



## THE TEXT IS ABOUT THE PHENOMENON OF COHESION

Aziza Zikiryayevna Shodikulova

Assistant teachers of Department of Languages Medicine and  
Education faculty Samarkand State Medical Institute

azizashodikulova87@gmail.com +998937280101

### Abstract

The article is devoted to the study of the process of cognitive interpretation of the phenomenon of metonymy. Metonymy is defined as a basic cognitive mechanism, which is the process of implication by one part of an idealized cognitive model, which consists in the projection of the elements of the source domain onto the target domain within the same conceptual model.

**Keywords:** metonymy, conceptual, cognitive process, model, phenomenon, reference, cognitive model.

### Аннотация

В статья посвящена изучению процесса когнитивной интерпретации феномена метонимии. Даётся определение метонимии как базового когнитивного механизма, который представляет собой процесс импликации одной частью идеализированной когнитивной модели, заключающегося в проекции элементов домена-источника на домен-цель в рамках одной и той же концептуальной модели.

**Ключевые слова:** метонимия, концептуализация, когнитивный процесс, модель, референция, феномен, когнитивная модель.

### Annotatsiya

Maqola metonimiya hodisasini kognitiv talqin qilish jarayonini o'rganishga bag'ishlangan. Metonimiyaning asosiy kognitiv mexanizm sifatida ta'rifi berilgan, bu idealizatsiya qilingan kognitiv modelning bir qismiga taalluqli jarayon bo'lib, u manba domeni elementlarini bir xil kontseptual model doirasida maqsadli domenga proektsiyalashdan iborat.

**Tayanch so'zlar:** metonimiya, kontseptsiya, bilish jarayoni, model, referensiya, fenomen, kognitiv model.

### I. Introduction

Researchers involved in the study of the text phenomenon have tried to describe this phenomenon from different perspectives. The well-known Russian stylist I.R. Galperin considers the text to be "a work that takes place in the form of a written document of completeness and is the product of a literary activity processed in accordance with this type of document." This work also consists of "titles and



separate units connected on the basis of lexical, grammatical, logical, stylistic connections" (Galperin 1981: 18).

In our opinion, the tradition of considering the text as a "literary reworked work" is one of the ideas that does not justify itself to the end, and the reason for this can be explained by the following:

- 1) The written form of communicative activity is secondary to the oral form of speech and removes it from the scope of speech activity for the text to be considered as a written product;
- 2) This interpretation prevents the inclusion in the text of fairy tales, epics, epics, proverbs, etc., which are the product of folklore;
- 3) Due to the fact that the text is given the quality of a "literary work", personal and official correspondence excludes speech structures, such as business documents, from this category.

Hence, there is no doubt that researchers are invited to analyze not only written and oral activities but also the products created in the process of oral communication in the form of text (Dressler 1978: 114). In order for a speech structure to receive text status, the units within it must form a chain of semantic connections in a complex structure. Semantic and syntactic connection is a constant and obligatory feature of the text. Underlying the interdependence of the organizational parts of the text, which is an ontological feature, is the interaction of events in reality and their integration on the basis of the principle of generality-specificity.

## II. Literature review

V.I. Karaban, who included the phenomenon of connection in the list of grammatical categories of the text, considers this phenomenon as an important ontological and organizing feature of the chain of sentences.

This feature, in turn, indicates that the text has an internal structure (macrostructure) proportional to reality (Karaban 1978: 25).

Psycholinguist A.A. Leontev, interpreting dependence as a linguistic concept, lists the following features of this concept:

- a) Grammatical signs: abbreviations under the influence of syntactic parallelism and syntactic austerity;
- b) Sinsemantism;
- c) Location of theme-remains structures;
- g) The emergence of intonation variants in the context;
- d) Semiotic relationship of parts;
- e) Symmetrical nature of speech relations (Leontev 1973: 42)

Apparently, there are different approaches to studying the structure of a text, the interdependence of its parts. However, the most important of these were described in terms of the grammatical and content content of the text to ensure its integrity. In linguistics, there is a tradition of calling these two approaches by the terms cohesion and coherence. Dictionaries note the different aspects of these terms. Cohesion is derived from the Latin word *cohaesus* "connected", which refers to the interconnection of parts of text in their external structure. Cohesion, on the other hand, is derived from the Latin adjective



coherency “interconnected,” which refers to a connection that occurs when several processes occur simultaneously (Jeribilo 2008: 152; Crystal 2008: 85).

### III. Research methodology

Representatives of the London School of System-Functional Linguistics M. Holidey and R. Hasan have a special role in the introduction of these terms. Their book *Cohesion in English*, published in 1976, ushered in a new era in textual studies. The authors note that the phenomenon of cohesion has a more logical basis, noting that this notion suggests that parts of the text have a functional connection. The concept of cohesion, on the other hand, refers to the grammatical analysis of a text and serves to describe a set of linguistic tools that ensure the interconnection of parts (see Crystal 2008: 85).

However, such a description should not lead to the idea that mano relationships are not important in determining cohesion. According to Holliday and Hassan, cohesion "represents the relationship of meanings that exist in the text and gives it textual status, and" cohesion describes the description of any element in the discourse as related to another element in the text (Halliday, Hassan 1976: 4).

Obviously, when two elements in a text are connected to each other, a specific “cohesive tie” is formed, and this connection affects the integrity of the text. In order for lexical and grammatical elements to take the form of a link, they must interact with other units in the text. The cohesive relationships that occur within these types of links fall into two main types: lexical cohesion and grammatical cohesion (Op.cit., Pp. 31-33).

Lexical cohesion is a relationship based on a connection between meaning and concept, which occurs between the lexical units that occur in the text. Cohesion, which falls into this category, is divided into types of renteration or “reiteration” and “associative formation” (collocation).

### IV. Analysis and results

In the occurrence of cohesion in the "repetition" method, a lexical unit is repeated in a certain part of the text or a general word referring to the previous unit appears. Repetition may also be replaced by a synonym or its alternative (Op.cit., P. 278).

Cohesion of the “associative structure” type is based on the associative proximity of lexical units. Grammatical cohesion is based on the mutual grammatical interdependence of units in a text, and its four types are distinguished: referential, subatitution (substitution), ellipsis, and connecting. The most common of these is referential, which in this case “allows the speaker to point out that something is repeating from the previous part of the text or that it has not yet appeared in the text” (Thompson 2008: 180).

In fact, we would like to point out that instead of the term reference used by Holliday and Hassan, other researchers prefer to use the term “coreference” (Brown, Ynle 1983).

### V. Conclusion

In this chapter of our study, we plan to study the role of metonymy in the formation of text cohesion. Dutch linguist Van Dyke argues that cohesion occurs in regional and global contexts. (van Djik 1980).



The first implies a connection between adjacent sentences in the text, i.e., there is a semantic and grammatical territorial character between these sentences. The global nature of cohesion is based on connections that occur throughout the text. Based on the scientist's description, we will try to analyze the role of metonymy in the structure of media texts at two levels, namely, regional and global. While the main focus is on the relationship between the parts, the integrity of the text is not overlooked.

## References

1. Cristal D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. - L. : Blackwell, 2008.-529.p.
2. Жерибило Т. В. Словарь лингвистических терминов. - Назраив: Пилиграм, 2008. - 485 с.
3. Holliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. - L. : Longman, 1976.
4. Thompson G. Introducing Functional Grammar. - Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2008.
5. Brown G, Yule G. Discourse analysis. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
6. Huang Y. The Pragmatics of anaphora. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
7. Holliday M.A.K An Introduction to Functional Grammar. - L. : Edword Arnold, 1994.
8. Трегубович Т. П. Опыт анализа семантико - синтаксической структура текста: Автореф дисс... канд.филол.наук.- Минск, 1978-24с.чява
9. Юсупов У. К. Инглиз тили ғрамматикасидан универсал қулланма.- Т.: Академнашр, 2011.- 376 б.
10. Quirk R. Greenbaum S. A University Grammar of English. - L. : Loungman, 1989-484p.
11. Van Dijk T.A Macrostructures. - Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum 1980.-246p.