

The Concept of Discourse and its Definition

Kholboboeva Aziza Sherboboevna

PhD student, Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Uzbekistan, Tashkent



Abstract – This article is devoted to the determination of the discourse in linguistics. Discourse (lat. *discursus* – reasoning, argument) is one of the complex and difficult to define concepts of modern linguistics, semiotics and philosophy, which has become widespread in English. The meaning of the word-speech, speech, reasoning. In many languages, this word has no equivalent. It is translated as discourse, discourse, speech, word, text, reasoning. This article gives essential definition about the linguistic features of the discourse.

Keywords – Opinion, Concept, Communicative Situation, Context, Scientific Phenomenon, Language Function.

I. INTRODUCTION

Discourse – is the subject of interdisciplinary studies. Apart from theoretical linguistics, to the study of discourse related science and research areas such as computer linguistics and artificial intelligence, psychology, philosophy and logic, sociology, anthropology and ethnology, literature, semiotics, historiography, theology, law, pedagogy, translation theory and practice, politics and etc. Each of these disciplines approaches to the study of discourse on its own way.

From the point of view of modern approaches, discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon, which in addition to the text includes extra linguistic factors (opinions, knowledge about the world, the recipient's goals, attitudes) necessary for understanding the text.

The three main classes of use of the term "discourse" can be most clearly distinguished, which relate to various national traditions and the contributions of specific authors. The first class includes directly linguistic uses of the term discourse. Historically, the first use of this term was in the title of an article by the American linguist Z. Harris

"Discourse analysis", which was published in 1952. The full extent of the term "discourse" has become popular in linguistics in approximately two decades. The actual linguistic uses of the term are varied, but in general there are attempts to develop and clarify the traditional concepts of text, speech and dialogue.

In linguistics, so far there is no single common opinion about the current direction – the study of discourse. Palette of opinions in the scientific phenomenon is extremely diverse: from the extreme aversion, a critical review in order to identify the truth, the particular object of linguistics study to completely positive assessments of individual methods of developing the direction. Instability boundaries evolving discipline that has emerged at the junction of several humanities, its procedural dynamic nature suggest that it is still in the degrees of development and lacunarity discourse research, as it is evidenced by a fuzzy approach to the terminology regarding this issue. The transition from the concept of speech to the term "discourse" is associated with the desire to introduce a third concept, which is paradoxically "more speech" than speech itself, and at the same time, more amenable to study with the help of

traditional methods of linguistics, into the classical opposition of speech and language belonging to de Saussure. On the one hand, discourse is understood as speech that is embedded in a communicative situation and therefore is a category with a more pronounced social content than the individual's speech activity.

Grounds of discourse analysis have been identified in the works of American linguists Z. Harris, J. Ggimes, R. Longeykra, T. Givon, W. Chafe.

Discourse itself a complex object with an ambiguously defined concept in modern linguistics. About the "blur category" of discourse spoke T.A. van Dijk and explained it as conditions of formation and existence of the term, and uncertainly about the place of discourse in the system categories of language.

Z. Harris in his article "Discourse Analysis", published in the mid-twentieth century, interpreted this concept extremely simply as a sequence of statements, whose length is greater than the sentence's. Structural and syntactic perspective on discourse is reflected in the definition of V.A. Zveginitseva: "discourse – it is logical correlation existing between two or more sentences ...".

The concept of "discourse" in linguistics is defined in a variety of ways. Sometimes it is understood as a type of conversation, sometimes it is defined as a complex communicative event in General, sometimes as a specific conversation (the discourse always concerns speech, while the text is related to the language system) or a genre (scientific, news).

Discourse – a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic: pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors; text taken in the event aspect; speech considered as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes).

Discourse includes paralinguistic accompaniment of speech (facial expressions, gestures), which performs the following main functions dictated by the structure of discourse:

- *Rhythmic ("Auto-Rating");*
- *Reference, Linking Words To The Subject Area Of The Language Application (Deictic Gestures);*
- *Semantic (Facial Expressions And Gestures Accompanying Certain Meanings);*

- *Emotional-Evaluative, The Function Of Influencing The Interlocutor, I.E. Illocutive Force (Gestures Of Motivation, Beliefs).*

Currently, discourse is understood as a text, immersed in the situation of communication. From the standpoint of pragmalinguistics, discourse is an interactive activity of the participants of communication, information sharing, influencing on each other, using different communication strategies, their verbal and nonverbal embodies in communication practice. The functional approach involves analyzing the functions of discourse conditionality in study of language functions in a broad social context. Linguo-stylistic discourse analysis allocates registers of communication, demarcates oral and written language in their genre varieties, and studies the characteristics of functional styles. From the standpoint of formal or structural-oriented linguistics discourse is defined as the language above sentence or phrase. Linguacultural study of discourse establishes the specificity of communication within a particular ethnic group, defines definable model of etiquette and verbal behavior in general. Sociolinguistic approach to the study of discourse involves analysis of members of communication as representatives of different social groups and analysis of the conditions of communication in a board social context. Interest to the discourse as cognitive-semantic phenomenon is relatively recent. Every communicative action within the spontaneous or organized discourse represents the realization of certain communicative and cognitive structures. These cognitive structures are frame-based models containing information about sociocultural nature. Frame is considered as one of the ways to represent a stereotyped situation, covering the different species. Renowned Dutch linguist T.A. van Dijk said about the term "frame" in connection with the organization of the "common knowledge" in the conceptual system. Frames are treated as units organized around a certain concept and contain basic, typical and potential information associated with a particular concept.

All of the above approaches to addressing the concepts of discourse are interrelated. Different directions and methods of discourse analysis explain the existence of a large number of definitions of the concept.

II. TYPES OF DISCOURSE

There are three types of discourse:

Oral, Written and Mental discourse. The most important distinction in the classification of discourse is the contrast between written and oral discourse. First of all, this

distinction is associated with the transmission channel: in written discourse - visual, in oral - acoustic. Sometimes the difference between written and oral forms of language use is equated with the difference between text and discourse, but such a confusion is not justified.

Written discourse, despite the fact that for many centuries enjoyed great prestige, is derived from the oral. To date, most languages exist only verbally. However, a real comparison of written and oral discourse as alternative forms of the existence of language began only in the 1970s.

The difference in the transmission channel has important implications for the processes of written and oral discourse: In oral discourse, understanding and generation are synchronized; in written discourse, they are not. In oral discourse, there is a phenomenon of fragmentation, that is, speech is generated by intonation units separated by pauses. Written discourse is integrated into sentences and other syntactic constructions. In written discourse, there is no contact between the speaker and the addressee in space and time. In written discourse, there is a separation of the addressee and the speaker from the described information. A person can use a language without producing any graphic or acoustic traces of language activity. In this case, we should talk about mental discourse. The language used in thought discourse is communicative, but the same person is both the addressee and the speaker. Mental discourse is not well understood due to the absence of easily observable manifestations. Mental discourse is also called internal speech.

III. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we note that the category of discourse is one of the basic concepts of communicative linguistics. This term allows not only the pronunciations (with the accent on the first or second syllable), but also a lot of scientific interpretations. Extensive use of discourse as a generic category in relation to the concepts of text, voice, and dialogue is more common in the linguistic literature. Definition of such category as discourse involves some ideological orientation, its own point of view on language learning and language communication.

REFERENCES

- [1] Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. and Finegan, E. (1999) *The Longman grammar of spoken and written English* (London: Longman).*Google Scholar*
- [2] Blakemore, D. (2002) *Relevance and linguistic meaning: The semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).*CrossRefGoogle Scholar*
- [3] Brinton, L. J. (1996) *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter). *CrossRefGoogle Scholar*
- [4] Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press).*Google Scholar*
- [5] Clift, R. (2001) 'Meaning in interaction: The case of actually', *Language*, 77 (2): 245–491.*CrossRefGoogle Scholar*
- [6] Degand, L. (2014) "“So very fast then.” Discourse markers at left and right periphery in spoken French", in K. Beeching and U. Detges (eds.) *Discourse functions at the left and right periphery: Crosslinguistic investigations of language use and language change* (Brill: Leiden), pp. 151–178.*CrossRefGoogle Scholar*
- [7] Moder, C. L. and Martinovic-Zic, A. (2004) *Discourse across languages and cultures* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins). *CrossRefGoogle Scholar*
- [8] Telia V. N. on the methodological foundations of linguoculturology / / XI international conference "Logic, Methodology, philosophy of science", Moscow: Obninsk, 1985
- [9] Humboldt V. F. on the difference in the structure of human languages and its influence on the spiritual development of mankind// *Selected works on linguistics.*- M, 1984. - p. 100
- [10] Telia V. N. about Metaphorization and its role in the self-creation of the language picture of the world. / / *the Role of the human factor in language.* - Moscow: Nauka, 1088. - p. 204.
- [11] Humboldt V. F. *Language and philosophy of culture* / Humboldt V. F.-m.: Progress, 1985. - with 451.
- [12] Vereshchagina E. M. and Kostomarov. V. g. *lingvostranovedcheskaya Teoriya slova.* - M.: 1980. - 320 p.