

## History of Research on Text Linguistics

**Rahimov Zokir Azimovich**

Fergana State University, Doctor of Philology, associate professor

**Mirzayeva Dilshoda Ikromjonovna**

Fergana State University, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Department of English, Senior Lecturer, Ph.D

**Abduolimov Urinboy Xudoberdiyevich**

Fergana State University, Linguistics (English), 2nd stage master's student

### ANNOTATION

The science of linguistics has made great progress so far. This situation is clearly visible in the interpretation of problems related to each of the phonological, morphological, and syntactic levels of the language.

**KEYWORDS:** onomastics, language, inclination, grammatical category, grammatical structure, verb, structural classification, grammatical classification, semantic relations.

In world linguistics, research on the study of text and its linguistic nature began to be put on the agenda for the next thirty to forty years. This thing is characteristic not only for some specific linguistics, such as Russian, Ukrainian, French, German, English linguistics, but also for general linguistics. The answers given by linguists to the question of where to start the linguistic analysis of the text and what issues should be paid attention to are not very consistent. For example, the scientists who argue that the text is a category of speech, put on the agenda the issues of what is its symbolic nature, whether the text should be called a speech process or whether it should be interpreted as the result of a speech process, whether it is correct to study the text in connection with oral speech or written speech.

The issue of whether the text is a speech category is directly related to the concepts of "speech process itself" and "result of speech activity". Czech scientist K. Gauzenblaz interprets the text both as a product of speech activity and as a result of speech activity. In this case, written speech is interpreted as a product of speech activity, and oral speech (including its expression on magnetic tape) is interpreted as a speech process. Spoken speech also includes various repetitions and gibberish, and therefore it is not very appropriate to recognize it as a text that can be an object of investigation. Questions such as whether text analysis should be studied in syntax or stylistics, or whether a new field called "text linguistics" should be scientifically based, are also waiting for their solution in science. Indeed, it has not been long since the question of textual linguistics began to be interpreted. According to the German scientist R. Harweg, at least a hundred years are still needed for the full foundation of text linguistics. The field of linguistic syntax was considered the highest level of linguistic analysis until the 60s of the last century. At this point, the following opinion of the Polish scientist M.R. Mayenova can be cited: "Until recently, linguistic observations ended at the end of the sentence form, and the text containing many sentences was excluded from the scope of this scientific research."

It is known that a sentence is the highest unit of the language. However, it should not be forgotten that in the speech process, a sentence is a sentence of small units of the language. Accordingly, we think that it is appropriate to interpret the sentence as the building material of the text, to consider it as the main language unit that forms the text. As the German linguist M. Pfützte noted, any text consists of a combination of phrases (sentences) entering into a mutual relationship for the purpose of expression. However, when the text is interpreted in the form of construction material as above, the special use of independent words and phrases in the text style is ignored. In fact, a single, separate sentence is realized as a connected speech material based on the interaction of words and phrases in the text. It is clear that the main attention is focused on this side of the issue in the comments of M. Pfützte, which we quoted above.

The well-known French linguist R. Barthes understands the text as follows: "It is appropriate to call any fragment of speech that is internally connected and consists of meaningfully interconnected sentences for the purpose of communication as a text." In general, R. Barthes' study "Text Linguistics" (1970) provides information about the multi-component type of text. Here, too, it becomes clear that the scientist's main attention is directed not to a small, one-sentence text, but to a large text, "any fragment of speech consisting of several interconnected sentences". This situation is also observed in the scientific activities of other well-known linguists. For example, the Polish linguist A. Boguslavsky interprets the text as a speech material consisting of several sentences. In this, he focuses not on what the author is talking about and its content, but on determining what components the text "consists of several interconnected sentences" is made of. T. van Dijk, a professor at the University of Amsterdam, studies the text and its specific nature in connection with pragmatics. In his research, the main focus was on the communicative-pragmatic features of the text. T. van Dijk first tried to study the grammatical aspects of the text in connection with the rules of logical and analytical philosophy, and later he began to seriously deal with the issues of text semantics.

Professors Lakoff and Fillmore of the University of California had a great influence on T. van Dijk's serious attention to the semantics of the text. In the course of his research, T. van Dijk comes to the correct conclusion that the text is not only made up of the interconnection of sentences, but also of the interaction of speech acts. Remarkable are the comments of the Czech linguist Kveta Kojevnekova about the text and its linguistic nature. The main focus of this scientist's research was on the study of the fact that the text is a product of connected speech, the components of connected speech and their interaction. It is noteworthy that K. Kozhevnikova, when commenting on the text, emphasizes that it is complete in terms of content. The scientist's opinion that the components of the text are related both semantically and grammatically is noteworthy, because most linguists emphasize that the components of the text are connected only in terms of content and slightly ignore the connection of the text through lexical-grammatical means.

In her works, K. Kozhevnikova understands the text as the highest ideal communicative unit of the language, complete in terms of content. Here, it can be seen that interpreting the text in the form of a speech or a language unit consisting of the relationship of language units such as a sentence, a complex syntactic device, a paragraph, a chapter is not very suitable for the purpose. This is because, according to some linguists, for example, the famous Russian psycholinguist A.A. Leontev, "the text is a functionally complete unit of speech." It is not a

mistake to understand a text as a unit of speech, because when we say a text is a communicative unit, we understand a unit of communication, and any communication, in turn, is formed in the process of speech. Czech linguist Jan Korjensky connects text interpretation with the concepts of semantic and pragmatic components. In this, he believes that the semantic component consists primarily of the semantic base that organizes the text material and the means that ensure its realization. The scientist includes the speaker, that is, the human factor, in the sentence of the semantic component of the text. The pragmatic component of the text refers to various relationships that are important in the system of meaning expression. For example, in this regard, personal pronouns such as I, you, he, we, you, they can be included in the sentence of pragmatic means of the text. In contrast to personal pronouns, demonstrative and interrogative pronouns are semantic tools or semantic components of the text. Because they represent the relationship between individuals (actants). Personal pronouns act as the acting person (actant) in the text.

### Reference:

1. A'zamjonovna, Y. S., & Odiljon qizi, Q. M. . (2022). Internetga Oid Terminlarni Ingliz Tilidan Rus Va O'zbek Tillariga Tarjima Qilish Xususiyatlari. *MiastoPrzyszłości*, 30, 252–254.
2. A'zamjonovna, Y. S. (2022). LINGUISTIC AND SOCIAL FEATURES OF SLANG. *Scientific Impulse*, 1(5), 1789-1793.
3. Andreyevna, P. K., A'zamjonovna, Y. S., & Faxriddinovich, U. F. (2022). MEDIA DISCOURSE FEATURES. *Scientific Impulse*, 1(3), 561-565.
4. Sabohatxon, Y., Zilolaxon, T. Y., & Shaxlo, Y. L. (2022). EXPRESSION OF METAPHOR IN DIFFERENT SYSTEM LANGUAGES. *RESEARCH AND EDUCATION*, 1(2), 209-212.
5. Yusupova, S. (2022). ИЖТИМОЙ ГУРУХЛАРДА ҲУРМАТ КАТЕГОРИЯСИ ИФОДАЛАШ. *Science and innovation*, 1(B5), 350-352.
6. Юсупова, С. А. (2022, September). ЎЗБЕК ТИЛИ ТИПОЛОГИЯСИДА ҲУРМАТ КАТЕГОРИЯСИ. In *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE "THE TIME OF SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS"* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 10-14).5. ogli Melikuziev, A. L. (2022). HISTORICAL AND MODERN CLASSIFICATION OF PARALINGUISTICS. *Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research*, 3 (10), 126–128.