Amasya Social Sciences Research Journal
2026, Vol: 3, No: 1,1-25
https://dergipark.org.tr/pub/asbad
Doi: http://doi.org/10.70869/asbad.1725071

e-ISSN: 3023-7300

***Cite as*: Zengin, Mevlüde. "Intertextuality: Later Theoreticians in and Parameters of the Theory of Intertextuality". *Amasya Social Sciences Research Journal*, 3/1, (30 March 2026): 1-25.**

Intertextuality: Later Theoreticians in and Parameters of the Theory of Intertextuality

Mevlüde Zengin [1*]

[1] Assoc. Prof. (PhD), Faculty of Letters, Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Sivas, Türkiye. ORCID: 0000-0002-7778-8268

Abstract

This study is a sequel to "An Introduction to Intertextuality as a Literary Theory: Definitions, Axioms and the Originators", which presents a discussion of intertextuality and its commencement as a critical theory with the formulations provided by the former theoreticians such as Ferdinand de Saussure, Mikhail Bakhtin, Roland Barthes and Julia Kristeva. Although the core tenets have remained unchanged in the works of theorists following Barthes and Kristeva, intertextuality has gained renewed novelty and popularity through the contributions of later theoreticians. In other words, while the core principles of intertextuality have remained consistent with those of earlier theorists, the concept has evolved and gained broader acceptance over time. Since Jacques Derrida, Harold Bloom, Umberto Eco, Gérard Genette, and Michael Riffaterre have contributed to the development and conceptual reframing of intertextuality through their insights and theories, the present study attempts to define their respective positions within the trajectory of intertextuality. Given the significant contributions of the aforementioned theorists in advancing the theory of intertextuality and reshaping its conceptual framework through their perspectives and theories, the study seeks to explore and analyse their individual roles and influences in the theory of intertextuality, with each theorist examined in a dedicated section of the essay. To this end, the study focuses on identifying the connections between intertextuality and the theories of these theorists, as well as the novel perspectives and ideas provided by them and that contributed to intertextuality. This study is expected to offer deep insights into the dynamic nature of literary connections and the construction of meaning in texts, and to be especially useful for laypersons, as was the case with the previous study.

Keywords: Literary Theory, Intertextuality, Jacques Derrida, Harold Bloom, Umberto Eco, Michael Riffaterre, Gérard Genette.

Type: Research Article

Article History
Received: 23.06.2025
Accepted: 30.09.2025
Published:30.03.2026

*Corresponding Author:
Mevlüde Zengin
mzengin@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

Copyright & License
(CC BY-NC 4.0)
Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work.

Amasya Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi
2026, Cilt: 3, Sayı: 1, 1-25
https://dergipark.org.tr/pub/asbad
Doi: http://doi.org/10.70869/asbad.1725071 **e-ISSN: 3023-7300**

***Atıf*:** Zengin, Mevlüde. "Metinlerarasılık: Metinlerarasılık Teorisinde Sonraki Teorisyenler ve Değişkenler". *Amasya Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3/1, (30 Mart 2026): 1-25.

Metinlerarasılık: Metinlerarasılık Teorisinde Sonraki Teorisyenler ve Değişkenler

Mevlüde Zengin [1*]

[1] Doç. Dr. Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sivas, Türkiye, ORCID: 0000-0002-7778-8268

Öz

Bu çalışma, Ferdinand de Saussure, Mikhail Bakhtin, Roland Barthes ve Julia Kristeva gibi kuramcıların formülasyonları vasıtasıyla, eleştirel bir kuram olarak metinlerarasılığı ve onun başlangıcını tartışan "An Introduction to Intertextuality as a Literary Theory: Definitions, Axioms and the Originators" başlıklı çalışmanın devamı niteliğindedir. Temel ilkeler Barthes ve Kristeva'dan sonra gelen kuramcılarla değişmemiş olsa da metinlerarasılık, sonraki kuramcıların teorileriyle yenilik ve popülerlik kazanmıştır. Başka bir deyişle, metinlerarasılığın temel ilkeleri önceki teorisyenlerinkiyle tutarlı kalırken, kavram zamanla evrilmiş ve daha geniş bir kabul görmüştür. Jacques Derrida, Harold Bloom, Umberto Eco, Gérard Genette ve Michael Riffaterre'in, metinlerarasılığın gelişimine ve kavramsal olarak yeniden çerçevelenmesine katkı sağlamış olmalarından hareketle, bu çalışma onların metinlerarasılık yörüngesindeki ilgili konumlarını tanımlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma, adı geçen teorisyenlerin, metinlerarasılık teorisinin geliştirilmesinde ve bakış açıları ve teorileri aracılığıyla kavramsal çerçevesinin yeniden şekillenmesindeki önemli katkılarını göz önüne alarak ve her bir kuramcıyı ayrı bölümde ele alarak, onların metinlerarasılık teorisi içindeki rollerini ve etkilerini araştırmayı ve analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla çalışmada metinlerarasılık ile bu teorisyenlerin kuramları arasındaki bağlantıların yanı sıra bu teorisyenlerin sunduğu ve metinlerarasılığa katkıda bulunan yeni bakış açıları ve fikirlerin tespitine odaklanılmıştır. Bu çalışmanın, edebi bağlantıların dinamik doğasına ve metinlerde anlamın inşasına ilişkin derinlemesine bilgiler sunması ve önceki çalışmada olduğu gibi metinlerarasılığı çalışmaya özellikle yeni başlayanlar için faydalı olması beklenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Edebi Kuram, Metinlerarasılık, Jacques Derrida, Harold Bloom, Umberto Eco, Michael Riffaterre, Gérard Genette.

Tür: Araştırma Makalesi

Makale Geçmişi
Gönderim: 23.06.2025
Kabul: 30.09.2025
Yayınlanma: 30.03.2026

*Sorumlu Yazar:
Mevlüde Zengin
mzengin@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

Telif Hakkı ve Lisans
(CC BY-NC 4.0)
Yazarlar dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler.

Introduction

Intertextuality, a term popularized by Julia Kristeva in the 1960s, refers to the notion that a text is not an isolated work but rather exists in a network of relationships with other texts. This means that every piece of writing is influenced by, and engages in dialogue with other texts, thereby forming a web of meaning that transcends individual works. However, a new attempt to define intertextuality may be proposed: Intertextuality refers to the existence of any kind of relationship or interconnectedness between various forms of artifacts, texts, or creations across social, psychological, historical, scientific, cultural, and artistic realms — whether these relationships are intentional or unintentional, and whether they exist in alignment with or in opposition to other artifacts, texts or creations. As a literary theory, intertextuality 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" (Zengin, 2016, p. 300). Following the conceptual foundations of intertextuality established by Saussure's linguistic theories, Bakhtin's theories of 'polyphony', 'dialogism', and 'heteroglossia', Kristeva's coinage of the term 'intertextuality', and her recognition of intertextuality as a form of 'transposition', as well as Barthes's distinctions between 'readerly' and 'writerly' texts along with his notion of 'the death of the author', various significant contributions to the field of intertextuality have been made through the theories of the later theoreticians like Jacques Derrida, Harold Bloom, Umberto Eco, Michael Riffaterre and Gérard Genette. Their insights into language, literature, literary criticism, and culture have led to both conceptual advancements in intertextuality and noteworthy shifts within the field of literary studies. For this reason, in the rest of the study, as the following title conveys, the engagements in and contributions to the theory of intertextuality of the theoreticians who have come later in time and advanced the theory will be explored by means of discussions of their partly distinctive, partly intermingled theories of intertextuality.

Later Theoreticians Engaging in and Developing the Theory of Intertextuality

Echoes and Dialogues: Intertextuality through a Derridean Lens

The French philosopher Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) is a key theorist of modern times with his philosophy of deconstruction. Derrida's contributions to intertextuality theory are profound and influential, particularly through his concepts of 'deconstruction' and the 'différance'. This part aims to detect the influences of Derrida's deconstructionist theory on intertextuality. Derrida's ideas about language, textuality, meaning, and the inherent instability of texts resonate deeply with intertextuality. In order to draw meaningful connections between intertextuality and Derrida's deconstructionism, several key points from his oeuvre should be highlighted—such as 'différance', 'textuality', 'trace', the notion of context, the decentering of authority, the deconstruction of binary oppositions, and the multiplicity of meaning. Derrida is a pivotal figure in the development of deconstruction,

which has significant implications for understanding intertextuality. He introduced the method of deconstruction, a critical approach that involves analyzing texts to uncover their inherent contradictions and ambiguities. This approach underscores that meaning is not fixed but rather fluid, opening up texts to various interpretations. Therefore, in textual analysis, intertextuality becomes a crucial approach, as texts cannot be understood in isolation—they are always in relation to other texts. Derrida's deconstructionist theory, which is inherently critical of the idea of stable and secure meaning in a text and of the text's supposed authority over its own meaning, has significantly influenced the theory of intertextuality. Like theorists such as Kristeva and Barthes, Derrida challenges the traditionally dominant ideas of not only the stable, self-contained, and authoritative meaning of a work, but also its isolation and individuality—that is, its independence from other texts. For Derrida, a text is something whose meaning is generated in the process of the activation of intertextual connections between it and other texts by the reader. Derrida's notions of 'différance', 'trace' and 'transcendental sign' in particular provide the theoretical foundation for the intertextual strand of his theory.

Derrida introduced the concept of 'différance', which is one of the most crucial concepts in his theory. In *Of Grammatology* he writes that "différance defers-differs [différe]" (Derrida, 1997, p. 66) and describes 'différance' as "differing/deferring" (Derrida, 1997, p. 23), combining the meanings of the terms, 'difference' and 'deferral'. 'Differance' is "the scattering or dispersal of meaning"; it "concerns the principle of the continuous (and endless) postponement or deferral of meaning" (Cuddon, 1998, p. 211). It suggests that meaning is always deferred, never fully present, and that a text's meaning is constructed through its relationship with other texts. Derrida (1997) claims that "words and concepts receive meaning only in sequences of differences" (p. 70). He posits that meaning in language is always deferred through a chain of signifiers, which creates an endless play of meanings. For him, the boundaries of a text are porous; namely, a work cannot be understood in isolation. Similarly, intertextuality posits that a text's meaning is shaped by its interactions with other texts, creating a fluid and dynamic exchange rather than a fixed interpretation. The concept of 'differance' underscores how texts derive meaning not in isolation but through their relationships with other texts. The meaning of a text is fluid and contingent, reinforcing the idea that intertextual connections are dynamic and ever-evolving. Derrida's deconstruction challenges the notion of an original, stable, unique meaning, as well as its presence within the text. This critique aligns perfectly with intertextuality, which posits that a text is never fully self-contained. Instead, it is in a constant dialogue with other texts. Thus, meaning constantly shifts and evolves based on these relationships, and any interpretation is influenced by various intertextual references.

By shattering the established traditional concept of meaning, Derrida also subverts the idea of *logocentrism*—the belief that regards words and language as a fundamental expression of an external reality. He argued that meaning is inherently unstable and shaped by multiple contexts, suggesting that understanding any text necessitates consideration of its

intertextual connections. Derrida's deconstruction also challenges the idea of a singular authorial meaning or intent. His emphasis on the instability of authorial intent challenges traditional interpretations that prioritize the author's voice. In the realm of intertextuality, decentering authority encourages readers to explore the multiple meanings which are likely to arise when texts interact with each other, and multiple interpretations are shaped through the interplay of various texts rather than focusing solely on the author's original intent. It paves the way for diverse interpretations based on the reader's contexts and the intertextual connections that inform their readings.

Derrida also focuses on the context in which the texts are situated. Derrida's emphasis on the notion of context in shaping meaning is vital in intertextuality. The contexts enhance one's understanding of how intertextuality operates. Understanding how texts are situated within cultural, historical, and literary contexts not only illuminates the nuances of their intertextual relationships but also helps give meaning to the texts. It should also be noted that context refers not only to the context surrounding the text, but also to that of the reader. For Derrida, context extends beyond the traditional understanding of the text's surrounding circumstances to include the reader's own situation, experiences, and perspectives. He emphasizes that meaning is not fixed and can shift depending on various contexts, including the reader's interpretation and the socio-cultural environment in which the reading occurs. He posits that "the same piece of content may conceal a different meaning when it occurs in various people or in various contexts" (Derrida, 1978, p. 209). This aligns with his deconstructive approach, which challenges the idea of a singular, stable meaning and highlights the interplay between text, reader, and context. So, in Derrida's framework, the reader's context is indeed a crucial aspect of how a text is interpreted. The contexts in general enhance one's understanding of how intertextuality operates. By recognizing that meanings shift according to context, one can gain deeper insight into how texts influence one another and how interpretations can vary significantly based on the reader's background and situational context.

Derrida (1977) argues that language is a system of signs that are never fixed, which contributes to the multiplicity of meanings (pp. 6-8). In intertextuality, this notion highlights how references and allusions can create new meanings that shift and evolve depending on the readers' contexts and the contexts where texts are produced. At this point it is crucial to mention Saussure's theory of language. Though Saussure's concepts of 'sign' and the 'signified', which are foundational in semiotics, served much to the theory of intertextuality, Saussure and Derrida approach them in distinct ways. In Saussure's theory, a 'sign' is composed of two parts: the 'signifier' (the form of a word or expression) and the 'signified' (the concept the signifier represents). Saussure emphasizes that language is a system of signs where meaning is generated through the relationships between signs. In Saussure's theory, the interconnection appears to take place just between signs and their meanings, i.e. in a restricted manner (Saussure, 1966). In Derrida's view, language is a system of signs that never truly captures an essence and every sign attains its meaning in relation to other signs.

This idea finds a parallel in intertextuality, where the interplay of various texts leads to a multiplicity of meanings, as each reference or allusion can invoke different interpretations and contexts. While Saussure presents a more structured and stable view of signs and their meanings, Derrida challenges this framework by emphasizing the fluidity and complexity of meaning, advocating for a more dynamic understanding of the relationship between the 'signifier' and the 'signified'. Saussure emphasizes the stability of the 'sign'. He posits that the meaning of words is determined by their relationships to other signs within a system, i.e. language, creating a relatively stable structure of meaning. Likewise, Saussure's focus on the binary relationship between the 'signifier' and the 'signified' leads to a more static understanding of meaning. Derrida critiques Saussure's model by introducing the idea that meaning is never fixed but always deferred. He argues that the signifier is not simply linked to a specific signified; instead, it is part of a chain of signs where meaning is constantly shifting. In contrast with Saussure's idea of partly stable meaning, Derrida has the idea that meaning arises from the differences between signs rather than from a direct connection to the signified. The relationship between the 'signifier' and the 'signified' is unstable and influenced by the reader's context, leading to multiple interpretations rather than a single, definitive meaning. All of this implies the instability of meaning, and that interpretation is always in flux and context-dependent.

The notion of 'trace'—how every text carries remnants of other texts—highlights the interconnectedness of texts and suggests that understanding a text necessitates considering its relationships with others. Derrida uses the term 'trace' to refer to the traces of other texts within a text. He emphasizes that every text carries traces of other texts, indicating that no text is wholly original. According to Derrida, "every sign […] contains a trace of other signs which differ from itself […] No sign is complete in itself. One sign leads to another via the trace—indefinitely" (Cuddon, 1998, p. 924). This notion also provides a compelling way to analyse a text from the perspective of intertextuality, detecting the intertextual practices in it. The idea of 'trace' is central to intertextuality because the traces of other texts within a text create a network of meanings. The presence of these traces or the remnants of other meanings in the text in question demonstrates how intertextual relationships are foundational to meaning-making, as each text reflects and refracts influences from others. Recognizing these traces can illuminate how texts interact with and inform one another. This paves the way for the creation of a multiplicity of meanings, which emphasizes that texts can be interpreted in multiple ways depending on the intertextual relationships they engage with.

Here, it is beneficial to distinguish between Saussure and Derrida in order to indicate the evolution of thought within intertextuality. Saussure argues that a sign consists of the signifier and the signified and emphasizes that the meaning of a sign arises from the systematic relationship between the signifier and the signified within a language. This idea aligns well with intertextuality because it suggests that meaning is not isolated but rather created through the interplay of signs within a system. On the other hand, Derrida

challenges the stability of the signifier-signified relationship. He introduces the concept of "différance", which highlights that meaning is always deferred and open to interpretation, which cannot be characterized with uniqueness or stability. Derrida changes, as he himself puts it in an essay titled "The Time of a Thesis: Punctuation", "the accredited, authorized relation between a word and a concept" (quoted in Wood, 2009, p. 13). For Derrida, meaning is not fixed but fluid, as it can change depending on context and the interplay of various signs. In Jeremy Hawthorn's (1998) formulation, for Derrida "the meaning of a text is always unfolding just ahead of the interpreter, unrolling in front of him or her like a never-ending carpet whose final edge never reveals itself" (p. 39). In Hans Berten's (2001) words "a text never achieves closure—which quite literally means that its case can never be closed: there is no final meaning, the text remains a field of possibilities" (p. 131). This perspective is quite compatible with intertextuality, suggesting that texts engage in a complex network of relationships that resist definitive interpretations. So, it can be said that Saussure's theory supports a more stable relationship conducive to intertextuality, while Derrida's perspective highlights instability and fluidity in meaning. This contrast illustrates the evolution of thought in intertextuality as a literary theory.

In conclusion, by focusing on the above points, an attempt has been made to articulate a nuanced understanding of how Derrida's theory parallels and informs the concept of intertextuality. Although Derrida did not coin the term 'intertextuality', his philosophical framework and critical approach certainly added depth and complexity to the theory, influencing how scholars and readers engage with texts and understand their interrelations. Overall, Derrida's work has laid the groundwork for a more complex understanding of intertextuality, emphasizing the interconnectedness of texts and the fluid nature of meaning in literature and language. In essence, Derrida's theories illuminate the way texts engage with one another, encouraging readers to embrace the complexity and interconnectedness of literary works. This perspective not only enriches our understanding of literature but also highlights the creativity involved in reading and interpreting texts. His ideas provide a more fluid and dynamic approach to literature, which resonates deeply with the essence of intertextuality.

Exploring Umberto Eco's Influence on Intertextuality

Umberto Eco (1932-2016), Italy's world-famous intellectual known for both his novels and literary and cultural theories, is another post-structuralist theorist whose work explores the complex relationships between texts and the ways in which meaning is constructed through intertextual references and connections. One of Eco's key contributions to intertextual theory is his concept of the "open work" or "open text". Eco argues that texts should be seen as open, inviting readers to actively engage with them and participate in the process of meaning-making. He focuses on the reading process of the addressee during which s/he interprets and gives meaning to the text. Eco believes that readers bring their own knowledge, experiences, and intertextual references to the reading process, influencing the

interpretation of a text. His concept of the 'open text/work' is a derivative of Barthes's (1974) *scriptible* (writerly) text. Eco divides works of art into two as 'finite' or 'closed', and 'open'. For him, closed works are those that "prescribe specific repetition along given structural coordinates" whereas open works are "brought to their conclusion by the performer at the same time as he experiences them on an aesthetic plane" (Eco, 1989, p. 3). An open text—of which James Joyce's fiction is, for Eco, a true example—is one that allows multiple or mediated interpretations by readers and elicits infinite meanings. In contrast, a closed (or finite) work guides the reader toward a single intended interpretation. Rather than viewing the 'completeness' of a work as the presence of an immutable meaning imposed by the author, Eco understands it as the work being materially finished. He sees texts as open and attributes the production of meaning to the reader. "A work of art", he writes,

> is a complete and *closed* form in its uniqueness as a balanced organic whole, while at the same time constituting an *open* product on account of its susceptibility to countless different interpretations which do not impinge on its unadulterable specificity. Hence, every reception of a work of art is both an *interpretation* and a *performance* of it, because in every reception the work takes on a fresh perspective for itself. (Eco, 1989, p. 4)

Eco's idea of the 'open work/text' suggests that a text is not a static entity with a fixed meaning, but rather a dynamic and evolving construct that invites multiple interpretations. This perspective encourages readers to explore the intertextual references within a text and to engage in the process of constructing meaning by connecting various textual elements. This has provided a further advancement in intertextual theory. Eco emphasizes the importance of the reader's ability to recognize and decode intertextual practices. He has developed the idea of the 'model reader' —an idealized reader who possesses the necessary knowledge and cultural references to fully appreciate and engage with a text's interweaving elements and intertextual practices. According to Eco, the 'model reader' is able to recognize and make connections with other texts, enriching his reading experience. Therefore, the reader of a text endowed with a "measure of openness […] knows that every sentence and every trope is 'open' to a multiplicity of meanings which he must hunt for and find" (Eco, 1989, p. 5). This also means that the reader, according to the feelings he has at that particular moment, chooses a "possible interpretative key which strikes him as exemplary of this spiritual state. He will *use* the work according to the desired meaning (causing it to come alive again, somehow different from the way he viewed it at an earlier reading" (Eco, 1989, pp. 5-6). Eco (1979), viewing the reader as an addressee and interpreter being an "abstract and constitutive element in the process of actualization of a text", (p. 4) takes into account the possibility of the reader's interpretation of a text against "the background of codes different from those intended by the author" (p. 8). Therefore, it can be argued that Eco clarifies not only the extent to which the reader is free in interpreting an open text, but also the extent to which the reader is guided toward a stabilized or intended meaning. It is true that an open text, for Eco, "calls for the cooperation of its own reader but also wants this reader to make a series of interpretive choices which even though not infinite are, however, more than one" (1979, p. 4). Eco (1979) writes: "You cannot use the text as you want, but only as the text

wants you to use it. An open text, however, 'open' it be, cannot afford whatever interpretation" (p. 9). Eco bases his notion of the intertextual practice on a model/ideal reader having intertextual competence.

In conclusion, the philosopher, semiotician, novelist, cultural critic, and political and social commentator Umberto Eco made significant contributions to intertextuality. His contributions to intertextual theory lie primarily in his creation of the concept of the 'open text'. His other contribution is his emphasis on the active role of the reader in creating meaning through their engagement with a text and its intertextual references. Eco's concept of the 'model' or 'ideal reader' highlights how readers bring their own experiences, knowledge, and interpretations to a text, influencing the way they understand and connect with intertextual elements.

Harold Bloom's Vision of Intertextuality and the Power of Influence in Literature

The prolific American writer, critic and editor Harold Bloom (1930-2019) has taken part in the intertextual trajectory with his theory of 'the anxiety of influence', which is the keystone in his approach to both writing and criticizing literary works, and is itself an account of intertextuality. The theory of the anxiety of influence found expression in his 1973 book, *The Anxiety of Influence,* which is the first book in his tetralogy, and is further explored in the other three related books. Bloom's (1997) thesis is that "poetic history […] is held to be indistinguishable from poetic influence, since strong poets make that history by misreading one another, so as to clear imaginative space for themselves" (p. 5). Through his theory what Bloom does is to reinterpret the literary history via Freud's theory of 'the Oedipus complex'. Considering Freud's theory to be one of the most prominent features of literary history, Bloom claims that all poets are in an Oedipal relationship of influence and competition with their predecessors. According to Bloom, the poets write anxiously in the shadow of "strong poets" preceding them. One of the "strong poets" having "strong poems" is Shakespeare because he "did not think one thought and one thought only; rather scandalously, he thought all thoughts, for all of us" (Bloom, 1997, pp. xxvii-xxviii). Another name for "strong poets" used by Bloom is the "precursor", and the later poets coming after the precursor are called the "ephebe" by him. As sons are always oppressed by their fathers and they have a fear of castration, they develop the Oedipus complex. The rationale of the Oedipus complex, though it is unproven, is that before learning to suppress such feelings toward his mother, a son desires to possess his mother sexually or marry her and wishes to supplant or kill his father. Likewise, the later poets living in the shadow of the influential poets feel oppressed by their precursors, which results in a search for discarding the "strength by entering it from within, writing in a way which revises, displaces and recasts the precursor poem" (Eagleton, 1996, p. 159). In effect, what happens when a new poet reads his precursors' poems is that firstly he reads them in admiration and he is inspired by them but then the poet at hand has a feeling that he has read them only to find that the things he wants to say in his poetry have already been said by his predecessors and thus he becomes disappointed. Then in order to

evade such a mood in himself, he begins to think and believe that there must be something wrong with the previous poems. Bloom sees a kind of motivation in the young poet's anxiety of influence because feeling antagonistically, the new poet tries to add something to the tradition that he thinks his precursors lack. Though Bloom (1997) states that he never "meant by "the anxiety of influence" a Freudian Oedipal rivalry" (p. xxii), he himself and many critics have righteously considered it as a rivalry between the predecessors and young authors because young authors are always in a competition with their precursors whom "they have to dislodge and supplant to make room for themselves" (Schmitz, 2007, p. 201). Another critic Culler (2001) comments on this contest as in the following:

> [E]ach poet must slay his poetic father; he must displace his precursors by a revisionary misreading which creates the historical space in which his own poetry takes place. The hidden order of literary history is based on a negative and dialectical principle, which also orders the relationship between reader and text: the reader, like the new poet, is a latecomer bound to misconstrue the text so as to serve the meanings required by his own moment in literary history. (p. 15)

For Bloom (1997), "poetry is the anxiety of influence, is misprision [deliberate misreading], is a disciplined perverseness. Poetry is misunderstanding, misinterpretation, misalliance" (p. 95). What poets do, then, is merely reconstruct and reform earlier poems. Therefore, the meaning of a poem is always in another poem, that is, a poem is comprehensible in terms of other texts which it prolongs. In Bloom's theory, text is seen as an intertextual construct which "completes, transforms and sublimates" (Culler, 2001, p. 121). These ideas can also be found in Bloom's *A Map of Misreading* (1975), the second work in his tetralogy; *Kabbalah and Criticism* (1975), the third; and *Poetry and Repression: Revisionism from Blake to Stevens* (1976), the fourth. In the last work, in which he begins presenting his criticism as an alternative to *New Criticism* and *Structuralism*, Bloom applies his theory of misreading to the poets after Blake. He begins his book asserting the intertextual nature of text and its meaning:

> Few notions are more difficult to dispel than the 'commonsensical' one that a poetic text is self-contained, that it has an ascertainable meaning or meanings without reference to other poetic texts. […] Unfortunately, poems are not things but only words that refer to other words, and *those* words refer to still other words, and so on into the densely overpopulated world of literary language. Any poem is an inter-poem, and any reading of a poem is an inter-reading. (Bloom, 1976, pp. 2-3)

In *A Map of Misreading*, Bloom further develops his explanation of the anxiety of influence and offers a revised definition of the theory—one that provides the intertextual aspect of his theory of the anxiety of influence: "Influence, as I conceive it, means that there are *no* texts, but only relationships *between* texts" (Bloom, 1975a, p. 3). He also argues that every new poet approaches their predecessors with antagonism and a sense of belatedness, stemming from the disappointment mentioned above. He writes: "Initial love for the precursor's poetry is transformed rapidly enough into revisionary strife, without which individuation is not possible" (Bloom, 1975a, p. 10). Desiring to be original or unique at first,

the ephebe then accepts that what a poet is doing is nothing more than an imitation. Bloom argues that poetry or literature in general can imitate rather than create afresh. Thus, he describes poems as "defensive processes in constant change, which is to say that poems themselves are *acts of reading.* A poem is […] a fierce, proleptic debate *with itself*, as well as with precursor poems" (1976, p. 26). Therefore, Bloom's vision of poetry and its creation can be described as wholly intertextual. Bloom extends his theory of the anxiety of influence, which sees poetic influence as misreading, to a theory of critical interpretation. The ephebe, for Bloom, misreads his predecessor's poems; likewise, the critic/interpreter misreads the relationship between the ephebe and the precursor. If all readings are misreadings, all interpretations are misinterpretations. According to Bloom's theory "reading is […] a miswriting just as writing is a misreading […] all poetry necessarily becomes verse criticism, just as all criticism becomes prose-poetry" (1975a, p. 3). By 'reading', Bloom (1976) means "the work of both poet and critic" (p. 18). Thus, Bloom adoption of a deconstructionist manner in his criticism brings poets and critics closer together, since a critic's deciphering of texts is itself a sign—a concept of paramount importance in intertextuality. Like Kristeva and Barthes he draws attention to the meaning-making role of the reader in interpretation. Bloom (1975b), in his *Kabbalah and Criticism*, expounds this idea: "the interpreting thought is the reading of the poem, but this reading is itself a sign" (p. 57). He then explains the case of a critic who is the addressee here:

> When you *know* both precursor and ephebe, you know poetic history, but your knowing is as critical an event in that history as was the ephebe's knowing of the precursor. The remedy for literary history then is to convert its concepts from the category of being into the category of happening. To see the history of poetry as an endless, defensive civil war, indeed a family war, is to see that every idea of history relevant to the history of poetry must be a *concept of happening.* That is, when you *know* the influence relation between two poets, your knowing is a conceptualizing, and your conceptualizing (or misreading) is itself an event in the literary history you are writing. Indeed your *knowledge* of the later poet's misprision of his precursor is exactly as crucial a concept of happening or historical event as the poetic misprision was. Your work as an event is no more or less privileged than the later poet's event of misprision in regard to the earlier poet. Therefore the relation of the earlier poet to the later poet is analogous to the relation of the later poet to yourself. (Bloom, 1975b, p. 63)

In conclusion, Bloom's theory of "the anxiety of influence" posits that poets and writers are in a constant struggle with the influence of their predecessors. Intertextuality theory and Bloom's theory intersect in the sense that both highlight the interconnectedness of texts and the way in which writers engage with and are influenced by the works that have come before them. Intertextuality theory expands on this idea by emphasizing how texts are in dialogue with one another, creating a network of references and meanings that enrich the reading experience. Bloom's theory adds a psychological dimension to the theory of intertextuality by suggesting that authors must grapple with the influence of past authors in order to establish their own unique voice and originality. Overall, the relationship between intertextuality and Bloom's theory lies in their shared focus on the intricate web of

connections that exist between texts and the impact of literary predecessors on the creative process.

Unraveling the Layers of Intertextuality with Gérard Genette's 'Transtextuality'

Gérard Genette is a prominent literary theorist known for his significant contributions to the concept of intertextuality. Generally speaking, intertextuality refers to the relationships between texts, where one text is influenced by or referred to by another text. Genette expanded on this idea by exploring the various ways in which texts are interconnected and how meaning is produced through these relationships. Richard Macsey's defining Genette as "the most intrepid and persistent explorer in our time of the relations between criticism and poetics" (Genette, 1997b, p. xii) helps understand Genette's place in the intertextual trajectory. Genette's structuralist approach to literary texts enables a connection between intertextuality and the critical analysis of a text. Thus Structuralist criticism takes its place in intertextuality by foregrounding and investigating not only the text itself but also its connection to the system out of which it is constructed.

In the context of Genette's work, the concept of palimpsest serves as a metaphor for the intertextual relationships that exist between texts. Intertextuality, for which Genette (1997) coined the term *transtextuality* (p. 1), is a central concept in Genette's book *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (1982) as it highlights the interconnectedness of texts and the ways in which they reference and build upon each other. A palimpsest is defined as "a manuscript or piece of writing material on which later writing has been superimposed on effaced earlier writing" (Oxford Languages). It is a manuscript page—typically from a scroll or book—that has been scraped clean and reused, yet still bears visible traces of the original writing. As Thomas De Quincey (1945) evocatively describes it, it is "a membrane or roll cleansed of its manuscript by reiterated successions" and more broadly, it is "a thing likened to such a writing surface, esp. in having been reused or altered while still retaining traces of its earlier form; a multilayered record" (no pagination). A palimpsest is like a layering of stories on top of one another, revealing the passage of time and the evolution of ideas. Therefore, palimpsests are significant artifacts offering a glimpse into the past and the ways in which knowledge has been preserved and transformed over time. Palimpsests, as physical artifacts and metaphorical constructs, embody the idea of intertextuality by preserving traces of previous texts while also presenting new layers of meanings. Just as a palimpsest reveals the palimpsestic nature of literature, where texts are constantly overlapping and influencing each other, so does intertextuality highlight the way in which texts are interconnected and enriched by their references to other works. According to Sarah Dillon (2017) in *The Palimpsest: Literature, Criticism, Theory*, the concept of the palimpsest offers a powerful metaphor for understanding interdisciplinarity (p. 14). She suggests that disciplines encounter one another within the palimpsest, and their interrelations are defined according to its logic. The palimpsest thus becomes a figure for interdisciplinarity itself—marked by

the "productive violence" of imbrication, intersection, interruption, and indwelling, as disciplines overlap and redefine one another (Dillon, 2017, p. 14).

Genette's book, *Palimpsests,* delves into the concept of palimpsest in literature, that is, it is a book exploring the concept of intertextuality in literature. In this book, Genette (1997) examines how texts refer to and influence each other, and the ways in which texts can be layered with meaning, intertextuality, and references to other works. As Gerald Prince puts it in his "Foreword" to *Palimpsests*, for Genette "the object of poetics is not the (literary) text but its textual transcendence, its textual links with other texts" (in Genette, 1997, p. ix). In the book, Genette discusses how authors borrow from and interact with other texts, how they build upon existing texts, creating new works that are enriched by the echoes of the past. Genette also discusses the complexities of literary allusions, quotations, and adaptations, providing analyses of how literary texts can be seen as palimpsests, with traces of other texts visible beneath the surface (Genette, 1997). Genette's analysis provides a deep understanding of the complexities of literary creation and the interconnectedness of texts across time and space. The concept of palimpsest thus becomes a means or a lens through which to view the complex web of intertextual connections that shape literary works and contribute to the richness and depth of the literary canon.

Intertextuality, as highlighted by Genette, reveals the intricate web of connections between texts, where writers draw upon existing works to enrich their own creations. The relationship between palimpsest and intertextuality constructed by Genette (1997) in his book provides an understanding of how texts are layered with meanings and how writers engage with a literary tradition that stretches back through time. Through the lens of the palimpsest, Genette offers a consideration about how texts interact with each other by creating a range of intertextual references and thus shaping texts. As a concluding remark, it can be argued that Genette's concept of the palimpsest underscores the notion that texts are not created in isolation but are instead part of a larger intertextual network, where each work bears the imprint of those that came before it. Genette's exploration of palimpsests in literature highlights the intertextual nature of texts, where layers of meanings are built upon echoes of the past.

Genette is the critic who proposed a series of terms to distinguish between the types of intertextual practices; thus, he made definitional contributions to intertextuality. He proposed the term 'transtextuality' as a more inclusive word than 'intertextuality' and made 'intertextuality' a subtype of 'transtextuality'. With Genette's introduction of the term 'transtextuality' in place of 'intertextuality', a question arises: Despite his coinage of a new term, why do scholars, critics, etc. still use 'intertextuality' instead of 'transtextuality' to describe the interconnectedness of texts? It is a fact that the term 'intertextuality' has become more commonly used in academic and critical discourses while Genette introduced the term 'transtextuality' to refer to the relationship between texts. One possible reason for this may be that 'intertextuality' has gained broader recognition and acceptance within the field of

literary studies and cultural theory. Additionally, the term 'intertextuality' is often associated with the influential works of theorist Julia Kristeva, which may have contributed to its widespread usage. Ultimately, both terms convey a similar idea of interconnectedness between texts, and the choice of terminology may simply come down to the scholarly convention and preference.

Genette's 'transtextuality' encompasses all the ways in which one text relates to or refers to other texts. Genette categorized different types of transtextuality, such as intertextual elements (like quotations and allusions), paratextual elements (like titles, prefaces, and footnotes), metatextual elements (commentary or critical analysis within a text), hypertextual elements (like pastiche, parody, any kind of imitation or transformation of a previous text) and architextual elements (like the generic features that connect texts and exist in the system of literary conventions). Macksey (1997) makes a list of the subtypes of transtextuality formulated by Genette in his *Palimpsests* (1997, pp.1-4):

> 1. Intertextuality: "a relation of co-presence between two or more texts, that is to say, eidetically and most often, by the literal presence of one text within another". It appears in the form of quotation, plagiarism or allusion.
> 2. Paratextuality: "The subject of the present book, comprising those liminal devices and conventions, both within the book *(peritext)* and outside it *(epitext),* that mediate the book to the reader". "Titles and subtitles, pseudonyms, forewords, dedications, epigraphs, prefaces, intertitles, notes, epilogues, and afterwords" are the elements surrounding the main body of a text.
> 3. Metatextuality: "The transtextual relationship that links a commentary to "the text it comments upon (without necessarily citing it)". In this sense a text making a commentary about another text is a metatext.
> 4. Hypertextuality: "The literature in the second degree", "the superimposition of a later text on an earlier one that includes all forms of imitation, pastiche, and parody". When a text transforms, modifies or extends a previous text, this previous text becomes a hypotext and the other text is a hypertext; a hypertextual relationship between these two texts occurs.
> 5. Architextuality [or architexture]: "The most abstract and implicit of the transcendent categories, the relationship of inclusion linking each text to the various kinds of discourse of which it is a representative". (pp. xviii-xix)

With Genette, there has been a renewed focus on language as a sign system, which is closely related to intertextuality. By viewing language as a system of signs that are interconnected and influenced by other texts, he emphasizes the idea that texts are not isolated entities but rather part of a larger network of meaning. Intertextuality, which examines how texts refer to and interact with other texts, aligns with this view by emphasizing the interconnected nature of literary works and the ways in which they influence one another. In essence, Genette's emphasis on language as a sign system and his exploration of intertextuality both underscore the complex and dynamic relationships between texts within the broader context of literary analysis. In his trilogy, *The Architexts*, *Palimpsests*, and *Paratexts*, Genette moved structuralist poetics to intertextuality (Allen, 2000, p. 98). Walter Allen refers to, as we will do, Genette's concept of 'bricoleur' when explaining

the relationship between Genette's ideas and intertextuality. In his famous and influential article, "Structuralism and Literary Criticism", Genette elaborates on Claude Lévi-Strauss's concept of 'bricolage' to explain what a literary critic does when engaging in structuralist analysis based on a literary work. Genette, like Kristeva and Barthes, views a literary text or artwork as not original, unique, or a unitary whole, but rather, as a specific arrangement within an enclosed system—namely language. The text, for them, is created by means of the author's choices of words, phrases as well as the author's combinations of language units or manipulations of linguistic elements. Allen states that "[t]he author takes elements of the enclosed literary system or structure and arranges them into the work, obscuring the work's relation to the system. The critic takes the work and returns it to the system, illuminating the relation between work and system obscured by the author" (Allen, 2000, p. 96). For Genette, a literary critic is someone who "creates a structure out of a previous structure by rearranging elements which are already arranged within the objects of his or her study" (Allen, 2000, p. 96). Since a literary text may not explicitly reveal its relationship to the system, it becomes the critic's task to uncover these connections. Allen (2000) also states that

> [t]he structure created by this rearrangement is not identical to the original structure, yet it functions as a description and explanation of the original structure by its very act of rearrangement. To put this simply, the *bricoleur*-critic breaks down literary works into 'themes, motifs, key-words, obsessive metaphors, quotations, index cards, and references' […] in other words, s/he rearranges the original literary work into the terms of literary criticism. The critic can then display the work's relation to the system of 'themes, motifs, key-words' which make up the literary system out of which the work was constructed […] Both critic and author, then, can be termed *bricoleurs.* (p. 96)

Genette has also deepened the role of intertextuality in the ways of critical analyses of literary works; that is, intertextuality has become more involved in the methods of interpretation of literary texts. Intertextuality is recognized by Genette as a crucial tool in literary analysis and interpretations of literary texts. Genette was more structuralist than poststructuralist, so he was interested in systematizing literary analysis. It is not possible to argue that Genette aimed to establish indisputable interpretations or critical certainty, that is, he was not claiming that texts have only one stable or definitive meaning; however, he offered frameworks or tools for analysis. Genette (1983) writes, in his "Introduction" to *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, in which he elaborates on a theory of narrative, that the

> analysis of narrative discourse as I understand it constantly implies a study of relationships: on the one hand the relationship between a discourse and the events that it recounts (narrative in its second meaning), on the other hand the relationship between the same discourse and the act that produces it [...] (narrative in its third meaning)". (p. 27)

He sees the analysis of narrative discourse as "a study of the relationships between narrative and story, between narrative and narrating, and (to the extent that they are inscribed in the narrative discourse) between story and narrating" (Genette, 1983, p. 29). Genette discusses

the analysis of narrative discourse, emphasizing the importance of studying the relationship between the discourse itself and the events being described as well as the relationship between the discourse and the act of narrating those events. Essentially, he highlights the interconnectedness between the text, the events within it, and the act of storytelling, suggesting that understanding these relationships is crucial in analyzing narrative discourse effectively.

In conclusion, Genette's systematic and structuralist approach to refining and categorizing textual relationships—along with his exploration of how intertextuality shapes interpretation and contributes to meaning—has had a significant impact on intertextuality theory. By highlighting the interconnectedness of texts and the ways in which they influence one another, Genette has made contributions to intertextuality that have been instrumental in shaping literary theory and analysis, encouraging critics to embrace the complexity and fluidity of textual meanings rather than seeking fixed or absolute interpretations.

Intertextual Insights: Riffaterre's Semiotic Approach to Intertextuality

The influential French theoretician and literary analyst Michael Riffaterre (1924-2006) contributed to intertextual theory initially with his structuralist and semiotic studies and later, with his studies on intertextuality. Riffaterre's approach to intertextuality revolves around the idea that texts are in constant dialogue with one another, influencing and shaping each other's meanings. He argues that authors draw on intertextual references and literary conventions to create meaning during the production of texts. Riffaterre elaborated on these ideas successively in *Semiotics of Poetry* (1978), *Intertextualité* (1982), and *Text Production* (1983). Exploring the intersection of semiotics and literary analysis, particularly focusing on the genre of poetry, Riffaterre, in his seminal work *Semiotics of Poetry*, highlights two points: the interconnectedness of different works of literature and the role of interpretation in literary analysis. He discusses the relationships between texts, how they influence each other and how meaning is generated through language and intertextual references. Riffaterre (1980) explains what intertextuality is, classifying it into three ways:

> there are three types of intertextuality: first, the complementary type (every sign has a reverse and an obverse; the reader is forced to interpret the text as the negative, in the photographic sense, of its intertext); second, the mediated type (where the reference of text to intertext is effected through the intercession of a third text functioning as the interpretant that mediates between sign and object [...]); and third, the intratextual type (where the intertext is partly encoded within the text and conflicts with it because of stylistic or semantic incompatibilities). (p. 627)

Riffaterre's theories also focus on the relationship between the text and the reader. He discusses how readers interpret texts based on their prior knowledge and experiences. He focuses on the idea of 'hypertextuality' where readers bring their own experiences and knowledge to interpret a text, creating multiple layers of meaning. Riffaterre explores the concept of intertextuality in depth, showing how texts refer to and interact with one another to create layered meaning. In his intertextual phase, he developed a theory arguing that texts

do not refer directly to the world but to other texts, and he consistently examined how literary works derive their significance through such implicit textual relationships. In his *Text Production*, he delves into the process of text production and the ways in which authors draw on intertextual references and literary conventions to create meaning. He examines the creative process behind writing and the influence of existing texts on new literary works. Like Roland Barthes and Julia Kristeva, Riffaterre emphasizes the importance of texts' being influenced by and referring to other texts. These three thinkers also emphasize the function of the reader and reading process, during which the generation of the meaning is provided. For Riffaterre, the meaning of a text is not fixed but emerges through the reader's interpretive process, often shaped by intertextual references —an idea that aligns in part with the intertextual theories of Barthes and Kristeva, who emphasize the instability and multiplicity of meaning. In contrast, Genette's structuralist approach seeks to categorize textual relationships systematically, reflecting a more controlled – though not entirely fixed – view of textual interpretation.

At the heart of Riffaterre's semiotic approach is his conviction that a poem is a formal and semantic unity. For him, literary texts do not (aim to) imitate or refer to the reality due to the occurrence of semantic indirection in a poem "produced by displacing, distorting, or creating meaning […] All of them *threaten the representation* of reality, or mimesis" (Riffaterre, 1978, p. 2). Instead, he asserts that the meaning is derived from the interconnected semiotic structures that bind together the elements such as words, phrases, sentences, images, themes, and rhetorical devices within the text. The centrality of intertextuality in Riffaterre's work is underscored by his anti-referential approach. Intertextual theory holds that texts and signs do not primarily refer to external reality or abstract concepts, but rather to other texts and signs.

Riffaterre does not take intertextuality just as influence or imitation, and intertext just as the source. For him, an intertext "does not signify a collection of literary works that may have influenced the text or that the text may have imitated" (Riffaterre, 1984, p. 142). He defines an intertext as "a corpus of texts, textual fragments, or textlike segments of the sociolect that shares a lexicon and, to a lesser extent, a syntax with the text we are reading (directly or indirectly) in the form of synonyms or, even conversely, in the form of antonyms" (Riffaterre, 1984, p. 142). Thus intertextuality may occur by means of the use of synonyms or even antonyms. Riffaterre exemplifies this in the following statement: "[T]he depiction of a stormy night may serve as an intertext for a tableau of a peaceful day; crossing the trackless sands of the desert may be the intertext of furrowing the briny deep" (Riffaterre, 1984, p. 142). Riffaterre argues that intertextuality is more than a cultivated reader's ability to recognize similarities or differences between texts. It is not merely a skill reserved for those with a good memory or classical education. Rather, intertextuality is a fundamental cognitive process essential to any act of textual decoding—that is, to understanding any written text. By claiming that "intertextuality necessarily complements our experience of textuality" (1984, p. 142), Riffaterre means that intertextuality is essential to enhance our understanding

of a text; and this suggests that fully grasping a text requires considering its connections to other texts. Riffaterre also discusses that intertextual mimesis can manifest in two ways: either a text depicts reality by resorting to references that do not match that reality, or a text portrays reality by contradicting references that align with it (1984, p. 143). In essence, a text's meaning is dependent on its relationship with other texts, whether in agreement or contradiction.

For Riffaterre, in the literary representation of reality, the following factor is always constant: "The mimesis proper refers not to referents but to elementary representations of these. The mimetic text is not composed of words referring to things but of words referring to systems of signs that are ready-made textual units" (Riffaterre, 1984, p. 159). What Riffaterre suggests is that mimesis does not involve the direct representation of real-world objects or concepts. Instead, it refers to the representation of pre-existing textual elements — signs and codes drawn from other texts. In this view, a mimetic text is not composed of words pointing to external realities, but of signs that refer to other signs within the intertextual system. Another prominent claim by Riffaterre attracts the reader's attention, too. He states: "The more faithfully a text is supposed to reflect the manifold aspects of reality, or the more it proclaims itself a mirror, the more total the subordination of the mimetic multiplicity to a single message, to a semiotic oneness" (Riffaterre, 1984, p. 159). Namely, when a text claims to faithfully depict aspects of reality or presents itself as a mirror of reality, it often reduces its complex mimetic elements to a singular message or unified meaning. For Riffaterre, "[i]nterpretation takes over at the very point where the text would seem closest to an objective recording" (1984, p. 159). Therefore, interpretation of a text requires the reader's participation. The act of interpretation is unavoidable and indeed central even (or especially) when a text seems objective or transparent. Riffaterre is emphasizing that meaning is never simply given, but always produced through a decoding process involving intertextual recognition. Texts never function as transparent, objective mirrors of reality. When a text appears to simply record or report reality in a straightforward way (like a news report or factual statement), it may be assumed that it requires no interpretation. But precisely at this point—where the text seems "objective"—interpretation is most crucial because language always involves signs and codes that require decoding. Readers must interpret how the elements structuring texts function and what meaning is being constructed by them. For Riffaterre, meaning arises not from a direct connection between words and the real world, but from the reader's recognition of the intertextual system —how a text's signs relate to other signs in the cultural-literary system.

Delving into the importance of interpretation and the reader's role in understanding the intertextual connections within a text, Riffaterre emphasizes hermeneutics in intertextuality. In his essay "The Intertextual Unconscious", Riffaterre (1987) discusses how the intertextual dimension, which operates at an unconscious level, influences the reader's engagement with the text. The main subject in it is the exploration of the role of intertextuality in shaping the reader's understanding and interpretation of literary texts. In

this work, Riffaterre investigates how readers draw upon their knowledge of other texts, genres, and cultural references to make sense of the text they are currently reading. He argues that this intertextual unconscious plays a crucial role in shaping the reader's interpretation and enriching the meaning of the text. The analysis and interpretation of a text, for Riffaterre, are reader-oriented, which indicates Riffaterre's engagement with the reader-response theory. His statement that "[t]he text tends [...] not to be interpreted for what it is, but for what is selected from it by the reader's individual reactions" (Riffaterre, 1987, p. 372) suggests that how readers interpret and make sense of texts is based on their own experiences, cultural background and linguistic competence. Riffaterre (1987), accepting the reader not a passive agent, but one actively "reacting to the text" through "his way of thinking, and of conceiving representation" (pp. 371-372) shows how intertextuality operates at a deeper, unconscious level in the reading process, shedding light on the intricate ways by which texts interact and influence each other in the reader's mind. Therefore, reading is unstable, for Riffaterre (1978) and "interpretation is never final", a poem is "endlessly rereadable" (pp. 165-166).

Riffaterre focuses on the relationship between the reader and the text in his intertextual theory of poetry, which he developed in *The Semiotics of Poetry*. He argues that the intertextual references in poetry are the products of the way the reader interprets the text. In Riffaterre's reading strategy, a poem can be read from a mimetic and hermeneutic level of meaning, that is, it occurs in two stages: mimetic reading and semiotic reading. In the first stage, the reader thinks that the linguistic signs refer to a non-textual external world and perceives the linguistic signs with their first referential meaning. In the second stage, on the semiotic level, that is, the hermeneutic level, is reached, and thus, the grammatical anomalies that emerge in mimetic reading are made possible to be explained. This is "a retroactive reading which proceeds, in a non-linear fashion, to unearth the underlying semiotic units and structure which produce the text's non-referential significance" (Allen, 2000, p. 116). As a result, the elements in the poetic text where the meaning is not clear are given meaning through hermeneutic reading.

Riffaterre's key ideas regarding the interpretation of a text involve a number of concepts. Among them are 'syllepsis' (which he took from Derrida (Riffaterre, 1980, p. 629) and 'hypogram'. Riffaterre's concept of syllepsis is a literary device that involves a disjunction between the meanings of a word in two different contexts within a text, "one meaning being literal or primary, the other figurative" (Riffaterre, 1980, p. 629). This "rhetorical term", as suggested by Allen (2000), "means something in one context and has an opposed or clashing meaning in another context" (p. 118). It cannot be denied that syllepses are primarily beneficial for the reader as they enable the recognition of intertextual practices within the text. Furthermore, they assist the reader in deriving meanings and interpreting the text. According to Riffaterre, syllepsis operates in three different ways in the text. In the complementary type, where "the syllepsis itself suffices to presuppose the intertext and by itself conveys the significance", in the mediated type, in which "the syllepsis refers to the

textual interpretant" and in the intratextual type, in which "the syllepsis symbolizes the compatibility, at the significance level, between a text and an intertext incompatible at the level of meaning" (Riffaterre, 1980, p. 629). In all three cases, syllepsis creates a sense of ambiguity or multiple interpretations for the reader. Syllepsis plays, in effect, a role in highlighting the complexity of language and the way meaning can shift depending on the context in which a word is used. It adds layers of depth and nuance to the text; and this invites even forces readers to engage more actively with the material given in the text and consider different possible interpretations.

In *Semiotics of Poetry*, Riffaterre introduces his theory of hypogram and explores the relationship between text and the meaning-making process of the reader. His concept of hypogram refers to a subtextual element within a text that serves as a key to unlocking deeper layers of meaning. The hypogram is not explicitly stated in the text but is rather a hidden or implicit structure that informs the reader's interpretation. It acts as a kind of underlying code or pattern that influences the way the text is constructed and understood. In Riffaterre's theory of reading, the hypogram "is already a system of signs comprising at least a predication, and it may be as large as a text. The hypogram may be potential, therefore observable in language, or actual, therefore observable in a previous text" (Riffaterre, 1978, p. 23). Riffaterre goes on to characterize the hypogram as follows:

> This hypogram (a single sentence string of sentences) may be made out of clichés, or it may be a quotation from another text, or a descriptive system. Since the hypogram always has a positive or negative 'orientation' (the cliché is meliorative or pejorative, the quotation has its position on an aethethic and/or ethical scale, the descriptive system reflects the connotations of its kernel word), the constituents of the conversion always transmute the hypogram's markers [...] This means that the significance will be a positive valorization of the textual semiotic unit if the hypogram is negative, and a negative valorization if the hypogram is positive. (Riffaterre, 1978, pp. 63-64)

It is clear that the hypogram, which can consist of clichés, quotes from other texts, or descriptive systems, always carries a certain tone or direction (positive or negative). This tone is influenced by the elements that make up the hypogram, leading to a transformation of its original meaning. This implies that a negative hypogram will result in a positive interpretation of the textual element, while a positive hypogram will lead to a negative interpretation of the same element. Riffaterre (1978) also states that "the hypogram from which the poem is derived is also quoted in the poem, as is the interpretant, in fragmentary form" (p. 110). By identifying and analyzing the hypogram, readers can gain a better understanding of the underlying themes, motifs, and symbolic elements at play in the text. It should be stated that Riffaterre (1987) calls this process "hypogrammatic derivation" (p. 110) —a process in which the reader finds out the hypogram, makes sense of the interpretant combining the context in which it is used and its poetic function in the sociolect. All of this adds complexity and richness to the reading experience, allowing for the reader's deeper engagement with the text.

Riffaterre highlights the importance of recognizing intertextual connections in order to fully grasp the multiple layers of meaning within a text. By engaging with these references, readers can uncover deeper insights and better appreciate the complexity of the text's relationships to other texts. In conclusion, Riffaterre has made significant contributions to intertextual theory, shedding light on the intricate connections between texts and the potential for deeper layers of meaning through an awareness of intertextuality.

Conclusion

This study has aimed to introduce and analyse the intertextual theories of the thinkers, critics, and theoreticians who followed the first formulators of intertextuality. It has focused on the relationships between intertextuality and their respective theories, highlighting their significant contributions to the development of intertextual theory. The redefinitions and theoretical contributions of Jacques Derrida, Umberto Eco, Harold Bloom, Gérard Genette, and Michael Riffaterre have been examined in detail in the relevant sections.

This study has revealed a close relationship between intertextuality theory and Derrida's deconstruction. To explore the influence of Derrida's deconstructionist thought on intertextuality, key concepts such as différance, textuality, trace, and context have been examined, along with his critiques of authorial authority, the deconstruction of binary oppositions, and the multiplicity of meaning. Derrida, opposing the stable relationship between the signifier and the signified proposed by Saussure, argues that meaning is never fixed but always deferred. In other words, while Saussure emphasized the stability of linguistic meaning, Derrida posits that meaning arises from the differences between signs rather than from a fixed relationship to a singular concept. Intertextuality theory similarly asserts that texts derive their meaning through their relationships with other texts, underscoring the idea that meaning is always shaped by context and textual interplay. Both intertextuality and deconstruction challenge the notion of a single, stable meaning, instead emphasizing multiplicity, relationality, and textual openness. Derrida's deconstructionism, in particular, focuses on the inherent instability and complexity of language and how it shapes our understanding of the world, revealing how meaning is always contingent, contextual, and in flux. Deconstruction also critiques traditional binary oppositions and highlights the fluidity of meaning. In essence, both intertextuality theory and deconstruction emphasize the interconnected nature of texts and assert that meaning is not fixed but constantly evolving. They both invite readers to critically engage with texts and to consider the multiple layers of meaning embedded within them.

Focusing on Umberto Eco's concept of the open text—which suggests that a text is not rigid or definitive in its meaning but is instead a fluid and evolving construct that invites multiple interpretations – this study has explored his contributions to the reader-centered process of meaning-making within intertextuality. Overall, Eco's insights are central to understanding the interactive nature of reading and interpretation, as well as the role of intertextual references in enriching the layers of meaning within a text. His work has had a

lasting impact on intertextual analysis, shaping how scholars approach the complex relationships between texts and emphasizing the active role of the reader in interpretation.

In the part exploring the effects of Harold Bloom's ideas on intertextuality, his insightful book *The Anxiety of Influence* has been taken as a point of departure. In this book, Bloom explores how poets struggle with the influence of their precursors: while they are inspired by earlier poets, they also experience anxiety about preserving their own originality. In this part of the study, it has been concluded that Bloom's theory of "the anxiety of influence" has expanded the scope of intertextuality by suggesting that authors must confront and negotiate the influence of their literary forebears in order to develop a distinct style and creativity.

In the following section of the study, the concept of palimpsest in Gérard Genette's work has been explained alongside his introduction of the term 'transtextuality' as a replacement for 'intertextuality'. Through the concept of palimpsest, Genette emphasizes the interconnectedness of texts. He supports the idea that texts are enriched by references to earlier works, layered with multiple meanings, and thus open to various interpretations. In this part of the study, Genette's definitional contributions to intertextuality have also been examined. By introducing a range of new terms, Genette categorizes different types of textual relationships. He narrows the definition of intertextuality and proposes new categories such as 'paratextuality', 'metatextuality', 'hypertextuality', and 'architextuality' to more precisely describe these interactions. It has also been pinpointed that the term 'transtextuality', which broadly suggests the interconnectedness of all texts, has not gained wide usage among scholars – a phenomenon likely due to academic convention or individual preference. Through his concept of the 'bricoleur', Genette presents his structuralist approach to literature, viewing the literary text as a construction shaped by the author's selection and combination of words, phrases, and linguistic units within the larger system of language. In this view, the author draws upon the literary system to assemble their work, much like a bricoleur working with available materials. This section of the study has explored Genette's structuralist approach to literary analysis, which aims to bring conceptual clarity to intertextual relationships rather than interpretive certainty. He is credited with integrating intertextuality into the literary analysis of texts and narratives, emphasizing the interconnectedness not only between texts but also between a narrative and the events it portrays, as well as between the narrative and the act of storytelling itself. Therefore, Genette highlights the importance of identifying these relationships in the interpretation of narrative discourse, and he sees a close link between narrative analysis and the construction of meaning.

Finally, Michael Riffaterre, known for his focus on signs and their interpretation in literary texts, is the final theorist examined in relation to intertextuality. His semiological approach shedding light on the complex relationships between texts, readers, and the meanings that arise from their interaction has been discussed. While the theories of Genette

and Riffaterre have added complexity to the concept of intertextuality, they have also made it more comprehensive. The last section has emphasized Riffaterre's semiotic approach to literary texts, particularly poetry, and his challenge to the traditional theory of mimesis. According to Riffaterre, the signs in a poem do not refer to an external reality — even though the reader might experience that illusion through a mimetic reading. For Riffaterre, a poem is a semantic construct, composed of linguistic elements such as words and phrases, rather than a mimetic or referential representation of the world. The study states that Riffaterre's anti-referential approach to texts encourages a hermeneutic reading, in which semiotic units in the text are interpreted and analysed to uncover meaning. The study also highlights Riffaterre's emphasis on the reader's active role in constructing meaning and the dynamic relationship between the text and the reader's interpretive process. Exploring intertextual elements and deciphering underlying textual structures enables readers to uncover deeper layers of meaning and engage more profoundly with the text. One final point meriting a remark is that in Riffaterre's reader-oriented approach to textual interpretation, the concepts of 'syllepsis' and 'hypogram' play a significant role. Accordingly, these concepts have been explained in the study with appropriate references to Riffaterre's own theoretical works.

In conclusion, by engaging with the theories of prominent scholars such as Jacques Derrida, Harold Bloom, Umberto Eco, Gérard Genette, and Michael Riffaterre, this study offers a comprehensive examination of the evolving discourse on intertextuality and its implications for literary analysis. Through exploring the influence of these later theorists on the development and boundaries of intertextuality, the study provides deep insights into the dynamic nature of literary connections and the construction of meaning in texts. As intertextuality continues to shape and enrich literary theory, the ideas and contributions discussed here are expected to serve as a useful foundation for future academic research.

References

Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2000.

Barthes, Roland. *S/Z.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1974.

Bloom, Harold. *A Map of Misreading.* New York: Oxford UP, 1975a.

Bloom, Harold. *Kabbalah and Criticism.* New York: Seaburry Press, 1975b.

Bloom, Harold. *Poetry and Repression: Revisionism from Blake to Stevens*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry.* New York & Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.

Cuddon, John Anthony. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1998.

Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction.* London& New York: Routledge. 2001.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology.* Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Trans.). Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 1997.

Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference.* Alan Bass (Intr. and Trans.). USA: Chicago University Press, 1978.

De Quincey, Thomas. "The Palimpsest of the Human Brain". 1845. *Quotidiana.* Ed. Patrick Madden. Accessed from https://essays.quotidiana.org/dequincey/palimpsest_of_the_human_brain/ on 11.10 2025.

Dillon, Sarah. *Palimpsest: Edebiyat, Eleştiri, Kuram*. Ferit Burak Aydar (Trans.). İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2017.

Eco, Umberto. "Introduction: The Role of the Reader". *The Role of Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts.* Thomas A. Sebeok (Ed.). (3-43). Bloomington: Indiana UP., 1979.

Eco, Umberto. *The Open Work.* Anna Cancogni (Trans.). David Robey (Intr.). Cambridge: Harvard UP., 1989.

Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Channa Newman & Claude Doubinsky (Trans.). Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Jane E. Lewin (Trans.) Jonathan Culler (Intr.). New York: Cornell University Press. (First published 1972 (French)1980 (English). 1983.

Hawthorn, Jeremy. *A Concise Glossary of Contemporary Literary Terms*. London: Oxford UP., 1998.

Macksey, Richard. "Foreword". *Paratexts: Tresholds of Interpretation.* Gérard Genette. Jane E. Lewin (Trans.), Richard Macksey & Michael Sprinker (Ed.). (i-xxi). Cambridge: UP., 1997.

Palimsest Oxford Languages. Retrieved from https://languages.oup.com/google-dictionary-en/ on 06.05.2025

Prince, Gerald. "Foreword". Gerard Genette (author). *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree.* (ix-xi). Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Trans.). USA: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Riffaterre, Michael. *The Semiotics of Poetry*. Great Britain: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1978.

Riffaterre, Michael. "Syllepsis". *Critical Inquiry*. Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 625-638. USA: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Riffaterre, Michael. "The Intertextual Unconscious". *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 13, No. 2, The Trial(s) of Psychoanalysis, pp. 371-385. USA: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Wood, Sarah. *Derrida's Writing and Difference: A Reader's Guide.* London & New York: Continuum, 2009.

Zengin, Mevlüde. "An Introduction to Intertextuality as a Literary Theory: Definitions, Axioms and the Originators". *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute* Vol. 25, No.1, pp. 299-32. 2016.

CONTRIBUTION RATE OF RESEARCHERS

The author contributed 100% to the study.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

This study involves no potential conflicts of interest.