

Concept of Discourse in Modern Linguistics

Gulnorakhon Niyazova

Senior Teacher, Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D),

Alisher Navai Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature

ABSTRACT

This article deals with the concept of discourse and perception of the cognitive-pragmatic theory when reading literary texts. On the basis of the article, an attempt was made to substantiate the question of the dynamism of the term "Discourse" in terms of its semantic change, the most common use in the field of linguistics, the ambiguity of this term and its use in various fields of humanitarian knowledge, which creates different approaches to the interpretation of the meaning and essence of this concept. This study is relevant for researchers of a new, but increasingly developing cognitive discourse of linguistics, as it directly affects the issues of pragmatics and gender linguistics.

KEYWORDS: *essence of communication, discursive concept, cognitive-pragmatic approach, communicative units of the language, text linguistics*

Introduction

It is quite legitimate to raise the question of the dynamism of the term "discourse" from the point of view of its semantic change, since in recent decades it has been most widely used in the field of linguistics. In addition, the reason for this is probably the lack of a clear and universally recognized definition of speech, covering all cases of its use. Currently, the functional-communicative approach considers speech as the most important form of daily life practice of a person and defines it as a complex communicative phenomenon that includes extra linguistic factors (knowledge of the world, thoughts, and attitudes) in addition to the text., the receiver's goals) necessary to understand the text.

Object of study. The definition of the concept of "discourse" causes serious difficulties because it is in demand within a number of scientific disciplines such as linguistics, anthropology, literary studies, ethnography, sociology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology and others. It is quite natural that the ambiguity of the term "discourse" and its use in different 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 with the efforts of scientists of various fields, the theory of speech is currently being formed as an independent interdisciplinary field that reflects the general trend towards integration in the development of modern science.

Results and discussion. Even before the emergence of modern discourse theory, which began to take shape as an independent discipline only in the mid-1960s, there were attempts to define this term. The word discourse has the most "old" meaning in French and refers to dialogic speech. Already in the 19th century, this term had multiple meanings: the German dictionary "Deutsches Woerterbuch"

by Jacob Wilhelm Grimm in 1860 shows the following semantic parameters of the term "discourse":

1. Dialogue, - conversation;
2. Speech, - lecture.

Such an approach was typical during the formation of speech theory within the framework of many studies called text linguistics. This period was the period when linguistics left the scope of studying a separate sentence (sentence) and moved to the analysis of the syntagmatic chain of sentences that make up the text and have the constitutional characteristics of completeness, integrity, consistency, etc. the study of the text was connected with the desire to consider the language as an integral means of communication, to study more deeply the relations of the language with various aspects of human activity carried out through the text. The rapid development of text linguistics as a science of the essence, conditions and conditions of human communication made a turn from linguistics to speech linguistics and increased attention to the act of communication.

From the beginning, within the framework of research studying the organization of connected speech text, there was a controversy regarding the terminological definition of the object of study, as well as the field of linguistics that studies the text. Initially, the emerging term "text linguistics" was not entirely successful for many scientists, and in some linguistic works, coherent speech text is called speech. Polysemy of the term "discourse" T.M. Nikolaeva: "Discourse is a multi-valued term of text linguistics, which is used by a number of authors almost synonymously. The most important of them are: 1) consistent text;

2) oral-conversational form of the text; 3) dialogue; 4) a group of semantically connected sentences; 5) speech work is given - written or oral" [1, p. 467].

The emergence of speech theory marked a qualitative leap in the development of linguistics and set researchers the most difficult task of providing a linguistic description of speech. The theory of speech, which arose within the framework of text linguistics, never lost contact with it, but consistently moved towards the distinction of the studied subject, the distinction between the concepts of "text" and "discourse". For example, according to the definition of V.G. According to Borbotko, speech is a text, but it consists of communicative units of the language of sentences and their combination into larger units with continuous semantic connection, which allows perceiving it as an integral formation [2, p. 8]. Borbotko emphasizes that the text as a linguistic material does not always represent coherent speech, that is, speech. Text is a more general concept than speech. Speech is always text, but the reverse is not true. Not all text is speech. Discourse is a special case of text.

In modern linguistics, discourse is interpreted in two ways. There are several approaches to the definition of speech.

1. Communicative (functional) approach: speech as oral communication (speech, use of language, activity) or as a dialogue or as a conversation, that is, as a type of dialogic statement or as speech from a speech position. The speaker, unlike the narrator, who does not consider such a position. Within the framework of the communicative approach, the term "discourse" is "a certain symbolic structure that turns it into a speech with its subject, object, place, time, creation (production) conditions" [3, p. 5].
2. Structural-syntactic approach: speech as a piece of text, i.e. education above the sentence level (superlative unit, complex syntactic whole, and paragraph). Communication refers to two or more sentences that have a semantic relationship with each other, and connection is considered one of the main features of speech.
3. Structural-stylistic approach: speech as an extra textual organization of colloquial speech is characterized by a fuzzy division into parts, a predominance of associative links, spontaneity, situationality, high contextually, and stylistic originality.
4. Socio-pragmatic approach: speech is presented as a socially or ideologically limited type of speech or as a "language within a language", but as a text embedded in the situation of communication, life, but as a separate social object, it has its own texts.

This classification allows us to understand that the nature of speech is threefold: one side of it focuses on pragmatics, typical situations of communication, and the other on the processes that occur in the minds of the participants of communication and their characteristics, consciousness, and the third to the text itself.

Summary: The selected approaches are contradictory. The concept of "discourse" is closely related to the concepts of speech and text. Speech as a communicative event is an intermediate connection between, on the one hand, oral communication, speech as an activity, and, on the other hand, a specific text recorded in the process of communication. In a simpler contrast, speech should be understood as a cognitive

process related to the production of real speech, knowledge about the speech work, and the text as the result of the process of speech activity, resulting in a certain finished form. This contrast of real speech to its result leads to the realization that a text can be interpreted as speech only when it is actually perceived and enters the current consciousness of the perceiver.

REFERENCES:

1. Baranov, A.N. Linguistic theory of argumentation (cognitive approach); abstract of dissertation ... d-khf philol. Sciences / A.N. Baranov.: Institute of Russian. Yaz. Acad. sciences of the USSR. -M., 1990. - 48s.
2. Belova, E.N. Structure and semantics of argumentative discourse: (Based on the hearings of the comm. and subcommittee of the US Congress): author. Dis. ... cand. Philological sciences: 10.02.04 / E.N. Belova; Ros.ped. U-t im. HOW. Gersen. - St. Petersburg, 1995.-18s.
3. Borbotko V.G. General theory of discourse. Principles of formation and meaning: Dis.... Dr. Philol. Sciences. - Krasnodar, 1998. - 250 p.
4. Grishaeva, L.I. Discourse, discursive event and text / L.I. Grishaeva // Nomination and discourse: materials of reports. mejunar. Scientific conf.; Minsk. State linguist. No. - Minsk, 2006. - S. 11 - 13.
5. Karasik V. I. On the tipax of discourse / V. I. Karasik // Linguistic personality: institutional and personal discourse: Sat. scientific tr. - Volgograd, 2000. - S. 5-20.
6. Karasik, V.I. On the tipax of discourse / V.I. Karasik // Linguistic Personality: Institutional and Personal Discourse: Sat. scientific tr. - Volgograd, 2000a. - P. 5 - 20.
7. Safarov, Sh. Ethnocultural components of discursive activity / Sh. Safarov // Language, discourse and personality: Cognitive and communicative aspects: Sat. scientific Job; Tver. State No. - Tver, 1990. - S. 105 - 111.
8. Slishkin, G.G. Discourse and concept (about the linguocultural approach to the study of discourse) / G.G. Slishkin // Linguistic Personality: Institutional and Personal ADiscourse: Sat. scientific tr. - Volgograd, 2000a. - S. 38 - 45.