Contents

Intermedial Narration: Text-Picture Combinations

Part II Music, Sound and Performance

Gabriele Rippl
0 Introduction

1 Why Intermediality?

This *Handbook of Intermediality* introduces the vast field of intermediality research which has been ever-expanding since the 1980s. Paying tribute to the fact that media do not exist disconnected from each other, the handbook aims at familiarizing its readers with the diverse – affirmative as well as critical – approaches to theoretical concepts such as intermediality, multi- and plurimediality, intermedial reference, transmediality, intermedial methodology and related concepts such as visual culture, literary visuality, the musicalization of fiction and poetry, literary acoustics, remediation, adaptation, and multimodality etc. Generally speaking, the term 'intermediality' refers to the relationships between media and is hence used to describe a huge range of cultural phenomena which involve more than one medium. One of the reasons why it is impossible to develop *one* definition of intermediality is that it has become a central theoretical concept in many disciplines such as literary, cultural and theater studies as well as art history, musicology, philosophy, sociology, film, media and comics studies – and these disciplines all deal with different intermedial constellations which ask for specific approaches and definitions.

The popularity and increasing importance of intermediality studies and other related fields can be attributed to the fact that in our digital age many works of art, cultural artifacts, literary texts and other cultural configurations either combine and juxtapose different media, genres and styles or refer to other media in a plethora of ways. The focal nodes of this handbook are intermedial relationships and networks between Anglo-American as well as Anglophone postcolonial literary texts and other media. Intermedial literary texts transgress their own medial boundary – writing – in many creative ways by including pictures and illustrations or by referring to absent (static and moving, analog and digital) pictures, by imitating filmic modes or by mimicking musical structures and themes. In the face of the sheer number of Anglophone literary texts which participate in intermedial interfaces – a few recent examples are Charles Simic's *Dime-Store Alchemy* (1992), David Dabydeen's *Turner* (1994), Salman Rushdie's *The Moor's Last Sigh* (1995), John Updike's *Seek My Face* (2002) or Siri Hustvedt's *What I Loved* (2003) – literary scholars today have come to accept that media and art forms cannot be analyzed in isolation and instead have to be discussed against the backdrop of their medial networks, what Bernd Herzogenrath calls their "arch-intermediality" (2012, 4). Literature's role and function must hence be appraised in a cultural field characterized not only by the competition and collaboration of different media, but also by medial interfaces. Our digital age also has an impact on how we

think of 'literature' today: The term has undergone a considerable change in meaning and has come to include not only relatively stable literary texts which exist in oral or printed form, but also hypertextually encoded fictions such as Michael Joyce's *Afternoon: A Story* (1990), Stuart Moulthrop's *Victory Garden* (1991), Simon Biggs's *The Great Wall of China* (1996) and Caitlin Fisher's hypermedia novella *These Waves of Girls* (2001), all of which exist only in an electronic medial form. Hyperfiction's interactive and multimedial form reminds us that any concept of a purely verbal art does not work and invites us to investigate intermedial configurations.

As a central notion in the analysis of the arts, the media and their border-crossing, the concept of intermediality allows for a reading of literary texts against the backdrop of their cultural and medial contexts from systematic and historical perspectives. Taking into account the network of medial connections and the collaboration of media throughout history (even if today with digital media these collaborations and fusions have dramatically increased), scholars of intermediality investigate how meaning is generated in/by inter-, multi- and transmedial constellations and cross-medial references. This task asks for interdisciplinary engagement, which is why any study of literary texts or other cultural phenomena should be – as Mieke Bal puts it –

> interdisciplinary, at least in its framework of interpretation. [...] We live in a world in which we are surrounded by images but, more crucially, in which images and language jointly participate in a much wider and more 'mixed' cultural life. [...] The question of words and images is not, therefore, a matter of definitions of essences and separation of practices, but of how people communicate: with one another, with the past, with others. (Bal 1999, 169)

The fact that over the last twenty years, literary departments have fostered teaching in the field of intermediality, and that even centers for intermediality research have been established to great success – for instance at the Austrian University of Graz (cf. *CIMIG*, the *Centre for Intermediality Studies in Graz*, which also publishes the successful book series *Word and Music Studies*), at the Swedish Linnaeus University (*Forum for Intermediality Studies*) and at the Canadian Universities of Montreal and Quebec (*Centre de recherche sur l'intermédialité*, *CRI*) – proves, together with the steadily growing *International Society for Intermedial Studies* (*ISIS*), that intermediality has indeed become "one of the most vital and invigorating developments within the humanities today" (Herzogenrath 2012, 2).

2 Historical Perspectives: *Sister Arts* to Intermediality

Literary texts have always had close ties with music and images: While poetry, due to its rhythmic qualities, has a natural link to music and, due to the arrangement of

its lines, can show iconic qualities, narrative literary texts, too, may foster close relationships with other media and art forms, e.g. through formal and stylistic imitation of musical genres and styles (cf. e.g. Wolf 1999; Balestrini 2005; Redling forthcoming; ↗26 The Musicalization of Poetry). Steven Paul Scher has presented a triadic distinction between 'literature in music,' 'music and literature' and 'music in literature' (Scher 1968; ↗24 Literature and Music: Theory), long before intermediality studies emerged. The investigation of text-music relationships is a vibrant one; however, to date more research has been undertaken on text-image relationships, which is probably due to the fact that for a long time visuality has been taken as modernity's signature, while more recently the field of literary acoustics has proven that this is not necessarily the case (↗25 Literary Acoustics; Schweighauser 2006).

In intermedial studies, relationships between words and images in particular have become a central field of investigation, which is reflected in the space dedicated to the topic in this handbook. There is a plethora of text-image interactions to be found in Anglophone literary texts which fall into at least three major categories (cf. Pfister 1993): (a) the inclusion of images such as cover pictures and frontispieces, miniature paintings in medieval texts or illustrations such as the woodcuts in Virginia Woolf's short story "Kew Gardens" (1919); there are also genres based on text-picture combination such as the popular early modern emblem or postmodern graphic narratives like Paul Karasik and David Mazzucchelli's adaptation of Paul Auster's *City of Glass* (2004); (b) typographical experiments, where text and image are simultaneously present and actually form a unit; this is the case in so-called figure poems or technopaignia, a genre which dates back to antiquity but has been successful throughout literary history (one famous seventeenth-century example is George Herbert's metaphysical poem "Easter-Wings," and a later example of typographical experimentation is Jonathan Safran Foer's novel *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close* published in 2005); and (c) ekphrasis, i.e. the description of paintings, drawings, photographs and sculptures in texts (cf. Rippl 2005, 2012, 2014).

In accordance with W. J. T. Mitchell, who claims that there is no such thing as a 'pure' medium – "all arts are 'composite' arts (both text and image); all media are mixed media" (1995, 94–95) – this handbook's premise is the insight that all media and art forms are interconnected and that intermedial qualities always inhere in cultural phenomena. Referring back to Gilles Deleuze, Bernd Herzogenrath states that "rhizomatic intermedia[lity] is the quasi-ontological plane underlying all media, out of which the specific media that we know percolate [...] there is one intermedia[lity] that comes first, which is the quicksand out of which specific media emerge, and a second intermedia[lity] that focuses on the various interconnections possible, from the very perspective of these specific media forms." (Herzogenrath 2012, 3) To speak of specific media forms does not imply that 'medium' is understood in an essentializing way, but rather underlines the fact that when we speak of individual media we refer to conventional conceptualizations, material restrictions, and affordances of individual media. Already in 1999, Wolf underscored that delimitations of media and the idea of

medial distinctness are nothing but a convention: "Intermediality can [...] be defined as a particular relation (a relation that is 'intermedial' in the narrow sense [cf. 3.2]) between conventionally distinct media of [...] communication" (Wolf 1999, 37). Not only questions concerning the specific material qualities of words, images, sound and music, but also investigations into their interfaces, the ways different media interact with one another and the role they have in the communication processes of postmodern societies have transformed literary studies into a more interdisciplinary field.

It is important to note, however, that questions of intermediality and the relationship between art forms are not wedded to modernity. In fact, they reach back to the time of ancient Greece and Rome (cf. Webb 2009) when structural similarities between text and image as well as functional analogies were foregrounded. In his *Ars poetica*, Horace (65–8 BCE) referred to an influential formula ascribed to Simonides of Ceos (late 6th century BCE), *ut pictura poesis*, which has been translated: 'as in painting so in poetry.' This formula was still influential in the Renaissance, when painting and poetry were first referred to as *sister arts* (cf. Hagstrum 1958). However, the term *sister arts* hides the fact that the different art forms were increasingly understood as competitive ones: Clearly, the story of medial purification and the idea of separating the arts arose in the Renaissance, when Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519) and others engaged in the *paragone*, the competition between the arts, by lifting the visual arts from their status as crafts to independent art forms which surpass poetry (cf. Rippl 2005b; Klarer 2001). In the eighteenth century, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing compared the artistic media painting and poetry, examining their strengths and limitations. In his essay *Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry* (1984 [1766]) Lessing attempted to differentiate between words and pictures on a semiotic and medial basis. He separated the two sign systems as two radically different and independent modes of representation. Whereas language follows the rules of arbitrariness, successivity and time, images adhere to the laws of simultaneity and space. While Lessing's essay was widely read and accepted at the time, the succeeding generation of Romantics began to blur Lessing's neat line of demarcation between the two arts. The late Romantic writer Walter Pater, for instance, stated in his essay on "The School of Giorgione" (1877) that

> although each art has thus its own specific order of impressions, and an untranslatable charm, while a just apprehension of the ultimate differences of the arts is the beginning of aesthetic criticism; yet it is noticeable that, in its special mode of handling its given material, each art may be observed to pass into the condition of some other art, by what German critics term as *Anders-streben* – a partial alienation from its own limitations, through which the arts are able, not indeed to supply the place to each other, but reciprocally to lend each other new forces. (Pater 1986, 85)

While Pater is positive about the arts' *Anders-streben*, in his *New Laokoon* (1910) Irving Babbitt accused Romantic writers of 'eleutheromania,' i.e. of not respecting medial borderlines between the arts, and thereby distorting and perverting them; consequently, he asked for a new art, a modern art, which would develop a new

generic and medial purity and accept the uniqueness of the different arts. In the same vein, in his 1940 essay "Towards a Newer Laocoon," leading American art critic Clement Greenberg insists on the specificities and unique nature of individual media and rejects hybrid forms. According to him, discussions about the purity and boundaries of media help to stop the confusion of the arts: "Purity in art consists in the acceptance, willing acceptance, of the limitations of the medium of the specific art." (Greenberg 1993, 32) When we turn to see how modernist writers addressed the question of mediality, Ezra Pound is an interesting figure. In his essay "I Gather the Limbs of Osiris" (1911–1912), Pound elaborates on the medial differences between the arts:

> The reasons why good description makes bad poetry, and why painters who insist on painting ideas instead of pictures offend so many, are not far to seek.
>
> I am in sympathy equally with those who insist that there is *one* art and many media, and with those who cry out against the describing of work in any particular art by a terminology borrowed from all the others. This manner of description is objectionable, because it is, in most cases, a make-shift, a laziness. We talk of the odour of music and the timbre of a painting because we think we suggest what we mean and are too lazy to understand the analysis necessary to find out exactly what we do mean. There is, perhaps, *one* art, but any given subject belongs to the artist, who must know that subject most intimately before he can express it through his particular medium.
>
> Thus, it is bad poetry to talk much of the colours of the sunrise [...] in the matter of the actual colour he [the poet, GR] is a bungler. The painter sees, or should see, half a hundred hues and varieties, where we see ten; or, granting we are ourselves skilled with the brush, how many hundred colours are there, where language has but a dozen crude names? Even if the poet understands the subtleties of gradation and juxtaposition, his medium refuses to convey them. [...]
>
> I express myself clumsily, but this much remains with me as certain: that any given work of art is bad when its content could have found more explicit and precise expression through some other medium, which the artist was, perhaps, too slothful to master. (Pound 1973, 36–37)

Although Pound's poems are saturated with spatial and iconic strategies, he seems to accept medial boundaries and to have a clear understanding of the problems a metaphoric use of 'painterly' language in connection with poetry and music can trigger:

> We go to a particular art for something which we cannot get in any other art. If we want form and colour we go to a painting, or we make a painting. If we want form without colour and in two dimensions, we want drawing or etching. If we want form in three dimensions, we want sculpture. If we want an image or a procession of images, we want poetry. If we want pure sound, we want music. [...] A painting is an arrangement of colour patches on a canvas, or on some other substance. (Pound 1980, 6)

Lessing, Pater, Babbitt, Greenberg and Pound all present examples of the different ways of defining the relationship between art forms and media. But no matter how such a relationship is conceived, words have always been measured against images and music and vice versa. This attests to the flexible and ever-changing positions and borders of art forms and media within the medial networks. To be informed of these very different eighteenth-, nineteenth- and twentieth-century voices helps us

to understand the new insights intermediality studies has to offer. While the *sister arts* paradigm, together with the so-called *Interart Studies* or *Comparative Arts,* dealt with a range of contacts between literature and the 'high arts' such as music and painting throughout the twentieth century (Wolf 2005, 252), basically contending that the different arts are alike and function according to the same rules, intermediality studies are more 'democratic' since they not only deal with art forms and high brow cultural products exclusively, but with all kinds of cultural configurations, be they performances, products of popular culture or the new media. What has also become clear is that intermedial configurations and medial border blurring are not at all novelties, but of course "new aspects and problems have emerged especially with respect to electronic and digital media" which have boosted "different views on medial border-crossings and hybridization" and have led to "a heightened awareness of the materiality and mediality of artistic practices and of cultural practices in general" (Rajewsky 2005, 44). The diverging views on medial border-crossings and hybridization are reflected in the many different terms and concepts that describe intermedial phenomena such as multi- and plurimediality, medial border-crossing, transmediality, remediation, media-fusion, hybridization and multimodality. In what follows, a range of theories and concepts will be discussed.

3 Theories and Concepts

3.1 Medium

Intermediality is a semantically contested, inconsistent term whose various definitions refer to a general problem centered around the term 'medium,' which itself has accumulated a wide range of competing definitions (cf. Rippl 2012 for a more detailed discussion of different concepts of 'medium' and 'mediality'; cf. also Jäger, Linz, and Schneider 2010). Clearly, media allow for the production, distribution and reception of signs, hence they enable communication, but in spite of the many definitions on offer, there is not one definition of 'medium' which scholars working in the field of literary, cultural and media studies would agree on. Etymologically, the term 'medius' in Latin means 'middle' and 'intermediate,' 'Vermittler' in German. It entered the English language around 1930 to designate channels of communication; however, since then, it has become a highly ambiguous term. In the plural form, "media," it is often equated with mass and popular culture:

> Ask a sociologist or cultural critic to enumerate media, and he will answer: TV, radio, cinema, the Internet. An art critic may list: music, painting, sculpture, literature, drama, the opera, photography, architecture. A philosopher of the phenomenological school would divide media into visual, auditory, verbal, and perhaps gustatory and olfactory (are cuisine and perfume media?).

An artist's list would begin with clay, bronze, oil, watercolor, fabrics, and it may end with exotic items used in so-called mixed-media works, such as grasses, feathers, and beer can tabs. An information theorist or historian of writing will think of sound waves, papyrus scrolls, codex books, and silicon chips. 'New media' theorists will argue that computerization has created new media out of old ones: film-based versus digital photography; celluloid cinema versus movies made with video cameras; or films created through classical image-capture techniques versus movies produced through computer manipulations. The computer may also be responsible for the entirely new medium of virtual reality. (Ryan 2004, 15–16)

This quote demonstrates the wide range of the term 'mediality' and its different uses in various contexts. One influential definition of the term was given by Marshall McLuhan: Media are in a very general way a sort of prosthesis, "any extension [...] of man" (1964, 3) be it of the body or the consciousness. Aleida Assmann (1993, 1996) and Horst Wenzel (1995) also understand 'medium' in an encompassing way, including not only technical media but also non-technical ones such as spoken language, writing, painting, the human body etc., while Friedrich A. Kittler, a literary scholar who has worked on the history of material media and developed a hermeneutics of media technologies, uses the term 'medium' exclusively when talking about technical channels, and acoustic and optic media for transmitting and storing information such as the typewriter, film, television etc. (cf. Kittler 1985, 1986). In German-speaking literary departments discussions of the 'materiality of the sign,' the 'media of communication' and the interrelationship between meaning and materiality in literary texts have been topical since the 1980s (Gumbrecht and Pfeiffer 1988). In this tradition, 'medium' refers in a very general sense to the material side of the sign, i.e. its carrier (Rippl 2005) – it is that which mediates – and the focus is on the question of how this material side of the sign / semiotic system is involved in the production of narrative meaning. To talk about mediality means to question the applicability of verbal models to all cultural manifestations. Whereas semiotics and a post-Saussurean logocentrism believe in language as the master discourse of all media, scholars working with concepts like mediality and intermediality use interdisciplinary approaches and consider problems encountered when attempting to apply the rules of language to pictures and music. In her influential book *Philosophy in a New Key* (1942), Susanne Langer summarizes the differences between words and images by referring to the differences of their medial or material basis in the following way:

[a]ll language has a form which requires us to string out our ideas even though their objects rest one within the other; as pieces of clothing that are actually worn one over the other have to be strung side by side on the clothesline. This property of verbal symbolism is known as *discursiveness*; by reason of it, only thoughts which can be arranged in this peculiar order can be spoken at all [...].

Visual forms – lines, colors, proportions, etc. – are just as capable of *articulation*, i.e. of complex combination, as words. But the laws that govern this sort of articulation are altogether different from the laws of syntax that govern language. The most radical difference is that *visual forms are not discursive*. They do not present their constituents successively, but simultaneously,

so the relations determining a visual structure are grasped in one act of vision. Their complexity, consequently, is not limited, as the complexity of discourse is limited, by what the mind can retain from the beginning of an apperceptive act to the end of it.

Photography, therefore, *has no vocabulary.* The same is obviously true of painting, drawing, etc. There is, of course, a technique of picturing objects, but the law governing this technique cannot properly be called a 'syntax,' since there are no items that might be called, metaphorically, the 'words' of portraiture.

Since we have no words, there can be no dictionary of meanings of lines, shadings, or other elements of pictorial technique. We may well pick out some line, say a certain curve, in a picture, which serves to represent one nameable item; but in another place the same curve would have an entirely different meaning. It has no fixed meaning apart from its context. (Langer 1942, 81, 93, 95)

Whereas language consists of a certain vocabulary and follows more or less fixed semantic and syntactical rules, according to Langer this is not the case with pictures. What would be the equivalents of the phonological, morphological, syntactical and semantic elements of language when it comes to pictures? If one talks about the 'pictorial text' or the 'imagetext' and the 'sculptural text' or 'sculpture text' as semioticians do, what then would be the 'grammar' of these 'texts'? Structural and cognitive semioticians such as Ferdinand de Saussure and Louis Hjelmslev have often focused almost exclusively on the content, the *signifié* or cognitive side while neglecting the material *signifiant*-side. This is why the linguist Ludwig Jäger speaks of a displacement or repression of the problem of mediality, i.e. the sensuous side of a sign, in semiotics (1999, 13).

According to Marie-Laure Ryan, different media such as oil painting, music, digital photography, and film "are not hollow conduits for the transmission of messages but material supports of information whose materiality, precisely, 'matters' for the type of meanings that can be encoded" (Ryan 2004, 1–2). Instead, "a medium is a category that truly makes a difference about what stories can be evoked or told, how they are presented, why they are communicated, and how they are experienced" (2004, 18). Ryan distinguishes between at least three different approaches to media: (1) semiotic approaches such as that of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1984 [1766]) and Werner Wolf (1999, 2002), who have looked into codes and sensory channels that support various (verbal, visual, and musical) media; (2) material and technological approaches that focus on how the semiotic types are supported by media (Ryan 2005, 15); and (3) cultural approaches that are interested in social and cultural aspects of the media as well as in the network of relations among media. While many scholars in media theory today disregard semiotic categories when discussing media and prefer to call them 'modes' and a combination of modes 'multimodal' (cf. 3.4), Ryan points out that semiotically based media such as music and two-dimensional images cannot be ignored and that 'modes of signification' play a major role in distinguishing media from each other. There is no way to build a media system without taking semiotic criteria into consideration and, moreover, "'mode' is as difficult to define as medium is" (2014, 28). Like Ryan, Werner Wolf (2011) has argued for a flexible concept of medium.

He accounts for the material effects of a medium and "thus mediates between the positions of media determinism and media relativism" (Fludernik and Olson 2011, 16).

To solve some of the terminological dilemmas of the term 'medium,' Harry Pross also argues for a more systematic approach to media by subdividing three different types of media according to their degree of technological saturation: (1) 'primary media' such as the human voice, body language etc., with no technology involved; (2) 'secondary media' such as a flute (here technology is needed for the production of sound, but not for its reception, cf. Pross 1996, 36); and (3) 'tertiary media' such as analog television, radio, cinema and television (technology is needed for production and reception, cf. Pross 1972). A fourth category, "quaternary media" (i.e. media which require digital technology such as computer, multi-media, e-mail, WWW), has been added by Werner Faulstich (2002, 25). Siegfried J. Schmidt, too, developed a typology which helps to chart a diffuse field. He has argued that media systems consist of four components: (1) a semiotic instrument of communication, the prototype being natural oral language; (2) a media technology (since the development of writing examples of media technologies have included print, film, both kinds of "notebooks"); (3) a social system, that is, institutions on which technologies are based, such as schools or TV stations; and (4) media products or offerings such as literature or music that provide the opportunity to study aspects like production, distribution, reception, and processing (Schmidt 2008). In addition, the entry for "medium" in *Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary* (1991) is enlightening. It includes two definitions of 'medium,' a 'transmissive' and a 'communicative' one: (1) a channel or system of communication, information, or entertainment [transmissive definition], and (2) material or technical means of artistic expression [communicative definition; communicative media are not simply conduits and hollow pipes, but also carry out configuring action. Obviously, each medium has certain constraints and possibilities, i.e. built-in properties, which shape the message they encode]. Of the two definitions of the term "medium" given by *Webster's Dictionary* listed above, the first one, medium as channel of communication, has been far more influential in Anglo-American media studies, where scholars commonly concern themselves with technologies of mass communication and cultural institutions developed in the twentieth century. The second definition of the term medium, material means of expression, has become more relevant for German media studies from the 1980s onwards as discussed above (cf. Voigts-Virchow 2005).

This short overview of terminology has demonstrated that the meaning of the term 'medium' is notoriously shifting and ambiguous; what constitutes a medium depends very much on the scholarly background and purpose of the investigator. However, it seems that the narrow use of the term medium, which focuses solely on technological and sociological aspects and highlights media differences and specificities, is now passé. It has been replaced by a broad understanding of the term which triggers an investigation of how meaning is generated by cross-medial references and allows for a systematic analysis of inter-, multi- and transmedial constellations. While

for a long time, media scholars investigated individual media, they now agree that the specific characteristics of media can only be reconstructed through a comparative analysis of media that takes into account the history and collaborations of all media, their network of connections. Likewise, literary scholars also concur that literature's role in a cultural field characterized by networks of media and of artistic constellations has to be investigated and questions concerning literature's 'mediality,' i.e. its status as verbal or written text, as printed (cf. Eisenstein 1979; Giesecke 1991) or digitally encoded document (cf. Landow 1992; Segeberg and Winko 2005), are crucial to the understanding of how meaning is produced.

3.2 Intermediality – Plurimediality – Transmediality

After the preceding discussion of the wide range of meaning of the term 'medium' which has accumulated a whole plethora of competing definitions, it comes as no surprise that intermediality, too, is a semantically contested, inconsistent term (cf. Mahler 2010) and that intermediality studies covers an extremely diverse field: praxis-wise and discourse-wise. Since 'medium' etymologically means 'middle,' 'intermediate' and 'between,' and since 'inter' means 'between', intermediality "can very literally be described as *between the between*" (Herzogenrath 2012, 2). In spite of the fact that the term intermediality is charged with all kinds of problems inherited from the debates around the term 'medium,' some widely accepted definitions of intermediality as well as typologies of intermedial configurations have been developed. Since the 1980s the term intermediality has become strikingly successful in German-speaking academic debates and, subsequently, gained recognition in various disciplines (cf. Caduff et al. 2006; Todorow 2011). Dick Higgins published a pioneering article called "Intermedia" in 1966, where he describes the rich interdisciplinary and intermedial activities that occur between genres that became prevalent in networks of artists such as *Fluxus* in the 1960s. Higgins stated that 'intermedium' is the "uncharted land that lies between" (Higgins 1984, 22) different media and that he had come across the term 'intermedium' in Samuel Taylor Coleridge who used it in a lecture on Edmund Spencer in 1812 to explain functions of allegory (cf. Friedman 2005, 51; Müller 2009, 31). It was Aage Hansen-Löve, a scholar of Russian literature, who introduced the German term "Intermedialität" in a 1983 article. Whereas he applied it to text-picture relations such as modern Russian pattern poems, where both media, i.e. writing and pictures, are co-present, today intermediality is considered an umbrella term which also includes ekphrastic phenomena, where only one medium, writing, is present. Although intermediality as a field of research requires interdisciplinary approaches and collaboration between literary scholars, art historians, musicologists, film and media scholars, etc., literary scholars initially tended to understand intermediality as a neglected extension of intertextuality, which was a central field of research in the 1970s and 1980s. In German-speaking literary and cultural studies, some of the

early influential scholarly publications on intermediality were Eicher and Bleckmann 1994, Wagner 1996, Wolf 1996, Helbig 1998, and Griem 1998; in film and media studies Paech 1994, Müller 1996, Spielmann 1998; and in communication theory Luhmann 1995. Today intermediality research is also increasingly recognized internationally.

Major theoreticians of intermediality like Werner Wolf and Irina O. Rajewsky have presented definitions and typologies which help to differentiate a wide range of intermedial phenomena. As Rajewsky points out, "researchers have begun to formally specify their particular conception of intermediality through such epithets as transformational [Spielmann 1998], discursive, synthetic, formal, transmedial, ontological [Schröter 1998], or genealogical intermediality [Gaudreault and Marion 2002], primary and secondary intermediality [Leschke 2003], or so-called intermedial figuration [Paech 2002]" (Rajewsky 2005, 44–45 fn. 4). For Rajewsky, intermediality is an umbrella-term and hypernym for all kinds of phenomena that take place between media:

– "intermedial" designates those configurations which have to do with a crossing of borders between media;
– "intramedial" phenomena do not involve a transgression of medial boundaries;
– "transmedial" phenomena are, for instance, the appearance of a certain motif or style across a variety of different media.

Intermedial phenomena can be studied from a synchronic research perspective, which allows scholars to develop typologies of specific forms of intermediality, and a diachronic perspective, which investigates the history of the media and their intersections and collaborations. According to Rajewsky, the current debate reveals two basic understandings of intermediality: "a broader and a narrower one, which are not in themselves homogeneous. The first concentrates on *intermediality as a fundamental condition or category* while the second approaches *intermediality as a critical category for the concrete analysis of specific individual media products or configurations*" (Rajewsky 2005, 47). Rajewsky's literary conception of intermediality in the latter and more narrow sense encompasses three subcategories, but single medial configurations will also match more than just one of the three subcategories:

– Firstly, media combination (also called multi-media, pluri-media as well as mixed media); the examples she gives are opera, film, theater, performances, illuminated manuscripts, comics, computer installations etc. In this subcategory, intermediality is "a communicative-semiotic concept, based on the combination of at least two medial forms of articulation" (Rajewsky 2005, 52).
– Secondly, medial transposition, including, for example, film adaptations, novelizations etc. This category is production-oriented, the intermedial quality "has to do with the way in which a media product comes into being, i.e., with the transformation of a given media product (a text, a film, etc.) or of its substratum into another medium" (Rajewsky 2005, 51).

    –   Thirdly, intermedial references (Rajewsky 2005, 52), for instance references in a literary text to a piece of music (the so-called 'musicalization of fiction'), the imitation and evocation of filmic techniques such as dissolves, zoom shots, montage editing etc.; descriptive modes in literature which evoke visual effects or refer to specific visual works of art ('ekphrasis'). Intermedial references contribute to the overall signification, like the first category, they are of a communicative-semiotic nature, but they involve "*by definition* just *one* medium" (Rajewsky 2005, 53). It is important to note that the mere mention of another medium or medium-product does not justify the label intermedial, but only such media-products which evoke or imitate formal and structural features of another medium through the use of their own media-specific means (the "as if" character and illusion-forming quality of intermedial references; they create the illusion of another medium's specific practices; Rajewsky 2005, 54–55).

In addition to Rajewsky, Wolf is a literary scholar and narratologist who has published widely on intermediality. Intermediality applies in its broadest sense to any transgression of boundaries between *conventionally* and culturally distinct media and thus is concerned with 'heteromedial' relations between different semiotic complexes and how they communicate cultural content. Media in this sense are specified principally by the nature of their underlying semiotic systems, i.e. verbal language, pictorial signs, music, etc., or in cases of 'composite media' such as film, a combination of several semiotic systems; their technical or institutional channels are merely secondary. There are four main intermedial phenomena (Wolf 2005, 253–255):

    –   "transmediality" (an extracompositional variant), which describes such transmedial phenomena that are non-specific to individual media (motifs, thematic variation, narrativity) and which appear across a variety of different media;

    –   "intermedial transposition" (an extracompositional variant), the 'transfer' of the content or of formal features from one medium to another, e.g. a film adaptation of a novel;

    –   "intermedial relations / references" (an intracompositional variant), where the involvement with the other medium may take place explicitly, "whenever two or more media are overtly present in a given semiotic entity" (Wolf 2005, 254), or covertly, i.e. indirectly (e.g. musicalization of fiction, or ekphrasis, i.e. visualization of fiction/poetry). Mere thematization of another medium is not enough, the term should be reserved for an evocation of certain formal features of another medium;

    –   "multi- or plurimediality" (an intracompositional variant), or combination of media (ballet, opera, film, comic strips, radio plays) (Wolf 2005, 253–255).

Obviously, the typologies developed by Rajewsky and Wolf (↗24 Literature and Music: Theory) are similar attempts at charting the vast field of intermedial relations. Discussions of examples for each of their categories can be found in the three parts

of this handbook. As in all classifications there are borderline cases hard to classify, and multiple labeling of one and the same phenomenon is sometimes necessary. This is why Rajewsky as well as Wolf point out the heuristic value of their typologies and underline the importance of analyzing individual intermedial constellations.

Jens Schröter (2012), a media scholar, also suggests a typology, but his typology is one of (at least) four types of *discourse* on intermediality. He does not intend to define what intermediality "'really is,' but to describe what ways of talking about intermediality, in a most general sense, there are" (Schröter 2012, 16; he explains that his last two models are different sides of the same phenomenon rather than two completely different categories):

– Synthetic intermediality: In this discursive field "intermediality is discussed as the process of a (sexually connoted) fusion of several media into a new medium – the intermedium – that supposedly is more than the sum of its parts" (Schröter 2012, 16); synthetic intermediality is associated with some artistic movements of the 1960s such as Happening and Fluxus and is rooted in Wagner's nineteenth-century artistic synthesis of a *Gesamtkunstwerk*; 'monomedia' are condemned and more holistic intermedial approaches and art forms favored, for instance by Dick Higgins (a Fluxus artist), which break up habitualized forms of perception and support utopian impulses for the reunification of individuals in a classless society (here the mix of multimedial and utopian-holistic ideas is problematic since intermediality becomes ubiquitous); one inescapable problem of this model is, however, the differentiation of intermedia/intermedial forms such as 'visual poetry' (where a conceptual fusion occurs) and mixed media (regarded by the viewer as separate).

– Formal or transmedial intermediality: This discursive field is built on the concept that there are transmedial structures (such as fictionality, rhythmicity, compositional strategies, seriality) that are not specific to one medium but can be found in different media. Models utilizing transmedial intermediality have the problem that 'media specificity' is hard to conceptualize.

– Transformational intermediality: This discursive field deals with the representation of one medium through another medium (what Bolter and Grusin 1999 term 'remediation'); here the question arises whether transmedial intermediality is an intermedial category at all, since a representation of a medium is no longer a medium but a representation; nevertheless, "one would obstruct an interesting perspective if, with this argument, one would skip representation. [...] if photography can point or relate to a *written* text then we are already dealing with a relation between two media. One medium *refers* to another – thereby it can comment on the represented medium, which would allow one to make interesting inferences to the 'self-conception' of the representing medium." (Schröter 2012, 27) Schröter suggests the term "intermedial representation" for "a representation that explicitly refers to the represented medium" (Schröter 2012, 27). Since a transformation cannot be observed without knowledge "of what the represented medium (alleg-

edly) *is* [...] as well as what the representing medium (allegedly) is," the descriptions of transformations always have "ontological implications" (Schröter 2012, 27–28). Transformational intermediality is therefore the reverse side of Schröter's fourth category.

– Ontological intermediality or ontomediality, which highlights the fact that media always already exist in a medial network and never in splendid isolation. The question that has to be asked is this: "Do the clearly defined unities that we call media and that are characterized by some kind of media-specific materialities precede the intermedial relation, or does a sort of primeval intermediality exist that conversely functions as a prerequisite for the possibility of such unities?" (Schröter 2012, 28) Ontological intermediality does not follow the specificities of given and defined media, but rather precedes them; the concept of ontological intermediality or ontomediality undermines the idea of clearly separated media, and "we have to recognize that it is not individual media that are primal and *then* move toward each other intermedially, but that it is intermediality that is primal and that the clearly separated 'monomedia' are the result of purposeful and institutionally caused blockades, incisions, and mechanisms of exclusion" (Schröter 2012, 30).

It is notable that for Schröter media always already exist in relation to other media, never in isolation: "Intermediality is rather the ontological *conditio sine qua non*, which is always before 'pure' and specific media, which have to be extracted from the arch-intermediality." (Herzogenrath 2012, 4)

3.3 Future Fields of Intermediality Research

Some very interesting intermedial constellations in the field of literature are to be found in postcolonial, transcultural and cosmopolitan Anglophone literatures. Unfortunately, these postcolonial intermedial texts have been largely neglected so far, even if aspects like work-image intersections, ekphrasis and visual culture have raised some academic interest (Kortenaar 1997; Döring 2002; Emery 2007; Meyer 2009; Mendes 2012). In her pioneering article in this handbook, Birgit Neumann not only explores the multifaceted role of intermedial configurations in postcolonial literatures, she also debates the applicability of the concept of intermediality to postcolonial literatures. Since intermediality as a concept touches upon notions of hierarchy, superiority and legitimacy in the field of cultural representation, it is predestined to discuss the politics of symbolic forms in postcolonial literatures. As Neumann states, the field of "intermediality is one of the most promising and invigorating research areas within postcolonial studies today. And yet, despite the prominence of intermedial constellations in postcolonial literatures, to date there have been only few attempts to systematically introduce the concept into the field." (↗27 Intermedial Negotiations: Postcolonial Literatures) She opens up numerous fruitful intermedial perspectives for the

interpretation of postcolonial literatures and discusses the constitutive and dynamic role of media in construing forms of sociality and perpetuating cultural knowledge, including concepts of identification, alterity and power in postcolonial contexts. Since postcolonial literatures are often concerned with renegotiating imperial legacies and the ensuing predominance of Eurocentric epistemologies, the concept of intermediality, by opening up a space of semiotic and material in-between-ness, may intervene in the social fabric of existing medial configurations, reworking them in a way that allows readers to experience, see and imagine the world differently. By unsettling colonial epistemologies, which typically promote notions of cultural purity, the intermedial strategies of postcolonial literatures may bring to the fore "the heterogeneity and plurality of meaning-making and, in a wider sense, reflect the essential impurity and – to use a central concept of postcolonial studies – hybridity of all cultural formations." (↗27 Intermedial Negotiations: Postcolonial Literatures, 514) Postcolonial writers are often preoccupied with countering the colonial gaze, intervening in the existing relationship of visuality and power by, for instance, delivering subversive ekphrases of colonial painting, thus using ekphrasis' transformational potential to discuss colonial legacies. Chapter 7 on postcolonial ekphrasis also contributes to the field of postcolonial intermedial studies. It expounds on the fact that Anglophone postcolonial literatures testify to visuality as a battleground on which colonial legacies are negotiated at a time when increasing globalization is accountable for today's conspicuous transnational and transcultural dimensions of the lives and works of so many Anglophone writers. This handbook hopes to augment efforts at bringing together postcolonial studies and intermediality studies more closely.

Among the areas of intermediality research which are of special interest in our times of media hybridization, and hence likely to be further developed in the future, are also transmediality research and inter-/transmedial narration. As a theoretical framework, transmediality research seems to be a central category for understanding our media-saturated world characterized by media transposition, adaptation and 'remediation' (cf. 3.4; also ↗13 Adaptation – Remediation – Transmediality). In intermediality research, transmediality is a category that refers to phenomena that crop up across a variety of media, for instance fictionality, rhythmicity, seriality, motifs, thematic variations and narrativity. One of the most productive fields of transmediality research is inter- or transmedial storytelling (cf. Grishakova and Ryan 2010; Schwanecke 2012; Thon 2014, 2016 forthcoming). As comparatively recent concepts, inter- and transmedial storytelling made their first prominent appearance in the early 2000s (cf. Rippl and Etter 2013 for a more detailed discussion). Werner Wolf triggered the debate with a groundbreaking article in 2002 that systematically investigated the narrative potential of music, paintings, and picture series by bringing together the findings of intermediality studies and literary narratology, thus developing a new intermedial narratology. On the basis of formal (chronology, repetition, teleology, causality/cohesion) and thematic indicators (tellability and singularity; cf. Wolf 2002, 47–51), Wolf has discriminated *genuinely narrative* genres such as novels that are based on pre-

dominantly verbal media (written and oral text) from works that indicate narration, such as picture series and mono- or polyphase pictures. The narrative potential is low whenever a considerable input to the production of narrativity is required from the recipient (cf. Wolf 2002, 96). In other words, prototypical narration in a novel requires a minimal narrativizing activity on the part of the recipient, whereas instrumental music demands a maximum (cf. Wolf 2002, 95); comic strips hold a middle position on Wolf's scale (cf. Hoppeler, Etter, and Rippl 2009, 96). Thus, intermedial narration is based on the insight that narrativity is a transmedial cognitive frame. While most classical narratology has "disregarded the interrelation between narrativity and media, [...] [p]ostclassical narratology has started to dismantle th[e] hegemony of narrator-transmitted narratives and has emphasized the transmedial nature of narrativity as a cognitive frame applicable to ever 'remoter' media and genres" (Wolf 2011, 145). In 2011, Wolf defined transmedial narratology as the study of narrativity in works of art outside the literary text, such as painting, sculpture, instrumental music (cf. Wolf 2011, 158). If narratology leaves behind concepts such as that of the narrator and the preoccupation with the verbal medium and focuses instead on prototypical and cognitive aspects of narrativity, a transmedial reconceptualization of narrative becomes possible. While narrative, like all cognitive macro-frames, can be realized in more than one medium, it is to a large extent (but never completely) medium-independent and hence a transmedial phenomenon. But this does not imply that transmedial narration does not take into account the material specificities of the respective medium in which an idea or story is expressed (cf. Wolf 2002; Ryan 2004; Walsh 2006). Generally speaking, transmedial narratology contends that the tellability of any given narrative depends intimately on the resources and the constraints of a given medium, just as each medium has particular affinities for certain themes and certain types of plot: "You cannot tell the same type of story on the stage and in writing, during conversation and in a thousand-page novel, in a two-hour movie and in a TV serial that runs for many years" (Ryan 2004, 356).

3.4 Critical Voices and Alternative Conceptualizations

Media-fusion, media transposition and a general tendency towards the dissolution of medial boundaries are central features of contemporary digital culture, which explains why more recently the question whether it makes sense at all to investigate individual media on their own and to contend that categorial media borders exist has become a crucial one. As a consequence, the concept of intermediality itself has come under scrutiny since it presupposes media borders that are then transgressed (cf. Weingart 2010). Researchers such as Wilhelm Voßkamp and Brigitte Weingart warn against essentializing media borders and media purism; they claim the constructedness and historicity of any conception of medium. Referring to W. J. T. Mitchell and Jacques Derrida, text, picture and music are not conceived as different media with

clear-cut borders, and instead a principal permeability between media is stated (cf. Weingart 2001; cf. also Voßkamp and Weingart 2005). Precisely because intermedial artifacts and phenomena aim at dissolving and transcending media borders, rigid and essentializing conceptions of media borders as well as media purism have to be challenged in favor of an understanding of media as relational constellations and situational incidences. Theories and typologies of intermediality can hence never be anything but heuristic instruments.

In spite of this criticism, researchers such as Marie-Laure Ryan (2005), Irina O. Rajewsky (2010) und Werner Wolf (2011) find it problematic to give up the concepts of media borders, "border zones" (Rajewsky 2010, 65) and media specificities altogether. They instead refer to the heuristic potential of these terms in analyses of various intermedial conceptions and specific intermedial manifestations:

> Currently, efforts are being made to strengthen common and crossover features [...] in intermediality studies [...]. Contrary to this tendency, I have advanced the thesis that medial differences and the notion of media borders play a crucial and extremely productive role in the context of intermedial practices. [...] thus starting from the objects of investigation as such, it is precisely the concept of the border which can be strengthened. In my view, the concept of the border is the precondition for techniques of crossing or challenging, dissolving or emphasizing medial boundaries, which can consequently be experienced and reflected on *as* constructs and conventions. [...] My thesis thus encompasses the idea of fostering a process of rethinking the notion of boundaries: it should be shifted from taxonomies to the dynamic and creative potential of the border itself. (Rajewsky 2010, 63–65)

Rajewsky talks about individual media without, however, conceiving of them as 'pure' media: Referring to Wolf (1999, 37), she underscores that media are only "conventionally perceived as distinct from other media" (Rajewsky 2010, 66 fn. 7). For the analysis of concrete intermedial configurations and intermedial practices in the arts, "media borders and medial specificities are indeed of crucial importance," as are their basic material and operative conditions (Rajewsky 2010, 53).

In addition to the controversial debates about the concept of media borders versus that of 'arch-intermediality' and the unsolved problem of a clear differentiation between media and art forms, there exists another striking problem within intermediality studies, that of the diverging terminologies used in different disciplines and fields. An example is Henry Jenkins's concept of "transmedia storytelling," which he defined in his book-length study *Convergence Cultures* (2006, esp. 95–134) as "[s]tories that unfold across multiple media platforms" and "a more integrated approach to franchise development than models based on urtexts and ancillary products" (Jenkins 2006, 334). Transmedia storytelling is interested in the circulation of media content across different media systems, favoring an integrated approach to franchise products which ignores older models based on categories like 'the original' or the 'source text/urtext' and later (supposedly aesthetically less valid) derivative texts. While according to Jenkins, during the nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth

media differentiation took place, today we encounter the *convergence of media* in the form of digital code and computer processing which renders investigations into individual media anachronistic. Although Jenkins implicitly agrees with Ryan's stance that every medium has its idiosyncratic ways of shaping a narrative, he has more in mind for the term "transmedia" than the switching from one medium to another while telling one and the same story: He is interested in how a certain narrative is spread simultaneously over a field of several media. The *new* media product – the one that, according to him, merits the term "transmedia" – can be observed in those cases where the 'travels' across media are planned and laid out right from the start (cf. also Mittell 2012). Jenkins's main focus is on the franchising strategies of cultural products in our highly mediatized, digital world characterized by a convergence culture with its "flow of content across multiple media platforms, the cooperation between multiple media industries, and the migratory behavior of media audiences who will go almost anywhere in search of the kinds of entertainment experiences they want" (Jenkins 2006, 2).

Digitality and the computer as a new hyper-medium play pivotal roles in all attempts at defining intermediality. As a result, media scholars have asked whether the concept should be restricted to the analog arts and media, because only there is the materiality of a medium actually present (Paech and Schröter 2008). Intermediality's role as sole player in today's theoretical landscape in the discussed field is challenged by scholars who consider Jenkins's term 'convergence culture' and related concepts such as 'culture of remediation,' 'postmodern culture of recycling' and 'adaptation' to open up better approaches to and explanations of today's cultural products.

While Jenkins has introduced the term 'convergence' to describe the series of intersections between different media systems in our digitalized world, Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin also discuss inter- and transmedial relationships in connection with digital media; however, they use a different term, namely 'remediation,' a metaphor from media ecology which has replaced McLuhan's vision of media as network. Bolter and Grusin claim that in current (digital) media, "*all* mediation is remediation" (Bolter and Grusin 1999, 55), understanding the concept of 'remediation' as a particular kind of intermedial relationship undergoing processes of medial refashioning. They define remediation as "the formal logic by which new media refashion prior media forms" (Bolter and Grusin 1999, 273), as "*the mediation of mediation*: Each act of mediation depends on other acts of mediation. Media are continually commenting on, reproducing, and replacing each other, and this process is integral to media. Media need each other to function as media at all" (Bolter and Grusin 1999, 55):

> [New] visual technologies, such as computer graphics and the World Wide Web [...] are doing exactly what their predecessors have done: presenting themselves as refashioned and improved versions of other media. Digital media can best be understood through the ways in which they honor, rival, and revise linear-perspective painting, photography, film, television, and print. No medium today, and certainly no single media event, seems to do its cultural work in isolation from other media, any more than it works in isolation from other social and economic forces.

> What is new about new media comes from the particular ways in which they refashion older media and the ways in which older media refashion themselves to answer the challenges of new media. (Bolter and Grusin 1999, 14–15)

Remediation can easily be aligned with concepts like adaptation, especially when the adaptation is to a different medium, which is the case with filmic adaptations of texts, and here remediation may serve as a synonym for adaptation (Hutcheon 2006, 3; ↗13 Adaptation – Remediation – Transmediality). Rajewsky comments on Bolter and Grusin's concept of remediation as "a defining characteristic of the new digital media" (Bolter and Grusin 1999, 45) and a basic trait of all medial practices. While their concept of remediation is a subcategory of intermediality in the broad sense, it is nevertheless "hardly reconcilable with conceptions of intermedial subcategories like medial transformation, media combination, or medial references" for the very reason that remediation "necessarily implies a tendency to level out significant differences both between the individual phenomena in question and between different media with their respective materiality; differences that come to the fore as soon as detailed analyses of specific medial configurations, their respective meaning-constitutional strategies, and their overall signification are at stake" (Rajewsky 2005, 64).

Another important related field of intermediality research investigating visual phenomena and networks is 'visual culture studies' (cf. Mirzoeff 1999; Rimmele and Stiegler 2012). Visual culture plays an important role in different disciplines such as American Studies (cf. Böger and Decker 2007; Decker 2010; Hebel and Wagner 2011), English Studies (cf. Brosch 2004, 2011) and Germanic Studies (Benthien and Weingart 2014; cf. also Stiegeler 2014). In addition, the relatively new field, literary visuality, investigates the role of literature(s) in visual culture(s): The approach is the result of a "fast-developing dialogue of textual studies with visual culture studies" (Harrow 2013, 1) and "constitutes an alternative or complementary paradigm to intermediality studies in that it posits the larger framework of visual rather than media culture as the context in which to analyse the visualities of literature." (cf. Isekenmeier ↗17 Literary Visuality, 325) Intermediality studies, and ekphrasis research in particular, have been criticized by scholars working in the fields of visual culture and literary visuality for being mainly concerned with pictures and their media. Because of their understanding of cultures as semiotic systems, which combine social practices, material artifacts and conventional codes, literary visuality's range – according to Guido Isekenmeier – extends beyond (the) media and questions their centrality in or for visual culture(s) by putting visuality, i.e. vision, sight and seeing, center stage. A literary studies approach to visuality in particular "has to look or read beyond (the) media in order to elucidate literature's participation in visual culture at large" (↗17 Literary Visuality, 326). While it seems logical to underline the embeddedness of pictures and visual media in visual practices, scholars of intermediality would reply that all practices of looking and scopic regimes presented in literature are exclusively accessible

through the medium in which the text is encoded, hence the question of medium cannot be foregone.

A last concept that needs introduction is 'multimodality.' Werner Wolf distinguished between 'covert intermediality,' which refers to the transformation of another medium into a literary verbal text, and what he terms 'overt intermediality' (cf. Wolf 1999, 37–44), which goes by the name of 'multimodality' in social semiotic approaches (↗34 Non-verbal Semiotic Modes and Media in the Multimodal Novel). Examples of overt intermediality are opera or film, which both combine language, music, sound etc.: "As a rule, such conventionalized forms of the co-presence of different media in one work of art constitute literary or aesthetic genres of their own with a very specific and conventionalized interrelation between the different media and have therefore also been termed 'plurimediality' (as in the case of the theater play [...]), or the 'multimodality' of film [...] or of novels" (cf. Hallet ↗32 Methodology of Intermediality in Literary Sudies, 606). Multimodality as a theoretical framework in the humanities has been developed to account for the shortcomings of monomodal disciplinary approaches in linguistics as well as literary studies, where "language was (seen as) the central and only full means for representation and communication" (Kress and van Leeuwen 2001, 45). Kress and van Leeuwen have first developed the notion of an intrinsic combination of 'different codes' and 'modes' in acts of signification and communication. They define mode as any semiotic resource that produces meaning in a social context (for a critical discussion of Kress and van Leeuwen cf. Elleström 2010b, 13–17; 40 fn 7 and 8). With the emergence of new multimedia technologies and electronic multimedial environments, linguistic theories of communication as well as literary theories of symbolic representation need to account for the combination of different media and symbolic forms. In its most basic sense, multimodality is a theory of communication and social semiotics, it describes communication practices in terms of the textual, aural, linguistic, spatial, and visual resources – or modes – used to compose messages. In social semiotics, media are defined as merely physical and material resources "used in the production of semiotic products and events, including both the tools and the materials used (e.g. the musical instrument and the air; the chisel and the block of wood)" (Kress and van Leeuwen 2001, 22). Wolfgang Hallet (2009) is a preeminent literary scholar who – in reaction to the fact that since the 1990s a new kind of Anglophone novel has emerged which integrates a wide range of non-linguistic symbolic forms and non-narrative modes such as visual images, diagrams, maps, screenshots, drawings, handwritten letters and e-mails into the narrative discourse – has adapted multimodality theories from social semiotics and discourse analysis in linguistics to discuss the sub-genre of the multimodal novel and to describe how the combination of various semiotic modes and forms of symbolization serves signifying and communicative purposes.

It is not easy to bring the two fields, intermediality studies and multimodality research, together, since the concepts of media are diverging ones. As Hallet succinctly summarizes, a semiotic mode is

always tied to a specific material or medial carrier, but media in themselves do not produce meaning. This is a substantial conceptual difference between intermediality theories and multimodality theories. Whereas in the former the verbal text and a visual image are regarded and described as different, interrelated media, text-image relations in the multimodal novel (as in multimodal texts in general) are not conceptualized as intermedial relations, but as an interplay of two distinct semiotic modes (textual entities) in the same 'medium,' i.e. the printed book, which jointly contribute to the production of one whole meaning in a single act of communication [...]. (↗34 Non-verbal Semiotic Modes and Media in the Multimodal Novel, 642)

An interesting and promising attempt at discussing multimodal and intermedial approaches and their conflicting terminologies together has recently been put forward by Lars Elleström who claims that "all kind of sign systems and also specific media productions and works of art must be seen as parts of a very wide field including not least the material, sensorial, spatiotemporal and semiotic aspects" which Elleström calls "the four 'modalities' of media," and which allow him to pinpoint the commonalities and differences between art forms, media, etc. (Elleström 2010a, 4). He also distinguishes between "three aspects of the notion of medium. *Basic media* are simply defined by their modal properties whereas *qualified media* are also characterized by historical, cultural, social, aesthetic and communicative facets. *Technical media* are any objects, or bodies, that 'realize', 'mediate' or 'display' basic and qualified media." (Elleström 2010a, 5; for a critique of Elleström's model ↗31 Performing Games) These three types of media are not separate ones, but "complementary, theoretical aspects of what constitutes media and mediality" (Elleström 2010b, 12); the modalities of media build "a medial complex integrating materiality, perception and cognition" (Elleström 2010b, 15). The material modality is defined as "the latent corporeal interface of the medium"; the sensorial modality is "the physical and mental acts of perceiving the present interface of the medium through the sense faculties"; the spatiotemporal modality of media covers "the structuring of the sensorial perception of sense-data of the material interface into experiences and conceptions of space and time"; and finally, the semiotic modality is "the product of a perceiving and conceiving subject situated in social circumstances" (Elleström 2010b, 17–18, 21).

A few years before Gunter Kress and Theo van Leeuwen published their influential book-length study *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication* in 2001, W. J. T. Mitchell claimed in *Picture Theory* that "all media are mixed media, combining different codes, discursive conventions, channels, sensory and cognitive modes" (Mitchell 1995, 94–95). In this vein, Elleström, too, explains that "[a]ll media are mixed in different ways. Every medium consists of a fusion of modes that are partly, and in different degrees of palpability, shared by other media. Every medium has the capacity of mediating only certain aspects of the total reality" (Elleström 2010b, 24). There is no doubt that in the future, the concepts of intermediality, transmediality, multimodality, etc. will be further discussed and refined as new inter- and transmedial manifestations are encountered in our digital and globalized culture.

* * * * *

The *Handbook of Intermediality: Literature – Image – Sound – Music* is the first volume in the new De Gruyter series *Handbooks of English and American Studies: Text and Theory*. This handbook has a theoretical focus; however, theory is brought together with concrete interpretation of literary texts against the backdrop of literary and cultural history – which is the programmatic idea behind the series. As an attempt to chart the rich field of intermediality research in literary studies and related fields, editor and contributors are aware that this cannot be a comprehensive undertaking: there are so many additional issues which ask for more in-depth discussion (cf. the Further Reading section of this Introduction). In the thirty-four chapters of this *Handbook of Intermediality* that follow, a range of crucial concepts of intermediality will be discussed in connection with literary examples from different centuries and Anglophone cultures. In its three parts – I Text and Image, II Music, Sound and Performance, and III Intermedial Methodology and Intersectionalities – the handbook reflects the different areas of intermediality research relevant to the study of Anglophone literatures. The three parts are of different length long and thus reflect the expertise of the editor in the field of text-picture intersections. The longest, Part I Text and Image, consists of five subsections: Ekphrasis; Literature and Photography; Literature and the Moving Image; Literary Visuality and Intermedial Framing; as well as Intermedial Narration: Text-Picture Combinations. Part II Music, Sound and Performance includes chapters on musico-literary relationships, literary acoustics, postcolonial intermedial negotiations, theatrical intermediality, literature-dance encounters, as well as intermediality and video games. Part III Intermedial Methodology and Intersectionalities offers a chapter on a methodology of intermediality in literary studies, a field which has so far been neglected, but is of course of great importance for students. Part III also offers two chapters on multimodality and how to operationalize the concept in analyses of 'texts' which include visual material such as pictures and maps: Chapter 33 is authored by a linguist and communication scholar, chapter 34 is provided by a specialist of teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) and literary scholar. In all contributions, the choice of approaches and literary examples inevitably reflects individual preferences, however not to the disadvantage of the project, but rather as an indication of the vibrant and diverse field of intermediality studies and its neighboring research fields. Paying tribute to the broad range of scholarly backgrounds and the wide spectrum covered, the chapters vary in their use of British and American English and spelling. At the end of the handbook, the reader finds two index lists covering subjects and names which will assist efficient use of the handbook.

This handbook would not have materialized without the indefatigable commitment of my team members at the University of Bern, Dr. des. Lukas Etter, Ryan Kopaitich, Sofie Behluli and Rahel Braunschweig, the generous and indispensible advice of Dr. Ulrike Krauss, Katja Lehming and Lena Ebert at De Gruyter, and the support of

all contributors – a big thank you goes to all of them. Special thanks, however, go to Markus Haas who has been incredibly patient with me over the last two years.

4 Bibliography

4.1 Works Cited

Assmann, Aleida. "Exkarnation. Gedanken zur Grenze zwischen Körper und Schrift." *Raum und Verfahren*. Ed. Jörg Huber and Alois Martin Müller. Zurich: Stroemfeld/Roter Stern, 1993. 133–155.

Assmann, Aleida. "Schrift und Autorschaft im Spiegel der Mediengeschichte." *Inszenierte Imagination: Beiträge zu einer historischen Anthropologie der Medien*. Ed. Wolfgang Müller-Funk and Hans Ulrich Reck. Vienna and New York: Springer, 1996. 13–24.

Babbitt, Irving. *The New Laokoon: An Essay on the Confusion of the Arts*. London and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1910.

Bal, Mieke. "Art, Language, Thought, and Culture: Cultural Analysis Today." *The Contemporary Study of Culture*. Ed. Austrian Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Verkehr and the Internationales Forschungszentrum Kulturwissenschaften. Vienna: Turia + Kant, 1999. 169–192.

Balestrini, Nassim Winnie. *From Fiction to Libretto: Irving, Hawthorne, and James as Opera*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2005.

Benthien, Claudia, and Brigitte Weingart, eds. *Handbuch Literatur & Visuelle Kultur*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014.

Böger, Astrid, and Christof Decker, eds. *Transatlantic Perspectives on American Visual Culture*. Special issue of *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 52.1 (2007).

Bolter, Jay David, and Richard Grusin. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999.

Brosch, Renate. "Visual Culture." *The European English Messenger* 13.1 (2004): 32–42.

Brosch, Renate, ed. *Moving Images – Mobile Viewers: 20th Century Visuality*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2011.

Caduff, Corina, Sabine Gerhardt Fink, Florian Keller, and Steffen Schmid. "Intermedialität." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 51.2 (2006): 211–237.

Decker, Christof. *Visuelle Kulturen der USA: Zur Geschichte von Malerei, Fotografie, Film, Fernsehen und Neuen Medien in Amerika*. Bielefeld: transcript, 2010.

Döring, Tobias. *Caribbean-English Passages: Intertextuality in a Postcolonial Tradition*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Eicher, Thomas, and Ulf Bleckmann, eds. *Intermedialität: Vom Text zum Bild*. Bielefeld: Aisthesis, 1994.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformation in Early-modern Europe.* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Elleström, Lars. "Introduction." *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*. Ed. Lars Elleström. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010a. 1–8.

Elleström, Lars. "The Modalities of Media: A Model for Understanding Intermedial Relations." *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*. Ed. Lars Elleström. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010b. 11–48.

Emden, Christian, and Gabriele Rippl. "Introduction: Image, Text and Simulation." *ImageScapes: Studies in Intermediality*. Ed. Christian Emden and Gabriele Rippl. Oxford and Bern: Peter Lang, 2010. 1–18.

Emery, Mary Lou. *Modernism, the Visual, and Caribbean Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Faulstich, Werner. *Einführung in die Medienwissenschaft*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2002.

Fludernik, Monika, and Greta Olson. "Introduction." *Current Trends in Narratology*. Ed. Greta Olson. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2011. 1–33.

Friedman, Ken. "Intermedia: Four Histories, Three Directions, Two Futures." *Intermedia: Enacting the Liminal*. Ed. Hans Breder and Klaus-Peter Busse. Dortmund: University of Dortmund, 2005. 51–62.

Gaudreault, André, and Philippe Marion. "The Cinema as a Model for the Genealogy of Media." *Convergence* 8.4 (2002): 12–18.

Giesecke, Michael. *Der Buchdruck in der frühen Neuzeit: Eine historische Fallstudie über die Durchsetzung neuer Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologien*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991.

Greenberg, Clement. "Towards a Newer Laocoon." 1940. *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism*. Vol. 1. Ed. John O'Brian. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1993. 23–38.

Griem, Julika, ed. *Bildschirmfiktionen: Interferenzen zwischen Literatur und neuen Medien*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1998.

Grishakova, Marina, and Marie-Laure Ryan, eds. *Intermediality and Storytelling*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2010.

Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich, and Karl Ludwig Pfeiffer. *Materialität der Kommunikation*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988.

Hagstrum, Jean H. *The Sister Arts: The Tradition of Literary Pictorialism and English Poetry from Dryden to Gray*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Hallet, Wolfgang. "The Multimodal Novel. The Integration of Modes and Media in Novelistic Narration." *Narratology in the Age of Interdisciplinary Narrative Research*. Ed. Sandra Heinen and Roy Sommer. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2009. 129–153.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. "Intermedialität und Intertextualität. Probleme der Korrelation von Wort- und Bildkunst: Am Beispiel der russischen Moderne." *Dialog der Texte: Hamburger Kolloquium zur Intertextualität*. Ed. Wolf Schmid and Wolf-Dieter Stempel. Vienna: Gesellschaft zur Förderung slawistischer Studien, 1983. 291–360.

Harrow, Susan. "Introduction." *The Art of the Text: Visuality in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Literature and Other Media*. Ed. Susan Harrow. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2013. 1–14.

Hebel, Udo, and Christoph Wagner, eds. *Pictorial Cultures and Political Iconographies: Approaches, Perspectives, Case Studies From Europe and America*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2011.

Helbig, Jörg, ed. *Intermedialität: Theorie und Praxis eines interdisziplinären Forschungsgebietes*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1998.

Herman, David. "Toward a Transmedial Narratology." *Narrative across Media: The Languages of Storytelling*. Ed. Marie-Laure Ryan. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. 47–75.

Herzogenrath, Bernd. "Travels in Intermedia[lity]: An Introduction." *ReBlurring the Boundaries*. Ed. Bernd Herzogenrath. Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2012. 1–14.

Higgins, Dick. "Intermedia." *Horizons: The Poetics and Theory of the Intermedia*. 1966. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984. 18–28 [originally published as "Synesthesia ad Intersenses: Intermedia." *Something Else Newsletter* I.I. Something Else Press, 1966].

Hollander, John. *The Gazer's Spirit: Poems Speaking to Silent Works of Art*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Hoppeler, Stephanie, Lukas Etter, and Gabriele Rippl. "Intermedialität in Comics: Neil Gaimans *The Sandman*." *Comics: Zur Geschichte und Theorie eines populärkulturellen Mediums*. Ed. Stephan Ditschke, Katerina Kroucheva, and Daniel Stein. Bielefeld: transcript, 2009. 53–79.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Jäger, Ludwig. "Die Sprachvergessenheit der Medientheorie: Ein Plädoyer für das Medium Sprache." *Sprache und neue Medien*. Ed. Werner Kallmeyer. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1999. 9–30.

Jäger, Ludwig, Erika Linz, and Irmela Schneider. "Preface." *Media, Culture, and Mediality: New Insights into the Current State of Research*. Ed. Ludwig Jäger, Erika Linz, and Irmela Schneider. Bielefeld: transcript, 2010. 9–16.

Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Cultures*: *Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York and London: New York University Press, 2006.

Kittler, Friedrich A. *Discourse Networks 1800–1900*. Trans. M. Metteer. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990. (German original *Aufschreibesysteme*, 1985).

Kittler, Friedrich A. *Grammophon – Film – Typewriter*. Berlin: Brinkmann & Bose, 1986.

Klarer, Mario. *Ekphrasis: Bildbeschreibung als Repräsentationstheorie bei Spenser, Sidney, Lyly und Shakespeare*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2001.

Kortenaar, Neil ten. "Postcolonial Ekphrasis: Salman Rushdie Gives the Finger back to the Empire." *Contemporary Literature* 38.2 (1997): 232–259.

Kress, Gunther. *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Kress, Gunther, and Theo van Leeuwen. *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Arnold, 2001.

Landow, George, P. *Hypertext. The Convergence of Contemporary Critical Theory and Technology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Langer, Susanne K. *Philosophy in a New Key*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Leschke, Rainer. *Einführung in die Medientheorie*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2003.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry*. 1766. Trans. E. A. McCormick. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Laokoon oder die Grenzen der Malerei und Poesie*. 1766. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1994.

Luhmann, Niklas. *The Reality of the Mass Media (Cultural Memory in the Present)*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Mahler, Andreas. "Probleme der Intermedialitätsforschung: Medienbegriff – Interaktion – Spannweise." *Poetica* 44 (2010): 239–260.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media*: *The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Mendes, Ana Cristina, ed. *Salman Rushdie and Visual Culture*. New York and London: Routledge, 2012.

Meyer, Michael, ed. *Word & Image in Colonial and Postcolonial Literatures and Cultures*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.

Mirzoeff, Nicholas. *An Introduction to Visual Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

Mitchell, W. J. T. *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Mittell, Jason. "Playing for Plot in the *Lost* and *Portal* Franchises." *Eludamos: Journal for Computer Game Culture* 6.1 (2012): 5–13.

Müller, Jürgen E. *Intermedialität: Formen moderner kultureller Kommunikation*. Münster: Nodus, 1996.

Müller, Jürgen E. "Intermedialität als poetologisches und medientheoretisches Konzept." *Intermedialität: Theorie und Praxis eines interdisziplinären Forschungsgebiets*. Ed. Jürg Helbig. London: Turnshare, 2009. 31–40.

Paech, Joachim. "Das Bild zwischen den Bildern." *Film, Fernsehen, Video und die Künste. Strategien* der *Intermedialität*. Ed. Joachim Paech. Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 1994. 163–178.

Paech, Joachim. "Intermedial Figuration – am Beispiel von Jean-Luc Godards *Historie(s) du Cinéma.*" *Mediale Performanzen: Historische Konzepte und Perspektiven*. Ed. Jutta Eming, Annette J. Lehmann, and Irmgard Maassen. Freiburg: Rombach, 2002. 275–295.

Paech, Joachim, and Jens Schröter, eds. *Intermedialität – Analog/Digital*: *Theorien, Methoden, Analysen*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2008.

Pater, Walter. "The School of Giorgione." *The Renaissance*. 1873. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986. 83–98.

Pfister, Manfred. "The Dialogue of Text and Image. Antoni Tapiès and Anselm Kiefer." *Bild und Text im Dialog*. Ed. Klaus Discherl. Passau: Wissenschaftsverlag Rothe, 1993. 321–345.

Pound, Ezra. "I Gather the Limbs of Osiris." *Ezra Pound: Selected Prose, 1909–1965*. Ed. William Cookson. New York: New Directions, ²1973. 21–43.

Pound, Ezra. "Affirmations – Vorticism." *The New Age*, 14 Jan. 1915. 277–278. Reprinted in *Ezra Pound and the Visual Arts*. Ed. Harriet Zinnes. New York: New Directions, 1980.

Pross, Harry. *Medienforschung*. Darmstadt: Carl Habel, 1972.

Pross, Harry. *Der Mensch im Mediennetz*. Zurich: Winkler, 1996.

Rajewsky, Irina O. "Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality." *Intermédialités* 6 (2005): 43–64.

Rajewsky, Irina O. "Border Talks: The Problematic Status of Media Borders in the Current Debate about Intermediality." *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*. Ed. Lars Elleström. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. 51–68.

Redling, Erik. *Translating Jazz into Poetry: From Mimesis to Metaphor*. Berlin: De Gruyter, forthcoming.

Rimmele, Marius, and Bernd Stiegler. *Visuelle Kulturen/Visual Culture*. Hamburg: Junius, 2012.

Rippl, Gabriele. *Beschreibungs-Kunst: Zur intermedialen Poetik angloamerikanischer Ikontexte (1880–2000)*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2005a.

Rippl, Gabriele. "Literatur und (visuelle) Medien in der frühen Neuzeit." *Kulturgeschichte der englischen Literatur: Von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart*. Ed. Vera Nünning. Tübingen and Basel: Francke/utb, 2005b. 36–47.

Rippl, Gabriele. "English Literature and Its Other: Towards a Poetics of Intermediality." *ImageScapes: Studies in Intermediality*. Ed. Christian Emden and Gabriele Rippl. Oxford and Bern: Peter Lang, 2010. 39–65.

Rippl, Gabriele. "Film and Media Studies." *English and American Studies*. Ed. Martin Middeke, Timo Müller, Christina Wald, and Hubert Zapf. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2012. 314–332.

Rippl, Gabriele. "Intermedialität: Wort/Bild." *Literatur und Visuelle Kultur*. Ed. Claudia Benthien and Brigitte Weingart. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014. 139–158.

Rippl, Gabriele, and Lukas Etter. "Intermediality, Transmediality, and Graphic Narrative." *From Comic Strips to Graphic Novels. Contributions to the Theory and History of Graphic Narrative*. Ed. Daniel Stein and Jan-Noël Thon. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013. 191–217.

Ryan, Marie-Laure. "Introduction." *Narrative Across Media: The Languages of Storytelling*. Ed. Marie-Laure Ryan. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. 1–40.

Ryan, Marie-Laure. "On the Theoretical Foundations of Transmedial Narratology." *Narratology beyond Criticism: Mediality, Disciplinarity*. Ed. Jan Christoph Meister. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005. 1–23.

Ryan, Marie-Laure. "Story/World/Media: Tuning the Instruments of a Media-Conscious Narratology." *Storyworlds across Media: Toward a Media-Conscious Narratology*. Ed. Marie-Laure Ryan and Jan-Noël Thon. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014. 25–49.

Ryan, Marie-Laure, and Jan-Noël Thon. "Storyworlds across Media: Introduction." *Storyworlds across Media: Toward a Media-Conscious Narratology*. Ed. Marie-Laure Ryan and Jan-Noël Thon. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014. 1–21.

Scher, Steven Paul. *Verbal Music in German Literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Schmidt, Siegfried J. "Medienkulturwissenschaft." *Metzler Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie*. Ed. Ansgar Nünning. Stuttgart: Metzler, ⁴2008. 472–474.

Schröter, Jens. "Intermedialität. Facetten und Probleme eines aktuellen medienwissenschaftlichen Begriffs." *Montage/AV* 7.2 (1998): 129–154.

Schröter, Jens. "Four Models of Intermediality." *ReBlurring the Boundaries*. Ed. Bernd Herzogenrath. Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2012. 15–36.

Schwanecke, Christine. *Intermedial Storytelling: Thematisation, Imitation and Incorporation of Photography in English and American Fiction at the Turn of the 21st Century*. Trier: wvt, 2012.

Schweighauser, Philipp. *The Noises of American Literature, 1890–1985: Toward a History of Literary Acoustics*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006.

Segeberg, Harro, und Simone Winko, eds. *Digitalität und Literatur: Zur Zukunft der Literatur*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2005.

Spielmann, Yvonne, *Intermedialität: Das System Peter Greenaway*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1998.

Stiegeler, Bernd. "Visual Culture." *Handbuch Literatur & Visuelle Kultur*. Ed. Claudia Benthien and Brigitte Weingart. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014. 159–172.

Thon, Jan-Noël. "Toward a Transmedial Narratology: On Narrators in Contemporary Graphic Novels, Feature Films, and Computer Games." *Beyond Classical Narration: Unnatural and Transmedial Challenges*. Ed. Jan Alber and Per Krogh Hansen. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014. 25–56.

Thon, Jan-Noël. *Transmedial Narratology and Contemporary Media Culture*. 2016 forthcoming.

Todorow, Almut. "Intermedialität." *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Vol. 10. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2011. 399–410.

Voigts-Virchow, Eckart. *Introduction to Media Studies*. Stuttgart: Klett, 2005.

Voßkamp, Wilhelm, and Brigitte Weingart. "Sichtbares und Sagbares: Text-Bild-Verhältnisse – Einleitung." *Sichtbares und Sagbares: Text-Bild-Verhältnisse*. Ed. Wilhelm Voßkamp and Brigitte Weingart. Cologne: DuMont, 2005. 7–22.

Wagner, Peter. *Icons – Texts – Iconotexts. Essays on Ekphrasis and Intermediality*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1996.

Walsh, Richard. "The Narrative Imagination across Media." *Graphic Narrative*. Special issue of *Modern Fiction Studies* 52.4 (2006): 855–868. Ed. Hillary L. Chute and Marianne DeKoven.

Webb, Ruth. *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield: Merriam-Webster, 1991.

Weingart, Brigitte. "Where is your rupture? Zum Transfer zwischen Text- und Bildtheorie." *Die Adresse des Mediums*. Ed. Stefan Andriopoulos, Gabriele Schabacher, and Eckhard Schumacher. Cologne: DuMont, 2001. 136–157.

Weingart, Brigitte. "Bastards: Text/Image Hybrids in Pop Writing by Rolf Dieter Brinkmann and Others." *Media, Culture, and Mediality: New Insights into the Current State of Research*. Ed. Ludwig Jäger, Erika Linz, and Irmela Schneider. Bielefeld: transcript, 2010. 429–461.

Wenzel, Horst. *Hören und Sehen – Schrift und Bild: Kultur und Gedächtnis im Mittelalter*. Munich: Beck, 1995.

Wolf, Werner. "Intermedialität als neues Paradigma der Literaturwissenschaft?" *AAA–Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 21.1 (1996): 85–116.

Wolf, Werner. *The Musicalization of Fiction: A Study in the Theory and History of Intermediality*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999.

Wolf, Werner. "Das Problem der Narrativität in Literatur, bildender Kunst und Musik. Ein Beitrag zu einer intermedialen Erzähltheorie." *Erzähltheorie transgenerisch, intermedial, interdisziplinär*. Ed. Vera Nünning and Ansgar Nünning. Trier: wvt, 2002. 23–104.

Wolf, Werner. "Intermediality." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. London: Routledge, 2005. 252–256.

Wolf, Werner. "Narratology and Media(lity): The Transmedial Expansion of a Literary Discipline and Possible Consequences." *Current Trends in Narratology*. Ed. Greta Olson. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2011. 146–180.

4.2 Further Reading

Adler, Jeremy and Ernst Ulrich. *Text als Figur*. Wolfenbüttel: Herzog-August-Bibliothek/Weinheim: Acta humanoria, 1987.

Baetens, Jan. *Pour le roman-photo*. Brussels: Les Impressions Nouvelles, 2010.

Bal, Mieke. *Reading 'Rembrandt': Beyond the Word-Image-Opposition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Bal, Mieke. "Visual Essentialism and the Object of Visual Culture." *Journal of Visual Culture* 2.1 (2003): 5–32.

Bateman, John A., and Karl-Heinrich Schmidt. *Multimodal Film Analysis: How Films Mean*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012.

Bay-Cheng, Sarah, Chiel Kattenbelt, Andy Lavender, and Robin Nelson, eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010.

Becker, Sabina, and Barbara Korte, eds. *Visuelle Evidenz? Fotografie im Reflex von Literatur und Film*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2011.

Bernhart, Walter, and Werner Wolf, eds. *Word and Music Studies* (book series). Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999–.

Bolter, Jay David. "Ekphrasis, Virtual Reality, and the Future of Writing." *The Future of the Book*. Ed. Geoffrey Nunberg. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996. 253–272.

Bronfen, Elisabeth. *Crossmappings: Essays zur visuellen Kultur*. Zurich: Scheidegger & Spiess, 2000.

Brosch, Renate. *Krisen des Sehens: Herny James und der Strukturwandel der Wahrnehmung*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1999.

Brosch, Renate, ed. *Ikono/Philo/Logie: Wechselspiele von Texten und Bildern*. Berlin: Trafo, 2004.

Brosch, Renate, and Ronja Tripp, eds. *Visualisierungen: Textualität – Deixis – Lektüre*. Trier: wvt, 2007.

Bryson, Norman, Michael Ann Holly, and Keith Moxey, eds. *Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations*. Hanover and London: Wesleyan University Press, 1994.

Chapple, Freda, and Chiel Kattenbelt, eds. *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006.

Cheeke, Stephen. *Writing for Art: The Aesthetics of Ekphrasis*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.

Domsch, Sebastian. *Storyplaying: Agency and Narrative in Video Games*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.

Elleström, Lars. *Media Transformation. The Transfer of Media Characteristics among Media*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Fischer, Olga, and Christina Ljungberg, eds. *Iconicity in Language and Literature*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011.

Fjellestad, Danuta. "Resisting Extinction: The Pictorial in Contemporary American Literature." *Writing Technologies* 3 (2010): 10–24.

Georgi, Claudia. *Liveness on Stage: Intermedial Challenges in Contemporary British Theatre and Performance*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014.

Gernalzick, Nadja, and Gabriele Pisarz-Ramirez, eds. *Transmediality and Transculturality*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2013.

Griem, Julika, and Susanne Scholz, eds. *Medialisierungen des Unsichtbaren um 1900*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2010.

Hallet, Wolfgang. "Multimodalität." *Metzler Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie*. Ed. Ansgar Nünning. Stuttgart: Metzler, ⁵2008. 546–547.

Hallet, Wolfgang. "Medialisierung von Genres am Beispiel des Blogs und des multimodalen Romans: Von der Schrift-Kunst zum multimodalen Design." *Medialisierung des Erzählens im englischsprachigen Roman der Gegenwart: Theoretischer Bezugsrahmen, Genres und Modellinterpretationen*. Ed. Ansgar Nünning and Jan Rupp. Trier: wvt, 2011. 85–116.

Hallet, Wolfgang. "The Rise of the Multimodal Novel: Generic Change and Its Narratological Implications." *Storyworlds across Media: Towards a Media-Conscious Narratology*. Ed. Marie-Laure Ryan and Jan-Noël Thon. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014. 151–172.

Hartmann, Johanna. *Literary Visuality in Siri Hustvedt's Works*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2015 forthcoming.

Hedling, Erik, and Ulla-Britta Lagerroth, eds. *Cultural Functions of Intermedial Exploration*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2002.

Heffernan, James A. W. *Museum of Words. The Poetics of Ekphrasis from Homer to Ashbery*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Heusser, Martin. *I Am My Writing: The Poetry of E. E. Cummings*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1997.

Heusser, Martin, et al., eds. *On Verbal/Visual Representation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.

Hoffmann, Thorsten, and Gabriele Rippl, eds. *Bilder: Ein (neues) Leitmedium?* Göttingen: Wallstein, 2006.

Johnston, Andrew James, Margitta Rouse, and Philipp Hinz, eds. *The Medieval Motion Picture: The Politics of Adaptation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Johnston, Andrew James, Ethan Knapp, and Margitta Rouse, eds. *The Art of Vision: Ekphrasis in Medieval Literature and Culture*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2015 forthcoming.

Kennedy, David. *The Ekphrastic Encounter in Contemporary British Poetry and Elsewhere*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.

Krämer, Sybille. "Die Schrift als Hybrid aus Sprache und Bild: Thesen über die Schriftbildlichkeit unter Berücksichtigung von Diagrammatik und Kartographie." *Bilder. Ein (neues) Leitmedium?* Ed. Thorsten Hoffmann and Gabriele Rippl. Göttingen: Wallstein 2006, 79–92.

Lagerroth, Ulla-Britta, Hans Lund, and Erik Hedling, eds. *Interart Poetics: Essays on the Interrelations of the Arts and Media*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1997.

Ljungberg, Christina. "Performative Strategies in Intermedial Art." *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*. Ed. Lars Elleström. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. 81–96.

Ljungberg, Christina. *Creative Dynamics: Diagrammatic Strategies in Narratives*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2012.

Loizeaux, Elizabeth Bergman. *Twentieth-Century Poetry and the Visual Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Louvel, Liliane. *Poetics of the Iconotext*. Introd. Karen Jacobs, trans. Laurence Petit. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.

Marcsek-Fuchs, Maria. *Dance and British Literature: An Intermedial Encounter*. Amsterdam: Brill/
      Rodopi, 2015.
Marcus, Laura. *The Tenth Muse: Writing about Cinema in the Modernist Period*. Oxford: Oxford
      University Press, 2007.
Merten, Kai. *Intermediales Text-Theater: Die Bühne des Politischen und des Wissens vom Menschen
      bei Wordsworth und Scott*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2015.
Mitchell, W J. T. *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press,
      1986.
Mitchell, W. J. T. "There Are No Visual Media." *Journal of Visual Culture* 4.2 (2005): 257–266.
Morra, Joanne, and Marquard Smith, eds. *Visual Culture: Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural
      Studies*. 4 vols. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.
Murphet, Julian, and Lydia Rainford, eds. *Literature and Visual Technologies: Writing after Cinema*.
      New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
Neitzel, Britta, Nina Bishara, and Winfried Nöth. *Mediale Selbstreferenz: Grundlagen und Fallstudien
      zu Werbung, Computerspiel und Comics*. Cologne: Halem, 2008.
Neumann, Birgit, and Ansgar Nünning, eds. *Travelling Concepts for the Study of Culture*. Berlin and
      Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.
Nöth, Winfried, and Lucia Santaella. "Literature and the Other Arts: The Point of View of Semiotics."
      *The Role of Comparative Literature in the Sharing of Knowledge and in the Preservation of
      Cultural Diversity*. Ed. Lisa Block de Behar. Oxford: Eolss, 2009. www.eolss.net/sample-
      chapters/c04/e6-87-02-04.pdf. (10 Oct. 2014).
Paech, Joachim. "Intermedialität: Mediales Differenzial und transformative Figurationen."
      Intermedialität: Theorie und Praxis eines interdisziplinären Forschungsgebiets. Ed. Jörg Helbig.
      Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1998.
Plett, Heinrich F. "Intermedial Rhetoric." *Rhetoric and Renaissance Culture: Rhetoric and
      Renaissance Culture*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004. 295–412.
Rajewsky, Irina O. *Intermedialität*. Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 2002.
Rajewsky, Irina O. "Intermedialität – Eine Begriffsbestimmung." *Intermedialität im
      Deutschunterricht*. Ed. Marion Bönnighausen and Heidi Rösch. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider
      Verlag Hohengehren, 2004. 8–30.
Reulecke, Anne-Kathrin. *Geschriebene Bilder: Zum Kunst- und Mediendiskurs in der
      Gegenwartsliteratur*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2002.
Ribbat, Christoph. *Blickkontakt: Zur Beziehungsgeschichte amerikanischer Literatur und Fotografie
      (1945–2000)*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2003.
Schmitz-Emans, Monika, ed. *Visual Culture: Beiträge Zur XIII. Tagung Der Deutschen Gesellschaft für
      Allgemeine und Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft, Potsdam, 18.–21. Mai 2005*. Heidelberg:
      Synchron, 2008.
Schneider, Ralf. *Narrative and Media Awareness: Transmedial Narratology and the History of British
      Prose Fiction*. Forthcoming.
Simonis, Annette, ed. *Intermedialität und Kulturaustausch: Beobachtungen im Spannungsfeld
      zwischen Künsten und Medien*. Bielefeld: transcript, 2009.
Stein, Daniel. *Music Is My Life: Louis Armstrong, Autobiography and American Jazz*. Ann Arbor:
      University of Michigan Press, 2012.
Straub, Julia. "Diaphanous Angels: Julia Margaret Cameron's and Walter Pater's Go-Betweens."
      Textus 21 (2008): 261–278.
Straumann, Barbara. "Noise and Voice: Female Performers in Meredith, Eliot and Dinesen." *Unlaute:
      Noise/Geräusch in Kultur und Medien seit 1900*. Ed. Sylvia Mieszkowski and Sigrid Nieberle.
      Bielefeld: transcript, 2016 forthcoming.

Teukolsky, Rachel. *The Literate Eye: Victorian Art Writing and Modernist Aesthetics*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Thon, Jan-Noël. "Subjectivity across Media: On Transmedial Strategies of Subjective Representation in Contemporary Feature Films, Graphic Novels, and Computer Games." *Storyworlds across Media: Toward a Media-Conscious Narratology*. Ed. Marie-Laure Ryan and Jan-Noël Thon. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014. 67–102.

Thurlow, Crispin, and Kristine Mroczek, eds. *Digital Discourse: Language in the New Media*. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Torgovnick, Marianna. *The Visual Arts, Pictorialism and the Novel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Tripp, Ronja. *Mirroring the Lamp: Literary Visuality, Strategies of Visualization, and Scenes of Observation in Interwar Narrative*. Trier: wvt, 2013.

Weisstein, Ulrich. "Literature and the (Visual) Arts: Intertextuality and Mutual Illumination." *Intertextuality: German Literature and Visual Art from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century*. Ed. Ingeborg Hoesterey and Ulrich Weisstein. Columbia: Camden House, 1993. 1–17.

Yeazell, Ruth Bernard. *Art of the Everyday: Dutch Painting and the Realist Novel*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008.