INTERTEXTUALITY AS A METHODOLOGICAL TOOL IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

Kholibekova Omongul Kenjaboyevna*

*Basic Doctoral Student,
Navoiy State Pedagogical Institute,
Navoi, UZBEKISTAN
Email id: kholibekova.o@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

Language and translation include texts in a wide sense but here we are concerned with a specific aspect of their relations. There is, in particular, a concept that seems to be useful for translation studies in the sense that it can help us to understand better various components and dimensions of culture, religion, and language, and to keep them together when doing research into translation. This concept is intersexuality, which is not foreign to translation as it can be argued that translation is inherently one sort of intertextuality.

KEYWORDS: *intersexuality, post structuralism, allusion, interpretation, target text.*

INTRODUCTION

"Intertextuality" is a term used in many ways. It is an expression which refers to a universalphenomenon that basically signifies "all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious orconcealed, with other texts" **[1].**

In other words, it means – at least – the actualpresence of one or many other texts within another. As a single text does not come into being orexist in total isolation and is necessarily connected with earlier and later texts, it becomes clear thatthis is a phenomenon that engages translation and translated works. In that sense, even thoughintertextuality as a technical term was not launched until the late 1960s, as will be seen, as aphenomenon it has been part of western literal tradition since Antiquity, i.e., at least as long astranslation has existed.

Methods

From the point of view of this study, there are interesting connections between intersexuality, translation studies, and two of Michel Foucault's **[2]** ideas. The function of intersexuality in translation is a process whose result cannot be mechanically calculated. There is no predestined result because there is a human factor, the contributing and to some extent unpredictable reader-translator, between the source text and the target text. Foucault's ideas are reminiscent of writings on genre and dialogism by the Russian scholar Mikhail Bakhtin **[3],** which the French poststructuralist Julia Kristeva introduced to western audiences with the term 'intersexuality,' which she coined in the late 1960s. Julia Kristeva affirms that "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotation" **[4].** The notion of intertextuality replaces that ofintersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double. Through Mikhail Bakhtin, she saweach text as a web of citations, full of influences from other texts. She saw texts as functioningalong two axes: the first is the horizontal axis that determines the relationship between the reader and the text whilst the second is the vertical axis that contains the complex set of relations of thetext to other texts. "The word's status is thus defined horizontally (the word in the text belongs to both writing subject and addressee) as well as vertically (the wordin the text is oriented toward an anterior or synchronic literary corpus." **[5]** Morgan remarks that "Foucault's idea of the 'always already' of our knowledge resonates with Bakhtin's emphasis on the fundamental inter

discursivity of the human world" **[6].** And also interpretation, following Fairclough's category that "procedure which deals with the analysis of texts can be called 'description', and the parts which deal with analysis of discourse practice and with analysis of the social practice of which the discourse is a part can be called "interpretation." As far as I know, there has not been so far a wider cultural historical research of the term, although it would be very useful. These two axes join in the framework of pre-existing codes that guide and shape every text and its reading. Reading becomes a process of moving between texts. Horizontal intertextual relations are those between a text and those texts which precede and follow it in thechain of texts, that is, they are relations a text has to other specific texts. Two intertextual examples are speaking turns and a letter. Speaking turns in a conversation respond to turns that precede them, and equally anticipate those that will follow. A letter in turn is related to earlier and subsequent letters within a given correspondence. Vertical intertextual relations exist between a text and other texts that constitute its more or less immediate or distant contexts, i.e. intertextual relations of texts to conventions. Both of these intertextual relations may refer to linguistic, generic, and structural relations. Atleast it can be argued that intertextuality means that texts are full of snatches of other texts whichthe text may assimilate, contradict, echo, or relate to in some ways. These other, prior texts have contributed to their production and meaning. In other words, texts always constitute additions to existing chains of speech communication. It can be argued that intertextuality has its roots in the origins of 20th century linguistics, in particular in the work of the Swiss linguist Ferdin and de Saussure **[7].** It seems that Julia Kristeva attemptedto combine both Saussure an and Bakhtinian theories of language and literature **[8].** It must be noted that the term intertextuality is not used by Bakhtin himself, and yet, in his work, the development of translinguistic (in Kristeva's terms: intertextual) analysis of texts was a major theme, closely linked to some other issues of language including his theory of genre. He was one of the first scholars to underline the social character of language which makes it dialogical. He observes how the ways in which written and spoken texts are related to each other, to those prior texts they respond to, and to those subsequent texts they anticipate. All texts are demarcated by a change of writer or speaker, and are oriented retrospectively to the utterances of previous speakers. They are also oriented prospectively to the anticipated utterance of the next writers or speakers. «Our speech… is filled with others» words, For Saussure signs are not refererential. Their meaning is determined by the combinations and associations in relation to other signs. Signs exist within a system and have their meaning through their similarity to and difference from other signs. Meaning resides in the sign. Structuralism based its ideas on Saussure's definitions of sign and linguistic structure. Texts are thus inherently intertextual in the sense that they are constituted by elements which originated in other texts. When we read a text, we unconsciously compare it to other texts we have read, even though it may be that we do not remember those texts. Also, we do not learn language by reading a dictionary but through other speakers and writers. This means that a text cannot exist as a hermetic or self-sufficient entity, and that it is not a closed system. The writer is also, to a nontrivial extent, a reader of texts. The repetition of other texts – past or contemporary – can range "from the most conscious and sophisticated elaboration of other poets' work, to a scholarly use of sources, or the quotation (with or without the use of quotation marks) of snatches of conversation typical of a certain social milieu at a certain historical moment" **[9].**

RESULTS

Intertextuality has been used by structuralist and poststructuralist theorists to show that language is a code system existing before and irrespective of whether a given speaker makes any

communicative act. Structuralists basically identified language as a series of inter connections between signs. Consequently, it became important to recognize the relationships between signs and the ways they interact to produce "meaning-formations" **[10].** This meant that a code system of language and genre was given a preponderant place, and the importance of the author began to decline. In France Kristeva introduced the term 'intertextuality' during a period when structuralism was debated, leading to the emergence of post structuralism. Structuralists emphasized the idea that human culture may be best understood by analogy with language, i.e., through a linguistic structure that is distinct from the organizations of reality and ideas. Post structuralists emphasize not only the ways in which signs depend on each other, but also the ways in which the more complex relations, especially texts, depend on each other for their meaning. Julia Kristeva's interpretation of Mikhail Bakhtin shows how post structuralism already inhabits structuralist discourse: "What allows a dynamic dimension to structuralism is his [Bakhtin's] conception of the 'literary word' as an intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point (a fixed meaning), as adialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character), and the contemporary or earlier context." **[11]** It must be emphasized that the idea of 'intertextuality' according to Bakhtin was conceived in a different kind of linguistic understanding than Kristeva's . Bakhtin viewed language and types of discourse as social systems more than anything else. A text is for him part of a spoken utterance, it refers to other utterances, i.e., it is characteristically dialogical. An oral dialogue, speaking, is part of the human being's social being. Bakhtin's work centers on human beings employing language in specific social situations. Bakhtinian dialogism or intertextuality implies "the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history" **[12].** The insertion of history into a text means that the text absorbs and is constituted by texts from the past, history, as texts are art efacts that constitute history. The insertion of a text into history means that as the text "responds to, reaccentuates, and reworks past texts," it helps to make history and contributes to wider processes of shape in society as well as it anticipates and tries to shapes ubsequent texts.

Thus, Julia Kristeva's intertextual idea of Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogism is limited to dealing with no direct reference to the reality outside of texts, where dialogue takes place as social reality. Texts refer only to each other, speak only of each other; they do not speak of a world outside the texts. Infact, intertextuality becomes the condition sine qua non for the existence of a text.

ANALYSIS

The identification of an inter text is an act of interpretation, and the inter text cannot be regarded as a real and causative source but as a theoretical construct, serving the purposes of a reading .The link is not absolute and cannot be objectively defined, as it is generated in each reading process and for the purposes of each reading. The occasional appearance of that kind of intertextuality means that it is difficult, or occasionally even impossible, to research on anonymous or unconscious connections. For this reason, there is no generally accepted methodology of researchon intertextuality, and the research has remained on a rather abstract level. This may also be one reason why any study of translation practices and strategies is relative, not absolute, as the link between text and other texts is not absolute. These intertextual ideas of structuralist and poststructuralist theorists disturb a belief in the uniqueness of a text and/or in the originality of an author. However, until the Renaissance it was commonly accepted that a literary text was a patchwork of existing texts. This patchwork either directly appropriated or indirectly modified existing texts into a new form. The identity of the author was not so important. Literature was a common matter, and themes, mythical elements, and forms of expressions were at everybody's disposal, and were repeated from one work to another. A literal work was no one's private property; it was part of tradition, and the free use of contents and styles proposed by tradition was natural. The Bible, the myths of Antiquity, and history were

continuously   used   as   the   source   texts. But tradition did not offer only literal sources, it also offered ideals of successful literary works and figures, e.g. Homer, Virgil, and Cicero, and their masterpieces were unattainable and eternal models. However, it is commonly accepted today that a text can and does operate in a reality which   is   to some extent also non-linguistic. Texts are in contact with the world outside. This has given some value back to the author. S/he is not considered an autonomous creator and source of a text but a socially and culturally determined and determining social and cultural reality. This gives a slightly different view of intertextuality from that offered by Kristeva's textual concept.

DISCUSSION

Texts do not refer to other texts in an eternal circle, but intertextuality means relations with literary conventions and that which other texts claim from the reality outside the texts. Borrowing from others is acceptable, if the borrowed elements are used in a creative way. To summarize: it can be said that intertextuality, understood in a wide sense, has always been part and parcel of western literature, but it was not until the 20th century that it was systematized on an academic level, a bit earlier than translation studies as an independent academic discipline took its first steps. To study intertextuality means to plunge oneself into a series of questions, as it is a split, multiple concept.

REFERENCES:

1. Genette G. Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree. Translated by ChannaNewman & Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press. 1997.

2. Foucault M. The Order of Discourse. In: Michael J. Shapiro (ed.), Language and Politics.Oxford: BasilBlackwell, 1984. pp.108–138.

3. Kristeva J. Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman. Critique 1967. pp.239, 438–465

4. Bakhtin MM. The Dialogic Imagination. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Seventh Paperback Printing (1981). Austin: University of Texas Press. 1990.

5. Lea D. Intertextuality. In: Childs P and Fowler R. (eds.), The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms. London and New York: Routledge, 2006. pp.121–123.

6. Morgan T. The Space of Intertextuality. In Patrick O'Donnell and Robert Con Davis (eds.), Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989. pp.239–279

7. Foucault M. The Order of Discourse. In: Michael J. Shapiro (ed.), Language and Politics.Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984. pp.108–138.

8. Allen G. Intertextuality. Second Edition (2000). Londonand New York: Routledge. 2011.

9. Hayes M. Cultural Studies at the Crossroads. In: Herbrechter S. (ed.), Cultural Studies, Interdisciplinarity and Translation. Amsterdam-New York, NY: Rodopi, 2002. pp.19–30.

10. Still J, Worton M. Introduction. In: Worton M. and Still J (eds.), Intertextuality: Theories and practices. Reprint (1990). Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1991. pp.1–44

11. Saariluoma L. Saatteeksi. In Liisa Saariluoma and Marja-Leena Hakkarainen (eds.), Interteksti ja konteksti. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1998. pp.7–12.

12. Ruokonen M. Intertekstuaalisuus ja kaunokirjallisuudenkääntäminen. In: Jorma T. (ed.), Kieli ja kulttuurikääntäjäntyövälineinä. Turku: Turunyliopisto, 2006. pp.57–82