HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

THE CONCEPT OF DISCOURSE IN LINGUISTICS

Mamasoliyeva Sarvinoz Hasanjon qizi

Independent reasearcher ASIFL

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23162936

Abstract: This article examines the concept of discourse in modern linguistics within the framework of a systems approach, its implications for interpretation, and the distinction between discourse and text. The article examines the main trends in the use of the concept of discourse from the perspective of the functional and formal approaches, which have become part of the systems approach within the framework of descriptive methodology. The descriptive method gained popularity in the second half of the last century with the increasing role of socio-cognitive processes in the study of political discourse. The article considers the problems of structural diversity and structural changes in language, as well as the relationship of formal types with the linguistic picture of the world. The study revealed the main trends in the development of the modern scientific linguistic paradigm: the systems approach and the basic principles that form the components of the systems approach, the functional and formal approaches, and the difference between discourse and text at the current stage of their research. The increased interest in the problem of distinguishing between text and discourse within the framework of the modern cognitive-descriptive paradigm determines the relevance of this study.

Key words: discourse, functionalism, formalism, text, systems approach, typology, discourse analysis, text linguistics.

Research into political discourse has become relevant since the emergence of political linguistics (mid-20th century), which originated in the United States. Initial studies focused on quantitative monitoring of lexical units in discourse corpora, which could not provide a complete picture of the interpretation of the implicit ideological orientation of discourse. Thus, the problem of language functioning has become a pressing issue in discourse studies, giving impetus to the study of language in terms of form and function, which served as the basis for the development of a systems approach.

V. Demyankov offers the following interpretation of "discourse" within the framework of linguistics: "Discourse is a text in its formation before the mental eye of the interpreter. Discourse consists of sentences or their fragments, and the content of discourse is often, although not always, concentrated around a certain "supporting" concept called a "discourse topic" or a "discourse topic". The logical content of individual sentences of the components of discourse is called propositions. These propositions are connected by logical relations: conjunctions "and", disjunctions "or", implications "if then", etc. Understanding discourse, the interpreter composes elementary propositions into a common meaning, placing new information contained in the next interpreted sentence within the framework of the already received intermediate, or preliminary interpretation..." [1].

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

From the point of view of the scientific and methodological anthology of the term "discourse", the forerunner of the emergence of this interdisciplinary concept is the systems approach, the founders of which are V. von Humboldt, I. I. Sreznevsky, A. A. Potebnya, I. A. Baudouin-de-Courtenay and F. de Saussure, which resulted in systemic linguistics, within the framework of which language is a mental form of communication with a subsequent distinction between the languages of speech and thought; as well as a reaction to Saussure's, and then Chomsky's, reductionism of the subject of linguistics due to the shift of interests of linguistics towards the communicative component of linguistic communication, the approach to speech as a social action, to the subjective aspect of speech, the removal of syntax beyond the sentence, the development of the pragmatics of speech. In the second half of the twentieth century. Scientists are interested not in how language is structured, but in how it functions. Due to the fact that it is impossible to answer this question from the point of view of immanent linguistics, an expansion of its subject matter and a revision of the philosophical and ontological foundations of the discipline itself were predetermined. If in the 19th century rationality was considered the defining essence of discourse, then by the end of the 20th century there was a greater interest in examining discourse from the point of view of intuition and introspection, which is explained by increasing attention to subjectivity and the human factor in linguistics. A. Kibrik [5] predicts a transition from discrete linguistics (based on the logic of Aristotle's concepts) to taxonomic linguistics, focused on the question "How?" The ensuing discussion about formalism and functionalism brought two different views into conflict Yes, on linguistic research and on the nature of language itself (methodological and theoretical aspects, respectively). Formalism insists on the study of "language in itself," on the absolute independence of form from function, negatively perceiving the burden of language research with the communicative aspect. In the first stage, researchers guided by the formal approach worked in the field of phonetics and morphology, on the basis of which rigorous formal methods of analysis were developed: distributional, communicative, oppositional (N. Chomsky, L. Tenier, and others). Then, Chomsky's transformational generative grammar marked the beginning of the syntactic stage in research; the sentence is declared the main unit of the language system. In the 1980s, N. Chomsky developed the theory of binding control. Many of the ideas of formalism, on which structuralism and structural linguistics are based, entered mathematical linguistics and influenced the development of programming languages and computer technology.

Functionalism, on the other hand, refers to the semiotic understanding of language as a system of signs that serve and are used to achieve specific goals and perform specific functions. The functional approach studies both the structure of language and its functioning in order to identify the correspondence between them, recognizes the interdependence between form and function, and takes into account the influence of language use on its structure. The predecessors of the functional approach were A. Potebnya, I. Baudouin-de-Courtenay, A. Peshkovsky, S. Katznelson, E. Sapir, O. Jespersen, and others. More modern research was conducted by R. Jakobson, W. Mathesius, and A. Martinet. The latter developed the principle of economy as the most important factor in the historical development of language, according to which language changes are a compromise between the need for communication and the human desire to minimize the efforts applied in the speech act. The characteristic features of functionalism are its fundamental typological orientation; The absence of a priori systems in the structure of language; interest in the entire set of facts of natural languages (which is contrasted with Chomskyan grammar, which was originally created as a formal abstraction of the syntax of the English language and was subject to significant changes in order to fit

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

the material of typologically heterogeneous languages into the framework of a priori axiomatics). In contrast to the works of the formal approach, studies of the functional approach usually contain a typological perspective and place the facts of the language under study in the space of typological possibilities. Another feature of formal studies of language is empiricism or the use of large corpora of data. A third characteristic feature is the frequent use of quantitative methods (counts, statistics). Moreover, functionalism is characterized by interdisciplinary interests, and functionalist scholars work at the intersection of psychology, sociology, statistics, history, and the natural sciences. Such interdisciplinarity is characteristic not only of linguistics, but of all modern sciences. The "borders" that existed in the disciplines that prevailed until the mid-20th century are gradually being erased [5].

At the present stage, form and function are studied within the framework of the systems approach, the founders of which are: W. von Humboldt, F. de Saussure, A. A. Potebnya, I. A. Baudouin d'Courtenay. Significant contributions to the study of the systems approach were made by outstanding modern Russian linguists R. O. Jakobson (early research) and G. P. Melnikov (recent research). The latter developed the concept of a systems approach, formed on the basis of ideas and methods applied to solving both engineering and physical problems, as well as linguistic, primarily typological ones. At earlier stages, the question of the systemic nature of language did not arise for scientists, however, the latest research in the field of linguistics is characterized by an interest in the structural features of the language system, in particular, in the uniqueness of the substantive characteristics of its components. Implying the integrity of components, function and form, the systemic study of language presupposes their synthesis and analysis, accordingly, for solving typological problems by structuralist methods, structural typology arises. A separate discipline, the main principles of which are developed by B.L. Uspensky [7]. The prerequisite for the emergence of a systems approach is the Humboldt idea of the "spirit of the people" and the "spirit of language", which is developing in parallel with the search for an external source of the originality of individual elements of the system. Studies of language from the point of view of social changes appear, attention is drawn to the influence of social processes on its development (N. Ya. Marr), a hypothesis is developed about the dependence of the originality of the language of the worldview and the surrounding reality (Sapir, Whorf); the existence of "immanent" tendencies in the language of the stasis and dynamics in its comparison with a living organism is recognized (A. Schleicher's theory), demon The logical relationship between the phonetic, phonological, and morphological features of languages, which follows logically from the systemic nature of language (A.A. Reformatsky), is developed, the problem of the functioning of the elements of the linguistic system is raised, and methods for detecting implicit connections between individual linguistic elements and processes are developed. Thus, the main questions of modern typological methodology are formed, namely:

What are the causes of structural diversity and structural change in languages?

How are formal types related to the linguistic picture of the world?

And separate types of typology are distinguished:

Staged;

Structural;

Semantic;

Systemic.

Being the subject of system typology, the system includes:

substance (elements);

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

structure (form, connections of elements);
function (role in the system) [8].

Thus, form and function are studied in parallel, forming a coherent linguistic system whose constituent parts are its substances or elements, and the formal and functional approaches are part of a systems approach developed in connection with the need to determine the functioning of internal and external connections of units. The systems approach is also applied in other sciences: history, philosophy, ethnology, and is interdisciplinary, as evidenced, for example, by the works "Morphology of History" by G. Yu. Lobarsky, "Rises and Falls in the History of Ethnic Groups. On the Life and Work of L. N. Gumilyov" by I. Yu. Smirnov, Lectures on Pre-Platonic Knowledge by Yu. V. Tchaikovsky, and others.

There are the following "axioms" "principles" that the function adheres and which form the "grammar of language games":

Language is a socio-cultural activity;
It is the cognitive (or communicative) function of language that determines the structure of language;
The structure is motivated and iconic;
There is variability in the structure;
The meaning is not autonomous and depends on the context;
The categories are vague and non-discrete;
The structure is a flexible system, not a frozen formation;
Grammars are constantly emerging and changing;
There are deviations in grammatical rules [1; 2; 4;].

E. Givon notes that all of the above principles are valid only in "certain contexts" [18]. Here, not only the formal approach is challenged, but also the reductionism associated with it (the postulates of Chomsky and Saussure), which adheres to the point of view of the arbitrary and unmotivated nature of grammar. Thus, discourse analysis, being part of the functional paradigm, integrates the achievements of formal-structural linguistics, having for this historical prerequisites the emergence of discourse analysis itself as a separate scientific direction in the study of language and linguistic communication, which testifies to its deep connections with the formal and structural approaches.

M. Makarov says that the category of "discourse" is one of the main ones in communicative linguistics and other modern social sciences, and the concept allows for both pronunciation variants (stress on the first or second syllable) and interpretation variants; that the very definition of this category already presupposes an ideological orientation and one's own point of view on the study of language and communication [6]. Deborah Shifrin identifies three main approaches to the interpretation of this concept [3]: language above 1) from the position of formally oriented linguistics: “Discourse is language above the level of a sentence or phrase” [7]; “Discourse, therefore, will be understood as two or more sentences that are in a semantic connection with each other” [3]; “Discourse at the level of a sentence or phrase” [4]. Despite the introduction of the criterion of semantic coherence, this approach to defining discourse, due to its abstractness and commitment to The study of the functions of elements of language and discourse in relation to other elements, to the detriment of the study of the functions of elements in relation to context, does not take into account situations of real communication and complicates analysis from the standpoint of functional linguistics: discourse is given the following definitions: “...the study of discourse is the study of any aspect of

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

language use" [1]; "...discourse analysis, if necessary, is an analysis of language use" [13]. This approach proposes to carry out language analysis and study functions in a broad socio-cultural aspect, with the admission of both emic (study of the entire spectrum of functions of certain forms and elements of discourse) and etic (highlighting a number of functions with subsequent correlation of forms of discourse with these functions) approaches,

3) the third variant of interpretation of the category of "discourse" brings to the forefront the interaction of form and function: "discourse as an utterance" [3]. It is implied that discourse is not a primitive set of isolated units of linguistic structure (exceeding the size of a sentence), but an integral set of functionally organized, contextualized units of use of the linguistic system.

Based on the dichotomy of "oral text" and "written text", many researchers distinguish between discourse analysis (oral speech) and text linguistics (written text), but this approach does not work in cases where the analysis of reports is carried out, which can be considered both a written text and a public oral presentation at the same time [9]. In accordance with this, an attempt was made to distinguish between the concepts of "text" and "discourse", as a result of which the general tendency to understand discourse analysis is characterized by an increased interest in longer sections of speech than one sentence, as well as sensitivity to the context of the social situation (discourse: text "+" situation; text: discourse" situation). The concept of "discourse" does not apply to ancient texts, since they no longer have a connection with living life that could be directly restored. Many functionalist scholars point to the tendency to contrast discourse with text by identifying the opposition: functionality-structurality, process-product, dynamism-staticity, relevance-virtuality, discourse-as-process (functional) text-as-product (structural) [11]. Based on a number of studies, D. Shifrin interprets text as an abstract theoretical construct that is realized in discourse, just as a sentence is actualized in an utterance, thus theoretically linking theory with function [24; 26]. Other authors transfer a similar opposition to a whole series of grammatical categories: for grammarians these are usage, sentence, locution, text, cohesion; for representatives of discourse analysis these are use, utterance, illocution, discourse, coherence [11].

Thus, historically, the concept of discourse was considered from the perspective of formal and functional linguistics, which subsequently became part of the systems approach, which began to be developed in the 1970s and 1980s. Currently, scholars are actively attempting to delineate the concept of "text" and "discourse," proposing various oppositions (functionality versus structure, process versus product, oral speech versus written text). The scientific novelty of this study lies in its consideration of the functional and formal approaches within the framework of the systems approach, as well as in its distinction between the form and function of utterance, which subsequently allows for an adequate comparison of the concepts of "discourse" and "text." Today, the study of discourse and text is more relevant than ever, as the proliferation of mass media has made it possible to receive information immediately, and the often deliberate presence of lacunae in the act of communication hinders the adequate interpretation of a message, which can lead to predetermined public opinion and facilitate the manipulation of public consciousness through the distortion of reality. Today, a large number of works are appearing on comparative studies of discourse, on the study of the idiostyles of individual politicians and conceptual metaphor, etc.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bondarko A.V. Functional grammar. L., 1984. P. 18-36.
2. Dem'yankov V.Z. Interpretation of political discourse in the media // Language of the media as an object of interdisciplinary research: textbook / ed. M.N. Volodin. Moscow: Publishing house of Moscow State University named after M.V. Lomonosov, 2003. pp. 116-133
3. Zvegintsev V.A. The sentence and its relation to language and speech. Moscow, 1976. 12 p.
4. Kobrina N.A. Functional model of language // Interaction of linguistic units of different levels.
5. Kibrik A. E. Where is modern linguistics heading? // Linguistics at the end of the 20th century: abstract of international conference. Moscow: 1995. Vol. 1. P. 217-219.
6. Makarov M.L. Communicative structure of the text. Tver, 1990. 7. Melnikov G.P. Principles and methods of systemic typology
7. Melnikov G.P. Basics of Terminology. Moscow: RUDN University Press, 1986. Pp. 6-17.
8. Melnikov G.P. Systematic typology of languages. Synthesis of morphological classification of languages. Lecture course. Moscow: RUDN University Press, 2000. pp. 121-137.
9. Melnikov G.P. Systemic typology of languages: Principles. Methods. Models. Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, 2003. 395 p. 11. Methodological problems of linguistics / ed. A.S. Melnikov. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1988. 216 p.
10. Modern theories of discourse: multidisciplinary analysis (Series "Discourse Studies"). Ekaterinburg: Publishing house "Discourse-Pi", 2006. 35 p.
11. Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis. Cambridge, 1983. 25 p.
12. Bühler K. Language Theory: The Representational Function of Language. Jena, 1934, 39 pp.