Functions of Allusion and Allusion as a Marker of Intertextuality and Precedence

Ma'ripov Jalolkhan Kamoliddin ugli

Jizzakh branch of the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, The faculty of psychology, the teacher at the department of foreign languages

Alimkulova Khulkar Tolibovna

Jizzakh branch of the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, The faculty of psychology, the teacher at the department of Uzbek language and literature

Abstract: It is known that the term "allusion" appears in many European languages already in the 16th century. But, despite the long tradition of using this word in foreign literary criticism and linguistics, the phenomenon itself begins to be actively studied only at the end of the 20th century. At present, due to the interest in implicit ways of transmitting information in the text, more and more attention of researchers is attracted by such a stylistic device as allusion. Allusion is usually considered either from the standpoint of the theory of intertextuality, or from the standpoint of stylistics. However, it is worth emphasizing that these two approaches have much in common and complement each other.

Keywords: allusion, linguistics, intertextuality, intertextual markers, society, paradigm, concept.

The concept of intertextuality arose in the second half of the 20th century and quickly became one of the key terms in both literary criticism and linguistics. Intertextuality is considered as intertextual interaction, i.e. the presence in one text of a part of another text in the form of allusions, quotations, references, etc.

The founder of the theory of intertextuality is M. M. Bakhtin, who was the first to use the concept of a dialogic word, i.e. each text is figuratively interpreted as a dialogue. The term "intertextuality" was introduced by Y. Kristeva, according to whom intertextuality is interpreted as "textual interaction that occurs within a single text" [Kristeva, 1967]. However, Yu. Kristeva, unlike M.M. Bakhtin considers dialogic not only words, but the entire text. Yu. Kristeva interprets the text as a "historical and cultural paradigm", as a "society". [Kristeva op. according to: Ilyin, 1995, 204].

As the analysis of linguistic literature showed, in the works of V.E. Chernyavskaya and M.L. Malakhovskaya distinguishes three main models for interpreting the phenomenon of intertextuality:

➢ a broad model of intertextuality (intertextuality as a universal property of any text);

➢ a narrow model of intertextuality (intertextuality as a fact of co-presence in one text of one or more other texts, which is realized in conscious authorial techniques);

➢ Negative model of intertextuality (intertextuality is a buzzword that has no linguistic reality behind it).

The development of the idea of intertextuality led to the emergence of the concept of "intertext", which is multi-valued. After analyzing the works of post-structuralists, T.V. Tsyrendorzhieva identified three basic concepts of intertext: 1. A directly analyzed text that

absorbs many texts, having its own meaning; 2. texts outside the analyzed one, with which the analyzed text enters into semantically productive relations, 3. General text, which can be an intertext of any text [Tsyrendorzhieva, 1999: 35]:

In our work, an intertext is understood as a segment of the text in which one or another reference to the previous text is used, included in it in the form of an allusion, quotation, statement, epigraph, etc.

The theory of intertextuality and the theory of precedence are closely interrelated and interdependent. Intertextuality is considered as a multidimensional connection of texts, which is created with the help of various references to previously created texts, functioning as a precedent text. Various linguistic means of introducing precedent texts can be considered as intertextual markers, inclusions, and signals. Intertextuality in our work is considered as a mechanism of intertextual interaction, which is implemented in the intertext by introducing a segment or fragment of a precedent text into it.

I.V. Arnold understands intertextuality as the inclusion in the text of whole other texts with a different subject of speech, or their fragments in the form of quotations, reminiscences and allusions [Arnold, 1999:346]. E.V. Mikhailova considered the term intertextuality as a category of text. Intertextuality in its understanding is a multidimensional connection of an individual text with other texts along the lines of content, genre and stylistic features, structure, formal sign expression, is a backbone category of discourse. [Mikhailova, 1999:2].

At present, the theory of intertextuality is still in the focus of attention of many researchers. In particular, the use of intertextualisms in political discourse, in the media, in scientific speech, in fiction, etc. is being studied.

The theory of precedent texts is closely related to the theory of intertextuality. intertextuality is primarily manifested in the use of precedent texts - potentially autonomous semantic blocks of a speech work, actualizing the background information significant for the author and appealing to the "cultural memory" of the reader. The concept of "precedent text" was introduced into linguistics by Yu.N. Karaulov and means "texts (1) significant for a particular person in cognitive and emotional terms, well-known to the wide circle of the given person, including his predecessors and contemporaries, and, finally, such, (3) the appeal to which is renewed repeatedly in the discourse of this person" [Karaulov, 1987: 216].

The phenomenon of precedence has received versatile coverage in the linguistic literature. The focus of researchers is predominantly "culturally significant" precedent statements based on the commonality of universal - social, cultural or linguistic - background knowledge of the author and the reader. So, Yu.N. Karaulov classifies well-known quotations, names of characters, titles of works and their authors, as well as cultural signs of a non-verbal nature as precedent texts. V.Ya. Shabes distinguishes social, collective and individual precedent statements. V.V. Krasnykh considers social precedent, national precedent and universal precedent text structures. Yu.A. Sorokin points to the cognitive significance of precedent texts, which are cultural and axiological signs and represent a holistic, coherent, semantic and formally complete emotive formation [Sorokin et al. 1997:24].

G.G. Slyshkin understands a precedent text as any sequence of symbolic units characterized by integrity and coherence, which has value significance for a certain cultural group [Slyshkin 2000:28]. So, G.G. Slyshkin considers the text in a broad sense, not necessarily literary, and, in addition, identifies precedent texts for various groups, and not just for the national culture as a whole. E.A. Zemskaya believes that texts included in the text in an unchanged form (citation) and in a transformed, altered form (quasi-citation) can be precedent, since they are well known to a wide range of people and have the property of

repeatability in different texts [Zemskaya, 2000: 105].

Thus, precedent texts are considered as any sequence of symbolic units characterized by integrity and coherence, which has value significance for a certain cultural group. Precedent texts are part of the current background knowledge and are identified at the intersection of the intertext of the work and the actual background knowledge.

References:

1. Alshawi H. Memory and context for language interpretation. - Cambridge, 1987. - 188 p

2. Anderson J. R. Language, memory, and thought. - New York, 1976. - 291 p.

3. Bell R.T. Translation and Translating Theory and Practice. - London, New York. Longman, 1991. -298 p.

4. Brewka G. Principles of Knowledge Representation. - California, 1996. - 318 p.

5. Charniak E. On the Use of Framed Knowledge in Language Comprehension// Artificial Intelligence, vol.11, 1978. - P.225 - 265.

6. Charniak E. Organization and Inference in a Frame-Like System of Common Sense Knowledge. - Castagnola, ISCS, 1975.

7. Fillmore Ch.J. The Case for Case Reopened // P.Cole, J.M.Sadock. Syntax and Semantics, 8: Grammatical Relations. -N.Y.: Academic Press, 1977. - P.59 - 82.

8. Johnson-Laird Ph.N. Mental Models. - Cambridge (Mass.]. Harvard Univ.Press, 1983.-XIII, 513 p.

9. Klix F. On stationary and infernal knowledge // XXIInd International congress of psychology (Leipzig, GDR, July 6 - 12, 1980) . Abstract guide. - Leipzig, 190. - P. 27 - 29.

10. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live by. - Chicago; London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980.-XIII, 242 p.

11. Rumelhart D.E. Notes for a Schema for Stories// representation and Understanding: Studies in Cognitive Science/ Ed. by D.Bobrow, A.Collins. - N.Y.: Academic Press, 1975. -P.211 -236.

12. Schank R.C. Dynamic Memory: A theory of Reminding and Learning in Computers and People. - Cambridge etc.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982. - XV, 234 p.

13. Schank R.C., Abelson R.P. Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding. - Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1977. - 248 p.

14. FEATURES OF ANTHROPOCENTRIC STUDY OF SACRED TEXTS. Maripov Jalolkhan Kamoliddin ugli, Alimkulova Khulkar Tolibovna. JournalNX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, ISSN No: 2581 – 4230 VOLUME 8, ISSUE 1, Jan. -2022.

15. DINIY TA'LIMOTLAR VA DINIY MATNLARNI TAHLIL QILISHNING O`ZIGA XOS JIHATLARI. Ma'ripov Jalolkhan Kamoliddin ugli, Alimkulova Khulkar Tolibovna. «ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ И НАУКА В XXI ВЕКЕ». Выпуск №22 (том 2) (январь, 2022)