DISCOURSE IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Eshanqulova Nigora
Urgench state university, department of linguistics (English) 2nd stage master's student

Abstract: The article is devoted to the definition of the concept of discourse in linguistics through the prism of 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 turned to pragmatics, to typical communication situations, the other - to the processes taking place in the minds of the participants of the 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: the concept of discourse, text, communicative approach, structural-syntactic approach, structural-stylistic approach, socio-pragmatic approach, extralinguistic factors.

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

The definition of the concept of "discourse" causes considerable difficulties due to the fact that it has proved to be in demand within a number of

scientific disciplines, such as linguistics, anthropology, literary studies, 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 in various fields, the theory of discourse is currently being formed as an independent interdisciplinary field, reflecting the general trend towards integration in the development of modern science.

Even before the appearance of the modern theory of discourse, which began to develop into an independent field of science only in the mid-60s of the XX century, there were attempts to define this term. The word discours has the most "old" meaning in French and means dialogical speech. Already in the XIX century, this term was polysemic: in the Dictionary of the German language by Jacob Wilhelm Grim "Deutsches Woerterbuch" of 1860, the following semantic parameters of the term "discourse" are indicated: 1) dialogue, conversation; 2) speech, lecture. This approach was characteristic during the formation of the theory of discourse in the framework of numerous studies called text linguistics. This was the period when linguistics went beyond the study of an isolated utterance (sentence) and moved on to the analysis of the syntagmatic chain of utterances forming a text, the constitutive properties of which are completeness, integrity, coherence, etc. The interest in the study of the text was due to the desire to consider language as an integral means of 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 marked a turn from the linguistics of language to the linguistics of 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 coherent speech, there was a controversy related to the terminological definition of the object of research, as well as the field of linguistics studying the text itself. The term "linguistics of the text" originally appeared to many scientists is not entirely successful, and in some linguistic works the text of coherent speech is called a discourse. The polysemicity of the term "discourse" is fixed in the "Short Dictionary of Terms of the Linguistics of the text" by T.M. Nikolaeva: "Discourse is a polysemous 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) an oral-colloquial form of the text; 3) a 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 set researchers the most difficult task – to give a linguistic description of discourse. Having arisen within the framework of the linguistics of the text, the theory of discourse has never lost its connection with it, but has consistently gone to the differentiation of the subject of its research, to the differentiation of the concepts of "text" and "discourse". For example, by definition V.G. Borbotko, discourse is a text, but one that consists of communicative units of language – sentences and their associations into larger units that are in

continuous semantic connection, which makes it possible to perceive it as a whole formation [2, p. 8]. Borbotko emphasizes the fact that text as a linguistic material is not it is always a coherent speech, that is, a discourse. Text is a more general concept than discourse. A discourse is always a text, but the reverse is incorrect. Not every text is a discourse. Discourse is a special case of text.

In modern linguistics, discourse is treated ambiguously. It is possible to divide 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 dialogical utterance, or as speech from the speaker's position in contrast to the narrative, which does not take into account such a position. Within the framework of the communicative approach, the term "discourse" is interpreted as "a kind of symbolic structure that its subject, object, place, time, circumstances of creation (production) make discourse" [3, p. 5].

2. Structural-syntactic approach: discourse as a fragment of text, that is, education above the sentence level (super-phrasal unity, complex syntactic whole, paragraph). Discourse is understood as two or more propositions that are in semantic connection with each other, while coherence 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 an indistinct division into parts, the dominance of associative connections, spontaneity, situativeness, 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 utterances, or as a "language within a language", but presented as a special social reality that has its own texts.

This classification allows us to understand that the nature of discourse is threefold: one side of it is addressed to pragmatics, to typical situations of communication, the other - to the processes taking place in the minds of the participants of communication, and to the characteristics of their consciousness, the third – to the actual text.

The highlighted approaches are partly contradictory. The concept of "discourse" is understood in an inextricable connection with the concepts of speech and text. Discourse as a communicative phenomenon is an intermediate link between speech as verbal communication, as an activity, on the one hand, and a specific text recorded during communication, on the other. In a simpler juxtaposition, discourse should be understood as a cognitive process associated with real speech production, with knowledge of a speech product, and the text as

the final result of the process of speech activity, resulting in a certain finished form. Such an opposition of real speaking to its results leads to the realization that a text can be interpreted as a discourse only when it is actually perceived and gets into the current consciousness of the individual perceiving 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 due to 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 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 it occurs

a break with the grammatical structure of the language. Discourse is an empirical object that a linguist encounters when he discovers traces of the subject of the act of utterance, formal elements indicating the assignment of language to speakers" [4, p. 124]. In his opinion, an essential feature of the discourse he understands in a broad sense is the correlation of the 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 consists of a number of stages of an individual's communicative action (entering into speech contact, putting forward an initial topic of conversation and its ratification, changing roles during a communicative act, changing the topic of conversation, leaving a communicative act), each of which is due to a complex of external and internal factors.The linguistic and 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 above a separate utterance (sentence) to a meaningfully integral work (stories, 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 as a process (taking into account the impact of socio-cultural, extralinguistic and communicative-situational factors), and as a result in the form of a fixed text.

As we 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 in which this text is updated. The definition of

discourse proposed by V.V. Petrov and Yu.N. Karaulov would be appropriate here. This definition accumulates views on the "discourse" of the Dutch scientist T.A. Van Dyck, who in modern linguistics has priority in the description of discourse: "... discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, also extralinguistic factors (knowledge about the world, attitudes, goals of the addressee) necessary for understanding the text" [6, p. 7]. It should be noted that this concise definition was 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 largely deepens previous definitions: "Dis-cours is a discourse, an arbitrary fragment of text consisting of more than one sentence or an independent part of a sentence. Often, but not always, it centers around a certain reference concept; creates a general context describing actors, objects, circumstances, times, actions, etc. P., being determined not so much by the sequence of sentences, as by the world common to the creator of the discourse and its interpreter, which is "built" in the course of the unfolding of the discourse.The initial structure for the discourse has

a kind of sequence of elementary propositions connected by logical relations of conjunction, disjunction, etc. Elements of discourse: the events being presented, their participants, performative information and "non-events", that is, a) the circumstances accompanying the events; b) the background explaining the events; c) the assessment 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 quantity adequate to the text, or even, as is clear from the definitions given above, synonymous with it, but much broader.

With a socio-pragmatic approach, the researchers focus on 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 research of French structuralists and post-structuralists, primarily M. Foucault. A. Greimas, J. Derrida, and 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 widest possible meaning that is meant by saying "style is a person") and individual language (cf.: the traditional expressions "Dostoevsky's style", "Pushkin's language" or "the language of Bolshevism" with such more modern sounding expressions like "modern Russian political discourse" or "Ronald Reagan's discourse"). The term "discourse" understood in this way (as well as the derivative and often replacing term "discursive practices" used by Foucault) describes the way of speaking and necessarily has a definition - which or whose

discourse, because researchers are not interested in the discourse in general, but its specific varieties, set by a wide set of parameters: purely linguistic distinctive features (to the extent that they can be clearly identified), stylistic specifics (in many ways- determined by quantitative trends in the use of linguistic means), as well as the specifics of the topic, 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 primarily a certain type of utterance inherent in a certain socio–political group or era.

T.A. Van Dyck also has a definition that interprets discourse as a social phenomenon: "Discourse is a speech stream, a language in its constant movement, absorbing all the diversity of the historical epoch, 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 Yu. Habermas. In his works, discourse is a type of speech communication conditioned by a critical consideration of 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 the alternative world, fact and causality, is interesting. Stepanov also gives a broad linguistic and philosophical interpretation of discourse as a "language within a language", presented as a special social given. At the same time, discourse cannot be reduced to style, grammar or vocabulary as just a language. It "exists, first of all, and mainly in texts, but those that have a special grammar, a special lexicon, special rules of word usage and syntax, special semantics, and ultimately a special world" [10, p. 45]. Although Stepanov also talks about the existence of discourse in texts, his vision of the 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", but emphasizes the dynamic, time-unfolding nature of language communication; in contrast, the text is thought of primarily as static the object, the result of language activity. Some researchers interpret discourse as including two components at the same time: both the dynamic process of linguistic activity inscribed in its social context and its result (that is, the text); this is the preferred understanding.

Summary

.The Concept of Discourse in Modern Linguistics.

The article investigates the concept of discourse through various approaches and defines specifics of each approach. Four approaches were used to research the concept of discourse, including communicative, structural-syntactical, structural-stylistic, and social-pragmatic ones. It has been found out that the nature of discourse has three aspects: the first relates to prag- matics, standard communicative situations, the second one relates to the mental processes of interlocutors and characteristics of these processes, while the third aspect relates to the text itself. Therefore, discourse can be considered as a process and at the same time as its result in the form of text.

Key words: the concept of discourse, text, communicative approach, structural-syntacti- cal approach, structural-stylistic approach, social-pragmatic approach, extralinguistic factors.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА:

1. Николаева Т.М. Краткий словарь терминов лингвистики. – М.: Прогресс, 1978. – 480 с.

2. Борботько В.Г. Элементы теории дискурса. – Грозный: Изд-во Чечено-Ингуш. гос. ун-та, 1981. – 113 с.

3. Карасик В.И. Религиозный дискурс // Языковая личность: проблемы лингвокуль- турологии и функциональной семантики: Сб. науч. тр. – Волгоград: Перемена, 1999. – С. 5–19.

4. Гийому Ж., Мальдидье Д. О новых приёмах интерпретации, или проблема смысла с точки зрения анализа дискурса // Квадратура смысла. – М.: Прогресс, 1999. – С. 124–136.

5. Орлов Г.А. Современная английская речь. – М.: Высш. шк., 1991. – 240 с.

6. Ван Дейк Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – 310 с.

7. Демьянков В.З. Доминирующие лингвистические теории в конце XX века // Язык и наука конца XX века. – М.: Ин-т языкознания РАН, 1995. – С. 239–320.

8. Ван Дейк Т.А. К определению дискурса. – Л.: Сэйдж пабликэйшнс, 1998. – 384 с.

9. Habermas J. Erläuterungen zum Begriff des kommunikativen Handelns // Habermas J. Vorstudien und Ergänzungen zur Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns. – Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verl., 1989. – S. 571–606.

10. Степанов Ю.С. Альтернативный мир, Дискурс, Факт и принцип Причинности // Язык и наука конца XX века: Сб. ст. / Под ред. Ю.С. Степанова. – М.: РГГУ, 1995. – С. 35–73.