

## INTERTEXTUALITY VS INTERDISCURSIVITY AS AN ESSENTIAL PHENOMENON OF MODERN DISCOURSE

Haydarova Nodirabegim Ahtamjon qizi

Bukhara State University

Department of Translation Studies and Linguodidactics

[nodirabegimhaydarova15@gmail.com](mailto:nodirabegimhaydarova15@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** The article presents in detail the history of the emergence and development of the term "intertextuality", as well as the history of the phenomenon described by this term before it began to be designated by this word. The features of the understanding of intertextuality by various scientific schools, the narrow and broad interpretation of the term are analysed.

**Key words:** intertextuality, interpretation, interdiscursivity, intertext, literary criticism.

The French researcher Julia Kristeva introduced the concept of «intertextuality» in 1967. In "The Revolution of Poetic Language" (1974), Kristeva gives the following definition of intertextuality: "... intertextuality is the transposition of one or more sign systems into another sign system" [1, p. 52]. Structuralists and poststructuralists understood intertextuality as the productivity of a text. The text (unlike the work) is not something limited, it is open, connected by myriad threads with its countless pretexts and contains the potential for an infinite number of intertexts. Roland Barthes writes: "Every text is an inter-text in relation to some other text, but this intertextuality should not be understood in such a way that the text has some kind of origin; <...> the text <...> is formed from anonymous, elusive and at the same time already read quotations - from quotations without quotes". According to Barthes, intertextuality also includes texts that appeared after the work. Barthes refers to the example given by Levi-Strauss, in which the myth of Oedipus also contains its Freudian version: "... when reading Sophocles, we must read him as a quotation from Freud and Freud as a quotation from Sophocles". As V.E. Chernyavskaya, "Bart emphasizes the receptive side of intertextuality". Declaring the "death of the author", the French school of intertextuality actually denies the historical approach in literary criticism, according to which the author is influenced by writers of previous eras. "Influence" is replaced by "intertextuality". However, American researchers such as Jay Clayton, Eric Rothstein question the existence of a boundary between these two concepts. Susan Stenfold Friedman argues that the very fact that Kristeva calls on Bakhtin to defend his concept of intertextuality demonstrates the principle of influence and, on the other hand, suggests that "the discourse of intertextuality already existed implicitly in the study of literary influences as a methodology".

Chernyavskaya distinguishes two models of intertextuality - wide and narrow. Chernyavskaya calls the broad model based on the ideas of Kristeva and Barth (who, in turn, rely on Bakhtin's dialogism), literary criticism, and the narrow model, according to which intertextuality is a special quality inherent only in some texts, linguistic. It is thanks to the narrow concept that the term became widespread, since "the global theory of intertextuality led to the inevitable blurring of the boundaries of this concept, its inflation". As will be shown below, most researchers adhere to a diametrically opposite point of view, considering a broader approach to the concept of intertextuality to be linguistic, and a narrow approach to literary criticism.

Meanwhile, the narrow concept of intertextuality, which represents the designation of the type of relationship that one specific text enters into with another specific text or texts (quotes, allusions, reminiscences, etc.), does not carry a new point of view, but "repeats under the new label the old views of literary criticism, rhetoric, and classical philology". That is, in the case of the term "intertextuality" we see a scale of meanings, when at one end - infinity, blurring, inflation, at the other - un informativeness, tautology, redundancy.

It is obvious that the research program that he adheres to determines the place on this scale determined by one or another scientist using these terms. It is also obvious that these places will correlate, and this will, if not eliminate, then at least level the confusion that may arise in the use of these (and other related) terms. So, for example, typological intertextuality, which implies "reproducibility in a particular text instance of invariant

text-forming features determined by the model of its text construction and – perception – by the type/genre of the text”, may well be called discourse in its narrowest sense (practically merging with the concept of functional style).

Such a view on the relationship between the concepts of "intertextuality" and "interdiscursivity" is shared by Natalie Piguët-Gros, who proposes to consider any appearance in the text of another specific text as intertextuality, regardless of its style and nature (up to letters, various kinds of plates and restaurant menus). All other forms of dialogism, including the so-called typological intertextuality, the author refers to the concept of "interdiscursiveness". A broader understanding of intertextuality, according to Piéguet-Gros, makes this term irrelevant for literary analysis.

Particularly noteworthy is the description of interdiscursive processes as intermedial and metadiscursive, which is given by Georginova, referring to N.S. Olizko, who, following the representatives of the French school, considers “interdiscourse as a linguosociocultural space in which discourse is formed and produced”. Comparing intertextuality and interdiscursivity, I.V. Silantiev argues that a more complex discourse with a higher status in the sociocultural hierarchy reflects and bears traces of a wider range of other discourses.

The scientist draws attention to another very subtle feature of the phenomenon of interdiscursivity, which distinguishes it from the intertextuality of texts of various functional styles. Using examples from the novels "War and Peace" by L. Tolstoy and "Crime and Punishment" by F. Dostoevsky, he explains that the presence of non-fiction discourses in them is a "semantically productive fusion" of artistic, aesthetic, historiosophical and evangelical discourse. Interdiscursivity is not only a stylistic phenomenon; by definition, it involves the merging of artistic and non-fictional texts: the “transfer” into the text of different areas of knowledge, principles of thinking – artistic and non-artistic (scientific).

To emphasize the importance of the role played by linguo-socio-cultural space in discourse analysis, we will quote A.M. Kaplunenko example: “The phrase “I was born” was framed in the same statement: “I, Kaplunenko Alexander Mikhailovich, was born on April 8, 1947 in the city of Ussuriysk, Primorsky Territory.” It is difficult to say how many times this statement was repeated. But I have no doubt that it, written for the first time at the age of 16, is not identical to him, written for a job after defending his doctoral dissertation, I have no doubts”

Such a large number of definitions of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, in our opinion, is due to the fact that the concepts of text and discourse underlying them also have many different interpretations. The text, as well as the relatively recently widely used scientific discourse, is one of the cornerstones on which scientific theory is built. Since the text and discourse have an ontological status, the understanding of these terms directly depends on the scientific and worldview concept that the scientist adheres to.

Summing up the consideration of the existing concepts, it should be added that intertextuality as a form of secondary artistic convention contributes to the metaphorization of the text, creating a field of artistic figurative representation. In a literary text, it can act as the basis of a remake, all kinds of allusions, reminiscences, constructing additional meanings, varieties of textual and sub textual increment of meanings. Interdiscursivity, going back to the rhetorical discourse of oratorical speeches, which aimed to substantiate the subject of discussion and convince listeners, introduces an analytical principle into the literary text.

Interdiscursivity is mainly recipient-oriented, requiring a high level of scientific and artistic abstraction from the reader, gives additional volume to the literary text, creating a hierarchy of contexts by including codes from different areas of culture.

## References:

1. Иерусалимская Анна Олеговна Интертекстуальность vs интердискурсивность как сложившийся дискурс // Вестник Северного (Арктического) федерального университета. Серия: Гуманитарные и социальные науки. 2016. №2. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/intertekstualnost-vs-interdiskursivnost-kak-slozhivshiy-diskurs>.
2. Haydarova, N. (2021). INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDAGI ANTISEMIK MUNOSABATDA BO'LGAN TIBBIY FRAZELOGIZMLARNING LINGVOKULTUROLOGIK XUSUSIYATLARI.

- ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 1(1). извлечено от [https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals\\_buxdu/article/view/2158](https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/2158)
3. Khaydarova Nodirabegim Ahtamjonovna. (2021). Significance of Phraseological Units application in Medical Discourse of English and Uzbek Language. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2021.11.471>
  4. Haydarova, N. A. "Linguocultural analysis of English and Uzbek medical phraseological units describing physiological processes." *European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability* (2020): 15-16.
  5. Haydarova, N. (2021). Badiiy diskursda inson fiziologiyasi bilan bog`liq til birliklarining lingvomadaniy tahlili. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 6(6). извлечено от [https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals\\_buxdu/article/view/3571](https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/3571)
  6. Xafizovna, R. N. . (2022). Discourse Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Literary Work: Speech Acts and Politeness Strategies. *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*, 5, 123-133.
  7. Nafisa, K. . (2021). Semantics and Pragmatics of a Literary Text. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 374-378.
  8. Usmonova, Z. H., & Fayziyeva, A. A. (2019). LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES OF COMPLEX TERMS IN ISAAC ASIMOV'S WORKS. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, 1(5), 257-262.
  9. Anvarovna, F. A. (2021, December). ON PRAGMATIC STRATEGIES OF TRANSLATION. In *Archive of Conferences* (pp. 97-99).
  10. Fayziyeva Aziza Anvarovna. (2022). CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR UNIVERSALS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK. *JournalNX - A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal*, 8(04), 54–57.
  11. Anvarovna, A. F. (2021). Peculiarities of translating self-help book titles into the uzbek language. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(11), 869-873.
  12. Khaydarova Nodirabegim Akhtamovna Advantages of role play technique in teaching speaking in EFL classes // *Достижения науки и образования*. 2018. №5 (27). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/advantages-of-role-play-technique-in-teaching-speaking-in-efl-classes>.
  13. Tashpulatovich, B. M. . (2021). Using Multimedia Technologies in Teaching Foreign Languages. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 64-67. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/514>
  14. Khaydarova Nodirabegim Akhtamovna Essential use of role-play technique in overcoming communication barriers // *Достижения науки и образования*. 2018. №5 (27). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/essential-use-of-role-play-technique-in-overcoming-communication-barriers>
  15. Khaydarova Nodirabegim Ahtamovna The essence of motivation in teaching English as a foreign language // *Достижения науки и образования*. 2017. №4 (17). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/the-essence-of-motivation-in-teaching-english-as-a-foreign-language>