

матеріали Міжнародної заочної научно-практичної конференції. 3 июля 2010 г. – Чебоксары : НИИ педагогики и психологии, 2010. – С. 48–51.

12. Мірошніченко Л. Паратекст і його функції у романі Доріс Лессінг «Ущелина» / Л. Мірошніченко // Іноземна філологія : [зб. наук. праць]. – Львів : ЛНУ ім. І. Франка, 2012. – Вип. 124. – С. 269–277.

13. Погорелова О. В. Специфіка пара текстуральності лірики О. Ірванця / О. В. Погорелова // Наукові записки Харківського національного педагогічного університету ім. Г. С. Сковороди. Сер. : Літературознавство. — 2014. – Вип. 2(1). С. 91–100.

14. Рогоза О. Б. Роль передмови в організації французького епістолярного роману / О. Б. Рогоза. – Київ : Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2006. – 240 с.

15. Сокол М. О. Прагматичні аспекти пара тексту (на матеріалі повісті І. Франка «Захар Беркут») : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.01.06. «Теорія літератури» / М. О. Сокол. – Тернопіль, 2011. – 21 с.

INTERFIGURALITY IN THE SYSTEM OF CHARACTERS IN NEIL GAIMAN'S NOVEL «AMERICAN GODS»

Ivan Pasternak

Postgraduate student,
Department of World Literature and Comparative Literary Criticism,
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University (UKRAINE),
76018, Ivano-Frankivsk, 57 Shevchenko str., e-mail: ivan.pasternak@pu.if.ua

UDC: 821.111

ABSTRACT

Pasternak Ivan. *Interfigurality in the System of Characters in Neil Gaiman's Novel «American Gods».*

The article deals with the problem of interfigurality as one of the most important forms of intertextual interrelations. There have been discussed different approaches to the definition of the notion of «interfigurality». The aim of the article is to reveal the interfigural components in the novel by English writer Neil Gaiman «American Gods» and to explore the specificity of their functioning. Attention in the article is focused on the mythological and folklore figures in Neil Gaiman's novel. The article gives a detailed analysis of interrelations between the characters of different mythological systems and the novel «American Gods». There have been investigated different forms of interfigurality, including means of direct and descriptive nomination, amalgamation of several figures in one image, «re-used figures». The article is great help for the further investigation of the problem.

Key words: intertextuality, interfigurality, image, figure, English literature.

Статтю присвячено дослідженню інтерфігуральності як однієї із найважливіших форм інтертекстуальних зв'язків. Розглянуто різні підходи до визначення поняття «інтер-

фігуральності». Метою статті є виявити інтерфігуральні елементи в романі англійського письменника Ніла Геймана «Американські боги» та дослідити специфіку їх функціонування. Увагу в статті зосереджено на міфологічних та фольклорних персонажах роману. Представлено детальний аналіз взаємозв'язків між персонажами різних міфологічних систем та роману «Американські боги». Досліджено різні форми вираження інтерфігуральних зв'язків, зокрема через пряму та описову номінацію, злиття кількох персонажів у одному образі та «повторно використані персонажі». Дане дослідження може бути використане для подальшого вивчення проблеми інтерфігуральності.

Ключові слова: інтертекстуальність, інтерфігуральність, образ, персонаж, англійська література.

The interrelationships that exist between the figures of different texts are one of the most important means of expression of the intertextuality [ref.: 5, p. 101]. However, the amount of the researches dealing with this problem is quite limited. In the opinion of the German literary critic Wolfgang Müller, it is caused by two factors: the first one is the «ideological prejudice» of such investigations; the second factor is the absence of a proper term for denomination of this interrelationships [ref.: 5, p. 101]. To avoid the «ideological prejudice» the scholar suggests studying the figures as «structural and functional textual elements» and uses the term «figure», which is «less suspicious» than the term «character» [ref.: 5, p. 101]. To distinguish the character layer of the text in studying the intertextuality in general the German scholar suggests the term «interfigurality», which he defines as «the interrelationships between literary characters» [5, p. 102]. In our opinion, the phenomenon of interfigurality is to be considered as the interrelationships between the figures of different literary texts and as the expression of the figure's character through the different means of nomination, because according to the Yury Tynyanov's statement «there are no „unlanguage“ names in a literary text» [2, p. 127].

In his article «Interfigurality. A Study of Interdependence of Literary Figures» W. Müller considers a number of different forms of interfigurality. The most obvious one, according to him, is using the name of the character from pretext in its original or transformed mode. The scholar states that this form of interfigural interrelationships is a superficial one, as the usage of the figure's name does not signal the transfer of its character [ref.: 5, p. 103]. This form of interfigurality has also been investigated by Russian scholar S. V. Libig. But, unlike W. Müller, he thinks that the notion of interfigurality should be considered in the semiotic context, as it is necessary for understanding of any literary text [ref.: 1].

Another form of interfigurality is the subsequent use of the figure in sequels. Here W. Müller differentiates between the autographic sequels (written

by the same author) and allographic sequels (written by different authors). In the first case it goes about the author's use of *his own* figures, in the second one – about the situations when the writer, in his work, continues the plot from *the other writer's* work, using the system of figures from it [ref.: 5, p. 110–112].

The most widespread form of interfigural interrelationships is the so-called «figure on loan» (Th. Ziolkowski's term). In this form writer uses both the name and the character of the figure from pretext. However, the theoretic comprehension of this form of interfigurality is connected with certain problems, including the problems of terminological character. American philologist, Germanist, the specialist in comparative literary criticism Theodore Ziolkowski in 1983 suggested the term «figure on loan». The introduction of this term by the American philologist made it possible to study the specificity of functioning of literary figure transferred from one literary text into the other [ref.: 5, p. 107].

The Th. Ziolkowski's position has drawn the criticism from W. Müller. The objection was caused by the fact that, in German scholar's opinion, the term «figure on loan» (*Germ.* «Figuren auf Pump») suggests that after being used in the posttext the «borrowed» figure has to be returned to the pretext. Moreover the term presupposes the full identity of figures in pretext and posttext, which, according to W. Müller, is possible only if we treat figures as a sum of traits of character but not as an artistic whole: «Ontologically and aesthetically it is, however, impossible to have entirely identical characters in literary works by different authors. For if we do not regard a fictional character as a mere sum of qualities ...we realize that it cannot reappear in its identical form in another author's work» [5, p. 107]. Such situation is caused by the fact that the quoted name has almost the same qualities as a quotation [ref.: 5, p. 102]. It means that, according to H. Plett, there appears a conflict between it and between the context in the posttext [ref.: 6, p. 300], that is why the figure being transferred from one text into another is inevitably transformed [ref.: 5, p. 107]. To avoid the inaccuracy of the term given by Th. Ziolkowski, W. Müller suggests changing the term «figure on loan» into the new-coined term «re-used figures». It stipulates that the author borrowing any figure uses it in his own way and transforms it according to the needs of his work [ref.: 5, p. 102].

The aim of our article is to study the phenomenon of interfigurality as one of the forms of intertextuality and to study the functional interfigural

elements in Neil Gaiman's² novel «American gods» (2001).

The topicality of interfigural interrelationship investigation is caused by the fact that its exposure helps the reader to make foresight of the figures' behavior³. So the possibility of interfigural relations detection comes to the actualization of the background knowledge by the reader. The background knowledge in this case consists of four components: 1) knowledge of the figures; 2) knowledge of the narrative situation; 3) knowledge of the genre; 4) knowledge of the intertextual information [4].

In his novel «American gods» N. Gaiman draws the figures from Scandinavian, Celtic, Indian, Slavic and African mythological systems transferring them in the modern world. Drawing these figures, the author uses different forms of interfigurality.

1) N. Gaiman inserts into the novel two gods from the Scandinavian mythology – Odin (*Old Norse Óðinn*) and Loki (*Old Norse Loka*). But the writer does not use the direct means of nomination in reference to these figures at once. So, the author calls Odin Mr. Wednesday and describes him as an ordinary person: *«His hair was a reddish gray; his beard, little more than stubble, was grayish red. A craggy, square face with pale gray eyes. The suit looked expensive, and was the color of melted vanilla ice cream. His tie was dark gray silk, and the tie pin was a tree, worked in silver: trunk, branches, and deep roots»*[3]. Here the writer only hints at untypical nature of the figure, naming him accordingly to his day in mythology and pointing at one of his symbols, namely the pin in form of Yggdrasil (the tree of life), on his tie. N. Gaiman also tells that Mr. Wednesday doesn't have one eye: *«Wednesday stared at Shadow with his mismatched eyes. One of them, Shadow decided, was a glass eye, but he could not decide which one»* [3] giving one more hint on the nature of the figure of Odin, who, according to the myths, has sacrificed his eye to get the access to Mimmisbrunnr (the source of wisdom in Scandinavian mythology). In the next chapter the author tells about the first people coming from the North to America and about their praying to Odin, so the well-informed reader can use the given information to

² Neil Gaiman – born in 1960, in Portchester, Great Britain. Constantly lives in the USA. The author of the novels: «Neverwhere», «Stardust», «American Gods», «Anansi boys» and others. Awards: Hugo Award, Nebula Award, Bram Stoker Award, John Newbery Medal, Locus Award.

³ British linguists E. Sanford and K. Emmot made up «Scenario-Mapping Theory», which states that general knowledge is organized in the person's mind into scenarios, which consists of a number of slots, each slot is activated in a proper moment [7, p. 377–378]. So the cognitive representation of the discourse is formed in the person's mind through the relation of a new situation to already known information [ref.: 4]. Reading a definite text the reader can foresee the behavior of a certain figure in posttext reasoning from its behavior in pretext.

foresee the further development of the plot. The name «Odin» itself, i.e. the direct means of nomination, appears only in the third chapter.

In his turn Loki, the trickster god or the god of mischief, is presented in the novel by the idiom «*Low Key*», meaning inconspicuous, supplemented by the noun «*grifter*». In this way the author using the means of descriptive, or indirect, nomination gives the reader a possibility to guess the nature of the figure, but the real meaning of idiomatic pun, i.e. the name «Loki», is revealed only at the end of the novel: «„*Jesus. Low Key Lyesmith,*” said Shadow, and then he heard what he was saying and he understood. „*Loki,*” he said. „*Loki Lie-Smith*”»[3]. N. Gaiman also reveals the nature of Odin and Loki through the description of the trickery committed by them.

2) In the novel N. Gaiman also draws the figures from the Slavic mythology, using the direct means of nomination. It concerns the images of Czernobog (ukr. Чорнобог) and Bielobog (ukr. Білобог) that are fully presented through the mythological system of mystification and without any change of their primary character from the Slavic mythology. The author shows Czernobog in opposition to Bielobog, who is only regarded to as the Czernobog's brother: «„*Speaking of Bielebog, have you heard anything from him?*” Czernobog shook his head. He looked up at Shadow. „*Do you have a brother?*” „*No,*” said Shadow. „*Not that I know of.*” „*I have a brother. They say, you put us together, we are like one person, you know? When we are young, his hair, it is very blond, very light, his eyes are blue, and people say, he is the good one. And my hair it is very dark, darker than yours even, and people say I am the rogue, you know? I am the bad one. And now time passes, and my hair is gray. His hair, too, I think, is gray. And you look at us, you would not know who was light, who was dark.*” „*Were you close?*” asked Shadow. „*Close?*” asked Czernobog. „*No. How could we be? We cared about such different things*”»[3]. At the end of the novel the writer reveals the sense of the opposition showing that, just like in mythology, Czernobog and Bielobog are the two entities of one image of Czernobog-Bielobog, that constantly change each other: «„*Czernobog?*” asked Shadow. Then, „*Are you Czernobog?*” „*Yes. For today,*” said the old man. „*By tomorrow, it will all be Bielebog. But today, is still Czernobog*”»[3]. The image of Czernobog is also presents through the means of descriptive nomination through the description of his character and his occupation: «„*First we come to New York,*” said Czernobog. „*All our countrymen go to New York. Then, we come out here, to Chicago. Everything got very bad. Even in the old country, they had nearly forgotten me. Here, I am just a bad memory. You know what I did when I got to Chicago?*” „*No*” said Shadow.

„I get a job in the meat business. On the kill floor. When the steer comes up the ramp, I was a knocker. You know why we are called knockers? Is because we take the sledgehammer and we knock the cow down with it. Bam! It takes strength in the arms. Yes? Then the shackler chains the beef up, hauls it up, then they cut the throat. They drain the blood first before they cut the head off. We were the strongest, the knockers.” He pushed up the sleeve of his bathrobe, flexed his upper arm to display the muscles still visible under the old skin. „Is not just strong though. There was an art to it. To the blow. Otherwise the cow is just stunned, or angry. Then, in the fifties, they give us the bolt gun. You put it to the forehead, bam! bam! Now you think, anybody can kill. Not so.” He mimed putting a metal bolt through a cow’s head. „It still takes skill.” He smiled at the memory, displaying an iron-colored tooth» [3]. So in description of Czernobog and Bielobog the means of direct nomination are primary and the descriptive means of nomination are secondary.

3) N. Gaiman draws the image of Shadow, which is the amalgamation of images of Odin and Baldr (*Old Norse Baldr*). Perception of this figure fully depends on the reader, as the author provides him both with the features of Odin, in particular Shadow’s self-sacrifice to Odin, besides just like Odin Shadow hung on Yggdrasil for nine days; and of Baldr, the author tells that it is possible to kill Shadow only with a branch of mistletoe: «„Yes” said Mr. World. „I know. When this is all done with, I guess I’ll sharpen a stick of mistletoe and go down to the ash tree, and ram it through his eye...”»[3].

4) In addition to the figures from mythology the writer also draws images from folklore of different peoples, in particular he uses the images of Mad Sweeney and Hinzelman. But, unlike other images, in case with these figures the author uses only their names, but not the whole figure.

The image of Mad Sweeney has been taken by Neil Gaiman from the Irish legend of the 12th century, but in the novel the author presents him as leprechaun, changing at the same time traditional stereotype about the appearance of leprechauns, and showing him as a tall and a strong man: «„I’m a leprechaun,” he said, with a grin. Shadow did not smile. „Really?” he said. „Shouldn’t you be drinking Guinness?” „Stereotypes. You have to learn to think outside the box,” said the bearded man. „There’s a lot more to Ireland than Guinness.” „You don’t have an Irish accent.” „I’ve been over here too fucken long.” „So you are originally from Ireland?” „I told you. I’m a leprechaun. We don’t come from fucken Moscow”»[3], «Shadow got to his feet and looked up into Mad Sweeney’s face: how tall was the man? he wondered» [3].

The name Hinzelman is borrowed by N. Gaiman from the legend about kobold Hinzelman, who, according to the legend, was a house spirit in the lord's castle. In the novel he is presented as an amalgamation of a kobold and a god, who has appeared as a result of a child sacrifice. He creates his own town, where he functions as a house spirit, taking care of the welfare of its citizens and taking a child's life as an annual payment: «„They were giving their children to me before the Romans came to the Black Forest” he said. „I was a god before ever I was a kobold.” ...Where Hinzelmann had been standing stood a male child... He was pierced with two swords, one of them going through his chest, the other entering at his shoulder, with the point coming out beneath the rib-cage. ...And Shadow thought to himself, of course. That's as good a way as any other of making a tribal god... You take a baby and you bring it up in the darkness, letting it see no one, touch no one, and you feed it well as the years pass, feed it better than any of the village's other children, and then, five winters on, when the night is at its longest, you drag the terrified child out of its hut and into the circle of bonfires, and you pierce it with blades of iron and of bronze. Then you smoke the small body over charcoal fires until it is properly dried, and you wrap it in furs and carry it with you from encampment to encampment, deep in the Black Forest, sacrificing animals and children to it, making it the luck of the tribe. When, eventually, the thing falls apart from age, you place its fragile bones in a box, and you worship the box; until one day the bones are scattered and forgotten, and the tribes who worshipped the child-god of the box are long gone; and the child-god, the luck of the village, will be barely remembered, save as a ghost or a brownie: a kobold» [3]. Transforming the image of the house spirit from the ancient legend and laying it onto the images of child-gods from the pre-Columbian American Mythology, the author creates an image of Hinzelman, which is a vivid example of «re-used figure».

So, in his novel «American gods» Neil Gaiman uses the following forms of interfigurality: 1) presentation of two images of mythological figures on the basis of descriptive nomination; 2) presentation of two images of mythological gods on the basis of direct nomination; 3) the synthesis of two mythological figures in one image; 4) presented only by the name folklore image deprived of its primary content.

Such interfigurality system of expressing the intertextuality is one of the key mechanisms of building the artistic world and formation of the reader's expectations in the novel «American gods».

REFERENCES

1. Либиг С. В. К вопросу об интертекстуальности номинаций. – Режим доступа : <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/k-voprosu-ob-intertekstualnosti-nominatsiy-na-primerere-dramy-f-shillera-vilgelm-tell-i-povesti-m-frisha-vilgelm-tell-dlya-shkoly>
2. Тынянов Ю. Архаисты и новаторы / Юрий Тынянов. – Ленинград : Прибой, 1929. – 596 с.
3. Gaiman N. American gods / N. Gaiman. – Mode of access : http://www.openculture.com/2008/03/neil_gaimans_american_gods_-_free_digital_copy.html
4. Mikkonen K. Everyday Knowledge in Understanding Fictional Characters and Their Worlds / K. Mikkonen // Narrative Matters 2014 : Narrative Knowing / Récit et Savoir, Jun 2014, Paris, France. – Mode of access – <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01077644>
5. Müller W.G. Interfiguralität. A Study of Interdependence of Literary Figures / W. G. Müller // Intertextuality / edited by Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin; New York : de Gruyter, 1991. – P. 101–121.
6. Plett H.F. The poetics of quotation / H. F. Plett // Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis: Sectio Linguistica 17. – Budapest : Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, 1986. – P. 293–313.
7. Sanford A. Scenarios, Character's Roles and Plot Status / A. Sanford, C. Emmot, M. Alexander // Characters in Fictional Worlds : Understanding Imaginary Beings in Literature, Film, and Other Media. – Berlin : De Gruyter, 2010. – 594 p.

А. С. ПУШКИН У МАГІЛЁВЕ: ВАЧЫМА АФРААМЕРЫКАНСКАГА ПІСЬМЕННІКА ДЖОНА ОЛІВЕРА КІЛЕНЗА

Юрый Стулаў

Кандыдат філалагічных навук, дацэнт,
загадчык кафедры замежнай літаратуры,
Мінскі дзяржаўны лінгвістычны ўніверсітэт (БЕЛАРУСЬ)
220034, г. Мінск, вул. Захарова, 21, Беларусь, e-mail: yustulov@mail.ru

UDC: 821.111(73)-3.09(045)

ABSTRACT

Stulov Yuri. A. S. Pushkin in Mogilev from the Perspective of African American Writer John Oliver Killens.

The paper deals with the novel «The Great Black Russian» by the outstanding African American writer John Oliver Killens (1916–1987), in which he addresses the figure of the great Russian poet Alexander Pushkin who has become a symbol of the ingenuity and creativity of people of African descent for millions of African Americans. The writer's