AN INTRODUCTION TO INTERTEXTUALITY AS A LITERARY THEORY: DEFINITIONS, AXIOMS AND THE ORIGINATORS

Mevlüde ZENGİN[∗]

*"The good of a book lies in its being read.
A book is made up of signs that speak of
other signs, which in their turn speak of
things. Without an eye to read them, a
book contains signs that produce no
concepts; therefore it is dumb."*

Umberto Eco, *The Name of the Rose*

Abstract

The aim of this study is to provide a succinct discussion of intertextuality from a theoretical perspective. The concept of intertextuality dates back to the ancient times when the first human history and the discourses about texts began to exist. As a phenomenon it has sometimes been defined as a set of relations which a text has with other texts and/or discourses belonging to various fields and cultural domains. Yet the commencement of intertextuality as a critical theory and an approach to texts was provided by the formulations of such theorists as Ferdinand de Saussure, Mikhail Bakhtin and Roland Barthes before the term 'intertextuality' was coined by Julia Kristeva in 1966. This study, focusing on firstly, the path from 'work' to 'text' and 'intertext', both of which ultimately became synonymous, and secondly, the shifting position of the reader/interpreter becoming significant in the discipline of literary studies, aims to define intertextuality as a critical theory and state its fundamentals and axioms formulated by the mentioned originators of the intertextual theory and thus to betray the fact that intertextuality had a poststructuralist and postmodern vein at the outset. The study was motivated by both a lack of a study differing the intellectual origins/mental conceptors from the later theoreticians and the rarity of intertextuality's being dealt with as a separate literary approach, i.e. its being scrutinized mostly as a part of other critical approaches. For this reason, the study has been thought to be beneficial especially for laypersons.

Key Words: *Intertextuality, Text, Intertext, Intertextual relations, Literary theory*

BİR EDEBİYAT KURAMI OLARAK METİNLERARASILIĞA GİRİŞ: TANIMLAR, İLKSAVLAR VE YARATICILAR

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı teorik açıdan metinlerarasılığın ne olduğuna dair kısa bir tartışma sunmaktır. Metinlerarasılık kavramı insanlığın ilk tarihinin ve metinler hakkındaki söylemlerin ortaya çıkmaya başladığı zamana dayanır. Bir olgu olarak metinlerarasılık kimi zaman bir metnin farklı alanlara ve kültürel alanlara ait diğer metin ve/veya söylemlerle olan bir dizi ilişkisi olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Bir edebiyat kuramı ve metinleri değerlendirme yolu olarak metinlerarasılık, 1966'de Julia Kristeva'nın 'metinlerarasılık' terimini ilk kez kullanmasından önce Ferdinand de Saussure, Mikhail Bakhtin ve Roland Barthes gibi teorisyenler tarafından oluşturulmaya başlanmıştı. Bu çalışma öncelikle 'eser' kavramının nihayetinde eşanlamlı hale gelen 'metin' ve 'arametin' kavramlarına doğru gidişine ve okurun edebiyat eleştirisindeki değişen yeri ve önemine odaklanarak metinlerarasılığı edebi bir okuma biçimi olarak tanıtmayı ve metinlerarasılık kuramının adı geçen yaratıcılarının koyduğu ilke ve ilksavlarını göstermeyi hedeflemekte ve böylece metinlerarasılığın daha başlangıçta postyapısalcı ve postmodern bir yönü olduğunu ortaya koymaya çalışmaktadır. Metinlerarasılığın düşünsel

---

∗ Assist. Prof. Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Letters, English Language and Literature Department, Sivas.
e-posta:mzengin@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

kökeni ile zihinsel kurucularını teorinin sonraki teorisyenlerinden ayıran bir çalışmanın olmaması ve metinlerarasılığı ayrı bir yazınsal yaklaşım olarak ele alan çalışmaların azlığı, başka bir deyişle metinlerarasılığın daha çok diğer eleştirel yaklaşımların bir parçası olarak çalışılması bu çalışmayı motive eden unsurlar olmuştur. Bu nedenle çalışmanın metinlerarasılığı çalışmaya özellikle yeni başlayanlar için yararlı olacağı düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Metinlerarasılık, Metin, Arametin, Metinlerarası bağlantılar, Edebiyat kuramı*

I. INTRODUCTION

Although the term 'intertextuality' was coined by Julia Kristeva in 1966, after which time intertextuality, as a term denoting a literary theory, became widely used, the phenomenon itself dates back, in practice, to antiquity when the first recorded human history and the discourses about texts began to exist. However, the notions and practices of intertextuality in such a distant past as antiquity and the origins of intertextuality as a phenomenon especially in the Greek and Roman art and culture will be kept beyond the scope of this study; rather the current paper will focus on intertextuality after its emergence as a literary theory and practice in the 20th century with the theories of such theorists as Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913), Mikhail M. Bakhtin (1895-1975), Julia Kristeva (b. 1941) and Roland Barthes (1915-1980). The poet-critic T. S. Eliot (1888-1965) will also be taken as the forerunner of intertextuality with regard to his insights presented in his "Tradition and the Individual Talent" even if they sound semi-intertextual. Eliot defining the relation between a work and tradition and culture, which is a vast network of texts, and in which all other texts reside synchronically, paved the way for the quasi-intertextual assumptions that every author has and should have a historical consciousness and no text exists of its own in the tradition. This paper presents Eliot's ideas as contributory but limited endeavour in intertextuality. Intertextuality, in its broadest sense, is a poststructuralist, deconstructionist and postmodernist theory that changed the concept of text, recognizing it as an intertext owing to the interrelations between texts and texts' absorptions of other texts. Another novelty posited by intertextuality is the distinction between work and text. A work, for the theorists of intertextuality, is a product which is consumed and a text is a process which is produced. Intertextuality is a theory which provides the reader with numberless ways of deciphering the texts including literary works because it considers a work of literature, as it views all texts, not as a closed network but as an open product containing the traces of other texts. In effect, it was Kristeva who first saw no discrimination between the literary and non-literary texts. The primary focus in intertextuality is the interdependence of texts. All texts are intertexts because they refer to, recycle and draw from the pre-existing texts. Any work of art, for Kristeva, is an intertext which interacts with the other texts, rewrites, transforms or parodies them. Intertextuality suggests a range of links between a text and other texts emerging in diverse forms as direct quotation, citation, allusion, echo, reference, imitation, collage, parody, pastiche, literary conventions, structural parallelism and all kinds of sources either consciously exploited or unconsciously reflected. By so doing an intertext transforms or reproduces the texts preceding it.

An intertext has also the power of subverting and reacting against other texts in the whole discursive field as in the case of the post-colonial discourses. Another axiom which theorists engaging with intertextuality claim is that the existing knowledge of the reader who is situated in a certain cultural and historical position is a determinant among many others in giving the meaning to the text; thus the reading process is an active endeavour.

This study attempts to provide a short introduction to intertextuality with regard to itsaxioms and originators. To this end, the paper expounds intertextuality and the theories of the conceptual mentors and first theorists mentioned previously and through whose ideas intertextuality was formulated as a critical theory. Other theorists such as Umberto Eco, Jacques Derrida, Harold Bloom, Michael Riffaterre and Gérard Genette having their own intertextual theories, and practitioners coming after the originators of intertextuality will be kept out of the scope of this study due to firstly, the limited length of the study and secondly, the fact that their theories insofar as they are related with intertextuality are even so rich that they can be another area of investigation for a study on intertextuality dealing with the later developments in the theory. Therefore, with the aim of serving the intended ultimate purpose of the paper – to introduce intertextuality as a critical theory and give its first assumptions and axioms, and theoreticians as both originators and contributors – it will be indicated how intertextuality itinerated from its position in which it was just supposed to be the influence and source study to the position in which 'work' has become '(inter)text'.

II. AXIOMS THAT INTERTEXTUALITY IS BASED ON AND THE ORIGINATORS OF INTERTEXTUALITY AS A LITERARY THEORY

In its simplest sense, intertextuality is a way of interpreting texts which focuses on the idea of texts' borrowing words and concepts from each other. Every writer, both before writing his text and during the writing process, is a reader of the texts written before his text. S/he either borrows from the prior or concurrent texts and discourses in the network through allusions, impressions, references, citations, quotations and connections or is affected by the other texts in some ways. Therefore, an author's work will always have echoes and traces of the other texts to which it refers either directly or indirectly and either explicitly or implicitly. It will also have layers of meanings rather than a solid and stable meaning which is supposed to be constructed through the writer's authorial vision. Intertextuality asserts that when a text is read in the light of the text(s) to which it refers or from which it has traces, all the assumptions and implications surrounding those referred texts will shape the critic's interpretation of the text in question. It is because a network of other texts provides the reader, critic and interpreter with the contexts of possible meanings and therefore it would not be misleading to say that his or her meditation on the meaning of the text at hand is shaped by the quotations from, absorptions and insertions in and transformation of another text or discourse. It is important to cite that intertextuality cannot be limited only to the discussions of literary arts. It provides an area of study of influences, adaptation and appropriation of texts into not only the written or literary texts but also the other media or non-literary fields. It is also a method for the

analysis of any text constructed in culture and a way of interpretation of any cultural phenomenon correlated with non-literary arts and the current cultural epoch. All cultural and artistic productions in such cultural and artistic domains as cinema, painting, music, architecture, photography, sculpture and popular culture may be interpreted through their relations to previous works. Therefore, pieces of music, movies, buildings, paintings and sculptures can be viewed as texts having interdisciplinary connections with each other. One may think that intertextuality can be exploited to interpret and analyze artistic productions with regard to their relations to and borrowings from each other. This may be attributable to two features of intertextuality: 1. It is an interdisciplinary theory and 2. It foregrounds the complex interrelations and intersections between literature and other art disciplines as well as one art discipline and other. Intertextuality refers to not only the artist or author's borrowing, transformation, rewriting or absorption of a preceding text or texts but also the reader's reference to a text or other texts which he read and knew already while he is reading the text in question. The generating of the meanings of a text is realized not only in the act of production but also in the act of reception. As a post-structuralist approach to text and the reader, intertextuality searches for neither a fixed meaning lying outside the text nor, as the structuralists do, a meaning waiting to be discovered in or behind the structure of the text (the deep meaning); rather it accepts that interpretation is a matter of reader and that text and reader interact to produce an infinite flow of meanings. Therefore, intertextuality presents text as a "*growing, evolving, never-ending process*" (Irwin, 2004: 232). Intertextuality is a theory offering new ways of thinking and new

strategies for understanding and interpreting texts.

In his *Intertextuality* – a book providing the reader, especially for laymen, with a glossary of terminology of intertextuality– Graham Allen returning to the history of 'intertextuality' gives its current meanings and applications. He defines intertextuality as "*an attempt to understand literature and culture in general*" (2000: 7) and states that it "*foregrounds notions of relationality, interconnectedness and interdependence in modern cultural life*" (2000: 5). Allen stresses a significant aspect of intertextuality, which has already been mentioned in the previous paragraph: "*The systems, codes and traditions of other art forms and of culture in general are also crucial to the meaning of a work of literature*" (2000: 1). This indicates that intertextuality foregrounds associations between a literary text and the vast cultural network. Since modern theories view text as something lacking in any kind of independent meaning, "*the act of reading […] plunges us into a network of textual relations. To interpret a text, to discover its meaning, or meanings, is to trace those relations. Reading thus becomes a process of moving between texts*" (Allen, 2000: 1). Therefore, intertextual analysis requires that the reader/interpreter pursue the intertextual echoes in a text in order to get the text's meaning(s). A text derives its meaning not from the author's creation but from its relation to other texts; meaning becomes something that exists in the network of textual links and can be found between a text and all the other texts, to which the text refers and relates. However, the reader/interpreter cannot get a stable meaning of a text because the meaning is produced in the space(s) between the texts and because the meaning is always shifty and elusive. Seen in this light, "*every

text is an intertext" (Leitch, 1983: 59); an intertext is "*a text between other texts*" (Plett, 1991: 5). The new notion of text comprises the social and cultural texts as Hans-Peter Mai notes: "*This 'text' is no longer the object with which textual criticism used to deal. Actually it is no object at all; it is, as a way of writing (ecriture), a productive (and subversive) process*" (1991: 37). Intertextuality, thus, as a post-structuralist theory, not only challenged the traditional approaches to text seeing it as an object to be deciphered and decoded, but also disrupted the notions of a fixed meaning residing in the text and of the probability of an objective interpretation. Focusing on the contextualization of the text, poststructuralist and postmodern disciplines claim that no work of art is original and no work of art emerges from nothingness. In this respect, the beliefs that in the cultural context all verbal or non-verbal texts (literary texts, texts of history, philosophy, mass media texts, texts of popular culture, music, films, advertisements, television programs, visual images and so forth) interact with one another, no text is independent from the other texts in culture, no artist can create his/her work individually and independent of the culture in which s/he generates his/her work and the meaning is thus a floating one are all poststructuralist and postmodernist attitudes. And this constitutes the postmodern vein of intertextuality.

II. 1. T. S. Eliot's Quasi-Intertextual Ideas in "Tradition and the Individual Talent":

The concept of intertextuality became an influential practice in the discipline of literary studies a few decades after the publication of T. S. Eliot's "Tradition and the Individual Talent" in *The Egoist* in 1919, the notion may nevertheless be considered to have existed in this famous poet-critic's influential essay. Although the general trend towards Eliot's insights presented in his essay is in the direction of combining them with modernism, his ideas sound partly intertextual. Due to the common conception of intertextuality – that every text is related to other texts and these relations are essential as well as constitutive for the generation of the text's meaning(s) – it may be thought that Eliot's work highlighting the synchronicity of all texts and seeing the intertext as a synonym for tradition and culture offered, in its own time, new insights about the text and the network of texts. The essay reads

No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead […] *what happens when a new work of art is created is something that happens simultaneously to all the works of art which preceded it. The existing monuments from an ideal order among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them. The existing order is complete before the new work arrives; for order to persist after the supervention of novelty, the whole existing order must be, if ever so slightly, altered; and so the relations, proportion values of each work of art toward the whole are readjusted;*

and this is conformity between the old and the new. Whoever has approved this idea of order, of the form of European, of English literature will not find it preposterous that the past should be altered by the present as much as the present is directed by the past. And the poet who is aware of this will be aware of great difficulties and responsibilities (Eliot, 2015).

Eliot also notes that each work "*exists within the tradition from which it takes shape and which it, in turn, redefines*". He sees tradition as "*something to which the poet must be 'faithful' and something that he or she actively makes; novelty emerges out of being steeped in tradition*" (Eliot, 2015). A link can be drawn between intertextuality's recognition of text as a cultural artifact as well as its approach to text in its contextual aspect and that of Eliot which accepts text as an artifice based on tradition and history and as a production of the culture in which it is produced and therefore, as a part of that culture. According to Eliot an artist has and should have a historical consciousness while producing his/her work of art because s/he is not a separate entity but rather a 'being' culturally involved in the tradition. Seen from this perspective, no author and no text are unique, which is at the same time a declaration of intertextuality. Additionally, all texts in a network, for both Eliot and intertextuality, are concurrent. The two insights are identical in the sense that every text is more or less related to every other text and that the artist does not produce any unique art because his work will always have the effects, traces and impressions of culture or 'tradition' in Eliot's term.

Eliot's talk of the need for the artist's "depersonalization" also seems to coincide with the intertextual ideas on the nonexistence or invisibility of the author. Eliot claims that "[t]*he progress of an artist is a continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of personality. There remains to define this process of depersonalization and its relation to the sense of tradition*" (Eliot, 2005). In Eliot's piece, there is actually nothing incompatible with intertextuality when its definition is considered. Intertextuality is defined as "*a text's dependence on prior words, concepts, connotations, codes, conventions, unconscious practices, and texts. Every text is an intertext that borrows, knowingly or not, from the immense archive of previous culture*" (Leitch, 2001: 21). Eliot's notion of the forging of the new work into the old one(s), and vice versa as well as his conception of the role of the artist in the process of artistic creation seem to be closely related to the perception of intertext in intertextuality.

There may also be found, in Eliot, some clues of intertextual reading practice, during which all possible intertextual relations are at work for the generation of the meaning(s) of a text. Eliot offers a reading which is similar to an intertextual way of reading and deconstructs all close readings because no single reading gives the meaning of a text; the meaning depends on the intertextual relations constructed in the processes of both the production and reception of a text. By means of the synchronic way of reading offered by intertextuality, the meaning of a text becomes not an absolute but a sliding one; that is, whenever a new text joins the network of texts, the meanings of both the new text and the old ones change.

And this is similar to Eliot's suggestion of reading the old works through the new ones and reading the new works through the old ones. This actually opens the internal structure of a text with the consequences that every text relates to one another and the meaning is unstable, which provides the immensity of intertextual readings.

Eliot, even in his own poetry, and long before intertextuality emerged as a critical approach in literary studies, provided the reader with the various layers of meaning in the multi-faceted and kaleidoscopic nature of his poetry that he had gained by means of his technique of collage, his employment of especially mythical and classical allusions and of fragmentations and his constructing parallels between his text and other texts. So it would not be incorrect to say that Eliot himself produced his work through the practice of intertextual connections a few decades before intertextuality took its place as a discipline in the literary studies.

II.2. Saussure and the Impact of His Linguistic Theories on Intertextuality:

The whole of modern literary theory is often viewed as having stemmed from the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure's structuralism and semiotics (Allen, 2000: 8; Plett, 1991: 8) and therefore it would not be wrong to say intertextuality took its origins from the concepts formulated by Saussure. It is also true that Saussure comes first, considering the chronology of Saussure's ground-breaking work *Course in General Linguistics* (1915) and Eliot's "Tradition and the Individual Talent" (1919). However, it has not been seen any drawback of beginning with Eliot because both Saussure's linguistic theories were prevailing and Eliot's theory was introduced at a time when intertextuality had not become a practice in literary

studies yet. Besides, these two figures' intertextual theories developed in different courses. While Eliot's approach recognizing text in its cultural context offers more cultural interpretations about intertextuality, Saussure's concerns linguistic and semantic strands of intertextuality. Saussure's linguistic theories recognizing language as a system of syntax, phonology and semantics were applied to literature much later.

Viewing language as an intricate web of signs, a structured system of linguistic elements, grammatical rules and constructions, Saussure established the bases for structuralism. Structuralism challenged such long-established beliefs and assumptions that a literary work expresses its author's mind and personality and that it gives its readers an objective reality, an essential truth about human life. Structuralism offers a structural analysis of a literary text to reach its deep meaning. It emphasizes the structural elements of the text and closes it down rather than opening it up, considering no outside context such as historical and biographical contexts. Then by Kristeva, Saussure's innovating ideas were developed to challenge the closure of text; she also questioned the notion that a text is a closed off entity, and forwarded the notion that a literary text is not a product of an author's original ideas with one referential meaning, rather it is a construction of several/various ideas with diverse meanings embedded in the text. Actually, Saussure had a great impact on the post-structuralism which succeeded structuralism. It was Kristeva who also developed Bakhtin's ideas. In the study to avoid the interruption between these three theorists, it has been thought that it would be wise to begin with Eliot's notion of intertextuality, as we did in the previous part, though Eliot's notion is quasi-intertextual.

As was stated previously, Saussure, the founder of modern linguistics, the father of semiotics and structuralism has always been credited with providing the major assumptions about language, which he calls *langue*, and individual utterances which he calls *parole*. In a comparable manner, his account on language and speech has always been cited by many to have foreshadowed intertextuality. Saussure, in *Course in General Linguistics*, a posthumously published work, views language as "*a self-contained whole and a principle of classification*", but human speech as "*a social product*" which is "*many-sided and heterogeneous*" (Saussure, 1966: 9). *Langue* suggests language as a structured system based on certain rules; *parole*, specific acts of speech or utterance which are grounded on those pre-existing rules. It generates from the system of language. Saussure's originality lies in his distinction between '*langue*' and '*parole*'. While *langue* is a phenomenon that is social, communal, objective, and functional and that has rules, *parole* is individual, personal, subjective, non-functional; it is the application of rules already determined in language. Creating a new terminology, Saussure suggests that *sign* refers to the whole construct; *signifier* suggests the sound image and *signified*, the concept. What *signifier*, *signified* and *sign* designate may be displayed in the following diagram:

Signifier > the word or sound-image / the form of the word constructed by the letters 'c, a" and 'r', and the sounds provided by them, e.g. "car"

Signified > the mental concept of "car"

Sign > Actual object: car

There is always an umbilical link between the sound image and the concept it refers to. The signifier "car" is associated with a certain concept. Here Saussure's famous analogy may be recalled: He imagines the bond between the signifier and signified as the link between the two faces of a sheet of paper. Thought is the front and the sound is the back side of the same piece of paper and "*one cannot cut the front cutting the back at the same time; likewise in language, one can neither divide sound from thought nor thought from sound*" (Saussure, 1966: 112).

Saussure also argues that language is a system of signs in relation, a structured system, an entire network of signs. Language is just one type of sign systems among many others in the world (– the system of traffic lights is the most frequently referred one). Therefore, everything belonging to a system is a sign and the sign's meaning is determined by its association with the other signs in the same system. Thus no sign has a meaning in isolation. The signification of a sign depends on its relation to other signs as well as the diversity of all signs in the system. The relational nature of a sign makes it always in combination with other signs. Signs, for Saussure, have no meaning in themselves; rather, meaning emerges out of signs' relation with one another; in other words, they "*take their meaning from their function within a given structure – from their relations with other signs*" (Bertens, 2005: 67). Therefore, the meaning of a sign depends upon its combinatory and associative relations with other signs. However, a sign is also differential. It is different from the other signs with its sound-image and the sign it signifies. A sign's meaning also rests on its difference from other signs. This may be summarized by means of Saussure's own phrase: "*In language, there are only differences*" (1966: 120). So language works on differences. So language works

on differences. To conclude, a sign operates in the system with its two dimensions: its relational and differential nature.

The case is not different for a 'linguistic sign'. It is composed of a signifier and a signified. It has meaning not directly in terms of the world, but in terms of its place in a language system. A 'linguistic sign' produces its meaning via its similarity to and difference from other signs in the system. For Saussure, the signs are the words we use to refer to ideas or concepts. Words/Signs have also an aspect of a signifier because they signify, either in written or spoken form, the signified – what is thought when the word is written, uttered, read and heard. However, words do not refer to things directly; differently put, there is no discernible relation between a word and its referent because "*the linguistic sign is arbitrary*" (Saussure, 1966: 67). The relation between a sing and its referent is in the first instance arbitrary because the signifier "*actually has no natural connection with the signified*" (1966: 69), and then it becomes convention. Arbitrariness of the combination of thought and sound refers to "*the choice of a given slice of sound to name a given idea*" (Saussure, 1966: 113). For Saussure, language is a system grounded on the arbitrariness of the sign. He notes: "*In fact, every means of expression used in society is based, in principle, on collective behavior or – what amounts to the same thing – on convention*" (1966: 68). So due to the arbitrary nature of a sign, a society's usage and general acceptance of that sign and the combination between the sign and the idea it refers to are the prerequisites of creation of a language as a system of signs. Therefore, no individual is able to fix the combination between thought and sound by himself (Saussure, 1966: 113). Signs do

not take their specific forms because of what they mean but their being different from the other signs in the system (Saussure, 1966: 65-67). There is no natural bond between a word and the object it signifies. Therefore, the meaning of a word rests on not a natural relation between the word and the object or concept rather the differences among words in linguistic system. A sign, for Saussure, is not a word's reference to an object in the world, rather a combination between the signifier and the signified, i.e. language users refer to not the objects but concepts through signs. In Saussure's theory words do not stand for pre-existing concepts, so

> *instead of pre-existing ideas* […] *we find* […] *values emanating from the system. When they are said to correspond to concepts, it is understood that the concepts are purely differential and defined not by their positive content but negatively by their relations with the other terms of the system. Their most precise characteristic is in being what the others are not* (Saussure, 1966: 117).

Saussure's linguistic theory is innovating in two respects: its annihilation of the referential value of word, and its claim that language operates along two axes: the syntagmatic or horizontal and paradigmatic or vertical. The syntagmatic axis, as Green and LeBihan explain, "*represents combination: linguistic elements are combined in sequence with other elements*". The paradigmatic axis, on the other hand,

> *represents selection or choice: each element is selected from a number of possible choices.* […] *Some of the items* […] *have a great number of possible substitutions, some much*

less so. Each substitution will determine what will be acceptable in the following element. Thus syntagmatic and paradigmatic elements are intimately related, and can be seen at every level of discourse […] at the level of individual word, letters or sounds combine in a sequence. At a higher level, sentences combine in sequence to form texts. At each point within each level, a number of possible elements can be realized (Green & LeBihan, 1996: 4).

As can be inferred from the above extract, the syntagmatic axis represents the combination of the linguistic elements. To put it differently, the placing of words side by side to compose a sentence involves the syntagmatic axis of language. And the paradigmatic axis represents selection of each element from a number of possible choices. In other words, the selection or choice of certain words from a set of other possible words involves the paradigmatic axis of language. So *parole* is produced by the operation of language on these two axes. The individual utterance is in fact a process in which a speaker's or writer's selection of words from a range of words in the sign system that can be used instead of one another (this is what is termed the paradigmatic axis) and the speaker's or writer's putting words together in a sentence (this is what is termed the syntagmatic axis) are combined. Moreover, the words that are not selected by the speaker or the writer can still determine the meaning of the word which is selected due to a. formal associations between the words, b. associations between the senses evoked and c. associations concerning form and meaning between the words

stemming from the same root (Yüksel, 1995: 25).

Saussure's theory about *sign, signifier* and *signified* is helpful to illuminate intertextuality's attachment to text. An analogy between Saussure's theory of sign and language, and the theory of intertextuality may be constructed to understand the connection between these two theories, and Saussurean impact on intertextuality. Language is a system whose constituents are sentences interrelated with each other in the system. Numberless sentences in a language and even the words in a sentence may be resembled to texts in a network. Texts are interrelated with each other and they gain their meanings through their relations with each other in a larger context in the same way as sentences in the language system and various items (words) of a sentence by which the sentence is made up are always in relation with each other.

For Saussure language is a powerful self-contained self-regulated structure that humans are born into; in other words, it is the language which speaks and writes rather than humans. It is important to note here that in Saussure's linguistics, a literary text such as a play, a novel or a piece of poem imitates language structures that have been conventionally maintained. As has already been seen, the initial impetus for the conception of text in recent theories such as intertextuality dates back to Saussure's ideas of arbitrariness in signs and their differential aspect. Saussure's theories redefine the individual and the nature of literary texts. Structuralism decentred the individual and projected the self as a construct resulting from impersonal systems. So individuals neither originate nor control the conventions of their social existence or mental life. The case is not different in their mother tongue.

Individuals are "*created by social and cultural systems, within which they are subjects*" (Leitch, 2001: 20). That is, they are no longer autonomous individuals creating original works. This is a revolutionary notion which reversed the idea of an autonomous writer and work. Therefore, a literary text is no longer a unique product originating from an author's thought and containing meaning constructed by the authorial intention, rather its meaning emerges in the space between itself and other texts in the same way as the meaning of a word generates not through the word's relation to something but through its relation with other signs and its being different from other linguistic elements in the language, which is itself a sign-system.

In Saussure, the notion of semiology or semiotics – the science of sign systems – including his theory of signifier, signified and sign paved the way for Structuralism, a philosophical and cultural theory redefining human culture in terms of sign systems and binary oppositions. A structural analysis of a literary work concerns itself with the underlying structures in the text and putting them in syntagmatic and horizontal axes so that the deep meaning could be achieved. Contrary to the diachronic approach, which was prior to Saussure, and which studies the changes in language over a period of time, Saussure adopted a synchronic approach which recognized language as a structure that could be studied as a systematic whole. Denying that there is an intrinsic relation between words and things and urging that this connection is arbitrary at the outset and later on conventional, Saussure became a pioneer of radical and influential insights. With Saussure, a word in language was begun to be accepted as a sign, the reference of which is to the

system, not directly to the world. Words/signs possess meaning not because of their referential function but because of their function in the linguistic system. This view of language challenged the concept of reality – a reality existing independently outside of language. In this context, Saussure's view implies that we develop an understanding of the world, i.e. view the world through language. This is the novelty that stemmed from Saussure's linguistic turn.

Structuralism itself can be considered to be not only one origin of intertextuality but the nucleus within which post-structuralism emerged. The main features of post-structuralism such as the problematizing of linguistic referentiality, a stress on difference and an emphasis on heteroglossia, the decentering of the subject and the rejection of reason as universal have all been touched on by Structuralism and they are the assumptions concerning intertextuality.

Saussure's linguistics made a radical departure from the traditional concept of language as a rhetorical medium which people could freely use to express their ideas, emotions and so on. Saussure posits that language works on the basis of signification and difference. Signs generate meaning not because they refer to things but because they have arbitrary relationship to things. What is important for our purpose here is Saussure's concept of language as a sign system governed by arbitrariness and difference. His notion that meaning is the product of difference, that is, one sign is different from the other sign so that a different meaning can be produced, is equally important. Saussure with his conception of sign as an element having an arbitrary and non-referential nature reversed the traditional belief that a single individual is the unique source of

any utterance and that it is the speaker or author who produces meaning in his or her words he or she selects from the system. Therefore, *parole* – the individual utterance is the result of the speaker or author's selection from the language system pre-existing the speaker or author.

The revolutionary "linguistic turn" in the human sciences provided by Saussure may be recognized as one origin of the intertextual theory. If a "linguistic sign" is not a stable but a non- referential and differential element whose meaning emerges out of its relation to and differences from the other signs in the network of signs, the same thing is equally correct for the literary sign. Authors select words from the language (*langue* – the structured sign system) to compose their works (*parole* – the individual utterance based on the authors' selection of signs in the system). Likewise, they select "*plots, generic features, aspects of character, images, ways of narrating, even phrases and sentences from previous literary texts and from the literary tradition*" (Allen, 2000: 11). If we see the literary tradition as a synchronic system, then the author becomes a figure working with two systems: 1. Language in general, and 2. the literary system in particular. Such a view leads us to notice that while reading a literary work, due to the non-referential nature of signs, we do not connect the signs involved in it with the objects in the world but rather we tend to associate them with the literary system out of which the text is produced. For example, when we begin reading a novel, we become intensely aware of its generic qualities and the novel's place in the canon. We also have presuppositions about the novel as a genre, before reading it. For instance we expect that it has its own way of depiction of the characters and actions, there is/are point of view(s) employed in it, it will represent a kind of reality and so forth. In

short, before reading a novel, our ideas about it have already been shaped by the literary system. While reading a short story or a piece of poem our expectations would be different from those we have before and while reading a novel. The same shift of expectations would occur before and while reading particular works of particular authors.

Perhaps one of the most striking developments traced in Saussure's linguistic theory is his implication that human beings build up an understanding of the world by means of language, i.e. they view the world through language. In effect, while learning a language or when we have an interaction with a language, our worldviews and ways of thinking are shaped by that language. This is without doubt a clear effect of Saussure on the intertextual theory that perceives author, reader, critic and interpreter as social and cultural constructs.

II. 3. Bakhtin's Relation with Intertextual Theories:

To cite Mikhail M. Bakhtin as the origin of the ideas connected with intertextualiy is as problematic as to cite Saussure as the originator of intertextuality because both of these theorists' ideas are not directly related with intertextuality; rather, their specific and revolutionary ideas paved the way to the articulation of intertextual theories of others. As an instance it can be said that the post-structuralist theories of Bakhtin led to the conception of text in the theory of intertextuality. Bakhtin's theory of dialogism and *heteroglossia* lies at the core of Julia Kristeva's theory of intertextuality, which will be held in the study after giving briefly Bakhtin's contributions to intertextuality. Though Bakhtin did not use the term 'intertextuality', intertextuality was first used with reference to his

dialogism and *heteroglossia*. For Bakhtin, it is the dialogic aspect of language which "*foregrounds class, ideological and other conflicts, divisions and hierarchies within society*" (Allen, 2000: 21). Bakhtin stresses the notion of '*otherness*' in words. Because the words we select in both speech and writing have an otherness about them and because they belong to specific speech genres, it is inevitable for the words to bear the traces of previous utterances. Bakhtin's insistence on '*otherness*' is related with the theory of intertextuality because for him, the meaning of every word or utterance is formed through the speaker's relation to other people, other people's words and expressions and the specific culture experienced in a specific time and place. This leads us to his dialogism which is directly related with intertextuality. Bakhtin calls attention to the dialogic nature of language, referring to Dostoyevski's novels in his *Problems of Dostoyevski's Poetics:*

> *Thus, at the very beginning of the novel the leading voices in the great dialogue have already begun to sound. These voices are not self-enclosed or deaf to one another. They hear each other constantly, call back and forth to each other, and are reflected in one another (especially in the microdialogues). And outside this dialogue of "conflicting truths" not a single essential act is realized, nor a single essential thought of the major characters* (1984: 47).

Bakhtin, in effect, viewed language with its social dimension. His emphasis was on the second dimension of language, which Saussure had defined as *parole*, the individual utterance. Terry Eagleton argues that "*Bakhtin shifted attention from the abstract system of langue to the concrete*

utterances of individuals in particular social contexts" and that "*language was seen as inherently 'dialogic': it could be grasped only in terms of its inevitable orientation towards another*" (2008: 101). In Bakhtin's study of language, the focal point is the *addressivity* of the word and utterance. As he notes, "[a] *characteristic feature of the letter is an acute awareness of the interlocutor, the addressee to whom it is directed. The letter, like a rejoinder in a dialogue, is addressed to a specific person, and it takes into account the other's possible reactions, the other's possible reply*" (Bakhtin, 1984: 97). So all utterances are "*responses to previous utterances and are addressed to specific addressees*" (Allen, 2000, p. 21). Bakhtin points out the non-originality of the utterance in his *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* as such:

> *The speaker is not the biblical Adam, dealing […] with […] unnamed objects, giving them names for the first time […] In reality […] any utterance, in addition to its own theme, always responds […] in one form or another to others' utterances that precede it. The speaker is not Adam, and therefore the subject of his speech itself inevitably becomes the arena where his opinions meet those of his partners […] or other viewpoints, world views, trends, theories, and so forth [in the sphere of cultural communication]. World views, trends, viewpoints, and opinions always have verbal expressions. All this is others' speech (in personal or impersonal form), and cannot but be reflected in the utterance. The utterance is addressed not only to its object, but also the others' speech about it* (1986: 93-94)

Bakhtin draws attention to the fact that once a word is created, it is not possible to create it twice. The word was originally created by Adam. For this reason, it is only the "mythical Adam", who

> *approached a virginal and as yet verbally unqualified world with the first word, could really have escaped from start to finish this dialogic inter-orientation with the alien word that occurs in the object. Concrete historical human discourse does not have this privilege: it can deviate from such inter-orientation only on a conditional basis and only to a certain degree* (1990: 279).

The life of the word, for Bakhtin, "*is contained in its transfer from one mouth to another, from one context to another context, from one social collective to another*" (1984: 201). Bakhtin explains, by means of this aspect of the word, the double-voicedness of language. A word is "*double-voiced*" or "*double-accented*". Bakhtin uses the term "*hybriditiy*" to delineate how language can be double-voiced. It is because the hybrid nature of language that even a single sentence can be double-voiced. "*What is hybridization?*" Bakhtin asks, and answers: "*It is a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor.*" (1990: 358) So language, for Bakhtin, has an ability to be the same and different at the same time – an ability of a word or utterance, within itself, to unmask, parody or make irony of the other utterance. Besides, a literary text is a representation of discourses, and the

polyphonic novel with its dialogic formation and heteroglot qualities is a hybrid genre which is constituted by the elements taken from all other discourses. In Bakhtin's theory of dialogism, the central idea is that every word "*is directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer-word: it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction*" (1990: 280). Therefore, the novel can be accepted as a genre in which an intersection of discourses can be recognized and this intersection can be achieved through either transformation or parody of the other canonized genres or carnivalesque, which are inherently dialogic. According to Bakhtin, the polyphonic novel, a true instance of which is Dostoyevski's novels, is the only literary genre that paves the way to the relation between itself and the other texts and discourses. It is the polyphonic novel which has a dialogue with the other genres either by means of rewriting or transforming or parodying them. This may be the result of its being a hybrid genre. The polyphonic novel with its hybrid and dialogic nature interacts with all other literary texts.

Bakhtin sees poetry such as epic and lyric and the traditional realistic novels as monologic since they are constructed only to transmit the author's ideology rather than various ideologies belonging to different characters representing different worldviews. In contrast with the monologic works, polyphonic novel's discourse is dialogic since it recognizes the multiplicity of voices and perspectives other than the poet's and thus it does not represent merely the author's reality but a number of realities. Therefore, the polyphonic novel is open-ended; it has a multiplicity of meanings rather than the one which is supposed to be situated in the

text by the author and is thus immanent in the text. The polyphonic novel is a site of *heteroglossia* since the language of the novel represents multiple speech genres formed by the different social classes and groups. Polyphonic novel, as Allen notes, "*fights against any view of the world which would valorize on 'official' point-of-view, one ideological position, and thus one discourse, above all others*" with its construction lacking "*no objective narratorial voice to guide us through the vast array of voices, interpretations, world-views, opinions and responses*" (2000: 24). Thus it presents to its readers a world which is itself dialogic and paves the way for unfinalized interpretations and a multiplicity of meanings, which are the significant axioms in the theory of intertextuality.

The last thing to be noted in Bakhtin's dialogism is perhaps his ideas about style. For him, style is referred to as "doubly-voiced" discourse because the novelist presupposes the stylistic devices which were produced beforehand and thus he/she enters into a dialogic relationship by mingling his/her voice with that of another author. Bakhtin states that

> *the author may also make use of someone else's discourse for his own purposes, by inserting a new semantic intention into a discourse which already has, and which retains, an intention of its own. Such a discourse, in keeping with its task, must be perceived as belonging to someone else. In one discourse, two semantic intentions appear, two voices. Parodying discourse is of this type, as are stylization and stylized skaz. Here we move on to the characteristics of the third type of discourse.*

> *Stylization presupposes style; that is, it presupposes that the sum total of stylistic devices that it reproduces did at one time possess a direct and unmediated intentionality and expressed an ultimate semantic authority* (1984: 189).

In brief, doubly-oriented discourse is inherently intertextual, for Bakhtin, due to its relatedness to the stylistic elements or generic qualities. The stylistics elements through which the author writes his/her text have already been defined and determined before the author's act of writing. A doubly-oriented discourse is by nature closely connected with the generic qualities of the genre out of which it is composed. It is also intertextually related with other discourses, which establishes a dialogue between itself and other texts. Bakhtin's idea that every text is in a dialogical relationship with the other text sounds intertextual enough.

II. 4. Kristeva and Her Theories of Intertextuality:

It was Julia Kristeva, the progenitor of intertextuality, who coined the term 'intertextuality'. The literary critic and feminist psychoanalyst, Kristeva used the term in her seminal essays on Bakhtin and intertextuality, in both "Word, Dialogue and Novel" in 1966 and "The Bounded Text" in 1967. These many-sided essays shed light on the fact that "*Kristevan concept of intertextuality" had its roots from her own reading of Bakhtinian dialogism "as an open-ended play between the text of the subject and the text of the addressee*" (Moi, 1986: 34). Drawing on Bakhtin's dialogism and carnivalesque, Kristeva both introduced Bakhtin to the French readers and maintained a starting

point for her own studies. According to Bakhtin, a text is a representation of various discourses ranging from everyday communication to social, historical, literary discourses etc. or jargon, dialects or all other uses in the same language. It has a heteroglossic structure. What Bakhtin called dialogism and *heteroglossia* was called, in a sense, intertextuality by Kristeva. Kristeva righteously sees Bakhtin as one of the first critics to see text not merely as an organized structure closed in itself, but as a structure generated in relation to another structure. In "Word, Dialogue, and Novel" she maintains that

> *What allows a dynamic dimension to structuralism is his* [Bakhtin's] *conception of the 'literary word' as an intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point (a fixed meaning) as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character) and the contemporary or earlier cultural context* (Kristeva, 1980: 65; 1986: 36).

Kristeva also explains Bakhtin's dialogism. She envisages texts as functioning along two axes. She notes: "*The word's status is thus defined horizontally (the word in the text belongs to both writing subject and addressee) as well as vertically (the word in the text is oriented towards an anterior or synchronic literary corpus)*" (Kristeva, 1980: 66; 1986: 36-37). While the horizontal axis contains the link between the text and the reader, the vertical axis determines a host of complex relations of the text with the other texts. "*What coheres these axes is the framework of pre-existing codes that governs and shapes every text and every reading act*" (Childs and Fowler, 2006: 121).

Taking the term intertextuality to mean that texts intersect and therefore can be analyzed together is not wrong. Yet Kristeva furthered the term; by means of intertextuality she meant something much more interesting. In her *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1941) Kristeva gives an analysis of language, which helps understand intertextuality. By the term 'intertextuality' she means "*the way in which one signifying practice is transposed into another*". For her, the "*signifying practice is never simple and unified. It is the result of multiple origins or drives, and hence it does not produce a simple uniform meaning*" (McAfee, 2004: 26). Kristeva explains the term 'intertextuality' with the term 'transposition'. She also criticizes those taking intertextuality for a fashionable label for source-influence studies, delineating the drawback of the use of intertextuality – the misunderstanding caused by the term – in the following part of her work; however, as we all know intertextuality means transformation.

> *The term inter-textuality denotes this transposition of one (or several) sign system(s) into another; but since this term has often been understood in the banal sense of "study of sources," we prefer the term transposition because it specifies that the passage from one signifying system to another demands a new articulation of the thetic – of enunciative and denotative positionality. If one grants that every signifying practice is a field of transpositions of various signifying systems (an inter-textuality), one then understands that its "place" of enunciation and its denoted "object" are never single, complete, and identical to themselves, but always plural, shattered, capable of being*

tabulated. In this way polysemy [multiple levels or kinds of meaning] can also be seen as the result of a semiotic polyvalence – an adherence to different sign systems (Kristeva 1984: 59–60).

In Kristeva, intertextuality refers to the dialogic nature of all types of language whether be literary or non-literary. The literary text, for Kristeva, is no longer viewed as a unique and autonomous entity but as the product of a number of pre-existent codes, previous discourses and texts. In this respect every word in a text is intertextual and therefore, it must be read not only in terms of a meaning presumed to locate in the text, but also in terms of the relations between the text and other cultural discourses existing outside the text. As can be viewed, in Kristeva intertextuality refers to the concepts of signification and of meaning in language. Therefore, even the intertextual relations are not intended by an author, there can still be found intertextual links in and outside the text owing to the dialogic nature of language and the emergence of meaning in a text's relation with other texts.

Kristeva's theory of intertextuality does not make a division between a literary text and non-literary texts generated within the same culture, which constitutes a post-modern attitude to text. Structuralist semiotics, argues that, as Allen puts it, the texts, whether they be literary or non-literary such as historical documents or travel writings, texts coming from the oral cultural tradition such as myths, or any cultural text can be scientifically analyzed because "*at any one moment signifiers exist and function within a synchronic system which provides determinable signifieds for those signifier*" (2000: 31-

32). This is what Kristeva attacked: The objectivity of the language. She never separates the study of language and subjectivity. This is because she sees the language as personal utterance, as the choice of the speaker or writer. Language cannot be objective because it depends on the subjectivity of the speaker. No type of language can be objective due to the assumptions and knowledge a writer puts in his/her text and the reader brings to a text. Different readers will ultimately bring different experiences to a text in the same way as writers write their texts putting their own experiences, assumptions, insights and so on. Noelle McAfee succinctly gives what Kristeva has done:

Where other linguists and philosophers have studied language as a separate, static entity, Kristeva has insisted that the study of language is inseparable from the study of the speaking being. Instead of studying language per se, she studies the signifying process, the process by which the speaking being discharges its energy and affects into its symbolic mode of signification. Her study of the signifying practice rests on psychoanalytic theory, drawing a developmental picture of the speaking being, who first begins to signify well before she learns words. First significations occur when the child is still immersed in the semiotic chora, the psychic space in which its early energy and drives are oriented and expressed. Even when the child matures into an adult, this semiotic dimension will continue to make itself felt (2004: 27).

Briefly, it can be asserted that for Kristeva, there is no identical reader and

there is no identical reading – an axiom which is of prime importance in intertextuality. Kristeva takes Saussure's ideas in a different way. In Saussure a signifier always signifies the same idea or concept. But in Kristeva "*signification is not a straightforward matter*" because it is always "*disrupted by more archaic impulses. It also means that, as speaking beings, we are always works in progress. Our subjectivity is never constituted once and for all*" (McAfee, 2004: 43). With Kristeva the text has become "*the site of a resistance to stable signification*" (Allen, 2000: 33). She has the idea that semioticians neglected "*the human subject who performs the utterance under consideration*". They ignored not only the human subject but also the facts that "*signifiers are plural, replete with historical meaning, directed not so much to stable signifieds as to a host of other signifiers*" (Allen, 2000: 32). Her *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1974) is really revolutionary in the sense that its main thesis is that texts are not meaningful in the way we think. In other words, "*meaning is not made just denotatively, with words denoting thoughts or things. Meaning is made in large part by the poetic and affective aspects of texts as well*" (McAfee, 2004: 13). All these constituted the starting point for Kristeva's theory of intertextuality. Kristeva also considers "*writing subject, addressee and exterior texts*" as the three dimensions of dialogue, from which text itself absorbs. These coordinates always interact with each other. For Kristeva, even the addressee

> *is included within a book's discursive universe only as discourse itself. He thus fuses with this other discourse, this other book, in relation to which*

the writer has written his own text. Hence horizontal axis (subject-addressee) and the vertical axis (text-context) coincide, bringing to light an important fact: each word (text) is an intersection of word [sic] *(texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read. In Bakhtin's work, these two axes, which he calls dialogue and ambivalence, are not clearly distinguished. Yet, what appears as a lack of rigour is in fact an insight first introduced into literary theory by Bakhtin: any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double* (1980: 66; 1986: 37).

Kristeva emphasizes that the author and the reader or the critic of the text join the process of continual production; "*they are in process/on trial* […] *over the text*". (1986: 86) A similar account given by Roland Barthes puts the reader into an active productive reading process. According to Barthes, it is the writerly text which makes readers of the text productive in their reading. He posits in "From Work to Text" that "*the Text is experienced only in an activity of production. It follows that the Text cannot stop (for example on a library shelf); its constitutive movement is that of cutting across (in particular, it can cut across the work, several works)*" (Barthes in Leitch, 2001: 1471). In Barthes's theory, attention is given to the reader and reading process, which is actually a process of meaning-formation. As he writes in *S/Z* (1970) with regard to reading act: "*This 'I' which approaches the text is already itself a plurality of other*

texts, of codes which are infinite, or more precisely, lost (whose origin is lost)" (Barthes, 1974: 10). Like Barthes Kristeva regards reading a text as a "*complicated*" and "*heterogeneous practice*" through which old texts are put in a dialogue with the new ones. It "*involves the reader as well as the 'writing subject', a subject shaped jointly by the forces of history, ideology, the unconscious, and the body*" (Becker-Leckrone, 2005: 13).

For Kristeva, a text is "*a production that cannot be reduced to representation*" (1986: 86). She implies that "*ideas are not presented as finished, consumable products, but are presented in such a way as to encourage readers themselves to step into the production of meaning*" (Allen, 2000: 34). In the intertextual theory, the text is defined as a productive process and this process is subjected to the interpretation made by the reader having an aggregation of many values and things and shaped by culture. Thus, the text's meaning is dependent on its receiver and therefore not stable but variable. In Kristeva's theory of intertextuality, the text is approached as a construction of already existent discourses. The text becomes "*a permutation of texts, an intertextuality: in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another*" (Kristeva, 1980: 36). Henceforth, the authors, for Kristeva, do not create original texts but rather they compile them from pre-existent texts, and the texts are nothing more than compilation. It is this quality of the text which generally becomes the center of attention in intertextuality:

> The theory of intertextuality insists that a text (for the moment to be understood in the narrower sense) cannot exist as a hermetic or a self-sufficient whole, and so does not function as a closed system. This is for two reasons. Firstly, the writer is a reader of texts (in the broadest sense) before s/he is a creator of texts, and therefore the work of art is inevitably shot through with references, quotations and influences of every kind. […] Secondly a text is available only through some process of reading: what is produced at the moment of reading is due to the cross-fertilisation of the packaged textual material (say, a book) by all the texts which the reader brings to it (Worton and Still, 1991: 1-2).

It can be said that both for Kristeva and the other theorists of intertextuality meaning is not something absolute and eternal or essential and intrinsic, but rather contingent on the process of reading. Their enquiry "*treats meaning as something produced, something specific to a time and a place, and that emerges out of that context*" (West-Pavlov, 2009: 22). This means that there may be a variety of interpretations of a literary text depending on the context; meaning is not textual but contextual. It is because "*an artifact no longer has 'a' meaning, no longer unveils 'a' truth under the stern scrutiny of the scholar, but rather participates in myriad relations and connections which permit it to be in such a way that it can subsequently be asked to reveal its truth*" (West-Pavlov, 2009: 23). We should once again bear in mind that intertextuality's approach to text and its meaning is a poststructuralist and postmodernist one with its emphasis on the interdependence of texts and on the unstable sliding meaning of the text changing through reworking of earlier texts.

It would be suitable to mention the *Tel Quel* group and their bond with intertextuality at this point of the study.

With its essays working on post-structuralism and deconstruction, *Tel Quel*, an avant-garde literary magazine founded in 1958 by Philippe Sorrels and Jean-Edern Hallier changed radically the traditional approach to text. It challenged the conventional beliefs in the uniqueness of the text and the authorial originality, and the respects for the originality of the author's creativity. *Tel Quel* authored and collaborated with such thinkers and theorists as Roland Barthes, Jacques Derrida, Jean-Pierre Faye, Philippe Sollers, Umberto Eco, Gérard Genette along with Julia Kristeva, investigated literature's radical relation to political and philosophical thought. The *Tel Quel* group's contribution to the generation of the intertextual theory is its resistance to "*the stabilization of the signifier/signified relation*" (Allen, 2000: 33). Thus the text has become something that resists stable signification. This is perhaps one of the most significant pronouncements of intertextuality: In a text there is no original thought, no unique intended meaning created by a unified authorial consciousness and a unique meaning to be discovered and deciphered by the reader. As the text is "*a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture*" (Barthes in Leitch, 2001: 1468), it has a plurality of meaning, i.e. it embraces the layers of meaning.

With Kristeva, along with the other members of the *Tel Quel*, intertextuality made a fundamental reversal of the traditional relation between a work and its author, whereby work is seen a product and an author a producer, and work is made the object of interpretation, behind which a deep meaning is supposed to be lying to be deciphered. Intertextual interpretations' emphasis on a text's meaning forming processes rather than the meaning in the text which was traditionally thought to be the object of interpretation is a significant paradigm shift that owes much to Kristevan ideas.

II. 5. Barthes and Intertextuality:

Barthes is a leading figure in the intertextual theory. Before dealing with Barthes's ideas connected with intertextuality, it should be stated that Barthes's theory is, of course, a big topic, much too large to deal with in its entirety in this short study presenting introductory information. For this reason, we will lead, with Barthes, the pattern akin to the ways we have already followed in the presentation of the other theoreticians – we will limit the study on the theoretician with his notions which, we think, helped theorize intertextuality. It was Barthes who made the transition from structuralism to poststructuralism possible and carried structuralism and semiotics to a cultural arena. Detecting the limitations of structuralism, (though his first theoretical studies were composed of the structural analyses of texts), he analyzed the text from a cultural viewpoint and saw language as a phenomenon bound to social institutions and codes. In his both "Theory of the Text" and "From Work to Text" (1971) he makes a clear distinction between 'work' in the traditional sense and 'text' in the post-structuralist sense. The distinction between work and text can be found in the first of Barthes's seven propositions which he put in "From Work to Text":

The difference is this: the work is a fragment of substance, occupying a part of the space of books (in a library for example), the Text is a methodological field. […] *the one is displayed, the other demonstrated; likewise, the work can be seen (in*

bookshops, in catalogues, in exam syllabuses), the text is a process of demonstration, speaks according to certain rules (or against certain rules); the work can be held in the hand, the text is held in language, only exists in the movement of a discourse (or rather, it is Text for the very reason that it knows itself as text); the text is not the decomposition of the work, it is the work that is the imaginary tail of the Text (Barthes in Leitch, 2001: 1471).

For Barthes, a text is "*the phenomenal surface of the literary work*" (1981: 32). "*A text is the material inscription of a work. It is that which gives a work permanence, repeatability and thus readability*" (Allen, 2000: 61). Barthes claims that the text is "*the fabric of words which make up the work and which are arranged in such a way as to impose a meaning which is stable and as far as possible unique*" (1981: 32) and he posits that

The notion of text implies that the written message is articulated like the sign: on one side the signifier (the materiality of the letters and of their connection into words, sentences, paragraphs, chapters), and on the other side the signified, a meaning which is at once original, univocal, and definitive, determined by the correctness of the signs which carry it. The classical sign is a sealed unit, whose closure arrests meaning, prevents it from trembling or becoming double, or wandering. The same goes for the classical text: it closes the work, chains it to its letters, rivets it to its signified (1981: 33).

Barthes in his *S/Z* divides the texts into two as readerly (*lisible*) and writerly (*scriptible*). Terry Eagleton defines Barthesian conception of text as such:

The most intriguing texts for criticism are not those which can be read, but those which are 'writable' (scriptible) – texts which encourage the critic to carve them up, transpose them into different discourses, produce his or her semi-arbitrary play of meaning athwart the work itself. […] The 'writable' text usually a modernist one, has no determinate meaning, no settled signifieds, but is plural and diffuse, an inexhaustible tissue or galaxy of signifiers, a seamless weave of codes and fragments of codes, through which the critic may cut his own errant path. There are no beginnings and no ends, no sequences which cannot be reversed, no hierarchy of textual 'levels' to tell you what is more or less significant. All literary texts are woven out of other literary texts, not in the conventional sense that they bear the traces of 'influence' but in the more radical sense that every word, phrase or segment is a reworking of other writings which precede or surround the individual work. There is no such thing as literary 'originality', no such thing as the 'first' literary work: all literature is 'intertextual' (2008: 119).

The readerly text is associated with the realistic novel of the 19th century which was designed towards representation and through whose reading process the reader tries to extract the meaning which is supposed to be given by the author by means of his narration; and therefore, the

reader is positioned as a passive receiver (Allen, 2000, p. 79). With the writeable text "*the reader or critic shifts from the role of consumer to that of producer*" (Eagleton, 2008,p.119).

For Barthes, reading is an actual communicative process as an intertext cannot be pinned down: "[*T*]*he text is experienced only in an activity, in a production.It follows that the Text cannot stop (for example, on a library shelf); its constitutive movement is that of cutting across (in particular, it can cut across the work, several works)*" (2001: 1471).

Barthes argues that a text can never be free from the network in which it is produced and it always connects with the other texts in this network, and it is a 'woven tissue'. This is an important and famous motif in *The Pleasure of the Text* (1973):

> *Texts means Tissue: but whereas hitherto we have always taken this tissue as a product, a ready-made veil, behind which lies, more or less hidden, meaning (truth), we are now emphasizing, in the tissue, the generative idea that the text is made, is worked out in a perpetual interweaving; lost in this tissue – this texture – the subject unmakes himself, like a spider dissolving in the constructive secretions of its web* (Barthes, 1998: 64).

In Barthes's theory, text becomes something that "undercuts its traditional medieval and Renaissance epistemological function and becomes an instance of purest textuality" (Lentricchia, 1980: 144). Barthes claims:

> *We know that a text is not a line of words releasing a single 'theological'*

meaning (the 'message' of the Author-God) but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centers of culture. […] the writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original. His only power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them (2001: 1468).

Barthes sees the French poet Stephan Mallarmé as "*the first to see and foresee in all its full extent the necessity to substitute language itself for the person who until then had been supposed to be the owner*" (1977: 143). Barthes shares the same notion with Mallarmé that "*it is language which speaks, not the author; to write is, through a prerequisite impersonality (not at all to be confused with the castrating objectivity of the realist novelist), to reach that point where only language acts, 'performs', and not 'me'*" (1977: 143). Barthes, declaring the death of the author, celebrates the birth of the reader:

> *A text is made up of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation, but there is one place where this multiplicity is focused and that place is the reader, not, as was hitherto said, the author. The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination. Yet this destination cannot any longer be personal: the reader is without history, biography, psychology; he is simply that someone who holds together in a*

single field all the traces by which the written text is constituted […] we know that to give writing its future, it is necessary to overthrow the myth: the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author (1977: 148).

Barthes believes in the death of the author because "[t]*o give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing*" (1977: 147). "The Author" in "The Death of the Author" is used metaphorically and refers to "Author God" not the *"scriptor"*. Thus it means that "*nobody has the authority over the meaning of the text, and that there is no hidden, ultimate, stable meaning to be deciphered*" (Haberer, 2007: 58). Through these assertions of Barthes, we further get the idea that the text is plural. Plurality of the text does not simply mean that a text has several/various meanings. It means that a text "*accomplishes the very plural of meaning: an irreducible (and not merely an acceptable) plural*". This plurality always results from an interaction of reader with author and of texts with other texts. It is a "*condition of 'intertextuality' whose dynamics also challenge assumptions about what is intrinsic or extrinsic to the literary object*" (Becker-Leckrone, 2005: 13).

As indicated already, intertextuality is a critical theory and a method of interpretation of texts, the origins of which lie in the theories and philosophies of Saussure, Bakhtin, Kristeva, and Barthes. Saussure with his influential theory of language seeing language as an aggregation of systematization, Bakhtin with his theory of dialogism, Kristeva combining Bakhtin's ideas on the social context of the language with Saussurian approach to language as a sign system,

Barthes proclaiming the liberation of the reader in the reading activity and seeing text as a structure requiring reader's practical collaboration in the process of the deciphering of texts all are the originators and mental conceptors of intertextuality as a critical approach.

III. CONCLUSION

As a consequence, one can think that the conceptual foundations of intertextuality can be found in Saussure's linguistic theories in general, and his theories of sign, signifier and signified in particular, Bakhtin's theories of polyphony, dialogism and heteroglossia, Kristeva's coinage of intertextuality, her efforts to carry Saussure's theory of language to the area of literature and her recognition of intertextuality as 'transposition', and Barthes's theories of 'readerly' and 'writerly' text and 'the death of the author'. With the theories of these conceptual mentors of modern theories, there have existed notable shifts in the discipline of literary studies. Beginning from the time of the emergence of the intertextual theories with its new axioms about text and intertext, the conception of literature and literary work began to be changed radically as well.

In the domain of literary theory and criticism, the change began with Saussure's theories about language and his introduction of the significant dichotomy of *langue* and *parole*. Saussurean linguistics seeking to explain language as a synchronic system brought new dimensions to the theory of language. Saussure described *langue* as the mental and social construct of linguistic signs which all the language users have internalized as rules and structures, whereas *parole* is the manifestation of language in spoken and written form. For

Saussure, language (*langue* in Saussure's term) is a self-structured system of signs having underlying rules, structures and conventions that the individual speaker or writer cannot interfere with or change. Saussure's novelty also comes from his notion of sign that has an arbitrary relation with its signified and is always relational, non-referential and differential. Such recognitions of linguistic and literary sign paved the way for the reconsideration of the nature of literary works. A literary work was no longer seen as the product of the author's mind, and a writer was no longer seen as the originator of the literary work. A work of literature is not something containing meaning in itself either. Rather, it is an intertext whose meaning emerges in the spaces between the other texts in the network of literary studies. Therefore, a literary work has a potential of having multiple meanings that generate from the associations among all texts.

Bakhtin's contributions to intertextuality lie in his acceptance of language as a socially constructed phenomenon and of text as a social construction having traces of social, cultural and ideological norms. Conventionally, a text was considered to be shaped by the original mind of its author. Shifting attention away from the originality of the author's mind, Bakhtin decentred the individual author and portrayed him/her as a consequence of social and cultural values and defined literary texts as socio-cultural productions. With Bakhtin's ideas text also became a rich texture that was made out of the conventions of genre and out of styles. Texts were no longer self-contained structures but differential, cultural, historical and ideological constructions. With his theories of polyphonic, double-voiced and heteroglossic novel, Bakhtin

provided the intertextual theory with a strong base.

Kristeva's insistence on text and textuality over Bakhtin's actual human subjects employing language in certain social situations is the diversity between their theories. Whilst, Bakhtin sees the individual speaker – a socially and culturally constructed being as the source of utterance, Kristeva posits that texts are made up of textuality. Yet they share an idea that there is always a correlation between texts and the social and cultural contexts out of which the texts are produced. For Kristeva, the subject is lost in writing – an idea that the poststructuralists declared so much. Her putting the intertextual analysis into a triangular relationship of writer, text and reader is a rejection of the autonomy of text, which is intertextuality's main assumption. Kristeva also distinguishes between source criticism focusing on the concept of influence and intertextual analysis stressing the intertextual connections and the transformational nature of the text. For her, intertextual analysis depends on the interpretation of a text's intertextual connections, through which the text is constructed. It is also an analysis of how the intertextual material is transformed into the other text as well as its functional integration in the later text.

Barthes's structuralist attitude to texts, his analyses of texts through their structures changed the reader, critic and interpreter's approach to literary works. Traditionally, the literary criticism searched for the meaning reflected in the literary work and work's relation to the world and reality. With Barthes the writing subject was lost with his famous declaration of "the death of the author". He substituted the birth of the reader and the textuality of text, instead. Barthes, like Kristeva argued that the reader and

interpreter recreate the text in the process of reading.

Beside these theoreticians recognized as the originators and mental conceptors of intertextuality, T. S. Eliot, with his ideas in "Tradition and the Individual Talent" has been included in this study as well. He has been taken as a forefather of intertextuality though his notions sound quasi-intertextual. In "Tradition and the Individual Talent", to see the artist and his work in relation to other artists, even the dead ones, is of essence. Emphasizing the importance of literary tradition Eliot considers the author as a receptacle for previous images, symbols, evocations, words, expressions, phrases and sentences, genres and generic qualities, and even emotions. An author, for Eliot, creates his artistic work out of such traces and associations. Bearing in mind that Eliot by means of both his poetry and literary critiques offered new ways of writing and interpretation, which created an awareness of the eternal connection between the literary text and culture and thus paved the way for intertextual theories before the theory had not been named yet, we placed the discussion about Eliot before the theorists in question.

By means of the theories of the above theoreticians, intertextuality, which was traditionally conceived as nothing more than the investigation of sources and influences, has become much more than this. Intertextuality now refers to the appropriation of earlier texts in the present texts by means of the author's selecting from texts, editing some parts of them, transforming or even distorting them for his or her own use. Hence the literary work has become to be viewed as an intertext/intertextual discourse which needs intertextual analysis, and the reader has become a bringer of meaning to a text and someone having responsibility for the construction and production of meaning. In this sense, intertextual practices depend on the reader's competence as well as on the writer's. So intertextuality necessitates a compulsory reader-response. Thus it can be claimed that intertextuality is a theory that focuses on the processes of both production and reception. Intertextuality has also paved the way for dislodging works of literature from the traditional ways of interpretation and analysis relying on the authorial intention and foregrounding their logocentric vision. In contrast with the traditional literary studies defining literature as a universal aesthetic category and structuralist approaches seeing texts as self-contained structures, intertextuality insists on tracing relations between texts and foregrounds appropriation of one text by another text, and transformations, assimilations or inclusions of one text in another text or a group of texts. The purpose of intertextual analysis may also be to explain the process which makes one text to be read as reaction to another text or as a parody, irony or subversion of the other text(s).

Intertextuality's emphasis on interrelatedness of texts in particular constitutes its poststructuralist and postmodern vein. Therefore, though intertextuality can be considered a separate literary theory, it can also be aligned with such theories as feminism, reader-response criticism, poststructuralism, deconstructionism, postcolonialism, new historicism and cultural materialism. Throughout this study the path from work to text has been attempted to be demonstrated and through this study it has been observed that in the intertextual trajectory, intertextuality has been of threefold: One type foregrounds the connections between (inter)texts, the other foregrounds the relation between not only the writer and the (inter)text but also the

reader and the (inter)text; and the last one foregrounds the (inter)text's being referential. Thus intertextuality suggests reading a work placing it in a discursive space and giving its meaning by means of its associations and combinations with the other texts and with the codes of that discursive space. It also emphasizes that writing is a similar activity in which the writer takes up of a position in a discursive space.

The study also draws attention to the fact that intertextuality does not refer to merely the interconnectedness between written texts but the dialogue between every kind of artistic and cultural artifacts or phenomena in a cultural context and in a larger network. Therefore, it would not be wrong to conclude that stressing multidisciplinarity, intertextuality is itself a multidisciplinary theory. As a boundary-crossing discipline, intertextuality offers numberless ways of interpretation of not only literary texts but texts of all kinds.

As stated in the Introduction part, Umberto Eco, Jacques Derrida, Harold Bloom, Michael Riffaterre and Gérard Genette have contributed to the theory of intertextuality and developed it by means of their partly distinctive-partly intermingled theories of intertextuality. Their engagement with and contributions to the theory of intertextuality are so vast that they can be another area of survey and a subject matter of another article.

Intertextuality always disturbing the traditional belief in the originality of the text and of the uniqueness of the authorial consciousness and inventiveness has deflected the focus of literary criticism from the authorial issues to the textual ones. Author has not been seen as the original source of the work and its meaning, and in the intertextual practices the text has not been accepted as an autonomous entity deciding its own meaning; henceforth intertextuality is a promising theory opening new avenues of investigation in literary studies.

REFERENCES

Allen, G. (2000). **Intertextuality**, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, London.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). **The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics**, (Ed. and Trans. Carly Emerson; Intr. Wayne C. Booth), University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986) **Speech Genres and Other Late Essays,** (Trans. V.W. McGee.). University of Texas, Austin.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1990). **The Dialogic Imagination,** (Ed. Michael Holquist,Trans. Carly Emerson and Michael Holquist). Universirty of Texas Press, Austin.

Barthes, R. (1974). **S/Z**. (Trans. Richard Miller, Preface. Richard Howard), Blackwell, New York.

Barthes, R. (1977). **Image Music Text**,(Trans. Stephen Heath), Fontana Press, London.

Barthes, R. (1998). **The Pleasure of the Text**. (Trans. Richard Miller and Richard Howard With a Note on text, Richard Howard,), Hill and Wang, New York.

Barthes, R. (2001). "The Death of the Author". **The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism**. (Ed. Vincent B. Leitch. Et al). W. W. Norton & Company, New York and London, pp.1466-1470.

Barthes, R. (2001). "From Work to Text", **The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism**, (Ed. Vincent B. Leitch. Et al.). W. W. Norton and Company, New York and London, pp. 1470-1475.

Becker-Leckrone, M. (2005). **Julia Kristeva and Literary Theory**, Palgrave Macmillan, England.

Bertens, H. (2005). **Literary Theory: The Basics**, Routledge, London and New York.

Childs, P. and Fowler, R. (2006). **The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms**, Routledge, USA.

Culler, J. (2001). **The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction**, Routledge, London and New York.

Eagleton, T. (2008). **Literary Theory: An Introduction**, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Green, K. & LeBihan, J. (1996). **Critical Theory and Practice: A Coursebook**, Routledge, London and New York.

Haberer, A. (2007). "Intertextuality in Theory and Practice", **Literatura**. 49/5, pp.54-67, University of Lyon 2, France.

Irwin, W. (2004). "Against Intertextuality", **Philosophy and Literature**, 28 /2, pp.227-242.

Kristeva, J. (1980). **Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art**. (Ed. Leon S. Roudiez, Transl. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez), Columbia University Press, New York.

Kristeva, J. (1984). **Revolution in Poetic Language**. (Trans. Margaret Waller, Intr. Leon S. Roudiez), Columbia UP, New York.

Kristeva, J. (1986). **The Kristeva Reader**. (Ed. Toril Moi), Columbia University Press, New York.

Leitch, V. B. (1983). **Deconstructive Criticism: An Advanced Introduction**, Hutchinson, London.

Leitch, V. B., Et al. (Eds.) (2001). **The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism**, W. W. Norton and Company, London.

Lentricchia, F. (1980). **After the New Criticism**, Cambridge UP, Great Britain.

McAfee, N. (2004). **Julia Kristeva**, Routledge, New York.

Mai, H. P. (1991). "Bypassing Intertextuality: Hermeneutics, Textual Practice, Hypertext", **Intertextuality**, (Ed. Heinrich F. Plett), Walter de Gruyter and Co., Berlin and New York, pp. 30-59.

Moi, T. (1986). "Introduction". **The Kristeva Reader**, Columbia University Press, New York.

Plett, H. F. (1991). "Intertextualities", **Intertextuality**, (Ed. Heinrich F. Plett), Walter de Gruyter and Co., Berlin and New York, pp. 1-29.

Saussure, F. (1966). **Course in General Linguistics**. (Eds. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye in collabration with Albert Riedlinger, Trans and Intr. Wade Baskin), McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, Toronto and London:

West-Pavlov, R. (2009). **Space in Theory: Kristeva, Foucault, Deleuze**, Rodopi, New York.

Worton, M. & Still, J. (1990). "Introduction", **Intertextuality: Theories and Practices**, Manchester UP, Manchester and New York, pp. 1-44.

Yüksel, A. (1995). **Yapısalcılık ve Bir Uygulama: M. Cevdet Anday Tiyatrosu,** Gündoğan, Ankara.

Internet Sources:

Eliot, T. S. (2015). "Tradition and the Individual Talent". **The Sacred Wood.** Retrieved August 10, 2015 from http://www.bartleby.com/200/sw4.html