THE CONCEPT OF DISCOURSE IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Abdumalikova Dilfuza
Teacher of the Department of Mother Language
Teaching Methodology at Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

Annotation
The article is devoted to the definition of the concept of discourse in linguistics through the prism different approaches with the identification of the characteristics of each. Four approaches were chosen to consider the concept of discourse: communicative, structural-syntactic, structural-stylistic and socio-pragmatic. As a result of studying these approaches, it was revealed that one side of the discourse is addressed to pragmatics, to typical situations of communication, the other to the processes taking place in the minds of the participants in communication, and the third to the text itself. This gave reason to believe that discourse can be considered both as a process and as a result in the form of a fixed text.

Keywords: concept of discourse, text, communicative approach, structural-syntactic approach, structural-stylistic approach, socio-pragmatic approach, extralinguistic factors.

Raising the question of the dynamism of the term "discourse" in terms of its semantic variation is quite legitimate, since in recent decades it has become the most frequently used in the linguistic field. And it is possible that this was facilitated by the lack of a clear and generally recognized definition of discourse, covering all cases of its use. At present, the functional-communicative approach considers discourse as the most important form of everyday life practice of a person and defines it as a complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, extralinguistic factors (knowledge of the world, opinions, attitudes, goals of the addressee) necessary for understanding the text.

The definition of the concept of "discourse" causes significant difficulties due to the fact that it turned out to be in demand within a number of scientific disciplines, such as linguistics, anthropology, literary criticism, ethnography, sociology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology and some others. And it is quite natural that the ambiguity of the term "discourse" and its use in various fields of humanitarian knowledge

give rise to different approaches to the interpretation of the meaning and essence of this concept. Nevertheless, it can be said that, thanks to the efforts of scientists from various fields, discourse theory is currently taking shape as an independent

interdisciplinary field, reflecting the general trend towards integration in the development of modern science.

Even before the advent of the modern theory of discourse, which began to take shape as an independent field of science only in the mid-1960s, there were attempts to define this term. The word discours has the most "old" meaning in French and means dialogical speech. Already in the 19th century, this term was polysemous: in the German Dictionary of Jacob Wilhelm Grim "Deutsches Woerterbuch" of 1860, the following semantic parameters of the term "discourse" are indicated: 1) dialogue, conversation; 2) speech, lecture. Such an approach was typical during the formation of the theory of discourse in the framework of numerous studies, called linguistics of the text. This was the period when linguistics went beyond the study of an isolated statement (sentence) and moved on to the analysis of a syntagmatic chain of statements that form a text, the constitutive properties of which are completeness, integrity, coherence, etc. Interest in studying the text was due to the desire to consider language as an integral means communication, to study more deeply the connections of language with various aspects of human activity, realized through the text. The intensive development of text linguistics as a science of the essence, prerequisites and conditions of human communication has outlined a turn from linguistics of language to linguistics speech, caused increased attention to the act of communication.

From the very beginning, within the framework of studies studying the organization of the text of connected speech, there was a controversy related to the terminological definition of the object of study, as well as the very field of linguistics that studies the text. Initially, the term "text linguistics" that arose was not entirely successful for many scientists, and in some linguistic works the text of coherent speech is called discourse. The polysemy of the term "discourse" is recorded in the "Concise Dictionary of Terms of Text Linguistics" by T.M. Nikolaeva: "Discourse is a multi-valued term of text linguistics, used by a number of authors in meanings that are almost homonymous. The most important of them are: 1) a coherent text; 2) oral-colloquial form of the text; 3) dialogue; 4) a group of statements related to each other in meaning; 5) a speech work as a given – written or oral" [1, p. 467].

The emergence of the theory of discourse marked a qualitative leap in the development of the science of language and posed the most difficult task for researchers - to give a linguistic description of discourse. Having arisen within the framework of text linguistics, the discourse theory never lost touch with it, but consistently moved towards differentiation of the subject of its study, towards the distinction between the concepts of "text" and "discourse". For example, according to the definition of V.G. Borbotko, discourse

there is a text, but one that consists of communicative units of the language - the proposed material is not always a coherent speech, that is, a discourse. Text is a more general concept than discourse. Discourse is always text, but the reverse is not true. Not all text is discourse. Discourse is a special case of text.

In modern linguistics, discourse is interpreted ambiguously. There are several approaches to the definition of discourse.

1. Communicative (functional) approach: discourse as verbal

communication (speech, use, functioning of language), either as a dialogue, or as a conversation, that is, a type of dialogic utterance, or as speech from the position of the speaker, as opposed to narrative, which does not take into account such a position. Within the framework of the communicative approach, the term "discourse" is interpreted as "a certain sign structure, which is made discourse by its subject, object, place, time, circumstances of creation (production)" [3, p. 5].

2. Structural-syntactic approach: discourse as a text fragment, that is, education above the sentence level (superphrasal unity, complex syntactic whole, paragraph). Discourse is understood as two or more sentences that are in a semantic relationship with each other, while connectivity is considered as one of the main features of discourse.

3. Structural and stylistic approach: discourse as a non-textual organization of colloquial speech, characterized by fuzzy division into parts, dominance of associative links, spontaneity, situationality, high contextuality, stylistic specificity.

4. Socio-pragmatic approach: discourse as a text immersed in a situation of communication, in life, either as a social or ideologically limited type of statements, or as a "language in a language", but presented as a special social entity that has its own texts.

This classification makes it possible to understand that the nature of discourse is threefold: one side of it is turned to pragmatics, to typical situations of communication, the other to the processes occurring in the minds of the participants in communication and to the characteristics of their consciousness, the third to the text itself.

The selected approaches are somewhat contradictory. The concept of "discourse" is comprehended in close connection with the concepts of speech and text. Discourse as a communicative phenomenon is an intermediate link between speech as a verbal

communication as an activity, on the one hand, and a specific text recorded in the course of communication, on the other. In a simpler opposition, discourse should be understood as a cognitive process associated with real speech production, with knowledge of a speech work, and text as the end result of the process of speech activity,

resulting in a certain finished form. Such opposition of real speaking to its result leads to the realization that a text can be interpreted as a discourse only when it is actually perceived and enters the current consciousness of the individual who perceives it. G. Vidousen made an attempt to differentiate the concepts of "text" and "discourse" by including the category "situation" in this pair. Thus, discourse is considered by him as "text" + "situation".

The concept of "discourse" was introduced as a result of the urgent need in science to take into account not only the characteristics of the "text as such", based on its internal specifics, but also the text as a "message" addressed to someone and expressing some needs of the addressee and the author. The French scientist E. Benveniste speaks of discourse as "speech appropriated by the speaker": "Discourse is not a simple sum of phrases; at its birth, there is a break with the grammatical structure of the language. Discourse is such an empirical object that the linguist encounters when he discovers the traces of the subject of the act of utterance, the formal elements that indicate the appropriation of language. speaking" [4, p. 124]. In his opinion, an essential feature of discourse, understood by him in a broad sense, is the correlation of discourse with specific participants in the act of communication, that is, the speaker and the listener, as well as with the communicative intention of the speaker to influence the listener in some way. The structure of conversational discourse is made up of a number of stages of an individual's communicative action (entering into speech contact, putting forward the initial topic of conversation and its ratification, changing roles in the course of a communicative act, changing the topic of conversation, leaving the communicative act), each of which is determined by a complex of external and internal factors.

The linguo-communicative aspect of discourse can be traced in the definition of G.A. Orlov, who considers discourse as a category of (natural) speech, materialized in the form of an oral or written speech work, relatively complete in semantic and structural terms, the length of which is potentially variable: from a syntagmatic chain over a separate statement (sentence) to a meaningfully integral work (story, conversations, descriptions, instructions, lectures, etc.) [5, p. 14]. The concept of "discourse" is characterized by the parameters of completeness, integrity, coherence and others (that is, all the properties of the text), it is considered simultaneously and as a process (taking into account the impact of socio-cultural, extra-linguistic and communicative-situational factors), and as a result in the form of a fixed text.

As you can see, the definition of the term "discourse" gradually expanded and began to include, in addition to listing the main parameters of the text, an indication of the conditions under which this text is updated. Here it would be appropriate to give the

definition of discourse proposed by V.V. Petrov and Yu.N. Karaulov. This definition accumulates views on the "discourse" of the Dutch scientist T.A. Van Dyck, who in modern linguistics has priority in describing discourse: "... discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, also extralinguistic factors (knowledge of the world, attitudes, goals of the sender) necessary for understanding the text" [6, With. 7].

It should be noted that this laconic definition was taken as the starting point for many linguistic studies of the text of the modern period.

V.Z. Demyankov, based on new works on foreign linguistics, gave a definition of discourse that reflects the functional nature of discourse and greatly deepens the previous definitions: "Discours is a discourse, an arbitrary piece of text consisting of more than one sentence or an independent part of a sentence. Often, but not always, centered around some core concept; creates a general context that describes actors, objects, circumstances, times, actions, etc., determined not so much by the sequence of sentences, but by the world that is common to the creator of the discourse and its interpreter, which is "built" in the course of discourse deployment. The initial structure for discourse has the form of a sequence of elementary propositions interconnected by logical relations of conjunction, disjunction, etc. Discourse elements: narrated events, their participants, performative information and "non-events", i.e. a) the circumstances accompanying the events; b) background explaining the events; c) evaluation of the participants of the event; d) information correlating discourse with events" [7, p. 7]. The core of this definition can be considered the position that discourse is defined not as a value adequate to the text, or even, as it is clear from the above definitions, synonymous with it, but much wider.

With a socio-pragmatic approach, the focus of researchers is on a speech action, the participants of which are some types of linguistic personalities who find themselves within certain circumstances and conditions of communication.

The understanding of discourse as a social phenomenon goes back to the studies of French structuralists and post-structuralists, primarily M. Foucault. A. Greimas, J. Derrida, Y. Kristeva also played an important role in the study and justification of this term. In the works of these scientists, there is a desire to clarify the traditional concepts of style (in the very broadest sense that they mean when they say "style is a person") and individual language (cf.: traditional expressions "Dostoevsky's style", "Pushkin's language" or "the language of Bolshevism" with more modern-sounding expressions such as "contemporary Russian political discourse" or "Ronald Reagan's discourse"). Understood in this way, the term "discourse" (and Foucault's derivative

and often substituted term "discursive practices") describes a way of speaking and necessarily has

definition - what or whose discourse, because researchers are not interested in discourse in general, but in its specific varieties, given by a wide range of parameters: purely linguistic distinctive features (to the extent that they can be clearly identified), stylistic specificity (largely determined by quantitative trends in the use of language means), as well as the specifics of topics, belief systems, ways of reasoning, etc. Moreover, it is assumed that the way of speaking largely determines and creates the very subject area of discourse, as well as the corresponding social institutions. So, for the French school, discourse is, first of all, a certain type of statement inherent in a certain socio-political group or era.

At T.A. Van Dyck also has a definition that interprets discourse as a social phenomenon: "Discourse is a speech flow, a language in its constant movement, absorbing all the diversity of the historical era, individual and social characteristics of both the communicant and the communicative situation in which communication takes place. The discourse reflects the mentality and culture, both national, universal, and individual, private" [8, p. 47].

The term "discourse" was widely used in his works by the famous German philosopher J. Habermas. In his works, discourse is a type of verbal communication conditioned by a critical examination of the values and norms of social life (see [9, pp. 571–606]). The point of view of Yu.S. Stepanov, who connects discourse with the concepts of an alternative world, fact and causality. Stepanov also gives a broad linguo-philosophical interpretation of discourse as a "language in a language", presented as a special social entity. At the same time, discourse cannot be reduced to style, grammar or lexicon as simply language. It "exists, first of all, and mainly in texts, but those that are followed by a special grammar, a special lexicon, special rules of word usage and syntax, a special semantics, and ultimately a special world" [10, p. 45]. Although Stepanov also talks about the existence of discourse in texts, his vision of discourse as a special, possible world takes discourse far beyond the text.

Thus, summarizing the above definitions of the concept of "discourse", it can be argued that this term, as it is understood in modern linguistics, is close in meaning to the concept of "text", however, it emphasizes the dynamic nature of linguistic communication unfolding in time; in contrast, the text is conceived primarily as a static object, the result of linguistic activity. Some researchers interpret discourse as simultaneously including two components: both the dynamic process of linguistic activity inscribed in its social context, and its result (that is, the text); this is the preferred understanding.

References

1. Nikolaeva T.M. Brief dictionary of terms of linguistics. – M.: Progress, 1978. – 480 p.

2. Borbotko V.G. Elements of the theory of discourse. - Grozny: Checheno-Ingush Publishing House. state un-ta, 1981. - 113 p.

3. Karasik V.I. Religious Discourse // Linguistic Personality: Problems of Cultural Linguistics and Functional Semantics: Sat. scientific tr. - Volgograd: Change, 1999. - S. 5-19.

4. Guillaume J., Maldidier D. On new methods of interpretation, or the problem of meaning from the point of view of discourse analysis // Quadrature of meaning. - M.: Progress, 1999. - S. 124-136.

5. Orlov G.A. Modern English speech. - M .: Higher. school, 1991. - 240 p.

6. Van Dyck T.A. Language. Cognition. Communication. - M.: Progress, 1989. - 310