UDC 811.161
DOI https://doi.org/10.32838/2710-4656/2022.1-2/28

Halahan Ya. V.
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Drahan O. A.
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

TRADITION AND INTERTEXTUALITY AS TEXTUAL STRATEGIES OF CREATING THE OWN IDIOSTYLE

The current paper clarifies the key concepts of literary tradition, continuity, dialogicity, and intertextual connections. It should be noted that the work of minor writers often contains, from a contact-genetic point of view a more unambiguous connection with the canons of classical literature than the work of the primary ones, because they carry out the continuity of literary values much more straightforwardly. In their artistic manner, the characteristic features of general trends in the development of literature are manifested more directly. In the works of the most significant writers, all these common features are refracted through the prism of individual characteristics, that is, what they have in common is more subordinate to the special, exceptional. At the stage of apprenticeship, the authors unconsciously imitate their predecessors. Imitation becomes a launching pad for them, allowing them to create original works while maintaining a connection with a sample of a certain era and aesthetics. From imitation, they move to the formation of their own idiostyle, in which intertextual elements occupy a large place. Due to the growing interest in the intertextual reading of texts and the interdisciplinary emphasis on scientific research, the number of papers on this issue continues to grow. It is important to emphasize that tradition and intertextuality are theoretically complex concepts, and a unified definition of this term remains very difficult to achieve. The variety of interpretations of these terms is due to their multidimensional nature. A number of prominent theorists promote a variety of meanings, paying attention to one side of it. In this situation, researchers prefer to use definitions that correspond to the tasks of their scientific research. The article discusses the features of forms and functions of intertextuality, as well as the main ways of its formal expression in the text.

Key words: *literary tradition, continuity, dialogicity, intertextual connections.*

Stating the problem. Studying tradition and continuity, literary scholars consider various factors that determined their reinterpretation in literature: general cultural, nationally specific, individual-authorial. Scientists fix the specifics of the tradition of a particular era or a particular trend/ author, determine the directions and forms of their subsequent modernization. The process of translating accumulated experience into new forms, inseparable in diachrony, is open and endless. The literary critic considered tradition to be the essential component of the entire process of literary evolution. The scientist emphasized the importance of the influence of predecessors and tradition as the beginning that defines "boundaries of the personal initiative" of each writer or poet. Only knowing the predecessors – what he uses in his work, what he received as a given, it is possible to determine what proportion of the new brought this or that talent into the treasury of world culture.

Analysis of the research and publications on the issue under consideration. The most significant modern generalizing works devoted to the development of methodology and terminological apparatus of the theory of intertextuality belong to I. Arnold, P. Torop, N. Fateeva, M. Lipovetsky, K. Sidorenko, I. Skoropanova, N. Kuzmina, V. Moskvin, V. Milovidov, I. Smirnov. Their authors address the problem of the functioning of intertext as a literary device, the study of its role in the work of a particular writer, a certain genre-thematic direction, etc. In recent decades, such literary critics as N. Belaya, Yu. Borev, M. Gasparov, G. Kurlandskaya, A. Lagunov, E. Markaryan, V. Musatov, T. Pahareva, E. Stetsenko, K. Chistov, N. Chistyakova, S. Khoruzhiy, L. Yachnik etc. have addressed the problem of tradition and the study of the peculiarities of its representation on specific literary material, including the work of individual authors and certain genre varieties and works. In their works, the boundaries

of the concept of "tradition" and the understanding of the mechanism of its functioning have significantly expanded. For example, K. Chistov in his work "Folk Traditions and Folklore" (1986) considers tradition as a "mechanism of accumulation, transmission and actualization of human experience, i.e. culture", as a "network (system) connections of the present with the past", with the help of which "accumulation, selection and, what is very important, the stereotyping of experience and the transmission of stereotypes are carried out, which are then reproduced again", as "collective (social) memory, which assumes activity, duration (continuity), activity, multiple transmission and reproduction" [25, p. 108]. However, these concepts require more detailed study and analysis due to the lack of consensus on understanding the essence of these categories in the research society.

Stating the task. The article is aimed at characterizing the main units of the conceptual and terminological apparatus, with the help of which it is possible to identify the features of the authors' personal artistic strategy.

The main body. A. N. Veselovsky was one of the first to address the issue of tradition based on folklore material, considering it as an important component of literary evolution. Based on the thesis that "both in the field of culture and the field of art, we are bound by tradition and are expand in it, not creating new forms, but attaching new relationships to them" [9, p. 376], the scientist saw the task of historical poetics in determining the role and place of legend (i.e. traditions) in the process of personal creativity and expressed the opinion that "a poetic image comes to life if it is experienced by the artist, perceived from nature or renewed by the power of imagination, renewed from memory or a ready-made plastic formula" [9, p. 375]. Considering the problem of the relationship between tradition and personal initiative in the field of poetic creativity, A. N. Veselovsky was sure that "the poet is bound by the material inherited from the previous period; his starting point is already given by what has been done before him. Every poet enters the realm of a ready-made poetic word, he is bound by interest in well-known subjects, enters into the rut of poetic fashion, and finally, he appears at a time when one or another poetic genus is developed. To determine the degree of his personal initiative, we must trace in advance the history of what he wields in his work" [9, p. 448].

Almost a century later, the idea of a "ready-made poetic word" was embodied in the postmodern theory of intertextuality. Developing the ideas of A. N. Veselovsky, Yu. N. Tynyanov in his works "Literary Fact" (1924), "On Literary Evolution" (1927), "Tyutchev and Heine" (1921), expressed the idea that "the main concept of the change of evolution is the change of systems, and the question of "traditions" is transferred to another plane" [21, p. 191]. The researcher distinguished between the concepts of "literary evolution" and "genesis of literary phenomena", in fact, the origins of the tradition. He considered the process of artistic evolution as a kind of oscillatory movement arising from "attacks", "rudiments in some systems" and displacements, transformations "into the rudiments of other systems". At the same time, the critic emphasized that "a new phenomenon replaces the old, takes its place and, not being a "development" of the old, is at the same time its substitute" [21, p. 191].

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the problem of tradition as a category of modernist aesthetics in English literary criticism was developed by the famous American-English poet, playwright and literary critic Thomas Eliot, who in his program essay "Tradition and Individual Talent" (1919) expressed the opinion that tradition is not something once and for all set, a poet cannot mechanically adopt it from his predecessors or inherit [26, p. 477]. The fundamental thesis of Eliot's theory of tradition was the idea of the simultaneous coexistence of literary works in a single cultural space. O. M. Ushakova points out that "the ideal unity he represents embraces the creators of all countries and languages, a universal scale of the value of a work of art is being formed, in which the poet acts as a "medium", having lost his own individuality" [22]. Thus, "in the coordinate system proposed by Eliot, the very concepts of "old" and "new", "past", "present" and "future" are relative" [22].

It is important for our work that the work of an individual poet is considered by T. Eliot in the context of the whole – tradition. In turn, M. M. Bakhtin, one of whose central ideas is the idea of the dialogicity of art, noted that in the process of the formation of world culture, different works and different epochs constantly echo, complement and reveal each other [Бахтин, 11, p. 383–391]. Yu. M. Lotman, developing M. M. Bakhtin's thought about the dialogue of cultures, refers to the phenomenon of "cultural memory" and its mechanisms, seeing it as a means of preserving the past in the present. The scientist points out that "the texts forming the "common memory" of a cultural collective not only serve as a means of deciphering texts circulating in a modern-synchronous cross-section of culture but also generate new ones" [15, p. 201].

The term "tradition", being extremely broad (Lat. traditio – transmission, custom, long-established opinion or habit) is rather ambiguously interpreted in modern literary criticism. On the one hand, it is connected with the everyday consciousness of a person, on the other – in the humanities, including the literary science of recent decades, it has acquired a new heuristic meaning. The special significance of continuity in the life of society and the development of art is noted by representatives of the most diverse areas of intellectual thought: cultural and semiotic schools, receptive aesthetics and hermeneutics, schools of intertextual and intermedial analysis. The semantic field of the term is narrowed by the field of literary studies: under traditions in literary studies, it is customary to understand historical and literary successive ties in the development of general patterns of artistic creativity, because every work of art is historical and arises only as an answer to the questions of its time and only in its conditions draws content and form.

One of the first dictionary definitions of the term "tradition" is proposed in the "Dictionary of Literary Terms" by V. Dynnik, who notes that this term "is applied both in relation to a succession connection uniting a number of coherent literary phenomena and in relation to the results of such a connection, to the stock of literary skills" [12, p. 972–973]. Pointing out that tradition borders on imitation, influence and borrowing in its meaning, V. Dynnik draws attention to the difficulties of distinguishing them in practice, because "most literary phenomena are connected by not one, but several connections and tradition is often intertwined with direct influence, imitation and borrowing..." [12, p. 972–973].

In the "Literary Encyclopedia of Terms and Concepts" edited by A. N. Nikolyukin (Moscow, 2001), tradition is interpreted as "a general humanitarian concept characterizing cultural memory and continuity. Linking the values of the historical past with the present, passing on cultural heritage from generation to generation, tradition carries out selective and proactive mastery of heritage in the name of its enrichment and solving newly emerging problems (including artistic ones)" [14, p. 1089]. It manifests itself through "verbal and artistic means that have been used before, as well as fragments of previous texts (reminiscences that do not have a parody character)", "worldviews, concepts, ideas that already exist both in non-artistic reality and in literature", and through "life analogues of verbal and artistic forms" [14, p. 1089].

One of the main ways of forming tradition is someone else's style in a literary work. In this aspect, A. S. Bushmin, Yu. B. Borev highlighted influences, borrowings, imitations, stylizations, parodies, variations, etc., nominating the types of connection between the author's artistic picture of the world and the artistic experience of predecessors. These types of communication differ from each other in "volume" and in the nature of the use of tradition. In Y. Borev's encyclopedic dictionary of Terms "Aesthetics. Theory of literature" (2003) tradition is defined as "the presence of the past in the present", "actualized culture of the past", "mobilization of the experience of the past in the interests of the present" [8, p. 481]. The most active and broadest of all is the concept of influence, which presupposes a kind of creative impulse, an "external push". Considering it, A. Bushmin noted that "the influence of the predecessor on the successor can be direct, direct, and carried out through an intermediary, i.e. indirect" [27, p. 136]. The influence can be unconscious by a creative person, spontaneous, and realized when a writer gives himself up to active literary study, deliberately turns to the experience of others. In the second case, the conscious assimilation of tradition can acquire either a deeply creative character or, on the contrary, be expressed in borrowings, imitations, emulations or superficial stylizations leading to epigonism. Coming into contact with emulation, influence and borrowing, tradition still differs from them, since the "material" of tradition, which has been tested by time, is a qualitative aesthetic substrate. It is thought of as generally recognized in this literary environment, it forms part of its artistic usage, sanctioned by custom, which has become common property, while imitation, influence and borrowing also deal with material lying outside this environment, which has not yet been assimilated by. The complex incessant interaction of cultural texts, the renewal and enrichment of the content and form of literary works with artistic achievements and discoveries, innovative approaches are impossible without tradition. Everything new in literature is based on traditions, comes from them, develops them and at the same time creates forms that become traditions, and those serve as the starting point of the new. The author emphasized that the culture of each new epoch remembers the past, and remembers it not unchanged, but transformed, adapted to modernity; this is the way to mobilize the experience of the past in the interests of the present. Based on this, the concept of literary tradition has a temporal coordinate, since the previous literary experience can relate not only to

various national cultures but also to various cultural and historical epochs, which determines the legitimacy of distinguishing the tradition of the ancient, medieval, Renaissance, classical, romantic, etc. In general, the concept of tradition presupposes the realization of continuity both using the experience of national literature /culture and relying on the artistic achievements of other peoples /cultures. The constituent elements of a literary tradition can be stylistics, composition, rhythm, imagery, ways of creating the artistic world, visual and expressive means, genre structures, themes, etc. For example, the tradition of the theme determines the nature of the work. In this case, the author correlates his decision with those that have already been found by culture; the tradition of the image assumes taking into account the decisions already accumulated by culture regarding this or that character; the national tradition is connected with the system of values adopted in a particular culture: ethical, aesthetic, historical; the tradition of artistic techniques combines lexical, syntactic, rhythmic, plot-compositional techniques; the stylistic tradition synthesizes all the above possibilities. Here we can talk about the author's traditions (for example, Pushkin's, Nekrasov's, Shakespeare's) or the traditions of certain trends or even epochs [8, p. 481].

According to N. V. Belaya, "having historical stability, tradition, at the same time, is subject to functional changes: each epoch chooses from the past culture what is valuable and vital for it. At the same time, the sphere of continuity in each national culture changes over time" [7]. The study of tradition in literature helps to identify a number of patterns in the development of literature of a particular period, emphasizes the importance of introducing the writer to the tradition of folk culture (folklore) [7]. To analyze the personal artistic strategy of *writers of the second raw* view of V. E. Khalizev's tradition seems to be the most acceptable. It distinguishes between two meanings of the term: "reliance on past experience in the form of its repetition and variation ("traditionalism" and "academism"). Such traditions are strictly regulated and take the form of rituals, etiquette, ceremonial, strictly observed" [24, p. 390–391]. Later (starting from the middle of the 18th century), traditionalism, according to the researcher, "lost its role and began to be perceived as an obstacle to artistic activity," and judgments about the "oppression of traditions", about tradition as an "automated technique" came into use [24, p. 391].

The second meaning of the term "tradition" became particularly relevant in the twentieth century, when, due to a change in the cultural and historical situation, "the ritual-regulating principle began to be minimized." Then tradition began to be understood as "the initiative and creative inheritance of cultural (and, in particular, verbal and artistic) experience, which involves the completion of values that make up the heritage of society, the people, humanity" [24, p. 391]. V. E. Khalizev believes that "an organically assimilated tradition becomes a kind of guideline for individuals and their groups, a kind of spiritual-practical strategy. The involvement of tradition is manifested not only in the form of a clear conscious orientation to a certain kind of values but also in the forms of spontaneous, intuitive, unintentional. The world of traditions is like the air that people breathe, most often without thinking about what an invaluable good they have" [24, p. 391].

A. M. Ranchin, defining the role of tradition in the literary process, identifies two types of its perception by literature, interpolation into the text. The first is connected with the functioning of tradition as a "background" (at the same time, it is perceived as something that has a universal character and does not have a "concrete" character) [19, p. 14]. In the second case, we are talking about an open manifestation of tradition in the form of citation, although "the uncited expression of tradition is determined by its semantic program in the context of the work" [2627, p. 42]. The attitude of writers' interest in the literature of the past largely determines the specifics of their works. Their writings are characterized by high reminiscence saturation, which can be considered one of the essential properties of her poetry. That is why, in our opinion, without an intertextual reading of their works, a full-fledged perception of her artistic world is impossible.

In this regard, let us focus on the characteristic of the concept of intertextuality. We have already noted that the philological science of the twentieth century is largely focused on the study of the continuity of certain artistic elements in the process of literary evolution (M. M. Bakhtin, Yu. N. Tynyanov, M. L. Gasparov, G. N. Pospelov, M. N. Epstein, V. Chernyavskaya, M. I. Shapir, etc.). This is especially true of poetry – probably the most sensitive to the "alien" word form of verbal creativity. Despite the steady attention of researchers to the manifestation of tradition and influences at the level of verse, vocabulary, phraseology, syntax, genres, etc., the understanding of the typology of creative dialogue methods remains as relevant, and therefore the problem of intertextual connections is among the most pressing problems of modern philological science. This is confirmed by

an impressive list of theoretical and practical scientific papers devoted to the development of terminological apparatus, methodology and methodology of intertextual analysis. Let's consider the main theoretical positions underlying the study of the issue of intertextuality.

The foundations of the conceptual framework of intertextuality were laid at the beginning of the twentieth century in the works of M. O. Gershenzon, V. V. Vinogradov, V. M. Zhirmunsky, Yu. N. Tynyanov, B. M. Eichenbaum, M. M. Bakhtin and other researchers. If in M. O. Gershenson's unfinished article "Pushkin's Plagiarism" [10] the presence of a large number of reminiscences was limited to the elementary registration of an intertextual connection without specifying its type, then the formalists also considered specific types of this connection. Yu. Tynyanov developed the problem of intertext in the light of the study of parody, in which he saw the fundamental principle of updating artistic systems based on the transformation of previous texts. The theory of intertextuality is largely based on the research of M. M. Bakhtin [9], one of whose central ideas was the idea of dialogism, which, in the words of Natalie Piege-Gros, played a "decisive role in the genesis of intertextuality" [17, p. 65]. According to M. M. Bakhtin, "the dialogic orientation of a word is a phenomenon peculiar to every word. On all its paths to the subject, in all directions, the word meets with someone else's word and cannot but enter into a lively intense interaction with it" [Бахтин, 9, vol. 3, p. 32]. The researcher has not yet used the term "intertextuality", but, defining "someone else's speech", defines it as "speech in speech, utterance in utterance, but at the same time it is also speech about speech, utterance about utterance" [Бахтин, 10, p. 445]. The appearance of the term "intertextuality" was associated with the formation of the linguistic theory of intertextuality within the framework of poststructuralism. It was introduced into the scientific discourse by Yu. Kristeva in the work "Bakhtin, the word, dialogue and the novel" (1967), where the researcher formulated her concept of intertextuality on the basis of rethinking the work of M. M. Bakhtin's "The Problem of content, material and form in Verbal artistic creativity" (1924), in which the interaction of the artist of the word with the preceding and contemporary cultural context was emphasized. Starting from the ideas of M. M. Bakhtin, Yu. Kristeva considers "every word (text) as such an intersection of two words (texts), where at least one more word (text) can be read", and asserts that "any text is built as a mosaic of citation, any text is the absorption and transformation of some other text" and "thereby the concept of intersubjectivity is replaced by the concept of intertextuality and it turns out that poetic language lends itself to at least double reading" [13, p. 166]. The creative heritage of Yu. Kristeva has become the subject of special attention of literary critics and linguists. "Since Kristeva defined intertextuality in the context of theoretical research in the late sixties of the XX century, the latter has become one of the most important literary and critical concepts," notes Natalie Piege-Gro [17, p. 43], interpreting the term "intertextuality" as a "general concept", "a device by which one text overwrites another text." "Intertext" is considered by her as "a set of texts reflected in this work, regardless of whether it correlates with the work in absentia (for example, in the case of an allusion) or is included in it in absentia (as in the case of a quotation)" [17, p. 48]. Based on the concept of Kristeva the term "intertextuality" has become one of the main ones in the analysis of postmodern art works. To date, there are discrepancies in research papers regarding this term. According to Ilyin, it is applicable as a means of analyzing a literary text, as a category for describing the specifics of the existence of literature and for determining the world and self-perception of the person himself. The concept of intertextuality has both narrow and broad interpretations: it is considered, limited only to dialogical relations in which one text contains explicit references to specific pretexts, or assuming semantic multiplicity, an incomplete number of interpretations, the formation of the recipient's semantic activity. The variety of interpretations of the term "intertextuality" is due to the multidimensional nature of the concept itself. And, since the formulation of an exhaustive and detailed definition of intertextuality seems to be a rather difficult problem, different authors, as a rule, pay attention to one side of it. In this situation, researchers prefer to use definitions that correspond to the tasks of their scientific research. Gerard Genette adheres to a narrow interpretation of this term. In the book "Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree" (1982), he considers intertextuality as one of the varieties of the broader concept of "transtextuality", which denotes "everything that includes [this text] in explicit and implicit relationships with other texts" [17, p. 54]. Pointing to the traditional practice of quoting marked with quotation marks (with or without specifying the source), as well as allusion and plagiarism, the scientist suggests a "five-part classification of different types of text interaction: 1) intertextuality as the co-presence of two or more

texts in one text (quotation, allusion, plagiarism, adaptation, dramatization, etc.); 2) paratextuality as the relation of a text to its title, afterword, epigraph, etc.; 3) metatextuality as a commenting and often critical reference to its preface; 4) hypertextuality as ridiculing and parodying one text of another; 5) architectuality, understood as a genre connection of texts" [23, p. 121]. Genette then divides these main classes of intertextuality into numerous subclasses and types and traces their interrelations. This classification, it seems to us, does not quite clearly define the boundaries between the selected subclasses and types. A similar task is to identify specific forms of literary intertextuality (borrowing and processing of themes and plots, explicit and implicit quotation, translation, plagiarism, allusion, paraphrase, imitation, parody, dramatization, adaptation, use of epigraphs, etc.) – the authors of the collection "Intertextuality: Forms and Functions" (1985) set themselves German researchers W. Broich, M. Pfister and B. Schulte-Middelich, who also addressed the problem of the functional meaning of intertextuality. The theory of intertextuality was further developed in the works of I. V. Arnold, who considered intertextuality "the inclusion in the text of either whole other texts with a different subject of speech, or their fragments in the form of marked or unmarked, transformed or unchanged quotations, allusions and reminiscences" [1, p. 346].

A similar interpretation is found in V. P. Rudnev, who defines intertext as "the main type and method of constructing a literary text in the art of modernism and postmodernism, consisting in the fact that the text is constructed from quotations and reminiscences to other texts" [20, p. 113]. More broadly, the concept of intertextuality was interpreted by representatives of poststructuralism: R. Barth, V. Leitch, S. Grivel and others. According to R. Barth, each text is an open structure in relation to any other text and the reader, its thesaurus assumes completion and addition: "the text is infinitely open to infinity: no reader, no subject, no science is able to stop the movement of the text..." [2, p. 425]; "Every text is an inter-text in relation to some other text, but this intertextuality should not be understood so that the text has some kind of origin; all searches for "sources" and "influences" correspond to the myth of the filiation of works, while the text is formed from anonymous, elusive and at the same time already read quotes – from quotes without quotes" [2, p. 418]. That is, the question of any primary beginning of the text is questioned by Barth. And Polish researcher Zofia Mitosek clarifies: "Intertext is a fragment of someone else's previous text, introduced into a new, freshly created literary work. This is actually a quote, a reminiscence or an allusion, the name of a character, a comparison, etc." [16, p. 343–344].

A similar opinion is shared by the French philosopher and literary theorist J. Derrida, proving in his works that there can be no beginning in principle: "traces" endlessly refer to other "traces", to the absolute past, therefore "a letter can no more begin than a book can end" [11, p. 22]. Perceiving the whole world as an endless text, the scientist considers writing as a temporary formation of language, its new, contextual meanings.

E. V. Povetyeva, summing up the definitions of intertextuality Yu. Kristeva, R. Bart, E. Genette, M.Riffater,I.R.Galperin,Z.Ya.Turaeva,T.M.Nikolaeva, O. B. Vorobieva, V. I. Karasik, L. Jenny, M. M. Bakhtin and Yu. M. Lotman, summarizes: "intertextuality is productivity in dynamics, endless permutation of texts; their interpenetration and subjective (through language and writing) the birth of one text through an infinite number of others. Intertextual inclusions should be divided into relations of co-presence (quotation, reference, plagiarism, allusion) and relations of derivation (parody, burlesque travesty, stylization)" [18, p. 44]. Intertextuality performs various functions in a literary text, depending on the goals set, has a polyfunctionality. Bezrukov calls such intertextuality functions as informative, characterizing, evaluative, eidological, symbolic (symbolic), style-forming, meaning-forming, functional, referential, synthesizing (unifying), etiquette, decorative, dialogizing, rhythm-forming, thematizing and others [12, p. 47].

In the culture of modern and modern times, intertextuality acquires a special character. Modern researchers have also developed a number of directions opposing the poststructuralist approach, in which intertextuality is interpreted as the most important textual category associated with the dialogicity of the text. Quotation, allusion, any form of literary roll call is considered not as a private, secondary element of the text, but as an essential side of the author's idea and individual author's style. According to A. N. Bezrukov, this "multidimensional category of text has a direct way out to solving urgent problems of literary criticism, a holistic perception of the author's individual and personal style. In literary studies, the categorical apparatus of this phenomenon has been formed, the main forms and types of intertextual relations have been identified, its markers have been identified, but this does not remove the question of further study of intertextuality" [6, p. 3].

A special place among the studies on this issue is occupied by N. A. Fateeva's monograph "Intertext in the world of texts", the author of which – a supporter of a broad interpretation of intertextuality – includes both linguistic and literary characteristics of works of art in the classification. Based on the classification of J. Genette and P. Torop, N. A. Fateeva complements them by highlighting centonic texts, intertexts-retellings, additions of someone else's text, parodies and language play. In addition, analyzing poetic texts, the researcher also names such models as intertext in the form of a trope or stylistic figure, intermediate tropes, borrowing techniques, a poetic paradigm [178, p. 200]. From the point of view of N. A. Fateeva, intertextuality is a way of "the genesis of one's own text and the postulation of one's own poetic "I" through a complex system of relations of oppositions, identification and disguise with texts of other authors (i.e. other poetic "I") [23, p. 20], therefore, "...in the literature of recent years, each new text is simply not born otherwise than from fragments or with an orientation to the "atoms" of the old ones, and the correlation with other texts becomes not a point, but a general compositional, architectonic principle" [23, p. 31].

In the classification of intertextual elements proposed by N. A. Fateeva, the intertextual elements themselves are defined, forming the construction "text within text"; paratextual; metatextual; hypertextual; architectual. Various graphic means can serve as markers of intertextual connections: quotation marks, bold font, italics. In modern literary studies, it is customary to distinguish such forms of intertextuality as: author's (ideological), external (structural), internal (semantic), reader's (interpretive), research (analytical). The main methods of its formal expression in the text can be a citation way of thinking, individual style, autobiography, internal monologue, dialogical word, patchwork writing, author's code, borrowing, fragmentary, allusion, processing of themes and plots, explicit and hidden citation, collage, paraphrase, translation, imitation, plagiarism, parody, play of words, etc. [6, p. 44–45]. According to how intertextuality manifests itself in the text – directly or indirectly, fixed or dynamic, several types of intertextual elements can be distinguished, which we will consider in the future: quotation and centon (textual connections), stylization and reminiscence (contextual connections), allusion (metatextual connections) [6, p. 48].

Conclusions. The problem of the influence of the classical tradition on the literature of the twentieth century and individual classical writers on the work of their followers remains one of the urgent problems of literary criticism, because influence becomes a factor of literary continuity, evolution. From the forms of passive assimilation and apprenticeship it passes into the forms of incentive and independent creativity. It seems to us that in the study of intertextual elements, a total fusion of meanings occurs, as a result of which each individual component enters into such connections, turns such sides, discovers such potential meanings and semantic associations that it did not have outside and before this process. Thus, the future for intertextual studies seems promising as the use of intertext in the form of genre nominations, characteristic images, stable utterances and their transformations, precedent constructions of various types is regular in the work of writers of the second row and not only enhances the expressiveness of artistic speech but can also be considered as one of the characteristic features of their idiostyle.

References:

1. Арнольд И. В. Объективность, субъективность и предвзятость в интерпретации художественного текста. Семантика. Стилистика. Интертекстуальность: сборник статей. СПб. : СПбГУ, 1999. С. 341–350.
2. Барт Р. Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика. М. : Прогресс, 1989. 616 с.
3. Бахтин М. М. Собрание сочинений: в 7 т. М. : Русские словари; Языки славянской культуры, 1997–2012. Т. 3: Теория романа (1930–1961 гг.). 2012. 880 с.
4. Бахтин М. М. Эстетика словесного творчества [сост. С. Г. Бочаров, примеч. С. С. Аверинцева и С. Г. Бочарова]. М. : Искусство, 1979. 423 с.
5. Бахтин М. М. Фрейдизм. Формальный метод в литературоведении. Марксизм и философия языка. Статьи: сборник трудов [сост., текстолог. подготовка И. В. Пешкова; коммент. В. Л. Махлина, И. В. Пешкова]. М. : Лабиринт, 2000. 640 с.
6. Безруков А. Н. Поэтика интертекстуальности : учебное пособие. Бирск, Бирск. гос. соц.-пед. академия, 2005. 70 с.
7. Белая Н. В. Традиция и новаторство как важнейшие составляющие литературного прошлого. URL: http://www.vestnik.adygnet.ru/files/2007.3/528/belaya2007_3.pdf
8. Борев Ю. Б. Эстетика. Теория литературы: Энциклопедический словарь терминов. М. : ООО «Издательство Астрель": ООО «Издательство АСТ», 2003. 575 с.
9. Веселовский А. Н. Историческая поэтика. Л. : Художественная литература, 1940. 448 с.

10. Гершензон М. О. Статьи о Пушкине. М. : Academia, 1926. 124 с.
11. Деррида Ж. Позиции. М. : Академический проект, 2007. 160 с.
12. Дынник В. Традиция // Литературная энциклопедия. Словарь литературных терминов: в 2 т. М. ; Л. : Изд-во Л. Д. Френкель, 1925.Т. 2. П–Я. С. 972–973.
13. Кристева Ю. Избранные труды. Разрушение поэтики. М. : Российская политическая энциклопедия (РОССПЭН), 2004. 656 с.
14. Литературная энциклопедия терминов и понятий [под ред. А. Н. Николюкина]. М. : НПК «Интелвак», 2001. 1600 с.
15. Лотман Ю. М. Память в культурологическом освещении. Избранные статьи в трех томах. Т. 1: Статьи по семиотике и типологии культуры. Таллинн : Александра, 1992. 479 с.
16. Митосек З. Теория литературных исследований. Симферополь : Таврия, 2005. 408 с.
17. Пьего-Гро Н. Введение в теорию интертекстуальности. М. : Изд-во ЛКИ, 2008. 240 с.
18. Поветьева Е. В. Проблемы теорий интертекстуальности в современном языкознании: Международный журнал прикладных и фундаментальных исследований, 2012. № 8. С. 39–44.
19. Ранчин А. М. Роль традиций в литературном процессе. Теория литературы. – Т. IV. Литературный процесс. М. : ИМЛИ РАН, «Наследие», 2001. С. 13–22.
20. Руднев В. П. Словарь культуры XX века. М. : Аграф, 1997. 384 с.
21. Тынянов Ю. Н. О литературной эволюции. Литературная эволюция: Избранные труды. М. : Аграф, 2002. 496 с.
22. Ушакова О. М. Европейская культурная традиция в творчестве Т. С. Элиота : автореф. дисс. на соискание ученой степени доктора филолог. наук: спец. 10.01.03 «Литература народов стран зарубежья» (европейская и американская литература. URL: http://cheloveknauka.com/evropeyskaya-kulturnaya-traditsiya-v-tvorchestve-t-s-eliota
23. Фатеева Н. А. Типология интертекстуальных элементов и связей в художественной речи. Известия АН. Серия литературы и языка. 1998. Т. 57. № 5. С. 25–38.
24. Хализев В. Е. Теория литературы. [2-е изд.]. М. : Высшая школа, 2005. 398 с.
25. Чистов К. В. Народные традиции и фольклор: Очерки теории. Л. : Наука, 1986. 304 с.
26. Элиот Т. С. Традиция и индивидуальный талант / Называть вещи своими именами [сост. Л. Г. Андреев]. М. : Прогресс, 1986. 640 с.
27. Ячник Л. Н. Интертекстуальность в поэзии Александра Кушнера и русская литературная традиция : дисс. … канд. филолог. наук: 10.01.02. К., 2014. 219 с.

Галаган Я. В., Драган О. А. ТРАДИЦІЯ ТА ІНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНІСТЬ ЯК ТЕКСТОВІ СТРАТЕГІЇ СТВОРЕННЯ ВЛАСНОГО ІДІОСТИЛЮ

Статтю присвячено дослідженню ключових понять літературної традиції, наступності, діалогічності й інтертекстуальних зв'язків. Слід зазначити, що творчість письменників другого плану часто містить, з контактно-генетичної точки зору, більш однозначний зв'язок із канонами класичної літератури, ніж творчість авторів першого плану, оскільки вони якнайбільше сприяють розвитку традицій спадкоємності літературних цінностей. У їх художній манері більш рельєфно окреслені характерні риси загальних тенденцій розвитку літератури. У творчому доробку найбільш відомих письменників всі ці спільні риси передано крізь призму індивідуального стилю, тобто можна сказати, що спільне більшою мірою підпорядковане особистому, винятковому. На етапі учнівства автори несвідомо наслідують своїх попередників. Імітація стає для них таким собі стартовим майданчиком, що дозволяє створювати оригінальні твори, зберігаючи при цьому зв'язок зі зразком певної епохи й естетики. Від наслідування вони переходять до формування власного ідіостилю, в якому значне місце займають інтертекстуальні елементи. У зв'язку зі зростаючим інтересом до інтертекстуального читання текстів і міждисциплінарним акцентом в наукових дослідженнях кількість робіт, присвячених цій проблемі, продовжує зростати. Важливо підкреслити, що традиція й інтертекстуальність є теоретично складними поняттями, і єдине визначення цього терміна дуже важко віднайти. Розбіжності в тлумаченні зазначених понять обумовлені їх багатовимірною природою. Оскільки теоретики пропонують різні дефініції, подекуди акцентуючи увагу на одній, на їхню думку, диференційній рисі, за умови такої ситуації дослідники вважають за краще використовувати визначення, що відповідають завданням їхніх наукових розвідок. У статті наголошено на особливостях форм і функцій інтертекстуальності, а також на основних способах її формального вираження в тексті.

Ключові слова: *літературна традиція, спадкоємність, діалогічність ,інтертекстуальні зв'язки.*