From Bakhtin to *Skyrim*: An Examination of Chronotopes, Genre, and the Chivalric Romance
Sean Fischer
SUNY Geneseo
Mentor: Dr. Ken Tiller

1.   An Introduction to the Importance of Genre

The issue of defining genres is one of absolute importance in the study of literature. As E.D. Hirsch Jr. observed in his essay "Objective Interpretation," genres allow readers to organize texts in such a way that they can draw initial assumptions about an entire group of texts.[i] As Hirsch articulates, "The genre provides a sense of the whole, a notion of typical meaning-components."[ii] Due to the fact that genres influence how readers read a text, the ways that theorists and critics define genres are incredibly important. It should be clear that different definitions will provide different groupings and because these definitions are all derived from theoretical positions there is no definition that should be considered more correct than any other. Rather, critics and theorists should understand that some methods of grouping can simply provide more interesting and insightful results.

These more interesting and insightful groupings are particularly meaningful when assessing the history of genres. Some genres have gained in popularity and increased use, only to find themselves disappearing from contemporary literature or existing in a severely diminished form, a century later. Conversely, some genres have managed to survive centuries. The most important aspect in regards to how a genre's history will be interpreted is how the genre itself is defined.

This facet is particularly true of Chivalric Romance. As a genre, Romance originally grew in popularity during the Middle Ages, and seemed to die out by the 16th century. However, if one shifts how they define the Romance genre, from the traditional Aristotelian view to a more progressive one, it should become obvious to them that the Romance is still a popular and expanding genre in the 21st century. In particular, shifting how one thinks about Romance should make it easy to see how contemporary texts, such as *The Elder Scrolls V: Skyrim*, are continuing the literary tradition of the original Romances. This finding should raise several interesting questions for the critic interested in the cultural significance of literature, given that Romance carries very little weight in traditional contemporary literary circles.

2.   English Chivalric Romance as a Mode and Genre

Writers, such as W.R.J. Barron and Bibhash Choudhury, have done a fantastic job documenting the historical and cultural growth of English Chivalric Romance. The views put forth by these writers have largely gone unchallenged and are generally considered the accepted positions on the matter. Critics and readers have most likely easily accepted their ideas about Romance because of the manner in which the ideas blend English social and cultural history, in order to provide what would seem to be the most full and reasonable basis for the development of the English Chivalric Romance.

The history of the Romance, according to Barron, begins with the widespread acceptance of *Romanz*, a vulgar form of Latin spoken in the Western Roman Empire.[iii] Initially, the title of "Romance" was only given to works written in *Romanz*, but it eventually spread to all those works favored by the lay aristocracy who were familiar with the language due to their position outside of the clergy.[iv] As Barron correctly observes, this constant and widespread shifting in meaning was indicative of the fact that "as the genre evolved and ramified through the centuries

it charged romance with multiple meanings and emotional associations which underlie our ambivalent response to it today."[v] The state of change is still a noticeable feature of the Romance today, as the genre has evolved to define a group of popular fiction novels that society broadly considers to belong to a lower class of unliterary works.

Even with large changes to Romance over the course of its history, some elements have remained constant. These elements, which originate in the writings of the ancient Greeks, can be said to define Romance as a mode, instead of a genre.[vi] Specifically, Barron notes three aspects of categorization for modes from Aristotle's *Poetics* that he uses to generalize Romance, Myth, and Realism:

1) That in which the hero is superior in *kind* to other men and their environment, since he is divine being, the subject of a myth.

2) That in which the hero is superior to other men in *degree* (not necessarily, though frequently, in rank, but rather in personal qualities) and to his environment by virtue of his superlative, even supernatural, abilities which make him the characteristic protagonist of *romantic* fiction.

3) That in which the hero is superior neither to other men nor to the environment in that, however admirable or abject his personal qualities, he is subject to the criticism of others and to the order of nature of his actions, which are related in various types of *mimetic* or realistic fiction.[vii]

These ways of categorizing the hero relative to his environment and experiences allows for the further establishment of modes of literature, from which Romance blossomed. As Barron puts it:

In classical and European literature these three fictional modes – mythic, romantic, mimetic – though associated with various genres, are not exclusively confined to any particular form. In application to periods and types of literature, the terms indicate the predominance of certain elements rather than the presence of a fixed canon of characteristics identified with a specific genre.[viii]

The allowance for texts in a genre to take any form is crucial to Barron's definition of Romance, as he defines Romance in relatively non-formalist terms, such as characterization and repeated themes and motifs.

The multiplicity of forms in Romance is also important for Barron and those who support his vision because they choose to link the Romantic mode to the society of the time. In their eyes, Romance reflects an idealized form of society by creating an imagined reality, similar to our own, but obsessed with concepts of perfection and other values.[ix] Again borrowing from Barron, the defining aspect of all Romances is the way that "they represent life as it is *and* as it might be, as imperfect reality *and* imagined ideal in one."[x] Barron also adds on to this definition the condition that "the romance mode may also embody the specific idealism of a particular society or class and express itself in distinctive literary forms peculiar to the culture of an age."[xi]

Often, critics build on the essence of this definition to limit the scope of Romance, as Choudhury does in his *English Social and Cultural History*. Choudhury takes Barron's definition of Romance being an ideal society and then limits medieval romance to "an adventure

story which had kings, knights, members of the nobility, and ladies who encountered and came to terms with numerous issues."[xii] Choudhury's vision for the medieval romance builds on the English social and cultural structures of the Middle Ages, suggesting that these systems are made perfect through an emphasis on love and devotion, the essential chivalric qualities.[xiii] Presented in these terms, it is easy to see how critics could define Romance through repeated social and cultural themes, motifs, and symbols.

One definition of Romance that influences those already given is that of critic Northrop Frye. Frye's definition, presented in his essay "Archetypal Criticism: Theory of Myths," begins with the assumption that "In every age the ruling social or intellectual class tends to project its ideals in some form of romance, where the virtuous heroes and beautiful heroines represent the ideals and the villains the threats to their ascendancy."[xiv] This assumption makes the characters symbolic representations of larger ideals. In Frye's vision of Romance, the characters represent larger ideas, whose importance comes from the society and culture that produces the work. Additionally, Frye notes that Romance centers on the dialectical relationship between the hero and the villain; they represent opposing worldviews and as such are inherently in conflict.[xv] The conflict manifests itself in the form of an adventure or quest, which characters either support or hinder.[xvi] Again, the quest itself is not just a quest but also a larger battle between the two opposing ideologies. As such, each romance becomes a representation of social and cultural values and ideas; the texts' politics begin to take center stage instead of their literariness.

3.   Theories on Genre and the Problem with Our Definition of Romance

These generally accepted definitions of Romance seem to work very well but are certainly not perfect. The main problem with Barron, Choudhury, and Frye's definitions is that they are derived entirely from themes, motifs, and symbols. These definitions assume that the most important aspects of Romance are the texts' politics and relation to the time in which they were written. However, in viewing Romance in this way, critics ignore the fact that not all the works in Romance share common themes or represent the same idealized notions.

The problem of defining Romance through themes, motifs, and symbols goes back to these definitions operating under the assumption that Romance acts as a mode of literature, not a genre. The difference between a mode and a genre is an important distinction because modes focus on how ideas are represented through characters instead of through the broader concept of literariness. As Frye puts it in his essay "Historical Criticism: Theory of Modes," "Fictions, therefore, may be classified, not morally, but by the hero's power of action, which may be greater than ours, less, or roughly the same."[xvii] Classifying literature in this way is attractive because it allows the critic to judge in terms other than morals.[xviii] This method of classification is also helpful as it opens up further distinctions between emphasis on the plot, the characters, and themes.[xix] As such, it can be stated that all works are both fictional and thematic, meaning that any work can be read either as literature or as or as a social allegory, in which the literary elements are reduced to tools for displaying a social or cultural idea.[xx] This reading of literature as a social allegory is problematic because it suggests that the works have little value beyond their social significance; the critic ignores the literariness of the text in favor of its social and cultural features.

Given this understanding of mode, it becomes easy to see how the earlier definitions of Romance are all examples of thinking in terms of social and cultural significance. The definitions ignore the repeated and shared literary devices amongst those works considered parts of the Romance tradition. Ignoring these more formal elements limits the overall view of what

Romance actually is. A better option would be to treat Romance as a genre, instead of a mode. In doing so, critics would be able to speak to more than just the social and cultural thematic issues. As John Frow defines in his (appropriately titled) guide to genre, *Genre*, a genre can be understood to be "a historically specific pattern of organization of semiotic material along a number of dimensions."[xxi] This definition offers an improved view of Romance compared to those definitions that are built on the general definition of mode, but it is still limited. What this definition does do well though, is point to the main principle of structuralist genre theory.

Structuralist genre theory, according to Thomas Winner, begins with Mukarovsky and his early attempts to define genre. Mukarovsky defined genre as "a stabilized system of creative devices."[xxii] Instead of defining genres in thematic terms, one should look to "formal elements and their interrelationships."[xxiii] Mukarovsky, as such, was calling for the formation of genres based on the usage of certain literary devices. The flaw in Mukarovsky's theory, however, is the widely accepted view that form and meaning are inseparable.[xxiv]

Strucutralist theories of genre grew from Mukarovsky through the musings of the Prague Lingusitic Circle and later the writings of Roman Jakobson and Jurij Lotman and their followers.[xxv] One theorist of particular importance amongst those following Jakobson and Lotman is Tzvetan Todorov. Todorov argues in his *Introduction à la literature fantastique* that genres are fundamentally different from biological classification systems. The major difference Todorov points to is the fact that every new text changes its genre, while individual animals are incapable of changing their taxonomic groups.[xxvi] The scholar Robert Scholes summarizes Todorov's position very well when he states, "Genres are the connecting links between individual literary works and the universe of literature."[xxvii] This view of genre leads to Todorov's distinction between two types of genres, the "theoretical" and the "historical," or those genres derived from theory and those genres that are created through the actual study of literary texts.[xxviii] Yet, Todorov's most important point may be his synthesis of these two types of genres:

> [Any genre] must satisfy constantly the exigencies of two orders: practical and theoretical, empirical and abstract. The genres that we deduce theoretically must be verified by the texts…On the other hand, the genres that we encounter in literary history must be submitted to the explanation of a coherent theory.[xxix]

This statement, which Scholes quotes from *Introduction à la literature fantastique*, is integral to structuralist theories of genres. This guideline suggests that the analysis of genre is the combination of theory and close reading, which is to say that generic analysis relates works to the larger system or systems that they belong to.

Drawing from this structuralist background, Winner was able to construct a functional structuralist theory of genre of his own. His theory, a combination and refinement of the strucuturalist theories that came before his, argues that genres develop from two sources: first, "the opposition between semiotic systems and the individual texts generated by them;" second, the allowance that texts "may be grouped together by a variety of criteria, which are highly variable."[xxx] In other words, Winner suggests that genres be formed around any conceivable structural pattern in a group of texts.

The beauty of this theory is that the group of texts can conceivably be from any medium, mode, or form. Thus, using this theory one would conceivably be able to compare poetry to novels, novels to films, and films to video games, so long as the principle governing the grouping holds for each text. Additionally, Winner's theory is particularly interesting and more

liberating because it is built on the principle that "Genre is simultaneously a problem of history and a problem of synchronic structure, an evolving system, which is a dialectical combination of both variants and invariants, that is, of identifications and differentiations."[xxxi] This means that the structuralist theory of genre that Winner is proposing is particularly interested in allowing a critic to see how text's use a device through time, which is to say how a device's usage evolves over time. As Winner quotes from Mikhail Bakhtin, "A genre is always that and not that, it is always both old and new simultaneously. The genre is reborn and renewed in each new stage of the development of literature and *each individual creation* of a given genre."[xxxii] In quoting this passage from Bakhtin, Winner reiterates that genres are not static. They will change in the way a device is used and in the way a device is received. From this principle of a genre evolving, Winner is able to account for the place of culture in genre: according to Winner, culture produces reading conventions that influence how devices are read in different time periods and different social situations.[xxxiii] Simplified, this assertion means that culture influences how the reader interprets the devices in any text or genre.

Not surprisingly, Winner sums up his theory best: "Genres are mutable systems within systems…they are codes or subcodes, models for the organization of texts, which must be understood both synchronically and diachronically, grammatically and functionally, and which cannot be abstracted from the pragmatic sphere."[xxxiv] The advantages of this theory over those previously addressed is the looseness of Winner's and the fact it naturally looks through time to address how a genre has changed, both in the way it is constructed and in the way it is received.

4.   Bakhtin's Chronotope and Genres

Winner's theory, then, offers a better place to start examining Romance as a genre than the traditional models offered by Barron or Choudhury. However, a large issue remains, which is the selection of criteria for the group of works that will be understood to be Romance. It would be a poor idea to cherry-pick a specific device usage from those works commonly associated with Romance, as that would likely only reinforce current visions of what constitutes Romance. At the same time, it is largely impractical, given the limited scope of this research, to read hundreds of works associated with romance in the hope that in close reading each, a distinct structural quality will become apparent in all of them. Yet, this project does not end here in failure. In tweaking and then combining another theory on genre with Winner's structuralist theory, it is possible to solve the problem of choosing criteria for defining Romance.

This other theory comes from Bakhtin's writing on what he calls *chronotope*. Chronotope is, in Bakhtin's own words, "the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature."[xxxv] Additionally, Bakhtin adds that "Time, as it were, thickens takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history."[xxxvi] In other words, chronotopes are different ways of representing the relationship between time and space in literature. Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist, in their biography of Bakhtin and history of his work, are quick to emphasize the fact that the examination of chronotopes is a way of creating a historical poetics, as chronotopes function as historical markers.[xxxvii]

However, chronotopes do not just serve as historical markers in literature. Bakhtin highly emphasizes the fact that chronotopes have "an intrinsic *generic significance*."[xxxviii] He continues stating, "It can be said that it is precisely the chronotope that defines genre and generic distinctions."[xxxix] This means that to Bakhtin, genres are determined based on the way texts represent the world they create. In this sense, the major social and cultural themes a work may

have are not important. Rather, the work's representations of time and space are most important because man is inherently represented in space and time; or, to borrow again from Bakhtin, "The image of man is always intrinsically chronotopic."[xl]

As Clark and Holquist note, though, Bakhtin only uses chronotopes to distinguish between historical categories of literature [xli]. In their own words, "By focusing on the way a particular chronotope defines a particular genre or subgenre, Bakhtin traces the rise of the novel back to Hellenistic Greece."[xlii] Given this use of chronotopes, it is fair to say that Bakhtin does not see chronotopes as any sort of literary device, but rather a product of writing in different sociohistorical periods. This means that in Bakhtin's view, chronotopes are the product of representation. As such, it would not be possible to use the usage of chronotopes as the unifying device in Winner's structural theory of genre.

However, based on Bakhtin's own writing and his use of chronotopes in analysis of different genres, as well as his comments on the incompleteness of the theory, there is enough evidence to suggest that chronotopes can be used as a literary device. This would mean that the use of chronotopes comes before their effects, namely the representation of man in time and space.

In each of Bakhtin's case studies of a historical genre, he attempts to establish how a specific chronotope represents the genre in question. This process of representation, for Bakhtin, begins with addressing how time and space are presented in the work. A critic can find these elements through an examination of the plot, story, characterization, or any other major literary element or device relevant to the period. The result is the description of how individual elements establish the chronotope in question throughout the genre. Take for example what Bakhtin refers to as "The Greek Romance." Bakhtin begins his analysis by stating that Greek Romance makes use of "a subtle and highly developed type of *adventure-time*."[xliii] Adventure-time, as defined by Clark and Holquist, is a chronotope that when employed results in "no identifying traces of the historical period…an absence of biological or maturational change."[xliv] More simply, adventure-time is the jumping from unrelated event to unrelated event with no logical order or organization. Bakhtin claims this chronotope is created through the plots of Greek Romances, which are fairly standard and involve a series of adventures as two lovers attempt to find one another across varied geographic locations.[xlv] The character's lack of change in their characterization from beginning to end is also important in demonstrating the lack of time.[xlvi]

In this example, it is obvious that Bakhtin sees the formal usage of plot and characterization as the cause of the chronotope. Yet, what if this situation were reversed and the chronotope motivated the usage of the plot and characterization? It is not impossible, as Bakhtin is incredibly vague in his definition of chronotope. As Nele Bemong and Pieter Borghart observe in their essay "Bakhtin's Theory of the Literary Chronotope: Reflections, Applications, Perspectives," "a *definitive* definition of the concept is never offered."[xlvii] Bemong and Borghart build on this observation and make note of the fact that because there is no specific definition, scholars have been conducting chronotopic analysis in a variety of different ways. In one case, though, Nele Bemong actually makes this move, as he claims that "generic chronotopes function as prototypes, internally structuring genre systems."[xlviii] This move, made in reference to Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory and Dirk De Geest and Hendrik Van Gorp's prototype theory, essentially states that chronotopes are structural elements, meaning chronotopes are motivations instead of productions.

With this place for chronotopes now established, it could be helpful to examine one more of Bakhtin's examples of chronotopic analysis – the most important of which, to this paper, is the

analysis of the Chivalric Romance genre – and demonstrate how the chronotope in question works. Bakhtin begins his analysis of the Chivalric Romance by stating that the chronotope being used is similar to the adventure-time used in Greek Romance in that both break time down into fragmented adventures.[xlix] Additionally, Bakhtin notes that in the Chivalric Romance, as in the Greek Romance, "We encounter…the same simultaneities and disjunctions in time, the same play with distance and proximity, the same retardations."[l] In regards to space, Bakhtin tells his readers that in the Chivalric Romance "the 'otherness' of [the] world is portrayed in a variety of ways, and has a somewhat abstract character."[li] However, Bakhtin notes that the chronotope of the Chivalric Romance is inherently different from that of pure Greek adventure-time, in that in Chivalric Romance the violation of nature is "normalized."[lii] This means that in the Chivalric Romance the exceptional is such a constant that it becomes ordinary, yet still exceptional. Essentially, where Greek Romance attempts to employ a system to restructure the hero's life, the Chivalric Romance turns to the miracle and the adventure. The chaos these two concepts would normally cause in literature is diminished in the Chivalric Romance because they occur so frequently that they are expected.[liii] Additionally, the chronotope in Chivalric Romance differentiates itself from the pure adventure-time in that it presents its heroes as individuals who are themselves symbolic.[liv] This is important because the space that these characters inhabit challenges them and forces them to make a name for themselves as individuals, but contextually they remain symbolic of a larger idea. The example Bakhtin uses is Lancelot. Clearly, Lancelot is a unique character, there is no other figure like him. However, he still has come to represent larger ideas, similar to those characters who appear in epics.[lv] Finally, Bakhtin establishes another relationship between the world and the hero, which operates through inseparability. The character and the world are a pair; the world is entirely "other" to the hero as he moves through it and discovers that no matter where he goes, the governing principles are the same.[lvi]

Bakhtin calls the chronotope he has described to this point the chronotope of "*a miraculous world in adventure-time*."[lvii] He simplifies his definition of this chronotope down to:

> The chronotope of the miraculous world, which is characterized by this subjective playing with time, this violation of elementary temporal relationships and perspectives, has a corresponding subjective playing with space, in which elementary spatial relationships and perspectives are violated. In the majority of cases, moreover, there is no trace of the "free" relationship of man to space that is affirmed in folklore and fairy tales – what we get rather is an emotional, subjective distortion of space, which is in partly symbolic.[lviii]

This generalization is the device, then, that drives the Romance genre. In Bakhtin's analysis, this chronotope motivates the formation of the plot, the presentation of the setting, and the characterization. However, it is important to remember that the form of representation can change, so long as time and space are presented in accordance with the chronotope.

5.   Bringing Everything Together: A Case Study in *Skyrim*

This final point is incredibly important when considering Bakhtin's theory of the chronotope . Chronotopes simply establish how time and space operate, the method of representing that quality of operation is left open. This fits in nicely with Winner's genre theory, which assumes that structural principles define a genre, but are received differently over time. In regards to the issue of defining Romance, combining the two theories offers a unique solution to the problem. Taking the chronotope of a miraculous world in adventure-time as the defining

structural principle a genre establishes a group of works, some of which are considered traditional romances and some that certainly are not, that could be considered Romance. Furthermore, this theory provides the theoretical basis for generic analysis that Todorov says is absolutely essential when examining genres, while a close reading provides the additional textual evidence that Todorov's position requires.

      a. *The Elder Scrolls V: Skyrim*

It is important to begin a close reading of *The Elder Scrolls V: Skyrim* by acknowledging that it is a video game played either on the computer or on a console. As such, it is not a traditional literary text like a novel, poem, or film. Nevertheless, the issue of its genre is still important. The video game industry has labeled *Skyrim* as an Open World Fantasy Role Playing Game, which means that *Skyrim* is set in a game-space that is meant to mimic the scale and openness of our real-world space. Open World Fantasy Role Playing Games are also rely heavily on quests and adventure plot structures that allow players to experience a sense of improvement and achievement. This label comes from the gaming industry's approach to defining genres, which mixes traditional literary methods with more technical styles. This traditional video game method reflects the critical history of video games, in that the industry cannot seem to decide whether the works it produces are literary texts or technical marvels. One can find examples from industry insiders suggesting both cases, depending on the context of their being asked to comment. However, it seems that so long as a game has a sufficient narrative element, which is to say that a game tells a story, then the game should be treated as a literary text at the very minimum.

In the case of *Skyrim*, it is easy to see where storytelling exists within the framework of the game experience. *Skyrim* has a main storyline and a seemingly infinite number of side stories. Given its game format, *Skyrim* develops its narratives through immersive events, in which the player becomes an active participant in the various plots unfolding. In mimicking the real world, the game's narratives develop simultaneously, with narratives beginning with random encounters in the wilderness, by being in the right place, or talking to the right people.

Yet, the game stops mimicking reality at this point: *Skyrim* does not force the player to choose which quests to complete or which storylines to explore by setting hard time restrictions for when certain actions need to be completed. Rather, the game simply logs and records which storylines the player has discovered and which they have completed. The player can work through them in whatever order they would like, without any participant in the stories noticing the seemingly long and unrealistic time it takes for their story to play out. In this way, *Skyrim* develops a time system that seems to do away with any sense of real time. Hours, minutes, days, months, and years all pass normally with differences between daytime and nighttime, but the narratives and all the characters inside of the narratives do not notice.

Additionally, *Skyrim* creates a spatial system that follows the model of the Chivalric Romance. A core component of the game is the world map, which offers the player the ability to "fast travel" to different locations after the player has discovered them in the actual game environment. In providing this feature, the game diminishes the effect of space on the player; the player is able to transcend any sort of physical limitation on travel, outside of carrying too much weight or being stuck in combat. This mirrors the spatial element of the Chivalric Romance in that the chronotope of a miraculous world in adventure time relies on the violation of normal spatial relationships. Most Chivalric Romances borrow their spatial relationships

from reality, yet because *Skyrim* is a video game, it is able to set its own relationships and then violate them.

Thus, in pairing its temporal system with its spatial system, *Skyrim* transcends traditional Fantasy or Science Fiction and enters into the world of Chivalric Romance. The entire game, through the establishment of these systems, generates norms and then allows players to violate them and become superhuman. This follows the structural model of other Chivalric Romances, especially those from the Middle Ages detailing the heroics of King Arthur and his knights, such as Sir Thomas Mallory's *Le Morte D'Arthur*. In this case, then, the textual evidence supports the theoretical position, confirming that *Skyrim* does, in fact, belong to the Chivalric Romance genre.

6.　　　Implications and Conclusion

The point of this close reading is not to suggest that *The Elder Scrolls V: Skyrim* is certainly a Chivalric Romance. Rather, the purpose of this paper is to demonstrate how, when it comes to genres, shifting the way one approaches constructing them can have radical implications on the subsequent analysis of a text. In the case of *Skyrim*, by changing how Chivalric Romance is defined, it became possible to group *Skyrim* with texts like *Le Morte D'Arthur* or *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. These other texts are traditional romances, dating back to the Middle Ages, and the fact that a contemporary text can be shown to follow from the same generic lineage suggests that culturally, these two periods are similar.

This cultural similarity can be seen in each time's conception of the hero. The hero of *Skyrim* and the heroes of Medieval Chivalric Romances are both very similar; they transcend reality and overcome physical limitations. In doing so, they come to manifest the same cultural anxieties and desires; it is natural to fear time, death, and physical weakness and want to gain strength, knowledge, and pure power. The larger implication, then, for the cultures is that the values they hold most important, in regard to their heroes, are mainly the same. This conclusion, of course, challenges a common belief that the ideals and values of contemporary Western culture are radically different from those of medieval culture. The issue of relating cultures across times is itself both incredibly important to literary and cultural studies and incredibly broad in scope. As such, this issue requires its own study and research.

---

[i] E.D. Hirsch Jr., "Objective Interpretation," *PMLA* 75.4 (1960): 469.

[ii] Ibid.

[iii] W.R.J. Barron, *English Medieval Romance*, Longman Literature in English Series (London: Longman, 1987) 1.

[iv] Ibid.

[v] Ibid.

[vi] Ibid., 2.

[vii] Ibid.

[viii] Ibid.

[ix] Ibid., 4.

[x] Ibid., 6.

[xi] Ibid., 7.

[xii] Bibhash Choudhury, *English Social and Cultural History: An Introductory Guide and Glossary* (New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Learing Pvt. Ltd., 2005) 28.

[xiii] Ibid.

[xiv] Northrop Frye, "Archetypal Criticism: Theory of Myths: The Mythos of Summer: Romance," in *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000) 186.

[xv] Ibid., 195.

[xvi] Ibid.

[xvii] Northrop Frye, "Historical Criticism: Theory of Modes," in *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*, vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), 33–67.

[xviii] Ibid., 33.

[xix] Ibid., 52.

[xx] Ibid., 53–54.

[xxi] John Frow, *Genre*, vols. (London: Routledge, 2005).

[xxii] Thomas G. Winner, "Structural and Semiotic Genre Theory," in *Theories of Literary Genre*, ed. Joseph P. Strelka, vols. (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978), 254–268.

[xxiii] Ibid., 257.

[xxiv] Ibid., 258.

[xxv] Ibid., 258–262.

[xxvi] Robert Scholes, *Structuralism in Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974) 128.

[xxvii] Ibid.

[xxviii] Ibid.

[xxix] Ibid., 128–129.

[xxx] Winner, "Structural and Semiotic Genre Theory" 262.

[xxxi] Ibid., 264.

[xxxii] Ibid., 265.

[xxxiii] Ibid., 265–266.

[xxxiv] Ibid., 266.

[xxxv] M.M. Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel," in *The Dialogic Immagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, vols. (University of Texas Press, 1981), 84–258.

[xxxvi] Ibid., 84.

[xxxvii] Katernia Clark and Michael Holquist, *Mikhail Bakhtin*, vols. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984).

[xxxviii] Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel" 84–85.

[xxxix] Ibid., 85.

[xl] Ibid.

[xli] Clark and Holquist, *Mikhail Bakhtin* 280.

[xlii] Ibid.

[xliii] Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel" 87.

[xliv] Clark and Holquist, *Mikhail Bakhtin* 281.

[xlv] Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel" 87–88.

[xlvi] Ibid., 90.

[xlvii] Nele Bemong and Pieter Borghart, "Bakhtin's Theory of the Literary Chronotope: Reflections, Applications, Perspectives," in *Bakhtin's Theory of the Literary Chronotope: Reflections, Applications, Perspectives*, ed. Nele Bemong et al., vols. (Gent: Academia Press, 2010), 3–16.

[xlviii] Nele Bemong, "Internal Chronotopic Genre Structures: The Nineteenth-Century Historical Novel in the Context of the Belgian Literary Polysystem," in *Bakhtin's Theory of the Literary Chronotope: Reflections, Applications, Perspectives*, ed. Michel Bemong et al., vols. (Gent: Academia Press, 2010), 159–178.

[xlix] Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel" 151.

[l] Ibid.

[li] Ibid.

[lii] Ibid., 152.

[liii] Ibid.

[liv] Ibid., 153.

[lv] Ibid.

[lvi] Ibid., 153–154.

[lvii] Ibid., 154.

[lviii] Ibid., 155.