

INTERTEXTUALITY IN ROALD DAHL'S POETRY

Anna Pikalova

Ph.D. in Linguistics, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology, Municipal Establishment "Kharkiv Humanitarian and Pedagogical Academy"

Kharkiv Regional Council, Ukraine

e-mail: pikalova.aa@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0002-9291-113X

Summary

This paper aims to consider intertextuality and discover its types in Roald Dahl's poetry intended for children. The study focuses on the poetic texts rather than the author and reader, although the author and children-readers are regarded either. The data used for this study are R. Dahl's *Revolting Rhymes* (1982), *Dirty Beasts* (1983), and *Rhyme Stew* (1989) devoted to children from seven years old and above. Acknowledging "intertextuality" as the concept for indicating the relation between the texts, the classification of types of intertextuality proposed by R. Pope (2002), has been taken into consideration in analyzing the data. This article includes the recognition of the types of intertextuality in R. Dahl's poetry for children. According to the scholar's division (Pope, 2002), three types of intertextuality are distinguished. They are explicit, implied and inferred intertextuality. Mainly, analyzing the data testifies explicit intertextuality as the most frequent type in R. Dahl's poetry for older children.

Keywords: intertextual relation, explicit intertextuality, nursery rhymes, fairy tales, R. Dahl, children.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/5117>

1. Introduction

Although the concept "intertextuality" has been widely discussed, it remains "one of the most commonly used and misused terms" (Allen, 2000: 2). Intertextuality constantly attracts the attention of scholars whose discussion provides many ideas. Intertextuality is often considered as a way how different "sorts of texts contain references to other texts" which influenced on their creating (Childs, & Fowler, 2006: 121). Developing Bakhtin's ideas (Bakhtin, 1981), Julia Kristeva (Kristeva, 1980) initially introduced this notion, regarded the text as operated in the horizontal and the vertical axes. The first axis maintains the relation between the text and the reader, whereas the second one sets the relations of the text to other texts (Kristeva, 1980).

In literary theory intertextuality admits "interpretation is a matter of reader and that text and reader interact" (Zengin, 2016: 302) producing a large number of meanings. Intertextuality is defined as "an attempt to understand literature and culture in general" (Allen, 2000: 7). From the linguistics positions, intertextuality is observed as "specific presuppositions" which are "conventions, systems of combination and a logic of assumption" (Culler, 1976: 1395). Supporting the similar idea, N. Fairclough applies intertextuality as an implement of discourse analysis, distinguishing two types of intertextuality: manifest intertextuality and constitutive intertextuality (Fairclough, 1992b: 117; Fairclough, 1992b). D. Birch investigates intertextual stylistics, moving beyond the boundaries of a particular text. His approach is oriented to the readers' intertextuality, which is a result of their own experiences (Birch, 1989: 271). R. Pope discusses "intertextuality" as "the general term for the relation between one text and another" (Pope, 2002: 246). This study focuses on intertextuality as the relation of the text to the other ones.

There is an excerpt from “Matilda” by Roald Dahl: “*It seemed so unreal and remote and fantastic and so totally away from this earth. It was like an illustration in Grimm or Hans Andersen. It was the house where the poor woodcutter lived with Hansel and Gretel and where Red Riding Hood’s grandmother lived and it was also the house of The Seven Dwarfs and The Three Bears ... It was straight out of a fairy-tale*” (Dahl, 2016: 180).

This short extract from author’s novel is a vivid example of a direct reference to different fairy tales, which is demonstrate intertextuality as the relation between R. Dahl’s novel and fairy tales. In *Matilda*, there is another example of a direct reference in which he represents the masterpieces of literature and their authors: “... Matilda read the following book:

“*Nicholas Nickleby* by Charles Dickens

Oliver Twist by Charles Dickens

Jane Eyre by Charlotte Bronte

...

Tess of the D’Urbervilles by Thomas Hardy

...

Kim by Rudyard Kipling

...

The Old Man and the Sea by Ernest Hemingway

The Sound and the Fury by William Faulkner

The Grapes of Wrath by John Steinbeck

...

Animal Farm by George Orwell” (Dahl, 2016: 14).

The author continues in this novel, referring to some of mentioned above authors and the characters, plots, time and places of their literary works: “*The book transported her (Matilda) into new words and introduced her to amazing people who lived exciting lives. She went on olden-day sailing ship with Joseph Conrad. She went to Africa with Ernest Hemingway and to India with Rudyard Kipling.*” (Dahl, 2016: 17).

There are only some mentioned above examples of intertextuality among those, which are represented in *Matilda*. Moreover, these mentioned above examples of intertextuality are from only *Matilda* by R. Dahl. Intertextuality has become a significant element of R. Dahl’ writing style. It is as noticeable as invisible. In this way, it can be explicit and implicit. Therefore, this paper intends to examine intertextual references in R. Dahl’s poetry, which is devoted to children in order to acquire a deeper understanding on his unique writing style. The aim of this study is to identify the types of intertextuality represented in R. Dahl’s poetry.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. The notion “intertextuality” and its types

Term “intertextuality” denoting in a literary theory has become widely used phenomenon in linguistic and cultural studies. Its emergence is connected with such scholars as F.de Saussure, M.M. Bakhtin, J. Kristeva and R. Barthes. According to F. Saussure’s linguistic theory, people make up their world’s understanding by means of language. While interacting with a language, people’s worldview is formed by this language. The scholar’s prominent linguistic theory recognizing language as a system of phonology, semantics and syntax concerns linguistic framework of intertextuality (Saussure, 1966).

Intertextuality “focuses on the idea of texts’ borrowing words and concepts from each other... through allusions, impressions, references, citations, quotations, connections and impact of the other texts” (*Zengin, 2016: 301*). According to the view that text is a “growing, evolving, never-ending process” (*Irwin, 2004: 232*), intertextuality is presented as “new ways and new strategies for understanding and interpreting texts” (*Zengin, 2016: 302*). Intertextuality is defined as “an attempt to understand literature and culture in general” (*Allen, 2000: 7*), confirming the broad meaning of the term.

M. Bakhtin’s interpretation that the life of the word “is contained in its transfer from one mouth to another, from one context to another context, from one social collective to another” (*Bakhtin, 1984: 201*) has been explained by J. Kristeva. She decodes this statement noting Bakhtin’s “conception of the ‘literary word’ as an intersection of textual surfaces... as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character) and the contemporary or earlier cultural context (*Kristeva, 1980: 65; 1986: 36*). J. Kristeva’s conception of intertextuality has its roots from M. Bakhtin’s dialogism (*Moi, 1986: 34*). They both “share an idea that there is always a correlation between texts and the social and cultural contexts out of which the texts are produced” (*Zengin, 2016: 322*). Thus, J. Kristeva asserts that the text can be regarded as an intertextuality within society and history (*Kristeva, 1986*).

R. Barthes affirms that the text is “the fabric of words which make up the work and which are arranged in such a way as to impose a meaning which is stable and as far as possible unique” (*Barthes, 1981: 32*). The theorist states that “the notion of text implies that the written message is articulated like the sign: on one side the signifier... and on the other side the signified” (*Barthes, 1981: 33*).

G. Genette attempts to distinguish the types of intertextuality. The scholar produces the theory of “transtextuality” as an analogue of “intertextuality”, investigating the relationships between the text and the architectonic (*Genette, 1997a*). Moreover, the theorist elaborates five sub-categories of transtextuality, which are “intertextuality, paratextuality, architextuality, metatextuality and hypertextuality” (*Genette, 1997b*).

M. Riffaterre proposes another idea of intertextuality, differentiating “two faces of a poetic sign”. From his positions these two faces are “textually ungrammatical, intertextually grammatical; displaced and distorted in the mimesis system, but in the semiotic grid appropriate and rightly placed” (*Riffaterre, 1978: 165*). M. Riffaterre distinguishes two types of intertextuality, which are aleatory (it is involved many potential intertexts) and determinate (an intertext is clearly presenting behind the text) (*Riffaterre, 1984*). What is more, the scholar expands his consideration of intertextuality, defining it as “a structured network of text-generated constraints on the reader’s perceptions” (*Riffaterre, 1994, p.781*).

At the same time, the notion of intertextuality is actively used in linguistic theory as discussion of textual segments taking into consideration implications, assumptions or presuppositions. Referring to the idea of intertextuality, J. Culler suggests two approaches to the consideration of intertextuality. The first one deals with specific presuppositions in a text, while the second one regards rhetorical or pragmatic presuppositions (*Culler, 1976*).

N. Fairclough distinguishes two types of intertextuality: manifest intertextuality and constitutive intertextuality (*Fairclough, 1992b: 117*). According to the researcher’s view, the first type indicates intertextual elements such as presupposition, negation, parody, irony, etc. Considering the second type, which points out the interrelationship of discursive features in a text, such as structure, form, or genre, N. Fairclough determinates it as “interdiscursivity” (*Fairclough, 1992b: 104*).

R. Pope suggests three kinds of intertextual relation” “explicit, implied and inferred intertextuality” (Pope, 2002: 246). The researcher states that explicit intertextuality involves all the texts that the writer has openly referred to and all the concrete sources that the writer has demonstrably mentioned. Implied intertextuality includes all the allusions to other texts and all the effects, which the writer has created obviously for recognition by the reader. Inferred intertextuality refers to all those texts that readers appeal to help their understanding of the text. (Pope, 2002: 246).

R.S. Miola argues that “intertextuality” comprises “the he widest possible range of textual interactions” including “sources and influences” (Miola, 2004: 13). He divides intertextuality into seven types. Among distinguished types of intertextuality, which can be actualises in the text there are revision, translation, quotation, source, conventions and configurations, genres, and paralogues (Miola, 2004: 13-23).

The first category covers first four types of intertextuality. “This category comprises specific books or texts mediated directly through the author” (Miola, 2004: 14). The second category supports by traditions. An original text emits “its presence through numberless intermediaries and indirect routes (commentaries, adaptations, translations, etc.)” (Miola, 2004: 20-21). The last category involves “what any audience brings to a text rather than what the author put in”. Thus, “the focus moves from texts and traditions to the circulation of cultural discourses” (Miola, 2004, p. 23). Making division into categories and their subclasses, the scholar supposes that proposed distinctions between types and categories “are not absolute and exclusive” (Miola, 2004: 13).

As this article examines the phenomenon of intertextuality in R. Dahl’s poetry, the focus concentrates on the text rather than the author and reader, although the author, his intent and the reader will be touched incidentally.

2.2. R. Dahl and his controversial style of writing for children

Literature discloses that “imaginative perspectives, interrogate[s] values and assumptions, and lead[s] to enhanced understanding of global cultures and differences” (Birketveit & Williams, 2013: 7). Poetry can allow children “to focus closely on the beauty, play, and emotive power of language” (Elster & Hanauer, 2002). Reading poetry develops readers’ understanding, capability of reflection, and imagination. Reading for pleasure has significant “cognitive, emotional, and social advantages” (Hempel-Jorgensen, Cremin, Harris & Chamberlain, 2018: 87). Humor increases motivation for reading. As R. Dahl remarks in his interview “a good children’s book does much more than just entertain. It teaches children the use of words, the joy of playing with language” (West, 1990a: 65). Employing the “same kinds of humour that children use themselves” and “sympathizing with children in their conflict with adults”, R. Dahl manages to provide pleasure to his children readers (West, 1990b: 116). R. Dahl understands “what children find funny, and what they desire, and it is truly noticeable in his writing” (Alston & Butler, 2012: 39). R. Dahl states that his only purpose for writing books for children is to encourage them to develop a love for books. “I’m trying to entertain them. If I can get a young person into the habit of reading and thinking that books are fun, then, with a bit of luck, that habit will continue through life” (West, 1997: Interview 111-112).

In the beginning of R. Dahl’s writing career, he was well known as a storyteller for adults. However, when he started writing children’s books, which are famous and beloved by children, his writing style has immediately raised controversy. His style was heavily criticised. Critics supposed it anarchistic and not appropriate. Despite adults were mostly against R. Dahl’s books children adored them. Even nowadays R. Dahl remains one of the most popular children’s

author. He has regarded as “one of the greatest storytellers for children of the 20th century”, Dahl has been named one of the 50 greatest writers. He ranks amongst the world’s best-selling authors. C. Butler points out R. Dahl “was (and remains) controversial” (*Butler, 2012: 1*).

Critics call R. Dahl’s *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* “the most tasteless books ever written for children” (*as cited in Silvey, 1995: 116*). In response to these negative statements, the author argues “adults judge a children’s book by their own standards rather than by the child’s standards” (*West, 1997: Interview 112*). The difference between children and adults in the perception of R. Dahl’s humour and jokes “involves differences in the psychology of children and adults” (*West, 1999*). Humour is changeable as it can change with the development of the society. “The sense of humour could easily change as we grow from a child to an adult person. It also depends on the other factors such as intellectual ability, past experience” (*Mallan, 1993*). In R. Dahl’s interview, there is the explanation why adults disapprove his books and consider them as tasteless stories, situations, and jokes while children find them humorous: “I generally write for children between the ages of seven and nine. At these ages, children are only semicivilized. They are in the process of becoming civilized, and the people who are doing the civilizing are the adults around them, specifically their parents and their teachers. Because of this, children are inclined, at least subconsciously, to regard grown-ups as the enemy. I see this as natural, and I often work it into my children’s books” (*West, 1997*).

R. Dahls was blamed for the spoiled “moral universe”, enjoyment of “writing about violence” (*Rees, 2012: 144*). However, the author himself elucidates this subjective opinion, remarking the inclusion of some violence in his books is always undercut with humor. “It’s never straight violence, and it’s never meant to horrify. I include it because it makes children laugh”. In author’s opinion, children know that the violence in his stories is “only make-believe and just like in fairy tales they are aware that it is not real”. R. Dahl adds, “when violence is tied to fantasy and humor children find it more amusing than threatening” (*West, 1997: Interview 113*).

On the contrary, J. Culley describes R. Dahl’s writing style as full of “the sensual quality of words” with “onomatopoeia, the construction of onomatopoeic words, alliteration, puns and verbal humour” (*Culley, 2012: 67*). The scholar supposes that the writer “is aware that ‘unusual words may create humour, impart information or indicate meaning in the context’” (*Culley, 2012: 68*). A. Schober claims those critics who condemn R. Dahl’s books fail to acknowledge the vigorous play of language in Dahl’s books, which abound which funny, witty puns, rhymes, jokes, alliteration, onomatopoeia, spoonerisms, malapropisms, as well as eccentric use of nonsense (*Schober, 2009: 34*).

R. Dahl’s humour in his children’s books is considered as “perfectly natural and normal”. Adults use their “civilized” humour and every deviation from its norms is attacked. R. Dahl understands that children have another taste and he applies “the same kinds of humor that children use themselves”, and he sympathizes “with children in their conflicts with adults” (*West, 1999: 94*). This is one of the main reasons of R. Dahl’s extreme popularity as children’s author (*West, 1999: 93-94*).

C. Cullingford states that fantasy is the key element of R. Dahl’s books for children. The author “constantly plays with the very thin line between imagination, fantasy and reality”. The bright evidence of this fact can be a quote from R. Dahl’s “*Minpins*”: “Those who don’t believe in magic will never find it.” (*Dahl, 2004: 44*).

That is why children adore his books (*Cullingford, 1998: 156*).

R. Dahl is famous for his inventive and playful usage of language. His special kind of humour causes readers to laugh. R. Dahl is popular for his especial, unusual and unique writing style. He encourages his children-readers to let their imagination run free. The key elements of

R. Dahl's books for children are creative approach to language use, fantasy and humour which all feature his prominent style.

3. Intertextuality in R. Dahl's poetry for children

This paper considers intertextuality in Roald Dahl's poetry. His poetry not only in poems but also in his novels. R. Dahl's collections of verse are *Revolting Rhymes* (1982), *Dirty Beasts* (1983), and *Rhyme Stew* (1989). The author reproduces familiar tropes from nursery rhymes, fables and fairy tales; however, he gives them unexpected twists. R. Dahl's poetry tightly interweaves with his prose attracting readers' attention. The writer states children do not have "the concentration of an adult, and unless you hold them from the first page, they're going to wander, and watch the telly, or do something, else. They only read for fun; you've got to hold them" (as cited in Lehane, 2016). Therefore, poetry included in R. Dahl's prose works can be assumed to appear as a kind of technique for maintaining children's attention, for interest in further reading the book. For instance, there is a limerick in *Matilda*, which has appeared long before in *Life* magazine (1946) and several anthologies:

*An epicure dining at Crewe
Found a rather large mouse in his stew.
Cried the waiter, 'Don't shout
And wave it about
Or the rest will be wanting one too.*
R. Dalh. *Matilda*.

An epicure, dining at Crewe,
found quite a large mouse in his stew,
said the waiter, "Don't shout,
and wave it about,
or the rest will be wanting one, too!
Anonymous. *Life* magazine.

As we can see from the examples the differences are in punctuation and changing words *quite* into *rather* and *said* into *cried* that testifies R. Dahl's tendency to the exaggeration. He says he makes his "points by exaggerating wildly as that's the only way to get through to children" (Blair, Amis, & Fuller, 2014-2015: 92). According to R. Pope's types of intertextual relation, it is an explicit intertextuality (Pope, 2002: 246).

The intertextuality of children's poetry by R. Dahl can be traced in his verses from *Rhyme Stew* (2008), which are in the intertextual relations with nursery rhymes included in the collection *Book of Nursery Rhymes* (1993, 2000, 2016): "Hey, diddle, diddle," "Mary, Mary, quite contrary", "I had a little nut-tree," "St Ives" and others. It should be remarked that this is an explicit intertextuality, for example:

R. Dalh. (2013). *Rhyme Stew*

"Hey diddle diddle"

*Hey diddle diddle
We're all on the fiddle
And never get up until noon.
We only take cash
Which we carefully stash
And we work by the light of the moon.*

"Mary, Mary"

*Mary, Mary, quite contrary
How does your garden grow?
'I live with my brat in a high-rise flat,
So how in the world would I know.'*

"I had a little nut-tree"

*I had a little nut-tree,
Nothing would it bear.
I searched in all its branches,
But not a nut was there.*

'Oh, little tree,' I begged,
'Give me just a few.'
The little tree looked down at me
And whispered, 'Nuts to you.'

“St Ives”
 As I was going to St Ives
 I met a man with seven wives
 Said he, 'I think it's much more fun
 Than getting stuck with only one.'
 Book of Nursery Rhymes
 (1993, 2000, 2016).

“Hey, diddle, diddle”
 By Mother Goose
 Hey, diddle, diddle,
 The cat and the fiddle,
 The cow jumped over the moon;
 The little dog laughed
 To see such sport,
 And the dish ran away with the spoon.

“Mary, Mary, quite contrary”
 By Mother Goose
Mary, Mary, quite contrary
How does your garden grow?
With silver bells and cockleshells
And pretty maids all in a row.

“I had a little nut tree”
I had a little nut tree,
Nothing would it bear,
But a silver nutmeg and a golden pear.
The King of Spain's daughter
Came to see me,
All because of my little nut tree.
I skipped over the water,
I danced over the sea,
And all the birds in the air couldn't
catch me.

“As I was going to St. Ives”
As I was going to St. Ives,
I met a man with seven wives,
Each wife had seven sacks,
Each sack had seven cats,
Each cat had seven kits:
Kits, cats, sacks, and wives,
How many were there going to St. Ives?

As we can see from the above given examples, the intertextual relation is explicit in R. Dahl's poetry. In “Hey diddle diddle” the rhythmic scheme remains the same however R. Dahl's rhyme is more accurate. The writer misses punctuation used in the original. Although the main difference is in content. In R. Dahl's verse, nonsense is saved representing contemporary life style (*we only take cash*). “Mary, Mary,” saves the same scheme and rhyme, excepting the third line. Moreover, the first two lines are equal. Again, R. Dahl's nursery rhyme displays modernity (*in a high-rise flat*) so Mary does not know how the garden grows. R. Dahl's “I had a little nut-tree” loses original's scheme, shorting the original verse from nine lines into eight, divided into two stanzas. They have the same rhyme schemes (ABCB). When “*I begged*” a little nut tree “*give me just a few*” nuts, unexpected ending is represented: “*The little tree looked down at me / And whispered, 'Nuts to you.'*”. That is various from the original as “*a little nut tree*” gives “*a silver nutmeg and a golden pear*”. “As I was going to St Ives” is a traditional nursery rhyme that shapes a riddle (*How many were there going to St. Ives?*). R. Dahl comes to the humorous conclusions in his verse (“*I think it's much more fun / Than getting stuck with only one*”) which can be considered as the answer to the riddle in the original. Reducing the amount of lines at minimum (from seven to only four), R. Dahl creates four-line stanza, maintaining the first two lines in the original (*As I was going to St Ives / I met a man with seven wives*). The only one thing that the writer changes in these lines is omitting punctuation marks of the initial variant. The writer's verse has a shorten title “St Ives” as well as “Mary, Mary” while the other

verses preserve their original titles. R. Dahl modifies traditional rhymes with his extraordinary writing style so that children do not lose interest in reading.

Rhyme Stew (2008) contains other examples of explicit intertextuality, for example “The Tortoise and the Hare”, “Hansel and Gretel”, “Ali Baba and forty thieves”, “Aladdin and Magic Lamp”.

Revolting Rhymes (2003) is a book of well-known tales in rhymed form. This collection includes six classical fairy tales which reinterpreted by R. Dahl. They are “Cinderella”, “Jack and the Beanstalk”, “Snow White”, Goldilocks and the Three Bears” “Little Red Riding Hood” and “The Three Little Pigs”. The writer’s references to the famous tales particularly to their titles represent the explicit intertextuality.

Although the titles of fairy tales are known to readers, but tales have a completely different storyline and unexpected ending. Thus, the fairy tale “Cinderella” (*Dahl, 2003*) has a beginning that immediately attracts the reader's attention, while maintaining the interest of the addressee: “*I guess you think you know this story./ You don't. The real one's much more gory./ The phoney one, the one you know,/ Was cooked up years and years ago./ And made to sound all soft and sappy/ just to keep the children happy.*”. R. Dahl differently starts the tale as well as he proposes another ending: “*Oh kind Fairy./ 'This time I shall be more wary./ 'No more Princes, no more money./ 'I have had my taste of honey./ I'm wishing for a decent man./ 'They're hard to find. D'you think you can?/ Within a minute, Cinderella/ Was married to a lovely feller./ A simple jam maker by trade,/ Who sold good home-made marmalade./ Their house was filled with smiles and laughter/ And they were happy ever after.*”, showing readers that life is not always like in a fairy tale, however it is possible to be happy in life under any circumstance. In common, R. Dahl’s tales start as the ones we all know; they are mainly remarkable with the usage of speech expressivity and the contemporary language; they have unexpected twist at the end, leading to the happy ending, which can be humorous.

R. Dahl’s writing style is influenced by his childhood. When he was a boy his mother, Sofie Dahl, told traditional Norwegian myths and legends from her native homeland to R. Dahl and his sisters. Thus, some of his children’s books comprise references inspired by these stories. Thus, A. Schober considers R. Dahl’s “The Pig” from *Dirty Beasts* as the version of *Animal Farm* by G. Orwell, remarking “this rewriting of Orwell’s *Animal Farm*” (*Schober, 2009: 35*). This fact testifies the phenomena of intertextuality represented in R. Dahl’s poetry for children. This kind of intertextuality can be determined as implied (*following R. Pope, 2002*).

R. Dahl’s tales can be placed in the traditions of the fable, the fairy tale (European fairy tales, their versions written by Charles Perrault and Brothers Grimm) and Norwegian myths and legends. The writer’s poetry can be considered as modern adaptations of fables, fairy tales, myths and legends. These contemporary versions by R. Dahl assumes some features which characterized fables and tales. In fables there is summing up of morality at the end (*Blackham, 2013*). Fairy tales begin with conflict. They deal with magical instruments, powerful animals or humans (*Zipes, 2012: 2*). For example, in “Jack and the Beanstalk” there is a moral ending encouraging children to follow the rules of personal hygiene. “The Three Little Pigs” maintains the problem of overeating. In “Cinderella”, there is the Magic Fairy while in “Jack and the Beanstalk” – the Giant. What is the most prominent feature about Dahl’s tales is his faithful adherence to the classic “happy ending”. Although Dahl’s tales are contemporary, some of their ideas can “be placed in quite a long-standing tradition” (*Petzold, 1992: 186*). These aspects give evidence intertextual relations in R. Dahl’s poetry as well as in his prose. R. Dahl’s works in the traditions of fables and fairy tales is worth being examined in the aspect of intertextual relations and might be the subject of a separate research.

4. Conclusions

To conclude, most of R. Dahl's poetry includes sources directly connected with folklore traditions. The writer openly referred to the concrete texts (nursery rhymes and tales), demonstratively mentioning them (indicating their titles). Thus, according to R. Pope's classification of types of intertextuality, the explicit intertextuality has appeared as the most frequent and the most vivid type in R. Dahl's poetry for children.

R. Dahl's *Revoltin' Rhymes* is a collection of famous fairy tales reinterpreted in a contemporary way with unexpected ending twists. *Rhyme Stew* by R. Dahl is the collection of hilarious verses, which are related to fairy tales, fables and nursery rhymes. *Dirty Beasts* is a collection of R. Dahl's irrelevant verses, which make readers' imagination run wild. Implied intertextuality is represented in this book.

R. Dahl's poetry devoted to older children represents his exclusive writing style. R. Dahl's style is characterized by lively fantasy, extraordinary humour and ingenious usage of language.

Future avenues for investigation can be the research focused on different types of intertextuality in R. Dahl's poetry for children as well as in his children's novels.

References

1. Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
2. Alston, A., & Butler, C. (2012). *Roald Dahl*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: four essays*. C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Trans.). Austin TX: University of Texas Press.
4. Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. C. Emerson (Ed. and Trans.), W. C. Booth (Intr.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
5. Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. V.W. McGee (Trans.). Austin: University of Texas.
6. Bakhtin, M. M. (1990). *The Dialogic Imagination*. M. Holquist (Ed.), C. Emerson and M. Holquist (Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
7. Barthes, R. (1981). *Theory of the text*. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A poststructural reader* (pp. 31-47). London: Routledge.
8. Birch, D. (1989). *Working effects with words - whose words? Stylistics and reader intertextuality*. In R. Carter & P. Simpson (Eds.), *Language Discourse and Literature: An introductory reader* (pp. 257-273). London: Unwin Hyman.
9. Birketveit, A. & Williams, G. (Eds.). (2013). *Literature for the English classroom*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
10. Blackham, H. J. (2013). *The fable as literature*. London: Bloomsbury.
11. Blaire, N., Amis, M., & Fuller, J. (Eds.). (2014-2015). *Modern poetry. Anthology of modern & contemporary poetry. Readers' favourite world poets*. New-York: Writers and Artists Publishing.
12. Butler, C. (2012). *Introduction*. In A. Alston & C. Butler (Eds), *Roald Dahl* (pp. 1-13). London: Palgrave Macmillan. doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-28504-1_1.
13. Childs, P., & Fowler, R. (Eds.). (2006). *The Routledge dictionary of literary terms*. London: Routledge.
14. Culler, J. (1976). *Presupposition and intertextuality*. *MLN*, 91(6), 1380-1398. doi.org/10.2307/2907142
15. Culley, J. (2012). *Roald Dahl – 'It's about children and it's for children' – but is it suitable?* *Children's Literature in Education*, 22.1 (1991), 59-73.

15. Cullingford, C. (1998). *Children's literature and its effects: the formative years*. London : Cassell.
16. Dahl, R. (2002). *Dirty Beasts*. London : Puffin Books.
17. Dahl, R. (2003). *Revolt Rhymes*. London : Puffin books.
18. Dalh, R. (2004). *Minpins*. London: Puffin Books.
19. Dahl, R. (2008). *Rhyme Stew*. London: Puffin Books.
20. Dahl, R. (2016). *Matilda* . London: Puffin Books.
21. Elster, C., & Hanauer, D. (2002). *Voicing texts, voices around texts: Reading poems in elementary school classrooms*. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 37(1), 89-134.
22. Fairclough, N. (1992a). *Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis*. *Discourse and Society* 3(2). 193-217.
23. Fairclough, N. (1992b). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity.
24. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. Boston MA: Addison Wesley.
25. Genette, G. (1997a) *Palimpsests: Literature in second degree*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
26. Genette, G. (1997b) *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
27. Gliori, D. (Ed.). (2000). *The Dorling Kindersley book of nursery rhymes*. London: Gardners Books.
28. Gustafson, S. (Ed.). (2016). *Favorite nursery rhymes from Mother Goose*. New York: Greenwich Workshop Press.
29. Hempel-Jorgensen, A., Cremin, T., Harris, D., & Chamberlain, L. (2018). *Pedagogy for reading for pleasure in low socio-economic primary schools: beyond 'pedagogy of poverty'?* *Literacy*, 52 (2), 86-94. doi.org/10.1111/lit.12157
30. Irwin, W. (2004). *Against intertextuality*. *Philosophy and Literature*, 28/2, 227-242.
31. Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A Semiotic approach to literature and art*. L. S. Roudiez (Ed.), T. Gora, A. Jardine and L. S. Roudiez (Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
32. Kristeva, J. (1986). *The Kristeva reader*. T. Moi (Ed.). New York Columbia University Press.
33. Lehane, Una. (2016, September 2). *Roald Dahl: 'Children only read for fun; you've got to hold their attention'*. *From the archive: Roald Dahl speaks to the Irish Times in 1982 about writing for children, his inventions and becoming an accidental art collector*. Retrieved from <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/roald-dahl-children-only-read-for-fun-you-ve-got-to-hold-their-attention-1.2777356>
34. Mallan, K. (1993). *Laugh lines: Exploring humour in children's literature*. Newtown, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association.
35. Miola, R. (2004). *Seven types of intertextuality*. In: M. Marrapodi (Ed.), *Shakespeare, Italy, and intertextuality* (pp. 13-25). Manchester: Manchester UP.
36. Moi, T. (1986). *Introduction*. In *The Kristeva reader*. Columbia University Press, New York.
37. Petzold, D. (1992). *Wish-fulfilment and subversion: Roald Dahl's Dickensian fantasy*. *Children's Literature in Education*, 23 (4), 185-193. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2FBF01134005.pdf>
38. Pope, R. (2002). *The English studies book. An introduction to language, literature and culture*. (2nd ed.). London, New York: Routledge.
39. Rees, D. (2012). *Dahl's chickens: Roald Dahl*. *Children's Literature in Education*, 19.3 (1988), 143-145.
40. Riffaterre, M. (1978). *The semiotics of poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

41. Riffaterre, M. (1984). *Intertextual representation: On mimesis as interpretive discourse*. *Critical Inquiry*, 11(1), 141-162.
42. Riffaterre, M. (1994). *Intertextuality vs. hypertextuality*. *New Literary History*, 25(4), 779-788.
43. Saussure, F. (1966). *Course in general linguistics*. C. Bally, A. Sechehaye, & A Riedlinger (Eds.), W. Baskin (Trans. and Intr.). McGraw-Hill Book Company: New York, Toronto and London.
44. Schober, A. (2009). *Roald Dahl's reception in America: The tall tale, humour and the gothic connection*. *Papers: Explorations into Children's Literature*, 19, 30-39. Retrieved from <http://paperschildlit.com/index.php/papers/article/view/39>
45. Silvey, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Children's books and their creators*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
46. Susina, J. (2004). *Children's literature*. In P. S. Fass (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of children and childhood: In history and society* (pp. 178-185). New York: Macmillan Reference USA.
47. West, M. I. (1990a). *Interview with Roald Dahl*. *Children's Literature in Education*, June, Volume 21, Issue 2, 61-66. doi.org/10.1007/BF01464461
48. West, M. I. (1990b). *The grotesque and the taboo in Roald Dahl's humorous writings for children*. *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, Vol. 15, N. 3, 115-116. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/249138>
49. West, M. I. (Ed.). (1997). *Trust your children: voices against censorship in children's literature*. Interviews 109-114. (2nd ed.). New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers.
50. West, M. I. (1999). *The grotesque and the taboo in Roald Dahl's humorous writings for children*. In L. Rollin, & M. West (Eds.), *Psychoanalytic responses to children's literature* (pp. 91-96). Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland.
51. Wright, B.F. (Ed.). (1993). *Real Mother Goose*. New York: Scholastic Inc.
52. Zengin, M. (2016). *An introduction to intertextuality as a literary theory: Definitions, axioms and the originators*. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 50, 299-327.
53. Zipes, J. (2012). *The irresistible fairy tale: The cultural and social history of a genre*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.