The Theory of Discourse in Modern Linguistics

Rano Gayratova, Ph.D
Scholar Teacher at Urganch Ranch University of Technology

Annotation: The article examines the peculiarities of discourse and study of its various types. The analysis of various interpretations of discourse, its essence and content is given. The paper presents approaches to the definition of the concept of discourse: functional, formal, situational and cognitive. Within the framework of this study, discourse is understood as the unity of linguistic and cognitive structures in their interaction, since the linguistic sphere cannot function in isolation from the cognitive one, this interaction is a communication process.
Key words: Discourse, polysemy, speech, text, context, linguistics, language.

INTRODUCTION

One of the urgent problems of modern linguistics is the study of the peculiarities of discourse and the study of its various types. Having been widely used in the 60-70s, the term "discourse" became the object of study of sociology, philosophy, computer linguistics, which in turn led to an increase in the number of definitions of discourse, taking into account its interdisciplinary nature.

The polysemicity of the term "discourse" is fixed [Khurmatullin, URL: https://cyberleninka.ru] in the "Short Dictionary of Terms of Text Linguistics" in 1978, by T.M. Nikolaeva: "Discourse is a polysemous term of text linguistics used by a number of authors in meanings that are almost homonymous. The most important of them are: 1) a coherent text; 2) an oral-colloquial form of the text; 3) a dialogue; 4) a group of statements related in meaning; 5) a speech work as a given – written or oral" [Nikolaeva, 1978: 467].

LITERATURE ANALYSIS AND METHODOLOGY

One of the first researchers of discursive analysis as an object of scientific work were scientists I.R. Galperin, E.A. Referovskaya, Z.Ya. Turaeva (1981-1986). Modern scientists continue to study the phenomenon of discourse, and despite the many interpretations of the concept of "discourse", they agreed that the social context is an inseparable part of discourse, it should be taken into account that "text in a social context" is represented by the object of study, i.e. "context" is the basic component of discourse.

By definition of V.G. Borbotko, a text that is a single whole of the communicative speech units of the language, which are sentences, as well as when they are combined into other units, only larger, and they are in a semantic continuous connection, allowing this text to be perceived as a whole formation – this is discourse. V.G. Borbotko separately highlights the fact that the linguistic material, which is the text, is not always coherent speech, that is, discourse [Borbotko, 1981: 8]. Text is considered as a more general concept than discourse. Therefore, discourse is always a text, but "not every text is a discourse." Discourse is a special case of the text [Khurmatullin, URL: https://cyberleninka.ru].

In his works, E. I. Sheigal designates "discourse" and "text" as real and virtual, text finds its realization in discourse as a mental constructor, and discourse is an actual speech event in real time. [Sheigal, 2002:11]. Other scientists isolate text and discourse as a part and a whole. "Text" is expressed as a

fixed object of speech activity, i.e. static, and "discourse" is presented as a communicative phenomenon that develops rapidly and dynamically over time.

RESULTS

An analysis of the literature on the research topic allows us to conclude that at the moment there is no definite precise position in understanding these two concepts (discourse as an act of speech generation and discourse as a text). If we turn to scientists of cognitive linguistics, they mainly compare the totality of the process (discourse as an act of speech generation) of verbalized speech-thinking activity with discourse, and the result (discourse as a text) [Temnova, 2004:31]. So, according to I. K. Arkhipov, discourse is all "pre–text and post-text processes taking place in consciousness" [Arkhipov, 2000: 203].

Thus, in our study, we adhere to the opinion of K. D. Kasimova that discourse is understood as a unity of linguistic and cognitive structures in their interaction, since the linguistic sphere cannot function in isolation from the cognitive one. This interaction is a communication process.

Communication is inextricably linked with society, the initiator of the discourse, who is a participant in speech activity, influences the opinion and emotional state of the addressee of the discourse. Studying discourse, we process linguistic knowledge, but not only our own linguistic knowledge, but also general scientific knowledge about the nature of things, about the world, for analysis requires all the knowledge that a reasonable person uses. Thus, discourse acts not only as a verbal garb of a person's thought, but also becomes an indicator of a way of thinking and cognition. [Kasimova, 2023: 123]

DISCUSSION

Considering that discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that has a feature of differentiation, some scientists (i.e. Van Dijk, V.Z. Demyankov, A.E. Kibrik, I.M. Kobozeva, etc.) designate this as a product of speech action with relevance, semantic uniformity, tied to a certain context and genre. Other scientists (O.V. Alexandrova, E.S. Kubryakova, V.V. Krasnykh et al.) are reflected with verbalized activity when correlated with the nature of culture, social community or a certain historical period.

The term "discourse" includes the concept of consciousness, which distinguishes it from speech or text. T. Van Dijk gives two different definitions of discourse [Van Dijk, URL http://psyberlink.flogiston.ru]. In a broad sense, discourse is a complex communicative event that occurs between a speaker and a listener (observer), in a certain temporal, spatial and other context. A communicative action can be verbal, written, and also have verbal and non-verbal components (for example, talking with a friend, dialogue between passengers of transport, reading a newspaper) [Temnova, 2004:24].

When considering discourse as a component of speech linguistics, it appears as a process of live verbalized communication, in which there are many changes and deviations from exemplary, i.e. canonical written speech, therefore, discourse is associated with such elements of speech as spontaneity, completeness, intelligibility of conversation for other people, thematic coherence. The structural characteristics of discourse entail tonal and genre changes. The tone of discourse refers to such parameters as everyday life or ritualism, seriousness or frivolity, the desire for conflict or unison, an increase or decrease in the distance of communication. These parameters are interrelated. [Karasik, 2004: 232-243].

The above variety of definitions of discourse is explained by the different approaches from which the definitions of this phenomenon are formulated. Functional, formal, situational and cognitive are the main approaches to defining the concept of discourse [Kibrik, http://www.kmgosvet.ru].

The formal approach (structurally oriented) defines discourse in the form of a connotational connection of several (two or more) sentences, where coherence is a sign of discourse. Therefore, in this way of consideration, discourse is a super—phrasal unity, a complex syntactic whole, its unity can be determined using connectors.

While the functional approach is based on every case, every use of language, it implies the study of the functions of discourse and the analysis of the functions of language. The situational approach is associated with the context of social, emotional and culturally significant criteria and circumstances in the interpretation of discourse. It is generally believed that this approach connects the formal and functional, it can be considered a compromise.

The cognitive approach positions discourse as a unit of cognitive order, as it is a term containing a specific reference to the transfer and communication of knowledge, accumulation, analysis and the creation of new connections.

Thus, linguists study discourse in various aspects listed above, which makes it possible to build up and improve the holistic concept of discourse. Considering that the word "discourse" translated from the French "speech as an act, action, speech as an event", this allows scientists to define the provided concept as "speech immersed in life" [Arutyunova, 1990: 137], one of the components of activity, human interaction during communication [Isaeva, http://vii.sfu-kras.ru].

The polysemy of the term discourse in this work was presented from various points of view of scientists and their definitions of discourse – this is text, speech, coherent conversation, type of speech communication, unity, the process of live verbalized communication, the act of speech generation, speech, coherent text, as well as the organization of speech activity. Summarizing the definitions given in this study on the concept of "discourse", we can agree with the point of view that this term is close in meaning to the concept of "text", although it emphasizes the dynamics of development over time and the nature of linguistic communication. This is the unity of linguistic and cognitive structures in their interaction, i.e. in the process of communication.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above, we come to the conclusion that "translation discourse" - blocks of translation texts in different combinations of language pairs; translation practices, including the legal status of translators engaged in various industry professional practices, translator forums; the socio-cultural context of interaction between translators, translation specialists, employers and recipients of a translation product.

Discourse is a complex communicative event that occurs between a speaker and a listener (observer), in a certain temporal, spatial and other context. A communicative action can be verbal, written, and also have verbal and non-verbal components. The concept of discourse is not static, linguists study discourse in various aspects, which makes it possible to comprehend new facets of these types of speech communication, text, speech, coherent conversation or acts of speech production according to modern interpretations of the concept of "discourse". The separation of written and oral types of discourse makes it possible to find common and distinct characteristics. The polysemy of discourse is manifested not only in a large number of differing definitions of the term "discourse", but also in a variety of typical classifications, when scientists put forward many typological criteria without coming to a certain denominator. The thematic focus of the discourse defines a set of basic lexical units, syntactic structures of the discourse. Culture and language are inextricably linked, studying the discourses of different countries, it is necessary to take into account the cultural characteristics of the participants in the discourse.

LITERATURE

1. Khurmatullin A. K. The concept of discourse in modern linguistics // Scientific Journal of Kazan university. Ser. A humanitarian science. 2009. №6. URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ponyatie-diskursa-v-sovremennoy-lingvistike.

2. Nikolaeva T. M. Concise dictionary of linguistics terms. – M.: Progress, 1978. – 480 p.

3. Borbotko V. G. Elements of the theory of discourse. – Grozny: Chechen-Ingush State Publishing House. University, 1981. – 113 p.

4. Sheigal, E. I. Cultural concepts of political discourse / E. I. Sheigal // Communication: theory and practice in various social contexts: materials of the International Scientific and practical Conference "Communication - 2002". – Pyatigorsk: GTGLU, 2002. – pp. 24-26.

5. Temnova E.V. Modern approaches to the study of discourse / Language, consciousness, communication: Collection of articles / E. V. Krasnykh, A. I. Izotov, Moscow: MAKS Press, 2004. Issue 26. 168 p.

6. Arkhipov I. K. // Studia Linguistica: Collection of articles– Issue 9: Cognitive-pragmatic and artistic functions of language. – St. Petersburg: Trigon, 2000. – pp. 202-213.

7. Kasimova D. I. Linguocognitive modeling of the political discourse of Russia and the USA [text]: abstract. ... Candidate of Philology: 02/10/20 / D.I. Kasimova. – Moscow, 2023. – 202 p.

8. Van Dijk T. A. towards the definition of discourse. [Electronic resource] / T.A. Van Dijk – Access mode: URL http://psyberlink.flogiston.ru/internet/bits/vandijk2.htm, free. – Title from the screen.

9. Karasik, V. I. The language circle: personality, concepts, discourse [Text] / V. I. Karasik. – M.: GNOSIS, 2004. – 389 p.

10. Kibrik, A. A. Discourse /A. A. Kibrik, P. B. Parshin // Encyclopedia "Krugosvet" – Access mode: http://www.kmgosvet.ru/articles/82/1008254/1008254a9.htm, free. – Title from the screen.

11. Arutyunova N. D. Discourse / N. D. Arutyunova /- Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. – M., 1990. – p. 137.

12. Isaeva E. D. The concept of discourse in modern linguistics. Title from the screen. [Electronic resource]/http://vii.sfu-kras.ru/info/public/vii/book/ponyatie-diskursa-v-sovremennoy-lingvistike-2009