

**THE LINGUISTIC INTERPRETATION OF POETIC DISCOURSE:
FROM TEXT TO DISCOURSE**

Ortiqov Eldor Mardonovich
Independent Researcher at Denau
Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy
Phone: +998 91 517 07 47
Email: eldor.mardonovich@bk.ru
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5046-403X>

Annotation:

This article examines the theoretical foundations of poetic discourse as a systemic phenomenon within the shift from text linguistics to discourse linguistics. The study focuses on speech act theory, the correlation between the concepts of “text” and “discourse,” and their reinterpretation within the cognitive-discursive paradigm. Drawing on the works of M. Halliday, I. M. Kobozeva, and N. D. Arutyunova, the paper highlights the distinction between text as a static product of speech activity and discourse as a dynamic, socially and pragmatically conditioned process. Special attention is paid to cognitive linguistics, poetic linguistic personality, intertextuality, and precedent phenomena as essential components of the discursive space of poetic texts. The research substantiates the non-binary opposition between text and speech in modern linguistics and emphasizes their functional and cognitive unity.

Keywords: text, discourse, speech act, cognitive-discursive paradigm, poetic speech, linguistics, intertextuality, precedent phenomenon.

In contemporary linguistics, considerable attention is being paid to speech acts, the culture of interpersonal communication, and discourse linguistics. This focus allows for the scientific evaluation of linguistic phenomena in English and Uzbek within the framework of Eastern and Western traditions, values, linguo-cultural and cognitive-mental foundations, and customary cultural practices.

In recent years, a number of studies have been conducted within the framework of speech act theory. Specifically, M. Halliday emphasizes that a speech act involves selecting one of the interrelated alternatives constructed on the basis of the semantic potential of language. According to I. Kobozeva, speech act theory can be seen as one of the ways to describe the active nature of language. The subjects of speech act theory understand a speech act as “a means for a person to

achieve a specific social goal.” This process is directed toward a communicative purpose (intention) and is carried out through illocutionary acts; it is considered a unity of normative social-linguistic behavior within specific pragmatic situations.

The development of speech theory occurs through its interconnection with the text category, which implies an interrelation between the concepts, methods, and principles of text linguistics.

In the history of linguistics, the study of human speech activity has acquired scientific-theoretical significance because issues related to speech activity form the foundation of linguistic theory. “In speech, a person’s thought is expressed along with their inner world. Therefore, studying a person’s ‘living’ speech, which reflects their social activity in the objective world, is important not only for theoretical linguistics but also for related fields such as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, linguo-culture, and communicative linguistics.” Consequently, this focus has influenced foreign linguistics in differentiating and developing the notions of language and speech.

Initially, the term “text linguistics” served as a general label for any linguistic study of written or spoken texts. Accordingly, the terms “text” and “discourse” (Latin: *discursus*, French: *discours*, English: *discourse*) were often used synonymously in linguistic studies. However, by the late 1970s and early 1980s, as the general linguistic paradigm shifted in the 20th century, a tendency emerged to differentiate these concepts.

The cognitive-discursive paradigm transforms the overall approach to text study, as a change in scientific paradigm is always accompanied by a shift in metaphor, the emergence of new fields, comparisons, and new analogies. Researchers who attempt to contrast discourse and text consider the text as a structural unit, while seeing discourse as differing in terms of functionality and process.

Studying the text as an immanent structure is replaced by a dynamic approach that examines its functional and cognitive aspects and its semantics. The text’s metaphor becomes three-dimensional:

- a) the semantic structure of the text;
- b) the hierarchy of its semantic components;
- c) the text as a semantic field.

Text is understood as “primarily an abstract, formal construction, whereas speech is a realization of it from the standpoint of mental processes and in relation to

extralinguistic factors.” Arutyunova provides a precise view on the understanding of the developed terms “text” and “discourse” in modern linguistics.

A text is the objectified product of a speech-creative process with completeness in written form; depending on the type of document, it consists of literary material, integrated with various lexical and grammatical units, a title, and a set of core components, demonstrating logical and stylistic coherence, alignment with a specific purpose, and pragmatic orientation.

Discourse is “a coherent text harmonized with extralinguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, and other factors; as a phenomenon, it is a text, a goal-directed social action, considered as a component participating in human interactions and mental mechanisms (cognitive processes).”

Although speech has been defined multiple times as a type of text, speech and text are clearly distinguished by a number of parameters. In descriptions of text, qualities such as integrity, completeness, processing, coherence, and structure are emphasized, whereas definitions of speech particularly highlight dynamism and the idea of “eventfulness.” If the text is considered a product, speech is the objective result of the activity of speech creation; when appropriately processed, it becomes either a structural component of the speech process or the process itself (speech as taken in its event aspect; speech considered as a purposeful social action; a component participating in human interactions and mental mechanisms—i.e., cognitive processes).

In cognitive linguopoetics, the study of speech becomes increasingly complex due to the aesthetics of speech, the problems of imagination, and the necessity of creating “possible worlds.” The axiom of cognitive linguistics posits that all human cognitive phenomena (perception, thought, language, memory) are organically interconnected.

In cognitive linguopoetics, this complexity is further enhanced by the secondary nature of these cognitive formations, which is determined by the conditions of poetic understanding indirectly obtained by all subjects of poetic communication.

This corresponds to a new level of linguopoetic tasks, including:

The search for linguistic correlations of objects that constitute the mechanism of poetic structure, such as intellect, knowledge, perception, interpretive ability, linguistic-communicative consciousness, and linguo-creative thinking.

Identification of figurative speech strategies, rules, and operations developed by the poet on a cognitive-semiotic basis, as well as the reconstruction of the

complex system of non-linguistic and linguistic knowledge embodied and applied by the individual in poetic discourse.

As a product of associative-figurative speech, a poetic text exists within a cultural context, confirming the unparalleled role of humans as poetic linguistic subjects in the world and, in particular, in the realm of culture. The poetic linguistic subject is simultaneously the creator of the text and its object and subject; the individual is at once author-addressee and the addressee of the text.

The functional scope of language is extremely broad, with two primary functions:

1. Denotation – naming;
2. Expression of relations.

The cultural aspect of poetic text is most clearly manifested in the category of intertextuality within the discursive space. Precedent cases allow the observation of the formation of the most characteristic phenomena of textual harmony. Precedent names are events in the semantic space of a text that probabilistically predict the semantic content of a poetic text. Named precedent events link the receiving text to the source text. The functioning of precedent events within the discursive space of intertext is observed through cognitive-discursive and intertextual analysis, implemented using specially developed methodologies.

Contemporary linguistics emphasizes the non-rigid opposition between text and speech, which is likely due to the diversity of scholars' opinions regarding their relationship. The text is considered the elementary (basic) unit of speech, whereas speech is viewed as either an entire text or a complex of texts united by certain features.

References

1. Halliday, M. A. K. *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold, 1978.
2. Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976.
3. Кобозева И. М. *Лингвистическая семантика*. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2000.
4. Арутюнова Н. Д. *Дискурс*. // *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь*. М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1990.
5. Арутюнова Н. Д. *Язык и мир человека*. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999.
6. Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

7. Searle, J. R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

8. Караулов Ю. Н. *Русский язык и языковая личность*. М.: Наука, 1987.