

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEXT AND DISCOURSE

Kurbanova Mukhabbat

Professor of NUU

Shonazarova Dilfuza

Independent researcher of NUU

Abstract. The concept of discourse has become one of the most widely used concepts in linguistics today. Since then, prominent scientists of the world have been conducting research on this issue and expressing their views on it. In a number of their works, it can be observed that efforts were made to interpret the concept of discourse and its scope, to clarify its essence and function, to identify and explain the subject and its objects in this aspect. Naturally, in this process, the question of the nature of discourse, the process of discourse-dialogue, discourse-analysis, and its advanced and still unsolved aspects were addressed.

Key words: discourse, text, text content, spoken and written adjectives

ОТНОШЕНИЕ ТЕКСТА И ДИСКУРСА

Курбанова Мухаббат

профессор НУУ

Шоназарова Дильфуза

Независимый исследователь НУУ

Абстрактный. Понятие дискурса стало одним из наиболее широко используемых понятий в современной лингвистике. С тех пор выдающиеся ученые мира проводят исследования по этому вопросу и высказывают свои взгляды на него. В ряде их работ можно наблюдать попытки истолковать понятие дискурса и его объемы, уточнить его сущность и функцию, выявить и объяснить предмет и его объекты в этом аспекте. Естественно, в этом процессе решался вопрос о природе дискурса, самого процесса дискурса-диалога, дискурс-анализа, его передовых и еще нерешенных сторон.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, текст, содержание текста, устные и письменные прилагательные.

INTRODUCTION

Text (Latin *textus* – fabric, combination) – human thought connected to a certain material carrier – connected speech; a common, consistent, complete sequence of characters. There are two main interpretations of the concept of "text": immanent (extended, focused on philosophical views) and representative (mainly reflecting a private attitude). The immanent approach implies an unbiased attitude to reality in the text, focusing on the third-person illumination of its internal structure. The representational approach means considering the text as a special form of presenting information about external reality. In linguistics, the term text is used in a wide range, especially in the process of oral speech. Text comprehension is widely studied in linguistics and psycholinguistics. I.R.Galperin, focusing on the features of the text, defines it as follows: "A text is a written document objectified in the form of a written document, consisting of a series of statements combined with various lexical, grammatical and logical connections, having a moral character, a pragmatic attitude and, accordingly, "literary is a written message with certain characteristics"[3,152].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Any text consists of sentences (sentences) that form a whole in accordance with the purpose set for it. If the text consists of a single sentence expanded by adding different parts of the sentence, the text is not counted. Because the text should be composed of several independent (content-dependent) sentences. The semantic integrity of the text consists in the fact that it reflects the connections and connections in the existing reality - social events, natural phenomena, interpersonal relations, the inner and outer world of a person, communication, speech, various views of the world of existence.

All the meanings of the words in the text become a whole, and this is considered its theme. The topic is the semantic core of the text - its condensed and generalized content.

The concept of "textual content" is a process related to the category of informational content of speech, which is unique to the text. It informs the reader of the connection between events, their importance in all areas through the author's individual attitude, gives it semantic integrity.

It is known that texts are divided into macro and microtexts [5,228]. The completeness of the thought expressed in the text is related to the semantic integrity of the text. The essence of this is that any text arises from the logical connection of two or more sentences, they acquire unity, integrity and are focused on one center.

A specific language is studied in harmony with the human factor that owns it. It is known that a number of studies have been carried out in world linguistics in connection with the study of language architecture in this direction. Prof. As D. Khudoyberganova noted in her doctoral dissertation, the following scientific and practical results were obtained as a result of the scientific research conducted in this regard:[4,75]

a) the scientists of Groningen University, Utrecht University concluded that text, from a cognitive point of view, is a transformation of mental structure into language, and is a verbal representation of a whole structure moving from whole to part;

b) Linguistic scientists of Moscow State University, Moscow University of Linguistics proved that the text, from the psycholinguistic point of view, is a product of the individual's speech thinking, the ability to reflect the objective existence through the language system;

c) Linguistic scientists of Vitebsk State University approach the text from a linguistic and cultural point of view, that language and culture have the characteristics of preserving information of social importance, transmitting it from generation to generation, creating and developing intercultural communication, in which it is both a product of culture and the main condition of its existence. those who have scientifically proved that it acts as a factor determining its appearance and ensuring its succession;

g) and finally, texts containing similes, metaphors, proverbs and phraseological units, speech etiquettes were studied by the scientists of the Kazakh National University as a linguistic and cultural phenomenon embodying national and cultural values [6].

Based on these, D. Khudoyberganova is currently conducting scientific research in such priority directions as the linguistic-cultural characteristics of a certain ethnic language, the role of language in creating a world view, the cognitive-semantic characteristics of the text, in particular, the conceptualization and categorization of reality, as well as the factor of personal psychology in the creation of the text. did not go unnoticed.

The most important source for explaining the relationship between language and personality is the text. After all, it is a speech structure that embodies all levels of the language, and it is also a phenomenon that fully manifests the linguistic potential of the speaker (writer). The external and internal structure of the text, in the words of D. Khudoyberganova, can be likened to a unique mirror that reflects the linguistic ability of speakers of a certain nationality. In fact, just as the mirror reflects the being it is aimed at, the text also reflects the potential and ability of the speaker to express the wealth of the language's vocabulary.

While the focus on the person who created it in the works related to text research was initially highlighted in psycholinguistics and pragmalinguistics, today rapidly developing fields such as cognitive linguistics, functionalism, ethnolinguistics, linguoculturology, and discursive analysis have turned this issue into one of the central problems of linguistics.

While continuing the thoughts on the text, we can add the following, that the worldview, perception of reality, and the ability to communicate to others cannot be underestimated in the attempts of a native speaker of a certain language to compose a text. Because he focuses all his efforts on one goal in composing a text, that is, he appears as a "master of the language". Therefore, he will have the ability to compose speech and

understand it. In this process, he appears as a performer of speech activity. As a communicator, he uses language as a means of communication, and as a person who owns a vocabulary that reflects the national, cultural, and spiritual values of the nation he belongs to, he can express his authority semantically in the text. Therefore, in any text, the mental characteristics of the native speaker stand out. From the texts of interviews to the texts of great epic works, the author's worldview, knowledge, and ability to use language capabilities are felt. Therefore, the text is closely related to the social status of the communicator. This gives a social spirit to the text, which makes it necessary to approach it as a product of a social phenomenon. In the previous chapter, we talked about the essence of the concept of discourse. This season we are thinking about the text. The expected goal is one: to consider what commonalities, relations and differences exist between text and discourse. It should be emphasized that the issues of the relationship between text and discourse have not yet been fully resolved in linguistics. Based on these studies, we present our conclusions.

As we have shown above, in the 50s of the last century Z. Harris, who mentioned the term discourse for the first time in his research, analyzed the relationship between the text and its social situation. Later, in the researches of the French scientist M. Foucault, the signs of the concept of discourse were more widely covered. Scientists such as Dj. Grimes, R. Longacre, T. Rivon, and U. Cheif have begun researching discourse within the framework of traditional methods and individual language concepts[10]. Scholars such as E.Kubryakova, O.Aleksandrova came to the conclusion that the discourse is related to the creation of real speech, and the text is the final result of the process of speech activity. In fact, in interviews, oral speech comes to the fore and appears as speech in a real situation. This speech (that is, the material appearance of the discourse in the interview) becomes a text only if it is reflected on paper for certain purposes. At this point, it is appropriate to recall that in the initial understanding of Anglo-Saxon linguists, discourse meant the text, text information and its features. Later, they also recognized

that discourse is not only textual information, but the spoken text underlying this information.

Based on the opinions of scientists, discourse can be considered as a direction aimed at establishing a connection between form and function in verbal communication. In this case, it is seen that the discourse, like the text, consists of a single sound or a single gesture, different from words, sentences and text.

The closeness between text and discourse can be felt in the following definition given to discourse in "Brief Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" by lexicographer T.M. Nikolaeva. However, if you look carefully, it becomes clear that the text is different, and the discourse is different: "In some linguistic studies, there are opinions that discourse is a linguistic term with many meanings that is almost synonymous with related speech. But the main aspects of the discourse are: 1) connected text; 2) oral-conversational form of the text; 3) dialogue; 4) a group of semantically connected thoughts; 5) is a speech work in oral and written form[7,30].

It can be said that research related to discourse reached a new level in the 60s and 70s of the last century based on the interrelationship of linguistics, semiotics, psychology and sociology. In these years, discourse was interpreted as "text plus situation" and text as "discourse minus situation" in linguistics. More precisely, the view that the discourse is a speech situation added to the text, and the text is a unity that has reached a certain form separated from this speech situation, became the priority.

It should also be noted that the ideas about the expression of discourse through the text are found in the studies of T. Van Dijk and V. Kinch[2,153-211] . These scholars defined discourse as synonymous with connected discourse, acknowledging the increased interest in the study of connected speech or discourse in a number of humanities and social sciences in recent years. During the period when T. Van Dijk and V. Kinch emphasized the relevance of discourse to the content of the text, as a result of European

and American linguistic research, both independent paradigms of text grammar and discourse were developed.

While dealing with discourse and text problems, M.Stubbs gives 3 different definitions of discourse analysis:

- 1) studies the relationship between language and society;
- 2) deals with the features of dialogic or mutual speech in everyday communication;
- 3) studies the relationship with the language that deviates from the boundaries of the sentence.

It is clear from this definition that the scientist evaluates the discourse as a process that has the nature of communication. So, on the one hand, while studying the relationship between language and society, discourse attracts attention with its direct relevance to the language phenomena we are researching. Because it deals with dialogs in the interactions that occur in everyday life. Communicants deal with the features of speech and in the process learns the language-text relationship that goes beyond the boundaries of speech.

This is why the linguist scientist N.D. Arutyunova considers the discourse to be a text related to extralinguistic, pragmatic, psychological and other factors, a social situation aimed at the purpose of speech, the interaction of people participating in the speech, and a component in the mechanisms of their consciousness [1, 5-32]. That is, he argues that discourse is "speech loaded with vitality." He believes that the difference between discourse and text is that it is directly related to real life and does not have the nature of regeneration. He explains that text is a general concept, and discourse is a specific concept. The scientist also mentions that discourse is literally a text, and discourse and text are not opposed in a certain sense. Because the text is carried out in a certain process, but studied in its completed state, while the discourse is studied in a specific space and time. The concepts of discourse and text have a similar process-product relationship. Any text can be the result of a discourse, but not any text can be a discourse.

According to the scientist, the book on the shelf is a text until it reaches the addressee. It can be seen that N.D. Arutyunova interprets the discourse as a product of the oral speech process, and the text as a product of the written speech, and considers this term to be the most correct conclusion.

RESULT

It was not for nothing that Yu.S. Stepanov called discourse "Discourse is a language within a language." That is, the discourse that appears in existence is really a simple language that does not have its own "grammar" and "lexicon" [8, 65-69], . Discourse within a language is primarily manifested in texts and has its own lexicon, grammar, usage rules, syntax and semantics. The world of discourse has its own rules of synonym exchange, rules of reality, its own etiquette. Each discourse is an opportunity in language, which means that the direction is related to the live audience and the direction is related to the abstract audience.

According to the scientist, the discourse is alive, it is born, it lives, and it dies when the subject is discussed and loses its relevance. Text is eternal, discourse is text that takes place in the speech process, written texts have never been discourse, text becomes discourse when it is used by a person. Text is a unit of communication, a tool. Discourse is a form, a process of communication. He interprets that while text is food for thought, discourse is the clarity of thought expressed. It is clear from the scientist's comments that the difference between the text created with a specific purpose and discursive texts is clearly noticeable. For example, a writer creates a text (a story, short story, novel, or other type of work) for others to read. The author of the text refers to the reader only when he considers this connected speech that he has composed. This text is stable in this respect. Discourse is created in a certain process and differs from it by its variability. If the writer addresses the text he created as a result of a certain goal to the reader only when he is "satisfied", the discourse may change depending on the situation. What is important is that the discourse itself stands out as a product of a living process. No matter what the

author aims to write a text about in the discourse, it is common for this goal to change in the course of the conversation and become different. This proves that A.Yu. Popov's discourse is a textual representation of the process that takes place in the speech process, which is prone to change, and confirms that the form is a process of communication[9,75]. This especially shows that the interview is a key feature of the texts. Although the interviewing journalist plans the task of organizing the conversation in the direction he aims for, he is forced to change the content of his planned questions and divert them in different directions based on the state and mood of the interlocutor in this situation.

In her articles, E.S. Kubryakova emphasizes not to limit text to discourse. According to him, it is a mistake to put a Chinese wall between the text and the discourse. Because the discourse also appears in the "image" of the text. The difference is that while the text we are referring to is in the form of a materialized "product", discourse becomes text only after the communication process is completed. It is for this reason that they are distinguished by genetic consanguinity. In other words, any text is not outside of discourse, that is, any text was in a state of discourse before it was recorded. In addition, he says that the most important thing in the analysis of "text and discourse" is to understand conditional signs and ambiguous thoughts in communication. He distinguishes between discourse and text as follows:

d i s k u r s m a t n

pragmatic process is a separate linguistic category

process category outcome category

abstract structure is an activated form of text

A number of other scientists stand in the position of the issues we have considered and insist on the need to distinguish between the partial differences between the discourse and the text. For example, V. G. Borbotko believes that the discourse is a text, but it is a connection of thoughts consisting of communicative language units, sentences and their

larger units and perceiving the goal. He showed in his research that the text is not related to speech like discourse, the text is a broader concept than the discourse, and the discourse always finds content from the text.

It is clear from this that in linguistics there are many alternative opinions and views about the difference between discourse and text. First of all, the ideas that discourse and text are linguistic phenomena with oral and written qualities were emphasized in the works of a number of Uzbek linguists, and there were cases in which these ideas were supported or objected to. There is another case where the view that discourse is a phenomenon in oral form and text in written form caused objections about these two language units. Nevertheless, the idea that discourse is a substantive type of human speech in connection with the situation and the activity of consciousness, while the text is its formal type, is leading.

In fact, the conclusion that a discourse is a spoken or written speech that carries social information, regardless of its size, used in a social environment, stands out as a stop noted in a number of studies. This speech is analyzed according to who is making it and in what situation. It is worth noting that this same interview appears more clearly in the texts.

These ideas expressed around the discourse, their relevance to the text and their differences show that the range of phenomena represented by the discourse is very wide. This is why the Russian scientist A.I. Gorshkov noted that the term "discourse" is widely used in linguistic literature, that is, to express situations ranging from "part of the text" to the whole "speech". The scientist understands the term "discourse" in the sense of "part of the text" and the study of discourse as part of the problems of the text, in the literature "a unit larger than a phrase", "complex syntactic whole", "text component", "register", "sentence", "prosaic stanza", As it is synonymous with "syntactic complex", "monological sentence", "communicative block", it is not important to study this term separately. In scientific studies, the interpretation of the meaning of discourse in the form

of "coherent statement, conversation, dialogue" shows one of its aspects. In this case, the result of the discourse appears as a dialogic text.

In our opinion, it is not advisable to study the concepts of text and discourse as conflicting phenomena. But these concepts cannot be called alternative units. Let's say, if we analyze the sentence "When the spring comes in our country, the mountains, hills, hillsides turn blue" and this sentence is considered as a text from a grammatical point of view, then from the pragmatic point of view, it is understood that the process of living begins in Tabat, in all the valleys of the region, with the arrival of spring. It can be seen from this that since the text cannot be considered as a phenomenon with immutable, motionless, stable characteristics, in order to determine its grammatical features, it is necessary and important to pay attention to the aspects related to conscious discursive activity.

It should be noted that special researches on discourse in Uzbek linguistics were carried out by the linguist Sh.Safarov. Prof. Shahriyor Safarov's monograph entitled "Pragmalinguistics" occupies a special place within the issues we are paying attention to. In the monograph Sh. Safarov's personal attitude to the current ideas in world linguistics about concepts and terms such as language and speech dichotomy, linguistic activity, linguistic ability, discourse is clearly noticeable. The linguist noted about the problems of text and discourse, "if both text and discourse are the result of human linguistic activity, I suspect that it is possible to distinguish them by the qualities of "oral" and "written" based only on the external-formal indicator. Similarly, it is difficult to imagine one of them as a material phenomenon, and the other one without this feature. After all, if both of these will be the product of the resulting activity, the achieved result should take a material form, right? It can be concluded from the opinions of the above linguists that "discourse is both a process of linguistic activity and a product of it (activity)" should be considered appropriate. It is the result of these considerations that we mentioned above - that there is no need to put a Chinese wall between them.

CONCLUSION

Based on the opinions and comments of scientists about text and discourse, it will be possible to point out the following different and also some related features of them:

- a) the text takes a material form as language material;
- b) the text also appears as language material;
- c) the text will have relative completeness;
- g) the text shows general characteristics;
- d) the text will have statistical properties.

Discourse differs from it in these aspects:

- a) discourse acquires speech activity;
- b) the discourse belongs to the actual space and time;
- c) discourse is a product of speech process;
- g) the discourse will have specificity;
- d) the discourse will have the characteristic of dynamism.

The relationship between text and discourse is as follows:

- a) both will have communicative features;
- b) both will have the characteristic of pragmatism;
- c) both of them will have the characteristic of informativeness, i.e. information carrier;
- g) both are products of the target process;
- d) both show the characteristic of anthropocentricity;
- e) both are the result of creative activity.

So, there are many aspects that should be distinguished in text and discourse communication, and the interview of this issue confirms that one of the right ways is to consider the relationship between text and discourse communication as a separate research object.

LIST OF USED REFERENCES

1. Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора и дискурс // Теория метафоры. – М.: Прогресс, 1990.
2. Дейк Т.А. ван, Кинч В. Стратегия понимания связного текста // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 23. Когнитивные аспекты языка. – М.: Прогресс, 1988.
3. Искандарова Ш. Тил системасига матн асосида ёндашув.- Тошкент: Фан, 2007.
4. Курбонова М., Йўлдошев М. Матн тилшунослиги. Т.: Университет, 2014.
5. Махмудов Н., Нурмонов А. Ўзбек тили назарий грамматикаси. Т.: Ўқитувчи, 1995.
6. Менглиев Б.Р. Лисоний тизим яхлитлиги ва унда сатҳлараро муносабатлар. АДД., Тошкент, 2002.
7. Нейматов Ҳ., Бозоров О. Тил ва нутқ. Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1993.
8. Стернин И.А. Когнитивная интерпретация в лингвокогнитивных исследованиях // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики.- М., 2004.-№1.
9. Турниёзов Н. Тилшуносликка кириш. - Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ, 2002.
10. Фуко М. Археология знания. Ника-Киев, 1996.