DISCOURSE IS A COMBINATION OF LANGUAGE ACTIVITY AND TEXT

Aytbaev Dilshodkhuja Temirbaevich
Candidate of philological sciences, associate professor of TSPU named after Nizami

Abstract. In this article, the relationship between discourse and text has attracted the attention of linguists in linguistics in general, and in Uzbek linguistics in particular, the fact that the phenomenon that causes text and discourse phenomena to meet is culture, the important aspect of discourse is that each speech act unit in the communication process is the discourse speaker and the listener's mental state, worldview, training, position in society, situations of the speech act, etc., have meaningful diversity.

Keywords: discourse, text, event, communication, speech unit, speech act situations.

Since the 1960s, the concept of "discourse" has become one of the key not only in linguistics, but also in a number of humanitarian disciplines. Many linguists see the reason for this phenomenon in the "linguistic revolution", which arose as a result of the spread of structural linguistics and structural methodology. The basis of the structural concept is the position that the study of the structure of the language is the key to the study of the universe and human existence.

Discourse is one of the main categories of communicative linguistics and a number of other modern sciences. This term was first introduced into theoretical linguistics by the Belgian E. Buissance, who in his work "Language and Discourse", published in 1943 in Brussels, introduced discourse into the opposition of language and speech as the third element. According to him, discourse is a mechanism for transferring into living speech a system of signs - a language.

The representative of the French school, M.Pesho, is based on the ideological conception of the discourse analysis. M.Pesho considers discourse as a point of contact between language and ideology. He recognizes discourse analysis as an analysis of the ideological aspects of language use and the implementation of ideology in language. His ideas influenced the views of modern representatives of French discourse analysis: P.Serio, E.P.Orlandi, J.J.Courtin, D.Maldidier and others.

According to A.E.Kibrik, discourse is a combination of language activity and text - the result of this activity. Text is a component of discourse. In addition to the text, discourse covers the processes associated with the creation and understanding of text in real time and space. The text is a static object, which is the result of language activity.

According to V.G. Borbotko, discourse is a text consisting of communicative language units that are in continuous semantic connection and perceived as a whole.

G.A.Orlov considers discourse as a specific speech category, expressed in the form of an oral or written speech derivative, formed in the content and structural aspects, from the syntagmatic chain of individual phrases to a complete work (story, conversation, description, indication, report.

Evaluation of discourse based on a content approach, i.e. its consideration as a chain of whole phrases can also be observed in the studies of I.Bellert, M.M. Bakhtin, V.A.Koch, S.I.Gindin and others. Thus, according to I. Bellert, discourse is such an order of phrases S1...,Sn, where the memantic interpretation of each S1 (based on $2 \langle i \rangle$ n) depends on the interpretation of the phrases

of the sequence S1..., Si-1. More precisely, all the phrases in the discourse are so meaningfully related that in order to understand a particular phrase in it, it is necessary to know the content of the previous phrase.

Patrick Serio, emphasizing the multifaceted use of the term "discourse", points out eight of its meanings, which are unique to the representatives of the French school of discourse analysis:

The equivalent of the concept of "speech" introduced by Saussure, i.e. any specific phrase.

A unit is more than a phrase, an expression with a broad meaning; the subject of study of the grammar of the text, which deals with the study of the composition of expressions.

From a pragmatic point of view, "discourse" is the influence of the expression on the listener and its place in the speech situation.

Discourse is a conversation, considered as the main type of expression (phrase).

Discourse is speech opposed to the usual message, narration, with the direct participation of the speaker and the listener (Benveniste).

Also, in some sources, language and discourse are opposed. At the same time, discourse is distinguished - the study of a specific element "in language" and its study "in speech".

The term "discourse" is often used to refer to a system of restrictions from the social and ideological point of view to limitless expressions. For example, when talking about "political discourse" or "feminist discourse", one should not talk about a particular corpus, but types of expression inherent in politicians or feminists in general.

Traditionally, discourse analysis, defining the subject of research, distinguishes between phrase and discourse.

Summarizing all the definitions of the term "discourse" in the language, Deborah Shifrin highlights the top approach to interpreting discourse. The first is from the point of view of formal or structural linguistics. Here, discourse is seen as a language above the level of phrases and sentences. More precisely, a discourse is two or more sentences related in content".

According to the second approach, the discourse acquires a functional interpretation, and is considered as any use of the language. At the same time, the analysis of the function of discourse is carried out in unity with the analysis of the broad sociocultural function of language.

Proponents of the third approach consider discourse from the point of view of the relationship between form and function, i.e. as a discourse phrase. At the same time, discourse is considered not just a collection of individual "more than a sentence" units of the language structure, but the need to evaluate it as a collection of functionally formed, contextual units is emphasized. All of the above indicates that the concept of "discourse" is complex, voluminous and does not have an unambiguous interpretation. At the same time, the problem of the relationship between discourse and text remains unresolved.

The relationship between discourse and text attracts the attention of linguists in general, and Uzbek linguists in particular. Sh. Safarov, emphasizing the need for a broader interpretation of discourse compared to the text, argues that it is correct to study the relationship between discourse and text in the hyperonymic and hyponymic aspects. And according to the expert, discourse is a specific type, a cycle of human conscious activity, and the text is one of its varieties. The reason for the mutual meeting of the phenomena of text and discourse is culture. It is known that on the one hand, the flow of communication and the formation of the text is a cultural process. On the other hand, the text is an important node that connects language and culture, since using the analysis of the composition of the text, one can collect linguoculturological information about the

scientific and cultural features of the language system. Accordingly, the text shows an active attitude to the language system, the language is not only the main tool, a participant in the construction of the text, but it itself undergoes serious qualitative changes in the process of the text. Evidence of this is the right to freely use language units precisely in the structure of the text, breaking out of the "fetters" of the rules of the language.

The approach to linguistic means based on dialectical categories, in particular general and particular, contributes to the solution of many problems. In Uzbek linguistics, there are a number of studies aimed at studying linguistic units based on dialectical categories. D. Nabieva, speaking about invariant and variant relations between linguistic units, emphasizes that the coverage of language units on the basis of the dialectic of general and particular contributes to a deeper understanding of their essence.

According to the author, the recognition of the presence in the basis of material means that we can feel a certain commonality, essence led to the emergence of the theory of invariance in science, which was of great importance for the theory of knowledge (epistemology), deepening and concretizing the theory of reflection. The invariant-variant contradiction reflects the contradictory, dual feature of the attributes-properties of objects belonging to a particular class.

Invariance indicates the general properties of a certain object that are present in another similar object. Variance, on the other hand, manifests the property of only one of the objects united in a certain class by invariant properties.

The invariant and its variant are closely related through realization relations. Each invariant is realized through several variants.

The concrete - the material cannot remain exactly the same with various changes. The same can be said about the material-physical property of any object.

This means that invariance can only be attributed to abstract objects and abstract attributes of objects.

So, changing the parameters of various objects made from the same material leads to a change in their weight and volume, that is, their physical characteristics change. However, despite such changes, all of them retain the property of having "weight" and "volume". It is these signs, common and unchanged for all objects that are subject to various changes, that are invariant.

If we approach the issue of discourse from the point of view of invariance-variance based on the dichotomy of language and speech, in our opinion, the solution of the relationship between discourse and text will take on a slightly different form.

It is known that it is precisely those units that make up the language that materialize in speech. If the text takes place in the language layer as a generalized construct, then its manifestation in real time and space, the real situation can be considered as a discourse.

As noted in all the above definitions, discourse is a speech derivative, covering such factors as content integrity in phrases, sociological, psychological indicators of the speaker and listener, their relationship in a particular speech situation, and the correct organization of a speech act. All these factors, being outside the language, are superimposed in the process of communication on one of the communicative units of the language - the text. Therefore, in each specific application, a specific text acquires various meaningful facets.

M.Makarov, exploring the theoretical foundations of discourse, interprets it as follows: **discourse = speech + text**.

As you can see, the type of text, the unit of communication, which has absorbed specific speech features in a particular speech situation, is discourse. There is an invariant and variant relationship between discourse and text. The text, like all linguistic structures, is a phenomenon that has obvious and hidden layers, arising within the framework of the unity of content and form. The real speech expression (reflection), the form of materialization of the text is discourse.

In recent years, special attention has been paid to discourse analysis in Uzbek linguistics.

So, D.Khudoyberganova believes that the formation and development of anthropocentric linguistics undoubtedly had a great influence on such an interpretation of discourse. Discursive analysis, figuratively speaking, is a crossroads where several directions of linguistic analysis meet. Discursive activity, i.e. the process of conscious construction of speech involves the study of the personality factor. Since any manifestation of speech is the result of the activity of a person belonging to a specific socio-cultural environment, which has psychological and cognitive characteristics.

The remarkable side of discourse is that in the process of communication each unit of a speech act - discourse acquires a meaningful diversity under the influence of various factors, such as the mental state of the speaker and listener, their worldview, occupation, position in society, speech act.

REFERENCES

1. Бахтин М. М. Эстетика словесного творчества. –М.: Искусство, 1979; Гиндин С.И. Риторика и проблемы структуры текста // Общая риторика/ Дюбуа Ж., Эделин Ф. и др. –Москва, 1971.
2. Беллерт И. Об одном условии связности текста // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике, вып. VIII. Лингвистика текста. –М.: Прогресс, 1978. С.3.
3. Борботько В. Г. Элементы теории дискурса. – Грозный, 1981. С.8
4. Демьянков В.З. Доминирующие лингвистические теории в конце XX века //Язык и наука конца 20 века. –М.: Институт языкознания РАН, 1995. С.239-320; http: //www. infolex.ru/; http://ling.ulstu.ru.
5. Звегинцев Г.С. Предложение и его отношение к языку и речи. –Москва, 1976.С.170.
6. Кибрик А.А. Анализ дискурса в когнитивной перспективе. Дисс. на соискание.....докт. филол. наук. –Москва, 2003. С.5.
7. Макаров М. Основы теории дискурса. –М.: Гнозис, 2003. С.89.
8. Набиева Д. Ўзбек тилида лисоний бирликларни диалектик категориялар асосида тадқиқ этиш. Филол.фан.докт.....дисс. –Тошкент, 2007.
9. Орлов Г.А. Современная английская речь. –М.: Высшая школа, 1991. С.14
10. Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. –Т.: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2008. -Б. 221.
11. Сафров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. –Т.: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2008. -Б. 227.
12. Серио П. Квалратура смысла. Французская школа анализа дискурса. –Москва, 1999. –С.8.
13. Худойберганова Д. Матннинг антропоцентрик тадқиқи. –Т.: Фан, 2013; Саидхонов М. Бадиий матн коммуникатив восита сифатида // ЎТА, 2009, №5. 80-82-б.
14. Schiffrin D. Approaches to discourse. –Oxford: Cambridge, MA, 1994. p.20-43.
15. http: //www.madipi.ru