

Specifics of reading intertext

Nana Gabadadze

School "Mermisi", Kutaisi, 4600, Georgia

Email: gabadadze@gmail.com

DOI: [10.56580/GEOMEDI0009](https://doi.org/10.56580/GEOMEDI0009)

Abstract

The material presented in the article focuses on intertextuality indicators, which can be both conventional and explicit. We emphasize the interest of the reader in trying to understand an inter text whose interpretation depends not on its erudition but on a thought strategy, a combination of collective and individual memory, which reveals, the life-giving ability of national linguistic and literary traditions.

Keywords

Intellectuality, reading, author, reader, cognition

Main Text

The main feature of intertextuality is the rejection of the linearity of the text. Every reader encounters the greatest resistance when reading an intertextual work. He is faced with the greatest dilemma, whether to continue reading a given work or to re-read the "first source" of a "familiar" work and then to begin a comparison study [1; 5].

When reading an intertextual work, we become a kind of accomplice of the narrator-author of the text, who can guess our opinion in the style of narration of the given text, and decipher the text field in the field of meanings of the existing work, so our main task is not Different forms and levels of reading, different dimensions of reading. What will help us in this? Of course the intertextuality indicators are very noticeable in the intertext. They are indicated by topographic signs, italics, and quotation marks, even semantic layers.

Explosive and implicit indicators are noticeable in the intertext. If we talk about the latter, then we are referring to the set of associations that abound in the intertext. If we are more specific and discuss implicit indicators in detail, then we need to talk about stylistic-lexical differences, the list of which will take us far. According to Michael Sifeter, the "trace of intertext" is not only in the "heterogeneity of the text, but also in its grammaticality", which

is considered as "any textual fact" that disrupts the reading culture of the reader even if its form of existence is implied/La France ad "Intertexte"/. Such aggression is always noticeable as "violation of the norm or inconsistency with the context." All this forces the reader to search for the intertext, to escape the difficulties, to save his memory and to compare the common fragmentation between them from the totality of different works. We, in the intertext, look for a particularly "rare" word that sounds different but with some similarities to different authors.

Thus, reader memory is the mainstay of intertext. What, then, can the reader of "lazy memory" do? The author of any intertext tries to count his work on his loyal readers, to force it to focus on the heterogeneity of semantic fields in the latter intertext, and to subject the reader of "lazy memory" to the intertextual connections existing in his creation.

We can conclude that the intertextuality rates are quite different from each other. They can be both congenital and explicit. But it is not uncommon for the reader to try to understand the intertextual indicators in the works of this or that author. Therefore, discovery, identification, and intertext interpretation are often highly interrelated, while intertextual content, which is associated with some constraint on reading mode, allows for hyperinterpretation. It is difficult to prove the objectivity of intertext, which may turn out to be a subjective impression of the reader or a memory error.

As for the interpretation of the intertext, it depends not on the erudition of the reader, but on his thought strategy. It is a kind of connection with the collective and individual memory, which reveals the vitality of the national-linguistic and literary traditions. The intertext is a guide to the diversity of interpretations of thought fields from the perspective of the centuries to the 21st century.

Here the reader is not asked for a certain level of in-depth knowledge and understanding of something. The intertext only activates certain thoughts. It forces the reader to know in the work what is in it, only to be surprised. He draws attention to the ambiguity of the intertext, but it is also noteworthy that the literary culture of the intertext is often inaccurate. Some thought from the text may even go unnoticed by us, and it is at this time that the reader comes to the aid of the author, no matter how surprising it may sound.

It is in a single dialogue mode with the author's knowledge and memory, which is a constant in evoking other texts in the new text. This argues that intertexts created in different eras are intertwined with each other by a certain mechanism that forces the reader to recognize the indicators of intertextuality in this or that work, which in a completely different way represent

the complex relationship between the text reader and history. Intertextuality in this triad sets its own cognition parameters.

We ask the question: how do we define intertextual memory and then the thinking that comes from it? What place do they occupy when creating this or that work and then reading it?

The narrative process, the so-called. Creative burning, with different authors. Any author is the inheritor of a unified world memory, which is distinguished by the similarity of metonymic character and intertextual form:

Encyclopedic knowledge in the intertext emphasizes not the stock of the reader's knowledge, but his memory, which is surrounded by countless texts. They emphasize in space the invariance of space, the variability of location. The facts presented may have been so varied in the labyrinths of the centuries that we could not even find traces of intertext in them.

The intertext is a kind of circle where the subject, the narrative style, the place and the memory are closely related to each other. The variability of the "I" connects space and time in the intertext, emphasizing the dynamism of the subject. It is a bridge to the past and the present. The author of the intertext tries to penetrate, as it should not sound paradoxical, into the labyrinths of the future reader's memory, which will inevitably be a carrier of a certain culture and tradition, while modernity, existence is the fact of the existence of the "I".

We have evidence that any text created on the engrams of various works that reject non-textual reality does not value the "burning" process of literary creation.

The word is dialogic in its essence, and the dialogical relationship is the true sphere of the existence of language, concludes M. M. Bakhtin. This means that verbal expressions in intertextual works express different positions of the subject, which in turn are bounded by different contexts and views. Here any expression of the subject elicits an active reaction from the addressee. Every new author's word is subject to the echoes of different authors's words, but with new layers of its meanings it enriches the new semantic field, presents its subjective views, exposes different positions to the meaning of the new word, agrees or disagrees with the meanings of foreign words in the semantic field. Trying to imagine a new subcontinent; It's a kind of dialogue, as M. M. Bakhtin explains the "human soul", Etimon, the inner "I", self-knowledge.

The main characteristic of the "inner man" is human freedom. We can not place any special hopes on him. Man is his own master and he often has to break some of the laws that surround him. Man never repeats himself, therefore, the existence of any human being presupposes the

coincidence with the latter, the erasure of all limitations, the awareness of the existing being the definition of its deep layers without its own participation. This is why, as long as man is free, he always seeks in the bosom of the word his final word [5; p. 65].

MM Bakhtin's dialogue is a process of furious struggle between "Mesa" and "others". Any person is looking for an "accomplice" in another person, but only faces the enemy of his freedom, falling into conflict with him. On the other hand, the "other person", who does not have the power and ability to penetrate into the "inner truth" of another individual, submits to his inclination to the "other" and ... remains tempered: it is a kind of fragile reality between "mesa" and "other" and for some time it even disappears over time. Its basis is the difference of word, thought and world, a different perception.

Existence seems to be torn in two. "I" and "other" is the final word of the individual, it always depends on the evaluation of the other, where the intellect is less taken into account. It is a kind of dialogical confrontation with a group of views united by other non-common goals.

This "disagreement" is heterogeneous, fundamentally different, and contradictory. It often leads to the formation of common values that do not disrupt the polyphonic universes, only cognition and self-cognition are endowed with solid responsibilities. Characteristic feature of Bakhtin subject. This contradiction with Julia Kristeva is read in the texts and discourse. It is the result of the transformation of other texts, where intertextuality and intersubjectivity even disappear [6; p. 167].

Therefore, the intertext requires a special mode of reading, form, presentation of other conditions of cognition to the reader, consideration of different positions, cognition of the individual cognitive system based on intertextuality, other cognition of the world picture, which includes universal national culture, linguistic layers, world, author. It is a new way of being and seeing the Creator. It is the subject - the addressee and the text - the contrast of the context, where the subject seems to disappear from our sight, but any text is meant.

References

1. Лоран Ж. Стратегия формы. М. 1984.
2. Ин. А. Кузьмина. Интертекст и его роль в процессе эволюции поэтического языка.
3. Бахтин М.М. «Проблемы поэтики Достоевского. Соб. сог. 7м. т. 6. М. 1987».
4. Гаспаров М. Л. избр. труды Т.П. М. «Языки русской культуры» М. 1997)
5. Бахтин М.М «Проблемы поэтики Достоевского» собр. сог. 7т. т.6. М. 1987
6. Кристева. ГЕЗБР. Труды.