

## THE CONCEPT OF “DISCOURSE” IN LINGUISTICS AND ITS LINGUISTIC INTERPRETATION

Oripova Kamolaxon Erkinjon qizi

*Kokand state pedagogical institute*

*Teacher of the foreign languages faculty*

UZBEKISTAN

[kamolaxon.oripova@gmail.com](mailto:kamolaxon.oripova@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** This article is devoted to study discourse and its importance in literature. Many linguistics discussed about definitions of discourse and also gave some important and valuable information for discourse.

**Key words:** discourse, semantic, dynamism, communicative-pragmatic, linguistic, cognitive, science, complex.

**Аннотация:** Данная статья посвящена изучению дискурса и его значения в литературе. Многие лингвисты обсуждали определения дискурса, а также давали важную и ценную информацию для дискурса.

**Ключевые слова:** дискурс, семантика, динамизм, коммуникативно-прагматический, лингвистический, когнитивный, наука, комплекс.

Raising 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 commonly used in the linguistic field. And it is not excluded that this was facilitated by the lack of a clear and generally accepted definition discourse covering all cases of its use. Currently functional-communicative approach considers discourse as the most important form of everyday human life practice 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 considerable 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 areas, discourse theory is currently being formalized as an independent interdisciplinary field reflecting the general trend towards integration in the development of modern science.

Let us turn to the history of the phenomenon under consideration. Discursive analysis originated in the French linguistic tradition in the 1950s, where discourse was seen as speech assigned speaker<sup>1</sup>, on the basis of which the position of the speaker in the statement was main object of study. Started almost at the same time develop the Anglo-American concept of discursive analysis, associated with the name of Z. Harris, within which the direction arose "discourse analysis". Discourse was treated as a sequence sentences, a piece of text larger than a sentence. Further, a functional-linguistic approach to the definition discourse, which happened under the influence of the theory of communicative-pragmatic models of language and the ideas of cognitive science. Starting from works T. A. van Dyck, discourse began to be studied as an actualized text (in difference from the text as a formal grammatical structure), as a complex unity of linguistic form, meaning and speech action, which can be characterized by the concept of a communicative event or communicative act.

<sup>1</sup> Бенвенист, Э. Общая лингвистика. – М.: Прогресс, 1974. – 448 с.

Text analysis as a communicative structure events was generalized by T. A. van Dijk in one of his works<sup>2</sup> [3]. As a result change of approach to the consideration of the object of study in the discursive analysis, the dynamic nature of the discourse came to the fore. Apart from text in the focus of discursive analysis turned out to be a number of contextual, cognitive and pragmatic factors (context of the situation, knowledge of the world, presuppositions). T. A. van Dyck notes that the text can only be understood when we understand the situation in question. Therefore, "models situations" are necessary as a basis for interpreting the text<sup>3</sup>.

Since the 1970s, discursive analysis has become an integrative discipline, which includes the main achievements of ethnolinguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and other scientific areas. It is appropriate to mention the interpretation of discourse offered by the "Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary", where N. D. Arutyunova defines discourse as "coherent text in conjunction with extralinguistic - pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors; text taken in the event aspect; speech considered as purposeful social action as a component involved in interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes)"<sup>4</sup>.

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 - give a linguistic description of the discourse. Arising within linguistics text, discourse theory never lost touch with it, but consistently went to the differentiation of the subject of her research, to the distinction between the concepts of "text" and "discourse". In modern linguistics, discourse is interpreted ambiguously. There are several approaches to the definition of discourse.

**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 a speech from the position speaker, as opposed to narrative, which does not take into account such positions. 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)"<sup>5</sup> [3, p. 5].

**Structural-syntactic approach:** discourse as a fragment of text, 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 connection with each other, while the connection considered as one of the main features of discourse.

**Structural-stylistic approach:** discourse as a non-textual organization colloquial speech, characterized by fuzzy division into parts, dominance associations, spontaneity, situationality, high contextuality, stylistic specificity.

**Socio-pragmatic approach:** discourse as a text immersed into a situation of communication, into life, either as a social or ideologically limited type of utterance, or as a "language in a language", but presented in the form of a special social given that has its own texts.

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 pragmatics, 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.

<sup>2</sup> Dijk, T. A. van. *Discourse as Structure and Process*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1997. – 111 p.

<sup>3</sup> Дейк, Т. А. ван. *Язык. Познание. Коммуникация*. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – 312 с.

<sup>4</sup> *Методология исследований политического дискурса: актуальные проблемы содержательного анализа общественно-политических текстов*. – Минск, 2009. – 215 с.

<sup>5</sup> Карасик В.И. *Религиозный дискурс // Языковая личность: проблемы лингвокультурологии и функциональной семантики*: Сб. науч. тр. – Волгоград: Перемена, 1999. – С. 5–19

## References:

1. Карасик В.И. Религиозный дискурс // Языковая личность: проблемы лингвокультурологии и функциональной семантики: Сб. науч. тр. – Волгоград: Перемена, 1999. – С. 5–19
2. Бенвенист, Э. Общая лингвистика. – М.: Прогресс, 1974. – 448 с.
3. Dijk, T. A. van. Discourse as Structure and Process. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1997. – 111 p.
4. Дейк, Т. А. ван. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – 312 с.
5. Методология исследований политического дискурса: актуальные проблемы содержательного анализа общественно-политических текстов. – Минск, 2009. – 215 с.