

Seven types of intertextuality

ROBERT S. MIOLA

This chapter is an attempt to map out some complex territory - namely, the range of intertextual transactions evident in early modern literature, especially Shakespeare. Here the term 'intertextuality' encompasses the widest possible range of textual interactions including those of sources and influences. The focus is on distinct and separate texts interacting, rather than on collaborations, different voices in the same text, or purely linguistic expressions, such as puns, homophones, foreign words and phrases, phonemes, and etymological play. Heinrich Plett distinguishes between this broad understanding of intertextuality and the highly specialized usage of Kristeva, Barthes, and Derrida that excludes varieties of conscious and unconscious imitation from consideration.¹ Based on assumptions about language and meaning that seem increasingly untenable, the post-structuralist approach fails to address the most prevalent intertextual relationships in the period. These relationships occupy this preliminary exercise in distinction.

We may distinguish among seven types of intertextuality, though this number is open to reduction or addition. These seven types divide into three categories. Unequally present in the types and categories are three variables: first, the degree to which the trace of an earlier text is tagged by verbal echo; second, the degree to which its effect relies on audience recognition; third, the degree to which the appropriation is eristic. The distinctions between types and those between categories are not absolute and exclusive; rather these divisions all appear on a continuum with various shadings and overlappings. The continuum moves from closest approximations to ever freer adumbrations, from conscious, positivistic, and author-directed imitations, through more distant and subtle evocations, to, finally, intertextualities that exist in discourses created by the reader, rather than the writer.

Category I

This category comprises specific books or texts mediated directly through the author. Revision, translation, quotation, allusion, sources, conventionally understood, an author's earlier work - all belong here. Largely the dynamic consists of authorial reading and remembering, though performances count too (as a kind of reading) and the memory may be subconscious rather than conscious and purposeful. Emrys Jones, for example, well demonstrated the shaping influence of Mystery Play cycles on Shakespeare's histories and tragedies.² The evidence for textual transactions in Category I has largely been the identification of verbal iteration or echo (those endless and often disappointing lists of parallel passages) though there are verbal possibilities in matching concatenations as well, in lexical or imagistic patterns.³ There is also non-verbal evidence available in scenic form, rhetorical and stylistic figuration, and thematic articulation.

Type 1: Revision

This type of intertextuality features a close relationship between anterior and posterior texts, wherein the latter takes identity from the former, even as it departs from it. The process occurs under the guiding and explicitly comparative eye of the revising author. The revision may be prompted by external circumstance - censorship, or theatrical, legal, or material exigencies. Alternatively, the revision may simply reflect an author's subsequent wishes. The reviser who is not the author presents another scenario and an entirely different set of problems and considerations. In all cases, however, the transaction is linear, conscious, and specific, marked by evidence of the reviser's preference and intentionality.

Modern editors disagree about the legitimacy of revision prompted by external circumstance. The editors of the Oxford Shakespeare, for example, noted that Shakespeare changed the name of Oldcastle to Falstaff in response to protests from Oldcastle's descendants; they restored the name Oldcastle in *1 Henry IV*, rejecting a change that resulted from 'unsolicited censorship' and which did not reflect original authorial intention or initial stage practice.⁴ Editors who define the text more as a product of cultural and social factors than as individual property necessarily place less emphasis on authorial intention as a criterion of textual authenticity. They tend to view external factors as legitimate co-creators of the historical artefact that comes down to us as text. For them, Falstaff will always be Falstaff.

Editors have by and large approved authorial revision that appears to be unconstrained by external factors, that presumably reflects subsequent intentions. Normally, readers respect an author's right to second thoughts. But this sort of revision has also become vexed and problematic. For one thing,

audiences several hundred years distant can never be sure that second thoughts have come freely bidden by the promptings of the Muse, untinged by circumstance, exigency, or accident. Printed texts in the period differ from each other for all sorts of reasons. Early modern plays, for example, arise from various kinds of copytexts, sometimes marked by collaborating authors, actors, scribes, and bookkeepers, always produced by composers, printers, and proofreaders. Folio *King Lear* (1623) cuts some three hundred lines from the earlier Quarto version (1608) and adds one hundred new ones. The later version probably represents a theatrical revision but no one can be sure that Shakespeare alone was the reviser and that no external factors prompted the changes. Ben Jonson's revision of *Every Man in His Humour* provides another interesting case: the Quarto (1601) features a Florentine setting and characters with Italian names; the Folio (1616) features a London setting and English character names, along with many additions and deletions. Editors and critics have been nearly unanimous in approving the revision, and consequently it has dominated critical and theatrical history. They have assumed that the author controls the text and that revision brings it to ontological and aesthetic completion. But this assumption falsifies literary history. The Quarto represents the version staged by the Lord Chamberlain's Men for 1598 audiences at The Curtain; its Italian setting, satire on duelling, tobacco, and sonnetting, and abiding concern with the art of poesy perfectly fitted its original moment at the end of the century. The Folio version takes advantage of later developments in city comedy and inaugurates Jonson's monumental construction of himself and his career in a collection of works. Each text appeared in specific form at a specific time for specific reasons. Furthermore, one scholar has recently argued that certain Folio alterations in the play, namely the cuts in the fifth act, resulted from material circumstances: Jonson and the printer had set aside six quires for the play and simply ran out of room.⁵ The intertextual relationship between a text and a revised version is always more complex than the regnant critical assumptions allow.

Revision of a work by another represents a very different scenario. Readers tend to view this sort of revision as illegitimate interference. (Witness the disrepute of the allied terms - piracy, plagiarism, disintegrationism.) So too authors, sometimes with very good reason. Robert Persons, SJ, for example, was shocked to find his devotional book *The First Book of the Christian Exercise* (1582), 'Perused' and republished by a Yorkshire minister, Edmund Bunny. Bunny kept the title and most of the text but excised Catholic materials and altered the language to fit Protestant orthodoxy. In 1584 and in subsequent editions, Persons responded in a 'Preface' which listed Bunny's 'shifts, and fallacies, and other abuses' (*The Christian Directory*, 1607, sig. *3). The problem is not merely one man's dishonesty, Persons, explained, but heresy, and its general tendency to corrupt books of devotion. Persons cites similar injuries to

the works of Thomas à Kempis, St Augustine, St Bernard, and, of course, the corruptions and falsifications of Holy Scripture perpetrated by Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and others.

In the less exalted precincts of the theatre, Elizabethans frequently collaborated in various ways. And though publication was a secondary concern at best, many today still cherish the ideal of the single, unified author(ity) who produces a text. Critical favour has now shifted toward the A-text of Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, now thought to be closer to Marlowe's original manuscript, and away from the B-text, which represents a mix of authorial and theatrical provenances, and which contains additions by several later playwrights. If the chronological distance between the texts is great, then the second text takes life as an adaptation. Adaptations are literary progeny that bear direct and immediate descent from original texts and that exist in a very conscious counterpoise of tribute and criticism. Shakespeare's plays have sustained adaptations by many, including Dryden, Garrick, Cibber, and Tate, as well as the recent radical revisions of Kurosawa and Marowitz. In these transactions the reviser appropriates the authority of the author, and assumes control of the text. If an author's revision of his or her own work asserts his or her power and domination, then the reviser of another's work enacts a rebellion and usurpation.

Type 2: Translation

Translation transfers, 'carries across', a text into a different language, recreates it anew. The later text explicitly claims the identity of the original, its chief project an etiological journey to itself, or to a version of itself. Translations are generally grouped according to source language, and judged by standards of 'fidelity', i. e., the closeness of the rendering to the original and the success of the translator in representing the original's literary quality and effects.

But the usual distinctions among translation verbatim, paraphrase, and metaphrase, deflect attention from the real difficulty inherent in this type of intertextuality - namely the unbridgeable cultural and linguistic spaces between languages and cultures. Translations from Greek or Latin best illustrate this difficulty, where it has been called the problem of belatedness. The consequent varieties of estrangement, linguistic and cultural, Thomas M. Greene has helpfully gathered together under the rubric 'Historical Solitude', 'the disquiet stemming from the historicity of the signifier', the sense of pathos and irrecoverable loss in confrontation with classical antiquity.⁶ Chapman's *Iliad* provides an interesting example here, especially as the translator repeatedly claims (in commentary and prefatory materials) to have caught the true sense and spirit of Homer (even reporting later on in *Euthymiae Raptus* a Homeric bardophany). The change from Homeric biology and religion to humoural anatomy and Reformation belief effects pervasive reimagining:

untranslatable terms such as *phrenes*, *thumos*, and *Hades* become, for example, 'wits', 'heart', and 'hell', respectively, each betokening different values in a different physical and moral universe.

Despite its claims, every line of Chapman's great work, informed by linguistic and cultural change, transforms the original Greek.⁷ Homer, for example, uses the same Greek verse for the important deaths of Patroclus and Hector; the *psuchê* of each flies from the body, *hon potmon gooosa, lipous' androtêta kai hêbên*, 'lamenting its fate, leaving behind manhood and youth' (8.857, 22.363). Homer's *psuchê*, perhaps deriving from a word for breath, sometimes vanishing like smoke sometimes appearing with wings, begins its own lament; the participle deriving from *goân*, expresses private sorrow and communal grief. The *psuchê* mourns *potmon*, one's fate, what befalls people, one of those huge abstractions that negate human life; the lament asserts the value of those who belong to generations that go to the earth like so many leaves. Chapman portrays a different drama, the soul of Patroclus, 'sorrowing / For his sad fate, to leave him young and in his ablest age'; that of Hector, 'mourning his destinies, / To part so with his youth and strength'. *Psuchê* changes to 'soul', a word freighted with Biblical overtones and two millennia of intense discussion. The infinitive constructions and personal possessive pronouns present the drama of individual deaths, not the sad fate of all mortals. To varying extents all translations exhibit this kind of intertextual impossibility.

Type 3: Quotation

Quotation literally reproduces the anterior text (whole or part) in a later text. (For general purposes of description, we may view textual allusions as a types of quotation, in effect, quotation without verbal iteration, quotation as reference not re-enactment.) Quotations may be variously marked for reader recognition, by typographical signals, by a switch in language, for example, or by the actual identification of the original author or text: Holofernes remembers a school text, Mantuan's *Eclogues*: '*Fauste, precor gelida quando pecus omne sub umbra ruminat*, and so forth. Ah, good old Mantuan!' (*LLL* 4.2.91-3). Sometimes authors simply weave quotations into the new context: Hamlet's 'Come, the croaking raven doth bellow for revenge' (3.2.251-2) combines two lines from *The True Tragedy of Richard III* (1594). Readers might analyse quotations in early modern texts grammatically, according to quantity, quality, distribution, frequency, interference, and markers, and pragmatically according to sender, receiver, code, place, time, medium, and function. Critics might also assess the degrees to which audience recognition is assumed or necessary (though this is often difficult). 'Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?' (*AYL* 3.5.82), for example, seems consciously designed to evoke a popular text, perhaps, or poet, Christopher Marlowe. Pistol's 'Have we not Hiren here?' (*2H4* 2.4.159) replays a tag line bandied about in the drama. An interesting

problem arises with such lines and very familiar phrases. If audience recognition is clearly indicated, as with Pistol's verse here or, for that matter, any parody, then our assumptions about familiarity with the main text may begin paradoxically to reverse themselves. The reputation of certain lines and fragments (this one from Pistol or 'O eyes, no eyes, but fountains fraught with tears' from *The Spanish Tragedy* 3.2.1) took on a life of their own separate from original contexts. They may be merely stock jokes rather than fragments of well-known texts. Proverbs, verses from ballads and songs, isolated lines, then, often merely trade in common linguistic currency. In our day, for example, recitation of the catch-phrase 'To be or not to be' does not necessarily indicate familiarity with the original context or play.

Whatever categories one employs, criticism might well consider a quotation's evocative value in context. Titus quotes Ovid, *Terras Astraea reliquit* (4.3.4), 'Astraea has left the earth', in a play replete with Ovidian allusion, one which features the *Metamorphoses* as an important prop on stage, which replays in sophisticated fashion the myths of Philomel, Procne, and Tereus, as well as the myth of the world's Four Ages.⁸ The quotation consciously evokes classical myth to portray the absence of divine order and justice in the corrupt world. Sometimes the power of the evocation becomes clear only in association with other quotations. Quotations from Seneca *tragicus* gradually yield to quotations from his philosophical essays in Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* thus marking a shift in standards of judgement.

Quotations often appear as text fragments in later texts that are themselves whole. Other kinds of poetical works in the Renaissance consist almost wholly of quotations, the various centos, chrestomathies, commonplace books, and florilegia so popular in the period. An author like Mirandula (*Illustrium poetarum flores*, Lyons, 1566), for example, arranges quotations from various authors under moral categories such as Anger, Patience, Despair. That anthology of anecdote and wise saying, William Baldwin's *A Treatise of Moral Philosophy* (1547) enjoyed many reprints and expansion throughout the period. In such works the quotations entirely comprise the new text; they are completely decontextualized and exist now in a new dialogue with each other, the boundaries of which have been determined by the compiler. Erasmus's great *Adagia* presents a sophisticated and interesting variation on this kind of quotation intertextuality; this collection glosses Greek and Latin proverbs with thousands of ancient references and quotations.

The name of Erasmus provides transport into the regions of scholarly rather than literary intertextualities. The great scholars and editors of the early modern period applied immense learning to the elucidation of texts. This application often took the form of quotation and allusion in commentary, marginalia, or notes. Sometimes an editor makes explicit what is implicit in a text; a great Renaissance edition of Virgil (*Opera*, Venice, 1544, for example),

provides illustrative passages from Homer and other Greek as well as Latin writers. Sometimes the commentary more actively shapes interpretation; the German Jesuit Spanmüller (Jacobus Pontanus) published a Virgil bedecked with detailed moral, allegorical, and symbolic commentary, *Symbolarum libri XVII Vergilii* (Augsburg, 1599). The scholarly practice of parallel citation, reference, and glossing, so important to quotation intertextuality in the period, sometimes carried back over into original compositions. Early modern authors used these practices to create their texts: Spenser published the glosses of 'E. K.' on *The Shepherd's Calendar*, for example; Jonson supplied explanatory and erudite notes to *The Masque of Queens*. These complex polyphonies represent an important subdivision of quotation intertextuality.

Type 4: Sources

Source texts provide plot, character, idea, language, or style to later texts. The author's reading and remembering directs the transaction, which may include complicated strategies of *imitatio*. The source text in various ways shapes the later text, its content, or its rhetorical style and form. There are at least three subdivisions possible here.

The source coincident. Here the earlier text exists as a whole in dynamic tension with the later one, a part of its identity. The later one may simply respond to an earlier one: Raleigh writes a famous reply to Marlowe's *Passionate Shepherd*, for example. Gabriel Harvey and Thomas Nashe engage in a pamphlet war. The serious literature of controversy, political and religious, employs extensive quotation and reference so that the originating text and present response take on a new identity. Thomas More's *The Confutation of Tyndale's Answer*, for example, quotes Tyndale in block before offering a point-by-point refutation. Additionally, a later text may complete an earlier one. Both George Chapman and Henry Petowe published continuations of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* in 1598. In all cases of this sort, knowledge of the earlier is necessary for understanding of the later; the relationship is based on parity and recognition as the two assume a kind of corporate identity.

The source proximate. This is the most familiar and frequently studied kind of intertextuality, that of sources and texts. The source functions as the book-on-the-desk; the author honors, reshapes, steals, ransacks, and plunders. The dynamics include copying, paraphrase, compression, conflation, expansion, omission, innovation, transference, and contradiction.

Shakespeare's use of North's Plutarch in *Julius Caesar* provides a good example of a proximate source. There are numerous verbal and non-verbal markers identifying the primary source of the play, though no stage moment requires this identification for effect. Earlier critics such as Nicholas Rowe and Samuel Johnson thought Shakespeare's reliance on the source excessive and detrimental to the action. Later generations, perhaps spurred by MacCallum, focus on

Shakespeare's creative departures from Plutarch, his aggressive reworking of historical narrative into tragic drama.⁹ These include innovation (Casca, the quarrel scene, the character of Lucius), omission (most of Caesar's early career), transference - the switching of characters and reattribution of personal traits: Plutarch's Caesar suspects both Brutus and Cassius, not just Cassius; the conflict about leading the right wing actually occurs between Brutus and Cassius, not Antony and Octavius (5.1.16-20), where it foreshadows future discord and Antony's eventual fall. And Shakespeare contradicts the source outright: Plutarch's Brutus visits Caius Ligarius, whereas Shakespeare's receives him; Plutarch's Caesar is a powerful swimmer whereas Cassius's Caesar in the play almost drowns; Plutarch's Caesar cannot read Artemidorus' warning because of the crowd; Shakespeare's, in a significantly self-conscious gesture of largesse, refuses to consider it: "What touches us ourself shall be last served" (3.1.8). Even in a closely followed source, there appears an interesting range of intertextual dynamics.

The source remote. This last term includes all sources and influences that are not clearly marked, or that do not coincide with the book-on-the-desk model. The field of possibilities here widens to include all that an author previously knew or read: grammar-school texts, classical stories and authors, the Bible, evident in allusions, turns of phrase, or reappropriated motifs. The dynamic still consists of reading and remembering, even if the process of recollection and rearticulation occurs in the subconscious mind of the author. Remote sources often include the work of particularly original, earlier playwrights: Thomas Kyd, for example, who readapted Senecan conventions to the Elizabethan stage; Christopher Marlowe, who served as *agent provocateur* for early Shakespeare, as Nicholas Brooke put it;¹⁰ John Lyly who created brilliant English comedies of rhetorical wit and love. Ovid, and Virgil appear as remote sources everywhere. Obviously, the calibration of intertextual distance must be to some degree subjective, depending on one's knowledge of a playwright and sense of his working habits and creative processes.

Category II

Category II contains traditions. An originary text radiates its presence through numberless intermediaries and indirect routes - through commentaries, adaptations, translations, and reifications in other works. It exists in combination with other originary texts, largely as a set of inherited expectations, reflexes, and strategies. The source remote does not lie far off from the traditions of Category II. But there is a real distinction between the direct influence of, say, a sixth-form Virgil passage, half-remembered many years later, and the indirect influence of traditions, *in which the originary text may never have ever been read by the author at all.*

Type 5: Conventions and configurations

Poets constantly appropriated and adapted numerous conventions from classical, medieval, and continental literatures, formal and rhetorical. Senecan conventions in tragedy, the chorus, messenger, domina-nutrix dialogue, stichomythia, and soliloquy, for example, have all attracted due attention.¹¹ So have Plautine and Terentian conventions in comedy: eavesdropping, disguise, lock-outs, stock characters like the witty slave, bragging soldier, blocking *senex*, and so on.¹² Configurations of classical character and situation also appear importantly in the drama: Shakespeare adapts the New Comedic triangle consisting of importunate *adulescens*, blocking *senex*, and nubile *virgo* into marvellous, varied, and expressive tensions throughout his career. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* presents a relatively simple adaptation: Egeus blocks Hermia's love for Lysander and commands her to marry Demetrius; the lovers flee into the enchanted forest and the daughter eventually triumphs over her father. More complicated variations appear in the triads of Lear-Cordelia-Burgundy and France, Polonius-Ophelia-Hamlet, Prospero-Miranda-Ferdinand. No single Plautine or Terentian play acts as the 'source' (proximate or remote); instead Shakespeare, like most Elizabethans, reworks inherited traditions, creating various combinations of character, action, and genre. The very stuff and substance of his work ultimately derives, by whatever indirect route, from classical origins, from discrete texts that have now become pervasive presences.

The marvellous outpouring of Italian drama in the cinquecento, itself rooted in classical tragedy, history, romance, and epic, also supplied conventions and configurations, while altering dramatic horizons of expectation and possibility. Louise George Clubb has elegantly and persuasively demonstrated the power and flexibility of theatregrams, the interchangeable 'units, figures, relationships, actions, *topoi*, and framing *patterns* ... that were at once streamlined structures for svelte play making and elements of high specific density, weighty with significance from previous incarnations'.¹³ Once Ariosto, Bibbiena, Machiavelli, and others had written, cross dressings, garrulous nurses, and witty, wondrous women passed permanently into the vocabulary of European theatre. Shakespeare may have read none of these dramatists in Italian or in translation yet he could no more have escaped them in the practice of his craft than moderns can escape Freud or Marx, though only a relatively small percentage of people have actually had direct contact with those seminal thinkers.

Type 6: Genres

Category II intertextuality also includes the wide range of linkings implicit and explicit in generic choices. These may appear in individual signifiers (e.g., the play-within-the-play of revenge tragedy, the singing shepherds in pastoral), which function much like conventions, or range to broader and less discrete forms. On the far end of the spectrum often a sophistication and smoothness

of adaptation makes difficult positive identification of origins: Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* absorbs classical, medieval, and contemporary works into a new creation; Milton yokes and challenges epical and Biblical traditions in *Paradise Lost*. Italian pastoral (and not just *Aminta* and *Il Pastor Fido*) as well as Italian tragicomedy inspire and inflect Renaissance poetry in England and on the continent.¹⁴ Often genres commingle surprisingly.

One Shakespearean example may demonstrate the subtlety and evocative power of generic intertextuality. No one has ever successfully proved that Shakespeare ever read a single line of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*. Yet any reader of Shakespeare's sonnet sequence or *Love's Labour's Lost* recognizes an intimate familiarity with the conventions and genre that Petrarch (along with Dante and others) originated. These conventions and assumptions, in turn, Shakespeare further adapts in *Romeo and Juliet*, where Petrarch is appropriately invoked by Mercutio (2.4.38-40). Romeo in love with Rosaline seems to be conventional Petrarchan lover, full of fanciful and literary paradoxes:

Why, then, O brawling love! O loving hate,
 O anything of nothing first create,
 O heavy lightness, serious vanity,
 Misshapen chaos of well-seeming forms,
 Feather of lead, bright smoke, cold fire, sick health,
 Still-waking sleep, that is not what it is!

(1.1.176-81)

And Romeo, in love with Juliet, appears to outgrow all this. Yet, in the last act we find various Petrarchan images and *topoi* assembling themselves into new paradoxes; in different senses we witness on stage the misshapen chaos of well-seeming forms, the still-waking sleep, that is not what it is. One of the most famous Petrarchan images is the lover as a ship at sea; we recall Petrarch's 189 and Sir Thomas Wyatt's celebrated translation: *Passa la nave mia colma d'oblio / per aspro mare, a mezza notte, il verno*, 'My galley charged with forgetfulness / Thorough sharp seas in winter nights doth pass'; the poem concludes starkly: *Morta fra l'onde e la ragion e l'arte: Tal ch'i' incomincio a disperar del porto*, 'Drowned is the reason that should me comfort, / And I remain despairing of the port.'¹⁵ Romeo uses the same imagery:

Come, bitter conduct, come, unsavory guide,
 Thou desperate pilot, now at once run on
 The dashing rocks thy sea-sick weary bark!

(5.3.116-18)

Instead of the lover desiring a safe port from the seas of unrequited love and suffering, Romeo wants shipwreck. Shakespeare does not transform by some unknown intermediary a specific Petrarchan text or image; rather, here and throughout the last scene, where the lovers unite in death, he transforms the

lyric genre of the *dolce stil novo*, giving it a new shape and name, harnessing Petrarchan energies in service of drama. Overgoing the Petrarchan lover, Romeo is absolute unto death. The lyric becomes subsumed in tragedy.

Category III

In the age of intertextual *écriture*, this last category consists of what any audience brings to a text rather than what the author put in. The focus moves from texts and traditions to the circulation of cultural discourses. Cesare Segre has called this kind of intertextuality, 'interdiscursivity', which he defines as 'i rapporti che ogni testo, orale e scritto, intrattiene con tutti gli enunciati (o discorsi) registrati nella corrispondente cultura e ordinati ideologicamente, oltre che per registri e livelli',¹⁶ 'the relationships that each text, oral and written, holds with all other utterances (or discourses) recorded in a corresponding culture and organized ideologically, according to registers and levels'. This means in practice whatever the literary critic perceives as revelatory of cultural poetics; he or she, not the author, brings the text to the table.

Type 7: Paralogues

Paralogues are texts that illuminate the intellectual, social, theological, or political meanings in other texts. Unlike texts or even traditions, paralogues move horizontally and analogically in discourses rather than in vertical lineation through the author's mind or intention. Today, critics can adduce any contemporary text in conjunction with another, without bothering at all about verbal echo, or even imprecise lines of filiation. In some ways the discussion of paralogues departs from past critical practices, bringing new freedom; but, of course, new perils threaten: rampant and irresponsible association, facile cultural generalization, and anecdotal, impressionistic historicizing. Though some would not care to admit it, the practice of adducing paralogues is not new. E. M. W. Tillyard's citations to Richard Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* and Dionysius the Areopagite's treatise on celestial hierarchies function intertextually as do post-structuralist citations of the *hic mulier* pamphlets as background to the gender play of early modern literature. The same holds true for modern uses of *The Return of Martin Guerre*, the rhetoric of Elizabeth or James I, or the documents of colonial discourse, though now moderns tend to see literary texts as contested sites, rather than as self-contained, discursively significant wholes.

This chapter does not propose an inclusive system but attempts to make some sense of a joyful abundance. The new millennium will doubtless disclose new types of intertextuality to add to this preliminary listing. Some already clamor for attention. *Onomastic intertextuality*, for example, may include the range of allusion, reference, and significance evoked simply by a name,

Theseus, for example, or Helen.¹⁷ *Printing intertextuality* can signify the accidental inclusion of one text in another during the printing process. Randall McCleod, for example, notes an advertisement for Peacham's soap transferred accidentally to a George Herbert text (private correspondence). *Reception intertextuality* may reverse the chronological axes entirely so that later texts can influence the reading and printing of earlier ones. Woodcuts to Italian editions of Virgil, especially Book 6, for example, show the enormous influence of Dante's *Commedia* on conception and understanding of the ancient poet. And, finally, we may consider *forgery*, as a kind of ghostly intertextuality, wherein an anterior text pretends to be an original. Forgery occupies a large role in the literary and cultural history of this period. John Wolfe faked Italian imprints to boost the sale of his books; for the same reason, William Jaggard published in *The Passionate Pilgrim* under the name of William Shakespeare, though the collection included some twenty poems by other poets. Lorenzo Valla momentarily exposed as a fake the *Donation of Constantine*, which gave temporal power to the Church. Antony Grafton, moreover, reminds us of extensive forgeries in Gratian's *Decretum*, in the *Corpus* of Latin inscriptions, and even in Erasmus's work. In forgery there is a complete assumption of identity that denies ontological difference. The text makes an etiological journey to itself, perhaps, in the case of the forgery of a known text at least, the *terminus ab quo*, of Category I, though many other distinctions are possible.

Notes

- 1 Heinrich, F. Plett, ed., *Intertextuality* (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1991), pp. 3-4. See also Michael Riffaterre, 'Syllepsis', *Critical Inquiry*, 6 (1980), 625-38; 'Intertextual Representation: On Mimesis as Interpretive Discourse', *Critical Inquiry*, 11 (1984), 141-62. For a critique of post-structuralist assumptions see Brian Vickers, *Appropriating Shakespeare* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1993).
- 2 Emrys Jones, *The Origins of Shakespeare* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. 31-84. Quotations from Shakespeare below are cited from *The Complete Works*, ed. David Bevington, updated 4th edn (New York, 1997).
- 3 See, for instance Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1935); John W. Velz, 'Sir Thomas More and the Shakespeare Canon: Two Approaches', in T. H. Howard-Hill, ed., *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More'* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 171-95.
- 4 Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, et al., *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1987; New York, 1997), p. 330.
- 5 James A. Riddell, 'Jonson and Stansby and the Revisions of *Every Man in His Humour*', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 9 (1997), 81-91.
- 6 Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1982), pp. 4-27 (p. 8).

- 7 See Robert S. Miola, 'On Death and Dying in Chapman's *Iliad*. Translation as Forgery', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 3 (1996), 48-64.
- 8 Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 101-17.
- 9 M. W. MacCallum, *Shakespeare's Roman Plays and Their Background* (London, 1910).
- 10 Nicholas Brooke, 'Marlowe as Provocative Agent in Shakespeare's Early Comedies', *Shakespeare Survey*, 14 (1961), 34-44; cf. Maurice Charney, 'The Voice of Marlowe's Tamburlaine in Early Shakespeare', *Comparative Drama*, 31 (1997-8), 213-21.
- 11 Gordon Braden, *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition: Anger's Privilege* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1985); Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992).
- 12 Daniel C. Boughner, *The Braggart in Renaissance Comedy* (Minneapolis, Minnesota University Press, 1954); Leo Salingar, *Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1974); Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare and Classical Comedy: The Influence of Plautus and Terence* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994).
- 13 Louise George Clubb, *Italian Drama in Shakespeare's Time* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1989), p. 6.
- 14 See Clubb, *Italian Drama*; Robert Henke, *Pastoral Transformations: Italian Tragicomedy and Shakespeare's Late Plays* (Newark, University of Delaware Press, 1997).
- 15 Francesco Petrarca, *The Canzoniere*, trans. Mark Musa (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1996); Sir Thomas Wyatt, *Collected Poems*, ed. Joost Daalder (London, Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 25.
- 16 Cesare Segre, *Teatro e romanzo: due tipi di comunicazione letteraria* (Turin, Einaudi, 1984), p. 111.
- 17 See Peter Holland, 'Theseus' Shadows in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 47 (1994), 139-51.
- 18 Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1990).

Simple Examples of Intertextuality for a Better Understanding. Oftentimes, we borrow phrases, concepts, or ideas from other works to be reflected in our own. This is called intertextuality. According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, intertextuality means the complex interrelationship between a text and other texts taken as basic to the creation or interpretation of the text. According to *A Glossary of Literary Terms* by M. H. Abrams, intertextuality is used to signify the multiple ways in which any one literary text is made up of other texts, by means of its open or covert citations and allusions, its repetitions and transformations of the formal and substantive features of earlier texts, or simply its unavoidable participation in the common stock. "Intertextuality seems such a useful term because it foregrounds notions of relationality, interconnectedness and interdependence in modern cultural life. In the Postmodern epoch, theorists often claim, it is not possible any longer to speak of originality or the uniqueness of the artistic object, be it a painting or novel, since every artistic object is so clearly assembled from bits and pieces of already existent art." (Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*. "We can distinguish between two types of intertextuality: iterability and presupposition. Iterability refers to the 'repeatability' of certain textual fragments, to citation in its broadest sense to include not only explicit allusions, references, and quotations within a discourse, but also unannounced sources and influences, clichés, phrases in the air, and traditions.