

**СЎЗ САНЪАТИ  
ХАЛҚАРО ЖУРНАЛИ  
4 ЖИЛД, 1 СОН**

**МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ  
ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА  
ТОМ 4, НОМЕР 1**

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL  
OF WORD ART  
VOLUME 4, ISSUE 1**



**Бош муҳаррир:**

**Холбеков Муҳаммаджон**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Бош муҳаррир ўринбосари:**

**Тўхтасинов Илҳом**

ф.ф.д., доцент (Ўзбекистон)

**Тахрир хайъати:**

**Назаров Бахтиёр**

академик. (Ўзбекистон)

**Якуб Умарўгли**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Туркия)

**Алмаз Улви Биннатова**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Озарбайжон)

**Бокиева Гуландом**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Миннуллин Ким**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Татаристон)

**Махмудов Низомиддин**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Керимов Исмаил**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Россия)

**Жўраев Маматкул**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Куренов Рахыммамед**

к.ф.н. (Туркменистон)

**Кристофер Жеймс Форт**

Мичиган университети (АҚШ)

**Умархўжаев Мухтор**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Мирзаев Ибодулло**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Болтабоев Ҳамидулла**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Дўстмухаммедов Хуршид**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Лиходзиевский А.С.**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Сиддикова Ирода**

ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Шиукашвили Тамар**

ф.ф.д. (Грузия)

**Юсупов Ойбек**

масъул котиб, доцент (Ўзбекистон)

**Главный редактор:**

**Холбеков Муҳаммаджон**

д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Заместитель главного редактора:**

**Тухтасинов Илҳом**

к.ф.н., доцент (Ўзбекистон)

**Редакционная коллегия:**

**Назаров Бахтиёр**

академик. (Ўзбекистон)

**Якуб Умар оглы**

д.ф.н., профессор (Туркия)

**Алмаз Улви Биннатова**

д.ф.н., профессор (Азербайджан)

**Бакиева Гуландом**

д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Миннуллин Ким**

д.ф.н., профессор (Татарстан)

**Махмудов Низомиддин**

д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Керимов Исмаил**

д.ф.н., профессор (Россия)

**Джураев Маматкул**

д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Куренов Рахыммамед**

к.ф.н. (Туркменистон)

**Кристофер Джеймс Форт**

Университет Мичигана (США)

**Умархаджаев Мухтар**

д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Мирзаев Ибодулло**

д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Балтабоев Ҳамидулла**

д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Дустмухаммедов Хуршид**

д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Лиходзиевский А.С.**

д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Сиддикова Ирода**

д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

**Шиукашвили Тамар**

д.ф.н. (Грузия)

**Юсупов Ойбек**

отв. секретарь, доцент (Ўзбекистон)

**Editor in Chief:**

**Kholbekov Muhammadjan**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Deputy Chief Editor**

**Tuhtasinov Ilhom**

Ph.D. Ass. Prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Editorial Board:**

**Bakhtiyor Nazarov**

academician. (Uzbekistan)

**Yakub Umarogli**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Turkey)

**Almaz Ulvi Binnatova**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Azerbaijan)

**Bakieva Gulandom**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Minnulin Kim**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Tatarstan)

**Mahmudov Nizomiddin**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Kerimov Ismail**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Russia)

**Juraev Mamatkul**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Kurenov Rakhimmamed**

Ph.D. Ass. Prof. (Turkmenistan)

**Christopher James Fort**

University of Michigan (USA)

**Umarkhodjaev Mukhtar**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Mirzaev Ibodulla**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Boltaboev Hamidulla**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Dustmuhammedov Khurshid**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Lixodzievsky A.S.**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Siddiqova Iroda**

Doc. of philol. sci., prof. (Uzbekistan)

**Shiukashvili Tamar**

Doc. of philol. sci. (Georgia)

**Yusupov Oybek**

Ass. prof. (Uzbekistan) - Senior Secretary

# МУНДАРИЖА \ СОДЕРЖАНИЕ \ CONTENT

## Адабиётшунослик

### 1. Rahmonqulova Zarnigor

DISTOPIK EKZISTENSIALIZMNI INGLIZ YOZUVCHISI UILYAM GOLDINGNING "LORD OF THE FLIES" ROMANIDA AKS ETISHI.....6

### 2. Усманова Севара

ЧЎЛПОН ВА С.РИЧАРДСОН РОМАНЛАРИДА БАДИИЯТ МУАММОЛАРИ.....14

### 3. Yusupova Dildora

SHOIR SO‘Z AYTGANI KELAR DUNYOGA...(Shoira Halima Xudoyberdiyevaning hayot va ijod yo‘liga chizgilar).....21

### 4. Қўчқорова Садоқат

ФОЛЬКЛОРДА ЭРТАКНИНГ ЖАНР СИФАТИДАГИ ХУСУСИЯТИ.....28

### 5. Мажитова Сабоҳат, Ярашов Шариф

АМИР ХУСРАВ ДЕҲЛАВИЙ ВА АБДУРАҲМОН ЖОМИЙ ҒАЗАЛЛАРИДА «ДИЛ» (ЮРАК, ҚАЛБ) ТИМСОЛИНИНГ ЛЕКСИК-СЕМАНТИК МАЙДОНИ.....35

### 6. Джалилова Зарнигор

ИНГЛИЗ ШЕЪРИЯТИДА ИНСОН СИФАТЛАРИНИНГ ГУЛЛАР ТИМСОЛИДА ИФОДАЛАНИШИ.....42

## Лингводидактика

### 7. Khamzaev Sobir, Gilyazetdinov Eldar

THE PRINCIPLES OF SPEAKING SKILLS' FORMATION AMONG STUDENTS OF LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITIES.....48

## Тилшунослик

### 8. Boygucheva Lola

THE ROLE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN MODERN LINGUISTIC THEORY.....54

### 9. Кобилова Азиза

ШИФОБАХШ ЎСИМЛИКЛАР ЎРНИДА ИШЛАТИЛАДИГАН ПЕРИФРАЗЛАР ТАҲЛИЛИ (ИНГЛИЗ ВА ЎЗБЕК ТИЛЛАРИ МИСОЛИДА).....59

### 10. Mamanazarova Gulhayo, Paluanova Halifa

ISSUES ON OIL AND GAS TERMINOLOGY IN LINGUISTICS.....65

### 11. Melikova Elnora, Abdullayeva Nargiza

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY PREDICATION.....71

### 12. Saidova Farida

O‘ZBEK TILI LEKSIK SINONIMLARINING LEKSIKOGRAFIK TALQINI.....77

### 13. Turniyazov Behzod

FAKTIVLIK ASOSIDAGI KAUZATSIYA.....83

<b>14. Гафуров Бахтиёр</b> АНАЛИЗ ЛИНГВОСТАТИСТИЧЕСКОЙ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ АКЦЕНТНЫХ ФОНОВАРИАНТОВ ИМЕН СУЩЕСТВИТЕЛЬНЫХ РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА.....	91
<b>15. Ибаев Анвар</b> КОМПАРАТИВ СИНТАКТИК ҚУРИЛМАЛАР ТИЛШУНОСЛИКНИНГ ЎРГАНИЛИШ ОБЪЕКТИ СИФАТИДА.....	97
<b>16. Исмаилов Тургун</b> ПРЕЗИДЕНТ ДИСКУРСИДА HOMELAND КОНЦЕПТИНИНГ МИЛЛИЙ ҚАДРИЯТЛАР ОРҚАЛИ ТАСАВВУР ЭТИЛИШИ (FREEDOM, LIBERTY ҚАДРИЯТИ МИСОЛИДА).....	103
<b>17. Камолитдинова Вазира</b> ОКСЮМОРОН ВА УНИНГ УСЛУБИЙ - СЕМАНТИК ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИНИНГ ҚЎЛЛАНИЛИШИ.....	111
<b>18. Нигматова Лолахон</b> ЎЗБЕК ТИЛИ МАХСУС КОРПУСЛАРИ – ТИЛ ВА МАДАНИЯТ МУШТАРАКЛИГИНИ ЎРГАНИШ ВОСИТАСИ.....	116
<b>19. Сабирова Ёъзоа</b> ЎЗБЕК ТИЛИНИНГ ИЗОҲЛИ ЛУҒАТЛАРИДА ЎЗЛАШМА ЮРИДИК ТЕРМИНЛАР ТАЛҚИНИ.....	121
<b>20. Сулаймонова Нигора</b> ЗАМАХШАРИЙ ГЎЗАЛ НУТҚ ВА САБР ОДОБИ ҲАҚИДА.....	130
<b>21. Тўева Зулфия, Юлдашева Дилором</b> БАЁН ВА УНИНГ ТУРЛАРИ ҲАҚИДА.....	137
<b>22. Xolova Muyassar</b> BOYSUN SHEVASI ONLAYN MA'LUMOTLAR BAZASI (QIDIRISH VA SARALASH IMKONIYATLARI ASOSIDA).....	146
<b>23. Abdullayeva Oqila Xolmo'minovna</b> O'ZBEK TILI KORPUSINI YARATISH BOSQICHLARI VA MUAMMOLI JHATLARI....	153
<b>24. Abdunazarova Zarina Islomovna</b> THE FORMATION OF SPEECH COMPETENCE.....	146
<b>25. Nilufar Abduraxmonova</b> O'ZBEK TILI KORPUSINI YARATISHDA LINGVISTIK ANNOTATSIYALASH TAMOYILLARI.....	164
<b>26. Shamuradova Naima</b> O'ZBEK VA INGLIZ XALQ MAQOLLARINING QIYOSIY O'RGANILISHI HAQIDA (ASOSIY QISMLARINI QO'LLASH).....	171
<b>27. Яхёева Гулнора Бахтиёровна</b> ОСОБЕННОСТИ РАЗВИТИЯ ТВОРЧЕСКОЙ АКТИВНОСТИ СТУДЕНТОВ В ПРОЦЕССЕ ОБУЧЕНИЯ ИНОСТРАННОМУ ЯЗЫКУ.....	175

<b>28. Irgasheva Umida</b> INGLIZ TILI DARSLARIDA TALABALAR KASBIY NUTQ KOMPETENTSIYASINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISHDA STEAM TEXNOLOGIYALAR AHAMIYATI.....	179
<b>29. Jumaniyozova Nuriya Axmedovna</b> YURIDIK DISKURS LINGVISTIK TADQIQOT OBYEKTI SIFATIDA.....	184
<b>30. Khayitova Feruza Abdikhalikovna</b> THE PRACTICAL ANALYSIS OF TOPONYMS IN GREAT BRITAIN BASED ON THE STORY OF A. CONAN DOYLE "THE HOUND OF THE BASKERVILLES".....	188
<b>31. Z. Masodiqova, Sh. Xatamqulova</b> O'ZBEK VA NEMIS MAQOLLARINI QIYOSHLASH.....	193
<b>32. Teshaboyev Dilmurod Rahmadjonovich, Axmadjonova Mohinur Bahodirovna</b> SON SO'Z TURKUMINING BOSHLANG'ICH SINF DARSLIKLARIDA IFODALANGAN SHAKLLARINI AKT ORQALI TUSHUNTIRISH.....	193
<b>33. Maxmurova Mavjuda Halimovna</b> METAFORALAR NUTQ SHAKLI SIFATIDA.....	204
<b>34. Nazarov Rustam Irkinovich</b> THE IMPORTANCE OF PAIR WORK AND GROUP WORK ACTIVITIES IN TEACHING ENGLISH IN TECHNICAL UNIVERSITIES.....	210
<b>35. Saidbekova Raykhona Rustambekovna, Ruzmatova Dilnoza Ramatjonova</b> FAMILY PERSPECTIVES IN THE NOVEL "AND THE MOUNTAIN ENCHOED" BY KHALED HUSSEINI.....	217
<b>36. Алижон Раҳматович Қосимов, Хумора Муҳаммадиса қизи Иминова</b> ТИЛНИНГ БИОПСИХОСОЦИАЛ ОНТОЛОГИК МАҚОМИ МУАММОЛАРИ.....	222


# СЎЗ САНЪАТИ ХАЛҚАРО ЖУРНАЛИ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF WORD ART

Тилшунослик

**Boygucheva Lola Urinbaevna**

Teacher, Tashkent State University of Uzbek  
Language and Literature after Alisher Navo'i  
lolaboyguchova@gmail.com

## THE ROLE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN MODERN LINGUISTIC THEORY

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.26739/2181-9297-2021-1-8>

### ABSTRACT

The article describes the role of discourse analysis in modern linguistic theory. The article presents the content of the discourse, the work being done in this area today, the views and theories of scientists. The purpose of discourse analysis is to identify the social context behind oral or written speech, and to explore the interrelationships of language and social processes. It also includes the interpretation of language as speech and the attitude towards it as a form of social action that is directly developed in the social context of the implementation of this process. In this theory, language is not seen as a set of meanings that are universally or permanently assimilated, but as a field of action that influences the actions, thoughts, and feelings of others in the daily life practices of people. At the same time, the links between verbal actions and the social context of their use are emphasized.

**Key words:** discourse, communication, linguistic analysis, language, verbal.

**Бойгучева Лола Уринбаевна**

Преподаватель Ташкентского государственного  
университета узбекского языка и литературы им. Алишера Навои  
lolaboyguchova@gmail.com

## РОЛЬ ДИСКУРСИВНОГО АНАЛИЗА В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОЙ ТЕОРИИ

### АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье автор описывает роль дискурсивного анализа в современной лингвистической теории. В статье представлены содержание дискурса, работа, которая ведется в этой сфере сегодня, взгляды и теории ученых. Целью анализа дискурса является выявление социального контекста устной или письменной речи и изучение взаимосвязи языка и социальных процессов. Он также включает в себя интерпретацию языка как речи и отношение к нему как к форме социального действия, непосредственно развивающейся в социальном контексте реализации этого процесса. В этой теории язык рассматривается не как набор значений, которые универсально или постоянно ассимилируются, а как поле действия, которое влияет на действия, мысли и чувства других в повседневной жизни людей. В то же время

подчеркивается связь между вербальными действиями и социальным контекстом их использования.

**Ключевые слова:** дискурс, коммуникация, лингвистический анализ, язык, вербальный.

**Boygucheva Lola O'rinboevna**

Alisher Navoiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat  
o'zbek tili va adabiyoti universiteti o'qituvchisi  
lolaboyguchova@gmail.com

## HOZIRGI ZAMON TILSHUNOSLIK NAZARIYASIDA DISKURS TAHLILINING TUTGAN O'RNI

### ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada muallif hozirgi zamon tilshunoslik nazariyasida diskurs tahlilining tutgan o'rni bayon qilingan. Maqolada muallif tomonidan diskursning mazmuni, bugungi kunda ushbu sohaga oid olib borilayotgan ishlar, olimlarning fikrlari, nazariyalari keltirilgan. Diskurs tahlilining maqsadi og'zaki yoki yozma nutq orqasidagi ijtimoiy kontekstni aniqlash, til va ijtimoiy jarayonlarning o'zaro bog'liqligini o'rganishdir. Shuningdek, tilni nutq sifatida talqin qilish va bu jarayonni amalga oshirishning ijtimoiy sharoitida bevosita ildiz otgan ijtimoiy harakat shakli sifatida unga bo'lgan munosabatni o'z ichiga oladi. Ushbu nazariyada til universal yoki doimiy ravishda o'zlashtiradigan ma'nolar to'plami sifatida emas, balki insonlarning kundalik hayotiy amaliyotida boshqalarning xatti-harakatlari, fikrlari va hissiyotlariga ta'sir ko'rsatadigan harakatlar sohasi sifatida qaraladi. Shu bilan birga, so'zlar orqali amalga oshiriladigan harakatlar va ulardan foydalanishning ijtimoiy mazmuni o'rtasidagi bog'liqliklar ham ta'kidlanadi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** nutq, aloqa, lingvistik tahlil, til, ijtimoiy kontekst, universal, og'zaki.

The term "discourse" has long been entrenched in science, and there is no longer any need, it would seem, to justify the legality of its use. The use in areas with fundamentally different subjects of research has led to a different interpretation of this term. Undoubtedly, the frequency of its use led to a fashion for discourse, as a collective imitation of novelties, and they began to replace concepts and terms that have long been registered in linguistics. However, it should be noted that discourse quite legitimately occupied the niche formed in terminology, received its own definition, and, most importantly, allowed expanding the possibilities of linguistic analysis.

Sometimes "discourse" is understood as including simultaneously two components: both the dynamic process of linguistic activity, inscribed in its social context, and its result (i.e., the text); this is the preferred understanding. Sometimes the attempts to replace the concept of discourse with the phrase "coherent text" are not very successful, since any normal text is coherent.

The structure of discourse assumes the presence of two radically opposed roles - the speaker and the addressee. It is for this reason that the very process of linguistic communication can be viewed from these two perspectives. Modeling the processes of constructing (generating, synthesizing) discourse is not the same as modeling the processes of understanding (analyzing) discourse. In the science of discourse, two different groups of works are distinguished - those that study the construction of discourse (for example, the choice of a lexical means when naming a certain object), and those that study the recipient's understanding of discourse. In addition, there is a third perspective - consideration of the process of linguistic communication from the standpoint of the text itself, arising in the process of discourse.

The interdisciplinary direction that studies discourse, as well as the corresponding section of linguistics, is called equally - discourse analysis (discourse analysis) or discourse (iv) studies (discourse studies). As a scientific direction proper, discourse analysis has emerged only in recent decades. This happened against the background of the dominant linguistics for most of the XX century. Struggle for the "purification" of the science of language from the study of speech. F. de Saussure believed that the true object of linguistics is the language system (as opposed to speech), N. Chomsky urged linguists to study linguistic "competence" and abstract from the issues of

language use. Recently, however, cognitive attitudes in the science of language begin to change, and an opinion is gaining momentum, according to which no linguistic phenomena can be adequately understood and described outside of their use, without taking into account their discursive aspects. Therefore, discourse analysis is becoming one of the central sections of linguistics. The purpose of discourse analysis is to identify the social context behind oral or written speech, to study the relationship between language and social processes. The interpretation of language as a discourse includes an attitude towards it as a form of social action, directly rooted in the social conditions of its implementation.

In linguistics, discourse is traditionally correlated with concepts such as utterance, speech, speech activity, text, communicative situation, monologue, dialogue, which leads, on the one hand, to an understanding of which series of phenomena discourse belongs to, and on the other hand, creates misconception about the identity of these phenomena. The purpose of the article is to compare discourse with speech and text, which makes it possible: first, to clarify the very concept of discourse and differentiate it from close but not identical concepts; secondly, to isolate approaches to the interpretation of discourse, which are based on the relationship discourse - speech, discourse - text; thirdly, to determine the main features of discourse. Summarizing the various definitions of discourse, we can distinguish two approaches to understanding this phenomenon: communicative-speech and structural-textual.

Within the framework of the communicative-speech approach, discourse is characterized as a communicative process, and its equivalents are concepts such as “speech”, “speech action”, “communicative situation”, etc. (N.D. Arutyunova, E. Benveniste, V. G. Borbotko, J. Guillaume, D. Maldidier, T.B. Gulyar, T. van Dyck, N. M. Kozhina, N. I. Formanovskaya, L. S. Chikileva). This understanding of discourse is based on the concept of “speech” in all its meanings: first, as oral natural speech, opposite to the written form of language; secondly, as the process itself, or speech activity, and its result, that is, the functioning of the language in the process of communication. It should be noted that the relationship between the concept of “speech” and “speech activity” varies from author to author. For example, F. Saussure under speech activity means language in combination with linguistic ability, and under speech (parole) - an individual part of speech activity (language); in the works of L. V. Shcherba, speech activity combines the processes of speaking and understanding. In our work, we use the concepts of “speech” and “speech activity” as synonyms. In accordance with this, discourse is considered as “the equivalent of the concept of “speech” in the Saussurean sense, that is, any specific statement” [1, p. 26]; “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” ”[2, p. 137]; speech in combination with extralinguistic factors [3], “the functioning of the language in real time” [4, p. 308]. In other words, discourse is understood broadly as the process of using language in certain conditions, as verbal communication.

The unit of verbal communication is an utterance, the main feature of which is the orientation towards the participants in the speech. For example, NI Formanovskaya defines an utterance as a “minimal“ cell ”of communication, which, as a rule, interacts with other utterances, forming a larger unit - discourse” [5, p. 80].

It is necessary to emphasize the difference between utterance and discourse. First of all, this concerns the volume of concepts: an utterance is a unit of discourse, and discourse is a set of utterances, an exchange of utterances (according to R. Jakobson). Secondly, the degree of realization of the intention and achievement of the communicative goal is different. As T. B. Gulyar rightly noted, comparing the statement and discourse: if only a single hit / miss in the target is allowed in the statement, then the discourse allows adjustments, changes in the original task [6]. Continuing this thought, we can add that within the framework of discourse, speech intention is formed, realized, changed, and there can be several intentions; within the framework of the statement, basically only one intention is realized.

In addition, some linguists understand discourse as speech behavior, as the process of implementing the speaker's speech intentions and interpreting them by the listeners in a specific

speech situation, that is, the communicative function of the language is brought to the fore. In other words, we can talk about discourse as the speaker's speech behavior, considered "in the fullness of its expression (verbal-intonational and paralinguistic) and aspiration, taking into account all extra-linguistic factors (social, cultural, psychological) that are essential for successful speech interaction" [7, p. 34 - 35].

Discourse analysis, being a young discipline, is very heterogeneous, and there is no single approach shared by all specialists in discourse. However, the most popular approaches to date can be identified.

In the first place should be indicated the direction known as the analysis of everyday dialogue. Other leading directions of discourse analysis are mainly grouped around the research of individual scientists and their immediate followers. We should mention such schools as the study of information flow by W. Chaf, studies of the links between grammar and interpersonal interaction in dialogue (S. Thompson, B. Fox, S. Ford), the cognitive theory of the connection between discourse and grammar by T. Givon, experimental discursive research by R. Tomlin, "grammar of discourse" by R. Longuyera, "system-functional grammar" by M. Halliday, research of understanding strategies by T. van Dyc and U. Kinch, general model of the structure of discourse by L. Polanyi, sociolinguistic approaches by U. Labov and J. Gamper-sa, the psycholinguistic "model of building structures" by M. Gernsbaker, and in a somewhat earlier period also the discursive studies of J. Grimes and J. Hinds. Of course, this list is far from complete - discourse analysis is a conglomeration of disparate (though not antagonistic) trends.

Discourse, like other linguistic entities (morphemes, words, sentences), is organized according to certain rules characteristic of a given language.

When studying discourse, like any natural phenomenon, the question of classification arises: what types and varieties of discourse exist. The most important distinction in this area is the opposition of oral and written discourse. This distinction is associated with the channel of information transmission: with oral discourse, the channel is acoustic, with written discourse, visual. Despite the fact that for many centuries the written language enjoyed greater prestige than the oral one, it is quite clear that oral discourse is the original, fundamental form of the existence of language, and written discourse is a derivative of the oral one. The difference in the channel of information transmission has fundamentally important consequences for the processes of oral and written discourse (these consequences were investigated by W. Chafe). First, in oral discourse, generation and understanding occur synchronously, but not in written discourse.

At the same time, the writing speed is more than 10 times lower than the speed of oral speech, and the reading speed is slightly higher than the speed of oral speech. In written discourse, predications are integrated into complex sentences and other syntactic constructions and associations. The second fundamental difference associated with the difference in the channel of information transmission is the presence of contact between the speaker and the addressee in time and space: in written discourse, such contact is not normal (that is why people resort to writing). As a result, during oral discourse, the speaker and the addressee are involved in the situation, which is reflected in the use of first and second person pronouns, indications of the speaker and addressee's thought processes and emotions, the use of gestures and other non-verbal means, etc. In written discourse, on the contrary, the speaker and the addressee are removed from the information described in the discourse, which, in particular, is expressed in the more frequent use of the passive voice. In addition to the two fundamental types of discourse - oral and written - another one should be mentioned: mental. A person can use language without producing any acoustic or graphic traces of language activity. In this case, the language is also used communicatively, but the same person is both the speaker and the addressee. Due to the absence of easily observable manifestations, mental discourse has been studied much less than oral and written. One of the most famous studies of mental discourse, or (in traditional terminology) inner speech, belongs to L.S. Vygotsky.

As differentiating features, one can single out such as procedurally, attachment to time, relevance, and implementation in written or oral form. That is, discourse and text differ on the following grounds:

1) on the basis of the presence / absence of procedurality: "Linguistics has narrowed the content of the concept of "text" as much as possible, limiting it only to the material side, and leaving the processuality for researchers of discourse" [19, p. 7]. This property is interpreted as functionality, structure, process-product, dynamism-static (M. L. Makarov, L. S. Chikileva). In accordance with them, a structural text is distinguished as a product and a functional discourse as a process;

2) on the basis of the presence / absence of attachment to time. So, for example, M. Ya. Dymarsky notes "the impossibility of the existence of discourse outside the attachment to real, physical time in which it flows" [13, p. 39]. In this sense, the text is devoid of a rigid attachment to time and these relations are of an indirect nature;

3) based on the presence / absence of relevance. Thus, discourse interpreted as speech "immersed in life" (N.D. Arutyunova) is not usually used in relation to ancient and other texts, since it is impossible to directly restore their connections with the social situation. In other words, a sign of discourse is its relevance as its significance for the modern moment;

4) on the basis of oral / written form. If discourse is defined as the process of using language in oral and written speech, then text is usually understood as "any recorded speech (literary work, composition, document, etc., as well as a part, an excerpt from them)" [2, p. 646].

Thus, in general, formal linguistics is not very actively interested in the problems of discourse. This is partly due to the objective complexity of the formalization of discursive processes, partly with the existing postulate of N. Chomsky about the centrality of syntax. However, some formal linguists are trying to introduce elements of discursive concepts into the arsenal of generative grammar (this concerns issues of reference and theme-rhematic structure, for example, in the works of T. Reinhart). At present, discourse analysis has become fully institutionalized as a special (albeit interdisciplinary) scientific direction. Specialized journals devoted to the analysis of discourse are published - "Text" and "Discourse Processes".

Of course, these approaches, which we have identified for the convenience of theoretical analysis, are not delimited from each other, but are interrelated, in addition, the authors often use both the concept of speech and the concept of text when defining discourse. In doing so, it should be noted that the relationship between discourse, speech and text.

## Иқтибослар/Сноски/References

1. Akimova T.G. Functional grammar theory. Quality. Quantity. Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 1996. 264 p.
2. Alefirenko N.F. Linguocultural content of the concept of "discourse" in modern cognitive linguistics. 1999.Vol.1. p. 9-18.
3. Bayramova L.K. An introduction to contrastive linguistics. Kazan: Publishing house of Kazan Unta, 2004.112 p.
4. Vereshchak M.V. Language and its social power // World of the Russian word. 2002. No. 5. P. 47-49.
5. Kamenskaya O.L. Text and communication. M.: Higher school, 1990.152 p.
6. Makarov M.L. Foundations of the theory of discourse. M.: 2003.P. 50.
7. Mironova N.N. On the study of evaluative discourse in modern linguistics// Linguistics at the end of the XX century: results and prospects: Abstracts of the international conference. M.: 1995. P. 344-345.
8. Arutyunova N.D. Discourse. Speech. 2002. - P. 136-137.
9. Formanovskaya N.I. Speech influence: communication and pragmatics. – M.: 2007. - 480 p.
10. Kozhina N.M. Discursive analysis and functional stylistics from a speech-study point of view - St. Petersburg: Publishing house of St. Petersburg State University of Economics, 2004. - P.9-33.



ISSN 2181-9297

Doi Journal 10.26739/2181-9297

**СЎЗ САНЪАТИ**  
**ХАЛҚАРО ЖУРНАЛИ**  
**4 ЖИЛД, 1 СОН**

**МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ**  
**ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА**  
**ТОМ 4, НОМЕР 1**

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL**  
**OF WORD ART**  
**VOLUME 4, ISSUE 1**

**Контакт редакций журналов. [www.tadqiqot.uz](http://www.tadqiqot.uz)**  
ООО Tadqiqot город Ташкент,  
улица Амира Темура пр.1, дом-2.  
Web: <http://www.tadqiqot.uz>; E-mail: [info@tadqiqot.uz](mailto:info@tadqiqot.uz)  
Тел: (+998-94) 404-0000

**Editorial staff of the journals of [www.tadqiqot.uz](http://www.tadqiqot.uz)**  
Tadqiqot LLC The city of Tashkent,  
Amir Temur Street pr.1, House 2.  
Web: <http://www.tadqiqot.uz>; E-mail: [info@tadqiqot.uz](mailto:info@tadqiqot.uz)  
Phone: (+998-94) 404-0000