Discurse and its Relationship with the Science of Linguistics

***Qurbonova Sayyora,* Ph.D**

Associate professor at Ferghana State University, Doctor of Philosofy in Philologi

Zokirov Mukhtorali Turdaliyevich

Associate professor at Ferghana State University, Candidate of Philology

Egamberdiyev Azizbek

1st year Master of Linguistics (Inglish language) at Fergana State University

Abstract: This article seeks to explore the relationship of discourse to linguistics, its place in linguistics, and the process by which discourse emerges.

Keywords: discourse, phrase, text, sentence, linguistic and non-linguistic means,

Introduction

Today, due to the research and efforts of scientists, a number of modern trends and terms are entering the science of linguistics. The term "discourse" is often used in much of the world's linguistic work. Although we often come across this term, many find it difficult to understand its true meaning. This is due to the fact that there is no consensus on "discourse" in both world linguistics and Uzbek linguistics. The term discourse is one of the new concepts for linguistics. That in itself requires further research and study of discourse. In today's article we will try to clarify its essence.

The main part

The word discourse (French discourse, English discourse, Latin discursus - movement, continuous exchange, conversation, conversation) is used in the sense of the process of speech activity and style of speech.

Discourse has many different definitions, depending on the disciplinary affiliation and scientific views of the experts studying it. Due to the difficulties of clearly interpreting this concept, there are natural difficulties in using the term "discourse" even within a single discipline.

In linguistics, the term "discourse" was first used in the 1952 article "Discourse Analysis" by the American scholar Z. Harris. The article raises the question of how to determine what the text is. Z. Harris argued that there is a system in language that is one step above syntax, and that the concept of text belongs to this system. Discourse analysis, in his view, considers the patterns (structures) of language in broader elements than speech. He described the speech as "a sequence of statements written or spoken by one (or more) person in a particular situation." During this period, linguists such as T.A. Van Dyke, W. Chayf, and others published works on the concept [1].

Discourse analysis is more comprehensive than syntactic analysis (phrase, sentence, text). By the 1970s, discursive analysis had become a separate discipline. Much research has been done on linguistic approaches to the concept of discourse analysis and its content.

As for the linguistic approach to the concept of discourse, there are many interpretations of this term in this field, the main trend of which can be reduced to the definition of speech through the concepts of speech and language. Since the time of the Swiss linguist F. de Saussure, speech and language have traditionally been opposed in linguistics, and one of its main rules was the distinction between speech and language in speech activity: "By distinguishing language and speech, we: 2) random and more or less important than chance [7, 126].

"Discourse" is put in line with speech and language, finding the characteristics of both in the concept of speech. Speech is considered to be more like speech than what is manifested in action, process, and is distinguished by its structural features such as organizational and form, type differences. This brings it closer to the concept of language. But language, unlike speech, is a more abstract system. In this regard, one of the most famous statements about speech is the figurative description of N. D. Arutyunova: "Discourse is a speech immersed in life" [1].

The main feature that distinguishes speech from language and speech is the existence of a socio-cultural context, without which this concept is not taken into account. Because of this, speech has become an object of interdisciplinary research. Even in the field of linguistics, it cannot be considered from a linguistic point of view alone. Therefore, it is also studied in complex disciplines such as sociolinguistics, pragmalinguistics and linguistic philosophy.

Linguist Yu. S. Stepanov gives the following definition: "Communication is the use of language that expresses a specific mentality or ideology due to the use of certain grammatical and lexical schemes" [8].

Muayyan nutqning birinchi tahlillaridan biri frantsuz-shveytsariyalik tilshunos Patrik Serio tomonidan amalga oshirilgan. U bu kontseptsiyaga xuddi shunday ta'rif berdi: "Muloqot so'zlashuvning ijtimoiy yoki mafkuraviy jihatdan cheklangan turidir".

As V. Hegay rightly points out, although the term is widely used in text linguistics as well as in the fields of literature, sociology, political science, philosophy, logic, psychology, it is also used by a single plural in text linguistics itself. the recognized interpretation is used to express a variety of meaningless, meaningless concepts. Initially, the terms "discourse" and "text" were used interchangeably, then "text" was used for written communication and "discourse" was used for oral communication [3, 63-65]. For example, Dutch linguists T.A. Van Dyke and W. Kinch noted that "in recent years there has been a growing interest in the study of related speech or discourse in a number of humanities and social sciences." "As a synonym. Related speech, of course, means text, and it seems that the terms "text" and "discourse" are used interchangeably. It is also common to use the terms "text" and "discourse" to refer to different concepts. Researchers say that in French philology, the term "discourse" is used in four different senses [10, 143-144].

As AI Gorshkov pointed out, in the linguistic literature the term "discourse" has no definite meaning, the range of events it represents is very wide, that is, from "part of the text" to the whole "speech" used to represent events. He notes that the word "discourse" can be a term meaning "part of a text," but that in many linguistic literatures where the problem of text has been studied from different perspectives, "unity greater than hypothesis," "complex syntactic integrity," , Synonymous with "text component", "register", "sentence", "prosaic stanza", "syntactic complex", "monologue sentence", "communicative block", etc., the term "discourse" is not needed.

V.E.Chernyavskaya nutq tushunchasini matn tushunchasi bilan bog'liq holda ko'rib chiqib quydagi tarifni beradi: "Diskursni situation kontekst bilan chanbarchas bog'langan matn(lar) sifatida tunish kerak" deb ta'kidlaydi. Bu atama haqidagi fikrlar, izohlar, ilmiy izlanishlar davom ettirilib borilmoqda. ijtimoiy, madaniy-tarixiy, mafkuraviy, madaniy-ma'rifiy,

ma'naviy-ma'rifiy ma'lumotlar bilan bog'liq holda , psixologik va boshqa omillar, muallifning kommunikativ-pragmatik va kognitiv maqsadlarini belgilash tizimiga ega bo'lib, adresat bilan o'zaro ta'sir qiladi, matnda mujassamlanganda turli darajadagi til birliklarining alohida tartiblanishiga olib keladi [7].

In addition, V. E. Chernyavskaya concludes that the text is the result of speech, because it is a formal structure characterized by speech, arising from the communicative process.

According to V. Z. Demyankov, "Discourse is an arbitrary part of the text consisting of several sentences or an independent part of a sentence" [5]

While V.E. Chernyavskaya was interpreted as a text connected with a certain situation, Demyankov argued that a sentence or an independent part of a sentence in a speech situation in the text can also be a discourse.

 A number of scholars are also conducting research in Uzbek linguistics. Linguist A. Pardaev explains that dictation is the process of practical use of language and non-linguistic means in the form and type they consider most effective in order for the speaker and the listener to interact with each other. Discourse is a process of human activity. It is the combination of linguistic and hundreds of non-linguistic factors in a common goal [6].

From this definition we can understand that "discourse" is connected with pragmatics, which is one of the new directions in modern linguistics, when expressed in linguistic (formed in the human mind and through language) non-linguistic (signs, actions, gestures) means we can see that The focus of pragmatics is on nonverbal means. From the philosophical tradition, speech analysis has taken an approach called pragmatics. This field studies the use of language for communicative purposes. One of the most important concepts in this approach is the concept of a speech act, the main feature of which is intentionality (existence of purpose). Using a pragmatic approach in discourse analysis, researchers typically explore the question of how the linguistic form relates to the communicative function of speech.

Discourse on discourse was also conducted by Sh. Safarov. The linguist explains the problems of text and discourse as follows: if both text and discourse are the result of human linguistic activity, I doubt that they can be distinguished by their oral and written qualities only on the basis of physical and formal indicators. It is difficult to imagine a material phenomenon, the latter without this feature, for example, I conclude from these observations that "discourse" is a broader concept than the text. As mentioned above, both discourse and non-linguistic means are used in the discourse, as well as the state and feelings of the speaker and listener in the process of communication [6].

Under the concept of discourse is understood as the main weapon for people to enter into social dialogue. Recently, modern linguistic research materials distinguish the following types of discourse: pedagogical, political, critical, military, religious, economic, scientific, educational, journalistic, advertising, etc., that is, discourses related to any aspect of human activity.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we can say that the concept of discourse is very close to the concept of text or its oral form - the concept of speech. But world and Uzbek linguists have not come to an agreement. Thus, we can say that a distinctive feature of speech analysis is the use of general knowledge and contextual information to analyze texts, taking into account their communicative purpose. Unlike quantitative methods, it does not collect facts, but studies interpretive processes, which can be considered both an advantage and a disadvantage of this method due to the risk of subjective interpretation.

References

1. Arutyunova N. D. Diskurs // Lingvesticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar; gl.red. V.N.Yartseva. – M. : Sov. Entsiklopediya, 1990

2. Borbotko V.G. Elementy teorii diskursa. - Groznyy: Izd-vo Checheno Ingush. gos. un-ta, 1981

3. Gorbunov A. G. Diskurs kak novaya lingvofilosofskaya paradigma. – Chita, 2001

4. Karasik V. I. O tipax diskursa // Yazykovaya lichnost: institutsionalnyy i personalnyy diskurs. – Volograd, 2000.

5. Karasik V.I. Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs // V.I. Karasik. – M: Gnozis, 2004

6. Muhamedova S, Saparniyozova M. Matn lingvistikasi. –Toshkent-2011

7. Osipov G. A. Vzglyady i tendentsii v sovremennoy teorii diskursa // Vestnik Adygeyskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2: Filologiya va iskusstvovedenie. – 2011. - № 1.

8. Stepanov Yu. S. Alternativnyy mir, Diskurs, Fakt va printsip Prichinnosti // Yazyk i nauka kontsa XX veka. – M., 1995.

9. Xegay V.O ponyati diskurs// Filologiya masalalari, 2006 , N 2(11),

10. Xovanskaya Z.I. Analiz literaturnogo proizvedeniya v sovrennoy fransuzskoy filologii. – M.: Visshaya shkola, 1980

11. Qurbonova, S. (2022, June). ON THE ANALYSIS OF LEXICAL UNITS IN PSYCHOLINGUISTICS. In *International Conference on Research Identity, Value and Ethics* (pp. 512-513).

12. Ibragimova, E. I., Zokirov, M. T., Qurbonova, S. M., & Abbozov, O. Q. (2018). Filologiyaning dolzarb masalalari" mavzusidagi Respublika ilmiy-amaliy internet-konferensiya materiallari: Ilmiy ishlar to" plami. *Farg" ona*, *113*.

13. Sayyora, Q. (2022). FORMATION OF TEXT ANALYSIS IN LINGUISTICS. *Modern Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *4*, 58-61.

14. Sayyora Qurbonova, & Rafiqova Malika Faxriddinovna. (2022). MEANS OF PERSONAL PERSONALITY IN UZBEK LANGUAGE TEXTS. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, *10*(6), 308–310.

15. Mamamjonov, M. (2019). Фольклор асарлари персонажлари исмларининг дискурс релеванти сифатида қўлланилиши. *Буюк ипак йўлида фольклор санъатининг ривожланиш жараёнлари*.

16. FARG'ONA, M. T. L. V., & TILSHUNOSLIGI, D. U. O. Z. ILMIY ISHLAR TO 'PLAMI.

17. ROZIKOVA, G. (2018). Non-traditional communication as a methodics instrument. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, *1*(3), 116-117.

18. MAMAJONOV, A., & ROZIKOVA, G. (2018). Stylistics expressive speech system. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, *1*(4), 69-71.

19. Розикова, Г. З. (2016). Изучение процесса нормирования узбекского литературного языка синергетическим и квантитативным методами. *Ученый XXI века*, *32*.

20. Zokirov, M. T. (2021). To typology of language situations. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 11 (103)*, 706-710.

21. Turdaliyevich, Z. M. (2022). About Grammatical or Morph syntactic Interference. *European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science*, *4*, 768–773.

22. Turdaliyevich, Z. M. (2022). To the Question of the Study of Arabisms in the Persian Language. *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*, *5*, 566-570.

23. Turdaliyevich, Z. M., & Shukrona, A. (2022). About Turkish-Uzbek Vocabulary Words in the Lexical Structure of the Tajik Language. *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*, *5*, 620-624.

24. Ismoil, H., Mukhtorali, Z., Jumaboy, J., & Parviz, A. (2022). WORD FORMATION FROM THE TAJIK BORROWINGS. *Modern Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *5*, 71-76.

25. Mukhtorali Turdaliyevich Zokirov, Sohiba Mukhtoraliyevna Zokirova (2021). About The Influence Of The Uzbek Language In Rishtan Tajik Dialects Of Ferghana Region. Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI 12 (4), 115-122.

26. Turdaliyevich, Z. M., & Ergashevna, S. S. (2022). About the "Space" and "Time" Philosophical and Language Categories. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, *13*, 96-100.

27. Zokirov, M. T., & Ibragimova, M. S. N. (2021). Alisher Navoi about style problems. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science,(12)*, 601-604.

28. Turdalievich, Z. M., & Mukhtaralievna, Z. S. (2007). (nd). UDK: 398.221 specific features of language interference in contrastive linguistics.

29. Zokirov, M. T., & Zokirova, S. M. (2020). On researching phonetic level of the languages. *GIS Business*, *15*(6), 148-154.

30. Zokirov, M. T. (2021). MASTERY OF USING TABOOS AND EUPHEMISMS BY ABDULLAH QADIRI. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (5), 112-115.

31. Zokirov, M., & Isomiddinov, F. (2020, December). About the holes of language language dictionary. In *Конференции*.

32. Turdaliyevich, Z. M. (2022). ORIGIN AND TYPES OF WRITING. *Modern Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *5*, 153-159.

33. Turdaliyevich, Z. M. (2022). Analysis of Phraseological Units in Tohir Malik's Novel" Talvasa". *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*, *6*, 364-368.

34. Зокиров, М. Т. (2015). Об общей характеристике билингвизма. *Учёный XXI века*, (7-8 (8-9)), 24-27.

35. Зокиров, М. Т. (2017). ТИЛШУНОСЛИК ВА ТАРИХ. *Актуальные научные исследования в современном мире*, (4-2), 45-49.

36. Fayruza, A. (2022). KOMPYUTER LINGVISTIKASIDA OMONIMLIK HODISASI TADQIQI. *RESEARCH AND EDUCATION*, *1*(2), 135-143.

37. Alijonova, F. (2022). KOMPYUTER LINGVISTIKASIDA OMONIMLIK HODISASI TADQIQI. *Academic research in educational sciences*, *3*(5), 416-425.

38. Шукуров, Р. М., & Абдурахимова, Ф. Б. (2021). ТУРЛИ ТИЗИМЛИ ТИЛЛАРДА СЎЗ ЯСАЛИШИНИНГ ЎЗИГА ХОС ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИ. *Academic research in educational sciences*, *2*(8), 493-505.

39. Mirzatillayevich, S. R., & Madina, Q. (2022). Borrowings at Andizhan Region Toponyms. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, *17*, 256-261.

40. Mirzatillayevich, R. S., & Zokirjonogli, A. N. (2021). Precedent names in the artistic text as allusive names. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, *11*(8), 46-52.

41. ALIMOVA, Z. (2018). On the Uzbek loan-words with prefix no-from the Percian-Tajik languages. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, *1*(5), 109-112.

42. Алимова, З. (2021). Форсча-тожикча ўзлашмаларда вокализмларнинг ўзгариши. *ФарДУ. Илмий хабарлар*, 129-133.

43. Алимова, З. (2015). Айрим форсча ўзлашмаларнинг лексик маънолари хусусида. *ФарДУ. Илмий хабарлар*, 129-133.