

COGNITIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERTEXTUALITY IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH POETRY

Nigina Davronova Akhmedjon kizi

New Century University

English language teacher

D.Nigina12@gmail.com

Abstract: This article will discuss the phenomenon of intertextuality from cognitive perspective. The samples from English and Uzbek poetry will be analyzed to illustrate cognitive features of intertextuality in literary discourse. As a common marker of intertextuality antonomasia will be analyzed in the samples and the other markers will enlisted.

Key words: intertext, precedent text, recipient text, knowledge structures, discourse, non-linguistic knowledge structures, linguistic structures, intertextuality, antonomasia

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada intertekstualik hodisasi kognitiv nuqtai nazardan tahlil qilinadi. Adabiy diskursdagi intertekstualikning kognitiv xususiyatlarini ko'rsatish maqsadida ingliz va o'zbek she'riyati namunalariga tahlil o'tkaziladi. Intertekstualikning umumiy belgilovchisi sifatida antonomasiya namunalar orqali tahlil qilinadi va boshqa belgilovchilar ro'yxatga olinadi.

Kalit so'zlar: intertekst, pretsedent matn, qabul qiluvchi matn, bilim tuzilmalari, diskurs, no-lingvistik bilim tuzilmalari, lingvistik tuzilmalar, intertekstualik, antonomasia

Introduction

After the introduction of new linguistic paradigm called Anthropocentric paradigm, the linguistic studies shifted to human factor in language. As the structure itself was not enough to learn language use and its processing, the new paradigm emerged in the late 20th century. This paradigm focuses on language users, their background and knowledge structures in addition to language itself. For this reason, the studies of this paradigm covers a bigger scope.

The emergence of new shift has also resulted into different study fields in linguistics. One of them is text linguistics which focuses on text, its structure, semantics, the principles of formation, perception, methods of text analysis and so on. According to Uzbek linguist D. Ashurova, fundamental works of this field trace back to the works of several Russian and foreign scientists such as A.A. Potebnya, Z.V. Scherba, V.V. Vinogradov, R. Jakobson, Z. Harris [1]. The first work which marks the beginning of text linguistics is Harris's "Discourse analysis" (1952) [3]. According to him, language is presented in the form of a text not in separate words or sentences. His statement has become the main conception of text linguistics.

The studies in the field of text linguistics have brought several new topic to analyse. One of them is text categories, which is classified differently by linguists. As anthropocentric paradigm puts human factor in the center, the analysis require interdisciplinary approach. So, text linguistics also possess interdisciplinary character by its relation with different fields. It contains internal and external interdisciplinarity. This interdisciplinary character makes it urgent to analyse text from this approach too.

The text category show how intertextual the text can be. Although several scientists have diverse opinions, they have their own reasons to choose. According to I. Galperin text contains categories such as informativity, segmentation, cohesion, continuum, prospection/retrospection, modality, integrity, completeness [4]. While Z.Y. Turayeva introduces progression, stagnation, the author's image, causality, subtext, S.G. Ilyenko distinguishes extension and cohesion [6,5]. We agree with the classification given by D. Ashurova, as it contains a rather complete list of text categories [1]. The linguist separates the categories into two: optional and obligatory. Intertextuality is included in optional one as it is not considered a must in text formation, and depends on author's intent and purpose.

The current study will analyse the phenomenon of intertextuality from cognitive perspective as it related human knowledge and language use. The importance of this topic is that the comparison of two languages will make linguacultural studies and communication easy, and it will be a part of sources to conduct comparative studies. The article will outline intertextual markers in texts, analyze from cognitive perspective and conclude considering two language samples in literary discourse.

Main part

Intertextuality differs in definition in a broad and narrow sense. In a broad sense, intertextuality is studied in literature. So, any text can be considered as an intertext as they are related to our knowledge structure. Knowledge structures, in turn, is our ready knowledge base that is gathered by experience and enables us to acquire new knowledge easily and comprehend better. So, any kind of text reflect human culture, history and background. This notion is supported by M. Lotman, M. Gasparov, R. Barth, D. Ashurova. However, in linguistic perspective intertextuality must have special signals or markers in the text. So, there are several types of markers such as title, epigraph, parody, repetition of structure, rhythm, antonomasia, allusion. The most common and popular marker of intertextuality is allusion.

Intertextuality contain precedent and recipient texts. According to the definition given by D. Ashurova, precedent text is a source referred to [2]. The recipient text is the text containing intertextual inclusions. It is fully comprehended by the markers or signals of intertextuality and their references.

Before analyzing intertextuality, knowledge structures and their types will be discussed as intertextual markers will activate these knowledge types and makes the comprehension easier.

Knowledge structures are separated into two groups: linguistic and extra-linguistic. Extra-linguistic knowledge structures are shaped by human experience and background. For example, historical, religious, literary, cultural and other human features are included in non-linguistic type of knowledge structures. For this reason, discourse is needed to analyse the problem along with extra-linguistic factors.

We will now analyze poetry samples from English and Uzbek, and draw a conclusion comparing them.

Alhazar, alhazar, ming bor alhazar,
Ana, yurishibdi kiyganlari zar,
Qodiriyni sotib shoir bo'lganlar —
Mehrobingdan chiqqan chayonlaring bor...[7]

The extract is taken from Uzbek poet Muhammad Yusuf's poem titled "Yurdim, ado bo'lmas armonlaring bor", which narrates miserable fate of prominent people in its

history, who were sacrificed for the development of the country and science. So, in the extract the writer uses two antonomasias at the same time and they are connected to each other so that the meaning behind them can be easily understood. The first one is the title of a famous work by A. Qodiriy - "Mehrobdan chayon" (The scorpion from the Mihrab (Altar)), which is about the people who use the situation for their own interest and ruins religious beliefs of others. For this reason, the title also refers to this issue. The plot of the novel is very clear for Uzbek readers and using this title as an antonomasia activates literary knowledge structures and refers to the people who betray the country. The use of the title only refers to treacherous people of all time and as a reference to their victims, who have no guilty proper noun "Qodiriy" is used. This activates historical knowledge structures and reminds how this prominent poet was killed with false accusations. These two intertextual markers deepen the meaning of each other and makes comprehension and the writer's intended reference easier to follow.

To understand the recipient text a reader must be aware of the precedent text well, which is quite limited in the scope of Uzbek readers. Therefore, for them the meaning behind the precedent text is clear and they can associate it intertext with the recipient to comprehend. However, in the case of English sample, we will try to compare a different one.

Such sample from English poetry is given below from Eliot's poem "The love song of Alfred Prufrock":

No! I am not Prince Hamlet, nor was meant to be,
Am an attendant lord, one that will do
To swell a progress, start a scene or two,
Advise the prince: no doubt, an easy tool,
Deferential, glad to be of use,
Politic, cautious, and meticulous;
Full of high sentence, but a bit obtuse;
At times, indeed, almost ridiculous -
Almost, at times, the Fool.[8]

In the extract above, the writer used a reference to a character of "Hamlet", but it was not just the character, it was a reference to the Prince Hamlet's features. For this reason, the name of the prince can be considered as an antonomasia. From Cognitive perspective, this marker activates literary knowledge structures and forms the conceptual frame of Prufrock's life.

This antonomasia plays an important role to identify cognitive character of Prufrock. In the play by Shakespeare Hamlet is described as a person with introspection, philosophical thinking, morally disciplined. This character is the prototypical intellectual character of Renaissance period. However, in this poem used this antonomasia for contrast and Prufrock considers himself as an opposite character of Hamlet. This means that Prufrock is psychologically limited, so unlike Hamlet who is the main, central character in the tragedy, he is powerless, peripheral character in his life. So, as described in the rest of the poem, he cannot decide and always follows the rules of the community without any criticism.

This intertextuality is also limited to a group of people who are familiar with Shakespearean literature or a Renaissance period. However, the scope of this group can be larger as the precedent text source, Shakespeare's novel, is globally known. It can be said that it is easily identified by non-native speakers too.

As the samples above illustrated that precedent text can be familiar or unfamiliar to the readers according to their background knowledge structures. Due to the globalization of today's world and transformation of information, it can be expected readers to comprehend intertext which contains features related to a particular community.

Conclusion

In conclusion, intertextuality is a complex phenomenon and can be studied from cognitive perspective. Cognitive approach to phenomena will enable us to understand linguistic layer of text better. This phenomenon is included in stylistics, text linguistics and many other fields, so its study will be necessary for the fields such as comparative literature, comparative linguistics, translation studies and linguaculturology. In terms of English and Uzbek language samples, we have partially analyzed cognitive features of intertextuality and the precedent text familiarity of readers. We have identified the followings:

From the activation of cognitive script models, in Uzbek sample intertextuality forms didactic and moral scripts, such as betraying, while in English sample it is usually an individual, psychological character.

In Uzbek sample antonomasia serves as a emotionally assessing function while in English one it is used as a language economy achieved by this stylistic device.

In Uzbek sample the process of decoding intertext is strongly linked to the context while in English it is a quite universal and easily identified.

Overall, this study can be further analyzed in details and it will be the subject matter of our future studies.

REFERENCES:

1. Ashurova, D. (2012). Text linguistics. Tashkent
2. Ashurova, D. U., & Galieva, M. R. (2013). Stylistics of literary texts. Tashkent.
3. Harris, Z. (1963). Discourse analysis: Reprints. The Hague: Mouton.
4. Гальперин, И. Р. (1981). Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. Москва: Наука.
5. Ильенко, С. Г. (1989). Синтаксические единицы в тексте. Ленинград.
6. Тураева, З. Я. (1986). Лингвистика текста. Москва: Просвещение.
7. <https://tafakkur.net/yurtim-ado-bolmas-armonlaring-bor/muhammad-yusuf.uz>
8. <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poetrymagazine/poems/44212/the-love-song-of-j-alfred-prufrock>