
INTERTEXTUALITY AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUOPRAGMATIC RESEARCH

Murodilloyeva Zulfizar Khakim kizi

Teacher of School N_110 IDUM

email: khakimovna98@gmail.com

Abstract

This article explores intertextuality as a legitimate and productive object of linguopragmatic research. While intertextuality has traditionally been examined within literary theory and stylistics, its pragmatic dimensions — including communicative intent, reader inference, presupposition activation, and illocutionary force — remain underexplored. Drawing on the theoretical foundations established by Kristeva, Bakhtin, and Barthes, and integrating them with pragmatic frameworks such as Speech Act Theory, Implicature, and Relevance Theory, this article argues that intertextuality functions as a strategic communicative device. The proposed five-step linguopragmatic framework is applied to two illustrative cases — the title of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (English) and O'tkir Hoshimov's *Ikki eshik orasi* (Uzbek) — demonstrating how intertextual markers activate presupposed knowledge, generate implicature, and shape reader interpretation across different cultural contexts. The article concludes that intertextuality, when examined linguopragmatically, reveals itself not merely as a textual property but as a dynamic cognitive-pragmatic process grounded in shared cultural knowledge and communicative cooperation.

Keywords: Intertextuality, linguopragmatics, allusion, implicature, Speech Act Theory, Relevance Theory, cognitive linguistics, literary discourse.

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada intertekstuallik lingvopragmatik tadqiqotning qonuniy va samarali predmeti sifatida ko'rib chiqiladi. An'anaviy ravishda adabiyotshunoslik va stilistika doirasida o'rganilgan intertekstuallikning pragmatik jihatlari — kommunikativ niyat, o'quvchi xulosasi, presuppozitsiya faollashuvi va illokutiv kuch — hozirgacha yetarlicha tadqiq etilmagan. Kristeva, Bakhtin va Bart tomonidan asos solingan nazariy tushunchalarga tayangan holda, ular Nutqiy akt nazariyasi, implikatura va relevantlik nazariyasi kabi pragmatik yondashuvlar bilan uyg'unlashtiriladi. Taklif etilgan besh bosqichli lingvopragmatik model ikkita amaliy misol — Aldous Huxleyning "Brave New World" (ingliz) va O'tkir Hoshimovning "Ikki eshik orasi" (o'zbek) asarlari sarlavhalari — misolida qo'llaniladi va intertekstual belgilarning turli madaniy kontekstlarda qanday farqli tarzda ishlashini ko'rsatadi.

Kalit so'zlar: intertekstuallik, lingvopragmatika, allyuziya, implikatura, Nutqiy akt nazariyasi, relevantlik nazariyasi, kognitiv tilshunoslik, badiiy diskurs.

АННОТАЦИЯ

В данной статье интертекстуальность рассматривается как правомерный и продуктивный объект лингвопрагматического исследования. Прагматические аспекты интертекстуальности — коммуникативное намерение, инференция читателя, активация пресуппозиции и иллокутивная сила — традиционно остаются недостаточно изученными. Опираясь на теоретические положения Кристевой, Бахтина и Барта и интегрируя их с прагматическими концепциями — теорией речевых актов, имплицатурой и теорией релевантности, — автор показывает, что интертекстуальность функционирует как стратегическое коммуникативное средство. Предложенная пятиступенчатая модель применяется к двум примерам — заглавию романа Олдоса Хаксли «О дивный новый мир» (англ.) и роману Уткира Хашимова «Йкки эшик ораси» (узб.), — что демонстрирует различия в активации пресуппозиций в разных культурных контекстах.

Ключевые слова: интертекстуальность, лингвопрагматика, аллюзия, имплицатура, теория речевых актов, теория релевантности, когнитивная лингвистика, художественный дискурс.

1. INTRODUCTION

Intertextuality, since its introduction by Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s, has become one of the most influential concepts in contemporary literary and linguistic theory. This perspective, rooted in Mikhail Bakhtin's (1981) notion of polyphony and dialogism, fundamentally challenged the view of texts as autonomous, self-contained entities. Instead, intertextuality posited that every text exists within a vast network of preceding and surrounding texts, constantly referencing, echoing, and transforming them.

Despite its widespread acceptance, intertextuality has been predominantly studied within literary theory, stylistics, and semiotics. The linguistic dimension — particularly the pragmatic aspects of intertextuality — has received comparatively less attention. Yet, as this article argues, intertextuality is inherently pragmatic in nature. When an author employs an allusion, quotation, or other intertextual device, they are engaging in a communicative act that relies on shared knowledge, presupposes certain background information, and generates implicatures that must be inferred by the reader. In this sense, intertextuality functions as a strategic tool for encoding meaning, shaping reader interpretation, and achieving specific communicative effects.

The purpose of this article is threefold. First, it aims to establish intertextuality as a legitimate object of linguopragmatic research by demonstrating its compatibility with established pragmatic theories. Second, it seeks to provide a framework for analyzing intertextual phenomena through a pragmatic lens, focusing on the communicative functions, inferential processes, and cognitive mechanisms involved in the production and reception of intertextual references. Third, unlike purely theoretical treatments of the topic, this article operationalizes the proposed framework by applying it to two concrete literary titles — one English, one Uzbek

— in order to illustrate, rather than merely assert, how the framework functions in practice. By bridging the gap between intertextuality theory and pragmatics, this article contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how literary texts communicate meaning.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Theoretical Foundations of Intertextuality

The concept of intertextuality emerged from the convergence of two intellectual traditions: Bakhtin's dialogism and Kristeva's poststructuralist semiotics. Bakhtin (1981) introduced the idea of polyphony, which reveals “a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses” within literary discourse (p. 6). For Bakhtin, speech is inherently dialogical, meaning that every utterance is shaped by previous communicative experiences and anticipates future responses. This dialogic nature implies that language is never neutral; it carries the echoes of prior usages, social contexts, and ideological positions. Kristeva coined the term “intertextuality” in her 1966 essay “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” written within the Tel Quel circle's engagement with Bakhtin's work and later made available to English-language readers in *The Kristeva Reader* (Kristeva, 1986). She famously asserted that “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations” (Kristeva, 1986, p. 37), meaning that every text is formed through the absorption and transformation of other texts rather than created *ex nihilo*. This formulation is sometimes conflated in secondary sources with Kristeva's later article “Narration et transformation” (Kristeva, 1969); the two are, however, distinct publications, and the present article follows Moi's standard English edition for the direct quotation. Kristeva's broader semiotic project, of which the 1969 article forms a part, further elaborated the idea that a text is a dynamic intersection of multiple textual surfaces, quotations, and cultural references. Roland Barthes (1977) further radicalized this view by declaring the “death of the Author,” asserting that “the text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture” (p. 146). Within linguistics, a narrower approach to intertextuality has been adopted. Genette (1997) systematized this text-linguistic tradition under the broader label of “transtextuality,” distinguishing several concrete relations — intertextuality proper, paratextuality, metatextuality, architextuality, and hypertextuality — that subsequent scholarship has used to classify explicit and implicit forms of citation. Within this tradition, intertextuality is understood as an “explicit or implicit citing of other texts” (Arnold, 1999), functioning as a mechanism through which two or more texts co-exist within a single text that contains an explicit reference to the other (a definition surveyed in Makhmatkulova, 2025). This linguistic perspective focuses on identifiable intertextual markers — such as titles, epigraphs, quotations, allusions, repetitions, and antonomasia — that signal the presence of precedent texts within the recipient text.

2.2. Levels and Techniques of Intertextuality

Researchers have identified multiple levels and techniques through which intertextuality operates. Following a taxonomy summarized by Makhmatkulova (2025) and broadly

consistent with Genette's (1997) classification of transtextual relations, six levels of intertextuality can be delineated:

1. Face-value borrowing: the text draws on prior texts as authoritative sources of meaning.
2. Social drama: the text portrays explicit social dramas from prior texts engaged in discussion.
3. Background and support: the text uses other statements as background, support, and contrast.
4. Implicit reliance on common knowledge: the text relies on beliefs and ideas generally circulated and familiar to readers.
5. Evoking social worlds: the text uses recognizable language, phrasing, and genres associated with particular social worlds.
6. Available linguistic resources: the text relies on the available language of the period and the cultural world of the times.

These levels range from highly explicit (direct quotation) to deeply implicit (reliance on common linguistic and cultural resources). Similarly, techniques for identifying intertextuality include direct quotation, indirect quotation, mentioning of persons or documents, comment or evaluation, recognizable phrasing, and generic echoes (as summarized by Makhmatkulova, 2025).

2.3. The Pragmatic Gap in Intertextuality Research

While the literature on intertextuality is extensive, most studies have focused on its structural, stylistic, or semiotic dimensions. Relatively few researchers have examined intertextuality from a pragmatic perspective. Bykova (2025) analyzed the pragmatic potential of intertextuality in French internet discourse, identifying pragmatic functions such as persuasion, evaluation, and irony. Uzentsova and Molchanova (2025) explored intertextuality in advertising discourse, demonstrating how intertextual inclusions exert pragmatic influence on consumers. Coca (2025) examined phraseological intertextuality in Romanian newspaper headlines, identifying pragmatic functions including information transmission, evaluation, and mockery. However, a systematic integration of intertextuality with core pragmatic theories — Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969), Gricean Implicature (Grice, 1975), and Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986) — remains underdeveloped. This article seeks to address this gap by adapting established discourse-pragmatic analytic procedures into a five-step operational framework specifically tailored to intertextuality, and by demonstrating that framework on concrete material in Sections 4 and 5.

3. LINGUOPRAGMATIC FRAMEWORK FOR INTERTEXTUALITY

3.1. Intertextuality and Speech Act Theory

Speech Act Theory, pioneered by Austin (1962) and developed by Searle (1969), posits that utterances perform actions: they have illocutionary force (the intended function of the utterance) and perlocutionary effects (the actual effect on the hearer). When an author employs an intertextual device, they are performing a complex speech act. For instance, when an author uses a quotation, they are not merely reproducing words but performing acts of authority (citing

an authoritative source), homage (paying tribute to a predecessor), critique (subverting or parodying the source), or solidarity (aligning with a particular tradition).

Considering the example of allusion, a particularly rich intertextual device from a pragmatic standpoint. When an author alludes to a biblical story, a mythological figure, or a historical event, they rely on the reader's presuppositional knowledge. This presupposition — the background information that must be mutually known for the speech act to succeed — is a quintessentially pragmatic phenomenon. If the reader fails to recognize the allusion, the intended illocutionary force may be lost, and the perlocutionary effect diminished.

3.2. Intertextuality and Gricean Implicature

Grice's (1975) theory of implicature provides another powerful lens for analyzing intertextuality. Grice distinguished between what is said (the literal meaning of an utterance) and what is implicated (the additional meaning conveyed indirectly). Intertextual references often generate conversational implicatures. When an author echoes a familiar phrase or recontextualizes a well-known quotation, they invite the reader to infer connections, contrasts, or ironies that are not explicitly stated. For example, the title “The Weak Link” invokes the conventional wisdom that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link (an example discussed in Makhmatkulova, 2025). This title does not explicitly state its meaning; rather, it implicates that the subject of the text is a weak point within a larger system. The reader must infer this meaning by recognizing the adage, understanding its conventional wisdom, and applying it to the new context. This process of inference — moving from the literal title to its implicated meaning — is governed by pragmatic principles, particularly the Cooperative Principle and its maxims.

3.3. Intertextuality and Relevance Theory

Relevance Theory, developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986), offers a cognitive-pragmatic framework that is particularly suited to the study of intertextuality. According to Relevance Theory, communication involves the deliberate use of ostensive stimuli that make manifest a communicator's informative intention. The hearer then processes these stimuli in search of relevance, selecting the interpretation that yields the greatest cognitive effect for the least processing effort. Intertextual references are exemplary ostensive stimuli. They are intentionally placed by authors to signal the relevance of external texts. The reader, recognizing the reference, expends cognitive effort to access the precedent text, retrieve its meanings, and integrate them with the current text. The reward for this effort is a richer, more nuanced interpretation — what Relevance Theory calls a positive cognitive effect. However, if the reference is too obscure, the processing effort may exceed the cognitive reward, resulting in communication breakdown.

This cognitive-pragmatic perspective highlights the delicate balance that authors must strike when deploying intertextuality. They must assess the reader's background knowledge, anticipate the processing effort required, and calibrate the explicitness of the reference

accordingly. This is fundamentally a pragmatic decision, grounded in the author's assumptions about the reader's cognitive environment.

3.4. Presupposition and Intertextual Activation

Presupposition — the background assumptions that must be true for a speech act to be felicitous — is another pragmatic concept central to intertextuality. Intertextual references are inherently presuppositional. An allusion to Hamlet presupposes that the reader knows the play, or at least recognizes the name. An epigraph from the Qur'an presupposes familiarity with Islamic scripture. These presuppositions are not always met; readers from different cultural backgrounds may lack the necessary knowledge, resulting in failed communication or the emergence of new, unintended meanings. From a linguopragmatic perspective, intertextuality can be understood as a mechanism for activating presupposed knowledge structures. The author strategically selects intertextual markers that align with the presupposed knowledge of the intended readership. This selection process is guided by pragmatic considerations about the audience, the communicative context, and the desired interpretative outcomes.

4. MATERIAL AND METHODS

To demonstrate the applicability of the linguopragmatic framework outlined above, this article supplements its theoretical discussion with a qualitative analysis of two literary titles chosen for their prototypical, well-documented intertextual character: Aldous Huxley's English-language novel *Brave New World* (1932) and O'tkir Hoshimov's Uzbek-language novel *Ikki eshik orasi* [Between Two Doors] (1985). The two works were selected purposively rather than randomly: both are canonical within their respective national literatures, both carry titles whose meaning depends on activating a precedent text or cultural frame, and together they allow a preliminary cross-cultural comparison of how intertextual presupposition operates in an Anglophone versus an Uzbek communicative context. The analytical procedure follows the five-step method proposed in Section 6 below: (1) identification of the intertextual marker; (2) contextualization of its precedent text or cultural frame; (3) pragmatic analysis of the illocutionary act, implicature, and presupposition it activates; (4) cognitive assessment of the processing effort required of the reader; and (5) a brief comparative note. The analysis is qualitative and illustrative in nature; it is not intended as an exhaustive corpus study, but as a demonstration of how the proposed framework operationalizes the theoretical claims made in Sections 2 and 3.

5. ANALYSIS: APPLYING THE FRAMEWORK

5.1. English Material: Brave New World

(1) Identification. The title *Brave New World* is a direct, unmarked quotation from Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (Act V, Scene I), where Miranda, upon first seeing other human beings, exclaims: "O brave new world, / That has such people in't!" Huxley reproduces the phrase without quotation marks or attribution on the title page itself, relying entirely on the reader's recognition.

(2) Contextualization. The precedent text — Miranda's naive wonder at a world she has never seen — is activated as a cultural frame that the reader is expected to already possess, either through direct familiarity with Shakespeare or through the phrase's independent circulation in English as a semi-proverbial expression.

(3) Pragmatic analysis. Read against Huxley's dystopian content, the title performs a complex illocutionary act best described as ironic subversion. Miranda's exclamation, taken at face value, is an expression of wonder and hope; positioned as the title of a novel depicting a dehumanized, engineered society, it generates a strong conversational implicature (Grice, 1975): the reader is invited to infer that the society depicted is admirable in appearance only, and that its people possess humanity in a debased, manufactured sense. The gap between the source utterance's sincere illocutionary force and its ironic deployment in the title is itself the communicative point.

(4) Cognitive assessment. Recognizing the allusion requires a moderate degree of cultural-literary competence — familiarity with a single, canonical, frequently anthologized line from Shakespeare — which yields a comparatively low processing effort. Sperber and Wilson's (1986) principle of relevance predicts that Huxley calibrated the reference to this level of accessibility precisely because the ironic effect depends on quick, near-automatic recognition; a more obscure allusion would dilute the immediate ironic contrast the title is designed to produce.

(5) Comparative note. The English example illustrates a case in which the presupposed knowledge — a single Shakespearean line — is widely shared across the Anglophone literary tradition, making the intertextual marker relatively stable across readerships and generations.

5.2. Uzbek Material: Ikki eshik orasi

(1) Identification. Unlike Huxley's title, Hoshimov's *Ikki eshik orasi* does not quote a specific authored precedent text; rather, it activates a recognizable idiomatic frame rooted in Uzbek proverbial and everyday speech, in which the expression *ikki eshik orasida qolmoq* (“to remain caught between two doors”) denotes a state of being suspended between two conditions, unable to belong fully to either.

(2) Contextualization. The precedent here is not a single authored work but a shared cultural-linguistic resource — corresponding to what Makhmatkulova's (2025) taxonomy terms “implicit reliance on common knowledge” and “available linguistic resources.” Recognizing it presupposes membership in the Uzbek speech community rather than literary erudition specifically.

(3) Pragmatic analysis. As a title, the phrase performs an act of thematic framing: it presupposes that the reader already grasps the idiom's conventional meaning and invites the inference — before a single page is read — that the novel's characters will occupy an intermediate, unresolved position. The implicature is generated economically: a two-word idiom activates an entire thematic expectation, in a manner functionally comparable to, though culturally distinct from, Huxley's Shakespearean allusion.

(4) Cognitive assessment. For a reader embedded in Uzbek culture, the processing effort is minimal, since the idiom belongs to everyday, high-frequency speech rather than to a specific text requiring prior reading. For a reader outside this speech community — for instance, an English-language reader encountering only a literal translation, “Between Two Doors” — the idiomatic frame is not accessible, the presupposition fails, and the title's pragmatic force is largely lost unless reconstructed through a translator's note or other paratextual explanation.

(5) Comparative note. Placed side by side, the two cases show a structurally similar pragmatic mechanism — an economical title-level allusion generating implicature through presupposed shared knowledge — operating over two different types of precedent: a specific, authored literary line in the English case, and a diffuse, communally owned idiom in the Uzbek case. This difference has direct consequences for translatability: Huxley's title travels relatively well into cultures with some Shakespearean literacy, whereas Hoshimov's title is comparatively more culture-bound, a pattern consistent with Relevance Theory's prediction that intertextual communication succeeds only when the relevant cognitive environment is genuinely shared (Sperber & Wilson, 1986).

6. METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The linguopragmatic framework proposed and demonstrated in this article has broader methodological implications for the analysis of intertextuality. Researchers interested in studying intertextuality linguopragmatically should adopt the following approach:

1. Identification: Begin by identifying intertextual markers in the text. These may include quotations (direct and indirect), allusions, repetitions, epigraphs, titles, antonomasia, and recognizable phraseology. Each marker must be documented and classified.
2. Contextualization: For each intertextual marker, identify the precedent text or source. Determine what cultural, historical, or literary knowledge is presupposed. Consider whether the reference is explicit (e.g., a direct quotation with citation) or implicit (e.g., an allusion without overt attribution).
3. Pragmatic Analysis: Analyze the communicative function of each intertextual marker. Ask: What illocutionary act is the author performing? What implicatures are generated? What presuppositions are activated? What is the intended perlocutionary effect on the reader?
4. Cognitive Assessment: Consider the cognitive effort required to process the intertextual reference. Is the reference likely to be recognized by the intended readership? What background knowledge is required? How does the reference contribute to the overall meaning of the text?
5. Comparative Analysis: Where appropriate, compare intertextual usage across texts, genres, languages, or cultural contexts. This comparative dimension is particularly valuable for studying intertextuality in Uzbek and English literary texts, as illustrated in Section 5.

7. CONCLUSION

This article has argued that intertextuality is a fundamentally pragmatic phenomenon that can be productively analyzed using the tools and concepts of linguopragmatics. By integrating

intertextuality theory with Speech Act Theory, Gricean Implicature, Relevance Theory, and presupposition analysis — and by applying the resulting five-step framework to two concrete titles, Huxley's *Brave New World* and Hoshimov's *Ikki eshik orasi* — this study has shown how intertextual markers encode communicative strategies, generate inferential processes, and depend on cognitive mechanisms that differ in systematic ways across languages and cultures. Intertextuality is not merely a stylistic ornament or a literary curiosity; it is a strategic communicative device that authors employ to encode meaning, shape reader interpretation, and achieve specific pragmatic effects. The success of intertextual communication depends on shared presuppositions, cooperative inferential processes, and the careful calibration of explicitness and implicitness — as well as, the comparative analysis suggests, on whether the presupposed knowledge is anchored in a specific authored text or in a diffuse cultural-linguistic resource.

For linguopragmatic research, intertextuality offers a rich and underexplored field of inquiry. Future research should extend the framework proposed here to a larger and more systematic corpus, across diverse textual genres, languages, and cultural contexts. In particular, comparative studies of intertextuality in Uzbek and English literary texts — accounting for cultural differences in presupposed knowledge and communicative norms — promise to yield valuable insights into the interplay between language, culture, and cognition in literary discourse.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
2. Arnold, I.V. (1999). *Semantics. Stylistics. Intertextuality*. Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg University Press.
3. Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
4. Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
5. Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, Music, Text* (S. Heath, Trans.). London: Fontana Press.
6. Bykova, O.A. (2025). Pragmatic potential of intertextuality in French internet discourse. *Moscow State Linguistic University Bulletin*.
7. Coca, M.G. (2025). Intentional discursive interference through phraseological intertext in Romanian newspaper headlines (2016–2025). *ANADISS*.
8. Genette, G. (1997). *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (C. Newman & C. Doubinsky, Trans.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
9. Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
10. Hoshimov, O. (1985). *Ikki eshik orasi [Between Two Doors]*. Toshkent: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va San'at nashriyoti.
11. Huxley, A. (1932). *Brave New World*. London: Chatto & Windus.
12. Kristeva, J. (1969). Narration et transformation. *Semiotica*, 1(4), 422–448.

13. Kristeva, J. (1986). Word, dialogue and novel. In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva Reader* (pp. 34–61). Oxford: Blackwell. (Original work published 1966)
14. Makhmatkulova, Y. (2025). Intertextuality as a cognitive category of the text. *American Journal of Philological Sciences*, 74, 283–285.
15. Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
16. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
17. Uzentsova, E.A., & Molchanova, S.E. (2025). Intertextuality in advertising discourse: Linguopragmatic aspect.