



ACADEMICIA
An International
Multidisciplinary
Research Journal
 (Double Blind Refereed & Peer Reviewed Journal)



DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2021.01551.2

DIFFERENTIATING DISCOURSE AND TEXT ON THE BASIS OF THE INTEGRATIONAL APPROACH

Nodirakhon Abduvokhid qizi Sheraliyeva*

*Teacher of the English Language,
 Kokand State Pedagogical Institute,
 UZBEKISTAN

Email id: nodiraxon.sheraliyeva@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article provides criteria of differentiating discourse and text on the basis of the integrational approach. Discourse is viewed as a inter-subject process of interaction of minds aimed at constructing language signs, while text is considered as a stimulus for such interaction. It also deals with the views of famous linguists and studies the discourse and the text in broad understanding, particularly as psychological and philosophical phenomena. Additionally, it studies these two "unidentified objects" from the point of view of an integrationist, and defines as there is no single system of linguistic symbols sitting motionless in the mind the area of linguistic, neatly divided into departments, and the use of language consists in creatively endowing certain phenomena with semiotic significance in order to carry out meaningful operations over the world in accordance with the needs of a continuous stream of unique communicative situations in real time.

KEYWORDS: *Discourse, Structural, Functional (Situational, Semiotic) And Integrational Approach, Text, Interaction Of Minds, "Unidentified Objects", Phenomena, Single System, Communicants, "Miraculous Transformation".*

INTRODUCTION

Despite hundreds of definitions and dozens of monographs devoted to the problem of differentiation of discourse and text, these two opposed to each other phenomena in many ways continue to remain "unidentified objects." In the overwhelming majority of cases, linguists work with written texts (fiction, journalistic, newspaper, scientific, business, etc.). And each time,

raising the text analysis object to rank of discourse, the linguist has difficulty trying to find a justification for this "miraculous transformation."

Apparently, the reason for this state of affairs lies in the fact that the dichotomies that have become established in modern linguistic studios, used to distinguish between text and discourse, do not affect the nuclear features of the corresponding concepts that reflect the nature of the phenomena under consideration. This leads to the fact that the problem of criteria for delimiting text and discourse does not lose its relevance. Fundamentally new methodological foundations for solving the problem are offered by the currently actively developing integration theory of language, which determines the purpose of our article - to establish the grounds for distinguishing between discourse and text from the standpoint of an integration approach.

The criteria for delimiting text and discourse differ depending on from what methodological positions - formal or functional - the discourse is defined.

Formal and functional approaches differ in the nature of the rationale, i.e. connection of the essence with its ontological foundations [32, p. 198]: the structural representation of the language in the form of levels is substantiated by the constituents of these levels, and the functional - by the ways of interaction between units performing a certain functional role and the context [32, p. 198].

Because of this, the inherently functional relationship of language to the world in discourse is not given, static [18, p. 142]; "It is constantly being created and supported by communicants, since it performs a certain function" [32, p. 205], and this function varies depending on the context of the discourse.

The notion of context is the main subject of controversy between the formalists and functionalists. In the formal approach, the context is limited to other linguistic units, and in the functional approach, it includes the mental and social "life world" of the communicants [18, p. 140].

The formal idea of discourse as a "language above the sentence or the clause" [35, p. 1]) is realized in such definitions: "Discourse <...> will mean two or several sentences that are with each other in a semantic connection" [11, p. 10]; "Discourse is a text of coherent speech, consisting of a sequence of communicative units of the language, exceeding the volume of a simple sentence, which is in a semantic connection, expressed by linguistic means" [5, p. 19].

Such an interpretation gives rise to oppositions written text :: oral discourse, monologue text :: dialogical discourse, which, however, are easily overcome when a deeper insight into the essence of the analyzed phenomena. The first opposition is simplified, since it reduces the entire volume of the concepts under consideration to two forms of linguistic activity, and the second is conditional, since any speech activity, including monologue, is dialogical in nature, as, in fact, both language and consciousness [2, p. 303-306].

With the functional approach, discourse is interpreted broadly, summing up everything that is said or written under this concept ([3, p. 3]; see also [7, pp. 225-227]). In other words, discourse is interpreted as speech activity, which is realized in written, oral (dialogical, polylogical, monological) or paralinguistic form, and directly given to the researcher in the form of linguistic material (for L.V. Shcherba) in sound, graphic or electronic representation.

Such a broad understanding of discourse is quite common in linguistics and is the norm in psychology and philosophy [22, p. 20-21]. In this case, the text is understood as “linguistic material fixed on one or another material medium with the help of descriptive writing (usually phonographic or ideographic)” [4, p. 5-6].

However, the functional direction of discourse analysis is heterogeneous, which allows D. Shifrin to divide it into two approaches: “moderate” and “extreme” [34, p. 1-2].

A moderate approach is aimed at studying the functions of a linguistic sign in a wide socio-cultural context, as a result of which it is also called situational [22, p. 22-23]. Extreme approach considers discourse as social practices of linguistic and non-linguistic nature, which are based on ideology or cultural differences [34, p. 1-2], and is called semiotic [18, p. 141].

A narrow version of the situational interpretation of discourse as any use of language (“the study of discourse is the study of any aspect of language use” [31, p. 65]; “the analysis of discourse is necessarily the analysis of language in use” [30, c. 1]) forms the basis for distinguishing a sentence as a unit of text and an utterance as a unit of discourse; see for example:

“A proposal is a common structural element for us. The statement combines both the sentence itself and the social context of its use. At the highest level, the same relationship is repeated in the text and discourse” [21, p. 75]. This distinction leads to the dichotomy of discourse-as-process :: text-as-product:

“Discourse is a broader concept, the text is. Discourse is both a process of linguistic activity and its result (= text)” [26, p. 307]. Such an interpretation of u1074 entails the opposition of discourse and text in terms of functionality:: structure, dynamism :: static, actuality :: virtuality. These dichotomies list the characteristics of the phenomena under consideration, but do not reveal their constitutive signs, the absence of which would turn them into entities of a different order.

The actual situational interpretation of discourse manifests itself in taking into account the social, psychological and cultural factors of the situational context of communication. Discourse and text are differentiated here on the basis of the concept of a situation. Discourse is considered as “text plus situation”, and text, respectively, as “discourse minus situation” [33]. This package implicitly contained in many similar definitions: “Discourse is the unity and interaction of a text and non-linguistic conditions and means of its implementation” [6, p. 183]; “discourse is verbalized speech-thinking activity, understood as a set of process and result and possessing both linguistic and extralinguistic plans” [14, p. 113]; “We define discourse as an integral phenomenon, as a thought-communicative activity, which appears as a set of process and result and includes extralinguistic and linguistic aspects proper; in the latter, in addition to the text, we highlight the presupposition and context (pragmatic, social, cognitive), which determines the choice of linguistic means” [28, p. 37]. A similar understanding is reflected in the “Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary” by N.D. Arutyunova, who interprets the discourse as “A coherent text in conjunction with extralinguistic - pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors” [29, p. 136]. Within the framework of the functional approach, there is also a slightly different interpretation of the connection between text and discourse. So, M. Ya. Dymarsky sees discourse as “a way of transmitting information, not a means of accumulating and multiplying it; discourse is not a carrier of information” [8, p. 40], and it is in this that he sees its difference from the text.

This understanding comes into contact with the concept of Chiang Kim Bao, based on methodology of the Eastern linguistic school. Discourse and text are presented here as the interpenetration of two opposite sides of one essence - yin and yang, where the text is a potential (yin), and discourse is the realization of this potential in speech activity (yang). This takes into account all linguistic and extralinguistic factors, participating in the organization and functioning of the text as a means of verbal communication, and it is also argued that both the text and discourse have such characteristics as linearity and volume [27, p. 3-7].

Developing the provisions of the yin-yang concept and starting, in particular, from the provisions on the volume and linearity of the text and discourse, Yu. Prokhorov defines discourse and text using the geometric concept of a figure as a set that can be represented from a finite number of points, lines or surfaces.

In the interpretation of the researcher, real communication contains three “non-merged, but also indissoluble components”: material the figure of communication - reality as a set of material conditions for the implementation of communication; an extroverted figure of communication - discourse as a set of verbal forms of the practice of organizing and formalizing the content of communication; as well as an introverted figure of communication - a text as a set of rules for linguistic and extra linguistic organization of the content of communication of representatives of a certain linguocultural community [22, p. 34-35].

The fundamental difference between these concepts from other functional theories is manifested in the fact that the text is presented here not as a material medium, but rather as an information base, on the basis of which a discursive interaction of subjects is possible. It must be admitted that the texts do provide information about the world. However, the data of cognitive and psycholinguistics suggests that “the set of rules for the linguistic and extra linguistic organization of the communication content of representatives of a certain linguocultural community” is not manifested in consciousness in the form of texts, but in the form of structured, hierarchically organized units of information.

Cognitivists represent information structures as a hierarchy of a database, including the concept sphere (all analyzed conceptual space) → domain (information node within the concept sphere) → parcel (node within a domain) → concept (constituent of a parcel denoted by a separate word or other linguistic unit). The database model is served as a frame as a structure concentrating information in the nodes (slots) and relational arcs connecting these nodes and “permeated with propositions” [9, p. five]. Psycholinguists use the concept of an information base as an extremely complex system of “multi-tiered multiply intersecting fields, with the help of which, more or less complete readiness for use in activities, versatile information about objects and phenomena of the surrounding world, about their properties and relationships, about their assessment by an individual is ordered and stored. etc., as about the features of the verbal units designating them” [10, p. 428]. Basic unit information base is a concept, and access to the base is carried out using a word - the name of the concept. When the first word of a new message is perceived, not prepared by the context or situation, the individual's previous experience determines a certain angle of view for establishing a connection between the heard or read word form and stored in memory with information - an internal context (perceptual-cognitive-affective), which correlates with an external context (textual - verbal or situational) [ibid, p. 419-436]. With all the discrepancies, linguists of both the cognitive and psychological directions give the role of the

basic unit of structured knowledge, which makes it possible to connect meaning with a unit of language that verbalizes it in a text / discourse, a concept. From the standpoint of the semiotic approach, the context of the discourse is understood in the socio-ideological sense. It includes the power relations, political views and beliefs of the communicants. The focus of researchers' attention is on "discursive practices" as tendencies in the use of similar in function, alternative linguistic means of expressing a certain ideological meaning [18, p. 144]. A semiotic interpretation of the discourse is offered by Yu.S. Stepanov: "Discourse is" language in language, "but presented as a special social reality. Discourse does not really exist in the form of its grammar and its lexicon, as a language simply does. Discourse exists primarily and mainly in texts, but those that are followed by a special grammar, a special lexicon, special rules of word use and syntax, a special semantics - ultimately - a special world "[24, p. 676].

The semiotic approach easily fits into the formula "style plus ideology" [18, p. 144], which undoubtedly reflects the essence of the matter, but does not in the least help the solution of the problem of the criteria for distinguishing between text and discourse, and even vice versa. The identification of discourse with style brings us back to doubts about the need to introduce the concept of "discourse" in the presence of the concept of "style" (for a solution to the problem, see [23, pp. 30-31]).

It seems that the methodology integrative approach to the study of language, cognitive in essence and activity-based in the style of thinking, which radically changes the traditional (representational) ideas about the subject of linguistics [1; 12; 13; 15; 19; 25].

Representatives of the integration theory of language understand a linguistic sign as a material entity, a priori given to the consciousness of the subject through the organs of sensory perception. The only difference between a linguistic sign and another material entity is that its source is the consciousness of another subject. This circumstance necessarily presupposes interaction between subjects (or rather, their consciousnesses). Several important circumstances follow from this. First, since the meaning never leaves consciousness and does not constitute parts of the material body of the sign (M.V.Nikitin wrote about this back in 1988 [20, p. 16]), its transfer from subject to subject in a finished form is impossible. Receiving the form by the listener / reader takes place, but "receiving" the meaning does not [1, p. 167]. Secondly, since signs do not carry meaning (at any level of unity of form and content of a sign does not exist), but induce identical or similar informational states in the minds of the sender and the perceiver [17, p. 119], "understanding" becomes possible due to the attainment by the consciousness of the perceiving subject of a state similar to the state of the subject-sender of the sign. "Understanding the content of the mark is a description <...> states of the one who describes "[16, p. 169]. The basis for "understanding" the content of a sign is the phenomenological property of intersubjectivity inherent in the subject as a social being, i.e. the ability to separate mental and emotional states. "More complex states of the sender of a message correspond to sets of states, which, in turn, correspond to the meanings of individual words included in the message (text). Thus, the resulting state arises and constantly acts in the course of communication, which is expediently called discourse "[1, p. 162]. The stated provisions lead to the understanding of a linguistic sign as a form filled with meaning only in the process of direct verbal and mental interactive interaction of subjects (or rather their minds) "in the universe of intersubject discourse as part of the material world" [12, p. 153]. "From the point of view of an

integrationist, there is no single system of linguistic symbols sitting motionless in the mind <...>the area of linguistic, neatly divided into departments, and the use of language consists in creatively endowing certain phenomena with semiotic significance in order to carry out meaningful operations over the world in accordance with the needs of a continuous stream of unique communicative situations in real time”[15, p. 115].

Discourse, accordingly, is understood not simply as an activity / interaction in everything variety of social contexts, but as a mental process of interactive interaction of consciousnesses, aimed at the construction of linguistic signs. This understanding actually solves the problem of differentiating between text and discourse. The proposed interpretation of the text and discourse does not deny, but only confirms the existence of differences between them, recorded in terms of the above dichotomies, but at the same time gives a fundamentally different interpretation of the essence of these phenomena. The presence of a text as a material object, which differs from another material object only in that it is a product of the activity of human consciousness, is the main condition for the emergence of discourse. Discourse is born at the moment when the text falls into the area of attention of the interpreter, who is taken for reading or listening to the text in real life time. Getting into the interpreter's area of attention, the text stimulates in his consciousness states similar to the states of the sender, which gives rise to similar meanings and associations. At this moment, there is an interactive interaction of two consciousnesses: the subject, closed in the horse of his own consciousness on himself [17, p. 124], gains access to the consciousness of another the subject through the interpretation of his states, captured in the text. As a result of the interactive interaction of two consciousnesses, the forms of linguistic expressions of the text are filled with meaning, and the process of interaction itself is discourse.

We see the prospects of work in the use of the obtained conclusions in further research of text and discourse.

REFERENCES:

1. Arkhipov I.K. - Polyphony of the world, text and loneliness of the cognizing consciousness
2. I.K.Arkhipov- Studia Linguistica Cognitiva.
3. Language and cognition: Methodological problems and perspectives. - M.: Gnosis, 2006.-- S. 157-171.
4. Bakhtin M. M. Aesthetics of verbal creativity
5. Bakhtin M. M. - M.: Art, 444 p.
6. Bogdanov V. V. Speech communication: pragmatic and semantic aspects
7. Alemi, M.,Tayebi, A. (2011). The influence of incidental and intentional vocabulary acquisition and vocabulary strategy use on learning L2 vocabularies.
8. Alipour,M., Gorjian,B., Zafari,I. (2012) The Effect of Songs on EFL Learners' Vocabulary Recall and Retention: The case of Gender. Advances in Digital Multimedia Vol.1, No.3
9. Ansarin,A. and Khojasteh,M . Retention in Meaning-Based Vocabulary Instruction. SKY
10. Journal of Linguistics 26 (2013), 7–19 Bec, Mckeown, and Kucan (2002) Bring Words to Life.
11. Learning and Ability of Retention through the Use of CALL. Thanks in University Library Journal Vol.1