

6. Гаджиева Н.З. Основные пути развития синтаксической структуры тюркских языков. – М.: 1973. – С. 12-20.
7. Есперсен О. Философия грамматики. – Москва: Изд-во иностранной литературы, 1958. –С. 404.
8. Леонтьев А. А. Язык, речь, речевая деятельность. 3-е изд. -М.: 2005.
9. Ломов А. М. Русский синтаксис в алфавитном порядке: Понятийный словарь-справочник. Воронеж, 2004. -317 с.
10. Малащенко В. П., Богачев Ю. П. Словосочетание и члены предложения // Вопросы языкознания. 1984. № 6. С. 81—86.
11. Моисеев А.И. Семантическая структура пространственных предлогов в современном русском языке (опыт сопоставительных классификаций). Статья 2 // Термин и слово: Межвуз. сборник ГГУ, 1979. - С. 120-129.
12. Пешковский А.М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении. 7-е изд. – Москва: Учпедгиз, 1956. –С. 512.
13. Сайфуллаева Р., Менглиев Б., Бокиева Г. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. -Тошкент: Фан ва технологиялар, 2010. 391-б.
14. Турниёзов Н. Ўзбек дериватологиясининг бугунги аҳволи ва истиқбол тараққиёти ҳақида//Тил тараққиётининг деривацион қонуниятлари. – Самарқанд: 2009. 3-6-б.
15. Турсунов У., Мухторов А., Рахматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. -Тошкент: “Ўзбекистон”, 1992. 400-б.
16. Фортунатов Ф.Ф. Сравнительное языковедение // Избранные труды / Отв. ред. М.Н.Петерсон. т.1. -М: Учпедгиз, 1956. - С. 23-191.
17. Шахматов А.А. Из трудов по современному русскому языку (учение о частях речи) Текст. / А.А. Шахматов. -М.: Учпедгиз, 1952. -С. 132-135.

РЕЗЮМЕ. Мақолада сўз бирикмалари назарияси шаклланишининг тарихи ва сўз бирикмаларининг умумназарий муаммоларини тадқиқ этиш соҳасида ечимини қутаётган муаммолар ҳақида фикр юритилади. Сўз бирикмаси тизимини мукамал ўрганиш ҳаракатлари ўтган асрнинг ўрталарида янада жадаллашиб, ушбу тизим бирлигини сўз ҳосил қилувчи морфосинтактик, синтагматик, семантик омилларни тавсифлаш ва сўз бирикмаларини бошқа лисоний бирликлардан фарқлаш ҳамда таснифлаш борасида қатор изланишлар олиб борилди. Изланишлар натижасида эришилган ҳулосалар сўз бирикмаси тизими ҳақидаги таълимотнинг назарий тус олишига туртки берди.

РЕЗЮМЕ. В статье отражена история становления теории словосочетаний и проблемы, ожидающие решения в области исследования общетеоретических проблем словосочетаний. В середине прошлого века активизировались усилия по изучению системы словосочетаний, и был проведен ряд исследований по описанию морфосинтаксических, синтагматических, семантических факторов, входящих в состав слов этой системной единицы, по выделению и классификации словосочетаний, сочетания других языковых единиц. Выводы, сделанные в результате исследования, дали толчок развитию теории системы словосочетаний.

SUMMARY. The article reflects on the history of the formation of the theory of word combinations and the problems awaiting solution in the field of researching general theoretical problems of word combinations. In the middle of the last century, efforts to study the system of word combinations intensified, and a number of researches were carried out to describe the morphosyntactic, syntagmatic, semantic factors that make up words of this system unit, and to distinguish and classify word combinations from other linguistic units. The conclusions reached as a result of the research gave impetus to the theory of the word combination system.

THE PROBLEM OF DISCOURSE IN LINGUISTICS
G.B.Joldasova – *Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogical Sciences*
Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh
G.A.Klishbekova – *Master student*
Nukus State Pedagogical Institute named after Ajiniyaz

Таянч сўзлар: тил, тилшунослик, интеграл матнлар тўплами, тилнинг таърифлари, нутқ, тилнинг элементлари.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, лингвистика, интегративная совокупность текстов, дефиниции дискурса, речь, элементы дискурса.

Key words: discourse, linguistics, integrative set of texts, definitions of discourse, speech, elements of discourse.

The concept of "discourse" appeared in connection with the expansion of linguistic research beyond the sentence - in the sphere of superphrasal syntax. Therefore, a discourse from a linguistic point of view is a set consisting of a logical chain of sentences that are in a semantic connection.

Let's consider the concept of "discourse" in linguistics. Speech activity interests not only modern linguistics, but also related areas of knowledge, primarily psychology, sociology, and cultural studies. Many linguistic, pragmalinguistic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, and linguoculturological terms are interpreted ambiguously. Undoubtedly, such a concept as discourse belongs to them. Different linguistic dictionaries give different definitions of the word "discourse". According to the linguistic encyclopedia, "discourse" is a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors; a text taken in the event aspect; speech considered as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes). A discourse is a speech that is immersed in life. That is why "discourse", unlike "text", is not applicable to ancient and other texts that do not have a direct connection with living life [8:105]. In the dictionary of linguistic terms edited by T.V.Zherbilo, we see the following definition: "discourse" is an integrative set of texts connected by semantic relations and united in a communicative and functional - goal relation [9: 89]. In the dictionary edited by V.Y.Mikhailchenko, we find the following definition: "discourse" is a logically constructed text in conjunction with a socio - cultural context (psychological, cultural, pragmatic social); speech as a component that participates in the relationship of people. If the socio-cultural context in which a text was

created and existed is lost, then the term "discourse" cannot be applied to it, since the meaning of the discourse is not isolated. The definition of discourse is also of interest to many scientists in the sociolinguistic aspect, since the discourse structure of the text is closely related to social factors. For example, studies of political discourse by French linguists can be included to a certain extent in sociolinguistic discourse, since all of them affect the social context, in the extra-linguistic situation in which a particular text was created. It is taking into account the social conditionality of discourse that brings the study of these texts closer to social linguistics. An important aspect of the theory of discourse is the development of typical situations (frames) of language communication [10:213].

In the explanatory dictionary of translation studies, we find the following definitions of discourse:

An **arbitrary text fragment** consisting of more than one sentence or an independent part of a sentence. Often, but not always, it concentrates around a certain reference concept; it creates a general context describing actors, objects, circumstances, times, actions, etc., being determined not so much by the sequence of sentences as by the world that is common to the creator of the discourse and its interpreter, which is "built" in the course of the development of the discourse - this is the point of view "ethnographies of speech". The initial structure for the discourse has

A type of sequence of elementary propositions connected by logical relations of conjunctions, disjunctions, etc. Elements of the discourse: the events described, their participants, performative information and "non-events", i.e. a) circumstances accompanying the events; b) background explaining the events; c) assessment of the

participants of the event; d) information relating the discourse to the events.

This is a speech stream, a language in its constant movement, which includes all the diversity of the historical era, individual and social characteristics of both the communicant and the communicative situation in which communication takes place. The discourse reflects the mentality and culture of both the national, general, and individual, private.

This is a complex communication phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, also extralinguistic factors (knowledge about the world, opinions, attitudes, goals of the addressee) necessary for understanding the text.

Any statement that is more than a phrase that is considered from the point of view of the rules for connecting a sequence of phrases.

A coherent text combined with extralinguistic factors.

Text taken from the event aspect.

Speech considered as a purposeful social action.

A coherent text, with a paraphrasespace [11:267].

In the understanding of the German philosopher and sociologist J. Habermas, "discourse" is a special ideal type of communication, carried out in the greatest possible distance from social reality, traditions, authority, communication routine, etc., and aimed at critical discussion and justification of the views and actions of participants to communication. [7:347]

So, after analyzing the various interpretations of the term "discourse" among many linguists, we can identify similar features of this concept. A discourse is a logically constructed text that exists in a particular context. It cannot exist separately from modernity, it always carries extralinguistic problems and is closely connected with life, although it is still very important. Habermas in his definition expresses a sharply opposite opinion, considering that discourse can exist in isolation from reality. Such linguists as V.Y.Mikhalchenko, V.N.Yartseva, T.V.Zherebilo and others consider discourse more broadly and compare it with speech immersed in life. In this paper, following the dictionary of sociolinguistic terms edited by V.Y.Mikhalchenko, "discourse" will be understood as: a logically constructed text in conjunction with a socio-cultural context (psychological, cultural, pragmatic social); speech as a component that participates in the relationship of people. When studying discourse, we will often encounter such related concepts as "speech" and "text".

Let us consider the works of linguists devoted to the study of the concept of "discourse". Many works have been devoted to the study of the problem of discourse in linguistics, the authors of which understand this phenomenon in so many different scientific systems that the very concept of "discourse" has turned out to be broader than the concept of "language".

Thus M. Stubbs identifies three main characteristics of discourse: 1) in formal terms, it is a unit of language that exceeds the volume of a sentence, 2) in content terms, the discourse is related to the use of language in a social context, 3) in its organization, the discourse is interactive, that is, dialogic [3:89].

P. Serio defines eight meanings of the term "discourse": 1) the equivalent of the concept of "speech" (according to F. Saussure), i.e. any specific utterance; 2) a unit larger than the phrase; 3) the impact of the utterance on its recipient, taking into account the situation of the utterance; 4) conversation as the main type of utterance; 5) speech from the speaker's point of view, as opposed to narration, which does not take into account such a position (according to E. Benveniste); 6) the use of language units, their speech actualization; 7) socially or ideologically limited type of utterances, for example, feminist discourse; 8) a theoretical construct designed to study the conditions of text production [5:26- 27].

V.S.Grigorieva in her monograph "Discourse as an element of the communicative process: pragmalinguistic and cognitive aspects" examines discourse as a linguistic unit of communication, which assumes that, like any language unit, it has a sign of signiness as a set of certain properties of the material (form) and ideal (content). Any sign itself is an object of the real world. Verbalization and objectification of certain content, represented in the act of speech, marks the work with information, a cognitive process that is born in the processes of cognition and perception of the world [1:156].

Special attention should be paid to the identification of two types of research devoted to discourse - cognitive-discursive and communicative-discursive [2: 46]. This juxtaposition of approaches to discourse leads to a distinction between semantics and pragmatics of the sign. The semantics of discourse in this sense can be interpreted as a set of intentions and propositional attitudes in communication, and the pragmatics of discourse - as ways of expressing the corresponding intentions and attitudes. In this case, multiple connections of a discourse with other phenomena, including connections of a certain type of discourse with other types of discourse, represent its syntactics (connection of a sign with other signs) [3:149].

According to the scholar V. E. Chernyavskaya, discourse in its broadest sense is a collection of thematically related texts. The author notes that the concept of "discourse" in publications of recent decades is given special attention. Although Chernyavskaya emphasizes that the use of this term is getting more and more negative dynamics, rather than positive [6:8].

The study of discourse as a special category has developed in various independently existing and developing national schools. The scientific tradition is of key importance. The French tradition of discourse analysis, associated with the names of J. J. Lacan, M. Foucault, M. Pesce, L. Althusser, P. Seriot, is highlighted - a tradition, first of all, of political-ideological, historical and socio-cultural analysis of discourse. It is the most autonomous and independent in its approach and is incompatible with the linguistic principles of analysis. It stands out as an independent Anglo-American linguistic tradition of the analysis of coherent speech, when discursive analysis is primarily aimed at oral communication, at the interactive interaction of the speaker and listener. The German-Austrian school of discourse analysis developed separately, applying traditional methods of textual analysis of written text to the category of discourse.

L. S. Polyakova In her article "Theoretical approaches to the definition of the concept of "discourse" also states that the interpretation of the concept of "discourse" has undergone multiple changes since the introduction of the term into the everyday life of scientific knowledge by Selling Harris in the early 50s of the twentieth century. He called discourse analysis "a method of analyzing coherent speech" designed "to expand descriptive linguistics beyond a single sentence at a given time and to correlate culture and language."

Thus, the ambiguity of this term is confirmed by the etymology of the word discourse. Initially, in Latin, the word discourse meant "deviating from the course", "running away", etc. But already in the nineteenth century in the dictionary of the German language of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm pointed out the ambiguity of this concept:

1. dialogue, conversation; 2. speech, lecture [4:87].

These studies of the concept of "discourse" have made a serious contribution to the development of linguistics, but there is still no consensus on this issue. Because of the polysemantic nature of the concept of "discourse", it is difficult for linguists to identify its main characteristics. That is why this problem is still extremely relevant in linguistics.

References

1. Discourse as an element of the communicative process: pragmalinguistic and cognitive aspects. Tambov: Publishing House of Tambov State Technical University. univ., 2007, 288 p. (in Russian)
2. Danilova, N. K. "Signs of the subject" in discourse.- Samara: Publishing house "Samara University", 2001. -P. 228.
3. Karasik, V. I. On types of discourse // Language personality: Institutional and personal Discourse: Collection of scientific works, Volgograd: Peremena Publ., 2000, -P. 5-20.
4. Polyakova, L. S. Language. Text. Discourse/ L. S. Polyakova// Scientific almanac. - 2009. - No. 7. - pp. 87-91.
5. Serio, P. How texts are read in France // Quadrature of meaning: The French school of Discourse Analysis: translated from French and Portuguese-Moscow: Progress, 1999. -P. 415.
6. Chernyavskaya V. E. The discourse of Power and the power of discourse. -Moscow: Flinta: Nauka Publ., 2006, -P.136.
7. Philosophical Discourse on Modernity: translated from German by M.M.Belyaev. -Moscow: 2003, -P.416.
8. Linguistic Encyclopedia / V. N. Yartseva, Moscow: 1990, -P. 688.
9. Dictionary of Linguistic Terms. - Magas.: In GU Publishing House, 2004. -P. 155.
10. Dictionary of Sociolinguistic Terms / edited by V. Yu. Mikhalechenko. -Moscow: 2006, -P.312.
11. Explanatory Translation Dictionary. - 3rd ed., reprint. -Moscow: «Flinta»: Nauka Publ., 2003, -P. 320. (in Russian)

РЕЗЮМЕ. Мақолада мустақил равишда мавжуд бўлган ва ривожланаётган турли миллий мактабларда ривожланган тадқиқот ҳақида сўз боради. “Дискурс” тушунчасининг полисемантик хусусияти туфайли тилшунослар ўнинг асосий хусусиятларини ажратишда қийналишади. Шунинг учун ҳам бу муаммо тилшуносликда ҳамон долзарблигича қолмоқда.

РЕЗЮМЕ. В статье рассказывается об изучении дискурса как особой категории, сложившейся в различных самостоятельных существующих и развивающихся национальных школах. Из-за полисемантичности понятия «дискурс» лингвистам сложно выделить его основные характеристики. Именно поэтому эта проблема до сих пор чрезвычайно актуальна в языкознании.

SUMMARY. The article tells about the study of discourse as a special category has developed in various independently existing and developing national schools. Because of the polysemantic nature of the concept of "discourse", it is difficult for linguists to identify its main characteristics. That is why this problem is still extremely relevant in linguistics.

KÓRKEM TEKSTTI LINGVOPOETIKALIQ ANALIZLEWDIŇ TEORIYALIQ TIYKARLARI

Sh.Jolmbetova – tayanish doktorant

Ajiniyaz atındaǵı Nókis mámleketlik institutı

Tayanich sózlar: til, taqqoslash, poeziya, lingvopoetika, stilistika, poetika.

Ключевые слова: язык, сравнение, поэзия, лингвопоэтика, стилистика, поэтика.

Key words: language, comparison, poetry, lingvapoetics, stylistics, poetics.

Búgingi kúnde dúnya til biliminde XX ásiridin ékinshi yarımınan baslap kórkem tekstti lingvopoetikalıq jaqtan analizlew áhmiyetli máselelerdin biri bolıp tabıladı. XX ásir jańa texnologiyalar hám informaciýalar ásirine aylangan bir waqıtta til bilimi hám ádebiyat salasında da kóplegen jańalıqlardı keltirdi. Onıń stilistika hám ádebiyattanıw tarawları menen ortaǵ tárepleri tereń úyrenilmekte. Tildi úyreniwde jańa baǵdarı etnolingvistika, parolingvistika, lingvokulturologiya hám basqada tildin tarawların úyreniw keń rawajlandı. Eń áyyemgi dáwirlerden berli poetika terminini ádebiyattanıwǵa qansheli baylanıslı bolsa, til bilimine de sonsheli baylanıslı. Onıń stilistika hám ádebiyattanıw tarawları menen de tereń úyrenilmekte. Lingvopoetika til bilimi kórkem ádebiyatqa júdá jaqın baylanıslı. Áweli stilistika menen júdá tıǵız qarım-qatnasın kórsetiwge boladı. Sonı atap ótiw kerek, lingvopoetika menen stilistikaniń qarım-qatnası jónindegi másele kóplegen jaǵdaylarda, olardıń hár birin úyreniw salasın yamasa stilistikalıq (tiykarınan lingvostilistikalıq) dep esaplaw stilistikaniń oǵada keńeyiwı onıń predmetin túrlishe aytıw hám funkciyasın kóp tárepleme belgilew ayılǵanlıǵın esapqa alǵan halda. Haqıyqattan da lingvopoetika hám stilistika birdey izertlew obiektime iye ekewide shıǵarma tilin úyrenedi. Biraq olardı birdey zat dep esaplaw nadurıs, olardıń arasındǵı parıq izertlew sheńberi shegi jańa izertlew maqsetinen kelip shıǵadı. Stilistika jazıwshı tili hám tekstin milliy hám kórkem ádebiyatqa baylanıslı til menen salıstırıp analiz qılıw múmkin. Al, basqa tárepten lingvistika bolsa kórkem teksttin tilin, tildin ózgeshe formasına qarap estetikalıq jónelisi jańa kórkem mazmunǵa qarata hártli belgilew máselesi pragmatikalıq kózqarastan túsindirildi. Analiz lingvopoetikalıq bizge málim, poetika ataması dáslep Aristoteldin «Poetika» shıǵarmasında qollanǵan.

Lingvopoetika-til biliminin poetikalıq tildi izertleytuǵın tarawı bolıp tabıladı. Lingvopoetika házirgi waqıtta til biliminin bir pútnligin tiklewı múmkin bolǵan jańa taraw dep tán alınıp atırǵan eken, onda onıń maqseti, wazıypaların, basqa ilimler menen baylanısın anıqlaw zárúr. Lingvopoetikalıq izertlewdiń tiykarǵı maqseti-kórkem shıǵarmanıń estetikalıq bahasın hám tásirshenlik kúshin belgilep beriwden ibarat. Dúnya til biliminde kórkem shıǵarmalardı lingvopoetikalıq jaqtan úyreniw tek

til bilimi ushın emes, al oǵan jaqın bolǵan tarawlar ushın da úlken material beriwı óziniń tastıyıqlawın tapqan. Bul tarawda ilimiy izertlew jumsların kóbeytiw keyingi waqıtları til bilimi iliminiń eń áhmiyetli wazıypalarınan esaplanadı. Jáhan til biliminde usı kúнге shekem kórkem tekst tilin úyreniw boyınsha kóplegen ilimiy monografiýalar, dissertaciýalar jazılmaqta. A.A.Poetbnaya, A.Peshkovskiy, I.V.Sherba, V.M.Jirmunskiy, V.V.Vinogradov sıyaqlı ilimpazlar kórkem tekst ústinde analiz isledi. Al, házirgi waqıtta rus ilimpazları A.A.Lipgart, G.I.Klimovskayalardıń miynetlerin aytıp ótsek boladı. Olardıń pikirine qaraǵanda, «kórkem tekst forması hám dúzilisi ortasındaǵı buzılmaıtuǵın birlik awızeki ádebiyattın mazmunın úyreniwge estetikalıq tásir jasaydı». Kórkem shıǵarma tili júdá quramalı hám ózgeshe qubılıs. Eń dáslep teoriyalıq jaqtan rus ilimpazı Akademik V.V.Vinogradov «Проблемы русской стилистики» degen fundamental miynetinde poetika haqqında ádebiy kórkem shıǵarma strukturasını úyreniwde lingvopoetikalıq, estetika-stilistikalıq, ádebiyattanıw qatnaslar poetika sheńberinde birlesip ketetuǵının kórsetip ótedi [1:84].

Sonǵı jıllarda kórkem shıǵarmalardı lingvistikalıq analiz qılıw kórkem ádebiyatqa baylanıslı kózqarastan keń kórilip izertlenbekte. Lingvostilistika hám lingvopoetikalıq kózqarastan orıs hám jergilikli ilimpazlar tárepten keń izertlenip atır. Rus til biliminde tekst (tekst) túsiniǵı ótken ásiridin 40-jıllarında payda bolǵan. Al, ótken ásiridin 60-jıllarının ékinshi yarımınan baslap «tekst lingvistikası» degen jónelish payda bola basladı. Tildi úyreniwde ilimpazlarımız tildin filosofiyalıq túsiniǵı hám estetikalıq tábiyatına úlken itibar qaratqan. Házirgi dáwirde rus filologiyasında lingvopoetikaniń teoriyalıq máseleleri menen shuǵıllanıp kiyatırǵan alımlardan biri A.A.Lipgartın «Основы лингвопоэтики» atlı miynetinde tómendegishe pikir bildiredi. «Бесусловно, не все, но очень многие художественные тексты содержат в себе нечто, обнаруживаемое лишь при рассмотрении их как совокупности отдельных элементов, что заставляет говорить о необходимости разработки особых исследовательских приемов, которые позволили бы уменьшить степень субъективности при проведении лингвопоэтического анализа развернутого произведения речи [2:12]. Ataqlı rus alımı V.Ya.Zadornov