

INTERTEXT AND JOURNALISTIC INTERTEXT

Tamara Masharipova

Karakalpak State University Named After Berdakh,

Nokis s., Karaqalpakstan, Uzbekistan

Abstract

In this article, we aim to prove two theses: 1) a text, separated from the author, is an intertext; 2) all folk dastans of the Karakalpaks possess the quality of intertextuality.

The first thesis, in turn, is divided into two parts: a) what intertext is (author's hypothesis); b) how postmodernists understand intertext.

Introduction

In this article, we aim to prove two theses: 1) a text, separated from the author, is an intertext; 2) all folk dastans of the Karakalpaks possess the quality of intertextuality.

The first thesis, in turn, is divided into two parts: a) what intertext is (author's hypothesis); b) how postmodernists understand intertext.

The Concept of Intertext. Intertext and interhuman. We believe that when a journalist composes the text of his work, it is essentially equivalent to the process of neuro-linguistic programming. This is because the journalist, when writing a text, simultaneously forms a program for the audience's understanding of his composition, meaning he writes the text as a program of influence. Therefore, it can be said that the preparation of a work is, at the same time, the creation of a program for linguistic influence, as this is a process of concurrently shaping the future impact of this work on others. Here, the text is equal to the program; it is not only a text but also, simultaneously, a program of influence. There is no text outside the program, and conversely, there is no programming impact on the audience outside of the text. This influence is known in science as neuro-linguistic programming (NLP), where the effect occurs at the level of psycholinguistic action. In other words, when a journalist writes material, he first tests the text on himself, meaning he clarifies whether the words resonate with his perception and consciousness as he intended, and only then does he adapt this text for the audience, for their consciousness.

Why do others perceive the text of a journalist? Because a person is a social being, and his knowledge and words were developed in community with others. Consciousness, knowledge, words, concepts, etc., constitute a unified intellectual space common to all people. Both consciousness and any word are the result of collaborative creation by many individuals; every word always has a social character. Therefore, the words and concepts used by the journalist are known to others.

From this, we can draw an important conclusion that the words spoken by a person are common to all interwords, while a text separated from the person (for example, a work written by him on paper) is an intertext because it is understood by others. Since the text is accessible to many people simultaneously, it is an intertext, that is, a universally comprehensible interhuman text.



It is no coincidence that the concept of a draft exists. A journalist's draft is an excellent opportunity to trace how the author's internal text becomes an external intertext. By studying the draft, the researcher attempts to penetrate the writer's thinking laboratory through this manuscript. After all, a draft is the most precise, remarkable, and astonishing laboratory for the transition of a text into an intertext. This is precisely why the words of the Russian writer Mikhail Bulgakov, "manuscripts do not burn," have become so popular. This saying means that outstanding works are immortal, and the writer's creative laboratory is inexhaustible.

Thus, a text is always an intertext, and the idea expressed through it is always an interidea. In order for an idea to be understood, it must inevitably be accessible to a multitude of people, i.e., an interidea. At the same time, it is clear that without a new idea, there can be no new work. Therefore, regarding journalistic creativity, any new work must contain a new idea, some element of novelty. Without novelty, there cannot be a work presented for the first time. Of course, these will be familiar ideas, but interwoven with elements of novelty, or in other words, woven into a new journalistic text.

The Mechanism of the Emergence of Intertext. Inditext and Intertext. A question arises: when does a text become an intertext, and what is the initial moment of this? We believe that a text that has departed from its owner, master, or creator – in the form of a manuscript, oral speech, etc. – and has been transferred to another person becomes an intertext simply by the very fact of this transfer. This is a fundamentally important point.

Let us explain how this happens. The fact that a person is simultaneously both a physical and a social being is undisputed. The physical essence of a person is his physical, animal world. The social essence of a person is his spiritual world. Thus, being a physical individual, i.e., a person with personal bodily qualities, he is spiritually an interhuman, as a person who exists in society. No matter how strange it may sound, without this interhuman essence, he lacks sociality, i.e., neither consciousness nor reason. In short, a person is physically individual but socially communal. As a result, a person is simultaneously an interhuman.

Therefore, it would be correct to say that the moment of text creation is the separation of the text from the author, for example, in the form of its presentation on paper. This process is the immediate moment of the emergence of intertext. The journalist writes so that others can understand him. To achieve this, he must separate the text from himself. While the text is within him, it is his individual text. When the text departs from him, for instance, when it is written on paper, it initially undergoes a kind of labor, as it is corrected, clarified, etc. In other words, it is in the process of transitioning from an individual text to an intertext; this is the time of its becoming as an intertext. Thus, the creation of the text represents the time of transition from inditext (individual text) to intertext.

Thus, we can say that a journalistic text always appears before the reader solely as an intertext because a person is a social being. The text is an intertext by its very genetics, origins, and generation. A person is not simply an individual; at the same time, he mentally and psychologically reflects in his consciousness the consciousness of another person. In other words, his consciousness is common, unified with the consciousness of other people because consciousness has a social origin. Therefore, if he is physically an individual person (indihuman), then socially he is a communal being (interhuman).



The next stage of our argument is that outside the interhuman, there can be no intertext; intertext is always a product of the interhuman. Intertext is the result of human relationships with one another. If a text is the product of interpersonal relationships, then this means that it is simultaneously an intertext. The intertext is the textual relationships among people.

Thus, we introduce yet another new classification of text. There is personal individual text and there is intertext because there can be no text at all (no text as material outside the personality of the journalist and outside the people who engage with this text). A text can only exist in the form of inditext, and once it is separated from the author, it exists solely as intertext. No other types of text exist. Any internal text is an inditext, while any handwritten or published work is exclusively an intertext.

Postmodernists on Intertext. It seems that everything began with the Russian scholar M.M. Bakhtin (1895-1975). He profoundly revealed the nature of dialogue, i.e., the phenomenon where the text of one work engages in dialogue with other texts that precede it in time or exist concurrently with it. We can add that a text also contributes to the creation of texts after it, for instance, in the interpretation and explanation of the national anthem.

One of the primary sources of intertextuality as an artistic-aesthetic and cognitive concept is M.M. Bakhtin's theory of polyphony, which he illustrated using a particularly successful example – the works of F.M. Dostoevsky. It is well-known that F.M. Dostoevsky is one of the most vivid authors in terms of the dialectical portrayal of the personalities of his characters. All of them are in a constant state of turmoil and search: the student R. Raskolnikov, the prince L. Myshkin, the Karamazov brothers. They exist, so to speak, in a free, non-linear life text.

As is known, Y. Kristeva first used the concept of intertextuality in 1967, which provoked an ambiguous reaction from scholars and necessitated the personal intervention of a prominent scholar such as R. Barthes, who stood up in defense of the Bulgarian researcher. Y. Kristeva wrote: "...In this case, the lack of rigor should rather be regarded as a discovery first made by Bakhtin in the field of literary theory: any text is constructed as a mosaic of citations, any text is an absorption and transformation of some other text. Thus, the concept of intertextuality replaces the concept of intersubjectivity."¹

In postmodernism, the text as a uniqueness and even a wholeness disappears, dissolving into everyday existence. All stable elements of the text and models vanish. The text as a principle ceases to exist; only fragments, collections of quotes, and migrating images remain. According to postmodernists, the text cannot be a general concept because such concepts do not exist in nature; they are artificially concocted by philosophers. The text can only reflect something singular and concrete.

This is what one of the founders of postmodernism, Roland Barthes, writes about the intertextual nature of any messages: "All official linguistic institutions are machines that continuously chew the same gum; school, sports, advertising, mass culture, song production,

¹Kristeva, Y. Bakhtin, Word, Dialogue, and the Novel / In the book: // French Semiotics. From Structuralism to Poststructuralism. – Moscow: Progress, 2000. – C. 427–457. // <http://www.klex.ru/ov5>



and media incessantly reproduce the same structure, the same meaning, and sometimes even the same words: stereotype is a political phenomenon, it is the very embodiment of ideology."² The same elements – structure, meaning, and words – represent the elements of intertext, repeating in new combinations and new works. It is very important that postmodernism emerged within the field of literary studies and only later acquired a broader philosophical and general methodological direction.

The programmatic public nature of the intertext. Postmodernists diverted scholarly and artistic pursuits in the humanities from the logical abstraction into which all had fallen after Kant and Hegel, towards a diverse and polyphonic reality. In the works of postmodernists, literary elucidation of real life has come to prevail over philosophical and political discourse. In our opinion, at the center of the journalistic interpretation of life lies the individual and the surrounding reality, or more precisely – nature and society. The reality with nature and society at its core is an eternal, universal civilizational criterion for any art and any form of activity. As long as humanity exists, this will remain the case.

Further speaking, it can be noted that the public nature of any text is all-encompassing and inevitably serves as a dominant and determining factor within it. A journalistic text, while "territorially" situated, to simplify, between artistic and scientific writing, is imbued with emotions just as strongly as a literary work. The difference lies in the fact that artistic emotions are more aesthetic, whereas journalistic emotions are more morally and politically inclined. Therefore, we consider journalism to be an emotional reflection of an event, or, conditionally speaking, its emotional mirror. And since emotions vary among individuals, works on even the same topic turn out to be different. This is easy to demonstrate. Two articles by two journalists about the same event, for example, about the Aral Sea, will differ, and this is natural in journalism.

Intertextuality of Karakalpak Dastans. Let us move on to the second thesis. We believe that the content of all Karakalpak folk dastans, without exception, is intertextual. Let us proceed to the proof.

Despite the fact that intertextuality was first addressed by postmodernists (J. Kristeva, 1967), its elements (such as wandering plots or images) have long been considered in literary and journalistic theory. For instance, the authors of the "Literary Encyclopedia" write: "The archetype-image contains the most stable and omnipresent 'schemes' or 'formulas' of human imagination, manifesting both in mythology and in art at all stages of its historical development (in archaic, classical, and contemporary art). Permeating all literary art from its mythological origins to the present, archetypes form a constant reservoir of plots and situations that are transmitted from writer to writer." This is confirmed by numerous works in literary studies and journalistic studies written in different periods and years.

2Barthes, R. The Pleasure of the Text. // Selected Works: Semiotics: Poetics: Translated from French / Compiled, edited, and with an introductory article by G.K. Kosikov. — Moscow: Progress 1989. – C. 495. // <http://socium.ge/downloads/komunikaciisteoria/bart.pdf> Taken: 20.03.18, 9:02.



A vivid example of such intertextuality is the content of Karakalpak dastans. Moreover, this intertextuality manifests itself not only in space but also in time. Regarding space, it can be noted that the images of Edige, Alpamys, and Gulpارشin, as well as Garib Ashik and Shahsanem, are characteristic not only of the Karakalpaks but also of Turkic peoples living in other regions. In terms of time, it can be said that these images have been passed down from generation to generation for several centuries.

These are the most obvious, but not the only elements of their intertextuality. Deeper and equally strong intertextual archetypes of the dastans include the steppe and the river, animals and birds, trees and grass, as well as love for the native land, its protection from foes, care for parents, loyalty in friendship, fidelity to one's beloved, manifestation of respect for guests, and a careful attitude toward nature, etc. Another factor in their intertextuality is the characteristic multi-authorship, as this is a direct step toward the depersonalization and nationalization of the text.

The literary content of the dastans encompasses both contemporary perceptions and historically specific contexts—psychological, scientific, everyday, ritual, and so on. It is evident that the literary text of many dastans includes elements from other texts, which further enhances their intertextuality. Therefore, oral verbal creativity is that aesthetic magnet which always attracts an audience.

Ultimately, it turns out that it is not the event that organizes the text, but rather the text that organizes the event. The dastan reflects the event, thereby creating the reality as perceived by the storyteller. As a result, it is the text created by the performer that remains in the memory of the audience. This is particularly evident when viewed from several centuries away, when the original context of the emergence of Karakalpak dastans has long been forgotten, and only the classic texts remain, through which we learn about the events of that time.

Thus, we have no doubt about the obvious intertextuality of Karakalpak dastans. All folk poems of the Karakalpaks are nothing more than intertexts. The matter is that specialists in the field of historical textology should determine when and in what form they were first composed, how their content gradually changed, who performed them at different times and in what manner (performance had a strong influence on their perception), who the zhirau and bakshi were that performed them, how successive generations of storytellers supplemented these poems, and how they brought them to a mass audience. The answers to these questions contain the specific elements of the intertextuality of Karakalpak dastans.

Perceiving a text merely as a text is a narrow and inadequate approach for its proper comprehension. A text becomes a full-fledged concept when it is perceived, understood, and interpreted specifically as an intertext. The text most closely aligns with the psychological characteristics of a person, as it organically combines both methods of cognition and the two aspects in which a personality continually resides—sensory and rational, logic and emotions. The phenomenon of the text is linked to two interconnected processes—articulation and perception. Both are complex processes of mental activity: perception, understanding, memory, and so on.

The text also serves as a program for its impact on consumers. The journalist is the first and most demanding part of the audience. Overall, the composition of a text is akin to the process of neuro-linguistic programming. Therefore, it is essential to delve deeper into the interaction



between the text and the author on one side, and the mass audience on the other, that is, the textual-creative process of influencing the audience.

"In postmodernism, the idea of the end of time, the death of God, the philosopher, the subject, the author, the text, and the composer can be traced. The brightest representatives of this contemporary image of philosophical thinking include Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, Michel Foucault, Roland Barthes, Jean Baudrillard, Jean-François Lyotard, Jacques Lacan, and others."³ In contrast to them, our common conclusion is this: the text does not die; it transitions into intertext, possessing the ability to achieve immortality.

Journalistic intertext and intertextuality. The concept of journalistic intertext. The separation of intertext and intertextuality into a distinct paragraph is driven by the fact that relatively recently, within the framework of such an influential contemporary scientific movement as postmodernism, a fundamentally new approach to understanding and interpreting the text has emerged. This is prompted by significant explorations by postmodernists into the depths of the thought process, and, importantly, into the processes by which language and text (as an ordered sequence of words) impact the mass audience. In their view, language is the sole, and therefore universal, omnipotent, total means of communication, including journalistic communication.

The concept of text was discussed by us earlier. Let us turn to intertext. Here is how one of the founders of postmodernism, Roland Barthes, explains the emergence of intertext: "Text means Weaving; however, if until now this weaving has been invariably considered a kind of veil behind which sense (truth) is more or less successfully concealed, then we (the postmodernists – T.M.)—speaking today of this weaving—emphasize the idea of generation, according to which the text is created and produced through the endless weaving of numerous threads..." From this, it is clear that, according to Barthes, the fabric of the new text is woven anew from already existing threads, that is, from previously created fragments of various texts. This is intertext. Below, we will explore this question in more detail.

Conclusion

Thus, we can draw the following conclusion about the article. The definition of "journalistic intertext" should not be understood narrowly in terms of textual meanings—words, paragraphs, classical literary images, etc. Along with this, numerous other elements are included in such an intertext, some of which were listed above in this paragraph. The main criterion for determining whether a particular text is a journalistic intertext is the fact that this word or concept was used earlier by other authors for journalistic purposes.

As for journalism, virtually all terms and meanings used here relate to intertext: words, phrases, definitions, objects, subjects, methodology, as well as social issues, authorial ideas, journalistic positions, language, style, genres, and many others.

³<http://www.bolshoyvopros.ru/questions/2383584-kakie-est-filosofy-postmodernisty.html>, 22 May 2020

