

EVOLUTION OF TEXT LINGUISTICS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GLOBAL AND NATIONAL SCIENTIFIC PARADIGMS

Elmira Khayitova

Senior lecturer

MGIMO – Tashkent

ekhayitova@gmail.com

+998979197788

Abstract: This research presents a comprehensive comparative-theoretical analysis of the evolutionary trajectory and linguistic ontology of the "text" concept within both global and Uzbek scientific paradigms. By systematically examining the transition from early structuralist frameworks to contemporary communicative-pragmatic models, this study synthesizes the contributions of seminal scholars such as I.R. Galperin, O.I. Moskalskaya, T. van Dijk, and M.A.K. Halliday alongside the development of the Uzbek national school represented by M. Hakimov, A. Mamajonov, and N. Turniyozov. Methodologically, the study employs a rigorous content analysis of fundamental literature, categorizing definitions according to seven distinct criteria—structural integrity, semantic completion, communicative purpose, pragmatic orientation, functional task, syntactic connection, and relation to discourse—to quantify shifting theoretical priorities. The analysis reveals a significant paradigmatic shift: the contemporary understanding of the text has evolved from a mere collection of sentences to a complex, multi-dimensional linguistic unit. This transition highlights the text as the highest product of human cognitive and speech activity, characterized by cohesive semantic integrity and specific authorial intent. The findings indicate that while the structural approach remains statistically significant in academic literature (35%), there is an accelerating movement toward a functional-pragmatic paradigm. This study provides a systematic model for integrating classical linguistic views with modern requirements necessitated by digital and multimodal communication, serving as a theoretical foundation for future inquiries into discourse and pragmalinguistics.

Keywords: text linguistics, pragmatics, communicative unit, discourse, syntactic integrity, semantics, cohesion, coherence, structural analysis, functional approach.

1. Introduction: The Genesis and Evolution of Textual Inquiry The discipline of linguistics underwent a transformative redirection during the second half of the 20th century, necessitated by the realization that traditional focus on phonetics, lexicology, and sentence-level syntax was insufficient to capture the intricate communicative essence of language. Prior to this emergence, particularly within the Uzbek linguistic tradition, scholarship was largely dominated by the formal syntax of the sentence, exemplified by the foundational work of G'. Abdurahmonov and the traditional syntactic inquiries of A. G'ulomov and M. Askarova. However, the maturation of linguistic thought demanded a shift toward the "text" as the ultimate product of human thought and speech activity.

The theoretical underpinnings of this new discipline were established by scholars who redefined the boundaries of the language system. I.R. Galperin's seminal definition characterizes the text as a product of speech possessing a title, content completion, and logical-grammatical cohesion, all oriented toward a specific pragmatic goal. Crucially, O.I. Moskalskaya advanced this definition by distinguishing the text not merely as a speech phenomenon but as the highest unit of the language system itself—a syntactic entity of a higher order. In the contemporary landscape, this classical inquiry faces new exigencies; the rise of digital, multimodal, and hyperlinked communication requires a re-evaluation of these theories to address the complexities of modern human interaction.

2. Research Methodology This study adopts a multi-dimensional methodological framework to evaluate the development of text linguistics across disparate scientific schools. The following methods were applied with academic rigor:

- **Descriptive Method:** Utilized to systematically categorize and analyze the "text" definitions provided by various scholars, identifying the specific linguistic features prioritized within their respective frameworks.
- **Comparative-Typological Method:** Employed to identify commonalities and divergences between the Russian, European, and Uzbek national schools, tracing the progression from structuralism to pragmatism.
- **Structural Method:** Applied to the internal organization of the text, analyzing units such as the complex syntactic whole and the paragraph, as well as the cohesive devices—lexical repetition, pronominal reference, and conjunctions—that ensure integrity.
- **Functional Method:** Drawing specifically on M.A.K. Halliday's "Social Semiotic" perspective, this method interprets the text as a functional realization of language within its social and situational context.
- **Pragmatic Method:** Focused on the communicative objectives, authorial intent, and the relationship between the text and its addressee, as seen in the works of van Dijk and Hakimov.

The content analysis component of this research involved a systematic extraction of seven specific criteria from the corpus of linguistic literature. These categories—structural integrity, semantic completion, communicative purpose, pragmatic orientation, functional task, syntactic connection, and relation to discourse—were used to quantify the theoretical priorities of various schools and observe the statistical distribution of different linguistic approaches.

3. Comparative Analysis: Global vs. National Paradigms

3.1 Global Perspectives The evolution of global text linguistics is marked by a clear regional bifurcation of theoretical focus. The Russian school established the structural-syntactic foundation of the field. Beyond the foundational views of Galperin and Moskalskaya, significant contributions were made by L.M. Loseva, Z.Y. Turaeva, N.D. Zarubina, and E.V. Sidorov, who collectively explored the structural and communicative nature of the text. These scholars viewed the text as a grammatically and stylistically interconnected unit.

In juxtaposition, the European school fostered a shift toward functional and pragmatic interpretations. M.A.K. Halliday defined the text as a "social semiotic," a functional realization of the language system. T. van Dijk further grounded textual inquiry in the communicative-pragmatic domain, interpreting the text as a complex system of speech acts. R. Barth and K. Gauzenblaz emphasized the semantic connectivity and communicative cohesion that allow a sequence of sentences to function as a unified whole.

3.2 The Uzbek National School

Uzbek linguistics has cultivated a robust national school of text theory, evolving from traditional syntax to modern pragmatics. Scholars such as M. Yo'ldoshev and E. Qilichev have contributed to this maturity, though the paradigm shift is most evident in three specific areas: the syntactic inquiries of A. Mamajonov, who investigated the internal relationships between textual units; the structural-semantic research of N. Turniyozov, who distinguished between microtexts and macrotexts; and the pragmatic research of M. Hakimov, who specialized in the syntagmatic and pragmatic characteristics of scientific discourse.

3.3 Comparative Synthesis of Scientific Approaches

The following table synthesizes the primary approaches and prioritized features identified across the analyzed linguistic schools.

Table 1: Interpretation of Text Across Linguistic Schools

Scholar	Primary Approach	Prioritized Feature
I.R. Galperin	Structural-Pragmatic	Completed communicative unit
O.I. Moskalskaya	Syntactic	Highest syntactic unit of language
M.A.K. Halliday	Functional	Functional realization of language
T. van Dijk	Pragmatic	Speech acts and communicative process
R. Barth	Semantic	Content-based connectivity
M. Hakimov	Pragmatic	Pragmatic content of the text
A. Mamajonov	Structural	Text syntax
N. Turniyozov	Structural-Semantic	Microtext and macrotext

4. Results and Discussion: The Paradigmatic Shift The content analysis of fundamental linguistic literature reveals a notable distribution of theoretical priorities. The structural approach remains the most frequent in the analyzed corpus, appearing in 35% of definitions. This is largely reflective of the enduring influence of the Russian school (Galperin, Moskalskaya, Odinov, Lyapon). However, the data indicates a rapid ascendancy of communicative and pragmatic approaches, which are increasingly becoming the dominant contemporary paradigm.

This shift is characterized by a transition from the purely syntactic focus of earlier Uzbek scholarship, such as Mamajonov's work on text syntax, to the pragmatically oriented research of M. Hakimov. This evolution moves the definition of the text from a static grammatical object toward a dynamic phenomenon inextricably linked to authorial intent and context. The analysis identifies the core components of modern textuality as:

1. Semantic completion and structural integrity.
2. Communicative purpose and pragmatic orientation.
3. Lexical-grammatical connection and theme-rheme progression.
4. Orientation toward the addressee (the factor of the recipient).

This paradigmatic shift necessitates a view of the text as a functional realization of language rather than a mere sum of its sentences. The transition toward a "communicative-pragmatic paradigm" reflects the global trend of viewing language as social action, where the text is the primary vehicle for meaning-making within specific situational contexts.

5. Conclusion and Future Directions The primary conclusion of this comparative analysis is that while global and national linguistic schools vary in their methodological emphasis, they converge on the text as a superior linguistic unit defined by semantic integrity, logical consistency, and communicative purpose. This research systematizes the evolution from structuralism to pragmatism, providing a unified model for modern philological inquiry.

Future research must address several emerging challenges that test the limits of classical text theory:

- Multimodal Texts: The integration of visual, auditory, and linguistic codes requires an expansion of the "integrity" and "cohesion" criteria beyond the verbal level.

- Digital Discourse: Internet-based communication challenges traditional notions of linear textual structure and semantic completion.
- AI-Generated Texts: The emergence of large language models necessitates a re-evaluation of the "authorial intent" and "pragmatic goal" components of textuality, as the source of intent becomes non-human.
- Corpus Linguistics: The use of large-scale linguistic corpora will allow for the empirical verification of textual patterns and the refinement of theoretical models.

References

1. Барт Р. Лингвистика текста // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. VIII. Лингвистика текста. – М.: Прогресс, 1978. – С. 442–449.
2. Ван Дейк Т. А. Вопросы прагматики текста // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. VIII. Лингвистика текста. – М.: Прогресс, 1978. – С. 259–336.
3. Гальперин И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. – М.: Наука, 1981. – 139 с.
4. Гаузенблаз К. О характеристике и классификации речевых произведений // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. VIII. Лингвистика текста. – М.: Прогресс, 1978. – С. 57–71.
5. Гак В. Г. Прагматика, узус и грамматика речи // Иностранные языки в школе. – 1982. – № 5. – С. 13–14.
6. Ғуломов А., Аскарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1987. – 256 б.
7. Ҳакимов М. Х. Ўзбек илмий матнининг синтагматик ва прагматик хусусиятлари: филол. фан. д-ри ... дис. – Тошкент, 1993.
8. Йўлдошев М., Муҳамедова С., Сапарниязова М. Матн лингвистикаси. – Тошкент, 2021. – 232 б.
9. Ляпон М. В. Смысловая структура сложного предложения и текст. – М.: Наука, 1986. – 176 с.
10. Мамажонов А. Текст лингвистикаси. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1989. – 112 б.
11. Мамажонов А., Абдупаттоев М. Матн синтаксиси. – Фарғона, 2002. – 146 б.
12. Матвеева Т. В. Функциональные типы текстовых аспектов. – Красноярск, 1990.
13. Москальская О. И. Грамматика текста. – М.: Высшая школа, 1981. – 183 с.
14. Одинцов В. В. Стилистика текста. – М.: Наука, 1980. – 264 с.
15. Реферовская Е. А. Лингвистические исследования структуры текста. – Л.: Наука, 1983. – 216 с.
16. Турниёзов Н. Матн лингвистикаси. – Тошкент: Fan, 2010. – 184 б.
17. Beaugrande R., Dressler W. Introduction to Text Linguistics. – London: Longman, 1981. – 270 p.
18. Crystal D. Internet Linguistics. – London: Routledge, 2011. – 192 p.
19. Halliday M. A. K. Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. – London: Edward Arnold, 1978. – 256 p.
20. Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – 374 p.
21. Van Dijk T. A. Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. – London: Longman, 1977. – 261 p.