



DOI: **10.5958/2249-7137.2021.00994.0**

## THE CONCEPT OF DISCOURSE IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Viktoriya Gimadetdinova\*; Elena Shevchenko\*\*

\* Lecturer,  
Department of Metodology Russian Language,  
Ferghana State University,  
UZBEKISTAN

\*\* Lecturer,  
Department of Metodology Russian Language,  
Ferghana State University,  
UZBEKISTAN

### ABSTRACT

*This article is devoted to the concept of "discourse", its scientific definition from the point of view of Russian and foreign linguists research. The article presents the main characteristics of the discourse features depending on the scientific field of its research and application*

**KEYWORDS:** *Discourse; Basic Characteristics; Discourse Features and Peculiarities.*

### INTRODUCTION

Many terms used in the field of research are characterized in many ways and are contradictory. They certainly include such a concept as discourse. Many disciplines are related to the study of discourse, for example, pedagogy, sociology, pragmalinguistics, speech linguistics, cultural studies, psycholinguistics, law, etc. Each science and scientific direction approaches the study of discourse depending on the specifics of the subject.

Discours (French) (from Lat. discursus-movement, conversation, conversation) is translated as "discourse" (less often-speech, type of speech, text, type of text). It is considered one of the complex concepts for the definition. But, despite this, it is often an applicable and functionally convenient term.

Initially, the word "discourse" in French linguistics meant speech in general or text. As it is supposed, the theory of discourse takes its origins from the concept of E. Benveniste, who defines discourse "as speech assigned to the speaker". He drew a line between the plan of the narrative (récit) and the plan of the language appropriated by the speaker (discours). An identical

distinction was also observed in L. V. Shcherba : language as a system and as an ability, speech activity and language material, texts.

Studying discourse as a subject of text linguistics, and discursive analysis

- one of his methods, T. M. Nikolaeva considers discourse as "a polysemantic term of text linguistics, used by a number of authors in meanings that are almost homonymous"[ 11] and identifies the main ones :

- 1) Dialog;
- 2) oral-colloquial form of the text;
- 3) a group of statements related to each other in meaning;
- 4) coherent text;
- 5) a speech work as a given, oral or written.

In the future, the definition of "discourse" as a term of text linguistics was not limited to the text and "began to include an enumeration of the conditions in which this text is updated" [10]. In this case, it will be relevant to recall the definition of discourse proposed by T. A. van Dycck , who in modern linguistics holds the first place in the description of this phenomenon, "as a speech flow, language in its constant movement, absorbing the diversity of the historical era, individual and social characteristics of both the communicant and the communicative situation

, in which the communication takes place .The discourse reflects the mentality and culture both national, universal, and individual, private. "[4]. Therefore, "... discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that includes , in addition to the text, also extralinguistic factors (knowledge about the world ,opinions, attitudes, goals of the addressee) necessary for understanding the text" [8] It should be noted that this definition is the basis for numerous linguistic studies of the text of the modern period.

V. Z. Demyankov, relying on the works on foreign linguistics, offers a more in-depth definition of discourse, which ,according to Yu. S. Stepanov, is the most complete in the modern theory of linguistics :

"Discours – a discourse, an arbitrary fragment of text consisting of more than one sentence or an independent part of a sentence. Often, but not always revolves around some reference concept; creates a shared context of describing the characters, objects, circumstances, times, actions, etc., being determined not so much a sequence of sentences, as those common to create discourse and interpreter of the world that is "built" for code deployment of the discourse, is a point of view "Ethnography of speech"... [ 5]

It should be noted that in this definition, discourse consists of features and features characteristic of various disciplines-from semiotics to sociology, communication theory, modal logic, etc.

P. Serio believes that the concept of "discourse" can not be combined with either empirical speech produced by the subject, or with the text .This definition has many definitions: 1) the equivalent of the concept of "speech" (according to F. Saussure), i.e. any specific utterance; 2) a unit that exceeds the phrase in size; 3) the impact of the utterance on its recipient, taking into account the situation of the utterance ; 4) conversation, as the main type of utterance ; 5) speech

from the standpoint of the speaker, as opposed to the narrative, which does not take into account such a position ( according to E. Benveniste); 6) the use of language units , their speech actualization: language and speech are contrasted (langue/ discourse);

7) A socially or ideologically limited type of utterance, for example, feminist discourse ; 8) a theoretical construct designed to study the conditions of text production [ 12]

Focusing on the interaction between the study of language formations and the analysis of the conditions of the social context, M. Stubbs distinguishes three basic characteristics of discourse: 1) in formal terms, it is a unit of language that exceeds the volume of a sentence, 2) in informative terms, the discourse is associated with the use of language in a social context, 3) in its form, the discourse is interactive, i.e., dialogical. («It refers to attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units , such as conversational exchanges or written texts . It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with language use in social contexts , and in particular with interaction or dialogues between speakers».[ 14].

The above statements make it possible to assert that discourse is likened not only to text (oral and written) and dialogue, but also to language and speech.

Discourse is a means of updating language in speech. On the one hand, it is characterized as speech embedded in a communicative situation and, in this regard, as a category with a pronounced social content in comparison with human speech activity : discourse is speech "immersed in life" [2; 7], the minimum component of which is a statement (a replica in a dialogue) – "characterized by a change of subjects of speech , completeness, genre design, connection with other statements of the dialogue and integrity. The statement, first of all, is connected with the response statement of another communicant, the interlocutor" [9]. As a result, interaction, transaction, or dialogic unity is distinguished

– a unit of the next level of discourse analysis. Examples of dialogic unity are the QUESTION/ANSWER, REQUEST/RESPONSE, etc. pairs [1]. On the other hand, the actual practice of modern (since the mid-1970s ) discursive analysis is associated with the study of flow patterns information within the framework of a communication situation, and performed primarily through the exchange of replicas. Thus, the structure of dialogical interaction, which was initiated by Z, is actually described. By Harris .

Discourse is a key phenomenon in human life "in language", what B. M. Gasparov calls linguistic existence: "Every act of using language-whether it is a work of high value or a fleeting remark in a dialogue-is a part of the continuously moving flow of human experience. In this capacity, it captures and reflects the unique set of circumstances under which and for which it was created." These circumstances include :

- 1) The author's communicative intentions;
- 2) The relationship between the author and the addressees;
- 3) All sorts of "circumstances", significant and random ;
- 4) The general ideological features and stylistic climate of the era as a whole and of the specific environment and specific personalities to whom the message is directly or indirectly addressed;

5) Genre and style features of both the message itself and the communicative situation in which it is included;

6) A lot of associations with previous experience that somehow fell into the orbit of this language action [ 3]

In the work of A. A. Kibrik, another definition of discourse is given, which also reflects the diversity of its features: "Discourse should be considered as the interaction and intersection of four structures:

1) The structure of the ideas expressed in the text;

2) Structures of the speaker's thought processes;

3) The language structures used by the speaker;

4) The structure of the speech situation ( the relationship between the speaker and the listener)" [6].

The above allows us to conclude that the basis of discourse is the cognitive processes of the writer or speaker, namely, the processes of understanding, interpretation and generation of discourse.

Along with the two main concepts of discourse ( the identification of discourse and text and discourse and speech), there is another one, according to which discourse is characterized as a discursive practice (this understanding belongs to M.Foucault [13]) , representing the field of practical use of language in political science, social semiotics, and sociology . In this case, the following components of the discourse are studied: the specifics of the topic, language distinctions, stylistic features, discussion of a certain discourse that characterizes an individual or a group of subjects.

So, based on the above, it should be noted that the whole set of scientific ideas about discourse, interacting with each other and being inseparable parts of one concept, indicates the frequent use of this term in modern science, but at the same time emphasizes the lack of transparent boundaries and a finite number of structural components of this concept.

## REFERENCES

1. Abramova, T. V. Dialogical unity "request-reaction" (based on the material of the Russian and English languages) / T. V. Abramova. - Autoref. diss.. ... candidate of Philology. - Voronezh. - 2003. - 20 p.
2. Arutyunova N. D. Diskurs / N. D. Arutyunova // Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. - M.: Sovetskaya enciklopediya, 1990. - p. 136-137.
3. Gasparov B. M. Language, memory, image. Linguistics of linguistic existence. - M.: Nov. Lit. Obozrenie, 1996. -352 p.
4. Dijk, T. A. van. Language, cognition, communication [Text] / T. A. van Dyck. -M.: Progress,1989. -312 p.

5. Demyankov V. Z. Morphological interpretation of the text and the structure of the dictionary // Questions of cybernetics: Communication with computers in natural language. - M.: Scientific Council on the complex problem "Cybernetics", 1982. - p. 75-91.
6. Karasik V. I., Slyshkin G. G. Linguocultural concept as a unit of research // Methodological problems of cognitive linguistics: Sat. nauch. tr – - Voronezh: VSU, 2001. - p. 75-80.
7. Karasik V. I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse / V. I. Karasik.- M: Gnosis, 2004 – - 390 p.
8. Karaulov Yu. N. Russian language and language personality. Moscow: Nauka, 1987. 264 p.
9. Lomov A.M. Russian syntax in alphabetical order: a conceptual dictionary-reference / A.M. Lomov. - Voronezh: Publishing House of Voronezh State University, 2004. - 400 p.
10. Mironova N. N. Discourse - analysis of evaluative semantics.- Textbook. - M.: NVI-THESAURUS, 1997. - 158 p.
11. Nikolaeva T. M. Linguistics of the text. Modern state and prospects [Text] / T. M. Nikolaeva // New in foreign linguistics.- Issue 8: Linguistics of the text. - M., 1978. - 479s.
12. Serio P. How to read texts in France // Quadrature of meaning : The French school of discourse analysis: Trans. with French. and portug. - M.: Progress,1999. Ss. 14-53.
13. Foucault, M. Archeology of knowledge [Text] / M. Foucault. - Kiev, 1996.
14. Stubbs M. Discursive analysis: Sociolinguistic analysis of natural language. Oxford Blackwell, 1983, 272 p.