

**DISTRIBUTION OF DISCOURSE AND TEXT FROM THE POSITION OF
INTEGRATION APPROACH**

Ergashev Mukhammadjon Rakhmonovich

English teacher of the Kokand State

Pedagogical Institute

Jurayeva Nasibakhon Nodirjon qizi

Student of the Faculty of Foreign language, group 310

Annotation: *The article establishes the criteria for delimiting discourse and the text of the integration approach. Discourse is understood as a process interactive, intersubjective interaction of consciousnesses, aimed at constructing language snacks, and text is understood as a material incentive for the emergence of discourse.*

Key words: *discourse, formal, functional (situational, semiotic) and integration approach, text.*

Despite hundreds of definitions and dozens of monographs devoted to the problem of delimiting discourse and text, these two opposing phenomena in many respects continue to be “unidentified objects”. In the vast majority of cases, linguists work with written texts (fiction, journalistic, newspaper, scientific, business, etc). And each time, raising a textual object of analysis to the rank of discourse, the linguist experiences difficulties in trying to find justifications for this “wonderful transformation”.

Apparently, the reason for this state of affairs lies in the fact that the dichotomies established in modern linguistic studies, used to distinguish between text and discourse, do not affect the core features of the corresponding concepts that reflect the nature of the phenomena under consideration. This leads to the fact that the problem of criteria for delimiting text and discourse does not lose its relevance. Fundamentally new methodological foundations for solving the problem are offered by the integration theory of language that is currently being actively formed, which determines the purpose of our article - to establish the grounds for distinguishing between discourse and text from the standpoint of an integration approach.

The criteria for delimiting text and discourse differ depending of what methodological positions - formal or functional - determine the discourse. Formal and functional approaches differ in the nature of justification, i.e. connection of the essence with its ontological foundations [32. With.198]; the structural representation of the language in the form of levels is justified by the constituents of these levels, and the functional one is justified by the ways of interaction between units that perform a certain functional role and the context [32. p.198.]. Because of this, the relation of language to the world, functional in its essence, in discourse is not given, static [18, p.142]; “it is constantly created and supported by communicants, since it performs a certain function” [32, p.205]. and this function varies depending on the context of the discourse.



The concept of context is the main point of contention between formalists and functionalists. With a formal approach, the context is limited to other linguistic units, and with a functional one, it includes the mental and social “life world” of communication. [18, c.140].

The formal idea of discourse as a “language above the sentence or the clause” [35, p.1] is realized in the following definitions: several sentences that are in semantic connection with each other” [11, p.ten]; discourse is a text of coherent speech, consisting of a sequence of communicative units of the language, exceeding in volume a simple sentence, which is in a semantic connection expressed by linguistic means” [5, p.19]. Text: dialogic discourse, which, however, are easily overcome with a deeper insight into the essence of the phenomena being analyzed.

With a functional approach, the discourse is interpreted broadly, summing up everything under this: what is said or written ([3, p.3]; see also [7, p.225-227]). In other words, discourse is interpreted as a speech activity that is realized in written, oral (dialogical, polylogical, monologue) or paralinguistic form, and is directly given to the researcher in the form linguistic material (by L.V. Shcherba) in sound, graphic or electronic representation. Such a broad understanding of discourse is quite common in linguistics and is the norm in psychology and philosophy [22, p.20-21]. In this case, the text is understood as “linguistic material. Fixed on one or another material carrier with the help of descriptive ‘writing (usually phonographic or ideographic)” [4, p.5-6]. However, the functional direction of discourse analysis is heterogeneous, which allows D. Shfrin to divide it into two approaches: “moderate” and “extreme” [34, p.1-2]. A moderate approach is aimed at studying the functions of a linguistic sign in a wide socio-cultural context, as a result of which it is also called situational [22, p.22-23]. The extreme approach considers discourse as social practices of linguistic sometimes of a non-linguistic nature, which are based on ideology or cultural differences [34, with.1-2], and is called semiotic [18, p.141].

A narrow version of the situational interpretation of discourse as any use of language (“the study of discourse is the study of any aspect of language use” [31, p.65]; “the analysis of discourse is necessarily the analysis of language in use” [30, c.1]) forms the basis for the distinction between a sentence as a unit of text and an utterance as a unit of discourse: see for example: “The sentence is a usual element of structure for us. The statement combines both the sentence itself and the social context of its use. At the highest level the same relations are repeated in the text and discourse” [21, p.75].

“Discourse is a broader concept than text. Discourse is at the same time a process linguistic activity, and its result (text)” [26, p.307]. Such an interpretation entails the opposition of discourse and text in terms of functionality: structureness, dynamism: static, actually: virtuality.



LITERATURE:

1. Arkhipov I.K. Polyphony of the world, text and loneliness of the cognizing consciousness
2. I.K. Arkhipov *Studia Linguistica Cognitiva* issue.
3. Language and knowledge :Methodological problems and perspectives.-
M. Gnosis, 2006.
4. Bakhtin M.M. *Aesthetics of verbal creativity* 444p.
5. Bogdanov V.V. *Speech communication: pragmatic and semantic aspects*

