

INTERTEXTUALITY OF THE LITERARY TEXT

<https://doi.org/10.70728/phil.v05.i04.078>

Intizo Umarova

intizorumarova12@gmail.com

Samarkand State University named after Sharof Rashidov

Abstract: This article examines the phenomenon of intertextuality in literary texts and analyzes its theoretical foundations within modern literary and linguistic studies. The theory of intertextuality emerged from the fundamental works of Mikhail Bakhtin, Julia Kristeva, Roland Barthes, Gérard Genette, and Jacques Derrida, whose studies emphasized the dialogic nature of texts and the interaction between cultural and literary discourses. The paper explores the concept of intertextuality from both broad and narrow perspectives, highlighting its role as a universal property of textual production as well as a deliberate stylistic device used by authors. Special attention is given to the classification of intertextual relations proposed by Gérard Genette, including intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality, and architextuality. The study also examines the role of paratextual elements, particularly epigraphs, as important markers of textual interaction and meaning construction. Furthermore, the article discusses the functions of intertextual references such as quotations, allusions, and reminiscences in shaping literary meaning and establishing connections between texts. The results of the study demonstrate that intertextuality represents an essential category of literary texts and plays a significant role in the interpretation and analysis of artistic discourse. The findings highlight the importance of developing systematic approaches for identifying and evaluating different forms of intertextual relations in literary works.

Keywords: Intertextuality; literary text; quotation; allusion; reminiscence; paratextuality; textual analysis; literary discourse

The theory of intertextuality, which has gained considerable popularity in recent decades, was formed on the basis of the fundamental works of Mikhail Bakhtin, Julia Kristeva, Roland Barthes, Gérard Genette, Jacques Derrida, Michael Riffaterre, Igor Smirnov, Peeter Torop, Natalia Fateeva, Natalia Kuzmina, and Mikhail Yampolsky, among others. Their studies laid the theoretical foundation for the understanding of textual interaction and the dialogic nature of literary discourse.

In contemporary scholarship, research devoted to the use of intertextual elements in various types of discourse is considered particularly promising. Such studies examine the functioning of intertextual references in journalistic texts, scientific

discourse, political communication, advertising language, and translation practices. Nevertheless, the phenomenon of intertextuality is most vividly manifested in literary texts, which provide extensive opportunities for scholarly investigation.

The concept of intertextuality was first formulated by Julia Kristeva as a reinterpretation of the ideas of Mikhail Bakhtin concerning dialogism, polyphony, and the multiplicity of voices inherent in literary discourse. Later, this concept was further developed in the works of post-structuralist thinkers. From this perspective, the entire culture of humanity may be understood as a single, comprehensive text embedded within reality. In other words, all newly created texts originate from a common pre-text while simultaneously becoming intertexts themselves as they enter the cultural sphere.

When defining intertextuality, scholars frequently rely on the interpretation proposed by Roland Barthes, according to whom every text represents an intertext containing traces of other texts in various forms. Such a text can be viewed as a kaleidoscope composed of quotations, formulas, cultural codes, and other semiotic elements.

Thus, two principal approaches to intertextuality may be distinguished: the broad and the narrow interpretations.

In the broad sense, intertextuality is regarded as a universal property of any text, functioning as a factor that shapes the creative process independently of the author's conscious intention. In the narrow sense, intertextuality refers to the explicit presence of one or more texts within another text, deliberately introduced by the author and realized through specific intertextual markers such as quotations, allusions, and reminiscences. From this perspective, intertextuality functions as a literary device intentionally employed alongside metaphor, metonymy, and other rhetorical figures.

Within this framework, the notion of the text itself requires clarification. In the present study we rely on the definition proposed by Ilya Galperin, who interprets the text as a product of speech activity characterized by such features as completeness, coherence, purposeful orientation, and pragmatic intention.

The question of textual categories remains highly debated among linguists. The definitions of key concepts, the list of textual categories under investigation, and their classification into obligatory and optional characteristics vary depending on the theoretical approach adopted by scholars. These approaches include text linguistics, stylistics of the text, text grammar, as well as conceptual and cognitive studies.

From the perspective of the first approach to intertextuality, the problem of textual boundaries remains particularly significant. According to Olga Kamenskaya, a text must possess identifiable demarcators that define its limits. Indeed, a text cannot exist as an entirely boundless phenomenon; for the purposes of scholarly analysis, it is necessary to determine its beginning and end. In this regard, the second approach

appears particularly productive. According to this view, intertextuality represents the ability of a text to establish relationships with other texts. It functions as a method of textual creation characterized by explicit or implicit references to preceding texts. One of the advantages of this approach lies in the possibility of limiting the number of texts involved in the analysis. Researchers identify precedent texts and examine intertextual markers that establish connections between successive textual structures.

Furthermore, understanding a text as a system of interacting elements with a defined structure contradicts the concept of an "infinite text." In such an unlimited textual space, it would be impossible to determine formal structural indicators. By contrast, a systemic view of the text allows scholars to analyze the structural organization of specific literary works, compare the structures of texts belonging to different genres, and identify general textual regularities.

It should be noted that in both broad and narrow interpretations the category of openness remains an essential feature of the text. Scholars such as K. I. Belousov, N. A. Kuzmina, G. G. Moskalchuk, and V. A. Pishchalnikova consider openness to be one of the important textual characteristics. In the broad sense, any text is open to multiple interpretations by different groups of readers. In the narrow sense, a completed text contains intertextual markers deliberately inserted by the author, which function as interpretative "windows" for the reader.

Consequently, intertextuality may be examined from both the author's and the reader's perspectives. For the author, the incorporation of intertextual elements performs several functions, including expressive, appellative, phatic, poetic, referential, and metatextual functions, while simultaneously contributing to the formation of the text itself.

Scholars have also proposed different classifications of intertextual relations. One of the earliest attempts to systematize these relations was made by the French literary theorist Gérard Genette, who proposed the following typology:

Intertextuality - the coexistence of two or more texts within a single text (quotation, allusion, plagiarism, etc.);

Paratextuality - the relationship between the main text and its accompanying elements such as titles, epigraphs, and prefaces;

Metatextuality - a critical or commentative reference to another text;

Hypertextuality - the transformation or parody of one text based on another;

Architextuality - the generic relationship between texts.

Among these types, paratextual relations play a particularly important role in texts that contain epigraphs. The dialogic nature of paratextual elements lies in their ability to influence the reader's perception before or after the reading of the main text.

According to Ilya Galperin, paratextual elements possess a certain degree of independence from the main text while remaining closely connected with it. Many

studies emphasize that epigraphs occupy a borderline position between text and paratext, forming a distinct hierarchical level within the textual structure.

An epigraph is usually an authentic quotation attributed to a specific author; therefore, it can be considered a particular case of quotation and one of the main intertextual markers. A quotation represents the reproduction of two or more components of the source text while preserving the original predicative structure. The reproduced model may appear either in its original form or with slight modifications.

According to Igor Smirnov, quotation often represents a form of reconstructive intertextuality that combines elements of both "one's own" and "foreign" texts. Unlike other intertextual markers, quotations are relatively easy to identify because epigraphs are graphically separated from the main text and placed in a pre-textual position. Nevertheless, texts containing epigraphs may also include other intertextual markers such as allusions and reminiscences. Therefore, the position of the epigraph can be described as a zone of maximal intertextuality.

The significance of the concept of intertextuality lies not only in providing a deeper theoretical understanding of contemporary culture, which increasingly strives for integration and unity, but also in its strong influence on the consciousness of modern authors and the texts they create.

Intertextuality is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon that requires further comprehensive research. In our view, intertextuality should be included among the obligatory textual categories alongside coherence, integrity, delimitation, and segmentation. For this purpose, it is necessary to develop a unified system for evaluating different manifestations of intertextuality, including quotations, allusions, reminiscences, poetic formulas, parodies, aphorisms, and other textual elements.

References

1. Mikhail Bakhtin. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
2. Julia Kristeva. (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
3. Roland Barthes. (1977). *Image-Music-Text*. London: Fontana Press.
4. Gérard Genette. (1997). *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
5. Jacques Derrida. (1976). *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.