

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DISCOURSE IN SCIENCE

Yusupova Dilshoda Rakhmon kizi

Lecturer, Kokand State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract: In linguistic science today, the theory of discourse is becoming increasingly important, since linguopragmatics treats discourse as a phenomenon with social content, focusing on the dynamic nature of linguistic communication that develops over time. Discourse is characterized as a social phenomenon, since any communicative situation involves the exchange of information and communication in which the participants have a clear social status.

Key words: Linguopragmatics, in linguistic science, discourse, phenomenon, speech, text.

Information, as a result of the global nature of information processes in modern society, is not only an object or a means of achieving certain goals, but also remains the main factor influencing various spheres of life and activity of society.

Undoubtedly, it is important to study discourse as a process, the main factor of which is the study of the text from the point of view of the situation of real communication, as well as outside the framework of such a situation. The interpretation of discourse, adopted in foreign linguistics, goes back to E. Benveniste, and explains discourse as a kind of object, with the emergence of which a break with the grammatical structure of the language occurs. In this regard, discourse is an individual extra-linguistic code, unique for each individual. To decode information that is transmitted by an individual through a personal code, the addressee needs to make significant efforts to correctly perceive this code or code of discourse and logically relate himself to a specific communicative situation.

P. Serio identifies eight meanings in the interpretation of the term “discourse”: firstly, the definition of the term “speech” in the Saussurean sense, in other words, any clear statement; secondly, a unit that is larger in volume than a phrase; thirdly, in pragmatics - the influence of the utterance on the addressee, taking into account the communicative situation, which presupposes the addresser, the addressee, the time and a specific place of the utterance; fourthly, conversation is an important type of communication; fifthly, comprehension of speech (according to E. Benveniste) from the point of view of the addresser, as opposed to narration, where the addresser’s opinion is not taken into account; sixth, the use of language units and speech actualization of language units; seventh, the impact of social and/or ideological position on specific systems of restrictions that are imposed on an unlimited number of statements (for example, “feminist discourse”, “administrative discourse”, etc.); eighth, a theoretical component designed to analyze the conditions for the implementation of the text [1].

Since discourse is understood as speech opposite to language, there is a need to introduce the category of text. In our work, we highlight the constituent components when considering the concepts of “speech” and “text”. Tern van Dake, one of the first scientists in Western European linguistics, clearly defines the boundary between the phenomena of “text” and “discourse”: “Discourse is an actually spoken text, and a text is the abstract grammatical structure of what is spoken. Discourse is a concept relating to speech, an actual speech act, while text is a concept relating to the system of language or formal linguistic knowledge, linguistic competence”. [2].

In other words, discourse is no longer speech itself; it is more of an abstract concept of speech. In the linguistic encyclopedic dictionary, this term is interpreted as follows: discourse is “a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic - pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors; text taken in the event aspect; speech, considered as a purposeful, social action, as a component participating in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes)”. [2]

However, in science there is still no single definition of discourse, however, most scientists believe that in defining the concept of “discourse” it is necessary to take into account its main functional, formal and situational features.

In his work “Language and Discourse” (1943), E. Bussans proposed the term “discourse”, where discourse is considered as a mechanism for translating language – a sign system – into living speech. In addition, the scientist included discourse in a binary opposition: language - speech - discourse. The interpretation of discourse at that time was considered synonymous with the concepts of “text” and “speech”. Significant changes in understanding the concept of discourse began to occur only in the 1960s. with the emergence of structural linguistics, the meaning of which was that language is a universe, a matrix that contains coded information about the phenomena of the surrounding reality, and the structure of language is a tool that creates and changes this reality. A striking representative of the structural approach in the study and analysis of discourse was the work proposed by Claude Lévi-Strauss [3]. The basis of his research was the study of the discourse of ancient myths, their open structure, since mythological discourse produces various variations of subjective reality through which the surrounding reality is perceived.

The structural-linguistic approach to the study of discourse was largely developed by representatives of the French school of discourse analysis: M. Pesce, P. Serio, E. P. Orlandi, J. J. Curtinne and D. Maldidier. The main result of Michel Pesce’s work is the study of discourse as a sociocultural structure that indicates the place of the individual in society.

This theory was originally proposed by Louis Althusser, a Marxist structuralist. However, the uniqueness of the interpretation of M. Pesce’s discourse lies in the fact that there is an interaction between linguistic and ideological approaches in the aspect of structural discourse analysis of the text. The scientist studies discourse as the center of concentration of ideology and language, while discourse analysis serves as a means of studying ideological concepts of language use and, in addition, with the help of language, ideological attitudes are realized. M. Pesce attributed the process of discourse itself to the sphere of ideological class relations [4]. From the perspective of linguistics, this process is a certain system of relations of synonymy, metonymy, paraphrase, related to ideology, where these structures correlate the social and the individual in discourse. The basis of automatic discourse analysis by M. Pesce is the hypothesis of the mutual influence of place, time and sociocultural factors in the formation of discourse, while the socio-historical and sociocultural aspects are considered fundamental, since it is not the individual who shapes the discourse, but the “matrix of meanings” or “ideological formation”. Thus, the individual as a subject of discourse is positioned ideologically and is formed under the influence of discourse structures. M. Pesce defines these discursive structures as “interdiscourse” [4].

Yu.M. Lotman’s rhetorical construction “text within a text” [5] is characterized by differences in the coding of certain parts of the text, where the main factor is the author’s construction and the reader’s perception of the text. In this regard, culture can be considered as a complex text, which is divided into a hierarchy of “texts within a text” and forms complex interweaving of texts.

The sociolinguistic characteristics of discourse directly or indirectly depend on the sociocultural context, and the peculiarities of the linguistic context cannot be ignored. Taking into account the above, we should dwell in detail on such important concepts as horizontal and vertical contexts.

Thus, despite the fact that in science there is still no single definition of discourse, most scientists come to the conclusion that the interpretation of the concept of “discourse” should take into account its main formal, functional and situational features.

Bibliography:

1. Serio P. How texts are read in France // Quadrature of meaning: French school of discourse analysis: trans. from fr. and Portuguese. M.: Progress, 1999. 416 p. pp. 12–53.
2. Newsom D., Turk D. van S., Kruckeberg D. All about PR. Theory and public relations practice. M.: INFRA-M, 2001.
3. Levi-Strauss K. Structure and form. Reflections on one work of Vladimir Propp // Semiotics: anthology / comp. Yu.S. Stepanov. 2nd ed., rev. and additional M.: Academic project; Ekaterinburg: Business book, 2001. 702 p.
4. Pecheux M. L'inquietude du discours. Paris: Edition des Cendres, 1990. 330 p.
5. Lotman Yu.M. Text in text // Selected articles. Tallinn: Alexandra, 1992. T.1. 480 p. pp. 148–161.