

THE CONCEPT OF THE LITERARY AND ARTISTIC DISCOURSE IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Abdukarimova Nilufar Abdukarimovna

Teacher of Samarkand district specialized school № 2

Abstract: In this article, it is substantiated the importance and relevance of the study of discourse in general and literary- and- artistic discourse in particularly, theoretical issues of understanding the concept of literary and artistic discourse in modern science and highlighted, an overview of various scientific concepts in the field of the study of discourse.

Key words: discourse, text, linguistic, the semiotics of discourse, literary and artistic discourse.

INTRODUCTION. The definition of the concept of “discourse” causes significant difficulties due to the fact that it has proved to be in demand within a number of scientific disciplines, such as linguistics, anthropology, literary studies, ethnography, sociology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology and some others. Even before the appearance of the modern theory of discourse, which began to develop into independent field of science only in the mid-60s of the 20th century, there were attempts to define this term. The word discourse has the most “old” meaning in French and means dialogical speech. Already in the 19th century, this term was polysemic: in the Dictionary of the German language by Jacob Wilhelm Grim “deutsches Woerterbuch” of 1860, the following semantic parameters of the term “discourse” are indicated: 1) dialogue, conversation ; 2) speech, lecture. This approach was typical during the formation of the theory of discourse in the framework of numerous studies called linguistics of the text. The term “linguistics of the text” that originally appeared to many scientists does not seem to be entirely successful, and in some linguistic works the text of coherent speech is called b discourse. The polysemicity of the term “discourse” is recorded in the “ Short Dictionary of Terms of Text Linguistics” by T.M. Nikolayeva: “ Discourse is polysemious term of the text linguistics used by b number of authors in meaning that are almost homonymous. The most important of them are: 1) a coherent text; 2) the oral-colloquial form of the text; 3) a dialogue; 4) a group of statements related in meaning; 5) a speech work - written or oral. [9, p. 467]

Main part. In modern linguistics, discourse is interpreted ambiguously. There are several approaches to defining discourse. 1. Communicative (functional) approach: discourse as verbal communication (speech, usage, functioning of language), either as a dialogue, or as a conversation, that is, a type of dialogical utterance, or as a speech from the speaker’s position, as opposed to a narrative that does not take into account such as a position. Within the framework of the communicative approach, the term “discourse” is interpreted as “a kind of symbolic structure that its subject, object, place, time, circumstances of creation (production) make discourse”. [6, p. 5].

2. Structural and syntactic approach: discourse as a fragment of the text, that is, education above the sentence level (super-phrasal unity, complex syntactic whole, paragraph). Discourse refers to two or more sentence that are in semantic connection with each other, while coherence is considered as one of the main features of discourse.

3. Structural and stylistic approach: discourse as a non-textual organization of colloquial speech, characterized by indistinct division into parts, the dominance of associative connection, spontaneity, situationality, high conceptuality, stylistic specificity.

4. Socio-pragmatic approach: discourse as a text immersed in a situation of communication, in life, either as a social or ideologically limited type of utterance, or as a “ language within a language: but, presented as a special social reality with its own texts.

This classification makes it possible to understand that the nature of discourse is threefold: one side of it is addressed to pragmatics, to typical communicational situations, the other to the processes taking place in minds of participants in communication and to the characteristics of their consciousness, the third to the text itself.

The highlighted approaches are partly contradictory. The concepts of “discourse” is understood in an inextricable connection with the concepts of speech and text. Discourse as a communicative phenomenon is an intermediate link between speech as verbal communication, as an activity, on the one hand, and a specific text recorded during communication, on the other. In a simpler contrast, discourse should be understood as a cognitive process associated with real speech production, with knowledge of a speech work, and text as the final result of the process of speech activity, resulting in a certain finished form. This opposition of real speaking to its result leads to the realization that a text can be interpreted as a discourse only when it is actually perceived and enters the current consciousness of the individual perceiving it. G. Vidousen made an attempt to differentiate the concepts of “text” and “ discourse” by including the category “situation” in this pair. Thus, discourse is considered by him as a “text”+ “situation”. “Discourse is speech immersed in life” [1, p. 136]. That is, the social and interactions are the leading conditions for the organization of discourse. From this point of view, by literary and artistic discourse we mean an artistic text synthesizing the linguistic embodiment of the process of artistic communication itself, conditioned by various internal and external factors, and a subjective assessment of the writer’s reality. It is important to note that the center of this subjectivity explicitly or more often implicitly always contains the cognitive-directed action of the writer on the readership, in which “he is guided by certain attitudes, as well as communicative intentions and techniques of aesthetic influence on the addressee known to him” [5, p. 484].

The specifics of literary and artistic discourse.

The defining criteria for distinguishing the types of discourse are attribution of the pragmatics of the text. The parameters of its organization and genre-stylistic features, as well as the author’s intentions to a particular sphere of speech usage. Based on this, the researchers present the following list of discourses: journalistic, political, advertising, religious, literary, artistic or author’s discourse. The main distinguishing feature of literary and artistic discourse from all other types is the creation of a fictitious world where the author of the work, in fact, bears no responsibility for the information presented, moreover, “ his distortion of the sources of information to which he refers, any manipulation of historical realities and other events or texts that took place, they are not false in the direct sense of the world, which cannot be said about political, newspaper, advertising, etc. discourses –they serve specific purposes of artistic discourse” [11. 5]

Another feature of literary and artistic discourse is the aesthetic function, which, by “dressing” linguistic units in the necessary format, helps to awaken various feelings and emotions in the reader, thereby forming his spiritual and value attitude to reality. The aesthetics of a work of art presupposes the realization of the creative idea of the writer through the individual author’s specificity of the usage of linguistic units that explicate both the personal and social nature of the author’s worldview. Thus, literary and artistic discourse, involving the reader in its space, opens up to him a fictitious world in which a communicative act with the writer takes place. It is worth noting that the positions of the author and the reader in artistic discourse in linguistic research occupy different positions. Thus, the dominant role of the writer was defended by such scientists as M. Bakhtin, W. Booth, P. Lubbock, S. Burke. The fact that the reader occupies a leading position in the

structure of a literary text was insisted by E. Enneken, A. Beletsky, R. Barth, he also introduced concept of “death of the author”, M. Foucault, W. Eco and the American school of receptive criticism. [7 p. 3]. Recent publication on this issue have been less controversial, paying more attention to the dialogical interaction of the addressee and not focusing on the superior role of one of them. In addition, the dialogical character of the participants in literary and artistic discourse manifests itself not only a personal level, but also on an existential one, which is realized through an artistic understanding of the comprehension of the world.

The structure of literary and artistic discourse.

Literary and artistic discourse being a complex communicative phenomenon and the result of the interaction of consciousness, thinking and language of its participants, has an open, non-rigid, dynamic and continuum-labial structure. According to L.A. Manerko, the multidimensionality of the discursive space of a literary text implies an appeal to the deep basic processes of understanding the text, the reader’s reliance on his knowledge in combination with the data extracted directly from the discourse, laid down by the author of the work. [8, p. 113]. It is this environment, in our opinion, that forms the semiotic space of discourse, which reflects the cultural codes of the writer and society in a certain space-time slice. The complexity of the structure of literary and artistic discourse allows for linguistic analyses at various levels: rhythmic intonation, lexical, grammatical, syntactic, from the point of view of taking into account cultural and national-specific values, etc. the most characteristic visual means are such linguistic phenomena as the usage of phraseological units, the usage of functional synonyms, the presence of language play, the inclusion of epithets, metaphors, allusions and paraphrases, the usage of a hypertext model of the text construction (for example, the novels of James Joyce “Ulysses” or “The Game of Classics” by Julio Cortazar). Semantic and pragmatic components implemented in keywords and concepts should also be taken into account. V.Z. Demyankov believes that discourse, concentrating around some basic concepts, creates a common context describing actors, objects, circumstances, times, deeds, etc., being determined by the world common to the creator and interpreter, which is also built in the course of the discourse unfolding. [12 cit. 11]. In literary and artistic discourse, such as basic concepts are most often represented by nominating lexemes: life, death, good, evil, love, friendship, happiness, faith, god, etc. it is important to note that concept as complex mental formations are initially formed outside the text and discourse, in the writer’s mind, then, having received rational understanding during the creation of an artistic idea, they are verbalized in the text, thereby determining its communicative orientation and aesthetic impact. Of course, all these signs are closely related and intertwined, since the organization of textual elements is dictated by certain rules of the text construction based on the pragmatic attitude of the writer, the interpretation of which can be determined only by establishing the meaning and connection of individual linguistic units.

Conclusion. Thus, summarizing the above definition of the concept “discourse”, it can be argued that this term, as it is understood in modern linguistic, is close in meaning to the concept of “text” however, it emphasizes the dynamic, time-unfolding nature of linguistic communication. In contrast, text is thought of primarily as a static object, the result of linguistic activity. Some researchers interpret discourse as including two components at the same time: the dynamic process of linguistic activity, inscribed in its social context, and its result (that is, the text); this is the preferred understanding.

The list of used literature

1. Арутюнова Н.Д. Дискурс // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / под ред. В.Н. Ярцевой.-М. :Советская энциклопедия, 1990-682 с.
2. Barths R. La linguistique du discours. Sign. Language. Culture. The Hague, Paris, Mouton, 1970, pp. 580–584.
3. Baudouin de Courtenay I.A. Works on linguistics, M. 1961,340 p
4. Bloomfield L. Language. M. Ed. lit. in foreign language. M. 1960.420s
5. Гуо Х. Особенности дискурса художественного произведения // Молодой ученый. - 2017.-№20 (154).-С. 483-486

6. Карасик В.И. Религиозный дискурс Карасик В.И. Религиозный дискурс // Языковая личность проблемы лингвокультурологии и функциональной семантики Сб. науч. Тр.-Волгоград перемена,1999.-С, 5-19
7. Макеенко Е.В. Автор и читатель в структуре художественного текста (на материале русской литературы 1990-х-2010-х гг.): автореф.дис....канд.филол.наук.-Новосибирск,2013.-19 с.
8. Манерко Л.А. структур знаний, представленные в художественном и академическом дискурсах // вестник Моск. Ун-та.-2013.-Сер. 22 Теория перевода.-С.100-118
9. Николаева Т.М. Краткий словарь терминов лингвистики,-М. : Прогресс,1978-480 с
10. Humboldt. In Selected works on linguistics, M. Progress 320 s
11. Самарская Т.Б.,Мартиросьян Е.Г. Художественный дискурс: специфика составляющих и организация художественного текста // Сфера услуг: инновации и качество.-2012.№10.-С.20
12. Хайруллина Д.Д. Ключевые проблемы изучения дискурсов современной лингвистике // Известия Гос. Пед. Ун-та.-2018.-№10(133).-С.85-89