REVIEW OF DISCUSSION OF DISCOURSE AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTICS.

[1]Haydarov Ilhom To'xtayevich, [2]Nigmatova Dilsoz Yadgarovna, [3]Sattorova Marifat Ortikovna, [4]Khalilova Himoyat Khatamovna, [5]Allaberganova Dilfuza Ilyasovna

[1,2,3,4]Department of "Foreign languages", Tashkent Institute of Finance, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

[5]Department of "English" University of World Economy and Diplomacy.

ABSTRACT:

This article discusses the critical discussion and rationale for discourse as an object of linguistics. The complexity of the concept of "discourse", due to the ambiguity of this term, provides some definitions. The article analyzes the essence of the concept of discourse in the following definitions. Discourse should be understood as the text inextricably linked with the situational context: in conjunction with social, cultural, historical, ideological, psychological and other factors, with a system of communicative-pragmatic and cognitive goals author interacting with the addressee, which determines the special ordering of language units of different levels when embodied in the text. The discourse characterizes the communicative process leading to the formation of a certain formal structure - the text. Depending on the research tasks, discourse, in one case, means a separate concrete communicative event, in the other - means a communicative event as an integrative set of individual communicative acts, the result of which is a meaningful thematic community of many texts. In the article, ideas of the scientist about discourse are analyzed and generalized. Modern linguistics has replenished with a number of new disciplines that require new research methods. In this work, we will try to define discourse as an object of linguistics and correlate the concepts of "text" and "discourse" in modern linguistics.

INTRODUCTION:

The article is devoted to the definition of discourse in linguistics through the prism of different approaches with the identification of the characteristics of each. Four approaches were chosen to consider the concept of discourse: communicative, structural-syntactic, structural-stylistic, and socio-pragmatic. As a result of the study of these approaches, it was revealed that one side of the discourse is directed to pragmatics, to typical situations of communication, the other to

the processes taking place 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.

Discourse in the broad sense is the unity of speech and external factors affecting its features, has verbal and non-verbal components. Discourse is socially determined, and ideological socialization is carried out precisely in discourse. Thus, discourse is also a sociocultural term, since the need to take into account the totality of circumstances before its occurrence is specifically stipulated.

In the narrow sense, discourse is a written or verbal product of a communicative action, but not just a text, but an actual pronounced text, a verbal product. Discourse is also used to denote a genre - there are "scientific discourse", "art discourse", "political discourse" and so on. The discourse includes paralinguistic accompaniment of the verbal product - gestures and facial expressions, in the structure of the discourse performing rhythmic, semantic, emotional and evaluative functions of influencing the interlocutor. The context of the discourse is modeled in the form of frames or scripts (typical situations or scenarios), the development of which is one of the most important parts of the theory of discourse. The discourse refers to such mental processes of the subjects of communication as the ethnographic, psychological and sociocultural rules of the generation and understanding of speech, determining its necessary pace, degree of connectivity, fixing the speaker's point of view, as well as the ratio of general and private, known and new, subjective and objective in content discourse.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

The discourse is studied by theoretical linguistics, and also such sciences as psychology, sociology, logic, philosophy, political science, ethnology, anthropology, semiotics, theory and practice of translation, theology, pedagogy, jurisprudence, communication studies and others are connected with its studies.

Three main classes of use of the term "discourse" are most clearly distinguished, correlating with various national traditions and contributions of specific authors:

1. Linguistic use of the term "discourse", the first of which was its use in the title of the article. Discourse analysis of the American linguist Z. Harris, published in 1952. This term was fully used in linguistics after about two decades.

In linguistics, discourse is considered as the concept of "speech, text, dialogue", inscribed in the communicative situation. This is a speech analysis. A discourse from the position of linguistics considers the patterns of information flow in the context of communication situations.

Discourse in this sense is opposed to the text as dynamic to statistical. It is in this understanding that discourse is used in the English tradition.

2. Goes back to the French structuralists and post-structuralists, and above all to M. Foucault, although A. Greimas, J. Derrida, Y. Kristeva also played an important role in justifying these uses; later, this understanding was partly modified by M. Pesce et al. In journalism, discourse is almost equated with style. He clarifies the concept of style and individual language, political discourse, teacher discourse.

"Which discourse or whose discourse" (Language of Alisher Navoiy, discourse of Bobur) - In this understanding, discourse reflects the originality of the object of social action.

3. The third use of the term "discourse", associated primarily with the name of the German philosopher and sociologist J. Habermas. Discourse is called a special ideal form of communication, carried out in the maximum possible detachment from social reality. Aimed at critical discussion and justification of the views and actions of the participants in communications. Discourse = Discussion

All three of these macro understandings (as well as their varieties) interacted and interact with each other; in particular, the formation of the French school of analysis of the discourse of the 1970s was significantly influenced by the publication in 1969 of a French translation of the

aforementioned work of Z. Harris 1952. This circumstance further complicates the general picture of the use of the term "discourse" in the humanities.

Also, the term "discourse", as it is understood in modern linguistics, is close in meaning to the concept of "text", however, it emphasizes the dynamic, unfolding in time nature of language communication; in contrast, the text is conceived primarily as a static object, the result of linguistic activity. Sometimes "discourse" is understood as including two components at the same time: the dynamic process of linguistic activity inscribed in its social context and its result (i.e., text); it is this understanding that is preferred. Sometimes there are attempts to replace the concept of discourse with the phrase "connected text" is not very successful, since any normal text is connected. Extremely close to the concept of discourse and the concept of "dialogue". Discourse, like any communicative act, presupposes the presence of two fundamental roles - the speaker (author) and the addressee. At the same time, the roles of the speaker and the addressee can be alternately redistributed between persons participating in the discourse; in this case, they talk about dialogue. If during the course of the discourse (or a significant part of the discourse) the role of the speaker is assigned to the same person, such a discourse is called a monologue. It is incorrect to assume that a monologue is a discourse with a single participant: with a monologue, an addressee is also necessary. In essence, a monologue is simply a special case of dialogue, although traditionally dialogue and monologue have been sharply opposed. The terms "text" and "dialogue" as more traditional have overgrown with a large number of connotations that interfere with their free use. Therefore, the term "discourse" is convenient as a generic term that combines all types of language use. As a scientific direction, discursive analysis was formed only in recent decades. Discursive analysis is becoming one of the central sections of linguistics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Discourse is an ambiguous term for a number of humanities, the subject of which directly or indirectly involves the study of the functioning of the language - linguistics, literary criticism, semiotics, sociology, philosophy, ethnology and anthropology. A clear and universally recognized definition of "discourse", covering all cases of its use, does not exist, and it is possible that this contributed to the wide popularity acquired by this term over the past decades.

Therefore, the term discourse (French Discours, English Discourse, and German Diskurs) began to be widely used since the 1970s. It is now clear that discourse acts as a multi-valued concept used in linguistic, literary and theoretical studies, as well as in philosophical studies, to describe various phenomena.

Thus, according to the Anglo-American linguistic tradition, discourse is understood as connected speech, and the discourse is identified with dialogue. Discourse analysis (discourse analysis) is aimed primarily at oral communication, at the interaction of the speaker and the listener.

Different concepts has been developing since the mid-70s. In the works of the French linguist and sociologist Michel Foucault, who uses this concept to designate socially-historically developed systems of human knowledge.

The discourse, according to Foucault, acts as part of the "discursive practice" - the aggregate set of diverse spheres of human knowledge. This is a set of anonymous, historical, always determined by time, space rules that in a given era, and for a given social, economic, geographical or linguistic environment determined the conditions for the impact of the utterance. Insisting on the historical conditionality of discourse, Foucault wants to emphasize that discourse is not only the totality of signs used to denote objects, phenomena. This is something more that is subject to a discursive analysis itself — social and historical information, a background relating events to discourse, or "the world of discourse". Therefore, in contrast to the classical hermeneutical tradition, discursive analysis, according to Foucault, seeks an answer not so much to the question "What was really said in what is said?" Rather "Why does this statement take place and nothing else in its place?"

The ideas of M. Foucault became an incentive and a prerequisite for further developments in this direction. So, continuing in many respects the main principles of the French researcher, W. Maas singles out the following conceptual provisions for the theory of discourse: any text is a part and expression of social practice, which already determines the mass of other possible texts. At the same time, the analysis of the text becomes an ideologically oriented analysis of the discourse, which acts as the corresponding linguistic formation in relation to socially and historically determined social practice.

It is significant that the concept of a system or, more precisely, the systematic nature of linguistic phenomena, the general principles of their use, behind a specific discourse, is key to the concept of discourse by M. Foucault, W. Maas, and other followers. Discursive analysis covers the rules that constitute a particular discourse. This aspect, essential for understanding the concept of discourse, is emphasized by Y.S. Stepanov in his analytical review "Alternative World, Discourse, Fact and Principles of Causality": Discourse is a special use of language to express a special mentality, a special ideology; special use entails the activation of certain features of the language and, ultimately, special grammar and special vocabulary rules. Ultimately, in turn, creates a special "mental world." Along with this, it is emphasized that discourse does not really exist in the form of its "grammar" and its "lexicon". Discourse exists in texts - those followed by a special grammar, a special vocabulary, and special rules of usage, special semantics, and ultimately a special world.

The above judgments are similar in that they consider discourses as special language formations that correlate with a particular area of social practice, human knowledge and communication.

The idea of analyzing various discourses has proven extremely productive for modern linguistic research. The concept of discourse is very actively used, primarily in foreign linguistics of the text. It is enough to give just a few examples: political discourse, legal, medical, advertising discourse; discourse of racism, fascism; Soviet discourse, discourse of perestroika. This series can be continued many times. A surge of interest in this phenomenon occurred in the 1990s, when textual analysis completely reoriented itself into discourse analysis.

An analysis of foreign and domestic publications shows that among linguists there are at least two basic understandings of what constitutes discourse.

Therefore, relatively speaking, discourse denotes a specific communicative event, recorded in written texts and oral speech, carried out in a specific cognitively and typologically conditioned communicative space. This means, on the one hand, that the prototypical nature of communication is found in correlation with specific models of the text of generation and perception: the text functions as a representative of a certain type of text. On the other hand, communicative activity and the products of this activity - texts are correlated with a certain mental sphere, which concentrates the corresponding knowledge.

A similar understanding of discourse, adopted in a number of foreign works, is close to the definition given by N.D. Arutyunova in the Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary: Discourse - a coherent text in the aggregate and with extra linguistic: pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors; speech, considered as a targeted social action. As a component involved in the interaction of people and their mechanisms of consciousness (cognitive processes). On one side, the discourse is directed to the pragmatic situation, and on the other, to the mental processes of the participants in communication, i.e. to strategies for generating and understanding speech in various conditions that determine the relationship between the new and the known, excitatory and explicit, etc. Obviously, the concept of discourse presented here is based on the separation of the concepts of "text" and "discourse". So, if the analysis of the text is aimed, first of all, at the "internal" - inside the text - relations of utterances among themselves, their propositional and illocutionary structure, the relationship of the text whole and its parts, then the analysis of the discourse gives a characteristic of features and functions external to the text communicative process. The discursive analysis is focused on the degree and nature of the influence of the extra-

linguistic background - social institutions, cultural, ideological and other factors on the formation of certain linguistic patterns.

It is intended to provide an answer to the question of how the various components of the communication process are: the author of the message, its addressee, the sphere of communication, channel of communication, intention, etc. reflected in the textual organization and determine the specific in it - that, and not another ordering of linguistic units and structures. Thus, the use of discourse as a unit of operational analysis seems promising and organic in connection with the linguistics development priorities postulated in recent years. In particular, with a functional approach to language, as M.N. Kozhina formulated it - in the sense of studying the problems of language use by a person in the processes of communication and activity. Hence, attention to extra linguistic factors, consideration of goals and situations of communication, subjects of speech: the speaker (writer) and the listener (reader), i.e. as a whole, the study of language is not as an immanent entity, not in distraction from a person, but "woven" into a person's activity. This is what allows discourse to be defined as "speech immersed in life", repeating N.D. Harutyunov.

We emphasize that discourse as a linguistic category does not duplicate and does not replace the concept of text. Discourse denotes a communicative and mental process leading to the formation of a certain formal construction - the text. Specific texts constitute an empirical basis for describing the discourse, which, however, cannot be reduced only to the characterization of the propositional and illocutionary aspects, but requires the inclusion of data on the organization of communicative-cognitive processes that led to the creation of these texts.

In a number of modern studies, especially widely represented in German-language linguistics of the text, the term discourse is used to indicate other content. So, here under the discourse is understood: a set of thematically related texts: texts combined into a discourse, turned in one way or another, to one common topic. The content (theme) of the discourse is revealed not by one separate text, but intertextually, in the complex interaction of many separate texts.

From this point of view, discourse is a complex interconnection of many texts (types of text), functioning within the same communicative sphere. At the same time, it is proposed to consider individual socio-historical spheres of human cognition and communication (M. Foucault called them discursive formations) as special discourses or in other terminology, types of discourse. Examples include medical, legal, advertising, etc. discourses. Research goes in the direction of how the thematic unity of discourse is ensured, i.e. which language elements of individual texts are common, typical of the discourse as a whole, and also what types of text represent the corresponding discourses. So, for example, political discourse is correlated with such communicative-speech spheres as legislation, internal party building, political advertising, which, in turn, are reflected by special types of text: bill, law, protocol; party program, commentary; pre-election speech, leaflet, survey, etc.

Paul Ricoeur believes that the text is a unified structured form of discourse, recorded in writing. Based on the definition in which the priority of the text is fixed, discourse can be considered as the subject of linguistics of the text. This approach was typical during the formation of text linguistics and was recorded in the "Short Dictionary of Text Linguistics Terms" by T.M. Nikolayev: Discourse is a multi-valued term for text linguistics, used by a number of authors in terms that are almost homonymous. The most important of them: 1) a coherent text, 2) an oral-colloquial form of the text, 3) a dialogue, 4) a group of utterances related by meaning, 5) a speech work as a given - written or oral.

Later, the definition of "discourse" as a term of text linguistics went beyond the text and began to enumerate the conditions under which this text is updated. This definition accumulates views on the discourse of T.A. Van Dike, who has priority in describing the discourse.

Discourse is not defined as a quantity adequate to the text or even synonymous with it, but much wider. It includes characteristics related to different disciplines - from semiotics to the theory of communication, sociology, modal logic, etc. The discourse is studied by different sciences and from separate directions and interdisciplinary sciences.

It can be stated that by now two basic concepts of discourse have formed:

1. Discourse as a text, updated under certain conditions and

2. Discourse as a discursive practice.

Various types of discourse (pedagogical, political, scientific, critical, pragmatic, etc.) correspond to certain discursive practices in which various types of discourses occur, one of the inherent properties of which is their verbalization. Discourses are updated in the form of texts.

It is significant that one discourse can be constituted by texts of various types and, on the other hand, texts of one type can act as elements of various special discourses. For example, an advertisement can be included in political discourse as party advertising, and in literature and art discourse as advertising for a film, performance and in everyday household discourse (advertising of goods and services).

If the text can be considered as a sequence of statements that are linked into a single text system according to the criteria of textuality, then the discourse appears as a collection of texts that somehow correlate with each other. Moreover, discourse is produced by a collective subject - for example, a party, political or social institution, or movement.

The advantage of discourse as a unit of operational analysis is that it allows the text, as a relatively closed entity, built according to its intra-textual laws, to go to other existing or potentially possible texts.

This brings the discourse analysis undertaken here to another crucial aspect, namely the issue of interdiscursivity. This concept has been included in linguistic studies relatively recently in connection with the growing interest in the issues of discourse in general and the interaction of special discourses among themselves in particular. Naturally, the theory of intertextuality and intertext creates methodological priorities in this area.

Such a communication process should be considered interdiscursive, because of which many special discourses, correlated with the corresponding communicative spheres, are integrated into a single interdiscourse. Interdiscursive are all those linguistic elements, structures, functional-semantic types of speech that characterize simultaneously many special discourses. The most striking and revealing example of the existence of interdiscourse is, of course, fiction. The language of the press reveals the same interdiscursive nature today.

The two main approaches to the definition of discourse discussed here are not fundamentally different and incompatible. They emphasize different sides of the same cognizable phenomenon. Therefore, in the first definition of discourse, conditionally called discourse, the emphasis is on the conventional character of communication: proceeding from the presence of a certain communicative norm: a specific communicative event takes place in the corresponding cognitively and typologically defined space. Tied to certain pragmatic, mental conditions of generation and perception of the message and certain models of the text of generation - types of texts. From this point of view, discourse means nothing more than a condition for successful communication, i.e. production and perception of messages, in general. Such an understanding of discourse does not contradict its other definition - as a combination of thematically related texts. Here, the discourse denotes the communicative space in which the interaction of certain types of text is possible, therefore, it includes not only a communicative (discursive) event in the sphere of "attraction" of the discourse, but their whole complex, in interconnection. Describing the discourse as a content-thematic community of texts, the researcher should also characterize the communicative-pragmatic, social conditions in which these texts operate and which determine their thematic community in a particular area of communication, as well as general (over individual) cognitive strategies embodied in texts.

It seems that both approaches are mutually complementary, and both of them should be taken into account in the practice of linguistic analysis of discourse and texts representing it.

As a conclusion, we can say that discourse should be understood as the text inextricably linked with the situational context. In conjunction with social, cultural, historical, ideological, psychological and other factors, with a system of communicative-pragmatic and cognitive goals of the author, interacting with the addressee, which determine the particular and not another - the

ordering of linguistic units of different levels when embodied in the text. The discourse characterizes the communicative process leading to the formation of a certain formal structure - the text. Depending on the research tasks, discourse, in one case, means a separate concrete communicative event, in the other - means a communicative event as an integrative set of individual communicative acts, the result of which is a meaningful thematic community of many texts.

In other words, the concept of discourse is as vague as the concepts of language, society, ideology. We know that often the most vague and difficult to define concepts become the most popular. "Discourse" is one of them. In addition, if we proceed to the definition of this concept, we can say that:

Discourse in the broad sense (as a complex communicative event) is a communicative event that occurs between the speakers, the listener (observer, etc.) in the process of communicative action in a certain temporal, spatial, etc. context. This communicative action can be verbal, written, have verbal and non-verbal components. Typical examples are an ordinary conversation with a friend, a dialogue between a doctor and a patient, reading a newspaper.

Discourse in the narrow sense (as a text or conversation) - As a rule, only the verbal component of the communicative action is distinguished and they are referred to further as a "text" or "conversation". In this sense, the term Discourse refers to the completed or ongoing "product" of a communicative action, its written or verbal result, which is interpreted by the recipients. That discourse in the most general sense is a written or verbal product of a communicative action.

Discourse as a specific conversation - and a broad and narrow understanding of Discourse includes the fact that the use of the concept of discourse always refers to specific objects in a specific setting and context: "this discourse", "its discourse", "these discourses";

Discourse as a type of conversation - The concept of discourse is also used in this sense, and may concern not specific communicative actions, but types of verbal production;

Discourse as a genre - The concept of discourse is used to denote a particular genre, for example: "news discourse", "political discourse", "and scientific discourse";

Discourse as a social formation - the most abstract meaning of the concept of discourse - when it refers to a specific historical period, social community or to the whole culture. Then they say, for example, "communist discourse", "bourgeois discourse" or "organizational discourse". In these cases - by analogy with the sociological concepts of "social formation" or "social order" - they say "discursive formation" or "discursive order".

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

REFERENCES:

1. Arutyunova N. D. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. - M., 1990.

2. Bakirova H.B. Teaching foreign language terminology at non-language universities. International journal of discourse on innovation. Integration and education. Volume: 01 Issue: 01. 2020 http://summusjournals.uz/index.php/ijdiie

3. Bakirova H.B. Formation of terminological competence in ESP education. Novateur publications. Journal NX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, ISSN No: 2581 – 4230 VOLUME 6, ISSUE 11, India.-2020. P 63.

4. Boom G.Y. Dialogue and creativity. - Riga, 1985.

5. Dialogue: linguistic and methodological aspects. Collection of scientific papers. - M., 1992.

6. Cognitive-pragmatic and artistic functions of the language. Studia Linguistica. - St. Petersburg, 2000.

7. Makarov M. Fundamentals of the theory of discourse. - M., 2003.

8. Mironova N.N. Discourse analysis of evaluative semantics. - M., 1997.

9. Word, sentence and text as interpreting systems. Studi00a Linguistica. - St. Petersburg,   1999.

10. Slyshkin G.G. From text to symbol: Linguistic and cultural concepts of precedent texts in consciousness and discourse. - M., 2000.

11. Text and discourse. Problems of economic discourse. Collection of scientific articles. - St. Petersburg, 2001.

12. Shevchenko N.V. The basics of linguistics text. - M., 2003.