

УДК 821.161.2:821.111:82.091

## THE CONCEPT OF INTERTEXTUALITY AND APPROACHES TO IT

*Anastasiia Shystovska, postgraduate student*

*Odessa National I. I. Mechnikov University, Ukraine*

*shystovskaya@bk.ru*

*The article analyzes the concept of «intertextuality», emphasizes its essential features and characteristics.*

*The intertextuality is defined as a dialogue of a text with other text, the features of one text in another, which is known to the reader, is recognized by him, correlates with a certain historical and cultural epoch. The intertextuality introduces this work of art into the context of the new epoch as a new phenomenon.*

*The appearance of the term and its evolution are traced. The intertextuality is analyzed from the point of view of the historical and literary, communicative, system and typological method. There is establishing the connection with M. Bakhtin's dialogueness theory and it is analyzing the main points and opinions of intertextuality researchers: J. Derrida, L. Jenny, R. Bart, J. Kristeva.*

**Key words:** *intertextuality, historical and literary method, communicative method, system method, typological method, dialogueness theory.*

Term «intertextuality» has an author and date of birth. It was offered by Yu. Kristeva in 1969 in her first book. The term was probably so necessary that it became quickly used by many researchers. At first glance, it appears that intertextuality is engaged in the same activities as literature, namely it has a common research object. Nevertheless, this is a superficial similarity, as researchers of intertextuality are interested first not in sources-texts, which elements are transferred into a new work, but a place of these elements in the structure of the work, a role in semantic filling of the text. These relations of the text-source and a new text may be described as special, transparent, visible to the reader, assigned to it.

Concept of dialogueness by M. Bakhtin essentially influences on intertextuality theory. Surely, intertextual researches cannot be deemed one of the forms of realization of its concept. Certainly, dialogueness is a wider notion than intertext, but it should not be perceived as a so-called detailing of the concept by Bakhtin. Intertextuality is an independent sphere of research, with its own problematic, object and subject. Nevertheless, the common feature that connects the concept of dialogueness by M. Bakhtin with intertextuality may be deemed «totality of problems, which is called by him as stylization, namely inheritance of a language of the other by means

of own language» [2, p. 288]. Hence, dialogue of the text with the text, elements of one text in another, being known to the reader, recognized by him, may be deemed manifestations of intertextuality. In our opinion, it is necessary to speak about actualization of two texts on a semantic level where the principal one is a text, which uses references, and a referenced text is secondary.

Besides theory of dialogueness by M. Bakhtin, researches of formalists greatly influenced on understanding of the notion of intertextuality, in particular concepts of parodies by Yu. Tynianova. In formalists' and Yu. Tynianova's opinion, parody is a language tool that serves for creation of a new original text. In this text, reference, for example, is an important factor, as this is a reference to notion, sense of the primary text of artistic work. This is a constructive approach to understanding of the parody containing not only a language game, but also intertextuality links and properties. At such approach, parody is treated as not a literature genre, but as intertextuality, a sign of an analyzed text. Nevertheless, when parodying intertextuality is not only a mean, but also a goal of different kind of expressions, that is why determination of its function, showing their role in difficult and ingenious, tortuous texts is one of its tasks.

Term «intertextuality» is used in several meanings, namely it is not semantically uniform and clearly defined. In Yu. Kristeva's opinion, intertext is not a targeted collection of citations but is a certain space for convergence of possibility of citation and its manifestation [3, p. 233].

I. Smirnov writes «Intertextuality is two or several artistic works united by characteristics being indicators of intertextual connection» [3, p. 233].

Thus, this definition of intertextuality is treated as a feature of a work to be associated with other works, to born certain associative series in a recipient's mind. Thanks to these associations the new structures of reproduced text of an artistic work occur. We can call it intertextuality.

Intertextuality can occur in different levels of structure of an artistic work, namely genre, motive, position of narrator, reader etc.

Problem of motivation of intertextual relations, connections, especially citations, is related, in our opinion, to genre differentiation. In dramatic works, these relations can be motivated as usual, while in lyrics they are not motivated, as one subject dominates here. There is not always an indication of a function of intertextual elements in a new text in lyrical works. In addition, vice-versa, in dramatic works there are many subjects included into a certain fragment or situation of the text, nevertheless expressions of

characters, not referenced to cited sources, are important here. And here a problem of genre delineation of intertextuality moves to a new level of research, namely narrative one. Intertextuality is manifested in this level by the position of the author, the narrator, who can freely pass from motive to motive and «above all from style to style, and also he not so much narrates as polemizes while narrating» [2, p. 293]. Here it is appropriate to talk about quite significant constitutive sign of intertextuality, namely intentional reference. The narrator conscientiously addresses it to the reader who must feel it, try to determine why the author says not his own, by the other's words. This consideration of the author's intentions when investigating intertextuality and narrative strategies gives the right to analyze the latter in pragmatic, communicative point of view.

With such approach intertextuality is treated wider, not as just a feature of artistic, literature work, namely it can be a feature of speaking of a certain social group, epoch and culture. In this case, intertextuality is feature of literatureness. Nevertheless, this is another aspect in communicative approach to intertextuality. Researchers have long observed that each epoch uses its own methods of analysis of texts of previous epochs. In this perspective, intertextuality is a subject of research in Communication Science. Given the communicative goal, task, functioning, the body of hypertexts primarily giving birth to references is formed.

That is why intertextuality cannot be neutral; it involves not only the context space of an artistic work to analysis, but culture and epoch as well.

With such communicative approach to intertextuality, the important thing is category of interpretant (according to terminology by Peirce). Interpretant is not only a linguistic identity but also totality of factors that determines attitude to a borrowed text in the new context, which is defined by French structuralists as intertext. Borrowed element of the full text that has been created earlier is expressed and perceptibly prevails in the field, which can be defined as mentioned above. Nevertheless, the element described earlier has become an element of a new work, something new, that is why it gets new features that it has not had in the work described above. «Interpretant is a designation contained in the text, which instructs in a certain way how this elements must be understood, construed, determines the perspective from which it should be seen» [2, p. 296].

In other works, the fragment itself of a text created earlier, borrowed text in a new context is not significantly clearly determined, properly speaking the matter of its delineation, attribute is resolved by the interpretant.

In this meaning interpretant is an immanent element of any intertextual relations [6]. The category of interpretant itself is a prerequisite of detection and understanding of intertext. Relations of the thing «that has been said» and the new text can be different, namely parody, stylization, citation, polemics etc. And this is a problem of reception of intertextual constructions, which is determined by the levels of readers' competence and intelligence. We can say that «text that has been said» and the new one enter into dialogue relations, relations of language game, thus creating a new text. Such dialogueness, polyphony ensures intertextuality of an artistic work.

Therefore, in terms of pragmatics, communicativistics, intertextuality is determined by the category of the interpretant, which ensures the language game, polyphony, dialogueness of the text that has been created and the new one, considers context and markers-designations that play a role of instruction to perception of the text created earlier in the new one.

Nevertheless, intertextuality is also investigated on historical and literature point of view. Not deepening in history of the problem, we can observe that each epoch uses texts created earlier in its own way, elaborates schemes of using the components of the text created earlier in the new one. Each epoch appeals to its range of texts, to its body of citations and reference that are relevant and tendentious in this epoch.

Thus, in order to object statements and postulates of one epoch, the references and statements of another epoch that is recognized as exemplary, model, sample to follow can be used. For example, we can consider the necessity of references to works by Lenin, Marks, and Engels during the soviet period, compulsory citation of these authors and full ignorance in literature of 90<sup>th</sup> of XX century, for example. Time trends in this way find revelation in literature outlining the body of the texts and postulate pragmatic features of intertextuality. Changing therefore the view to literature, its features, properties, genre transformations, we change the nature of texts referred and cited. Namely, literature in such an approach is a living organism, dynamic and not static phenomenon. Dynamics of literature in this case is ensured by intertextuality.

We can say that intertextuality is one of the features of literature evolution and ensures changes of content and nature of works in different historic periods. Sometimes certain intertextual relations are consciously cultivated by authors of a certain epoch, and vice versa, other are ignored. Such conscious instruction on certain intertextual relations influences on structures properties, functions, concept of literature in general. This predictability of

intertextual relations ensures their identification, provides interests to the new work, estimated assessment of the latter. Thus, each epoch accepts certain intertextual relations and adapts them to its time and requirements, and rejects some of them as excessive and unnecessary.

With historic and literature view of intertextuality the genre specifics is actualized and «It seems that except for cases when the main differential feature is construction of an expression of processed elements as in cento or collage, as well as such elements, in which the main differential criterion is relations with other texts (parody as a genre), there are no genres, in which the intertextual co-factors are outlined beyond history» [2, p. 307]. This idea seems sensible; it can be supported by ideas of researchers who trace dependence between a genre and a certain epoch, for example, by D. Lykhachov, M. Bakhtin, Yu. Tynianov, M. Khrapchenko, I. Franko, L. Ukrainka etc. Relations of this text with literature of the past are ensured in this way. Dependence of occurrence of the new text from previous literature traditions and directions is analyzed in work by M. Bakhtin «Problems of Content, Material and Forms in Verbal Artistic Creativity» (1924). In this work M. Bakhtin determines this dependence, and today we would say intertextuality as a dialogue between the author and former literature phenomena. Introducing the notion of «extraneous words», he seems to prepare subsoil for appearance of the term «intertextuality» offered later by Yu. Kristeva.

Just with historical and literary point of view intertextuality provides relation of this text with historical, social, ideological, text characteristics and factors of a certain historical epoch. Intertextuality provides construction and perception of an artistic work as autonomous, existing on its own. This idea is developed by poststructuralists. Theorists and philosophers of post-structuralism ensure autonomy of a text, the world is construed by them as a single general text containing hidden and obvious accumulation of allusions, citations and reminiscences from the past. «Explaining any text as a single intertextual, universal text, which is a consequence of a textual reality and in turn the material and the reason of occurrence of new texts, the main feature of intertextuality according to Bart is infinity caused by infinity of language (writing)» [3, p. 233]. As we see, according to Bart intertextuality is global literature category providing multiplicity and infinity of printing thorough of new artistic works in different historical and literary epochs.

L. Jenny says that feature of intertextuality is «in introduction of a new method of reading that undermines linearity of the text» [3, p. 233].

Surely, any intertextual reference can make the reader apply to the original source or continue reading the work. Here the reader's intertextual stock, associative thinking, reading memory, interpretation and reception abilities snap into action. In fact, reading association and interpretation and reception abilities are the basis for intertextuality. There is a so-called rupture of autonomy of the text; intertextual practices of reading the text are introduced. Such deprivation of self-isolation of the text has resulted in search of new points of intersection of this text with other texts, epochs, culture, history that entitles us to speak not about other literature influences, but about intertextuality. Intertextuality contains focuses of assessment and reading of this artistic work. This is not originality that is distinguished in the text, but probably the nature of artistic work. Intertextuality ensures search of not a biographic author, but the narrator. Manifestations of authors' strategies in the text, their search and distinguishing become possible thanks to intertextuality. Moreover, intertextuality provides communicative attitude of the reader, his expectations and intentions. After all, all acts of intertextuality of an artistic work are aimed at it and for it. For this reason, intertextuality provides change of approach to determination of the value of the artistic work not as a self-sufficient and self-valuable, but such aimed at a reader.

Intertextuality provides the field of functioning of this work, introduces it into historical and literature context as a chain link, and not as a separated phenomenon related to nothing. This idea is proved in essay «Living On» by Derrida, convincing that autonomy of the text is actually impossible, and text exists only in the chain of textual relations [4].

R. Barthes interprets the text as a product of social and historical forces, as a sign where these forces are manifested. That is why this text, in R. Barthes' opinion, cannot be perceived as an artistic fact «itself», as it is dependent on cultural value and is its sign [1].

Thereby, having analyzed intertextuality as a sign of an artistic work, we hereby ascertain that the latter is determined by the researchers as a dialogue of a text with a text, elements, features of one text in another one. These features are surely known to the reader, recognized by him, associated with texts and certain cultural and historical epochs.

Intertextuality can be investigated with different views, namely historical and literature, communicative, systematic, typological. Moreover, it can be expressed in different levels of the structure of the artistic work, namely genre, motive, position of the narrator, the reader.

Problem outlined as literary was investigated by Yu. Kristeva in 1969, it is theoretically grounded and developed in works by J. Derrida, L. Jenny, R. Bart, M. Hlovinskyi, S. Pavlychko and other researchers.

### REFERENCES

1. Bart, R. (2001), S/Z [S/Z], Translated by Kosikova H. K, Editorial URSS, Moskva [in Russian].
2. Hlovinskyi, M. (2008), Intertekstualnist. Teoriia literatury v Polshi. Antolohiia. Druha polovyna 20 — pochatok 21 st. [Intertextuality. The Theory of literature in Poland. Anthology. The second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century — the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century], Translated by Yakovenka S., Kyevo-Mohylianska akademiia, Kyev, pp. 284–309 [in Ukrainian].
3. Leksykon zahalnoho ta porivnialnoho literaturoznavstva (2001), [The Lexicon of the general and comparative literature], Zoloti lytavry, Chernivtsi [in Ukrainian].
4. Derrida, J. (1986), Parages [Pas, Survivre, Titre a préciser, La loi du genre], Galilée, Paris [in French].
5. Jenny, L. (1979), La Strategie de la forme / Poetique, no. 27, pp. 268–269 [in French].
6. Riffaterre, M. (1979), Semiotique intertextuelle: l'interpretant // Revue d'Esthetique. — no.1–2 [in French].

## ПОНЯТИЕ ИНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНОСТИ И ПОДХОДЫ К НЕМУ

*Анастасия Шистовская, аспирантка*

*Одесский национальный университет имени И. И. Мечникова*

*В статье анализируется понятие «интертекстуальности», выделяются её существенные признаки и характеристики. Прослеживается появление термина и его эволюция. Анализируется интертекстуальность с точки зрения историко-литературного, коммуникативного, системного и типологического подходов. Методологической основой статьи является теория диалогичности М. Бахтина, концепция пародии Ю. Тынянова, учитываются основные положения и мысли исследователей интертекстуальности, таких как Ж. Деррида, Л. Женни, Р. Барт, Ю. Кристева.*

**Ключевые слова:** *интертекстуальность, историко-литературный метод, коммуникативный метод, системный метод, типологический метод, теория диалогичности.*

## ПОНЯТТЯ ІНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНОСТІ ТА ПІДХОДИ ДО НЬОГО

*Анастасія Шистовська, аспірантка*

*Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова*

*У статті аналізується поняття «інтертекстуальність», виділяються її суттєві ознаки та характеристики. Прослідковується поява терміну та його еволюція. Інтертекстуальність розглядається як самостійна сфера досліджень, з власною проблематикою, об'єктом та предметом. Вона визначається як діалог тексту з текстом, як наявність риси одного тексту в іншому, який відомий читачеві, впізнається ним, співвідноситься з певною історико-культурною епохою. Інтертекстуальність уводить даний художній твір у контекст нової епохи як новий феномен.*

*Відзначається, що саме на читацьких асоціаціях та інтерпретаційно-рецептивних здібностях і базується інтертекстуальність. Саме за рахунок їх розмаїття і вводяться інтертекстуальні практики прочитання тексту. Таким чином відбувається свого роду розрив автономії тексту. Таке позбавлення самоізоляції тексту спричинило пошук точок перетину даного тексту з іншими текстами, з епохою, культурою, історією, що дає право говорити не про літературні впливи, а про інтертекстуальність. Інтертекстуальність зміщує фокуси оцінки та прочитання даного художнього твору, у якому виокремлюється не оригінальність, а швидше природа художнього твору. Інтертекстуальність забезпечує пошук не біографічного автора, а наратора. Прояви авторських стратегій у тексті, їхній пошук та виокремлення стають можливими завдяки такому контексту. Отже, інтертекстуальність забезпечує комунікативну настанову на читача, його очікування та інтенції. Адже всі акти інтертекстуальності художнього твору спрямовані до нього і на нього. Тому інтертекстуальність забезпечує зміну підходу до визначення цінності художнього твору не як самодостатнього і самоцінного, а як такого, що націлений на читача.*

*Аналізується інтертекстуальність з погляду історико-літературного, комунікативного, системного та типологічного підходів.*

*Методологічною основою статті є теорія діалогічності М. Бахтіна, концепція пародії Ю. Тинянова, враховуються основні положення та думки дослідників інтертекстуальності, таких як Ж. Деррида, Л. Женні, Р. Барт, Ю. Крістева.*

***Ключові слова:** інтертекстуальність, історико-літературний метод, комунікативний метод, системний метод, типологічний метод, теорія діалогічності.*

### СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Барт Р. S/Z: [под ред. Г. К. Косікова / Р. Барт. — М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2001. — 232 с.
2. Гловінський М. Інтертекстуальність / М. Гловінський // Теорія літератури в Польщі. Антологія текстів. Друга половина 20 — початок 21 ст. / упоряд. Б. Бакули; за заг. ред. В. Моринца; пер. з польськ. С. Яковенка. — К.: Вид. дім «Киево-Могилянська академія», 2008. — С. 284–309.



3. Лексикон загального та порівняльного літературознавства. — Чернівці: Золоті литаври, 2001. — 636 с.
4. Derrida J. Parages: Pas, Survivre, Titre a préciser, La loi du genre / Jacques Derrida. — Paris : Galilée, 1986.
5. Jenny L. La Strategie de la forme / Laurent Jenny // Poetique. — 1979. — № 27. — P. 268–269.
6. Riffaterre M. Semiotique intertextuelle: l'interpretant / Michael Riffaterre // Revue d'Esthetique. — 1979. — Nr. 1–2.

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 27 лютого 2017 р.*