

*Materials of Conferences***SUBJECTIVENESS
AND INTERTEXTUALITY:
PROS AND CONS**

Povetyeva E.V.

*Samara Branch of Moscow City Pedagogical University,
Samara, e-mail: fabulous15@mail.ru*

This article aims in making analysis of subjective aspect of intertextuality in the world wide textual field.

As French philosopher, paleontologist and geologist Pierre Teilhard de Chardin once said: «Human spirit lies in our personality not individuality. We all strive for perfecting our individuality, while the true value lies in our personality, which we do have power to stand for» [5].

Introduction. The modern world of cultural artifacts is very rich and developed. It grows daily. It is widely recognized that no phenomena of the contemporary art, no matter how «unique» and «highly-individual» it may be represented is being based on the author's personality only. Modern world of culture tends to be constantly quoting itself. Which is not surprising, assuming our society is highly globalized. It happened even before Mass Media became so powerful throughout the planet. Artistic worlds and its creators, even if preferring to be independent, always happen to be aware of each other's works which, to different extends, is often interinfluencing. These days almost all segments of general thinking seem to be interpenetrative. In the field of science it can be perfectly explainable: no research in any possible area of study can be accomplished (and even started) without being based on the previously made set of works, no matter developing or disproving them completely. The whole history of science is based on the principle of taking into account prior techniques, research and exploration surveys.

However, for literature, a subjective zone of expressing each author's uniqueness, such a paradigm always looked inappropriate. Any work of art is supposed to reflect individual perception of the world described by means of the particular language and the precise resources of this language skilled by the author.

Usually, when comparing literature to science in general, the researchers mention that they both use the means of the language to verbalize their ideas, although the aims of the two are completely different.

Nevertheless, there is a very important aspect both literature and science share: both phenomena are drawn heavily on the basis of all the previous experience. And, returning to the field of literature specifically, it doesn't involve the language itself only.

No text is being born in the modern world without being dependent on the previously created one.

Intertextuality. The phenomenon of permutation of texts in world literature (and other forms of art, for example, cinematography) is being called «intertextuality». The term itself was first brought into linguistics by a French researcher Julia Kristeva in her studies devoted to semiotics of post-modernism in 1967. She defines intertextuality as textual interaction, which takes place in any literary text. For any subject (reader) the phenomenon of intertextuality is an attribute of a specific way of interpretation of the certain history and the way of fitting into it [4]. In Kristeva's further studies it is being underlined, that «intertext» (an object) shall be completely detached from the term «intertextuality» [3]. Kristeva claimed, that intertextuality – being a permutation of different texts – is a characteristic that makes each text «a field inside which a number of certain utterances (narratives) taken from outer texts intercross each other and often neutralize one another». Text, in Kristeva's works, is a certain combinatory area. It is a space of multilevel interchangeable process among the large number of fractions, which again and again are being reallocated by written discourses. Any new text is being created based on the variety of prior precedent texts (which are being deconstructed, denied or regenerated). We may say that for Julia Kristeva intertext itself is not at all a device with a help of which a new text is transcribing or reduplicating a previous one. On the contrary, intertextuality is a constant boundless process, which we shall call textual dynamics.

Roland Barthes developed and adds new theses to Kristeva's theory in his works in 70s. In his academic paper of 1973 he dwells upon the statements mentioned in researches of Kristeva. He brings the terminology Kristeva used in her thesis in the general theory of literary text. Primary position is his paradigm is being held by the phenomenon of «productivity», which is tightly associated with the concept of «intertextuality». Basically, for Barthes text means productivity.

Consequently, literary text, if based on the concept of Kristeva, is initially an intertext. It holds the characteristics of intertextuality not because it owns the elements of borrowing or adoption, deformation, repetition or imitation, but because any written text which produces literary text works on the principle of redistribution, deconstruction and dissemination of the variety of primary works of literature. Summarizing this principle, Barthes writes: «absolutely any literary text is an intertext» [1].

Any literal text is operating as an intertext on several levels. The level of identifiability in it can be differentiated. However, the reader is able to de-

tach from it the essential elements borrowed from the texts of coevals and predecessors, from the history of arts; any text can be looked upon as a sort of cloth being inweaved out of the variety of quotations. As a result an uncertain amount of cultural codes, memorable quotes, fragments of social dialects, rhythmical models, etc. Intertext is an eroded field of anonymous «formulae», the roots of which is not always recognizable. Basically, it is a large area of automatically used quotations, which don't need speech marks in their textual organization.

Summarizing the ideas of Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes, we can draw a conclusion: intertextuality shall not be considered a repetition or a certain filiation. We may say, however, that the essence of intertext is not only borrowing (quotations of different kinds in the intertextual field are always lack quote marks), but mostly unconsciously usage of barely recognizable traces. Intertextuality, thus, presupposes usage of a crucial «responsiveness» and dynamism of the process of writing itself, which operates as a transposing instrument, working in cooperation with precedent or comprehensive literary uttering.

Laurant Jenny sums up the ideas elaborated by Barthes and Kristeva and brings them into the topic of intertext itself. «Intertext speaks a language, thesaurus and active vocabulary of which is being formed, set up and developed by means of assemblage of the whole number of literary texts existing in the world of literature» [3].

The point of view of the mentioned authors has one very important aspect in common. They all claim intertextuality to be a phenomena which is free from subjectiveness. Barthes writes: «objectivity and subjectivity are of course forces which can take over the text but they are forces that have no affinity with it» [1]. Intertextuality is a purely extensive notion, which operates not only by allusion, parody and stylization, but also by any possible forms of reminiscences, rewriting or other ways of interacting informational blocks which may exist between a literary text and comprehensive language entirety. If literature itself is intertextual, then this process is functioning not only because any sort of written text is «listening» to the precedent literature works, but also because any text exists on the same basis and on the same rights as the whole mass of discourses which surround it. Intertextuality is a text in dynamics, textual permutation and interaction. Any text is productive; it creates its own language.

So, is there any space for subjectiveness in the intertext? Does the author is the one and only initial power that brings this characteristic of literary text on? Or is it just a question of interpretation and the reader is the one who creates the new rendering of the text?

Back To Science. Let's address to the history of science again to answer this question. In the world of science and technology the subject of pro-

ductivity and creativity itself never comes to be the leading factor. This can be easily explained. Let's make a trivial example. It is widely known – the electric light, one of the everyday conveniences that most affects our lives, was invented in 1879 by Thomas Alva Edison. He was neither the first nor the only person trying to invent an incandescent light bulb. However, Edison was neither the first nor the only person trying to invent an incandescent electric lamp. Many inventors had a lot of work and research to invent other devices, very close to the electric bulb as done by Edison. Among those inventors who made a step forward in understanding the eclectic light were Sir Humphrey Davy, Warren De la Rue, James Bowman Lindsay, James Prescott Joule, Frederick de Moleyns and Heinrich Göbel. Besides, a large number of people worked on perfecting the electric bulb and illumination in general. Needless to say, it is being improved and developed now and will be perfected tomorrow.

Basically, the nature of the whole phenomenon of scientific work is successive by its essence. Backward compatibility is one of the most important features of it in the matter of science conventions and progress in general. The names of Nicolaus Copernicus, Galileo Galilei, Isaac Newton, Albert Einstein, Thomas Edison and others are widely known not because of their unique inventions, but because their ideas led directly to the scientific revolutions – change of the way of thinking in general. Let's go deeper into the history and remember the times of Nicolaus Copernicus. Was his invention a real breakthrough? Did he actually invent anything? Well, not exactly. He was the first to notice that inspite of the fact that we clearly see the Sun travelling round the sky, the stars at night stay still on the same place. Thus, he concluded, the Earth is not the center of the Universe. On the contrary, our planet turns round the Sun. We have to admit – he was wrong about many things, mentioned in his works. He claimed the space to have the so-called «finite substance», a sort of a solid wall, on which the stars are being lunched. His ideas were later developed greatly and the whole new worldview came to life. Generally speaking, Copernicus laid the foundation of the large number of future inventions. But his name is a loud one, because thanks to him the whole ideology world outlook and mindset of humanity had been changed. Human being is not the meridian, not the heyday of creation and the Universe!

So, a famous name in scientific history is usually a name of scientific revolutionist. While the scientific inventions, goals and failures are being written collectively. There is no subject in it – the world progress is a world-wide matter, collective success and common heritage. Each new invention is being done being strongly influenced by absolutely all the precedent works.

And Back To Literature Again. But back to the world of literature. The word literature literally means «things made from letters». Those can

be any *things*: all the thoughts of human mind – arranged into a story, claiming facts, fiction or nothing in particular (modernism, postmodernism, futurism in general, considerable part of Asian prose, biggest part of the lyrics, etc.). But, even when we speak about plotless literary works, characteristic of intertextuality shall not be excluded. Any text is being arranged in accordance to the certain number of unspoken rules. Those rules: spelling, punctuation, syntax, word order, morpheme arrangements, stresses, metaphors, stylistics, etc. – are being dictated by the whole history of literature. We can apply those rules to any text – from the phone book to the novel.

How strict shall we be to the factor of author's (or reader's) subjectiveness in this case?

The problem of intertextual subject, or – «inter-subject», is a trace which the theorists of intertextual theory itself have been well aware of.

I. Ilyin in his book «Poststructuralism. Deconstruction. Postmodernism» in 1996 summarizes the ideas stated by the researches who dealt with the intertextuality in their works: Algirdas Julien Greimas, Roland Barthes, Jacques-Marie-Émile Lacan, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida and others. Ilyin underlines that those theorists stressed one and the same feature of the language in general: human mind is – if we speak in terms of classic structuralism – «panyazikovoy» (totally *everything* in the world is a **language**) by its nature. We think in terms of a text. Moreover, we think in terms of a written text. How else can we arrange out thoughts? Writing is the only available constructure, known to humankind, that allows us to fix our utterings. Logically enough, in structuralism and constructivism, as well as at the present times of post constructivism, we call «a text» quite a range of phenomena: literature, culture, history, society, a human [6].

The thesis that history of humankind and society in general can be the phenomena which shall be

«read» as a «text» consequently lead to the understanding of world culture as a unified «intertext», which, in its complete variability serves as a preliminary precedent text (pre-text) to any newborn literary text.

The aspect of sovereign subjectiveness of an author (and at some point, a reader) in texts- consciousnesses which act like bricks in the wall of «The Great Intertext of The World» turns to be blurred if not completely vanished. There is no place for subjectiveness in the world of intertextuality. Whatever you are going to write – it's only going to be quotations, allusions, reminiscences, rewriting and stylization. But it doesn't mean that one shouldn't write.

Fine words! I wonder where you stole them.

Jonathan Swift

References

1. Barthes R. L'aventure semiologique // Poétique. – 1985. – № 93. – P. 368.
2. Erdinast-Vulcan E. Bakhtin's homesickness: A late reply to Julia Kristeva // Textual practice. – 1995. – Vol.9. № 2. – P. 223.
3. Jenny L. La strategie de la forme // Poétique. – 1976. – № 27. – P. 113.
4. Kristeva J. Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art Text. / J. Kristeva. – N.Y., 1980. – P. 431.
5. Teilhard de Chardin P. Hymn of the Universe / Harper & Row. – N. Y., 1961. – P. 312.
6. Ilyin I.P. Poststructuralism. Deconstruction. Postmodernism / Intrada. – M., 1996. – P. 114.

The work was submitted to International Scientific Conference «Section of young scientists, students and professionals», Turkey (Antalya), 16-23, August, 2012, came to the editorial office on 04.07.2012.