

VOLUME-1, ISSUE-11

Contrastive linguistics and text linguistics.

Mirzaaliyeva Maftuna Ulfat qizi

4th year students at Djizzak branch of National University  
of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulug'bek

Supervisor: Zilola Abdurakhmanova

Assistant teacher in the department of Foreign languages at Djizzak  
branch of National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulug'bek

Annotation

*This article is about information of contrastive linguistics and text linguistics.*

**Key words:** analysis, similarities, differences, types

Some problems of contrastive analysis and text linguistics I want to begin this paper with a superficial statement that it has been admitted for some time now that sentence grammars are not able to cope with certain language phenomena. There are linguistic facts within and between sentences (such as pronominalization, ellipsis, thematic structure) that can be accounted for only in the framework of a larger context. As in other kinds of linguistic comparison there are two problems in connection with text analysis: the problem of equivalence and semantic representation on the one hand, and comparison of certain surface phenomena on the other hand. This paper will discuss some difficulties connected with those two problems. 1 No satisfactory semantic representation has been proposed so far, but it is certain that such a semantic representation will have to consist of a set of semantic categories and relations (cf. discussion in Krzeszowski 1974:23ff., and Krzeszowski 1974, Ch. III). Some of the semantic features would be grammaticalized in a particular language, i.e. expressed in a structured way (as a subsystem), some would be present in the meanings of lexical units. If a semantic feature is grammaticalized in two languages to a similar extent we say that a structure  $\chi$  in  $L_j$  is equivalent to a structure  $y$  in  $L_j$  (no matter whether the surface structures are similar or not). Thus systems of number in English and Polish would be more extensively equivalent (general and uniform in both languages to a similar degree) than passives. The passive structures of the two languages overlap only partially. For the rest of the English passives we would have to specify additional conditions (e.g. Indirect Object cannot be subjectivized in Polish, etc.). When a semantic feature is grammaticalized in one language but not in the other (i.e. when a semantic feature is expressed grammatically in language  $L$ , and lexically, or

partly lexically, partly grammatically, in language  $L_j$ , we conclude that the language  $L_j$  does not have an equivalent to the structure in  $L_i$ ).

**REFERENCES:**

1. Abduraxmanova, Z., & Mamurova, M. (2021). THEORETICAL APPROACH TO SPEECH DISFLUENCIES IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETATION. In МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ (pp. 43-45).

2. Абдурахманова, З. (2022). Analysis of pauses and interruptions as elements of linguistic production in simultaneous interpretation. Современные инновационные исследования актуальные проблемы и развитие тенденции: решения и перспективы, 1(1), 533-535.

3. Grossberg, L., Nelson, C., & Treichler, P. A. (Eds.). (1992). Music and Cultural Theory. University of Illinois Press. p 1-20, 89-105.

4. Ma'ripov J. ANTROPOSENTRIZM–TILSHUNOSLIKNING ZAMONAVIY YONALISHI SIFATIDA//Zamonaviy dunyoda innovatsion tadqiqotlar: Nazariya va amaliyot. – 2022. – T. 1. – №. 28. –С. 62-68.

5. Ma'ripov J. K. A BRIEF INFORMATION ABOUT TENSES //O‘ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY VA O‘RTA. – С. 464