

Foreword

“Compare, contrast, translate. Approach and question. Approach to question. The critical practice proceeds in a double movement towards multiple poles – objects or subjects – that are only accessible as text – *across* the text. Essentially a movement across fields of forces, the intertext resists totalitarian impulses and totalitarian politics as it never allows privileged objects or subjects to ossify in a position of power. Host and parasite, the critical gaze is always prone to crossing boundaries, confusing reference, (mis)appropriating – thus multiplying the voices of the text.”

This is but an excerpt of the Call for Papers for the third issue of *Concordia Discors vs. Discordia Concors*, graciously inviting submissions (in English, French, German or Spanish) on the (still) thorny topic of intertextuality. Of a host of enthusiastic (but by no means “spur-of-the-moment”) reactions to such a luring research theme, a dozen articles exploring intra- vs intertextuality in their multifaceted aspects were finally selected. And, whether tackling directly and explicitly the given topic or not, the articles that make up the present volume incite the pleasure of recognition of palimpsestic (sometimes dangerous) textual “liaisons”.

Derived from the Latin *intertexto*, meaning “to intermingle while weaving”, intertextuality is a term first introduced by Julia Kristeva in the late sixties, but actually its origin seems to be inseparable, at large, from the *Tel Quel* group (founded in 1960 and directed by Philippe Sollers). This key concept, which made its official entrance into the (post)structuralist terminology in the two journals which disseminated the works of Tel Quel (namely *Théorie*

d'ensemble and *Recherches pour une sémanalyse*), has been incessantly redefined, revisited, reshaped and reconsidered for over half a century now.

A direct consequence of “the death of the author” and of “the birth of the writer” (Barthes, 1977), intertextuality was “invented” to put an end to obsessions with the author’s influences, the text’s sources, origins etc. and initiate others instead, such as problematizing the idea of a text having boundaries or reflecting a little more on what separates *text* from *context*. In essays such as “Le mot, le dialogue et le roman” [Word, Dialogue, and Novel], Kristeva argues that “[A]ny text is constructed of a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (1966: 66). T. S. Eliot had said it long before, in other words:

No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone.

His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead. I mean this as a principle of aesthetic, not merely historical, criticism.

(T.S. Eliot, *The Sacred Wood*, 1920, our emphasis)

As a matter of fact, this idea of interdependence is at least as old as Montaigne, who professes in his *Essays* that “nous ne faisons que nous entreglosser” [we do nothing but inspire each other] (chapter 13, Book III, 1595).

Kristeva’s coinage of *intertextuality* is, thus, an attempt to synthesize and organise old theories, which include even Saussure’s. She even goes as far as to admit, in “Word, Dialogue, and Novel” (in the good old intertextuality spirit which means, above all, to give to Caesar what is Caesar’s), that she owes the essentials of this concept to Mikhail Bakhtin who, without naming it as such, had used it to outline his “dialogic imagination” theories. It was high time intertextuality replaced intersubjectivity. Loosely defined, whilst the term

intertextuality would normally be used to refer to allusions to other texts, a related kind of allusion, *intratextuality*, involves internal relations within the text.

After Kristeva, the Tel Quel circle and Roland Barthes largely contributed to advertising intertextuality and making it a favourite “entry” in the structuralist vocabulary, Dominique Maingueneau chooses, in his *Initiation aux méthodes de l'analyse du discours* (Hachette, Paris, 1976), to oversimplify the concept, in an attempt of scientific or pedagogic vulgarisation. He obtained a much easier concept to handle, as it narrowed to source criticism only, but otherwise rather too streamlined if we take into account that intertextuality had just been made to refer to far more than the “influences” of writers on each other.

One would think that after the next important French stop (Genette) in the conceptual evolution of intertextuality, nothing much was likely to arrive. After all, Gérard Genette completely redefined the theoretical field where intertextuality could be placed (*Introduction à l'architexte*, Seuil, 1979; *Palimpsestes*, Seuil, 1982). To Genette, intertextuality is but one of the five subtypes of the more inclusive *transtextuality*, along with *paratextuality*, *architextuality*, *metatextuality* and *hypertextuality*, and refers to the actual presence of a text in another text, as in quotation, plagiarism or allusion. But time and technology have been eating away even at Genette's famous classification, for Genette's *hypertext* tends to be replaced by *hypotext*, in order to make room for *computer-based textuality* (a text which can take the reader directly to other texts, regardless of authorship or location), a newer kind of intertextuality which does away with the traditional “linearity” of texts. Furthermore, a taste for these newer kinds of intertextuality seems to have become addictive, which reminds us of Linda Hutcheon's warning (dated 1989): Beware! As intertextuality is more often than not found “in the eye of the beholder” and does not necessarily entail a

communicator's intentions, an "excessive interest in intertextuality" is likely to reject / annihilate the role of the (primary) Author.

Compare, Contrast, Approach and Question.

As difficult as it might be to seize this protean concept into a methodologically coherent approach, some very interesting reflections on intertextuality can be found in the Comparative Literature Section of this volume. If reflexivity is (still) one of the vital criteria for the validation of intertextuality, then most of them, if not all, are deliberately (self-)reflexive.

Cristina Ciuntuc, for one, delves into the complex theoretical bowels of the very field of comparative literature which she tries to untangle with the necessary theoretical instruments provided primarily by the theorist Adrian Marino. Her article, entitled *Une nouvelle perspective sur la littérature comparée: la réflexion d'Adrian Marino* [A New Perspective on Comparative Literature: Adrian Marino's Poetics] revisits the idea of *Weltliteratur* and analyses Marino's new theoretical concept, that of *literary invariant*, which casts a whole new light on comparative literature.

After this highly necessary prefatory article, the Comparative Literature Section proceeds, deductively, to more explicit inquiries into the innately reflexive nature of intertextuality. **Petronela-Gabriela Țebrea**n identifies, in Constantin Fântâneru's journal-novel *Interior* [Inside], which she approaches from an intertextual perspective, possible similarities with Knut Hamsun, Max Blecher, Mircea Eliade or Feodor Dostoevsky. But making an inventory of analogies with other works of art / characters is barely the tip of the iceberg in intertextuality, and the author candidly admits at the end of her article that grasping the real image of a character such as C lin

Adam is illusory, nothing but an apparent concretization which tends to remain frustratingly unclear.

Eleonore De Felip questions Intra- and Intertextuality in Oswald Egger's Long Poem *Herde der Rede*, a highly dialogic and polyphonic text (in the sense used by M. M. Bakhtin). Quotations, repetitions and reversals are seen as strategies of a (meta-)poetic discourse abounding in subtexts.

Last but definitely not least in the Comparative Literature Section, **Hans-Joachim Schott** moves across the text of ethics by tackling the paradoxical innocence of plagiarism (*Die Unschuld des Plagiats. Brechts intertextuelle Schreibstrategie* [The Innocence of Plagiarism. Brecht's Intertextual Writing Strategy]). Accused by contemporary literary critics of having copied Rimbaud in his drama *Im Dickicht der Städte*, Bertolt Brecht developed a genuine literary poetics out of these accusations. He founded his aesthetics and ethics of plagiarizing on a four-fold reasoning which has as much to do with the art of forgetting as with the proto-communist concept of common property. The author of the article enlarges upon the Brechtian eulogy of the copy as deeply deconstructive and essentially ideological.

Compare, Contrast, Approach to Question.

Cross-Cultural Strategies hosts a very interesting article which tells in German the story of Bukovinian dialects (Ukrainian, Rumanian, Polish, Buchenländisch and Yiddish) spoken in Bukovina during the Austrian monarchy. **Oleksandr Ogyu** alludes, in his *Interkulturelle Diskurskontakte Deutsch vs. Buchenländisch -Ukrainisch (bzw. ihr Interferenzgrad) in der Bukowina (1900-1920)* [Inter cultural Discourse Contacts of German vs. Bukovinian and Ukrainian in Bukovina (1900-1920), with Remarks on Their Interference Degree) in Bukovina (1900-1920)], to the idea that intertextuality, apart from being an illimitable tissue of connections and

associations, paraphrases and fragments, texts and con-texts, is also *interference*, thus prefacing the section on Translation Strategies.

Emilia Munteanu, preoccupied with the permeability of Tardieu's plays (*Le théâtre tardivien entre diaeresis et sunagôgè* [The Theatre of Tardieu between Diaeresis and Sunagôgè]), also enlarges upon the *explicitness* of Tardieu's intertextuality (diverse forms ranging from direct allusion to clichés). Never at a loss among the unexpected techniques of experimental theatre where sometimes intertextuality appears as an implicit form of spectacular interactivity, the author clearly delineates and orders the references to other plays, while accurately observing how the discourse gradually turns into a sort of metatheatre.

Galyna Dranenko, on the other hand, while also determined to assess how reflexive (or self-conscious) the use of intertextuality can be in drama (*Mythe et intertextualité dans le théâtre de Bernard-Marie Koltès : approches intertextuelle et mythocritique* [Myth as Intertext in Bernard-Marie Koltès' Drama: Intertextual and Mythocritical Approaches]), resorts to mythocriticism and mythopoetics in order to find a way out of the palimpsestic labyrinth which functions as an intertext in the play *Roberto Zucco*.

Oana Andreea Maria Vieriu Gorb nescu, who authors a further article dealing with drama, this time in German (*Die östliche Theaterbühne unter der Lupe des westlichen Publikums am Beispiel von Christoph Heins Dramen: Schlötel oder was solls?, Lassalle fragt Herbert nach Sonja. Die Szene ein Salon, Die wahre Geschichte des AhQs, Passage. Ein Kammerspiel* [The East-German Drama on the West-German Stage, Illustrated by Christoph Hein's Dramas: *Schlötel oder was solls, Lassalle fragt Herbert nach Sonja. Die Szene ein Salon, Die wahre Geschichte des AhQs, Passage. Ein Kammerspiel*]), conducts a diachronic and synchronic survey of the impact Christoph Hein's dramas had on the West-

German stage. The author of the article identifies two major directions in the reception of Christoph Hein's literature: either via the writer's affiliation or non-affiliation to the socialist party or by treating the author's texts as chronicles of the eastern society of that time. The article is a reminder of the fact that intertexts need not be simply "literary" and that sometimes historical and / or social factors can be of equally seminal importance when it comes to diverting literary practices.

Angelica Hobjil (*Aspects interlinguistiques dans la société roumaine actuelle* [Interlinguistic Aspects in Today's Romanian Society] brings a symmetrical, symbolical counterpoint at the end of the section with a series of questions on the relationship between *culturalisation* – *intraculturalisation* – *interculturalisation* starting from certain linguistic hypostases in the Romanian mass-media and certain arguments that the latest *A Dictionary of Romanian Orthography, Orthoepy and Morphology* (DOOM, 2005) provides for the inclusion in the Romanian language of the lexical units that characterize other cultures.

Compare, Contrast, Translate.

Intertextuality need not be looked for in translation (studies) as it lies at the very heart of both the production and reception of translation(s). Translation is also, first and foremost, practically by definition, an intertextual practice. There is more than one level of intertextuality in translation; yet, as Lawrence Venuti emphasized in his lecture on *Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation* (2011), we should be fully aware, as readers, translators, would-be writers, that "the possibility of translating most foreign intertexts with any completeness or precision is so limited as to be virtually nonexistent. As a result, they are usually replaced by analogous but ultimately different intertextual relations in the receiving language."

The very nature of the relationship between the source text (which we might assimilate to a sort of prototext) and the target text (or metatext) leads us, therefore, back to intertextuality. As Farzaneh Farahzad pointed out in an article from 2009 (*Translation as an Intertextual Practice*), the source text and the target text stand essentially in an intertextual relationship to one another because "the metatext repeats the prototext in terms of content and form without being limited to it."

Intertextuality and language interference are, again, united in *Linguistic and Cultural Evaluation of Etienne Galle's Translation of Chinua Achebe's Anthills of the Savannah as Les Termitières de la Savane*, an article signed by **Njosi Festus Chukwuka** and **Moruwawon Babatunde Samuel**. The paper analyses Chinua Achebe's *Anthills of the Savannah* and its French translation *Les Termitières de la Savane* and emphasizes the difficulties encountered by translators in dealing with pidgin English and loanwords.

La recepción de la obra de Émile Verhaeren en España [Reflections on the Way Émile Verhaeren's Literary Work Is Viewed in Spain] (**José Manuel Pozo López**) reiterates reception theories, this time from the perspective of translation studies. According to Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystems theory, Verhaeren's central position in the Belgian literature in French is contradicted by the one he has in the Hispanic area, where he occupies a secondary place. We are told that Verhaeren's work came to Spain always secondarily, accompanying other Symbolists. Furthermore, Verhaeren (much like Agatha Christie's Poirot, should such a reversed intertext – from fiction / film to life - be permitted, for the sake of intertextuality at least), was usually identified as French, he being Belgian.

As for *The House of Usher or the House of Mirrors: A Recast of the Double* (**Magdalena-Simona Tru can**), the article recalls the universal myth of the double from the

translation perspective in Edgar Allan Poe's *Fall of the House of Usher* by analyzing two remarkable translations (signed by Ion Vinea and Liviu Cotruș, respectively). The fact that one of the translations (namely Vinea's) is overtly domesticating while the other (Cotruș's) deliberately foreignizing, offers the perfect opportunity for some interesting reflections on the (basically intertextual) nature of translation as always ruled by ambivalent (double) standards.

A partial conclusion could be that intertextuality enables translation by paradoxically complicating it. Another, that intertextuality, either explicit or implicit, leads more often than not to a re-reading, a revisiting of the source text. When writing / translating / reviewing / etc. we do nothing else but ceaselessly reinvent the wheel, because intertextuality is absolutely unavoidable. The concept of *intertextuality*, far from having reached its state of completion, undergoes a process of constant redefinition.

Daniela Hisan

Bibliography

- BARTHES, Roland (1977): *Image, Music, Text*, London, Fontana Press / Harper Collins, translated by Stephen Heath
- ELIOT, T. S. (1920): *The Sacred Wood. Essays on Poetry and Criticism*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf
- FARAHZAD, Farzaneh (2009): "Translation as an Intertextual Practice", in *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, Volume 16, Issue 3-4, pp. 125-131
- GENETTE, Gérard (1979): *Introduction à l'architexte*, Paris, Seuil
- GENETTE, Gérard (1982): *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*, Paris, Seuil
- HERMANS, Theo (2003): "Translation, equivalence and intertextuality", in *Wasafiri*, Volume 18, Issue 40, 2003, pp. 38-41
- HUTCHEON, Linda (1989): "Historiographic Metafiction: Parody and the Intertextuality of History", in *Intertextuality and Contemporary*

- American Fiction*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 3-32
- KRISTEVA, Julia (1966): “Le mot, le dialogue et le roman”, reprinted in *Séméiotikè: Recherches pour une sémanalyse* Paris, Seuil, 1969, pp. 143-73
- KRISTEVA, Julia (1980): *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, New York, Columbia University Press
- MAINGUENEAU, Dominique (1976): *Initiation aux méthode de l'analyse du discours*, Paris, Hachette
- MONTAIGNE (1595): *Essais* (Livre III), reprinted in Hachette, Paris, 2001
- VENUTI, Lawrence (2011): *Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation*, invited lecture at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki