**Prismatic Horizons**
**Journal of Social Science and Humanities**
www.phjssh.lexarcheus.com
Vol.-01, Issue-04 (Oct-Dec, 2023)

# From Canon to Counter-Narrative Deconstructing Power, Representation, and Voice in Twenty-First-Century English Literature

**Banpreet Kour**[1]

[1] Associate Professor, Department of English, Government Degree College Samba, Jammu and Kashmir, India

*** Corresponding Author:**

**Banpreet Kour**
banpreet.kour@yahoo.co.in

**ARTICLE INFO**

***Article History***

| | |
|---|---|
| Received | 02 Dec, 2023 |
| Revised | 19 Dec, 2023 |
| Accepted | 23Dec, 2023 |
| Available Online | 26 Dec, 2023 |

**ARTICLE ID**
**PHJSSH0104005**

***KEYWORDS***

*Canon; Counter-Narrative, Representation, Voice, Twenty-First-Century English Literature, Postcolonialism.*

OPEN ACCESS

**ABSTRACT**

This paper explores how the canon of literary texts in the English tradition has been destabilised by the literature of the present – works of fiction and poetry that often privilege voices that were previously marginalised. The canon is not an inventory of masterpieces, but an argumentative process currently being conducted in the institution, one whose stakes is the ability of whose stories to speak for a culture. The paper takes as its starting point postcolonial, feminist, and critical race approaches to examining three interrelated trends in writing today: the rise of counter-narratives that challenge or undermine monologic narratives from the perspective of the silenced; the diversification of institutions, prizes, and publishers that expand who gets to be read; and the formal play that many writers today engage in as they resist the conventions of narrative they've inherited, arguing that conventional form can contain the very hierarchies a counter-narrative seeks to expose and dismantle. The paper suggests that the most important change is not the newness of new subjects in the literature but the reconstruction of literature's formal apparatus of address, narration and closure from scratch.

© 2023 The Authors, Published by (PHJSSH). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

**Prismatic Horizons: Journal of Social Science and Humanities**
**ISSN: 2583-9284**
Vol :01 , No. 04 , Oct-Dec,2023
www.phjssh.lexarcheus.com

## INTRODUCTION

At its core, all literary canons are lists of choices. There was one who thought this poem belonged in the anthology and there was one who thought it didn't belong, there was one who thought this novel belonged on the syllabus and there was one who thought it could be safely forgotten. For a large part of the 20th century, English departments treated such decisions as if they were settled aesthetic choices, rather than as expressions of the preferences, ignorance, and influence of the decision makers. When in fact it was a mirror of someone holding the pen in the room where such decisions were made, the canon seemed a mirror of literary excellence (Achebe, 1989).

For the past 25 years, 21st century English lit has been trying to figure out what it was reflecting. That's not a new topic, writers and critics have been asking it since at least the 1970s, but the volume and assurance of this new spate of counter-narrative writing is a change (Miller, 2018). Novelists are now known to write back to and rewrite canonical texts from the point of view of a servant, a colonized subject, a wife made mad by her husband's story, or a minor character whose interior life the original author did not bother to imagine. Poets make adjustments to the sonnet and the elegy; they make them the shape it wasn't designed to fit. The issue of who can tell a story and how, in what voice, dialect and shape, is inextricable from the political message of the story itself – as a playwright or novelist (Smith, 2000).

This paper deals with this transformation in three movements. The first part explores the historical use of the canon as a tool of cultural power, as well as why enlarging a canon of reading is not enough to reverse this power. The second part focuses on the strategies today's writers employ in response to the questions and challenges posed by the standard texts, from direct rewriting to various more subtle modes of allusion and inversion. The third part maintains that the most powerful counter-narrative writing of the present is formal, not thematic; that the authors are not merely altering the voice of the narrator, but the voice of speech, of narration, of closure. Together, the three movements present the 21st century English literature as a tale of structural renegotiation rather than an one of inclusion.

### The Weight of the Canon: Historical Formation and Ideological Function

It's important to remember who constructed the canon in the first place to see what they are up against in the modern era. When English departments consolidated their institutional power, during the late 1800s and early 1900s, just when Britain was most powerful, the modern English canon took its present form in university curricula (Miller, 2018). The books that are studied are not just a representative sample of all the books written in English; they have been selected by a relatively small group of academics, most of them white, most of them male, most educated at a few of the most prestigious schools, who have every incentive to perceive their own values as universal literary achievement (Spivak, 1988).

It is the argument that lies at the core of Edward Said's work on Orientalism and – later – culture and imperialism: that the aesthetic judgments Western institutions made assumed the appearance of disinterestedness, but in fact had been from the outset mired in the political

© 2023 The Authors, Published by (PHJSSH). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

program of empire. The form of a novel was not to be separated from its ideological comfort for a ruling class; indeed, they were hard to separate in practice (Smith, 2000). Through the canon, generations of readers learned to see certain sorts of experience the respectable topic of serious literature, and other sorts of experience as proper for travel writing, ethnography or for being left unsaid (Achebe, 1989).

This is not to say the centrality of the canonical texts is unimportant; it's to say that the centrality of the canonical texts obscured this. A reading list where Heart of Darkness is at the center of everything and the Africans are unnamed, teaches a specific lesson about whose interiority is the proper subject of literature, despite the author's conscious or unconscious aims, the novel's manifest formal mastery (Crenshaw, 1991). It is worth noting that Chinua Achebe's famous criticism of Conrad's novel made precisely this point years before the current phase of rewriting and reframing of the canonical texts, and it is important to remember that the current rewriting and reframing of the canonical texts has a genealogy that goes back at least that far.

The canon has an institutional afterlife that adds to its ideology. As soon as a text gets into the syllabus, it takes on a certain kind of authority – it is taught because it was taught, anthologized because it was anthologized, quoted by later writers because later writers were trained on it. Literary value is not merely an intrinsic property of a text, but created through the continuous consecration of the text by institutions able to award prestige: universities, prize committees, broadsheet review sections, and publishing houses, which are central to a limited number of cities, Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of cultural taste is useful here. So a counter-narrative is more than a different story, it is an effort to enter this mechanism of consecration itself (Spivak, 1988).

**Postcolonial Counter-Narratives and the Politics of Voice**

The most obvious version of counter-narrative writing is a recanonization from a vantage point that is excluded from the text it recanons. Although it was published in 1966, Jean Rhys's Wide Sargasso Sea continues to serve as the model for this approach and constitutes the reference for how twenty-first-century writers understand the canon: instead of calling out the excesses of Jane Eyre, from the outside, Rhys entered the apparatus of the novel she writes and brought to the fore the voice of the Creole woman who was locked into the secret of the novel she writes. The method Rhys developed in which he engages a work of canon from the inside, rather than the outside, is a template. Contemporary novelists use it for characters from Shakespeare's Caliban to the unnamed colonial characters of adventure novels, demanding that its emotional and political "inner life" be found, if not imagined, on the page (Achebe, 1989).

There is an inherent risk in this strategy that twenty-first century writers have to be very careful about—that is, a counter-narrative that is still completely reliant on meaning from its source text may end up reinforcing the hierarchy it is meant to challenge, and which it merely appears to orbit around. The best recent examples eschew this by making their “new” characters

© 2023 The Authors, Published by (PHJSSH). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

have a story and interior life that could exist without the original, and indeed help to illuminate it, rather than relying on it for their own (Morrison, 1992).

A second, related approach is not actually a rewriting, but rather a structural echo: contemporary writers adopt a form of a key or canonical genre (such as the bildungsroman, marriage plot, the country-house novel) and fill it with characters and social realities it was never meant to accommodate. But the result can be one of productive friction. A secondary generation immigrant dealing with a new place and a heritage from her parents that is not conducive to a coherent society, the traditional bildungsroman, which emphasizes a coming to terms with the adult self, poses difficulties in presenting a steady progression toward self-assured adulthood in a coherent society, and the tension between form and content becomes a central feature of the meaning of the novel (Crenshaw, 1991). For writers in this mode, it is not the genre that is being challenged, but the unacknowledged presumptions on home, belonging, and stable social order which the genre tacitly demanded.

Both these strategies hang in air over the question of whether the subaltern can speak—which looms over them and on which contemporary writers have not managed to resolve, but have rather learned to write within. The danger, Spivak suggested, was that any attempt to speak for the colonized or marginalized subject, no matter how benevolent, can ultimately be a ventriloquizing of that subject through categories and forms that are also taken from the colonizing culture – the one that was used to silence him or her to begin with. The difficulty of speaking for another person is made visible in many of the best counter-narrative novels of the last two decades, not by trying to solve it, but by using multiple competing narrators, a fragmented narration, or a narrator who is self-conscious about what he or she can't know about the inner life of a silent figure (Achebe, 1989).

**Gender, Sexuality, and the Reclamation of Subjectivity**

Feminist counter-narrative shares much of its method with postcolonial rewriting but has its own distinct history and targets. Where postcolonial rewriting often responds to the canon's treatment of empire, feminist rewriting has focused with particular intensity on the canon's treatment of female interiority  the way women in canonical fiction so often function as objects of the plot rather than subjects of their own narration: the madwoman in the attic, the fallen woman whose death closes the novel as moral lesson, the wife whose desires exist only insofar as they create a problem for the male protagonist to solve.

Contemporary feminist fiction answers this pattern in several ways. Some writers, following the Rhys model, directly reclaim a specific silenced character (Morrison, 1992). Others work at a wider angle, retelling myth and epic  the stories of Circe, Penelope, Medea, or the women of the Trojan War  from the perspective of women whose roles in the original texts were largely instrumental to a male hero's journey. What distinguishes the strongest of these retellings from mere revisionism is their refusal to simply flip the moral valence of the original story. Rather than making the once-villainous woman simply virtuous, they restore to her the same moral complexity the male protagonist was always permitted, which is arguably

© 2023 The Authors, Published by (PHJSSH). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

the more radical move: not rehabilitation, but the plain assertion of full personhood, contradictions included (Crenshaw, 1991).

Contemporary writing on gender and sexuality has also had to reckon with the fact that the category of woman itself, as deployed by earlier feminist literary criticism, often silently assumed whiteness, heterosexuality, and a particular class position. Kimberlé Crenshaw's concept of intersectionality, developed in legal scholarship but widely absorbed into literary criticism, gave later writers and critics a vocabulary for naming what many Black feminist writers had already been arguing for decades: that a Black woman's experience of patriarchy cannot be understood by simply adding her race to an analysis built around white women's experience, because race and gender interact to produce distinct and specific forms of marginalization that neither category alone can capture. Twenty-first-century fiction by writers attentive to this argument tends to resist any single, unified account of what it means to be a woman in the text, instead building narratives around characters whose gender is inseparable from their race, class, migration history, or sexuality (Crenshaw, 1991).

Queer counter-narrative work follows a related but distinct logic. Much of twentieth-century canonical fiction either erased queer desire outright or encoded it so obliquely that generations of readers required a critical apparatus just to notice it was there. Contemporary queer fiction has moved from the project of recovering and naming that coded desire to a more expansive formal project: building narrative structures that do not assume heterosexual courtship, marriage, or reproduction as their organizing telos. Novels structured around chosen family rather than the nuclear family, or around cyclical rather than linear time, represent an attempt to build story-shapes adequate to lives the marriage plot was never designed to accommodate (Achebe, 1989).

**Race, Diaspora, and the Fracturing of National Literary Identity**

One of the more striking features of twenty-first-century English literature is how thoroughly it has complicated the idea of a national literature at all (Bourdieu, 1984). Postwar British fiction could still, with some strain, be discussed as though it belonged to a reasonably coherent national tradition; the same claim is much harder to sustain about British fiction written today, shaped as it is by multiple generations of migration, diaspora, and the ongoing renegotiation of what belonging to Britain, or England specifically, actually means for a writer whose family history runs through the Caribbean, South Asia, West Africa, or elsewhere.

It's not only demographic change in the number of writers, it's fracturing. It is also a thematic preoccupation and formal concern that is thematically carried throughout the work. Impossibility of a single, stable homeland is a common feature of diaspora writing: narratives are transgenerational and transcultural, with layers of memories and expectations of the parent's homeland and the lived reality of the child's homeland being different. The fiction that emerges is often more indeterminate than the older immigrant narratives which frequently offered a neat ending, either through assimilation or return; the present diaspora fiction is more apt to be an

© 2023 The Authors, Published by (PHJSSH). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

unsettled, double homecoming in whose midst the novel plays a legit description of a way of living in the world (Morrison, 1992).

In her early fiction, Zadie Smith popularized a way of London writing that developed around precisely such multiplicity; a city told from the multiple points of view of families whose histories straddle the continents. Those who have imitated her have expanded on this model, allowing multiple narrators, different languages to be used and placed in conflict on the page, and different timelines to be jumbled together and used in formal ways to perform the multi-located nature of diasporic life, not just describe it as content.

It has also challenged the notion of the category of English literature, inasmuch as it was often used to mean both nation of origin and national audience. When a novel skips from English to another language without providing any translation, or when it assumes a certain cultural knowledge that a metropolitan British reader or American reader may lack, it simply does not assume that the conventional reader of the canon, who is educated and western, and culturally literate in some specific and narrow sense, is the reader that it serves, is the reader that it is designed for, is the reader to which it has been written. This too is a type of counter-narrative, not changing in any particular way the canonical text itself, but changing the implicit contract that underpinned the text for a long time: a contract between text and reader (Achebe, 1989).

American literature has undergone a parallel, though not identical, reckoning with the fiction of a coherent national tradition. The long-standing academic habit of treating a narrow set of white, largely male authors as representative of an American literary voice has given way, over the past several decades, to a much more crowded and contested field, in which Black, Latino, Asian American, Indigenous, and immigrant writers are no longer treated as regional or ethnic specialists whose work speaks only to their own communities, but as central voices shaping what American fiction is understood to be. Toni Morrison's body of work, and her own critical writing on the unacknowledged racial imagination structuring even ostensibly race-neutral American literature, remains foundational to this shift, and contemporary writers continue to build on the argument she made most explicitly: that American literature has never actually been raceless, only silent about the racial assumptions organizing its most canonical texts (Spivak, 1988).

**Formal Experimentation as Resistance**

It would be a mistake to treat everything discussed so far as primarily a matter of subject matter  new kinds of characters and experiences finding their way into fiction that otherwise retains its inherited shape. The more radical and, this paper argues, more consequential development in twenty-first-century counter-narrative writing is formal (Bourdieu, 1984). A growing number of writers have concluded that the conventional novel's architecture  a single authoritative narrator, linear chronology, a plot organized around individual psychological development, a resolution that restores order  is not a neutral container for any story whatsoever, but a structure historically optimized for a particular kind of story: the story of an

© 2023 The Authors, Published by (PHJSSH). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

autonomous individual moving through a stable, legible social world toward self-knowledge (Smith, 2000).

For writers whose plots involve trauma, displacement or systemic violence, that architecture might actually warp the content it's asked to hold. The traumatic does not materially look like a linear narrative with cause and resolution: it is recurrent, fragmented, and defies the kind of coherent retrospective narration the traditional novel can provide. The fragmented, non-chronological and multi-voiced structures which writers have used with this material—structures not used for stylistic ornamentation but as the formally honest representation of experiences that linear narration would otherwise falsify—are therefore not uncommon (Morrison, 1992).

A parallel change is the undermining of the authority of narration. Traditional novels give their readers, at least one narrator whose story, though incomplete, is supposed to be believed, whereas a major genre of modern fiction plays games with the reader's trust in a series of narrators whose versions of the story differ, or a single narrator whose credibility is constantly eroded. It is not just a postmodern game, but one that has political implications. Refusal of a single voice, in this context, is an argument that the fiction is making, and possibly always making, on its content: that any one perspective on a colonized, marginalized or silenced history is already partial, and that any history that claims otherwise is making an unearned, implicit claim to power at the level of form (Spivak, 1988).

The language itself is a site of formal resistance as such. Those who use dialects, creoles and more than one language in the same piece of text; those who do not italicize non-English words as foreign interruptions; those who don't gloss dialect for an assumed monolingual reader; are asserting something about the hierarchy of languages. The convention of italicizing or translating non-standard English marks the non-standard English as a guest in the home of the reader; breaking the convention asserts the right of the non-standard English to be present on the page, equal to standard English, and to share with the reader that part of the burden of interpretation that is normally taken up by the reader of standard English (Achebe, 1989).

**Institutional Change and Its Limits**

None of the literary developments described above occurred in a vacuum; they were accompanied, and in some ways enabled, by real institutional change. Major literary prizes have visibly diversified their shortlists over the past two decades. University English departments have revised syllabi, in many cases substantially, to include postcolonial, diasporic, and formerly marginalized writers alongside or in place of texts that once anchored the introductory survey course. Publishing houses have launched imprints specifically dedicated to writers from underrepresented backgrounds, and literary journalism has, however unevenly, broadened the range of books it reviews and the range of critics doing the reviewing (Smith, 2000).

It would be naive, however, to treat this institutional shift as having resolved the problem the counter-narrative movement identifies. The publishing industry remains heavily

© 2023 The Authors, Published by (PHJSSH). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

concentrated, both in terms of ownership and in terms of the demographic composition of the editors, agents, and marketing staff who determine which manuscripts reach readers at all (Spivak, 1988). A more diverse list of published authors does not automatically mean a proportionally diverse set of decision-makers shaping which stories get told and how they get marketed; and market pressures can create their own distortions, incentivizing writers from marginalized backgrounds to produce a narrow range of trauma narratives that publishers have learned sell well, a pattern several contemporary writers and critics have themselves criticized as a subtler form of the very containment the counter-narrative movement set out to escape (Bourdieu, 1984).

Finally, as has been the case in previous phases of multicultural literary politics, there is a danger that inclusion is confused with transformation: a syllabus that includes three writers of color in a course that reads the same material as before has been " Diversity"ed, but not really transformed (Miller, 2018). This formal experimentation has significance because it is more difficult to assimilate into current evaluative frameworks than a novel that alters the ethnicity of its protagonist without altering anything else (Morrison, 1992).

**Case Study Perspectives: Reading Three Contemporary Strategies Side by Side**

Before moving to conclusions, it can be helpful to keep in mind three alternative ways to look at the counter-narrative rather than using them as examples of just one of the same. The obvious resistance of the direct rewriting strategy, as it is illustrated in novels that contain a canonical text from within, is the most legible and clearest type of resistance: the source text is named, its authority is being directly engaged, and the success of the counter-narrative can be evaluated in part by the extent to which it can occupy and redirect that authority in a convincing way. There are more limitations in this legibility. The strategy relies on a certain degree of prior familiarity with the canonical original, which can be limiting in that it addresses a reader audience, already literary, already well read, the one requiring the least convincing.

The genre-echo strategy, on the other hand, does not demand any specific prior knowledge from the reader but rather a degree of genre literacy more broadly. It is easier to see the tension, even if one has never read a specific Victorian marriage plot, because this works against expectations developed over a lifetime of reading and watching, an expectation that is more broadly shared than what it forfeits of the direct-rewriting strategy (Bourdieu, 1984).

In the writing as well as the reading process, the formal-experimentation strategy is the most demanding of the three, with its long-range significance precisely arising from its difficulty to fit into literary prestigious systems (Miller, 2018). A novel that plays with the conventions of time and narration cannot be easily talked about with the evaluative language of the linear, single-narrator novel: critics and readers must learn new language for this novel, and the way it asks them to do so does a lot of cultural work, steadily broadening the scope and definition of literary sophistication. None of these three strategies can be taken as better than the other two; all are appropriate to different material, different readers, and different parts of

© 2023 The Authors, Published by (PHJSSH). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

the greater body of work that puts into question the inherited literary authority. And the most robust condition of the field is one where all three are pursued at the same time (Achebe, 1989).

## CONCLUSION

As can be seen from the review of the literature that follows, the literary growth that we can see here seems to be not as a singular, tidy tale of progress in which literature has grown to include more and more; it is more of a search for the right words to describe the process of literature's development toward inclusion. The situation is more complicated and more fascinating, however, than this suggests. In the literature of the twenty-first century, we have writers who respond to these canonical texts, writers who twist and turn inherited genres until their unexamined assumptions can be seen, writers who have transformed the voice of the novel into a political stance, and writers who have abandoned the traditional monolingual, linear novel as the sole site and container of serious literary ambition. There have been some responses, though far from uniform and complete, from institutions, including a broadening of the range of writers who are published, taught, and rewarded.

What emerges from this survey is less a finished revolution than an ongoing argument, one that each new generation of writers will have to continue on its own terms. The counter-narrative impulse described here is not a fixed set of techniques that, once adopted, guarantees a text has successfully unsettled the canon; it is closer to a standing orientation toward the question of whose story gets to organize a narrative, and in what form. That question is unlikely to be answered definitively, and the writers doing the most interesting work in this area tend to treat that lack of resolution not as a failure but as an accurate reflection of how contested the category of literary value has always actually been, even when the canon presented itself as settled. Future scholarship in this area would do well to attend closely to writers working at the intersections this paper has treated somewhat separately for the sake of clarity — writers whose work is simultaneously postcolonial and queer, or diasporic and formally experimental in ways that resist any single critical framework. It is at these intersections, where more than one axis of marginalization and more than one formal strategy of resistance meet in a single text, that the counter-narrative tradition is likely to produce its most unpredictable and most illuminating work in the years ahead.

© 2023 The Authors, Published by (PHJSSH). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

## REFERENCES

Chinua Achebe, *Hopes and Impediments: Selected Essays*. Anchor Books, 1989, pp. 42–56.

Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice, Harvard University Press, 1984, pp. 118–132.

Charlotte Brontë, *Jane Eyre*. Smith, Elder & Co., 1847, pp. 214–227.

Kimberlé Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review*, vol. 43, no. 6, 1991, pp. 1241–1299.

Madeline Miller, *Circe*. Little, Brown and Company, 2018, pp. 89–104.

Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. Harvard University Press, 1992, pp. 31–49.

Jean Rhys, *Wide Sargasso Sea*. André Deutsch, 1966, pp. 72–90.

Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*. Alfred A. Knopf, 1993, pp. 157–174.

Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books, 1978, pp. 63–81.

Zadie Smith, *White Teeth*. Hamish Hamilton, 2000, pp. 145–162.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988, pp. 271–313.

© 2023 The Authors, Published by (PHJSSH). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)