The Concepts of *Text* and *Discourse* in Linguistics

MUKUMOV MAKHMUD KHUDAYBERDIEVICH
Termez State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the study of text and discourse in linguistics. Currently, modern linguistics pays special attention to the study of various types of discourse. The reason for this is a steady interest in the ways of verbal expression of information. Due to the specifics of scientific communication, which is expressed in the continuous development and permanent continuity and allows us to consider science as an organic sphere of actualization of intertextuality, medical scientific discourse is of great research interest. The phenomenon of intertextuality, being a unique means of generating new meaning in discourse, reflects the essence of the processes of semantic dialogical interaction between the ideas of the past and the present. In connection with the storage, transmission, as well as the current system of scientific information production, the study of linguistic means, namely, intertextual links, through which the representation of new knowledge in discourse is carried out, is of great importance for linguistic science.

Keywords: Scientific discourse, intertextuality, intertextua intertextual markers, linguistic means of intertextuality representation.

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, in linguistics, the term *text* is understood as a speech work created by an individual in the form of a single

sentence or an entire fragment [1].The text is a product of human speech activity in the form of a fixed finished message, which can be implemented either orally or in writing. It should be borne in mind that the expression of an idea is carried out with the help of whole texts, and not individual statements. And if we take into account the point of view of the Swiss linguist F. de Saussure, concerning the primacy of speech in comparison with language, the text acts as a special material, which determines the existence of the language system itself.

It is customary to attribute integrity and consistency to the important features of the text. On the one hand, these signs are in independent relations from each other, and from the other – one of their properties of the text suggests the presence of the second. The completeness of the text is also inextricably linked with integrity. The presence of such specific features in the text as isolation and completeness, which are not related to the linguistic proper, is due to the conditions of communication.

In any text, there is a special hierarchical system in which thematic fragments are located (there can be either one or several topics). In other words, the text has a special structure. However, not all the components in it have a wordy (verbal) expression. So some elements can be represented by non-verbal means (either completely or partially), for example: graphs, diagrams, tables, figures, etc.

It is important to emphasize that "the text is a "profitable" didactic material in the sense that it is a complete and complete in form and content, "a sample of speech communication of native speakers" containing the target language (lexical, grammatical) material, a certain topic that stimulates the communication situation" [2, p. 642]. Consequently, each text acts as a carrier of a specific thought, and is also a formula for the implementation of a particular language material in terms of communication.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Currently, the term *discourse* can be called one of the most difficult in linguistics, since it "denotes the highest reality of

language, discursive activity" [3, p. 9]. According to etymology, the word "discourse" was formed from the Latin *discursus* (French and English discourse), which means conversation, conversation and negotiations. Such a definition of this concept was adhered to until the XVIII century. Since then, due to the rapid pace of development of science and the influence of time, significant changes in the interpretation of this phenomenon can be observed.

N. D. Arutyunova offers the following interpretation of this term: "Discourse (Fr.discours – speech) is a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors, a text taken in a conceptual aspect; speech, considered as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes). Discourse is speech immersed in life" [4, p. 136137].

It is important to note that, on the one hand, discourse is inextricably linked with the pragmatics of the situation, which determines its logic, the adequacy of the ongoing communication, as well as semantic components – presupposition and implication, providing interpretation of meaning. On the other hand, discourse is also connected with the thought process of communicants, which include special norms reflecting the specifics of psychology, ethnography, culture and society, as well as strategies for understanding and generating speech, including such features as coherence, pace, choice of means by which the goal would be achieved, as well as the ratio general and particular, implicit and explicit, objective and subjective.

In connection with various forms of communication, discourse as a cognitive-semantic phenomenon has a special typology. V.I. Karasik in the article "On types of discourse" identifies two main types of discourse: personality-oriented (i.e. personal) and institutional. The first type is characterized by the representation of a wide range of features of the inner world and the personality of the speaker. In the second type of discourse, an individual is a representative of the ideas of a certain institution of society.

Personality-oriented discourse, in turn, is divided into existential (monologue, use of literary language, semantic saturation) and everyday (it is a dialogue with a high degree of implicitness, preference is given to emotionally colored language).

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

At the same time, it is customary to refer to the institutional type: legal, medical, business, advertising, military, stage diplomatic, political, pedagogical, mystical, administrative, religious, sports, scientific and mass information. It should be borne in mind that this list may narrow or expand due to the fact that social institutions differ from each other, and also undergo changes in the course of historical development.

Being a special language unit of the highest level, discourse has a range of the following features:

- The difference between discourse and other linguistic units lies in its very structure;
- Discourse is characterized by a high degree of integrity (when functioning in a language);
- When translated, it acts as a common unit. It should be noted that in addition to lexical lacunae, stylistic ones may also occur. Thelatter, as a rule, implies transposition.
- A peculiar structural formula is inherent in the discourse, which is a model of a communicative situation.

Thus, the discourse "may correspond to a certain linguistic "stemma" with a complex structure, having a matrix system significance" [2, p. 642].

It is important to note that originally in French linguistics, discourse was understood as a whole speech, of which the text was synonymous. Thus, the two concepts were in identical relations with each other. However, with the development of such fields of science as psycholinguistics, communication theory, cognitive linguistics and sociolinguistics, the

interpretation of the two terms underwent gradual changes, which led to the formation of different meanings.

For the first time, an attempt to differentiate "text" and "discourse" was made by the Dutch linguist, T. A. van Dyck. However, in the scientific work "Strategies for understanding a coherent text", a clear boundary was not drawn between the above terms due to the fact that in English the word discourse can be used both to denote the text itself and the conversation.

Such researchers as O. V. Alexandrova and E. S. Kubryakova dealt with the issues of distinguishing between the two concepts, who believed that "by discourse one should mean precisely the cognitive process associated with real speech production, the creation of a speech work, while the text is the final result of the process of speech activity, resulting in a certain finished (and fixed) form" [5, pp. 19-20].

According to V.E. Chernyavskaya, at the center of the discourse process is the text that was created on the basis of the works of the predecessor, namely, precedent texts that "are mandatory constituents of discourse, providing understanding processes, but are not obligatory as components of the text" [6, pp. 231-232].

CONCLUSION

A more detailed study concerning the relationship between the concepts of text and discourse can be found in A.Y. Popov. The scientist compares the features of these two concepts, which include: static nature of the text and discursive spontaneity; static and dynamics; arbitrariness and limitation in the time interval; focus on the audience (abstract and live); a wider range of use of (non)verbal means in discourse than in the text. The researcher believes: "Discourse is alive, it is born, lives and dies when the subject under discussion loses its relevance... The text is eternal (manuscripts do not burn)... discourse – text (there are no disconnected texts in nature). A written text was once a discourse, and a text, when a person's hand touches it and his consciousness turns on, will turn into a discourse... Text is a means and unit of communication. Discourse is the form in

which this communication takes place. The text gives food for thought, the discourse is an explicit reflection" [7, pp. 41-42].

Summarizing the above, we can conclude that the key differences between the text and the discourse include the following:

- text is a category of linguistics, discourse is a category of pragmatics [8, pp. 166-170. 9];
- text is the result of speech activity (it is static), discourse is a category of the process [10, pp. 61-62. 11, pp. 156-159];
- text is an abstract construction, discourse is the implementation of this construction [12, pp. 212–219. 13].

Thus, discourse and text are in an interdependent relationship. Every discourse is a text, however, a text is not always a discourse. For example, a magazine that lies on the table remains a text until it is read by the recipient [14, pp.305-309]. Consequently, despite the fact that there are differences between the definitions of discourse and text, they have a causal relationship, since the text is the result of an individual's speech activity.

<div align="center">REFERENCES</div>

1. Kubryakova E.S. About the text and the criteria for its definition [Electronic resource]. URL: http://www.philology.ru/linguistics1/ kubryakova-01.htm. Accessed 27.05.2016.
2. Popova E.S. Text and discourse: differentiation of concepts / Young scientist. - 2014. – No. 6. – pp. 641-643.
3. Kubryakova E.S. On the concept of discourse and discursive analysis in modern linguistics: review / Discourse, speech, speech activity. Functional and structural aspects: a collection of reviews. – M.: INION RAS, 2000. – pp. 7-25.
4. Arutyunova N.D. Discourse / Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary.M.: Sov. Encyclopedia, 1990. – pp. 136-137.
5. Kubryakova E.S. Types of space, text and discourse / Categorization of the world: space and time: materials of a scientific conference. – M.: Dialog–MSU, 1997. – pp. 19-20.

6. Chernyavskaya V.E. From text analysis to discourse analysis / Chernyavskaya V.E. // Text and discourse: traditional and cognitive–functional aspects of research: Collection of scientific tr. – Ryazan, 2002. – pp. 230-232.

7. Popov A.Yu. Forms of economic texts and discourses / Text and discourse. Problems of economic discourse: a collection of scientific articles. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of SPbGUEF, 2001. – pp. 41-44.

8. Makhmud, Mukumov. "Conceptual and Terminological Apparatus of Cultural Linguistics." *International Journal of Innovations in Engineering Research and Technology*, vol. 8, no. 04, 2021, pp. 166-170.

9. Мукумов, М. Х. (2021). INTERPRETATION OF THE TERMS WORLD MODEL, WORLDVIEW, IMAGE OF THE WORLD IN COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 4(2).

10. Bahromovna, Y. S. (2021). Thematic Division of Clothing Names in English and Uzbek. EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION, 1(2), 61–62. Retrieved from http://inovatus.es/index.php/ejine/article/view/41

11. Makhmud, Mukumov. "Using the Moodle Distance Learning System in the Educational Process." *JournalNX*, vol. 6, no. 11, 2020, pp. 156-159.

12. Ibragimova, H. B. qizi . . (2022). INGLIZ TILINI O'QITISHDA PODKASTLAR VA ULARDAN FOYDALANISHNING AMALIY JIHATLARI. Results of National Scientific Research International Journal, 1(8), 212–219. Retrieved from http://academics.uz/index.php/rnsr/article/view/1118

13. IbragimovaHilolaBahodirjonQiziPodkastlarningdidaktikvametodik funksiyalari // Science and Education. 2020. №2. URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/podkastlarning-didaktik-va-metodik-funksiyalari (дата обращения: 20.09.2023).

14. Yadigarova, S. B. (2023). Clothing names as the linguistic objects. ISJ Theoretical&Applied Science,03 (119), 305-309.

MUKUMOV MAKHMUD KHUDAYBERDIEVICH
SENIOR TEACHER, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN
LANGUAGES THEORY AND METHODOLOGY
TERMEZ STATE PEDAGOGICAL INSTITUTE, UZBEKISTAN
E-MAIL: <CAEN05@GMAIL.COM>