D.I. Xodjayeva
BSU
PhD

Go'zal Jo'rayeva
BSU
M.A student

THE INTERTEXTUALITY IN THE LITERARY DISCOURSE

Abstract: The article presents a comprehensive study of the notion of intertextuality, its usage and the role in a study of literary discourse. Functions and types of intertextuality in the literary discourse are analyzed in this article.
Key words: intertextuality, literary discource, intersubjectivity, cognitology, semiosphere, types of intertextuality, genres, paralogues, functional approach.
Language: English
Citation: Xodjayeva, D. I., & Jo'rayeva, G. (2020). The intertextuality in the literary discourse. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 06 (86), 538-544.
Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-86-99   Doi: crossref https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.06.86.99
Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Richard Nordquist introduces intertextuality as self-reliant states in which texts relate to one another (as well as to the culture in general) to produce meaning. A central idea of modern literary and developmental theory, intertextuality has its fundament in 20th century linguistics, specifically in the work of Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913). The term itself was offered by the Bulgarian-French philosopher and psycologist Julia Kristeva in the 1960s.

The term "intertextuality" is borrowed from the Latin *intertexto*, meaning to intermingle while weaving. In scientific researches such as "Word, Dialogue, and Novel," Kristeva broke with traditional notions of the author's influences and the text's references, positing that all signifying systems, from table settings to poems, are constituted by the manner in which they transform earlier signifying systems.

The notion "intertextuality" has been derived and altered many times since it was offered by the poststructuralist Julia Kristeva in 1966. As philosopher William Irwin wrote, the term "has come to have almost as many meanings as users, from those faithful to Kristeva's original vision to those who simply use it as a stylish way of talking about allusion and influence".

Kristeva's understanding of "intertextuality" shows an attempt to combine Ferdinand de Saussure's semiotics which is his on the the most significant researches of how signs derive their meaning within the arrangement of a text. For Kristeva, the concept of intertextuality changes the concept of intersubjectivity, when we comprehend that signification is not borrowed directly from author to reader but on the other hand is filtered through, or mediated by, "codes" conveyed to the writer and reader by different texts. For instance, when we read James Joyce's *Ulysses* we understand it as a modernist literary investigation, or as a response to the epic heritage, or as part of some other discourse, or as part of all of these dialogues at once. This intertextual view of literature, as represented by Roland Barthes, reinforces the notion that the meaning of a text does not exist in the text, but is represented by the reader in connection not only to the text in question, but to the complicated system of connections of texts appeal to the reading process.

More recent post-structuralist theory, such as that formulated in Daniela Caselli's *Beckett's Dantes: Intertextuality in the Fiction and Criticism*, re-examines "intertextuality" as a production within texts, rather than as a series of relationships between different texts. Some postmodern theorists like to talk

about the relationship between "intertextuality" and "hypertextuality"; intertextuality makes each text a "living hell of hell on earth" and part of a larger mosaic of texts, just as each hypertext can be a web of links and part of the whole World-Wide Web. Indeed, the World-Wide Web has been theorized as a unique realm of reciprocal intertextuality, in which no particular text can claim centrality, yet the Web text eventually produces an image of a community--the group of people who write and read the text using specific discursive strategies.

One can also make distinctions between the notions of "intertext", "hypertext" and "supertext". As a hypertext it consists of links to different articles within itself and also every individual trajectory of reading it. As a supertext it combines male and female versions of itself, as well as three mini-dictionaries in each of the versions.

In "Merriam-Webster Dictionary" intertextuality is defined as "the complex interrelationship between a text and other texts taken as basic to the creation or interpretation of the text".

In "Nation Mater Encyclopaedia" intertextuality is defined as the shaping of texts' meanings by other texts. It can refer to an author's borrowing and transformation of a prior text or to a reader's referencing of one text in reading another.

Intertextuality means the shaping of texts' meanings by other texts. Or the study of the way in which text of one poem may relate to the text of another poem. It can also be defined as the relationship between texts.

I. Forms of intertextuality and linguistic means of its fulfilment

Semiotic and synergetic interpretation of discourse provides integration of achievements in linguistics, cognitology, semiotics and synergetics. It offers opportunities for comprehensive review of literary work functioning in the semiosphere (semiosphere is a set of sign systems, including text, language and culture in general). This approach is universal because it is appropriate for the description of different types of discourse. The approach doesn't contradict conventional theories of discourse analysis, it's based on generally accepted linguistic statements and it supplements modern scientific theories and research guidelines. Besides, the approach is dynamic and open for further development.

In this research discourse as a constituent part of the semiosphere is considered to be the developing synergetic system that has the following basic principles of organization: hierarchical structure, instability, nonlinear nature, emergence, symmetric/ asymmetric property and openness. Taking into consideration hierarchical structure, the semiosphere consists of micro- (intertext), macro- (discourse), mega- (interdiscourse) levels: interdiscoursive

semiosphere is formed by a diverse set of discourses, each of them consists of many intertexts .

The system "intertext – discourse – interdiscourse" is characterized by instability due to changes in the intertextual inclusions that lead to the discourse transformation which, in turn, affects interdiscourse of the semiosphere as a whole. The property of openness allows the system to evolve from simple to complex state because each hierarchical level acquires an opportunity to develop and become complicated. Meanwhile discourse is characterized by the emergence that provides the appearance of spontaneously occurring properties that are non-relevant for certain hierarchical levels (intertext, discourse or interdiscourse), but peculiar to the system as a holistic functional formation. Due to its inherent non-linearity and instability textual environment is considered as unpredictable, but it is always ready to create new semantic variations. Dominant meaning synchronizes symmetric (which are in dynamic equilibrium) and asymmetric (which are in the dynamic disequilibrium) system elements; it is the creative attractor that organizes discourse.

In linguistics there are several forms of intertextuality inerrability and presupposition. Inerrability refers to the "repeatability" of certain textual fragments, to citation in its broadest sense to include not only explicit allusions, references, and quotations within a discourse, but also unannounced sources and influences, clichés, phrases in the air, and traditions. That is to say, every discourse is composed of "traces," pieces of other texts that help constitute its meaning. Presupposition refers to assumptions a text makes about its referent, its readers, and its context – to portions of the text which are read, but which are not explicitly *there*. *Once upon a time* is a trace rich in rhetorical presupposition, signaling to even the youngest reader the opening of a fictional narrative. Texts not only refer to but in fact contain other texts.

R. S. Miola separated seven types of intertextuality:

1) Revision. This type of intertextuality features a close relationship between anterior and posterior texts, wherein the latter takes identity from the former, even as it departs from it. The process occurs under the guiding and explicitly comparative eye of the revising author. The revision may be prompted by external circumstance - censorship, or theatrical, legal, or material exigencies. Alternatively, the revision may simply reflect an author's subsequent wishes. The reviser who is not the author presents another scenario and an entirely different set of problems and considerations. In all cases, however, the transaction is linear, conscious, and specific, marked by evidence of the reviser's preference and intentionality.

2) Translation. Translation transfers, 'carries across', a text into a different language, recreate it anew. The later text explicitly claims the identity of

the original, its chief project an etiological journey to itself, or to a version of itself. Translations are generally grouped according to source language, and judged by standards of 'fidelity', i. e., the closeness of the rendering to the original and the success of the translator in representing the original's literary quality and effects. But the usual distinctions among translation verbatim, paraphrase, and metaphrase, deflect attention from the real difficulty inherent in this type of intertextuality – namely the unbridgeable cultural and linguistic spaces between languages and cultures.

3) Quotation. Quotation literally reproduces the anterior text (whole or part) in a later text. Quotations may be variously marked for reader recognition, by typographical signals, by a switch in language, for example, or by the actual identification of the original author or text.

4) Sources. Source texts provide plot, character, idea, language, or style to later texts. The author's reading and remembering directs the transaction, which may include complicated strategies of *imitatio.* The source text in various ways shapes the later text, its content, or its rhetorical style and form. There are at least three subdivisions possible here.

The source coincident. Here the earlier text exists as a whole in dynamic tension with the later one, a part of its identity. The later one may simply respond to an earlier one: Ralegh writes a famous reply to Marlowe's Passionate Shepherd, for example. Gabriel Harvey and Thomas Nashe engage in a pamphlet war. The serious literature of controversy, political and religious, employs extensive quotation and reference so that the originating text and present response take on a new identity.

The source proximate. This is the most familiar and frequently studied kind of intertextuality, that of sources and texts. The source functions as the book on-the-desk; the author honours, reshapes, steals, ransacks, and plunders. The dynamics include copying, paraphrase, compression, conflation, expansion, omission, innovation, transference, and contradiction. Shakespeare's use of North's Plutarch in *Julius Caesar* provides a good example of a proximate source.

The source remote. This last term includes all sources and influences that are not clearly marked, or that do not coincide with the book-on-the-desk model. The field of possibilities here widens to include all that an author previously knew or read: grammar-school texts, classical stories and authors, the Bible, evident in allusions, turns of phrase, or re-appropriated motifs. The dynamic still consists of reading and remembering, even if the process of recollection and re-articulation occurs in the subconscious mind of the author. Remote sources often include the work of particularly original, earlier playwrights: Thomas Kyd, for example, who readapted Senecan conventions to the Elizabethan stage.

5) Conventions and configurations. Poets constantly appropriated and adapted numerous conventions from classical, medieval, and continental literatures, formal and rhetorical. Senecan conventions in tragedy, the chorus, messenger, domina-nutrix dialogue, stichomythia, and soliloquy, for example, have all attracted due attention. So have Plautine and Terentian conventions in comedy: eavesdropping, disguise, lockouts, stock characters like the witty slave, bragging soldier, blocking *senex,* and so on. Configurations of classical character and situation also appear importantly in the drama: Shakespeare adapts the New Comedic triangle consisting of importunate *adulescens,* blocking *senex,* and nubile *virgo* into marvellous, varied, and expressive tensions throughout his career.

6) Genres. These may appear in individual signifiers (e.g., the play-within-the-play of revenge tragedy, the singing shepherds in pastoral), which function much like conventions, or range to broader and less discrete forms. On the far end of the spectrum often a sophistication and smoothness of adaptation makes difficult positive identification of origins: Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* absorbs classical, medieval, and contemporary works into a new creation; Milton yokes and challenges epical and Biblical traditions in *Paradise Lost.*

One Shakespearean example may demonstrate the subtlety and evocative power of generic intertextuality. No one has ever successfully proved that Shakespeare ever read a single line of Petrarch's *Canzoniere. Yet* any reader of Shakespeare's sonnet sequence or *Love's Labour's Lost* recognizes an intimate familiarity with the conventions and genre that Petrarch (along with Dante and others) originated. These conventions and assumptions, in turn, Shakespeare further adapts in *Romeo and Juliet,* where Petrarch is appropriately invoked by Mercutio. Romeo in love with Rosaline seems to be conventional Petrarchan lover, full of fanciful and literary paradoxes:

Why, then, O brawling love! O loving hate,
O anything of nothing first create,
O heavy lightness, serious vanity,
Misshapen chaos of well-seeming forms,
Feather of lead, bright smoke, cold fire, sick health,
Still-waking sleep, that is not what it is!

And Romeo, in love with Juliet, appears to outgrow all this. Yet, in the last act we find various Petrarchan images and *topoi* assembling themselves into new paradoxes; in different senses we witness on stage the misshapen chaos of well-seeming forms, the still-waking sleep, that is not what it is.

7) Paralogues. Paralogues are texts that illuminate the intellectual, social, theological, or political meanings in other texts. Unlike texts or even traditions, paralogues move horizontally and analogically in discourses rather than in vertical

lineation through the author's mind or intention. Today, critics can adduce any contemporary text in conjunction with another, without bothering at all about verbal echo, or even imprecise lines of foliation. In some ways the discussion of paralogues departs from past critical practices, bringing new freedom; but, of course, new perils threaten: rampant and irresponsible association, facile cultural generalization, and anecdotal, impressionistic historicizing.

II. Intertextuality as a literary device

Intertextuality is a sophisticated literary device used in writing. In fact, it is a textual reference within some text that reflects the text used as a reference. Instead of employing referential phrases from different literary works, intertextuality draws upon the concept, rhetoric or ideology from other texts to be merged in the new text. It may be the retelling of an old story, or you may rewrite the popular stories in modern context for instance, James Joyce retells *The Odyssey* in his very famous novel *Ulysses*.

Although both these terms seem similar to each other, they are slightly different in their meanings, because an allusion is a brief and concise reference that a writer uses in another narrative without affecting the storyline. Intertextuality, on the other hand, uses the reference of the full story in another text or story as its backbone.

Intertextuality Examples from Literature include as follows:

Example 1: Wide Sargasso Sea by Jean Rhys.

In his novel, *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Jean Rhys gathers some events occurred in the famous novel the novel, *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Bronte. The purpose is to tell the readers an alternative tale. Rhys presents the wife of Mr. Rochester, who played the role of a secondary character in *Jane Eyre* setting of this novel is Jamaica not England, and author develops the back-story for his major character. While spinning the novel, *Jane Eyre,* she gives her interpretation amid the narrative by addressing issues such as roles of women, colonization and racism that Bronte did not point out in her novel otherwise.

Example 2. A Tempest by Aime Cesaire.

Aime Cesaire's play, *A Tempest* is an adaptation of *The Tempest* by William Shakespeare. The author parodies Shakespeare's play from post-colonial point of view. Cesaire also changes the occupations and races of his characters. For example, he transforms the occupation of Prospero, who was a magician, and changes him into a slave-owner, and also changes Ariel in Mulatto, though he was a spirit. Cesaire, like Rhys, makes use of a famous work of literature, and put a spin on it in order to express the themes of power, slavery and colonialism.

Example 3. Lord of the Flies by William Golding.

William Golding in his novel, *Lord of the Flies,* takes the story implicitly from *Treasure Island* written by Robert Louis Stevenson. However, Golding has utilized the concept of adventures, which young boys love to use on the isolated island they were stranded on. He, however, changes the narrative into a cautious tale, rejecting glorified stories of Stevenson concerning exploration and swash buckling. Instead, Golding grounds this novel in bitter realism by demonstrating negative implications of savagery and fighting that could take control of human hearts, because characters have lost the idea of civilization.

Example 4. The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe by C.S. Lewis.

In this case, C.S. Lewis adapts the Christ's crucifixion in his fantasy novel, *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. He, very shrewdly, weaves together the religious and entertainment themes for a children book. Lewis uses an important event from *The New Testament* and transforms into a story about redemption. In doing so, he uses Edmund, a character that betrays his saviour, Aslan, to suffer. Generally, the motive of this theme is to introduce other themes such as evil actions, losing innocence and redemption.

Example 5. For Whom the Bell Tolls by Earnest Hemingway In the following example, Hemingway uses intertextuality for the title of his novel. He takes the title of a poem, Meditation XVII written by John Donne. The excerpt of this poem reads: "No man is an island… and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee." Hemingway not only uses this excerpt for the title of his novel, he also makes use of the idea in the novel, as he clarifies and elaborates the abstract philosophy of Donne by using the concept of Spanish Civil War. By the end, the novel expands other themes such as loyalty, love and camaraderie.

Majority of the writers borrow ideas from the previous works to give a layer of meanings to their works. In fact, when readers read the new text with reflection of another literary work, all related assumptions, effects and ideas of other text provide them a different meaning and changes the technique of interpretation of the original piece. Since readers take influence from other texts, and while reading new texts they sift through archives, this device gives them relevance and clarifies their understanding of the new texts. For writers, intertextuality allows them to open new perspectives and possibilities to construct their story. Thus, writers may explore a particular ideology in their narrative by discussing recent rhetoric in the original text

III. Intertextuality in translation

Intertextuality is a quality of any literary text and represents the ability of a text to accumulate information not only directly from the personal experience, but also indirectly from other texts,

Clarivate
Analytics indexed

intertextuality is an ontological quality of any text, and, first of all – fictional. It is intertextuality that determines adoption of a fictional text into the process of the literary evolution. It means that fictional writing becomes a text only when its intertextuality is being actualized. In the fictional text intertextuality is actualized by the usage of the author of so-called "intertextual inclusions", to be more exact, by the usage of intertextual elements. In the process of translation of a fictional text, translation of the intertextual elements requires a special attention of a translator, and these facts allow us to identify intertextual element as a unit of translation.

Intextextual elements are "multifunctional: they increase time frames and cultural space of the text", thus making basis for creation of the multiple associations; they can be the means to express evaluation (as a way to affect by evaluation, which is made not directly, but with the help of the precedent texts), they can also be used to strengthen arguments or to create irony. Inclusion of the existing texts into new forms and their cultural and literal transformation at different levels give us the opportunity to consider intertextual elements as the most important part of intertextuality, which is defined by the reference of the text elements to the precedent facts. On the one hand, intertextuality is associated with ways of signification and labelling at the structural level, on the other – with the creation of associations aimed at the textual and the discursive levels.

A text with intertextual elements is always stylistically marked, as intertextual elements may lose connection with a source text, becoming, thus, the speech stereotypes. Thus, the preservation of intertextual element in the process of translating a literary text is a necessary condition for the equivalent translation, which allows us to consider intertextual element as a unit of translation.

In the modern translation studies, the problem of defining a unit of translation is one of the most debatable and difficult. R.K. Minyar-Beloruchev identifies two possible approaches to understanding of units of translation in the aspect of intertextuality:

1) "Semantic" approach in the isolation of the units of translation enables us to follow the source text strictly. The author notes that the very isolation of the units of translation at the same time, like any other segmentation of the text is, firstly, linear, and secondly, has subjective nature. Among the supporters of the "semantic" approach are the following researchers: J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet, Y.S. Stepanov, A.F. Shiryaev, R.K. Minyar-Beloruchev, V. Alimov, V.N. Comissarov, T. Kazakova and others.

In determining the principles of selection of the units of translation T. Kazakova believes that "the main condition for the correct determination of the initial units of translation is identification of the textual features of a unit". In the process of defining the units of translation in a source text, the text should be evaluated in terms of relations that determine content or the structural and functional properties of its constituent words. The author notes that the unit of translation may be a segment of words to the text.

According to R.K. Minyar-Beloruchev, to provide the units of translation, and therefore make a list of possible solutions in advance for all the cases in the practice of translation is impossible. These units can be any unit of speech, requiring a separate decision during the process of translation. The provision of such units of speech is also determined by the conditions of work.

2) "Functional" approach to the defining of the units of translation is featured by such authors such as Y.I. Retsker, L.S. Barkhudarov, S. Tyulenev, V. Sdobnikov etc. These researchers are based upon the proposition that every minimal amount of source code that executes in any function must have its compliance in the translation. And such a minimal amount of time is determined only by comparing the original text with the translated text. The functional approach allows us to speak about the translation of units mainly in the presence of inconsistencies between the source and target texts.

Thus, in the process of translation of the intertextual element from one language into another a translator should:

1) identify the intertextual element in the fictional text;

2) choose an appropriate variant of translation.

These terms and conditions are necessary to keep the meaning of the intertextual element in the translated text, as intertextual element as a unit of translation requires a separate translation solutions. When intertextual element is not identified in the original text, there may be a mistake in the choice of the unit of translation, and it may lead to disturbance of the equivalency of the translated text.

IV. Conclusions

The following research explores articles, scientific works and research conducted on the theme of intertextuality. The sources, however vary in their definitions of the intertextual notion, its forms and linguistic means of its realization. For instance, some sources define intertextuality as the determination of text meanings through other texts, others offer the notion of the complex relations between a text and other texts, and sometimes intertextuality was considered as a plagiarism. However this negative assumption didn't affect the final decision which is that intertextuality is extremely important in the total understanding of any literary text.

This article highlights seven types of intertextuality which are translation, revision, quotation, sources, conventions and configurations, genres and paralogues. What is more, there were

shown three types of intertextual frames and some of the means with the help of which intertextuality can be created. Every notion is supported by the example and comments on the each unit.

It can be clearly seen from the research that intertextuality conducts a double focus. On the one hand, it attracts attention to the importance of the text which were used for intertextual creation, but on the other hand intertextuality leads readers to understanding of the prior texts as a contributions to a code which only makes possible the various effects of significance.

Numerous studies have been conducted on various facets of intertextuality as a literary device, and it is often compared to allusion, however intertextuality uses the references of the story in total in another text. This idea is supported by five examples and proved.

Considering a question of intertextuality in translation it can be defined as one of the most debatable and difficult. Two possible approaches to understanding the units of translation are defined in the intertextual context and seven definitions of the intertextuality translation are offered. In addition, the process of translation should include the identification of the intertextual elements and a choice of the appropriate variant of translation.

Finally, the theoretical research of the intertextuality has shown that intertextuality includes appeal to already created text and the most popular intertextual elements include allusion, quotation, translation and duplication. By the comparative analysis which was conducted, it can be seen that intertextual elements are used mainly in literary sources. On the assumption that there are no unique methods of transferring or rendering the intertextual elements inn translation, they can represent some difficulty when translating the source text into the target one.

References:

1. Arnol`d, I.V. (1993). *Chitatel`skoe vosprijatie intertekstual`nosti i germenevtika. Intertekstual`nye svjazi v hudozhestvennom tekste: mezhvuz. sb. nauch. tr,* (pp.4-12). SPb.: Izd-vo RGPU im. A.I. Gercena.

2. Bojko, L.B. (2006). K voprosu o perevode interteksta. *Vestnik Rossijskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. I. Kanta*, Vyp.2: ser. Filologicheskie nauki, (pp.52-59). Kaliningrad.

3. Denisova, G. (2001). *Intertekstual`nost` i semiotika perevoda: vozmozhnosti i sposoby peredachi inteksta.* Tekst. Intertekst. Kul`tura: Sbornik dokladov mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii (Moskva, 4-7 aprelja goda). Rossijskaja akademija nauk. In-t rus. jaz. im. V.V. Vinogradova; Red.-sost.: V.P. Grigor`ev, N.A. Fateeva. (pp.112-128). Moscow: Azbukovnik.

4. Chernjavskaja, V.E. (2009). *Lingvistika teksta: Polikodovost`, intertekstual`nost`, interdiskursivnost`.* Uchebnoe posobie, (p.248). Moscow: Knizhnyj dom «LIBROKOM».

5. Allen, G. (n.d.). *Intertextuality* [Electronic resource]. The Literary Encyclopedia. Retrieved from http://www.litencyc.com/php/stopics.php?rec=true&UID=1229.

6. Bendixen, A. (2010). *The Emergence and Development of the American Short Story.* A companion to the American short story / [ed. A. Bendixen, J. Nagel], (p.3-19). N. Y.; L.: John Wiley&Sons Ltd.

7. Jingxia, L. (2013). Intertextual Techniques in Advertisements. *International Journal of Innovative Interdisciplinary Research*, Issue 211, pp.11-19.

8. Keep, Ch., McLaughlin, T., & Parmar, R. (n.d.). *Intertextuality* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from http://www2.iath.virginia.edu/elab/hfl0278.html

9. Klages, M. (n.d.). *Postmodernism* [Electronic resource]. Access available at: Retrieved from http: www.colorado.edu/English/ENGL2012Klagespomo.html.

10. Klimovich, N.V. (2012). Intertextual Element as a Unit of Translation. *Journal of Siberian Federal University.* Humanities and Social Sciences, Issue 4, pp.500-505.

11. Robert, M.S. (n.d.). *Seven types of intertextuality* [Electronic resource] - Access available at: Retrieved from http://loyolanotredamelib.org/Chaired/docs/SevenTypesIntextuality-04.pdf.

12. Niknasab, L. (n.d.). *Translation and Culture: Allusions as Culture Bumps* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI05/pdf_doc/03.pdf.

13. Nordquist, R. (n.d.). [Electronic resource]. Access available at: Retrieved from http://grammar.about.com/od/il/g/Intertextuality.htm.

14. Olizko, N. S. (2012). *Semiotico-synergetic interpretation of discourse* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from http://www.rusnauka.com/29_NIOXXI_/Philol ogia/3_116975.doc.htm.

15. Porter, E.J. (n.d.). *Intertextuality and the Discourse Community* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from http://grammar.about.com/od/il/g/Intertextuality .htm.

16. Wilson J. (n.d.). *Characteristics of English Literature* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from http://www.ehow.com/list_6566183_characteris tics-english-literature.html.

17. (n.d.). *Allusion* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from http://literarydevices.net/allusion/.

18. (n.d.). *Ben-Hur: A Tale of the Christ* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ben-Hur:_A_Tale_of_the_Christ.

19. (n.d.). *Camelot* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Camelot.

20. (n.d.). *Duchess* (Alice's Adventures in Wonderland) [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Duchess_(Alice% 27s_Adventures_in_Wonderland).

21. (n.d.). *Encyclopaedia Britannica* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from http://www.britannica.com.

22. (n.d.). *Eye of Providence* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eye_of_Providenc e.

23. (n.d.). *Intertextual* [Electronic resource], Access available at: Retrieved from http://www.gutenberg.us/articles/intertexual.

24. (n.d.). *Intertextuality - Literary Devices* [Electronic resource], Access available at: literarydevices.net/intertextuality.