

# *Theoretical Aspects of Problem of Intertextuality in Modern Literary Studies*

Anna A. Ilunina

Chair of Foreign Languages

Voronezh State University of Forestry and Technologies n.a. G.F. Morozov

Voronezh, Russia

ailunina@yandex.ru

**Abstract**—The articles deals with the theoretical aspects of the problem of intertextuality. The special attention is given to the formation of the term in the works of M.M. Bakhtin and J. Kristeva and to its definition in the modern literary studies. Intertextuality is seen as a central feature of postmodern poetics, the basis of postmodern writing. In postmodern philosophy the interaction of texts appears as a universal principle of the existence of culture. The concept of the world as text, characteristic of the current cultural situation, implies that every text, be it literary, historical, social, turns out, regardless of the author's will, involved in interaction with other texts, both created before him and at the same time and written later. However, despite some differences in approaches and formulations, there is a common desire of scholars to reflect in their definitions such underlying property as intertextuality, as conscious from the point of view of the author's desire to establish links between his work and the works of his predecessors.

**Keywords**—intertextuality; postmodernism

## I. INTRODUCTION

Problems of intertextual interactions have long attracted the attention of literary researchers. A new impetus to research in this area was given by the introduction to the scientific use of the concept of intertextuality (literally translated from the Latin "interweaving of texts, the presence of one text in another"). Currently, it has become widespread in literary criticism, linguistics, and culture studies.

## II. BAKHTIN'S DIALOGISM

The most important prerequisite for the creation of term 'intertextuality' was the doctrine of the Russian scientist M.M. Bakhtin about the alien word, about the dialogue as a universal cultural category. By an alien word, Bakhtin called every word of a stranger, every word that is not his word. He quite rightly noted that the boundaries between his and an alien word can shift, and on these boundaries there is a tense dialog struggle, since any particular statement is only a link in the chain of verbal communication and is full of responses to other statements. Bakhtin noted that, on the one hand, "the alien speech can be explicitly cited and graphically distinguished (quotes), but on the other hand, in each statement one can find a whole series of half-hidden and hidden words of different degrees of alienity. The researcher came to the conclusion that only at the point of contact of texts the light flashes,

introducing this text to the dialogue - this contact is the dialogical contact between the texts. There is no isolated statement. There is neither the first nor the last word, there are no limits to the dialogic context (it goes into the infinite past and the infinite future), according to Bakhtin, emphasizing that the meaning is revealed and generated at the intersection of texts, "his" and "alien" words, in the process of communication, the meeting of two subjects - the author and the reader, each of which is immersed in the infinite cultural context [1].

## III. ORIGIN OF THE TERM

In the late 1960s, Bakhtin's ideas were interpreted by the French poststructuralists, theorists of language and literature, J. Kristeva and R. Barthes, in whose writings the theory of intertextuality received its classical expression. It was J. Kristeva who first used the term "intertextuality" in the 1967 article 'Le mot, le dialogue et le roman', the impetus for the creation of which was the work of M. Bakhtin. Developing the fundamental principles of Bakhtin's theory, she rightly stated that when analyzing a work, one should consider any statement not as a point (stable meaning), but as a place where the text planes intersect, as a dialogue of different types of letters - the writer himself, the recipient and, finally, the letters formed by the current and previous cultural context. Kristeva indicated that any text is built as a mosaic of citations; any text is a product of absorption and transformation of some other text. Because of this, according to the figurative expression of the researcher, the identity of the subject of the letter begins to fade, giving way to the impersonal productivity of the text, thanks to which the latter is endowed with an almost autonomous existence independent of the author's will [2].

In a similar vein in the 1960s-1970s, R. Barthes also developed the theory of intertextuality. As he stated in his 1968 essay, 'The Death of the Author', the text is composed of many different types of letters, originating from different cultures and entering into a relationship of dialogue, parody, controversy. According to the scientist, intertextuality as a concept signals that the author ceases to be the only source of meaning of the text, because it indicates that the language that the writer uses comes from a variety of codes and models born of cultural space, in which the author and the reader exist and realize themselves [3].

Accordingly, as Barthes reasonably asserts, the text can no longer be perceived as an autonomous, unique entity with an

inherent unchanged meaning, once and for all invested by the author-creator of the work. The text is intertextual in its essence, its meaning is not 'inside' itself, but exists between texts, in relation to text to many other texts - sources, not only those that existed before, but also those that appeared after. It can realize its own meaning only within the reader's discourse, because only in the mind of the reader the correlation of the text with the current, previous and future cultural context is activated. Barthes argued that every text is an intertext; the texts of the previous and surrounding culture are absorbed by him and mixed in it.

Thus, both Kristeva and Barthes in their scientific research follow the ideas of Bakhtin, but offer to read them in the context of the system of views on the sign and text, which was formed among the French poststructuralists of the 1960s-1970s, primarily in the works of J. Derrida, whose philosophical views, according to many researchers (J. Clayton, E. Rotshtein, I. P. Ilyin, N. A. Fateeva, G. Allen and others), became the basis of the literary concept of intertextuality.

#### IV. DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEORY OF INTERTEXTUALITY

In the traditional concept of the sign, developed by Swiss scientist F. de Saussure, the value was derived from the relationship of the signifier and the signified, which were thought of as closely related to each other (fr. *significance* is a sign). The idea of the impossibility or, at least, the difficulty of the transition from the signifier to the signified, which are separated by time and space, was first heard by J. Lacan, and received his classical development in the writings of J. Derrida. The statement of the autonomy of the plan of expression leads to the loss of its connection with the signified and the statement that no sign can reliably reveal the truth, the ideological content, it can designate not a phenomenon, but only a trace of this phenomenon, not an object, but only its absence. Therefore, the emphasis is on the relationship of signs, mainly play. The principle connecting the text is henceforth the process of meaning (French neologism - *significance*), which is derived from the connections of the signifiers alone. In other words, the main thing now is not the problem of the relationship between language and extra-linguistic reality, but the interrelationship of a purely linguistic nature - one signifier with another, one word with another, one text with another. Derrida notes that every text lives among the responses, inoculations of one text on another and proposes deconstruction as a new way of philosophical reflection. Deconstruction aims to reveal in the text (artistic or cultural) traces of its interactions with other texts, non-systemic, marginal elements that internally undermine its structure [4].

Refusing to interpret the text as a purely linguistic phenomenon and extending this concept to non-linguistic semiotic objects, Derrida demonstrates that every reality is textual in its structure: literature, culture, society, history, human consciousness, including the author and the reader. "There is no out-of-text reality at all," (J. Derrida) [4], and Barthes, developing this thought, focuses on the fact that the 'I' that collides with the text itself is in itself a multitude of other texts and endless, or rather, lost codes.

German researcher M. Pfister describes the post-structuralist view of the sign and the text. The destruction of the boundaries of the concept of the text and the text itself and, at the same time, the separation of the sign from its referential signification, carried out by Derrida, reduced all communication to the free play of signifiers and spawned the picture of the universe texts, in which individual impersonal texts refer to each other and to all at once, since they all are only part of the universal text, which in turn coincides with the already textual bathrooms reality and fiction [5].

In their works, M.M. Bakhtin, J. Kristeva, R. Barthes fix the dependence of any text on the global cultural hypertext. At the same time, in the works of J. Kristeva and R. Barthes, the role of the subject (writer) in the phenomenon of intertextuality turns out to be insignificant. The creator of the work is equated at the level of interpretation to the reader, since the choice and change of focus, the technology of reading the text depend mainly on the addressee. The emphasis is shifted to an impersonal text that connects, often independently of the will of the author, various literary, social, historical, psychological contexts and allows for an infinite number of interpretations on the part of the reader. Such a "radical" approach to the concept of intertextuality was later perceived by many researchers and developed in all branches of humanitarian knowledge.

At the same time, it should be noted that in a number of cases, scientists, using the term 'intertextuality', which later became extremely popular, offered their interpretations of this concept, markedly different from the original Kristeva/Barthes concept. The poststructuralists were reasonably criticized the tendency to abstraction and distance from reality, which led to the fact that within the framework of this trend, no acceptable text analysis methods were developed.

Most researchers sought to "narrow" the concept of intertextuality, more closely linking it with the author's intention, the writer's conscious desire to establish a relationship between the text he created and the work of his predecessors. The reasons for this, as already mentioned, are obvious: an extremely broad understanding of intertextuality makes it very difficult to use this concept in the analysis of texts, and to identify cases of interaction of specific texts.

This trend is clearly manifested in the studies of a number of literary critics and linguists. Among them are such representatives of Western philological thought as G. Genette, M. Riffaterre, L. Dellenbach, P. van den Heuvel, M. Pfister and others. The works of these scholars obviously contain traces of the structuralist desire to stabilize meaning.

In particular, G. Genette notes that previously intertextuality was called the most different relations between texts, and he suggested a narrower definition of intertextuality, applying this concept to not necessarily explicit, but point-like relations between one and the other text (such techniques as a quote, hint) [6].

In the works of M. Riffaterre, an attempt is also made to limit the concept of intertextuality. In this regard, the researcher quite, in our opinion, rightly, introduces the concept

of author's intertextuality as a network of restrictions imposed by the text on the reader's perception [7].

L. Dellenbach and P. van den Heuvel connect intertextuality with the interaction of intertext discourses: the narrator's discourse with character discourse, one character with another, etc. [5].

"Narrow" interpretation of intertextuality is, according to our observations, a priority in the eyes of most modern scientists, both literary scholars and linguists, because, considering any text as intertext dissolves the very concepts of the text and intertextuality, casts doubt on their intrinsic value and integrity, does not allow one to identify various typological forms.

Unified in the understanding of intertextuality as a conscious installation of the author on the construction of links between his work and other texts, such scientists as I.P. Smirnov, A.K. Zholkovsky, M.B. Yampolsky, N.A. Fateeva, N.A. Kuzmina, V.E. Chernyavskaya, E.A. Bazhenova, I.V. Arnold, V.P. Rudnev, V.E. Halizev, A.M. Zverev offer more specific and therefore more suitable definition for the purposes of linguistic and literary analysis.

In particular, according to the observations of researcher N.A. Fateeva, intertextuality can be comprehended from the point of view of the author as a way of genesis of one's own text and postulating oneself through a complex system of relations of opposition, identification and masking with texts of other authors, and the reader can deepen understanding by establishing multidimensional links with other texts [8].

According to V.E. Chernyavskaya, intertextuality means a literary device, a special quality of certain texts that are specifically oriented to links with any texts, a dialogue with a specific foreign semantic position, serving as a special way of meaning and text construction. Intertextuality is the ability of the text to fully or partially form its meaning by referring to other texts and means setting the addressee as a carrier for the memory shared with the writer [9].

E.A. Bazhenova defines intertextuality as a textual category, reflecting the correlation of one text with another, the dialogical interaction of texts in the process of their functioning, providing an increment of the meaning of the work [10].

Researcher N.A. Kuzmina speaks of intertextuality as the roll of texts marked by certain linguistic signals, the depth of the text, which is found in the process of its interaction with the subject [11].

In particular, in the works of a number of researchers there are attempts to create terminology for intertextual interactions. One text involved in the intertextual dialogue is called pretext, prototext, donor text, precedent text, name, situation, hypotext, and the other is called metatext, text-basis, text-recipient, hypertext.

Several classifications of intertext interactions have been developed, the most notable having been proposed by G. Genette in the 'Palimpsests: literature in the second degree' and 'Introduction to architext'. According to the classification of the French researcher, transtextuality variations (as a

general concept for intertext interactions) are intertextuality as the presence of two or more texts in one text (quote, allusion, plagiarism, etc.); paratextuality as the ratio of text to the title preface, metatextuality as a commenting and often critical link to your pretext; hypertextuality as mockery and parodying with one text of another, and architextuality, understood primarily as genre link of texts.

Recently Genette's classification has been specified by N. Fateeva, who proposed using the following classification:

1 Intertextuality itself, forming the construction text in text

1.1. Quotes

1.1.1 Attribution Quotes

1.1.2. Quotes without attribution

1.2. Allusions

1.2.1. Attribution allusions

1.2.2. Unattributed allusions

1.3. Centone texts

2 Paratextuality, or the ratio of the text to its title, epigraph, epilog

2.1. Quote titles

2.2. Epigraphs

3 Metatextuality as a retelling and commenting link to pretext

3.1. Intertext retelling

3.2. Variations on the pretext

3.3. Supplementing "alien" text

3.4. Pretext language game

4 Hypertextuality as ridicule or parody of one text. other

5 Architectuality as a genre connection of texts

6 Other cases and models of intertextuality

6.1 Intertext as a trope

6.2 Intertmedia tropes and stylistic figures [8].

It is obvious that the modifications proposed in Fateeva's work have touched upon intertextual connections in the narrow sense; in particular, the researcher has divided the quotes and allusions into attributive and non-attributive, described features of centonic texts and also identified several varieties of metatextuality.

As we can see, despite some differences in approaches and formulations, there is a common desire of these scholars to reflect in their definitions such underlying property as intertextuality as conscious from the point of view of the author's desire to establish links between his work and the works of his predecessors.

The differences between these two concepts of intertextuality, we think, should not be absolutized, because most supporters of a narrow approach to the definition of this phenomenon do not deny the integration of any text into a holistic system of human knowledge, its obvious connection with the totality of linguistic and extralinguistic sign background.

For example, G. Genette uses the concept of transtextuality as a generic for all types of textual interconnections, M. Riffater speaks of the presence of free associations in every amorphous connection, calling it hypertextuality, V. Cherniavskaya introduces the concept of interdiscourse to designate a globally understood infinite intertext [6, 7, 9].

We believe that both narrow and broad approaches to the problem of intertextuality are legitimate. While a broad interpretation of philosophical generalizations and describes the principles of the functioning of culture as a whole, a narrow approach is more important for practical research, because it offers specific strategies for analyzing works in terms of their inclusion in the dialogue of texts. Thus, one should be aware of the potential limitless intertextuality of the text, its ability to generate in the act of reading an endless network of semi-conscious, almost independent from the author's will associations that connect it with the entire set of preceding, created and simultaneously emerging texts.

Nevertheless, within the framework of literary analysis, it is fair, in our opinion, to focus primarily on identifying in the text examples of the author's deliberate, conscious references to the works of predecessors and contemporaries, his conscious dialogue with the cultural tradition.

#### V. INTERTEXTUALITY AND POSTMODERNISM

Let us note that the overwhelming number of researchers emphasize that intertextuality is the central feature of postmodern poetics, the basis of postmodern writing [12].

Some researchers are of the opinion that intertextuality is solely connected with the poetic of postmodernism, and the intertextual analysis of texts that do not have relations to postmodernism profanes the very the concept of intertextuality, discrediting it and speculating on its terminology [13].

However, most researchers argue intertextuality is by no means confined to postmodern literature, although in the latter, of course, has its own specifics (see, for example, works by H. Pfister, J. Steele, M. Wharton, N.A. Fateeva, I.P. Ilyin) [14, 15].

Intertext is seen as the main way and type of building artistic text in the art of modernism and postmodernism, consisting in the fact that the text is built from quotations and reminiscences to other texts.

The reason for this phenomenon lies in the fact that in the aesthetics of postmodernism, the interaction of a text with a symbolic background is not of a local nature, as in previous literature, but becomes a global principle, the basic principle of the generation and perception of a literary text.

The concept of intertextuality, in our opinion, has become so popular in the artistic practice of postmodernism, because it turned out to be consonant with the postmodern world view. In connection with this statement, it should be noted that the concept of intertextuality in the era of postmodernism goes beyond the textual category and is used, as a definition of the world-and self-consciousness of modern man.

Having emerged in the 1960s and 1970s as a set of trends in the field of theoretical thought and art and, more generally, as a special type of world outlook and world view, postmodernism criticized the preceding tradition in areas of philosophical thought and artistic creativity characteristic of Western civilization, starting with the New Time and implying the existence of a model of the world in the center of which is a person or some other force (natural (Darwin), social (Marx), psychological (Freud)). Such model implied an unshakable hierarchy, a structure of interconnections in any sphere of life activity.

Following the principle of deceneration, proposed by J. Derrida, postmodernism questions any attempt to establish any hierarchical order based on universal values, truths and beliefs (for example, humanism, history, progress, etc.), which rejects priority systems.

The main principle of the postmodern world view is the denial of any possibility of the existence of a natural or social hierarchy, the abandonment of monological truth and the transition to a new multidimensional paradigm of thinking. In the field of literary creativity, this fundamental idea leads to a rethinking of the status of a work of art.

If earlier the work was traditionally characterized by unity of genre, form and author's subjectivity, then now the main principles of text organization are 'non-hierarchy' and 'non-selection' (D. Fokkema) (or quasi-non-selection and quasi-non-hierarchy). In the framework of a literary work, this implies the presence and coexistence in the text of heterogeneous elements, styles, genre codes. The author not only does not seek to assimilate them into the fabric of the text, but also deliberately emphasizes their heterogeneity. This serves to create the effect of a deliberate narrative chaos that conveys the idea of perceiving the world as torn, fragmented, devoid of a clear hierarchy, pronounced structure.

At the end of the second millennium in art, a sense of crisis, culture fatigue, 'the end of history', the next 'fin de siècle' syndrome, (by M. Bradbury's definition) leads to the realization that all novelty is now lurking in new, unexpected interpretations of already existing texts.

'Distrust of meta-stories' (God, Being, Meaning of life, Nature, Truth) (J.-F. Lyotard), which a person had previously used to understand his position in the world, gives rise to the principle of playing with the reader and the reader.

In postmodernism, the avant-garde attitude to novelty is opposed to the desire to incorporate into the orbit of modern art the entire experience of world artistic culture through its ironic quotation. The refusal of the renowned tradition of belief in universally recognized authorities, doubt in the authenticity and possibility of knowing the world turns the text into a game space built primarily on the principles of irony

and parody, which become the only form of interaction with a chaotic, unstructured, textualized reality. Countless quotations, allusions, reminiscences coexisting in it on the principles of equality make the work a territory open to multiple interpretations.

In this regard, the concept of intertextuality is consonant with anti-dogmatism, the rejection of the claim to possessing absolute knowledge - the defining features of postmodern worldview, in which the idea of the existence of objective and absolute truth has been replaced by the idea of a plurality of truth.

The postmodernist consciously refuses to explicitly express his position in the work. Creating a text that openly seeks to break out of its limits, constantly reviews to other texts, the writer creates conditions under which reading implies not so much the finding of the only true truth laid down in the text by a certain author, but the development of his view, some interpretation.

The process of reading in modern culture is perceived not as a simple absorption of the unchanged value of the text, but as a complex, non-ending process of the increment of meaning. Thus, postmodernism questions the category of authorship, putting the relationship between text and reader in the first place, since only within the reader's discourse can the text realize its own meaning.

A postmodern text can thus be interpreted as an "open work" (a term proposed by U. Eco), a work that does not prescribe a predetermined reproduction in given coordinates, but ends with the performer (reader) in the process of its performance and aesthetic perception, thus, initially encouraging the conscious freedom of the performer. He is free to create any form, without being bound by external necessity, which would prescribe to him certain forms of reflection and organization of the material; a work that promotes its entire organization multiplies the number of readings.

According to the Italian writer and philologist U. Eco, openness is always implicitly present in art, but it is the contemporary artist who creates works in which the maximum, more radical openness was originally laid down [12].

Intertextual inclusions help to create an 'open work' that become the key to the constant self-growth of the text, allowing the reader to engage in the endless process of generating new meanings, to activate his creative impulse, while leaving a wide scope for interpretation variability.

Accordingly, the concept of the role and function of the creator in contemporary art is also changing. The play becomes the author's way of being in the postmodern space, the series of masks and poses that the creator uses makes his position elusive, elusive, elusively unequivocal, dissolves the author's intention in the kaleidoscope of positions, points of view that sound in the work.

All of the above allows us to evaluate the postmodern thinking style as "quote thinking", and the postmodern texts as "quote literature" (Morrisette), "paraliterature" (Jameson),

"pastish" (Fr. "pastishe" from It. "pasticcio") (Jameson, Hassan) [16]. These terms fix immersion in culture, until complete dissolution in it. In a number of cases, such philosophical and aesthetic attitudes are expressed in the art of postmodernism with pronounced confirmation.

It should, however, underline the special place that the notion of "tradition" occupies in the postmodernist understanding of intertextuality. Deanonizing the values of past eras, postmodernism, nevertheless, as it were, revives in its artistic practice the entire cultural memory of humanity. Attraction and interaction of various cultural layers, their installation is turning into a new means of cultural synthesis, in which their partial destruction is accompanied by a new technique of their reproduction and restoration. The disappearance of belief in absolutes brings to life the idea of relativity, variability, instability and, at the same time, interconnection and interdependence of all things, and also "stimulates the search for a new integrity, not false and artificial, but true and natural.

Postmodernism marks a certain stage in the development of art: the time when tradition dominated was over, but the era of innovation domination is coming to an end. There are motives for the discovery of innovation within the tradition, the question of their novelty gives way to the question of their combinations, the forms of their interaction. In this regard, the prospect of deconstructing cultural standards and privileged positions, outlined by postmodernism, has a serious cultural meaning and heuristic orientation.

The inwardness of what mankind lived through, the impossibility of doing without references, quoting, borrowing, does not at all signify the impotence of the art of postmodernism, but contributes to the continuous birth of many new meanings and interpretations. The borrowed old form in the new, unusual context evolves, acquires a new content, redevelops and appears in a completely different social and cultural way, although its original content is still behind it is preserved and should be recognized as a functional component of the new form.

Intertextuality, referring to the rich history of culture, thus creates the basis for further movement and this, of course, is an inexhaustible supply of new artistic possibilities for the literature of postmodernism.

Despite the fact that postmodernism declares its appeal not only to the intellectual, but also to the mass public, it is evident that it is primarily a sophisticated audience with sufficient background knowledge and capable of appreciating the quotation of the work. The high demands that the art of postmodernism places on its addressee are expressed, for example, in such terms as 'ideal reader' (U. Eco), 'aristocratic reader' (R. Barthes), etc.

In this regard, among researchers of postmodernism there is a well-founded point of view that granting the reader the right to unrestricted freedom of interpretation is, to some extent, a trap into which his postmodernist authors are lured; the perception of a complex whole artwork without taking into account all the elements is still unthinkable, and only an analysis of the text, taking into account all its intertextual

connections, makes it possible to penetrate the intricacies of meaning. It is in this case that the various positions will enrich the perception with diverse resonances and echoes without prejudice to the original essence of the work itself [17].

Thus, postmodern literature and art acquire a rhizome-like character. The term 'rhizome' (from Fr. *root*) was proposed in 1976 in a joint work 'Anti-Eodipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia' by G. Deleuze and F. Guattari as an image of postmodern space, text as opposed to classical, "tree" or "root-shaped". The latter was conceived by scientists as being based on a hierarchical system, that is, obeying linear structuring and having a center and periphery. On the contrary, according to the theory of Deleuze and Guattari, the rhizom-like space is devoid of hierarchy, it is alien to core unity, any point, rhizome line is connected with any other, unlike a tree or root, which fix order in general. The fundamental properties of a rhizome as a nonlinear type of organization of integrity become polymorphism, multiplicity while maintaining unity, immanent instability due to its potential for self-variance: the rhizome space cannot be observed from the outside, it can be exploited only by traveling around it [18].

In the light of the foregoing, in postmodern philosophy the interaction of texts appears as a universal principle of the existence of culture. The concept of world as text, characteristic of the current cultural situation, implies that every text, be it literary, historical, social, turns out, regardless of the author's will, involved in interaction with other texts, both created before him and at the same time and written later, it acquires in the process of this communication new values that are not implied by the author. Each work, building its own intertextual field, restructures the entire previous cultural foundation but becomes primarily a means of asserting the originality of the writer.

## VI. CONCLUSION

Thus, the concept of intertextuality is one of the most discussed in the modern linguistics, literary and culture studies.

Being the central feature of postmodern poetics, intertextuality can be studied both as a philosophy of postmodern and as deliberate references to the works of predecessors and contemporaries, author's conscious dialogue with the cultural tradition.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my colleagues in the Chair of Foreign Languages, Department of Economics, Voronezh State University of Forestry and Technologies and the Chair of Foreign Literature, Department of Philology, Voronezh State University for their support and my thesis supervisor Professor Maria Popova.

## References

- [1] M. Bakhtin, "The dialogic imagination: four essays," M. Holquist, Ed. Transl. by C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1981.
- [2] Y. Kristeva, "Desire in language: a semiotic approach to literature and art," Léon S. Roudiez, Ed. Transl. by T. Gora and A. Jardine, Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.
- [3] R. Barth, "Theory of the text," Transl. by Ian McCleod. "Untying the text: a post-structuralist reader," R. Young, Ed. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981, pp. 31-47.
- [4] J. Derrida, "Letter and distinction," Moscow, 2000, p. 21.
- [5] I.P. Ilyin, "Intertextuality styles. Problems of modern stylistics," Moscow, 2010, p. 94.
- [6] J. Genette. "Figures: works on poetics," Moscow, 1998, p. 22.
- [7] M. Riffaterre, "Criteria of stylistic analysis," Moscow, 1988, p. 135.
- [8] N.A. Fateeva, "Intertext in the world of texts. Counterpoint intertextuality," Moscow: KomKniga. 2006.
- [9] V.E. Chernyavskaya, "Intertext and interdiscourse as a realization of text openness," Questions of cognitive linguistics, vol. 1, pp. 106-115, 2004.
- [10] E.A. Bazhenova, "Intertextuality," Moscow, 2003, pp. 104-108.
- [11] N.A. Kuzmina, "Intertext and its role in the processes of evolution of the poetic language," Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2004.
- [12] G. Allen, "Intertextuality," London: Routledge, 2000.
- [13] Retrieved from: [http://www.dll.botic.ru/az/lit/coll/litext5/14\\_losk/htm](http://www.dll.botic.ru/az/lit/coll/litext5/14_losk/htm).
- [14] J. Marko, "Towards a history of intertextuality in literary and culture studies," CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, vol. 10, iss. 3, 2008.
- [15] M. Pfister, "Konzepte der Intertextualität," in Intertextualität. Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien. U. Broich and M. Pfister, Eds. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1985. pp. 1-30.
- [16] J. Jameson, "Postmodernism or, The cultural logic of late capitalism," Durham, 1991.
- [17] U. Eco, "The role of the reader: exploration in the semiotics of texts," HarperCollins Ltd, 1981, p. 86.
- [18] G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, "Anti-Eodipus: capitalism and schizophrenia," University of Minnesota, 2000.