

ANDREY N. BEZRUKOV
Birsk

INTERTEXTUALITY RECEPTION IN POSTMODERNIST DISCOURSE

KEYWORDS: intertext, postmodernism, reception of the text, discourse, dialogue, interpretation, intertextuality, Alexander Pushkin, Venedikt Yerofeyev

ABSTRACT: The main study subject of the article is intertextual postmodern text interaction with the legacy of Russian classics of XIX–XX centuries. A cultural dialogue being a semantic point of convergence of the text factual and ideological levels is in the focus of investigation. The purpose of the research undertaken is observation of the postmodern artistic unity transformational nature, represented by the projection of systemic/non-systemic writing/reading. Methodologically, the work is based on the receptive approach to identification of individual features of the text and its semantic correlates. The analysis allowed us to direct attention to intertextual variations, discursive imagery circumvolutions, presence of parallel and reverse vectors in the newly created texts. The concepts of the intertextual matrix situation put across are illustrated with the fictional examples (Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Yerofeyev). The article is intended (field of application) for the Russian and foreign researchers of the postmodern discourse, intertextual communication, literary forms dialogue, signimic level text transformed into a semantic construct. The analysis results posit that formal intertextuality character (citation scale) in the individual text concept expands to the phenomenon, bearing convergent characteristics, and the semantic field extension can be carried out with the help of the receptive approach.

1. Introduction

The transformational nature of postmodern artistic unity can be represented by the projection of systemic/non-systemic mechanism of writing/reading. This problem representation is promising both in terms of identifying the individual characteristics of the text, its functional characteristics, as well as by way of the idea of relative multiplicity of semantic correlates (Kiklewicz 2015), intertextual (Kristeva 1984; Genette 1997; Eco 1984; Смирнов 1995; Арнольд 1999; Graham 2000; Kiebusinska 2001; Фатеева 2007; Пъере-Гро 2008) and discursive variations and speed imagery embodiment. Text “neutrality” observed in the literary process of the end of XX – beginning of XXI century is characterized by the fact that the authorial, ideological, programmatic level, as well as the aesthetic background of language array becomes quite variable.

The narratives, generated in the course of epochs change, condition a number of opportunities moving closer to the reader's choice. The system of values that forms the basis of the text created (or being created) is not limited by the choice of only one truthful superstructure of the literary work. The text becomes a construct overcoming the conditional barrier of semantic multiplicity in the reader's mind. Thus the creative writing becomes an artistic empiricism generalization.

The text creator does not enter the reader's figure in mental brackets, on the contrary, he leaves the text semantic ellipsis which also conditions further thought advance on the natural spiral vision of the internal structure of the work. The same is not true as far as the ideal text (Бахтин 2002; Корман 2006), the text of the cultural genesis (Derrida 1978), or the fact of the literary text paradigm are concerned. At the present stage of terminological revision, it would be more appropriate to dwell on the discursive form of spherical structure comprising literary experience improvisations.

The literary forms dialogue, texts cohesion, intertextual communication, "text-reader" opposition, "the world as a text" (Derrida) thesis, intertextual interactions field – these are the statements of the XX century literary theory where the dualistic correctness and semantic dispersion principle dominates (Безруков 2016). The game field of the reader is open to the maximum retrospection. Therefore, the reader's consciousness incorporates the whole literary-historical process, the sign level of the text being transformed into a semantic construct. The hermeneutic or general cultural reader's competence is prerequisite of such "play of the structure" (Derrida 1978, 352), play of meanings. We agree with the idea that "The text is the locus where meaning is produced and becomes productive (signifying practice)" (Eco 1984, 25). The presence of parallel and reverse vectors in newly created text forms the *intertextual matrix* situation the principles of which are prospectively comprehensible through their functional significance identification. Intertextual matrix should be treated as a peculiar kind of textual space structuring where subjective nature is being subdued as a result of code interpenetration. Consequently, intersubjectivity expands receptive opportunities of notional dimension exposure.

2. Intertextual paradigm vector

The study of intertextuality is important both in terms of theory (G. Genette, R. Barthes, J. Kristeva, J. Derrida, M. Riffaterre, M. Holquist, A. L. Nielsen, M. Pfister, A. Graham, N. Fairclough, M. Worton, S. Judith) and practice (N. Bratosevich, U. Broich, B. Johnson, C. G. Gonzalez, A. Haberer, A. Popovich). This multi-dimensional text category has direct access to the solution of literary criticism

topical problems and holistic reception of the author's individual and personal style. "The theory of intertextuality destroys traditional notions of the origin of meaning, whether they are located in the sign (with a presumed stable signified) or the author (presumed God-like creator of meaning)" (Graham 2003, 81). The fact that the categorical apparatus of this phenomenon has already been formulated, the basic forms and types of intertextual relations defined, and its markers exposed in the literary studies, does not diffuse the demand of intertextuality further study.

Intertextuality – is a basic text-creating and semantic category, assuming the process of dialogical interaction of texts in the planes of content and expression, carried out both at the level of the whole text and at the level of certain semantic and formal elements. According to narrow understanding intertextuality is limited by dialogical relationship in which one text contains explicit references to specific pre-texts. However, understanding of the given category cannot be reduced to mere citation, materialization of certain associative lines in the reader's consciousness, allusion formation and reminiscence. There exists another intertextuality model, which suggests its intentionally-generative character, semantic multiplicity, the incomplete interpretations number, the recipient's notional creation activity formation. Intertextuality covers various text levels being the category of its discoverability, possesses notional incompleteness, procedurality of notional institutionalization as its cultural medium motion.

In the last quarter of the XX century the liberal arts developed under the conditions of the theoretical reflection linguistic models overwhelming dominance. As a result of research, the worldview was perceived as a text, discourse. The language expression substituted the reality itself, the thesis of J. Derrida "there is nothing outside the text" became mainstream. Due to this, the whole human culture becomes a certain amount of texts, a sort of cultural text, i.e. intertext. Consciousness is observed as a text, the unconsciousness – as a text, "I" – as a text, the text that can be read using relevant grammar rules, which are certainly specific but constructed by analogy with the natural language grammar.

Structuralists (Greimas 1983) and poststructuralists engaged in the study of the postmodernist literary works poetics first of all draw attention to functioning of the language material: "the symbolic language to which literary works belong is *by its very structure* a plural language whose code is constructed in such a way that every utterance (every work) engendered by it has multiple meanings" (Barthes 1987, 27). In the researchers' works the language is regarded as a measure of all things, it presents not only as a characteristic feature of the postmodernist text, but is also characterized by a specific way of thinking, and the connected thinking of modern person is identified with the invariant of a written text. Postmodernist theorists advocate the idea that the world itself cannot be cognized and cannot be presented in literature. After all, the whole reality enters the language system but techniques for creating virtual, unreal, fictional language space do not

provide the key to comprehension of the discourse construction principles of about the world-reality which is a substitute for reality itself.

When closer to interpretative procedures (Jauss 1982), text analysis in its postmodern understanding focuses on the study of the end sign (work) and the processes of its generation. The progress towards available structure of the organized language is the most appropriate for the text analysis. In the postmodern practice (Guattari 2013), language is determined by the game nature of signs and representations; links flexibility between the signifier and the signified; the emergence of new context meanings; disclosure of the literary text semantic structure of into the cultural field, in the world of the Text.

The concept of intertextuality became common for the textological theory of postmodernism, admitting that interaction between the text and sign context serves as fundamental condition for sense creation. Deconstruction the principle of intertextual matrix makes it possible to objectify the plurality of semantic parallels. The meaning emerges as a result of linking semantic vectors, which draw in the broad cultural context acting as an external semiotic sphere for any text. Postmodernism synthesized the idea and theory of intertext. It is concerned with the artist's peculiar type of thinking, way text creation, unique artistic picture of the world formation. The concept of intertextuality is perceived by the theoretical autoreflection of postmodernism and at the same time by its normative poetics. It provides basis for estimating the postmodern style of thinking as thinking of citation, and for estimating postmodern texts as citatory literature built on the principle of *intertextual matrix*. For postmodernists, structure plays a major role but it is not a metaphysical absolute but a misty coupling of initial conditions yielding only indirect expression. It is a certain letter which is understood as a direct current statement and is perceived as a process of creation. This phenomenon (letter) includes not only artistic creativity, not only writing, but also a symbolic expression. The total of symbols in time and space forms a text.

In postmodern practice the script has no literal entity, it begins both before the actual initial stage of the text composition and its final completion point; the script is not the original concept or form but a function, timeless language its new, contextual meanings establishment. Reflecting on the extra-textual interactions, one should turn to the notion of context with one important clarification. As extra-textual reality, context is a system of meta-meanings essential to a discourse participant. Context is a discourse subject belonging; by definition it is subjective and is constant process of establishment and change/development. Context cannot be perceived as a set phenomenon, a text/work supplement entirely and permanently created; it is the essential component of extra-textual structures; literary context is a dynamic and flexible system. Each new incorporation of the text into the cultural and historical text generates new implications on the basis of which the old meaning-representations are corrected and earlier meanings to the new ones are substituted.

3. Dispersion literary forms

The intertextual interactions of Russian postmodern literature with the heritage of national and world classics of XIX–XX centuries are not *res nova*. However, there occur some aspects calling for special consideration. In particular, it refers to the intertextuality functional limit as it is not always possible to clearly interpret what compresses the perception program of postmodern (Jameson 2002) form markedly bordering with classical examples. Besides the decorative, aesthetic and eidologic functions, intertextuality in postmodernism plays the role of reference, which sends the reader to the pre-text capable to illustratively supplement the artistic picture of modern age, symbolically correct the way of semantic assessment. Needless to say that the role of the intertext is to group the text unit and give it a sense, not from a unification perspective, but from the perception level of the complex of “representations, which are already fully integrated into the linguistic universe” (Пьере-Гро 2008, 126).

The text of the Venedikt Yerofeyev’s poem “Moscow – Petushki” (1969) among the other modernist texts of 1960–80-ies allows researchers to impressively illustrate the intertextual views and authors’ voices contact situation, the category of intertextuality (as a significant element of postmodern poetics), the fact of continuity in the Russian literary space. As commonly cited “Moscow – Petushki” is a precursor of Russian postmodernism alongside with “Pushkin’s house (Pushkinskiy dom)” by A. Bitov and “School for fools (Shkola dlya durakov)” by Sasha Sokolov and thus is a unique cento absorbing and developing postmodern poetics features. The texts dialogue in the postmodern literature presents the convergence point of a number of ideological and actual levels (Безруков 2016, 69–78). The perfunctory nature of intertext (citation scale) expands in the individual text concept to the phenomenon that has convergent attributes. Their presence marks the transit from once own to the other, and vice versa. Therefore, semantic field extension can be performed by means of the receptive approach (Безруков 2015) and open reading.

4. “Moscow – Petushki” by Venedikt Yerofeyev: reception of the text

Yerofeyev’s text spherically absorbs the artistic-linguistic range of Antiquity, Europe, Russia, past and present. Almost everything is used in poem: the Ancient world – Greece and Rome cultural heritage; the Middle Ages – the legends, fables, narratives; Ancient Russia – the hagiographies, confessions, travels; the New Time – the structure dogmatics, peripheral basis; the XIX century – A. Pushkin, I. Turgenev, F. Dostoevsky, the XX century – the Soviet, “post-Soviet” print periodicals – holistically-linear discourse-letter. The strategy of abstract meaning absolute achievement

becomes feasible in the case when the condition of possible propositions variation related to already created literary fact is a fundamental principle. Achievement of the final result, i.e. the meaning search as action form/function, is polypositional in this case. Work reception goes beyond the limits of the given text; perception becomes the combinatorial structure of the ring/circle. This phenomenon can be defined as the game textualization principle of foreign discourses. The discourse perceived as “the secondary objects in relation to the reality” (Kristeva 2004, 226) is capable of metalinguistic motions. Utterance commitment and the fact of its pronouncement aren't one level modality. Their multidirectionality is determined by the essential criteria: path/knowledge and facet/truth.

Presenting the text “Moscow – Petushki” in the wide literary context, Yerofeyev does not limit the spherical sense dominant but texturizes it. Mark Lipovetsky notes: “In this case we may speak of a conscious combination of the principles of citational accuracy and citational confusion. The very model of culture this creates is in the zone of “unprepared contact” with current, “lower” reality: it turns out to be simultaneously canonical and yet *open-ended*. The image of culture loses its aura of epic legend and becomes the object of radical *novelization*” (Lipovetsky 1999, 70). Thus he creates collision of game into structures/meanings and functionally divides the text into significant (explicit) and conceivable (probable-positional). The exterior part acquires the internal contradictions hues; while the immanent sense pedestal tends to discursive productivity. Intertextuality is intrinsic for transition, crisis; because it is the modification and internal semantic-semiotic transformation that it needs to exist. Thus the intertext functional facet is convergent, interdependent related to all the things conceivable. The perception of “the poem's textual component by a stream of the consciously encountered and unconsciously skipped by the author/reader demonstrates that the name of Pushkin is topical for Yerofeyev” (Bezrukov 2015, 142–143). One can hardly state that Yerofeyev is entirely absorbed by Pushkin, it more obvious with F. M. Dostoevsky, A. A. Ahmatova and some other writers and poets, nevertheless it is evident that the postmodernist author depends on the classical figure of the 19th century. “Eugene Onegin”, “Boris Godunov”, “Mozart and Salieri”, “The Gypsies”, “The Imitations of the Koran” (“Podrazhanija Koranu”), “The Queen of Spades” (“Pikovaya Dama”) – this is an incomplete list of the overtones setting pace to the textual array formation of the poem “Moscow – Petushki”.

The beginning of the first chapter: “Everybody says: The Kremlin, the Kremlin” (Yerofeyev, “Moscow – Petushki”) associatively coincides with the beginning of the Pushkin's tragedy “Mozart and Salieri” where Salieri proclaims: “Everybody says: there is no justice on earth [...]” (Pushkin, “The Gypsies”). By means of this technique of verbal introduction in the text the author emphasizes speakers' communicative dependence: by definition, the pronounced word is to be heard, apprehended and understood. Linguistically, Yerofeyev treats the Pushkin text ironically, respectfully, dialogically, authoritatively, and discretely. This is the phenomenal adoption

of Pushkin's heritage by Yerofeyev for himself, the name of the poet in the poem text undergoes complex poetic turns – from barbed wit proper to author's piety – at the same time everything is in accord with the general key of creative convergence.

The code principle of Yerofeyev's play with Pushkin's variants of reality artistic modeling can be observed in the theme expansion (latitude, option, creation), in images – motifs formation and in structuring the utterance meaning. Functionally intertext expands the aesthetic borders of the poem "Moscow – Petushki" both at the form level and content plane. It is possible to notice a particular interest of Yerofeyev to new (e.g., Pushkin-style) ways of Venichka's artistic image formation. He is the author's mask for which there is no infallible superstructure. Living the linguistic culture block the author/character comprehends the realities of the fictional world, strives for the absolute of his own literary power over the sign/function. Intertextuality functions convergence in the point of situational discharge grades both the author (his own ego) and his projection (of the character, Venichka). The traditions of classical forms and texts of A. S. Pushkin (lyric poetry and drama), of N. V. Gogol ("Dead Souls"), of F. M. Dostoevsky ("Crime and Punishment", "The Idiot") enable to create the unique version of post-modern text, the text which is capable to endure reader's silence as an expectation of a personified recipient's birth.

Intertextuality functioning is the solution of certain contradictions and creation of the others "consequently comprehension is followed by secret generation" (Ямпольский 1993, 90). The pre-understanding experienced by the reader's mind leaves a certain artistic imprint. The apparent construction devoid of logic eludes in the field of literary phenomenon. J. Derrida states that "the form fascinates when one is no longer capable to understand force from within, that is to create" (Derrida 2007, 13). The "dialogical opposition" (Bakhtin 2002, 280) of opinions effectively communicates sense scintillation.

Pushkin's heritage within the scope of the tragic and comic in the poem "Moscow – Petushki" is undermined and acquires its own postmodern framework. The tragedy and comedy in the beginning of Venichka's "delusions" is the variant of Yerofeyev's approach to his own narration. The tragic fact of life by Pushkin: "[...] there is no truth on earth they say, // There is no truth in heaven either [...]" (Pushkin, "The Gypsies") is reduced to the comparison of two forms interdependent in the creative key of images. Mozart's and Salieri's figures complement one another, a variation of truth separation is created: into the true and the false, the craftiness and the obligation, the mastery and the copy. Actually the Yerofeyev's hero is partly autobiographical copy, partly literary forgery, a copy of the copy. In post-modernism it is called simulacrum, forgery, unreality, resemblance. Pushkin is transformed into the divine soul according to the Yerofeyev's poem heroes: "Drink, get drunk, but don't touch Pushkin!.. Drink everything, drink my blood, but don't tempt your God!" (Yerofeyev, "Moscow – Petushki"), – the tormented Evtjushkin shouts. Game simulation with the help of image – Pushkin-as-person, lyric-poet,

Evtjushkin-as-hero, heroine, author-as-demiurge, scripter – is carried out also on the phonetic level: “and still, perhaps, love is yearning”, which is corrected intermediately: “Within my soul has not quite burned away” (Pushkin, “The Gypsies”).

5. Conclusion

It is difficult not to agree that, “A term which continually refers to the impossibility of singularity, unity, and thus of unquestionable authority, intertextuality remains a potent tool within any reader’s theoretical vocabulary. By that same logic, however, it also remains a tool which cannot be employed by readers wishing to produce stability and order, or wishing to claim authority over the text or other critics” (Graham 2000, 209). Accordingly, attributively everything converges at the point of “bipolar artistic discourse” (Безруков 2009, 289–299). Pushkin’s authorship does not dominate Yerofeyev, but draws into unconscious dialog the communication which Pushkin couldn’t and which the author of “Moscow – Petushki” can’t do without. The text “Moscow – Petushki” ends as a non-point, non-final: “[...] and since I haven’t come to consciousness and I will never come” (Yerofeyev, “Moscow – Petushki”) while Pushkin has: “No, all I will not die - the soul in the sacred lyre // My ashes will survive [...]” (Pushkin, „The Gypsies”), which naturally creates intertextual situation: Erofeev-as-author, Erofeev-as-image, Erofeev-as-myth. At the same time, as Venichka notes: “everything in the world must happen slowly and it is wrong if the man cannot fence himself, if the man becomes sad and bewildered” (Yerofeyev, “Moscow – Petushki”), therefore, no personal “I”, “I” – above oneself, “I” – in the others, only “I” in oneself! The reader feels this note after reading the text (Izer 1976) and also after the reader’s adaptation period. Eternal life in an existential string, in love, in feelings is achieved by Pushkin and also by Erofeev in the creative impulse and implementation act: “And long the people yet will honour me // Because my lyre was tuned to loving-kindness...” (Pushkin, “The Monument”).

For Yerofeyev and for Pushkin there was nothing more beautiful and sincere than the text, the available amount of which dissolves in a multiplicity of creative bearings. Thus the limit of intertextual relationships convergence applies to the actual (present) contact side, to writing (as a productive act of reading) and to the convergence of voices – one’s own and someone else’s. Matrix unit of postmodern literature inherently drives to the reader’s expectations horizon, into the potential infinity of codes and sense diffractions.

References

- ARNOLD, I. V. [= Арнольд, И. В.] (1999), Семантика. Стилистика. Интертекстуальность. Санкт-Петербург.
 ВАХТИН, М. М. [= Бахтин, М. М.] (2002), Собрание сочинений. Т. 6. Москва.
 BARTHES, R. (1987), Criticism and truth. London.

- BEZRUKOV, A. N. [= Безруков, А. Н.] (2009), Смысловое формирование в системе дискурса. В: Czapiga, A./Czapiga, Z. (red.), Коммуникативные аспекты грамматики и текста. Rzeszow, 289–299.
- BEZRUKOV, A. N. [= Безруков, А. Н.] (2015), Рецепция художественного текста: функциональный подход. Вроцлав.
- BEZRUKOV, A. N. [= Безруков, А. Н.] (2016), Детерминация смысла «Благой вести» Вен. Ерофеева с позиций теории рецепции. В: Polilog. Studia Neofilologiczne. VI, 69–78.
- DERRIDA, J. (1978), *Writing and Difference*. London.
- ECO, U. (1984), *Semiotics and the philosophy of language*. Bloomington.
- GENETTE, G. (1997), *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Lincoln.
- ГРАНАМ, А. (2000), *Intertextuality*. London.
- ГРАНАМ, А. (2003), *Roland Barthes*. London.
- GREIMAS, A.J. (1983), *Structural Semantics: An Attempt at a Method*. Lincoln.
- GUATTARI, F. (2013), *Schizoanalytic cartographies*. London.
- ФАТЕЕВА, Н. А. [= Фатеева, Н. А.] (2007), Интертекст в мире текстов: контрапункт интертекстуальности. Москва.
- HOLQUIST, M. (1990), *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. London.
- ISER, W. (1976), *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore.
- JAMESON, F. (2002), *A Singular Modernity. Essay on the Ontology of the Present*. London.
- JAUSS, H.-R. (1982), *Aesthetic experience and literary hermeneutics*. Minneapolis.
- JAUSS, H.-R. (1982), *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Minneapolis.
- КИБУЗИНСКА, С. (2001), *Intertextual loops in modern drama*. Madison.
- КІКЛЕВИЧ, А. (2015), О коммуникативно-прагматических аспектах многозначности (2). В: *Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski*. VI/1, 167–179.
- КОРМАН, В. О. [= Корман, В. О.] (2006), *Теория литературы: избранные труды*. Ижевск.
- КРИСТЕВА, Ж. (1984), *Revolution in Poetic Language*. New York.
- КРИСТЕВА, Ж. [= Крестева, Ю.] (2004), *Избранные труды: Разрушение поэтики*. Москва.
- ЛИРОВЕТСКИЙ, М. Н. (1999), *Russian Postmodernist Fiction : Dialogue with Chaos*. London.
- ПЬЕГЕ-ГРО, Н. [= Пьеге-Гро, Н.] (2008), *Введение в теорию интертекстуальности*. Москва.
- ПУШКИН, А. С. [= Пушкин, А. С.] (1993), *Собрание сочинений*. Т. 2. Санкт-Петербург.
- СМИРНОВ, И. П. [= Смирнов, И. П.] (1995), *Порождение интертекста (Элементы интертекстуального анализа с примерами из творчества Б. Л. Пастернака)*. Санкт-Петербург.
- ЯМПОЛЬСКИЙ, М. В. [= Ямпольский, М. В.] (1993), *Память Тиресия. Интертекстуальность и кинематограф*. Москва.
- ЕРОФЕЕВ, В. В. [= Ерофеев, В. В.] (2001), *Собрание сочинений*. Т. 1. Москва.