



INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL ONLINE CONFERENCE

TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES

TSUL ICON FLT



TASHKENT 2021



THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

TASHKENT STATE UNIVERSITY OF LAW

An international scientific and practical online conference on the topic
**TSUL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES
(TSUL ICON - FLT)**

Foreign languages department

Tashkent – 2021

THE STUDY OF DISCOURSE AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN LINGUISTICS

Turdiyeva Yulduz Tuxtamuradovna

Teacher, Uzbek State World Languages University,

Kichik Halqa yuli, Uchtepa, Tashkent

yulduzxonturdieva@mail.ru

DOI 10.5281/zenodo.4963024

Abstract: This very article aims to discuss the study of discourse and discourse analysis in linguistics as well as some other related fields. Indeed, this very term has been a controversial discussion among many linguistics due to its abstractness. Therefore, several definitions have been provided prior to its emergence and usage in linguistics. In fact, the oppositions “discourse-text” and “discourse-speech” are of great significance in order to illustrate the essence of discourse itself. Based on the various perceptions of the scholars, the author also indicates her own views on these terms accordingly. All in all, in our view more in-depth study of discourse and discourse analysis is still needed for further research.

Key words: *discourse, discourse analysis, concept, approaches, disciplines, speech, text, linguistics, communication*

For a start, being a very broad concept, discourse is currently used in a number of scientific disciplines and interdisciplinary research. Depending on the object of study, each area of knowledge puts different shades of meaning into the concept of discourse. Prior to its usage in linguistics, this very term has owned various definitions in terms of philosophy, sociology, political sciences and etc. As Demyankov stated the Latin lexeme “discursus” in the meaning of “conversation, interaction” was recorded in the 5th century [1, 35]. Various variations of the word “discursive” are found in the sphere of scientific usage in the late 19th and early 20th centuries: “discursive thought,” “discursive activity,” “discursive cognition,” and so on. However, it is only in the 1970s that the word “discourse” started to gain a terminological status [2, 244].

Despite the large amount of research in this field, discourse still lacks a consistent and widely accepted definition since it is basically an interdisciplinary term. Its polysemy is noted in many dictionaries; for example, discourse is defined in the Philosophical Encyclopedia as "one of the complex and difficult to define concepts of modern linguistics, semiotics, and philosophy, which has spread widely in Anglo- and especially French-speaking cultures." "Discourse" is described as "an undefined term-concept used in linguistic, literary, philosophical, psychological, and historical study" in the stylistic encyclopedic dictionary of the Russian language.

For linguistics, the meaning of this term is of utmost importance. There are two major approaches of the description of discourse in this field. It is often associated with the concept of text in the first approach, and with the concept of speech in the second. In his work "Discourse Analysis," published in 1952, American scientist Z. Harris (1952) coined the idea of "discourse" in the theory of linguistics of the text and he then characterized "discourse" as a series of sentences spoken (or written) by one (or more) people in a specific situation ("the sentences spoken or written in succession by one or more people in a single situation"). The researcher further points out that language is realized in a coherent discourse, not in jumbled words and sentences - from a single word to a broad book, from a monologue to a speech [3, 3]. Moreover, he noted that discourse analysis helps to create a specific form of discourse by providing an understanding of the text, its type, and the significance of each factor in its construction. Two issues with discourse analysis are found by the linguist. The first suggests that descriptive linguistics is restricted to the sentence as a basic unit, while in the course of expression, the speaking person actually connects sentences. The second is linguistic and cultural, with the following mandatory elements: an individual, speech, and scenario.

Furthermore, discourse was defined as a coherent text combined with extralinguistic factors in the 1990s of the previous century. "Discourse is a

coherent text in conjunction with extralinguistic - pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological, and other influences, a text taken in the event aspect,” according to the Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. The relationship between the terms of "discourse" and "text" is, however, a moot question. The text is thought to be a result of human interaction, the perception process, and discourse is the interaction, the process itself, with the text being a part of it. In a bid to provide a clear definition, Kaplunenko emphasizes that “Discourse is a more general linguistic object that encompasses not only the linguistic framework of a speech work, but also the usual parameters of a communicative process, communicant features, and communication strategy, whereas the text is a more limited phenomenon that does not extend beyond the structural and semantic boundaries of a speech work” [4, 100].

According to the second approach, the correlation between "discourse" and "speech" can be traced back to F. de Saussure. In European and Russian science schools, categorical features like "language in live contact" and link with "speaking individual" established the foundation for understanding discourse. The sense of a specific form of utterance, characteristic of a separate socio-historical class, was added to the understanding of "discourse" within the context of this approach.

D. Shiffrin, a well-known American scientist, defines "discourse" as the presence of two scientific paradigms: formal and functional. For those who believe in the first, discourse is a degree of linguistic structure that extends beyond the sentence, i.e. discourse is linked to the text in this case. Discourse, for functionalists, is expression that enables them to perform specific tasks, or in other words, discourse is social contact. The linguist argues that in order to understand the discourse, these concepts must be integrated into the formal-functional framework. As a result, discourse is seen as a set of functionally ordered, contextualized language use units. The utterance is the basic unit of discourse. Hence, discourse is associated with speech, or speech behavior, which focuses emphasis on two aspects of discourse: first, the property of processuality, and

second, the relationship with the social world [5,17]. As a result, it could be concluded that social study, rather than linguistic research, is more prevalent in this school. Linguistics, in collaboration with sociology and psychology, has as its primary goal the recognition of the addressee's communicative intentions and the message's address.

Of the many approaches to the definition of discourse, one stands out, which differs in the depth of comprehension. This is the approach of the French school of discourse analysis, which took shape in the 70s of the 20th century. Linguists K. Arosh, P. Henri, and M. Pesche did not completely agree with Z. Harris's definition of discourse and critically analyzed F. de Saussure's main concepts. As a consequence, discourse is described in the French tradition as "an intentionally decided heterogeneous unity, realized either in the form of oral speech as a result of communicants' interaction in a specific socio-cultural setting, or in the form of a written text in its various aspects." [6, 28].

Considering the abovementioned approaches, from our perspective, the concepts (text/speech/discourse) are not interchangeable despite their close relationship and interdependence. We opine that the definition of "discourse" is much broader than the concepts of "text" and "speech communication" or "speech," since it encompasses a variety of extralinguistic variables, has several dimensions, and is not constrained by any temporal or spatial context, as the concepts of "text" and "speech communication" or "speech". Besides, these components serve as discourse fragments, an essential and indispensable aspect of entire communication in a particular scenario.

References

1. Demyankov, V.Z. (2005). *Text and discourse as terms and as words of an ordinary language*. M.: Languages of Slavic cultures.
2. Gorbunova, M.V. (2012). To the history of the emergence of the term "discourse" in linguistic science. *Известия ПГПУ им. В.Г. Белинского*, 27.
3. Harris, Z. (1952). *Discourse analysis*. *Language*, 28 (1).



4. Kaplunenko, A.M. (2013). *Discourse course: under the Foucault flag*. Bulletin of the Irkutsk State Linguistic University.
5. Schiffrin, D. (1990). The language of discourse: Connections inside and out.
6. Temnova, E.V. (2004). *Modern approaches to the study of discourse*. Language, consciousness, communication. –M.: MAKS Press.