1-1-2008

A Place for Originality within Intertextuality: The Texts and Intertexts of Dorothy Gale and the Wizard of Oz

Savannah Ganster
Penn State University, Berks Reading, Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/tor

Part of the American Literature Commons, Comparative Literature Commons, Literature in English, Anglophone outside British Isles and North America Commons, Literature in English, British Isles Commons, and the Literature in English, North America Commons

A Place for Originality within Intertextuality: The Texts and Intertexts of Dorothy Gale and the Wizard of Oz

A Place for Originality within Intertextuality: The Texts and Intertexts of Dorothy Gale and the Wizard of Oz

Savannah Ganster
Penn State University, Berks
Reading, Pennsylvania

Stephen King's *Wizard and Glass* and Gregory Maguire's *Wicked: the Life and Times of the Wicked Witch of the West* have many borrowed texts and commonalities with L. Frank Baum's *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. These exchanges raise a prime question of intertextuality: is it still possible to create an original work or are all works simply a collection of borrowed phrases and ideas? Intertextuality suggests that all works borrow, whether consciously or unconsciously, from the works before them. All text is cluttered with intertexts, those intertexts creating new texts. The primary

question for intertextuality is whether or not these newly created texts are original. Some theorists argue that there is no room for originality within intertextuality.   However, I appreciate the concept of intertextuality and agree with those theorists who argue that there is a place for originality within intertextuality, especially in light of the texts that I have examined for this essay. King's *Wizard and Glass* and Maguire's *Wicked: the Life and Times of the Wicked Witch of the West* are works that borrow heavily from Baum's *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* in addition to borrowing from other works[1]; however, each of these works is original despite and because of the intertexts found within them.

Understanding Originality within Intertextuality

James E. Porter defined intertextuality and intertexts in his essay, "Intertextuality and the Discourse Community." According to Porter, "[e]xamining texts 'intertextually' means looking for 'traces,' the bits and pieces of Text which writers or speakers borrow and sew together to create new discourse. . . . Intertext is Text – a great seamless textual fabric. And, as they like to intone solemnly, no text escapes intertext" (34). Porter's definition of intertextuality is the concept of smaller texts or intertexts belonging to one collective Text, whereby this Text is borrowed from by writers and speakers to create their own works, which contribute, in turn, to this Text and subsequently help to enlarge it. Moreover, in the further breaking down of this definition, it is easy to understand that all texts become intertexts and all intertexts are a part of the one collective

Text. Intertexts are the small scraps of texts taken and attached to other intertexts to form Text.

Even before "Julia Kristeva coined the term intertextuality to designate a special form of textual interrelations" (Machacek 523), people were aware of the connectivity of texts to one another. As Matthew Arnold said in his Oxford Inaugural Lecture in 1857, "[e]verywhere there is connection, everywhere there is illustration, no single event, no single literature is adequately comprehended except in relation to other events, to other literatures." He was correct. Intertextuality links texts together through intertexts, thus continuing to reinforce the connectivity of texts to each other and to the discourses around them.

There are many opponents and proponents of intertextuality. Among the critics, for example, is Alexander Zholkovsky, who asserts that "the 'intertextualists' claim that every word in [literature] is generated intertextually (just as every word in a language comes from its dictionary) can be conceded in a trivial sense" (728). Detractors of intertextuality might also argue that these connections are non-existent, that they are merely fabrications of an over-zealous reader. Gregory Machacek's article, "Allusion," considers the various terms that critics use when dealing with intertextuality and what each term might suggest. Machacek writes that intertextuality "suggests a relation between equals and may on that basis be preferred over traditional terms by critics who wish to stress that the later author's creativity in adapting an echoed phrase to a new context is no less remarkable than the creativity manifested by the earlier

author in composing the line" (525). Ultimately, Machacek
argues that critics latch onto a specific ideal of intertextuality
in order to make their arguments.

Proponents may argue that intertextuality is
inevitable and affects our creative operations. According
to Perry Share, "[i]ntertextuality refers to how our
contemporary cultural environment is marked by
duplication, interpenetration of texts and the circulation and
recirculation of images, sounds and words in multiple forms
and formats. Intertextuality is ubiquitous and inevitable"
(1). Intertextuality, by this definition, is not confined merely
to texts; it can be applied to many aspects of our discourse
communities. Share goes on to write, "It is almost as if
everything and anything that can be said, has been said. The
only remaining creative option is to rejigger and manipulate
existing narratives, images and texts" (4). In other words,
creativity exists in the option of reworking intertexts to
create new texts.

With creativity being limited only to changing and
adapting intertexts within this model, one could be left with
the idea that there is no room for originality, but how can
this be possible? A creative writer is a writer who makes a
new adaptation out of something old, but could a creative
writer also be a writer who creates something completely
original from something old?   Porter answers this question
when he writes, "Genuine originality is difficult within
the confines of a well-regulated system" (40). The system
to which he refers is the discourse community, which
requires intertextuality. While Porter argues that originality

is difficult within discourse communities that require intextextuality, there are some theorists who would argue for a complete lack of originality in regards to intertextuality. However, I disagree with such theorists. I believe fully that there is a place within intertextuality for originality and that by using intertexts to create new texts, originality can thrive.

The Reinvention and Originality of Dorothy Gale

There are many intertexts from *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* found in both *Wizard and Glass* and *Wicked: The Life and Times of the Wicked Witch of the West*. However, the most interesting of these intertexts are the characters Dorothy Gale and the Wizard of Oz. Both King's *Wizard and Glass* and Maguire's *Wicked* include these named intertexts from Baum's *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* within their texts, though each of these novels uses each of these intertexts in a way that supports innovation and originality.

Although it is certainly possible that further inquiry will find earlier sources for the character, my research indicates that Baum created Dorothy Gale in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. She is introduced to the reader as an orphaned Kansas farm girl who was adopted by her Aunt Em and her Uncle Henry and who set on a journey in the Land of Oz. Baum describes Dorothy as "a well-grown child for her age" (22). He paints Dorothy as an innocent, seemingly helpless young girl who must survive many trials and tribulations to reach her goal. This original Dorothy is a well-developed character who experiences the fear of being lost in a strange place but summons the will to pursue her passage home.

Upon meeting the Wizard of Oz, she is told that she will not be sent home until she has killed the Wicked Witch of the West, to which she cries to her friends, "There is no hope for me . . . for Oz will not send me home until I have killed the Wicked Witch of the West; and that I can never do" (109). Accidently, Dorothy kills the Wicked Witch of the West by throwing water on her when the witch steals her silver slipper. Eventually, after a few more tests of her will, Dorothy is sent back to Kansas by Glinda, the Good Witch of the South.

In Stephen King's *Wizard and Glass*, we see an original and completely unique Dorothy, despite and because of King's borrowing from Baum's Dorothy. King allows the characters of his story -- the Gunslinger, Roland, and his band of friends -- to tell the story of *The Wizard of Oz*, the film adaptation of Baum's *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, as they roam a strange and desolate Topeka, Kansas on their way to their own Emerald City. King wrote of how Roland's friends told him the story with which they were so familiar:

> They told him . . . about a Kansas farm girl named Dorothy Gale who was carried away by a cyclone and deposited, along with her dog, in the Land of Oz…. [Dorothy and her friends] each had… a fondest wish, and it was with Dorothy's that Roland's new friends (and Roland himself, for that matter) identified with the most strongly: she wanted to find her way home again…. 'The Munchkins told her that she had to follow

the yellow brick road to Oz,' Jake said, 'and so she went. She met the others along the way, sort of like you met us, Roland.' (653-54)

This passage is King's way of showing that Roland is Dorothy. The story of Baum's Dorothy parallels the story of the Gunslinger and his friends. Dorothy's ka-tet, or her group, is the equivalent to his group. Both Dorothy and her band of fellow travelers and Roland and his ka-tet are on a mission to find their own respective Emerald Cities. Moreover, Dorothy has three friends and a dog, and Roland has three friends and a dog-like creature called a Billy-bumbler.

It is important for King to recall the images of Dorothy as Baum had invented her since this reference allows the reader to make a strong comparison between Baum's Dorothy and King's Roland. Baum's innocent and helpless Dorothy only serves to make King's Roland an even more dangerous and able-bodied character in comparison, despite the fact that they have been drawn from a common root. In essence, the intertexts of Dorothy as applied to *Wizard and Glass* turn Dorothy into Roland, the Gunslinger, wandering a strange world on a quest to find what he wants the most, the Dark Tower. Moreover, the intertexts of Dorothy as applied to Roland, the Gunslinger, create an original text in which Dorothy is reinvented as a dangerous gunslinging man on his way to see the Wizard of Oz.

Gregory Maguire's *Wicked: The Life and Times of the Wicked Witch of the West* also borrows intertexts of the

character Dorothy to create yet another original Dorothy.
In fact, Maguire includes this description of Dorothy in the
prologue of his novel, "[Dorothy] was sitting with her feet
tucked underneath her and her arms wrapped around her
knees. She was not a dainty thing, but a good-size farm girl,
dressed in blue-and-white checks and a pinafore. In her lap,
a vile little dog cowered and whined" (3). Dorothy does
not play a major role in *Wicked* until the end of the novel,
but she becomes a character that readers have not before
encountered. Beyond the point of physical description, the
intertexts that Maguire borrows from Baum in regards to
Dorothy create an entirely new and original character that
is easily identified. Within *Wicked*, Dorothy is described as
a charming child who is filled with remorse over the death
of the Wicked Witch of the East, if for no other reason than
the undue pain that it is causing Elphaba, the Wicked Witch
of the West. Moreover, Dorothy defends Elphaba to the
Cowardly Lion, the Scarecrow, and the Tin Woodsman,
and she does so with sympathy and great sincerity. As in
Baum's work, the Wizard of Oz sends Dorothy to murder
Elphaba before he will consider sending her home to
Kansas. However, Dorothy decides that she will not murder
Elphaba but that she will beg her forgiveness regarding
the death of The Wicked Witch of the East and then return
to Oz and pretend to have murdered her. It is at this point
that Dorothy sobs to Elphaba, "I would say to you: Would
you ever forgive me for that accident, for the death of your
sister; would you ever, ever forgive me, for I could never
forgive myself!" (Maguire 513). Maguire's Dorothy has

no interest in harming Elphaba, and it is only when some of the flaming broom catches Elphaba's dress alight that Dorothy throws water on the Wicked Witch of the West in an attempt to save her life. His Dorothy is a sincere and caring Dorothy in need of forgiveness and the parallel of Elphaba herself, who sought forgiveness from a dead lover's wife, only to be thwarted in her desire by her lover's wife's death. While the original Dorothy does not want to kill the Wicked Witch of the West, it is because she fears the witch for her wickedness and does not understand how she could possibly kill her. However, in *Wicked*, Dorothy has no intention of ever murdering the Wicked Witch of the West because of her essential humanity, her remorse, and her need for forgiveness. Maguire succeeds in creating the ultimately pure and naïve Dorothy by using the intertexts taken from *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. His Dorothy is individual and original despite and because of the intertexts he borrowed.

The Wizard of Oz, Himself, Rewritten

In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz,* the Wizard is a complex and original character. In the beginning, when she arrives in Munchkinland via the cyclone, Dorothy is instructed to go to the City of Emeralds. She is given directions by an old woman who says, "'It is exactly in the center of the country, and is ruled by Oz, the Great Wizard I told you of. . . . He is a good Wizard. Whether he is a man or not I cannot tell, for I have never seen him'" (Baum 26). Throughout Baum's novel, the Wizard is depicted as a great being who is very powerful and who does great deeds for the people he presides over. At the Wizard's request,

Dorothy goes to kill the Wicked Witch of the West, but when she succeeds and returns to the Emerald City looking to be rewarded by being sent back to Kansas, she and her friends learn that the Wizard of Oz is merely himself an old man from Omaha, Kansas, with no magical powers at all: "'I am Oz, the Great and the Terrible,' said the little man, in a trembling voice, 'but don't strike me – please don't! – and I'll do anything you want me to…. My dear friends… I pray you not to speak of these little things. Think of me, and the terrible trouble I'm in at being found out'" (Baum 150). The man who was thought to be the Great and Terrible Wizard of Oz is no more than a "humbug" (150).

In King's *Wizard and Glass*, intertexts borrowed from *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* serve to create a new and inventive Wizard of Oz, independent from but also linked to Baum's original model. King's characters, Roland and his ka-tet, eventually reach their own Emerald City, which stands along the Beam of the Bear and the Turtle, thus placing it in their way on their quest to find the Dark Tower. Upon reaching the Emerald City, Roland and his ka-tet enter the greenish glowing palace to find that it seems to be alive with machinery and magic. As they walk forward, they are addressed by a voice, "'I . . . AM . . . OZ!' the voice [thunders]. The glass columns [flash], so [do] the pipes behind the thrown, 'OZ THE GREAT! OZ THE POWERFUL! WHO ARE YOU?'" (King 668). King begins by creating a Wizard of Oz who seems to be identical to the original; however, only a few pages later, his true identity is revealed: "'Pay no attention to the man behind

the curtain,' [says] a voice behind them, and then [titters]. . . . Jake [swings] around and [sees] that there [is] now a man sitting in the middle of the great throne, with his legs casually crossed in front of him" (671). This man is not quite human; in fact, he is Marten Broadcloak, also known as Maerlyn the Wizard and as Randall Flagg. He is an actual wizard who is centuries old and one of Roland's greatest enemies, for both he and Roland have outlived time itself. As Roland attempts to kill him, Flagg disappears. Moreover, going along with the idea that Roland, the Gunslinger, is the original character representation of Dorothy in *Wizard and Glass*, the fact that Roland attempts to murder the Wizard, Randall Flagg, represents a very large deviation from the original story of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, in which Dorothy makes no attempt on the Wizard's life. This wizard is an actual, evil adversary from Roland's past. Again, King uses direct references and intertexts to remind the reader of Baum's original Wizard of Oz if only to heighten the contrast to Randall Flagg. Baum's Wizard was a selfish fraud with absolutely no power, but King's Randall Flagg is a very evil and very powerful wizard who would love the opportunity to destroy Roland. By setting Randall Flagg against Baum's original Wizard of Oz, King is able to depict the absolute evil and danger of Flagg, while still maintaining about him a level of enchantment.

In *Wicked*, Maguire offers his own variation on the Wizard of Oz. Maguire writes that the Wizard of Oz "was without disguise, a plain-looking older man wearing a high-collared shirt and a greatcoat, with a watch and fob hanging

from the waistcoat pocket. His head was pink and mottled, and tufts of hair stuck out above his ears. He mopped his brow with the handkerchief and sat down, motioning the Witch to sit, too" (447). Beneath his manufactured facade, like that of the original Wizard, Maguire's Wizard is ordinary in appearance. However, Maguire's Wizard differs from Baum's in the matter of behavior since he is a political tyrant. For example, he is likened to Hitler when he discriminates against a segment of the population, the Animals:

> Then the Goat turned and in a milder voice than they expected he told them that the Wizard of Oz had proclaimed Banns on Animal Mobility, effective several weeks ago. This meant not only that Animals were restricted in their access to travel conveyances, lodgings, and public services. This Mobility it referred to was also professional. Any Animal coming of age was prohibited from working in the professions or the public sector. (114)

In *Wicked*, Animals, which are animal creatures with spirits and the ability to master logic and reasoning and speech, are persecuted like the Jews of Europe just before and during World War II. This helps to add to the political unrest and instability of Oz and its surrounding lands.

Moreover, to add to the complexity of Maguire's characterization, the Wizard is actually able to perform some magic. It is discovered near the end of the book that

the Wizard of Oz drugged or "magicked" Melena, Elphaba's mother, with a potion from a green glass bottle labeled "MIRACLE ELIXER" and then raped her, which resulted in the conception of Elphaba, the Wicked Witch of the West (38). Elphaba is, therefore, a direct descendant of the royal line of Munchkinland and is expected to take her place as a rightful ruler of that land, while, at the same time, she is also the illegitimate daughter of the tyrannical Wizard of Oz, whom the rulers of Munchkinland oppose by wishing to secede from Oz to create a separate, sovereign state. Moreover, she despises both parts of her lineage. While Elphaba finds out that she is the illegitimate daughter of the Wizard some time before her death, the Wizard does not learn of his ties to the Wicked Witch of the West until Dorothy brings him a relic from Elphaba's house upon her return to Oz. Maguire writes:

> [S]o she brought the green glass bottle that said MIRACLE ELI- on the paper glued to the front. It may merely be apocryphal that when the Wizard saw the glass bottle he gasped, and clutched his heart. . . . It is a matter of history, however, that shortly thereafter, the Wizard absconded from the Palace. He left in the way he had first arrived – a hot-air balloon – just a few hours before seditious ministers were to lead a Palace revolt and to hold an execution without trial. (518)

Whether out of guilt for his transgressions against Elphaba

and the people of Oz or out of the knowledge that his reign of terror is over, the Wizard leaves Oz and returns to his own world. The tyranny and maliciousness of the Wizard in *Wicked* stand in sharp contrast to the pathetic failures and disappointments of the Wizard in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.

Dorothy and the Wizard: Original Reinventions or Intertextual Regurgitations?

Baum creates Dorothy, the innocent and persistent farm girl, who served as a model for King's Roland and Maguire's Dorothy. King creates a dangerous gunslinger; Maguire creates the pinnacle of purity and the absolute voice of naivety. However, each character, though drawn from Baum's Dorothy, is unique. What would happen if each of these characters were to be meshed into yet another character, my own Dorothy? Who would my Dorothy be? She would be a pistol-toting, chain-smoking, strong farm girl in a blue check dress, with a heart of gold and a burden of guilt over the death of the Wicked Witch of the East. My Dorothy would not take the Yellow Brick Road; rather, she would be an adventurer, cutting her own way to the Emerald City. Upon reaching her destination, she would demand of the Wizard of Oz that she be sent home immediately to Kansas, thus boycotting his plan to murder the Wicked Witch of West. Furthermore, my Dorothy would be granted her demand because my Wizard of Oz, a slimy, elderly, selfish, horrible Wizard with a black heart filled to the brim with evil and a soul stifled by his cowardice, would be too fearful of such a forceful and dangerous Dorothy. Despite all of his

ruthlessness and his terrible deeds, my Wizard of Oz would know that Dorothy is much stronger than he and that she poses a threat to him if she were to remain in Oz; thus, he would use his powers to send her home to Kansas so that he could continue to rule Oz with his iron fist of oppression. My Wizard of Oz would be the amalgamation of Baum's selfish, cowardly, old fraud, King's evil and powerful wizard, Randall Flagg, and Maguire's tyrannical, Hitler-channeling, raping, pillaging, and plundering Wizard of Oz. Yes, I could create revamped, reinvented, reissued contemporary counterparts to these characters and still be original.

Notes

[1] *Wicked* borrows heavily from historical events and people such as World War II, Hitler, the Watergate scandal, the Nixon Administration, and, finally, the first Bush Administration. *Wizard and Glass* borrows from contemporary music, most notably "Hey Jude" by the Beatles. In addition, *Wizard and Glass* borrows from cowboy films and from advertisements for Keebler cookies and Coca-Cola; it appropriates the tick-tock creatures from later L. Frank Baum novels.

Works Cited

Arnold, Matthew. *On the Modern Element in Literature*. Inaugural Lecture. University of Oxford, Oxford, NY. 14 Nov. 1857.

Baum, L. Frank. *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. New York: Barnes and Noble Classics, 1900.

King, Stephen. *Wizard and Glass: the Dark Tower IV*. New York: Signet, 1997.

Machacek, Gregory. "Allusion." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 122 (2007): 522-36.

Maguire, Gregory. *Wicked: the Life and Times of the Wicked Witch of the West*. New York: Harper, 1995.

Porter, James E. "Intertextuality and the Discourse Community." *Rhetoric Review* 5 (1986): 34-47.

Share, Perry. "Managing Intertextuality--Meaning, Plagiarism, and Power." 2006. 27 Oct. 2007 <http://www.jiscpas.ac.uk/documents/papers/2006Papers21.doc>.

Zholkovsky, Alexander. "Intertextuality, Its Contents and Discontents." *Slavic Review* 47 (1988): 726-29.