

THE FUNCTIONS OF INTERTEXTUALITY IN CONTEXT

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17942139>

Otabek Murtazoyev

Bukhara state university

Uzbekistan

Abstract

In academic discourse, intertextuality is a universal principle of constructing an academic text at the content level, as any text is retrospectively and persistently linked to other studies. According to the law of continuity of knowledge, each new academic text is associated with a complex mechanism that carries out the preservation of knowledge as well as communication between people who produce this knowledge. The interpretation of the text depends on the knowledge of other texts. Intertextuality activates the reader's knowledge stored in memory, while text recipients must be armed with previous information to understand new texts.

Keywords

Intertextuality, semiotics, monologism, dialogism, retrospective, communicative pragmatics, retrospective. Key words: Intertextuality, obligatory, optional, accidental, allusion, quotation, calque, plagiarism, translation, pastiche, parody.

Each text is intertextual by nature: it contains elements of other texts for a specific purpose. Intertextuality considers a text to be a fabric or a web, where texts derived from very different discourses are crossed and ordered. The methodological base of the study leads to modern linguistic, discursive and communicative approaches. The topic of the study corresponds to the development trends of modern linguistics in the context of a new scientific paradigm. The results suggest that intertextuality in academic discourse is a universal principle of creating a scientific text at the content level, as any text is retrospectively and persistently associated with other studies. The history and origins of intertextuality theories come from the following theoretical approaches: 1. Semiotics and the semiotic theory of culture are based on culture as a system of signs, as well as the following ideas about culture and text: Bartes in 1970, Bakhtin in 1979, Derrida in 1972, and Fairclough in 1970. 2. Semiosphere theory, dedicated to the philosophical concepts of dialogism against monologism: Buber in 1950, Lotman in 1973. 3. Theories of French literary theorists and philosophers who shaped the transition to

poststructuralism and studied the text as an open text system produced in intertextuality: Barthes in 1970, Derrida in 1972, Genette in 1970 and Kristeva in 1967. 4. Research of Russian formalists: Shklovsky in 1930, Tinianov in 1930, Tomashevsky in 1920, and structuralists of various national schools: Jacobson in 1930, Riffaterre in 1970. The contribution of their literary scholarship is that it sharply focused on the main problems of literary criticism and literary studies, first of all, on the peculiarities of its object, which changed the concept of a literary work. 5. From the literary and linguistic points of the Eurasian Union of scholars (ESU) # 4(73), 2020-37 an extensive study of the problems of intertextuality view: Grivel in 1978, Jung in 1970, and Van Dijk in 1978.

Intertextuality has recently been studied in the texts of various communicative fields, in particular intertextuality in academic communication in different languages, such as Russian, English, German, Spanish texts. The material for the study was academic papers by Spanish scientists with a total volume of 1,000 pages from 2005 to 2019. The academic text in this study is considered as a special type of text created specifically in the process of carrying out scientific activities for the purpose of preserving, developing and transmitting scientific knowledge. It is characterized by such characteristics as informativeness, integrity, consistency, accuracy in the presentation of material, dependence, completeness, articulation and orderliness, which are manifested at the functional-meaningful, communicative-pragmatic and linguistic-stylistic levels.

The methodological foundations of our research include: discursive and communicative approaches; philosophical categories: 1) the activity in which the concept of a scientist's speech activity stands out; 2) consistency, according to which the scientific picture of the world is reflected in the academic text; 3) speech theory. To develop the concept of intertextuality, special attention should be paid to its analysis from different points of view. There are very different concepts of intertextuality, which can be divided into two groups in the general sense: the broad approach, where intertextuality is a universal property of the text, and the narrow approach, which states that it is a characteristic functionally conditioned by different types of speech.

The term intertextuality comes from a theory developed by Bakhtin based on dialogical words. In 1967 Julia Kristeva M. Relying on Bakhtin's ideas in "others' words" and "dialogism", he published the article "Bakhtin, Le mot, le dialogue et le roman", through which he introduced the concept of intertextuality. According to Julia Kristeva "any text is built as a mosaic of quotes and is to break and modify another text". Texts are intertextual by nature: they cover elements of other texts for a specific purpose. Intertextuality considers a text to be a fabric or a web, where

texts derived from very different discourses are crossed out and put together in common. In theoretical discussions on the subject of intertextuality, there were two main concepts [2, p. 43]: - a global model of poststructuralism that treats any text as if it were part of a universal intertextuality, conditioning it in all its aspects; - more specific structuralist models that limit the concept of intertextuality to conscious, intentional or defined references between text or groups of texts. Both models have their own cognitive potential and their assumptions in terms of language theory, text theory and knowledge theory. In academic discourse, intertextuality is a universal principle of constructing an academic text at the content level, as any text is retrospectively and persistently linked to other studies. According to the law of continuity of knowledge, each new academic text is associated with a complex mechanism that carries out the preservation of knowledge as well as communication between people who produce this knowledge. The interpretation of the text depends on the knowledge of other texts. Intertextuality activates the reader's knowledge stored in memory, while text recipients must be armed with previous information to understand new texts. Intertextuality on the surface of a scientific text has a set of markers capable of identifying the knowledge given within the framework of new scientific knowledge, and it is important to note that academic speech requires the use of specific markers. Inter-textual methods of representation within a scientific text are as follows:

1. Intertextual suffixes that repeat the resulting fragment on the surface of the new text structure are quotation (full and abbreviated), indirect style, the introduction of "words of others" or a combination of words.
2. Intertextual suffixes that are references and do not reproduce the parts obtained within the new text structure, but refer the reader to the source of information, the previous excuse. Official signs of appeals are parentheses, numbers of different registers, signs.
3. Intertextuality can manifest itself by changing the verbal system. Notable aspects of scientific terminology include the use of Latin terms, such as: Para la extracci and the genrokismico de D of DNA. melanogaster, D. simulans and D. mauritiana se utilizaron ... symbolic relations represent different intertextual relationships in Spanish scientific texts that use different systems of symbols (symbols), namely: formulas, diagrams, graphs, drawings, etc. Latin phrases and placements are often used to navigate through a scientific text. For example, Et. Al (and others): when we cite a text with several authors; Supra: up; Infra: down; Op. Edge: relying work; Idem: same; here. = Ibrakkabdem, which means "somewhere".

The term intertextuality has now been broadened to include all types of interrelated media. Originally it was used specifically for literary texts and it is generally accepted that the theory has its origins in early 20th-century linguistics.

The word intertextual was coined in the 1960s by Julia Kristeva in her analysis of Bakhtin's concepts of Dialogism and Carnival. The term is derived from the Latin word 'intertext', which translates as 'to intermingle while weaving.' She thought that all texts were 'in conversation' with other texts, and could not be read or understood completely without an understanding of their inter-relatedness. Since then, intertextuality has become a staple characteristic of both

Postmodern works and analysis. It is worth noting that the practice of creating intertextuality has been around for much longer than the more recently developed theory of intertextuality. Postmodernism is a movement that followed and often reacted against Modernism. Postmodernist Literature is generally considered to be

Literature published after 1945. Such Literature features intertextuality, subjectivity, non-linear plots, and metafiction. Famous Postmodern authors you may have studied already include Arundhati Roy, Toni Morrison and Ian McEwan.

Basically, literary intertextuality is when a text refers to other texts or to its cultural environment. The term also implies that texts do not exist without context. Other than being a theoretical way of reading or interpreting texts, in practice, linking to or referencing other texts also adds additional layers of meaning. These author-created references can be deliberate, accidental, direct (like a quote) or indirect. An author or poet can use intertextuality deliberately for a variety of reasons. They would probably choose different ways of highlighting intertextuality depending on their intention. They may use references directly or indirectly. They might use a reference to create additional layers of meaning or make a point or place their work within a particular framework. A writer could also use a reference to create humour, highlight an inspiration or even create a reinterpretation of an existing work. The reasons and ways to use intertextuality are so varied that it is worth looking at each example to establish why and how the method was used.

REFERENCES:

1. Bakhtin, M.M. Questions of Literature and Aesthetics. Moscow: Arts, 1979.
2. Kristeva J. Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman. Paris, 1967
3. Chernyavskaya V.E V.E. Polycodedness. Intertextuality. Interdiscursivity. Moscow: Librocom, 2009.
4. Dolzhich E.A. Intertextuality in modern scientific discourse. Germany: LAMBERT Academic Publishing GmbH&Co, 2012. LAP

5. Rasulov, Z. I., & Murtazoyev, O. N. (2023). TYPES OF INTERTEXTUALITY IN ENGLISH LINGUISTICS. *INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENTS AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION*.