

## **Intertextuality and Intermediality as Cross-cultural Communication Tools: A Critical Inquiry**

Asunción LÓPEZ-VARELA AZCÁRATE

Universidad Complutense Madrid, Asunción

Depto. Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Filología UCM, Madrid 28040

alopezva@filol.ucm.es

**Abstract.** Cross-cultural communication is about generating dialogical positions across cultural barriers. Communication is achieved when participants are able to construct meaning across varied sign systems. Oral communication makes use of a wide range of signs that contribute to make meaning, from eye contact to gestures and speech. In written/printed communication, together with the reproduction of visual images through painting, photography, etc., the most important resource is the textual format. Texts are grounded on a cognitive deictic basis and work alongside the cause-effect relationship that links events in human working memory. This relationship frequently posits a hierarchical dependency between the understanding of visual images, textuality and narrativity. Although texts are vehicles of contextualized information and cultural positions are often presented in a historiographical way, culture is not just about textuality; it is also about multimodality, that is, the use of symbolic forms that employ simultaneously several material-semiotic resources to create a kind of common framework of socially acceptable behaviours and customs which arise both from individual personal experiences and from shared cultural and ethical values. Signs are used to represent these values and, in turn, these representations affect their further emotional interiorization. This creates particular strong moments of remembrance and recollection in human memory. In addition, the production, distribution and reception of culture has always been dependent on changing material formats and technologies, from manuscripts to printed books, from mural painting to photography, and from architecture to virtual recreations on a computer screen. In recent years, the interest in intertextual and intermedial configurations is mostly due to the growth of hypermedia paradigms, and is reflected in the increasing number of disciplinary publications and conferences devoted to the topic. This paper shall explore the reasons behind a renewed interest in intertextual and intermedial manifestations in cross-cultural communication.

**Keywords:** intertextuality, intermediality, cross-cultural communication

### **INTRODUCTION**

Human culture is dependent on masses of signs and shared meanings, inherently social and intersubjective, that is, requiring the consciousness of more than one subject (see López-Varela, 2010 for a broader study). Dur-

ing the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century faster and cheaper international transportation, together with the growth of media technology, has expanded the stream of human signs and meanings into a real surge. In traditional oral cultures, signs and meanings were less easily transported across space and time. Printed formats in the form of manuscripts and books and their translations contributed to moving and re-locating cultural representations to various locations, where they could be interpreted differently. One of the most important effects of the contemporary conversion of analogue into digital formats is precisely the fact that global meanings are placed next to other territorial levels, that is, at the national and community (local) levels. Virtual communities, such as the social networks YouTube and Facebook, create, distribute and receive cultural meanings at a transnational, transterritorial level, that of cyberspace.

Paradoxically, and perhaps also as a consequence, the mobility of information is not always accompanied by an increase in intersubjective, intercultural communication. Many critical voices claim that the exchange of diverse meanings and varied sign systems across the World Wide Web or through the use of modern cell-phones has in fact contributed to the disentanglement of the bonds that have traditionally joined people together and to their communities. As a result of globalization, some traditional value systems as well as customs and habits are disappearing and the fear of losing one's identity is one of the most avidly discussed themes (for a more extensive discussion, see López-Varela, 2006 and 2012b).

For a long time identities, like meanings, were contemplated as contextual, belonging to a specific time and place of production. Nowadays, the perception of contexts shifts from the point of origin and creation to the channels of distribution and reception. As market demands change, so do cultural products, adapting new online selling conditions intended to reach all kinds of consumers. Perceptions and behaviours of communities and individuals no longer hold a relation to their physical, territorial and social contexts. The meanings, values and views, which would find concrete forms of expression in national institutions, community and social relations, shared belief systems, customs and habits, no longer hold. Recent events in nations such as Egypt, Spain and other parts of the world show how the power of social networking, facilitated by the widespread use of the Internet, can shake the long-standing foundations of institutional powers, whether in the case of totalitarian regimes or democratic systems. No meaning is seen as "essential" and immutable. Even individual identity

is now contemplated as a negotiated event, a subject position open to dialogue with others. In Stuart Hall's words, "things and events in the real world do not contain or propose their own integral, single and intrinsic meaning, which is then merely transferred through language. Meaning is a social production, a practice" (Hall, 1982: 67).

In order to measure the scope of cultural change, research could attempt to measure change-patterns across the different levels of intersubjective and intercultural communication: (1) the microenvironment (private spaces: dwelling-places, work spaces, offices, private gardens, etc.); (2) the level of proximate environments (semi-public spaces: blocks of flats and their immediate surroundings, parks, green spaces, etc.); (3) the public environment level, involving both built spaces (villages, towns, cities; for a study of urban environments, see for instance López-Varela and Net, 2009) and the natural environment (the countryside, landscape, etc.); and (4) the level of the global environment (the environment in its totality, both built and natural) that also includes natural resources.

This analysis can take the form of statistical quantitative results, via the measurement of the rate of sign exchanges across a particular environment, for instance. However, these results, which can be extracted almost intuitively by just taking a look at the economical impact of products and services offered through the World Wide Web, yield no real interest to research on the qualitative aspects of interpersonal and intercultural situations. Therefore, given that interacting with and encountering other people is the usual medium for consciousness and that social encounters encourage both personal development and shared cultural knowledge, this paper defends the value of humanistic disciplines in educational spaces as opportunities to reflect on these issues in a self-reflexive (meta-cognitive) way. Disciplines within the social sciences and humanities contemplate history, rituals and other cultural practices from various vantage points; for instance, the arts will explore these issues from the emotional point of view and their capacity to re-create feelings associated, for instance, with particular historical situations; history or anthropology would, however, present the facts, without the emotional colouring. This offers possibilities for making sense of the impact of cultural, or rather intercultural, exchanges in different ways. The discursive and textual patterns of human languages are common to all of these disciplines (unlike the sciences, which generally employ artificial languages such as mathematics or computer codes). As mentioned above, the dependency on discourse posits a

hierarchical dependency upon narrativity and the cause-effect linear patterns of recollection (although forms of episodic memory are also important). This paper will attempt to draw the relationship between some of these issues and the concepts of intertextuality and intermediality in relation to cross-cultural communication. Translation also occupies a central position in intercultural exchanges but its study would fall beyond the scope of this paper.

## THE BASIS OF INTERTEXTUAL STUDIES

In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the study of intertextuality has been contemplated as an open door to the exploration of the negotiation of authorities (roles, hierarchies and value systems) in communication. The term “intertextuality” was coined by Julia Kristeva in *Word, Dialogue, and the Novel* (1967; included in Moi, 1986: 34-61), even if her definition owes much, as Mary Orr (2004) has proved, to the work on “dialogism” developed by Mikhail Bakhtin, who wrote that the text “lives only by coming into contact with another text (with context). Only at this point of contact between texts does a light flash, illuminating both the posterior and the anterior, joining a give text to a dialogue” (Bakhtin, 1986: 162). Some comprehensive reviews of the notion trace its roots to Plato and Aristotle (Worton and Still, 1990).

Literary scholarship on intertextuality has been conducted from a range of perspectives, reflecting the field’s diversity of approaches to the study of language, literature and literacy. The first approaches came from formalism (Brooks, 1971; Wellek and Warren, 1949) and studied the allusions, quotes, references, paraphrases, formulaic expressions, etc., whether explicit or implicit. In some cases, the inclusion of these intertexts supports the authority of the main text. In other cases, as in Joyce’s *Ulysses* (see López-Varela, 2004), intertextuality seeks to question the authority of previous texts in order to establish the new author as a creator in his/her own right, an idea presented by Harold Bloom in *The Anxiety of Influence*. The intertextual phenomenon is thus closely linked to the negotiation of authority and to issues of mediation of values and emotions, and thus of cultural forms. Reference to previous canonical texts helps the author to establish (mediate) his/her own authority. Intertexts (allusions, quotes, references, footnotes, endnotes, annotations on the margins, etc.) can be considered “subtexts,” subordinated, perhaps even marginal, to the central

body of the text, supporting but also sometimes contradicting its authority. Modern complex forms of parodic intertextuality begin to reflect the main cultural concern of our age: the problem of communication (and meaning), connection, negotiation and mediation.

The spread of these interpretations of the concept of intertextuality had a serious impact on theories of the production, existence, structure, meaning, function and reception of texts, which began to be seen not just as representations, but as mediators in the semiotic construction of reality through their previous textualizations and intertextual connections. A re-examination of the affiliations of literary works belonging to different periods, cultural spaces and genres in different socio-cultural, linguistic-ideological and aesthetic contexts began to take place for, as Plottel and Charney note, “Interpretation is shaped by a complex of relations between the text, the reader, reading, writing, printing, publishing and history: the history that is inscribed in the language of the text and in the history that is carried in the reader’s reading. Such a history is given a name: intertextuality” (Plottel and Charney, 1978: xix-xx).

The increasing influence of cultural aspects on semiotic studies also contributed to strengthen the orientation towards cases where textual boundaries or frames are broken or made to overlap, and where textual information is re-semanticized or non-textual information is “textualized” (Orr, 2004: 814; see also Iser, 1989: 3-30 and 197-284). For Genette, the paratext “constitutes a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of *transaction*” (Genette, 1997b: 2), a definition he extends to cover quotation, plagiarism, allusion (topos, citation, allusion, paraphrase, imitation, translation, parody, travesty, pastiche and others) etc., pointing towards the cultural background behind the text: “the perception, by the reader, of the relationship between a work and others that have either preceded or followed it” (Genette, 1997a: 2). Riffaterre (1978) focuses on intertextuality as a “doubling” or syllepsis, that is, the use of a single construction that has two syntactic functions, and a theory of intertextuality as a riddle, explains Orr (2004: 39). Kristeva’s definition of intertextuality is broader, situated by H. F. Plett (1991) among “progressive intertextualists,” and advancing, as Orr has noted “a theory of *translinguistic* and transformative operations at work in any cultural transfer” (Orr, 2004: 27).

The word as a minimal textual unit thus turns out to occupy the status of mediator, linking structural models of cultural (historical) environment, as well as that of *regulator*, controlling mutations from diachrony to synchrony,

i.e. to literary structure. The word is spatialized: through the very notion of status, it functions in three dimensions (subject-addressee-context) as a set of *dialogical*, semic elements or as a set of *ambivalent* elements. Consequently the task of literary semiotics is to discover other formalisms corresponding to different modalities of word-joining (sequences) within the dialogical space of texts (Kristeva, 1969: 85, qtd. in Moi 1986: 37).

Inherent in the notion of competing ways of using discourse is the belief that discourse is never neutral and embodies ideologies or points of view “not only about the world to which it refers but toward the use of the mind with respect of this world” (Brunner, 1986: 121), ideologies that Bakhtin termed “voices.” As people act and react to each other, they use language and other semiotic systems to make meaning, to constitute social relationships and to take future action. By analysing these voices or verbal-ideological perspectives within texts, we approach an understanding of the relations between texts and subjectivities.

Also implicit in this analysis is the notion that subjectivity is multiple and exists in relation to other subjectivities, within or through a complex phenomenology of self-other relations. In terms of reader-response criticism what this means is that discourse as an act of intervention seeking to create a performative (emotional/cathartic) response in the audience (see studies by Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). The move away from the author as creator toward the multivocality of texts did not deny that the author played a role in the text amalgamation, but did move the ownership of the text and the location of meaning into the hands of those who encountered it. Digitalization has re-moved it yet again into the hands of those who distribute and receive it.

Bakhtin’s notion of the individual author is not that of an individual subjectivity, but a complex dialectical construction that involves participation in a variety of discourse communities; that is, the author is a multidimensional space through which the utterances of others speak. It involves the recognition of interactional factors within textuality, acknowledging its social and cultural significance. As people’s “voices” change, so do their ways of viewing the world, along with their personal and social identities. This approach allows the characterization of people’s actions as consequences of language systems, that is, systems for making meaning and taking social action through discourse. Therefore, it is inherently dialogic, as Bakhtin has announced. Events and meanings are more than cognitive constructs, located not just in people’s minds but also in the events them-

selves. Thus, Fairclough's (1992) formulation speaks of "interdiscursivity," a term already employed by Marc Angenot (1983) and his follower Donald Bruce (1995), which covers the appropriation of discursive frames as well as the texts themselves.

Texts are also open to re-contextualization and translation, operations that, as Mary Orr (2004) has indicated, may well be taken as forming part of tacit agendas behind intertextuality's representations. Umberto Eco's *Mouse or Rat* is about a series of negotiations the translator has to go through in order to transfer such a dialogical understanding across texts in different languages (Eco, 2005: 212-235). Eco's various levels of intentionality, *intentio auctoris*, *intentio operis*, *intentio lectoris* and *intentio intertextualis* (Eco, 2005: 121), include conscious direct intertextuality, subconscious intertextuality and cultural intertextuality in his study of the relationship between Joyce's and Borges' works, and shows how ideology and cultural values are part of the dialogical intertextual process at the intrapersonal, interpersonal and mass media levels of communication. Textual elements and texts necessarily presuppose other texts, refer to them, repeat and transform them, and would lack the ability to convey meaning without doing so, or would convey far less. That is to say, all texts are uttered in multiple voices in response to multiple voices and in anticipation of polyvocal responses.

This view of language as dialogical action is naturally *materially* realized, whether in face-to-face conversation, where actions are made known through contextualization cues (Gumperz, 1986), that is, verbal registers, non-verbal signs (gestures, postures, etc.), prosodic signals (intonation patterns, volume, stress patterns, etc.), or in writing. Negotiating meaning in a written text includes negotiating contested authorial voices and, as we indicated above, this can be done through intertextual uses. Thus, the written text can become a contextualization cue in itself; an artefact for cross-cultural negotiations. Furthermore, this view in which "language and interaction are seen as having a material basis, transformation of events and of the people located in those events involves a transformation of the material nature of the events" (Bloome and Egan-Robertson, 2004: 28), traces its roots to Volosinov's work and Marx's philosophy of historical materialism, where the artefacts humans construct, and this includes texts, can be related to each other in a local event, thus constituting the cultural ideology of that event. Following this approach, Bloome and Egan-Robertson (1993) describe a "text" as being constructed through the

process of “textualizing,” whereby people make the phenomena of their lived experiences part of the language system and therefore a socio-cultural construct and, thus, an important cross-cultural tool (see also Wells, 1999). In this way, intertextual routines, such as the repetition or echoing of words and phrases in the classroom, can be considered an intrinsic part of production, comprehension and interaction dialogue, constituting an important text-building strategy that creates a shared universe of discourse and transfers textual historical memory across generations and cultures and, as defended in this paper, through the relevant role of institutional processes, particularly those found in education and media communication. Wells (1999) explains that to be literate is to have the disposition – as a composer in writing or an interpreter in reading – to engage with a text in various modes depending on the genre involved and one’s purpose in using the text. Among the five modes of textual engagement outlined by Wells, the informational, the recreational and the epistemic would roughly correspond to Halliday’s semantic model, which distinguished thematic content (ideational or experiential meta-function), the attitude of the speaker towards his/her audience, bearing in mind the specificity of the community (interpersonal meta-function) and, finally, the resources for giving the text coherence, structure and texture (textual meta-function) (see Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004).

According to Lemke (2004), the intertexts of a text are all the other texts that are used to make sense of it, some of which share the same thematic pattern, or the same interpersonal and value-orientational point of view or, finally, the same activity structure, genre structure, etc. Thus Lemke identifies three primary principles of intertextuality: thematic, orientational and organizational (Lemke, 2004: 6–7). Lemke’s research has been oriented towards the study of semiosis in all three modes, including not only Halliday’s original three meta-functions of language but also parallel work on visual semiotics and work on semiotics of action. He explains that “it is precisely through this “parallelism” among different semiotic modalities (language, depiction, gesture, etc.) that the different aspects of a “multimedia” semiotic “text” cohere, interact, and in fact *multiply* each other’s meaning potential” (Lemke, 2004: 12).

This brief discussion yields interesting clues on the debate on intertextuality. It would seem that, when oriented to the material circumstances of the text, it reflects the perspectives of literary theory and semiotics. When contemplated from the material circumstances of reader and author, it re-



flects the perspectives of cognitive psychology. Finally, when it questions the material circumstances of the context, it reflects the perspectives of linguistics and sociolinguistics. The bottom line is that the ways in which intertextuality is appropriated and reflected in research reveals the ideological and cultural contexts in which each study resides.

### TRENDS ON INTERMEDIALITY

The term intermediality was initially associated with the exchangeability of expressive means and aesthetic conventions between different art and media forms and much research was conducted in Germany and at the Centre de recherche sur l'intermédialité established in 1997 at the Université de Montréal (for a review of the historical basis of intermedial studies, see Rajewsky, 2002; see also Punzy, 2007; Gimber and López-Varela, 2010; Tötösy, López-Varela, Saussy and Mieszkowski, 2011). Besides questioning the ontology of intermedia, much of this research turned to assessing its persistence across distinct time periods, perhaps in order to heighten awareness of the materiality and mediality of cultural practices. Many of these studies continued to see “textuality” as a common denominator, even when referring to completely different material formats such as literature and photography. Thus, Rachael Langford writes that intermediality highlights “textual relations as a dialogic process taking place between different expressive media, rather than as a set of static references to textual artifacts” (Langford, 2009: 10). However, a single medium seldom works in an ideal communicative situation where one form of perception prevails. Human perception is generally a multimodal experience (see López-Varela 2012a).

Irina Rajewsky has pointed out that there seems to be two distinct approximations to the study of intermediality. The first, coming from the world of literary studies and narratology along the lines of Michael Bakhtin's concept of intertextuality via Julia Kristeva, explores how a given medium may thematize, evoke and sometimes imitate elements and structures of another medium through the use of its own media-specific means (on this see Müller, 1996; Pfister, 1985; Plett, 1991; Wolf, 2002, Oosterling, 2003, among others). The second derives from media studies and it does not focus on medialized configurations but on the very formation of a given medium and on medial transformation processes, distinguishing groups of media phenomena which exhibit their own distinct intermedial quali-

ties (i.e. Spielmann, 1996; Paech, and Schröter, 2008, Elleström, 2010). Rajewsky distinguishes between intramedial (and thus intertextual) and intermedial references. Within the first, a medium evokes and generates an illusion of another medium's specific practices, as we mentioned above. Intermedial references, however, constitute themselves in various complex combinatory ways in relation to another medium (monomediality) or several media (plurimediality) as in the case of dance theatre. She proposes several categories that run from mere contiguity of two or more material manifestations of different media to a genuine integration. For instance, she explains that film adaptation can be classified as media combination (of theatre and photography) but also as medial transposition (of a literary text). Finally, she notes that the definite intermedial aspect has to do with the reference itself because the overall signification constitutes itself in relation to the media product or system to which it refers.

For Jens Schröter there are different types of intermediality – from synthetic intermediality or fusion of different arts and media into new forms, to trans-medial intermediality, representing conventions operating in several media. He also speaks of transformational intermediality, which refers to the representation of one medium in another medium.

In terms of its use, intermediality can be defined as the ability to critically read and write (in the widest possible sense) across varied symbol systems, related to certain critical media literacy, where the medium becomes central and serves to mediate signs, thus entering processes of production and reception and “relationships of respect and rivalry with other media” (Bolter and Grusin, 1999: 65), where “their function also depends on historical changes of these relationships” (Müller, 1996: 297). In agreement with Jens Schröter, a medium defines its own ontology through relating itself to another medium so that it is not possible to define the specificity of a medium in isolation except through a dialogical encounter with another medium. Media evolution is based on material and operative conditions, but also on conventions which are largely historical and often related to technological change. Thus the materiality of media is already culturally encoded.

It can be argued that intermedial practices constitute themselves in relation to certain delimitations by which new media refashions prior media forms (Bolter, and Grusin, 1999: 273). In the case of the computer-based technologies, the logic of the machine can be expected to significantly in-

fluence the cultural logic of media (Manovich, 2001: 46), with the digital emerging “as the mediation of new cultural forms” (Poster, 2006: 87).

The materiality of digital media allows the possibility of greater mobility of textual units because it follows numerical and algorithmic automatic patterns. It turns continuous and linear analogue data (printed format, analogue audio-visual formats, etc.) into separate and discrete units (pixels, polygons, voxels, characters, scripts). These elements can be assembled into larger-scale objects but continue to maintain their separate identities (Manovich, 2001: 30).

By removing the fundamental boundary and format of printed texts, hypertext challenges two key ordering principles in the logic of print and its theories. Firstly, the (hierarchical) status of main text to note, foreword, title or index is removed. Secondly, the (authoritative) order of reading the page and manipulating what-comes-where in textual reception is subverted. Approaching studies on task-oriented behaviour, action and performance in terms of such dynamics opens the way to the recognition of alternative and shifting frames available for the re-contextualization of texts.

## INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

In terms of cultural studies, the development of mass media and of online forms of communication has contributed to a situation of increasingly shared global knowledge. Terms such as “intertextual,” “intermedial,” “hybridism,” “in-between” and “third space” have become powerful metaphors that point towards cognitive aspects in the description of spatial relations (individual and collective) and their limits. Insofar as all these terms bring to the fore the dialogical, but also the transitional, ambiguous and paradoxical, they touch upon a problem of categorization. This trend is also enhanced in the move toward pluridisciplinary approaches that require uneasy combinations of analysis from various fields of research, and which relocate cultural criticism in general.

It has been argued (López-Varela and Net 2009) that the contemporary situation can be described as a liminal state (from the Latin word *limen*, meaning ‘threshold’) or period of transition, and that these symptomatic meta-cognitive negotiations of the awareness of limits and their dynamic (no longer territorially or categorically fixed) representations, together with the desire to transgress them by means of the articulation of ‘inter’ posi-

tions, are symptomatic of structural problems at the spatial-temporal interface of culture and its representations.

The flux of migration, including not only diasporic communities but also international exchange education programmes, international and transcontinental tourism, and international economic and political cooperation, together with the enormous impact of internet communication, are determinant cultural factors. Acculturation has become a central issue because individuals in diaspora prefer to integrate (in multicultural pluralist societies) rather than become assimilated (in melting-pot situations) to the host culture (see López-Varela, and Tötösy, 2010). Although in some cases separation and marginalization, leading to anxiety, occur. People such as foreign students, international businesspeople, foreign workers, etc., living and working in another country that differs markedly in culture and lifestyle, can experience this new situation as stressful. Integration has also been found to be positively correlated with task orientation. Task orientation can be defined as being concerned with purposeful efforts to solve a problem and training people to be task-oriented teaches them to be assertive, active and open to new experiences. The study of cultural representations can help in defining tasks that focus on intercultural activities.

According to cross-cultural psychologists, for example Schwarz (1994), educators can be considered central transmitters of socio-cultural behaviour patterns and of cultural values. Thus, it is important that educators are trained in socio-cultural sensibility and intercultural competence so that they will be able to disseminate cross-cultural knowledge and acculturative techniques, and influence members of host societies as well as members of different migrant groups. In the long run, educational institutions and educators, functioning as models of intercultural openness, create the basis of a society gradually developing towards pluralism and interculturalism. They can help prepare individuals to live and work effectively in new cultural settings, develop and maintain interpersonal relationships in other cultures, communicate more effectively in different cultural situations, assist others in managing cultural diversity, deal with inevitable cultural stress and, most importantly, reduce racism, sexism, homophobia and culture-related group conflicts.

Intertextual and intermedial variations (appropriation, repetition, direct and indirect quotation, stylization, parody, etc.) re-mediate and mediate new forms of institutional practices, relationships and identities, also in educational environments. Ivanic (2004: 288) identifies two actual inter-

textual practices that become intermedial: importing and reproducing a source text as artefact, that is, a text which is digitally cut and later copied/pasted, a process that underlies the importance of the material aspects involved. These processes of importation and reproduction of a source text lead to incorporation and assimilation of the source text in the classroom and to further conscious and unconscious simulation, transformation and/or mixing of text-type(s), processes that become symbolic, that is, pregnant with underlying values and practices as they are reproduced in educational environments.

Furthermore, elaborations from multiple sources allow better performance on memory tasks. Thus, intertextual and intermedial connections, consisting in the constructing of causal explanations between bits of information within the same text as well as crossing text boundaries are constituting as well as constitutive of complex cognitive processes (on this see Goldman, 2004; López-Varela, 2012a). Collaborative learning encourages the reframing of controversies and policy decision situations to include steps that can actually be achieved, as opposed to inflexible positions. Understanding the contextual basis of a problem can contribute to a focus on the concerns and interests of the parties involved, and target feasible progress, rather than demanding instant achievement of goals.

## CONCLUSIONS

This paper has explored the foundations of intertextuality and intermediality applied to the study of cross-cultural communication in educational environments. The main point raised is that, even if media formats evoke their referents in different ways, memory processing is about reconstituting relationships among ideas, and this promotes relational thinking and discriminating cognitive habits based on deictic processes (López-Varela, 2012a). The paper expands research developed under the programme *Studies on Intermediality and Intercultural Mediation* SIIM. The programme aims at showing how intertextual and intermedial connections work argumentatively by forcing re-evaluations of individual knowledge, beliefs and interpretations against a continually developing frame of reference which defies and complicates singularity, implicitly arguing for multiple perspectives on any issue, and not focusing on definite final solutions, but on learning how knowledge is a process that is cognitively situated.

Acknowledgments. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Comunidad de Madrid. Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación. Prof. George Landow (Brown University). Prof. David Damrosch (Harvard University). Prof. Zhao Baisheng (Peking University). For more information please see: <http://www.ucm.es/info/siim/>

#### References

- Angenot, Marc. "L'Intertextualité. Enquête sur l'émergence et la diffusion d'un champ notionnel." *Revue des Sciences Humaines* 189 (1983):121–135.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin, Tx: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Bauman, Richard. *A World of Other's Words: Cross Cultural Perspectives on Intertextuality*. Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Beaugrande, Robert-Alain de, and Wolfgang U. Dressler. *Introduction to text linguistics*. London: Longman, 1981.
- Bloome, David, and Ann Egan-Robertson. "The Social Construction of Intertextuality in Classroom Reading and Writing Lessons." *Reading Research Quarterly* 28.4 (1993): 305–332.
- Bloome, David, and Ann Egan-Robertson. "The Social Construction of Intertextuality." In *Uses of Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research*. Nora Stuart-Faris and David Bloome. Eds. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, 2004. 17–64.
- Bolter, Jay David, and Richard Grusin *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1999.
- Brooks, Cleanth. *A shaping joy: Studies in the writer's craft*. London: Methuen, 1971.
- Bruce, Donald. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York & London: Routledge, 1995.
- Brunner, Jerome. *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Eco, Umberto. *A Mouse or Rat: Translation as Negotiation*. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 2003.
- Eco, Umberto. *On Literature*. Trans. Martin McLaughlin. London: Secker and Warburg, 2005.
- Elleström, Lars. Ed. *Media Borders: Multimodality and Intermediality*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave-Macmillan Ltd., 2010.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1992.
- Gimber, Arno, and Asunción López-Varela Azcárate. "About Intermedialities: A Review Article of New Work by Paech and Schröter, Chapple and Kattenbelt, and Ellerström." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 12.3 (2010). <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol12/iss3/15>>.
- Goldman, Sarah. R. "Cognitive aspects of constructing meaning through and across multiple texts." In *Uses of Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research*. Nora Stuart-Faris and David Bloome. Eds. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, 2004. 317–351.

- Genette, Gerald. (1982) *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997a.
- Genette, Gerald. (1987) *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997b.
- Gumperz, John J. *Discourse strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Hall, Stuart. "The Rediscovery of 'Ideology': Return of the Repressed in Media Studies." In *Cohesion in English*. Michael A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan. Eds. London: Longman, 1976.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. and Christian Matthiessen. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold, 2004.
- Hedling, Erik, and Ulla Britta Lagerroth. Eds. *Cultural Functions of Intermedial Exploration*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Ivanic, Roz. "Intertextual Practices in the Construction of Multimodal Texts." In *Uses of Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research*. Nora Shuart-Faris and David Bloome. Eds. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, 2004. 279–314.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Bakhtin, le mot, le dialogue et le roman." *Critique* 239 (1967): 438–465.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Semiotikè: recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Points, 1969.
- Langford, Rachael, Ed. *Textual Intersections*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.
- Lemke, Jay L. "Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research." In *Uses of Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research*. Nora Shuart-Faris and David Bloome. Eds. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, 2004. 3–15.
- López-Varela Azcárate, Asunción. *Social Sciences and Humanities: Theories & Applications*. Vols. 1–3. InTech Publishers, 2012a
- López-Varela Azcárate, Asunción. "Posthuman Inscriptions & Humachine Environments: Blogs and Visibility in the Web." In *Between Page and Screen: Remaking Literature Through Cinema and Cyberspace*. Kiene Brillenburg Wurth. Ed. Oxford University Press, 2012b.
- López-Varela Azcárate, Asunción. "Exploring Intercultural Relations from the Intersubjective Perspectives Offered through Creative Art in Multimodal Formats (SIIM Research Program)." *Analisi delle culture; culture dell'Analisi Lexia. Revista di Simiotica*. Máximo Leone. Ed. Università degli studi di Torino, 2010. 125–147.
- López-Varela Azcárate, Asunción. "Webness Revisted." In *A Pleasure of Life in Words: A Festschrift for Angela Downing*. Marta Carretero, et al. Eds. Madrid: Universidad Complutense. Vol. II, 2006. 513–533.
- López-Varela Azcárate, Asunción. *Embers of Time: a pluridisciplinary exploration of the crisis of representational time in science and literature*. Doctoral dissertation. Universidad Complutense, 2004.
- López-Varela Azcárate, Asunción, and Mariana Net. Eds. *Real and Virtual Cities: Intertextual and Intermedial Mindscapes*. Bucuresti: Editura Univers Enciclopedia, 2009.
- López-Varela Azcárate, Asunción, and Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek. "Comparative Cultural Studies, éducation, nouveaux médias et l'interculturalisme." *Le Complexe*

- français. Quelle place pour les études et sciences de la culture en France?* Anne Chalard-Fillaudeau. Ed. *Revue d'Etudes Culturelles*, Dijon, Association Bourguignogne D'Etudes Linguistiques et Littéraires ABELL 5 (2010): 73–93.
- Manovich, Lev. *The Language of the Media*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 2001.
- Moi, Toril. Ed. *The Kristeva reader*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- Müller, Jürgen E. *Intermedialität. Formen moderner kultureller Kommunikation*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1996.
- Oosterling, Henk. "Sen(a)ble Intermediality and Interesse. Towards an Ontology of the In-Between." *Intermedialités* 1 (2003): 29–46. <<http://cri.histart.umontreal.ca>>.
- Peach, Joachim, and Schröter, Jens. Eds. *Intermedialität: Analog/Digital*. München: Fink, 2008.
- Pfister, Manfred. "Konzepte der Intertextualität." In *Intertextualität. Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister. Eds. Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1985. 1–30.
- Plett, Heinrich F. *Intertextuality, Research in Text Theory*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991.
- Poster, Mark. *Information Please: Culture and Politics in the Age of Digital Machines*. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Punzi, Maddalena P. *Literary Intermediality*. Germany: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Rajewsky, Irina. *Intermedialität*, Tübingen, Basel: Francke, 2002.
- Riffaterre, Michael. *Semiotics of Poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.
- Schröter, Jens, (n.y.) "Intermedialität" *Theories der Medien* <[http://www.theorie-der-medien.de/text\\_detail.php?nr=12](http://www.theorie-der-medien.de/text_detail.php?nr=12)>
- Schwartz, Shalom H. "Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values?" *Journal of Social Issues* 50 (1994): 19–45.
- Spielmann, Yvonne. "Intermedia and the Organization of the Image: Some Reflections on Film, Electronic, and Digital Media." *Iris* 25 (1998): 61–74.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven, Asunción López-Varela Azcárate, Haun Saussy, and Jan Mieszkowski. Eds. *New Perspectives on Material Culture and Intermedial Practice. Comparative Literature and Culture*. 13.3 (2011). Purdue Univ. Press <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol13/iss3/>>.
- Volosinov, Valentin. (1929) *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Trans. Ladislav Matejka & Irwin R. Titunik, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Wells, Gordon. *Dialogic Inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Wellek, René, and Austin Warren. *Theory of literature*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949.
- Wolf, Werner. "Towards a Functional Analysis of Intermediality: The Case of Twentieth-Century Musicalized Fiction." *Cultural Functions of Intermedial Exploration*. Ed. Erik Hedling and Ulla Britta Lagerroth. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002. 15–34.
- Worton, Michael, and Judith Still. Eds. *Intertextuality: Theories and practices*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1990.