THE CONCEPTUAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN SCIENTIFIC TEXT AND SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE IN CURRENT LINGUISTIC STUDIES

Makhmudova Sabinabonu Rakhmatilla qizi
PhD student, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages
Teacher of the Department of Practice of English Language
E-mail: sabinamaxmudova2000@gmail.com

Abstract. *This study aims to clarify the concepts of scientific text and scientific discourse within contemporary linguistic research. It considers major approaches to discourse analysis and highlights the functional, cognitive, and pragmatic characteristics of scientific discourse, with particular emphasis on its role in the creation and transmission of scientific knowledge.*

Keywords: *scientific discourse, scientific text, cognition, knowledge representation, analysis, communication.*

In contemporary linguistic research, the growing interest in discourse-oriented approaches has resulted in a reassessment of traditional text-centered analyses. Modern linguistics increasingly views language not only as a system of signs but also as a means of cognitive and social interaction embedded in specific communicative conditions. Within this framework, the concepts of scientific text and scientific discourse have gained particular relevance, as they reflect different stages and dimensions of scientific knowledge production. The terminological ambiguity surrounding these notions has led to diverse interpretations across linguistic schools and research traditions. While earlier studies primarily focused on the formal and structural features of scientific

texts, current approaches emphasize their discursive nature, highlighting pragmatic intentions, cognitive mechanisms, and extralinguistic factors involved in scientific communication. As a result, the distinction between scientific text as a finalized product and scientific discourse as an ongoing communicative process has become a central issue in disourse studies.

In the framework of M. P. Katyurova's theory of scientific speech, particular importance is attached to the notion of epistemic situation, which is interpreted as an objective extralinguistic component of scientific communication. This concept reflects the scholar's awareness of the textual action and includes several interconnected cognitive parameters. Specifically, the epistemic situation encompasses three fundamental dimensions of cognitive activity:

- ✓ Ontological, related to the subject matter and objects of scientific knowledge;
- ✓ Methodological, associated with the procedures and means of knowledge acquisition;
- ✓ Axiological, reflecting the value orientation and evaluative stance of the scientific subject.

These dimensions collectively shape the production and interpretation of scientific texts and determine their communicative effectiveness.

According to Ye. S. Kubryakova and O. V. Aleksandrova [3,29-20], the relationship between text and discourse becomes more transparent when examined within the cognitive paradigm. The researchers argue that a proper understanding of these categories requires considering discourse as a dynamic process, whereas text represents the finalized outcome of this process. From this perspective, discourse is the ongoing activity of meaning construction, while text is its materialized and observable result.

Discourse is therefore regarded as a multifaceted and complex phenomenon, the analysis of which presupposes an examination of the speaker's pragmatic intentions and communicative goals. Unlike discourse, the text can be directly analyzed as a tangible linguistic object. At the same time, both text and discourse should not be viewed merely as static products reflecting accumulated human knowledge. Rather, they function as generative processes that model possible worlds and enable the transformation of cognitive structures into linguistic forms. Consequently, discourse emerges in the course of real-time speech activity and mirrors the continuous flow of human thought.

Scientific discourse can be approached from two complementary perspectives. Firstly, the analysis of a scientific text inevitably involves the analysis of scientific discourse, since the textual structure is inseparable from the cognitive and communicative conditions of its production. These include pragmatic and cognitive strategies, the author's national and cultural attitudes, and various extralinguistic factors that interact with linguistic means. Within this framework, the notions of scientific text and scientific discourse may be treated as functionally equivalent.

Secondly, scientific discourse may be defined as an integrated corpus of texts produced by representatives of the scientific community, whose cognitive activity is aimed at generating and systematizing knowledge. Scientific texts belonging to genres such as dissertations, academic courses, and research articles are connected by a shared communicative purpose and functional style and are united through broad semantic relations.

An essential characteristic of scientific discourse is the relative equality of its participants, who are engaged in collective knowledge construction. The depth and reliability of scientific knowledge presuppose a critical and reflective

approach to research. Scientists perform multiple social roles: they act as researchers, educators, experts, and mediators between science and society. Accordingly, scientific discourse addresses two principal audiences: the general public, which consumes scientific information through journals and media resources, and novice researchers who are trained within academic institutions.

Within linguodidactics, the text is traditionally recognized as the primary instructional unit and as the highest form of speech activity involved in language teaching. It is viewed as a methodologically justified and authentic fragment of cultural and linguistic space, within which learners' interaction is modeled through controlled textual activity [4, 70–74]. Furthermore, the text is understood as an objectified form of communicative action that reflects both linguistic structure and communicative intent [1, 15].

Although the terms scientific discourse and scientific text are often used interchangeably in academic contexts, they perform different functions and are composed of distinct elements. Scientific discourse refers to the entire communicative process within the scientific community, encompassing both formal and informal modes of interaction. These include written publications, conference presentations, academic discussions, and everyday professional communication among scholars. Scientific texts, in contrast, represent the concrete and fixed products of this communicative activity. They provide systematic accounts of research procedures, analytical methods, and scientific conclusions. Taken together, discourse and text ensure the production, critical evaluation, and dissemination of scientific knowledge. Understanding their distinction contributes to a more profound comprehension of how scientific ideas evolve from initial hypotheses into established theoretical constructs. Ultimately, the interaction between discourse and text forms a stable

foundation for the continuous development of science and promotes an environment in which knowledge is generated, assessed, and refined on a global scale.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Apukhtin V. B. Psycholinguistic method of analyzing the semantic structure of a text: Abstract of PhD diss. Moscow, 1977. – 15 p.
2. Hyland K. Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing. Longman, 2000. – 211 p.
3. Kubryakova Ye. S., Aleksandrova O. V. Types of space, text and discourse // Categorization of the world: space and time. Proceedings of the scientific conference. Moscow: Dialogue, MSU, 1997. – P. 19–20.
4. Mazunova L. K. Text as a cultural and linguistic space and a unit of teaching a foreign language // Bulletin of the Bashkir University, 2001, No. 4. – P. 70–74.
5. Prokaeva E. P. Text as a means of developing speech skills and abilities of students of the national school // Scientific Journal of the Kuban State Agrarian University, 2013, No. 86 (02). – P. 86–88.
6. Tseitlin S. N., Pogosyan V. A., Elivanova M. A., Shapmro E. I. Language. Speech. Communication: An Interdisciplinary Dictionary. St. Petersburg: KARO, 2006.