



Intertextual Realms: Towards a Chronotopic Model of Intertextuality¹

by Birgit Spengler

Since the 1966 publication of Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*, it has become a literary fashion to re-imagine well-known, and often canonical, fictional texts from the perspective of 'the minor,' a character whose marginalized existence within the literary classic tends to reflect relations of power and privilege in the extra-fictional realm. Writing from a feminist perspective, poet Adrienne Rich has described "the act of [...] entering an old text from a new critical direction" as an "act of survival" (1979: 35). According to Rich, such forms of "re-vision" are a means "not to pass on a tradition but to break its hold over us" (35) since in order to "transcend and transform experience" the imagination "has to question, to challenge, to conceive of alternatives" (43). By re-(en)visioning a famous literary predecessor, rewritings such as *Wide Sargasso Sea*, *Ahab's Wife* (Naslund 1999), and *The Wind Done Gone* (Randall 2001) draw attention to the 'blind spots,' ideological presuppositions, and potential biases of literary texts that have been considered central to the Western canon and national literary traditions.² In

¹ The first sections of this article constitute a revised and abbreviated version of an argument that I have unfolded in more depth in *Literary Spinoffs: Rewriting the Classics – Re-Imagining the Community* (Spengler 2015). I am using this argument as a basis for developing the chronotopic model of intertextuality that my title refers to.

² This selection could be considerably extended. Just over the past thirty-five years, a myriad of authors have taken aim with the canonic works of the past by re-imagining them from the perspective



doing so, they negotiate and alter their specific literary 'past' in the form of a famous 'pre-text,' but they also contend with long-standing cultural narratives and 'myths' that are associated with the predecessor text or its popular versions and, thus, with narratives that have played key roles in shaping what Benedict Anderson has famously described as the "imagined community."³ In this manner, rewriting a literary or popular classic can become a means for "decolonizing" the mind and re-imagining the community, a process to which the decolonization of the literary and cultural imagination can contribute in important ways.⁴

However, contemporary legal frameworks and the trend towards an increasing consolidation of property rights in the cultural realm severely curtail the ways in which we can question, challenge, and unsettle dominant cultural narratives – and, thus, reform the cultural imagination. In his 2004 study *Free Culture*, copyright scholar Lawrence Lessig suggests that "[t]here has never been a time in our history when more of our 'culture' was as 'owned' as it is now" (12). In a similar vein, James Boyle warns of the risk of "enclosing" what he describes as a "commons of the mind" (2008: 45). What potentially evolves is a "permission culture" in which "creators get to create only with the permission of the powerful, or of creators from the past" (Lessig 2004: xiv) – or, to extend Boyle's complex spatio-social and legal metaphor, a 'gated community' of the rich and powerful that can impose severe limits on our shared imaginative 'property' and mobility. Although contemporary technology facilitates forms of "poaching" and other "tactics" (de Certeau 1984: 516, 519) through the (virtual) (re-)circulation, sharing, and dissemination of information and cultural contents in an unprecedented way, such legal trends can have far-reaching implications on economic, political, as well as on cultural levels, not the least on the ways in which we envision the "imagined community" through identity-constituting narratives.⁵

A case in point would be Alice Randall's appropriation of Margaret Mitchell's civil war epos *Gone with the Wind* (1936), which triggered a copyright lawsuit in 2001. Randall's rewriting *The Wind Done Gone* re-imagines Mitchell's world from the

of a minor character, including Nancy Rawles and Geraldine Brooks, as well as J.M. Coetzee, Emma Tennant, Peter Carey, Marina Warner, Lloyd Jones, and Maryse Conde to name but a few.

³ I am using the term pre-text to refer to a rewriting's literary predecessor text, in a sense that largely corresponds to Gerard Genette's use of the term hypotext (1997: 9). The notion that contemporary rewritings revise texts that have assumed a mythic status in contemporary American culture is one that I share with Christian Moraru and James Schiff and that Peter Widdowson's description of re-visionary fiction draws on. Moraru aptly details the mythic dimensions of literary narratives and specific American "mythic" texts in the following way: "There are highly canonical, widely popular fictions that capture, even give birth to key myths of certain communities. At the same time, they acquire in the long run a communally 'mythic' weight through successive editing, teaching, reading, and related institutionalizing acts" (2001: 3).

⁴ As Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin point out, "the rereading and the rewriting of the European historical and fictional record is a vital and inescapable task at the heart of the post-colonial enterprise" (1994: 196). However, critics of this particular strategy of decolonization within a postcolonial context have cautioned against reducing postcolonial literature and culture to acts of "writing back," since this gesture can reconfirm rather than subvert the central place of European colonialism in acts of post-colonial self-definition.

⁵ See also Henry Jenkins's conceptualization of fans as poachers.



perspective of Cyanara, a female slave from the Tara plantation whom Randall introduces as Scarlett's half sister and Rhett Butler's mistress. When the Mitchell estate sought to prevent the publication of this self-declared "[u]nauthorized [p]arody," what was at stake was much more than financial remuneration.⁶ Since the estate's permission for imaginatively "entering" Mitchell's world (Rich 1979: 35) depends on an author's willingness to perpetuate the myth of the South that *Gone With the Wind* embodies, Randall's 'case' highlights the ways in which copyright laws can help to keep powerful cultural myths intact.⁷ While Randall could have easily produced a less intertextually engaged work to criticize racism and slavery, it is precisely the deconstruction of the idealizing myth of the antebellum South that is embodied by Mitchell's novel and its media proliferations that renders *The Wind Done Gone* an effective interference with the ways in which the imagined community conceives of itself. In a reader's mind, Scarlett O'Hara's world and the Southern myth will never be the same again after Cyanara has gained admission to them. Re-(en)visioning characters and plots that have populated – or even colonized – the cultural imagination can render rewritings an effective literary form in processes of cultural meaning-making precisely because they use well-known narratives as a foil and backdrop to generate and exhibit 'difference,' thereby facilitating those contestations of meaning that are the basis for plural societies. However, current copyright laws, which are being pursued ever more aggressively (Heins and Beckles 2005: 4), can suppress and delimit aesthetic strategies that challenge readers to reconsider the ideological baggage transported and disseminated by a powerful cultural text.

In the following, I want to extend the spatial figure of thought that is inherent in such concepts as a "commons of the mind," a 'colonization' of the imagination, and a text that can be "entered" as well as in concepts such as the "imagined community" and fictional 'worlds' in order to argue for a spatio-temporal conceptualization of the workings of intertextuality that conceives of fictional texts in terms of time-spaces that interact with other literary and non-literary, diachronic and synchronic time-spaces, including the extra-literary, socio-historical spaces of author and reader. In other words, I would like to develop a *chronotopic* model of intertextuality that envisions the cognitive effect of rewritings in terms of complex interpenetrating time-space arrangements and ideational horizons that the reader negotiates in the process of reading.⁸

In order to develop this chronotopic model of intertextuality, I will delineate what I consider the key aesthetic strategies and characteristics of contemporary rewritings and theorize the form of reader involvement such texts trigger if read *as* rewritings – that is, by a reader who recognizes them as rewritings and takes their intertextual nature into account. I will argue that through their generic conventions

⁶ Compare the cover of Randall's novel for the designation as "[u]nauthorized [p]arody."

⁷ The Mitchell estate authorizes 'spinoffs' on the condition that the heroine survives, and that an author refrains from portraying gay or 'interracial' relationships (Conroy 2009). For extended versions of this argument, cf. Spengler (2015: 11-13, 111-116; 2011).

⁸ The chronotope is a concept developed by the Russian scholar Mikhail Bakhtin, which I will detail in greater depth in the final section of my argument.



and, specifically, through their intensive and extensive engagement with a literary predecessor, contemporary rewritings (and, potentially, other intensive and extensive forms of intertextuality) produce a particular arrangement of space and time on the cognitive and conceptual level – we could say an intertextual chronotope – that challenges the discrete boundaries of artistic creations by turning exchange and interaction into its primary and obvious aesthetic principles. Hence, the intertextual chronotope is a time-space created through intertextual strategies and practices that unsettle the idea of a stable, singular aesthetic work and ‘world’ with discrete boundaries and that instead foregrounds permeability and co-existence – the ability to transcend imaginary borders – and that posits the necessity of forms of mobility and exchange as basic principles of human meaning-making. A chronotopic model of intertextuality supports an intersubjective conceptualization of art and a reading of intertextuality that foregrounds its cultural dimensions and the “cultural work” (Tompkins 1985) that intertextual strategies perform through the emphasis on mutual exchange and permeability between fictional and non-fictional realms.

INTERTEXTUAL AESTHETICS: REWRITINGS AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

What happens when we re-imagine, re-(en)vision, or ‘re-visit’ a cultural text through the perspective of the previously marginalized? What cognitive processes do contemporary rewritings trigger and what strategies do they pursue to take aim with the dominant cultural narratives that are transported by literary and popular classics and their transmedia proliferations? I would like to approach contemporary rewritings as an intertextual genre that is marked by the extensive and intensive relationship to a literary pre-text as well as by the tendency to exhibit this relationship in a very explicit manner, for example through paratextual markers such as title, cover designs, or epigraphs.⁹ Through such flaunting gestures of affiliation, and through additional intertextual markers in the diegetic world of the spinoff, such as transworld characters as well as common motifs, themes, and plot elements, the pre-text text is continuously evoked and re-invoked as a foil and frame of reference for the ensuing reading process. Extensive and intensive intertextual strategies therefore invite a reading that will take the rewriting’s intertextual dimension into account by promising a level of

⁹ Although contemporary rewritings often allude to a specific literary pre-text in their title, this does not mean that their literary frame of reference is limited to a single pre-text. While the relation to one specific pre-text is usually highlighted, it is common that contemporary rewritings establish a complex literary and historical matrix that enriches and qualifies their engagement with the primary pre-text. Of course, *Wide Sargasso Sea* is a notable exception to the contemporary trend of explicitly relating to the pre-text by means of the title or other paratextual markers.

For genealogies of intertextual forms, which are the basis for my reading of rewritings as a contemporary intertextual genre and for my argument that forms of intertextuality are historically and culturally specific, cf. Pfister (1985) and Still/Worton (1990). For the notion that intertextuality can be perceived as a basic characteristic of all literature and language use compare my argument in *Literary Spinoffs*, p. 30ff.



meaning in which the intertextual relationship to the pre-text is in some way important.¹⁰ Characteristically, the engagement with the pre-text is based on a variety of aesthetic means and literary strategies and maintained throughout the rewriting, thus establishing a highly complex engagement with the pre-text and its matrix of associations. As I have argued elsewhere, such intertextual strategies activate a “variety of referential frames and explanatory patterns” which are played off against one another and used as a “means of mutual modification” (Spengler 2015: 36).

Based on the premise that the reader recognizes the intertextual dimension of the text and that this recognition will activate a range of associations and background knowledge about the pre-text, a rewriting’s obvious gestures of affiliation to one (or several) literary pre-texts can be considered as a generic contract with the reader which shapes his or her subsequent reading process by suggesting that the relation to the literary pre-text is constitutive for the rewriting and relevant for the process of interpretation.¹¹ And while the reader’s associations and forms of knowledge are necessarily idiosyncratic, they are shaped by her/his cultural situatedness – including world views, interpretatory traditions, and popular versions of the pre-text which provide the context, conditions, and delimitations for such idiosyncratic views and realizations of knowledge. In other words, even idiosyncratic responses are far from being arbitrary: They are a product of the reader’s socio-cultural and historical situatedness, or, we could say, of extra-literary arrangements of space and time.¹²

If recognized, the sustained engagement with a pre-textual matrix fosters a process that Linda Hutcheon has described in terms of an oscillation between two textual entities in a related context (*Adaptation*, xv, 6).¹³ Such oscillation encourages a contrastive and synthetic reading experience that challenges the reader to look at the pre-text through the lens of the rewriting and vice versa. The pre-text evokes a matrix of meanings and associations that constantly has to be reworked and revised in the process of reading the rewriting, but that can also be reconfirmed, extended, and enriched through the act of re-vision.

This process of inter- or transtextual oscillation constitutes a form of reader engagement that is highly characteristic of intensive and extensive rewritings and that can best be described as a variant of processes of aesthetic response as conceptualized by reader response critic Wolfgang Iser. Specifically, the process resembles the “synthesizing” operations Iser sees triggered by what he describes as the “discontinuities of textual segments” that occur within a single fictional text (2006:

¹⁰ While rewritings thus offer the possibility for intertextual readings, it depends on the actual reader whether and how an intertextual matrix or foil is realized in the process of readerly meaning-making. Typically, rewritings can be read at various levels of recognition or non-recognition of their intertextual dimensions.

¹¹ Cf. Frow (2006) on the effects of genre expectations on the reading process.

¹² In anticipation of my argument below, this cultural situatedness can also be described in terms of the chronotope, a time-space that is informed by common belief systems, shared knowledges, and ontological assumptions.

¹³ See Sanders (2006) and Widdowson (2006) for similar conceptualizations of the hermeneutic processes triggered by rewritings.



65, cf. also 1984). Iser suggests that readers have to establish what he calls “good continuation” or “connectivity” between textual segments by filling in textual “blanks” that cause the discontinuities. In fact, this is a highly complex process that takes place on various textual and conceptual levels and calls for a constant re-vision and re-synthesizing of knowledge, assumptions, and hypotheses about the world of the text but also potentially of the reader’s presuppositions and world views. The latter form of re-vision is caused by “blanks” of a more complex kind, which Iser refers to in terms of negativity and negation (1984: 284-356).

Iser describes the change of perspective triggered by a blank on the syntagmatic level, i.e., between textual segments, as a swinging back and forth between textual entities (1984: 306), but it can also be conceptualized with Winfried Fluck in terms of “constant perspectival shifts” (2000: 188) or in terms of the aforementioned process of oscillation. What is distinctive about rewritings and other highly intensive intertextual forms is that they deliberately promote inter- or transtextual perspectival shifts – i.e., shifts between two textual *entities* and their conceptual horizons – in addition to those between inner-textual segments. This process prompts the reader to establish the “good continuation” or “connectivity” between different textual worlds and their discursive or ideological presuppositions in addition to his or her own presuppositions and world views.¹⁴

One possible effect of this process is the dissolution of discrete textual borders in the reader’s imagination: As envisioned by Iser, “perspectival shifts” between textual segments trigger a process of “mutual modification” and thus effect a transformation of the reader’s conceptualization of both segments of a fictional text (1984: 303, my translation). Ideally, this process not only affects the reader’s understanding of textual segments but also her or his ideational horizon. In analogy to this process, the transtextual oscillation triggered by intensive rewritings also ideally affects the reader’s perception of both texts. To borrow Umberto Eco’s terminology, rewriting and pre-text become “open” works and the rewriting deliberately foregrounds and displays this open and mutually constitutive character of pre-text and rewriting (cf. Spengler 2015: 40).¹⁵

INTERTEXTUAL WORLD-MAKING

In tandem with the synthesizing activities that are triggered on the syntagmatic level of (inner as well as inter- or trans-) textual segments, rewritings typically also trigger synthesizing activities of the more complex kind that Iser refers to in terms of negation and negativity, and which directly involve or challenge the reader’s worldviews and

¹⁴ This does not necessarily mean that contradictions and incompatibilities will be glossed over, but that the reader will seek to negotiate them to establish a relation between the texts that may well involve contestation and ideological incompatibility.

¹⁵ This process happens alongside and in addition to the “synthesizing” activities between segments of the rewriting itself as conceptualized by Iser as a general characteristic of the reading process (Spengler 2015: 40).



ideological presuppositions. Through the allusion in the title or other prominent paratextual markers, the entire pre-textual world turns into a horizon of expectation and foil to the reading experience that exists alongside and in addition to the reader's own experiential world. As I would like to suggest, the world of the pre-text becomes another 'reality' or 'world' that is (temporarily) suspended by the rewriting. Essentially, the rewriting thereby doubles what Fluck has aptly described as the "doubling structure" of literary texts (2000: 187). This "doubling structure" is best understood as the "enabling structure and productive matrix" of a work of fiction (187, 188) and refers to fiction's suspension of a direct, referential relation to a 'reality' outside of the literary text. As Iser puts it, "literary texts do not relate to contingent reality as such, but to systems through which the contingencies and complexities of reality are reduced to meaningful structures" which are then "broken up and rearranged" in a text and turned into "objects for observation" (2006: 60-61). The "non-identity between fiction and world and between fiction and recipient is the prerequisite for the communicative character of fiction" (Iser 1984: 282-83, my translation, cf. Spengler 2015: 41-42). By effecting a suspension of the fictional text from its direct reference to an extra-textual 'reality,' the as-if or "doubling" structure of a work of fiction provides the basis for literature's potential to distance the reader from trained habits of thought or perceptions of reality.¹⁶ And while such distancing does not necessarily result in Iser's idealized outcome of the process – i.e., the reader's "transcendence" of world (2006: 67) – it may nevertheless effectively destabilize received truths or dominant cultural discourses by juxtaposing them with emergent or residual frames of interpretation.

An intensive and extensive rewriting, then, does not simply establish an as-if relationship to the reader's experiential world by momentarily suspending the truth claims of this world, but it establishes a similar as-if relationship to the pre-textual diegetic world and conceptual horizon by using the pre-text as a sustained intertextual matrix. The predecessor text thereby turns into another – or second order – experiential 'reality' that is temporarily suspended. Through their specific aesthetic strategies, rewritings augment the process of readerly meaning-making by adding another experiential world or foil that is continuously and systematically evoked as a background to the reading process. Accordingly, the special communicative situation established through the rewriting's use of the pre-text as a sustained intertextual (and experiential) matrix implies a squaring of the "doubling structure" of the literary text: (as-if)².¹⁷ In other words, the as-if relation to the extra-textual world is accompanied and augmented by an as-if relation to the literary pre-text and the literary pre-text thus

¹⁶ This creation of distance is a form of "negativity" as Iser puts it in *The Act of Reading*.

¹⁷ Kristeva describes the suspension of truth claims and of a scientific yes-no logic by works of fiction in terms of the (0-2) logics of literary texts (1980: 70). Rewritings augment this (0-2) logics of literary text by a (0-2) relationship to the literary pre-text: (0-2)². As I have put it in *Spinoffs*, the "squaring of two doubling structures" is a characteristic of "intensely intertextual texts" that "complicates the textual structure in comparison to literary texts that do not primarily construct themselves intertextually or that are less intensely intertextual," but which can be "less cognitively demanding than a permanent switch between various intertextual matrixes or less obvious relations to one or a number of pre-texts" (43). The following section closely follows my argument in section 1.3 of *Spinoffs*.



turns into a form of context-relation. The spinoff establishes an as-if or yes/no relationship that asserts the pre-text by evoking/importing it, but at the same time questions, challenges, revises, and, in fact, suspends it, thereby also ideally allowing the reader to achieve distance from habits of thought, perception, and worldviews that are transported by her or his understanding of the pre-text and its discursive formations. Whereas the opening up of cognitive, discursive, and ideological orders by means of an as-if relation to the world (i.e., a suspension of reality achieved by Iser's structure of negativity) is a general characteristic of works of fiction, the strategy of temporarily *and* more or less explicitly suspending at least two "realities," is a determining feature of rewritings.¹⁸ It is this feature that renders the genre of rewritings especially interesting from an epistemological and cognitive perspective: Rewritings' particular way of meaning making facilitates a form of second-degree/second-order observation of the reading process and of fictional world-making in general by foregrounding the effects of fiction's as-if relation to the reader's experiential world on the cognitive level.¹⁹

TOWARDS A CHRONOTOPIC MODEL OF INTERTEXTUALITY

The squaring of their as-if structure that intensive and extensive rewritings perform constitutes a complex spatio-temporal and cognitive arrangement that facilitates a juxtaposition and interpenetration of several synchronic and diachronic fictional and non-fictional 'worlds' – including the extra-literary, experiential world of the reader – and the ontologies, discourses, and value systems that inform these various time-spaces. This strategy of intertextual meaning-making, then, suggests a model of communication that consists of interpenetrating and interacting time-spaces and that emphasizes the discursive situatedness of conceptualizations of 'world' rather than conceiving of literature as a two-dimensional textual phenomenon or a poststructuralist *texte generale*.²⁰

Such a concept reflects ideas about intertextuality as proposed by the 'forefather' and 'foremother' of intertextual theory, Mikhail Bakhtin and Julia Kristeva,

¹⁸ Prequels and sequels work in a different manner, since they usually aim at creating seamless continuity with the world of the pre-text. Compare the section on "The 'Dialogic' Involvement with the Pre-Text: Dark Areas and In-/Compatibility of Fictional Worlds" in my *Literary Spinoffs* for a way to distinguish different forms of intertextual engagement with a pre-textual world through a modified version of Brian McHale's distinctions of the uses of "apocryphal history" in 'classic' and postmodern historical fiction.

¹⁹ Cf. my argument in section 2.3 of *Spinoffs*. The model therefore also has considerable implications for current approaches in narratology that focus on narratives' cognitive and pragmatic dimensions. My conceptualization of the reading process is necessarily an abstraction. See, for example, Gottfried Gabriel for a model that considers the formation of illusion (on the level of plot) as well as the process of interpretation, which is then followed by a fathoming of the text's "truth" in relation to world (1975: 103-104).

²⁰ I am seeking to complicate, but not to refute the poststructuralist claim of a textual character of 'world.'



both of whom emphasize the socio-historical and cultural situatedness of utterances in order to conceptualize an intertextual or interdiscursive structure that exceeds the two-dimensional borders of the text or word 'proper' by placing it into space and time. For Bakhtin, it is the dialogic nature of language – the fact that the word is always "half someone else's" (2006: 293) and is therefore always enriched and shaped by its previous usages – that opens up an intersubjective, dialogic, as well as a spatio-temporal dimension in language use. As Graham Allen puts it, the notion of double-voiced discourse is "essentially intertextual in that it recognizes that all utterances contain within them the dialogic force of competing interpretations, definitions, social and ideological inflections and so on" (2000: 212). Because it transports its previous uses, the dialogic word can serve as a means to conceptualize how on the micro level of the word discursive and socio-cultural contexts enter language and literary communication.

Building on Bakhtin's ideas, Kristeva conceptualizes a three-dimensional model of intertextual 'space' which opens up an entrance point for history, society, and culture into the literary text and 'translates' diachrony into synchrony by means of the dialogic word (cf. 1980a). In a later, modified version of intertextuality, Kristeva transforms Bakhtin's notion of the dialogical word into the ideologeme, which describes the "intertextual function" at work in a text:

The ideologeme is that intertextual function read as 'materialized' at the different structural levels of each text, and which stretches along the entire length of its trajectory, giving it its historical and social coordinates. [...] The concept of text as ideologeme determines the very procedure of a semiotics that, by studying the text as intertextuality, considers it as such within (the text of) society and history. (1980b: 36-37)²¹

To understand a text in terms of an ideologeme leads to a semiological attitude that thinks the text within (the text of) society and history because it examines it in terms of intertextuality. The ideologeme of a text is the focal point in which the perceiving rationality recognizes the transformation of *statements* (to which the text is not reducible) in a whole (the text), and in this also the connection between this totality and the historical and social text. (1971: 502, my translation)

According to Kristeva's concept, it is the ideologeme or intertextual function that attaches the literary text to a cultural context. Literary meaning-making combines literary and extra-literary systems and occurs through their intersections.²² For Kristeva,

²¹ See also the following quote: "Ideologeme is what we call the shared function that links a given structure (let us say, the novel) with other structures (let us say, scientific discourse) within an intertextual space. A text's ideologeme can be defined through its references to other texts" (1971: 502, my translation).

²² In "Word, Dialogue, Novel" Kristeva therefore emphasizes Bakhtin's call for a *translinguistic* approach. Compare also Mary Orr, from whom my own understanding of Kristeva's notions of intertextuality has greatly benefited: "The ideological is thus constantly threading and rethreading the textual fabric, not outside it in hermeneutical or critical analysis. Kristevan intertextuality as



it is the intertextual function that describes these intersections and attachments of literary and extra-literary spaces.

Moving from the micro-level of the dialogic word to the macro level of fictional and extra-literary time-spaces, Bakhtin had, in fact, already developed a model that conceptualizes the interaction and dialogic exchange between the literary and the extra-literary in his essay "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel," which was written between 1937-38, but not published until 1975 – i.e., well after Kristeva formulated her ideas on intertextuality and the ideologeme.²³ The term chronotope literally means time-space and is used by Bakhtin to describe "the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature (2006: 84). Bakhtin conceives of space and time not as separate aesthetic categories, but as mutually constituting and shaping one another: "In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. This intersection and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope" (84). It is important to note that Bakhtin's time-space arrangements are historically specific. According to Bakhtin, historically and culturally specific configurations of space and time shape fictional texts as well as the cultural contexts from which they arise. In fact, extra-literary and fictional time space arrangements are closely connected to one another in the form of a dialogic relationship, although literary chronotopes do not simply mirror extra-textual time-space arrangements. In a way that resonates with Fluck's and Iser's later formulations of the "doubling structure" or "distancing" that mark the relation between literary texts and the extra literary world, Bakhtin suggests:

Out of the actual chronotopes of our world (which serve as the source of representation) emerge the reflected and *created* chronotopes of the world represented in the work (in the text) [...] However forcefully the real and the represented world resist fusion, however immutable the presence of that categorical boundary line between them, they are nevertheless indissolubly tied up with each other and find themselves in continual mutual interaction; uninterrupted exchange goes on between them, similar to the uninterrupted exchange of matter between living organisms and the environment that surrounds them [...] this process of exchange is itself chronotopic: it occurs first and foremost in the historically developing social world, but without ever losing contact with changing historical space. (2006: 253-254)

permutation, like Bakhtin's 'dialogism' before it, amply allows for socio-historical, 'polyphonic' and 'carnavalesque' ideologemes in order that the status quo will be challenged. [...] Hence, 'intertextuality' as static, all-encompassing network, with no outside of the text, is not Kristevan" (2008: 28).

²³ The first English publication occurred in 1981 as one of four pieces in *The Dialogic Imagination*, edited by Michael Holquist (cf. Frank 203).



Insofar as conceptualizations of space and time are subject to historical change and may differ according to cultural context, both extra-literary and literary time-space arrangements are also indicative of larger conceptualizations of world and the discourses that shape such conceptualizations, including epistemological and ontological assumptions that shape a particular worldview as well as scientific, political, social, and cultural discourses: “All the novel’s abstract elements – philosophical and social generalizations, ideas, analyses of cause and effect – gravitate toward the chronotope and through it take on flesh and blood, permitting the imaging power of art to do its work [...]” (250). For Bakhtin, the chronotope is therefore “the basis for a history of the novel connected to broadest changes in the social and material history of Europe” as Simon Dentith suggests (1995: 52) and the basis for a “social and political reading of time and space” as Sue Vice puts it (1997: 209). The chronotope, in other words, is ideally suited as a basis for a discursive- and a reader-oriented model of literary communication.

Although the concept of the chronotope has recently begun to receive an increasing amount of scholarly attention, its potential for conceptualizing processes of aesthetic response and the effects of intertextual practices has not yet been sufficiently explored.²⁴ However, the chronotope seems ideally suited to help us conceptualize the complex juxtaposition and interpenetration of literary and extra-literary time-spaces in processes of readerly meaning-making and literary communication, including the specific ways in which intensive and extensive forms of rewriting rely on a deliberate juxtaposition and interpenetration not just of literary time-spaces and the reader’s extra-literary time-space and ideational horizon, but on the augmentation of this process through the addition of yet another time-space (in the form of a literary chronotope or experiential world that is suspended) to their process of meaning-making. Following Bakhtin, we can indeed conceptualize the complex juxtaposition of experiential, fictional and extra-literary worlds that rewritings perform in terms of a chronotopian model of intertextuality. From this point of view, literary texts are time-spaces (or conceptual worlds) that are in constant dialogue and exchange with their surroundings, including the – potentially – diachronic time-space of the reader. Extensive and intensive forms of rewriting essentially graft such fictional chronotopes onto one another, thus creating a complex textual and cognitive “architecture” that draws attention to its own principles of construction *and* the more general processes of readerly meaning-making it relies upon.²⁵ While each rewriting interacts in individual and specific ways with the respective time-space arrangements and discursive presuppositions of its pre-text, on a shared generic level, we can conceptualize the results of intensive and extensive forms of rewritings in terms of the

²⁴ For example, Kevin Paul Smith uses the concept of “chronotopic intertextuality” to describe intertextual engagements between texts on the level of shared genre characteristics and aspects of setting.

²⁵ I am borrowing the term “architecture” in relation to chronotopian world-making from Babette Tischleder, who has recently described the serial chronotope in terms of “a flexible, yet constitutive, architecture of the mind that is perpetually modified, and extended through narrative repetition and variation” (2017: 122)



creation of an “intertextual chronotope” – in other words, of a time-space arrangement that is characteristic for this particular contemporary genre. Such an intertextual chronotope, then, would be characterized precisely by the complex spatio-temporal “architecture” that is a result of the processes of grafting, interaction, and a permeability of fictional worlds that result from the intertextual strategies employed and the cognitive processes and forms of reader engagement that are encouraged by an intertextual reading of rewritings: an architecture of interpenetrating time-spaces or ‘worlds.’

The intertextual chronotope created by rewritings emphasizes the permeability of fictional worlds as well as the permeability of the boundaries between the fictional and the non-fictional in process of fictional world-building, meaning-making, and the creation of structures of negativity. If recognized as such, an intertextual time-space involves the reader in a permanent cognitive crossing of the borders constituted by ostensibly discrete worlds or chronotopes and the horizons of expectations that evolve from previous readings and knowledge of fictional and non-fictional worlds. Rather than performing a continuous process of “adding” and “layer[ing]” that accounts for the complexity of what Tischleder describes as the “serial chronotope” (2017: 121), the practice of rewriting establishes an intertextual chronotope that *also* engages in an adding and layering over time that aims at rendering the reader’s conceptualization of (fictional) world(s) more complex, but for which it is even more characteristic to juxtapose and deliberately “grate” different ideational horizons that challenge one another.²⁶ Rewritings can be understood as a specific form of seriality – one that most often aims at destabilizing the ontological and ideological premises of the pre-textual world. The process of grafting time-spaces and the interpenetration of different chronotopes that is typical for the intertextual chronotope can therefore make conceptual edifices, discrete worlds, and discrete world views instable and porous by re-configuring and restructuring them. The structure established is not a unitary “building” informed by a uniform albeit highly complex “architecture,” but a bricolage that emphasizes the processual nature, interminability, and the very necessity for an inconclusiveness of conceptual world-making.²⁷ Conceptually, the intertextual chronotope constitutes a time-space arrangement that foregrounds and displays the concept’s principles as envisioned by Bakhtin in terms of the permeability of the borders between different – fictional and extra-literary – time-spaces and the idea of a continuous, mutual, and interminable dialogue between them.

²⁶ However, the differences between a (prototypical) serial chronotope and intertextual one seems to be one of emphasis and degree.

²⁷ See Ishmael’s conceptualization of a work of art as unfinished and open in Sena Jeter Naslund’s *Ahab’s Wife*: “‘Think of the mighty Cathedral of Cologne,’ he said, ‘left with the crane still standing upon the top of the uncompleted tower. [...] Think of the Cathedral of Chartres. Think of its two towers. They do not match at all. Built perhaps a century apart, or more; but without both spires, our Chartres would not be Chartres. [...] Small erections may be finished by their first architects; grand ones, true ones, ever leave the finishing to posterity’” (1999: 663). Ishmael implicitly envisions pre-text and spinoff in terms of the two towers of the Cathedral at Chartres: parts of a whole that jar and do not match and that were built by different architects and at different times.



Finally, Bakhtin's suggestion that fictional time-space arrangements are historically and culturally specific and relate to extra-literary chronotopes in a process of "uninterrupted exchange" raises the question why this particular chronotope constitutes such a remarkable presence from the late 20th to the early 21st centuries.²⁸ I would like to conclude, then, with some suggestions on how the intertextual chronotope responds/enters into a dialogue with our own time-space arrangements. By "importing" the pre-text into the rewriting's process of meaning making as a second experiential reality that is temporarily suspended, the intertextual chronotope emphasizes the simultaneity of the historically divergent, the afterlife and continuous impact of the stories we tell, and the necessity to engage with these stories as a life-giving principle of transformation. The migration of transfictional characters from one text and literary time-space to another serves as a metaphor and a powerful reminder for the necessity to keep fictional and conceptual borders permeable because their closure fixes the imagined community within the narcissistic fiction of a stable and self-contained world that denies interrelations and interconnections and threatens to stifle the imagined community through self-inflicted isolationism and stasis. The cultural commons that is at stake in current copyright laws, and that contemporary rewritings powerfully assert, draws attention to the dangers and insufficiencies of quasi-"feudal" forms of ownership (Lessig 2004: xvi) and discrete boundaries in a world that is globally connected in the dangers, challenges, and possibilities that mark the contemporary moment. The intertextual chronotope therefore emphasizes the need to keep our self-constituting stories and constructions of the "imagined community" (Anderson) permeable and in flux, that is, in constant contestation and renegotiation, by drawing attention to the dangerous implications of "bounding" our imagination at a moment when global interdependencies are becoming more apparent than ever.

WORKS CITED

- Allen G., 2000, *Intertextuality*, Routledge, London.
Anderson B., 1983, *Imagined Communities*, Rev. Ed., Verso, London.
Ashcroft B., G. Griffiths and H. Tiffin, [1989] 1994, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*, Routledge, London.
Bakhtin M.M., [1975] 2006, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel", in Id., *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist, ed. M. Holquist, U of Texas P, Austin, pp. 84-258.
Boyle J., 2008, *The Public Domain: Enclosing the Commons of the Mind*, Yale UP, New Haven.
Brooks G., 2005, *March*, Viking, New York.
Carey P., [1997] 1999, *Jack Maggs*, Vintage-Random, New York.

²⁸ Bakhtin suggests the existence of characteristic time-spaces for individual literary genres at particular moments of literary history which are in dialogue with extra-textual time-spaces – namely the discursive make-up of the extra-literary world.



- Certeau, M. de., 1984, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. S.F. Rendall, U of California P, Berkeley.
- Coetzee J.M., [1986] 2010, *Foe*, Penguin, London.
- Conde M., [1995] 2003, *Windward Heights*, trans. R. Philcox, Soho, New York.
- Conroy P., 2009, *Declaration of Pat Conroy*, 11.04.2001, "Suntrust V. Houghton Mifflin Company Court Papers",
<http://www.houghtonmifflinbooks.com/features/randall_url/pdf/Declaration_Pat_Conroy.pdf> (2 August 2017).
- Dentith S., 1995, *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*, Routledge, Oxon and New York.
- Eco U., [2002] 2006, "Intertextual Irony and Levels of Reading", in Id., *On Literature*, transl. M. McLaughlin, Vintage-Random, London, pp. 212-235.
- Fluck W., 2000, "The Search for Distance: Negation and Negativity in Wolfgang Iser's Literary Theory", *New Literary History* 31:1, pp. 175-210.
- Frank M.C. and K. Mahlke, 2008, "Nachwort", in M. Bakhtin, 1975, *Chronotopos*, trans. M. Dewey, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt a.M.
- Frow J., 2006, *Genre*, Routledge, London.
- Gabriel G., 1975, *Fiktion und Wahrheit. Eine semantische Theorie der Literatur*, Frommann, Stuttgart.
- Genette G., [1982] 1997, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. C. Newman and C. Doubinsky, U of Nebraska P, Lincoln.
- Heins M. and T. Beckles, 2005, *Will Fair Use Survive? Free Expression in the Age of Copyright Control*, Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law Free Expression Policy Project, <<http://www.fepproject.org/policyreports/WillFairUseSurvive.pdf>> (12 December 2009)
- Hutcheon L., 2006, *A Theory of Adaptation*, Routledge, New York.
- Iser W., [1976] 1978, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*, trans. Routledge & K. Paul, Routledge, London.
- Iser W., [1976] 1984, *Der Akt des Lesens*, 2nd rev. Ed, Fink, München.
- Iser W., 2006, "Reception Theory: Iser", in Id., *How to Do Theory*, Blackwell, Malden, pp. 57-69.
- Iser W., 1989, *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*, Johns Hopkins UP, Baltimore.
- Jenkins H., 1992, *Textual Poachers: Television Fans & Participatory Culture*, Routledge, New York.
- Jones L., [2006] 2008, *Mr Pip*, Dial-Random House, New York.
- Kristeva J., [1967] 1980a, "Word, Dialogue, Novel", in Id., 1977, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, Trans. L.S. Roudiez., Columbia UP, New York, pp. 64-91.
- Kristeva J., [1968] 1971, "Probleme der Textstruktur", Trans. I. and J. Rehbein, *Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* II.2., ed. J. Ihwe, Athenäum, Frankfurt a. M., pp. 484-507.



- Kristeva J., [1969] 1980b, "The Bounded Text", in Id., 1977, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, trans. L.S. Roudiez, Columbia UP, New York, pp. 36-64.
- Lessig L., 2004, *Free Culture: The Nature and Future of Creativity*, Penguin, New York.
- Lobsien E., 1975, *Theorie literarischer Illusionsbildung*, Metzler, Stuttgart.
- Mitchell M., [1936] 2007, *Gone with the Wind*, Scribner, New York.
- Moraru C., 2001, *Rewriting: Postmodern Narrative and Cultural Critique in the Age of Cloning*, State U of New York P, Albany.
- Naslund S. J., 1999, *Ahab's Wife or, The Star-Gazer*, Morrow, New York.
- Orr M., 2003, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*, Polity, Cambridge.
- Pfister M., 1985, "Konzepte der Intertextualität", in U. Broich and M. Pfister (eds.), *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, Niemeyer, Tübingen, pp. 1-30.
- Randall A., 2001, *The Wind Done Gone*, Houghton, New York.
- Rawles N., 2005, *My Jim*, Three Rivers, New York.
- Rhys J., [1966] 1999, *Wide Sargasso Sea*, ed. J.L. Raiskin, Norton, New York.
- Rich A., 1979, "When the Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision", in Id., *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978*, Norton, New York, pp. 33-49.
- Sanders J., 2006, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, Routledge, London.
- Schiff J.A., 1992, *Updike's Version: Rewriting The Scarlet Letter*, U of Missouri P, Columbia.
- Smith K.P., 2007, *The Postmodern Fairytale: Folkloric Intertexts in Contemporary Fiction*, Palgrave/Macmillan, Basingstoke and New York.
- Spengler B., 2011, "Geiselnahme, Schwarzfahren oder einfach nur Trampen? *Literary Spinoffs*, Originalität und geistiges Eigentum", in J. Bung, M.-C. Gruber and S. Kühn (eds.), *Plagiate. Fälschungen, Imitate und andere Strategien aus zweiter Hand*, trafo, Berlin, pp. 139-156.
- Spengler B., 2015, *Literary Spinoffs: Rewriting the Classics – Re-Imagining the Community*, Campus, Frankfurt am Main.
- Still J. and M. Worton, 1990, "Introduction", in M. Worton and J. Still (eds.), *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*, Manchester UP, Manchester, pp. 1-44.
- Tennant E., [1989] 2011, *Two Women of London*, Faber, London.
- Tischleder B.B., 2017, "Thickening Seriality: A Chronotopic View of World Building in Contemporary Television Narrative", *The Velvet Light Trap* 79, pp. 120-125.
- Tompkins J., 1985, *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860*, OUP, New York.
- Vice S., 1997, *Introducing Bakhtin*, Manchester UP, Manchester and New York.
- Warner M., [1992] 1993, *Indigo*, Vintage-Random, London.
- Widdowson P., 2006, "'Writing Back': Contemporary Re-Visionary Fiction", *Textual Practice* 20:3, pp. 491-507.



Birgit Spengler teaches American Studies at the University of Bonn, Germany. Her publications include *Vision, Gender, and Power in Nineteenth-Century American Women's Writing, 1860-1900* (Winter, 2008) and *Literary Spinoffs: Rewriting the Classics – Re-Imagining the Community* (Campus, 2015). Her current research focuses on the articulation of states of exception, bare life, and precarious being in contemporary literature and media as well as on time-space arrangements and conceptualizations of mobility in contemporary cultural forms.

bspengle@uni-bonn.de