

# Language Evolution and Intertextuality in Texts

Nizomiddin Mahmudov

Professor, Doctor of Philological Sciences, Director, Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan

**Received:** 16 April 2026; **Accepted:** 04 May 2026; **Published:** 31 May 2026

**Abstract:** This article examines the relationship between language evolution and intertextuality in texts from the perspective of text linguistics. It highlights the role of texts as the highest communicative units through which language development is reflected and preserved. The study discusses the concept of intertextuality, its theoretical foundations, and its functions in literary, scientific, and official texts. Particular attention is given to the significance of intertextuality in scientific discourse, where it serves cognitive, communicative, and ethical purposes through citations and references. The article concludes that intertextuality is an essential mechanism of text formation and an indispensable feature of scientific communication and language development.

**Keywords:** Language evolution, text linguistics, intertextuality, scientific text, literary text, discourse, citation, communication, language development, academic writing.

**Introduction:** It is widely acknowledged that the evolution of a language is reflected, first and foremost, in the richness of its vocabulary, the continual enrichment and expansion of this lexical stock, the increasing scope of word meanings, as well as in various other processes, including the diversification and normalization of specific morphological and syntactic structures. At the same time, it is important to bear in mind that the degree of a language's development is ultimately assessed by a number of criteria, including the establishment of stable speech styles, the consolidation of their structural and semantic characteristics, the standardization of the key elements that shape each style, and the extent to which every style corresponds to the communicative needs of the domain it serves, with such correspondence being marked by precision, clarity, and effectiveness. There is no doubt that each functional style finds its expression in a particular type of text. Thus, the literary style is embodied in literary texts, the scientific style in scientific texts, the official style in official texts, and so on.

For this reason, in tracing, describing, and investigating

the historical and gradual development of a language, together with its various transformations and changes, the text – whether historical or contemporary – assumes exceptional importance; indeed, every text, without exception, constitutes a valuable source of linguistic evidence. From the perspective of the objectives pursued in studies on the history of the literary language, it becomes even more evident that the role of the text is indispensable in addressing these objectives and that it cannot be disregarded or bypassed.

It is well known that, once the recognition of the fact that the sentence is not the largest unit of language became firmly established, a new branch of linguistics – text linguistics – emerged and has continued to develop ever since. It has been convincingly demonstrated by prominent scholars of language that the text, rather than the sentence, is the unit capable of expressing a complete thought; that human communication is carried out through texts; and that the status of the highest and most autonomous linguistic unit rightfully belongs to the text. It should be emphasized that the text is not only the highest and

most autonomous unit of language but also the most complex one from structural, semantic, and communicative-pragmatic perspectives. This is because all linguistic units, both major and minor, interact within the text in a continuous, systematic, and integrated manner; they establish both horizontal and vertical relationships and function in mutual support of one another in accordance with well-defined linguistic principles.

According to the generalizations of scholars, the distinguishing features of a literary language primarily include: (1) the degree to which the language has been developed and refined; (2) its freedom from spontaneity and the selective nature of its elements; (3) its commonality and predominance across all dialects; (4) its greater or lesser degree of polyfunctionality and functional-stylistic variation; and (5) its tendency toward regulation and standardization. Accordingly, one of the principal tasks in the study of the history of literary languages is, naturally, to investigate the qualitative changes manifested in these very characteristics over the course of their development. The rigorous and scientifically substantiated accomplishment of this task is inseparably linked to the comprehensive analysis of texts from multiple perspectives.

Thus, the most complete, complex, and autonomous unit within the language system is undoubtedly the text. As many linguists have rightly emphasized, “the text constitutes the highest-level unit of communication; it incorporates all elements and structural components of the language system and occupies the status of the most independent linguistic unit.” Within a semantic context, linguistic units at every level – from the word to the sentence – appear to lose their autonomy, as it is only the textual environment that enables their meanings to be correctly interpreted and, consequently, makes possible the formation and development of effective verbal communication.”

A. Ghulomov, one of the pioneers of Uzbek linguistics and a distinguished linguist, was thoroughly familiar with contemporary developments in world linguistics. More than three decades ago, he became one of the first scholars in Turkic linguistics to emphasize that the completeness of an utterance is relative and that its full meaning can only be interpreted within the broader

context of a text. His following views on text are particularly noteworthy: “1. The expression of thought is not limited to the scope of a sentence (whether a simple sentence or a compound sentence).” A complete thought is usually conveyed by a syntactic whole that is larger than a sentence. Within this whole, the sentence is regarded as one of its components. 2. This component is connected to other components within that whole in various ways – both semantically and grammatically – through different linguistic devices. At the same time, it retains its own compositional structure and stylistic characteristics.” 3. Under certain conditions, a simple sentence within such a whole may itself constitute a separate paragraph. 4. Such a syntactic whole, a syntactic construction, is considered a text. An individual, isolated sentence expresses a relatively complete thought, whereas a text conveys the content of an entire complex of ideas. 5. Since a text constitutes an integrated whole, it may also have its own title or headings corresponding to its content. A text is divided into separate segments or parts (individual passages, paragraphs, and sentences). Thus, the fact that language serves as a means of communication is demonstrated even more clearly through text. Speech manifests itself in the form of text. 6. A text is a large unit of discourse, while a paragraph is a constituent part of the text... Therefore, the text is a higher-level syntactic unit... In this view, the upper boundary of syntax is not the syntax of the compound sentence, but rather the syntax of the text... Text syntax has not yet been studied in Uzbek linguistics.

Today, in world linguistics, a distinct field known as “text linguistics,” which began to emerge in the second half of the 1960s, has already been firmly established and continues to develop rapidly. At the same time, in Uzbek linguistics, a considerable number of studies devoted to the investigation of problems in text linguistics have been produced, and further research in this area is ongoing.

In Uzbek linguistics as well, based on contemporary linguistic perspectives and the nature of language data, generalized definitions describing the fundamental characteristics of text have been developed. In any case, as linguists have noted, “it is appropriate to interpret a text as a unified whole characterized by structural, semantic, and communicative integrity,

emerging in either oral or written form through the connectedness of a sequence of sentences, and as the highest-level unit of the syntactic system of language”.

It is worth noting with satisfaction that in recent years, the pragmatic, cognitive, structural-communicative, psycholinguistic, linguocultural, and linguopoetic features of the text have been studied quite seriously in Uzbek linguistics. In general, dissertations have emerged that reflect the positive effects of an anthropocentric paradigm approach to the text. As absolutely necessary research, they have significantly filled the gap in the science of the Uzbek language.

Undoubtedly, the main purpose of any text is to convey to others certain intellectual-logical or spiritual-aesthetic knowledge and information about the world and man.

Of course, in the creation of a text and, naturally, in its perception, the issue of the relationship between that text and other texts or, more precisely, texts created prior to it is one of the central problems of text linguistics. This issue, which constitutes one of the exceptionally important aspects in interpreting the formal organization, logical-semantic formation, psychological-aesthetic foundations, and, in general, the cognitive-communicative integrity of a text, is reflected in the phenomenon that has been generalized in text linguistics under the term intertextuality. This concept denotes the presence, within a given text, of elements related to other texts that is, the existence of a “text within a text.”

Specialists have noted that this phenomenon has a special place in the formation of the text as a whole text. For example, foreign scholars such as Bogrand and Dressler define the parameters that ensure a text as a text as follows: cohesion (connection), coherence (integrity), intentionality (purposefulness), comprehensibility, situationality, informativeness and intertextuality. Some researchers even consider intertextuality as a “general mechanism of text formation.” The theory of intertextuality has taken shape in world linguistics today, and this problem is being studied from various angles, and its various facets are being revealed. Experts note that the number of published works on the theory of intertextuality can only be compared with those devoted to the study of the theory of metaphor, both

of which are measured in the thousands.

M. Yuldashev, who has extensively studied the linguo-poetics of texts, makes the following observation regarding this concept and its designation: “According to researchers, the emergence of the concept of intertextuality in philological studies was prompted by the Russian scholar M. M. Bakhtin’s work Undoubtedly, the main purpose of any text is to convey to others certain intellectual-logical or spiritual-aesthetic knowledge and information about the world and man.

Of course, in the creation of a text and, naturally, in its perception, the issue of the relationship between that text and other texts or, more precisely, texts created prior to it is one of the central problems of text linguistics. This issue, which constitutes one of the exceptionally important aspects in interpreting the formal organization, logical-semantic formation, psychological-aesthetic foundations, and, in general, the cognitive-communicative integrity of a text, is reflected in the phenomenon that has been generalized in text linguistics under the term intertextuality. This concept denotes the presence, within a given text, of elements related to other texts that is, the existence of a “text within a text.”

Specialists have noted that this phenomenon has a special place in the formation of the text as a whole text. For example, foreign scholars such as Bogrand and Dressler define the parameters that ensure a text as a text as follows: cohesion (connection), coherence (integrity), intentionality (purposefulness), comprehensibility, situationality, informativeness and intertextuality. Some researchers even consider intertextuality as a “general mechanism of text formation.” The theory of intertextuality has taken shape in world linguistics today, and this problem is being studied from various angles, and its various facets are being revealed. Experts note that the number of published works on the theory of intertextuality can only be compared with those devoted to the study of the theory of metaphor, both of which are measured in the thousands.

M. Yuldashev, who has extensively studied the linguo-poetics of texts, makes the following observation regarding this concept and its designation: “According to researchers, the emergence of the concept of intertextuality in philological studies was prompted by

the Russian scholar M. M. Bakhtin's work artistic-aesthetic status, whereas intertextuality in a scientific text invariably possesses a cognitive-communicative status.

However, it is also impossible to overlook the fact that intertextuality is increasingly becoming an integral component of virtually all styles and genres and, consequently, of all types of texts. As Russian scholars have noted, over the past two decades everyday Russian speech has become highly intertextual, reflecting the strong influence of liberalization and democratization. Elements of 'other speech,' traditionally associated with bookish discourse and expressed through established linguistic formulas, are increasingly entering spoken language, and the linguistic taste of the era is undergoing change.

Intertextuality in the texts of official documents is not only possible but, in fact, directly necessary. As A. E. Suprun has pointed out, for example, in various official documents it is impossible not to refer to previous documents, general instructions, resolutions, and other official texts of a similar nature. In such cases, this constitutes one of the essential requirements of official documentation and administrative practice.

A scientific text is virtually inconceivable without intertextuality. For this reason, many researchers, including E.A. Bocharnikova, emphasize that intertextuality is one of the most important categories of scientific text. She rightly stresses the role of scientific works in preserving, transmitting to readers, and further developing scientific knowledge that records particular fragments of the scientific worldview from the perspective of a given discipline. At the same time, she summarizes the most significant views on this issue as follows: "The realization of the category of intertextuality in a scientific text is: 1) inevitable, because there are no scientific works that are entirely unrelated to previously accumulated knowledge and experience already reflected in specialized literature; 2) obligatory, because the requirements imposed on most scientific texts necessitate the use of fragments of previously existing texts within the relevant field of knowledge; 3) expedient, because the use of previously known (precedent) texts demonstrates the connection of a given work with the development of science, the author's erudition and intellectual competence, his or her thorough familiarity with the problem under

investigation, and a number of other important aspects."

Indeed, intertextuality in scientific texts is inevitable, obligatory, and purposeful. Whenever a particular topic is subjected to scientific investigation—whether major or minor, significant or relatively insignificant—the author makes use of, or directly relies upon, the knowledge, experience, ideas, principles, and laws accumulated by predecessors. These are preserved in other texts. Therefore, when creating a new text, the author inevitably refers to those earlier texts in an objective and explicit manner. If such reference is not made clearly and openly, the practice is legally condemned as plagiarism, that is, as "scientific theft". Just as there is no language on earth that is completely pure and has never borrowed words from another language, there is likewise no scientific text in any language that does not incorporate certain elements from another text or texts. In contemporary scientific writing, the sources of textual fragments, ideas, and viewpoints that give rise to intertextuality are properly acknowledged through bibliographic references. According to internationally established academic standards, for example, articles in the natural sciences should generally contain no fewer than 10–12 bibliographic references. As N. M. Razinkina aptly observes, such references not only ensure connections between scientific texts but also serve as a kind of "currency through which scholars repay their intellectual debts to their predecessors."

It may be said that a scientific text cannot consist solely of the author's own words and, consequently, only of the author's own ideas; the words of others inevitably and necessarily participate in scientific discourse as well. Naturally, within a text, "one's own" words and "the words of others" interact in various forms, manifestations, and ways. In this interaction, "one's own" words occupy the primary, leading, and foundational position, whereas "the words of others" assume a secondary and supportive role. In interpretations of intertextuality, concepts such as "one's own words," "one's own speech," and "one's own voice" are typically contrasted with notions such as "the words of others," "the speech of others," and "the voice of others." Accordingly, this phenomenon is explained as a form of dialogue and cooperation between these two categories. In almost all linguistic

traditions, the term 'reported speech' is used as a general designation for direct speech, indirect speech, and free indirect speech. However, in text analysis, we employ this term in a broader sense, referring not only to utterances that do not directly belong to the author and have been incorporated into the text from another text, but also to linguistic units larger or smaller than a sentence, as well as concepts, thoughts, and ideas associated with other texts.

While analyzing "reported-speech constructions" in the scientific style (scientific texts) of the Uzbek language, M. Mukarramov writes: "Direct and indirect speech used in scientific discourse differ from their counterparts in conversational and literary discourse by virtue of their precision. When another person's words are cited in scientific discourse, the reference clearly indicates the author, the date of publication, the place of publication, the title of the work, and the exact page on which the statement appears. Such precision is absent in reported speech used in conversational and literary discourse. In those contexts, only the author of the reported statement is generally identifiable." As can be seen, M. Mukarramov employs the term "reported speech" in its conventional linguistic sense. Naturally, reported speech in this sense also contributes to the creation of textual intertextuality. However, regrettably, the researcher examined this issue outside the framework of the text as an integrated whole, rather than within the domain of text analysis itself. It should be noted that the problem of intertextuality in scientific texts has not yet been studied sufficiently in Uzbek linguistics.

One of the principal forms of introducing another person's speech into a text is the quotation (citation), which is characteristic of all functional styles. However, its role in scientific texts is exceptionally distinctive. As researchers have rightly observed, the quotation is a direct constituent of the language of modern science and a fully legitimate element of the composition of contemporary scientific texts. At the same time, as a "text within a text," a quotation performs a number of important functions, including evaluation, substantiation, the synthesis of existing viewpoints, interpretation, the comparison of old and new ideas, and the methodological explication of scientific concepts. The methods and mechanisms for incorporating quotations into a text are also extremely

diverse, finding expression in scientific discourse through a variety of formal markers and devices.

The primary purpose of any scientific text is to construct a scientific picture of the world or, more precisely, to create those larger or smaller fragments that contribute to the formation of that picture as an integrated whole and to represent them within the framework of objective logic and with complete impartiality. Humanity has been endowed with the great gifts of reason and thought, and it is through these that all of its sound and unsound intellectual activity is directed toward comprehending the inexhaustible mysteries of the world and, consequently, toward constructing a scientific picture of reality. Scientific texts, which are the products of this endeavor, embody, preserve, and systematize the scientific linguistic representation of the world. Having traversed time and space, these scientific texts serve as a foundation for subsequent texts and ensure continuity in the development of knowledge. According to the conventions and standards established in the global academic community, ideas and viewpoints derived from such source texts must be presented openly in a new text, with the source explicitly acknowledged. Quotations are incorporated into scientific texts precisely in accordance with this principle, ensuring that intertextuality in scientific discourse is expressed explicitly rather than implicitly. In this respect as well, scientific texts differ considerably from literary texts. In literary texts, the sources of quotations or of insertions and references such as allusions and reminiscences are more often conveyed implicitly, relying on the reader's familiarity with them as precedent phenomena. For example, in the following passage from the novel "Lolazor" by M.M. Dost, the speech of the protagonist Yaxshiboev includes the well-known couplet by Alisher Navoi – "In this rose garden, the flower of permanence does not endure; great indeed is the fortune if one's name remains through good deeds." The source of the verse and its authorship are not explicitly identified. In this way, a highly meaningful form of intertextuality is created, one that serves the writer's artistic intention perfectly and carries a rich poetic significance: "In short, my wife, in this garden of the world no flower of permanence can endure; great indeed is the fortune if one's name remains through good deeds. But when

shall we leave such a name behind? Will we manage to do so before it is too late?" "Having thoroughly analyzed the various manifestations of intertextuality in Uzbek literary texts and the linguo-poetic mechanisms underlying their formation, M. Yuldashev describes another instance as follows: "Sometimes a writer incorporates well-known lines from another author's work into his or her own text. These lines function as a kind of symbol of that author, alluding to the author and his or her literary legacy. For example, in the poem "Farewell, Master," dedicated to the memory of Gafur Ghulam, Abdulla Aripov begins the poem with the famous opening lines of the great poet:

"Зўр карвон йўлида етим бўтадек

Интизор кўларда халқа-халқа ёш..."

Сарбоним, қўлингдан кетдимикин эрк,

Сарбоним, не учун кўтармайсан бош..."

In literary texts, this and similar beautiful examples of intertextuality are extremely numerous in the works of masters of the written word.

It is no secret that incorporating a fragment of a text into a new text without indicating its source or author is called plagiarism, or theft, and is regarded as an entirely negative, even reprehensible, act. Naturally, a text containing such a fragment from another text is also intertextual; however, this is a kind of intertextuality that serves no worthwhile purpose.

It should not be forgotten that the criteria and norms governing whether the source of a quotation should be indicated are not the same in literary and scientific texts. The Russian philologist M.I. Shapir writes: "Plagiarism is as disgraceful in art as it is in science. However, the status of quotation in art and in science is fundamentally different. References to the source of a quotation, which are obligatory in scholarly work, are in most cases absent from literary works... Examples demonstrating that references are optional in literary texts can, of course, be found in abundance."

In the passages cited above from literary texts, there is no direct reference to the source of the intertext. However, this is motivated by artistic purpose: although the source remains implicit, it is nevertheless recognized through various allusions or by virtue of its prior familiarity. It awakens the reader's literary and intellectual consciousness and activates the processes

of interpretation and comprehension. In other words, the absence of an explicit indication of another text's source in a literary work is not a sign of the author's dishonesty but rather a manifestation of artistic mastery and a thorough command of the linguopoetic resources of language.

In scientific texts, a reference indicating the source of a quotation is obligatory, since it is a requirement of academic integrity and scholarly ethics, and at the same time ensures that an idea is expressed precisely in a single, definite meaning rather than being open to multiple interpretations. Whereas the simultaneous actualization of two meanings in a literary text is demanded by artistic expression and is therefore regarded as a positive feature, in a scientific text such a situation leads to logical ambiguities and is consequently viewed as entirely undesirable. As M.I. Shapir aptly remarks, "a poetic quotation is, by its nature, metaphorical, whereas a scientific quotation is metonymic." Indeed, while a quotation in a literary text is intended to emphasize the semantic difference between two contexts the receiving text and the source text a quotation in a scientific text is based on semantic identity between those contexts. More precisely, as Shapir notes, a scientific quotation may even be regarded as a synecdoche, since, as a fragment of the source text, it represents the text as a whole and may stand in its place. In general, it may be stated that quotation is an essential component of scientific discourse, and indicating its source is one of the fundamental requirements of scholarly ethics in the construction of scientific texts.

Thanks to independence, science, technology, and innovation in Uzbekistan have been developing steadily and progressively. Particularly in recent years, through the initiative and prudent guidance of the country's President, academic science has entered new and productive paths of advancement. In harmony with these developments, noticeable progress can also be observed in the functional styles of the Uzbek language, especially in its scientific style. A comprehensive and in-depth study of scientific texts in Uzbek makes it possible to identify objectively the trends and patterns of their development.

## REFERENCES

1. Йўлдошев М. Бадиий матн лингвопоэтикаси. –

Тошкент: Фан, 2008. –Б.34 – 36.

2. Гухман М.М. История языка и текст / Литература. Язык. Культура. –М.: Наука, 1986. – С.254.
3. Колшанский Г.В. От предложения к тексту / Сущность, развитие и функции языка. –М.: Наука, 1987. –С.42.
4. Ғуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис (Қайта ишланган ва тўлдирилган учинчи нашри). –Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1987. –Б.7.
5. Ҳақимов М. Ўзбек тилида матннинг прагматик талқини: Филол. фан. д-ри ... дис. –Тошкент, 2001; Азимова
6. Безруков А.Н. Поэтика интертекстуальности. – Бирск: Бирская гос. соц.-пед.академия, 2005. – С.55.
7. Петрова Н.В. Интертекстуальность как общий механизм текстообразования (на материале англо-американских коротких рассказов): Дисс. ... д-ра филол. наук. –Волгоград, 2005.
8. Кремнева А.В. Эволюция теории интертекстуальности в контексте меняющихся парадигм / Вестник НГУ. Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. 2014. Том 12, выпуск 1. –С.55.
9. Анданиёзова Д. Ономастик бирликларнинг лингвопоэтик тадқиқи. –Тошкент: Turon zamin ziyo, 2016. –Б.49 – 54.
10. Кремнева А.В. Кўрсатилган мақола. –Б.55.
11. Супрун А.Е. Текстовые реминисценции как языковое явление // Вопросы языкознания. – 1995. –N6. –С.19.
12. Бочарникова Е.А. Интертекстуальность как одна из важнейших категорий научного текста / Альманах современной науки и образования. – Тамбов: Грамота, 2009. N 12 (31): в 2-х ч. Ч. II. – С.146.
13. Разинкина Н.М. Функциональная стилистика. – М.: Высшая школа, 1989. –С.156 – 157.
14. Мукаррамов М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тилининг илмий стили. –Тошкент: Фан, 1984. –Б.143.