Volume 7 | (2005) Issue 1   Article 4

Generic Identity and Intertextuality

Marko Juvan

University of Ljubljana

Follow this and additional works at: https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb

Part of the Comparative Literature Commons, and the Critical and Cultural Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

CLCWeb Volume 7 Issue 1 (March 2005) Article 4
Marko Juvan, "Generic Identity and Intertextuality"
<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol7/iss1/4>

Contents of *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 7.1 (2005)
<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol7/iss1/>

Abstract: In his paper, "Generic Identity and Intertextuality," Marko Juvan proposes that an anti-essentialist drive -- a characteristic of recent genology -- has led postmodern scholars to the conviction that genre is but a system of differences and that its matrix cannot be deduced from a particular set of apparently similar texts. Juvan argues that the concept of intertextuality may prove advantageous to explain genre identity in a different way: genres exist and function as far as they are embedded in social practices that frame intertextual and meta-textual links/references to prototypical texts or textual series. In Juvan's view, genres are cognitive and pragmatic devices for intertextual pattern-matching and texts or textual sets become generic prototypes by virtue of intertextual and meta-textual interaction: on one side there is the working (influence) of semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic features of prototypical texts on their domestic and foreign literary off-spring; on the other side we see meta-textual descriptions and intertextual derivations or references, which establish or revise retroactively the hard core of genre pattern. Any given text is, because of the generic and pragmatic component of the author's communicative competence, dependent on existing genre patterns.

Marko JUVAN

Generic Identity and Intertextuality
　　Translated from the Slovene by Andrej E. Skubic

In *Kinds of Literature*, Alastair Fowler notes that 1) literature is not a uniform class of phenomena but rather an "aggregate," 2) literature itself is actually viewed as a genre, comprising different genres in various socio-cultural environments and periods, and organizing changing genological systems and hierarchies, and 3) genre is a "concept with blurred edges" (i.e., a fuzzy set), since its members only bear Wittgensteinian family resemblances: "Individual members are related in various ways, without necessarily having any single feature shared in common by all" (3-19, 41). Although Fowler builds his genological synthesis fairly descriptively and prefers an erudite accumulation of examples, primarily from Anglo-American literature, to a rigorous theoretical argument, the above theses fit well into current views which have, since the 1970s, reshaped our thinking about traditional genological systems. After the paradigm shift from the modern to the post-modern -- usually associated with the emergence of post-structuralism, deconstruction, and reader-response criticism -- it was anti-essentialism that took power as the foundation of "normal" science, to borrow Kuhn's term. Anti-essentialism contested categorical thinking of essentialism based on long metaphysical tradition (see, e.g., Margolis) and it was genre theories that, within poetics, figured as a stronghold of essentialism ever since Aristotle (see Schaeffer, *Qu'est-ce* 12-24, 32-38).
　　Jean-Marie Schaeffer notes in his paper "Literary Genres and Textual Genericity" that genres, in theories from the Enlightenment and nineteenth-century historicism to structuralism, were regarded as internal forms, essences or deep structures from which the texts emerge. According to this view, a literary work with its meaning and form is essentially a consequence, an organic development of its generic core. This was the approach grounding Goethe's conception of three "natural forms" of poetry, as well as most Romantic notions of literary types. Thereafter, metaphysical categories ruled over genre theory for more than a century. Theorists attempted to determine the "essences" of individual literary kinds or genres with concepts like subject, object, time, or space. The essentialist approach to literary kinds and genres was in agreement with the general essentialist view of literature in that period. The line of argument was roughly as follows: literary discourse, defined by its aesthetic, imaginative, and other inner features, is divided into three types -- lyric, epic, and dramatic literature -- and only those works which belong to one of these "natural forms" can be considered literary. Schaeffer concludes that these theories reified the concept of genre. Literary scholars explained the relationship of a particular text to a genre and literature as hierarchic inclusion: the text "belongs" to a literary kind or genre; the latter belongs to one of the "natural forms" (types); and the type is necessarily part of the concept of literature.
　　While essentialism insisted that individual phenomena (like particular texts) possess *a priori* essences which define their identity within generalized category (such as a literary kind), anti-essentialism claimed that literary phenomena are indeterminable, without a stable content, and, as individual items, not bound to represent or illustrate a single type. On the one hand the identity of literary texts depend on their relationship to other equivalent phenomena, i.e., on the system of differences, and on the other hand, on the observer's socio-cultural, cognitive or ideological perspective as well as on historically contingent roles texts play in a given culture. Neither literature nor genre are therefore concepts that modern scholars would dare to describe like Goethe, who insisted with a fierce determination of a genius that poetry had only three forms given by nature (Hempfer 67). Those who nowadays want to demonstrate in literary and culture scholarship that they take recent theory seriously, would not dare to propose that literature or genre should have a permanent essence (on the issue of literariness, see Juvan, "On Literariness" <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol2/iss2/1/>). Instead of essence, internal form, archetype, *Grundhaltung*, deep structure, recognizable worldview, etc. (see Hempfer 56-110), which were supposed to be common to all texts belonging to a literary kind, genres -- as literature in general -

- look like to retain merely an identity defined by their use value or, in other words, by their function in the network of cultural practices (on this, see Glowinski 83).

In the heroic age of (post-)structuralist attacks against essentialism one could perhaps still hope that the term "genre" might help to solve the crux of drawing the dividing line between literature and non-literary discourses. Tzvetan Todorov was ready to admit that texts which had been in Europe classified as literature for about two hundred years were only similar according to their societal roles and the types of inter-subjective relations involved. Structural resemblances between texts or utterances could only be sought at the level of "discourse genres." However, in Todorov's opinion, these genres with the conventions for their production and reception frequently cross the borders of literature. He therefore proposed that scholarship on literature -- instead of trying to delineate and maintain a homogenous concept of "literature" -- should observe the plurality of genres' discursive rules within and outside the aesthetic realm (Todorov 13-26). On the other hand, Todorov maintained that, in comparison to literature, genres were more certain, objective. They are like conventions governing the internal structure of speech and linking it to ideologies of the socio-historical context. But the very concept of genre soon came upon a similar fate as Todorov's concept of literature. Thomas O. Beebee is neither the first nor the last theorist emphasizing that literary genres are merely ways of using texts. Genres only exist -- to summarize Saussure and Derrida freely -- as systems of differences without their own, positive content or structure (Beebee 257). As many theorists of literariness, Beebee adopts the pragmatic definition of generic system as "economics of discourse" or an institution (Beebee 274, 277). The view of genre as institution, which has proved to be an extremely productive theoretical analogy ever since Wellek and Warren's *Theory of Literature* (see Fishelov 86-99), was adapted by Beebee from Fredric Jameson (Jameson also understands genres as "essentially literary institutions, or social contracts between a writer and a specific public, whose function is to specify the proper use of a particular cultural artefact" [Jameson 106-07]).

In the late 1960s, the resistance to essentialism or -- to use the once popular Derridaian terminology -- the "metaphysics of presence" gave birth both to the idea of intertextuality and the critical observation that literature was an institution or middle-class ideological fiction (see Juvan, *Intertekstualnost* 52, 92-104, 117-38). The term intertextuality was, as known, coined by Julia Kristeva between 1966 and 1969; revisiting Bakhtin's dialogism to revitalize the allegedly formalist French structuralism and imbue it with historical, social, and political issues of the writing/reading subject, Kristeva also advocated a "different logic" ("une autre logique"), which should replace substances and *essences* with *relations* between entities (Kristeva 150-53, 172-73). The idea of intertextuality therefore originated from anti-essentialist post-modern and post-structuralist thought. Intertextuality, together with related concepts such as "writing" or "signifying practice," was introduced in the context of disassembling the once homogeneous concept of literature. In the critical light of French radical *theory*, "literature" turned into a functionalist plurality of "literatures" (see Leitch 59-60) or even completely lost its contours in an anarchic heteroglossia. The borderline between the aesthetic-artistic and other genres of symbolic exchange was no more supposed to be pre-given; it was claimed, instead, that it was socially constructed by means of institutionalized practices, such as the school system, literary history, and publishing. But later on even genre itself, although at first seeming to contain more substance than literature, proved to be nothing more than a network of inter- and supra-textual relationships. However, it is not only that intertextuality figures as an interpretative framework challenging established genological notions. Genological considerations, on their part, have also improved the explanation of key phenomena of intertextuality. We have become aware of the literary kinds whose identity indeed depends precisely on intertextuality that is foregrounded, so that the reader is ready to grasp it as a clear expression of the writer's communicative strategy. Marked and explicit intertextuality can be called citationality (Juvan, *Intertekstualnost* 57-59) and the literary kinds depending on it citational kinds: they include parody, travesty, burlesque, pastiche, counterfeit, *cento*, collage, paraphrase, variation, imitation, sequel, summarization, interpretation, etc. (see Juvan, *Intertekstualnost* 31-46, 265-70). Citational genres function in a similar way as "normal" genres, although they could also be seen as their modulations, as certain genologists hold about satire or other modal terms,

such as tragic, elegiac, bucolic (consequently, *parodic* novel, *parodic* sonnet, etc.). It cannot be denied that a text may be identified as a parody regardless of whether it is formally a sonnet, a tale, or a grotesque play. There are multiple reasons for that: 1) the texts denoted as parodies refer to their pre-texts in a parallel manner (by caricaturing their features and/or by introducing disharmonies in content/form) -- therefore they exhibit a similar intertextual syntax and semantics, 2) they play analogous communicative roles (from entertainment to criticism of ideas or styles) -- they are therefore related by their pragmatics, 3) they have successfully formed a cognitive class backing up literary perceptions of authors, readers, poeticists, critics and others -- this can be seen in the fact that a specific genre term has been conceived (the term "parody" is actually one of the oldest in literary scholarship) and that an extensive body of meta-discourse was produced about it since Aristotle (on this, see Juvan, *Intertekstualnost* 37-45).

How to discern between a romance and a mystery novel, between a sonnet and a ghazal, a comedy and a tragedy? To be sure, the text's linguistic structures are something else than the genre consciousness (see Glowinski 89) of those who perceive its specific patterns. Genre consciousness is like any other knowledge: it is either "theoretical," temporally and cognitively distanced from acts of writing and reading, or "practical," simultaneous and innate to these acts. In the latter case, it depends on historical and pragmatic circumstances in which an individual activates it. In genology, attention has been drawn to these differences more than once: for example, in the discrimination between genological objects, terms and concepts (see Skwarczynska), or, between the object and meta-descriptive generic levels (se Hempfer 16, 99-102). Todorov, too, distinguished the abstract sorting of "text classes" in theory from empirical accounts of the actual life of genres in social discourse (47-49). Genre concepts are formed and promoted by journalist literary criticism and the discourse of literary studies (see Pavlicic 33-37, 57-63, 70-77, 98-122); "endogenetic" generic terms inform author-dependent genre choices while "exogenetic" labels imply interpretations and classifications made *ex post* by lay and professional audiences (see Schaeffer, *Qu'est-ce* 77, 147-53).

Determining distinctive features of genres with reference to paradigmatic and borderline examples can therefore be deemed a theoretical activity, already removed from the heat of literary production and reading. But theory is by no means an opposite of historical practice. Theory itself is but a special genre embraced by such practice. As a meta-discourse producing genre concepts and systems, it enters into intricate relationships with the primary literary discourse, i.e., the writing and reading of literary texts. One such affiliation was indicated by Todorov. Meta-discourse on genres -- it may appear not only in literary criticism, but also in literary texts themselves (e.g., satires) -- bears witness to the historical existence of literary kinds. For example, the continuation of "tragedy" in seventeenth-century France can be seen not only in the recurrent patterns in a series of texts, but also in the consciousness of "tragedy" as a recognizable unit in the bustle of discourse; this awareness is historically documented owing to the genres of poeticists' disputes about "tragedy" and through the formation of meta-discursive concepts (see Todorov 49). Theoretical discourse displays a methodically regulated knowledge; a telling example is that, from Aristotle and the mediaeval *rota Vergiliana* to the genre maps by Frye, Scholes, or Hernadi (see Fowler 235-46), theorists were inclined to produce closed-set classifications, based on structural invariants of the texts stemming from different periods and environments. They considered textual volume, use of verse/prose, form, prevalent mode (dialogue, narrative, exposition, confession, etc.), style, topic, story, characters, emotional and evaluative mood, situation, the subject of utterance and other factors. In principle, such attempts construct genre concepts and systems only in retrospective, *ex post*. The poetics of genre therefore often tends toward universalism -- even in the case of theoreticians who, like Wilhelm von Humboldt, appreciated historicism and individuality of artistic creation (see Dolezel 16-25, 72-74; see also Zubarev <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol1/iss1/2/>).

There are comparatively few observers of literature involved in this post-activity, but their meta-descriptions, generalisations, or prescriptions can indeed be followed by countless academic readers. This was the case with Aristotle and his distinction of three manners of speech (*lexis*) and the German Romantics and their three literary types, either subjective or objective (see Genette,

"Introduction" 89-129). Such metatextual classifications of literary kinds used to gain authority affecting the production and reception of works of literature. Nevertheless, discriminating and identifying genres occur in literary life mainly through the daily practices that the individual, collective, and institutional agents conduct when dealing with particular texts. These practices are multiform: they can be seen in the readers' expectations and ideas of genres, in the author's or critic's genre naming of texts or in the intertextual evocation of family resemblances or significant discrepancy between the literary work and the corresponding patterns in other texts. The establishment, indication, reproduction, and recognition of generic features are therefore largely habitual tasks of authors and readers, as well as editors, journalists, opinion-makers, and others involved in presenting texts to the public and commenting on them critically. In any case, the demarcation of literary kinds and the recognition of the text's generic identity are linked to the contingent circumstances and goals of the literary field's agents. They do not yield to a regime of methodical cognition. To begin with, authors with genre choices attempt to envisage types of their text's audiences and potential responses; by targeting and recalling generic backgrounds, writers also place their texts among known works and discourses in order to outline topical, stylistic and ideological profile of their writing. For readers, identifying generic profile of the particular text and their knowledge about existing genre repertoires influence whether they will choose the text in question at all and with what presumptions will they go on reading. For example, in an adventure novel, what characters and plot can be expected, what kinds of events will most likely take place, how will the events be presented and connected. During the reading process, genre functions as the mediator, linking incoming data with memorized frames and schemata, such as chronotopes of travel, city, castle, etc., and this makes it easier for the reader to accommodate new information cognitively (see Keunen <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol2/iss2/2/>). In comparison with readers, critics include their assessment of the text's genre identity in acts of pronouncing and justification of value judgements to the public, for example when implying aprioristic scales of high and low genres. The mediators of texts -- i.e., editors, publishers -- bring into play generic targeting to facilitate their houses' accumulation of financial and symbolic capital; they estimate which genres are profitable, address certain groups of readers, provide prestige, etc. Last not least, public librarians pursue still other ends: the books must be catalogued and placed on the shelves according to generic principles in order to enable search for a specific type of information.

Discriminating genres is an activity incorporated in all the above mentioned usual practices on the literary field. What is more, we should bear in mind that these cognitive and communicative acts take place in diverse cultural and historical environments. As noted by Fowler, exact equivalents between generic terms in different languages are seldom found (e. g., historical terms for the current notion of the "novel": *syntagma, istoria, katha, monogatari, romanz, histoire, novela, novel, der Roman, romanzo, powiesc, povest*; see Kos, 5-21), since "literary conventions are most intimately bound up with national culture," and every such culture foregrounds other features of literature (Fowler 133). The confusion is further increased by the fact that criteria applied in distinguishing genres are themselves being constantly modified, contested, and negotiated; generic identity thus depends also on ever changing network of differences between the genological concept in question and the system of other genre-making categories (see Beebee 28, 257). Whether a text will be generically identifiable by the type or the name of the character, by its volume, verse or prose form, title style, narrator's voice, or any other kind of distinctive feature (book covers included) depends on which genres, from the author's or reader's point-of-view, form the currently relevant referential system. In the history of literature, the conceptual content of genre terms was often modified due to reshaping of genological context: for instance, the term *commedia* in Dante's time meant a tale with a happy ending; the term "drama," comprising all theatrical texts in the antiquity, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries became a literary kind in its own right, opposed to tragedy and comedy (Schaeffer, *Qu'est-ce* 105, 120; see also Zubarev <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol1/iss1/2/>). Particular texts were perspectivized generically quite differently as well: Cervantes's *Don Quixote* figured as burlesque, comical novel and novel of ideas, parody of the cavalier novel, etc. (Schaeffer, *Qu'est-ce* 69) and Fielding invited his readers to read *Tom Jones* as a comic epic (see Fowler 88). Finally, the diversity of the criteria applied by

the readers and authors to determine the genre identity of particular texts is influenced by the fact that every text -- especially a literary one -- is a "complex semiotic object" (Schaeffer, *Qu'est-ce* 80): it is not just a texture having its specific semantics and syntax, but also a speech act performing many different functions; several of them may have long been forgotten in the course of literary history, while the potentiality of others may remain unpredictable. Each of these dimensions enters the game as a basis for the possible formation of generic concepts. After all, it cannot be denied that texts obtain their genre identities only in the web of the strategies, needs, dispositions, and acts of agents -- be it individual or institutional -- within a special social subsystem/field called literature. However, we must still pose a couple of naïve questions: What exactly grounded the development of particular generic expectations? How and why did the texts gain their "use-value" (Beebee 7) in unwritten genological contracts between authors and readers?

From the standpoint of an epistemology accounting for the constructive role of the observer, it seems unacceptable to maintain that genological objects (genres, literary kinds and types) exist objectively, independent from consciousness. However, the statement still seems pertinent that genological objects are inseparable from their linguo-communicative structures, and that genres are after all part of functional variety of linguistic communication (see Skwarczynska 20, 23-24). In his breakthrough study "The Problem of Speech Genres" of 1952-53, Bakhtin called attention to something similar: language does not exist as an abstract system, but only through uses in socio-historically specific utterances. Repetition of certain linguistic or thematic patterns, due to their felicity in comparable situations of semiotic interaction, gradually develops relatively stable types of phrasing, called by Bakhtin "speech genres." These genres appear in everyday communication and public media as well as in literature. They determine topical, compositional and stylistic features of the utterance and function as interface between the linguistic system, the particular wording and the socio-historical context, so that every utterance is channeled through one or more such genres (Bakhtin). We may justifiably infer from this that speech genres are elements of the linguo-pragmatic competence of the speakers and addressees. Modern genology and speech-act theory came to parallel conclusions. Let us consider Derrida's paper "The Law of Genre," in which the wordplay on "citation/ré-cit" echoes the idea of iterability: the citable nature of structure in a series of utterances "grounds" the classification of genres and performatives (Derrida 57-58). It is very likely that, by stating this, Derrida responded to Todorov, who explained the emergence of discourse genres (literary and nonliterary alike) with the institutionalization or conventionalization of discursive features -- semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic -- reappearing in successive utterances. Todorov believed that genres were codifications of recurrent text characteristics. This is why they exist as institutions providing writing models for the author and horizons of expectation for the reader. The discursive genres that are closest to society's central ideologies undergo institutionalization (codification); hereby they gain power and authority to mediate between language's unlimited potentialities and social restraints brought on a speaker because of his/her specific standpoint in the cultural milieu (Todorov 49-51).

Likewise, Klaus W. Hempfer places genre models, understood as writing and reading conventions, in the frameworks of linguo-communicative competence and performance. Following Piaget's epistemology, he proposes a constructivist synthesis: genre concepts develop owing to interaction between the activity of the cognizing subject and the object of cognition, resulting in a harmonization between the conceptual construction and the matching pattern of 'objective' text properties. What seems important to me is that Hempfer claims that the existence of generic invariants can be proven experimentally (Hempfer 221-23). This is exactly the aim of Johan F. Hoorn's empirical study "How is Genre Created?" (see Hoorn <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol2/iss2/3/>). Hoorn does not deny the validity of the views that both the text's meaning and genre profile are constructed by readers according to their acquaintance with the text's author, and under the influence of library classifications as well as thanks to other contextual clues. He proves, however, that the inherent features of texts are at least equally important: for example, texts can be categorized into genres by the distribution of word frequencies. The readers are capable of identifying the generic pattern after having processed rather brief text segments. Owing to statistically significant appearance of certain word families, any set of words brings up series of further thematic associa-

tions. The texts which, in the eyes of readers, contain a sufficient number of similar or collocated words are classified into certain generic set, distinct from other groups of texts where different words stand out more often … in picaresque novels, the word "shepherd" will appear less often than in pastoral novels (see Hoorn <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol2/iss2/3/>). Combining statistics with set theory, Hoorn's method brings forth significant arguments against the rejection of ascertainable text components as valid factors in the cognitive genre formation.

Genre is a multi-layered phenomenon. As we can deduce from a by now classical study by Stefania Skwarczynska (1966), the existence of genres is interactive in its very basis. Genres only exist in constant interaction between the three following planes: a) the generic terms used by writers, readers, poeticists, critics and literary scientists to denote texts ("novel," "tale") or their particular formal or contentual dimensions (*comic* epic, *satirical* epistle), b) the generic concepts and images emerging from meta-linguistic descriptions of literary works and resulting in aesthetic generalizations, and c) the genological objects -- family resemblances between the semantic-structural features of literary works as they are observed by writers, readers, critics and others. The concept of genre thus connects the elements and patterns of speech/writing to cognitive acts that arrange the data being perceived into models and mental images, through which they are matched with the recalled genre patterns, i.e., with memory schemata derived from former text-processing. If we want to proceed along this thread of argument, the idea of intertextuality may prove to be very useful. It has already helped to elaborate a non-essentialist view not only of genre forms' genesis, existence and development, but also of the text's relationship to genre. From this viewpoint, literary kinds and genres are, of course, no longer conceived of as internal forms embodied in every particular item of the same class, but rather as outcomes of intertextual and meta-textual procedures encapsulated in writing and reading.

The intertextual explanation of genre was first made possible by the post-structuralist deconstruction of the opposition code vs. text. The structuralist concept of code was actually a hidden legacy of essentialism. The notion of code was reified, seen as a fundamental, original entity existing independently of texts and indeed preceding them, either in the inborn or inoculated mind of the individual or in the collective consciousness. In its relation to code, the text figured as secondary, derived. Such logic was also at work in accounts of the relationship between text and genre, since the latter was understood as a linguistic sub-code. Roland Barthes, in his transition from structuralism to post-structuralism, was perhaps the first to turn the code vs. text hierarchy upside down. He represented code not as an abstract system of signs realized in individual texts, but as unstable, open-ended crossing of texts in the signifying practice, or as a special kind of intertextuality. Ontologically, the code is to be conceived of as a parasite of actual texts and utterances. It is *déjà lu*, that which has been read and which intertextually blends into the writing or reading of new texts (Barthes, "Textual Analysis" 155-57); it consists of "associative fields, a supra-textual organization of notations" (155) or "perspective[s] of quotations, mirage of structures," "fragments of what has already been read, seen, done, experienced"; code is "the form of this *déjà*" (Barthes, *S/Z* 2021). Barthes's notion of the intertextuality of genre codes was further developed by Ulrich Suerbaum in his "Intertextualität und Gattung." Using the examples of Poe and Doyle, he demonstrates that genre identity of the detective novel is formed only by way of successive texts, in a cumulative process driven by two forms of generic intertextuality: linear and perspectival one. "Linear intertextuality" is a relationship in which a text refers to a series of similar pre-existing works of literature by citing or allusive adaptation, or by mentioning and modification of their paradigmatic patterns. And Fowler, too, considers allusions to be important signals of genre (Fowler 106-07). While Henry Fielding, for example, had to write extensive introductory essays to his unconventional novelistic texts in order to legitimize and reconcile them with existing generic classifications, Jane Austen, writing in the period when the novel was already well established with the readership of the period, could afford to foster generic identity of her texts only by occasional hints (i.e., generic allusions) to her predecessors, including gothic novels (see Fowler 91). Similarly, Walter Scott in *Waverley* referred to the generic tradition of romance and the first Slovenian novel, *Deseti brat* (1866) by Josip Jurcic, in the incipit borrowed from Scott explicitly.

Genre terms are indeed often used in the titles and subtitles (for example, *Poems* [1847] by France Preseren, including the cycles of *Sonnets of Unhappiness*, *Satirical Inscriptions*, *Ghazals*, *Crown of Sonnets*, and poetic texts like *Romance of the Steep Castle*, etc.). Genre titles, mottos, dedications, introductory essays, critical commentaries -- in short, everything that Genette terms "paratextuality," is employed over and over again by writers to signal to the readership that the aesthetic and semantic profile of their text should be interpreted intertextually, with reference to indicated genre patterns. Intertextual strategies of indicating generic backgrounds do not always respect the conversational maxim "be truthful"; instead, they focus the reader's attention to fla-grant discrepancies between the genre associations invoked and the outlook of actual text. For instance, many modernist texts by Veno Taufer from his collection *Sonnets* (1979) have practically nothing in common with the canonical structure of Italian sonnet, yet they aim at it for special purposes -- to deconstruct the aesthetic ideology embodied in sonnet writing since Pre?eren and his romantic mythology of poet (see Juvan, "The Sonnet"). The literary work can make the reader think of relevant traditional structures and generic prototypes with quite complex intertextual hints. It can, for example, allude to matrixes of genres by epigraphs, similarly sounding titles, by stylistic imitation, making use of the same form (sonnet, ghazal, haiku), or borrowing characters and settings from famous pieces, etc. (Josip Stritar placed some motifs of his post-romantic epis-tolary novel *Zorin* [1870] to Rousseau's Montmorency, re-activating this way a rather outdated genre pattern of his *Julie ou La Nouvelle Héloise*). Intertextual references, transpositions, imita-tions, and descriptions are among most prominent literary devices of developing, modifying, and reshaping the code of a given genre. The generic code's semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic inven-tory expands, its borders change, and the sense of what is possible and acceptable to produce from it is developed among writers, readers and critics. A good example of linear intertextuality is allusive similarity between the titles. Later works often imitate the title of a model text or group of texts (see Fowler 92-95): English Renaissance tragedies followed the example of the classical ones in taking the name of the main character as the title (*Othello*, *King Lear*), quite unlike the come-dies which have since the antiquity preferred collective names (*The Acharnians*), character fea-tures (*The Boastful Soldier*) or sayings and idioms (*Measure for Measure*, *Much Ado About Noth-ing*). On the other hand, Suerbaum's term "perspectival intertextuality" designates another back-ground for the emerging work of literature: the text also alludes to non-literary speech genres, such as diaries, letters, and journalist reports. Compared to linear intertextuality, the perspectival one draws on very much the same literary devices in order to establish the text's genre identity, however, through its relations with non-literary discourses; as a result, the work's style may be oriented closer to intimate, private discursive genres (such as a diary, a letter) or it may rather be associated with public messages of journalism, politics, etc.

In his *Metaphors of Genre*, David Fishelov introduces the working definition of genre based on prototypical, representative texts and flexible sets of constitutive rules derived from and exempli-fied by these texts (8, 12). Prototypes are not necessarily normative patterns which must be fol-lowed in subsequent text-production, but function as author's deliberate genre references as well (see Schaeffer "Literary Genres"). Emerging texts refer to paradigmatic patterns with a variety of intertextual signals and attitudes, from affirmative to explicitly polemical. In my view, the author of the later text thus cannot be regarded as only dependent on the pre-existing models (as old-fashioned genre critics used to believe). On the contrary, he/she brings into play generic refer-ences to the "already said" in order to invent for his/her text the relevant pre-existing lineage of genre and, so to speak, performs the fictional construction of the chosen genre tradition for the model reader. The writer is not only a prisoner of the "already said," but is also in a position to freely choose intertextual backgrounds and manipulate genre identity of her/his text. Moreover, we should bear in mind that Fishelov does not limit the concept of prototype to a single paradig-matic work, figuring as the mythical founder of a literary kind. Drawing on cognitive studies by Eleanor Rosch and Carolyn B. Mervis from the 1970s, Fishelov claims that the role of the prototype is played by a series of texts as well -- by the so-called hard core of typical genre items, whose constitutive features establish family resemblances and which are significantly different from the members of other generic categories (Fishelov 61-63). The readers recall those series, too, as they

are trying to identify the text's genre identity. Textual family resemblances develop genetically, through persistent intertextual references to prototypical texts or sets. The process is analogous to biological offspring. The offspring originates from common ancestors, following them in some respects and differing from them in others. The genre lineage is usually structured around authors and texts which are *in retrospective*, after their canonization, viewed as founders, fathers or parental figures, embodying possibilities of writing within the repertoire of the genre, for example, Homer and Vergil as fathers of the epic, Petrarch and Shakespeare as the founders of the sonnet (see Fishelov 65-67). To be sure, the lineage evolves also progressively, but again through intertextual references (ranging from imitation to polemical opposition in anti-genres and parodies), with the support of genological meta-discourse in paratexts, poetics, criticism and literary history and under the influence of various institutions, such as publishers, libraries, and schools (see Fowler 42, 114).

Genericity, therefore, relates to texts and textual series unavoidably, it is dependent on intertextual interaction between agents in the literary field. In literary life, prototypical text patterns -- they achieved this role because they became canonized or popular -- inspire imitation, variation, and transformation. First they are rehearsed by the "original" author, encouraged by recent success of his/her efforts, and then by all who are exposed to his or her influence. Intertextual references to prototypical texts are often quite obvious and practically cannot be missed. They are marked with citations, epigraphs, intertitularity, allusions to the origin of the genre. Pre?eren, for example, not only emulated and romantically reinvented Petrarch's style in his sonnets, he also made witty comparisons to the Italian master. Genre terms in titles and subtitles, such as *Sonnets of Unhappines* (France Preseren), *Sonnets* (Veno Taufer), *Lame Sonnets* (Milan Dekleva), or *Sonnets the Second* (Milan Jesih), signify the author's focus on the generic pattern chosen; they are meant to incite the genre consciousness of the readers. Participants in literary communication are relentlessly stimulated to classify the texts they produce, receive, or comment on; they organize them cognitively into classes as they, matching genre patterns intertextually, project or perceive their equivalences in structure, meaning or cultural function. But with every new text and its post-processing within the genological meta-discourse, the borders of such cognitive class are being redefined and negotiated. This is achieved primarily with the help of intertextual references to prototypical texts and discursive series. Such allusions map out the "ideal" genological context for the reader's navigation and his or her efforts to grasp the text's genre identity. Nevertheless, genre consciousness produced by only intertextual references would be elusive and anarchic. Since literature is an institution, it does not come as surprise that there are discursive powers regulating and channeling genre consciousness together with every particular act of genological text identification. Poetologists, rhetoricians, and grammarians, followed in modernity by influential reviewers, literary opinion-makers, academic critics, and the school system establish and reinforce more stable genological concepts or systems. These theoretical concepts and nets -- being meta-discursive categories disseminated from positions of authority across the entire literary field -- indeed influence the formation of the generic tradition; this was particularly the case in the canonized genres of pre-Enlightenment literature such as epic, tragedy or ode (see the distinction between "synthetic" and "analytic" genericity in Schaeffer, "Literary Genres").

Last but not least, the notion of intertextuality has been successful in deconstructing the former hierarchy of containments, according to which every text belonged to a literary kind, the kind to a literary type or "natural form," and the latter to literature as a meta-genre. A work of literature, quite to the contrary, evokes manifold generic references, effectively melting and blending them (on the merging, mixing, and hybridization of genres, see Fowler 156-57, 183-90). The text is the site where various generic codes not only meet, but also construct and deconstruct each other. Intertextual references to prototypical texts and formal-thematic conventions, scattered in variant series of similar texts, are the most decisive factor in the formation of literary kinds, maintaining them in the consciousness of writers, readers, critics and other participants in literary communication, at the same time changing them historically. Intertextuality transforms their structure, language, themes, and functions, places them in relationships with other literary and non-literary genres and thus moves them around the genre repertoire of the social discourse (see

Angenot). To conclude, the conception of intertextuality, originally opposed to the metaphysics of presence, provides today genology with an explanation of generic identity which does not neglect semantic, syntactic and pragmatic properties perceived in texts. These properties are the starting point of the formation of genres in literary production and in its contemporaneous or retrospective theoretical reflection, genre consciousness. Genres live on social practices which frame intertextual and metatextual references to prototypical texts or sets of texts. Genres are actually cognitive and pragmatic devices for intertextual pattern-matching. Texts or textual sets become generic proto-types by virtue of intertextual and meta-textual interaction: on one side there is the working (in-fluence) of semantic, syntactic and pragmatic features of prototypical texts on their domestic and foreign literary offspring; on the other side we see meta-textual descriptions and intertextual deri-vations or references, which retroactively establish or revise the hard core of genre pattern. Any given text is, because of the generic and pragmatic component of the author's communicative competence, dependent on existing genre patterns (these are not abstract codes, but intertextual *déjà lu*), since the linguistic material is necessarily ordered by them. Hovewer, the same text also actively participates in the plurality of generic context thanks to a variety of intertextual reference -- that is how the author constructs the meaning and structure of the text and affects the readers' expectations and reception.

Works Cited

Angenot, Marc. "Intertextualité, interdiscursivité, discours social." *Texte* 2 (1983): 101-12.
Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Problem govornih zanrov" ("The Problem of Speech Genres"). Trans. H. Biffio. *Estetika in humanisticne vede.* By Mikhail Bahtin. Ed. A. Skaza. Ljubljana: Studia humanitatis, 1999. 229-82.
Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. Paris: Seuil, 1970.
Barthes, Roland. "Textual Analysis of Poe's Valdemar." *Untying the Text*. Ed. R. Young. London: RKP, 1981. 133-61.
Beebee, Thomas O. *The Ideology of Genre: A Comparative Study of Generic Instability.* University Park: The Pennsylvania State UP, 1994.
Derrida, Jacques. "The Law of Genre." Trans. Avita Ronell. *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1980): 55-81.
Dolezel, Lubomír. *Occidental Poetics: Tradition and Progress.* Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1990.
Fishelov, David. *Metaphors of Genre: The Role of Analogies in Genre Theory.* University Park: The Pennsylvania State UP, 1993.
Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Seuil, 1982.
Genette, Gérard. "Introduction à l'architexte." *Théorie des genres*. Ed. G. Genette and T. Todorov. Paris: Seuil, 1986. 89-159.
Glowinski, Michal. "Les Genres littéraires." *Théorie littéraire. Problèmes et perspectives.* Ed. Marc Angenot and Jean Bessière. Paris: PU de France, 1989. 81-94.
Hempfer, Klaus W. *Gattungstheorie. Information und Synthese.* München: Fink, 1973.
Hoorn, Johan F. "How is a Genre Created? Five Combinatory Hypotheses." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 2.2 (2000): <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol2/iss2/3/>.
Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Symbolic Act.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981.
Juvan, Marko. " The Sonnet, Self-Referentiality, and Parodicity in Slovenian literature." *Die Welt der Slaven* 42.1 (1997): 86-110.
Juvan, Marko. "On Literariness: From Post-structuralism to Systems Theory." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 2.2 (2000): <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol2/iss2/1/>.
Juvan, Marko. *Intertekstualnost.* Ljubljana: DZS, 2000.
Keunen, Bart. "Bakhtin, Genre Formation, and Cognitive Turn: Chronotopes as Memory Schemata." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 2.2 (2000): <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol2/iss2/2/>.
Kos, Janko. *Roman* (The Novel). Ljubljana: DZS, 1983.
Kristeva, Julia. *Sémeiotikè. Recherches pour une sémanalyse.* Paris: Seuil, 1969.
Leitch, Vincent B. *Cultural Criticism, Literary Theory, Poststructuralism*. New York: Columbia UP, 1992.
Margolis, Joseph. "Essentialism." *A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory*. Ed. Michael Payne. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996. 176-78.
Pavlicic, Pavao. *Knjizevna genologija* (Literary Genology). Zagreb: Sveucili?na naklada Liber, 1983.
Schaeffer, Jean-Marie. *Qu'est-ce qu'un genre littéraire?* Paris: Seuil, 1989.
Schaeffer, Jean-Marie. "Literary Genres and Textual Genericity." *The Future of Literary Theory.* Ed. Ralph Co-hen. New York: Routledge, 1989. 167-87.
Skwarczynska, Stefania. "Un problème fondamental méconnu de la génologie." *Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich* 8.15 (1966): 17-33.
Suerbaum, Ulrich. "Intertextualität und Gattung. Beispielreihen und Hypothesen." *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Ed. U. Broich and M. Pfister. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1985. 58-77.
Todorov, Tzvetan. *Les genres du discours.* Paris: Seuil, 1978.

Zubarev, Vera. "The Comic in Literature as a General Systems Phenomenon." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 1.1 (1999): <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol1/iss1/2/>.

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 publications include *Intertekstualnost* (2000), *Vezi besedila* (Textual Ties) (2000), *Romanticna pesnitev* (The Romantic Epic Poem, editor, 2002), *Kako pisati literarno zgodovino danes?* (How to Write Literary History Today, co-edited with Darko Dolinar, 2003), "Fikcija in zakoni" ("Fiction and Laws") in *Primerjalna knjizevnost* 26.1 (2003), and "Literary Self-Referentiality and the Formation of the National Literary Canon" in *Neohelicon* 31.1 (2004). Juvan serves 2002-2006 as president of the Slovenian Comparative Literature Association. E-mail: <marko.juvan@guest.arnes.si >.

Translator's profile: Andrej E. Skubic received his doctorate in Slovenian linguistics from the University of Ljubljana in 2004. He is now a freelance writer and translator in Ljubljana. His interests include sociolinguistics of sociolects and critical discourse analysis, as well as literary and scientific translation. Skubic's publications include papers on sociolinguistics, as well as several works of fiction (novels and short stories) and translations of Irish and Scottish authors (O'Brien, McCabe, Welsh, Beckett, Joyce). E-mail: <andrej.ermenc-skubic@guest.arnes.si>