Intertextuality And Remix Culture

Posted on October 24, 2019

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/intertextuality-and-remix-culture/

Introduction

Intertextuality and remix culture describe related ways in which new works emerge through relationships with earlier language, sounds, images, genres, and cultural conventions. Intertextuality is the broader critical idea: texts gain meaning partly through other texts that audiences recognize, whether the relationship is quotation, allusion, adaptation, parody, genre, or inherited form. Remix culture is a more visible creative practice in which existing material is sampled, rearranged, edited, recontextualized, or combined to create a new work. Julia Kristeva developed the term intertextuality through dialogue with Mikhail Bakhtin's account of language as socially relational, while later writers such as Roland Barthes challenged the romantic idea of the author as a completely isolated source of meaning (Kristeva, 1980; Barthes, 1977). Digital technology has made remixing faster and more accessible, but recombination is not new. Storytellers, musicians, playwrights, painters, and designers have long reworked inherited forms. The key questions are therefore not whether influence exists, but how borrowing changes meaning, what creative contribution the new work adds, and what legal or ethical obligations remain toward source creators.

Forms of Borrowing and Transformation

Creative borrowing exists on a spectrum, and distinctions matter. Quotation reproduces identifiable material, allusion points indirectly toward another work, adaptation retells or relocates a story, parody imitates in order to comment, and pastiche reproduces recognizable style without necessarily criticizing it. In music, a sample incorporates part of an existing sound recording, a cover re-performs a composition, and a remix may restructure an existing recording or build new material around selected elements. A mashup combines distinct sources so their interaction becomes the main effect. These practices are not legally or artistically identical. Intertextuality can exist even when no material is copied; a film may echo the visual grammar of a western or a song may invoke a genre without sampling any recording. This distinction explains why originality and influence are not opposites. A creator can produce a work that is original in argument, arrangement, tone, or effect while openly depending on cultural materials that already exist. The analytical task is to identify what relationship the new work establishes with its sources rather than label every connection as theft or every reuse as automatically transformative.

Music Remixing as Production

Music demonstrates remixing as genuine production because the remixer makes decisions about tempo, harmony, rhythm, texture, space, structure, and audience. Official stems—grouped elements such as vocals, drums, bass, or instruments—allow precise alteration, but technical access does not equal permission. A leaked vocal stem may be easy to download and still be unauthorized. When stems are unavailable, producers may reconstruct a track by listening for chord movement, melodic shape, rhythm, and arrangement, then rebuilding the musical environment around an available vocal or hook. This process can develop ear training, synthesis, arrangement, and mixing skill. An acapella also shows how meaning changes through context: the same lyric can sound triumphant over one harmony and mournful or ironic over another. My own remixing practice is most valuable when reconstruction becomes analysis rather than imitation. Rebuilding from a vocal hook forces me to decide which features must remain recognizable, which can change, and what the new arrangement contributes. That creative labor is real, but it coexists with the contributions of the original songwriters and performers.

Sampling, Memes, Fan Culture, and Cultural Memory

Hip-hop sampling, fan editing, memes, and fashion show how remix also preserves and contests cultural memory. Hip-hop producers have transformed fragments of funk, soul, jazz, spoken word, and other recordings into new rhythmic systems, sometimes introducing older artists to new audiences while also generating disputes about ownership and compensation. Fan edits can change pacing or character emphasis, while video essays use clips to make analytical arguments. Memes depend on recognizable images or formats whose meaning shifts with each caption, demonstrating how audiences become active participants in cultural production. Fashion repeatedly returns to earlier decades, uniforms, subcultures, and traditional textiles. These practices can become creative dialogue, but they can also reproduce inequality when powerful companies remove designs from their cultural context, claim novelty, and profit without recognition or benefit to the communities that developed them. Legal permission does not settle every ethical question. Remix analysis should therefore ask who is borrowing from whom, what history is being invoked, whether credit is visible, whether consent matters, and how economic power shapes which creators can control circulation or challenge appropriation.

Copyright and Fair Use

Copyright creates a legal framework for remix because owners hold rights that can include reproduction, distribution, public performance, and preparation of derivative works. Music can involve separate rights in the composition and the sound recording, so clearing one element may not

authorize another. An online file is not free to reuse merely because it is technically accessible. At the same time, U.S. fair use permits some unlicensed uses after consideration of four statutory factors: purpose and character, nature of the copyrighted work, amount used, and effect on the potential market (U.S. Copyright Office, 2026). Transformative purpose can matter, but there is no universal rule that a specific number of seconds, notes, or images is automatically fair. Noncommercial use is not automatically protected, and commercial use is not automatically excluded. Criticism, commentary, parody, teaching, and scholarship may have stronger arguments when the borrowed material is used for a new purpose rather than as a substitute for the source. Fair-use analysis is therefore context dependent rather than mechanical, a point emphasized in scholarship on practical fair-use reasoning (Aufderheide & Jaszi, 2018).

Attribution, Consent, and Platform Power

Attribution, permission, consent, and platform enforcement answer different questions. Crediting a source can be ethically important and may be required by a license, but credit alone does not grant legal permission. Permission can make a use lawful while still leaving concerns about distortion, disrespect, privacy, or cultural appropriation. Creative Commons licenses can provide advance permission under stated conditions, and public-domain works offer broader freedom, but creators still need to verify the actual legal status of the material and edition they use. Platforms complicate this environment through automated copyright systems that can block, monetize, mute, or remove uploads. These systems help rights holders manage huge volumes of content but can also misidentify lawful quotation, public-domain material, or a creator's own work. Large firms often have greater capacity to challenge errors than independent creators do, while small artists may struggle when larger accounts copy them. The unequal ability to participate, contest claims, and monetize circulation is part of what Lessig (2008) identifies in broader debates over remix culture and hybrid creative economies.

Conclusion

Intertextuality explains that creation happens through relationships with prior language, form, genre, and cultural memory, while remix culture makes those relationships materially visible through sampling, editing, reconstruction, adaptation, memes, and design. Digital tools have expanded participation by giving ordinary users access to production and distribution capabilities once controlled by specialized industries. That expansion increases creative opportunity but also intensifies disputes over ownership, attribution, consent, platform power, and compensation. Musical remixing demonstrates that transformation can require substantial technical and interpretive skill, whether the producer works with official stems, an acapella, or a reconstructed arrangement. Yet creative labor does not erase the rights or histories embedded in source material. The strongest remix culture is therefore neither a world in which all borrowing is prohibited nor one in which every accessible file is treated as free. It is a culture of purposeful transformation, accurate credit, context-sensitive legal

judgment, ethical awareness, and recognition that originality often lies in how relationships are rearranged rather than in the impossible absence of influence.

References

Aufderheide, P., & Jaszi, P. (2018). *Reclaiming Fair Use* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
Barthes, R. (1977). The Death of the Author. In *Image-Music-Text*. Hill and Wang.
Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language*. Columbia University Press.
Lessig, L. (2008). *Remix: Making Art and Commerce Thrive in the Hybrid Economy*. Penguin.
U.S. Copyright Office. (2026). *More Information on Fair Use*.