

## Relationship of Discourse and Text

D. T. Aytbaev

Associate Professor of TSPU Named After Nizami, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

It is known that the very units that make up the language materialize in speech. If the text takes place in the linguistic layer as a generalized construct, then its manifestation in real time and space, in a real situation, can be considered as discourse.

*How to cite this paper:* D. T. Aytbaev "Relationship of Discourse and Text" Published in International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), ISSN: 2456-6470, Volume-6 | Issue-1, December 2021, pp.1393-1396, URL: [www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd48055.pdf](http://www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd48055.pdf)



Copyright © 2021 by author (s) and International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development Journal. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)



Since the 60s of the XX century, the concept of "discourse" has become one of the key not only in linguistics, but also in a number of humanitarian disciplines. Many linguists see the reason for this phenomenon in the "linguistic revolution" that arose as a result of the spread of structural linguistics and structural methodology. The basis of the structural concept is the position that the study of the structure of language is the key to studying the universe and human existence.

Discourse is one of the main categories of communicative linguistics and a number of other modern sciences. This term was first introduced into theoretical linguistics by the Belgian E. Buysans, who in his work "Language and Discourse", published in 1943 in Brussels, introduced discourse into the opposition of language and speech as a third element. According to him, discourse is a mechanism for transferring a system of signs - a language - into living speech.

The basis of the discourse analysis is the ideological concept of the representative of the French school M. Pesho. M. Pesho considers discourse as a point of contact between language and ideology. He recognizes discourse analysis as an analysis of the ideological aspects of the use of language and the

implementation of ideology in the language. His ideas influenced the views of contemporary representatives of French discourse analysis: P. Serio, E.P. Orlandi, J.J. Curtin, D. Maldidier and others.

According to A.E. Kibrik, discourse is a combination of linguistic activity and text - the result of this activity. The text is part of the discourse. In addition to the text, discourse covers the processes associated with the creation and understanding of text in real time and space. The text is a static object, which is the result of linguistic activity.

According to V.G. Borbotko, discourse is a text consisting of communicative language units that are in a continuous semantic connection and perceived as a whole.

G.A. Orlov considers discourse as a specific speech category, expressed in the form of an oral or written speech derivative, formed in content and structural aspects, from a syntagmatic chain of individual phrases to a complete work (story, conversation, description, instruction, report).

Discourse assessment based on a meaningful approach, i.e. its consideration as a chain of whole phrases can also be observed in the studies of I. Bellert, M. M. Bakhtin, V. A. Kokh, S. I. Gindin and

others. Thus, according to I. Bellert, discourse is such an order of phrases  $S_1, \dots, S_n$ , where the semantic interpretation of each  $S_i$  (based on  $2 < i > n$ ) depends on the interpretation of the phrases of the sequence  $S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}$ . More precisely, all phrases in the discourse are so connected in content that in order to understand a specific phrase in it, one needs to know the content of the previous phrase.

Patrick Serio, emphasizing the multifaceted use of the term "discourse", points to eight of its meanings, inherent only to representatives of the French school of discourse analysis:

Equivalent to the concept of "speech" introduced by Saussure, i.e. any specific phrase.

One is greater than a phrase, an expression with a broad meaning; the subject of study of the grammar of the text, which deals with the study of the composition of expressions.

From a pragmatic point of view, "discourse" is the influence of an expression on the listener and its place in a speech situation.

Discourse is a conversation considered as the main type of expression (phrase).

Discourse is speech opposed to the usual message, narration, with the direct participation of the speaker and listener (Benveniste).

Also, in some sources, language and discourse are contrasted. At the same time, discourse is discerned - the study of a specific element "in language" and its study "in speech".

The term "discourse" is often used to denote a system of restrictions from the point of view of social and ideological to limitless expressions. For example, when it comes to "political discourse" or "feminist discourse", one should speak not about the private corpus, but the types of expression inherent in politicians or feminists in general.

Traditionally, discourse analysis, defining the subject of research, distinguishes between phrase and discourse.

Summarizing all the definitions of the term "discourse" in the language, Deborah Shifrin highlights the top approach to the interpretation of discourse. The first is from the point of view of formal or structural linguistics. Here discourse is seen as a language above the level of a phrase and a sentence. More precisely, discourse is two or more sentences related in content".

According to the second approach, discourse acquires a functional interpretation, and is considered as any

use of language. At the same time, the analysis of the function of discourse is carried out in unity with the analysis of the broad sociocultural function of language.

Proponents of the third approach view discourse from the point of view of the relationship between form and function, i.e. as a discourse phrase. At the same time, discourse is considered not just a collection of separate "more than a sentence" units of the linguistic structure, but emphasizes the need to evaluate it as a collection of functionally formed, contextual units.

All of the above indicates that the concept of "discourse" is complex, voluminous and does not have an unambiguous interpretation. At the same time, the problem of the relationship between discourse and text remains unresolved.

The relationship between discourse and text attracts the attention of community linguists, in particular Uzbek linguists. Sh. Safarov, emphasizing the need for a broader interpretation of discourse in comparison with the text, argues that it is correct to study the relationship between discourse and text in the hyperonymous and hyponymous aspects. And in the opinion of a specialist, discourse is a specific type, a cycle of a person's conscious activity, and the text is one of its varieties. The reason for the mutual meeting of phenomena is text and discourse is culture. It is known that, on the one hand, the flow of communication and the formation of a text is a cultural process. On the other hand, the text is an important knot connecting language and culture, since using the analysis of the composition of the text, it is possible to collect linguocultural information about the scientific and cultural features of the language system. Accordingly, the text shows an active attitude to the linguistic system, the language is not only the main means, the participant in the construction of the text, but also itself undergoes serious qualitative changes in the process of the text. This is evidenced by the right to freely use linguistic units in the structure of the text, breaking free from the "shackles" of the rules of the language.

The approach to linguistic means based on dialectical categories, in particular the general and the particular, contributes to the solution of many problems. In Uzbek linguistics, there are a number of studies aimed at studying linguistic units based on dialectical categories. D. Nabieva, speaking about the invariant and variant relations between linguistic units, emphasizes that the coverage of language units on the basis of the dialectics of general and particular contributes to a deeper understanding of their essence.

In the author's opinion, the recognition of the presence at the base of the material means that we can feel a certain community, the essence led to the emergence of the theory of invariance in science, which was of great importance for the theory of knowledge (epistemology), deepening and concretizing the theory of reflection. The invariant-variant contradiction reflects the contradictory, dual peculiarity of the attributes-properties of objects belonging to a particular class.

Invariance indicates the general properties of a certain object, which are present in another similar object. Variation, on the other hand, manifests the property of only one of the objects united into a certain class by invariant properties.

The invariant and its variant are closely related through implementation relations. Each invariant is realized through several options.

The concrete - the material cannot remain exactly the same under various changes. The same can be said about the material-physical property of any object.

This means that invariance can be attributed only to abstract objects and abstract features of objects.

So, a change in the parameters of various objects made from the same material leads to a change in their weight and volume, that is, their physical characteristics change. However, in spite of such changes, all of them retain the property of possessing "weight" and "volume". It is these signs, common and unchanging for all objects that undergo various changes, and are invariant.

If we approach the issue of discourse from the point of view of invariance-variance based on the dichotomy of language and speech, in our opinion, the solution of the relationship between discourse and text will take on a slightly different form.

It is known that the very units that make up the language materialize in speech. If the text takes place in the linguistic layer as a generalized construct, then its manifestation in real time and space, in a real situation, can be considered as discourse.

As noted in all the above definitions, discourse is a speech derivative, covering such factors as content integrity in phrases, sociological, psychological indicators of the speaker and listener in a specific speech situation, the correct organization of the speech act. All these factors, being outside the language, are superimposed in the process of communication on one of the communicative units of the language - the text. Therefore, in each specific application, a specific text takes on different meaningful facets.

M. Makarov, exploring the theoretical foundations of discourse, interprets it as follows: discourse = speech + text.

As you can see, the type of text, a unit of communication that has absorbed specific speech features in a specific speech situation is discourse. There is an invariant and a variant relationship between discourse and text. Text - like all linguistic structures, a phenomenon that has explicit and hidden layers, arising within the framework of the unity of content and form. The real speech expression (reflection), the form of materialization of the text, is discourse.

In recent years, special attention has been paid to the analysis of discourse in Uzbek linguistics.

Thus, D. Khudoyberganova believes that such an interpretation of the discourse was undoubtedly greatly influenced by the formation and development of anthropocentric linguistics. Discourse analysis, figuratively speaking, is a crossroads where several directions of linguistic analysis meet. Discursive activity, i.e. the process of conscious construction of speech involves the study of the personality factor. Since any manifestation of speech is the result of the activity of a person belonging to a specific socio-cultural environment with psychological and cognitive characteristics.

A remarkable side of discourse is that in the process of communication, each unit of a speech act - discourse acquires a content-rich variety under the influence of various factors, such as the mental state of the speaker and listener, their worldview, occupation, position in society, speech act.

## LITERATURE

- [1] Bellert I. On one condition of text connectivity // *New in foreignlinguistics*, vol. VIII. *Linguistics of the text*. –M.: Progress, 1978. P.3.
- [2] Borbotko V.G. *Elements of the theory of discourse*. - Grozny, 1981.S.8
- [3] Bakhtin M. M. *Aesthetics of verbal creativity*. – M.: Art, 1979;
- [4] Demyankov V.Z. *Dominant linguistic theories at the end of the 20th century // Language and science of the late 20th century*. –M.: Institute of Linguistics RAS, 1995. P.239-320;
- [5] Gindin S.I. *Rhetoric and problems of text structure // General rhetoric / Dubois J., Edeline F. et al.* - Moscow, 1971.

- [6] Nabieva D. Ўzbek tilida lisoniy birliklarni dialektik kategoriyalar asosida tadqiq etish. Filol.fan.doct ..... diss. –Toshkent, 2007.
- [7] A.A. Kibrik Discourse analysis from a cognitive perspective. Diss. to apply for ..... doct. philol. sciences. –Moscow, 2003. C.5.
- [8] Orlov G.A. Modern English speech. –M.: Higher school, 1991. P.14
- [9] Serio P. The quality of meaning. French School of Discourse Analysis. –Moscow, 1999. –P.8.
- [10] Zvegintsev G.S. The proposal and its relation to language and speech. –Moscow, 1976, p. 170.
- [11] Schiffrin D. Approaches to discourse. — Oxford: Cambridge, MA, 1994. pp. 20-43.
- [12] Makarov M. Foundations of the theory of discourse. –M.: Gnosis, 2003. P.89.
- [13] Safarov Sh. Pragmalinguistics. –T.: Uzbekiston milliy encyclopedias, 2008. 221-b.
- [14] Khudoyberganova D. Matnning antropocentric tadqiqi. –T.: Fan, 2013;
- [15] Saidkhonov M. Badiy matn kommunikativ vosita sifatida // ЎТА, 2009, №5. 80-82-b.
- [16] <http://www.infolex.ru/>;
- [17] <http://ling.ulstu.ru>.
- [18] <http://www.madipi.ru>

