

Global And Uzbek Perspectives On Intertextuality: An Analytical Comparison

Yuldasheva Maftunaxon Azizjon qizi

Phd student, Fergana State University, Uzbekistan

Received: 15 September 2025; **Accepted:** 08 October 2025; **Published:** 12 November 2025

Abstract: This article provides a comparative analysis of intertextuality in Western and Uzbek linguistics. It traces the evolution of intertextual theory from Bakhtin's dialogism and Kristeva's semiotic approach to the postmodern interpretations of Barthes, Genette, and Eco. The study highlights how Uzbek linguists such as Yo'ldoshev, Khomidova, and Muzaffarova have localized and reinterpreted intertextuality within national literary and cultural contexts. Methodologically, the research employs comparative-descriptive and analytical approaches, focusing on the adaptation of global theories to Uzbek linguistic traditions.

Keywords: Intertextuality, dialogism, comparative linguistics, Uzbek linguistics, semiotics, poststructuralism, textual analysis.

Introduction: In contemporary linguistics and literary studies, intertextuality represents one of the most significant concepts defining the interrelation of texts. It expresses how every text, consciously or unconsciously, echoes previous ones and contributes to an ongoing cultural dialogue. While Western scholars have emphasized the structural and philosophical aspects of intertextuality—often linked with postmodern and deconstructive approaches—Uzbek scholars have reinterpreted it through the lenses of cognitive linguistics, cultural semiotics, and ethical aesthetics. This article aims to compare these traditions and highlight how global theoretical ideas have been transformed within the Uzbek intellectual context.

Bakhtin's concept of dialogism forms the foundation of intertextual theory. He proposed that every utterance is part of a dialogue that reflects prior statements and anticipates future ones. In *The Dialogic Imagination*, Bakhtin emphasized the heteroglossic nature of language, where multiple voices coexist. This dialogic principle later evolved into the modern notion of intertextuality, positioning the text as a living conversation among cultural and linguistic codes [2]. Julia Kristeva coined the term intertextuality in the late 1960s, expanding Bakhtin's dialogism into a broader semiotic framework. For Kristeva, every text is "a

mosaic of quotations" and "the absorption and transformation of another text" [1]. Her works, such as *Semeiotikè* and *Desire in Language*, introduced intertextuality as a structural condition of textual meaning. Kristeva's focus on the semiotic and symbolic dimensions of language made intertextuality a central concept in poststructuralist linguistics. R.Barthes further developed Kristeva's ideas by shifting attention from authorial intention to reader interpretation. In his essay *The Death of the Author*, Barthes argued that the text's meaning arises not from the writer's intent but from the interplay of textual codes decoded by readers [3]. Works such as *S/Z* illustrate this principle: every narrative is a network of prior cultural signs. This opened new perspectives for textual analysis where reading became an act of creative reconstruction [5]. G.Genette systematized intertextuality into a taxonomy he called transtextuality—comprising intertextual, paratextual, metatextual, hypertextual, and architextual relations[6]. His work *Palimpsests* (1982) demonstrated how literary texts rewrite previous ones. For example, *Wide Sargasso Sea* by Jean Rhys reinterprets *Jane Eyre* through postcolonial perspective, illustrating Genette's concept of hypertextuality. Genette's classification gave intertextual theory a clear structural framework. M.Riffaterre added a semiotic and hermeneutic

dimension to intertextuality. His idea of the hypogram—an underlying text that informs the new one—explains how meaning arises through recognition of hidden textual traces [4]. For Riffaterre, the act of reading involves deciphering intertextual codes that transform the text into a site of cultural memory. In *The Anxiety of Influence*, Bloom examined intertextuality as a psychological relationship between authors. He argued that every poet misreads his predecessors in an effort to assert creative independence. This “anxiety” drives literary evolution. Bloom’s contribution shifted intertextuality from structural to psychological and historical dimensions [7]. U.Eco viewed intertextuality as an interpretive process within the semiotic system. In *The Role of the Reader and Lector in Fabula*, he asserted that texts presuppose a shared cultural encyclopedia, allowing readers to activate meaning through intertextual recognition. His idea that texts are “open works” resonates strongly with later discourse analysis and reader-response criticism [8,9]. L.Hutcheon associated intertextuality with postmodern irony and parody, describing it as “repetition with critical distance.” In *A Theory of Parody*, she demonstrated how intertextual references critique ideological assumptions. For her, intertextuality is not only aesthetic play but also a form of cultural reflection that both honors and subverts tradition [10].

In Uzbek linguistics, intertextuality explores how texts are connected through shared meanings, references, and cultural symbols. It examines the ways in which authors use quotations, allusions, and stylistic echoes of previous works to create new meanings and perspectives within Uzbek literary and linguistic contexts. M.Yoldoshev was among the first Uzbek linguists to study intertextuality systematically. He emphasized that while poststructuralists viewed every text as a collage of earlier ones, such an approach risks denying authorial creativity. Yoldoshev reinterpreted intertextuality as a creative process where the author consciously integrates other texts to express aesthetic intent [12]. His analysis draws from A.I.Gorshkov’s differentiation between intertextuality and intertextual connections, defending the former as more accurate for capturing textual inclusions. M.Khomidova’s dissertation “Intertextuality in Literary Perception” focused on how readers recognize intertextual links through quotations, allusions, and epigraphs. She examined the influence of religious texts—Qur’an, Hadith, Bible—on Uzbek and world literature, emphasizing how intertextual recognition enhances interpretive depth and emotional engagement [11]. L.Muzaffarova explored intertextual space as a cognitive and cultural phenomenon. In her study on J.Salinger’s fiction, she analyzed how intertextuality

activates “knowledge structures” within readers’ minds, connecting literary memory with conceptual cognition [13]. Her approach highlighted the epistemological role of intertextuality in constructing meaning. D.Khudoyberganova investigated precedent units—culturally shared expressions, quotations, or references—as central to intertextuality. She viewed these as linguocultural markers that facilitate comprehension and cultural resonance within the text, aligning with the anthropocentric approach to linguistics [14]. X.Fayzullayeva’s article “Intertextuality and Its Functions in Literature” categorized intertextual functions as expressive, appellative, poetic, referential, and metatextual [15]. She described how intertextuality not only enriches a text’s semantic layers but also shapes cultural dialogue and aesthetic response, turning the reader into an active participant. M.Abdullayeva connected intertextuality with text linguistics, defining it as the presence of foreign textual elements within a text. She classified it into three types: intentional, optional, and incidental intertextuality, depending on whether the author or reader recognizes the connection consciously or unconsciously [16]. F.Khajiyeva studied intertextuality as an essential component of postmodern biographical novels, focusing on paremiological units, Qur’anic verses, and literary quotations. She argued that intertextual devices create a “cultural mosaic,” blending religious, folkloric, and global traditions. Her analysis linked intertextuality to cosmopolitanism, showing how diverse cultural codes coexist within one narrative [17]. N.Haydarova explored intertextuality in discourse analysis, considering it a key factor shaping textual coherence. She identified multiple functions—semantic enrichment, ideological signaling, characterization, and cultural memory activation [20]. In her paper “Interdiscursivity and Intertextuality,” she distinguished between intertextual and interdiscursive relations, emphasizing their role in forming dialogic discourse. A.Khalilova interpreted intertextuality as a cognitive category within literary texts. Using conceptual integration theory (Fauconnier & Turner), she proposed a model with three components: source text, receiving text, and the intertext itself. She explained how linguistic markers like allusions, epigraphs, and metaphors create new conceptual blends, expanding a text’s semantic field and activating readers’ cultural memory. Z.Urinova focused on readers’ comprehension of literary texts, analyzing how intertextual elements—particularly allusions—facilitate understanding of underlying meanings. She compared allusion to the classical poetic device *talmeh*, noting both similarities and distinctive cultural functions [23]. S.Qochqorova considered intertextuality an integral structural component of

artistic texts. She identified multiple functions—expressive, aesthetic, cognitive, and emotional—that collectively enhance textual polysemy. Her approach underlined intertextuality's role in evoking emotional resonance and intellectual engagement [21].

While Western theorists often interpret intertextuality as a deconstructive mechanism that destabilizes authorship and textual authority, Uzbek linguists view it as a constructive tool for preserving and reactivating cultural memory. Western scholarship prioritizes irony, hybridity, and multiplicity of meanings; Uzbek research emphasizes identity, spirituality, and moral reflection. The contrast illustrates how intertextuality evolves from a postmodern philosophical abstraction into a culturally grounded linguistic principle in Uzbek scholarship. Intertextuality remains a universal yet contextually adaptive phenomenon. In Western theory, it dismantles the boundaries of authorship and meaning; in Uzbek linguistics, it bridges tradition and modernity. Its study reveals the creative potential of language as a space of cultural dialogue. Ultimately, intertextuality unites global and local perspectives, demonstrating that every text is both a continuation of the past and a creation of the present.

REFERENCES

1. Кристина Ю. Бахтин, слово, диалог и роман. Французская семиотика: От структурализма к постструктурализму. – М., 2000. – С. 427-457. <http://www.philology.ru/literature/1/kristeva-00.htm>.
2. Бахтин М. Проблема текста в лингвистике, филологии и других гуманитарных науках. Опыт философского анализа // Эстетика словесного творчества. М., 1979 – 106 с.
3. Allen G. Intertextuality. Routledge, 2000. – p 62.
4. Riffaterre M. Semiotics of Poetry. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.
5. Barthes R. S/Z. – Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974. – P. 5–18.
6. Genette G. Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree. – Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997. – P. 14–39.
7. Bloom H. The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry. – New York: Oxford University Press, 1973. – P. 54–73.
8. Eco U. The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts. – Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979. – P. 102–118.
9. Eco U. Lector in Fabula. – Milano: Bompiani, 1979. – P. 35–61.
10. Hutcheon L. A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms. – New York: Methuen, 1985. – P. 65–78.
11. Ҳомидова М. Бадиий матн перцепциясида интертекстуаллик: Филол. фан. бўйича фалс. док. ... дис. – Тошкент, 2021. – 15 б.
12. Йўлдошев М. Бадиий матннинг лингвопоэтик тадқиқи: Филол. фан. д-ри... дисс. – Тошкент, 2009. – 127 б.
13. Музаффарова Л. Билим тузилмаларининг бадиий интертекстуаллик кўламида концептуаллашуви (Ж.Д. Сэлинджер асарлари мисолида): Филол.фан.б.фалс.док. ...дисс.автореф. – Тошкент, 2022. – Б. 15-17.
14. Худойберганова Д. Ўзбек тилидаги бадиий матнларнинг антропоцентрик тадқиқи: Филол. фан. доктори ... дис. – Тошкент, 2015. – Б. 129–160. Xudoyberganova D. O'zbek tilidagi badiiy matnlarning antroposentrik tadqiqi: Filol.fan.d-ri...diss. – Toshkent, 2015. – B. 129-160.
15. Файзуллаева Х. Интертекстуальность и её функции в литературе. // Oriental Renaissance: Innovative, Educational, Natural and Social Sciences. 2024, т. 4, № 11. – Б. 441–445.
16. Abdullayeva M. Intertekstuallikning tilshunoslikda o'rganilishi. // Ta'lim innovatsiyasi va integratsiyasi. 2024, № 19_1. – B. 58–61. – URL: <http://web-journal.ru/>
17. Khajieva F. Cultural-aesthetic function of intertextual devices in The Moor's Account by Layla Lalami. // Theoretical & Applied Science. 2021, № 11(103). – B. 1111–1115. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS>
18. Khajieva F. Cosmopolitanism through intertextual devices in the postmodern biographical novel. // ACADEMICA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. 2021, t. 11, № 11. – B. 156–161. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7137.2021.02428.9>
19. Haydarova N. Functions of intertextuality in discourse analysis. // Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity. 2022, № 6. – B. 142–146. – URL: <http://sjii.indexedresearch.org>
20. Haydarova N. Interdiscursivity and intertextuality: Relation of concepts. // Eurasian Research Bulletin. 2022, № 7. – B. 180–183. – URL: <https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/1295>
21. Qo'chqorova S. Badiiy matnlarda intertekstuallik kategoriyasining namoyon bo'lishiga oid. // Zamonaviy filologiya va lingvodidaktikaning dolzarb masalalari: Xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiya

materiallari. 2024, 23–24 aprel. – B. 1044–1047. – Chirchiq davlat pedagogika universiteti. – URL: <https://cspu.uz/>

22. Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (1998). Conceptual integration networks. *Cognitive Science*, 22(2), 133–187. Expanded web version, December 15, 2003.
<http://www.wam.umd.edu/~mtum/WWW/blending.html>
23. O'rinova Z. Badiiy matnni tushunishda intertekstual birliklarning o'рни. // *Oriental Renaissance: Innovative, Educational, Natural and Social Sciences*. 2023, t. 3, № 1. – B. 98–102. – URL: <https://www.oriens.uz>