

UDC 811.111'42-83

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/folium/2025.7.32>

PHENOMENON OF INTERTEXTUALITY IN LINGUISTIC AND TRANSLATION ASPECTS

Svitlana Fedorenko

*Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor,
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design*

ORCID ID 0000-0001-8517-9975

Scopus Author ID 58817680500

Web of Science Researcher ID J-6980-2017

s.fedorenko297@gmail.com

Key words: *intertextuality, intertext, text, linguistic aspect, translation aspect, typology of intertextuality.*

The article aims to highlight and systematize the essence of the phenomenon of intertextuality and its typology from the perspective of linguistic theories and the translation aspect. It has been found that intertextuality as a feature of any work is defined by scientists as a text-to-text dialogue, elements, features of one text in another. It is emphasized that these features are necessarily known to the reader, are associated with texts and certain cultural and historical eras. This phenomenon can manifest itself at different levels of the structure of the work: genre, motif, position of the author, reader. It is outlined that all forms of intertextuality are signs of a certain culture, era or ideostyle of any author (usually a classic), which in the process of their use have acquired several subtexts, thereby enabling a dialogue of texts, authors and cultures. Due to this, the “foreign word” in the intertext is strengthened, contributing to the generation of new implicit meanings. By analyzing different approaches and views of scholars on the phenomenon of intertextuality, it has been established that it consists in a new reading of the work from the point of view of intertextual connections, in particular, the identification of different forms and directions of writing (quotation, reminiscence, allusion, plagiarism, transformation, stylization in one textual plane). It is noted that manifestations of intertextuality are characteristic of any style, genre, which becomes the basis for a new conceptualization and representation of processed and newly perceived information, which is embodied in a new text. The results of the conducted research give grounds to assert that the issue of the typology of the category of intertextuality remains debatable, since there is still no single generally accepted definition of the linguistic phenomenon of intertextuality. Therefore, its classification, directions and methods for a comprehensive study of its theoretical foundations require new ideas and solutions, which determines the further scope for studying this issue in the field of modern theoretical and applied linguistics.

ФЕНОМЕН ІНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНОСТІ В ЛІНГВІСТИЧНОМУ ТА ПЕРЕКЛАДАЦЬКОМУ АСПЕКТАХ

Світлана Федоренко

докторка педагогічних наук, професорка,

Київський національний університет технологій та дизайну

Ключові слова:

*інтертекстуальність,
інтертекст, текст,
лінгвістичний аспект,
перекладацький
аспект, типологія
інтертекстуальності.*

У статті розглянуто сутність феномену інтертекстуальності та його типологію з точки зору лінгвістичних теорій та перекладацького аспекту. З'ясовано, що інтертекстуальність як ознака будь-якого твору, визначається науковцями як діалог тексту з текстом, елементи, риси одного тексту в іншому. Наголошено, що ці риси обов'язково є відомими читачеві, асоціюються з текстами та певними культурно-історичними епохами. Цей феномен може проявлятися на різних рівнях структури твору: жанру, мотиву, позиції автора, читача. Окреслено, що всі форми інтертекстуальності є знаками певної культури, епохи чи ідеостилу будь-якого автора (зазвичай класика), які в процесі свого використання набули декількох підтекстів, завдяки цьому уможлиблюючи діалог текстів, авторів та культур. Завдяки цьому "чуже слово" в інтертексті посилюється, сприяючи породженню нових імпліцитних смислів. Шляхом аналізу різних підходів і поглядів науковців на феномен інтертекстуальності встановлено, що він полягає в новому прочитанні твору з погляду міжтекстових зв'язків, зокрема виявлення різних форм і напрямів письма (цитата, ремінісценція, алюзія, плагіат, трансформація, стилізація в одній текстовій площині). Зазначено, що прояви інтертекстуальності характерні для будь-якого стилю, жанру, що стає основою нової концептуалізації та репрезентації переробленої та по-новому сприйнятої інформації, яка втілюється у новому тексті. Результати проведеного дослідження дають підстави стверджувати, що питання типології категорії інтертекстуальності залишається дискусійним, оскільки ще й досі немає єдиного загальноприйнятого визначення цього лінгвістичного феномену, а його класифікація, напрями та способи для всебічного вивчення його теоретичних засад потребують нових ідей та рішень, що зумовлює подальшу перспективу вивчення даної теми у сфері сучасної лінгвістики теоретичного і прикладного спрямування.

Introduction. The phenomenon of intertextuality occupies one of the leading places in modern linguistics. For a long time, the interest of scholars and researchers to the concept "intertextuality", which is characterized as a multidimensional connection of a certain text with other texts, has not waned. In the intertext, the author's dialogue with a certain foreign semantic position continues on the basis of the interaction of "one's own" and "foreign" language, the reader joins the author's reasoning. Although the principles of the theory of intertextuality were outlined in the middle of the twentieth century in the works of J. Kristeva, R. Barthes, and G. Genette, some of its provisions still require clarification and systematization. R. Barthes' notion of "the death of the author" clearly signals the futility of viewing texts as the sole property of an individual: "the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death

of the Author" (Barthes, 1977: 148). R. Barthes (1977) also refers to the infinite variety of connections and associations that intertextuality can provide. Hence, every utterance is intertextually anchored and authored somewhere in an infinite spectrum of discourse (Barthes, 1977). Similar views are expressed by J. Baudrillard (1993) in relation to the production of different goods. The active development of the theory of intertextual interaction of texts and the theory of adaptation (Hutcheon, 2006) as its narrower aspect at the turn of the XXth and XXIst centuries problematizes the issues of the peculiarities of the functioning of a "foreign text" in the recipient culture, the issue of the relationship between "foreign" and "author's" words in the reinterpretations of precedent texts of a given era, the issue of the hierarchy of intertextual connections, as well as their reproduction in translation.

Despite the fact that in modern linguistics the theory of intertextuality has been given one of the leading places, its terminological apparatus, which concerns its typology, is still at the stage of development. **The article aims** to highlight and systematize the essence of the phenomenon of intertextuality and its typology from the perspective of linguistic theories and the translation aspect.

Material and methods. The study utilizes a theoretical and analytical approach to researching into the essence of the phenomenon of intertextuality in the context of linguistics and translation studies. It is mainly based on a comprehensive review of scholarly sources. The methodological basis of the study was the main approaches of the dialectics of scientific cognition – systemic, diachronic and functional. General scientific methods of analysis and synthesis were exploited to systematically review scholarly approaches to the phenomenon of intertextuality, which constitutes the dialectical unity of opposites; the method of generalization was employed for the purpose of monological presentation of the main results of the present study and formulation of its conclusions.

Results and discussion. Linguists often point out that “intertextuality is a concept that is difficult to use due to the extreme uncertainty and vagueness of its content (Culler, 2002: 109). This uncertainty is explained partly by the lack of unity in understanding the basic categories of intertext theory, partly by the fact that intertextuality is usually perceived by researchers as an elementary and further indivisible concept; meanwhile, upon closer examination, it turns out that it is represented by a number of subtypes. From this point of view, the need to clarify the key concepts of intertext theory, as well as to represent the category of intertextuality in the form of a multi-component typological model with explicitly expressed parameters of subdivision, seems obvious.

The term intertextuality (Latin *inter* – between and *textum* – fabric, connection, structure) “as a term was first mentioned in Julia Kristeva’s “Word, Dialogue and Novel” (1966) and then in “The Bounded Text” (1966–67), essays she wrote shortly after arriving in Paris from her native Bulgaria” (Alfaro, 1996: 268). As stated by J. Kristeva, intertextuality is the basis of any textuality, the way in which a text is woven into history as a specific discursive practice (Kristeva, 1969). In turn, M. Riffaterre (1983), as one of the first theorists of intertextuality, considers this phenomenon as a text category. To reveal intertextuality, M. Riffaterre (1983) emphasizes, it is necessary to approach it as a process of perception of the text by the reader, revealing the connection between the work and another work that came before or will come after it.

In her later works, J. Kristeva (1980) views intertextuality as the transposition of one or more sign systems into another sign system, and this idea was later articulated by other researchers. She distinguishes a horizontal and a vertical axis that encapsulates the “three dimensions or coordinates of dialogue”, namely, “writing subject, addressee, and exterior texts” (Kristeva, 1980: 66). Modern definitions of the concept “intertextuality” indicate that it is not only a textual category that unites a literary work with other, previous or future texts, but also a broad cultural phenomenon that consists in the connection of several phenomena in the course of vocations (Alfaro, 1996). The phenomenon under study applies not only to literary texts, but also to non-literary forms of expression. According to J. Kristeva’s interpretation, intertextuality is an associative interaction of a number of texts, or textual interaction (Kristeva, 1969; 1980). Intertextuality is:

1) not all extratextual connections of a text, but only its connections with other texts, which makes unacceptable the interpretations of: intertextuality as the relation of a text to phenomena of reality outside the interpreted text: historical events, texts, customs, values, roles, laws and systems (Robbins, 1996: 40); intertextual analysis as the definition of the way in which a text configures and reconfigures phenomena of the extratextual world (Watson, 2002: 2);

2) neither a text nor a genre, which casts doubt on the adequacy of the interpretation of republication, translation, adaptation, etc. as “types of intertextuality” (Miola, 2004: 13–25);

3) not a set of texts reflected in a given work, but an associative interaction of a given work with such texts;

4) the interaction of not only two, but two or more texts, which excludes the quantitative limitation of intertextuality to the interaction of two texts (Eigeldinger, 1987: 10);

5) not a figure or a trope. It is known that many authors understand intertextuality as a certain literary device, as a trope or stylistic figure, a way of constructing an artistic text (Worton & Still, 1990). Meanwhile, intertextuality is not a technique, but an associative basis for the techniques of quotation, application, allusion, paraphrase and other intertextual figures, which do not always acquire an ambiguous character, and therefore are incompatible with any of the interpretations of the trope. Intertextuality is traditionally interpreted as a retrospective category: Intertextuality means textual interaction produced within a given specific text. The subject perceiving it understands the phenomenon of intertextuality as an indicator of how this text interprets history and places it within itself. Intertextually enriched speech is addressed to texts of the past, and therefore to history, speech

diachrony, hence the interpretation of allusion and other retrospective appeals as “diachronic figures” (Hollander, 1981: 113). Consequently, the understanding of such speech, its “retroactive reading” (Riffaterre, 1983: 17) are impossible without reference to precedent texts that served as sources or models for it, and therefore “textual lenses” (frameworks or perspectives that guide how a reader interprets a text) (Lynch, 1998: 114), which provide an adequate vision of it. A precedent text is understood as a pre-text – the original text, i.e., the text to which a given specific text goes back, previous discursive activity (Goodrich, 1986: 69), or with reference to written speech – as a certain text that precedes the current written activity of the author and determines his/her motivation or orientation, i.e., a text that serves as an associative support for an adequate understanding of intertextually enriched speech.

Definitions of the phenomenon of intertextuality are regularly absolutized, in particular:

- the interpretations of intertextuality as a synecdochic riddle and “riddle of creativity” (Giannuzzi, 2020), as the interaction of two texts with each other within one work, acting in relation to them as a whole to a part), as the inclusion in the text of either entire 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, as the inclusion of pretext segments by an intertextually organized text (Hammer, 2006: 34), as a phenomenon that arises from the repeated use of a motif or fragment of a text, in particular when using “autoreferences and autocitations” (Limat-Letellier & Miguët-Ollagnier, 1998: 27); as econtextualization – the transition from one context to another (Fairclough, 2003);

- the identification of intertextuality with imitation as well as its understanding as imitation of texts of the past, as a case where one text serves as a model for another (Genette, 1982), etc. the definition of intertextuality given within the framework of one of these two models will inevitably turn out to be one-sided, and therefore reductive.

Texts united by intertextual associations form a hypertext. Hypertext, or a hypertext system, is an abstract value, therefore it should be understood as an associative association, a system of texts, and not some specific text within which several texts coexist (Nielsen, 1995). Text is horizontal and (like speech) linear, hypertext is vertical, i.e., it is a thematically ordered system. T. Nielsen, who coined the term “hypertext”, understood it not as a text, but as a “structured complex of thoughts” (Kitzmann, 2006: 13–14). The ultimate form of hypertext should be considered the virtual

space that C. Grivel called “the general text (text général)” (Grivel, 1978: 30) and which in the Internet era became known as the Web, the world wide web of texts. The term “hypertext” “is one of the key concepts that makes the Internet work” (Fedorenko & Sheremeta, 2023: 12). As “today, the modern sociocultural environment has undergone fundamental shifts. In particular, the latest digital technologies have reduced the degree of dominance of the spoken and written words in various spheres of human life. These changes have made non-verbal and mixed texts more influential, and have also given rise to new forms of text creation (video, web pages, etc.), where purely linguistic text structures are supplemented with important visual, acoustic, kinetic, and other structures” (Fedorenko, Voloshchuk, Sharanova, Glinka & Zhurba, 2021: 178).

Since any text is a semiotically two-dimensional structure, it is customary to contrast two types of intertextuality:

- 1) material intertextuality, borrowing elements from the plane of expression of the text;

- 2) thematic intertextuality, borrowing elements from the plane of content of the text: themes, motifs, plots, images (Lemke, 2004: 5–6).

The latter, for instance, can be traced in the story by John Cheever’s “The Swimmer”. “Just as J. Cheever compresses much of a man’s adult life into a single afternoon in this story, he also gives the reader a quick tour of literary history by alluding to “the following works: “Odyssey” by Homer, Sonnet 116 by Shakespeare, and “The Picture of Dorian Gray” by F. Scott Fitzgerald (Allen, 1989: 289). John Cheever’s protagonist, Neddy Merrill, “after hitting on the idea at a cocktail party of swimming home through the pools of his suburban friends, comes to resemble Ulysses wandering the Mediterranean on his return to Ithaca. As in Joyce’s “Ulysses”, specific scenes in “The Swimmer” parallel such Homeric episodes as Ulysses’ encounters with Scylla and Charybdis, Nausicaä, and Circe. Early in the story, J. Cheever says of Neddy that “he might be compared to a summer’s day” (Cheever, 1979: 603) echoing Shakespearean sonnet about the constancy of its speaker’s lover in contrast to the changes of the weather” (Allen, 1989: 289).

Both John Cheever’s “The Swimmer” and Oscar Wilde’s “The Picture of Dorian Gray” explore the interplay between reality and fantasy, though through different means and with distinct outcomes. In “The Swimmer” Neddy’s journey home enters the world of fantasy as he gradually ages. In “The Picture of Dorian Gray” most of the story is realistic except for the portrait of Dorian, which ages as he remains youthful. In addition both

works deal with a protagonist who tries to maintain, or hang on to, his youth. Neddy does so through his delusions. Dorian does so by wishing that his portrait age while he remains young. Dorian's wish is fulfilled. In pursuing their goals, both Neddy and Dorian come to tragic ends. Neddy becomes a lonely, alcoholic old man. In an attempt to destroy his conscience, Dorian stabs his portrait, thereby turning himself into a decrepit old man who dies (Bowers, 2007).

Intertextuality is a very broad concept that can manifest itself at any level of text organization and can be expressed both in terms of individual words or phrases that have meaning in a given text and in terms of macrotextual conventions and constraints associated with genre, register, and discourse. attempts have been made to classify different types of intertextuality. Exploring the centrifugal dimensions of intertextuality across disciplinary/interdisciplinary fields, R. Chandrasoma, C. Thompson and A. Pennycook (2004) note the importance of conceptualizing student plagiarism in academia in two types of intertextuality: transgressive and non-transgressive. Taking into account referential characteristics, N. Fairclough (1992) defines two types of intertextuality, which are as follows: manifest and constitutive. The former focuses on literary devices such as irony, allusion, hyperbole, while the latter involves physical aspects of texts such as common features and structure.

Taking into consideration multimodal characteristics of a text, S. Awung (2002) dwells on two major types of Intertextuality, which are ekphrasis and iconotext. Ekphrasis comes into being when a writer describes a visual object such as painting or sculpture with a verbal media such as in a novel, poem, or other writings (e.g., the description of Achilles's shield in Homer's Iliad). In turn, iconotext presupposes the use of an image in a text or vice versa (e.g., newspapers, where articles sometimes carry pictures) (Awung, 2002).

As stated by R. Miola (2004), intertextuality can operate through seven types: revision, translation, quotation, sources, conventions, genres, prologues. These seven types are subdivided into three categories. "Unequally present in the types and categories are three variables: first, the degree to which the trace of an earlier text is tagged by verbal echo; second, the degree to which its effect relies on audience recognition; third, the degree to which the appropriation is eristic" (Miola, 2004: 13).

Intertextual relations differ significantly in functional and structural relations. Let us consider the types of intertextuality associated with these differences. According to the addresser's purpose, intertextual relations are divided into three intentional types, which are as follows:

1. Rhetorical intertextuality, pursuing aesthetic, eristic or other goals, i.e., acting as a rhetorical strategy (Redmond, 2009: 10), arises as a result of the exploitation of intertextual figures: a) citation; b) text applications and allusions; c) paraphrase and travesty; d) parody; e) creative imitation of a successful author.

2. Spontaneous intertextuality, not supported by special techniques and means, arises between the original and a) translation; b) versified or prosaized version; c) new edition of the text; d) adaptation; e) annotation; f) an abridged version.

3. Cryptophoric (Greek *κρύπτω* "I hide, conceal") intertextuality occurs in the case of plagiarism, when the author seeks to hide or destroy the connection with the pre-text (Rose, 1993: 69). The first type has a positive intertextual intention, the second – zero, the third – negative. Based on this trichotomy, some experts consider plagiarism as a form of intertextuality (Genette, 1982: 2).

Considering the translation studies, S. Holthuis distinguishes the following types of intertextual interpretations:

- author-oriented intertextual interpretation (intertextuality, which is interpreted from the perspective of the author's intentions and possible knowledge);

- reader-oriented intertextual interpretation (intertextuality interpreted from the perspective of possible reader associations);

- text-oriented intertextual interpretation (intertextuality interpreted from the perspective of the text itself and its properties) (Holthuis, 1994: 85).

It should be noted that in conditions where "everything has already been said", any text will in any case be derived from the previous ones, but intertextuality will be perceived and realized only in those elements that are recognizable and cause the joy of recognition. That is, intertext is only what the reader was able to see, and not everything that the author squeezed into the text. Thus, the translator, as the original (first) reader, is faced with the task of seeing as much as possible and using appropriate means to convey these intentions to the final perceiver. Therefore, the translation of intertextual elements requires taking into account many linguistic and extralingual factors. With the development of translation studies, textology and other related disciplines, there is no doubt that it is impossible to convey the full variety of meanings of a text (especially artistic, colloquial and journalistic) in translation. Translation is largely transformed into interpretation. The translator is constantly faced with a choice: if it is not possible to preserve everything, then which elements of content and form cannot be lost.

When translating, at the analysis stage, the translator must identify the intertextual element, find its prototext, determine the dominant function, and realize it in the system of the source language and source culture. At the synthesis stage, relying on the criteria of representativeness, it is necessary to decide whether it is possible to completely preserve this intertextual element in the translated text, that is, to convey the content, style, and intentions of the author. And, if this is possible, then by what methods can the semantic losses be compensated (minimized). At the same time, the formal similarity of texts is not self-sufficient. Sometimes representativeness requires a complete transformation of the intertextual element. The translation algorithm, created on the basis of the general categorization of intertextualisms, indicates in which cases it is necessary to preserve the similarity, and in which it can be abandoned. To achieve maximum relevance of translation, based on the observations of translation scholars, four categories of intertextualisms are distinguished: the category of popularity of the prototext; the category of dominant function; the category of the level of functioning of the intertextual element; the category of the format of the intertextual element.

Intertextual references are mainly culturally specific. Thus, the translator's bicultural competence is no less important than his/her linguistic competence. How to deal with culturally specific expressions is a matter of individual translator's decision, and there are a number of satisfactory solutions. M. Baker (1998) suggests several strategies for dealing with cultural connotation that can be applied to intertextual references: 1) literal translation; 2) cultural substitution; 3) clarification and explication; 4) omission; and 5) transliteration.

Conclusions. Thus, having analyzed intertextuality as a feature of any work, we can conclude that the latter is defined by scholars as a dialogue of a text with a text, elements, features of one text in another. These features are necessarily known to the reader, recognized by them, associated with texts and certain cultural and historical eras. Intertextuality can be studied from different points of view: historical-literary, communicative, systemic, typological, translational. In addition, intertextuality can manifest itself at different levels of the structure of the work: genre, motif, position of the author, reader. All forms of intertextuality are signs of a certain culture, era or ideological style of any writer (usually a classic), which in the process of their use have acquired several subtexts, thereby enabling a dialogue of texts, authors and cultures. That is why the "foreign word" in the intertext is enhanced, which contributes to the generation of new implicit meanings.

On the basis of the analysis of different approaches and views of scholars on the phenomenon of intertextuality, we state that it consists in a new reading of the work from the point of view of intertextual connections, in particular, the identification of different forms and directions of writing (quotation, reminiscence, allusion, parody, plagiarism, transformation, stylization in one textual plane). Therefore, manifestations of intertextuality are characteristic of any style, genre, which becomes the basis for a new conceptualization and representation of processed and newly perceived information, which is embodied in a new text.

The results of the conducted research give grounds to assert that the issue of the typology of the category of intertextuality remains debatable, since there is still no single generally accepted definition of the linguistic phenomenon of intertextuality, and its classification, directions and methods for a comprehensive study of its theoretical foundations require new ideas and solutions, which determines the further scope for studying this topic in the field of linguistics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alfaro, M.J.M. (1996). Intertextuality: Origins and Development of the Concept. *Atlantis*, 18(1/2), 268–285. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41054827>
2. Allen, W.R. (1989). Allusions to "The Great Gatsby" in John Cheever's "The Swimmer". *Studies in Short Fiction*, 26(3), 289–293.
3. Awung, S. (2002). Intertextuality in literature, film, and other popular media: Intermediality and signs relations. *GRIN Verlag*. Munich. <https://www.grin.com/document/107559?srsId=AfmBOopxzErIDptATfTXVVJh0ZI07RyS-jS5L1ObLVYRqQgAJ5gJFiNE1>
4. Baker, M. (1998). *In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
5. Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, Music, Text*. London: Fontana Press.
6. Baudrillard, J. (1993). *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
7. Bowers, T. (2007). John Cheever's Mock-Epic: "The Swimmer," the "Odyssey," and America's Pursuit of Happiness. *CEA Critic*, 70(1), 17–34.
8. Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and non-transgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3(3), 171–193.
9. Cheever, J. (1979). The Swimmer. In *The Stories of John Cheever* (pp. 403–411). New York : Alfred A. Knopf.

10. Culler, J. (2002). *The Pursuit of Signs: semiotics, literature, deconstruction*. Cornell University Press.
11. Eigeldinger, M. (1987). *Mythologie et intertextualité*. Genève.
12. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge : Polity Press.
13. Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London : Routledge.
14. Fedorenko, S., Voloshchuk, I., Sharanova, Y., Glinka, N., & Zhurba, K. (2021). Multimodality and Digital Narrative in Teaching a Foreign Language. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), Special Issue on CALL*, 7, 178–189. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/call7.13>
15. Fedorenko, S., & Sheremeta, K. (2023). U.S. University Websites as Specific Multimodal Texts. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, 26(2), 9–26. <https://dx.doi.org/10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/2-1>
16. Genette, G. (1982). *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*. Paris : Éditions du Seuil.
17. Giannuzzi, M. (2020). *Scarlett Baron. The Birth of Intertextuality: The Riddle of Creativity*. London : Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4148/2334-4415.2190>
18. Goodrich, S. D. (1986). *The reader and the text*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
19. Grivel, Ch. (1978). Les universaux du texte. *Littérature*, 30, 25–50.
20. Hammer, A. (2006). *Lyrikinterpretation Intertextualität*. Würzburg.
21. Hollander, J. (1981). *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.15552461>
22. Holthuis, S. (1994). Intertextuality and meaning constitution: An approach to the comprehension of intertextual poetry. In János, P. and Terry, O. (Eds.), *Approaches to poetry: Some aspects of textuality, intertextuality and intermediality* (P. 77–93). Berlin : de Gruyter.
23. Hutcheon, L. A. (2006). *Theory of Adaptation*. London : Routledge.
24. Kitzmann, A. (2006). *Hypertext handbook: the straight story*. N. Y. : Peter Lang Inc., International Academic Publishers
25. Kristeva, J. (1969). *Semeiotikè, recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris : Éditions du Seuil.
26. Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York : Columbia University Press.
27. Lemke, J. L. (2004). Intertextuality and Educational Research. In Shuart-Faris de N. & D. Bloome (Eds.), *Uses of Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research* (P. 3–17). Greenwich, CT : Information Age Publishing.
28. Limat-Letellier, N., & Miguet-Ollagnier, M. (1998). *L'intertextualité*. Presses Universitaires Franche Comté.
29. Lynch, S.J. (1998). *Shakespearean Intertextuality: Studies in Selected Sources and Plays*. Westport : Greenwood Press.
30. Miola, R.S. (2004). Seven types of intertextuality. In M. Marrapodi (Ed.), *Shakespeare, Italy, and intertextuality* (P. 13–25). Manchester University Press.
31. Nielsen, J. (1995). *Multimedia and Hypertext: The Internet and Beyond*. Boston : Morgan Kaufmann.
32. Redmond, M.J. (2009). *Shakespeare, politics, and Italy: intertextuality on the Jacobean stage*. Burlington.
33. Riffaterre, M. (1983). *Semiotique de la poesie*. Paris : Éditions du Seuil.
34. Robbins, V.K. (1996). *Exploring the texture of texts: a guide to socio-rhetorical interpretation*. Harrisburg.
35. Rose, M.A. (1993). *Parody: ancient, modern, and post modern*. Cambridge University Press.
36. Watson, D.F. (2002). Introduction. In D. F. Watson (Ed.), *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament* (P. 1–9). Atlanta, GA: Scholars.
37. Worton, M., & Still, J. (1990). *Intertextuality. Theories and Practices*. Manchester University Press.

Отримано: 11.08.2025

Прийнято: 08.09.2025

Опубліковано: 30.10.2025

