

**BUXORO DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI**  
**HUZURIDAGI ILMIY DARAJALAR BERUVCHI**  
**DSc.03/2025.27.12.Fil.08.08 RAQAMLI ILMIY KENGASH**

---

**BUXORO DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI**

**SAIDOVA MUXAYYO UMEDILOYEVNA**

**INGLIZ BADIY DISKURSIDA KOGERENSIYA TA'MINOTIDA**  
**KOGEZIV VOSITALAR FUNKSIONALLIGI**

**10.00.04 – Yevropa, Amerika va Avstraliya xalqlari tili va adabiyoti**

**FILOLOGIYA FANLARI doktori (DSc) dissertatsiyasi**  
**AVTOREFERATI**

**Buxoro – 2026**

**Filologiya fanlari doktori (DSc) dissertatsiyasi avtoreferati mundarijasi**

**Оглавление автореферата диссертации доктора филологических наук (DSc)**

**Contents of the dissertation for a Doctor of Science degree (DSc)**

**Saidova Muxayyo Umediloyevna**

Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogereksiya ta'minotida kogeziv vositalar funksionalligi .....5

**Saidova Mukhayyo Umediloevna**

The Functionality of Cohesive Devices in Ensuring Coherence in English Literary Discourse.....35

**Саидова Мухайё Умедилоевна**

Функциональность когезивных средств в обеспечении когеренции в английском художественном дискурсе .....67

**E'lon qilingan ishlar ro'uxati**

Список опубликованных работ  
List of published works.....72

**BUXORO DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI**  
**HUZURIDAGI ILMIY DARAJALAR BERUVCHI**  
**DSc. 03/2025.27.12.Fil.08.08 RAQAMLI ILMIY KENGASH**

---

**BUXORO DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI**

**SAIDOVA MUXAYYO UMEDILLOYEVNA**

**INGLIZ BADIY DISKURSIDA KOGERENSIYA TA'MINOTIDA**  
**KOGEZIV VOSITALAR FUNKSIONALLIGI**

**10.00.04 – Yevropa, Amerika va Avstraliya xalqlari tili va adabiyoti**

**FILOLOGIYA FANLARI doktori (DSc) dissertatsiyasi**  
**AVTOREFERATI**

**Buxoro – 2026**

**Fan doktori (DSc) dissertatsiyasi mavzusi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasida №B2025.2.DSc/Fil1003 raqam bilan ro'yxatga olingan.**

Dissertatsiya Buxoro davlat universitetida bajarilgan.

Dissertatsiya avtoreferati uch tilda (o'zbek, ingliz, rus (rezyume) Ilmiy kengashning veb-sahifasida (www.buxdu.uz) va "Ziyonet" Axborot ta'lim portalida (www.ziyonet.uz) joylashtirilgan.

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>Ilmiy maslahatchi:</b>  | <b>Mirzayev Ibodullo Kamolovich</b><br>filologiya fanlari doktori, professor  |
| <b>Rasmiy opponentlar:</b> | <b>Xajiyeva Feruza Melsovna</b><br>filologiya fanlari doktori, professor<br><b>Nasrullayeva Nafisa Zafarovna</b><br>filologiya fanlari doktori, professor<br><b>Satimova Dilafruz Numonjonovna</b><br>filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent |
| <b>Yetakchi tashkilot:</b> | <b>Jizzax davlat pedagogika universiteti</b>  |

Dissertatsiya himoyasi Buxoro davlat universiteti huzuridagi DSc.03/2025.27.12.Fil.08.08 raqamli Ilmiy kengashning 2026-yil "20" iyun soat 9<sup>00</sup> da majlisida bo'lib o'tadi. (Manzil: 200118, Buxoro sh., M.Iqbol ko'chasi, 11-uy. Tel.: (0 365) 221-29-14; faks: (0 365) 221-57-27; e-mail: buxdu\_rektor@buxdu.uz)

Dissertatsiya bilan Buxoro davlat universitetining Axborot-resurs markazida tanishish mumkin (925 raqami bilan ro'yxatga olingan). (Manzil: 200118, Buxoro shahri, M.Iqbol ko'chasi, 11-uy. Tel.: (0 365) 221-25-87.)

Dissertatsiya avtoreferati 2026-yil "5" iyun kuni tarqatildi.  
(2026-yil "5" iyun da 26-74 - raqamli reyestr bayonnomasi.)



*Dobromir*

*DA*

**D.I.Xodjayeva**

Ilmiy darajalar beruvchi Ilmiy kengash raisi,  
filologiya fanlari doktori, professor

**O.O.Bobokalonov**

Ilmiy darajalar beruvchi Ilmiy kengash  
ilmiy kotibi, filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa  
doktori, dotsent

**O.M.Fayzulloyev**

Ilmiy darajalar beruvchi Ilmiy kengash  
qoshidagi ilmiy seminar raisi, filologiya  
fanlari doktori, professor

## KIRISH (fan doktori [DSc] dissertatsiyasi annotatsiyasi)

**Dissertatsiya mavzusining dolzarbligi va zarurati.** Jahon tilshunoslik fani taraqqiyotining hozirgi davrida diskursiv, pragmatik, kognitiv nazariyalar yuzaga kelib, diskurs tahlil obyekti sifatida shakllanib, uning lingvopragmatik va lingvokognitiv xususiyatlari masalalariga katta e'tibor qaratilmoqda. Badiiy diskursning kogeziy, kogerent, intensionallik, qabul qiluvchanlik, informativlilik, situativlik va intertekstuallik kabi xususiyatlarga ega ekanligi uning tugal linguvistik birlik sifatida tarkib topishida ishtirok etayotgan lisoniy hodisalarning tub mohiyatini teran tushunish imkonini beradi. Bu esa badiiy diskursda kogeziya va kogerensiyaning funksional-diskursiv mohiyatini, kontekstual-pragmatik xususiyatlarini ochib berish, kognitiv-konseptual asoslarini aniqlash va ilmiy tavsiflashda muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi.

Dunyo tilshunosligida so'nggi yillarda kogeziya va kogerensiyaning diskurs doirasida namoyon bo'ladigan grammatik-leksik turlari va ularning xususiyatlari, kontekstual-pragmatik kategoriyalari, konseptual-kognitiv manzarasi, kommunikativ qoliplari asosida keng o'rganilishi va tadqiq qilinishi ustuvor vazifaga aylanmoqda. Mazkur lisoniy hodisalarning badiiy diskursda namoyon bo'lishi, ularning ichki mantiqiy tuzilishini ifodalashda, lisoniy materialning diskursiv misollar hisobidan boyitilishi, kognitiv-pragmatik tahlil paradigmasining ta'sirida oldindan ishlab chiqilgan lingvistik tavsif turlari tamoman yangi ko'rinish kasb etishi, o'z navbatida, lingvistik tadqiqotlar doirasini kengaytirishga va yangi xulosalar chiqarishga xizmat qiladi.

Mustaqillik milliy tilshunoslikni jahondagi ilg'or mezonlar asosida rivojlantirish uchun zarur bo'lgan barcha sharoitlarni yaratishi bilan birga, ushbu mezonlarga ko'p asrlik milliy mentalitetimiz asosida munosabat bildirish mas'uliyatini ham yuklaydi. Mazkur dissertatsiya natijalari O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti SH.M.Mirziyoevning "O'zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy ta'lim tizimini 2030-yilgacha rivojlantirish kontsepsiyasini tasdiqlash to'g'risida"gi Farmonida belgilangan "xalqaro tajribalardan kelib chiqib, oliy ta'limning ilg'or standartlarini joriy etish, jumladan o'quv dasturlarida nazariy bilim olishga yo'naltirilgan ta'limdan amaliy ko'nikmalarni shakllantirishga yo'naltirilgan ta'lim tizimiga bosqichma-bosqich o'tish"<sup>1</sup> vazifasining ijrosini ta'minlashda idrokiy-kognitiv model, pragmatik-diskursiv mexanizm va modellar yuzasidan olib borilgan qiyosiy tadqiqotlar muhim manba bo'lib xizmat qilishi mumkin.

O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining 2019-yil 8-oktyabrdagi PF-5847-sonli "O'zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy ta'lim tizimini 2030-yilgacha rivojlantirish kontsepsiyasini tasdiqlash to'g'risida", 2020-yil 20-oktabrdagi PF-6084-son "Mamlakatimizda o'zbek tilini yanada rivojlantirish va til siyosatini takomillashtirish chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida", 2022-yil 28-yanvardagi PF-60-sonli "2022-2026-yillarga mo'ljallangan Yangi O'zbekistonning taraqqiyot strategiyasi to'g'risida", 2023-yil 11-sentyabrdagi PF-158-son "O'zbekiston – 2030"

---

<sup>1</sup> O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining "O'zbekiston Respublikasi oliy ta'lim tizimini 2030 yilgacha rivojlantirish kontsepsiyasini tasdiqlash to'g'risida"gi Farmoni//PF-5847-son, 8.10.2019. URL: [lex.uz/docs/4545884](http://lex.uz/docs/4545884)

strategiyasi to'g'risidagi farmonlari, 2018-yil 5-iyundagi PQ-3775-son "Oliy ta'lim muassasalarida ta'lim sifatini oshirish va ularning mamlakatda amalga oshirilayotgan keng qamrovli islohotlarda faol ishtirokini ta'minlash bo'yicha qo'shimcha chora-tadbirlar to'g'risida", 2021-yil 19-maydagi PQ-5117-son "O'zbekiston Respublikasida xorijiy tillarni o'rganishni ommalashtirish faoliyatini sifat jihatidan yangi bosqichga olib chiqish chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida"gi qarorlari, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Vazirlar Mahkamasining 2017-yil 11-avgustdagi 610-sonli "Ta'lim muassasalarida chet tillarini o'qitishning sifatini yanada takomillashtirish chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida"gi Qarori hamda mazkur faoliyatga tegishli boshqa me'yoriy-huquqiy hujjatlarda belgilangan vazifalarni amalga oshirishda ushbu tadqiqot ishi muayyan darajada xizmat qiladi.

**Tadqiqotning respublika fan va texnologiyalari rivojlanishining ustuvor yo'nalishlariga mosligi.** Dissertatsiya respublika fan va texnologiyalari rivojlanishining: I. "Axborotlashgan jamiyat va demokratik davlatni ijtimoiy, huquqiy, iqtisodiy, madaniy, ma'naviy-ma'rifiy rivojlantirishda innovatsion g'oyalar tizimini shakllantirish va ularni amalga oshirish yo'llari" ustuvor yo'nalishiga muvofiq bajarilgan.

**Dissertatsiya mavzusi bo'yicha xorijiy ilmiy tadqiqotlar sharhi.** Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiya ta'minotida kogezi vositalar funkcionalligini o'rganishga yo'naltirilgan ilmiy izlanishlar jahonning yetakchi ilmiy markazlari va oliy ta'lim muassasalari, jumladan, Oxford University Language Centre, London Metropolitan University, Norwich Institute for Language Education (Buyuk Britaniya); University of Harvard, University of South Caroline, University of Texas (AQSH); Universitat Bonn (Germaniya); University of Oslo (Norvegiya); University of Vienna (Avstriya); Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (Niderlandiya); Stroudsburg Association of Computational Linguistics (Frantsiya); Sofia University (Bolgariya); Dublin City University (Irlandiya); University of Toronto (Kanada); Shanghai Foreign Languages University (Xitoy); English and Foreign Languages University (India); Moskva davlat universiteti, Sankt-Peterburg davlat universiteti (RF); shuningdek, Mirzo Ulug'bek nomidagi O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti, Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti, Buxoro davlat universiteti (O'zbekiston)da olib borilmoqda.

Dunyo tilshunosligida badiiy diskursida kogerensiya ta'minotida kogezi vositalar funkcionalligini o'rganish bo'yicha quyidagi ustuvor yo'nalishlarda tadqiqotlar olib borilmoqda: grammatik va leksik birliklar orqali kogerensiyaning ta'minlanishi, pragmatik yondashuv asosida kogezi vositalarning funkcionallik imkoniyatlarini o'rganish, kognitiv tilshunoslik doirasida diskurs elementlari o'rtasidagi semantik bog'liqlikni tahlil qilish, kogezi vositalarning madaniy va uslubiy xususiyatlarini adabiy matnlar doirasida o'rganish, madaniy kontekstlar kogerensiyaning shakllantirishdagi roli.

**Muammoning o'rganilganlik darajasi.** Jahon tilshunosligida matn va diskurs tahliliga bo'lgan e'tibor ortib, xususan, kogerensiya va kogeziyaning o'zaro aloqasi, ularni ta'minlovchi vositalarning turli lingvistik yondashuvlar – funkcionallik, pragmatik, kognitiv yondashuvlar asosida keng tadqiq etilgan.

Xususan, M.A.K.Halliday va R.Hasan ning *Cohesion in English*<sup>2</sup> asari asosiy nazariy poydevor bo‘lib xizmat qiladi. Unda kogeziy vositalar - grammatik va leksik birliklar orqali matnning bog‘liqligi va yaxlitligi izohlangan. R.de Bogrande va U.U.Dressler, J.Braun va J.Yul, J.Sinkler va M.Koulthard, T.Deborah, H.G.Uiddouson, S.Titscher va boshqalar, J.Renkem va boshqalar matn lingvistikasi va diskurs tahlili zamonaviy tilshunoslikning asosiy yo‘nalishlaridan biri, matnni mustaqil kommunikativ birlik sifatida o‘rganib, unda kogeziya va kogerensiyaga alohida e‘tibor qaratishgan<sup>3</sup>.

Pragmatik yondashuv doirasida D.Shiffrin, B.Frayzer, S.K.Levinson, K.Buler, H.P.Grays, D.Sperber va D.Uilson, R.Stalneyker, J.L.Ostin, J.Syorl<sup>4</sup> va boshqalarning tadqiqotlari muhim o‘rin tutsa, kognitiv yondashuv orqali matnni o‘quvchi ongida qanday mental modellar orqali tushunilishi bilan bog‘liq tadqiqotlar Tyun A. fan Dayk, U.Kintch, P.Uo‘rs, R.Shenk va R.Abelson, J.Braun va J.Yul<sup>5</sup> asarlarida kogerensiya va kogeziyani nutq va yozma matnlar doirasida pragmatik aspektdan yoritib, o‘quvchi yoki tinglovchining matnni qanday idrok etishi, qanday kutishlar asosida mantiqiy bog‘liqlik hosil qilinishi haqida asosli tahlillar bergan.

O‘zbek tilshunosligida A.Nurmonov, N.Mahmudov, Sh.S.Safarov, I.K.Mirzayev, Sh.Shaxobiddinova, Z.I.Rasulov, N.F.Qosimova, Sh.Abdurahmonova, G.Abdullayeva, Z.Ziyodova, N.E.Ermatova, M.M.Zokirovalarning tadqiqotlari matn va diskurs pragmatikasi, diskurs va uning lingvopragmatik xususiyatlari, diskursning kognitiv xususiyatlari va matn tuzilmasidagi kogeziy vositalar, ingliz badiiy matnlarida kogerensiyaning

---

<sup>2</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. *Cohesion in English*. – London: Longman, 1976. – 374 p; Halliday M.A.K., Hasan, Ruqaiya. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. – Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press, 1985. – 126 p.

<sup>3</sup> R.de Beaugrande, Dressler W.U. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. – London: Longman, 1976. – P. 3-95; Sinclair J, Coulthard M. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. – Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1975. – P.90-123; Deborah T. *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. – Washington, DC, USA: Georgetown University Press, 1982. – 365 p; Widdowson H.G. *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. – Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1979. – 202 p; Titscher S, Meyer M, Wodak R, Vetter E. *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. – London, UK: SAGE Publications, 2000. – 288 p; Renkema J. *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004. – 408 p.

<sup>4</sup> Schiffrin D. *Discourse markers*. – Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 342 p; Fraser B. "What are Discourse Markers?" *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 1999. – P.931-952; Levinson S.C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 420 p; Bühler K. *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language* (trans. Donald F. Goodwin, 1990). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1934/2011. – 282 p; Grice H.P. *Logic and Conversation*. In: Cole, P., & Morgan, J. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, 1975. – P. 41-58; Sperber D, Wilson D. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1986. – 380 p; Stalnaker R. *Pragmatic Presuppositions*. In: Munitz, M., & Unger, P. (Eds.), *Semantics and Philosophy*. New York: New York University Press, 1974. – P. 197-213; Austin J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. – 168 p; Searle J.R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p.

<sup>5</sup> Teun A. van Dijk. *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. – Hillsdale, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980. – P. 85-129; Kintsch W. *The Role of Knowledge in Discourse Comprehension: A Construction-Integration Model*. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 1988. – P. 163-182; Werth P. *Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*. London: Longman, 1999. – 432 p; Schank R.C, Abelson R.P. *Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977. – 248 p; Brown G, Yule G. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 288 p.

pragmatik asoslari, kogerensiya va kogezi vositalarning tarjima jarayonidagi talqini kabi masalalarga bag'ishlangan <sup>6</sup>.

Garchi yuqoridagi nazariyalar matn va diskursni tahlil qilishda muhim asos bo'lsa-da, aynan ingliz badiiy diskursida kogezi vositalarning kogerensiyani ta'minlashdagi funksional imkoniyatlarini kompleks tahlil qilgan tadqiqotlar nisbatan kam amalga oshirilgan. Ayniqsa, inglizabon yozuvchilarning qisqa hikoyalari asosida bu vositalarning grammatik, leksik, pragmatik va kognitiv jihatdan o'rganilishi dolzarb ilmiy masala hisoblanadi.

**Dissertatsiya tadqiqotning dissertatsiya bajarilgan oliy ta'lim yoki ilmiy-tadqiqot muassasasining ilmiy-tadqiqot ishlari rejalari bilan bog'liqligi.** Tadqiqot Buxoro davlat universiteti Ingliz tilshunosligi kafedrasining 2021-2026 yillarga mo'ljallangan "Pragmalingvistika, funktsional tarjimashunoslik, va til o'rgatish jarayonlari integratsiyasi" mavzuidagi ilmiy tadqiqot ishlari doirasida bajarilgan.

**Tadqiqotning maqsadi** ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiya ta'minotida kogezi vositalar funktsionalligini aniqlashdan iborat.

**Tadqiqotning vazifalari:**

ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiya va kogesiya tushunchalarining nazariy asoslarini o'rganish hamda ular o'rtasidagi o'zaro bog'liqlikni izohlash;

ingliz badiiy diskursida, xususan hikoyalar misolida grammatik kogezi vositalar: referensiya, ellipsis, substitutsiya, bog'lovchilar; leksik kogezi vositalar: sinonim, antonym, giponim, meronym, kollokatsiyalarning funksional tahlilini amalga oshirish;

ingliz badiiy diskursida pragmatik tasniflash, kontekst, diskurs markerlar, deiktik birliklar va ularning matn kogerensiyasidagi o'rnini aniqlash;

pragmatik yondashuv asosida badiiy diskursdagi kogerensiyani ta'minlovchi implikatura, presuppozitsiya va nutq aktlarining funktsionalligini aniqlash va ularning rolini ochib berish;

ingliz badiiy diskursida freym, skript, ssenariy, sxema kabi kognitiv mexanizmlarning matn kogerentligini ta'minlashdagi ahamiyatini tahlil qilish;

---

<sup>6</sup> Safarov Sh.S. Ingliz tilida diskurs va pragmatik tahlil. Toshkent: Sharq, 2020; Diskurs va koheziv vositalar: ingliz va o'zbek tillarida taqqoslash. *Filologiya masalalari*, 2017. – P. 45-60; Мирзаев И.К. Проблемы лингвопоэтической интерпретации стихотворного текста. Дисс.доктора филол.наук. – Ташкент: институт языкознания АН РУз, 1992. – 372 с; Rasulov Z.I. Nutqiy tuzilmalar axborot-diskursiv mazmuni shakllanishi jarayonida tejamkorlik tamoyilining faollashuvi (ingliz va o'zbek tillari materiali asosida). Fil.f.d. ... dissertatsiya. – B., 2022; Qosimova N.Q. Tarjima kognitiv mexanizmlarida psixolingvistik qoliqlar ishtirokining lingvomadaniy shartlanishi. Filol. fan. d-ri. (Dsc) ... diss. Avtoref. – B., 2024; Abdurahmonova Sh. Ingliz tilida pragmatik birliklarning lingvistik tahlili (deixis, presupposition, implicature). Filol. fan. bo'yicha falsafa d-ri. (PhD) ... diss. Avtoref. – T., 2018; Abdullaeva G. Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida matnning pragmatik strukturalari. Filol. fan. bo'yicha falsafa d-ri. (PhD) ... diss. Avtoref. – T., 2021; Ziyodova Z. Ingliz badiiy matnlarida kogerensiyaning pragmatik asoslari. Filol. fan. bo'yicha falsafa d-ri. (PhD) ... diss. Avtoref. – T., 2020; Ermatova N.E. Matn va diskurs pragmatikasi. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2016. – 135 b; Zokirova M.M. Diskurs va uning lingvopragmatik xususiyatlari. Toshkent: Fan, 2013. – 170b; Karimov A. "Matndagi bog'lovchilar orqali izchillikning ta'minlanishi." O'zbek tili va adabiyoti jurnal, 2020. – B.15-30; Tursunov X. "Diskursning kognitiv xususiyatlari va matn tuzilmasidagi kogezi vositalar." *Filologiya masalalari* jurnali, 2029. – B. 45-60; Yakubova G. "Ingliz tili badiiy matnlarida nutq aktlari va ularning pragmatik tahlili." *Filologiya masalalari*, 2012. – №2. B.45-51; Yusupova N. "Kogerensiya va kogezi vositalarning tarjima jarayonidagi talqini (ingliz va o'zbek tillari misolida)." *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2016. – №3. B. 82-88; Salomova M. "Matnning lingvopragmatik xususiyatlari: nutq aktlari va stilistik birliklar." *Til va adabiyot ta'limi*, 2014. – №4. B. 55-61.

kognitiv yondashuv asosida ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiyaning shakllanishida mental modelning vazifadorligi hamda inferensiyaning voqelanish shakllarini aniqlash.

**Tadqiqotning obyekt**i sifatida ingliz badiiy diskursida kogeziiv va kogerent vositalari tanlangan.

**Tadqiqotning predmet**ini ingliz badiiy diskursida kogeziiv vositalarning funksional xususiyatlari tashkil qiladi.

**Tadqiqotning usullari.** Dissertatsiyada tavsiflash, tasniflash, kontekstual-diskursiv, funksional-kommunikativ, lingvopragmatik, lingvokognitiv tahlil usullaridan foydalanilgan.

**Tadqiqotning ilmiy yangiligi quyidagilardan iborat:**

ingliz badiiy diskursida kogeziiv vositalarning kogerensiyani shakllantirishdagi funksional roli grammatik vositalar: referensiya, ellipsis, substitutsiya, bog'lovchilar hamda leksik vositalar: sinonim, antonim, giponim, meronim, leksik bog'lanma (kollokatsiya)lar badiiy matn izchilligi va mazmuniy yaxlitligini ta'minlashda birlamchi qiymat kasb etishi aniqlangan;

ingliz badiiy diskursdagi ma'no va mazmun yaxlitligini ta'minlovchi diskurs markerlar va deiktik birliklar matnni idrok etishga ta'sir ko'rsatadigan omil hamda uning kontekstual-pragmatik salohiyatini belgilashda ustuvor vositalar ekanligi isbotlangan;

ingliz badiiy diskursida gaplar o'rtasidagi mantiqiy bog'lig'lanishlar, kommunikativ maqsadlar aniq ifodalanmagan, biroq tushunilishi lozim bo'lgan tagma'no, implikatura hamda oldindan mavjud bo'lgan bilimlarga asoslangan tushuncha, presuppositiya kogerensiyaning pragmatik asosda namoyon bo'lishidagi ustivorligi dalillangan;

mental model nazariyasidan foydalanish asnosida ingliz badiiy diskursining subyekt bilim, tajriba va idroki darajasiga qarab, turlicha talqin qilinishi mumkinligini aniqlashda freym, skript, ssenariy, sxema kabi kognitiv vositalar ta'sirida resipient ongida yuzaga keladigan izchillik qoliplarining shakllanishi kogerensiya darajasiga bevosita ta'sir ko'rsatishi asoslangan;

ingliz badiiy diskursida kognitiv mantiqiy xulosa (inferensiya) resipientga matn ma'nolari tizimini, mavzuning kutilmaganda o'zgarishi natijasida yuzaga keladigan lisoniy va g'ayrilisoniy holatlarni tushunishda, hikoyaning kontekstual ma'no qirralari va kogerensiyasini ta'minlashda muhim omil ekanligi dalillangan.

**Tadqiqotning amaliy natijalari** quyidagilardan iborat:

ingliz badiiy diskursini tahlil qilishda kogesiya va kogerensiyani integrativ yondashuv asosida o'rganish metodikasi ishlab chiqilib, u orqali matnni grammatik, leksik, pragmatik va kognitiv jihatlardan izchil tahlil qilish imkoniyati yaratilgan hamda ushbu yondashuv tilshunoslik va adabiyotshunoslik sohalarida badiiy matnlarni chuqur tahlil qilishda qo'llanilishi asoslangan;

o'quv jarayonida badiiy matnlar asosida kogerensiya va kogeziyaga oid bilimlarni mustahkamlashga xizmat qiluvchi amaliy topshiriqlar majmuasi talabalarda matndagi izchillikni aniqlash, diskurs markerlarini farqlash, implikatura va presuppozitsiyani tushunish, shuningdek, kontekstual tafakkurni rivojlantirishga qaratilgani ochib berilgan;

pragmatik va kognitiv yondashuv asosida badiiy matnlarning kommunikativ tahlilini amalga oshirish bo'yicha namunaviy tahlil texnologiyasi matn ichidagi yashirin ma'no, kontekst, nutq aktlari va o'quvchining idrok modellarini aniqlash orqali kogerensiyani tushunishga yordam berishi va uni lingvodidaktik maqsadlarda ham qo'llash mumkinligi aniqlangan.

**Tadqiqot natijalarining ishonchligi** muammoning aniq qo'yilganligi, chiqarilgan xulosalarning dissertatsiyada tavsiflash, tasniflash, kontekstual-diskursiv, funksional-kommunikativ, lingvopragmatik, lingvokognitiv tahlil metodlari bilan asoslanganligi, nazariy g'oyalar va ma'lumotlar rasmiy manbalardan olinganligi, berilgan ilmiy-nazariy taklif va tavsiyalar amalda sinovdan o'tkazilganligi hamda natijalar vakolatli davlat organlari tomonidan tasdiqlanganligi bilan izohlanadi.

**Tadqiqot natijalarining ilmiy va amaliy ahamiyati.** Tadqiqot natijalarining ilmiy ahamiyati kommunikativ hamda kognitiv tilshunoslik g'oyalarini tilning diskursiv qonuniyatlari xususiyatlari, ingliz tilining funksional tizimi tadqiqiga tatbiq qilish imkoniyatida namoyon bo'ladi, shuningdek, olingan natijalar tilshunoslikning diskurs tahlili, kognitologiya, nutqiy tuzilmalar sintaksisi va pragmatikasiga oid qator muammolar yechimini izlash borasida nazariy ahamiyatga molikligi bilan belgilanadi.

Tadqiqotning amaliy ahamiyati, dastavval, uning natijalaridan oliy o'quv yurtlarida umumiy tilshunoslik, diskurs tahlili, matn lingvistikasi, zamonaviy tilshunoslik fanlari bo'yicha nazariy va amaliy mashg'ulotlarni o'tkazish va maxsus seminarlarni tashkil qilishda, yangi ko'rinishdagi darslik va o'quv qo'llanmalarini yaratish, turli ilmiy tadqiqot ishlarini bajarishda manba xizmatini o'tashi mumkinligida namoyon bo'lishi bilan izohlanadi.

**Tadqiqot natijalarining joriy qilinishi.** Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiya ta'minotida kogezi vositalar funksionalligi tadqiqini amalga oshirish jarayonida erishilgan ilmiy natijalar asosida:

ingliz badiiy diskursida kogezi vositalarning kogerensiyani shakllantirishdagi funksional roli grammatik vositalar: referensiya, ellipsis, substitutsiya, bog'lovchilar hamda leksik vositalar: sinonim, antonim, giponim, meronim, leksik bog'lanma (kollokatsiya)lar badiiy matn izchilligi va mazmuniy yaxlitligini ta'minlashda birlamchi qiymat kasb etishiga doir nazariy xulosalardan Toshkent davlat o'zbek tili va adabiyoti universitetida bajarilgan OT-F1-029 sonli "O'zbek davlatchiligi tarixida sug'diy til va yozuvining tutgan o'rni (mil.av.II – milodiy XII asrlar)" mavzuidagi fundamental loyihasida foydalanilgan (Toshkent davlat o'zbek tili va adabiyoti universitetining 2025-yil 3-iyundagi №01/4-2269-son ma'lumotnomasi). Natijada badiiy diskursga oid nazariy bilimlarni amaliy tahlil bilan uyg'unlashtirish orqali kommunikativ kompetensiyani oshirish imkoniyati yaratilgan;

ingliz badiiy diskursdagi ma'no va mazmun yaxlitligini ta'minlovchi diskurs markerlar va deiktik birliklar matnni idrok etishga ta'sir ko'rsatadigan omil hamda uning kontekstual-pragmatik salohiyatini belgilashda ustuvor vositalar ekanligi bilan bog'liq xulosalardan Toshkent davlat o'zbek tili va adabiyoti universitetida 2020-2023-yillarda bajarilgan AM-F3-201908172 "O'zbek tilining ta'limiy

korpusini yaratish” mavzuidagi amaliy loyihasida foydalanilgan (Toshkent davlat o‘zbek tili va adabiyoti universitetining 2025-yil 3-iyundagi №01/4-2270-son ma’lumotnomasi). Natijada ingliz badiiy diskursga oid nazariy ma’lumotlarni pragmatik tahlili orqali diskursiv kompetensiyani o‘rganish imkoniyati yaratilgan;

ingliz badiiy diskursida gaplar o‘rtasidagi mantiqiy bog‘lig‘lanishlar, kommunikativ maqsadlar aniq ifodalanmagan, biroq tushunilishi lozim bo‘lgan tagma’no, implikatura hamda oldindan mavjud bo‘lgan bilimlarga asoslangan tushuncha, presuppositiya kogerensiyaning pragmatik asosda namoyon bo‘lishidagi ustivorligiga doir xulosalardan Buxoro davlat universitetida AQSH Elchixonasi tomonidan moliyalashtirilgan SUZ80021IN3103-raqamli loyiha doirasida tashkil etilgan “Amerika adabiyoti klubi”da o‘tkazilgan Jon Steynbek, Frensis Skott Fitsdjerold va Ernest Xeminguey kabi amerika yozuvchilarining adabiy mahorati tahliliga bag‘ishlangan xorijiy loyihani bajarishda foydalanilgan (Urganch davlat universitetining 2025-yil 12-maydagi № 06/3059-son ma’lumotnomasi). Natijada o‘quvchilarga xorijiy til o‘rgatishda o‘qituvchilar tomonidan lingvota’limshunoslik terminlaridan samarali foydalanish imkoniyati yaratilgan.

mental model nazariyasidan foydalanish asnosida ingliz badiiy diskursining subyekt bilim, tajriba va idroki darajasiga qarab, turlicha talqin qilinishi mumkinligini aniqlashda freym, skript, ssenariy, sxema kabi kognitiv vositalar ta’sirida respient ongida yuzaga keladigan izchillik qoliplarining shakllanish kogerensiya darajasiga bevosita ta’sir ko‘rsatishiga oid xulosalardan O‘zbekiston Respublikasi oliy ta’lim, fan va innovatsiyalar vazirligining 2023-yil 29-noyabrdagi 673-sonli buyrug‘iga asosan berilgan №673-13 raqamli nashr guvohnomasi asosida 70230101 – Lingvistika (ingliz) mutaxassisligi talabalari uchun “Textlinguistics” nomli o‘quv qo‘llanmasini yaratishda foydalanilgan (Oliy ta’limni rivojlantirish tadqiqotlari markazining 2025-yil 16-maydagi №3226-son ma’lumotnomasi). Natijada kogeziya va kogerensiyaning til va nutqdagi o‘rni, qo‘llanishi, funksional xususiyatlariga doir nazariy hamda faktik materiallar orqali o‘quv adabiyoti mazmuni takomillashtirilgan;

ingliz badiiy diskursida kognitiv mantiqiy xulosa (inferensiya) respientga matn ma’nolari tizimini, mavzuning kutilmaganda o‘zgarishi natijasida yuzaga keladigan lisoniy va g‘ayrilisoniy holatlarni tushunishda, hikoyaning kontekstual ma’no qirralari va kogerensiyasini ta’minlashda muhim omil ekanligiga oid xulosalardan “Buxoro” telekanalining “Assalom, Buxoro”, “Najot bilimda” teleko‘rsatuvi ssenariysini tayyorlashda foydalanilgan (Buxoro viloyati teleradiokompaniyasining 2025-yil 13-maydagi №01-09-100-son ma’lumotnomasi). Natijada ushbu teleko‘rsatuvlar uchun tayyorlangan materiallarning mazmuni mukammallashtirilib, ilmiy dalillarga boy bo‘lishiga erishilgan va ko‘rsatuvning ilmiy-ommabopligi ta’minlangan.

**Tadqiqot natijalarining aprobatsiyasi.** Tadqiqot natijalari 15 ta ilmiy-amaliy anjumanda, shu jumladan, 4 ta xorijiy 11 ta respublika konferensiyalarida qilingan ma’ruzalarda aprobatsiyadan o‘tkazilgan.

**Tadqiqot natijalarining e’lon qilinganligi.** Dissertatsiya mavzusi bo‘yicha 32 ta ilmiy ish, shundan, 1 ta monografiya, 1 ta o‘quv qo‘llanma, 1 ta darslik

O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasining doktorlik dissertatsiyalari asosiy ilmiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan ilmiy nashrlarda jami 14 ta ilmiy maqola, jumladan, 4 tasi xorijiy va 10 tasi respublika jurnallarida chop etilgan.

**Dissertatsiyaning tuzilishi va hajmi.** Dissertatsiya kirish, to‘rt bob, xulosa, foydalanilgan adabiyotlar ro‘yxatidan iborat bo‘lib, umumiy hajmi 238 sahifani tashkil etadi.

## DISSERTATSIYANING ASOSIY MAZMUNI

**Kirish** qismida dissertatsiya mavzusining dolzarbligi va zarurati asoslangan, tadqiqotning maqsadi, vazifalari, obyekti, predmeti, respublika fan va texnologiyalar rivojlanishining ustuvor yo‘nalishlariga mosligi, ilmiy yangiligi, amaliy natijalari, olingan natijalarning ishonchliligi, ishning nazariy va amaliy ahamiyati, tadqiqot natijalarining amaliyotga joriy qilinishi, aprotatsiyasi, dissertatsiya tuzilishi bo‘yicha ma’lumotlar keltirilgan.

Dissertatsiyaning **“Kogeziya va kogerensiyaning nazariy asoslari”** deb nomlangan birinchi bobi uch fasldan tarkib topgan, unda kogerensiya va kogeziya tushunchalarining diskurs tahlilidagi o‘rni, badiiy diskurs doirasida kogerensiya va kogeziyaning ahamiyati, kogeziya va kogerensiyaga oid turli yondashuvlar va mazkur tadqiqotning nazariy asoslarini belgilash zaruriyati masalalar tadqiqi keltirilgan.

“Kogeziya” tushunchasi birinchi bo‘lib M.A.K.Xallidey va R.Hasan tomonidan ilmiy muomalaga kiritilgan bo‘lib, ularning asosiy e‘tibori matnda gaplarning o‘zaro qanday bog‘lanishini o‘rganishga qaratilgan. Ularning ta’kidlashicha, paragrafning turli qismlari o‘zaro kogeziv vositalar orqali bog‘lanadi.

*A text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text... If a passage of English containing more than one sentence is perceived as a text, there will be certain linguistic features present in that passage which can be identified as contributing to its total unity and giving it texture.*

M.A.K.Xallidey va R.Hasan ta’kidlaganlaridek, muallif matnda bog‘liq gaplar o‘rtasidagi ma’nolarni turli yo‘llar bilan bir butun holda ifodalash imkoniyatiga ega bo‘ladi va kogeziya aynan shu mazmun tuzilmasini shakllantirish uchun xizmat qiladi. Shuningdek, ular kogeziyani matnning yaxlit va uzviy bog‘langanligini yoki shunchaki aloqasiz gaplar to‘plami ekanligini ko‘rsatuvchi muhim omil sifatida baholaydilar. Biroq, alohida ta’kidlash kerakki, kogeziya gaplar o‘rtasidagi ma’noga daxldor bo‘lsa-da, u matnning mazmun jihatiga bog‘liq emas. M.A.K.Xallidey va R.Hasan ushbu holatni aniq ko‘rsatib o‘tganlar: **“Kogeziya matn nimani anglatishi bilan emas, balki uni semantik inshoot sifatida qanday tuzilganligi bilan bog‘liqdir”**<sup>7</sup>. Demak, kogeziya odatda paragraf doirasida muhim rol o‘ynasa-da, u butun matnning paragrafdan-paragrafga uzviylikini ta’minlamaydi.

---

<sup>7</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – 374 p;

Kogeziya gaplararo aloqani grammatik vositalar orqali ta'minlovchi til birliklari sifatida talqin qilinsa, kogerensiya H.G.Uiddouson tomonidan illokutsion aktlar o'rtasidagi munosabat sifatida ko'riladi. Ya'ni, biror nutq birligi kogerent deb baholanishi uchun, u orqali amalga oshirilayotgan harakatlar tinglovchi tomonidan anglanishi kerak. Nutq faqat kontekstda, ya'ni nutq strukturasi va kommunikativ strategiyalar orqali talqin qilinadi. Masalan, nutqni tushunishda biz ko'pincha agar bir gap boshqasidan keyin kelsa, ular o'rtasida qandaydir mantiqiy bog'liqlik bor deb taxmin qilamiz. Kogerensiya esa gaplar o'rtasidagi mantiqiy, semantik va kommunikativ aloqalar majmui sifatida qaraladi<sup>8</sup>. D.Shiffrin nuqtayi nazariga ko'ra, kogeziya turli xil nutq turlarida mavjud bo'lib, u so'zlovchi va tinglovchi o'rtasidagi interaktiv muloqot vositasi sifatida ishlatiladi. D.Shiffringa ko'ra, kogeziya vositalari – muloqot davomida ma'noni aniqlash va suhbatni anglashni osonlashtiruvchi ishoralaridir<sup>9</sup>. Shu sababli, nutq kogerensiyasi so'zlovchining turli lingvistik va nolingvistik vositalardan foydalangan holda o'z xabarini aniq kontekstda ifodalashi va tinglovchining ushbu ishoralarni bir butun tarzda anglash qobiliyatiga bog'liqdir.

R. de Bogrande va U.U.Dressler haqiqiy matn faqat grammatik jihatdan to'g'ri bo'lishi bilan emas, balki ma'no jihatdan yaxlit va kommunikativ vazifani bajara olishi bilan ajralib turadi deb ta'kidlashadi. Ular ilgari surgan yetti mezon kogeziya va kogerensiya bilan bir qatorda, intentionality (muallifning maqsadi), acceptability (o'quvchi tomonidan qabul qilinishi), informativity (yangi ma'lumot miqdori), situationality (matnning kontekstga bog'liqligi) va intertextuality (boshqa matnlar bilan aloqadorlik) matnning kommunikativ samaradorligini belgilovchi asosiy omillar sifatida qaraladi. Kogeziya matnda bog'lovchilar, ishora vositalari, sinonimiya va boshqa vositalar orqali yuzaga chiqsa, kogerensiya esa chuqur ma'no darajasida, mazmuniy izchillik va mantiqiy bog'liqlik orqali shakllanadi. Ularning yondashuvi matnni strukturaviy, semantik va pragmatik jihatdan kompleks tarzda o'rganish imkonini beradi<sup>10</sup>.

Kogerensiyani ta'minlashda diskurs markerlari ham muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi. Ular ishtirokchilarning muloqotini yengillashtiruvchi va mazmun, shakl va harakatlarni uyg'unlashtiruvchi vositalardir. Bular og'zaki nutqda lingvistik va ekstralingvistik (ya'ni, nolingvistik) belgilar bo'lib, ishtirokchilar o'rtasida umumiy tushunishni shakllantiradi. Biroq Shiffrin shuni ham qayd etadiki, nutq markerlarisiz ham mantiqan bog'langan bo'lishi mumkin. U agar suhbat kontekst doirasida davom etsa va gaplar o'rtasidagi ma'no aloqalari allaqachon aniqlangan bo'lsa, markerlar ishlatilishi shart emas deb ta'kidlaydi. Aksariyat hollarda, gaplar o'rtasidagi semantik munosabatlar tinglovchi yoki o'quvchi uchun yetarlicha aniq bo'ladi va markerlarsiz ham ularni tushunish mumkin deb hisoblaydi.

D.Bleykmor nutqni "gapning lingvistik shakli, kontekstual taxminlar va so'zlovchining o'z gapida dolzarb bo'lishi haqidagi taxmin" sifatida tavsiflaydi. D.Bleykmor ta'kidlaganidek, nutqni anglash ikki xil jarayon orqali amalga oshiriladi: aniq (explicit) va noaniq (implicit) jarayonlar. Aniq jarayon gap orqali

---

<sup>8</sup> Widdowson H.G. Explorations in Applied Linguistics. – Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1979. – 202 p;

<sup>9</sup> Schiffrin D. Discourse markers. – Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 342 p;

<sup>10</sup> R.de Beaugrande, Dressler W.U. Introduction to Text Linguistics. – London: Longman, 1976. – P. 3-95;

bevosita ifodalangan propozitsiyani aniqlashdan iborat bo'lsa, noaniq jarayon qo'shimcha, yashirin propozitsiyani aniqlashni o'z ichiga oladi. D.Bleykmor ning fikricha, relevansiya nazariyasi (relevance theory) nutqni anglash jarayonini har tomonlama tushuntira oladigan konsepsiyadir, chunki ayrim hollarda tinglovchining talqini faqatgina gapda aytilgan mazmunga emas, balki lingvistik bo'lmagan yoki kontekstual belgilarga ham asoslanadi. Bleykmor, shuningdek, kundalik muloqotda ishlatiladigan gaplarning ko'pi elliptik, ya'ni qisqa va to'liq bo'lmaganligini ta'kidlaydi. Masalan, oddiy suhbatda uchraydigan "Any e-mail?" kabi gaplar mustaqil ravishda aytilsa-da, tinglovchi tomonidan to'liq va aniq propozitsiyaga aylantiriladi va to'g'ri talqin qilinadi<sup>11</sup>. Demak, nutq kogerensiyasi to'g'ridan-to'g'ri tinglovchi bilan bog'liq bo'ladi va u har doim ham diskurs markerlari mavjudligidan dalolat bermaydi. D.Bleyk morning nuqtayi nazariga ko'ra, so'zlovchi matnda kogerensiyani tinglovchi uchun dolzarb etib ko'rsatganida, va tinglovchi so'zlovchi dolzarb bo'lishini taxmin qilganda, nutq to'g'ri anglanadi. Bunday holatda, tinglovchi yoki o'quvchi matnni talqin qilish uchun katta mas'uliyatni o'z zimmasiga oladi.

Kogerensiya, fan Dayk ta'rifiga ko'ra, "diskursning semantik xususiyati bo'lib, har bir gapning boshqa gaplar talqiniga nisbatan qanday talqin qilinishiga asoslanadi". Fan Dayk fikricha, gaplar o'rtasidagi kogerensiya faqat ketma-ket joylashgan propozitsiyalar o'rtasidagi aloqalarga emas, balki muayyan parchaning mavzusiga ham asoslanadi. Fan Dayk shuningdek, kogeziya kogerensiyani kafolatlamaydi va kogerensiyaning o'zi ham matnni butunlay izchil qilish uchun yetarli emasligini ta'kidlaydi. Ya'ni, matnda qo'shimcha til vositalari (masalan, kogeziy vositalar) bo'lmasa, u to'liq kogerent bo'lmaydi. Kogerensiyaning ikki darajasi mavjud:

1. Mikro-kogerensiya – propozitsiyalar o'rtasidagi ketma-ket yoki chiziqli bog'lanishlar.

2. Makro-kogerensiya – matn mavzusining umumiy rivojlanishi va butun diskursning mantiqiy izchiligi<sup>12</sup>.

N.E.Enkvist esa semantik bog'lanishning ikki turini ajratadi: 1) yuzaki darajadagi bog'lanish – kogeziya orqali; 2) chuqur darajadagi bog'lanish – kogerensiya orqali. N.E.Enkvist fikricha, kogeziya va kogerensiya bir-birini anglatmaydi. Ya'ni, matn kogeziy bo'lib, ammo kogerent bo'lmasligi yoki aksincha, kogerent bo'lib, ammo kogeziy bo'lmasligi mumkin. Shuningdek, matn bir vaqtda ham kogeziy, ham kogerent bo'lishi ham mumkin. Masalan: *Have you met Virasuda Sribayak? She was here yesterday.*

Ushbu misolda keltirilgan ikki gap "u" (she) olmoshi orqali grammatik bog'lanishga ega bo'lib, ular orasida semantik bog'lanish ham mavjud. Ya'ni, bu gaplar ham kogeziy, ham kogerent hisoblanadi. Quyidagi keying misolda esa, hech qanday grammatik yoki leksik bog'lovchi vosita (kogeziy element) ishlatilmagan bo'lsa-da, gaplar mazmunan bog'liq va kogerentdir. Ushbu misol kogerensiyaga

---

<sup>11</sup> Blakemore D. Understanding Utterances: An Introduction to Pragmatics. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1992. – 213 p;

<sup>12</sup> Teun A. van Dijk. Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition. – Hillsdale, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980. – P. 85-129;

ega, ammo kogeziy bo‘lmagan gap namunasini ko‘rishimiz mumkin. Masalan: *Liverpool shot a goal. The whistle blew.*

Keyingi misolda esa, gaplar orasida "uni" (him) olmoshi orqali grammatik bog‘lanish mavjud bo‘lib, u kogeziy vosita hisoblanadi, ammo gaplar o‘rtasida mazmun va mantiqiy izchillik, ya‘ni kogerensiya mavjud emas. Chunki pragmatik jihatdan bu gaplar bir-biri bilan mos kelmaydi. Ushbu gap kogeziy, lekin kogerent bo‘lmagan misol hisoblanadi. Masalan: *My grandfather died. I shall see him tomorrow.*

Matnda yuzaki kogeziya (surface cohesion) hamda umumiy kogerensiya (overall coherence) mavjud bo‘lishi zarur. N.E.Enkvist ta‘kidlaganidek, kogerentlik matndagi gaplar o‘quvchi yoki tinglovchining tajribasi yoki tasavvuridagi mavjud bo‘lishi mumkin bo‘lgan dunyo manzarasiga mos kelishi lozim. Shuningdek, matndagi xabar tinglovchi yoki o‘quvchi uchun matnni to‘g‘ri talqin qilish va bog‘lash imkonini beruvchi yetarli ishoralarni taqdim etishi kerak. U kogerensiyani “Matnni izchil dunyo manzarasiga mos qiladigan va uni umumlashtirish hamda talqin qilish imkonini beradigan sifat hisoblanadi”, deb ta‘riflaydi<sup>13</sup>. Shu bois, kogerensiya asosan matnning tabiati va xususiyati bilan bog‘liq bo‘ladi.

N.E.Enkvist kabi, J.Braun va J.Yul ham kogerensiya, birinchi navbatda, til orqali ifodalangan xabarlarining talqin qilinishiga bog‘liq ekanligini ta‘kidlashadi. Ularning fikricha, o‘quvchi yoki tinglovchi, hatto gaplar o‘rtasidagi bog‘lanishni ko‘rsatuvchi aniq kogeziy vositalar mavjud bo‘lmasa ham, gaplar ketma-ketligini kogerent deb talqin qilishga harakat qiladi.

*Within chunks of language which are conventionally presented as texts, the hearer/reader will make every effort to impose a coherent interpretation, i.e. to treat the language thus presented as constituting “text”. We do not see an advantage in trying to determine constitutive formal features which a text must possess to qualify as a “text.” Texts are what hearers and readers treat as texts* <sup>14</sup>.

Bundan tashqari, kogeziya va kogerensiyaga oid boshqa qarashlar ham mavjud. Masalan, R.Morgan va M.Sellner matnda mazmun (content) muhim o‘rin tutishini ta‘kidlaydilar. Ularning fikricha, kogeziya matn mazmuniga bog‘liq bo‘lib, shu bilan birga lingvistik natijalarni ham keltirib chiqaradi<sup>15</sup>. P.L.Kerrell esa kogeziya matnda kogerensiyani avtomatik ta‘minlamaydi, deb hisoblaydi, chunki “faqatgina mazmunning kogerensiyasi matnni kogerent qilmaydi”, aksincha, “matnni kogerent qiladigan qo‘shimcha lingvistik xususiyatlar (kogeziyaga o‘xshash) bo‘lishi ham mumkin” <sup>16</sup>. Demak, kogeziya – bu kogerensiyaning sababi emas, balki natijasidir. Sxemalar (schemata) asosida o‘quvchilar, hatto kam yoki umuman kogeziy vositalarsiz ham, matndan kogerensiyani anglab olishlari mumkin.

---

<sup>13</sup> Enkvist N.E. Coherence, Pseudocoherence, and Non-coherence. In *Nordic Prospects in Linguistic Theory*, edited by Jens Allwood and Jørgen L. Mey, Odense: Odense University Press, 1978. – P. 109-128;

<sup>14</sup> Brown G., Yule G. *Discourse Analysis*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 288 p.

<sup>15</sup> Morgan R., Sellner M. *Discourse Coherence and Human Experience. Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*. – Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980. – P. 363-380;

<sup>16</sup> Carrell P.L. *Cohesion Is Not Coherence*. – TESOL Quarterly, vol. 16, no. 4, 1982. – P. 479-488;

Matnshunoslik nuqtayi nazaridan M.Hoey leksik kogeziy vositalar matni qanday qilib tashkil etishini o'rgangan. U leksik birliklar va sintaktik takrorlar matndagi kogeziyani ta'minlashini tahlil qiladi. Tadqiqotida M.Hoey kogeziya va kogerensiya o'zaro bog'liq holda matn tashkil etishini ko'rsatadi. Umuman olganda, kogeziya kogerensiyani ta'minlovchi vosita sifatida qaraladi. Kogeziy va kogerent bo'lgan matn o'quvchiga axborotni tez va aniq anglash imkonini beradi. M.Hoey "Kogeziya – matnning xususiyati, kogerensiya esa o'quvchining matnga bergan bahosidir", deb ta'kidlaydi. Shuningdek, M.Hoey fikricha, leksik takror (lexical repetition), asosiy kogeziy vositalardan biri bo'lib, matnda bog'lanishlar tizimi va tarmog'ini yaratadi. U leksik takrorlar gaplar o'rtasidagi o'zaro bog'liqlikni ko'rsata olishini ta'kidlaydi. M.Hoey leksik takrorlarning sakkiz turini ajratadi: *oddiy leksik takror (simple lexical repetition)*, *murakkab leksik takror (complex lexical repetition)*, *oddiy o'zaro parafraz (simple mutual paraphrase)*, *oddiy qisman parafraz (simple partial paraphrase)*, *murakkab parafraz (complex paraphrase)*, *substitutsiya (substitution)*, *koreferensiya (co-reference)*, *ellipsis (ellipsis)*<sup>17</sup>.

A.M.Jons kogerensiyani ikki turga ajratadi: matnga asoslangan kogerensiya va o'quvchiga asoslangan kogerensiya. Uning ta'rifi ko'ra, matnga asoslangan kogerensiya matnning o'ziga xos xususiyati bo'lib, kogeziya va yaxlitlikni o'z ichiga oladi. Ushbu kogerensiya turi gaplarning qanday bog'langanligi va matnning qanday yaxlitligini anglatadi. O'quvchiga asoslangan kogerensiya esa o'quvchi va matn o'rtasidagi muvaffaqiyatli o'zaro aloqani talab qiladi. Ushbu turdagi kogerensiya o'quvchining kutilmalari va muallif maqsadi o'rtasidagi moslik darajasiga bog'liq bo'lib, matnning ichki tuzilmasi orqali namoyon bo'ladi<sup>18</sup>.

U.Konnor va A.M.Jons kogerent matni "o'quvchi kutilmalari ro'yobga chiqqan matn"<sup>19</sup> deb ta'riflaydi. O'quvchi matni talqin qilishda o'z dunyo haqidagi bilimlariga tayanadi va shu bilimlar matnning tuzilishi va mazmuni bilan mos kelishini kutadi. O'quvchi ushbu bilimlar orqali keyinchalik matnda keltiriladigan ma'lumotlarni oldindan taxmin qiladi. O'quvchi bilan o'zaro aloqada bo'lgan kogerent matn o'quvchining mantiqan ketma-ket g'oyalar haqidagi kutilmalarini qondiradi, bu esa o'quvchining matni tushunishiga va uning aniq ma'nosini anglashiga xizmat qiladi. Shu bilan birga, so'zlar va gaplarning yaxlit bog'lanishi orqali ifodalangan mantiqiy g'oyalar o'quvchining matndagi ma'lumotni oson va to'g'ri talqin qilishiga yordam beradi.

Garchi diskurs mavzusi bo'yicha tadqiqotlar murakkab soha bo'lsa-da, kogeziya va kogerensiya uning muhim jihati, diskursning ierarxik tashkil etilishini o'z ichiga oladi. L.Lotamatti o'quvchining matn va uning mavzusini qanday anglashini o'rgangan. Uning fikricha, kogerensiya aniq gap mavzusiga asoslanadi.

---

<sup>17</sup> Hoey M. *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991. – 244 p.

<sup>18</sup> Johns A.M. *Coherence and Academic Writing: Some Definitions and Suggestions for Teaching*. – TESOL Quarterly, vol. 20, no. 2, 1986. – P. 247-265;

<sup>19</sup> Connor U., Johns A.M. eds. *Coherence in Writing: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives*. – Alexandria, VA: TESOL, 1990. – 235 p;

U mavzu (topic) va izoh (comment) atamalaridan foydalanib, matn oqimini tahlil qilishga doir yondashuvni taklif etadi.

L.Lotamattiga ko'ra, mavzu, bu gap nimadan bahs etayotgani va izoh mavzu haqidagi ma'lumotdir. Har bir gap mavzusi matnning umumiy diskurs mavzusi bilan turli yo'llar bilan bog'liq bo'ladi. Diskurs mavzusi va kichik mavzular o'rtasidagi munosabatlar tizimi diskursning mavzuviy rivoji deb ataladi. Ushbu rivojlanish uch turdagi harakat orqali yuzaga chiqadi: Parallel rivojlanish (parallel progression) – ketma-ket gaplarda aynan bir mavzuning saqlanishi; ketma-ket rivojlanish (sequential progression) – oldingi gap izohining keyingi gapda yangi mavzu bo'lib paydo bo'lishi; kengaytirilgan parallel rivojlanish (extended parallel) – parallel rivojlanish bo'lib, u ketma-ket rivojlanish orqali uzilib, keyinchalik yana davom ettiriladi<sup>20</sup>.

Biroq, Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP), ya'ni funksional nazariya axborot oqimini boshqarish va diskursni tashkil etish uchun muqobil nazariy asosni taqdim etadi. Aksariyat FSP tarafdorlari gap mavzusi (topic), odatda, avvalgi gaplarda berilgan ma'lumotni ifodalaydi deb hisoblashadi. Izoh (comment) esa yangi ma'lumotni ifodalaydi, ya'ni oldingi gaplardan olinmagan yoki ularga bevosita bog'liq bo'lmagan ma'lumotni bildiradi. Shunday qilib, axborot oqimi mavzudan izohga tomon harakatlanadi, bu esa inson tafakkuri harakatini aks ettiradi, chunki ong yangi ma'lumotni qabul qilishdan oldin tanish yoki kontekstual ma'lumotga tayanadi. Shu bois, FSP nazariyotchilari gapni umumiy kommunikativ jarayon doirasidagi funksional qismlarga ajratish bilan shug'ullanadilar. Masalan, ingliz tilidagi oddiy gaplar ko'pincha mavzu va izoh elementlaridan iborat deb qaraladi. Gap mavzusi ko'pincha grammatik ega bilan bog'liq bo'ladi, izoh esa kesim bilan, ya'ni gapdagi asosiy diqqat markazi bilan bog'liq bo'ladi.

FSP talablariga mos keluvchi diskurs o'quvchi uchun o'qishga qulay va bog'langan bo'ladi. Mavzu (theme) o'rtasidagi bog'lanishlar odatda bir xil shaxs/obyekt zanjiri (identity chains), qisman o'xshashlik (partial identity), sinoimiya (synonymy), antonimiya (antonymy), giperonimiya (hyponymy) va meronimiya (meronymy) kabi semantik munosabatlar orqali yuzaga chiqadi. Rema (rheme) o'rtasidagi bog'lanishlar esa ketma-ket gaplarda takrorlanuvchi identik hukmlar (predikatsiyalar) orqali hosil bo'ladi. Shuni ta'kidlash kerakki, tema va rema o'rtasidagi bog'lanishlar modeli matnning faqat bir qismini izohlash uchun xizmat qiladi. Matndagi turli xil bog'lanish naqshlari (patterns) butun matnni qamrab oladi. Bundan tashqari, mavzu va izoh bog'lanishi modeli matn ichidagi bog'lanish naqshlarini ifodalashi mumkin bo'lsa-da, har xil matn janrlarida uchraydigan kogerensiyani (mazmuniy bog'liqlikni) to'liq tushuntirib bera olmaydi. Ya'ni, kontekstual va predikativ vaziyatlarda (propositional situations) uchraydigan kogerensiyani bu model yordamida har doim ham tushuntirish imkoni yo'q.

---

<sup>20</sup> Lautamatti L. Observations on the development of the topic in simplified discourse. In V. Kohonen & N.E. Enkvist (Eds.), *Text linguistics, cognitive learning, and language teaching*, 1978. – P. 71-104.

M.A.K. Xallidey va Ruqaya Hasan tomonidan ilgari surilgan kogeziy bog‘lanishlar (cohesive ties) nazariyasi keyinchalik kogeziy uyg‘unlik (cohesive harmony) nazariyasiga aylantirildi<sup>21</sup>. Matnni yaxlit va yaxshi yozilgan deb baholashda faqat kogeziy bog‘lanishlardan foydalanish cheklovlari sababli, R.Hasan kogeziy uyg‘unlik nazariyasini yaratdi. Ushbu yondashuvga ko‘ra, kogerensiya (mazmuniy bog‘liqlik) matnda qanday va qancha kogeziy bog‘lanishlar ishlatilgani bilan emas, ularning bir-biri bilan qanday va qanchalik tez-tez o‘zaro ta’sirga kirishishi bilan belgilanadi. R.Hasanning nazariyasiga ko‘ra, ikki turdagi kogeziy bog‘lanishlar bir-biri bilan o‘zaro aloqada bo‘lishi mumkin: identik zanjirlar (identity chains) – shaxs olmoshlari (pronominal cohesion) orqali hamda o‘xshashlik tizimlari (similarity strings) – substitutsiya (almashtirish), ellipsis (tushirish), takrorlash, sinonimiya, antonimiya, giperonimiya va meronimiya orqali ifodalanadi. O‘zaro ta’sir (interaction) bir zanjir yoki tizim a’zosi boshqa bir yoki undan ortiq zanjir yoki tizim a’zolari bilan identik munosabatda bo‘lganida yuzaga keladi.

Ikkinchi bob **“Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogeziya va uning funksional yondashuvdagi talqini”** deb nomlangan bo‘lib, unda M.A.K. Xallidey va R.Hasan tomonidan ilgari surilgan kogeziy vositalar nazariyasi, grammatik va leksik darajadagi kogeziy vositalar, ushbu vositalarning badiiy diskurs tarkibida matn birligini ta’minlashdagi o‘rni, ingliz badiiy diskursida bog‘lovchilarning funksional vazifalari, ularning kogerensiyani shakllantirishdagi roli, leksik kogeziy vositalar va ularning o‘ziga xosligi masalalari yoritilgan.

Kogeziya tushunchasi funksional yondashuvda, xususan M.A.K. Xallidey va R.Hasan tomonidan ishlab chiqilgan tizimli-funksional tilshunoslik modeli doirasida keng yoritilgan. Ushbu yondashuvga ko‘ra, matn kogeziyasining asosiy ko‘rinishlari grammatik va leksik vositalar orqali yuzaga chiqadi. Grammatik kogeziy vositalarga referensiya, ellipsis, substitutsiya va bog‘lovchilar kirsas, leksik vositalar esa sinonimiya, antonimiya, giperonimiya, meronimiya va kollokatsiyani o‘z ichiga oladi<sup>22</sup>. Aynan mana shu birliklar matn birligi va izchilligini, ya’ni kogerensiyani ta’minlovchi vositalar sifatida xizmat qiladi.

M.A.K. Xallidey va R.Hasan grammatik kogeziyaning to‘rtta asosiy turi: *referensiya*, *substitutsiya*, *ellipsis* va *bog‘lovchilarga* ajratadi. Ulardan referensiya grammatik kogeziyaning markaziy komponentlaridan biri bo‘lib, matnning ichki izchilligini ta’minlashda asosiy vosita sifatida xizmat qiladi. U matn ichida yoki tashqarisida joylashgan obyekt, hodisa yoki shaxsga ishora qilish orqali bog‘lanishni mustahkamlaydi. Referensiya ikki xil amalga oshadi: *endofora* – ishoraning talqini matn ichida berilganda, *ekzofora* – ishoraning talqini matndan tashqaridagi kontekstual ma’lumotlarga tayanilganda. Endofora esa o‘z navbatida *anafora* va *kataforaga* ajratiladi: anafora matnda oldinroq tilga olingan elementga qayta murojaat qilsa, katafora keyingi bo‘limlarda ochiladigan elementga ishora qiladi<sup>23</sup>.

---

<sup>21</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective. – Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press, 1985. – 126 p;

<sup>22</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – 374 p.

<sup>23</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – P.33.

Masalan: *Framton Nuttel endeavoured to say the correct something...He doubted more than ever whether these formal visits...* (H.H.Munro (Saki), “The Open Window”). Bu yerda *he Framton Nuttelga* ishora qiluvchi anaforik referensiya hisoblanadi.

Keyingi, *She was waiting for her husband to come home. Mary Maloney sat quietly in the chair.* (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”) misolda esa dastlab ishora, keyin *Mary Maloney* nomi keyin keltirilgan bo‘lib, ushbu misol kataforik referensiya sifatida talqin qilinadi.

Masalan: *There is one day that is ours. There is one day when all we Americans who are not self-made go back to the old home to eat saleratus biscuits and marvel how much nearer to the porch the old pump looks than it used to* (O.Henry, “Two Thanksgiving Day Gentlemen”). – egzoforik referensiya, *Thanksgivingga* bo‘lgan ishora bilvosita, noaniq tarzda berilgan. Barcha amerikaliklarning birgalikda ovqatlanishi va bayram marosimlarida ishtirok etishiga doir umumiy tajribani eslatadi. Adresatning *Thanksgiving* haqidagi madaniy bilimlari bu ishoraning ma’nosini ochib, qahramonlarning xatti-harakatlarini kengroq madaniy ramkaga joylashtiradi va shu yo‘l bilan matnga kogerentlik hosil bo‘ladi. *Ours* sifatida tilga olingan *Thanksgiving*, adresatning oldindan mavjud bilimiga tayanadi, ya’ni bu bayramning Amerika madaniyatidagi minnatdorchilik, to‘yib ovqatlanish va oilaviy an’analar kabi asosiy ma’nolarini tushunishiga ishonadi. Hikoya davomida, shuningdek, *Thanksgiving* davrida saxovat va kam ta’minlanganlarga yordam berishning ijtimoiy kutilganligi haqidagi ishoralar ham uchraydi. Qariya jentlmenning har yili kam ta’minlangan bir kishini *Thanksgivingda* ovqatlantirish odati, ushbu bayramda ehtiyojmandlarga yordam berishning keng tarqalgan ijtimoiy an’anasini ifodalaydi, ayniqsa, minnatdorchilik va hamjihatlik g‘oyalari bilan yo‘g‘rilgan *Thanksgiving* kunida. Referensiya vositalari matndagi g‘oyalarni ortiqcha takrorlamasdan izchil ifodalashga xizmat qiladi.

*Ellipsis* matnda ilgari aytilgan ma’lumotni takrorlamasdan, grammatik birlikni tushirib qoldirish orqali ko‘rsatiladigan bog‘lanish vositasi bo‘lib, u adresatdan kontekst asosida ma’lumotni to‘ldirishni talab qiladi. Ellipsis odatda gap bo‘laklari yoki to‘liq gap darajasida bo‘lishi mumkin. Ushbu xususiyatiga ko‘ra verbal (fe‘l), nominal (ot) va clausal (gaping bir qismi) turlarga bo‘linadi. Masalan, “*You want these Idaho potatoes?*” “*Oh yes, that’ll be fine. Two of those.*” (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”) Mazkur dialogda *those* birligi nominal ellipsisni ifodalab kelgan, yani *two of those (potatoes)* tushirib qoldirilgan. Ushbu misolda adresat tushirib qoldirilgan mazmuni osonlik bilan to‘ldira oladi, bu esa muloqotni ixcham va ravon qilishga yordam beradi, ayni paytda kogerensiyani ham ta’minlaydi.

Navbatdagi yana bir muhim grammatik kogeziya vosita – *substitutsiya (almashtirish)* bo‘lib, u biror til birlikning o‘rnini boshqa umumiy so‘z yoki ibora bilan almashtirish orqali kogeziya hosil qilinadi. U ham verbal, nominal va klozal turlarga bo‘linib, ko‘pincha *do, one, the same, so, such* kabi so‘zlar yordamida amalga oshiriladi. Masalan, *Jim looked at the chain admiringly. Della hoped he would do so* (O. Henry, “The Gift of the Magi”). Bu yerda *do so* konstruktsiyasi

oldingi fe'l guruhini takrorlamasdan saqlab kelgan. Substitutsiya takrorlashning oldini olish bilan birga, matnning stilistik ifodasini boyitadi va kogerensiyani ta'minlashda muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi.

Kogezivlikka hissa qo'shadigan yana bir muhim grammatik vositalardan *bog'lovchilar (conjunctions)* bo'lib, ular gaplar, bo'laklar va matnning yirik segmentlarini o'zaro birlashtirish orqali mantiqiy izchillik va kogerensiyani ta'minlaydi. M.A.K.Xallidey va R.Hasan yuqorida bayon qilganimizdek, bog'lovchilarni to'rt asosiy turini *additive (qo'shimcha ma'lumot qo'shish)*, *adversative (qarama-qarshi munosabatni ko'rsatish)*, *causal (sabab-oqibatni bildiruvchi)* va *temporal (voqealar ketma-ketligini ifodalovchi)* qayd etishgan<sup>24</sup>. Ingliz badiiy diskursida, ayniqsa qisqa hikoyalarda, bog'lovchilar o'quvchini voqea rivoji, qarama-qarshiliklar, sabab-oqibat munosabatlari hamda vaqt yoki nuqtai nazardagi o'zgarishlarni kuzatishda yo'naltiradi. Ingliz badiiy diskursida, ayniqsa qisqa hikoyalarda bog'lovchilar voqealar rivoji, personajlararo munosabatlar va tematik izchillikni yaratishda asosiy vositalardan biri sifatida xizmat qiladi. Ular orqali matnda sababiylik, qarama-qarshilik yoki emotsional holatlar aniq va tabiiy ifodalanadi.

Leksik kogeziv vositalar esa matndagi birliklar orasidagi semantik aloqani ta'minlovchi vositalar hisoblanib, ular orasida takror, sinonimiya, antonimiya, giponimiya, meronimiya va ayniqsa kollokatsiyalar muhim o'rin tutadi. Takror ma'no urg'usini oshirsa, sinonimiya va antonimiya stilistik boylik keltiradi. Masalan, *He was a painter... Behrman was a failure in art... this old artist had always dreamed of painting a masterpiece* (O. Henry, "The Last Leaf"). Mazkur fragmentda bir xil referent dastlab *painter*, keyinchalik *artist* leksemalari orqali ifodalanadi. Ushbu birliklar to'liq sinonim bo'lmasa-da, bir xil semantik maydonga mansub bo'lib, umumiy kasbiy identifikatsiyani bildiradi. Sinonimik qayta nominatsiya diskursda referensial uzluksizlikni saqlaydi, chunki o'quvchi ikkala leksemani bir xil referent bilan bog'laydi. Bunday leksik bog'lanish matn segmentlari o'rtasidagi semantik aloqani mustahkamlaydi va kogerentlikni ta'minlaydi.

Leksik kogeziv vositalar sifatida giponimiya va meronimiya ham diskursda semantik munosabatlar sifatida matnning yaxlitligi va izchilligini ta'minlashda muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi. Giponimiya umumiy va xususiy atamalar orasidagi munosabatlar, meronimiya butun va uning qismlari o'rtasidagi bog'liqliklar hikoya doirasida ma'noiy aloqalarni shakllantirishda muhim ahamiyatga ega. Masalan, *She carried the meat into the kitchen, placed it in a pan, turned the oven on high, and shoved it inside... ...She lifted it out, and looked at it... A leg of lamb* (Roald Dahl, "Lamb to the Slaughter"). Bu yerda umumiy kategoriya *meat* keyingi segmentda uning konkret realizatsiyasi *lamb* orqali aniqlashtiriladi. Muhim jihat shundaki, bu ikki birlik turli referentlarni emas, balki bitta obyektning turli darajadagi semantik ifodasini bildiradi. Diskursda semantik rivojlanish quyidagicha sodir bo'ladi, *general category (meat) → specific type (lamb) → concrete object (leg of lamb)*. Bu ierarxiya o'quvchi ongida referentni bosqichma-

---

<sup>24</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – P.238.

bosqich aniqlashtiradi. Dastlab *meat* umumiy, noaniq tushuncha sifatida qabul qilinadi. Keyingi segmentda esa *lamb* orqali bu tushuncha torayadi va aniq referent shakllanadi. Mazkur fragmentda giponimiya faqat leksik bog‘lanish emas, balki narrativ rivojlanish mexanizmi sifatida ham ishlaydi.

Keyingi misolda butun-qism munosabatli leksik kogeziyani ko‘rishimiz mumkin. Masalan, *The watch was his father's and his grandfather's. And now it was Jim's. And the next thing he knew, the chain was gone* (O. Henry, “The Gift of the Magi”). Mazkur fragmentda *watch* diskursning asosiy referenti sifatida kiritiladi, keyingi segmentda esa uning tarkibiy elementi *chain* tilga olinadi. Semantik ierarxiya *material object* → *personal possession* → *watch* → *chain* tarzida shakllangan. Bu yerda *chain* yangi referent sifatida emas, balki mavjud obyektning strukturaviy komponenti sifatida interpretatsiya qilinadi. Shu sababli diskursning referensial markazi o‘zgarmaydi. Ushbu jumlada meronimik bog‘lanish bir nechta funksiyalarni bajaradi: a) referensial aniqlashtirish – *chain* birlik *watch* obyektining ichki tuzilishini ochadi; b) semantik integratsiya – ikkala birlik bitta konseptual model tarkibida qabul qilinadi; c) interpretativ uzluksizlik – o‘quvchi yangi obyektini emas, balki mavjud obyektning qismi sifatida interpretatsiya qiladi. Shu tariqa, diskurs elementlari yagona semantik markaz asosida integratsiyalashib kogerentlikni yaratadi.

Tadqiqot davomida bir nechta vositalarning ham bir kontekstdagi voqelanishi ingliz badiiy diskursida leksik kogeziyaning murakkab integratsiyasini namoyon etadi. Bunday qo‘shma qo‘llanish strategiyasi matnni faqatgina semantik bog‘lanish darajasida emas, balki ko‘p qatlamli diskursiy tizim sifatida ham boyitadi.

Masalan: *Mary was in shock, a state of astonishment that turned into calm determination. The dinner – lamb, peas and potatoes – was set neatly, every plate and fork in place. Yet the scene swung between life and death, warmth and coldness, love and betrayal.* (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”). *Shock* – *astonishment* sinonimlari qahramonning psixologik holatini ifodalashda turli intensiv darajalarini ko‘rsatadi. *Shock* keskin zarbani, *astonishment* esa hayrat va taajjubning yumshoqroq, ammo baribir kuchli darajasini bildiradi. Shu orqali adresant sinonimlardan foydalanib, voqeaning emotsional kuchini bosqichma-bosqich kuchaytiradi. *Life – death, warmth – coldness, love – betrayal* antonim juftliklari esa voqeadagi dramatik burilish va yashirin ziddiyatlarni ochib beradi. Ular qotillik, ruhiy iztirob va ijtimoiy-psixologik kontrastni semantik darajada aniq ifodalab, hikoyaning dramatik ohangini mustahkamlaydi. *Lamb, peas, potatoes – dinner* giponimik qatori ovqat elementlarini umumiy kategoriya ostida birlashtirib, matnda tematik yaxlitlikni hosil qiladi. Bu sanash oddiy uy sahnasini ko‘rsatib, voqeaga kundaliklik va realistik tus beradi. *Plate – fork – table – dinner scene* meronimik munosabatlari esa qism-butun struktura orqali voqeaning makoniy tasvirini mustahkamlaydi. Detallarning ketma-ket berilishi oddiy oilaviy muhitni vizual tarzda boyitib, dramatik voqeaga kontrastli fon yaratadi. Ushbu murakkab leksik tarmoqni idrok etar ekan, voqeani ko‘p qirrali darajalarda anglash imkonini yaratadi. Ingliz badiiy diskursida bunday integratsiyalashgan ko‘p qatlamli bog‘lanishlar kogerensiyani har yuqori darajada mustahkamlashga xizmat qiladi.

Kollokatsiyalar esa doimiy leksik juftliklar orqali matnga tabiiylik va kontekstual uyg'unlik bag'ishlaydi. Masalan: *make a decision, strong tea, heavy rain* kabi birikmalar ingliz badiiy diskursida tez-tez uchraydi. Qisqa hikoyalarda kollokatsiyalar personajlarning ruhiy holatini, ijtimoiy fonni va ironik vaziyatlarni ifodalashda ko'p qo'llaniladi. Masalan, *She took his coat and hung it in the closet. Then she walked over and **made the drinks**, a strong one for him, a weak one for herself... he lifted the glass... the ice cubes tinkled... he **finished the drink** quickly and **poured himself another*** (Roald Dahl, "Lamb to the Slaughter"). *Drink* konsepti atrofida shakllangan leksik kollokatsion birliklar kundalik turmush ssenariysini hosil qiladi. *Make, pour, finish* fe'llari ichimlik iste'mol qilish bilan bog'liq tipik harakatlar ketma-ketligini ifodalaydi. Ushbu birliklar leksik maydon birligini ta'minlab, diskursda vaziyatning tabiiyligini kuchaytiradi. Aynan shu normallik keyinchalik buzilgani sababli hikoyadagi dramatik burilish yanada kuchliroq seziladi. Kollokatsiya nafaqat kogeziya, balki pragmatik kontrast orqali kogerentlikni ham mustahkamlaydi desak bo'ladi.

Keyingi misol ma'lum semantik doirada cheklangan kombinatsiya, *The cold breath of autumn had stricken its leaves from the vine... skeleton bare branches clung to the crumbling bricks* (O. Henry, "The Last Leaf"). *Restricted collocations* muayyan semantik maydon bilan bog'langan hisoblanib, ularning komponentlari cheklangan kombinatsiyalarda uchraydi. Ushbu misolda, *bare branches* yoki *fallen leaves* birliklari fasl o'zgarishi bilan bog'liq tasviriy kollokatsiyalar sifatida talqin qilinishi mumkin. Bu birliklar kuz fasli konseptual modelini hosil qiladi. M.A.K. Xallidey va R.Hasan yondashuvida bunday kollokatsiyalar semantik yaqinlik orqali matnning tematik yaxlitligini ta'minlaydi. Adresat kuz manzarasini alohida tasvirlar yig'indisi sifatida emas, balki yagona situatsion fon sifatida qabul qiladi.

Xulosa qilib aytganda, grammatik va leksik kogeziy vositalar matnning strukturaviy yaxlitligini, semantik izchilligini va stilistik mukammalligini ta'minlaydi. Ingliz badiiy diskursida ushbu vositalarning funksional tahlili matn kogerensiyasini chuqurroq anglash, shuningdek, muallifning uslubiy yondashuvi va kommunikativ strategiyasini tahlil qilish imkonini beradi. Mualliflarning badiiy matnlarida bu vositalarning keng qo'llanilishi matnning nafaqat lingvistik, balki mantiqiy yaxlitligi hamda kogerentligini ham shakllantiradi.

Uchinchi bob "**Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogeziya va kogerensiyaning pragmatik tadqiqi**" deb nomlanadi. Unda pragmatik yondashuvda kogerensiya, kontekst va uning talqin bilan bog'liqligi, diskurs markerlar, deiktik birliklar, implikatura, presuppozitsiya va nutq aktlari kabi pragmatik vositalarning kogerensiyaga ta'siri masalasi muhokama qilingan.

Bu borada bir qator olimlarning ishlari alohida ahamiyatga ega. Herbert Pol Graysning muloqot maksimalari va implikatura nazariyasi, ayniqsa, yashirin ma'no va matn izchilligi tushunchalarini tahlil qilishda muhim asos bo'lib xizmat qiladi. J.Syorl va J.L.Ostin "Speech act theory" orqali matndagi gaplar ortidagi illokutsion maqsadlarni aniqlash orqali kogerensiyani tushuntiradi. Debora Shiffrin "Discourse markers" asarida diskurs markerlar (masalan, *so, because, and, but*) matnning mantiqiy oqimida ulkan ahamiyat kasb etishi haqida to'xtalib o'tgan. Bryus Frayzer diskurs markerlarining

funksional turlarini ajratib bergan holda, ularning gaplararo semantik va pragmatik bog‘liqlikni ta‘minlovchi vosita sifatidagi rolini aniqlagan. U “Discourse markers” tushunchasini ilmiy muomalaga olib kirgan asosiy olimlardan hisoblanadi. Den Sperber va Diedre Uilson “Relevance Theory” orqali kontekstga mos axborot tanlovi va interpretatsiyasining kogerensiyadagi o‘rnini izohlaydi. Stefen Levinson tomonidan ishlab chiqilgan pragmatik nazariyada muloqot jarayonida yashirin ma‘no, implikatura, presuppozitsiya va kontekstning matn kogerensiyasidagi o‘rnini izohlaydi. U Grays ishlanmalarini chuqurlashtirib, konversatsion struktura va ijtimoiy kontekst doirasida matnning qanday izchil tuzilishini ko‘rsatadi<sup>25</sup>.

Ingliz badiiy diskursida mazmuniy izchillikni ta‘minlash nafaqat grammatik va leksik vositalar orqali, balki kontekst, nutq holati va muloqotga xos pragmatik vositalar orqali ham yuzaga chiqadi. Pragmatik yondashuv kogerensiyani o‘rganishda adresant va adresatning o‘zaro anglashuvi, ijtimoiy munosabatlari, kontekstual sharoit va nutqning maqsadiga asoslanadi. Ayniqsa, ingliz badiiy adabiyotida, xususan, qisqa hikoyalarda diskursning chuqur pragmatik qatlamlari personajlararo munosabatlar, voqea rivoji va dramatik keskinlikni anglashda hal qiluvchi rol o‘ynaydi. Ushbu bo‘limda kogerensiyani ta‘minlovchi asosiy pragmatik vositalar: diskurs markerlar, deiktik birliklar, implikatura, presuppozitsiya va nutq aktlari tahlilga tortilgan.

Diskurs markerlar (discourse markers) nutqdagi gaplar, g‘oyalar va kontekstlar o‘rtasidagi semantik, mantiqiy yoki temporal bog‘liqlikni ko‘rsatib beruvchi birliklar hisoblanadi. Ular matndagi axborotlar oqimini boshqarish, voqealar o‘rtasidagi sababiy yoki kontrast munosabatlarni bildirish, shuningdek, adresatning e‘tiborini kerakli nuqtaga yo‘naltirish funksiyalarini bajaradi. D.Shiffrinning tasnifiga ko‘ra, eng ko‘p uchraydigan *and, but, or, so, because, now, then, well, I mean, you know* kabi diskurs markerlarni pragmatik darajadagi asosiy ko‘rsatkichlar sifatida tavsiflab, ularni beshta diskursiy “plane” bo‘yicha tahlil qiladi, ular: *ideational, actional, exchange structure, information state* va *participation framework*<sup>26</sup>.

Masalan, “*Hullo Sam,*” *she said brightly.*

“*Good evening, Mrs. Maloney. How’re you?*”

“*I want some potatoes please, Sam. Yes, and I think a can of peas.*”

“*Anything else?*” *the grocer asked.*

“*Well – what would you suggest, Sam?*”

“*How about a nice big slice of cheesecake?*”

“*Perfect,*” *she said.* (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”). Mazkur fragmentda bir nechta diskurs markerlar bir vaqtning o‘zida turli pragmatik

---

<sup>25</sup> Grice H.P. Logic and Conversation. In: Cole, P., & Morgan, J. (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts, New York: Academic Press, 1975. – P. 41-58; Austin J.L. How to Do Things with Words. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. – 168 p; Searle J.R. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p; Schiffrin D. Discourse markers. – Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 342 p; Fraser, B. What are Discourse Markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 1999. – P.931-952; Sperber D., Wilson D. Relevance: Communication and Cognition (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1986. – 380 p; Levinson S.C. Pragmatics. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 420 p;

<sup>26</sup> Schiffrin D. Discourse markers. – Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 342 p;

qatlamlarda faoliyat ko‘rsatib, dialogning ko‘p darajali kogerentligini ta‘minlashini ko‘ramiz. *Mazmuniy qatlam* darajasida *and* markeri qo‘shimcha axborotni kiritib, propositsiyalar o‘rtasida semantik bog‘lanish hosil qiladi. *Muloqot almashinuv qatlami* nuqtai nazaridan *well* javobni yumshoq boshlash orqali replika almashinuvi jarayonini tartibga soladi. *Nutqiy harakat qatlami* darajasida *how about* taklif nutq aktini shakllantirib, kommunikativ harakatni yo‘naltiradi. *Ishtirokchilar tuzilmasi qatlamida* esa *well* adresant va adresat o‘rtasidagi ijtimoiy muvozanatni saqlashga xizmat qiladi. *Umumiy bilim maydoni* nuqtai nazaridan *yes* yangi axborotning qabul qilinganini bildiradi. Shiffrin yondashuviga ko‘ra bunday ko‘p qatlamli markerlar diskursni yagona kommunikativ tizimga birlashtiradi. Adresat dialogni o‘zaro bog‘langan nutq harakatlari tizimi sifatida qabul qilib, pragmatik kogerentlik kompleks tarzda yuzaga keladi.

Pragmatik yondashuvda kogerensiyani ta‘minlovchi vositalardan biri sifatida *deiktik birliklar* ham muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi. S. Levinson ularni pragmatikaning markaziy kategoriyalaridan biri deb baholab, besh asosiy turini – *shaxs (personal)*, *zamon (temporal)*, *makon (spatial)*, *diskurs (discourse)* va *ijtimoiy (social)* ajratib ko‘rsatadi<sup>27</sup>.

Masalan, “*My aunt will be down presently, Mr. Nuttel,*” said the young lady; “*in the meantime you must try and put up with me.*” (Saki, “The Open Window”). Mazkur fragmentda bir nechta deiktik birliklar nutq vaziyatining ko‘p koordinatali modelini yaratadi. *Personal deixis (you, me)* adresant va adresat o‘rtasidagi kommunikativ rollarni aniqlaydi. *Temporal deixis (presently, meantime)* voqea vaqtini nutq momentiga nisbatan tartiblaydi. *Spatial deixis (down)* harakat yo‘nalishini ko‘rsatib, makon modelini shakllantiradi. *Social deixis (Mr., aunt)* ijtimoiy munosabatni aniqlaydi. Levinson nazariyasida bunday ko‘p komponentli deiktik tizim interpretativ noaniqlikni kamaytiradi. Adresat ushbu birliklar yordamida nutq vaziyatini kompleks model sifatida qabul qiladi. Natijada diskursda referensial, temporal va ijtimoiy parametrlar o‘zaro uyg‘unlashib, pragmatik kogerentlik yuzaga keladi.

Pragmatik nuqtayi nazardan, kogerensiya yashirin ma‘no aloqalari orqali ham shakllanadi. Ana shunday yashirin ma‘no aloqalarini anglashda implikatura asosiy rol o‘ynaydi, “*what is meant often goes beyond what is said*”, ya‘ni nutqda aytilgan narsa ko‘pincha ifoda etilganidan ko‘proq ma‘noni o‘z ichiga oladi deb aytib o‘tilgan<sup>28</sup>. Shu tariqa implikatura matnning yuzaki mazmuni bilan uning kontekstual va kommunikativ maqsadi o‘rtasida ko‘prik vazifasini bajaradi, natijada matnning kogerensiyasi ta‘minlanadi.

H.P. Graysning “Logic and Conversation” asarida “Cooperative Principle” va “Conversational Maxims” tushunchalarini ishlab chiqib, muloqot jarayonida suhbatdoshlar o‘zaro tushunishni ta‘minlash uchun ma‘lum qoidalarga rioya qilishlari va ushbu qoidalar buzilganda yashirin ma‘no, ya‘ni *implikatura* paydo bo‘lishini ta‘kidlagan. *Konversatsion implikatura* tushunchasi *hamkorlik prinsipi (Cooperative Principle)* va to‘rtta muloqot maksimalari – *miqdor (Quantity)*, *sifat*

<sup>27</sup> Levinson S.C. *Pragmatics*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 420 p;

<sup>28</sup> Grice H.P. *Logic and Conversation*. In: Cole, P., & Morgan, J. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, 1975. – P. 41.

(*Quality*), *moslik (Relevance)* va *aniqlik (Manner)* asosida izohlaydi<sup>29</sup>. Bu maksimalar suhbatdoshlarning o‘zaro tushunishini, axborotning yetarliligini va muloqotning mantiqiy izchilligini ta‘minlaydi. Masalan, agar adresant yoki personaj ushbu maksimalardan birini ataylab buzsa, u holda adresat ushbu “buzilish”dan yashirin ma‘noni, ya‘ni implikaturani hosil qiladi. Shu jarayon badiiy diskursning kogerensiyasini kuchaytiradi, chunki adresat matnning chuqur qatlamlarini talqin qilishga jalb etiladi. Ingliz badiiy diskursida ushbu hodisa ayniqsa sezilarli, masalan, “*I’ll get the supper,*” *she said.*

“*Sit down,*” *he said.* (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”). Patrikning javobi semantik jihatdan bevosita taklifga mos kelmaydi. Graysga ko‘ra relevansiya buzilgandek ko‘rinsa ham, adresat yashirin ma‘noni anglashga harakat qiladi. Patrik suhbatni nazorat qilishga intiladi va muhim suhbat boshlanishini signal qiladi. Adresat nutqni literal emas, balki pragmatik signal sifatida interpretatsiya qiladi. Natijada dialogning ichki mantiqiy bog‘lanishi saqlanadi. Relevansiya maksimasi yuzaki buzilishi dramatik keskinlikni oshiradi va diskurs kogerentligini implikatura orqali mustahkamlaydi.

Pragmatik tahlilda implikatura va presuppozitsiya bir-biriga yaqin, ammo mohiyat jihatidan farqli tushunchalar hisoblanadi. Yuqorida ko‘rganimizdek, implikatura adresant tomonidan ataylab yuzaga keltirilgan yashirin ma‘no, u suhbatdoshning mantiqiy xulosasi orqali ochiladi. Presuppozitsiya esa, aksincha, gapning o‘z tuzilishiga singib ketgan, muloqot ishtirokchilari uchun allaqachon ma‘lum deb qabul qilingan ma‘lumotni bildiradi. Agar implikatura o‘quvchini matnning aytilmagan ma‘nosini anglashga undasa, presuppozitsiya uni aytilgan ma‘noning ortidagi yashirin taxminni aniqlashga yo‘naltiradi. Shu bois, presuppozitsiya adresat tafakkurida “haqiqatning fonini” yaratadi, ya‘ni kogerensiyani semantik barqarorlik orqali mustahkamlaydi. Yuqorida aytib o‘tganimizdek, bir qator olimlar presuppozitsiyani gapning semantik tuzilmasida yashirin, ammo muloqotda haqiqat sifatida qabul qilinadigan ma‘no qatlamlari sifatida izohlab, uning besh asosiy turini ajratishgan – *egzistensial (existential presupposition)*, *faktik (factive presupposition)*, *leksik (lexical presupposition)*, *strukturaviy (structural presupposition)*, *kontrfaktual (counterfactual presupposition)*<sup>30</sup> va ularning har biri muloqotdagi kogerensiyani turli darajalarda ta‘minlashini ko‘rsatadi. Masalan, *She looked at herself in the glass again* (O. Henry, “The Gift of the Magi”). Ushbu jumladagi *again* leksik presuppozitsion birligi harakatning takror sodir bo‘layotganini presuppozitsiya qiladi. Della oynaga yana qarashi uning tashqi ko‘rinishini avval ham tekshirganini anglatadi. Adresat oldingi diskurs segmentiga murojaat qilishga undalgan. Shu tarzda matnda vaqt davomiyligi va psixologik jarayon o‘rtasida bog‘lanish hosil bo‘ladi. Harakatning takrorlanishi qahramonning ichki ikkilanishini ko‘rsatadi va natijada diskursda temporal kogerentlik shakllanadi.

---

<sup>29</sup> Grice H.P. *Logic and Conversation*. In: Cole, P., & Morgan, J. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, 1975. – P. 43.

<sup>30</sup> Levinson S.C. *Pragmatics*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – P.167; Yule G. *Pragmatics*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapter 4, *Presupposition and Entailment*. – P. 25.

Ingliz badiiy diskursini tahlil qilishda nutq aktlari nazariyasi matnning chuqur kommunikativ qatlamini ochib beruvchi muhim pragmatik vositalardan biri sifatida namoyon bo'ladi. J.L.Ostin tomonidan ilgari surilgan va J.Syorl tomonidan tizimlashtirilgan bu nazariya shundan dalolat beradiki, har qanday so'zlovchi nafaqat ma'no bildiradi, balki u orqali maqsadli ta'sir ko'rsatadi, ya'ni so'z bilan amal bajaradi. Ingliz badiiy diskursida esa bu amal estetik va emotsional shaklda amalga oshadi. Personajning so'zi orqali u o'z ichki kechinmalarini, niyatini, yoki ijtimoiy pozitsiyasini namoyon etadi. Shu tariqa, nutq aktlari kogerensiya, ya'ni matnning ichki mantiqiy va kommunikativ yaxlitligini ta'minlashda markaziy o'rin tutadi.

Ingliz badiiy diskursidagi kogerensiya personajlarning o'zaro nutqiy aloqasi orqali ham shakllanishini ko'rdik. Har bir dialog, har bir nutq akti – iltimos, buyruq, iltifot, rad yoki tanbeh o'zidan oldingi va keyingi replikalar bilan sabab-oqibat munosabatida bo'ladi. Illokutiv kuch (adresantning maqsadi) va perlokutiv ta'sir (adresatga yetgan ta'sir) o'rtasidagi o'zaro bog'liqlik badiiy matnning mantiqiy oqimini va mazmuniy birligini mustahkamlaydi<sup>31</sup>. Jon R. Syorl esa J.L.Ostinning nazariyasini kengaytiradi va illokutiv aktlarni markazga qo'ygan holda, ularni funksional jihatdan besh toifaga ajratadi:

1. *Assertives* – gapiruvchining haqiqatga bo'lgan ishonchini ifodalaydi.
2. *Directives* – tinglovchiga biror harakatni bajarishni buyuradi yoki maslahat beradi.
3. *Commissives* – gapiruvchi o'zini kelajakdagi harakatga bog'laydi (va'da, majburiyat).
4. *Expressives* – his-tuyg'ular va munosabatni ifodalaydi.
5. *Declarations* – til orqali muayyan ijtimoiy holatni o'zgartiradi (sud qarorlari, ishdan bo'shatish va hokazo)<sup>32</sup>.

Illokutsion aktning chuqurlashtirib, til harakati turi va maqsadiga qarab turlarga ajratilgani kogerensiya tahliliga aniqlik keltiradi. Masalan, "*My hair grows so fast, Jim!*" she cried. "*Don't look at me that way,*" she said. "*I had it cut off and sold it.*" (O. Henry, "The Gift of the Magi"). Mazkur fragmentda nutq aktlari kombinatsiyasi diskursning dramatik markazini tashkil qilishini ko'rishimiz mumkin. Assertiv akt faktual ma'lumot berib, voqeaning sababiy asosini aniqlagan; ekspressiv akt qahramonning psixologik holatini ochib bergan; direktiv akt esa adresatning baholovchi reaksiyasini cheklashga qaratilgan. Syorl nazariyasida bunday kombinatsiya kommunikativ niyatni to'liqroq ifodalaydi. Adresat nutq aktlarini integrativ tarzda interpretatsiya qilib, diskursda sababiy, affektiv va interaksion kogerentlik birgalikda shakllanadi.

Pragmatik vositalar ingliz badiiy diskursining mazmunan izchil va semantik jihatdan yaxlit shakllanishida muhim o'rin egallaydi. Ingliz badiiy diskursida ushbu vositalar yordamida personajlar orasidagi muloqot, ichki kechinmalar va ijtimoiy-psixologik kontekst o'quvchiga aniq yetkaziladi. Pragmatik yondashuv orqali matn kontekstual darajada tahlil qilinadi va shu asosda chuqur kogerensiya

---

<sup>31</sup> Austin J.L. How to Do Things with Words. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. – 168 p;

<sup>32</sup> Searle J.R. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p.

hosil bo‘ladi. Bu esa o‘z navbatida matnni nafaqat tushunarli, balki ta’sirchan qilishda muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi.

Dissertatsiyaning to‘rtinchi bobi “**Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogeziya va kogerensiyaning kognitiv voqelanishi**” deb nomlangan bo‘lib, unda kognitiv yondashuv va o‘quvchining kognitiv modeli, kognitiv skriptlar, sxemalar va tafakkur modelining diskurs talqinidagi o‘rni, resipient tomonidan kogerensiyaning shakllanishi, taxminlar, mantiqiy bog‘lanishlar, kontekstual tafakkur kabi masalalar tahlilga tortilgan.

Kognitiv tilshunoslikda kogerensiya resipientning ongida shakllanuvchi mental model va freymlar orqali yuzaga keladi. Bu yo‘nalishda quyidagi olimlarning ishlari dolzarb hisoblanadi. Tyun A. fan Dayk mental model va situational model tushunchalari matnni qabul qilish jarayonida bilim fondi va tafakkurning rolini tushuntiradi. Uolter Kintch “Construction-Integration Model” orqali o‘quvchining matndan ma’no hosil qilish mexanizmini tahlil qiladi. Rojer Shenk va Robert Abelson “Script theory” orqali resipientning tajriba asosidagi kutishlari va matnni konstruktiv qabul qilishi jarayonini tushuntiradi. Jorj Lakoff va Mark Jonson kognitiv metafora nazariyasi orqali badiiy matnlarda tushuncha va fikrlarning qanday uslubiy va semantik bog‘liqlikda ifodalanishini ko‘rsatadi. Jillian Braun va Jorj Yul o‘zlarining “Discourse Analysis” asarida kogerensiya va kogeziyani nutq va yozma matnlar doirasida resipientning matnni qanday idrok etishi asosida mantiqiy bog‘liqlik hosil qilinishi haqida asosli tahlillar bergan<sup>33</sup>.

Zamonaviy matn lingvistikasi va diskurs tahlilida kognitiv yondashuv alohida o‘rin egallaydi. Bu yondashuvga ko‘ra, matnni tushunish va anglash jarayoni nafaqat til birliklari, balki inson tafakkuridagi bilimlar tuzilmasi va ongdagi model asosida amalga oshadi. Kognitiv lingvistika vakillari J.Lakof, R.Langaker, Ch.Fillmor, J.Fokonye, M.Tyorner, L.Talmi, fan Dayk, R.Shenk, R.Abelson, J.Braun va J.Yul va boshqalar matn mazmunining izchilligi va bog‘liqligi, ya’ni kogeziya va kogerensiya inson ongida mavjud bo‘lgan bilim strukturalari orqali shakllanishini ilmiy asosda ta’kidlaydilar<sup>34</sup>. Matn faqat til birliklari yig‘indisi emas, balki inson ongidagi bilimlar tizimi, tajriba va voqelikni idrok qilishning shakli sifatida namoyon bo‘ladi. Matnni kogerent va kogeziylik jihatidan tahlil qilishda inson ongida mavjud bo‘lgan freym, skript, ssenariy, sxema, mental model

---

<sup>33</sup> Teun A. van Dijk. Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition. – Hillsdale, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980. – P. 85-129; Kintsch W. The Role of Knowledge in Discourse Comprehension: A Construction-Integration Model. Psychological Review, 95(2), 1988. – P. 163-182; Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p; Schank R.C., Abelson R.P. Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures. – Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977. – 248 p; Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 288 p.

<sup>34</sup> Fillmore C.J. Frame semantics. In Linguistic Society of Korea (Ed.), Linguistics in the morning calm Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co, 1982. – P. 111-137; Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p; Langacker R.W. Foundations of cognitive grammar: Volume I, Theoretical prerequisites. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987. – 516 p; Fauconnier G., Turner M. The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind’s hidden complexities. – New York: Basic Books, 2002. – 464 p; Schank R.C., Abelson R.P. Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977. – 248 p; Brown G, Yule G. Discourse Analysis. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 288 p.

va inferensiya kabi bilim strukturasi va tafakkur mexanizmlari hal qiluvchi rol o'ynaydi. Ushbu bobdagi lingvokognitiv tahlillar J.Braun va J.Yul nazariyasi asosida olib borildi.

J.Braun va J.Yul diskurs kogerensiyasini talqin jarayoni sifatida izohlaydilar. Ularning fikricha, resipient matnning izchilligini avvaldan mavjud bilimlar tizimi, yani freymlar, skriptlar, ssenariylar orqali ta'minlaydi. Diskurs nafaqat grammatik birliklar majmuasi, balki ma'no yaratish va talqin qilish jarayoni sifatida talqin etishgan. Ularning nazariyasiga ko'ra, kogerensiya matnning o'zida kodlangan belgi bo'lmay, resipientning ongida shakllanadigan interpretativ jarayon hisoblanadi<sup>35</sup>.

*Freyms* inson ongidagi muayyan hodisa yoki tushunchaga oid bilimlar to'plami sifatidagi kognitiv tuzilma bo'lib, matn mazmunini tushunishda kontekstual asos yaratadi. Freymlar orqali resipient matn voqealarini ongida mavjud bo'lgan bilimlar bilan solishtiradi va matnni kogerent holatda qabul qiladi. Masalan: O. Henrining "Two Thanksgiving Day Gentlemen" hikoyasi *Thanksgiving* freymi atrofida qurilgan. Ushbu freym o'quvchi ongida *generosity, gratitude, tradition* (ehson, minnatdorlik, an'ana) kabi slotlar madaniy bilimlarni faollashtiradi. Hikoyaning dastlabki qismida resipient ushbu freymga asoslanib, xayriya va saxovatli an'anani kutadi. An'ana ijtimoiy burchga, saxovat esa azobga aylanadi. Shu tarzda, resipient ilgari shakllangan freymni qayta talqin etishga majbur bo'ladi. Bu holat J.Braun va J.Yulning "coherence as interpretation" tamoyiliga to'liq mos keladi, ya'ni kogerensiya sender tomonidan berilmaydi, balki resipientning talqin faoliyati natijasida yuzaga keladi.

Keyingi *skript* tushunchasi R.Shenk va R.Abelson tomonidan ularning mashhur "Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding" asarida ilmiy muomalaga kiritilgan bo'lib, u hodisalar ketma-ketligining inson ongida shakllangan stereotipik kognitiv modelini anglatadi. Agar freym muayyan vaziyatga oid statik bilimlar majmuasini ifodalasa, skript shu vaziyat doirasida odatda sodir bo'ladigan harakatlarning vaqt ketma-ketligini ifodalaydi.

J.Braun va J.Yul "Discourse Analysis" asarida skriptlarni tinglovchi va o'quvchi diskursni anglash jarayonida faol qo'llaydigan kognitiv resurslar sifatida talqin qiladilar<sup>36</sup>. J.Braun va J.Yul talqiniga ko'ra, skriptlar insonning muayyan vaziyatda "keyingi bosqichda odatda nima sodir bo'lishi"ni oldindan taxmin qilish imkonini beruvchi kognitiv andozalardir. Ular resipientning mavjud bilimlar bazasi hamda madaniy tajribasi bilan uyg'un holda ishlaydi va diskursni idrok etish jarayonida ma'no uzviyligini saqlashga xizmat qiladi. Shu bois, diskursni anglash jarayonida resipient har bir yangi ma'lumotni o'z ongida allaqachon shakllangan skriptlar tizimiga moslashtiradi, voqealar ketma-ketligini shu asosda rekonstruksiya qiladi va shu orqali kogerensiyani kognitiv darajada ta'minlaydi.

Masalan, "The Open Window" hikoyasida *polite social visit* (*mehmondorchilik va suhbat*) skripti asosiy kognitiv tayanch sifatida ishlaydi. Resipient bu holatni *greetings – talking – politeness – farewell* (*tanishuv – suhbat*

---

<sup>35</sup> Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – P.233.

<sup>36</sup> Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – P.241.

– *xushmuomalalik – xayrlashuv*) ketma-ketligi bilan bog‘laydi. Vera ismli qahramon esa aynan shu madaniy skriptni manipulyatsiya qiladi. U mehmondorchilik jarayonida yolg‘on hikoya to‘qib, tinglovchini chalg‘itadi. Resipient hikoyaning o‘rtalarigacha bu suhbatni odatdagi skript asosida talqin qiladi, biroq oxirida bu kutilmagan burilish bilan psixologik inkogerensiyaga duch keladi. Shu paytda ongda yangi skript – *firib va hazil* ssenariysi faollashadi. J.Braun va J.Yul bu jarayonda kogerensiyaning dinamik tabiatini ko‘rsatadi, yani resipient har bir yangi ma‘lumotni faol ravishda mavjud skript bilan solishtirib, nomuvofiqlik yuzaga kelganda talqinni yangilaydi. Adresantda aynan shu talqin harakatchanligi badiiy ironiyani yaratadi va matnni resipient tafakkurida yaxlitlashtiradi.

*Ssenariy* tushunchasi *skript*dan farqli ravishda vaqtga bog‘liq va istiqbolga yo‘naltirilgan kognitiv model sifatida tavsiflanadi. Agar skript “odatdagi ketma-ketlik” sifatida aks ettirsa, ssenariy hodisalarning ma‘lum sharoitda qanday rivojlanishi mumkinligini oldindan modellashtiruvchi mini-narrativ sifatida talqin qilinadi. J.Braun va J.Yul nazariyasida ssenariylar diskursdagi kognitiv prognozlash mexanizmini tashkil etadi. Resipient har bir yangi gapni avvalgi kontekst asosida talqin qiladi, natija kutilgan ssenariyga mos kelsa kogerensiya mustahkamlanadi, mos kelmasa ssenariy qayta quriladi.

Masalan, *The old ivy vine clung to the bricks of the wall. One leaf still clung to its stem* (O Henry, “The Last Leaf”). Ushbu hikoya boshida resipient ongida *kasallik va o‘lim kutish ssenariysi* faollashadi: *cold weather, illness, fallen leaves* (*sovuq havo, kasallik, so‘nayotgan barglar*) – bularning barchasi “o‘lim yaqin” degan ssenariyni uyg‘otadi. Ammo Bo‘rman tomonidan devorga chizilgan so‘nggi barg voqealar yo‘nalishini keskin o‘zgartiradi. Resipient yangi ma‘lumotni qabul qilarkan, avvalgi ssenariyni yangilaydi – endi “o‘lim” emas, balki “umid va fidoyilik” ssenariysi dominant bo‘ladi. Bu jarayon J.Braun va J.Yul bo‘yicha interpretiv kogerensiya mexanizmini aniq ifodalaydi. Matn izchilligi formal bog‘lovchilar orqali emas, balki resipientning ssenariyni yangilash va qayta tashkil etish faoliyati orqali yuzaga chiqadi. Sender shu tarzda resipientni kognitiv hamkorlikka jalb etib, har bir yangi voqeani o‘z ongidagi ssenariy bilan solishtirib, ma‘noni qayta quradi. Natijada hikoyada kogerensiya ta‘minlanadi.

Ingliz badiiy diskursida kognitiv nuqtai nazardan kogerensiyaning shakllanishi nafaqat freym, skript va ssenariylar orqali amalga oshadi, balki resipientning kognitiv tajribasi va avvaldan mavjud bilim tuzilmalari, ya‘ni *sxemalarning* faoliyati bilan ham belgilanadi. Yuqorida aytib o‘tganimizdek, J.Braun va J.Yul nazariyasiga ko‘ra, kogerensiya resipient tomonidan yaratiladigan interpretiv jarayondir. Shu nuqtai nazardan, sxemalar ham diskursni anglashda asosiy kognitiv tayanch sifatida namoyon bo‘ladi.

*Sxema* inson ongida mavjud bo‘lgan tartibga solingan bilim modeli sifatida talqin qilinib, u ilgari o‘zlashtirilgan tajriba, madaniy normalar va ijtimoiy qadriyatlar asosida shakllanadi. Tilshunoslik va diskurs tahlilida rivojlantirilgan ushbu tushuncha shuni ko‘rsatadiki, inson yangi ma‘lumotni tushunish jarayonida

uni avvalgi tajriba bilan assotsiativ tarzda bog‘laydi<sup>37</sup>. Shu bois, sxemalar badiiy matnni idrok etishda ma’no yaratishning asosiy kognitiv mexanizmi sifatida ishlaydi.

Masalan, *Every Thanksgiving Day for nine years the Old Gentleman had found his way to that same corner* (O. Henry, “Two Thanksgiving Day Gentlemen”). Ushbu satr resipient ongida *Thanksgiving tradition schemani* ishga solidi, ya’ni minnatdorlik, marhamat, xayriya, ijtimoiy birdamlik kabi. Shu asosda o‘quvchi odatiy marosimdagi iliqlikni kutadi. Ammo muallif bu sxemani mazmuniy burilish asosida ishlatadi: bayram endi quvonch emas, balki majburiyat, odatga aylangan ijtimoiy yuk sifatida namoyon bo‘ladi. Shu tarzda, resipient avvalgi madaniy sxemani *social burden schema* bilan almashtiradi va diskursni axloqiy-psixologik asosda talqin qiladi. Bu jarayon J.Braun va J.Yul tomonidan tavsiflangan *reader-based coherencing* yaqqol ko‘rinishidir: matn o‘z-o‘zidan izchil emas, balki resipient tomonidan ma’noni qayta tashkil etish orqali kogerentlik kasb etadi.

J.Braun va J.Yul nazariyasiga ko‘ra, kogerensiya ta’minotidagi keyingi kognitiv vosita *mental model* hisoblanadi. Mental model matnni anglash jarayonida o‘quvchi ongida shakllanadigan aqliy tasvirni anglatadi. Ushbu model resipientning matndagi ma’lumotlarni dekodlash emas, balki ularni ongda jonli vaziyat sifatida simulyatsiya qilish jarayonini ifodalaydi. J.Braun va J.Yul kogerensiyani matnning o‘zida emas, balki resipient tafakkurida yaratiladigan interpretiv tizim sifatida talqin etgan edi<sup>38</sup>. Resipient badiiy matnga duch kelganida *freym* orqali umumiy kontekstni faollashtiradi (masalan, joy, davr, ijtimoiy sharoit); *skript* asosida voqealar ketma-ketligini taxmin qiladi; *ssenariy* orqali hodisalarning rivoj yo‘nalishini tasavvur qiladi; *sxema* yordamida bu barcha elementlarni o‘z madaniy bilimlari bilan bog‘laydi hamda shu integratsiya asosida *mental model*, ya’ni ongdagi dinamik, vizual-situativ tasvir shakllanadi. Shu tarzda, freym, skript, ssenariy va sxemalar mental modelning tuzilma asosini tashkil etadi. Mental model bularning barchasini birlashtirib, kogerensiyani resipient tafakkurida yaxlit tizim sifatida shakllantirishga xizmat qiladi

Masalan, “The Gift of the Magi” hikoyasida dastlab resipient ongida *romantic sacrifice model* shakllanadi: *sevgi, fidoyilik, sovg‘a orqali mehrni ifodalash*. Bu model freym sifatida *Christmas gift-giving frameni*, skript sifatida *esa buy → wrap → exchange → rejoice* ketma-ketligini ishga soladi. Ammo hikoya yakunida kutilgan ssenariy teskari buriladi. Har ikki qahramon o‘z eng qimmat narsasidan voz kechgan. Endilikda *joyful exchange* ssenariysi *mutual sacrifice* modeliga aylanadi. Shu paytda resipient ongida mental model yangilanadi: endi asosiy ma’no “romantik sovg‘a”da emas, balki “ruhiy fidoyilik”dadir. Kognitiv zanjir quyidagicha bo‘lishi mumkin: *Initial model: love → gift → happiness;*

*Conflict: loss → irony → reversal;*

---

<sup>37</sup> Rumelhart D.E. Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*. – Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980. – P.33-58.

<sup>38</sup> Brown G., Yule G. *Discourse Analysis*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – P.224.

*Revised model:* sacrifice → wisdom → moral coherence. Kogerensiya ushbu ma'no qayta qurilishi natijasida chuqurlashadi. Resipient endi voqeani axloqiy jihatdan izchil, hissiy jihatdan to'liq qabul qiladi.

J.Braun va J.Yul nazariyasidagi oxirgi kognitiv mexanizm *inferensiya* matnda bevosita aytilmagan, ammo o'quvchi tomonidan kontekst asosida chiqariladigan xulosalardir. Mualliflar kogerensiya bevosita resipientning inferensial faoliyatidan kelib chiqadi deb ta'kidlashgan. "Discourse Analysis" asarida diskursni anglash jarayonini lingvistik tahlildan kengroq – kognitiv va interpretiv faoliyat sifatida talqin qiladilar. Ularning nazariyasida inferensiya diskurs kogerensiyasini ta'minlovchi asosiy mexanizmlardan biri sifatida e'tirof etiladi. Ular ta'kidlaganidek, har qanday diskurs yuzaki grammatik izchillikdan tashqari ma'no uzluksizligini ham talab qiladi, bu esa resipientning aqliy faol inferensiyasi orqali yuzaga keladi. Shuning uchun kogerensiya – bu matnda berilgan signallarning o'zaro mexanik bog'lanishi emas, balki resipientning "to'ldiruvchi tafakkuri" natijasidir<sup>39</sup>. Inferensiya orqali o'quvchi matnning ichki mantiqiy bog'liqligini aniqlaydi va uni izchil tarzda talqin qiladi. Bu jarayon kogerensiyani ta'minlovchi asosiy kognitiv faoliyat hisoblanadi.

J.Braun va J.Yul nazariyasida inferensiya uch asosiy ko'rinishda namoyon bo'ladi: *missing links* – matnda bevosita ifodalanmagan sababiy yoki emotsional bog'lanishlarni to'ldirish; *non-automatic connections* – gaplar orasidagi ma'no aloqalarini kontekst asosida ongda qayta tashkil etish; *filling in gaps or discontinuities* – diskursdagi semantik uzilishlarni rekonstruksiya qilish va global kogerensiyani tiklash. Bu jarayonlarning barchasida resipient tafakkuri markaziy o'rinda turadi: aynan u lingvistik signallarni freym, skript, ssenariy, sxema va mental model kabi kognitiv tuzilmalar orqali qayta ishlaydi va ma'noni to'liq kognitiv yaxlitlikka aylantiradi. Natijada kogerensiya matnning o'zida emas, balki resipient tafakkurida shakllanadi. Bu esa badiiy diskursni inson tafakkuri va interpretatsiyasiga asoslangan tirik kommunikativ hodisa sifatida talqin etishga imkon beradi.

Masalan, *The old ivy vine climbing halfway up the brick wall was visible from her window* (O. Henry, "The Last Leaf"). Yuzaki darajada bu jumla tasviriy detaldan iborat. Devorga o'ralgan tok novdasi tasvirlanadi. Ammo J.Braun va J.Yul ta'kidlaganidek, gaplar orasidagi bog'lanishlar har doim avtomatik tarzda hosil bo'lmaydi, ularni resipient tafakkuri kontekst asosida tiklaydi. Resipient ushbu detaldan *hope schemani* faollashtiradi: *ivy leaves* → *life* → *endurance* → *survival*. U *non-automatic inferensiya* orqali quyidagi mantiqiy bog'lanishni hosil qiladi: *The ivy is not just a plant but a symbol of psychological strength and persistence*. Muallif bu aloqani ochiq aytmaydi, u kognitiv to'ldirish (conceptual enrichment) orqali resipient tafakkurida hosil bo'ladi. Shu bilan kogerensiya lingvistik izchillikdan emas, balki semantik assotsiatsiya orqali yaratilgan ixtiyoriy bog'lanishdan vujudga keladi.

Kognitiv yondashuv kogeziya va kogerensiyani nafaqat til birliklari orqali, balki inson tafakkurida mavjud bo'lgan bilimlar strukturalari va aqliy faoliyat

---

<sup>39</sup> Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – P.256.

jarayonlari asosida tushuntiradi. Freym, skript, ssenariy, sxema, mental model va inferensiya kabi kognitiv vositalar matni yaxlit, izchil va tushunarli holga keltirishda asosiy rol o'ynaydi. Ayniqsa, badiiy diskursda bu vositalar orqali personajlar xatti-harakati, muallif pozitsiyasi va matnning umumiy g'oyasi o'quvchining tafakkurida kuchli semantik tizim sifatida shakllanadi. Bu esa ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiya ta'minotida kognitiv vositalarning o'rni beqiyos ekanligini isbotlaydi.

## XULOSA

Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiyani ta'minlashda kogeziiv vositalarning funksional xususiyatlarini o'rganish, mavzuga doir ilmiy-metodologik ishlar bilan tanishish natijasida quyidagi xulosalarga kelindi:

1. Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogeziya va kogerensiya matnning asosiy tamoyillaridan hisoblanib, ularning o'zaro uyg'un xarakteri o'quvchining matni to'liq va izchil idrok etish vositalardan bo'lib, kogeziyaning til birliklari orqali amalga oshishi, kogerensiya esa o'quvchining mantiqiy bilim darajasi orqali yuzaga kelishi va mazkur tushunchalarning o'zaro bog'liq hodisalar sifatida diskursning semantik, funksional, pragmatik va kognitiv xususiyatlarini ochib berishda asosiy vazifa belgilovchi vositalar sifatida talqin qilinishi tavsiflandi.

2. Lisoniy kogeziiv vosita (referensiya, substitutsiya, ellipsis, bog'lovchi)lar diskursdagi formal birliklar o'rtasidagi grammatik aloqadorligi matnning strukturaviy yaxlitligini ta'minlashi va ingliz badiiy diskursida ushbu vositalar personajlar, voqealar va harakatlar o'rtasidagi aniq munosabatni o'quvchiga yetkazib kogerentlik yaratishda muhim ahamiyat kasb etishi aniqlandi.

3. Referensiyalar ingliz badiiy diskursida ishoraviylik orqali matn bo'ylab aniqlik va kogerentlikni saqlashi, personaj yoki obyektarga qayta murojaat qilishda, zamon va makonni aniqlashtirishda, o'quvchi e'tiborini boshqarishda muhim funksional ahamiyat kasb etishi asoslandi.

4. Ingliz badiiy diskursida substitutsiya va ellipsis kabi lingvistik vositalar matndagi ortiqcha takrorlardan qochish, nutqni ixcham va sodda saqlash orqali nafaqat kontekstual tushunishni chuqurlashtirish, balki o'quvchidan yuqori darajadagi ilg'ovchanlikni talab qilib, kogerentlikni ta'minlashda xizmat qilishi ochib berildi.

5. Leksik kogeziiv vositalar – takrorlash, sinonimiya, antonimiya, giponimiya, meronimiya hodisalari matnning semantik darajadagi ichki uyg'unligini shakllantiribgina qolmay, uning kogerentligini ta'minlab, personajlar psixologiyasi hamda voqealar zanjirini bir-biriga uzviy bog'lagan holda semantik maydonda namoyon bo'lishi isbotlandi.

6. Ingliz badiiy diskursida qo'llanilgan kollokatsiyalar orqali semantik parallelizm yuzaga kelishi natijasida o'quvchining ongida konnotativ ma'nolar uyg'otib, badiiy tasvir kuchini oshirish hamda badiiy diskursda hayotiy manzaralar va insonlar orasidagi murakkab munosabatlarni badiiy mahorat bilan ochib berish orqali kogerentlikni ta'minlashi ochib berildi.

7. Ingliz badiiy diskursida diskurs markerlar, deiktik birliklar, presuppozitsiya, implikatura va nutq aktlari kabi pragmatik vositalar matnda ma'no va mazmun qatlamlarini ochib berish orqali uning kommunikativ kuchini oshirishi hamda personajlararo muloqotlarda ma'nodagi noaniqliklar va kinoyalarni ifodalashga xizmat qilib, badiiy diskursda kogerentlikka erishishda yetakchilik qilishi tavsiflandi.

8. Diskurs markerlar ingliz badiiy diskursida muloqot jarayonining izchilligini ta'minlash barobarida, pragmatik bog'lanishlar hosil qilib, muallifga voqealarni izohlash, ularni tahlil qilish, qarama-qarshiliklar keltirish hamda adresat e'tiborini muayyan mazmuniy nuqtaga yo'naltirish imkonini berishi asoslandi.

9. Deiktik birliklar ingliz badiiy matnlarida makon, zamon va shaxslarni aniqlash orqali uning semantik to'qimasini soddalashtirib, kontekstga bog'liq holda talqin qilinishi sababli, adresatdan yuqori darajadagi inferensial faoliyatni talab qilib kogerensiyani hosil qilishi aniqlandi.

10. Ingliz badiiy diskursida presuppozitsiya va implikatura kabi pragmatik vositalar matnning chuqur mantiqiy qatlamini shakllantirib, kogerensiyaning yuzaga chiqishida muhim rol o'ynashi; xususan, presuppozitsiyalar adresatning adresant tomonidan mavjud deb taxmin qilingan bilimlar bazasiga tayangan holda axborotlar orasida yashirin bog'liqliklar yaratishi, implikaturalar esa Graysning hamkorlik maksimlariga asoslangan tarzda aytilmagan, ammo tushunilishi kutilgan ma'nolar orqali diskursga stilistik murakkablik, ohang va kinoya olib kirib, adresatning kontekstual idrokiga tayanishi orqali matn kogerensiyasini mustahkamlashga xizmat qilishi dalillandi.

11. Nutq aktlari, xususan assertive, direktiv va ekspressiv funksiyalarni bajaruvchi shakllar, personajlararo munosabatlar hamda ularning ijtimoiy rollarini aniqlashda muhim vosita bo'lib xizmat qilishi bilan birga badiiy matnning semantik hamda pragmatik izchilligini mustahkamlashi, ingliz badiiy diskursida esa bu vositalar syujet rivojlanishiga bevosita ta'sir ko'rsatgan holda ijtimoiy tanqid va hissiy murakkablikni kogerent tarzda ifodalashi tavsiflandi.

12. Freym, skript, ssenariy, sxema, mental model kabi kognitiv mexanizmlar ingliz badiiy diskursida yuzaki lingvistik bog'lanishlardan tashqariga chiqib, resipient ongida mavjud bilim tuzilmalarini faollashtirish, voqealar ketma-ketligini konseptual modelga joylashtirish va inferensiya jarayonini yo'naltirish orqali interpretativ izchillikni uyg'unlashtirib, kogerensiyaga erishishning yuqori darajada unumdor vositalari sifatida namoyon bo'lishi aniqlandi.

13. Kognitiv yondashuvda freym, skript, ssenariy, sxemalar kogerensiyaga erishish jarayonida muhim ahamiyat kasb etib, matnni inson tafakkurida mavjud bo'lgan bilimlar bilan bog'lab, yangi axborotni mavjud konseptual tizim asosida idrok etish hamda qayta ishlash imkonini yaratishi asoslandi.

14. Mental modellar ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiyaning yuzaga chiqishida markaziy ahamiyat kasb etib, resipientga personajlar, hodisalar va sabab-oqibat bog'lanishlarini mantiqiy tizimda talqin qilish imkonini berishi, ayniqsa ingliz hikoyalarida yashirin kinoya yoki syujetdagi kutilmagan burilishlar orqali yuzaga keladigan semantik murakkabliklarni tushunishda resipient avvalgi kontekstlar asosida doimiy yangilanib boradigan mental modelga tayanishi va shu

tariqa ushbu modellar nafaqat o'qish jarayonining kognitiv tayanchi, balki matndagi kognitiv mexanizmlarning kogerensiyaviy samarasini to'laqonli anglash vositasi sifatida ham xizmat qilishi izohlandi.

15. Inferensiya kognitiv va pragmatik yondashuvlar kesishgan nuqtada joylashgan bo'lib, resipientning matnda bevosita ifodalanmagan, ammo kontekst asosida tushunilishi zarur bo'lgan ma'nolarni aniqlash salohiyatini namoyon etishda kogerensiyaning eng muhim ko'rsatkichlaridan biri sifatida matnni anglash jarayonini samarali boshqarishga xizmat qilishi asoslandi.

16. O'rganilgan ingliz badiiy diskurslari, xususan hikoyalar asosida olib borilgan tahlillar kognitiv va kogerent vositalarning o'zaro uyg'unligi hamda ularning grammatik, leksik, pragmatik va kognitiv darajalardagi kompleks ta'siri ingliz badiiy diskursining semantik boyligi va estetik ta'sirchanligini belgilab, matnlarni tahlil qilishda bunday ko'p qirrali yondashuvning samaradorligi dalillandi.

**SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL DSc.03/2025.27.12.Fil.08.08 AWARDED  
SCIENTIFIC DEGREES AT BUKHARA STATE UNIVERSITY**

---

**BUKHARA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**SAIDOVA MUKHAYYO UMEDILOEVNA**

**THE FUNCTIONALITY OF COHESIVE DEVICES IN ENSURING  
COHERENCE IN ENGLISH LITERARY DISCOURSE**

**10.00.04 – Language and Literature of the peoples of Europe, America and Australia**

**DISSERTATION ABSTRACT  
for a Doctor of Science (DSc) in PHILOLOGY**

**Bukhara – 2026**

The theme of the dissertation for a Doctor of Science (DSc) in Philology was registered under №B2025.2.DSc/Fil1003 by the Supreme Attestation Commission.

The dissertation has been accomplished at Bukhara State University.

The dissertation abstract in three languages (Uzbek, English, Russian (resume)) has been placed on the website (www.buxdu.uz) of the Scientific Council and "ZiyoNet" Information and educational portal (www.ziynet.uz)

**Scientific advisor:** **Mirzaev Ibodullo Kamolovich**  
Doctor of Science in Philology, Professor

**Official opponents:** **Khajieva Feruza Melsovna**  
Doctor of Science in Philology, Professor

**Nasrullaeva Nafisa Zafarovna**  
Doctor of Science in Philology, Professor

**Satimova Dilafruz Numonjonovna**  
Doctor of Science in Philology, Associate Professor

**Leading organization:** **Jizzakh State Pedagogical University**

The dissertation defense will be held on " 20 " June 2026 at 9<sup>00</sup> at the meeting of the Scientific Council DSc.03/2025.27.12.Fil.08.08 at Bukhara State University (Address: 200118, Bukhara, M.Iqbol street, 11. Phone: (0365) 221-29-14; Fax: (0365) 221-27-57; e-mail: buxdu\_rektor@buxdu.uz).

The dissertation is available at the Information-resource center of Bukhara State University, (registration number 925 ). Address: 200118, Bukhara, M. Iqbol street, 11. Phone: (0365) 221-25-87

The dissertation abstract is distributed on " 5 " June 2026.

(Mailing report № 26-14 on " 5 " June 2026).



**D.I.Khodjayeva**

Chairperson of the Scientific Council awarding scientific degrees, Doctor of Science in Philology, Associate Professor

**O.O.Bobokalonov**

Scientific Secretary of the Scientific Council awarding scientific degrees, Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences, Associate Professor

**O.M.Fayzulloyev**

Chairperson of the Scientific Seminar under Scientific Council awarding scientific degrees, Doctor of Science in Philology, Professor

## INTRODUCTION (Dissertation abstract for a Doctor of Science [DSc])

**Topicality and necessity of the thesis.** In the current period of development of world linguistics, discursive, pragmatic, and cognitive theories have emerged, and discourse has been separately selected as an object of analysis and formed as a separate field, with great attention being paid to the issues of its linguopragmatic and linguocognitive features. The fact that literary discourse has such features as cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativeness, situationality, and intertextuality allows one to imagine the true essence of the linguistic phenomena involved in its formation. This is important in substantiating the functional-discursive foundations of cohesion and coherence in literary discourse, revealing their pragmatic-contextual features, identifying and scientifically evaluating their cognitive-conceptual foundations.

In recent years, in world linguistics, the extensive investigation and research of grammatical and lexical manifestations of cohesion and coherence, discursive features, contextual-pragmatic categories, conceptual-cognitive picture, communicative models, manifested in functional, discursive conditions, has become a priority task. The manifestation of these linguistic phenomena in literary discourse, in the expression of their internal logical structure, the enrichment of linguistic material through discursive examples, a completely new view of previously existing types of linguistic description under the influence of the paradigm of cognitive-pragmatic analysis, in turn, serves to expand the boundaries of linguistic research and draw new conclusions.

Independence not only creates all the necessary conditions for the development of national linguistics based on the world's advanced criteria, but also imposes the responsibility of responding to these criteria based on our centuries-old national worldview. The results of this dissertation can serve as an important source in ensuring the implementation of the tasks defined in the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Sh.M.Mirziyoev “On Approving the Concept for the Development of the Higher Education System of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030”, “based on international experience, the introduction of advanced standards of higher education, including a phased transition in curricula from education aimed at acquiring theoretical knowledge to an education system aimed at forming practical skills”<sup>1</sup>, comparative research on the perceptual-cognitive model, pragmatic-discursive mechanism and models.

The present scientific study serves to a certain degree to achieve the objectives set out in the following legal documents: the Decree of the President PF-5847 “On Approval of the Concept for the Development of the Higher Education System of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030” dated October 8, 2019; the Decree of the President PF-6084 “On measures to further develop the Uzbek language and improve language policy in the country” dated October 20, 2020; the Decree of the President PF-60 “On the development strategy of New Uzbekistan

---

<sup>1</sup> Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Approval of the Concept for the Development of the Higher Education System of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030”//PF-5847, 8.10.2019. URL: [lex.uz/docs/4545884](http://lex.uz/docs/4545884)

for 2022-2026” dated January 28, 2022; the Decree of the President PF-158 “On the Strategy “Uzbekistan – 2030” dated September 11, 2023; the Resolution of the President PQ-3775 “On additional measures to improve the quality of education in higher educational institutions and ensure their active participation in the comprehensive reforms carried out in the country” dated June 5, 2018; the Resolution of the President PQ-5117 “On measures to bring the activities of popularization of foreign languages in the Republic of Uzbekistan to a qualitatively new level” dated May 19, 2021 as well as the Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. 610 “On measures to further improve the quality of foreign language teaching in educational institutions” dated August 11, 2017 and other regulatory legal documents related to this activity.

**Relevant research priority areas of science and developing technology of the Republic.** The dissertation work was carried out in the line with the priority directions of Science and Technology Development of the Republic I. “Developing the Democratic and Legal Society Spiritually-Morally and Culturally, Forming Innovational Economics”.

**A review of foreign research on the topic of dissertation.** Scientific research aimed at studying the functionality of cohesive devices in ensuring coherence in English literary discourse is carried out in leading scientific centers and higher educational institutions of the world, including Oxford University Language Centre, London Metropolitan University, Norwich Institute for Language Education (Great Britain); University of Harvard, University of South Carolina, University of Texas (USA); University of Bonn (Germany); University of Oslo (Norway); University of Vienna (Austria); Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (Netherlands); Stroudsburg Association of Computational Linguistics (France); Sofia University (Bulgaria); University of Dublin City (Ireland); University of Toronto (Canada); Shanghai University of Foreign Languages (China); University of English and Foreign Languages (India); Moscow State University, Saint Petersburg State University (RF); as well as the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Bukhara State University (Uzbekistan).

In world linguistics, research is being conducted in the following priority areas to study the functionality of cohesive devices in ensuring coherence in literary discourse: ensuring coherence through grammatical and lexical units, studying the functional capabilities of cohesive devices based on a pragmatic approach, analyzing the semantic connection between discourse elements within the framework of cognitive linguistics, studying the cultural and stylistic features of cohesive devices within literary texts, the role of cultural contexts in the formation of coherence.

**Problem development status.** In world linguistics, attention to the analysis of text and discourse has increased, in particular, the interrelationship of coherence and cohesion, the devices of providing them, are widely studied on the basis of various linguistic approaches - functional, pragmatic, cognitive approaches. In

particular, M.A.K.Halliday and Ruqayya Hasan's *Cohesion in English*<sup>2</sup> serve as the main theoretical foundation. It explains the connection and integrity of the text through cohesive devices - grammatical and lexical units. R.de Beaugrande & W.U.Dressler, G.Brown & G.Yule, J.Sinclair & M.Coulthard, T.Deborah, H.G.Widdowson, S.Titscher and others, J.Renkema and others studied text linguistics and discourse analysis as one of the main directions of modern linguistics, studying text as an independent communicative unit, paying special attention to cohesion and coherence in it.<sup>3</sup>

Within the framework of the pragmatic approach, the research of D.Schiffrin, B.Fraser, S.C.Levinson, K.Bühler, H.P.Grice, D.Sperber & D.Wilson, R.Stalnaker, J.L.Austin, J.Searle<sup>4</sup>, and others takes an important place, while in the works of Teun A. van Dijk, W.Kintsch, P.Werth, R.Schank & R.Abelson, G.Brown & G.Yule<sup>5</sup>, research related to the mental models through which the text is understood in the reader's mind through the cognitive approach illuminates coherence and cohesion from a pragmatic aspect within the framework of speech and written texts, and provides a well-founded analysis of how the reader or listener perceives the text, based on which expectations logical relationships are formed.

In Uzbek linguistics, the research of A.Nurmonov, N.Mahmudov, Sh.S.Safarov, I.K.Mirzaev, Sh.Shakhobiddinova, Z.I.Rasulov, N.F.Kosimova, Sh.Abdurahmonova, G.Abdullaeva, Z.Ziyodova, N.E.Ermatova, M.M.Zokirova, A.Karimov, Kh.Tursunov, G.Yakubova, N.Yusupova, M.Salomova is devoted to such issues as text and discourse pragmatics, discourse and its linguopragmatic features, cognitive features of discourse and cohesive devices in the text structure,

---

<sup>2</sup>Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. *Cohesion in English*. – London: Longman, 1976. – 374 p; Halliday M.A.K., Hasan, Ruqaiya. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. – Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press, 1985. – 126 p.

<sup>3</sup>R.de Beaugrande, Dressler W.U. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. – London: Longman, 1976. – P. 3-95; Sinclair J, Coulthard M. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. – Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1975. – P.90-123; Deborah T. *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. – Washington, DC, USA: Georgetown University Press, 1982. – 365 p; Widdowson H.G. *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. – Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1979. – 202 p; Titscher S, Meyer M, Wodak R, Vetter E. *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. – London, UK: SAGE Publications, 2000. – 288 p; Renkema J. *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004. – 408 p.

<sup>4</sup>Schiffrin D. *Discourse markers*. – Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 342 p; Fraser B. "What are Discourse Markers?" *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 1999. – P.931-952; Levinson S.C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 420 p; Bühler K. *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language* (trans. Donald F. Goodwin, 1990). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1934/2011. – 282 p; Grice H.P. *Logic and Conversation*. In: Cole, P., & Morgan, J. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, 1975. – P. 41-58; Sperber D, Wilson D. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1986. – 380 p; Stalnaker R. *Pragmatic Presuppositions*. In: Munitz, M., & Unger, P. (Eds.), *Semantics and Philosophy*. New York: New York University Press, 1974. – P. 197-213; Austin J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. – 168 p; Searle J.R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p.

<sup>5</sup>Teun A. van Dijk. *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. – Hillsdale, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980. – P. 85-129; Kintsch W. *The Role of Knowledge in Discourse Comprehension: A Construction-Integration Model*. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 1988. – P. 163-182; Werth P. *Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*. London: Longman, 1999. – 432 p; Schank R.C, Abelson R.P. *Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977. – 248 p; Brown G, Yule G. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 288 p.

pragmatic foundations of coherence in English literary texts, interpretation of coherence and cohesive devices in the translation process<sup>6</sup>.

Although the above theories are an important basis for the analysis of text and discourse, relatively few studies have been conducted that have comprehensively analyzed the functional capabilities of cohesive devices in ensuring coherence in English literary discourse. In particular, the grammatical, lexical, pragmatic, and cognitive study of these devices based on short stories by English-speaking writers is a relevant scientific issue.

**Relevance of the dissertation research with the plans of the scientific-research works of the higher educational institution where the dissertation has been conducted.** The research was carried out within the framework of the scientific research plan of the English Linguistics department titled “Pragmalinguistics, functional translation studies and integration of language teaching processes” for 2021-2026 at Bukhara State University.

**The aim of the research work** is to determine the functionality of cohesive devices in ensuring coherence in English literary discourse.

**The tasks of the research work** are as follows:

investigating the theoretical foundations of the concepts of *coherence* and *cohesion* in English literary discourse and to explicate the interrelationship between them;

conducting a functional analysis of grammatical cohesive devices in English literary discourse, particularly in short stories, including reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunctions, as well as lexical cohesive devices such as synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy and collocation;

identifying the role of pragmatic classification, context, discourse markers, and deictic expressions in establishing textual coherence in English literary discourse;

determining, within a pragmatic framework, the functionality of implicature, presupposition and speech acts in ensuring coherence in literary discourse, and to elucidate their respective roles;

---

<sup>6</sup> Safarov Sh.S. Ingliz tilida diskurs va pragmatik tahlil. Toshkent: Sharq, 2020; Diskurs va koheziv vositalar: ingliz va o'zbek tillarida taqqoslash. *Filologiya masalalari*, 2017. – P. 45-60; Мирзаев И.К. Проблемы лингвопоэтической интерпретации стихотворного текста. Дисс.доктора филол.наук. – Ташкент: институт языкознания АН РУз, 1992. – 372 с; Rasulov Z.I. Nutqiy tuzilmalar axborot-diskursiv mazmuni shakllanishi jarayonida tejamkorlik tamoyilining faollashuvi (ingliz va o'zbek tillari materiali asosida). Fil.f.d. ... dissertatsiya. – B., 2022; Qosimova N.Q. Tarjima kognitiv mexanizmlarida psixolingvistik qoliqlar ishtirokining lingvomadaniy shartlanishi. Filol. fan. d-ri. (Dsc) ... diss. Avtoref. – B., 2024; Abdurahmonova Sh. Ingliz tilida pragmatik birliklarning lingvistik tahlili (deixis, presupposition, implicature). Filol. fan. bo'yicha falsafa d-ri. (PhD) ... diss. Avtoref. – T., 2018; Abdullaeva G. Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida matnning pragmatik strukturalari. Filol. fan. bo'yicha falsafa d-ri. (PhD) ... diss. Avtoref. – T., 2021; Ziyodova Z. Ingliz badiiy matnlarida kogerensiyaning pragmatik asoslari. Filol. fan. bo'yicha falsafa d-ri. (PhD) ... diss. Avtoref. – T., 2020; Ermatova N.E. Matn va diskurs pragmatikasi. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2016. – 135 b; Zokirova M.M. Diskurs va uning lingvopragmatik xususiyatlari. Toshkent: Fan, 2013. – 170b; Karimov A. “Matndagi bog'lovchilar orqali izchillikning ta'minlanishi.” O'zbek tili va adabiyoti jurnal, 2020. – B.15-30; Tursunov X. “Diskursning kognitiv xususiyatlari va matn tuzilmasidagi kogezi vositalar.” *Filologiya masalalari* jurnali, 2029. – B. 45-60; Yakubova G. “Ingliz tili badiiy matnlarida nutq aktlari va ularning pragmatik tahlili.” *Filologiya masalalari*, 2012. – №2. B.45-51; Yusupova N. “Kogerensiya va kogezi vositalarning tarjima jarayonidagi talqini (ingliz va o'zbek tillari misolida).” *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2016. – №3. B. 82-88; Salomova M. “Matnning lingvopragmatik xususiyatlari: nutq aktlari va stilistik birliklar.” *Til va adabiyot ta'limi*, 2014. – №4. B. 55-61.

analyzing the significance of cognitive mechanisms such as frames, scripts, scenarios, schemata in ensuring textual coherence in English literary discourse;

identifying the functional role of the mental model in the formation of coherence in English literary discourse, as well as the manifestations of inference in the interpretive process from a cognitive perspective.

**The object of the research work** is cohesive and coherent devices in English literary discourse.

**The subject of the research work** is the functional features of cohesive devices in ensuring coherence in English literary discourse.

**Methods of the research.** Descriptive, contextual-discursive, functional-communicative, linguo-pragmatic and linguo-cognitive methods of analysis have been used in the dissertation.

**Scientific novelty of the research work** includes the following:

it has been identified that in English literary discourse, cohesive devices play a functional role in forming coherence, where grammatical means such as reference, ellipsis, substitution and conjunctions as well as lexical means such as synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, meronyms and collocations hold primary importance in ensuring textual consistency and semantic integrity of the literary text;

it has been proven that discourse markers and deictic units that provide hidden meaning and contextual consistency in literary discourse are a factor influencing the perception of the text, as well as the priority of these elements, which are considered pragmatically and contextually important in the text;

it has been substantiated that in English literary discourse, hidden logical connections between sentences, reader expectations, communicative strategies are not clearly stated, but the meaning that needs to be understood as implicature and a concept based on pre-existing knowledge as presupposition is manifested on the pragmatic basis of coherence;

it has been stated that literary discourse, based on the theory of mental models, can be interpreted differently depending on the reader's experience, expectations, and level of contextual understanding, and that the formation of coherence models arising in the reader's mind through frames (sets of information), scripts and scenarios (a sequence of habitual events), and schemata (a generalized knowledge structure based on human experience, stored in the mind) directly influences the degree of coherence;

it has been revealed that cognitive inferencing in English literary discourse is an important factor in the reader's understanding of hidden information in the text, understanding unexpected twists and emotional changes, ensuring the thematic depth and coherence of stories;

**Practical results of the research work** are as follows:

it has been developed a methodology for studying cohesion and coherence based on an integrative approach to the analysis of English literary discourse, through which the possibility of consistent analysis of the text from grammatical, lexical, pragmatic, and cognitive aspects has been created, and it has been

substantiated that this approach can be effectively applied in the fields of linguistics and literary studies for the in-depth analysis of literary texts;

it has been revealed that the set of practical tasks, which serve to strengthen the knowledge of coherence and cohesion based on literary texts in the learning process, is aimed at identifying consistency in the text, distinguishing discourse markers, understanding implicature and presupposition, as well as developing contextual thinking in students;

it has been established that the model analysis technology for conducting a communicative analysis of literary texts based on a pragmatic and cognitive approach helps to understand coherence by identifying hidden meanings, context, speech acts, and models of student perception within the text, and can also be used for linguodidactic purposes.

**Authenticity of the research results** is explained by the fact that the problem is clearly stated, conclusions drawn in the dissertation are based on descriptive, classification, contextual-discursive, functional-communicative, linguopragmatic, linguocognitive methods of analysis, theoretical ideas and information are obtained from official sources, the scientific-theoretical proposals and recommendations given are tested in practice, and the results have been confirmed by authorized organizations.

**Scientific and practical value of the research results.** The scientific significance of the research results is manifested in the possibility of applying the ideas of communicative and cognitive linguistics to the study of the features of the discursive regularities of language, the functional system of the English language, as well as determined by the theoretical significance of the obtained results in the search for solutions to a number of problems related to the discourse analysis of linguistics, cognitology, syntax and pragmatics of speech structures.

The practical significance of the research is primarily explained by the fact that its results can serve as a source for conducting theoretical and practical classes and organizing special seminars in higher educational institutions on general linguistics, discourse analysis, text linguistics, modern linguistics, creating new textbooks and teaching manuals, and conducting various scientific research.

**Implementation of the research results.** Based on the scientific results obtained in the process of studying the functionality of cohesive devices in ensuring coherence in English literary discourse:

theoretical conclusions based on the fact that in English literary discourse, cohesive devices play a functional role in forming coherence, where grammatical means – such as reference, ellipsis, substitution and conjunctions – as well as lexical means – such as synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, meronyms and collocations – hold primary importance in ensuring textual consistency and semantic integrity of the literary text were used in the fundamental project OT-F1-029 “The Role of the Sogdian Language and Writing in the History of Uzbek Statehood (2nd Century BC - 12th Century AD)” carried out at the Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature (Reference No. 01/4-2269 of Tashkent State University of Uzbek language and literature dated June 3, 2025).

As a result, it was possible to increase communicative competence by combining theoretical knowledge about literary discourse with practical analysis;

conclusions related to the fact that discourse markers and deictic units that provide hidden meaning and contextual consistency in literary discourse are a factor influencing the perception of the text, as well as the priority of these elements, which are considered pragmatically and contextually important in the text were used in the practical project AM-F3-201908172 “Creating an Educational Corpus of the Uzbek Language” carried out at the Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature in 2020-2023 (Reference No. 01/4-2270 of Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature dated June 3, 2025). As a result, it became possible to study discursive competence through pragmatic analysis of theoretical information about English literary discourse;

conclusions regarding the fact that in English literary discourse, hidden logical connections between sentences, reader expectations, communicative strategies are not clearly stated, but the meaning that needs to be understood - implicature and a concept based on pre-existing knowledge - presupposition - is manifested on the pragmatic basis of coherence were used in the implementation of a foreign project dedicated to the analysis of the literary mastery of American writers such as John Steinbeck, Francis Scott Fitzgerald and Ernest Hemingway, organized at the “American Literary Club” at Bukhara State University within the framework of the SUZ80021IN3103 project, funded by the U.S. Embassy (Reference No. 06/3059 of Urgench State University dated May 12, 2025). As a result, the opportunity was created for teachers to effectively use linguodidactic terms in the process of teaching foreign languages to students;

conclusions based on the fact that literary discourse, based on the theory of mental models, can be interpreted differently depending on the reader’s experience, expectations, and level of contextual understanding, and that the formation of coherence models arising in the reader’s mind – through frames (sets of information), scripts and scenarios (a sequence of habitual events), and schemata (a generalized knowledge structure based on human experience, stored in the mind) – directly influences the degree of coherence were used in the creation of a textbook entitled “Textlinguistics” for students of the specialty 70230101 - Linguistics (English) based on the publication certificate No. 673-13, issued on the basis of the order No. 673 of the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated November 29, 2023 (Reference No. 3226 of the Center for Research on the Development of Higher Education dated May 16, 2025). As a result, the content of educational literature was improved through theoretical and factual materials on the role, application and functional features of cohesion and coherence in language and speech;

conclusions related to the fact that cognitive inference in English literary discourse is an important factor in the reader's understanding of hidden information in the text, understanding unexpected twists and emotional changes, ensuring the thematic depth and coherence of stories were used in the preparation of the script for the TV programs “Hello, Bukhara”, “Salvation in Knowledge” of the “Bukhara” TV channel (Reference No. 01-09-100 of the Bukhara Regional

Television and Radio Company dated May 13, 2025). As a result, the content of materials prepared for these television programs has been improved, enriched with scientific evidence, and the scientific popularity of the program has been ensured.

**Approbation of the research results.** The research results were discussed in 13 conferences, including 4 international and 11 national scientific-practical conferences.

**Publication of the research results.** In total, 32 scientific papers on the topic of the dissertation have been published, as well as 1 monograph, 1 manual, 1 coursebook 14 articles in the scientific publications recommended for publication of the main results of doctoral dissertations of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Republic of Uzbekistan, including 4 were published in the foreign and 10 in the national journals.

**The outline of the thesis.** The dissertation consists of an introduction, four chapters, a conclusion, a list of references, the total volume is 269 pages.

## THE MAIN CONTENT OF THE DISSERTATION

In the introductory part, the relevance and necessity of the dissertation topic, information on the aim, tasks, object, subject of the research, compliance with the priority areas of development of science and technology of the republic, scientific novelty, practical results, reliability of the obtained results, theoretical and practical significance of the work, implementation of research results in practice, approbation, outline of the dissertation are presented.

The first chapter of the dissertation, entitled “Theoretical Foundations of Cohesion and Coherence,” consists of three sections, which examines the role of the notions of coherence and cohesion in discourse analysis, the significance of coherence and cohesion within the framework of literary discourse, various approaches to the study of cohesion and coherence, and the necessity to define the theoretical foundations of the present research.

The concept of “cohesion” was first introduced into scientific discourse by M.A.K.Halliday and R.Hasan, whose main focus was on studying how sentences are interconnected in the text. They emphasize that different parts of the paragraph are connected by means of cohesive devices.

*A text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text... If a passage of English containing more than one sentence is perceived as a text, there will be certain linguistic features present in that passage which can be identified as contributing to its total unity and giving it texture.*

As M.A.K.Halliday and R.Hasan emphasize, an author has the opportunity to express the meanings between the connected sentences in the text as a unified whole in various ways, and cohesion serves to form this very semantic structure. They also regard cohesion as an important factor indicating whether a text forms an integrated and consistent whole or is merely a collection of unrelated sentences. However, it should be noted that although cohesion pertains to the meaning between sentences, it is not related to the content of the text. M.A.K.Halliday and R.Hasan clearly pointed out this situation: “Cohesion is concerned not with what

the text means, but with how it is structured as a semantic construct”<sup>7</sup>. This implies that although cohesion usually plays an important role within a paragraph, it does not ensure the consistency of the entire text from paragraph to paragraph.

Cohesion is interpreted as linguistic units that provide inter-sentence connection through grammatical devices, while coherence is viewed by H.G.Widdowson as a relationship between illocutionary acts. In other words, for a speech unit to be evaluated as coherent, the actions carried out through it must be understood by the listener. Speech is interpreted only in context, that is, through the speech structure and communicative strategies. For example, when we process speech, we often assume that if one sentence follows another, there is some kind of logical connection between them. Coherence is considered as a set of logical, semantic, and communicative connections between sentences<sup>8</sup>. According to D.Schiffrin’s point of view, cohesion exists in different types of speech and is used as a means of interactive communication between the speaker and the listener. According to D.Schiffrin, cohesive devices are signals that facilitate the clarification of meaning and understanding of the conversation during communication<sup>9</sup>. Therefore, speech coherence depends on the speaker’s ability to express their message clearly within a specific context using various linguistic and non-linguistic means, and the listener’s ability to comprehend these signals as a unified whole.

R. de Beaugrande and W.U. Dressler emphasize that a genuine text is distinguished not only by its grammatical correctness, but also by its semantic integrity and ability to perform a communicative function. The seven criteria put forward by them, along with cohesion and coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality are considered as the main factors determining the communicative effectiveness of the text. Cohesion is realized in the text through conjunctions, reference devices, synonymy, and other means, while coherence is formed at the deep semantic level, through semantic consistency and logical connection. Their approach allows for a comprehensive study of the text from structural, semantic, and pragmatic perspectives<sup>10</sup>.

Discourse markers also play an important role in ensuring coherence. They are devices that facilitate the communication of participants and integrate meaning, form, and actions. In oral speech these are linguistic and extralinguistic (i.e., non-linguistic) signs, forming a common shared understanding between the participants. However, D.Schiffrin also notes that speech can be logically connected even without markers. She argues that the use of markers are not obligatory if the conversation continues within the context and the semantic relations between the utterances have already been established. In most cases, the semantic relations between sentences are sufficiently clear for the listener or reader, making it possible to understand them without markers.

---

<sup>7</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – 374 p;

<sup>8</sup> Widdowson H.G. Explorations in Applied Linguistics. – Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1979. – 202 p;

<sup>9</sup> Schiffrin D. Discourse markers. – Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 342 p;

<sup>10</sup> R.de Beaugrande, Dressler W.U. Introduction to Text Linguistics. – London: Longman, 1976. – P. 3-95;

D.Blakemore describes speech as “the linguistic form of a sentence, contextual assumptions, and assumptions about the speaker being relevant in their own speech.” As D.Blakemore noted, speech comprehension is carried out through two processes: explicit and implicit processes. If the explicit process consists of identifying the proposition directly expressed through the sentence, the implicit process involves identifying the additional, hidden proposition. According to D.Blakemore, relevance theory is a concept that can comprehensively explain the process of speech comprehension, since in some cases the listener’s interpretation is based not only on the meaning expressed in the sentence, but also on non-linguistic or contextual cues. D.Blakemore also points out that many sentences used in everyday communication are elliptical, that is, short and incomplete. For example, sentences such as “Any e-mail?” encountered in ordinary conversation, although uttered independently, are converted into a complete and clear proposition and correctly interpreted by the listener<sup>11</sup>. This illustrates that speech coherence is directly related to the listener and does not always imply the presence of discourse markers. According to D.Blakemore’s point of view, speech is correctly understood when the speaker makes coherence in the text relevant to the listener, and the listener assumes that the speaker will be relevant. In this case, the listener or reader takes on a great responsibility for interpreting the text.

Coherence, according to Teun A. van Dijk’s definition, “is a semantic feature of discourse that based on how each sentence is interpreted in relation to the interpretation of other sentences.” He argues that coherence between sentences is based not only on the connections between consecutive propositions, but also on the topic of a particular passage. Teun A. van Dijk further emphasizes that cohesion does not guarantee coherence, and that coherence itself is not sufficient to make the text completely coherent. That is, if the text does not contain additional linguistic devices (for example, cohesive means), it will not be fully coherent. There are two levels of coherence:

1. Micro-coherence - sequential or linear connections between propositions.
2. Macro-coherence - the overall development of the topic of the text and the logical consistency of the entire discourse <sup>12</sup>.

N.E.Enkvist distinguishes two types of semantic connection: 1) surface-level connection - through cohesion; 2) deep-level connection - through coherence. According to N.E.Enkvist, cohesion and coherence do not mean each other. That is, the text can be cohesive but not coherent, or conversely, coherent but not cohesive. Also, the text can be both cohesive and coherent at the same time. For example: *Have you met Virasuda Sribayak? She was here yesterday.*

The two sentences presented in this example have a grammatical connection through the pronoun “she”, and there is also a semantic connection between them. In other words, these sentences are both cohesive and coherent. In the following example, although no grammatical or lexical connecting devices (cohesive element) are used, the sentences are semantically connected and coherent. In this

---

<sup>11</sup> Blakemore D. *Understanding Utterances: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1992. – 213 p;

<sup>12</sup> Teun A. van Dijk. *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. – Hillsdale, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980. – P. 85-129;

example, we can see an example of a sentence that has coherence, but is not coherent. For example: *Liverpool shot a goal. The whistle blew.*

In the next example, there is a grammatical connection between the sentences through the pronoun “him,” which is a cohesive device, but there is no semantic and logical consistency, that is, no coherence between the sentences. Because pragmatically, these sentences do not correspond to each other. This sentence is a cohesive, but not coherent. For example: *My grandfather died. I shall see him tomorrow.*

The text must have both surface cohesion and overall coherence. As N.E.Enkvist emphasized, coherence requires the sentences in text correspond to the picture of the world that exists in the experience or imagination of the reader or listener. Additionally, the message in the text should provide the listener or reader with sufficient cues to allow for accurate interpretation and connection of the text. He defines coherence as “a quality that aligns a text with consistent picture of the world and allows to summarize and interpret it”<sup>13</sup>. Therefore, coherence is mainly related to the nature and characteristics of the text.

Like N.E.Enkvist, G.Brown and G.Yule emphasize that coherence primarily depends on the interpretation of messages expressed through language. In their opinion, even if there are no explicit cohesive devices indicating the connection between sentences, the reader or listener still tries to interpret the sequence of sentences as coherent.

*Within chunks of language which are conventionally presented as texts, the hearer/reader will make every effort to impose a coherent interpretation, i.e. to treat the language thus presented as constituting “text”. We do not see an advantage in trying to determine constitutive formal features which a text must possess to qualify as a “text.” Texts are what hearers and readers treat as texts*<sup>14</sup>.

In addition, there are other views on cohesion and coherence. For example, J.L.Morgan and M.Sellner emphasize that content plays an important role in the text. In their opinion, cohesion depends on the content of the text and, at the same time, produces linguistic results<sup>15</sup>. P.L.Carrell, on the other hand, believes that cohesion does not automatically provide coherence in a text, since “only the coherence of content does not make a text coherent,” on the contrary, “there may be additional linguistic features (similar to cohesion) that make a text coherent”<sup>16</sup>. Thus, cohesion is the result, not the cause, of coherence. Based on schemata, readers can understand coherence from the text, even in the partial or full absence of cohesive devices.

From the perspective of text linguistics, M.Hoey studied how lexical cohesive devices organize text. He analyzes how lexical units and syntactic repetitions ensure cohesion in the text. In his research, M.Hoey demonstrates that cohesion and coherence constitute text in an interconnected way. In general, cohesion is

---

<sup>13</sup> Enkvist N.E. Coherence, Pseudocoherence, and Non-coherence. In *Nordic Prospects in Linguistic Theory*, edited by Jens Allwood and Jørgen L. Mey, Odense: Odense University Press, 1978. – P. 109-128;

<sup>14</sup> Brown G., Yule G. *Discourse Analysis*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 288 p.

<sup>15</sup> Morgan R., Sellner M. *Discourse Coherence and Human Experience. Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980. – P. 363-380;

<sup>16</sup> Carrell P.L. Cohesion Is Not Coherence. – *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 4, 1982. – P. 479-488;

considered as a tool of ensuring coherence. A cohesive and coherent text allows the reader to quickly and accurately understand the information. Hoey emphasizes that “Cohesion is a property of the text, and coherence is the reader’s evaluation of the text.” He also states that lexical repetition is one of the main cohesive devices that creates a system and network of connections in the text. He insists that lexical repetitions can reveal the interrelations between sentences. Hoey distinguishes eight types of lexical repetitions: *simple lexical repetition, complex lexical repetition, simple mutual paraphrase, simple partial paraphrase, complex paraphrase, substitution, co-reference, ellipsis*<sup>17</sup>.

A.M.Johns divides coherence into two types: text-based coherence and reader-based coherence. According to his definition, text-based coherence is a characteristic feature of the text that includes cohesion and unity. This type of coherence refers to how sentences are connected and how the text maintains unity. Reader-based coherence requires successful interaction between the reader and the text. This type of coherence depends on the degree of correspondence between the reader’s expectations and the author’s intention and is manifested through the internal structure of the text<sup>18</sup>.

U.Connor and A.M.Johns define coherent text as “a text that fulfills the reader’s expectations”<sup>19</sup>. When interpreting the text, the reader relies on his knowledge of the world and expects that this knowledge to align with the structure and content of the text. Through this knowledge, the reader anticipates the information that will be presented later in the text. A coherent text that interacts with the reader satisfies the his expectations regarding logically sequential ideas, which serves the reader’s understanding of the text and comprehension of its clear meaning. At the same time, logical ideas, expressed through a holistic connection of words and sentences, help the reader to interpret the information in the text easily and accurately.

Although research on the topic of discourse is a complex field, cohesion and coherence represent its important aspect, encompassing the hierarchical organization of discourse. L.Lautamatti studied how the reader comprehends the text and its topic. In her opinion, coherence is based on the topic of a specific sentence. She uses the terms topic and comment to propose an approach for analyzing text flow. According to L.Lautamatti, the topic refers to what the sentence is about, and the comment is information about the topic. The topic of each sentence is connected in different ways with the topic of the text’s general discourse. The system of relations between the main topic of discourse and subtopics is called the thematic development of discourse. This development occurs through three types of progression: parallel progression - the preservation of the same topic in consecutive sentences; sequential progression - the emergence of the comment of the previous sentence as a new topic in the next one, extended

---

<sup>17</sup> Hoey M. *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991. – 244 p.

<sup>18</sup> Johns A.M. *Coherence and Academic Writing: Some Definitions and Suggestions for Teaching*. – *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 20, no. 2, 1986. – P. 247–265;

<sup>19</sup> Connor U., Johns A.M. *Coherence in Writing: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives*. – Alexandria, VA: TESOL, 1990. – 235 p;

parallel – a form of parallel progression, interrupted by sequential progression and later subsequently continued.<sup>20</sup>

However, the Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP), that is, functional theory, provides an alternative theoretical foundation for managing information flow and organizing discourse. Most supporters of FSP believe that the topic of a sentence usually represents the information given in previous sentences. The comment, on the other hand, represents new information, which is neither derived from previous sentences nor directly related to them. Thus, the flow of information moves from topic to comment, which reflects the course of human thought, because consciousness relies on familiar or contextual information before receiving new information. Therefore, FSP theorists are engaged in dividing sentences into functional parts within the framework of the general communicative process. For example, simple sentences in English are often considered to consist of topic and comment elements. The topic of the sentence is often associated with the grammatical subject, and the comment is connected with the predicate, which is the main focus in the sentence.

Discourse that meets the requirements of FSP is easier to read and more coherent for the reader. Connections between the theme usually emerge through semantic relations such as identity chains, partial identity, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy. And the connections between rheme are formed through identical propositions repeated in consecutive sentences. It should be noted that the model of interconnections between theme and rheme serves to explain only a part of the text. Various patterns of connection in the text encompass the entire text. Moreover, although the theme-rheme connection model can express patterns of connection within the text, it cannot fully explain the coherence encountered in different text genres. In other words, it is not always possible to explain the coherence encountered in contextual and propositional situations using this model.

However, the theory of cohesive ties, proposed by M.A.K.Halliday and R.Hasan, was later transformed into the theory of cohesive harmony<sup>21</sup>. Due to the limitations of using only cohesive ties when evaluating a text as complete whole and well-written, R.Hasan created the theory of cohesive harmony. According to this approach, coherence (semantic connectedness) is determined not by what and how many cohesive ties are used in the text, but by how and how often they interact with each other. According to R.Hasan's theory, two types of cohesive ties can interact with each other: identical chains - through pronominal cohesion, and similarity strings - through substitution, ellipsis, repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyperonymy, and meronymy. Interaction occurs when a member of one chain or system is in identical relationships with members of another one or more chains or systems.

The second chapter, titled **“Cohesion in English literary discourse and its interpretation in a functional approach”** explores the theory of cohesive devices

---

<sup>20</sup> Lautamatti L. Observations on the development of the topic in simplified discourse. In V. Kohonen & N.E. Enkvist (Eds.), *Text linguistics, cognitive learning, and language teaching*, 1978. – P. 71-104.

<sup>21</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. – Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press, 1985. – 126 p;

put forward by M.A.K.Halliday and R.Hasan, the grammatical and lexical cohesive devices, their role in ensuring the unity of the text within literary text, the functional roles of conjunctions in English literary discourse, their contribution to the formation of coherence, as well as lexical cohesive devices and their peculiarities.

The concept of cohesion is extensively discussed in the functional approach, in particular, within the framework of the systemic-functional linguistic model developed by M.A.K. Halliday and R.Hasan. According to this approach, the main forms of text cohesion are manifested through grammatical and lexical devices. Grammatical cohesive devices include reference, ellipsis, substitution, and conjunctions, while lexical devices encompass synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, and collocation<sup>22</sup>. It is these units that serve as means of ensuring the unity and consistency of the text.

According to M.A.K. Halliday and R.Hasan, grammatical cohesion is classified into four principal types: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction. Among these, reference constitutes one of the central components of grammatical cohesion, serving as a primary mechanism for ensuring the internal connectedness of a text. It reinforces cohesion by pointing to an entity, event or participant either within the text itself or in the external context. Reference operates in two main forms: *endophora*, where the interpretation of the referential item is found within the text, and *exophora*, where interpretation relies on contextual information outside the text. Endophoric reference is further subdivided into *anaphora* and *cataphora*: anaphora refers back to an element previously mentioned in the discourse, whereas cataphora anticipates an element that is introduced later in the text<sup>23</sup>.

For example, *Framton Nuttel endeavoured to say the correct something...He doubted more than ever whether these formal visits...* (H.H.Munro (Saki), “The Open Window”). Here *he* is an anaphoric reference referring to *Framton Nuttel*.

In this example, *She was waiting for her husband to come home. Mary Maloney sat quietly in the chair.* (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”). the referential expression precedes the introduction of the name *Mary Maloney*, and is subsequently clarified by it; therefore, this instance is interpreted as a case of cataphoric reference.

Next example, *There is one day that is ours. There is one day when all we Americans who are not self-made go back to the old home to eat saleratus biscuits and marvel how much nearer to the porch the old pump looks than it used to* (O.Henry, “Two Thanksgiving Day Gentlemen”). The exophoric reference to *Thanksgiving* is presented in an indirect and implicit manner. It evokes the shared cultural experience of Americans gathering to eat together and participate in festive rituals. The addressee’s cultural knowledge of Thanksgiving plays a crucial role in decoding the meaning of this reference, situating the characters’ actions within a broader cultural frame and thereby contributing to textual coherence. The reference

---

<sup>22</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – 374 p.

<sup>23</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – P.33.

to *Thanksgiving* as “*ours*” relies on the addressee’s pre-existing knowledge, presupposing an understanding of the holiday’s core meanings in American culture, such as gratitude, abundance and family traditions. Throughout the story, there are also implicit references to the social expectation of generosity and assistance to the less fortunate during Thanksgiving. The old gentleman’s annual practice of feeding a poor man on Thanksgiving reflects a widely shared social convention associated with the holiday, particularly on a day imbued with the values of thankfulness and communal solidarity. Reference devices (he, she, it, they, this, that, etc.) serve to consistently express the ideas in the text without excessive repetition.

Ellipsis is a cohesive device realized by omitting a grammatical to avoid repeating previously mentioned information. It requires the reader or listener to supplement the information based on the context. Ellipsis can usually occur at the level of parts of a sentence or the entire sentence. According to this characteristics, they are divided into verbal, nominal, and clausal types. For example, “*You want these Idaho potatoes?*” “*Oh yes, that’ll be fine. Two of those.*” (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”). In this dialogue, the item *those* functions as an instance of nominal ellipsis, whereby the full form *two of those (potatoes)* is omitted. The addressee can easily reconstruct the omitted meaning on the basis of the surrounding context, which contributes to making the interaction concise and fluent while simultaneously maintaining textual coherence.

Another important grammatical cohesive device is substitution, which functions as a mechanism whereby one linguistic item is replaced by another in order to avoid repetition and to maintain textual cohesion. It is also divided into verbal, nominal, and clausal types, and is often realized with the help of words such as *do, one, the same, so, such*. For example, *Jim looked at the chain admiringly. Della hoped he would do so* (O. Henry, “The Gift of the Magi”). In this instance, the construction *do so* preserves the preceding verbal group without repeating it explicitly. In addition to preventing redundancy, substitution enriches the stylistic expression of the text and plays a significant role in ensuring coherence.

Another important grammatical device contributing to cohesion is conjunction, which functions to link clauses, sentences, and larger segments of discourse, thereby ensuring logical continuity and coherence. As noted by M.A.K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, conjunctions can be classified into four primary types: *additive (introducing additional information)*, *adversative (indicating contrast)*, *causal (expressing cause-effect relations)*, and *temporal (signaling the sequence of events)*<sup>24</sup>. In English literary discourse, particularly in short stories, conjunctions guide the reader through the development of events, oppositions, causal relationships, as well as shifts in time or perspective. They serve as one of the principal means of constructing narrative progression, character interaction, and thematic continuity. Through the use of conjunctions, relations such as

---

<sup>24</sup> Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. *Cohesion in English*. – London: Longman, 1976. – P.238.

causality, contrast, and emotional nuance are articulated in a clear and natural manner, thereby reinforcing the overall coherence of the text.

Lexical cohesive devices are means of ensuring semantic connection between units in the text, among which repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, and especially collocations play an important role. If repetition increases emphasis of meaning, synonymy and antonymy contribute to the stylistic richness. For example, *He was a painter... Behrman was a failure in art... this old artist had always dreamed of painting a masterpiece* (O. Henry, “The Last Leaf”). In this fragment, the same referent is initially expressed through the lexeme *painter* and subsequently through *artist*. Although these items are not fully synonymous, they belong to the same semantic field and convey a shared professional identity. Such synonymic re-nomination maintains referential continuity in discourse, as the reader associates both lexical items with the same referent. This type of lexical cohesion strengthens the semantic linkage between segments of the text and contributes to the establishment of coherence.

As lexical cohesive devices, hyponymy and meronymy also play an important role in ensuring the coherence and cohesion of the text as semantic relations in discourse. Hyponymy refers to the relationship between general and specific terms, while meronymy refers to the relationship between the whole and its parts, both playing an important role in the formation of semantic connections within the framework of the story. For example, *She carried the meat into the kitchen, placed it in a pan, turned the oven on high, and shoved it inside... ..She lifted it out, and looked at it... A leg of lamb* (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”). In this instance, the general category *meat* is specified in the subsequent segment through its more concrete realization, *lamb*. Importantly, these two items do not refer to different entities; rather, they represent different levels of semantic specification of the same referent. The semantic development in the discourse unfolds as follows: general category *meat* → specific type *lamb* → concrete object *leg of lamb*. This hierarchical progression enables the reader to identify the referent in a step-by-step manner. Initially, *meat* is perceived as a broad and indeterminate concept; in the following segment, it is narrowed and concretized through *lamb*, resulting in a clearly defined referent. In this fragment, hyponymy functions not merely as a lexical cohesive tie but also as a mechanism of narrative development.

In the following example, a part–whole relationship as a form of lexical cohesion can be observed. For instance, *The watch was his father's and his grandfather's. And now it was Jim's. And the next thing he knew, the chain was gone* (O. Henry, “The Gift of the Magi”). In this fragment, *watch* is introduced as the central referent of the discourse, while in the subsequent segment its constituent element, *chain*, is mentioned. The semantic hierarchy is structured as follows: *material object* → *personal possession* → *watch* → *chain*. Importantly, *chain* is not interpreted as a new referent but rather as a structural component of an already established object. Consequently, the referential center of the discourse remains unchanged. In this sentence, the meronymic relation performs several functions: (a) referential specification, as *chain* reveals the internal structure of the object *watch*; (b) semantic integration, whereby both items are processed within a

single conceptual model; and (c) interpretive continuity, as the reader construes the newly introduced item not as a separate entity but as part of the existing referent. In this way, the elements of the discourse are integrated around a unified semantic center, thereby establishing coherence.

Throughout the research, the co-occurrence of multiple cohesive devices within a single context reveals the complex integration of lexical cohesion in English literary discourse. Such a strategy of combined usage enriches the text not only at the level of semantic linkage but also as a multi-layered discursive system.

For example: *Mary was in shock, a state of astonishment that turned into calm determination. The dinner – lamb, peas and potatoes – was set neatly, every plate and fork in place. Yet the scene swung between life and death, warmth and coldness, love and betrayal.* (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”). The synonyms *shock* and *astonishment* reflect different degrees of intensity in representing a character’s psychological state. While *shock* conveys a sudden and forceful emotional impact, *astonishment* denotes a milder yet still significant sense of surprise and amazement. Through the strategic use of such synonyms, the addressant gradually amplifies the emotional force of the event. In contrast, antonymic pairs such as *life – death, warmth – coldness, love – betrayal* expose dramatic turning points and underlying conflicts within the narrative. These oppositions articulate themes of violence, psychological distress and socio-psychological contrast at the semantic level, thereby reinforcing the story’s dramatic tone. The hyponymic set *lamb, peas, potatoes – dinner* groups individual food items under a broader category, creating thematic unity within the text. This enumeration evokes an ordinary domestic scene, lending the narrative a sense of everyday realism. Similarly, meronymic relations such as *plate – fork – table – dinner scene* strengthen the spatial representation of the event through a part-whole structure. The sequential presentation of these details visually enriches the depiction of a familiar family setting, establishing a contrasting background against which the dramatic event unfolds. The perception of this complex lexical network enables the addressee to interpret the narrative on multiple levels. In English literary discourse, such integrated, multi-layered lexical relations serve to reinforce coherence at a high level.

Collocations add authenticity and contextual harmony to the text through fixed lexical pairs. For example: *make a decision, strong tea, heavy rain* are often found in English literary discourse. In short stories, collocations are often used to express the mental states of the characters, the social background, and ironic situations. For example, *She took his coat and hung it in the closet. Then she walked over and **made the drinks**, a strong one for him, a weak one for herself... he lifted the glass... the ice cubes tinkled... he **finished the drink** quickly and **poured himself another*** (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”). The collocational lexical units organized around the concept of *drink* construct a scenario of everyday routine. The verbs *make, pour, finish* represent a typical sequence of actions associated with the consumption of a beverage. These units ensure the unity of the lexical field and enhance the naturalness of the situation within the discourse. It is precisely this sense of normality that, once disrupted, intensifies the

dramatic turning point in the narrative. Thus, collocation contributes not only to cohesion but also to coherence through the creation of pragmatic contrast.

The following example illustrates a semantically restricted combination: “*The cold breath of autumn had stricken its leaves from the vine... skeleton bare branches clung to the crumbling bricks*” (O. Henry, “*The Last Leaf*”). Restricted collocations are associated with a particular semantic field, and their components tend to occur in limited and conventionalized combinations. In this instance, units such as *bare branches* or *fallen leaves* can be interpreted as descriptive collocations linked to seasonal change. These expressions collectively construct the conceptual model of autumn. Within the framework of M.A.K. Halliday and R.Hasan, such collocations contribute to the thematic unity of the text through semantic proximity. The addressee perceives the autumn setting not as a collection of isolated images, but as a unified situational background, thereby reinforcing textual coherence.

In conclusion, grammatical and lexical cohesive devices ensure the structural integrity, semantic consistency, and stylistic completeness of the text. In English literary discourse the functional analysis of these devices allows for a deeper understanding of text coherence, as well as analysis of the author’s stylistic approach and communicative strategy. The extensive use of these devices in the literary texts of authors forms not only the linguistic, but also the logical unity and coherence of the text.

The third chapter is titled “**Pragmatic study of cohesion and coherence in English literary discourse**”. It discusses coherence within the pragmatic approach, context and its relationship with interpretation, discourse markers, deictic units, the influence of pragmatic devices such as implicature, presupposition, and speech acts on.

In this regard, the works of several scholars are of particular significance. Herbert Paul Grice’s conversational maxims and theory of implicature serves as an important basis for analyzing the concepts of implicit meaning and text cohesion. John Searle and Austin explain coherence by identifying illocutionary intentions behind sentences in a text through “Speech act theory.” Deborah Schiffrin in her work “Discourse Markers” noted that discourse markers (for example, *so, because, and, but*) are of great importance in the logical flow of the text. Bruce Fraser, determining the functional types of discourse markers, identified their role as a means of ensuring semantic and pragmatic connection between sentences. He is one of the main scholars who introduced the concept of “Discourse markers” into scientific practice. Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson explain the role of contextually appropriate information selection and interpretation in coherence through “Relevance Theory.” The pragmatic theory developed by Stephen C. Levinson explains the hidden meaning, implicature, presupposition, and the role of context in the coherence of the text in the process of communication. He delves

deeper into Grice's works, demonstrating how the text is organized coherently within a conversational structure and social context<sup>25</sup>.

In English literary discourse semantic consistency is ensured not only through grammatical and lexical devices, but also through pragmatic means specific to context, speech situation, and communication. The pragmatic approach to the study of coherence is based on the mutual understanding between the addresser and the addressee, their social relations, contextual conditions, and the intended purpose of the speech. Especially in English literary works, particularly in the stories, the deep pragmatic layers of discourse play a decisive role in understanding interpersonal relationships, the development of events and plot, and dramatic tension. This section analyzes the main pragmatic devices, discourse markers, deictic units, implicature, presupposition, and speech acts, that ensure coherence.

Discourse markers are units that show the semantic, logical, or temporal connection between sentences, ideas, and contexts in speech. They perform the functions of managing the flow of information in the text, expressing causal or contrasting relationships between events, as well as directing the reader's attention to the desired point. According to D. Schiffrin's classification, the productivity of the most common discourse markers *such as and, but, or, so, because, now, then, well, I mean, you know* is emphasized and described as key indicators at the pragmatic level and are analyzed across five discourse "planes," namely: *ideational, actional, exchange structure, information state, participation framework* <sup>26</sup>. For example,

"Hullo Sam," she said brightly.

"Good evening, Mrs. Maloney. How're you?"

"I want some potatoes please, Sam. Yes, and I think a can of peas."

"Anything else?" the grocer asked.

"Well – what would you suggest, Sam?"

"How about a nice big slice of cheesecake?"

"Perfect," she said. (Roald Dahl, "Lamb to the Slaughter"). In this fragment, multiple discourse markers operate simultaneously across different pragmatic planes, thereby ensuring the multi-layered coherence of the dialogue. At the ideational level, the marker *and* introduces additional information and establishes a semantic link between propositions. From the perspective of the exchange structure plane, *well* regulates the process of turn-taking by providing a softened initiation of the response. At the actional level, *how about* functions as a proposal-forming speech act, directing the communicative action. Within the participation framework, *well* serves to maintain social balance between the addresser and the addressee. From the standpoint of the information state, *yes* signals the acceptance

---

<sup>25</sup> Grice H.P. Logic and Conversation. In: Cole, P., & Morgan, J. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, 1975. – P. 41-58; Austin J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. – 168 p; Searle J.R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p; Schiffrin D. *Discourse markers*. – Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 342 p; Fraser, B. What are Discourse Markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 1999. – P.931-952; Sperber D., Wilson D. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1986. – 380 p; Levinson S.C. *Pragmatics*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 420 p;

<sup>26</sup> Schiffrin D. *Discourse markers*. – Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 342 p;

of newly introduced information. According to Deborah Schiffrin, such multi-functional markers integrate discourse into a unified communicative system. The addressee interprets the dialogue as a system of interrelated speech acts, through which pragmatic coherence is constructed in a complex and layered manner.

Within the pragmatic approach, deictic expressions constitute one of the key mechanisms contributing to the establishment of coherence. Stephen C. Levinson regards deixis as one of the central categories of pragmatics and distinguishes five principal types: personal, temporal, spatial, discourse, and social deixis<sup>27</sup>.

For example, “*My aunt will be down presently, Mr. Nuttel,*” said the young lady; “*in the meantime you must try and put up with me.*” (Saki, “The Open Window”). In this fragment, multiple deictic expressions construct a multi-coordinate model of the speech situation. Personal deixis *you, me* defines the communicative roles of the addresser and the addressee. Temporal deixis *presently, meantime* organizes the temporal framework of events in relation to the moment of utterance. Spatial deixis *down* indicates the direction of movement and contributes to the formation of a spatial model. Social deixis *Mr., aunt* specifies the social relationship between participants. Within the framework of Stephen C. Levinson, such a multi-component deictic system reduces interpretive ambiguity. Through these expressions, the addressee constructs the speech situation as a complex, integrated model. As a result, referential, temporal, and social parameters are harmonized within the discourse, giving rise to pragmatic coherence.

From a pragmatic perspective, coherence is also constructed through implicit meaning relations. In interpreting such implicit connections, implicature plays a central role, as it has been noted that “*what is meant often goes beyond what is said,*” indicating that utterances frequently convey more meaning than is explicitly articulated<sup>28</sup>. In this way, implicature functions as a bridge between the surface meaning of a text and its contextual and communicative intent, thereby contributing to the establishment of textual coherence.

In “Logic and Conversation”, H.P. Grice formulates the concepts of the “Cooperative Principle” and “*Conversational Maxims*”, arguing that interlocutors adhere to certain principles in order to ensure mutual understanding in communication, and that the violation of these principles gives rise to implicit meaning, that is, implicature. The notion of conversational implicature is explained on the basis of the Cooperative Principle and four conversational maxims—*Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner*<sup>29</sup>. These maxims regulate the sufficiency of information, truthfulness, relevance, and clarity in interaction, thereby supporting mutual comprehension and logical consistency in discourse. When an addressee or a fictional character deliberately flouts one of these maxims, the addressee infers an additional, unstated meaning from the perceived violation,

---

<sup>27</sup> Levinson S.C. Pragmatics. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 420 p;

<sup>28</sup> Grice H.P. Logic and Conversation. In: Cole, P., & Morgan, J. (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts, New York: Academic Press, 1975. – P. 41.

<sup>29</sup> Grice H.P. Logic and Conversation. In: Cole, P., & Morgan, J. (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts, New York: Academic Press, 1975. – P. 43.

which constitutes an implicature. This interpretive process enhances the coherence of literary discourse, as the addressee is actively engaged in constructing deeper layers of meaning beyond the surface text. In English literary discourse, this phenomenon is particularly salient, for example, “*I’ll get the supper,*” *she said. “Sit down,*” *he said.* (Roald Dahl, “Lamb to the Slaughter”). Patrick’s response does not semantically correspond directly to the preceding proposal. According to H.P. Grice, although the maxim of relevance appears to be violated at the surface level, the addressee is prompted to infer the underlying meaning. Patrick attempts to control the interaction and signals the initiation of an important conversation. Consequently, the addressee interprets the utterance not literally, but as a pragmatic cue. As a result, the internal logical connectedness of the dialogue is maintained. The apparent violation of the maxim of relevance enhances dramatic tension and reinforces discourse coherence through implicature.

In pragmatic analysis, *implicature* and *presupposition* are closely related yet conceptually distinct notions. As discussed above, implicature refers to an implicit meaning deliberately generated by the adresant and recovered through the interlocutor’s logical inference. Presupposition, by contrast, denotes information that is embedded in the structure of the utterance itself and is treated as already known or taken for granted by the participants in communication. While implicature encourages the reader to infer what is left unsaid, presupposition directs attention to the underlying assumptions that support what is explicitly stated. In this sense, presupposition establishes a “background of assumed truth” in the addressee’s cognition, thereby reinforcing coherence through semantic stability. As previously noted, a number of scholars have conceptualized presupposition as a layer of meaning that is implicit in the semantic structure of an utterance yet accepted as factual in discourse. On this basis, five major types of presupposition are commonly distinguished – *existential presupposition*, *factive presupposition*, *lexical presupposition*, *structural presupposition*, *counterfactual presupposition*<sup>30</sup> each of which contributes to the maintenance of coherence in discourse at different levels. For example, *She looked at herself in the glass again* (O. Henry, “The Gift of the Magi”). In this sentence, the lexical presuppositional item *again* presupposes the recurrence of the action. Della’s act of looking into the mirror once more implies that she has previously examined her appearance. The addressee is thus prompted to refer back to an earlier segment of the discourse. In this way, a link is established between temporal continuity and the character’s psychological process. The repetition of the action reflects the protagonist’s inner hesitation, and as a result, temporal coherence is constructed within the discourse.

In the analysis of English literary discourse, *speech act theory* emerges as one of the key pragmatic frameworks for uncovering the deeper communicative layers of a text. Originally proposed by J. L. Austin and subsequently systematized by J. Searle, this theory posits that speakers do not merely convey meaning through language but also perform purposeful actions – doing things with words. In literary

---

<sup>30</sup> Levinson S.C. *Pragmatics*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – P.167; Yule G. *Pragmatics*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapter 4, Presupposition and Entailment. – P. 25.

discourse, however, such actions are realized in aesthetic and emotional forms. Through a character's utterances, inner experiences, intentions, and social positioning are revealed. In this way, speech acts occupy a central role in ensuring coherence, that is, the internal logical and communicative unity of the text.

In English literary discourse, coherence is constructed not only through the interrelation of grammatical and lexical units but also through the interactional dynamics of characters' speech. Each dialogue turn and each speech act such as a request, command, expression of politeness, refusal or reproach stands in a cause-effect relationship with preceding and subsequent utterances. Consequently, the interaction between illocutionary force (the addressant's communicative intention) and perlocutionary effect (the impact produced on the addressee) reinforces the logical progression and semantic unity of the literary text<sup>31</sup>. John R. Searle expands Austin's theory, emphasizing illocutionary acts as central, and classifies them into five categories from functional aspect:

1. Assertives - express the speaker's belief in the truth.
2. Directives - order or advise the listener to perform an action.
3. Commissives - the speaker connects himself to a future action (promise, obligation).
4. Expressives - convey feelings and attitudes.
5. Declarations - change a certain social situation through language (judicial decisions, dismissal, etc.)<sup>32</sup>.

John R. Searle deepens Austin's illocutionary act, categorizing them based on language action type and purpose, which clarifies the analysis of coherence.

For example, "*My hair grows so fast, Jim!*" she cried. "*Don't look at me that way,*" she said. "*I had it cut off and sold it.*" (O. Henry, "The Gift of the Magi"). In this fragment, the combination of speech acts constitutes the dramatic core of the discourse. The assertive act provides factual information, thereby establishing the causal basis of the event; the expressive act reveals the psychological state of the character; and the directive act serves to constrain the addressee's evaluative response. Within the framework of John Searle, such a combination enables a more comprehensive realization of communicative intention. The addressee interprets these speech acts in an integrative manner, as a result of which causal, affective, and interactional coherence are jointly constructed within the discourse.

Pragmatic devices play an important role in the consistent and semantically integrated formation of English literary discourse. With the help of these devices, in English literary discourse, the communication between the characters, inner emotions, and socio-psychological context are clearly conveyed to the reader. Through a pragmatic approach, the text is analyzed at the contextual level, resulting in the formation of deep coherence. This, in turn, plays a significant role in making the text not only comprehensible but also impactful.

The fourth chapter of the dissertation is entitled "**Cognitive realization of cohesion and coherence in English literary discourse,**" and analyzes such issues

---

<sup>31</sup> Austin J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. – 168 p;

<sup>32</sup> Searle J.R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p.

as the cognitive approach and the reader's cognitive model, cognitive scripts, schematas, the role of the thinking model in the interpretation of discourse, the formation of coherence by the resipient, assumptions, logical connections, and contextual reasoning.

In cognitive linguistics, coherence emerges through mental models and frames formed in the reader's consciousness. In this direction, the works of the following scholars are relevant. Teun A. van Dijk explains the concepts of the mental model and the situational model, the role of the background knowledge and cognition in the process of text perception. Walter Kintsch analyzes the mechanism by which the reader generates meaning from a text through the "Construction-Integration Model." George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, through their theory of cognitive metaphor, show how concepts and ideas are expressed in stylistic and semantic relation in literary texts. Roger Schank and Robert Abelson explain the process of the reader's experiential expectations and constructive perception of the text through "Script theory." In their work "Discourse Analysis," G.Brown and G.Yule illuminated coherence and cohesion within the oral speech and written texts from a pragmatic perspective, providing grounded analysis on how a resipient or listener perceives a text, and how logical connections are formed based on their expectations<sup>33</sup>.

In modern text linguistics and discourse analysis, the cognitive approach occupies a special place. According to this approach, the process of understanding and comprehending a text is carried out not only on the basis of linguistic units, but also on the structure of knowledge in human cognition and model in consciousness. Representatives of cognitive linguistics, such as G.Lakoff, Ronald W.Langacker, Ch.Fillmore, G.Fauconnier, M.Turner, Teun A. van Dijk, R.Schank, R.Abelson, G.Brown, and G.Yule, scientifically substantiate that cohesion and coherence through of a text are formed through knowledge structures existing in the human mind<sup>34</sup>. Text manifests itself not only as a collection of linguistic units, but also as a form of perception of knowledge system, experience and reality in human consciousness. In the analyzing a text in terms of coherence and cohesion, the knowledge structures and cognitive mechanisms, such as frames, scripts, scenarios, schemas, mental models, and inference which exist in human

---

<sup>33</sup> Teun A. van Dijk. *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. – Hillsdale, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980. – P. 85-129; Kintsch W. *The Role of Knowledge in Discourse Comprehension: A Construction-Integration Model*. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 1988. – P. 163-182; Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p; Schank R.C., Abelson R.P. *Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures*. – Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977. – 248 p; Brown G., Yule G. *Discourse Analysis*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 288 p.

<sup>34</sup> Fillmore C.J. *Frame semantics*. In *Linguistic Society of Korea (Ed.), Linguistics in the morning calm* Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co, 1982. – P. 111-137; Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p; Langacker R.W. *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Volume I, Theoretical prerequisites*. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987. – 516 p; Fauconnier G., Turner M. *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. – New York: Basic Books, 2002. – 464 p; Schank R.C., Abelson R.P. *Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977. – 248 p; Brown G, Yule G. *Discourse Analysis*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 288 p.

consciousness, play a decisive role. Linguocognitive analyses in this chapter were conducted based on the theory of G.Brown and G.Yule.

G.Brown and G.Yule conceptualize discourse coherence as an interpretative process. According to their view, the recipient establishes textual coherence through pre-existing systems of knowledge, namely frames, scripts, scenarios. Discourse is thus understood not merely as a collection of grammatical units, but as a dynamic process of meaning construction and interpretation. Within this theoretical framework, coherence is not treated as a feature explicitly encoded in the text itself; rather, it is regarded as an interpretative outcome that emerges in the recipient's cognitive processing<sup>35</sup>.

A *frame* is a set of knowledge about a certain phenomenon or concept in human consciousness. It is a cognitive structure that creates a contextual basis for understanding the content of the text. Through frames, the recipient compares the events in the text with the knowledge existing in their consciousness and perceives the text as coherent. For example, O. Henry's short story "Two Thanksgiving Day Gentlemen" is structured around the Thanksgiving frame. This frame activates culturally embedded knowledge in the recipient's cognition through such slots as *generosity, gratitude and tradition*. In the opening part of the story, the recipient, relying on this frame, anticipates a charitable and benevolent ritual. However, as the narrative unfolds, tradition gradually turns into a social obligation, and generosity transforms into a source of suffering. As a result, the recipient is compelled to reinterpret the initially activated frame. This process fully aligns with Brown and Yule's principle of "coherence as interpretation," according to which coherence is not directly encoded by the sender but emerges as a result of the recipient's interpretative activity.

The other concept of *script* was introduced into scholarly discourse by R. Schank and R. Abelson in their seminal work "Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding", where it is defined as a stereotypical cognitive model representing a sequence of events as organized in human cognition. While a *frame* encodes a set of static knowledge associated with a particular situation, a *script* captures the typical temporal sequence of actions that usually occur within that situation.

In "Discourse Analysis", G.Brown and G.Yule interpret scripts as cognitive resources that listeners and readers actively employ in the process of discourse comprehension<sup>36</sup>. According to their account, scripts function as cognitive templates that enable individuals to anticipate "what typically happens next" in a given situation. These scripts operate in close interaction with the recipient's existing knowledge base and cultural experience, thereby supporting the maintenance of meaning continuity during discourse processing. Consequently, in the course of discourse interpretation, the recipient integrates each new piece of information into an already established system of scripts, reconstructs the sequence of events accordingly, and thus ensures coherence at the cognitive level.

---

<sup>35</sup> Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – P.233.

<sup>36</sup> Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – P.241.

For example, In the short story “The Open Window,” the *polite social visit script* functions as the primary cognitive anchor. The recipient associates this situation with the conventional sequence of *greetings – conversation – politeness – farewell*. The character Vera deliberately manipulates this culturally familiar script by fabricating a false story within the context of a social visit, thereby misleading the interlocutor. Up to the middle of the narrative, the recipient interprets the interaction on the basis of this conventional script; however, the unexpected ending produces a moment of psychological incoherence. At this point, a new script – one of deception and playful trickery is activated in the recipient’s cognition. Brown and Yule’s framework aptly illustrates the dynamic nature of coherence in this process: the recipient continuously compares incoming information with an already activated script and revises the interpretation whenever a mismatch arises. It is precisely this interpretative flexibility on the part of the recipient that enables the sender to construct literary irony and to achieve textual coherence as a cognitively emergent phenomenon.

The concept of a *scenario*, unlike that of a script, is characterized as a time-oriented and prospective cognitive model. Whereas a script represents a “typical sequence” of events, a scenario is interpreted as a mini-narrative that models how events may unfold under particular conditions. Within Brown and Yule’s theoretical framework, scenarios constitute a cognitive mechanism of prediction in discourse processing. The recipient interprets each new utterance in relation to the preceding context; if the outcome aligns with the expected scenario, coherence is reinforced, whereas a mismatch prompts the reconstruction of the scenario.

For example, *The old ivy vine clung to the bricks of the wall. One leaf still clung to its stem* (O Henry, “The Last Leaf”). At the beginning of the story, a scenario of illness and impending death is activated in the recipient’s cognition: *cold weather, illness, fallen leaves* collectively evoke the expectation that “death is near.” However, the appearance of the last leaf painted on the wall by Behrman radically alters the direction of events. As the recipient processes this new information, the previously activated scenario is revised: instead of a scenario of death, one of *hope and self-sacrifice* becomes dominant. This shift clearly exemplifies Brown and Yule’s notion of interpretative coherence. Textual coherence here does not emerge primarily through formal cohesive markers, but rather through the recipient’s active engagement in updating and reorganizing the underlying scenario. In this way, the sender draws the recipient into cognitive cooperation, prompting the continual comparison of each new event with the evolving mental scenario and the reconstruction of meaning accordingly. As a result, coherence is successfully achieved within the narrative.

From a cognitive perspective, the formation of coherence in English literary discourse is achieved not only through frames, scripts, and scenarios, but also through the operation of the recipient’s cognitive experience and pre-existing knowledge structures, namely schemas. As noted above, according to Brown and Yule’s theoretical framework, coherence is an interpretative process constructed by the recipient. From this standpoint, schemas likewise emerge as fundamental cognitive supports in the comprehension of discourse.

A *schema* is interpreted as an organized model of knowledge stored in the human mind, formed on the basis of previously acquired experience, cultural norms, and social values. Developed within linguistics and discourse analysis, this concept demonstrates that, in the process of understanding new information, individuals associate it with prior experience in an associative manner<sup>37</sup>. Consequently, schemas function as a fundamental cognitive mechanism for meaning construction in the comprehension of literary texts.

For example, *Every Thanksgiving Day for nine years the Old Gentleman had found his way to that same corner* (O. Henry, “Two Thanksgiving Day Gentlemen”). This line activates a *Thanksgiving tradition schema* in the recipient’s cognition, encompassing culturally associated values such as gratitude, generosity, charity, social solidarity. On this basis, the reader initially anticipates the warmth and benevolence typically associated with the ritual. However, the author strategically exploits this schema through a semantic reversal: the celebration is no longer presented as a source of joy but rather as an obligation, a habitual social burden. As a result, the recipient replaces the initially activated cultural schema with a *social burden schema* and reinterprets the discourse on an ethical and psychological level. This process exemplifies reader-based coherence as described by Brown and Yule, according to which coherence is not an inherent property of the text itself but emerges through the recipient’s active reorganization of meaning.

According to Brown and Yule’s theoretical framework, another key cognitive mechanism contributing to the establishment of coherence is the *mental model*. A mental model refers to the cognitive representation constructed in the reader’s mind during the process of text comprehension. This model does not merely involve decoding the information presented in the text; rather, it reflects the simulation of the described events as a vivid, situation-based experience in the recipient’s cognition. In this respect, Brown and Yule conceptualize coherence not as a property inherent in the text itself, but as an interpretative system that emerges within the recipient’s cognitive processing<sup>38</sup>. When a recipient encounters a literary text, the frame activates the general context (such as setting, historical period, social conditions); the script enables the prediction of the sequence of events; the scenario allows the recipient to envisage the direction of event development; and the schema links all these elements to the recipient’s cultural knowledge. On the basis of this integration, a mental model, that is, a dynamic, visual, situational representation in the mind is constructed. According to G. Brown and G. Yule’s principle of ‘local interpretation,’ each new sentence is evaluated in relation to the existing mental model. In this way, frames, scripts, scenarios, schemata constitute the structural foundation of the mental model. The mental model integrates all of these elements, thereby enabling coherence to emerge as a unified system within the recipient’s cognition.

For example, in “The Gift of the Magi” a *romantic sacrifice model* is initially formed in the recipient’s cognition, encompassing love, devotion, the expression of

---

<sup>37</sup> Rumelhart D.E. Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*. – Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980. – P.33-58.

<sup>38</sup> Brown G., Yule G. *Discourse Analysis*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – P.224.

affection through gift-giving. This model activates the *Christmas gift-giving frame* and, at the level of script, the conventional sequence *buy* → *wrap* → *exchange* → *rejoice*. However, at the conclusion of the story, the expected scenario is reversed. Both protagonists relinquish their most valuable possessions. Consequently, the *joyful exchange* scenario is transformed into a *mutual sacrifice model*. At this point, the recipient's mental model is updated: the central meaning no longer resides in the 'romantic gift' itself, but rather in 'spiritual self-sacrifice':

*Initial model:* love → gift → happiness;

*Conflict:* loss → irony → reversal;

*Revised model:* sacrifice → wisdom → moral coherence. As a result of this reconstruction of meaning, coherence is further deepened. The recipient is now able to perceive the event as morally consistent and emotionally complete.

The final cognitive mechanism in the framework proposed by G. Brown and G. Yule *inference* refers to conclusions that are not explicitly stated in the text but are derived by the reader on the basis of contextual information. The authors emphasize that coherence arises directly from the recipient's inferential activity. In their work "Discourse Analysis", they conceptualize discourse comprehension as a process that extends beyond purely linguistic analysis, framing it instead as a cognitive and interpretative activity. Within their theoretical perspective, inference is recognized as one of the central mechanisms responsible for the establishment of discourse coherence. As they argue, any discourse requires not only surface-level grammatical continuity but also semantic continuity, which emerges through the recipient's active inferential reasoning. Therefore, coherence is not the result of a mechanical linkage of textual signals; rather, it is the outcome of the recipient's *completive cognition*<sup>39</sup>. Through inference, the reader identifies the internal logical relations of the text and interprets it in a coherent manner. This process constitutes a fundamental cognitive activity underlying coherence.

In the theory proposed by G. Brown and G. Yule, inference manifests itself in three principal forms: *missing links*, which involve filling in causal or emotional connections that are not explicitly expressed in the text; *non-automatic connections*, which require the mental reorganization of meaning relations between sentences on the basis of context; and *filling in gaps or discontinuities*, which entails reconstructing semantic breaks in discourse and restoring global coherence. In all of these processes, the recipient's cognition occupies a central position: it is precisely the recipient who processes linguistic signals through cognitive structures such as frames, scripts, scenarios, schemata and mental models, thereby transforming meaning into a coherent cognitive whole. As a result, coherence is formed not within the text itself but within the recipient's cognition. This perspective allows literary discourse to be interpreted as a dynamic communicative phenomenon grounded in human cognition and interpretative activity.

For example: *The old ivy vine climbing halfway up the brick wall was visible from her window* (O. Henry, "The Last Leaf"). At a surface level, this sentence consists of a descriptive detail: it depicts an ivy vine clinging to a wall. However,

---

<sup>39</sup> Brown G., Yule G. *Discourse Analysis*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – P.256.

as emphasized by G. Brown and G. Yule, connections between sentences are not always formed automatically; rather, they are reconstructed by the recipient's cognition on the basis of context. From this detail, the recipient activates a *hope schema*: *ivy leaves* → *life* → *endurance* → *survival*. Through non-automatic inference, the recipient establishes the following logical connection: *the ivy is not merely a plant, but a symbol of psychological strength and persistence*. The author does not state this relationship explicitly; instead, it emerges in the recipient's cognition through *conceptual enrichment*. Thus, coherence here arises not from linguistic continuity, but from an optional, meaning-based association grounded in semantic inference.

The cognitive approach explains cohesion and coherence not only through linguistic units, but also through the knowledge structures and mental processes existing in human cognition. Cognitive devices such as frames, scripts, scenarios, schemas, mental models, and inference play a central role in bringing the text to a unified, consistent, and comprehensible state. Especially in literary discourse, through these tools, the behavior of characters, the author's position, and the overall idea of the text are formed as a strong semantic system in the reader's cognition. This proves the incomparable role of cognitive tools in ensuring coherence in English literary discourse.

## CONCLUSION

The study of the functional features of cohesive devices in ensuring coherence in English literary discourse, along with the review of relevant scholarly and methodological works on the topic, has led to the following conclusions:

1. In English literary discourse, cohesion and coherence are regarded as fundamental principles of textual organization, and their complementary interaction serves as a key means by which the reader achieves a complete and consistent interpretation of the text: cohesion is realized through linguistic devices, whereas coherence emerges through the reader's logical and inferential capacities; consequently, these concepts are interpreted as interrelated phenomena that play a central role in revealing the functional, pragmatic and cognitive dimensions of discourse.

2. It has been established that grammatical cohesive devices as reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction ensure the structural integrity of the text by creating grammatical relations among formal units of discourse, and that, in English literary discourse, these devices play a crucial role in conveying clear relationships among characters, events, and actions to the reader, thereby contributing to the construction of coherence.

3. It has been demonstrated that reference, through its deictic and anaphoric functions, maintains precision and coherence throughout the text in English literary discourse; it plays a significant functional role in re-identifying characters or objects, specifying temporal and spatial parameters, and guiding the reader's attention.

4. It has been revealed that linguistic devices such as substitution and ellipsis in English literary discourse not only contribute to avoiding redundancy and maintaining conciseness and simplicity of expression, but also deepen contextual comprehension and require a higher level of interpretive engagement from the reader, thereby serving as effective means of establishing coherence.

5. It has been demonstrated that lexical cohesive devices as repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy are not only establish semantic level internal unity within the text but also ensure coherence by integratively linking character psychology and the chain of events within a unified semantic field.

6. It has been shown that the use of collocations in English literary discourse generates semantic parallelism, which activates connotative meanings in the reader's cognition, enhances the expressive power of artistic representation, and ensures coherence by skillfully revealing life-like scenes and the complex relationships among individuals.

7. It has been demonstrated that pragmatic devices as discourse markers, deictic expressions, presupposition, implicature and speech acts enhance the communicative force of English literary discourse by revealing multiple layers of meaning; they facilitate the expression of ambiguity and irony in character interaction and play a leading role in the establishment of coherence.

8. It has been established that discourse markers in English literary discourse not only ensure the sequential organization of interaction but also create pragmatic links that enable the author to explicate events, provide interpretation, introduce contrasts, and direct the addressee's attention to specific points of meaning.

9. It has been established that deictic expressions in English literary texts contribute to the formation of coherence by specifying spatial, temporal, and personal parameters, thereby simplifying the semantic texture of the text; at the same time, their context-dependent interpretation requires a high degree of inferential activity on the part of the addressee.

10. It has been demonstrated that pragmatic devices such as presupposition and implicature play a crucial role in constructing the deeper logical layer of the text and in the emergence of coherence: presuppositions create implicit connections between pieces of information by drawing on the shared knowledge base assumed by the addresser, while implicatures, grounded in the cooperative maxims proposed by H. P. Grice, introduce stylistic complexity, tone, and irony through meanings that are not explicitly stated but are expected to be inferred, thereby reinforcing textual coherence through the addressee's contextual interpretation.

11. It has been demonstrated that speech acts, particularly those performing assertive, directive, expressive functions serve as important tools for identifying interpersonal relations among characters and their social roles, while also reinforcing the semantic and pragmatic coherence of the literary text; in English literary discourse, these devices directly influence plot development and enable the coherent expression of social critique and emotional complexity.

12. It has been established that cognitive mechanisms such as frames, scripts, scenarios, schemata and mental models extend beyond surface-level linguistic

connections in English literary discourse, functioning as highly effective means of achieving coherence by activating the addressee's existing knowledge structures, organizing sequences of events into conceptual models, and guiding the process of inferencing, thereby ensuring interpretive consistency.

13. It has been demonstrated that, within the cognitive approach, frames, scripts, scenarios and schemata play a crucial role in the process of achieving coherence by linking the text to the knowledge structures existing in human cognition, thereby enabling the perception and processing of new information on the basis of an already established conceptual system.

14. It has been explained that mental models occupy a central position in the emergence of coherence in English literary discourse, as they enable the addressee to interpret characters, events, and causal relationships within a coherent logical framework; particularly in English short stories, where implicit irony or unexpected plot developments generate semantic complexity, the addressee relies on a dynamically evolving mental model grounded in prior contexts, and thus such models function not only as a cognitive foundation for the reading process but also as a key means of fully apprehending the coherence-generating potential of cognitive mechanisms within the text.

15. It has been demonstrated that inference, situated at the intersection of cognitive and pragmatic approaches, functions as one of the most significant indicators of coherence by enabling the addressee to identify meanings that are not explicitly expressed in the text but are required to be inferred on the basis of context, thereby effectively guiding the process of text comprehension.

16. It has been established, on the basis of analyses of English literary discourse, particularly short stories that the interaction of cohesive and coherent devices, together with their combined effects at grammatical, lexical, pragmatic and cognitive levels, determines the semantic richness and aesthetic impact of English literary discourse, thus demonstrating the effectiveness of a multi-dimensional approach to text analysis.

**НАУЧНЫЙ СОВЕТ DSc.03/2025.27.12.Fil.08.08  
ПО ПРИСУЖДЕНИЮ УЧЕНЫХ СТЕПЕНЕЙ ПРИ  
БУХАРСКОМ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОМ УНИВЕРСИТЕТЕ**

---

**БУХАРСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ**

**САИДОВА МУХАЙЁ УМЕДИЛОЕВНА**

**ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНОСТЬ КОГЕЗИВНЫХ СРЕДСТВ В  
ОБЕСПЕЧЕНИИ КОГЕРЕНЦИИ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ  
ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОМ ДИСКУРСЕ**

**10.00.04 – Язык и литература народов Европы, Америки и Австралии**

**АВТОРЕФЕРАТ**  
**диссертации на соискание учёной степени доктора**  
**ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ НАУК (DSc)**

**Бухара – 2026**

Тема диссертации доктора наук (DSc) зарегистрирована под номером №B2025.2.DSc/Fil1003 в Высшей аттестационной комиссии.

Докторская диссертация выполнена в Бухарском государственном университете. Автореферат диссертации на трёх языках (узбекском, английском, русском (резюме)) размещён на веб-странице Научного Совета (www.buxdu.uz) и информационно-образовательном портале «ZiyoNet» (www.ziynet.uz).

**Научный консультант:** Мирзаев Ибодулло Камолович  
доктор филологических наук, профессор

**Официальные оппоненты:** Хажиева Феруза Мельсовна  
доктор филологических наук, профессор

Насруллаева Нафиса Зафаровна  
доктор филологических наук, профессор

Сатимова Дилафруз Нумонжоновна  
доктор филологических наук, доцент

**Ведущая организация:** Джизакский государственный педагогический университет

Защита диссертации состоится « 20 » июня 2026 года в 9<sup>00</sup> часов на заседании Научного совета DSc.03/2025.27.12.Fil.08.08 при Бухарском государственном университете. (Адрес: 200118, город Бухара, улица М.Икбол, 11. Тел.: +99865221-29-14; факс: +99865221-27-07, e-mail: buxdu\_rektor@buxdu.uz).

С диссертацией можно ознакомиться в Информационно-ресурсном центре Бухарского государственного университета (зарегистрировано за № 925). (Адрес: 200118, город Бухара, улица М.Икбол, 11. Тел.: +99865221-25-87.)

Автореферат диссертации разослан « 5 » июня 2026 года.  
(Протокол рассылки за № 26-14 от « 5 » июня 2026 года).



**Д.И.Ходжаева**

Председатель Научного совета по присуждению учёных степеней, доктор филологических наук, доцент

**О.О.Бобокалонов**

Учёный секретарь Научного совета по присуждению учёных степеней, доктор философии по филологическим наукам, доцент

**О.М.Файзуллоев**

Председатель Научного семинара при Научном совете по присуждению учёных степеней, доктор филологических наук, профессор

## **ВВЕДЕНИЕ (аннотация диссертации доктора наук [DSc])**

**Целью исследования** является определение функциональности когезивных средств в обеспечении когеренции в английском художественном дискурсе.

**Объектом исследования** являются когезивные и когерентные средства в английском художественном дискурсе.

**Научная новизна исследования** заключается в следующем:

определено, что в английском художественном дискурсе когезивные средства играют функциональную роль в формировании когерентности, где такие грамматические средства, как референция, эллипсис, субституция и союзы, а также лексические средства, такие как синонимы, антонимы, гипонимы, меронимы и словосочетания, имеют первостепенное значение в обеспечении текстовой согласованности и семантической целостности художественного текста;

доказано, что дискурсивные маркеры и дейктические единицы, обеспечивающие скрытый смысл и контекстуальную последовательность в художественном дискурсе, являются фактором, влияющим на восприятие текста, а также приоритет этих элементов, которые считаются прагматически и контекстуально важными в тексте;

аргументировано, что в английском художественном дискурсе скрытые логические связи между предложениями, ожиданиями читателя, коммуникативными стратегиями четко не выражены, но понимаемый смысл - импликатура и концепт, основанный на предсуществующих знаниях - пресуппозиция - проявляются на прагматической основе когеренции;

обосновано, что художественный дискурс, основанный на теории ментальных моделей, может интерпретироваться по-разному в зависимости от опыта читателя, ожиданий и уровня контекстуального понимания, а формирование когерентных моделей возникающих в сознании читателя - через фреймы (наборы информации), скрипты и сценарии (последовательность привычных событий) и схематы (обобщенная структура знаний, основанная на человеческом опыте, хранящаяся в сознании) - напрямую влияет на степень согласованности (когеренции);

доказано, что когнитивное умозаключение (инференция) в английском художественном дискурсе является важным фактором в понимании читателем скрытой информации в тексте, понимании неожиданных поворотов и эмоциональных изменений, обеспечении тематической глубины и когеренции рассказов;

**Внедрение результатов исследования.** На основе научных результатов, полученных в процессе изучения функциональности когезивных средств в обеспечении когеренции в английском художественном дискурсе:

теоретические выводы на основе того, что в английском художественном дискурсе когезивные средства играют функциональную роль в формировании когерентности, где такие грамматические средства, как референция, эллипсис, субституция и союзы, а также лексические средства,

такие как синонимы, антонимы, гипонимы, меронимы и словосочетания, имеют первостепенное значение в обеспечении текстовой согласованности и семантической целостности художественного текста были использованы в фундаментальном проекте ОТ-F1-029 «Роль согдийского языка и письменности в истории узбекской государственности (II век до н.э. - XII век н.э.)» выполненного в Ташкентском государственном университете узбекского языка и литературы (Справка № 01/4-2269 Ташкентского государственного университета узбекского языка и литературы от 3 июня 2025 года). В результате удалось повысить коммуникативную компетентность путем сочетания теоретических знаний о художественном дискурсе с практическим анализом;

выводы связанные с тем, что дискурсивные маркеры и дейктические единицы, обеспечивающие скрытый смысл и контекстуальную последовательность в художественном дискурсе, являются фактором, влияющим на восприятие текста, а также приоритет этих элементов, которые считаются прагматически и контекстуально важными в тексте были использованы в практическом проекте АМ-F3-201908172 «Создание образовательного корпуса узбекского языка» выполненного в Ташкентском государственном университете узбекского языка и литературы в 2020-2023 годах (Справка № 01/4-2270 Ташкентского государственного университета узбекского языка и литературы от 3 июня 2025 года). В результате появилась возможность изучения дискурсивной компетенции посредством прагматического анализа теоретической информации об английском художественном дискурсе;

выводы относительно того, что в английском художественном дискурсе скрытые логические связи между предложениями, ожиданиями читателя, коммуникативными стратегиями четко не выражены, но понимаемый смысл - импликатура и концепт, основанный на предсуществующих знаниях - пресуппозиция - проявляются на прагматической основе когеренции были использованы при выполнении зарубежного проекта, посвященного анализу литературного мастерства американских писателей, таких как Джон Стейнбек, Фрэнсис Скотт Фицджеральд и Эрнест Хемингуэй, организованного в «Американском литературном клубе» в Бухарском государственном университете в рамках проекта SUZ80021IN3103, финансируемого Посольством США (Справка № 06/3059 Ургенчского государственного университета от 12 мая 2025 года). В результате была создана возможность эффективного использования лингвообразовательных терминов учителями при обучении учащихся иностранному языку;

выводы о том, что художественный дискурс, основанный на теории ментальных моделей, может интерпретироваться по-разному в зависимости от опыта читателя, ожиданий и уровня контекстуального понимания, а формирование когерентных моделей возникающих в сознании читателя - через фреймы (наборы информации), скрипты и сценарии (последовательность привычных событий) и схемы (обобщенная структура знаний, основанная на человеческом опыте, хранящаяся в сознании) -

напрямую влияет на степень согласованности (когеренции) были использованы при создании учебного пособия под названием «Textlinguistics» для студентов специальности 70230101 - Лингвистика (английский) на основе свидетельства о публикации № 673-13, выданного на основании приказа № 673 Министерства высшего образования, науки и инноваций Республики Узбекистан от 29 ноября 2023 года (Справка № 3226 Центра исследований развития высшего образования от 16 мая 2025 года). В результате содержание учебной литературы было улучшено посредством теоретических и фактических материалов о роли, применении и функциональных особенностях когезии и когеренции в языке и речи;

выводы на основе того, что когнитивное умозаключение (инференция) в английском художественном дискурсе является важным фактором в понимании читателем скрытой информации в тексте, понимании неожиданных поворотов и эмоциональных изменений, обеспечении тематической глубины и когеренции рассказов были использованы при подготовке сценария телепрограмм «Здравствуй, Бухара», «Спасение в знании» телеканала «Бухара» (Справка № 01-09-100 Бухарской областной телерадиокомпании от 13 мая 2025 года). В результате содержание материалов, подготовленных для этих телевизионных программ, было улучшено, обогащено научными доказательствами и обеспечена научная популярность программы.

**Структура и объём диссертации.** Диссертация состоит из введения, четырех глав, заключения, списка использованной литературы; общий объем составляет 269 страницы.

**E'LON QILINGAN ISHLAR RO'YXATI**  
**СПИСОК ОПУБЛИКОВАННЫХ РАБОТ**  
**LIST OF PUBLISHED WORKS**

**I bo'lim (I часть; Part I)**

1. Saidova M.U. Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiya ta'minotida kogezi vositalar funkcionalligi. Monografiya. – Buxoro: Durdona, 2025. – 154 b.
2. Saidova M.U. Cognitive Processing of Cohesion and Coherence in Saki's (H.H. Munro) "The Open Window" // American Journal of education and learning. – Volume 03, Issue 01. – USA, 2025. – P. 868-872. (ResearchBib).
3. Saidova M.U. The role of hyponymy and meronymy in creating lexical cohesion in literary discourse // American Journal of education and evaluation studies. – Volume 02, Issue 03. – USA, 2025. – P.99-104. (ResearchBib).
4. Saidova M.U. Ellipsis and substitution in short stories: maintaining textual cohesion in literary discourse // Excellencia: International Multidisciplinary Journal of education. – Volume 03, Issue 03. – USA, 2025. – P.239-244. (CrossRef).
5. Saidova M.U. The use of reference as a grammatical cohesion device in english short stories: a discourse analysis // International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics. – Volume 04, Number 02. – USA, 2025. – P.154-157. (Index Copernicus).
6. Saidova M.U. Ingliz adabiyotshunoslik terminlarining o'zbek tiliga tarjima qilish masalalari // Ilm Sarchashmalari. – № 11. – Urganch, 2021. – B. 150-153. (10.00.00; №3).
7. Saidova M.U. Ingliz adabiyotshunoslik lug'atlari xususida mulohazalar // BuxDU Ilmiy Axborotnomasi. – № 9. – Buxoro, 2023. – B. 152-158. (10.00.00; №1).
8. Saidova M.U. Identifying types of cohesion: grammatical and lexical cohesion in short stories // Ta'lim va innovatsion tadqiqotlar. – № 12. – Buxoro, 2024. – B. 227-233. (10.00.00; №).
9. Saidova M.U. Exploring lexical and grammatical cohesion in O.Henry's 'Two Thanksgiving Day gentlemen' // BuxDU Ilmiy Axborotnomasi. – № 1. – Buxoro, 2025. – B.175-180. (10.00.00; №1).
10. Saidova M.U. Different approaches in investigating cohesion and coherence // Buxoro psixologiya va xorijiy tillar instituti Ilmiy Axborotnomasi. – № 2. – Buxoro, 2025. – B.333-339. (10.00.00; №).
11. Saidova M.U. The role of synonyms and antonyms as markers of lexical cohesion in short stories // Xorijiy filologiya. Til. Adabiyot. Ta'lim. – № 2. – Samarqand, 2025. – B. 73-78. (10.00.00; №10).
12. Saidova M.U. Kogeziya va kogerensiyani ifodalashda pragmatik vositalar funkcionalligi // Qo'qon DPI Ilmiy xabarlari. – №5 – Qo'qon, 2025. – B. 2695-2700. (10.00.00; №).

13. Saidova M.U. Ingliz badiiy diskursida diskurs markerlarning kogerensiya ta'minotidagi roli // Xorazm Ma'mun akademiyasi axborotnomasi. – Urganch, 2025. – №7/4. – B.177-179. (10.00.00; №21).

14. Saidova M.U. Deiktik birliklarning badiiy diskursda kogerensiya hosil qilishdagi pragmatik funksiyasi // O'zbekiston milliy universiteti xabarлари. – Toshkent, 2025. – № 1/7. – B.293-295. (10.00.00; №15).

15. Saidova M.U. Badiiy diskursda kogeziya va kogerensiyaning kognitiv voqelanishi // Tamaddun nuri. – Nukus, 2025. – №.9(72) – B.40-42. (10.00.00; №28)

## **II bo'lim (II часть; Part II)**

16. Saidova M.U. Exploring collocations as lexical cohesion devices in short stories // Prospects and main trends in modern science. International scientific online conference. – Spain, 2025. – P. 192-196.

17. Saidova M.U. Exploring conjunctions as cohesive devices in O. Henry's short stories // Scientific aspects and trends in the field of scientific research. International scientific online conference. – Poland, 2025. – P. 269-274.

18. Saidova M.U. Pragmatic Markers and their Role in Building Coherence and Cohesion in Roald Dahl's "Lamb to the Slaughter" // Sustainability of education, socio-economic science theory. International scientific online conference. – Finland, 2025. – P. 77-83.

19. Saidova M.U. The Role of Cohesive Devices in Creating Coherence // LIII Международная научная филологическая конференция имени Людмилы Алексеевны Вербицкой. – Россия, Санкт-Петербург 2025. – С. 523-525.

20. Saidova M.U. Culture and Pragmatics in Cohesion and Coherence // "Pragmalingvistika, funktsional tarjimashunoslik va til o'rgatish jarayonlari integratsiyasi" mavzuidagi xalqaro ilmiy-nazariy anjumani. – Buxoro, 2021. – B.324-325.

21. Saidova M.U. Типология и роль невербальных средств коммуникации в литературном дискурсе // "Pragmalingvistika, funktsional tarjimashunoslik va til o'rgatish jarayonlari integratsiyasi" mavzuidagi xalqaro ilmiy-nazariy anjumani. – Buxoro, 2023. – B. 200-203.

22. Saidova M.U. The importance of stylistic devices in the development of oral discourse // "Pragmalingvistika, funktsional tarjimashunoslik va til o'rgatish jarayonlari integratsiyasi" mavzuidagi xalqaro ilmiy-nazariy anjumani. – Buxoro, 2024. – B. 30-33.

23. Saidova M.U. Kogeziya va kogerensiya haqida nazariy qarashlar // Tilning leksik-semantik tizimi, qiyosiy tipologik izlanishlar va adabiyotshunoslik muammolari. Materiallar to'plami XV. – Buxoro, 2025. – B.29-32.

24. Saidova M.U. Pragmatic approach on exploring cohesion and coherence // "Tillarni o'qitish metodikasi sohasidagi zamonaviy tilshunoslik va adabiyotshunoslikning dolzarb masalalari" mavzusida I respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani. – Samarqand, 2025. – B.74-75.

25. Saidova M.U. A sociocultural exploration of cohesion and coherence in O. Henry's short stories // "Xorijiy tillarni o'qitish va amaliy tilshunoslik" mavzusida xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy anjumani. – Jizzax, 2025. – B.58-60

26. Saidova M.U. Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiya ta'minotida kogeziy birliklar ishtiroki // "Global lingvistika: yangi yondashuvlar va tadqiqotlar" mavzusida xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy anjumani. – Toshkent, 2025. – B.493-496.

27. Saidova M.U. Cognitive approach on exploring cohesion and coherence // "Pragmalingvistika, funktsional tarjimashunoslik va til o'rgatish jarayonlari integratsiyasi" mavzuidagi xalqaro ilmiy-nazariy anjumani. – Buxoro, 2025. – B. 25-27.

28. Saidova M.U. Kogeziya va kogerensiyani o'rganishda funktsional yondashuv // "Pragmalingvistika, funktsional tarjimashunoslik va til o'rgatish jarayonlari integratsiyasi" mavzuidagi xalqaro ilmiy-nazariy anjumani. – Buxoro, 2025. – B. 27-28.

29. Saidova M.U. The Role of Inferential Processes in Establishing Discourse Coherence // "Pragmalingvistika, funktsional tarjimashunoslik va til o'rgatish jarayonlari integratsiyasi" mavzuidagi xalqaro ilmiy-nazariy anjumani. – Buxoro, 2026. – B.50-52.

30. Saidova M.U. Ingliz badiiy diskursida kogerensiya va kogeziya – ijodiy uyg'unlik negizi // "Pragmalingvistika, funktsional tarjimashunoslik va til o'rgatish jarayonlari integratsiyasi" mavzuidagi xalqaro ilmiy-nazariy anjumani. – Buxoro, 2026. – B.162-164.

31. Saidova M.U. Text linguistics // O'quv qo'llanma. – B., 2024. –127b.

32. Saidova M.U. Text linguistics // Darslik. – B., 2025. –205 b.

Avtoreferat “Durdona” nashriyotida tahrirdan o‘tkazildi hamda o‘zbek, rus va ingliz tillaridagi matnlarning mosligi tekshirildi.



Bosishga ruxsat etildi: 26.05.2026-yil. Bichimi 60x84 1/16, «Times New Roman» garniturada raqamli bosma usulida bosildi. Shartli bosma tabog‘i 4,5.

Adadi: 100 nusxa. Buyurtma №372

