (Abrams, H. 2005, p.40)

Therefore, Kenneth Muir did not exaggerate when he stated that “Shakespeare was one of the spiritual godparents of the Communist Manifesto”. Since Marx was influenced by Shakespeare, through a Marxist reading of Shakespeare’s Hamlet and Merchant of Venice, one can perceive Marxist critique of class oppression and commodification in them. This paper reveals how Marxist theories can be applied on Shakespeare’s plays. It is noticeable that class struggle, avarice for power,

and victimization of the weaker ones are among Shakespearian dramatic themes. So, it can be perceived that although Shakespeare lived many years before Marx, his society was undergoing radical changes and class conflict, social disparity, and materialistic tendencies were surging up in it. "Twentieth-Century historians such as R. H. Tawney and Christopher Hill have demonstrated that a profound economic, social, and cultural

revolution was taking place in England during Shakespeare's lifetime". In Shakespeare's time, the feudal system of land-ownership was common and people tried hard to make themselves free from their monarchic-fascist oppressors. (Bloom, H., 2010, p.67)

One of the main parts of Marxist criticism concerns class struggle and since class distinctions and class struggle can be perceived throughout history and even literary genres, one can reasonably conclude that Marxist criticism is applicable to Shakespeare's dramas. Shakespeare was born in a middle-class family and his father "was a citizen of some prominence who became an alderman and bailiff, but who later suffered financial reverses". Shakespeare, whose father was a commoner, saw the corruption and immorality of the ruling class and aristocracy and their oppressive behavior towards the middle and lower classes and he tried to have the depiction of the different social classes and the struggle between them as one of his dramas' themes. In this paper, two of Shakespeare's well-known dramas, Hamlet and Merchant of Venice, a tragedy and a comedy respectively, are analyzed to shed light on the way Shakespeare's dramas portray class oppression, conflict and social inequality in view of Marxist theories. (Eagleton, T. 2008, p.31)

In Shakespeare's play Hamlet, He is the Prince of Denmark but does not act entirely like a superior to those around him. Hamlet's best friend,

Horatio, is not directly referred to having any position and while his love interest, Ophelia, a daughter of a lord, is still distinctly lower class to Hamlet. Despite the class difference, Hamlet sees these people as peers rather than talking down to them. The idea of preying on a lower class, wanting to be treated equal and the same, and lastly Hamlet is repressed along with the lower-class by societal structures reflects Marxist theory and social class theory. To start, Marxist theory is shown by Claudius heavily preying on the lower class. Marx believed social relations were directly affected by society's relation to material objects. The relation may not be entirely clear, but fetishes of money are fictional values that work to mask social inequalities. Marx explicitly is demonstrating a division between the human thoughts and the products that they create. The way I see this being important in Hamlet is that each character has a unique identity, but

particular characters such as Claudius overlook those around him by leveraging his physical commodities. In this quote shows the commodities that the upper-class or people of power in Hamlet demonstrate directly prey on of those below them. Claudius clearly speaks about the lower class as below him and does respect their leniency with Hamlet. The obvious gap here is also interesting as the public is siding with Hamlet, who would likely be considered to be of the upper class, preying on those below him. Claudius speaks on his frustration regarding the common people siding with Laertes, showing his continued disregard for the opinion of the masses. These are examples of how Claudius uses his position of power to control the masses as he attempts to strategically use these opinions to prey on people in lower classes. (Ferber, M. 1990, p.43)

Second, the idea that Hamlet is just trying to be treated equally is easily shown through Marxist theory. Marx further develops his thoughts on



commodities of production, seeing clear divisions economically in society. In this quote, Hamlet makes a direct point to reinforce Horatio as his equal. As prince of Denmark, Hamlet does not need to do this, but he seems to wholeheartedly want to be treated on a similar level with a lower-class. While Horatio is by no means of extreme poverty or anything of the sort, he still clearly is not royalty. Shakespeare makes a point not to define any position for him or give the background that demonstrates him to be upper-class. This being considered, Hamlet still cannot fully express the feelings of people below him in class as his upbringing never fully allows him to embrace a lower-class identity. Hamlet just wants to be seen as equal, which he shows through not fully understanding and realizing his class, which is why he believes he is equal even having power. Lastly, Louis Althusser provides additional ideas in Marxist theory that explain how Hamlet is repressed along with the lower-class by societal structures. Althusser's RSAS and ISAs are essential in framing Hamlet's repression. ISAs organically form in societies as material institutions that support rituals and practices to keep society in line. Marxist theory and social class theory are shown through the idea of preying off a lower class, wanting to be treated equal and the same, and lastly, Hamlet is repressed along with the lower-class. Hamlet both reinforces many examples of Marxist theory but also

challenges the reader to look deeper into how Hamlet acts unexpectedly. (Hatlen, B. 1980, p.91)

## 1.2. Problem of the Study

There is often a problem of overlap between two-part lists with the textual function of contrast, which is another textual-conceptual function discussed by Jeffries (2010). The two items of the list may be totally different and contrast each other, and in this case, readers should again

depend on the pragmatic meaning of such lists.

### 1.3. Research Question

What is the ideology in Hamlet?

What is the social situation of

Hamlet? How does Marxist

theory apply to Hamlet?

### 1.4. Aims of the Study

The aim of this research paper is to prove William Shakespeare's most popular literary type Hamlet as a superfluous hero, because he resembles strikingly and astonishingly in his character with the superfluous heroes of the nineteenth-century Russian, American and the other European novels.

## Section Two: Methodology

### 2.1. Ideology

The central topic of critical analysis research is ideology. The term ideology was coined in 1796 by the French philosopher Anotoine Destutt de Tracy. It was intended as a science, the science of ideas, like the other sciences. Definition of ideology is "those ideas that are shared by a community or society are a very important aspect of the world that we live in, and they are, of course, communicated, reproduced, constructed and negotiated through language." That language can be designated as "the primary instrument through which ideology is transmitted, enacted and reproduced." Thus, ideologies are these untouched thoughts or ideas that a certain group of people hold. Partly agrees with Jeffries but adds more and defines the term 'ideology' as "systems of thoughts and ideas that

represent the world from a particular perspective and provide a framework for organizing meaning, guiding actions, and legitimating positions.”(Hodges, 2015,p.53)

However, for ideology is “an important means by which dominant forces in society can exercise power over subordinate and subjugated groups”. As noticed above, some present linguists’ ideology as a negative concept and others describes it as a neutral term used regularly. In other words, people assign to ideology the kind of meaning they intend; ideologies are not necessarily bad or negative. For example, there are racist ideologies as well as anti-racist ones. Observes that no text is ideology-free nor is it objective; all texts must have specific values or shared norms attached within, and they cannot be separated from the social norms and processes that these norms and values contribute to maintaining, thus written and spoken language is the process through which these ideologies are reproduced, passed around and possibly changed. When it comes to detecting ideology, ideology can be detected in texts; the analyst may begin by looking at textual features and then explaining and interpreting those features. This includes studying the underlying ideologies through the linguistic features of the text, exploring certain bias aspects and presuppositions within texts and, in some cases exploring intertextuality, and relating texts to readers’ and speakers’ experiences and beliefs (Clark, 1995, p.78).

Another thing to point out is that some ideologies are stronger than others and might be dominant ideologies. That dominant ideologies operate as a tool for preserving unidentical power relations in society, viz. these ideologies cause the power relation chain. This can be expressed by language. Ideologies came to be due to a process known as naturalization. Naturalization is a process through which dominant ideologies become

inherent in everyday discourse as they become justified as natural, sound suppositions about how things are and should be (Simpson, 1993: 5). When ideologies are seen as common sense, they are then naturalized. People are often not aware of the order systems that control their social interaction when a process of naturalization occurs. There are instances of naturalization that people are not aware of. Gives an example of such a naturalization where, in the ‘natural’ case, a patient has to follow the doctor’s advice regardless of that patient’s social status or rank because simply the doctor knows more about medicine and diseases. (Fairclough, 1989, p.2)

## 2.2. Critical Stylistics

Critical stylistics is a fairly new coined branch of stylistics who attempts to integrate critical stylistics from stylistics and critical discourse analysis. Critical stylistics as a term that is used to refer to stylistic work studying how social meanings are represented through language. This stylistic tendency is motivated by critical linguistics and CDA. Believes that since stylistics has become an interdisciplinary approach, it is possible to make substantial progress to critical stylistics using stylistic theories and critical studies. Stylistics is an approach to the study of language where the majority of the focus is on ideology and style. In addition, the subjective views of an author are also analyzed and tested against certain criteria. Critical stylistics is based on her previous works, in which she tries to describe ideology and power in language. Critical stylistics is a response to CDA by returning the text to its central position in the analysis and to move away from a politically motivated nature. Because of the vagueness and lack of literary study analysis tools, Jeffries relies on stylistics that provided the vocabulary needed to describe literary effects. Tools of analysis of CDA are vague because they focus on contextual features of

powerful language. In fact, CDA does not provide a broad range of tools to explain how texts affect and persuade readers into certain ideologies (ibid). Originally, critical stylistics evolved from critical linguistics; they both draw on meta-functions of language in his “systemic functional linguistics” approach. (Ras, 2020, p.197)

### 2.3. Constraints Marxism

Marxism is a very effective method in analyzing literary works across many different time periods. However, there are a few constraints this particular theory because of the way they look at society. Marxism doesn't recognize that there are separate subdivisions within social classes, like gender and ethnicity. Instead, Marxism focuses heavily on the outer class structure itself. This creates a narrow mindset for people that follow this theory, it makes them blind to other divisions amongst classes and populations. Other divisions amongst classes, like gender, race, sexuality...etc., are completely ignored in Marxist theory, even though when analyzing literary works they can play a more important role than social class. Marxist theory is also constrained by a focus on media being the only thing that “blinds” people to larger problems in society. It neglects to look at political or religious leaders as a source of influence over the population. Even though Marxist theory is an effective way at analyzing works throughout time, it holds a narrowed sight with regards to the information that it uses to judge literary works and the society that they were constructed in. (Simpson, 1993, p.5)

### 2.4. Keyements in Marxism

Marxism helps to tell a story of human history; it combines a deep understanding of social ideas in literature while also including a sense of its political ramification. Marxist criticism introduces the idea



that different works of literature are just products of history that are all analyzed by the conditions, both social and material, that the works were constructed in. An element of Marxism is that it looks at literary works as reflections of the social institutions that influenced them at the time that they were developed. Another element of Marxist theory is that it is based around socialist ideas and dialect. (Teo, 2000, p.11)

There are two key elements to Marxist literary criticism. The first is its attempt to locate literature in its social, economic, and historical context from where is originated. This theory aims to understand how ideas introduced in a work of literature related to values that circulated at the time the work originated. This makes Marxist criticism particularly interesting because it makes a connection between literature and class. The second element in Marxist criticism is that it is a critique of ideology. Ideology is "the ruling ideas of the ruling class." It is used as a way of legitimizing/justifying social and economic arrangements in society that may seem unfair to a certain class because of the fact that they are characterized by inequality. According to the theory of Marxism, ideology has a few natural divisions within it. The final element of Marxism is that it relies upon the presence of social classes in society and the continuous political and economic development of society. Overall, these separate elements are put together to create a theory that criticizes different literary works based off of the social and economic standing of the surrounding society at the time of the development of the works. (Norgaard 2010, p.136)

## 2.5. Theories of Marxism

Marxism has been grouped with social movements such as sexism and racism. Sexism is defined as prejudice, stereotyping, or discrimination on the basis of sex or gender. Racism is the belief or doctrine that inherent

differences among the various human racial groups determine cultural or individual achievement, usually involving the idea that one's own race is superior and has the right to dominate others or that a particular racial group is inferior to the others. All these ideas are similar in that they have an uncompromising hostility to all forms of domination in common. However, Marxism stands out from other progressive movements due to the fact that Marxists struggle always to overcome the manifold forms of domination and exploitation in and through the self-emancipation of the working class. This makes Marxism fit into the category of Revolutionary Socialism, which refers to socialist tendencies that follow the idea that social revolution is necessary in order to effect structural changes to society.( Jeffries, 2014,p.408)

An opposing idea to Marxism is Anarchism, a political philosophy that advocates stateless societies. Marxism has its origins in the struggle for this perspective, unlike anarchism, which seeks to undermine all forms of authority. Anarchism also seeks the destruction of the capitalist state without promoting and preparing the working class for the seizure and holding of public political power. The two ideas have come together in the past as working-class movements; however, the groups often clash when it comes to issues of state and class. For Anarchists, classes exist because of the state. However, for Marxists, the state arose as a result of class conflict to assure the victory of a powerful minority class against the majority. (Jeffries, 2010, p.1)

### **Section Three: Result and Discussion**

Hamlet appears to be a patriarchal play, supporting and reinforcing the dominant patriarchal ideology. However, on closer inspection, pluralism and multiplicity are unconcealed. The characters in the play can be divided into two groups, the one which reinforces the dominant narrative and

ideology and the other which only seems to support the dominant ideology. Ghost King Hamlet, Polonius, Laertes and Fortinbras belong to the first group. Prince Hamlet, Claudius, Gertrude and Ophelia belong to the second category.

The return of ghost King Hamlet from the next world for the punishment of the offenders of the dominant ideology shows its power and authority. The ghost King is the arch symbol of the ruling ideologies. The ghost king overshadows the play and as a consequence, the play seems to reinforce and reproduce the dominant overarching patriarchal meta-narrative. Patriarchy and other social-cultural constructs, like honor, masculinity and female-fidelity seem to be the regime of truth supported and reinforced by the play and its major characters. This seems to be the only dominant narrative voice. The dominant patriarchal ideology has the status of commonsense and the received truth. People are expected to perform their roles in light of the dominant ideology. Any deviation from it can be a cause of shame and humiliation. Role performance is regulated by the ideological institutions and their attendant social- cultural constructs. This is why Prince Hamlet is immersed in deepest melancholy at the conduct and betrayal of his mother, because she has failed to perform her proper role as a patriarchal woman.

Ghost king Hamlet stands for the absolute patriarchal ideology. He returns from the next world to settle his accounts with his brother for disrupting the established patrilineal order and demands of his son for revenge. He is like the dead father of Portia, who imposes his will upon his living daughter (Shakespeare, 1984). As a patriarch, ghost King Hamlet expects his son to perform his proper role as a good son. Patriarchy has the status of a norm and commonsense here. He believes it is only natural that his son should fight his war. Nature is defined in light of the dominant

ideology. Patriarchy defines the world from the perspective of fathers.

The ghost King Hamlet also expects his wife Gertrude not to re-marry even after his death. He expects her to be like the Penelope, the pious wife of Odysseus, (Homer, 2006) a totally patriarchal woman, who has internalized the ideology and lives by it. The abusive language used by ghost against queen reflects the rage of ghost King Hamlet at the violation of patriarchal code. It is a graphic representation of the conditions mentioned by Althusser (1971). Hamlet has been interpellated by the ideology, therefore makes a promise for the fulfillment of the command of the ghost.

Polonius is a conformist to dominant ideology and patriarchal social-cultural constructs. He cannot see the relationship between Ophelia and Hamlet from her perspective. He means to control her sexuality as a weapon of patriarchy. Ophelia obeys her father. Ophelia is different from Hermia (Shakespeare, 1997), who openly revolts against patriarchy. The resistance of Ophelia to patriarchy is of a different kind. The patriarchal Polonius is a man of double standards. He is prepared to turn a blind eye to immoral engagements of his son Laertes, but controls the sexuality of his daughter. Polonius identifies himself totally with the dominant ideology.

Laertes is thoroughly interpellated by patriarchy. He has unitary and unified subjectivity, and therefore he is never assailed by doubt or undecidability. He views things with a patriarchal gaze. His exhortation to Ophelia is reflective of the desire of patriarchy to prescribe the place for women and to control their sexuality. Women are not allowed agency, which converts them into commodities. His reaction to the accidental murder of his father establishes his absolute allegiance to patriarchal ideology. Nothing is more important, including his life, than the self-

imposed task of revenge. Like Faustus (Marlow, 1976), he can risk anything, including the eternal damnation of his soul to perform his duty. Pyrrhus and Fortinbras are also interpellated by the dominant ideology and its attendant constructs. They are prepared to sacrifice their lives for their respective causes.

The fact that the play opens with a question regarding the identity of some characters, has great symbolic importance. It alerts us to the world of questions and doubts about identities, nature of narratives and unfolding of the nature of realities and truths. The play becomes a site of contest and conflict among several perspectives and narratives.

On the surface, Prince Hamlet does have a unitary, unified identity, and his allegiance to the dominant ideology of patriarchy seems absolute. However, the deconstructive lens reveals that Prince Hamlet inhabits the zone of multiplicity, undecidability, pluralism, and schizophrenia. He thinks of committing suicide but cannot do this, for he does not have the singularity of thought and being. He is fed up with this world and curses it in strongest possible terms, but still cannot free himself from it and its compulsions. He does not want to think about his mother but cannot help himself from thinking about her. He condemns this marriage as incest but almost fails to undo it. It is obvious that his subjectivity is marked by self-difference.

Hamlet is capable of creating his own personal, local, subjective reality in his imagination and can see the things with the eye of his mind. He equates the subjective reality with the objective reality. In his person, the boundaries between reality, hyperreality, counterfeit, original and copies are conflated. He raises questions and doubts about identities, the nature, and place of man in the scheme of things and the social-cultural constructs. He underlines like Cordelia in King Lear (Shakespeare, 1978)



the inadequacy of language to express the reality in the mind, anticipating the postmodernist notion of the gap between understanding/conception and imagination/expression. Verbal and non-verbal language cannot express his grief. In his subjective, personal world, he creates his own reality of Denmark being a prison. He can consider himself a king, though bound in a nutshell. Hamlet finds himself standing at the crossroads of pluralism and multiplicity. In his encounter with Ophelia, he thinks he exists in-between heaven and earth, a true postmodernist condition. His subjectivity is marked by self-difference and multiplicity. Though he does not practice what Rotary calls a “suitably cavalier, laid-back attitude” which is expected of a postmodernist character and play the role of an “ironist” (1989), he rather vents his rage by abusing his mother, showing the lukewarm subscription to the dominant ideology.

Many of his soliloquies/discourses can be read as the representations of the postmodern condition of multiplicity and pluralism. He is paralyzed by this orchestra of multiple strands in hi-alization. Eliot misunderstands this as a demerit of the play (1975). He questions the concept of objective universal reality and comes up with a postmodernist private and subjective concept of the creation of reality. He anticipates the idea of reality created by language and mind. Hamlet also anticipates Russell (2004) by his suggestion of the inherent insignificance of man as, “quintessence of dust”. One is reminded of Andrei when he falls wounded in the battlefield (Tolstoy, 1957). In his conversation with Polonius, he unwittingly parodies the written philosophies for being nothing more than gossip and slander, not more than empty and idle words, merely the language games: a true postmodernist position. His celebrated soliloquy “to be or not to be” is the essence of the postmodern condition. This proves that his subjectivity is marked by self-difference and schizophrenia. All his

rationalizations have failed to bridge the gap between his words and deeds. Thought of suicide is another possible way out of his dilemma. His state of mind is reflective of a condition, Russell calls as Pyrrhonism, the old name for absolute skepticism (2004). He is in a state of mind where one can never choose from the available choices and options. He is faced with undecidability, in the face of multiple alternative options. His multiple subjectivities have been fully unconcealed.

His failure to kill Claudius, when he is praying, proves the main thesis of the study that Hamlet exhibits the postmodern condition of pluralism and undecidability, with a subjectivity marked by self-difference, resulting in the ethics of avoidance. His subjectivity plays off alternative worlds in a state of pluralistic anarchy. He sits back with a decentered, fragmented, postmodernist subjectivity. Even the issue of his madness remains undecidable. Claudius is also a symbol of “free-floating, self-referential autonomy”. Of course, he is not absolutely decentered and fragmented subject, but he is not fully controlled or affected by the dominant ideology. He is practically divorced from ideological referents. He is supposed to be the defender and protector of his brother, like

Macbeth (Shakespeare, 1984) but he subverts and undermines all the social-cultural constructs which have been there as the regime of truth. Unwittingly he wages war on the totality. He is a man with multiple subjectivities and shows the self-difference of a

pluralistic being. His revolt against and the murder of his brother is an assault on the dominant ideology. He disregards pre-established rules and rejects the notion of external reality and creates his own reality through rhetoric. He murders his own brother, marries the wife of his dead brother. He lives by the reality created by his personal rhetoric. This great pretender, thief and killer create himself as a nationalist, a democrat and

a law-respecting ruler through his rhetoric. He can distort and dissimulate his naked self-interest and pass it off to his people for national ideology. Throughout, he remains playfully ironic and cavalier in his attitude. He creates his personal, local, subjective reality and truth and becomes a metaphor of postmodern condition. His oscillation and paralysis result from his multiple and pluralistic subjectivity. He wants to seek the forgiveness of God, but he does not want to surrender the benefits of his crime, so he is bound to multiple businesses and his personality is revealed as schizophrenic. The analysis confirms him as a decentered, fragmented postmodernist subject.

The murder of King Hamlet by Claudius is a form of resistance and challenge to the status quo. Claudius is not one coherent, unified subject, subscribing to one absolutist ideology. He does not believe in the existence of objective universal truth. He can manufacture truth through power and rhetoric, highlighting the postmodernist notion of truth as an effect of the discursive, linguistic and textual phenomenon. Like queen Sersi in Game of Thrones (Martin, 1996), Claudius believes that history is manufactured by kings. He creates the reality of his deepest sense of grief for the sad death of his brother. He can create himself as a true patriot. The rhetoric of nationalism is the disguised working of will to power. He uses rhetoric to transport the action from the sphere of personal to national. He creates the reality of his love and affection for Hamlet. He would have been quite successful with his truth making, but for the supernatural intervention in the form of the ghost.

Gertrude is already a “seeming-virtuous queen”. She is expected to play her proper role as a patriarchal woman, faithful even to the memory of her dead husband. She resists her placement and role performance through her marriage with Claudius. Her remarriage has brought her into a zone

of postmodernist ambivalence. She is never in an open rebellion against the dominant social-cultural constructs, but in practice, she wrecks and dismantles all the major social-cultural constructs. The marriage itself is a violation of the ideologies of the society and church. Her ambivalence and schizophrenia surface again when she confronts her son regarding his conduct towards Claudius. She confirms and reinforces the postmodernist postulate about the nature of reality by saying that it is merely the coinage of one's brain.

Ophelia is denied an opportunity to become an author of her life. She is required to respect her placement as alterity and perform her prescribed role as a patriarchal woman. The dominant patriarchal narrative tries to silence and oppress her. She subverts the grand narrative of patriarchy from inside. Her personality is schizophrenic. She resists both her brother and her father from inside and tries to subvert patriarchy from the available space. She wages her small war on totality in her own small way through an alternative micro-narrative voice from the outer margin. Her polite protests amount to the alternative narrative voice, which challenges the established regimes of truth. Though on the surface she obeys them both, yet she stands for the third space, incorporating both the perspectives, the patriarchal and the not- patriarchal disjoined in her. This is what Derrida says about the coexistence of to be and not-to-be in his reading of Hamlet in *Specters of Marx* (1994) This shows that she does not have a single form of subjectivity. Her self-difference and schizophrenia lead to her madness which is a form of resistance (Waterman, 1999). Her resistance of meta narrative through disruption by her micro-narrative and the multiple strands of consciousness and pluralism in her being and subjectivity make her a postmodernist subject.

## Conclusion

Hyper textuality is a very useful notion which can help us have a better understanding of the nature of literature as well as its relationship with history and ideology. Literature is the site for the dwelling of ideology in the field of aesthetic constitution and practice. It represents the real world in an aestheticized and unavoidably distorted fashion. The author has to select the topic, the plot, the setting, narrative, syntax, vocabulary and other factors in a literary text. And any choice involves ideological inclinations. The ideology of a literary text is latent, slumbering under the cover of aesthetical air. It derives its power from two channels: the social formation at the time of its production and the literary tradition of which the literary text is an integral part. It is both a complex absorbing in the existing ideologies from intertextual literary texts and a complex emitting out its ideological implications onto other literary texts. Ideology has several ways to get access to the text: through the process of signification of language as well as the selection of raw material and literary text-composing techniques. It fulfils its subversive power by the seduction or oppression of the social formation at the time of its consumption. The ideology of a literary text, which could not be fully understood in an imposed vacuum of the text, is an organic part of the historical existence of temporality and space. In this sense, hyper textuality can contribute a lot to the move of the interaction between history, text and ideology.

## **References**

- [1] J. Frow, *Marxism and Literary History*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1986.
- [2] R. Selden, *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*, second edition, Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1989.
- [3] T. Eagleton, *Ideology and Literary Form*, in *Selective Readings*



- in 20th Century Western Critical Theory, Zhang Zhong Zai, ed. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2002.
- [4] T. Eagleton, Literary Theory: An Introduction (second edition), Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- [5] F. Jameson, The Political Unconscious-Narrative as A Socially Symbolic Act, New York: Cornell University Press, 1981.
- [6] N. Fairclough, Language and Power, London: Longman, 2001.
- [7] T. Eagleton, Ideology: An Introduction, Verso, 1991.
- [8] L. Althusser, Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses, in Selective Readings in 20th Century Western Critical Theory, Zhang Zhong Zai, ed. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching And Research Press, 2002.
- [9] T. Eagleton, Ideology: An Introduction, Verso, 1991.
- [10] T. Eagleton, Literary Theory: An Introduction (second edition), Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- [11] S. Cicconi: "Hyper textuality," Mediapolis, Sam Inkinen ed. Berlino & New York: De Gruyter, 1999.
- [12] R. Williams, Culture and Society, London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1959. in Selective Readings in 20th Century Western Critical Theory, Zhang Zhongzai, ed. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching And Research Press, 2002.
- [13] R. Williams, Marxism and Literature, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- [14] Y. Chen, "A hypertext-based intelligent computer-Assisted instructed system," Computer Research Development, Vol. 35, May 1998.