

Article

Intertextuality as an Object of the Linguopragmatic Approach in Linguistics

Murtazoyev Otabek Nusrat ugli¹

1. Doctoral Researcher, Bukhara State University

Abstract: Intertextuality is an important research issue in contemporary linguistics. This article examines its linguistic aspects, the linguopragmatic approach, its distinctive features, and its functions in literary texts. It discusses the concept and types of intertextuality and the emergence and investigation of this phenomenon in modern linguistics. Particular attention is paid to the role of intertextual units in enabling language users to interpret texts correctly and grasp their original meaning. The article also engages with the views of linguists who have examined the scholarly significance of intertextuality and draws relevant conclusions.

Keywords: Intertextuality, frame, concept, intertextual units, literary text, literary fact, linguistics, text, linguopragmatics, mass-media text, scientific text.

1. Introduction

One of the most important characteristics of a literary text is that it develops through various degrees of connection with other texts. However original and individual a literary work may appear, it enters into direct or indirect relationships with the language system, genre traditions, cultural memory, and the images, motifs, and ideas embodied in earlier texts. Consequently, a new text emerges as part of a broader system of texts. In contemporary linguistics and literary studies, this phenomenon is termed intertextuality. This section first analyzes the formation and development of intertextuality theory in international linguistics and literary scholarship on the basis of academic sources. It then establishes the nature of intertextuality not merely as a structural-semantic phenomenon but also as an object of linguopragmatic research. Finally, it systematically describes its principal forms in literary discourse and explains their functional-pragmatic characteristics.[1]

To present the development of intertextuality theory objectively, it is useful to examine it through several successive stages rather than as a single process. The first stage covers the theoretical foundations of the phenomenon before the term itself was established (from ancient rhetoric to the Russian Formalist school); the second concerns the actual coinage of the term within French structuralism and poststructuralism (Kristeva, Barthes, Genette, and Riffaterre); the third is the independent development of the idea in Russian linguistics (Tomashevsky, Lotman, Toporov, and Kuzmina); the fourth involves critical reassessment of the theory (Irwin and Hutcheon); and the fifth concerns research on the phenomenon in Uzbek linguistics (Yo'ldoshev, Ashurova, Xomidova, Do'smuradova, Bozorova, and Hasanov). Each of these stages is considered separately below.[2]

Citation: ugli, M. O. N. Intertextuality as an Object of the Linguopragmatic Approach in Linguistics. International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics 2026, 5(2), 155-158.

Received: 4th Jan 2026

Revised: 29th Jan 2026

Accepted: 24th Feb 2026

Published: 31st Mar 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Another important stage in the development of intertextuality theory is associated with the French semiotician Roland Barthes. Radicalizing Kristeva's idea, he proposed that a text is a tissue of quotations drawn from innumerable centers of culture, arguing that textual meaning emerges not in the author but through the reader's perception of intertextual connections. [3] In his essay "From Work to Text," Barthes developed this idea further by distinguishing the "work" (*oeuvre*) from the "text" (*texte*): whereas a work is a completed material object, a text is an open-ended, dynamic process of producing meaning. [4]

2. Materials and Methods

The French structuralist Gérard Genette offered one of the most systematic accounts of intertextuality. In *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, [5] he proposed "transtextuality" as an overarching term for relationships between texts and divided it into five subcategories: intertextuality in the narrow sense (quotation, allusion, and plagiarism), paratextuality, metatextuality, architextuality, and hypertextuality. The particular value of Genette's approach lies in its precise, readily applicable classificatory framework rather than the philosophical and metaphorical language used by Kristeva and Barthes. For this reason, the present study adopts transtextuality theory as its principal methodological basis for systematizing types of intertextuality. Notably, Genette himself criticized the excessively broad use of the term "intertextuality" by Kristeva and proposed restricting it to one narrow subcategory of transtextuality. In other words, there is a fundamental distinction between Kristeva's original interpretation, which laid the foundations of the term, and Genette's subsequent differentiation of its forms. Researchers must therefore specify which definition they employ. As argued above, this study adopts Genette's narrower, operational interpretation.[6]

In Russian linguistics, ideas resembling intertextuality had already been raised by B. V. Tomashevsky in the 1920s in connection with the problem of intersections between texts. [7] At a later stage, the scholar Zinaida Turaeva treated intertextuality as an important aspect of text production and analysis. Drawing on Bakhtin's dialogic theory of text, she identified three textual functions: cognitive, communicative, and aesthetic. [8]

Within the Russian school of cultural studies, related ideas also appeared in the work of Yuri Lotman and Vladimir Toporov. Lotman interpreted culture as a unified "semiosphere", a complex of interacting sign systems, and proposed studying every text in relation to the "cultural memory" of this semiosphere. [9] Toporov, in turn, understood intertextuality as the perception of a text as a "diachronic matrix," that is, the process of "seeing" one text through another. In *Historical Poetics*, A. N. Veselovsky established still earlier roots of this idea by examining the movement of plots and motifs from oral folklore into written literature. [10] The work of these three scholars suggests that ideas related to intertextuality developed independently in Russian cultural studies well before French poststructuralism, although Kristeva is credited with introducing the term.

The study of intertextuality in Uzbek linguistics began comparatively late, primarily in the 2000s. M. Yo'ldoshev defined intertextuality as "the presence of elements of other texts within a particular literary text," emphasizing that any "foreign" text or fragment inserted into the main text becomes integrated with its meaning and linguistic structure and serves the author's aesthetic purpose. [11] D. U. Ashurova interpreted intertextuality as a text's capacity to enter into correlations with other texts and identified three core elements: the precedent text, the intertext, and the recipient text. [12] Research conducted under the supervision of S. Safarov also initiated comparative investigation of intertextuality in English and Uzbek. However,

as D. Bozorova observed, by 2018 intertextual markers in the two languages had not been sufficiently investigated from a comparative perspective. [13]

3. Results and Discussion

The research school led by Sh. S. Safarov, a prominent representative of cognitive linguistics in Uzbekistan, has argued that intertextuality should be approached not only structurally but also from a cognitive-cultural perspective. According to this view, decoding an intertextual unit depends on the system of “frames” or “concepts” present in the reader’s mind; consequently, the same intertext may be processed differently by members of different linguocultural communities. This perspective also provided a direct methodological basis for D. Bozorova’s comparative study of intertextual markers in English and Uzbek. [14] The scholarly value of the cognitive approach in this field is that it complements linguopragmatic analysis: whereas pragmatics answers the question “why,” cognitive linguistics addresses “through what cognitive mechanism.” Together, they make it possible to explain the linguistic and human dimensions of intertextuality more fully.

Terminological consistency in naming the phenomenon has not yet been fully established in Uzbek linguistics and literary studies. Most linguists, including M. Yo’ldoshev, D. Ashurova, M. Xomidova, Y. Do’smuradova, and D. Bozorova, use the terms “intertext” and “intertextuality,” whereas S. Hasanov proposed the neologisms “intermatn” and “intermatnlilik” in his 2025 comparative literary study. [15] In our view, although “intermatn” is an Uzbekized formation consistent with the language’s internal word-formation patterns, it has not yet gained widespread recognition among linguists and is used specifically within comparative literary studies. Following prevailing international and Uzbek linguistic usage, the present study in linguistics, particularly comparative linguistics, consistently employs the terms “intertext” and “intertextuality”.

4. Conclusion

In the author’s view, each of the theories examined above illuminates a particular aspect of intertextuality and therefore has scholarly value. Their applicability to linguistic research, however, varies. Although the concepts developed by J. Kristeva and R. Barthes have substantial philosophical and semiotic foundations, their high level of abstraction makes them difficult to apply directly as operational methods of linguistic analysis. By contrast, G. Genette’s classification of transtextuality provides a useful methodological foundation for describing intertextual relations because of its clear criteria and systematic structure. At the same time, his model focuses primarily on structural relationships between texts and does not fully account for their communicative-pragmatic dimensions.

The preceding analysis shows that intertextuality theory has undergone a complex scholarly development, from the philosophical and semiotic ideas of J. Kristeva and R. Barthes through G. Genette’s systematic typology, the Russian semiotic school, and early research in Uzbek linguistics. Nevertheless, most existing studies have interpreted intertextuality primarily as a structural-semantic or literary-poetic phenomenon, without sufficiently systematic investigation of its linguopragmatic nature: the aspects of intertextual relationships associated with communicative purpose, discourse participants, the addressee’s competence, and pragmatic effect. Addressing this research gap is one of the principal objectives of the present study; its theoretical and methodological solution is presented in the following section.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Barthes, *Selected Works: Semiotics and Poetics*. Moscow, Russia: Progress, 1994.
- [2] R. Barthes, "From Work to Text," in *Image, Music, Text*, trans. S. Heath. London, U.K.: Fontana Press, 1977, pp. 155–164.
- [3] G. Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Paris, France: Éditions du Seuil, 1982, 468 p.
- [4] B. V. Tomashevsky, *Theory of Literature: Poetics*. Moscow, Russia.
- [5] E. S. Vernigrova, "The scope and content of the concept of 'intertextuality' in theoretical studies of the artistic and cultural process," in *Methods and Methodology for the Study of Cultural Processes*. Moscow, Russia, 2015, p. 20.
- [6] Z. Turaeva, "Intertextuality: Ariadne's Thread in the Exploration of Literature," *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 31–42, 2016.
- [7] Y. M. Lotman, *Inside the Thinking Worlds: Human Being, Text, Semiosphere, History*. Moscow, Russia: Languages of Russian Culture, 1996, pp. 11–19.
- [8] A. N. Veselovsky, *Historical Poetics*. Moscow, Russia: Higher School, 1989, pp. 8–24.
- [9] M. Yuldoshev, *Linguopoetic Study of Literary Text*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2009, p. 128.
- [10] D. T. Bozorova, *Comparative Analysis of Intertextual Markers in English and Uzbek*, Master's thesis. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Uzbekistan State University of World Languages, 2018, p. 12.
- [11] D. U. Ashurova, *Text Linguistics*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2012, p. 52.
- [12] S. Sh. Hasanov, *Interpretation of Intertextuality in Contemporary Uzbek and English Prose: Based on the Works of Isajon Sultan, Bahodir Qobul, and Kazuo Ishiguro*, Ph.D. dissertation abstract. Samarkand, Uzbekistan: Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, 2025, p. 10.
- [13] D. T. Bozorova, *Comparative Analysis of Intertextual Markers in English and Uzbek*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2018, p. 15.
- [14] M. F. Khomidova, "The problem of intertextuality in modern linguistics," *Central Asian Problems of Modern Science and Education*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 259–263, 2019.
- [15] J. Sinclair, *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 1–10.