

<https://doi.org/10.28925/2412-2491.2024.2218>

UDC 821.111-2.09:141.78

FORMS OF INTERTEXTUALITY IN A POSTMODERN PLAY (A CASE STUDY OF “OLD MONEY” BY WENDY WASSERSTEIN)

Ostropalchenko Y. V.

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University
ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9831-2288>
y.ostropalchenko@kubg.edu.ua



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

The article analyses the forms of intertextuality in postmodern dramaturgy based on the material of Wendy Wasserstein's play “Old Money”. Postmodernism, as a cultural paradigm, is characterized by complex relations with its own history and traditions. The purpose of the article is to identify the main forms of intertextuality used by the author in the play “Old Money”.

The article examines the concept of intertextuality as a key aspect of literary analysis, which includes both conscious and unconscious processes of interconnection between different texts. It is noted that intertextuality is not limited to the conscious choice of the writer; the latter acts as a mediator between texts, and his thinking is formed from various clichés, the reinterpretation of which creates an original view.

In the studied play “Old Money”, Wasserstein actively refers to the texts of world literature and uses both implicit and explicit forms of intertextuality. Contextual and pre-textual forms are explored, including biographical intertextuality, allusions to famous texts, ancient and Shakespearean allusions, references to historical terms of events, and quotations. Particular attention is paid to the contextual form of intertextuality through the analysis of the title of the play, which implies the plot. The main forms of intertextuality in the play were revealed. In addition, the analysis of intertextual connections shed light on the specificity and value of the author's own creative method, revealing his cultural and intellectual preferences. The approaches to intertextuality in the plays “Old Money” and “Arcadia” are compared and common features of the use of references and allusions are highlighted. and connections that add depth and complexity to the plays, stimulating interpretation and reflection among readers.

Key words: *intertextuality, postmodernism, allusion, hypertextuality, drama.*

Остропальченко Ю. Форми інтертекстуальності у постмодерній п'єсі (на прикладі "Old Money" Венді Вассерштайн)

Дослідження присвячено аналізу форм інтертекстуальності у драматургії постмодернізму на матеріалі п'єси Венді Вассерштайн "Old Money". Постмодернізм, як культурна парадигма, відзначається складними відносинами з

власною історією та традиціями. Метою статті є виявити основні форми інтертекстуальності, які використовує автор у тексті "Old Money".

У статті розглядається поняття інтертекстуальності як ключового аспекту літературного аналізу, що включає як свідомі, так і несвідомі процеси взаємозв'язку між різними текстами. Зазначається, що інтертекстуальність не обмежується свідомим вибором письменника; останній виступає посередником між текстами, а його мислення формується з різних кліше, переосмислення яких створює оригінальний погляд.

У досліджуваній п'єсі "Old Money", Вассерштайн активно посилається на тексти світової літератури та використовує як імпліцитні, так і експліцитні форми інтертекстуальності. Досліджуються контекстуальні та передтекстові форми, зокрема біографічна інтертекстуальність, аллюзії до відомих текстів, античні та шекспірівські аллюзії, посилання на історичні терміни події та цитати. Особлива увага приділяється контекстуальній формі інтертекстуальності через аналіз заголовку п'єси, який передбачає сюжет. Було виявлено основні форми інтертекстуальності у п'єсі. Крім того, аналіз інтертекстуальних зв'язків пролив світло на специфіку та цінність творчого методу самого автора, розкриваючи його культурні та інтелектуальні вподобання. Порівнюються підходи до інтертекстуальності у п'єсах "Old Money" і "Arcadia" та виокремлюються спільні риси використання посилань, аллюзій та зв'язків, що додають п'єсам глибину та складність, що стимулює читачів до інтерпретації та рефлексії.

Ключові слова: інтертекстуальність, постмодернізм, аллюзія, гіпертекстуальність, драматургія.

Introduction. The study of intertextuality in drama is relevant in modern literary studies, as it helps reveal the complex relationships between different narratives, identify the influence of earlier written texts on contemporary books, and understand the cultural and intellectual context in which they exist.

Intertextuality is one of the characteristic features of postmodernism discourse. The key to this phenomenon is the category of "palimpsest" introduced by structuralist J. Genette in his study "Palimpsests. Literature in the Second Degree" (Genette, 1997), which describes a text created on the basis of other texts through which its semantics emerges. Intertextuality includes not only explicit or hidden quotations, but also the use of allusions, references, reminiscences, traditional motifs, plots, images, actualization of cultural codes and genre connections. Classical literature is most often used as a background of intertextual ties, in which Shakespearean characters ("Desdemona", 1994) and plots ("Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead", 1966) are borrowed, styles and genres of other playwrights ("The Crimes of the Heart", 1979) are imitated.

The interaction between the postmodern paradigm and dramatic art is a complex problem, the solution to which we seek by studying the phenomenon of "new drama". It gained the status of a term referring to drama in which the main emphasis is placed on the internal actions of the work, as opposed to the attention

to the external plot that is characteristic of a “well-made” play. The other features of the “new drama” are the internal psychological nature of the conflict and the limited number of open clashes along with active struggles between characters. The absence of extended monologues and long dialogues becomes the norm (Gaidash, 2004, p. 63).

Postmodern drama in Western literature, the USA included, actively uses intertextuality, referring to various cultural and literary backgrounds: T. Stoppard “Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead” (1966, UK), E. Bond “Lear” (1975, UK), B. Henley “Crimes of the Heart” (1989, USA), P. Vogel “Desdemona” (1994, USA), T. Howe “Pride’s Crossing” (1998, USA), B. Power “A Tender Thing” (2009, UK), to name just a few. This stimulates a diversity of perspectives and allows reflecting the multiplicity of the modern world.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the play “Old Money” (2000), to identify the forms and features of intertextuality used by the American playwright Wendy Wasserstein and how the author uses and transforms ideas, motifs and images from other texts, in particular, from the play “Arcadia” (1993) by the British playwright Tom Stoppard as well as other sources. There is a seminal study of intertextuality of the 20th century drama “Intertextuality in American Drama: Critical Essays on Eugene O’Neill, Susan Glaspell, Thornton Wilder, Arthur Miller and Other Playwrights” by Drew Eisenhauer and Brenda Murphy (2012), but from the perspective of postmodern drama such studies lack.

In the case of Wendy Wasserstein’s “Old Money” and Tom Stoppard’s “Arcadia”, intertextuality can be explored in a number of ways.

The study of intertextuality helps better understand Wasserstein’s authorial intentions and creative process, identify key themes and ideas that are transferred from other texts and their influence on the plot, dramatic personae in the play. It reveals the complex transatlantic interrelationships between texts and traces the development and evolution of literary and cultural motifs in the postmodern drama, too.

Theoretical Background. The term intertextuality was coined by the French researcher of Bulgarian origin Y. Kristeva in 1967. The notion of “intertextuality” became an important factor in Kristeva’s concept of seminalization as a model of “textual production” (Kristeva, 1980, p. 30). According to Kristeva, “any text is a permutation of other texts; in the space of a text, several statements taken from other texts intersect and neutralize each other” (Kristeva, 1980, p. 36). Therefore, intertextuality is understood as a general

property of texts through which texts can refer to each other explicitly or implicitly in a variety of ways.

Among other fundamental scholars of intertextuality is Ronald Barthes, who described the complexity of textual reality. His definition, which can be found in the article “The Universal Encyclopedia”, now seminal among other literary concepts related to the notion of intertextuality. Barth claims that “Every text is an intertext; other texts are present in it in various variations, in more or less recognizable forms, from both previous and current cultures. Each text is a new fabric of ready-made quotations” (Barthes, 2015).

Intertextuality encompasses various elements such as codes, formulas, rhythmic patterns, and fragments of social expressions that flow through a text and undergo redistribution. This occurs because language exists both prior to and around the text itself. The relationship between different texts, a fundamental aspect of any text’s existence, extends beyond merely tracing sources or influences. Intertextuality represents a broad domain of unattributed formulas, often originating from unfamiliar or automated sources, and presented without quotation marks, making their origins challenging to discern.

The notion of “intertextuality” is defined as a key concept for poststructuralism, which is considered ontologically as a necessary condition for the existence of a text. Building the structure of a narrative on the basis of a combination of different texts is a characteristic feature of postmodernist literary practice. Thus, for postmodern literature, intertextuality becomes a necessary condition for the creation of the text itself. From this point of view, R. Barthes’ position is important, as the sources of a text exist not only before its creation but also afterwards, since a text does not have a ready-made semantic content but generates it in the process of collision or interaction with other texts. Therefore, intertextuality is, according to Barthes, “a necessary precondition for any text” (Barthes, 1977, p. 4). However, it is worth noting that the orientation of a text exclusively to another text "destroys the principle of reference, which is a weakness of this theory" (ibid.).

In the early 1970s, postmodernism emerged as a new cultural paradigm that opposed the determining role of “meaningful discourses” or texts. The programmatic principle of postmodern consciousness is associated with the process of critical deconstruction, pluralism of concepts, and the recognition of the uncertainty of any judgment.

Khafaga Ayman explores the intertextual connections between W. Shakespeare's "King Lear" (1606) and E. Bond's "Lear" (1978) in his study "Approaching Intertextuality in Drama". In his analysis, Khafaga demonstrates that while "Lear" embodies elements of intertextuality and originality, it remains a unique synthesis. Despite retaining many aspects of Shakespeare's original, Bond's rendition exhibits originality by skillfully intertwining the narrative with contemporary themes. This adept fusion ensures the story's relevance to modern audiences (Khafaga, 2021, p. 1).

For our study are important Genette's forms of intertextuality:

- intertextuality, which involves the presence of two or more texts in the same work, such as various quotations, allusions, plagiarism, etc;
- hypertextuality, which manifests itself in the relationship of the hypertext to a previously written text, i.e. hypotext;
- architextuality, which implies genre interaction between literary works;
- paratextuality, which manifests itself in the relation of a literary work to its title, epigraph, etc.;
- metatextuality, which refers to or comments on the text that precedes it (Genette, 1997, p.2).

In Ukrainian literary studies intertextual practices are regularly and thoroughly studied by numerous literary scholars, among whom we single out V. Antofiychuk, O. Astafiev, A. Volkov, T. Dynnychenko, D. Zatonsky, N. Likhomanova, D. Nalyvaiko, N. Naumenko, A. Nyamtsa, T. Pashnyak, P. Rykhlo, O. Shtepenko, and many others. However, as Yevhen Vasyliiev notes, when it comes to drama, the problem of intertextuality is less popular, probably because a play attracts the attention of intertextuality much less often than prose and poetry texts (Vasyliiev, 2017, p.115).

Yet Ukrainian drama scholars, namely O. Bondareva, O. Kohut, M. Shapoval, T. Dynnychenko, including Y. Vasyliiev, tackle intertextuality in drama to a great extent.

O. Bondareva examines the transition from documentarism to intertextuality in contemporary Ukrainian dramatic texts (the broadest literary discourse is considered by modern playwrights as a kind of mythological system, suitable for play and interpretation due to the formation of its own associative field, and many of the latest dramaturgical texts are beginning to be oriented towards an elite recipient, capable of decoding certain game strategies in the processing of literary

myths), advancing the concept of the transitive hero and actively working with a wide range of their previous texts (Bondareva, 2006, p. 272).

In the era of postmodernism, the actual understanding of the text is significantly transformed, due to which the phenomenon of intertextuality, according to T. Dynnychenko, acquires the status of a universal comprehensive concept: “since literature and history, society and man began to be considered as a text, then human culture began to be perceived as a single “intertext”, which, in turn, serves as a pretext for any new text” (Dynnychenko, 2016, p. 11).

Determining the main types and forms of intertextuality in the prose of the French modernists, Dynnychenko, in her dissertation, distinguished *contextual forms of intertextuality* (quote, allusion, reference, reminiscence, topos, traditional plots, motifs, images, non-literary components in a literary text), *pretextual forms of intertextuality* (title, author’s genre definition, acknowledgement, epigraph) and *transtextual forms of intertextuality* (borrowing reception, stylization, parody) (Dynnychenko, 2016, p. 67). Relying upon her findings we will attempt to detect the forms of intertextuality in US-American postmodern drama.

Methods. The author employs close reading of the texts of drama, as well as theoretical concepts of intertextuality proposed within the framework of literary theory. The comparative approach is used along with historical and cultural methods.

Results and Discussion.

The title of the play “Old Money” serves as an independent component within the paratextual framework, possessing its own authority. However, akin to other paratextual elements, the name of the play synergizes with the main text. Frequently, the title hints at or directly unveils the content to the audience. It reflects what the author wanted to say and fulfills the semantic function of the expression “*old money*”, which means the acquired wealth that is usually inherited from upper-class families. This refers to the social class of wealthy people who can keep their wealth for several generations. Often these families have de facto aristocratic status in societies where there is no officially recognized aristocratic class, such as the United States. The text of the play presents the playwright’s perception of the richest Americans over the course of the century.

The drama’s structure is built on binary code: the dramatis personae in the present storyline have their counterparts in the past storyline, which is mentioned in the list of characters. Wasserstein uses this technique to draw parallels between the two eras.

The author of the play says, “*I drifted into an Edith Wharton fantasy of May Welland’s dinner parties in “The Age of Innocence”*. During an earlier New York gilded age a man’s worth might be based on his money, but the money would never be mentioned in public” (Wasserstein, 2000, p. 12). Wasserstein was inspired by Wharton’s novel and added some its elements to her play. The characters of the play mention movie based on the book “The Age of Innocence” in their conversation at the party in an ironic manner:

SID: Thank you, Henry James. Honey, was it Henry James who wrote that Scorsese movie with Winona?

PENNY: Age of Innocence. That’s an Edith Wharton movie (Wasserstein, 2000, p. 22).

Wasserstein, employing a satirical and witty tone reminiscent of Edith Wharton’s writing, keenly observes the enduring similarities in social norms, professional stature, and family dynamics over the past century.

“Old Money” looks into the intricacies of social class, generational differences, and the pursuit of happiness. The play begins with a party in the mansion of the wealthy American Bernstein family in New York, hosted by 48-year-old lawyer Jeffrey Bernstein, the current owner of a huge estate. He is the protagonist of the present time-line in the play, “*a legend in high-risk arbitration and at the top of the new money society*” (Wasserstein, 2002, p.4). Bernstein has restored Pfeiffer’s mansion (the first owner) and lives there with his 17-year-old son Ovid. Ovid is the namesake of the Roman poet of love. Ovid’s name symbolizes his love of history, the grace of the past, and the sophistication of the past society. In this way, Wasserstein strengthens this character taking the name of great antique poet. This is Shakespeare’s favorite poet and Wasserstein takes a lot of allusions to Shakespeare.

In the development of the present story-line, Jeffrey Bernstein organizes a party that everyone seems to want to come to, even in the inappropriate season. Ovid invites Vivian Pfeiffer, who is the 75-year-old grandson of the mansion’s first owner, to the party. The novelist and professor at Columbia University, Vivian returns for the first time to the house where he spent his childhood. His grandfather, Tobias Pfeiffer, was called a robber baron in those days.

Bernstein is a bank executive who turned fixed income arbitrage into a multimillion-dollar operation. This dramatis persona is the prototype of Wendy Wasserstein’s older brother Bruce, who was an American investment banker, businessman, and writer. The author even gave the protagonist a surname that is

consonant with her brother's. In this example, Wasserstein uses *biographical method* of intertextuality (biographical intertext). Also the setting is New York, the native city of the playwright.

The character of Jeffrey Bernstein (like his model, Bruce Wasserstein) made the money not in manufacturing, but in mergers and acquisitions. This generation was still pursuing the American dream, but like the robber barons of the fin de siècle in the USA, they were materialistic and ambitious businessmen. During America's Gilded Age "robber baron" was a rather derogatory term for the late 19th century American industrialists and financiers who made their fortune by monopolizing vast industries through the formation of trusts, engaging in unethical business practices, and exploiting working class. In this context the author uses historical allusion and refers to the term "robber baron", too. Tobias Vivian Pfeiffer (the main character of the past story-line) is depicted as a robber baron in the play. The author shows him as "*the coal miner's son from Uniondale who later owns the coal mines and builds railroads across America*" (Wasserstein, 2000, p. 3).

When Ovid introduces his father he describes him "...it's not really my father's bank, but my father pioneered its fixed-income arbitrage into the largest trading desk in the world. At least that's the story according to the *Wall Street Journal*" (Wasserstein, 2000, p. 4). In present days in the play Ovid asks his father: "Dad, when you were a boy did you think you'd be throwing parties in a robber baron's mansion?" (Wasserstein, 2000, p. 5).

One of the dramatic personae Caroline, in conversation with Ovid is interested in history and plans to write a paper about this term: "*Seeds of Revolution: From Robber Barons to Emma Goldman*" (Wasserstein, 2000, p. 22).

We can see the reference to term "robber baron" again and have the image of people of that time. For example, as mentioned, Emma Goldman. Andrew Carnegie may seem like an unlikely duo, but they both contribute to the history.

The dramatic personae are interested in history, art, cinematography and mention various real people and events. Mary and Toby (past story-line) in their conversation mention:

MARY: Who was Archduke Ferdinand, and why should we care?

TOBY: You're not worried about the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, Miss Gallagher? (Wasserstein, 2000, p. 14).

SID: Henry Kravis and Charlie Rose schvitzing in the garden. (Wasserstein, 2000, p. 16). In this example, besides reference to celebrities in the USA, we see

Yiddish word “schvitzing”, which means, to “panic” or to “worry”. The author was an American Jew and often used Yiddish notions and vocabulary in her plays.

For Jeffrey, “*Money is the way to liberation*” (Wasserstein, 2002, p. 89). In other words, money builds his reputation and gives him the chance to have relationships with whomever he wants. Jeffrey believes that his capital can buy him happiness and status as a Jew in elite society, and this is the point of dramatic conflict in Wasserstein’s text. Here the playwright uses allusion to Fitzgerald’s novel “*The Great Gatsby*” (1925), in which wealth plays a dominant role for the protagonist. In “*Old Money*”, the focus on class, money, and gendered power relations to explore male/female social dynamics. According to Wasserstein, by the 2000s, men seek the power that money and status symbols bring rather than social change (Wasserstein, 2000, p. 8). In this respect, her play reinterprets the themes tackled by the lost generation, and Scott Fitzgerald in particular, and therefore establishes continuum in US-American literary tradition.

In “*Old Money*”, Jeffrey uses his finances to improve his appearance and to make himself superior to others. The protagonist expects his son to be just like him, as an heir to his wealth and reputation. However, Ovid doesn’t share the same values; even the choice of their clothes is different. The younger family members of the Bernstein’s rebels against the values and lifestyle of their parents: e.g., Ovid enters the stage “*in standard chinos and a blue shirt*” (Wasserstein, 2002, p. 33), representing a more casual way of thinking than his father’s designer-suited generation.

In his “*Palimpsests*”, J. Genette pays attention to such a difficult concept as “hypertextuality”. The scholar gives the following definition to this phenomenon: “any relationship uniting a text B (which I shall call the hypertext) to an earlier text A (I shall, of course, call it the hypotext), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary” (Genette, 1997, p. 5). According to the theory of J. Genette, hypertext is identical palimpsest, that is, “texts in the second degree,” derived from a previously written text. “What I call hypertext, then, is any text derived from a previous text either through simple transformation, which I shall simply call from now on transformation, or through indirect transformation, which I shall label imitation” (Genette, 1997, p. 7).

The postmodern aesthetics of Wasserstein’s play develops the topic of intergenerational conflict and attempts to bridge two periods in the history of the USA that becomes a hypertextuality to Tom Stoppard’s “*Arcadia*”. Stoppard’s play intertwines two distinct timelines: one set in the early 19th century and the other

one in the present day. The plot revolves around the inhabitants of Sidley Park, an English country estate, demonstrating their intellectual pursuits, mysteries, and romances.

In the 19th century timeline, we follow the interactions among the precocious teenager Thomasina Coverly, her tutor Septimus Hodge, and other characters as they explore ideas of mathematics, science, and love. In the present-day timeline, scholars Hannah Jarvis and Bernard Nightingale endeavor to unravel the mysteries of the past, particularly focusing on the events at Sidley Park involving Lord Byron and a hermit named Ezra Chater.

As the play progresses, the two timelines become increasingly intertwined, revealing parallels between the past and present and exploring themes such as the nature of truth, the passage of time, the conflict between order and chaos, and the elusive quest for knowledge and understanding.

The structural intertextuality of the play “Old Money” lies in juxtaposition of two generations of *dramatis personae*: the first belongs to the era of the “golden twenties” (the beginning of the 20th century), while the second set of characters represents the 2000s.

Both plays look into intellectual themes such as time, knowledge, and the human condition. This is evidenced by the reasoning of protagonist’s Thomasina Coverley character: *“If you could stop every atom in its position and direction, and if your mind could comprehend all the actions thus suspended, then if you were really, really good at algebra, you could write a formula for the whole future; and though no one can be so clever as to do so, the formula must exist as if it could”* (Stoppard, 1993, p. 4).

Yet “Old Money” accentuates wealth, social status, rather than the passage of time in American society. This is illustrated by the following reflections of the character Jeffrey: *“Now we live in a world where business and art are the same. We live in the last days of the twentieth century. Everything is possible. Everything”* (Wasserstein, 2002, p. 15).

Wasserstein’s play is “an anthropological study of the individuals who acquire money and its influence” (Balakian, 2010, p. 174). By identifying similarities between the Roaring Twenties and the contemporary US, the author analyzes intergenerational values “in terms of social and cultural change” by comparing and contrasting the two centuries (Balakian, 2010, p. 166).

In the play, Wasserstein compares and contrasts the Gilded Age with contemporary America to criticize the social codes of the elite. Obsessed with

wealth, status, and materialism, Bernstein does not realize the importance of family. His son Ovid, on the other hand, values intelligence. For him, real power is knowledge, while for Bernstein, an anti-intellectual, money is power.

Despite the difference in setting, both plays use historical context to enrich their narratives and explore how past events affect present circumstances.

Wasserstein's "Old Money" uses humor and satire to explore themes of wealth and social mobility. The play's comedic moments provide insight into the characters' personalities and motivations, for example: "*Money can't buy you happiness, but it sure makes it easier to live with unhappiness*" (Wasserstein, 2002, p. 19). In this example, Wasserstein uses famous quotation from philosopher Rousseau written in 1750. Nowadays this statement is very popular and is quoted by many people. Ultimately, "Old Money" challenges the notion of wealth as a measure of value and suggests that true satisfaction comes when one embraces their identity.

The famous quotation as well as an American patriotic song written by Irving Berlin "God Bless America" is mentioned by Vivian (Wasserstein, 2000, p. 10).

By examining specific references, allusions, and connections to other texts in "Old Money" and "Arcadia", we can gain insight into how Wasserstein and Stoppard construct their narratives and participate in broader cultural discourses.

Both plays explore the concept of time and memory in unique ways. Whereas "Arcadia" shifts two time periods to explore the continuity of ideas and themes across the centuries, "Old Money" can use intertextuality to evoke feelings of nostalgia or reflect on the passage of time.

In "Arcadia" and "Old Money", all the events take place in the closed space of the mansions, but they are separated by more than a hundred years. Representatives of the same family and their guests go about their lives, which are diverse and eventful, including math and physics, love affairs with a hint of an impending duel, an upcoming celebration, attempts to uncover the Baron's secrets. Both plays explore the theme of identity and self-discovery. In "Arcadia", the characters struggle with their identity in relation to knowledge, science, and love, while in "Old Money", the characters navigate the context of wealth, social status, and family heritage.

Conclusions and perspectives. Intertextuality includes both conscious and unconscious processes of interconnection between different texts. The nature of intertextuality does not depend on the writer's conscious choice; the author acts as

an intermediary between texts, and his or her thinking may be intertextual, as it is formed from various clichés, the reinterpretation of which creates an original vision.

In her play “Old Money”, Wasserstein actively refers to the texts of world literature, uses both implicit forms of intertextuality (allusions, reminiscences, titles) and explicit (recognizable plots, cultural codes, classical ideas and motifs), which makes it possible to play the postmodernist game with a multilevel readership.

In the analysis of the forms of intertextuality in the play “Old Money” we detect contextual and pretextual forms of intertextuality according to Genette’s and Dynnychenko classification. Contextual forms of intertextuality in the play are: biographical intertext (the character of Bernstein, who is a prototype to author’s brother Bruce); allusions to the famous text of world literature (“Arcadia’s plot by Stoppard, “Age of Innocence” by Wharton, “The Great Gatsby” by Fitzgerald), antique and Shakespeare’s allusions (the poet Ovid, “Shakespeare in Love”), reference to historical terms and events (the term “robber baron”, the Gilded age, collapse of Ottoman Empire, Spanish American War), quotes (“God Bless America”, “Money is a way to liberation”), reference to famous facts, names and events (Emma Goldman, “Four Seasons” Vivaldi, “The Last Communion of St. Jerome” Botticelli, Theodore Roosevelt etc.).

Contextual forms of intertextuality in the play is the title in which we can presume the plot of the text.

Through the study of intertextuality in “Old Money” and “Arcadia”, a deeper understanding of how Wasserstein and Stoppard use references, allusions, and connections to create rich, multi-layered works that invite interpretation and reflection can be gained. Both playwrights use intertextuality to imbue their plays with depth, complexity, and a sense of connection that resonates with audiences. The following step in disclosing the features of intertextuality of postmodern US-American drama will be done on the material of Wendy Wasserstein’s plays “An American Daughter” (1997) and “Third” (2004).

REFERENCES

1. Balakian, J. (2010). *Reading the Plays of Wendy Wasserstein*. New York: Applause Theatre and Cinema.
2. Barthes, R. (2015). Texte. *Encyclopædia Universalis* [en ligne], consulté le 21 février 2015 // <http://www.universalis.fr/encyclopedie/theorie-du-texte/>
3. Barthes, R. (1977). “From Work to Text.” *Image–Music–Text*. New York: Hill and Wang, 155–164.

4. Bondareva, O. Y. (2006). *Mifi drama u novitn'omu literaturnomu konteksti: ponovlennya strukturnoho zv'yazku cherez zhanrove modelyuvannya: monohrafiya* / Olena Bondareva. K.: Chetverta khvylya, 512 s. [in Ukrainian].
5. Brantley, B. (2000). *Social Lions And Losers*. Theater Review. Режим доступу: <https://www.nytimes.com/2000/12/08/movies/theater-review-social-lions-and-losers.html?searchResultPosition=1>
6. Derrida, Z. (2004). Структура, знак і hra в дискусії гуманітарних наук / Derrida Zhak; [per. Zubryts'koyi M., Sokhots'koyi KH.]. *Slovo. Znak. Dyskurs. Antolohiya svitovoyi krytychnoyi dumky KHKH st.* [Za red. Mariyi Zubryts'koyi. 2-vyd., dopovnene]. L'viv: Litopys, S. 617 – 640. [in Ukrainian].
7. Dynnychenko, T. A. (2016). *Typolohiya form intertekstual'nosti u frantsuz'kiy modernist-s'kiy prozi (na materialy tvoriv Andre Zhida)* [dys.kand. filol. nauk: 10.01.06]. Kyiv. un-t im. B. Hrinchenka. 203 s. [in Ukrainian].
8. Gaidash, A. V. (2004). Zhinocha dramaturhiya USA v konteksti ideyno-estetychnykh shukan' amerykans'koho teatru kintsya 1970-90-kh rokiv [Dys. kand. filol. nauk]. K. [in Ukrainian].
9. Genette, G. (1997). *Palimpsests. Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. London: University of Nebraska Press
10. Hutcheon, L. (1988). *A Poetics of Postmodernism*. New York and London: Routledge.
11. Khafaga, A. (2021). Approaching Intertextuality in Drama. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*. 10.14744/alrj.2021.35693.
12. Kimmel, M. S. (2012). *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: Oxford UP.
13. Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Language and Art*. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez, ed. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.
14. Malkin, J. R. (1999). *Memory-Theatre and Postmodern Drama*. Ann Arbor. The University of Michigan Press, 260 p.
15. Roark, J. L. (2012). The American Promise. *A History of the United States*, Vol. 2. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
16. Schroeder, P. R. (1989). *The Present of the Past in Modern American Drama*. Toronto: Associated UP, 148 p.
17. Stoppard, T. (2009). *Arcadia*. London: Faber and Faber.
18. Vasyl'yev, Y. M. (2017). *Suchasna dramaturhiya: zhanrovi transformatsiyi, modyfikatsiyi, novatsiyi* : monohrafiya. Luts'k : PDV "Tverdunya", 532 s. [in Ukrainian].
19. Wasserstein, W. (2000). *Old Money*. New York: Harcourt.
20. Watson, L. (2001). Play Review: Old Money by Wendy Wasserstein Produced by Lincoln Center Theater at the Mitzi E. Newhouse. *Voice and Speech Review*. 2.1: 327–328. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23268263.2001.10761493>

Дата надходження статті до редакції: 21.03.2024

Прийнято до друку: 24.04.2024