



THEORETICAL VIEWS ON DISCOURSE IN LINGUISTICS

Tashkent architecture and civil engineering university
Foreign languages department, Ass. prof.
Saloydinova Nargiza Shukhratovna

***Abstract** This article discuss the theoretical and analytical views about discourse also expand that discourse is the process of language functioning, which cannot be incorporated by a linguist until it is proved that discourse is the process of language functioning, but until it is proved that discourse is the process by which language can function in all its aspects and directions.*

***Key words:** discourse, complex syntactic essence, linguistics-extralinguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and psychological factors, linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology, sociology*

Introduction

In linguistics, the first theoretical and linguistic views on the term discourse began to take shape in the middle of the 20th century. Although the term is also widely used in the fields of literature, sociology, political science, philosophy, logic, psychology, in addition to linguistics, we can witness that there is no known and clear single interpreted concept related to it in linguistics. Originally, the term "text" was applied to "discourse" for the same concept. However, later "text" was used to refer to written communication, while "discourse" was used to refer to oral communication. The meaning of the word is French discours – "speech", "to speak".
[1]

Existing sources initially treated the problem as a unit consisting of more than one sentence and with a "complex syntactic essence". This phenomenon has been evaluated in linguistics as a connection between logical grammar and colloquial speech. It has also been advanced in linguistics in the last century that the phenomenon of discourse is related to oral speech, that there are cases of their

expression in the process of speech, also with exclamations, introductions, introductory consonants, which can be the basis for their assessment as a "complex syntactic device".

Methods and materials

In foreign linguistics, the problem of discourse was introduced in the last century by Z.Promoted Harris. In the studies, discourse has been interpreted as a monopredicative unit of colloquial speech. By this time, such terms as textual linguistics, relevance of textual research to speech theory, applied Stylistics, communication theory, language learning, automatic translation began to be used in scientific sources. One of the greatest achievements of the 70s of the last century is the fact that the position of discourse in colloquial speech is formed as a separate branch of linguistics, as well as a separate source of research for the problem. Some sources have also expressed objections to the position of the term discourse in linguistics and its use. Even the linguist R.Godel's confession that the use of the term discourse in research on linguistics "can cast doubt on the exact inference of language and speech phenomena" is N.A.Slyusarev noted in his research [2] and R.Godel gave a reasonable, scientific response to the protest.[3]

The concept of discourse came to science in the 60-70s as a result of research in the fields of linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology and sociology. The discourse is based on the idea that all human beings, except humans and animals, have the ability to self-knowledge, as well as the fact that they do not have the ability to self-knowledge.

Results

Discourse is the process of language functioning, which cannot be incorporated by a linguist until it is proved that Discourse is the process of language functioning, but until it is proved that Discourse is the process by which language can function in all its aspects and directions. In dialectological descriptions, it is a word denoting a group of speakers of a dialect. Theologians, psychologists, and psycholinguists believe that discourse is a psychophysiological process in which

nutantion is a process in which nutation is a process, rather than a process in which nutation is a process in which nutation is a psychophysiological process. Tadeusz Kosciuszko. Thus, unlike most psychologists who consider nutation as a physiological phenomenon, psychologists do not consider this nutation as a physiological phenomenon, since all linguists believe that nutation is a manifestation of nutative activity.

Dutch linguist T. A. van Dijk broadly refers to discourse as a complex communicative event, and narrowly to a communicative action written or the speaker comments on the need to be viewed as a verbal product. It should be noted that T.A. van Dijk defines the difference between discourse and text as such: discourse is an actually spoken text, i.e. an active oratory action, while text is an abstract grammatical structure of thoughts belonging to a language system or to shaky linguistic knowledge.[4] discourse-specific conversation, and clarity, applies equally to the situation, text and object to which the concept of discourse applies. Discourse is a type of conversation. Discourse is like a genre. A colloquial genre is a type of speech characterized by the peculiarity of the use of artistic means, a certain communicative purpose and aspects such as informativity, imperativity, etiquette. The social nature of discourse allows for the emergence of new concepts such as novel discourse, publicistic discourse, political discourse, scientific discourse, artistic discourse, evaluative discourse. The variety of interpretations and annotations suggests that the concept of discourse is multifaceted and comprehensive. The study of a particular individual discourse as a separate research object allows for reflection on the linguopragmatic nature of discourse.

Based on his ideas about linguistics, Mazurkevich came to the conclusion that the concepts of “discourse” and “mate”, as well as their interchangeability and interrelationship, are not generally accepted.

For example, Michel Foucault believed that discourse is not nonsense, but the concept of consciousness. He said, "... According to Schubert, discourse is a sign

phenomenon, but it is not so much a sign phenomenon as a set of signs that make up a single whole. And he, like me, does not know the language" [5]. According to Foucault, the concept of "discourse" in this sense is commonly called discursive. It is not said, however, what it is about. "Discourse" in linguistics-extralinguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and psychological factors, a fight ensues.

Yu.S. Stepanov believes that V.Z.Demyankov's tariff to discourse is considered the best tariff. "Discourse is more of an arbitrary fragment of text than a single sentence or an independent sentence piece, and is concentrated around the concept. The discourse is not determined by the sequence of sentences, but by the universe that generates and interprets it, which is "created" with the discourse. In this part of the tariff, V.Z.Demyankov represents the intentional structure of discourse, i.e. interpretation has a discursive logical structure. Elements of discourse: the stated event, their participants, are not performative information and phenomena, i.e., (a) post-event States; (B) background that identifies events; (C) evaluation of event-event participants; (g) information comparing discourse with events [6:37-38]

V.G.Borbotko argues that discourse is a text composed solely of communicative units, and that propositions are assigned to units the combination and their possession of internal lexical meaningful connections allows them to be considered a single whole structure. [7].

Conclusion

Studies on the specifics and types of discourse, its structural construction and identification of its functions are small. For example, on the text and its place in the work of fiction, academician M. In his book "Lessons of creativity", Koshzhonov [8] gave a brief and general overview. N. Hothamov and B. In the "Russian-Uzbek Explanatory Dictionary of literary terms" of the Sarylakovs [9] there is also a special pause in discourse. Researcher G. Imomova, in her candidate dissertation on the topic "the role of artistic speech in creating typical National characters", called the expression of a national character in discursive speech, overestimated the tariff on textual discursive, limiting herself to noting that "the interweaving of textual

discursive dialogue is a means of describing different ethics and character that negates each other " [10]. Professor A.Gulomov and M.In the textbook "the present Uzbek literary language" (syntax), the discourse of the text is referred to as a kind of incomplete sentence and is thought over the structure of incomplete sentences that come in the discourse structure. In general, the scientific study of discourse issues in Uzbek linguistics dates back to the 60-70s of the last century. The order of research created during this period is a.[11], A. Boboeva[12], E. Shodmanov[13], P.Kholdorova[14], A.Shomaqsudov [15] scientific research can be recognized separately. The feature of discourses in these sources is addressed on issues. Chunonchi, A. Boboeva insists that the occurrence of incomplete sentences is by its nature a phenomenon associated with dialogical speech, especially colloquial speech.[16] issues such as the dialogue in question-and-answer form found in colloquial speech and its difference from incomplete sentences, the discrepancy between dialogue and monologue are a. Noted in the work of hazratqulov.[17] also, in some works, the fact that not all phenomena in dialogue, in the dialogical structure are literary normative phenomena, therefore, the study of this problem on the basis of literary language in sources, it is argued that the use of dialogical speech, which is a research object, in combination with the concepts of literary language is controversial.[18] it seems that in the traditional interpretations of the dialogue, it was examined either from an artistic or purely linguistic point of view, and its discursive essence, which is not yet socially necessary, remained out of research.

References

1. Slyusareva N. A. Terminology of Linguistics and the Metalanguage Function of Language. VYa, 1979, No. 4.
2. Slyusareva N. A. R. Godel. Les sources manuscrites du «Cours de linguistique générale» de F. de Saussure // Voprosy yazykoznanija. 1960. – No. 2. – Pp. 126-130
3. Kozhemyakin E. A., Pereverzev E. V., Amatov A. M. Discourse and Power: Representation of Dominance in Language and Communication / Translated from English. Moscow: LIBROKOM Book House, URSS, 2013.

4. Gulyga O. A., Romashko S. A., Dmitrovskaya M. A., introduction. Karaulov Yu. N Language. Cognition. Communication / Translated from English. Moscow: LENAND, 2015.

5. Zakirova Khilola Abduraxmanovna. (2024). LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL FEATURES OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS IN URBAN DISCOURSE. Web of Humanities: Journal of Social Science and Humanitarian Research, 2(11), 91–94.

6. Shukhratovna S. N. Terminology in Linguistics: Approach, Analysis and Research //Vital Annex: International Journal of Novel Research in Advanced Sciences. – 2022. – T. 1. – №. 5. – C. 375-377.