ANALYSIS OF DEFINITIONS OF THE CONCEPT "DISCOURSE" IN LINGUISTICS

Niyazova Dildora Furkatovna
PhD Student of the Samarkand State
Institute of Foreign Languages

A B S T R A C T	K E Y W O R D S
In this article is discussed and analyzes the definitions given to the idea, of language in linguistics. At the same time, ideas about the language given by European and Russian scientists were generalized and deeply analyzed. In linguistics, the term "discourse" has been used since ancient times. It is safe to say that the problem of defining this term has attracted the attention of scientists since the middle of the 20th century. The main problem of researchers is to determine the place of this explanation on the border of many scientific disciplines with different objects of study: sociology, psychology, political science, logic, ethnography, philosophy, literary criticism, stylistics, linguistics, etc. Therefore, today the term "discourse" does not have a single generally accepted definition.	discourse, analysis, term, problem, definition, concept, object, linguistics, field, variety.

INTRODUCTION

Beginning of the 21st century, as in every area of our social life, the study of new directions was put in the center of attention of scientists working in the field of linguistics, as one of the urgent problems. The rapid development of scientific areas related to communication issues has led to a significant difference of opinion in the scientific community. In linguistics, there are many views and studies regarding the analysis of discourse and the role of speech. Corpus linguistics is the most widely used area of speech in linguistics. First of all, let's look at the definitions given to this word. This concept is distinguished by its complexity in the world of linguistics, along with giving meaning to form and shape like many computer language research, corpus linguistics is unique in that it relies solely on natural language[18]. Different types of discourse can provide a language for research in corpus linguistics, for example, to analyze the proficiency levels of language learners. In sociology and psychology, scientists and researchers may use speech in their research.Such conclusions come from the study of speech patterns[18].

LITERATURE REVIEW

As a result of studying the definitions given to the term discourse in linguistics, that many foreign, Russian and local scientists have conducted research in this regard. Summarizing their definitions, we considered it admissible to give some of them. For example, the French philosopher Michel Foucault used the term "discourse" to refer to communicative relations in real power structures. Foucault was more of a social theorist than a linguist; However, his theories about pragmatics, or how language

makes sense, have had a significant impact on how many scholars view discourse. He stated that discourse turns people into certain ways of thinking and acting[19]. In linguistics, the term "discourse" has been used since ancient times. It is safe to say that the problem of defining this term has attracted the attention of scientists since the middle of the 20th century. Milevskaya T.V. said that in modern science the issues of units of " higher syntax" and the relationship between text and speech, as a process of its formation, come to the fore. According to the scientist, the change in the research paradigm is caused by "insufficient explanatory power of the traditional structural-semantic approach." The scope of studying the implementation of linguistic facts has expanded due to the idea of consistent speech "as an object of anthropocentrism and subjectocentrism"[1:32].

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The main problem of researchers is to determine the place of this word on the border of many scientific disciplines with various objects of study: sociology, psychology, political science, logic, ethnography, philosophy, literary criticism, stylistics, linguistics, etc. Therefore, today the term "discourse" is not has a single generally accepted definition. If we talk about Selezneva L.V., then, according to her research, the problem is aggravated by the fashion for speech. The word "reasoning" began to take the place of concepts and terms fixed in linguistics"[17:119]. Nevertheless, thanks to researchers from different fields of science, the concept of speech is being formalized. The goal of this small study is to explore the research that has been done on this concept and study the modern understanding of this concept by researchers, as well as the choice of a common definition of "communication" that can be used when working on a topic. The word "discourse" has been thoroughly approached in the works of a number of researchers, we can see these definitions in the works of E.Buissan, E.Benveniste and Z.Harris. The concept was first introduced into science by the Belgian scientist E. Buissans. In 1943, in Language and Discourse, he added a third element to Ferdinand de Saussure's binary scheme of speech activity ("language - discourse - password"), referring to the implementations of the combinations of the language code that underlie the mechanism of language transmission. . If you look at another definition, then this term entered scientific theory in the 50s of the 20th century thanks to the French scientist E. Benveniste, who, in his opinion, defined the word discourse as " a speech act that occurs whenever we speak [8 :312], in 1952, Z. Harris first introduced the term discourse analysis in an article devoted to the term discourse. In his work, he chose as the object of study a larger fragment of text, including the sentence [9:23]. In his opinion, the term "discourse" means "an exclusively phraseological unit in the context of other units and the socio-cultural situation associated with them."

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Professor T.A. van Dyck is considered one of the founders of modern speech theory. In 1972, he scientifically proved that a text is not just a sequence of ordered sentences, but a part of coherent speech. Theo van Dijk also states that the term " discourse" is a popular and vague concept, and gives several directions for understanding this concept: " a complex communicative event in a certain time, space and other contexts; certain conversation; genre; text or conversation [5:121,122]. Russian scientist Leontiev A. stands out among linguists for his great contribution to the improve of this word. Within the framework of speech communication theory, he describes the communicative situation - speech movement, internal structure of speech, goal, task[13:82] The structure of speech acts was developed and they were named as follows: directionality unit (location), planning unit (extralinguistic

factors), implementation unit (language code), factors influencing growth, such as motivation, environment, experience and task, are identified.

Until the end of the 20th century, scholars conducted intensive research on the relationship between text, speech, and speech. Some scholars have tried to define speech through text or speech without giving a sufficient definition of this concept and without studying it as a separate concept. The next scientist was V.A. Koch defines discourse as "any text (or parts of a text) containing manifestations of the same specific motif is a discursive text" [6:149-171]. If we characterize the concept of R. Barth, "discourse is a communication that is transmitted with secondary communicative goals and has an internal organization corresponding to these goals and is associated with other cultural factors independent of the language itself" [14:443,444]. The scientist introduces the concept of "discourse-text", and speech is interpreted as "the process of linguistic thought", and the text is interpreted as "a conclusion obtained during research"[10]. The next process, in the 90s of the 20th century, a communicative and situational approach began to be followed. Speech is seen as a complex concept that goes beyond text. According to the classification of some scientists " the complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, extralinguistic factors necessary for understanding the text (knowledge of the world, thoughts, goals of the addressee). According to A. A. Kibrik, speech is defined as " a communicative situation involving the consciousness of the interlocutors and the text created in the process of communication" . Stepanov defined speech as "language in language", that is, speech is a special way of using language to express consciousness. From the foregoing, we came to the conclusion about the concept of discourse that speech reflects both linguistic and sociocultural reality. It breaks through the consciousness of the speaker or listener, is realized in the text, which has its own structural and functional features" [15:71]. "Discourse" entered the 20th century as a complex multicomponent concept, including linguistic and extralinguistic components, inseparable from sociocultural, situational aspects. Here it is appropriate to cite the opinion of E.F. Kirov, according to him, speech is " a set of written and oral texts in a certain sense. Language in the history of the entire existence of a certain culture. The most complete definition of speech can be found in the study of N.D. Arutyunova: " Discourse (French disours - speech) is a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors; the text perceived in the aspect of the event; speech as a purposeful social action, a component involved in human interaction and it is considered as a mechanism of their consciousness[18]. Obviously, there are two approaches. to understanding speech: speech and text According to N. D. Arutyunova, E. Benveniste, V. G. Borbotko, T. B. Gulyar, T. van Dijk, N. I. its meanings (" speech act" , " communicative situation" , " dialogue" , etc.) is based on the concept of " speech" . However, unlike speech, "discourse presupposes a system, has the character of integrity, has an internal organization, it includes the concepts of type, genre and style, the communicative sphere." Speech is speech perceived as purposeful, socio-cultural, cognitive action[12:136,137]. In the modern sense, speech is an independent concept that includes speech and text as structural elements. In continuation of the theory begun by A.A. Leontiev, researchers single out the types of speech that make up speech, and thus the idea of "discursive competence" appeared. Modern scientists, recognizing the interdisciplinary nature of speech, do not limit its definition to only one discipline. From this point of view, E.S. Kunryakova's thoughts on speech are appropriate. According to him, " this is a form of language use in real (current) time (online), which reflects a certain type of human social activity. It is created to build a special world (or its image) with the help of its detailed linguistic description and usually described as part of

the way people engage in conversation, characterized by each act of communication, participants in communication, conditions for its implementation, etc. indeed, its goals"[2:525]. Based on the definition of the following scientist V. M. Leichik, he defines speech as "a complex mental, socio-cultural and individual cultural activity in which language and speech have an important, but not the only place." G. N. Manaenko distinguishes four components in the structure of speech: environment, social theme, role and personal relations of communication participants, content, intentions and goals). The scientist presents speech as a complex process [3:59]. V.S. Grigorieva emphasizes the role of the cultural characteristics of the country to which the language of communication belongs, as well as moral and ethical norms, universal and specific to a particular people [4].

CONCLUSION/ RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the process of writing and analyzing the article, the following conclusions can be drawn, the concept of "discourse" from being equivalent to the concepts of "speech" and "text" to understanding it as an independent multicomponent phenomenon, includes both text and speech in all its forms, has gone through a complex evolutionary path. There is no clear understanding of the components of speech. If we talk about the modern understanding of the structure of speech, then the most common and understandable is the definition of Yu.A. Komarova, and we agree with her words. However, there are no clear definitions of the internal elements of these three components. There is also no single approach to the classification of speech. The theory of speech is developing as an interdisciplinary science, so the problem of developing a single term remains open.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Milevskaya T.V. Connecting as a category of discourse and text. Rostov n/d: RSU, 2003.338 p. S. 39.
1. Kubryakova E.S. Language and knowledge: On the path of gaining knowledge about language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of the language in the knowledge of the world. M.: Languages of Slavic cultures, 2004. 560 p.
2. Manenko G.N. Discourse in his attitude to speech, text, language // Stereotype in creativity and text: Interuniversity. Sat. scientific. tr. Ext. 12. Perm: PSU, 2008. S. 48– 61.
3. Grigoryeva V.S. Discourse as an element of the communicative process: pragmalinguistic and cognitive aspects. Trambov: TSTU, 2007.288s.S.3.
4. Deik T.A. van. Language. Cognition. Communication. - M., 1989.
5. Koch V.A. A preliminary sketch of discursive analysis of a semantic type // New in foreign linguistics. Ext. VIII. Linguistics of the text. - M.: Progress, 1978. - S. 149– 171.
6. Bellert I. On one condition for the connectedness of the text // New in foreign linguistics. Ext. VIII. Linguistics of the text. - M., 1978. - S. 172– 207.
7. Harris Z.S. Discourse Analysis // Language. No. 8. P. 1-30.
8. Warsaw A.I. Semantic relations in the structure of the language (based on the material of modern English). L., 1984.
9. Arutyunova N.D. Discourse // Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. M.: Sov. Encyclopedia., 1990. S. 136– 137.

10. Ostrovskaya T.A., Khachmarova Z.R. The main directions of the discourse study in modern linguistics // News. Adyg. state. Un-te. Ser.: Philology and art history. Maykop, 2016. Issue. 2 (177). S. 99– 105.

11. Karasik V.I. On the types of discourse // Language personality: institutional and personal discourse: Sat. scientific. tr. Volgograd: Change, 2000. S. 5– 20.

12. Kubryakova E.S. Aleksandrova O.V. On the contours of the new paradigm of knowledge in linguistics // Structure and semantics of a literary text: reports VII Intern. Conf. M., 1999. S. 186-197.

13. Sedov K.F. The formation of discursive thinking of the linguistic personality: psycho- and sociolinguistic aspects. - Saratov, 1999.

14. Prokhorov Yu.E. Reality. Text. Discourse: Textbook. accomplishment. -2nd ed., Cred. M., 2006.

15. Komarova Yu.A. Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Ser. 9. 2012. Issue. 4 Functional-linguistic description of the English-language scientific discourse.

16. Selezneva L.V. Research of discourse in modern linguistics: experience, directions, problems. Bulletin of the SFFU, 2011, Volume 8, No. 4.

17. Ма Жуе. ИНФОРМАЦИОННАЯ СТРУКТУРА И ЕЕ РЕЧЕВОЕ ВОПЛОЩЕНИЕ В ВОЕННЫХ МЕМУАРАХ. ДИССЕРТАЦИЯ. Санкт-Петербург 2021.

18. https://na-journal.ru/3-2023-filologiya-lingvistika/4603-discourse-as-a-complex-concept

19. https://www.languagehumanities.org/what-is-the-role-of-discourse-in-linguistics.htm