

Towards a History of Intertextuality in Literary and Culture Studies

Marko Juvan  
*University of Ljubljana*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>



Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), and the [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#)

Dedicated to the dissemination of scholarly and professional information, **Purdue University Press** selects, develops, and distributes quality resources in several key subject areas for which its parent university is famous, including business, technology, health, veterinary medicine, and other selected disciplines in the humanities and sciences.

*CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: [<clcweb@purdue.edu>](mailto:clcweb@purdue.edu)

---

### Recommended Citation

Juvan, Marko. "Towards a History of Intertextuality in Literary and Culture Studies." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 10.3 (2008): [<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1370>](https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1370)

This text has been double-blind peer reviewed by 2+1 experts in the field.

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact [epubs@purdue.edu](mailto:epubs@purdue.edu) for additional information.

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

*CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." In addition to the publication of articles, the journal publishes review articles of scholarly books and publishes research material in its *Library Series*. Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <[clcweb@purdue.edu](mailto:clcweb@purdue.edu)>

---

**Volume 10 Issue 3 (September 2008) Article 1**  
**Marko Juvan,**  
**"Towards a History of Intertextuality in Literary and Culture Studies"**  
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol10/iss3/1>>

---

**Contents of *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 10.3 (2008)**  
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol10/iss3/>>

---

**Abstract:** In his paper "Towards a History of Intertextuality in Literary and Culture Studies" Marko Juvan argues that the theory of intertextuality reshaped fundamentally the understanding of influence in literature. It showed that supposedly primary sources are themselves but intertextual transformations dependent on cultural "encyclopedia." Intertextuality as a framework offers a refined terminology of forms and functions of both domestic and foreign literatures' creative reception while respecting specific linguistic and cultural spaces, traditions, and literary systems. It deconstructed the postulates of influence; for example, the concepts of author, the logic of cause and effect, and boundaries between texts. It revealed the socio-political power of influence -- of hierarchy, colonialism, and hegemony -- as well as its negative and positive role in identity formation. For these reasons, intertextuality in literary and culture scholarship provokes the appearance of polycentric and pluralistic models of influence and other inter-literary discursive forces. It made central the interactive, dialogic or bi-level contacts between a literary text and a literary or non-literary context whose national framings are no more self-evident.

**Marko JUVAN**

### **Towards a History of Intertextuality in Literary and Culture Studies**

Translated from the Slovene by Timothy Pogačar

An explicit theory of intertextuality arose in the late 1960s during a crisis in the arts and sciences when transitioning from the modern to the postmodern; however, when considering the history of the idea that a text is but a mosaic of citations, we may adduce older concepts, especially those that had almost as wide currency in literary studies. It is not only a matter of ideas from which the new category was directly derived (e.g., Bakhtin's dialogism and Saussure's research of anagrams), but also of percepts *ex post* interpreted as anticipatory premonitions or polemical targets that lent theories of intertextuality their own profile (see Pfister; Markiewicz; Still and Worton). Probably most important are *imitatio / aemulatio*, a pair rooted in the tradition of rhetoric and poetics, together with influence and origin, which figured as key issues of the historicist paradigm in national and comparative literary history. Many literary theorists praised intertextuality's breakthrough by pointing to its differences with so-called forerunner concepts in the first place.

The concept of influence impacted thinking about literature starting in the mid-eighteenth century when classical poetics and the doctrine of imitation had already met their demise (see Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence* 26; Primeau 4-5; Clayton and Rothstein 4-5). The term itself was coined from the Latin word *influer* and was used previously in theology, medicine, and astrology. Coming from a celestial metaphor, it denoted energy that flows from higher, more powerful agencies (the stars, gods, muses, and saints) into the spirituality of mortals and changes their behavior or ways of expressing themselves. In eighteenth-century literary criticism and esthetics it was used as a metaphor expressing one-way causality in a new understanding of inspiration, creativity, and genius (Morgan 240). The anxiety that influence as external force could threaten originality began to spread only with the advent of ideal of individual invention that was at the time compared with divine creation *ex nihilo*. With the idea of borrowing, the rhetorical-poetic paradigm took for granted the supra-historical value of poetic norms and examples. However, historicism, the epistemological ideology that arose from the crisis of Enlightenment rationalist universalism, posited historical individuality and changeability of all kinds of spiritual creativity: every phenomenon should be explained by its first causes, the same for things literary. Historicism in philology and the humanities would not have been possible without the comparative method. The latter, motivated by etiological epistemology actually identified putative influences. Textual comparisons were meant to reveal what in art was really original and what was an admixture of another, "purer" source of creativity: Jan Walsh Hokenson suggests that "the European, basically romantic notion of artistic originality has long been a mainstay of comparatists' conception of their work ... in the beginning comparative literature was a scholarly means of appreciating the originality of each literature" (66). The comparative method was thus applied not only to relations between individual writers and works but was employed in culture wars for ascendancy between collective individuals, such as the literatures of cultures and regions in contact zones. In the period of constituting the national imaginary, literature was considered the highest expression of the collective subject ("national spirit"); nations, too, had to demonstrate their right to existence in comparison to the Other by continually weighing their "original" strengths and uncovering foreign ingredients.

Grounded in the modern dualism of consciousness and the external world, influence is represented as an external energy that enters the author's mind and, without the discernable procedures that were key for *imitatio*, leads him or her to write differently. Masterful borrowing was until the eighteenth century acknowledged as the normal path to artistry; yet the situation changed with pre-romanticist and romanticist historical consciousness, which was subsequently assisted by strictures of copyright legislation: every comparison that uncovered a repetition of a prior pattern or some other trace of a presumed influence now potentially provoked a defensive search for arguments supporting originality. On the other hand, meticulous listing of an author's transnational influences became -- besides having public resonance -- empirical evidence of esthetic power or even a criterion for canonization, especially in "world literature." Influence was, as a matter of fact, accepted in literary historical terminology only from the second half of the nineteenth century on. Positivists and their descendants believed that aside from past literary works there were many other powerful impulses for artistic creativity (e.g., ancestry, race, surroundings, historical period, and spirit of the time or nation). Literary history and in particular comparative criticism also required the concept of influence to explain literature's relations with other arts, although they primarily used it in research of genetic contacts between national literatures or wider cultural areas. In any case, the prevailing model of influence was centered on authoring. It was binary, causal-genetic, and value laden. According to Göran Hermerén's study *Influence in*

*Art and Literature*, substantiating influences depends on the idea of temporal and cause-and-effect ordering (the workings of the feature *a* in work A causes feature *a'* in a work by author B), on proving actual contacts (*rappports de fait*) between author B and work A, on tracing how feature *a* is assimilated in work B, and on presenting evidence of apparent similarities between works A and B (92-99). An example of this can be found in the Byronic fashion in Russia: Byron's comic digressive epic *Don Juan* (work A), known throughout Europe along with the author's transgressive star figure, influenced with features (*a1, a2, a3*) -- authorial narrator, satiric digressions, and an individualistic but ordinary protagonist -- Pushkin to write the novel in verse *Eugene Onegin* (work B) on this model, and in such a way that he adapted the Byronic features to a new esthetic structure, different linguistic and cultural context, political conditions, and tradition.

Influence seems "automatically oppressive to newcomers" (Orr 62): author A outlines the field of invention in advance and packs it with formal conventions and other points for creative response to play off. Thus author B can only be a debtor and his/her work pejoratively stamped as "derivative" (Hokenson 67). Not coincidentally, in the modern Western world, dependant on financial capitalism, metaphors of economic dependence surrounded the concept of influence, as seen in expressions like "B borrowed *a1* from A" or "B's esthetic debt." In the discourse of (comparative) literary history, such views have been interjected into the building of the prevailing canon, which maintained hegemony of great authors, languages, and literatures. The orthodox concept of influence with its binariness, causality, and value freight has thus become an easy target of critics who advocated intertextuality, from Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes onward. They have pointed out influence's conservative privileging of canonized literary achievements and the way it holds up sources of influence as transcendental signifieds for the works of later writers (Rajan 61); attacked the support that influence lends to the ruling hierarchy of discourses (Clayton and Rothstein 3-4); questioned its epistemological simplicity, which they see as similar to Newtonian mechanics; and not least, have also sharply criticized its service to colonialism (Stanford Friedman 151-52) or "nationalistic cultural imperialism" hidden behind comparative literature's "alleged cosmopolitanism" (see Orr 83). The poststructural and postmodernist idea of intertextuality, born in neo-avant-garde circles of *nouvelle critique*, somehow one-sidedly portrayed influence and the academic method of genetic comparison as despicable epistemic antiquarianism. In this peculiar way influence shaped the genesis of intertextuality, albeit indirectly, as a negative and schematized horizon grounding a break-through appearance of new theoretical figures of thought. Barthes ("Theory of the Text" 32-45), for example, separated the intertext from older criticism of sources and influences, which were for him only corollaries of humanistic individualism and bourgeois views of authorship and private property. According to Barthes, the intertext differs from influence primarily by two characteristics: the irrelevancy of authorship ("the intertext is a general field of anonymous formulae") and the fact that it introduces "the volume of sociality" into the text (39). As is known, poststructuralists opened up the text and related it to the external world of the "general text"; in their view, intratextual structures and social discourses together -- mutually connected by the transgressive chain of semiosis -- fashion a literary work's identity, which is therefore mutable and relative. So there can be no longer any firm, finished, or coherent textual entities from which to determine origin, cause, or effect.

Those who polemicized with the influence model praised intertextuality for being an alternative more suited to the era of Einstein's theory of relativity (see Morgan; Frow "Intertextuality and Ontology"; Clayton and Rothstein; Rajan; Stanford Friedman; Juvan, "Vpliv in medbesedilnost"). The shift in the scholarly paradigm is already evident in changes to the metaphorical underpinnings of the competing concepts. The water metaphors of influence gave way to intertextuality's textile imagery (Jenny 38): in place of "natural" and "spontaneous" unidirectional streams appears artistic production by design with multidirectional interweaving of threads. In contrast to influence, intertextuality undermined the author's role and showed his psyche and subjectivity to be structured linguistically. It undid the boundaries both between texts and between the intra- and extratextual worlds. In place of dual, hierarchical, and causal relations between influencing and influenced authors it introduced plurality and anarchy, but especially interaction -- not only connections of the text with authorial masterpieces of the past but also with contemporary and anonymous discourses, clichés, and stereotypes. Intertextuality rejected causality, supplanting it with the idea that a later text is one that due to its receptive-creative moves assigns the status of source to the antecedent text, thus so to speak "causing" the influence on itself. Besides this, no text is primary and original because it is always a mosaic of citations. In intertextual theory, the reader took the place of the author that was previously considered the source and owner of meaning; since author B is always also reader of work A, the interpretation of A and the addressee's response to it are inseparably woven into the production of B's text.

Therefore, writer B is concurrently a reader: reading and writing are tied together in one continuum (*écriture-lecture*; Kristeva, *Desire in Language* 65).

The younger concept of intertextuality nonetheless seems cousin to influence and the comparative method. Manfred Schmeling was not the first or only comparatist to welcome the term intertextuality, explaining that it defines the links between literary works written in different languages more accurately than influence (231-32). In his opinion, the research object of comparative criticism should feature international intertextuality and Susan Stanford Friedman notes that the logic of intertextuality was already latent in studying influence; for example, in demonstrations of how a later author adapted and reshaped his source (155). Many comparatists, especially when attempting to defend the prestige of their national literatures, emphasized later writers' creative struggle against, and mastery and reworking, of influence (the national approach remains the standard approach of most established scholars in comparative literature today in contrast to those working in cultural studies or in comparative cultural studies; see also Juvan, "Ideologije primerjalne književnosti"). They stress(ed) the singularity of the idiolect of a writer from a particular country who managed to redirect influence -- conceived as a general flow -- into a local, specific, and original work (see Hokenson 66). The founder of Slovene comparative criticism, Anton Ocvirk, following Gide's example, understood influence in his *Teorija primerjalne literarne zgodovine* (1936) (Theory of Comparative Literary History) as an "internal stimulus or means to personal [i.e., the author's] liberation"; he explained "influences of a nation on a nation" -- as Bloom later would -- as "vital powers" at work in "the psychological process that we can compare to some mortal struggle between two organisms vying to conquer one another while preserving their peculiar essences" (Ocvirk 54-55, 113). In contrast to the flavor of cultural Darwinism which can be felt in Ocvirk's argument, several proponents of esthetic cosmopolitanism from Goethe and the Schlegel brothers forward were keen to idealize cross-fertilization, equal dialogue, and mutual enrichment of selected writers from different cultures. In contriving universalistic projects of "world literature," they were blind to political or economic power of cultural colonialism which channeled intercultural exchange together with their very notion of what belonged to the "world" (on this, see, e.g., see Casanova; Moretti, "Conjectures on World Literature," "More Conjectures"). It is precisely its connotations of "power(s) and empowerment," its engagement in "forces and force fields" that -- according to Mary Orr -- makes the concept of influence, although seemingly outdated, more suitable to contextualist explanations of cultural change and intercultural dialogues than postmodernist intertextuality, with its formalist touch of de-personalized, open, and endless transfigurations of texts, languages, and codes (60-66). Rejecting simplified causal and hierarchical notions of influence, Orr foregrounds its other, positive aspects: "The pertinent model for influence here is 'that which flows into,' a tributary that forms a mightier river by its confluences, or the main stream that comprises many contributors ... influence, like an incoming tributary, generates something which was not there previously, whether qualitatively or quantitatively" (84-85). As culturally productive force, influence empowers "the newly emerging branches of cultural production" or renews a stagnant heritage with imports and impulses from foreign cultures (86-89). From this, Orr concludes that influence "signals the *multiple* and often 'foreign' differences that make up what appears a single channel of expression" (90; emphasis in the original).

Studying influences in comparative scholarship have indeed long exceeded the limits of simple hierarchic and binary relations between two authors, works, or national literatures. Particular influences are nowadays usually held to be only an empirical input which should be discussed within more complex, systemic inter-dependencies grounding narratives about international or transnational literary currents and periods; for example, about the development of the European sentimental novel, Romanticism, or Western postmodernism (see Kos). It was Yuri Tynianov who in the 1920s established a dialectical understanding of influence and tradition and through it influenced, sometimes indirectly, many later theories of literary and interliterary processes, including the work of René Wellek, Felix Vodička, Yuri Lotman, Dionýz Durišin, Claudio Guillén, Itamar Even-Zohar, and perhaps even that of Harold Bloom. Tynianov's theoretical views -- in the company of certain other of the Russian Formalists' ideas -- indicated the path that led through Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of dialogism straight to Kristeva, the "founder" of intertextuality. Swayed intellectually by structural linguistics, Darwinist vitalism, and revolutionary dialectics, Tynianov, in his 1921 study "Dostoevskii i Gogol': K teorii parodii" ("Dostoevsky and Gogol: Towards a Theory of Parody"), challenged the idea of tradition as duration and continuity. For him literary development is primarily a struggle, a dialectic substitution of tendencies. Thus in searching his literary identity, Dostoevsky resisted the burdensome influence of Gogol's mastery. He assumed Gogol's techniques as a writer on two contradictory levels: on the one he appeared to follow them; but on the other he ironically altered their meanings. In this way Tynianov corrected one-sided positivist historicism with an interactive conception of influence, which is close to Bloom's.

Tynianov analyzed thoroughly the working and structure of influence in the text, and almost replaced it with the notions of stylization and parody, understood as bi-level structures on which two diachronic phases comprising stylistically and evaluative differing intentions confront each other and their respective constructive techniques. The term stylization became one of the models, still insufficiently explored, of the development of a theory of intertextuality. Bakhtin derived from Tynianov's idea of a bi-level structure of stylization and parody a general metalinguistic theory of "double-voiced discourse" that Kristeva referred to when introducing the concept of intertextuality.

The idea of relationality and the interactivity of both esthetic experience and production such as Tynianov and other Russian Formalists introduced led to the concept of intertextuality, but on the other hand also changed the notion of influence. In his 1971 *Literature as System*, for example, Guillén drew on the systemic ideas of Tynianov, Friedrich Schlegel, Fernand de Saussure and structuralist poetics, and on Harry Levin's understanding of literary convention. He conceived of thematic traditions, imagery and formal or genre conventions as a second-degree vocabulary and grammar given to the author through the very linguistic medium of literature. Such an anonymous system of coordinates came into being through clichés formed from a multitude of disparate genetic influences accumulated in considerable time-spans. The Slovene post-Romantic poet Simon Jenko, for instance, in 1858 published a text in a genre cycle of short lyrics entitled *Obrazi* (Pictures): "Moss has crept on walls / Fallen in decay, / Sadly breezes moan / As they breathe through them. // Speak, o fallen ruin, / Darkened in the sun! / What is human might / And all it has done? // And this life of ours, / Swiftly fleeing past, / Is it but a dream? / -- *Dream* -- the echo comes" (44). It would make little sense to elucidate the motif of the lonely ruins evoking reflection on an individual's and culture's transitoriness by a single genetic influence, say of Uhland's or Lenau's poems, which were probably familiar to Jenko and displayed the same thematic layout. Jenko's text is rather tied to a rich and age-old imaginary of ruins, the clichés and conventions of which were spread throughout Europe from antiquity to romanticism (Old English elegy "The Ruin," Vitalis, de Quevedo, Du Bellay, Sęp-Szarzyński, Spenser, Wordsworth, Mickiewicz, Petőfi, Hugo, etc.) -- and not only in literary genres, but in essay, travelogue, painting (Pannini, Robert, Piranesi, Friedrich), and park architecture as well. Jenko's intervention into the topos was nevertheless exceptional, because the Schopenhauerian feeling of life's elusiveness led his text to an undecidable conclusion: Is the ruins' echo an answer to the poet's question or just a meaningless, physical reverberation of a live voice? (see Juvan, "The Palimpsest of Ruins"). And hermeneutics and reception theory also updated the concept of influence. They showed that the influenced author is in the first place a reader whose response to and interpretation of a stimulating work of art takes the form of another literary production; the influence therefore turns out to be a creative reception depending largely on the second author's expectations, hermeneutic horizon, literary competence, as well as on her/his perception of the native culture and assessment of literary traditions. All of those factors -- together with the envisioned strategies of acting on one's literary or public field -- determine which other works, if any, will attract the writer's attention and why, how he will understand and use them, what in his own text will respond to them and in what manner. John Boening puts those considerations briefly, saying that reception esthetics renewed the concept of influence with a "complex agonal dialectics inherent in the intertextual relations" or a "bivalent conception of 'emitter' and 'receptor'" where the one influenced is no longer passive (546-47). The shift in thrust from the influencer (X) to the influenced (Y) made possible to refine descriptions of inter-literary relations. As the art historian Michael Baxandall, in his 1985 *Patterns of Intention*, puts it: "If we think of Y rather than X as the agent, the vocabulary is much richer and more attractively diversified: draw on, resort to, avail oneself of, appropriate from, have recourse to, adapt, misunderstand ... differentiate oneself from, assimilate oneself to ... copy, address, paraphrase, absorb, make a variation on, revive, continue, remodel, ape, emulate, travesty, parody ... subvert, perpetuate, reduce, promote, respond to, transform, tackle ... Most of these relations just cannot be stated the other way round -- in terms of X acting on Y rather than Y acting on X" (83).

As early as 1900, André Gide underlined, in his modernist apology for influence, that by opening himself to outside influence an author attempts to find an "interpretation of himself" (on this, see Juvan, "Vpliv in medbesedilnost" 28). It was, of course, Harold Bloom who set forth the view of influence as a complex intertextual process and psychic dynamism implied in shaping one's literary identity -- a writer exposed to anxieties of being influenced by some great precursor searches for his own poetic vision by engaging in an interpretative and transfigurative struggle with his predecessor. Bloom's books, *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973), *A Map of Misreading* (1975), *Poetry and Repression* (1976), *Poetics of Influence* (1988), and others, were in the latter third of the twentieth century the most resonant attempt to tailor the rigid concept of influence (treated by Bloom for the most part within the Anglo-American and not international tradition) to the challenges of poststructuralism, deconstruction,

reception esthetics, or hermeneutics. In analyzing influence, Bloom entered into a dialogue with post-structuralists, and this seems to be the reason why he was often considered one of the leading theorists of intertextuality. In truth, many of his tenets, beginning with the desire to overcome the standard "source hunting" or "allusion counting" (Bloom, *Anxiety of Influence* 31), correspond to those of Kristeva and Barthes. For Bloom, too, poetry is not mimetic; it does not represent anything outside of itself. The meaning of a poem arises only from its relations with other poems; in this manner the reader, too, comprehends the text. "The meaning of a poem can only be another poem," asserts Bloom (*Anxiety of Influence* 94), and in the introduction to *Poetry and Repression* he adds: "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. A poem is not writing, but *rewriting*" (3; emphasis in the original).

Bloom's idea of the "anxiety of influence" -- in addition to systemic conceptions of literary tradition, reception esthetics, hermeneutics, and the theory of intertextuality -- changed the understanding of influences, both those within a national literature and in an inter-literary context of the literary system. After the late 1960s even general outlines of comparative criticism joined the trend and reviewed the concept of influence, bringing it closer to intertextuality. Among the first scholars to review the concept of influence was the Slovak comparatist Ďurišin (*Problémy literárnej komparatistiky*, 1967, *Theory of Literary Comparatistics*, 1984). Revising influence from the standpoint of literary communication and reception theory, he claimed that traditional comparative studies had ignored the significance of the receiver's selective acts (which should have been treated as creative as well) and the importance of the received elements' transformations called forth by writing strategies obeying the habits or needs of the receiver's native literary process. For this reason he preferred to explicate the relations between two literary works as a form of creative inter-literary reception (*Theory of Literary Comparatistics* 159-60). For a scholar from an "in-between peripheral" Central European nation that comparative studies frequently pegged as a belated copier, this was an understandable change of perspective. Similar to Ulrich Weisstein in his *Introduction to Comparative Literature (Einführung in die Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft* 91-94), Ďurišin replaced the nebulous concept of influence with more precise articulation of creative reception. Influence is replaced with reminiscence, impulse, filiation, literary correspondence, and other techniques. Yet the problem with such expansion or disassembling of influence is that it mixes eclectically two levels, the discursive and the textual. In contrast to imitation, stylization, or citation, influence is not a category for describing textual structures or the structures of intertextual transformations, although it leaves its mark on both; rather, influence is a hypothetical psycho-social and cultural force that in the historical discourse of receiving and producing texts motivates intertextual analogies and transformations which, however, can be analyzed in subsequent comparisons of literary works. Next, Zoran Konstantinović was among the most significant Central European scholars who, in his reinterpretation of comparative criticism, followed Ďurišin's communicative grounding of influence ("Verwandlung im Wandel" 168-84). Konstantinović supplemented Ďurišin's framework with Bakhtin's dialogism, hermeneutic "otherness," and intertextuality. A national literature communicates in the course of its history with several systems of other literatures; it grasps their otherness or alterity through a variety of "inter-literary" contacts, such as translations, reviews, interpretations, migrant or bilingual authors, and mutual influences. Alterity as a mode of understanding and employing foreign elements in a new cultural horizon moves comparative criticism into global theory of dialogism and intercultural exchange (see Konstantinović, "Komparatistik als Methode"). Konstantinović's insight that the subject area of comparative criticism is actually intertextuality harmonizes with Yves Chevrel's view from his 1991 *Comparative Literature (La littérature comparée)* -- Chevrel was one of the reformers of the French comparative school proposing that the concept of intertext is most suitable for a specific comparative theory of the literary text (100).

In his *Komparatistik* (1992), Peter Zima also links intertextuality, influence, and intercultural exchange, stressing the interplay of social forces. As per Bakhtin, literary works reply to other texts and discourses, but also reprocess them by commenting on, developing, criticizing, making pastiche, parodying, and so forth. Zima thinks that influence should be understood as "creative processing of the others' discourse" or an "intertextual process by which the writing subject acquires other discursive forms" (93, 131). In my opinion Zima clarified successfully the relation of influence to intertextuality borrowing concepts from Bakhtin, text theory, sociolinguistics, and reception esthetics, without confusing the psychological, discursive, and textual realms. Konstantinović and Zima direct their Bakhtinian and intertextually inspired research on the road of intercultural questions: in contrast to traditional comparative criticism's residual nationalism, the inter-cultural approach is nowadays particularly drawn to the hybrid, transnational, multilingual, and transcultural settings, that is, to territo-

ries in which vital regional identities crossbreed, problematizing the "national" culture as the sole protagonist in historical narratives. Telling examples are the works of the Slovene Florijan Lipuš, the Austrian Peter Handke, and the Italians Pier P. Pasolini and Fulvio Tomizza, all of them from the Alpine and northern Adriatic region (i.e., Carinthia, Trieste, Friuli, or Istria). In their literary texts -- often characterized by multilingual syncretism and the use of dialects -- one can detect a shared historical experience, a common geographical space, similar cultural patterns, and ethnographic codes, but presented through ethnically conditioned inequality of social and political positions (see Strutz's and Zim-a's *Komparatistik als Dialog*). Systemic, transnational, and non-hierarchical conception of interliterary contacts or influences also underlies some of the most important tenets of Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek's proposals for a contextual (systemic and empirical) and interdisciplinary renewal of comparative literature and its merger with cultural studies resulting in "comparative cultural studies." Here, he reminds us that "to 'compare' does not -- and must not -- imply a hierarchy" and that comparativism has "to move and to dialogue between cultures, languages, literatures, and disciplines" with attention to all, especially marginalized, peripheral, minority forms of otherness; national self-referentiality and exclusions, characteristic of traditional national or comparative literary histories, should be replaced by "comparative cultural studies as a global, inclusive, and multi-disciplinary framework in an inter-and supra-national humanities" ("From Comparative Literature Today toward Comparative Cultural Studies" 259-61, <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol1/iss3/2>>). This is a desirable perspective, but, in attempting to achieve this cosmopolitan goal of literary/cultural scholarship, we should keep in mind that intercultural dialogue, as it unfolds in the economical and political realities of the world system, implies irreducible conflicts, struggles, mutual misunderstanding, and misappropriations, as well as asymmetries of power and cultural capital (see, e.g., Casanova's *The World Republic of Letters* and Moretti's "Conjectures on World Literature"). Tötösy de Zepetnek, too, is quite aware of such inequalities, especially when he discusses interactions between central, semi-peripheral, peripheral, and in-between peripheral literary systems (*Comparative Literature* 121-72); these are, I would add, also playgrounds of diverse forces and vectors of influencing.

In the age of globalization, when the frames of national literary histories are being challenged, Hokenson conceives comparative scholarship as research in "cross-cultural intertextuality" and as "intercultural poetics" in which Bakhtinian dialogism is proffered in order to recast influence (71). Likewise, Graham Allen gives convincing examples of how feminism and postcolonial studies return to Bakhtin in order to unmask the discursive forces that exclude or marginalize an individual, group, race, class, or gender (159-73). Bakhtinian expressions such as dialogism, double-voiced discourse, heteroglossia, hybridization, and carnivalization (see his *Dialogic Imagination* and *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*) capture the contradictions, ambivalence, and bi-level nature of any influence. As Allen observes, Elaine Showalter, Homi Bhabha, or Henry Louis Gates Jr., each in his/her own way, show how influencing can be understood through Bakhtin: the female or colonial subject on one level of his/her texts accept the dominant discourse and are actually constituted by the power of its discriminations; however, on another level they recast influential meanings and forms in a strategy that appears to copy the dominant discourse but actually assigns it a dissident function. The subject is shown to be fractured, a palimpsest, precisely because of influence and resistance to its power. Identity is formed in an in-between, floating space of different languages, cultures, or traditions. The same holds for "collective" identities, as Jola Škulj has shown in her "Comparative Literature and Cultural Identity." Based on her poststructuralist reading of Bakhtinian dialogism through Heideggerian interface, she explicitly connects identity formation of every "national culture" and literature with cross-cultural intertextuality: "Our cultural identity is our intertext. ... Forming itself and existing through cross-cultural interactions, cultural identity exposes its inevitable intertextual character" (149). Although Škulj, as many other comparatists still do, keeps equating cultural identity mainly with the categories of "national culture" or "national literature," she succeeds in deconstructing their self-referentiality and permanence; she stresses the essential role of difference, contradiction, and otherness in any identity construction. Consequently and parallel to the Kristevan notion of "subject in process," cultural identity is a process of constant historical self-defining and reinterpretation: on the one hand, it rearticulates itself through influences and ever-changing (intertextual) relations with distant, adjacent or interfering cultural spaces; on the other hand, it develops with the help of self-referential reshaping its own memory. Similar observations were put forward in other methodological perspectives, for example in Even-Zohar's polysystem theory which sees interferences and transfers between literary systems and their repertoires as a crucial cultural mechanism that, firstly, constitutes emergent literatures, and secondly, provides all established literary systems with heterogeneity and inner differentiation, without which they would cease to develop. Close to this inter-systemic notion is Đurišin's understanding of interliterary process; Marián Gálik, in his presentation of Đurišin's concepts, emphasizes



that "an interliterary impact and response to it is, as a rule, a prerequisite for a literary production in every literature;" influences as forms of genetic contacts between literatures "are a *condition sine qua non* of their development" as well as of their participation in complex systems of cultural regions or zones -- such as Latin American, Slavic, Balkan, or Swiss "interliterary communities" -- that constitute "the trans-ethnic, trans-national, and ... geoliterary development" of world literature (35-37).

Theories of intertextuality reshaped the understanding of influence; it showed that supposedly primary sources are themselves but intertextual transformations dependent on cultural encyclopedia; it offered a refined terminology of forms and functions of foreign literatures' creative reception, while respecting specific linguistic and cultural spaces, traditions, and literary systems; it deconstructed the postulates of influence; for example, the concepts of author, cause and effect logic, and boundaries between texts; and it revealed the socio-political power of influence -- of hierarchy, colonialism, and hegemony -- as well as its negative and positive role in identity formation. For these reasons intertextuality in literary scholarship provoked the appearance of polycentric and pluralistic models of influence as discursive force and other inter-literary relations. It made central the interactive, dialogic or bi-level contacts between a literary text and a literary or non-literary context whose national framings are no more self-evident.

### Works Cited

- Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. By Mikhail Bakhtin. Ed. M. Holquist. Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. and ed. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1981.
- Barthes, Roland. "Theory of the Text." Trans. Ian McCleod. *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Ed. R. Young. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981. 31-47.
- Baxandall, Michael. *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1987.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Bloom, Harold. *A Map of Misreading*. New York: Oxford UP, 1975.
- Bloom, Harold. *Kabbalah and Criticism*. New York: Seabury P, 1975.
- Bloom, Harold. *Poetry and Repression: Revisionism from Blake to Stevens*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1976.
- Bloom, Harold. *Poetics of Influence: New and Selected Criticism*. Ed. John Hollander. New Haven: Schwab, 1988.
- Boening, John. "Some Recent Theories of Reception and Influence: Their Implications for the Study of International Literary Relations." *Actes du Huitième Congrès de l'Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée*. Ed. Béla Kőpeczi. Stuttgart: Biebr, 1980. 543-49.
- Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Trans. M.B. Debevoise. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2007.
- Chevreil, Yves. *La Littérature comparée*. Paris: PU de France, 1991.
- Clayton, Jay, and Eric Rothstein. "Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality." *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Ed. J. Clayton and E. Rothstein. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991. 3-36.
- Đurišin, Dionýz. *Theory of Literary Comparatistics*. Trans. Jessie Kocmanová. Bratislava: Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1984.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. *Polysystem Studies*. Special issue, *Poetics Today* 11.1 (1990).
- Frow, John. "Intertextuality and Ontology." *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Ed. J. Still and M. Worton. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990. 45-55.
- Gálik, Marián. "Interliterariness as a Concept in Comparative Literature." *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2003. 34-44.
- Guillén, Claudio. *Literature as System: Essays toward the Theory of Literary History*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.
- Hermerén, Göran. *Influence in Art and Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.
- Hokenson, Jan Walsh. "The Culture of the Context: Comparative Literature Past and Future." *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2003. 58-75.
- Jenko, Simon. "Faces." Trans. Nada Grošelj. *Fragments from Slovene Literature: An Anthology of Slovene Literature*. Ed. V. Matajc. Ljubljana: Slovene Writers' Association, 2005. 44.
- Jenny, Laurent. "The Strategy of Form." *French Literary Theory Today: A Reader*. Ed. Tzvetan Todorov. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982. 34-63.
- Juvan, Marko. "Vpliv in medbesedilnost: Detronizacija ali retorizacija vpliva?" ("Influence and Intertextuality: A Detronement or Rhetoricization of Influence?"). *Primerjalna književnost* 14.2 (1991): 23-40.
- Juvan, Marko. "The Palimpsest of Ruins: Cultural Memory, European Literary Intertext, and Post-Romanticism in Simon Jenko's 'Picture VII'." *I dialetti della tribù / The Dialects of the Tribe / Le mots de la tribu*. Ed. Mario Domenichelli. Firenze: UP of Firenze, forthcoming.
- Juvan, Marko. "Ideologije primerjalne književnosti: Metropole in periferije" ("Ideologies of Comparative Literature: Metropolises and Peripheries"). *Primerjalna književnost* 20 (2008): forthcoming.

- Konstantinović, Zoran. "Verwandlung im Wandel: Komparatistische Betrachtungen zur Kategorie der Dialogizität und Alterität." *Dialogizität*. Ed. Renate Lachmann. München: Fink, 1982. 168-84.
- Konstantinović, Zoran. "Komparatistik als Methode." *Slavistična revija* 45.1-2 (1997): 313-22.
- Kos, Janko. "Teorija in praksa slovenske primerjalne književnosti" ("Theory and Practice of the Slovene Comparative Literature"). *Primerjalna književnost* 1.1-2 (1978): 30-44.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Ed. Léon S. Roudiez. Trans. Thomas Gora and Alice Jardine. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.
- Markiewicz, Henryk. "Odmiany intertekstualności" ("Varieties of Intertextuality"). *Ruch literacki* 29.4-5 (1988): 247-63.
- Moretti, Franco. "Conjectures on World Literature." *New Left Review* 1 (2000): 54-68.
- Moretti, Franco. "More Conjectures." *New Left Review* 20 (2003): 73-81.
- Morgan, Thais. "The Space of Intertextuality." *Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction*. Ed. Patrick O'Donnell and Robert Con Davis. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989. 239-79.
- Ocvirk, Anton. *Teorija primerjalne literarne zgodovine* (A Theory of Comparative Literary History). Ljubljana: Znanstveno društvo, 1936.
- Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2003.
- Pfister, Manfred. "Konzepte der Intertextualität." *Intertextualität. Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Ed. U. Broich and M. Pfister. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1985. 1-30.
- Primeau, Ronald. "Introduction." *Influx: Essays on Literary Influence*. Ed. R. Primeau. Port Washington: Kennikat P, 1977. 3-12.
- Rajan, Tilottama. "Intertextuality and the Subject of Reading/Writing." *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Ed. J. Clayton and E. Rothstein. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991. 61-74.
- Schmeling, Manfred. "Textuelle Fremdbestimmung und literarischer Vergleich." *Neohelicon* 12.1 (1985): 231-39.
- Škulj, Jola. "Comparative Literature and Cultural Identity." *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2003. 142-51.
- Stanford Friedman, Susan. "Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author." *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Ed. J. Clayton and E. Rothstein. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991. 146-80.
- Still, Judith, and Michael Worton. "Introduction." *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Ed. J. Still and M. Worton. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990. 1-44.
- Strutz, Johann, and Peter V. Zima, eds. *Komparatistik als Dialog. Literatur und interkulturelle Beziehungen and der Alpen-Adria-Region und and der Schweiz*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1991.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven. *Comparative Literature: Theory, Method, Application*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven. "From Comparative Literature Today toward Comparative Cultural Studies." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 1.3 (1999): <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol1/iss3/2>>.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven. "From Comparative Literature Today toward Comparative Cultural Studies." *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2003. 235-67.
- Tynianov, Yuri. "Dostoevskii i Gogol': K teorii parodii" ("Dostoevsky and Gogol: Towards a Theory of Parody"). *Texte der russischen Formalisten*. Ed. Yuri Striedter. München: Fink, 1969. Vol. 1, 300-71.
- Tynianov, Yuri. "On Literary Evolution." *Readings in Russian Poetics*. Ed. L. Matejka and K. Pomorska. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1971. 66-78.
- Weisstein, Ulrich. *Einführung in die Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1968.
- Zima, Peter V. *Komparatistik. Einführung in die vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft*. Tübingen: UTB, 1992.

Author's profile: Marko Juvan teaches literary theory at the University of Ljubljana and he conducts research at the Scientific Research Center of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts. His interests and publications include literary and cultural theory (intertextuality, literary discourse, cultural identity, literary field, canon, literary historiography, genre criticism), European romanticism, and twentieth-century Slovene literature. His recent single-authored book publications include *Intertekstualnost* (Intertextuality), *Vezi besedila* (Textual Ties), and *Literarna veda v rekonstrukciji* (Literary Studies in Reconstruction), and he edited *Romantična pesnitev* (The Romantic Narrative Poem), *Writing Literary History* (with D. Dolinar), and *Hybridizing Theory and Literature* (with J. Kernev Štrajn). E-mail: <[marko.juvan@guest.arnes.si](mailto:marko.juvan@guest.arnes.si)>

Translator's profile: Timothy Pogačar teaches Slavic languages and literatures at Bowling Green State University where he is chair of the Department of German, Russian, and East Asian Languages. He is editor since 1994 of *Slovene Studies: Journal of the Society for Slovene Studies* and he publishes translations from Russian and Slovene to English. E-mail: <[pogacar@bgsu.edu](mailto:pogacar@bgsu.edu)>