**Diyora MAJIDOVA**
Master's Student
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
*diyora_1066@mail.ru*

# THE STUDY OF DISCOURSE IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Мақолада дискурс тушунчасини талқин қилишда замонавий тилшуносликда мавжуд айрим муаммолар ёритилган. Дискурс тушунчасининг шаклланиш жараёни ўрганилган ва уни матндан ажратиб турувчи асосий хусусиятлари кўрсатилган.

В статье описываются некоторые трудности интерпретации понятия «дискурс» в современной лингвистике. Коротко представлен процесс становления понятия «дискурс» в лингвистике, отмечены главные особенности представленного понятия, отличающие его от понятия «текст».

The article describes some problems of the interpretation of the notion "discourse" in modern linguistics. The process of the formation of the notion "discourse" in linguistics is presented in brief; the main characteristics of this notion distinguishing it from the notion "text" are pointed out.

**Калит сўзлар:** матн, дискурс, нутк , нутқий фаолият.

**Ключевые слова:** текст, дискурс, речь, речевая деятельность.

**Key words:** text, discourse, speech, speech activity.

The definition of a discourse still remains in the center of attention of modern scientific discussions and there is its relevance and scientific value. Communicative characteristics of a discourse and its function in public practice became a subject of numerous disputes and discussions. In fact, each human activity possesses own, characteristic for it, a discourse (political, scientific, legal, economic) in which abilities of the person to a reflection and communication is realized.

Giving special accent and attention to a language role in formation of cultural-semiotic components of public consciousness and in cross-cultural social interaction that involves the corresponding expansion of the sphere of linguistic researches is characteristic for modern humanitarian thinking. Interests of

linguistics were significantly displaced from the structural description of language on the functional ones. The academic science which deals with studying of languages realized that the language that is learnt is actually the certain scientific abstraction or fiction which does not have a direct relation on real processes of communication. Studying of laws in any language did not affect users of that language. The absence of rules of usage of the accumulated knowledge of the language led to emergence of the functional disciplines which focused on human factors. Inclusion in a scientific paradigm of producers of language units, various parameters of speech situations promoted development of the theory of communication and speech interaction that caused emergence of the new directions in linguistics, new objects of research, new language unit – a discourse.

The discourse is thought as a substance which has no accurate contour and volume and it is in the continuous movement. Purpose of a conceptual framework of linguistics of a discourse consists in providing access to its structure-forming parameters. As the discourse has the dynamic character, methods which are applied in the analysis of the words or the sentences as static essence, stable elements of system are totally useless in application to a discourse. And the specified units which are used in discourse are not stable and find out semantic and formal variability and polysemy. The internal organization of a discourse is still described by scientists of the different scientific directions.

Discourse (fr. discours, English discourse, armor. discursus "running backwards-forward; movement, circulation", English – "conversation, talk"). "In Latin the word meaning was limited: races (in various directions) or the special bidirectional attack of army aiming to isolate parts of army of the opponent from each other (pincer movement).This Latin dictionary did not record. Most likely, this sema appeared already at later stages of functioning of language, outside title ethnos. In articles of the French and English dictionaries the sema of speaking dominates. Only in the private use in Edmund Spencer's poems (the 16th century) the word discourse describes military action and designates battle process. More specific value of the church sermon was also fixed in English where this word derived from French. Some conclusions and assumptions follow from the analysis of entries. At the metaforization of a loan word which occurred at very early stage the field of military action was blocked by a field of speech action. And the internal form of the word keeps all sema and analogies of evasion from a course, races in various directions, skirmishes, process of battle, defeat of the opponent. All these sema and analogies are realized at the level of a speech act. It is hard to say, at what stage there was such metaforization"[Belozerova].

In Anglo-American linguistic researches the discourse traditionally is understood as "the coherent speech", "dialogue", in this value the term is used in the 1950th by Z. Harris. Two decades later there is a definition of a discourse as "the speech that was immersed in life" by E.Benvenista. Researchers agree in opinion that the discourse – "is the speech immersed in a communicative situation and having thus the expressed social contents is more distinct in comparison withspeech activity of the certain individual" [Abakumova 2013: 64].

V. Shcherba. It allocated the third aspect of the language phenomena (after language and the speech) when wrote about "set of all sayings and understandings in a certain situation during this or that era of life of this or that public group" [Shcherba 1974: 26]. This aspect is called by Shcherba as language material, but this phenomenon will receive the name "discourse" later.

In modern science as the term "discourse" it is understood practically anything to the researcher, the term is extremely popular, as concept of a discourse also indistinctly, as concept of language, societies, ideologies. A discourse – object of interdisciplinary studying. Besides cognitive linguistics such sciences and the research directions as computational linguistics and artificial intelligence, psychology, philosophy and logic, sociology, anthropology and ethnology, a historiography, law, communication researches, political science are connected with research of a discourse. And in spite of the fact that each of these disciplines approaches studying of a discourse in own way, it is obvious that the discourse is a multiple-valued term of a number of the humanities which subject directly or indirectly assumes studying of functioning of language. Some interpretations which are used in different paradigms of knowledge in different values are assigned to this term. Therefore it is possible to speak about polysemanticism of this term both in linguistics, and in others sciences. A. Kibrik, P. Parshin allocate three main classes of the use of the term "discourse" corresponding to various national traditions and deposits of specific authors.

Actually linguistic uses of this term belong to the first class, it was firstly used in the name of the article "Discourse Analysis" of the American Linguist of Z. Harris which was published in 1952. Fully this term was demanded in linguistics approximately in two decades. Actually linguistic uses of the term "discourse" in it are very various, but in general behind them attempts of specification and development of traditional concepts of the speech, the text and dialogue are looked through. Thetransition from concept of the speech to concept of a discourse is connected with aspiration to enter into the classical opposition of language and the speech belonging to F. de Saussure, some third member – something paradoxically and "more speech", than the speech, and at the same time

– more giving in studying by means of traditional linguistic methods, more formal and by that "more language". On the one hand, the discourse is thought as the speech entered in a communicative situation and owing to this fact as category with more clearly expressed social contents in comparison with speech activity of the individual; on aphoristic expression of N.D.Arutyunova "the discourse is the speech immersed in life". On the other hand, real practice modern (from the middle of the 1970th years) the discourse analysis is interfaced to research of regularities of the information movement within a communicative situation which is carried out first of all through an exchange of remarks; thereby some structure of dialogue interaction that continues quite structural (though usually and not called that) line, which beginning just is really described and it was necessary to Harris.

Thus, however, dynamic character of a discourse that becomes for distinction of concept of a discourse and traditional idea of the text as to static structure is emphasized. The first class of notion of the term "discourse" is presented mainly in English-speaking scientific tradition to which also a number of scientists from the countries of continental Europe belongs; however beyond the scope of this tradition about a discourse as "the third member" of Saussuare's opposition the Belgian scientist E.Byuissans spoke for a long time, and the French linguist E.Benvenist consistently used the term "discourse" (discours) instead of the term "speech" (parole).

The second class of the uses of the term "discourse" which in recent years was beyond science and which became popular in journalism goes back to the French structuralism and post-structuralism, and first of all to M. Foucault though in justification of these uses the important role was played also by A. Greymas, Ge. Derrida, Yu.Kristeva; later this understanding was partly modified by M. Peshyo, etc. Behind these usages the aspiration to specification of traditional concepts of style (in that widest value which is meant, "style is a person") and individual language (cf. traditional expressions of Dostoyevsky's style, Pushkin's language or language of the Bolshevism with such is more modern the sounding expressions, as a modern Russian political discourse or Ronald Reagan's discourse) is looked through. The term "discourse" understood thus (and also the derivative and often replacing it by the term "discursive practice" which was also used by Foucault) describes the way of speaking and surely has definition – WHAT or WHOSE discourse because researchers are interested not in a discourse in general, and its concrete versions set by a wide set of parameters: purely language distinctive features (in that measure in what they can be distinctly identified), stylistic specifics (mostly determined by quantitative tendencies in use of language means), and also specifics of subject, systems of belief, ways of a convictions, etc. (it

would be possible to tell that the discourse in this understanding is stylistic specific one and the ideology stands behind it).

Moreover, it is supposed that the way of speaking in many respects predetermines and creates the subject sphere of a discourse, and also social institutes corresponding to it. Understanding of this sort, certainly, also is sociological in the strongest degree. As a matter of fact, WHAT definition or WHOSE discourse can be considered as the instruction on a communicative originality of the subject of social action, and this subject can be concrete, group or even abstract: for example, using expressions of violence discourse, mean not so much how speak about violence, so much, as the abstract social agent "violence" proves in communicative forms – that quite corresponds to traditional expressions like violent language.

There is, at last, a third use of the term "discourse" connected first of all with a name of the German philosopher and sociologist Y.Khabermas. It can be considered specific in relation to the previous understanding, but has considerable specifics. In it the third understanding "discourse" is called the special ideal type of communication which is carried out in the greatest possible discharge from social reality, traditions, authority, communicative routine, etc. and aiming at critical discussion and justification of views and actions of participants of communication. From the point of view of the second understanding, it is possible to call it "a rational discourse", the word "discourse" here obviously sends to the fundamental text of scientific rationalism – to the judgements on R. Descarte's method (in the original - "Discours de la méthode" that at desire it is possible to translate it as "a method of discourse").

All three listed macrounderstandings (and also their versions) interacted and interact with each other; this circumstance in addition complicates an overall picture of the use of the term "discourse" in the humanities. Besides, it must be kept in mind that this term can be used not only as patrimonial, but also in relation to concrete models of language interaction. The complexity of definition of a discourse is connected with difficulty of differentiation of a discourse and the text, and also that it is necessary to recognize dominating in system of a discourse. So, N. A. Lavrova [Lavrova 2010] accents the attention on actually linguistic and sociolinguistic in a discourse: "From speech linguistics position the discourse is the process of the real-life verbalized communication which is characterized by a set of deviations from initial written language, thus an important role play degree of spontaneity, completeness, thematic connectivity, clearness of conversation for other people.

Thus, the concept "discourse" has the deep semiotic, cognitive and linguocultural content, but the maintenance of a discourse is not limited to a conceptual basis since the discourse has also language, and extra language content.An originality of a discourse as events in science is caused by a research paradigm. Discourses, primary sources of the text, cause a continuity of development of scientific knowledge of the "highest reality of language" embodying regularities of outlook of the person, mechanisms of expression of an orientation of its spirit on itself and on people around.

## LITERATURE

1. Dijk van T. A. The Study of Discourse // Discourse as Structure and Process / ed. by A. Teun. London, 1997. Vol. l. Dijk van. Discourse Studies: a Multidisciplinary Introduction. P. 1-34.
2. DijkT.A. van. Text and Context. Exploration in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse / T.A. van Dijk. – L.: Longman, 1977. 3
3. HeislerT. Evaluative Metadiscursive Comments and Face-work in Conversational Discourse /T. Heisler, D. Vincent, A. Bergeron // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2003. – V. 35 – P. 1613–1631
4. Арутюнова Н. Д. Дискурс // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. , 1990. С. 136-137.
5. Дейк ван Т. А., Кинч В. Стратегия понимания связного текста // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М.: Прогресс, 1988. Вып. XXIII. С. 153-211.
6. Кубрякова Е. С., Александрова О. В. Виды пространства, текста и дискурса // Категоризация мира: пространство и время: материалы научной конференции. М.: Диалог-МГУ, 1997. С. 19-20.
7. Кубрякова Е. С. О понятии дискурса и дискурсивного анализа в современной лингвистике: обзор // Дискурс, речь, речевая деятельность. Функциональные и структурные аспекты: сборник обзоров. М.: ИНИОН РАН, 2000. С. 7-25.
8. Макаров М.Л. Основы теории дискурса / М. : ИТДГК "Гнозис", 2003
9. Почепцов Г.Г. Теория коммуникации / Г.Г. Почепцов. – М. : Рефл-бук; К. : Вак-лер, 2001. – 656 с.
10. Попов А. Ю.Формы экономических текстов и дискурсов // Текст и дискурс. Проблемы экономического дискурса:сборник научных статей. СПб.: Изд-во СПбГУЭФ, 2001. С. 130-137.
11. Чернявская В. Е. От анализа текста к анализу дискурса // Текст и дискурс: традиционный и когнитивно-функциональный аспекты исследования. Рязань, 2002. С. 230-232.