



## Intertextuality and Its Functions in a Literary Text

Feruz Bakhodir kizi Mukhamedova

Independent Researcher, Teacher, Uzbekistan State University of World Languages, Uzbekistan

E-mail: feruza9106@mail.ru

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v5i12.861>

---

### **Abstract**

Man has always strived to comprehend the new and unusual, to achieve the best and the highest. This search for the transcendent, the beyond is reflected in the texts of different cultures: legends, myths, fairy tales, sacred texts, and then in esoteric and fiction. Literary texts are of particular interest, as they are deeply anthropocentric, figurative, aesthetic. They are aimed at the reader and at the same time have an aesthetically oriented conceptuality – i.e. express the uniqueness of the author's concept sphere. In modern fairy tales and fantasy, much attention is paid to the form of the transcendent, which allows the authors to create entire fantastic worlds.

**Keywords:** *Intertextuality; Terms; Cultural Studies; Legends; Myths; Literature; Dialogue; Postmodernism*

### **Introduction**

In works on text linguistics, the terms “intertext”, “intertextuality” together with the term “dialogical” have become very widespread. However, both in domestic and foreign literature there is no clear theoretical justification for the concepts behind these terms.

Texts that include intertextual elements of various national cultures expand and activate the conceptual picture of the world of readers, connected with the past of both their native and world culture. They appeal to universal knowledge and values, complementing the relevant knowledge of readers. Intertextuality plays an important role in the globalization of human cultural knowledge. Comparison of texts from different cultures allows us to explore the transcendental concept sphere of modern man and the features of its representation within each individual culture.

While in mystical–philosophical novels, the most important is the search for an answer to general philosophical questions about the essence of the transcendent. When studying the concept of “intertextuality”, it is quite reasonable to distinguish between its two sides—research and author's. From the point of view of the researcher, intertextuality is a setting for a deeper understanding of the text or resolution of misunderstanding of the text by establishing multidimensional links with other texts associated with the precedent text (Arnold, 1997).

By analogy with intertextuality, one can speak of autotextuality, when misunderstanding is resolved by establishing multidimensional connections generated by a certain circulation of intertextual elements within the same text.

## ***Discussion***

In 1967, the theorist of poststructuralism Yulia Kristeva defined the term “intertextuality” as a common property of texts, expressed in the presence of links between them, allowing texts to explicitly or implicitly refer to each other. This happened in the autumn of 1966 in her report on the work of M.M. Bakhtin, made at R. Barth’s seminar and published in the spring of 1967 in the form of an article “Bakhtin, word, dialogue and novel”.

The fiction (and journalism) created in recent decades is rightfully considered intertextual. This is explained by the fact that any new knowledge, new information is always based on a number of historical, mythological, ideological and cultural knowledge, the bearers of which are the previous texts. Moreover, in the modern science of language, any text is considered as “part of an endless discourse”.

Scientific substantiation in literary criticism today acquires the assertion that in almost any text – fiction or journalistic – one can find citations, allusions, various historical and cultural references. An intertextual approach to the study of postmodern texts seems to be very timely, significant and extremely necessary. The named approach follows from the hermeneutic method of research, but somewhat expands its boundaries, which opens up new possibilities in the interpretation of literary and journalistic texts (Kuzmina, 2011).

The well-known researcher N.A. Fateeva believes that intertextuality is one of the signs of postmodern literature: “In general, postmodernism is determined by the technique of manipulating narrative perspectives, self-representation, to the point of erasing the difference between fiction and reality”.

It is noteworthy that various kinds of intertextual manifestations have been known for a long time. “You might think that this is a purely modern concept, but it covers the most ancient and most important practices of writing: no text can be written regardless of what was written before it; any text carries, in a more or less visible form, traces of a certain heritage and the memory of a tradition,” writes the French linguist Nathalie Pieguet-Gros in her work “Introduction to the theory of intertextuality” (Arnold, 1993).

Indeed, intertextuality as a technique is found as early as Antiquity and the Middle Ages, when texts, for the most part, were considered not as authorial works, but as collective works, acts of a common consciousness. Then quotations from different texts were included in others without references to the author and the inclusion of “foreign” words in quotation marks. At the same time, the so-called centons arose – texts composed entirely of fragments of other texts. In ancient Greece, “homerocentons” – works assembled from Homer’s poems – were very popular (Bocharnikova, 2009).

Somewhat later, Christian centons appeared - author’s poems, the content of which was Christian commandments and dogmas. A certain skill in terms of writing rhyming centones from the point of view of N.A. Fateeva, intertextuality is a way of “the genesis of one’s own text and the postulation of one’s own author’s “I” through a complex system of relations of oppositions, identification and disguise with the texts of other authors”. Similarly, we can talk about auto-intertextuality, when, when a new text is generated, this system of oppositions, identifications, and disguise already operates in the structure of the idiolect of a certain author, creating the multidimensionality of his author’s “I”.

Thus, in the process of creativity, the second “I” of the writer with whom he enters into a “dialogue” can be both the predecessor writer and himself. In the process of comprehension and

description, a “dialogic” of literary texts is created. This “dialogic” makes it obvious why duality becomes such an organic way of intertextualization: the correlation of a text with others gives rise to “twins” both at the plot level and at the “text–text” level.

It becomes obvious that any intertextual convergence is based not only on lexical coincidences, but also on structural similarities. That is why one should speak not only about actual intertextual connections, but also about deeper influences.

Thanks to the author’s intertextuality, the entire space of artistic and cultural memory is introduced into the structure of the newly created text as a meaning–forming element, and thus the literary tradition goes not from the past to the present, but from the present to the past. The texts of one author can also have such semantic reversibility, which is shown, for example, by M. Epstein’s study “The Bronze Horseman and the Goldfish. Pushkin’s fairy tale poem (Kuzmina, 2007).

In this work, the scientist, choosing the so–called “Petersburg text” of Dostoevsky as an interpretive text, finds commonality in the idea, composition, system of images in two almost simultaneously created, but completely different in genre, Pushkin’s works (“The Bronze Horseman” and “The Tale of the Fisherman and the Fish”). Pushkin’s auto–intertextual correspondences served as the basis for the comparison.

“What Pushkin divided into tragic and comic variants of the plot, in Dostoevsky, in an extremely compressed, monotonous formula, appears as a merged grotesque–fantastic image: the tragedy of a disappeared city and a bronze horseman comically stuck in a swamp. A monument to the founder of something that never acquired a foundation”, Epstein concludes. Fateeva completes this intertextual line by citing the words of V. Rozanov as an example: “God, Russia is empty...

Dreaming of the “goldfish” of the future and historical greatness, she sees the summed up plot of Russian history itself, similar to how Pushkin–Dostoevsky’s motives are summarized in the contexts “On the shore of desert waves ...”, “So that the goldfish serves me”(Kuzmina, 2011).

If earlier, at the beginning of the 20th century, the authors sought to assimilate the intertext in their text, to melt it into themselves until it was completely dissolved in it, to introduce the motivation of intertextualization, then the end of the century is distinguished by the desire for dissimulation, for the introduction of formal markers of interest connection, for a metatextual game with “foreign” text. For example, in the novel by V. Narbikova “Plan of the first person. And the second “the famous phrase of F.M. Dostoevsky’s “beauty will save the world” is played up like this: “She pointed to where there was beauty. “Yes,” Dostoevsky said, “it’s beautiful, that is, there is a level”. In the place where everything was for beauty, there was no beauty”. Any pre–existing poetic message turns into a new one—the halo of the “high” is deliberately removed in it, and it becomes “primitively tangible”.

In postmodern texts, each contact with the previous text turns into a connection, as a result, the intertextual connection takes on the character of a pun, hyperbole, or their overlap. This is how the “high” and “low” registers of a literary text are connected (Bocharnikova, 2009).

Analyzing the texts of works of art by different authors, one can single out the centering ones, which play the role of the core in establishing intertextual connections. They indicate to the researcher the intertextual relations between texts, in which the stylistic task is less pronounced. For example, Mayakovsky’s “Flute–Spine” and Mandelstam’s “Egyptian Mark” through the idea of “fracturing the spine” of their own work. Apparently, in this context, one can also talk about the “breaking of the spine” of the entire Russian cultural tradition of the 20th century, which was predicted by “strong” authors.

Thus, it is possible to single out the functions of intertext in a literary text. First of all, intertext allows you to introduce into your text some thought or a specific form of representation of thought,

objectified before the existence of this text as a whole. Thus, “each work, building its own intertextual field, creates its own history of culture, restructures the entire previous cultural fund”.

This statement means that fragments of “texts” of other arts can also be introduced into a literary text. So, for example, the phrases “Dark Figure” by A. Voznesensky and the virtual representation of “Black Square” by K. Malevich interact. Thus, thanks to the intertext, the text under study is introduced into a wider cultural and literary context (Antineskul, 2001).

Intertextual connections create a vertical context of the work, in connection with which it acquires a non–one–dimensional meaning. In this regard, the intertext, generating the constructions “text in the text” and “text about the text”, creates a semblance of tropeic relations at the level of the text (Bocharnikova, 2009).

The theory of intertextuality makes it possible to see a “metaphor” where there is a convergence of a fragment revealed in the text and a fragment of a precedent text that is not physically presented to the reader. The phenomenon of the generation of meaning unfolds between the real data and the whole text fragment that is present in the reader’s memory. So two texts become semantically adjacent. This gives rise to the effect of metatextual metonymy, the ultimate manifestation of which is sound paragrammatism (when an anagrammed whole is assembled according to sound parts).

The tendency to deploy around the text under study a whole “bundle” of texts of other authors correlated with it allows the artist of the word to determine his difference from other authors, to affirm his own creative “I” among others and in relation to others. In essence, intertextuality becomes a mechanism of metalinguistic reflection. However, intertextualization and autoreflexion, brought to the point of absurdity and passed through the theory of “deconstruction”, that is, destruction, by J. Derrida, just lead to the opposite effect – complete dissolution, dispersion of the author’s “I” in the semiotic space of “foreign” words and images of the “third faces” (Vaganova, 2010).

R. Barth writes the following: “Subjectivity is usually regarded as the fullness with which the “I” saturates the texts, but in fact it is a false fullness, these are just traces of those codes that make up this “I”. Thus, my subjectivity is ultimately only the banality of stereotypes. Consequently, the functions of the intertext in each text are determined solely through the “I” of its author, since the introduction of an intertextual relationship is, first of all, an attempt to thoroughly rethink another text in order to extract a new meaning from “one’s own” text.

The degree of meaning increment in this case is an indicator of the artistry of the intertextual figure. Intertextual connections are of a different nature, depending on the author’s intention (Anikina E.M, 2006).

It should be noted the organic connection between intertextuality and onomastics. There are many names and titles (onyms) in the texts, which allows us to conclude about the onomastic component of the concept of “intertextuality” (Vaganova, 2010).

Precedent texts can be anthroponyms (names of people), toponyms (geographical names), poetonyms (names in a literary work that perform a characterizing function) (Denisova, 2003).

Functionally, onyms perform in the text the role that the author has determined for them, that is, they depend on the author’s intention. For example, a text–forming function, as in the work of M. Paley “Cabiria from the Bypass Canal”, where Cabiria is the name of the majestic queen, and “Bypass Canal” is used as a generalized name of the lexical paradigm with the dominant “dirt”, “stench”, “stagnation” (Denisova, 2003).

## **Conclusion**

According to scientists, the role of precedent texts is that they act as an integral sign that refers to the text. The functions of intertextuality in a literary text are as follows:

1. The introduction of an intertextual relationship makes it possible to introduce into a new text some thought or a specific form of representation of thought, objectified before the existence of the given text as a whole;
2. Intertextual connections create a vertical context of the work, in connection with which it acquires a non–one–dimensional meaning;
3. Intertext creates a semblance of tropeic relations at the text level, and intertextualization reveals its constructive, text–generating function.

The study of intertextuality in sacred and mystical literary texts as a linguistic reflection of the modern transcendental concept sphere and intercultural dialogue can be continued in many directions. A similar study can be carried out on the material of other texts of the genres we have considered, on the material of texts from other cultures. The study of the interaction of intertexts and the modern worldview can be carried out in the space of other intertext systems.

## **References**

- Anikina E.M. (2006). Intertextuality in media discourse (on the material of the Anglo–American press): monograph. Ufa: BSU Publishing House.
- Antineskul O.L. (2001). Tender as a parameter of text formation. Perm: Publishing House of PGU.
- Arnold I.V. (1993). Intertextual connections in a literary text. St. Petersburg: Education.
- Arnold I.V. (1997). Problems of dialogism, intertextuality and hermeneutics. St. Petersburg: Education.
- Bocharnikova E.A. (2009). Actualization of the category of intertextuality in a scientific economic text: cognitive–discursive aspect: author. diss. cand. philol. sciences. Astrakhan.
- Vaganova E.Yu. (2010). Aphorism as a type of text in the aspect of intertextuality (on the material of the German language): monograph. Kaliningrad: Axios.
- Denisova G.V. (2003). In the world of intertext: language, memory, translation. Moscow: Azbukovnik.
- Dolzhich E.A. (2011). Intertextual links in the Spanish scientific discourse (on the basis of natural science articles and dissertations): author. dis. cand. philol. sciences. Moscow.
- Kuzmina H.A. (2007). Intertext and its role in the evolution of poetic language. Moscow: KomKniga.
- Kuzmina H.A. (2011). Intertext: theme with variations. The phenomenon of language and culture in intertextual interpretation. Moscow: URSS.

## **Copyrights**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).