ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО

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

Savytska L. V.
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Leshinska A. V.
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF THE CATEGORIAL TOOLKIT OF INTERTEXTUALITY: SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF THE CONCEPTS "TRADITION", "INTERTEXTUALITY", AND RELATED PHENOMENA

Undoubtedly, a large number of theoretical and practical scientific studies have been published in literature at the moment, the authors of which address the problem of the functioning of the intertext as a literary technique, the study of its role in the work of one or another writer, the definition of a genre-thematic direction, the deciphering of the tangled web of intertextual connections etc. Depending on his research goals, each author expresses his own understanding of the methodological approach to intertextuality. In turn, numerous differences in interpretation lead to difficulties in establishing a unified approach to this concept. Our study contributes to a deeper understanding of the multifaceted nature of intertextuality and its significance in contemporary culture. As part of our work, we aim to expand the horizons of theoretical research that played a decisive role in the formation of the theory of intertextuality. To achieve this goal, we traced and analyzed the scientific evolution of the concepts "tradition", "intertextuality" and related phenomena in the context of modern intertextology. The contribution of Ukrainian scientists to the popularization and conduct of extensive research on the theoretical aspects of intertextuality within the framework of domestic literary criticism is noted. Through their painstaking efforts, these scholars have offered their unique insight into a methodological approach to intertextuality. Their insightful research extends to the study of manifestations of intertextuality within specific genres and thematic areas based on Ukrainian works. Bush's theory, which became the forerunner of the concepts of "hypertext" and "intertext", deserves special attention, since for the first time the concept of organizing individual texts in a single information space was put forward based on the use of a machine called Memex. This article emphasizes the special role of the reader in the intertextual process where the reader becomes a co-author of the meaning, actively interacting with intertextual elements and contributing to the interpretation of the work

Key words: *tradition, parody, folklore, dialogism, intertextuality, memex, universal library.*

Stating the problem. In the 20th century, modern philology garnered considerable attention as it delves into the exploration of various artistic elements and their continuity within the literary realm. Intertextuality, a distinctive feature of the contemporary cultural landscape, assumes a profound significance. Scholars have consistently focused on unravelling the presence of tradition and influences across a multitude of facets including meter, lexicon, phraseology, syntax, and genres. However, the comprehension of the typology of creative dialogue remains a relevant and ongoing endeavour. Consequently, one of the most significant challenges faced by modern philology lies in deciphering the intricate web of intertextual connections. This challenge has prompted an impressive range of theoretical and practical scientific works that aim to advance the terminology, methodologыy, and analytical frameworks of intertextual analysis. Research has

convincingly established that an author's relationship with literary works of the past substantially shapes the distinctiveness of their creative output, often characterized by a pronounced inclination towards reminiscence. Hence, we assert that a comprehensive understanding of the artistic realm necessitates an immersive intertextual exploration of works crafted by skilled wordsmiths. The term "intertextuality" represents one of the most complex problems, requiring special attention in the fields of modern linguistics, text theory, discourse analysis, and semiotics. Numerous divergences in its interpretation lead to disagreements among scholars, making it difficult to establish a unified approach to this concept. Some researchers consider this term ideal, as its introduction into scientific literature allows for replacing numerous descriptive terms such as literary reminiscences, borrowings, traditions, and others. In our research, we aim to broaden the horizons of theoretical inquiries that have played a crucial role in shaping intertextuality theory and its establishment. We seek to analyse the profound significance of concepts such as "tradition", "intertext," "intertextuality," and related phenomena, reaffirming their relevance within the realm of contemporary intertextology. To accomplish this objective, we strive to trace the scholarly evolution of these categories and explore their extensive coverage in specialized literature.

Analysis of the research and publications on the issue under consideration. Let us examine the pivotal concepts of literary tradition, continuity, dialogism, intertextuality, and intertextual connections, which hold paramount importance in our study. These conceptual frameworks serve to elucidate the underlying patterns governing the development of literature within specific epochs. The community of scholars who have contributed to the establishment and advancement of "intertextology" (a term coined by H. Kosikov) continues to expand incessantly. Predominantly, these contributions have emanated from researchers hailing from Western Europe and the United States, such as R. Barthes [1], W. Broich, [2], V. Bush [3], H. Bloom, J. Derrida [4], J. Genette [5], G. Keller, J. Kristeva [6], R. Lachmann, R. Niche, N. Piege-Gro [7], M. Pfister, M. Riffaterre [8], and others. However, Ukrainian scholars have also made substantial strides in popularizing and engaging in extensive investigations into the theoretical aspects of intertextuality within the realm of domestic literary studies. In recent years, Ukrainian literary scholars, including F. Batsevych, L. Bilous [9], T. Bondareva [10], S. Bortnyk [11], O. Boyarchuk, T. Dynnychenko [12], O. Halchuk, V. Kysil [13], M. Kushnerova [14],

O. Pashko [15], V. Prosalova [16], P. Rykhlo [17], O. Ryabinina, L. Skorina, L. Statkevich [18], S. Vardewanian[19], H. Vivat [20], O. Yarema [21], among others, have directed their attentiveness toward the intricate problematics of intertextuality. Through their diligent efforts, these scholars have undertaken a thorough examination of intertextuality within Ukrainian literary works. Their meticulous analysis encompasses various manifestations, exploring the works of specific authors and distinct genre variations. Their valuable contributions have not only broadened the scope of the "intertextuality" concept but have also deepened our comprehension of the fundamental mechanisms that govern its operation. Undoubtedly, each author, irrespective of their foundational research perspectives, has offered their unique insights into the methodological approach to intertextuality. Noteworthy contemporary monographic publications dedicated to the development of methodological frameworks and terminological apparatus in the theory of intertextuality have been authored by M. Zhulinsky [22], V. Matviishyn [23], R. Movchan [24], E. Nakhlik [25], P. Rylko, M. Shapoval, O. Perelomova [26], S. Pavlychko, V. Pakharenko [27], L. Skoryna [28], B. Tykholoz [29], and others. These erudite scholars immerse themselves in the intricate workings of intertextuality as a powerful literary device, meticulously unravelling its profound influence on the creative expressions of individual writers and poets. Their insightful inquiries extend to exploring intertextuality's manifestations within specific genres and thematic orientations. Despite commendable progress in categorizing and identifying diverse forms and types of intertextual relationships, the exploration of intertextuality remains a continuously evolving and vibrant field. Countless aspects within this domain beckon further scholarly investigation, ensuring that the intricacies of intertextual issues remain dynamic and far from being exhaustively comprehended.

Stating the task. Within the scope of our research, our objective is to expand the scope of theoretical investigations that played a significant role in the development of intertextuality theory and its establishment and analyze the substantive significance of the concepts of "tradition", "intertextuality", and related phenomena, and to reaffirm their relevance in the context of contemporary intertextology. To achieve this goal, we endeavour to trace the scholarly development of these categories and examine their coverage in specialized literature.

The main body. The foundation of this theory and the concept of literature and art lies in fundamental philosophical works that originated in ancient Greek

times. Great classical philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle, offering their views on the nature and significance of art, based their arguments on its imitative nature and its ability to bring joy to people through recognition and perception. According to philosophers, imitation is naturally incorporated into a work of art and is an important characteristic of oratory: by incorporating "foreign text", the speaker's speech sounds more persuasive. In particular, they emphasized the pleasure and joy that audiences derive from recognizing and perceiving depicted facts and plots. Specifically, they examined imitative art and emphasized the pleasure and joy that viewers derive from recognizing and perceiving depicted facts and plots.

During the Renaissance and classicism, the idea of imitation became central in art, as it was believed that through imitating ancient works, one could approach ideals and perfection. This concept of aesthetic and creative approach was particularly appealing to educated and culturally developed segments of society, who sought to adhere to the aesthetics of ancient masters.

If we consider ancient Greek philosophy as the basis for many modern theories, significant breakthroughs in linguistics and other sciences occurred in the 20th century, leading to the emergence and establishment of intertextuality theory. The development of this theoretical framework is influenced not only by the emergence of new research methods but also by cultural changes characteristic of the 20th century. This period was marked by intensive information exchange, the development of mass communication, and the globalization of cultural influences. In such an environment, new forms of interaction between texts, ideas, and authors are born, stimulating intertextual processes and contributing to a deeper understanding of literary works.

Scientists have long been interested in the problem of similar plots observed in texts across different nations. The plot of a father fighting an unknown son is found in various cultures: in the ancient epic, it is the battle of Odysseus with Telegonus; in Germanic culture, it is Hildebrand fighting Hadubrand; in Iranian culture, it is Rustam fighting Sohrab. The plot of a king who turns into a beggar and then regains his kingship after enduring long trials is found among the Indians (1st century BCE), in Roman legends, and Ukrainian folk tales.

Let's consider the fundamental theoretical positions underlying the study of intertextuality. The conceptual basis of intertextuality was laid down as early as the 1920s. The origins of intertextuality theory are traditionally attributed to the research on anagrams by F. de Saussure. The anagrams in ancient poetry (encrypted divine names deciphered through a spe-

cific arrangement of sounds and letters), which F. de Saussure investigated, are not only difficult to prove but also lead to multiple interpretations of the same text. For instance, F. de Saussure discovered that the hymn in the Rigveda concealed the name of a forbidden God, both in pronunciation and in writing.

Putting forward the thesis that the genesis of plots belongs to prehistory, Veselovsky attempted to explain not only the origin of similar plots but also their development, considering mythological theory, the theory of borrowing, and ethnographic theory, which continue to exist in various forms to this day.

According to mythological theory (F. W. Schelling, the Schlegel brothers, the Grimm brothers, A. Kuhn, and others), which emerged during the Romantic era in the first third of the 19th century, plots originated from primordial myths. This explanation is contradicted by the absence of a common mythology among certain ethnic groups. However, this theory can be effective in explaining plots as manifestations of intertextuality among ethnic groups that share a common mythology at a certain historical stage of development.

According to the theory of borrowing plots, which dates back to the second half of the 19th century (T. Benfey, M. Muller, and others), the similarity of plots is the result of historical connections between peoples. Although the theory of borrowing has its vulnerabilities– it cannot explain the emergence of similar plots and other cultural similarities among peoples without direct contact– it is difficult to doubt the process of borrowing and the intertextual creation that occurs during certain stages of ethnic development under specific conditions.

The anthropological school (E. Taylor, E. Lang, T. Waitz, D. Frazer, and others), which emerged in Europe in the second half of the 19th century slightly later than the theory of borrowing, was based on the idea of the unity of humankind and the uniformity of cultural development. According to this theory, also known as the theory of spontaneous generation of plots, the explanation for the identical forms of beliefs, myths, and rituals lies in the similar genesis of the psyche and thinking of primitive humans. Based on extensive ethnographic material, proponents of this school concluded that all ethnic groups go through common stages of cultural development, with subsequent periods retaining remnants of previous ones. Thus, the theory of spontaneous generation of plots suggests that, on the one hand, similar plots can arise in a particular cultural environment, and on the other hand, it allows for the development of plots after their inception on an intertextual basis.

One of the first to address the question of tradition using folklore material was Veselovsky, who considered it as a crucial component of literary evolution. Based on the thesis that just as in the realm of culture, so in the realm of art, we are bound by tradition and expand within it, not creating new forms but attaching new relationships to them, the task of historical poetics, according to the scholar, was to determine the role and place of tradition in the process of personal creativity. He expressed the opinion that a poetic image comes to life if it is re-experienced by the artist, perceived from nature or revived by the power of imagination, rejuvenated from memory – or a ready-made plastic formula. In examining the problem of the relationship between tradition and personal initiative in poetic creation, Veselovsky was convinced that the poet is connected to the material inherited from the preceding era; his starting point is already given by what has been done before him. Almost a century later, the idea of the "ready-made poetic language" materialized in the postmodern theory of intertextuality.

The term "tradition" is interpreted in a rather ambiguous manner in contemporary literary studies. During the early 20th century, the problem of tradition as a category within modernist aesthetics in Anglophone literary studies was developed by the renowned American-English poet, playwright, and literary critic, Thomas Eliot. In his works, he actively discussed the theme of tradition and its role in contemporary society. In his seminal essay, "Tradition and the Individual Talent" (1919), Eliot explores the role of tradition in literature and its interaction with the writer's individual talent. He made an interesting point that tradition, in the widest sense of the word, undoubtedly involves something valuable. Through it, the new generation is connected to preceding historical periods, to the entire millennia-old culture that has shaped us. Through tradition, people gain access to the experience of our ancestors, which can be an invaluable source of wisdom and inspiration. However, the critic emphasizes that tradition is not something given once and for all, and the poet cannot mechanically adopt it from predecessors or inherit it. Nevertheless, Eliot also expressed his concern regarding blindly adhering to tradition without critical thinking and innovation. He highlighted the necessity of creative reevaluation and transformation of traditions, stressing that true tradition cannot be inflexible or passive, it must be capable of adapting and transforming to reflect new circumstances and expectations. Only then it remains alive and relevant. Thus, Thomas Eliot advocated for a balanced approach to tradition, acknowledging its value while simultaneously calling for a creative and critical attitude towards it, so that it may continue to inspire and guide the new generation. The fundamental thesis of Eliot's theory of tradition was the idea of the simultaneous coexistence of literary works within a unified cultural space. The ideal unity he presents encompasses creators from all countries and languages, forming a universal scale of artistic value in which the poet acts as a "medium" having relinquished their own individuality. Therefore, "in Eliot's proposed system of coordinates, the notions of 'old' and 'new,' 'past,' 'present,' and 'future' are relative themselves.

Dialogical concepts trace back to Socrates, who believed that dialogue is direct contact between interlocutors, a collaborative search for truth through conversations and debates. Continuing the historical excursion into intertextuality theory, it is essential to note the research of M. Bakhtin, who views dialogue as a universal category of human existence. One of the central ideas of the scholar was the concept of dialogism, which, according to Nathalie Piege-Gro, played a "decisive role in the genesis of intertextuality" [7, p. 65]. According to Bakhtin, the dialogical orientation of speech is a phenomenon inherent in every word. In all its paths towards the object, in all directions, the word encounters other words and cannot help but enter into a living and tense interaction with them. In other words, in the process of creation, the writer engages in dialogical connections with the addressee, previous human experience, and the diverse surrounding world, which now appears before them in their vision. The researcher has not yet used the term "intertextuality", but in defining "alien speech", he describes it as speech within speech, utterance within utterance, but at the same time, it is also speech about speech, utterance about utterance.

Furthermore, actively exploring the idea of dialogism, the philosopher believed that art, especially verbal art, must be comprehended as a dialogical process where different voices and perspectives engage in competition, interacting and exerting influence on one another. In his literary endeavours, including "Problems of Dostoevsky's Art" (1929–1961) and "The Aesthetics of Verbal Art" (1979), Bakhtin develops the idea that art is a field of multiple voices, where different points of view, genres, and styles engage in dialogue with each other. He notes that the dialogism of art arises from the diversity of authorial voices, characters, and their different worldviews. The word is not a thing but an eternally movable, eternally changeable environment of dialogical communication. It never belongs to one consciousness, one voice alone. He argues that the vitality of language lies in its

passage from one person to another, from one setting to another, from one social group to another, and from one generation to the next. Throughout this journey, the word retains traces of its origins and remains bound to the influences of the particular contexts it encounters.

According to him, art possesses the capacity to mirror and engage in a dialogue with diverse ideologies, cultural traditions, and social contexts. In the development of global culture, various works and different historical periods continuously echo, complement, and illuminate one another. Each voice and speech within a work of art makes its distinctive contribution, resulting in a multi-layered and polyphonic structure. He emphasized that every work is open and unfinished, eliciting a reaction and involvement from the reader or viewer.

So, the conception of dialogism proposed by Bakhtin highlights the dynamic interaction and mutual influence of diverse voices and perspectives within art, resulting in a polyphonic and open quality in artistic works. This fosters a deeper and more comprehensive understanding and interpretation of art.

To conduct a comprehensive analysis of cultural tradition, it is imperative to delve into the constituent elements of literary tradition, encompassing stylistics, composition, rhythm, imagery, the mechanisms of artistic world generation, expressive means, genre structures, themes, and other relevant factors. The thematic tradition, for instance, assumes a pivotal role in shaping the essence of a literary work. In such instances, the author's choices are invariably influenced by preceding decisions within the cultural domain. The concept of image tradition entails the incorporation of culturally accumulated solutions pertaining to specific characters. National tradition, on the other hand, pertains to the accepted system of values within a given culture, encompassing ethical, aesthetic, and historical values. The tradition of artistic techniques unifies lexical, syntactic, rhythmic, and plot-compositional techniques. Stylistic tradition synthesizes all the aforementioned possibilities, thereby representing a convergence of authorial traditions (such as Shakespearean), specific movements, or even epochs.

A significant contribution to the development of intertextuality theory was made by Jorge Luis Borges, the author of the famous story "The Library of Babel" written in 1941. In this work, Borges creates the image of the universal library, an infinite repository of knowledge containing all books ever written or yet to be written, produced by humans or nature. Externally, this library appears strictly structured, consisting of hexagonal rooms with staircases and mirrors. However, in reality, Borges's Universal Library is chaotic, infinite, and decentralized. It is impossible to make sense of it, to find the desired book, or even to find a librarian. In Borges's story, there is the idea that everything has already been said and written. In this context, each new book, each new text becomes just one of the countless elements that make up the endless puzzle of the library. The Universal Library symbolizes not only a multitude of texts but also a multitude of possible connections and references between them. Thus, Borges's "The Library of Babel" is not only an engaging work but also a philosophical insight into the nature of knowledge, creativity, and intertextuality, emphasizing not only the vastness of the textual space but also the complexity of searching for and interpreting connections between them. The work evokes an awareness of the infinite possibilities of interaction and interweaving of texts, as well as the importance of recognizing and studying intertextual references in literature and other fields of art.

Vannevar Bush, in his article "As We May Think"(1945) published in The Atlantic Daily, introduced the theory of the "memex" which suggests that humans accumulate and retrieve knowledge not through logical connections but through associative chains. According to this theory, associations form a complex network or "web" of connections that are reflected in the creation of new texts. The "memex" is a device capable of storing and retrieving information. Each individual possesses their own "memex" which is reflected in their works and new texts. The development of the "memex" served as a precursor to the concepts of "hypertext" and "intertext" as it represents a cognitive model of the process of forming connections between texts [3].

The creative legacy of Julia Kristeva has become the subject of special attention from literary scholars and linguists. The death of poetics was proclaimed in 1967 by Julia Kristeva in the article "The Destruction of Poetics" in her dissertation "The Text of the Novel" written during the same period, and in the article "Revolution in Poetic Language" (1974), the title of which somewhat softens the original version of "destruction". This idea, against the backdrop of some dissatisfaction in the global humanities with the limited possibilities of binary opposition, became so in demand that in the following five decades, hundreds, if not thousands, of literary scholars and philosophers commented on it and provided their arguments. "Since Julia Kristeva defined intertextuality in the context of theoretical research in the late 1960s, it has become one of the most important literary-critical concepts" notes Natalie Piege-Gro [7, p. 43]. She considers "intertext" as "the set of texts reflected in a

given work, regardless of whether it is related to the work in absentia (for example, in the case ofмallusion) or included in it in praesentia (as in the case of a quotation)" [7, p. 48].

The emergence of the term "intertextuality" became intertwined with the development of linguistic theory, particularly the theory of intertextuality within the realm of poststructuralism. Its introduction into scientific discourse can be attributed to J. Kristeva, who presented it in her seminal work "Bakhtin, Word, Dialogue, and Novel" (1967). Kristeva defines intertextuality as the textual interaction occurring within an individual text. From the perspective of the perceiving subject, intertextuality serves as an indication of the text's engagement with history and its integration into the historical narrative [6]. The researcher formulates her concept of intertextuality based on a reinterpretation of M. Bakhtin's work "The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art" (1924), which underscores the interaction between an artist's words and the cultural context preceding and concurrent with them. Drawing upon Bakhtin's ideas, Kristeva perceives intertextuality as the interplay of diverse texts and discourses within a literary work. She accentuates the presence of references, quotations, and allusions to other texts within a given text, thereby influencing its meaning and interpretation. Intertextuality engenders the creation of novel strata of significance and establishes connections among distinct works, thereby enriching their substance and contextual underpinnings. According to Kristeva, intertextuality embodies a form of dialogic interaction, wherein each text engages in a dialogue with other texts and the cultural context at large. She regards intertextual relationships as manifestations of literature's polyphonic nature, wherein multiple voices and perspectives converge and interact, yielding textual plurality and richness. A pivotal aspect of Kristeva's concept is the reader's active role. She underscores the reader's participation in identifying and discerning references and connections among various texts. Thus, the reader becomes a co-creator of meaning, actively engaging with intertextual elements and contributing to the interpretation of the work. Overall, Julia Kristeva perceives intertextuality as an indispensable facet of literature that reflects the intricate and multifaceted nature of cultural discourse. She attributes central significance to intertextuality in the analysis of texts, facilitating the exploration of their connections to other works. Moreover, she stresses that intertextuality not only enhances literary works but also enables the examination of cultural, historical, and political aspects embedded within

texts. She views intertextuality as a pathway to constructing a network of relationships and meanings that transcend the confines of individual work. Additionally, Kristeva acknowledges that intertextuality extends beyond literature alone, permeating other cultural domains such as film, art, and popular culture. She regards the interplay between diverse texts and discourses as a vital factor in the formation of meaning and cultural identity. In her works, Kristeva presents diverse approaches to the analysis of intertextuality, including forms of quotation, allusion, paradigms, and discursive practices. She advocates for the exploration of relationships among different texts, their contextual frameworks, and historical perspectives. Finally, it is important to note that Julia Kristeva's perspectives on intertextuality surpass analytical approaches, as she also emphasizes the emotional and aesthetic impact of intertextual relationships, highlighting their ability to evoke emotions, provoke irritation, and elicit joy in the reader [6].

M. Riffaterre (1987) held a similar viewpoint, suggesting that it is the reader who determines the boundaries of intertextuality [8]. Any meanings that the author did not encode and any game they did not conceive only come into play as long as the reader is capable of decoding them. However, some readers are erudite enough to trace even the accidental reflections that the author left unconsciously and assign them new meanings based on their own experiences (not just as readers), meanings that the author did not intend to convey.

The multitude of interpretations surrounding the term "intertextuality" arises from the inherent complexity of the concept. Defining intertextuality comprehensively and precisely presents a challenging task, leading various authors to concentrate on specific facets of the concept. Consequently, researchers opt for definitions that align with the objectives of their respective scientific inquiries.

Currently, the concept of intertextuality exists in literary studies in two opposing versions: Kristeva's one refers to self-generating textual formations that provide myriad meanings to any individual text or sign, resulting in the indeterminacy of its meaning in a chain of random references; and Genette's rendering, where intertextuality reclaims the meaning of Bakhtin's "intertextual space," in which significant traces of one text's presence in another can be found, such as quotations, allusions, paraphrases, plagiarism, translation, etc. [5, p. 213]. Gérard Genette defines intertextuality as the interconnection and interaction between different texts within a single work or between different works. Starting with an attempt

to formulate a methodological key for understanding Bakhtin's dialogism in her own intertextuality, Kristeva, not without the influence of the ideology of the French literary elite, lost control over her creation, which began to live its own life and acquired a meaning essentially opposite to what Bakhtin had in mind.

In the anthology "Intertextuality: Forms and Functions" published in 1985, a group of German scholars, namely W. Broich, M. Pfister, and B. Schulte-Middelich, undertook a collective endeavour to explore the various manifestations of literary intertextuality. Their objective was to identify and analyse specific forms such as the appropriation and reinterpretation of themes and plots, overt and covert citations, translations, instances of plagiarism, allusions, paraphrases, imitations, parodies, dramatic adaptations, the utilization of epigraphs, and more [2]. Within the framework of intertextuality, Uwe Broich perceives a dynamic process in which texts engage in reciprocal interactions, quoting and referencing one another, ultimately weaving an intricate tapestry of connections and interdependencies. The scholar acknowledges the fundamental role of reader experience and familiarity with preceding texts as vital components for comprehending the nuanced intertextual relationships at play. He also points out the key importance of reader expertise and knowledge of preceding texts for a full understanding of intertextual relationships. On the other hand, Martin Pfister focuses on intertextuality in the context of cultural discourse. He explores the interaction between different texts and discourses within a specific cultural domain. The researcher highlights that intertextuality plays an important role in shaping cultural identities and creating new meanings. He also watches out the social and political aspects of intertextuality, with reference to a site of resistance and reevaluation of dominant ideologies. Bettine Schulte-Middelich in addition contributes to the feasibility study of intertextuality. She examines it in the context of literary creation and emphasizes the leading role of dialogue between different texts. Schulte-Middelich underscores that intertextual relationships contribute to the construction of polyphony and textual complexity, and they also encompass aesthetic and emotional aspects.

The concept of intertextuality was interpreted more broadly by representatives of poststructuralism, such as R. Barthes, V. Leitch, Ch. Grivel, and others. The most vivid transfer of the "philosophy of multiplicity" to the text was made by R. Barthes. According to Barthes, every text is an open structure in relation to any other text and to the reader, its thesaurus implies replenishment and supplementation: "The text

is endlessly open into infinity: no reader, no subject, no science can stop the movement of the text..." [1, p. 425]. The "philosophy of multiplicity" forms the basis of Barthes' definition of intertextuality: "Every text is an intertext in relation to some other text, but this intertextuality should not be understood as the text having some kind of origin; all searches for "sources" and "influences" correspond to the myth of the filiation of works, whereas the text is formed from anonymous, elusive, and yet already read quotations – quotations without quotation marks" [7, p. 418]. In other words, Barthes calls into question the idea of any primary origin of the text.

Conclusions. In conclusion, it can be signed that research in the field of modern philology, particularly in the domestic context, in the 20th century has been focused on exploring the complex network of intertextual connections. Undoubtedly, a comprehensive analysis of a literary work requires intertextual reading. Intertextuality has become a significant feature of contemporary culture and poses one of the most serious challenges for scholars. This task has prompted an impressive range of theoretical and practical scientific works aimed at developing the terminology, methodology, and analytical frameworks of intertextual analysis.

The term "intertextuality" itself presents a complex problem, demanding special attention in the fields of modern linguistics, text theory, discourse analysis, and semiotics. Divergent and sometimes contradictory interpretations among scholars make establishing a unified approach to this concept challenging. We have successfully analysed and systematized a large volume of scientific works.

By analysing the concepts of "tradition", "intertextuality", and related phenomena, the presented article has expanded the scope of theoretical inquiries, highlighting the complexity and multi-faceted nature of intertextual relationships, as well as the influence of intertextuality on the process of creating and interpreting texts. The idea of the existence of interaction between texts, ideas and authors arose in ancient Greek philosophy along with the thesis of Plato and Aristotle on the importance of imitation in oratory. In the Renaissance, it became central to art, since it was believed that through imitation of ancient works, one could approach the ideal and perfection. The sources of the theory of intertextuality in the twentieth century are traditionally considered to be the studies of anagrams by F. de Saussure. Around the same time, Veselovsky put forward the thesis that the genesis of plots belongs to prehistory. The scientist also proposed the concept of a "ready-made poetic word".

The "memex" theory commands noteworthy consideration as it encapsulates a cognitive paradigm elucidating the mechanism of textual linkage formation, thus serving as the antecedent to the notions of "hypertext" and "intertext". The foundations of intertextuality are largely based on the studies of Bakhtin, one of whose central ideas was the idea of a global context and endless dialogue. The emergence of the term "intertextuality" was associated with the formation of the linguistic theory of intertextuality within the framework of poststructuralism where intertext exists in the meaning of a self-acting text formation that provides any individual text or sign with a myriad of meanings, due to which its meaning is indefinably lost in a chain of random references A key aspect of Kristeva's concept is the active role of the reader in identifying references and connections between different texts. Thus, the reader becomes a co-author of the meaning, actively interacting with intertextual elements and contributing to the interpretation of the work. Overall, our research contributes to a deeper understanding of intertextuality theory, its significance, and its role in contemporary culture, providing a foundation for further investigations in this area.

Bibliography:

1. Barthes R. L'Aventure semiologique. P., 1985. 368 p.

2. Broich U., Pfister M., Schulte-Middelich B. Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1985. XII. 373 p.

3. Bush V. As We May Think. The Atlantic Daily 1945 Available at: https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1945/07/as-we-may-think/303881

4. Derrida J. The Law of Genre: On Narrative. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981. 270 p.

5. Genette G. Nouveau discours du recit. P., 1983. 178 p.

6. Kristeva J. La revolution langage poetique: lavantgarde a la fin du XIX-e siecle / Julia Kristela. Paris, 1974.

7. Piégay-Gros N. Introduction à l'intertextualité, Dunod, P., 1996.

8. Riffaterre M. The Intertextual Unconscious. Critical Inquiry. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987. Vol. 13 (2). P. 371–385.

9. Біловус Л. І. Інтертекстуальність як модус новаторства (на матеріалі творчості І. Світличного та В. Стуса): дис. ... канд. філол. наук. Тернопіль, 2003. 172 с.

10. Бондарєва Т. Структура художнього світу Миколи Хвильового: інтертекстуальний аспект : дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.01.01 / Харків. нац. пед. ун-т ім. Г. С. Сковороди. Харків, 2017. 212 с.

11. Бортник С. А. Інтертекстуальна поетика Петра Карманського : дис. ... канд. філол. наук. Житомир, 2019. 243 с.

12. Динниченко Т. А. Типологія форм інтертекстуальності у французькій модерністській прозі (на матеріалі творів Андре Жіда) : дис. … канд. філол. наук. Київ, 2016. 210 с.

13. Кисіль В. Пародійна творчість К.С. Буревія: еволюція образу автора в пародіях Едварда Стріхи, політичний та естетичний дискурс, поетика комічного : дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.01.01 / Харк. нац. ун-т ім. В.Н. Каразіна. Харків, 2003. 190 с.

14. Кушнєрьова М. Гоголівський текст в українській літературі другої половини ХХ століття : дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.01.01 / Нац. пед. ун-т ім. М. П. Драгоманова. Київ, 2017. 204 с.

15. Пашко О. Рецепція творчості Сергія Єсеніна в Україні 1920-х років : дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.01.05 / Інститут літератури ім. Т.Г. Шевченка. Київ, 2015. 260 с.

16. Просалова В. Текст у світі текстів Празької літературної школи. Донецьк : Східний видавничий дім, 2005. 344 с.

17. Рихло П. Поетика діалогу. Творчість Пауля Целана як інтертекст / Чернівецький національний ун-т ім. Юрія Федьковича. Чернівці, 2005. 584 с.

18. Статкевич Л. П. Форми і функції інтертекстульності в поезії Томаса Стернза Еліота : дис. ... канд. філол. наук. Кам'янець-Подільський. 2008. 215 с.

19. Вардеванян С. Міфологема Каїна в українській літературі XIX – XX століть : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.01.01. Івано-Франківськ, 2008. 19 с.

20. Віват Г. Лірика дисидентів в інтертекстуальному полі множинності. Одеса : ВМВ, 2010. 368 с.

21. Ярема О. Б. Алюзія в текстах британської художньої літератури: лінгво-статистичний аспект (на матеріалі творів модерністів) : дис. ... канд. філол. наук. Запоріжжя, 2016. 355 с.

22. Жулинський М. Нація. Культура. Література: національно-культурні міфи та ідейно-естетичні пошуки української літератури. Київ : Наук. думка, 2010. 560 с.

23. Матвіїшин В. Український літературний європеїзм. Київ : ВЦ «Академія», 2009. 264 с.

24. Мовчан Р. У пошуках архітвору. З історії української літератури ХХ століття. Київ : ВД Дмитра Бураго, 2018. 448 с.

25. Нахлік Є. Перелицьований світ Івана Котляревського: текст – інтертекст – контекст. Львів : Вид-во Львів. політехніки, 2015. 541 с.

26. Переломова О. Лінгвокультурні коди інтертекстуальності українського художнього дискурсу: діа-хронічний аспект: монографія / Сумський держ. педагогічний ун-т ім. А. С. Макаренка. Суми, 2008. 208 с.

27. Пахаренко В. Шевченко як геній. Природа, своєрідність і стратегії інтерпретації геніяльности поета. Черкаси : Брама-Україна, 2013. 840 с.

28. Скорина Л. «Гомін і відгомін»: дискурс інтертекстуальності в українській літературі 1920-х років : Монографія. Черкаси: Брама-Україна, 2019. 704 с.

29. Тихолоз Б. Філософська лірика Івана Франка: діалектика поетичної рефлексії. Львів : Простір-М, 2009. 319 с.

Галаган Я. В., Савицька Л. В., Лещінська А. В. КАТЕГОРІАЛЬНИЙ ІНСТРУМЕНТАРІЙ ІНТЕРТЕКСТОЛОГІЇ: ЗМІСТОВЕ НАПОВНЕННЯ ПОНЯТЬ «ТРАДИЦІЯ», «ІНТЕРТЕКСТ», «ІНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНІСТЬ» ТА ПОВ'ЯЗАНИХ З НИМИ ЯВИЩ

Несумнівно, у літературознавстві на цей час видан великий масив теоретичних і практичних наукових досліджень, автори яких звертаються до проблеми функціонування інтертексту як літературного прийому, вивчення його ролі у творчості того чи іншого письменника, визначення жанрово-тематичного напрямку, розшифровки заплутаної павутини міжтекстових зв'язків тощо. Залежно від своїх дослідницьких цілей, кожен автор висловлює власне розуміння методологічного підходу до інтертекстуальності. У свою чергу багаточисленні розбіжності у трактуванні призводять до труднощів встановлення єдиного підходу до цього поняття. Наше дослідження сприяє більш глибокому розумінню багатогранності інтертекстуальності та її значення у сучасній культурі. У рамках нашої роботи ми прагнемо розширити горизонти теоретичних досліджень, які відіграли вирішальну роль у формуванні теорії інтертекстуальності. Для досягнення поставленої мети ми простежили та проаналізували наукову еволюцію понять «традиція», «інтертекстуальність» та суміжних феноменів у контексті сучасної інтертекстології. Відзначено внесок українських учених у популяризацію та проведення широких досліджень теоретичних аспектів інтертекстуальності в рамках вітчизняного літературознавства. Завдяки своїм копітким зусиллям ці вчені запропонували своє унікальне розуміння методологічного підходу до інтертекстуальності. Їхні проникливі дослідження поширюються на вивчення проявів інтертекстуальності в окремих жанрах і тематичних сферах на основі українських творів. Особливої уваги заслуговує теорія Буша, яка стала предтечею понять «гіпертекст» та «інтертекст», оскільки вперше була висунута концепція організації окремих текстів в єдиному інформаційному просторі на основі використання машини, яка називається Мемекс. У цій статті також підкреслюється особлива роль читача в інтертекстуальному процесі, де читач стає співавтором сенсу, активно взаємодіючи з інтертекстуальними елементами та сприяючи інтерпретації твору

Ключові слова: традиція, пародія, фольклор, діалогізм, інтертекстуальність, мемекс, універсальна бібліотека.