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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The objectives

Terry Pratchett’s *Discworld* books have gained notoriety for their subversive treatment of the fantasy genre, memorable characters, witticisms, humour and ubiquitous references – to the delight of the reading public, thus earning their author due fame, at home and abroad.

For the translator, their intertextuality may pose a challenge, bringing into the translating process an additional and extraordinary semiotic element with which to cope. This extraordinariness consists in it being never marked by quotation marks or a mention of the quoted author’s name or the source’s name or title and in its high degree of modification, alteration or paraphrase. The translator is twice put to the test in this way: first the references of all sorts – to literary and non-literary texts and even to non-textual sources – have to be discovered by the translator. Then comes the proper translation effort.

The purpose of this work is to look at the intertextuality of selected passages and the possible problems they may present to the translator and then to look into the way the translator actually copes with them and assess the resulting translation.

The following part of the introduction presents an overview of scholarly and other-than-scholarly publications dealing with the work of Terry Pratchett – finding them to be mostly concerned about the literary merits of Pratchett’s fiction, including intertextuality. Its translational issues appear to be absent from research.

Next, the origins and development of the concepts of intertextuality and intertext are discussed so as to clarify their use in the further analysis of the passages from the *Discworld* and their translations in *Świat Dysku*. The introduction ends with a taxonomy of intertexts discussed in this work.

Chapter II offers a thorough investigation into the intertextual nature of the 67 selected passages – as should be conducted by the translator before ‘hitting the keyboard’. The sources of the references are discovered and
the degree (ranging from unaltered to fully paraphrased) and manner of their modification are described – as well as the semantic effect of their appearance.

In Chapter III, on the basis of their analysis in Chapter II, the passages are given detailed consideration of their possible rendition or renditions, especially with regard to the existing target-language translations of the source texts. Next, their actual Polish translations are presented and discussed, followed by an assessment of the translator’s work in each case, especially with regard to the passage’s intertextuality’s effect, semantic or other.

The concluding chapter marshals the findings of Chapter III. Translational success and failure rates are given. The intertexts are divided by the degree of their translational difficulty. Quotation-based intertexts and intertexts involving wordplay are further discussed. Finally, an attempt is made at the disclosure of the translator’s approach to the task and the resulting modest translational success.

The target-language input (i.e. words, expressions, and sentences in Polish) has been restricted to the necessary minimum, with all the appearances of Polish given their English translation (by this author).

Research on Terry Pratchett’s literary output

In 1998 Terry Pratchett was appointed an Officer of the Order of the British Empire and in 2009 he was knighted – in both instances for services to literature. He has also received seven honorary doctorates from British universities and one from Dublin’s Trinity College and numerous literary awards in recognition of his achievements as an author. One might thus expect there should be a considerable body of critical academic work dealing with his writing, discussing its literary value and place in the realm of literary fiction.

Oddly, as of 2013, there is just about one, widely acclaimed, full-length thoroughly scholarly publication on Pratchett as a writer: Terry Pratchett: Guilty of Literature, whose second edition came out in 2004, looks into the various facets of Pratchett’s writing. As the title suggests, this collection of articles is meant to prove the artistic value of his fiction. The volume contains thirteen articles by twelve renowned scholars, essayists, and professionals, including a librarian, and a substantial introduction by a professional author. As a result there are as many as fourteen voices trying to establish Terry Pratchett as an author of literature. John Clute reveals Pratchett as a writer of comedies with high intertextual content. Looking at the 21-years-apart versions of Pratchett’s
first novel, *Carpet People*, Edward James demonstrates how Pratchett honed his unique style and developed as a writer. Cherith Baldry reviews Pratchett’s books for younger readers, concluding that those novels adeptly introduce their readers to certain serious issues, thus widening their horizons. Andrew M. Butler offers a sophisticated, well-researched analysis of Pratchett’s humour. Penny Hill follows the career of the ‘Unseen University’ — one of the key venues in *Discworld* — throughout the series. Andy Sawyer writes about the Librarian, one of *Discworld*’s trademark characters, and libraries in general, finding intriguing connections between the latest developments in this area and its fictional counterpart. Karen Sayer applies a gender-orientated approach to study the witch characters in *Discworld* and to describe relations between the sexes as found in the series. Nickianne Moody uses episodes from the *Discworld* featuring the recurrent character of Death to reveal hidden parallels to the social-political situation in 1980’s Britain. Stacie Hanes traces the development of the character of Death throughout the five *Discworld* novels with Death as one of the protagonists, concluding that Death is a vehicle for Pratchett to pose questions about the nature of humanity. In his other article Edward James describes the development of the central characters of the six-novel City Watch sequence within *Discworld* and finds those novels also to serve as Pratchett’s commentary on a number of issues. Matthew Hills tackles the Discworld’s topography, “mappability”, and identity — and their literary functions. Farah Mendlesohn deciphers Pratchett’s ethical code contained, as she believes, in his novels and notes his development as a writer. James Brown comes up with a profound analysis of Pratchett’s work with regard to some of its recurring themes, such as belief, reality, imagination, magic, and science (Rzyman, 2014). This volume also mentions a couple of earlier articles and book chapters in a similar fashion by some of the contributors. “Terry Pratchett and the Comedic Bildungsroman” by Andrew M. Butler, published in *Foundation: The Review of Science-Fiction* (1996), argues that *Discworld* novels contain elements of two of high literature’s major idioms, comedy and development of the protagonist – in this case: the concepts of the carnivalesque and bildungsroman as formulated by Mikhail Bakhtin. “The Big Sellers 3: Terry Pratchett”, by John Clute, published in *Interzone* 33 (1990), discusses Pratchett’s narrative technique, while *Science-Fiction in the Twentieth Century*, by Edward James, published by OUP in 1994, in which Pratchett gets a due mention, defines science fiction as a unique 20th-century literary genre which has affected people’s outlook on the modern world. The above-mentioned authors’ findings are partly referred to in articles contained in *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of Literature*. 
Some other scholars have penned essays to acknowledge Pratchett’s literary merits. In “Where the Falling Angel Meets the Rising Ape: Terry Pratchett’s Discworld” (2006) Amanda Cockrell argues that adult novels in the Discworld series have depth and do belong in literary canon. Similarly, in “Terry Pratchett: the Soul of Wit” (2008) Faren Miller offers a compact yet sophisticated overview of the Discworld series and also of Pratchett’s two trilogies for younger readers, showing the literary development of Pratchett’s fiction, stressing along the way Pratchett’s talent as a writer, humorist, ironist, and satirist, and attempting a sort of relative evaluation of the novels within the series.

Besides, in his essay “Retelling Stories Across Time and Cultures” (in: The Cambridge Companion to Children’s Literature) John Stephens highlights the rich and complex intertextuality of Pratchett’s The Amazing Maurice and His Educated Rodents, referring to it as a retelling of the Pied Piper of Hamelin legend enhanced by “borrowings from numerous other texts and discourses”, and also points to the biblical inspiration for Truckers.

There are also a handful of articles and master’s theses available online. Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts has “Cultural Palimpsests: Terry Pratchett’s New Fantasy Heroes” by Gideon Haberkorn (2008) and “Shakespeare in Discworld: Witches, Fantasy, and Desire” by Kristin Noone (2010). Haberkorn juxtaposes the traditional hero models found in fantasy fiction and Pratchett’s protagonists, concluding that although they derive to a smaller or larger extent from traditional types, Pratchett’s heroes are an ironic reaction against traditional heroes’ sameness, obsoleteness, and incongruity with modern laws and morals. Noone shows how Pratchett in two of his Discworld novels copiously draws on two of Shakespeare’s plays in order to look at the interplay of human desire and free will. Noone concludes that the message Pratchett thus wants to convey is that “the heart of successful fantasy lies in human [free-will-based] response to desire” (p. 8). Mythlore has “Nice, Good, or Right: Faces of the Wise Woman in Terry Pratchett’s Witches’ Novels” (2008) and “The Education of a Witch: Tiffany Aching, Hermione Granger, and Gendered Magic in Discworld and Potterworld” (2009) – both by Janet Brennan Croft. The first presents the witch characters in the Witches’ sequence and the moral choices they make according to the ethical system they have adopted, while the second compares the “issues such as education and gender and the responsible use of power” (p. 1) as presented in books by Terry Pratchett and J. K. Rowling. William T. Abbott’s master’s thesis White Knowledge and the Cauldron of Story: the Use of Allusion in Terry Pratchett’s Discworld (2002) is presented in full in The
L-Space Web, the leading “Terry Pratchett / Discworld Web Site”. Another master’s thesis is Dorthe Andersen’s An Analysis of Intertextual Resonance in the Witch Sequence of Terry Pratchett’s Discworld (2006). As their titles suggest, these two theses deal with the rich intertextuality of Pratchett’s Discworld novels.

In recent years Pratchett’s oeuvre has also caught the interest of students writing their bachelor’s theses (found online, too). In Postmodern Parody in the ‘Discworld’ novels of Terry Pratchett (1998) Christopher Bryant deals with the Discworld’s novel way of making use of fantasy and parody within the postmodernist idiom. In The Realm of Turtles: Why We Read Novels in the Electronic Age, as Demonstrated by Pratchett’s “Reaper Man” (2002), a companion article to his master’s thesis, Kevin Ma explains how Discworld novels empower readers to get closer to the fictional world. Jenna Miller in Terry Pratchett’s Literary Tryst with Shakespeare’s “Macbeth”: A Postmodernist Reading with a Humanist Guide interprets Pratchett’s Wyrd Sisters as a humanist and postmodernist adaptation of Macbeth, showing Pratchett’s atheistically humanist departure from Shakespeare’s Christian worldview, but also finding both authors to be on common ground with regard to certain social issues. True to her article’s title, Miller also mentions a politically-orientated article by Yael Peled When Granny Weatherwax Met Political Ideologies: Homo Narrans and Humanism in Terry Pratchett’s ‘Discworld’. Other B.A. and honours theses: Terry Pratchett’s “Wyrd Sisters”: Shakespeare Adapted by Radmila Radovanovic (1997), An Analysis of Terry Pratchett’s “Wyrd Sisters” by Eva Homolkova (2009), Political Satire in Terry Pratchett’s “Discworld” by Amy L. Duncan (2008), The Role of Satire in Terry Pratchett’s “Jingo” by John R. Naf (2008).

Terry Pratchett’s fiction is beginning to catch the interest of Polish researchers, too. In Potrzeba i konieczność prawdy według Terry’ego Pratchett’a (‘The Fundamental Need for the Truth, According to Terry Pratchett’ – transl. A.R.) Anna Gemra shows how in Lords and Ladies Pratchett expounds on how popular usage often distorts, i.e. falsifies, the original meaning of – in other words, the truth about – concepts, here: the true nature of elves. Anna Szóstak in Refleksja eschatologiczna w aspekcie problematyki czasoprzestrzeni w powieści Terry’ego Pratchett’a “Złodziej czasu” (‘Eschatological Reflection Upon Time-Space Issues in Terry Pratchett’s “Thief of Time”’ – transl. A.R.) discusses Pratchett’s treatment of the concept of time within the broader context of various philosophical, scientific, and popular ways of perceiving time. In her other article, Problematyka mitów genezyjskich w powieściowym cyklu o Świecie Dysku Terry’ego Pratchett’a (‘Echoes of Creation Myths in Terry Pratchett’s
Szóstak traces the creation myths alluded to and reworked by Pratchett in his *Discworld* novels.

Besides, Marcin Rusnak has devoted a subchapter of his doctoral dissertation *End Without Fear: Death in Contemporary Young Adult Speculative fiction* to discuss the male character Death and the humorous treatment of the otherwise somewhat sombre issue of death in Pratchett’s *The Amazing Maurice and His Educated Rodents*.

A different set of references is offered by ‘Terry Pratchett’ entry in Wikipedia, which discusses his background, interests, writing career, and writing. Of major interest with regard to the purposes of this work is the section on his writing. It briefly deals with its characteristic features, such as footnotes, lack of chapters, puns, allusions and culture references which are subject to parody, and “distinctive ways of speaking”. The references at the end can be divided into a number of categories: biographies, interviews, articles in connection with Pratchett’s new books, articles in connection with awards received by Pratchett, articles by Colin Smythe, Pratchett’s agent and long-time friend, articles on Pratchett’s works’ theatre and film adaptations, and also articles about Pratchett’s affliction, his donations to the study of the disease, his support for euthanasia, and his donations and support for the protection of orang-utan. Of these, only interviews and articles discussing his work can be of some interest for this work, because in them one can find the occasional sentence or two that refer to the literary quality or comment on various aspects of Pratchett’s writing.

Additionally, there is *Terry Pratchett. The Spirit of Fantasy* (2012) by Craig Cabell, a seasoned “freelance writer and reporter” (p. 243) – author of biographies of popular modern writers and documentaries on military matters, notably World War II. As the subtitle explains, it is a book about “the life and work” of Terry Pratchett. Fortunately, there is more about work and many of the issues the author deals with are of interest to this work, for instance Pratchett’s role within the fantasy genre, allusions to other literary works, parody as his trademark mode of conveying the message, juxtapositions with other recognised writers, and “play with words” (p. 25). Besides, it discusses Pratchett’s evolution as a novelist and discusses particular titles – within the *Discworld* series and outside – and some of his most remarkable characters and story arcs.

The above-presented overview of books and articles dealing with Terry Pratchett’s fiction shows which of its aspects have so far drawn most attention on the part of researchers and critics: Pratchett as a writer of comedies, Pratchett’s irony, parody, and satire, Pratchett’s references to Shakespeare, and other kinds of allusions to various other works of
Some researchers focus on Pratchett’s development as a writer, his books for younger readers, his humanist outlook and ethical code as conveyed by his novels, and on some of the most prominent Discworld characters, especially the witches and Death. Finally there are, as yet, one-off articles discussing Pratchett’s narrative technique, recurring themes, significance of the Discworld companion maps, and certain moral and philosophical concepts.

Overall, the stress is mostly on subject matter and not on literary form. The only exception to some extent is Pratchett’s references to other literary works and so-called culture texts, in other words – the intertextuality of his work. This aspect is frequently mentioned by various authors – rather expectedly, since it is one of the most obvious and characteristic features of Pratchett’s style. Besides, it is Craig Cabell, a writer himself, who finds “some beautiful writing” (2012: 25) in Pratchett’s fiction.

To the translator, the quality of writing, i.e. the use of language and stylistic devices are of primary importance. With Terry Pratchett’s writing one such device is, as has been pointed out above, the rich intertextuality in the form of a large variety of references and quotations, the latter in their pure form or paraphrased – although never marked.

Last but not least, there is a web page devoted to the location and explication of Pratchett’s intertextual references: “The Annotated Pratchett File, v. 9.0” (http://www.lspace.org/books/apf/), edited by Leo Breebaart and Mike Kew, containing a wealth of entries for all the Discworld novels and a number of other books by Pratchett. The APF shows clearly that the need for disambiguating Pratchett’s intertextuality (for the better understanding and enjoyment of his books) cannot be underestimated, even among his native English-speaking readers (note: many of the intertexts discussed in this work are not to be found in APF).

The generally available scholarly work on Pratchett, as shown above, does not, however, touch at all upon any translation-related issues. The apparent dearth of translatorial inquiry into his writing seems a result of the – initial, at least – general academic neglect of Pratchett. At the same time it makes a possible study of related translational issues so much more worthwhile. One of them – Pratchett’s translational intertextual challenge – is like an uncharted territory, awaiting its explorers. Hence the idea to take it on in this work.

**Note**

A fuller and most up-to-date gathering of literature devoted to Terry Pratchett’s literary oeuvre – alongside a collection of a couple of fresh
articles – can be found in the form of annotated bibliography in “Discworld and the Disciplines. Critical Approaches to the Terry Pratchett Works”, in: Critical Explorations in Science Fiction and Fantasy 45, ed. by Anne Hiebert Alton and William C. Spruiell, which came out in 2014 – after the appearance of the last full stop in this work.

Intertextuality

Intertextuality is among the most distinctive stylistic features of the Discworld. When dealing with this aspect of Pratchett’s writing, researchers use various terms to describe it: borrowings, allusions, reworking, parody, references, intertexts – on the general theoretical ground such a view of intertextuality is espoused by, for example, Mary Orr who speaks of “intertextuality under other guises such as allusion, adaptation, quotation and parody” (Orr, 2008: 8) – or by Paul Ricoeur when he names “repetition, transformation, and rejection (of former uses of a text)” as instances of intertextuality (Ricoeur, 2008: 35). John Clute stresses Pratchett’s ingenuity as a parodist and user of those intertextual devices – they are no ordinary ‘covers’ of existing texts (Clute, 2004: 19). Edward James, too, finds ingeniously reworked intertextual material in the ‘City Watch’ sequence within the Discworld series (James, 2004: 196-199). Craig Cabell contends that “parody is never far from Pratchett’s heart” (Cabell, 2012: 42). John Stephens speaks of Pratchett’s “parodic and iconoclastic versions” of “pre-texts” (Stephens, 2009: 104). In the previous section of this work, ‘intertextuality’ and ‘allusion’ appear in the titles of articles and MA and BA theses on Pratchett – and among them one source of intertextual references is even named directly (Shakespeare).

Given the above and that it thus may pose a challenge for the translator of Pratchett’s work, the notion of intertextuality requires closer examination. Since its induction in 1969 by Juliya Kristeva into the recognised terminological ranks of linguistics and literary studies, the concept of intertextuality has been developed further by other scholars, mainly in the form of various typologies of this phenomenon. For instance, about a decade later, Gérard Genette came up with his concept of second-degree literature, founded on five types of what he calls ‘transtextuality’. Among them there is ‘intertextuality’ which comprises quotations proper, i.e. ones marked by quotation marks, unmarked quotations (Genette calls them ‘plagiarisms’), and allusions. Another of Genette’s types which also seems to be of interest here, i.e. of interest to the translator of Pratchett’s Discworld, is called ‘hypertextuality’. It refers to any type of relationship between a text and some earlier text and at this point it sounds a bit ‘all-
inclusive’, yet Genette generally appears to use this term to speak of whole works of literature which are in some way (i.e. through transformation or imitation) derived from earlier (as a rule, it seems, well-known) works, a classic example being Joyce’s *Ulisses* as drawing upon the narrative structure of Homer’s *Odyssey*. However, Genette concedes that parody – one of formally hypertextual genres – is chiefly possible with “short texts, lines of text bereft of the context, famous statements, proverbs” (Genette, 2014: 7-24). Genette does note that there are no clear-cut boundaries between his types of transtextuality and, so, they tend to overlap to some extent. Consequently, the above-discussed two types of transtextuality can be amalgamated into one, comprising various kinds of borrowings from various textual sources – either in their pure, unaltered form but appearing in novel contexts, or paraphrased, modified, transformed, etc. Such a unification of Genette’s intertextuality and hypertextuality is supported by Michał Głowinski who is also in favour of the exclusion of ‘paratextuality’, another of Genette’s types, comprising titles, subtitles, chapter titles, prefaces, notes, from the realm of intertextual relationships (Majkiewicz, 2008: 15).

Generally, there seem to be two camps among the researchers with regard to what is and what is not intertextuality: those advocating the narrowing down of the meaning of the notion of intertextuality and those in favour of the broad approach to intertextuality.

A prominent representative of the former is Michael Rifaterre, who considers allusion and quotation as not belonging in intertextuality proper, because they depend heavily on the reader’s erudition and at the same time they are not really necessary to understand the larger text in which they appear (Nycz, 2000: 81). Similarly, Włodzimierz Bolecki sees allusion as significantly different from intertextuality: allusion has no specific “textual referent”, so anything can be taken for allusion, and “the recognition of allusion does not affect the semantics of the literary text” (Majkiewicz, 2008: 26, transl. A.R.).

Of the other camp, Ryszard Nycz argues that intertextuality is characteristic of postmodernism – the corollary of which being that the study of postmodernism is better served by the broad approach to intertextuality, since it encompasses all kinds of references: to other literary texts, to non-literary texts and discourses and even to other semiotic systems, such as painting, sculpture, music, films, comics, etc. (Nycz, 2000: 82). Zofia Mitosek describes the concept of “global intertextuality”, undoubtedly the most extreme broad approach to intertextuality: the whole of humankind’s linguistic experience makes up one overwhelming ‘intertext’ – literature being its paramount exponent –
so overwhelming that the writer’s creative role is ignored altogether (Mitosek, 2005: 389). Not rejecting the broad approach, Edward Balcerzan nevertheless is in favour of delineating the limits to intertextuality: he criticises postmodernism’s propensity for viewing “every fragment of the world” as ‘text’ and, consequently, calling any instance of human communication ‘intertextual’ (Balcerzan, 2011: 38). He, therefore, proposes to redefine the notion of ‘text’ in order to exclude certain hazy categories of ‘texts’, such as, for instance, the names of mountain ranges (“the Alps”) or folk music in general. The ‘text’ should: be possible to be seen as a specific instance of human communication, have clear delineation (a frame), make use of the linear sequence of signs (so the beginning and the end make up the frame), and be divisible into smaller semantic units, more or less autonomic, which can be cut out from an utterance and used in the form of quotations (ibid. 58). Balcerzan does see the quotation as the basic type of intertextuality which activates other sorts – which, in turn can be seen as ‘quotation derivatives’ (ibid. 78). ‘Broad, but not absurdly broad’ seems to be Balcerzan’s approach to the scope of intertextual relationships. Similarly, as a remedy for global intertextuality’s cognitive deficiencies, such as the programmatic exclusion of the writer from its interest and the “dissolution” of specific types of intertextuality in the general “textuality”, Mitosek presents the concept of “limited intertextuality” which is seen as a “play on specific texts, styles, and conventions, resulting in semantic effects based on two-in-one discourse, such as dialogue, repetition, imitation, and quotation or reference to what has already been said” (Mitosek, 2005: 390, transl. A.R.).

Pratchett’s writing definitely suits the postmodernist idiom and not just because of its birth date, but chiefly due to the subversive blow it deals to the conventional, well-established and, in this respect, rather un-postmodernist genre of fantasy, as represented by ‘The Inklings’ and their orthodox followers: he not only blew up the fantasy genre, but, in doing so, showed a new direction for other fantasy writers (Cabell, 2012: 45). A large part of Pratchett’s “anti-fantasy” – as the Discworld series is termed (James, 2004: 40) – consists in his humorous or ironic treatment of intertextual material, always lurking around throughout the series, to the delight of its aficionados.

Within the broadly approached intertextuality, however, its two categories should be distinguished: ‘intertextuality proper’ which covers explicit and implicit references to other texts, whose discovery is obligatory for the reader to be fully aware of the text’s semantics, and ‘facultative’ intertextuality, failure to discover it not being detrimental to the understanding of the text (Nycz, 2000: 85–86; Majkiewicz, 2008: 20).
However, the discovery by the reader of the “intertextual play” on the part of the author (Martuszewska, 2007: 27) in its full scope, obligatory or not, is essential for “the Barthesian model of the reader” to derive maximum pleasure and enjoyment from reading (Orr, 2008: 36; Majkiewicz 2008: 19), to “enjoy the textual playfulness” (Balcerzan, 2011: 38).

From the translator’s point of view, therefore, both types of intertextuality – or simply all kinds of intertextuality – are important, since the translator, ideally, ought not to deprive the reader of even a smallest chunk of the intertextual load of the original. The notion of intertextuality calls for erudition on the part of the reader (a text-book case in point being T.S. Eliot’s *The Waste Land*) and some instances of intertextuality are referred to as “erudite allusions” (Kwaśna, 2013: 133-134). Mitosek even draws a parallel between intertextual analysis and hermeneutics: both involve a web of textual-linguistic and cultural-biographic associations which, in turn, depend on the reader’s knowledge (Mitosek, 2005: 392). Such erudition changes from generation to generation (Balcerzan, 2011: 104, footnote 89), which may complicate things further; still it is the translator’s responsibility to satisfy the perfect erudite reader.

Amid all the debate about the indicators of textuality and the scope of intertextuality and its related categories, one can also come upon the less frequent attempts at defining the very notion of intertextuality. Orr explains its infrequency: “The purloining of Kristeva’s term by rival theorists, and the presence of parallel terms exploiting the same prefix, also make clear that a single definition or delimited application of intertextuality are impossible” (Orr, 2008: 60). Kristeva’s runs: “a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another [...]” (*ibid.* 21). Michael Riffaterre puts it in a different, and slightly tautological way: “[intertextuality] is the web of functions that constitutes and regulates the relationship between text and intertext”, the latter being defined by him as “a corpus of texts, textual fragments, or text-like segments”, lexically and partly syntactically connected with the text in which they appear “in the form of synonyms, or [...] even [...] antonyms” (Allen, 2010: 120-121). In his interpretation of Kristeva’s original ‘intertextuality’, Genette sees it as “the relationship of co-presence between two or more texts [...], most often: an instance of actual presence of one text in the other” (Genette, 2014: 7-8). Advocating the broad approach to intertextuality, Nycz defines intertextuality as “this aspect of all the properties and relationships of a particular text which suggests that its creation and reception is dependent on the familiarity (on the part of both the author and the reader) with other texts and also ‘architexts’, i.e. genre conventions and stylistic and narrative standards” (Nycz, 2000: 83,
This sounds like a development of an earlier definition, by Henryk Markiewicz, who focuses on the reader: “intertextuality is a relationship revealed in a particular text between it and its ‘prototext’ or ‘architext’” – to be taken into account by the reader, in which way “certain textual aspects or components get emphasised, clarified, modified, or enriched semantically and artistically – and at the same time the ‘prototext/architext’ gets further interpreted and validated” (Gajda, 2010: 15, transl. A.R.). Anna Majkiewicz broadens Nycz’s definition by including into it such modes of communication as “traditional visual arts, music, film, comic, etc.” (Majkiewicz, 2008: 21, transl. A.R.). Teresa Tomaszkiewicz stresses the complexity and totality of intertextuality which in her view means “the whole of complicated linguistic and thematic relationships created by the author between his text and other texts in the form of global coherence, reference, or dependence” (Tomaszkiewicz, 2004: 45, transl. A.R.).

Intertext

Therefore, generally speaking, intertextuality involves a text (for instance, a novel by Pratchett) and all sorts of more or less visible references in it to other texts already in existence at the time of the creation of the text which are referred to as ‘quotations’ (by definition being quotations of ‘texts’), ‘texts’, ‘textual fragments’, ‘text-like segments’, ‘prototexts’, the term ‘text’ itself encompassing specimens of linguistic and extra-linguistic “modes of communication” as mentioned above. Conceivably, a single term would be useful to cover all kinds of those specimens. Rifaterre’s definition has a collective ‘inter-text’, being a body of other texts showing in a particular text. Barthes uses the term ‘inter-text’ to address the inescapable omnipresence of the “infinite text” outside of which no text can exist (Barthes, 1975: 36). However, this term, spelt without the hyphen, has also taken on a new, more specific meaning by becoming a single term for all types of references recognised by the broad approach to intertextuality, thus facilitating the related discourse by obviating the need to enumerate at least the basic categories of ‘texts’ embedded in a particular text and immediately pointing to the intertextual focus of the discourse. For instance, Mitosek calls intertextuality “a double play: it bestows new status upon the incorporated fragments (intertexts)” (Mitosek, 2005: 381, transl. A.R.) and formulates her definition of the intertext: “a fragment of someone else’s earlier text, incorporated in a new text, whose creation is currently under way. Therefore, it is a quotation, reminiscence or allusion, name of the protagonist, comparison, metatextual
commentary of the ‘how [Shakespeare] would have put it’ type” (ibid. 383, *trans. A.R.*). At the same time Mitosek notes the difficult-to-spot presence in the main text of a small fragment, such as a hidden quotation, reminiscence, allusion, metaphor which are referred to as “microfragments” – by Rifaterre called “traces of the intertext” in his vision of ‘global intertextuality’ (ibid. 384, *trans. A.R.*). As can be seen, certain categories overlap, which justifies the use of ‘intertext’ with reference to both larger portions of text and smaller chunks. The latter seem especially frequent in Terry Pratchett’s *Discworld* and, so, are the focus of this study, while the term ‘intertext’ will be the chief one to refer to any of those abundant and semiotically diverse “incorporated fragments”. In other words, ‘intertext’ will be a handy term to refer to any instance of a textual reference, borrowing, allusion, reworking, parody, etc. of an existing ‘text’ in its broad sense, one incorporating literary, extra-literary, and non-literary sources (on the home turf, such an approach is, for instance, espoused by Majkiewicz – 2008: 34, or Garcarz – 2007, where ‘intertext’ is one of the key words).

**The variety of intertexts found in Pratchett’s *Discworld* series**

The sixty-seven intertexts selected for discussion here come from sixteen *Discworld* novels spanning the first twenty novels in the series – out of the total of forty so far (figures indicate the number of intertextual passages analysed):

- *The Colour of Magic* – 3
- *Equal Rites* – 3
- *Mort* – 3
- *Sourcery* – 2
- *Wyrd Sisters* – 21
- *Pyramids* – 3
- *Guards! Guards!* – 4
- *Moving Pictures* – 11
- *Reaper Man* – 1
- *Witches Abroad* – 2
- *Small Gods* – 1
- *Lords and Ladies* – 1
- *Men at Arms* – 6
- *Soul Music* – 3
- *Maskerade* – 1
- *Hogfather* – 2
The intertexts were chosen arbitrarily so as to show a possibly wide-ranging and representative portion of the whole spectrum of sources drawn on by Pratchett. A systematic study of the intertextuality of the Discworld would result in a multi-volume encyclopaedia, each volume dealing with just one novel in the series, so the arbitrariness was unavoidable. A large portion of the selection is made up of literary and extra-literary intertexts, these being conceivably of the highest literary value and — as will be shown — of greatest challenge to the translator. The high share of Wyrd Sisters intertextuality is chiefly due to the book’s underlying Shakespearian inspiration, manifest in numerous altered and unaltered quotations as well as structural elements. Naturally, any ‘writer-meets-Shakespeare’ intersection is a treat for the reader, researcher, and translator, so giving them broader coverage could not be resisted. In the other books of the series, equally interesting are references to other well-known authors, e.g. Vonnegut, Lovecraft, Herbert, Dunsany – hence the prominence of literary intertexts among their other types. One other often-quoted novel, Moving Pictures, boasts a markedly varied scope of intertextuality: from literature to cartoons to natural sciences.

With regard to their character, the intertexts can be divided into five categories: four of which are quite homogenous, proper categories, while one has to remain pretty catholic — otherwise it would have to be broken down into a number of separate categories — since they cannot be, even at a pinch, included into those four ones.

Meticulous pigeonholing of actual intertexts, however, is not required by the translator. Nor is giving their categories sophisticated technical names. Conceivably, what is needed is a set of categories and subcategories whose names will immediately reveal the general nature of a given intertext — thus facilitating the related translational discourse, especially if certain patterns of the translator’s copying with particular types of intertexts emerge. Additionally, the names of categories should be tailored to describe the intertextual profile of a literary work, i.e. its unique range of intertexts: it is highly unlikely that any two literary pieces will share the same set of intertextual categories.

Genette, an early researcher in the field, concerned with five broad categories of transtextuality (‘intertextuality’ and ‘hypertextuality’ being chiefly what has now become to be known as intertextuality) offered up the following terms for general categories of “hypertextual literary practice”: transformation: parody (ludic in character), travesty (satirical), transposition (serious) — and imitation: pastiche (ludic), charge (satirical), forgery (serious) (Genette, 2014: 34). Within these, Genette distinguished specific subcategories — each of them referring to one or more specific
literary works. As such they are of little use to the study of Pratchett’s intertextuality which is not of the ‘whole-work’ provenance. Only with his *Wyrd Sisters* which are distinctly yet loosely related to *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* does he meet halfway with Genette’s idea of a literary piece parodying another one. Parody is what often fuels *Discworld’s* humour – but it is always limited to short passages, rarely exceeding one paragraph.

Majkiewicz’s approach in her investigation into E. Jelinek’s intertextuality and the resultant intertextual categories (Majkiewicz 2008) seem much better suited to tackle postmodern intertextuality as found in Pratchett: Jelinek’s is, too, manifest in short passages. Majkiewicz’s main distinction is into the main three categories: text-text (intrasemiotic relationship), text-genre (structural relationship – following Genette’s architextuality), and text-reality (intersemiotic relationship, with ‘reality’ in the form of so-called ‘culture texts’). Within each she distinguishes four subcategories: “elementary indicators of intertextual reference” (marked quotations, names of authors and their works), “explicit indicators of intertextual reference” (graphic indicators, changes of style, thematic references – key words, characters’ names), “implicit indicators of intertextual reference” (unmarked quotations, thematic references – motifs, modified titles), “covert indicators of intertextual reference” (which can be generally described as: *i*) involving a higher degree of the reworking of the pre-text than one exhibited by implicit indicators: *ii*) totally depending on the reader’s erudition). Finally, within those four subcategories there are specific types of intertexts – named so as to fit intertexts found in a particular literary work, e.g. “paraphrase with grammatical modification and with amplification” as a type of elementary indicator.

A possible problem with such thorough, multilayered classifications used to describe not the natural world, but man’s artistic creations is that the boundaries between certain taxonomical units are difficult to establish and, as a result, they tend to overlap (preventing which would require further layers of subcategories and subtypes – *ad absurdum*). For instance, ‘unmarked quotation’ (*ibid.* 111) is mentioned both as an implicit indicator and a covert indicator (*ibid.* 141).

The reader’s erudition as a distinguishing factor between unmarked quotations as implicit indicators and as covert indicators seems a failed idea, since it is absolutely impossible to say which literary works and culture texts are obligatory for ‘the erudite reader’ to be well familiar with and which are not. T.S. Eliot’s *The Waste Land* is famously meant for the erudite reader – which, given the scope of literary references in the poem, means ‘a world-famous professor of literature’. It is probably more
sensible to assume that quotations in general and unmarked ones in particular pose a challenge to the reader, so erudition always pays off – the more of it, the better: for instance, does every reader know that the common phrase ‘this is the stuff the dreams are made of’ originates (and is found as a modified paraphrase in Pratchett) in a monologue by Shakespeare’s Prospero?

Pratchett’s intertexts found in the Discworld and discussed here fall into two main categories: intrasemiotic ones, i.e. references to other literary works, and intersemiotic ones, referring to sources other than literature (in its broad sense – including genre fiction). However, the latter category should be divided into: i) the intersemiotic proper, i.e. references to other artistic media (visual arts and music) and their spin-offs (cartoons, film scenes), and ii) the non-literary-yet-textual, i.e. references to extra-literary sources, such as non-literary names, rules, cultural information, scientific knowledge, fixed phrases (idioms, proverbs, sayings) – sometimes collectively referred to as ‘culture texts’ or ‘text-reality references’ (Majkiewicz, 2008: 233-234).

Quotations and names constitute a large body of Pratchett’s intertextuality: they range from original, unaltered to altered or modified and paraphrased to fully paraphrased. They are never marked – using Majkiewicz’s terminology they can be seen as implicit and covert. Consequently, they require certain degree of erudition on the part of the reader and translator. Pratchett says, reassuringly, that in order to have a fair chance of spotting the references he puts in his books the reader only needs to be “well-read (well-viewed, well-listened)” – in other words: to possess what he calls “white knowledge” – i.e. not thorough knowledge of literature and other arts in general, but “the sort of stuff that fills up your brain without you really knowing where it came from” (excerpts from an interview with Pratchett, in: Abbott, 2002 – Introduction). Some of the intertexts in the Discworld, however, require, as will be shown, a bit more than just average erudition – the more so if the reader is a target-language-native translator – and even more so if the reader is a target-language-translation reader.

The intertexts dealt with in this work can be filed in the following way:

**Literary quotations**

- a) unmarked truthful quotation: 1, 2, 3-6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
- b) unmarked single-word quotation: 7, 12, 13, 14-21,
- c) altered quotation: 7, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26,
- d) modified quotation: 27, 28
- e) paraphrased quotation: 29
f) literary title: 11

g) modified literary title: 11

g) total lexical paraphrase retaining the form: 30, 31, 32

h) reference to a topic in poetry: 33

**Literary and extra-literary names**

a) graphically alluding to names found in literary fiction: 34

b) semantically alluding to names found in literary fiction: 34

c) slightly modified names found in literary fiction: 35

d) paraphrased names found in literary fiction: 36

e) modified and paraphrased real plant names: 37, 38, 40

f) modified real plant names: 41

g) real botanical names: 39, 42

h) paraphrased names of elements: 43

i) structural and lexical references to botanical or zoological names: 44, 45

j) paraphrased airlines’ names: 46

**Idioms and proverbs**

a) unaltered idiom or fixed phrase: 11

a) fragments of idioms: 47

b) modified idiom: 48, 49, 50

c) paraphrased proverb: 51

**Visual arts references**

a) ekphrasis: 52, 53, 54

b) paraphrased cartoon scene: 55, 56, 57

c) paraphrased cartoon caption: 58, 59

**Other**

Linguistic reference (to word formation): 60

Phonetic reference (to an accent): 61, 62

Cultural reference (to Zen’s koans): 63, 64

Game reference (to chess): 65

Scientific reference: 27, 66, 67

Figures denote the reference numbers of the passages discussed in Chapter II and, in the same order, in Chapter III. For convenience, Annex shows all the passages. Some passages contain more than one intertext and that is why they appear more than once in this listing.
CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF SELECTED INTERTEXTS IN DISCWORLD

(1) Wyrd Sisters p. 5:

“As the cauldron bubbled an eldritch voice shrieked: ‘When shall we three meet again? There was a pause. Finally another voice said, in far more ordinary tones: ‘Well, I can do next Tuesday’”

The quotation within the excerpt is a rather well-known quotation from Macbeth (I.1.1). Spotting its intertextual nature thus requires from the reader familiarity with this play by Shakespeare. In Wyrd Sisters this quotation, too, appears in the opening paragraph, which suggests it may have a similar function: it foreshadows the successive meetings of this kind to take place in the course of the narrative, so it is a construction element of the plot. Additionally, it hints at the speaker’s identity: in Macbeth the characters in question are from the very beginning identified as witches, while in Wyrd Sisters at this point the reader is only informed of “three hunched figures”, one of whom speaks in an eldritch, shrieking voice (also a little hint here at a possibly out-of-ordinary personality of the speaker) – and who, later on, do turn out to be witches. Yet, there seems to be another purpose in the use of this quote and, consequently, its slightly old-fashioned form due to the now obsolete way of forming the future aspect of a sentence by means of the modal verb ‘shall’, coming from a tragedy written five hundred years ago: it adds to the solemn character of the passage which is then followed by the answer “in far more ordinary tones: ‘Well, I can do next Tuesday.’” The result is outright comic — a hallmark of Terry Pratchett’s writing, in this case achieved by the juxtaposition of a serious, awe-inspiring description of the setting followed by a character’s utterance in a touch outmoded fashion – and an absolutely modern, matter-of-fact answer given by another character, expertly defusing the ‘tension bomb.’

From a typological or scholarly point of view, the humour of this scene can be viewed as built up on the principle of antithesis under which
“a certain situation abruptly turns into its opposite” (Passi, 1980: 173; \textit{transl. A.R.}). Here, the solemn turns abruptly into the very ordinary. This observation will conceivably be of significance to the translator.

(2) \textit{Wyrd Sisters} p. 85

“The Fool fumbled in his sleeve and produced a rather soiled red and yellow handkerchief embroidered with bells. The duke took it with an expression of pathetic gratitude and blew his nose. Then he held it away from him and gazed at it with demented suspicion. ‘Is this a dagger I see before me?’ he mumbled. ‘Um. No, my lord. It’s my handkerchief, you see.’ ”

This passage contains an almost exact quotation of one of the most famous lines from Shakespeare’s plays: “Is this a dagger which I see before me, the handle toward my hand?” (Macbeth II.1.33). It is said by Macbeth to himself at the very beginning of a soliloquy in which he ponders the murderous act he is about to commit, egged on by his wife and his greed for power.

Pratchett repeats the line with a difference. First of all, there is a structural difference: Pratchett’s Duke Felmet asks the question some time after he stabbed King Verence, as a result of gathering remorse and growing edginess, when he is on the brink of disclosing his dark secret to the Fool (but is interrupted by the duchess’ entrance). This one-off vision of a dagger complements his recurring visions of his hands smeared with blood which will not wash away.

Another difference is the dropped conjunction ‘which’ – its omission makes the question sound much more like a normal question to ask in the course of an ordinary conversation and not a serious examination of one’s state of mind tinged with a bit of formal English as spoken formerly. It is difficult, however, to say if the omission is intentional, because if it were, in the latter part of the question the formal-sounding preposition ‘before’ would likely be replaced with its common equivalent phrase ‘in front of’.

Finally, since it is not an illusion-triggered internal monologue on the part of Duke Felmet, but it is part of his exchange with the Fool, the question concerns an existing visible physical object and, most importantly, gets answered by the Fool. The immediate situational context is thus totally different from Shakespeare’s original and this is the source of humour in this scene which might be seen as a parody of a scene from Macbeth. However, ridiculing Shakespeare would be inconsistent with Pratchett’s heavy (and very successful as attested by a number of articles on the subject – see, for instance, “Guilty of Literature”, ed. M. Butler et al.) drawing on Shakespeare’s writing in particular and Pratchett’s
overriding love of literature in general. Pratchett may give ironic treatment
to anything (and this means various aspects of contemporary life) but
literary classics, since their function is to provide him with an opportunity
to come up with pure humour based on intertextuality’s ‘statutory’ novel
settings and juxtapositions – and not on simplistic send-ups. The
deliberately incongruous or surprising juxtaposition (Dziemidok, 2011:
73-74) in this case may also point to one more manifestation of the ever
more panic-stricken mind of a hallucination-influenced murderer –
followed by a puzzled Fool’s down-to-earth answer while offering his
hanky.

(3) *Wyrd Sisters* p. 29

“‘I’faith, nuncle,’ he squeaked, ‘thou’t more full of questions than a
martlebury is of mizzensails.’”

(4) *Wyrd Sisters* p. 59-60

“‘Fool?’ ‘Marry, sir—’ said the Fool nervously, and gave his hated mandolin a
quick strum.”

“‘I’faith, nuncle—’ said the Fool.”

“‘How do you feel about Prithee?’ […] ‘Prithee I can live with’”

“‘How long have you been a Fool, boy?’ ‘Prithee, sirrah—’ ‘The sirrah,’ said
the duke, holding up a hand, ‘on the whole, I think not.’”

(5) *Wyrd Sisters* p. 90

“She grinned when she saw Granny’s face. ‘What ho, my old boiler,’ she
screeched above the din.”

(6) *Wyrd Sisters* p. 214

“‘Yes, and then they all said, “All hail, . . .” and then they started arguing
about my name, . . .’”

The passages above offer a small collection of words and short
expressions which, given Pratchett’s overt Shakespearian inspiration lying
at the root of *Wyrd Sisters*, should be seen as references to Shakespeare’s
plays. ‘I’faith’ is a contracted form of ‘in faith’ meaning ‘by my faith’
(Webster, 1963: 300). ‘Nuncle’ is defined as a dialectical variant of
‘uncle’, retaining part of the indefinite article ‘an’ as appearing before it
(Webster, 1963: 580). However, the commentary to *King Lear* gives a
different explanation: “‘Mine uncle’ in childish talk becomes transformed into ‘My nuncle’. Hence ‘nuncle’ becomes the word of a fool for his guardian or superior” (The New Penguin Shakespeare. King Lear, p. 208). ‘Marry’ is an archaic interjection “used to express agreement or surprise, especially in answer to a question” (Webster, 1963: 518). ‘Prithée’ – another archaic interjection “used to express a wish or request” (Webster, 1963: 677). ‘Sirrah’ – an obsolete term “used as a form of address implying inferiority and often used in anger or contempt” (Webster, 1963: 813). ‘Ho’ – an interjection “used especially to attract attention or something specified” (Webster, 1963: 395). ‘Hail’ – an archaic interjection “used as a salutation” (Webster, 1963: 374).

It cannot be, of course, definitively argued that those words come straight from Shakespeare’s works, since they are just archaic or obsolete, yet common, English words. It can, however, be assumed that the ‘vast majority’ of readers, both native and foreign, come to know those words through Shakespeare’s plays – the more that they are chiefly said by the comic characters which, prominent or secondary, are among the most memorable characters who are the source of verbal humour in the comedies and the source of brilliant quips and witty observations in the tragedies. All those characteristic words and short phrases appear in the plays which seem to have influenced Wyrd Sisters most: Hamlet, King Lear, Macbeth, A Midsummer Night’s Dream. Here are some examples. ‘I’faith’ is said by First Clown (Hamlet, V.1), First Carrier (Henry IV, Part One, II.1.38), Second Page (As You Like It, V.3.13), Helena (A Midsummer Night’s Dream, III.2.285). Besides, in those plays there are frequent uses of ‘faith’ on its own in the same meaning as ‘I’faith’.

‘Nuncle’ is said by Fool in King Lear almost each time he speaks to and answers Lear. ‘Marry’ is said by Falstaff (Henry IV, Part One, I.2.23), First Clown (Hamlet, V.1), Celia and Rosalind (As You Like It, I.2.25 and I.2.68, respectively), Porter (Macbeth, II.3.26). ‘Prithée’ is said quite often by Fool in King Lear (e.g. I.4.175, III.4.106, III.6.9 – in those instances followed by ‘nuncle’), Celia (As You Like It, I.2.25), Falstaff (Henry IV, Part One, I.2.16). ‘Sirrah’ is said by Fool in King Lear (I.4.97, I.4.114) and by Lear (I.4.109). “What, ho!” is said by Macbeth (Macbeth, II.2.11), Gadshill (Henry IV, Part One, II.1.48), and in A Midsummer Night’s Dream Puck says “Ho, ho, ho, ...” (III.2.421). ‘All hail’ and ‘hail’ is said by the three witches in Macbeth (I.3.47-49 and 61-68) and the four Fairies in A Midsummer Night’s Dream (III.1.170-173).

In Wyrd Sisters most of the above-discussed words and expressions are used by the Fool, because this is how he was trained to be a ‘professional’ Fool – he knows he simply has to use them. Pratchett has his Fool say
them regularly, but at first the Fool’s superior’s reaction to them is different from the way King Lear reacted to his Fool’s quips and Prince Henry to Falstaff’s. Duke Felmet cannot stand being addressed as ‘nuncle’ and hearing other expressions (except ‘prithee’) from a jester’s ‘standard’ repertoire: “If you preface your next remark with nuncle, i’faith or marry, it will go hard with you. [...] Prithee I can live with. [...] The sirrah [...] on the whole I think not” (p. 60). The clash between the Fool’s expectations and Duke Felmet’s response creates comic tension.

Generally, however, all those words and expressions seem to have a primarily ornamental function. They supplement the other references in *Wyrd Sisters* to Shakespeare’s plays, contributing to this novel’s Shakespearian aura.

(7) *Wyrd Sisters* p. 240-242

“Round about the cauldron go, In the poisoned entrails throw . . .” What are these supposed to be?”
“What happened to the toad?”
“That means no newt or fenny snake either, I suppose? ‘No, Granny.’ ‘Or tiger’s chaudron?’ ‘Here.’”
“Double hubble, stubble trouble, Fire burn and cauldron bub—” WHY isn’t the cauldron bubbling, Magrat?”
“Slab and grue, yes. But it doesn’t say how slab and grue.”
“Baboon hair and mandrake root”, ...”

These quotations come from scenes taking place in Tomjon’s dream. They are chiefly made up of direct or slightly modified quotations from a scene in *Macbeth* (IV.1.1-39) which shows a meeting of the “three Witches” during which, according to what they say, they prepare a concoction in a cauldron over a fire. The original lines in the play are (in corresponding order):

“Round about the cauldron go; In the poisoned entrails throw” (4-5)
“Toad that under cold stone” (6)
“Eye of newt, and toe of frog” (14)
“Fillet of a fenny snake” (12)
“Add thereto a tiger’s chaudron” (33)
“Double, double, toil and trouble; Fire burn, and cauldron bubble” (10-11)
“Make the gruel thick and slab” (32)
“Cool it with a baboon’s blood” (37)
“Root of hemlock dug in’t the dark” (25)
The three witches in Pratchett’s novel are Granny Weatherwax, Nanny Ogg, and Magrat. They are different from their nameless Shakespearian counterparts in that they are not so much witches in the ‘classic’ fear-inspiring sense of the word, but rather more like herbalists, though capable of the occasional paranormal activity, too. Therefore, what they are dreamt by Tomjon to be concocting takes on a form of something slightly more palatable than the original recipe in *Macbeth*. This seems to be Pratchett’s chief idea underlying this scene: a variation on a (rather well-known) theme. He transforms a description of a witches’ repugnant and probably symbolic ‘stew’ into a description of three country women – a maiden, a mother, and a crone (Sayer, 2004: 143-147) – actually making a stew over a fire. By means of modifications and comments made by the three witches Pratchett achieves a humorous effect. His object of irony is, in fact, modern, nutrition-conscious (or perhaps nutrition-obsessed) and animal-loving attitude to cooking and eating. Thus, for example, the original toad is replaced by “whole grain wheat and lentils”, because “Goodie was against all unnecessary cruelty. Vegetable protein is a perfectly acceptable substitute” (241). In this way Pratchett may be suggesting that too strict observance of certain modern fads and beliefs may render Shakespeare “politically incorrect” and unpalatable to some.

Apart from the possible hidden messages and the comic opportunity duly seized by Pratchett, the whole scene appears to be one other intertextual celebration of Shakespeare’s oeuvre, climactically bringing the playwright’s and Pratchett’s witches together in this ‘cauldron’ scene.

(8) *Moving Pictures* p. 305

"... the Thing was dissolving into its component molecules, ... [...] ‘It's deliquescing,’ said the Lecturer in Recent Runes. [...] [The Chair] prodded it with his foot. 'Careful,' said the Dean. ‘That is not dead which can eternal lie.’

The Chair studied it. ‘It looks bloody dead to me,’...

This passage contains the first line from a couplet by H.P. Lovecraft, appearing in his story *The Nameless City*: “That is not dead which can eternal lie, And with strange aeons even death may die” (Lovecraft, 2005: 30) and reappearing in the story *The Call of Cthulhu* (Lovecraft, 1999: 156). Lovecraft uses this couplet to refer to some unknown to modern man prehistoric alien beings who came to Earth from some other planet and who now sort of lie hibernating in a remote, inaccessible location – and have been doing so for millions of years (for “eons”), waiting for proper conditions for them to arise, meanwhile being worshipped by various sects around the world who have learnt about those beings from old legends.