

## THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF 'DISCOURSE' IN CONTEMPORARY LINGUISTICS

**Ibragimova Nayira Anvarovna**

TUIT, Foreign languages department

[nayira@inbox.ru](mailto:nayira@inbox.ru)

### ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the definition of the concept of discourse in linguistics through the prism of different approaches, identifying the features of each. The history of the 'discourse' term were widely analyzed. To consider the concept of discourse, four approaches were widely discussed. According to research of these approaches, it was revealed that one side of the discourse is addressed to pragmatics, to typical situations of communication, the other to the processes occurring in the minds of the participants in communication, and the third to the text itself. This gave reason to believe that discourse can be considered both as a process and as a result in the form of a fixed text.

**Keywords:** discourse, linguistics, study, discourse analysis, discursive linguistics, communicative, speech, text, cognitive.

### INRODUCTION

In the middle of the XX century, studies of the language as a complex of interrelated units has appeared. It included the elements that were not actually linguistic elements. The focus of researcher's attention increasingly began to develop specific features of language units associated with the purpose and participants of communication. Linguistics began not only to investigate the text as a phenomenon of language, but also it started to integrate the analysis of the communication situation: the communicative situation and the environment, the communicants and their socio-psychological characteristics, their worldview and relationships with each other into the study of the text. This is how discursive linguistics has evolved, aimed at the study of both proper linguistic and extra linguistic factors and phenomena in their interdependence. The term "discourse" refers to the actual dynamic process of language activity as an element of the social situation, embedded in the social context, and the direct result of communicative activity- the text. The lexeme "discourse" itself goes back to "dieksodos", by the way, which is found in Plato and has the meaning "to travel, go through the parts and come out of them to the general" [1], in the closest meaning, the term "discourse" is noted in the literature of the early modern period.

In England in the 17th century, the term discourse was one of the most popular types of scientific style, and in France in the 18th century; the term discourse was used to refer to dialogic speech, and later to text in general.

**Discourse**, (from late Latin ‘discursus’ - reasoning, argument; originally - scurry, bustle, circulation) is a polysemantic term meaning, in a general sense, speech, process of linguistic activity and systems of concepts that imply them. In the middle of the 20th century, "discourse" was understood as a sequence of connected sentences or speech acts, and, accordingly, in this interpretation, the concept of "discourse" was considered close to the concept of the "text". But by the end of the 20th century, “discourse” for researchers was a complex communicative phenomenon in the form of a knowledge system, which, in addition to the text, also includes certain extra linguistic factors necessary for a complete understanding of the text: knowledge about the world, attitudes, opinions, goals, etc. .Thus, "discourse" has ceased to be considered solely from the standpoint of syntax and semantics. [2]

## METHODS

T.V. Matveyeva in the "Complete Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" interprets discourse as "coherent speech in conjunction with the non-linguistic circumstances of its course, speech in conjunction with living life: its event context, socio-cultural, pragmatic, psychological characteristics of the speakers"[3]

In the XX century, E. Benveniste was one of the first who used the concept of "discourse", by which he meant "speech assigned to the speaker". E. Benveniste had opposed the ‘discourse’ to “objective narration”. [4]

The most detailed reflection of the evolution of the term "discourse" in scientific thought was found in the studies of Yu. A. Levitsky, who described the transformation of the term "discourse" in the 20th century, observed both in the works of German linguistic school (P. Hartman, P. Wunderlich), in studies belonging to the representatives of French post-structuralism (A. Greimas), in works on the logical-semantic description of texts, and in works on the sociolinguistic analysis of communication created in line with the American school (E. Shcheglova, G. Zags), as well as scientific research of many other scientists and various linguistic areas around the world. [5]

"Discourse" as a linguistic term was first used in 1952 by an American scholar Z. Harris in his book "Discourse analysis". [6] Formation of modern discourse theory as an independent field of science mainly corresponds to the mid-60s of the 20th century. The desire of scientists of this period to consider language as an indispensable means of communication was manifested in the study of texts. In the course of linguistics gradually leaving the form, formal-functional framework, and studying the

language meaningfully, holistically, consistently, the term discourse began to be actively used.

Real comparison of oral and written discourse as alternative forms of language existence appeared only in the 1970s. E. D. Isaeva distinguishes 4 approaches in defining discourse: formal, functional, situational, cognitive. [7]

The formal approach (structure-oriented) considers discourse as a semantic connection of two or more sentences, where coherence is a sign of discourse. Thus, in this interpretation, the discourse is a super phrasal unity, a complex syntactic whole, the integrity of which is determined by a certain system connectors.

From a functional point of view, discourse is identified with any use of language, which implies an analysis of the functions of discourse in connection with an analysis of the functions of language. The situational is associated with the interpretation of discourse in the context of social, psychological and culturally significant conditions and circumstances. It is believed that this approach combines formal and functional and can be considered as a compromise.

The cognitive approach interprets discourse as a phenomenon of a cognitive order that is, a phenomenon directly related to the transfer of knowledge, operating with them and creating new connections.

According to the Russian linguist V.I. Karasik, there are four approaches in the study of discourse:

- 1) discourse refers to a communication-based dynamic model of language (as opposed to a statistical one);
- 2) communicative situations themselves are studied considering psychological, social, cultural and historical characteristics;
- 3) communicative situations include pre-communicative (the origination of discourse), communicative and post-communicative (interpretation of discourse) stages;
- 4) origination and interpretation are important aspects of the study of discourse" [8].

## RESULTS

Thus, discourse is a text "immersed in the situation of communication", of particular importance in the study of discourse is the fact that "the form of a coherent text, conditionality by extra linguistic factors, the event aspect and purposeful social action are the most important characteristics of discourse". According to N. D. Arutyunova among the most significant features of discourse, one can designate "its correlation with eventual reality, orientation towards communication, that is, the interaction of interlocutors, suggestiveness and perception"[9]

With this approach, discourse is a compound complex that includes not only the material being presented, but also the participants in the discourse, communication (its

author and recipient/s), the communicative situation, which can also be decomposed into components (area of communication, chronotope, form of communication, the circumstances of the presentation itself, the assessment of what is being presented by the communicants, etc.), that is, both contextual and situational features of the discourse.

The problem of defining the concept of "discursive competence" is essential. According to E.M. Baskirina, discursive competence is the ability to generate and interpret various types of discourses, which requires the ability to use and interpret language constructs (words) while creating a text, as well as the skills to organize a coherent text. In her works, E.M. Baskirina focuses on the ability to achieve correspondence of thought to the text, for which it is necessary to be able to effectively use connectives - conjunctions, pronouns, adverbs, and other grammatical means. I.L. Kolesnikova and O.A. Dolgin, while emphasizing the importance of knowledge and ability to create texts of various functional styles and, accordingly, the ability to choose linguistic means, taking into account the type of utterance, give a similar definition. Besides the knowledge about the features inherent in certain types of discourse, A.N. Shchukin highlights the ability to use a variety of strategies to create and interpret texts. However, the most complete, in our opinion, is the definition of "discursive competence", proposed by N.V. Popova, who understands it as the ability to create a coherent speech statement, while observing the thematic organization, cohesion, coherence, rhetorical efficiency and logic within the real situation of communication and the functional style adequate to it. [10]

The Dutch scientist T. van Dijk, who is rightfully recognized not only as one of the largest researchers of discourse, but also as the founder of the "discourse analysis" direction, describes discourse as "a speech stream, a language in perpetual motion, along which this stream captures numerous historical, cultural, national and, of course, the individual characteristics of those who guide him, that is, the communicants". [11]

As an example of such a consideration of discourse, one can cite the definition of E.S. Kubryakova and O.V. Alexandrova, where discourse is a cognitive process that is directly related to the creation of a speech work. [12]

## DISCUSSIONS

After studying the phenomenon of discourse itself and the concept that reflects it, various classifications of discourse types began to be developed in line with discursive linguistics. It should be noted that due to the relatively short time of its appearance and development, discursive linguistics has not come to a unified view on the classification of discourse, a generally accepted system does not currently exist, which does not prevent the detailed development of individual types of discourse.

Three most important vectors are designated: culturological, dialogic and pragmalinguistic. [7] Within these vectors, various classification principles are considered: the communicative competence of the participants - in the cultural direction, the type of dialogue as the main form of discourse existence - in the dialogical and social status of the participants of communications - in a pragma linguistic approach. The format of relations between communication participants determines the division of discourse into personality-oriented, in which communicants (addresser and addressee) show their personal qualities, assessments, opinions, etc. without narrow restrictions, and status-oriented, assuming the presence of restrictions in the implementation by communicants of their speech / discursive intentions. Within this view, the discourse is divided into personal and institutional. [7]

V. I. Karasik states: "In relation to modern society, it seems that the following types of institutional discourse can be distinguished: political, diplomatic, administrative, legal, military, pedagogical, religious, mystical, medical, business, advertising, sports, scientific, technological, stage and mass information" [7].

Discourse analysis includes a variety of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, including linguistics, education, sociology, anthropology, social work, cognitive psychology, social psychology, area studies, cultural studies, international relations, human geography, environmental science, communication studies, public relations, argumentation studies, and translation studies, each of which is subject to its own assumptions, dimensions of analysis, and methodologies.[13]

## CONCLUSION

These types of discourses become objects of versatile and multifaceted research, but not to the same extent. Some attract more scholarly attention (e.g political discourse), some less (scientific discourse).

There is a differentiation of discourse in accordance with the form of communication (oral and written), with the number of communicants and the method of broadcasting information (individual and mass), with the communicative situation and the purpose of communication (academic, political, scientific, and religious, etc.). Moreover, concepts such as interdiscourse or sub discourse are being developed.

Thus, the category of discourse is one of the main concepts in communicative linguistics. This term allows not only pronunciation options (with stress on the first or second syllable), but also a variety of scientific interpretations. The widespread use of discourse as a generic category in relation to the concepts of text, speech, dialogue is increasingly found in linguistic literature. The definition of such a category as a

discourse, it assumes some ideological orientation, its own point of view on the study of language and linguistic communication.

### REFERENCES:

1. Lisovich I.I. Scientific discourses in the culture of England in the early modern period: author. diss. ... Doctor of Cultural Studies. M., 2015. 47 p.
2. Evstigneeva Ilona Alekseevna. "The role of modern information and communication technologies in the development of discursive skills of students of a language university" Questions of teaching methods at a university, no. 3 (17), 2014, pp. 211-219.
3. Matveeva T.V. Complete dictionary of linguistic terms. Rostov n/a: Phoenix, 2010. 562 p.
4. Benveniste E. General linguistics. M.: Progress, 1974. P115.
5. Levitsky Yu.A. Linked text structure. Perm: Perm. state un-t, 1978. 64 p.
6. Elbek O'Rol O'G'Li Ro'Ziyev. "Tilshunoslikda siyosiy diskurs tushunchasi" Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, vol. 1, no. 2, 2021, pp. 229-232.
7. Isaeva E.D. The concept of discourse in modern linguistics. Modern problems of the development of science, technology and education / Collection of scientific papers.2016. <http://vii.sfu-kras.ru/info/public/vii/book/ponyatie-diskursa-v-sovremennoy-lingvistike-2009>
8. Karasik V.I. Text linguistics and discourse analysis. Arkhangelsk - Volgograd: Change, 1994. Pp 3-4.
9. Arutyunova N.D. Discourse // Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1990. S. 136-137.
10. Evstigneeva Ilona Alekseevna. "The role of modern information and communication technologies in the development of discursive skills of students of a language university" Questions of teaching methods at a university, no. 3 (17), 2014, pp. 211-219.
11. Teun A. van Dijk. *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1988.
12. Kubryakova E.S., Aleksandrova O.V. Types of space, text and discourse // Categorization of the world: space and time: scientific materials. conf. M.: Dialogue, 1997. S. 19–20.
13. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Discourse\\_analysis](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Discourse_analysis)