
Research Of The Concepts Of Text And Discourse

¹Ishanjanova Munosibkhon Saidakhmadovna, ²Akhrorova Ruzakhon Usmanovna, ³Yusufjnova Shaxlo Muxtorovna, ⁴Akbarova Shaxlo Ganiyevna, ⁵Abdurazzoqov Yusufjon Usmailovich

¹Doctor of philosophy in philological sciences (PhD), assosite professor
Andijan State Institut of Foreign languages, (Uzbekistan)
ishanjanova77@mail.ru

ORCID iD: 0009-0003-5931-9980

²Doctor of philosophy in philological sciences (PhD), assosite professor
Fergana State University (Uzbekistan)
axrorova.prof@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5071-101X

³Doctor of philosophy in philological sciences (PhD), assosite professor
Fergana State University (Uzbekistan)
usufzonovasahlo@gmail.com

⁴Doctor of philosophy in philological sciences (PhD)
Fergana State University (Uzbekistan) acharlotte18@yahoo.fr.
ORCID 0000-0002-7115-7094

⁵Assistant professor
Ferghana State University (Uzbekistan)
yusuf@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0001-6331-6342

How to cite this article: Ishanjanova Munosibkhon Saidakhmadovna, Akhrorova Ruzakhon Usmanovna, Yusufjnova Shaxlo Muxtorovna, Akbarova Shaxlo Ganiyevna, Abdurazzoqov Yusufjon Usmailovich (2024) The Work-Child Nexus: Exploring the Impact of Parental Working Condition on Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE). *Library Progress International*, 44(3), 3531-3536.

Abstract

Currently, in world linguistics, many scientific studies are being conducted to study text and discourse problems and their linguistic nature. These researches are not within the framework of the linguistics of a specific language, but also for the general theoretical linguistics.

In the linguistic analysis of the text, the opinions of scholars are different and do not agree with each other. Theoretical concepts of the text-discourse dichotomy are common in academic research. Is it necessary to study the text separately from the discourse, is the text primary or the discourse, that is, does the text appear first or the discourse, if they are considered as a category of discourse, what is its symbolic nature, should the text be called a speech process or should it be interpreted as the result of a speech process, the problems of whether it is correct to learn in connection with oral speech or written speech constitute the purpose of research.

In the communicative process, the text serves to express a certain message. The main aspects of creating a text are the ability to organize sentences in the structure of the text, the relationship between the order and the lexical tools, semantically and syntactically, and the time relationship of the expression of thought.

The diversity of views on the characteristics of text and discourse requires their wider research. Studying their pragmatic and referential features is one of the next problems.

Key words: text, discourse, function style, sound image, mental image, linguistic character, speech process

Introduction

In linguistics, speech is considered as the highest level unit within language levels, but the development of interdisciplinary integration at the end of the 20th century raised the issue that text is the building object of language.

As a result, the attention of scientists was focused on "a fragment of speech consisting of several interconnected sentences" [1.220], and thus a unit of phrases formed by entering into a meaningful relationship according to the expression of a goal was interpreted as a text [2.443].

Considering the fact that the text is a product of connected speech, the text is complete in terms of content, considering that the components of the text are also connected in terms of meaning, the assessment of the text as the highest ideal communicative unit of the language complete in terms of content was recognized by European scientists [3.49-67].

In Uzbek linguistics, the components of speech, independent words, phrases, sentences, complex syntactic devices, paragraphs, chapters, etc. are all parts of the text and the ideas about the organization of the speech in which they enter into a stepwise (hierarchical) relationship in the structure of the text were reflected in the works devoted to textual research [4.21]. According to these studies, a word or phrase can be a text component when it forms the title of a text, but for the study of language units, even a text component consisting of a simple sentence is not sufficient for a perfect analysis.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Currently, in world linguistics, many scientific studies are being conducted to study text and discourse problems and their linguistic nature. These researches are not within the framework of the linguistics of a specific language, but also for the general theoretical linguistics.

In the linguistic analysis of the text, the opinions of scholars are different and do not agree with each other. Theoretical concepts of the text-discourse dichotomy are common in academic research.

Is it necessary to study the text separately from the discourse, is the text primary or the discourse, that is, does the text appear first or the discourse, if they are considered as a category of discourse, what is its symbolic nature, should the text be called a speech process or should it be interpreted as the result of a speech process, the problems of whether it is correct to learn in connection with oral speech or written speech constitute the purpose of research.

Linguists include R. Barth, M. Pfyutse, A. Boguslavsky, I. R. Galperin, G. Ya Solganik, V. V. Odintsov, M. Ya. Lyapon, E. Benvenist, T. Van Dyck, A. Nurmonov, Sh. Safarov's opinions and scientific concepts about the concept of text allow for a wider understanding of it. In scientific literature, the term discourse is also used when talking about text. According to the interaction between the speaker and the listener, discourse is defined as a sentence that reflects how the speaker conveys his or her speech goal to the listener by some means of language, it should be noted that the theoretical ideas of the linguists such as Z. Harris, M. Foucault, Dj. Grimes, R. Longacre, T. Rivon, U. Cheif, T. Van Dyck, M. Stabbs, T. M. Nikolaeva, A. Kibrik, V. Plungyan, N.D.Arutyunova, Yu.S.Stepanov, A.Yu.Popov, E.S.Kubryakova, S.Mukhammedova, M.Saparniyozova, Sh.Safarov, A.Pardaev help to deeply understand the essence of the discourse. The methods of description, classification, opposition, and component analysis are used to study the relationship between text and discourse.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the communicative process, the text serves to express a certain message. The main aspects of creating a text are the ability to organize sentences in the structure of the text, the relationship between the order and the lexical tools, semantically and syntactically, and the time relationship of the expression of thought [5.208-217].

In his scientific views, Ferdinand de Saussure emphasizes that the text itself forms a language system as "language material" [6.98-103]. And A. Boguslavsky recognizes that the text is a speech material consisting of several sentences [7.7-28]. In these views, it is preferable to consider the text as material, not as connected speech. In language functionalization, there is a view of the text mechanism as "speech activity - texts - language system - speech activity - texts" [8.206]. It is seen that the text is related to speech activity. The interpretation of the text as a functionally completed speech unit [9.18-36] is a reference to its communicative nature. Communicative units are formed in the process of speech. Based on the text-creating function of the language, it cannot be limited only to the sphere of speech [10.143]. This requires studying the individuality of the text. The individual character of the text is seen in the fact that it forms an abstract system of language when socially generalized, and its description as a product of speech activity ensures that it serves as a tool of speech activity.

While the text is studied as a unit of the language system and texts as a unit of speech, it is considered as a "communicative event" [11.204] with lexical, grammatical, semantic, stylistic, formal and substantive connections, communicative purpose, the possibility of transmitting and receiving messages, and the speech situation. It is emphasized that it is important to have features such as intertextuality, and if these features are not reflected in the text, it should be considered as a "non-textual" structure that does not meet the requirements of communication [11.204].

I. Galperin points out that the features of the text are of particular importance in its structure, in which content of the text corresponds to its title, is creatively worked out within the framework of semantically complete methodological requirements, the presence of units larger than sentence connected by logical and connecting points in its composition, and the presence of pragmatic features, if its reflected in the text, it admits that it causes the correct structure of the text, and if these features are not complete, it causes the incorrect structure and weakness of the text.

Currently, it is not enough to study the text at the syntactic level, but it is also important to interpret it from the stylistic point of view [13.49.59]. The stylistic features of the text are interpreted in a broad aspect in the scientific research of V. V. Odintsov [14.264]. The stylistic features of the text are reflected in the framework of speech styles,

which are characterized by the manifestation of language units in a specific way in speech styles. Also, the study of the limit of use of a specific linguistic unit within styles or inter-style neutrality requires special attention. By the 60s of the last century, the direction of anthropolinguistics began to develop in linguistics. In contrast to structural linguistics, anthropolinguistics, in language-related issues such as linguistic semantics, pragmalinguistics, cognitive linguistics, especially in the study of the text, placed the speaker and the listener in the main place. M.Ya.Lyapov emphasizes that the human factor is a living resource in the formation of the text, and the human factor is the focus of modern linguistics, recognizing that this factor has an important position in the implementation of the program "pragmatics — semantics — syntactics" [15.5 — 7].

In recent years, the development of the field of pragmatics requires the study of the text from both semantic and pragmatic aspects. In the 1950s, Uzbek linguist A. Nurmonov mentioned that since structural linguistics was considered one of the most important areas, attention was focused on the immanent study of the language without transcendental phenomena, and as a result, the participation of speakers and listeners in speech activity was not given importance in research. As the scientist noted, it is impossible to talk about speech activity without a speaker and listener. In every speech act there is a speaker and a listener [16.104]. Professor of the University of Amsterdam T. Van Dyke learns the text and its specific nature by linking it to pragmatics. The scientist illuminates the communicative – pragmatic aspects of the text [17.259-334]. In the analysis of the communicative characteristics of the text, it is justified by the differentiation of its formation not only from the interconnection of sentences, but also from the interaction of speech acts. Studies the grammatical features of the text in connection with the rules of logical and analytical philosophy [17.259-334].

In order for the content of the text to be complete and integrated, it is important to correctly distinguish the components of the text when studying its content.

Ya. Korzhensky emphasizes that various relationships that are important in the system of text meaning expression consist of semantic and pragmatic components, these components occur in the text space, and the speech is the main tool of the text component [18.68-78]. Deictic resources like *je-men, tu-sen, il, elle- u, vous-siz, nous-biz, ils,ells-ular, avant-oldin, apres-keyin, maintenant-hozir, ici-bu yerda, la'-u yerda, la'-bas -o'sha yerda, qui-kim, que-nima, ou-qayer, quand-qachon* in French and Uzbek languages are considered as pragmatic components of a text. As all the morphological tools in the text are considered text components, it is appropriate to analyze them based on semantic, syntactic and pragmatic plans when studying their pragmatic and semantic features.

According to the characteristics of purposefulness and completeness of the text, it is defined as "a finished, written product, consisting of units above the sentence connected on the basis of the title and various lexical, grammatical, logical, and methodological relations, and having a specific communication goal, a pragmatic plan" [19.18]. But as mentioned above, it is not enough that the text only appears in written form. At this point, it is also appropriate to consider the "oral" version of the text.

Based on the given definitions, it was felt that there is a need to conduct thorough research on the full disclosure of the features of the text. When studying the text problems in linguistics, the term "discourse" is also used to reveal its pragmatic characteristics. In the 1950s in linguistics, Zellig Harris first mentioned the term discourse in his research. In his scientific work, the scientist analyzed the issues of the relationship between the text and its social status [20.1-30]. Later the French scientist M. Foucault's research, the social status of the discourse concept was more widely covered [20.1-30]. Dj. Grayms, R. Longeykr, T. Givon, U. Scholars such as Cheif [21.153-212] have emphasized traditional methods and individual language concepts in the study of discourse. In Russian linguistics, discourse was initially used in a sense close to the term "functional style", but later, as a result of research, the terms "functional style" and discourse began to be used in their place in linguistics. While the term "functional style" refers to specific stylistic texts - colloquial, official-departmental, journalistic, etc., there was nothing similar in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, because stylistics did not exist as a separate field in their linguistics. Anglo-Saxon linguists approached stylistic features as textual features. In their initial understanding, discourse meant text, text information and its features. Later, they recognized that discourse is not just textual information, but the spoken text underlying this information. In some scientific literature, it is noted that theoretical ideas about discourse are also observed in the works of Ferdinand de Saussure [22.11]. Accordingly, the scientist distinguishes two components of the word: 1) sound image, 2) mental image. Each pronounced word automatically creates a unique image in the human mind that corresponds to it. He also recognizes that the same understanding or image of everything in society cannot always be similar, and discourse analysis is based on a chain of judgments about things or situations [23.432]. The chain of reasoning is based on various circumstances and characteristics of an object or situation, such as its role in the social environment, its origin. E. Benvenist defines discourse as any sentence that reflects how the speaker conveys his speech goal to the listener in some way, according to the interaction of the interlocutors' thoughts. The linguist T. Van Dijk points out that the discourse may consist of only one or more words such as stop (stop) or no smoking (smoking is forbidden) in the context of a speech consisting of several thousand words [25.103-136]. 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. In her "Brief Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" T.M. Nikolaeva defines discourse as follows: "In some linguistic studies, there are opinions that discourse is a multi-meaning linguistic term 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" [26.]. Discourse-related research began to develop in the 1960s and 1970s 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. Thoughts about the expression of discourse through the text can be found in the studies of T. Van Dijk and V. Kinch. These scholars emphasize that "in recent years there has been an increased interest in the study of related speech or discourse in a number of humanities and social sciences", they define "discourse" as a synonym of "related speech". In 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 [27.316]. The scientist's definition mainly emphasizes the relational nature of discourse. It should be noted that the term discourse was considered synonymous with text even in French traditional linguistics when it was originally studied. The concepts of meaning that these terms represent were considered the same. But with the development of theories of communication, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and formation of cognitive paradigms, these concepts began to differ. N.D. Arutyunova considers discourse as a component in the mechanisms of extralinguistic, pragmatic, psychological and other factors related to the text, the social situation in which the purpose of speech is directed, the interaction of people participating in speech, and the mechanisms of their consciousness. That is, she emphasizes that discourse is "speech loaded with vitality." She 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. She 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 is studied in its finished state, while discourse is studied in a specific space and time. The concepts of discourse and text have a process — product-like attitude. Any text can be the result of discourse, but not every text can be discourse. The scientist notes that the book on the shelf is a text before reaching the addressee. It can be seen that N.D. Arutyunova understands discourse as a product of the process of oral speech, a product of written speech in the text [28.136-137].

Yu.S. Stepanov identifies discourse as "discourse is a language within a language" [29.35-73]. That is, the discourse earned in the form of being is indeed a simple language that does not have its own "grammar" and "Lexicon". Discourse within the language, first of all, is manifested in texts and has its own lexicon, grammar, rules of word usage, syntax and semantics. The world of discourse has its own rule of exchange of synonyms, rules of reality, its own etiquette. Each discourse means an opportunity in this language [29.35-73].

A. Yu. Popov contrasts the discourse with the text and gave wide explanation on the relationship between them. It: a) discourse is variable ↔ text is static, b) the duration of the discourse depends on the interlocutor ↔ the text is a closed communicative system, c) the limitation of the discourse in time ↔ the duration of the text is a voluntary choice of the author, g) he created theoretical ideas such as the orientation of the discourse to the live audience ↔ the text to the abstract audience [30.41-44]. The scientist believes that discourse is alive, it is born, lives and argues that whenever the subject is discussed and loses its actuality, it dies. 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 the text is food for thinking, while the discourse is the clarity of the expressed thought [30.130-137].

E.S. Kubryakova emphasizes not to limit text by contrasting it with discourse. even they differ from each other they are genetically related. In other words, not every kandai text is out of discourse, that is, it was in a state of discourse before any text was recorded. In addition, in the analysis of "text and discourse" it is said that the most important thing is to understand conditional signs, ambiguous thoughts in communication.

He defines the differences between discourse and text as follows:

- 1) discourse-pragmatic, text-a separate linguistic category,
- 2) discourse-process category, text-result category,
- 3) text is an abstract structure, while discourse is its actualization [31.7 — 25].

According to V. G. Borbotko, discourse is a text, but it is a connection of communicative language units, sentences and their larger units, and a connection of thoughts that perceive the goal. He mentions 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 [32.113]. A.A. Zalevskaya comments that any line of speech generates discourse only in its activation in a relationship with the author or recipient. She emphasizes that the text is a ready-made speech product prepared by man, which, when imagined without human participation, is formed in the form of a "material body" [33.25]. Uzbek linguists S. Mukhammedova, M. Saparniyozova object to this opinion of the scientist. Although they recognize that the text, according to the interpretation of the scholar, has no value without the performer (author or recipient) of the activity that gives it meaning, but they say that it is difficult to imagine the existence of the text as a separate "body" [34.100-101]. Zalevskaya also agrees that the text and discourse are opposite, as many linguists admit. Scientists try to contrast these two concepts according to their active-inactive, dynamic-static properties. In Uzbek linguistics, on the issue of distinguishing between discourse and text: views such as discourse and text as linguistic

phenomena with oral and written qualities, or discourse as an oral phenomenon, and text as a written phenomenon, caused objections to arise about these two language units [11.254]. Nevertheless, while discourse is a substantive type of human speech in relation to the functioning of the situation and consciousness, the ideas that the text is its formative type lead[35].

In fact, discourse is an oral or written speech that carries social information in itself, which is used in a social environment, regardless of the size. This speech is analyzed according to the situation in which it is carried out by whom. It can be seen that the range of phenomena represented by discourse is very wide. Russian scientist A.I. Gorshkov notes that in linguistic literature, the term "discourse" is used in a wide range, that is, from "part of the text" to the entire "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", he says that it is not important to study the term separately, as it is synonymous with "syntactic complex", "monological sentence", "communicative block" [36.53-238]. In scientific research, the meaning of discourse is also explained in a "coherent statement, conversation, conversation" manner[37.39].

The issues of the relationship of text and discourse have not yet fully found their solution in linguistics. The study of these two concepts as a contradictory phenomenon, as in the above points, is not acceptable for the development of linguistics. But these concepts are not synonymous. For example, if we analyze the sentence "Studies will begin in September in all educational institutions" as an example, if this sentence is considered a text from a grammatical point of view, then from a pragmatic point of view, it is understood that all students will put their educational tools and textbooks on the throne before the beginning of studies. It can be seen from this that the text cannot be considered as a phenomenon with immutable, motionless, stable properties, it is important to pay attention to the aspects related to conscious discursive activity in order to determine its grammatical features.

4. Conclusions

So, based on the opinions and comments of the scientists about the text and discourse, the following different characteristics of them were determined.

Text: a) language material, b) speech material, C) completeness, g) generality, D) if it has static properties; discourse is different from it: a) speech activity, b) belonging to the actual time, C) the product of the speech process, g) specificity, D) has the characteristics of dynamism. Their relationship characteristics were: a) communicativeness, b) pragmaticity, C) informativeness, g) purposefulness, D) anthropocentricity, e) creativity.

Based on the theoretical and scientific views given to the text and discourse, the following definitions have been identified as important in their study.

Text is an abstract grammatical structure of what is said, a concept related to the language system, that is, a linguistic sign. Discourse is an actual spoken text, that is, a concept related to speech, a communicative event in a broad sense, a process between a speaker and a listener with a verbal or written, verbal or non-verbal structure, a type of human activity. The diversity of views on the characteristics of text and discourse requires their wider research. Studying their pragmatic and referential features is one of the next problems.

References:

- 1 Bart R. (1978) Linguistics of the text // New in foreign linguistics. Issue VIII. Text linguistics. – Moscow: Progress,. — P. 220.
2. Pfyutce M. (1978) Grammar and linguistics of the text // New in foreign linguistics. Issue VIII. Linguistics of the text. — Moscow: Progress. — P. 443.
3. Kozhevnikova K. (1979) On aspects of connectivity in the text as a whole // Text syntax. – Moscow: Nauka.— Pp. 49-67.
- 4.Yo'ldoshev B, Rajabova K. (2012) Linguistic of text — Samatkand: SamDU nashri, — P. 21.
5. Hajdol'f K.E.(1978) Contextual relations between sentences in generative grammar // New in foreign linguistics. The issue of USH. Linguistics of the text. — Moscow: Progress. — P. 208-217.
6. Sossyur F.de. (1977) Works on Linguistics.— Moscow: Progress.— P. 98-103.
7. Boguslavskij A.(1978) The term "resupposition" and the conceptual apparatus of the theory of text// Text.Język. Poetyka. Zbiór studio / Red. M.R. Mayenówa. Wrocław; Kraków; Gdansk: Ossolineum. — Pp. 7-28.
8. Vasil'ev L.M.(2012) General problems of linguistics: a textbook. — Ufa: RIC BashGU.— P. 206.
9. Leont'ev A.A.(1979) Utterance as a subject of linguistics, psycholinguistics and communication theory // Text syntax. — Moscow: Nauka. — P. 18-36.
10. Hellidej M.A.(1978) The place of "functional perspectives of the sentence" (FPP) in the system of linguistic survey. Issue 8. Linguistics of the text. — Moscow: Progress. — S. 143.
11. Beaugrande de R.A., Dressler W. (2002(1981) Introduction to Text Linguistics. http://www.beaugrande.com/introduction_to_text_linguistics. 2002. SH.Safarov.(2008) Pragmalinguistics— Tashkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi. — P. 254. (Access date: 02.06.2017)
12. Gal'perin I.R.(2007) Text as an object of linguistic research. – Moscow: Komkniga, 2007. — S. 144. SH.Safarov.(2008) Pragmalinguistics — Tashkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi. — P. 254.

13. Solganik G.YA. (1973) Syntactic stylistics (a complex syntactic whole). – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola. — P. 232.
14. Odincov V.V. (1980) Stylistics of text — Moscow: Nauka. — P. 264.
15. Lyapon M.V. (1986) Semantic structure of a complex sentence and text. — Moscow: Nauka. — P. 200.
16. Nurmonov A. (2009) From immanent to cognitive// Uzbek language and literature № 6, — Tashken: Fan. — Pp. 104-108.
17. Van Dejk. T. (1978) [Questions of the pragmatics of the text// New in foreign linguistics. Issue VIII. Linguistics of the text. - Moscow: Progress. — S. 259-334.
18. Korzhenskij, YAn. (1979) The pragmatic component and the theory of text Text. YAn Korzhenskij // Text syntax. - Moscow: Nauka. — P. 368.
19. Gal'perin I.R. (2007) Text as an object of linguistic research. Monograph. — Moscow: KomKniga. — P. 144.
20. Harris Z. (1952) Discourse analysis / Language, vol.28, № 1. — P. — 30.
<https://gtmarket.ru/library/articles/777> (Access date: 6.02.2020.)
21. Dejk, Van T.A. (1988) Strategii ponimaniya svyaznogo teksta [Strategies for understanding a coherent text] // Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. Vyp. 23. [New in foreign linguistics. Vol. 23.] — Moscow: Progress. — P. 153-212.
22. Vohrysheva E.V. (2017) Functioning of linguistic phenomena in the system of discourse: coll. monograph.. — Samara: SF GAOU VO MGPU. — P.180.
23. Sossyur F. (1999) Course of general linguistics. — Ekaterinburg: Izd-vo Ural. un-ta. — S. 432.
24. Mahmudov N. Nurmnov A. (2007) Theory of the Uzbek language (syntax) — Tashkent: O'qituvchi nashriyoti, 2007. — P. 149. www.ziyouz.com/kutubxonasi. (Access date: 30.03.2019.)
25. Van Dijk T.A. (1985) Semantic Discourse Analysis. Hand book of Discourse Analysis. Vol.2: Dimensions of Discourse. — London., — P. 103-136.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44493892_Handbook_of_discourse_analysis_edited_by_Teun_A_Van_Dijk (Access date: 07.03.2020.)
26. Nikolaeva T.M. "Kratkij slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov"
file:///Zherebilo_T_V_slovar_lingvisticheskikh_terminov.pdf (Access date: 7.03.2020.)
27. Stubbs M. (1983) Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language — Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press. — P. 316.
28. Arutyunova N.D. Diskurs. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary <http://lingvisticheskij-slovar.ru/description/diskurs/168> (Access date: 10.01.2019.)
29. Stepanov YU.S. (1996) Alternative world, Discourse, Fact and the Principle of causality// Language and science of the late 20th century. — Moscow: RAN. — P.p. 35–73.
30. Popov A.YU. (2001) The main differences between text and discourse // Text and discourse. Problems of economic discourse: Collection of scientific articles — St. Petersburg: Publishing House of SPbGUEF. — P.p. 41-44.
31. Kubryakova E.S. (2000) On the concept of discourse and discursive analysis in modern linguistics: a review// Discourse, speech, speech activity. Functional and structural aspects: a collection of reviews. — Moscow: INION RAN. — P.p. 7-25.
32. Borbot'ko V.G. (1981) Elements of the theory of discourse. — Grozny: CHIGU1. — P. 113.
33. Zalevskaya A. (2001) The text and its understanding. — Tver: TvGU. — P.177.
34. Muhammedova S. Saparniyozova M. (2011) Linguistics of text. — Tashkent, 2011. — P. 117.
35. Pardayev A. Some feedback on Discours. <https://e-books.tsue.uz/pdf-diskurs-haqida-ayrim-mulohazalar>. (Access date: 22.11.2018.)
36. Gorshkov A.I. (2001) Russian stylistics. — Moscow: Astrel –AST. — 370 s.
37. Milovidov V.A. (1998) Text, context, intertext: An Introduction to the Problems of Comparative Literary studies — Tver: TvGU. — P. 83.