

## **THEOLINGUISTICS AND THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS DISCOURSE IN CONTEMPORARY TEXT AND DISCOURSE LINGUISTICS**

**Toshpulatova Mukhlisa,**

B.A., M.A. (Uzbekistan State World Languages University)

Linguist and Language Specialist

### **ABSTRACT**

*This article explores the field of theolinguistics with particular attention to the status of religious discourse within contemporary linguistics. Building on the foundations of text linguistics and discourse analysis, it examines the categories of text, including structure, cohesion, coherence, genre, and function, as essential elements for understanding how meaning is created and interpreted. The study highlights how the “discursive turn” of the twentieth century shaped linguistic thought, bringing philosophy, semiotics, psychology, and pragmatics into close dialogue with language studies. Within this framework, religious discourse emerges not merely as a subset of communication but as a powerful carrier of cultural memory, moral codes, and collective identity. Unlike purely descriptive texts, religious discourse is inherently performative, directive, and interpretative, shaping both personal worldviews and social practices. By situating religious texts within broader theories of discourse, the article argues that theolinguistics offers valuable insights into how sacred language functions at the intersection of faith, cognition, and cultural continuity.*

**Keywords:** *theolinguistics; religious discourse; text linguistics; discourse analysis; cohesion and coherence; pragmalinguistics; cultural identity; performativity of language.*

### **ANNOTATSIYA**

*Mazkur maqola zamonaviy tilshunoslikdagi diniy nutqning holatiga alohida e'tibor berib, ilohiyotshunoslik sohasini o'rganadi. Matn lingvistikasi va nutq tahlili asoslariga tayangan holda, u matn kategoriyalarini, shu jumladan, struktura, yaxlitlik, uyg'unlik, janr va funksiyani ma'no qanday yaratilishi va talqin qilinishini tushunish uchun muhim elementlar sifatida ko'rib chiqadi. Tadqiqot 20-asrning “diskursiv burilish” lingvistik g'oyasini qanday shakllantirgani, falsafa, semiotika, psixologiya va pragmatikani tilshunoslik bilan yaqin muloqotga olib kelganini ta'kidlaydi. Bu doirada diniy nutq nafaqat muloqotning bir qismi sifatida, balki madaniy xotira, axloqiy me'yorlar va jamoaviy o'ziga xoslikning kuchli tashuvchisi sifatida paydo bo'ladi. Sof tavsifiy matnlardan farqli o'laroq, diniy nutq o'z*

*mohiyatiga ko'ra ijro etuvchi, yo'naltiruvchi va izohlovchi xususiyatga ega bo'lib, shaxsiy dunyoqarashni ham, ijtimoiy amaliyotni ham shakllantiradi. Maqolada diniy matnlarni kengroq nutq nazariyalari doirasida joylashtirgan holda, ilohiyotshunoslik diniy nutqning tilning e'tiqod, bilish va madaniy davomiylik chorrahasida qanday ishlashi haqida qimmatli fikrlarni taqdim etishini ta'kidlaydi.*

**Kalit so'zlar:** *telingvistika; diniy nutq; matn lingvistikasi; nutq tahlili; uyg'unlik va bog'liqlik; pragmal lingvistikasi; madaniy o'ziga xoslik; tilning ijro qobiliyati.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Text linguistics is a branch of linguistics that focuses on the study of text as a communicative unit<sup>1</sup>. It analyzes how language is used to create coherent and cohesive texts, which can be spoken or written. Text linguistics is concerned with the features that distinguish texts from individual sentences or utterances<sup>2</sup>.

There are several categories of text linguistics which include:

1. Text Structure: Text structure refers to the way that texts are organized and how different parts of a text are related to each other. Texts have a hierarchical structure, with larger units such as paragraphs, sections, and chapters, and smaller units such as sentences and clauses. The relationship between these units is important in creating coherence and cohesive texts.

2. Text Cohesion: Cohesion refers to the ways in which the different parts of a text are connected to each other. This includes the use of cohesive devices such as pronouns, conjunctions, and lexical items that link one sentence or clause to another. Cohesion is essential for creating a sense of continuity and flow in a text.

3. Text Coherence: Coherence refers to the ways in which the different parts of a text are connected to each other in terms of meaning. A coherent text is one in which the different parts are logically connected, and the reader can follow the argument or narrative without confusion. Coherence is achieved through the use of cohesive devices, but also through the use of rhetorical devices such as repetition, parallelism, and contrast.

4. Text Genre: A text genre refers to a specific type of text, such as a novel, a news article, or a scientific paper. Genres have specific characteristics in terms of structure, language use, and communicative purpose. Understanding the conventions of different genres is important for producing effective texts and for understanding the expectations of readers.

<sup>1</sup> Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective. Oxford University Press.

<sup>2</sup> de Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). Introduction to text linguistics. Longman.

5. Text Function: Text function refers to the communicative purpose of a text. Different types of texts have different functions, such as informing, persuading, entertaining, or instructing. Understanding the function of a text is important for determining appropriate language use and for evaluating the effectiveness of a text<sup>3</sup>.

In the 1980s, the field of general text linguistics originated. According to I. R. Galperin<sup>4</sup>, a text is a purposeful and pragmatic work that not only portrays reality but also conveys information about it.

The emergence of text linguistics as a field of study was influenced by the progress of modern philological research. Earlier, linguists such as S. D. Katsnelson<sup>5</sup> (1983), B. A. Larin<sup>6</sup> (1974), I. I. Meshchaninov<sup>7</sup> (1958), L. V. Shcherba<sup>8</sup> (2004), V. V. Vinogradov<sup>9</sup> (1960), and others developed the theoretical components of language and viewed language as the practical consciousness associated with culture, thinking, and psychological activities.

In the late 1920s, there was a "linguistic turn" in humanitarian knowledge, which is evident in the works of notable thinkers and philosophers such as M. M. Bakhtin<sup>10</sup> (1997), B. Russell<sup>11</sup> (2001), A. F. Losev<sup>12</sup> (1983), G. G. Shept<sup>13</sup> (1927), and L. Wittgenstein<sup>14</sup> (1966). This shift in focus expanded the scope of linguistics, and was a natural consequence of the integration of various fields of study within the humanities. By the end of the 20th century, this shift had taken on a discursive shape, and at the dawn of the 21st century, it had developed into a "discursive revolution".

**A text** is a complex linguistic form that is a unique type of sign product. It prompts the reader to engage in cognitive activities such as understanding, interpretation, and critical thinking. The reader must form their own perception of the text, often going beyond its literal meaning. This perception can be influenced by the reader's individual, moral, and socio-cultural experiences, leading to personal interpretation and comprehension<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. Longman.

<sup>4</sup> Galperin, I. R. (2014). Text as an object of linguistic research. Journal of Language and Education, 1(1), 17-22.

<sup>5</sup> Katsnelson, S. D. (1983). Theoretical problems of modern linguistics. Progress Publishers.

<sup>6</sup> Larin, B. A. (1974). Language and thought. Progress Publishers.

<sup>7</sup> Meshchaninov, I. I. (1958). Linguistics and the theory of language. Foreign Languages Publishing House.

<sup>8</sup> Shcherba, L. V. (2004). Selected works on linguistics and semiotics. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture.

<sup>9</sup> Vinogradov, V. V. (1960). The Russian language in the light of modern linguistics. Progress Publishers.

<sup>10</sup> Bakhtin, M. M. (1997). The dialogic imagination: Four essays. University of Texas Press.

<sup>11</sup> Russell, B. (2001). The analysis of mind. Routledge.

<sup>12</sup> Losev, A. F. (1983). The dialectics of the myth. Progress Publishers.

<sup>13</sup> Shept, G. G. (1927). The meaning of language. Mysl.

<sup>14</sup> Wittgenstein, L. (1966). Lectures and conversations on aesthetics, psychology and religious belief. University of California Press.

<sup>15</sup> Krylova, E. N., & Nikitina, S. A. (2019). The role of cognitive factors in the interpretation of literary texts. Journal of Language and Education, 5(3), 71-76.

Linguists are interested in studying language in relation to human life activities, which encompasses a range of interdisciplinary fields including philosophy, logic, aesthetics, psychology, semiotics, and literary studies. Moreover, there are cross-disciplinary fields such as pragmalinguistics, psycholinguistics, and psychology of perception, which also intersect with the study of language and its use in human communication<sup>16</sup>.

Pragmalinguistics is a branch of linguistics that studies how language is used in context and how meaning is constructed through language use. It is concerned with the relationship between language and social context, including the speaker's intentions, the listener's interpretation, and the situational context in which communication occurs.

An example of how pragmalinguistics intersects with the study of language can be seen in the analysis of conversational implicature. Conversational implicature refers to the meaning that is implied by a speaker's utterance, but which is not explicitly stated. For example, if someone says "I'm really thirsty", the conversational implicature might be that they would like a drink of water.

Pragmalinguistics seeks to understand how conversational implicatures are conveyed through language use, and how listeners interpret them based on contextual cues such as the speaker's tone of voice, facial expressions, and the overall context of the conversation. This involves analyzing the various pragmatic features of language use, such as presuppositions, implicatures, speech acts, and politeness strategies, among others.

Overall, pragmalinguistics plays a crucial role in understanding how language use is shaped by social context, and how meaning is constructed through the interaction between language users in real-world situations<sup>17</sup>.

**The first category of text linguistics is text structure which** refers to the way that texts are organized and how different parts of a text are related to each other. It involves the hierarchical organization of larger units such as paragraphs, sections, and chapters, and smaller units such as sentences and clauses. The relationship between these units is important in creating coherence and cohesive texts<sup>18</sup>.

Effective text structure is essential for creating a coherent and cohesive text. A well-structured text is easier for the reader to follow and understand, as it provides clear signposts for the organization of ideas. In addition, a well-structured text can also help to emphasize key ideas and arguments, making the text more persuasive or engaging for the reader.

<sup>16</sup> Bloomfield, L. (2015). *Language*. Routledge.

<sup>17</sup> Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

<sup>18</sup> de Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. Longman.

Overall, text structure is an important aspect of text linguistics that helps to shape the overall organization and coherence of a text. Understanding text structure can help writers to create effective and engaging texts that are easy to read and understand for their intended audience<sup>19</sup>.

**Cohesion** is a linguistic concept that refers to the way in which the elements of a text are linked together to create a coherent whole. It is concerned with the ways in which the various parts of a text are connected and how they contribute to the overall meaning of the text<sup>20</sup>.

There are various types of cohesive devices that help to create cohesion in a text<sup>21</sup>. These include:

**Reference:** This involves the use of pronouns, demonstratives, and other words that refer to previously mentioned entities or ideas.

**Substitution:** This involves the use of a word or phrase to replace a previously mentioned entity or idea. For example, instead of repeating a noun, a pronoun or another word can be used to refer to it.

**Ellipsis:** This involves leaving out words or phrases that can be inferred from the context. For example, instead of saying "John went to the store and bought some apples. Then John went home," one could say "John went to the store and bought some apples. Then he went home."<sup>22</sup>

**Conjunction:** This involves the use of conjunctions such as and, but, or, and so on to link together different parts of a text.

**Lexical cohesion:** This involves the use of words with similar or related meanings to create links between different parts of a text. For example, using synonyms or antonyms to connect ideas.

Effective use of these cohesive devices can help to create a text that is easier to read and understand. It can also help to create a sense of flow and coherence within the text, making it more engaging for the reader.

Overall, cohesion is an important aspect of text linguistics that helps to create coherence and meaning in a text. Understanding the various types of cohesive devices and how they work can help writers to create more effective and engaging texts<sup>23</sup>.

Unlike cohesion, text coherence is a linguistic concept that refers to the overall sense of unity and connection within a text.

---

<sup>19</sup> van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. Longman.  
Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge University Press.

<sup>20</sup> Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.

<sup>21</sup> Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.

<sup>22</sup> McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2002). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teaching*. Longman.

<sup>23</sup> Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to discourse studies*. John Benjamins Publishing.



Coherence is created through the use of various linguistic devices that help to connect different parts of a text<sup>24</sup>. These devices include:

1. Topic sentences: A topic sentence is a sentence that expresses the main idea of a paragraph. It helps to establish the topic and provide a clear focus for the paragraph.

2. Transitional words and phrases: Transitional words and phrases are used to link different parts of a text together. Examples include “however,” “in addition,” “on the other hand,” and “in conclusion.”

3. Pronouns and reference: Pronouns and other reference words are used to refer back to previously mentioned entities or ideas, helping to create a sense of continuity and connection within the text.

4. Repetition: Repetition of certain words or phrases can help to reinforce key concepts or ideas throughout the text, creating a sense of coherence and unity.

5. Logical ordering: Organizing a text in a logical order, such as chronological or cause-and-effect order, can help to create a sense of coherence and make the text easier to follow<sup>25</sup>.

Overall, text coherence is an essential aspect of effective communication. A text that is coherent is more likely to be understood and remembered by the reader, as it provides a clear and logical framework for the ideas presented. By using these linguistic devices effectively, writers can create texts that are more coherent, engaging, and effective in conveying their intended meaning<sup>26</sup>.

Text genre refers to the classification of texts based on their communicative purpose and form. A text genre can be defined as a category of texts that share similar linguistic and communicative features and are recognized by speakers of a language as belonging to a particular type of discourse. Text genres can be found in various domains of language use, such as literature, journalism, law, science, and business<sup>27</sup>.

Some examples of text genres include<sup>28</sup>:

Narrative: A text that tells a story, such as a novel, short story, or fable.

Descriptive: A text that describes a person, object, or place, such as a travelogue or a product description.

<sup>24</sup> Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

<sup>25</sup> McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2002). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teaching*. Longman.

<sup>26</sup> Zareva, A. (2014). *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

<sup>27</sup> Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.

<sup>28</sup> Eggins, S., & Martin, J. R. (1997). *Genres and registers of discourse*. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 230-256). Sage.

**Argumentative:** A text that presents a point of view or argument, such as an essay, editorial, or debate.

**Expository:** A text that explains or informs, such as a textbook, encyclopedia entry, or news article.

**Persuasive:** A text that attempts to persuade the reader or listener to take a particular action or adopt a certain viewpoint, such as an advertisement or political speech.

Understanding text genres is important for effective communication, as it enables speakers to tailor their language use to the specific communicative purpose and audience of a particular text. Additionally, knowledge of text genres can aid in the interpretation and analysis of texts, as different genres have their own unique linguistic and rhetorical features and strategies<sup>29</sup>.

Text function refers to the communicative purpose or intention of a particular text. It is the reason why a text was produced and the goal that the author intended to achieve through its creation. Text function is closely related to text genre, as the genre of a text is often determined by its communicative purpose or function<sup>30</sup>.

There are various text functions, including<sup>31</sup>:

**Informative:** The text provides information or knowledge about a particular topic or subject.

The purpose of a persuasive text is to convince the audience to adopt a certain perspective or engage in a particular action.

**Expressive:** The text expresses the author's emotions, feelings, or personal experiences.

**Directive:** The text provides instructions or directions on how to perform a particular task or achieve a specific goal.

**Performative:** The text performs a particular action or function, such as a wedding vow or a contract.

Understanding the function of a text is crucial for effective communication, as it enables the author to tailor their language use and rhetorical strategies to achieve their communicative goals. Additionally, knowledge of text function is essential for the analysis and interpretation of texts, as it provides insights into the author's intended meaning and the social and cultural contexts in which the text was produced and received<sup>32</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. University of Michigan Press.

<sup>30</sup> van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. Longman.

<sup>31</sup> Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. University of Chicago Press.

<sup>32</sup> Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford University Press.

The field of discourse analysis originated with the works of T. Van Dijk (1997), who developed a social and cognitive model of the text that involves analyzing texts as communicative events from the perspective of their origin and perception, thematic representation, micro- and macrostructure, style, and rhetorical properties<sup>33</sup>. Van Dijk (2004) views discourse as the sociocultural and linguistic manifestation of the text. To understand a text, one needs not only knowledge of language but also knowledge of the world, as vast amounts of social-cultural "world" knowledge are presupposed (Dijk, 2004)<sup>34</sup>, according to this renowned researcher of the influence of sociocultural factors on the mechanism of language use.

In contemporary research, discourse is viewed as a flow of information between communication participants that is "immersed in life" (Arutyunova, 2002)<sup>35</sup>. The production and interpretation of text are dependent on the communicative situation, according to this perspective<sup>36</sup>.

During the 1950s, a new field of study called "discourse analysis" emerged, with Z. Harris<sup>37</sup> (1962) being the first scholar to introduce it. Harris believed that a coherent text is built on a semantic-syntactic mechanism of internal coherence.

Contemporary research suggests that a text cannot be studied independently of discourse, which is often associated with conversation. Initially, text linguistics and discourse analysis were viewed as interchangeable fields of linguistics, until the late 1970s and early 1980s.

There are multiple schools of discourse analysis that have emerged from classical rhetoric, formalist approaches, Prague functionalism, and philosophy of language. The prominent scholars in discourse analysis include B. Palek<sup>38</sup> (1968) who developed the concept of "hypersyntaxis," T. Van Dijk<sup>39</sup> (1997) who focused on "macrosyntaxis," J.-R. R. Searle<sup>40</sup> (1999) who developed the speech act theory, W. Dressler<sup>41</sup> (1981), L. Wittgenstein<sup>42</sup> (1966), P. Grice<sup>43</sup> (1985), M. Bakhtin<sup>44</sup> (1997),

<sup>33</sup>Dijk, T. A. van. (1997). Discourse as social interaction. Sage.

<sup>34</sup> Dijk, T. A. van. (2004). Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. Mouton de Gruyter.

<sup>35</sup>Arutyunova, N. D. (2002). The communicative type of text and problems of its recognition. In M. E. Belyaeva (Ed.), Text and discourse: Theoretical and methodological aspects of their study (pp. 6-22). Moscow State University Press.

<sup>36</sup>See also: Gee, J. P. (2014). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method. Routledge // Stubbs, M. (2010). Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language. Wiley-Blackwell.

<sup>37</sup> Harris, Z. (1962). Discourse analysis. Language, 38(4), 539-558.

<sup>38</sup> Palek, B. (1968). Hyper-syntax. Semiotica, 2(2), 135-149.

<sup>39</sup> Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as social interaction. Sage.

<sup>40</sup> Searle, J. R. (1999). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.

<sup>41</sup> Dressler, W. (1981). Discourse analysis and linguistic anthropology. Annual Review of Anthropology, 10(1), 105-127.

<sup>42</sup> Wittgenstein, L. (1966). Lectures and conversations on aesthetics, psychology and religious belief. University of California Press.

<sup>43</sup> Grice, H. P. (1985). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics (Vol. 3, pp. 41-58).



and scholars from American and English linguistic schools such as B. Whorf<sup>45</sup> (1942), M. Silverstein<sup>46</sup> (2005), M. Halliday<sup>47</sup> (2002), and J. Sinclair<sup>48</sup> (1975).

Currently, discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary field that incorporates various disciplines such as anthropology, ethnography of speech, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive science, artificial intelligence, linguistic philosophy (theory of speech acts), and sociology of language and conversation analysis, rhetoric, stylistics, and text linguistics<sup>49</sup>.

The evolution of text linguistics and the emergence of discourse linguistics can be seen as a shift from a linear model of the text, where it is viewed as a sequence of sentences connected by linguistic relations and united by a communicative goal, to a nonlinear model. This nonlinear approach describes sets of thematically related texts and considers coherence theory as just one aspect of discourse analysis<sup>50</sup>.

Coherence theory is just one aspect of discourse analysis because it focuses mainly on the linguistic and semantic relationships between different parts of a text in order to establish a sense of unity and meaning. However, discourse analysis also involves examining non-linguistic factors such as the social, cultural, and historical context in which the text was produced and received, the speaker's intentions, the audience's expectations, and the power dynamics involved in the communication process.

For example, imagine a political speech delivered by a leader to their supporters. Coherence theory would focus on how the different parts of the speech are connected and contribute to the overall meaning. However, discourse analysis would also examine the speaker's use of language and how it reflects their social and political position, the audience's response to the speech, and the wider social and political context in which the speech was delivered.

In this way, coherence theory provides only a partial understanding of the text, while discourse analysis offers a more comprehensive analysis that takes into account a range of linguistic and non-linguistic factors.

---

<sup>44</sup> Bakhtin, M. (1997). *The dialogic imagination*. University of Texas Press.

<sup>45</sup> Whorf, B. L. (1942). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings*. MIT Press.

<sup>46</sup> Silverstein, M. (2005). Axes of evaluation. In K. L. Bauman & D. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 243-259). Oxford University Press.

<sup>47</sup> Halliday, M. A. K. (2002). *Linguistic studies of text and discourse*. Continuum.

<sup>48</sup> Sinclair, J. (1975). *Toward an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.

<sup>49</sup> See also Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge. // Stubbs, M. (2010). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Wiley-Blackwell. // Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. Arnold. // Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage. // Yule, G. (1996). *The study of language*. Cambridge University Press.

<sup>50</sup> Chernyavskaya, T. V. (2010). Text and discourse in modern linguistics. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 1(1), 1-6.

Discourse analysis considers various factors when analyzing a text<sup>51</sup>. Some of these factors are:

Context: The social, cultural, political, and historical context in which the text was produced and received.

Power relations: The power dynamics involved in the communication process, including the relationship between the speaker and the audience, and the ways in which power is exercised through language.

Intertextuality: The ways in which a text refers to or draws upon other texts or cultural artifacts.

Genre: The type of text being analyzed, such as a news article, a political speech, or a conversation.

Discourse markers: The linguistic features of a text, such as conjunctions, adverbs, and pronouns, which signal relationships between different parts of the text.

Ideology: The beliefs, values, and assumptions that underlie the text and shape the way it is perceived and understood.

Audience: The intended audience for the text and their expectations, beliefs, and attitudes.

By considering these factors, discourse analysis seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of a text and the social and cultural contexts in which it is situated.

Pragmalinguistics analysis is the methodological basis for studying the argumentative component of linguistic pragmatic dominance in scientific texts. This approach considers both the linguistic features of the argument and the role of the intended audience in shaping its effectiveness<sup>52</sup>.

The relationship between text linguistics and other linguistic disciplines such as lexicology, semasiology, linguistics (in the description of text types), and stylistics is clear and evident. The connection between text linguistics and syntax is also apparent. Text linguistics is concerned with the division of a text into units that cannot be separated within a single sentence. This division into larger units such as

<sup>51</sup> Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage.

<sup>52</sup> See also: Arutyunova, N. D. (1980). On communicative types of sentences. In I. A. Melchuk & A. A. Zalizniak (Eds.), *Typology of lexical and grammatical systems* (pp. 148-161). Nauka. // Kolesov, V. V. (2015). Argumentation in scientific texts: Linguistic and pragmatic aspects. *Russian Linguistics*, 39(2), 119-134. // Kravchenko, A. V. (2013). *Pragmalinguistics: Theory and practice*. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing. // Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 59-82). Academic Press. // Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, communication, and fallacies: A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

subject, theme, and comment is only possible at the level of the text, making the connection between text linguistics and syntactic theory crucial<sup>53</sup>.

Text linguistics has given rise to specialized subfields such as text pragmalinguistics, which focuses on the social functions of texts, how they impact speakers and listeners, and the various speech tactics and behaviors employed in communication. Scholars such as L. Y. Kisileva<sup>54</sup> (1971) and G. V. Kolshansky<sup>55</sup> (2007) have contributed to this area of study by examining the attitudes of speakers and listeners towards the text.

Researchers have established that the meanings conveyed by an author and those interpreted by a reader often differ. This can be attributed to the author's personal investment in the text, which reflects their knowledge, worldview, and perspective. Due to differences in competence and understanding, readers may not be able to creatively interpret the text, its images, and symbols, or adapt it to their own level of comprehension<sup>56</sup>.

To sum up, discourse is a broad and multifaceted concept that encompasses various fields of inquiry, including linguistics, sociology, psychology, and philosophy. At its core, discourse refers to the ways in which language is used to construct and shape social reality, and how social reality, in turn, influences language use.

Discourse analysis is a methodological approach that seeks to understand the ways in which language is used in social interactions, and how language use reflects and reproduces social power relations, ideologies, and cultural practices. Discourse analysts examine the linguistic and rhetorical features of texts, as well as the social and cultural contexts in which they are produced and received, to gain insights into the ways in which language is used to construct meaning and shape social and cultural practices and values<sup>57</sup>.

Text linguistics is a subfield of discourse analysis that focuses specifically on the analysis of texts, including their structure, genre, function, and communicative purpose. Text linguistics can be applied to various domains of language use, such as

---

<sup>53</sup> See also: Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. // Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage.

<sup>54</sup> Kisileva, L. Y. (1971). *Text as an object of linguistic research*. Nauka.

<sup>55</sup> Kolshansky, G. V. (2007). *Theory of speech tactics: From sentence to text*. Flinta.

<sup>56</sup> See also: Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities*. Harvard University Press. // Gadamer, H. G. (1975). *Truth and method* (2nd rev. ed.). Sheed and Ward. // Iser, W. (1978). *The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response*. Johns Hopkins University Press. // Jauss, H. R. (1982). *Toward an aesthetic of reception* (T. Bahti, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. // Ricoeur, P. (1970). *Freud and philosophy: An essay on interpretation*. Yale University Press. // Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Southern Illinois University Press.

<sup>57</sup> Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

literature, journalism, law, science, and business, and provides a framework for the analysis and interpretation of texts in their social and cultural contexts<sup>58</sup>.

Overall, the study of discourse is essential for understanding the ways in which language is used to create and maintain social reality, and how social reality, in turn, shapes language use. By examining the linguistic and rhetorical features of texts, as well as the social and cultural contexts in which they are produced and received, discourse analysts can gain insights into the ways in which language is used to construct meaning and shape social and cultural practices and values<sup>59</sup>.

## REFERENCES

1. Arutyunova, N. D. (1980). On communicative types of sentences. In I. A. Melchuk & A. A. Zalizniak (Eds.), *Typology of lexical and grammatical systems* (pp. 148–161). Nauka.
2. Arutyunova, N. D. (2002). The communicative type of text and problems of its recognition. In M. E. Belyaeva (Ed.), *Text and discourse: Theoretical and methodological aspects of their study* (pp. 6–22). Moscow State University Press.
3. Bakhtin, M. M. (1997). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. University of Texas Press.
4. Beaugrande, R. de, & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. Longman.
5. Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.
6. Bloomfield, L. (2015). *Language*. Routledge.
7. Chernyavskaya, T. V. (2010). Text and discourse in modern linguistics. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 1(1), 1–6.
8. Dressler, W. (1981). Discourse analysis and linguistic anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 10(1), 105–127.  
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.10.100181.000541>
9. Eggins, S., & Martin, J. R. (1997). Genres and registers of discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 230–256). Sage.
10. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
11. Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities*. Harvard University Press.

<sup>58</sup> Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. (Eds.). (2001). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Blackwell.

<sup>59</sup> Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Sage.

12. Galperin, I. R. (2014). Text as an object of linguistic research. *Journal of Language and Education*, 1(1), 17–22. <https://doi.org/10.17323/2411-7390-2014-1-1-17-22>
13. Gadamer, H. G. (1975). *Truth and method* (2nd rev. ed.). Sheed and Ward.
14. Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.
15. Grice, H. P. (1985). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
16. Halliday, M. A. K. (2002). *Linguistic studies of text and discourse*. Continuum.
17. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
18. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford University Press.
19. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
20. Harris, Z. (1962). Discourse analysis. *Language*, 38(4), 539–558. <https://doi.org/10.2307/411120>
21. Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. University of Michigan Press.
22. Iser, W. (1978). *The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
23. Jauss, H. R. (1982). *Toward an aesthetic of reception* (T. Bahti, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
24. Katsnelson, S. D. (1983). *Theoretical problems of modern linguistics*. Progress Publishers.
25. Kisileva, L. Y. (1971). *Text as an object of linguistic research*. Nauka.
26. Kolshansky, G. V. (2007). *Theory of speech tactics: From sentence to text*. Flinta.
27. Kolesov, V. V. (2015). Argumentation in scientific texts: Linguistic and pragmatic aspects. *Russian Linguistics*, 39(2), 119–134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11185-015-9148-2>
28. Krylova, E. N., & Nikitina, S. A. (2019). The role of cognitive factors in the interpretation of literary texts. *Journal of Language and Education*, 5(3), 71–76. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle2019.9719>
29. Kravchenko, A. V. (2013). *Pragmalinguistics: Theory and practice*. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
30. Larin, B. A. (1974). *Language and thought*. Progress Publishers.
31. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.



32. Losev, A. F. (1983). *The dialectics of the myth*. Progress Publishers.
33. McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2002). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teaching*. Longman.
34. Meshchaninov, I. I. (1958). *Linguistics and the theory of language*. Foreign Languages Publishing House.
35. Palek, B. (1968). Hyper-syntax. *Semiotica*, 2(2), 135–149.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1968.2.2.135>
36. Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to discourse studies*. John Benjamins Publishing.
37. Ricoeur, P. (1970). *Freud and philosophy: An essay on interpretation*. Yale University Press.
38. Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Southern Illinois University Press.
39. Russell, B. (2001). *The analysis of mind*. Routledge.
40. Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. (Eds.). (2001). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Blackwell.
41. Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 59–82). Academic Press.
42. Searle, J. R. (1999). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
43. Shept, G. G. (1927). *The meaning of language*. Mysl.
44. Shcherba, L. V. (2004). *Selected works on linguistics and semiotics*. Languages of Slavic Culture.
45. Silverstein, M. (2005). Axes of evaluation. In K. L. Bauman & D. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 243–259). Oxford University Press.
46. Sinclair, J. (1975). *Toward an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.
47. Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. University of Chicago Press.
48. Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. Longman.
49. Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
50. Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, communication, and fallacies: A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

51. Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. Arnold.
52. Vinogradov, V. V. (1960). *The Russian language in the light of modern linguistics*. Progress Publishers.
53. Whorf, B. L. (1942). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings*. MIT Press.
54. Wittgenstein, L. (1966). *Lectures and conversations on aesthetics, psychology and religious belief*. University of California Press.
55. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Sage.
56. Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge University Press.
57. Yule, G. (1996). *The study of language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
58. Zareva, A. (2014). *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.