



FABULOUS DISCOURSE IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN SCIENTIFIC TRENDS

Israilova Sayera Tashpulat kizi

Scientific researcher of the UzSWLU, Uzbekistan, Tashkent

ANNOTATION

The article discusses interdisciplinary attitude and new approaches to literary discourse and linguistic personality and their close relationships with cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology. It is claimed that a satisfactory account of discourse can only be achieved by means of the cognitive and linguoculturological studies.

KEY WORDS: *discourse, cognitive theory of discourse, cognitive approach, stylistic and pragmatic information, linguistic cultural analysis.*

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the history of discourse as a scientific concept, this phenomenon has been the subject of interdisciplinary research: this concept is widely used in philosophy, psychology, sociology, Ethnography, in the study of artificial intelligence problems, and in many other areas.

The word "discourse" was first used as a scientific term by the linguist Z. Harris in 1952, and linguistic research of this category began in the 1960s and 1970s and developed in the works of such scientists as V. Dressler (1978)[1]; N. Mironov (1997); V. I. Karasik (1998, 2002); T. van Dyck (2000); D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H. Hamilton (2003), A. A. Kibrik (2003); L. Phillips, M. V. Jorgensen (2004)...

Given the scope of this term, it is not surprising that it does not currently have a generally accepted meaning, both within individual disciplines and at the intersection of related fields of knowledge.

Each discipline that encounters the concept of discourse has an impact on discursive analysis and contributes to the definition of the concept of discourse. First of all, such Sciences are sociology and Ethnology, and sociolinguistics and ethnolinguistics developed from them. Summarizing the approaches of the Humanities to the definition of discourse, A. A. Kibrik and P. B. Parshin [2] distinguish three main classes of use of the term: linguistic (correlates-concepts of speech, language, dialogue), journalistic (correlates – concepts of style, individual language) and philosophical and sociological, inherent in the description of social life, norms and human values (Kibrik, Parshin).

The variability of understanding of the term "discourse" has contributed to its spread in modern linguistic research, since this feature provides ample

opportunities for considering through the prism of discursive analysis of traditional ideas about language, speech, style, etc., as well as creating new categories and concepts using it. Multiple contexts of using the term "discourse" based on basic linguistic concepts (language, speech, text, dialogue, etc.) are refined and developed by functioning in the definition itself and interacting with the defined concept of discourse. It is also important to take into account that the theoretical basis behind the term, Dating back to F. de Saussure, who studied the dichotomy of language and speech, involves the question of comparing and identifying differences between discourse and text. This question is also important for this study, as the empirical material for the work was the texts of folk tales created as a result of complex discursive practices. In this regard, it seems necessary to analyze the definitions of the term, formulated by linguists, and determine what interpretation forms the basis of the working definition of our work.

According to L. Phillips and M. V. Jorgensen, "discourse-defined as the use of language in everyday texts and communication – is a dynamic form of social practice that builds the social world, personalities, and identities" (Phillips, Jorgensen 2004). The emphasis on the social context of actualization of the phenomenon is made in her research by E. S. Kubryakova[3], who believes that discourse is a form of communication between people, a language in action. At the same time, language is the source material, and speech is the way to update it (Kubryakova 2000).

T. A. van Dyck[4] gives the following definitions of this term: in a broad sense, it defines discourse as a complex communicative event that occurs between the participants of a communicative action in a certain spatial, temporal, social, and other context. In a narrow



sense discourse is presented as a verbal product of the communicative action that is perceived by recipients. In this case, the discourse is often identified with a text or conversation in written or, accordingly, speech form. However, the difference between the text and the discourse in this case is that the text is an abstract and formal construction, the discourse is understood as various forms of its actualization, taking into account extralinguistic factors and the mentality of the participants in the communicative action. Speaking about other contexts of using the term "discourse," Van Dyck identifies discourse as a concrete conversation; discourse as a type of conversation; discourse as a genre; discourse as a social formation (when this term is applicable to a certain historical period, social layer or to the whole culture) (Dyck 1998).

Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary edited by V.N. Yartseva[5] defines discourse as a phenomenon inextricably linked with both the basic concepts of linguistics and the pragmatic component of the concept: discourse - "a coherent text in conjunction with extralinguistic - pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors; text taken in the event aspect; speech, considered as a targeted social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and their mechanisms of consciousness (cognitive processes)" (Arutyunova 1998, 136-137)[6].

Thus, discourse exists within a pragmatic situation that determines its connectivity, communicative goal, connotations, which, ultimately, serves as the basis for the interpretation of discourse. At the same time, the pragmatic aspect is also expressed in attention to the participants in communication, which determines the structure and connectedness of the discourse depending on their psychological, sociocultural and ethnographic characteristics.

MAIN PART

All the above definitions in one way or another affect two sides of the phenomenon: linguistic and extralinguistic. We find the formulation of this idea in the work of V.V. Krasnykh. The researcher describes the dual nature of discourse as follows: "Discourse has two planes - linguistic proper and linguistic-cognitive. The first is associated with the language, manifests itself in the language tools used and manifests itself in the totality of the generated texts (discourse as a result). The second is associated with linguistic consciousness, determines the choice of linguistic means, affects the generation (and perception) of texts, manifesting itself in context and presupposition (discourse as a process)" (Krasnykh 2003, 114)[7]. Thus, the text, having a linguistic essence, is the result of the discourse as a process and embodies the discourse as a result, and, being considered in isolation from the pragmatic, cognitive component of the discursive phenomenon, differs from discourse both in the framework of "part and whole", and by analogy "subject - image of the subject."

Given the observations and conclusions, we come to a working definition of discourse, agreeing with V.V. Krasnykh: discourse is a procedural set of

communicative practices with a specific topic, all of whose components are openly or implicitly reflected in a block of texts that arose as a result of cognitive and linguocognitive activity of participants in these practices.

It is also important to note that, being decisive in the process of creating a text, discursive factors affect the choice of language components, such as grammatical constructions, lexical and even phonetic units. Based on such observations, it can be noted that in order for a discourse to fulfill its pragmatic function, a certain structure and connectedness are necessary.

The coherence of discourse is ensured by the presence of a structure that obeys the general principles of structuring. Based on the research results of domestic and foreign scientists, two main levels of discourse can be distinguished: macrostructure and microstructure. So, the formulation of the principles of macrostructure involved E.V. Paducheva (2001, 2004)[8], A.N. Baranov and G.E. Kreidlin (Baranov, Kreidlin 1992)[9] and others. According to T.A. van Dyck, the goal of introducing such a thing as macrostructure is an abstract description of the essence of discourse, and hence the definition of its global connectivity (Dyck 2000). Consequently, the macrostructure of the discourse is global and represents the totality of its large components, while the general coherence of the discourse is achieved due to the thematic, event, space-time unity. The function of the macrostructure can be called providing a generalized understanding of the content of the discourse by the addressee. The macrostructure is built on the basis of certain rules called macro rules, which are applied recursively. The basic macro rules include generalization, omission, and construction; therefore, it is logical that following these rules is one of the strategies for understanding the discourse by its addressee.

T.A. van Dyck also highlights the concept of superstructure, or the scheme by which specific categories of discourses are built. This concept is associated with the genre, and not with the content of a single discourse. Currently, most genres have characteristic superstructures, but the most studied in this regard is narrative discourse, the standard construction scheme of which is as follows: *Ориентация – Complication / Осложнение – Evaluation / Оценка – Resolution / Разрешение – Coda / Кода* (Labov, Walwitzky 1997).

The microstructure of discourse, its local structure, in contrast to the globality of the macrostructure, is a division of discourse into minimal constituent units that are of value for the interpretation of discourse. In modern research, it is common to refer to these minimum units as clauses or predications that exist in interaction with each other. According to the theory of rhetorical structure by W. Mann and S. Thompson, connections between units of discourse are called rhetorical relations necessary to achieve a certain goal. All units of discourse, both minimum and maximum, enter into rhetorical relations, which allows us to use this approach to describe the construction of discourse at all levels of the hierarchy of its structure, and the connections between these units provide a General



coherence of the discourse (Mann, Matthiessen, Thompson, 1992)[10]. In addition, studies show that at the microstructure level, the relationships between minimal units form a local connectivity, which, according to T. Givon[11], can be divided into 4 types: referents / определяемые объекты, spatiality / пространство, temporality / время, tense-aspect modality / грамматическое время и вид глагола и action routines / события (Givon 1976). At the level of the macrostructure, global coherence is achieved through the unity of the discourse theme.

Recently, research has also highlighted the hyperstructure of discourse, which has an interdiscursive character and reflects the relationship of discourse with other discourses and discursive practices. In addition, we can also talk about metastructure as a connection of discourse with the discursive practices of the communicant, his knowledge, assessments, psycho-emotional characteristics, etc. (Kashkin 2010).

The broad scientific scope of the term discourse determines the existence of different classifications and typologies depending on the criteria used. The criterion of the information transmission channel is the basis for the most important distinction between the types of discourse: oral and written. Oral discourse implies an acoustic channel and is the initial form of language existence. Written discourse is perceived through a visual channel and is a derivative product of oral discourse. In oral discourse, the processes of generation and understanding are synchronized; in written discourse, they are distanced. These observations also contribute to the distinction between the concepts of "text" and "discourse". In addition to oral and written discourse, A. A. Kibrik also distinguishes its mental variety: the researcher believes that communication does not necessarily imply the presence of its graphic or acoustic form; in the case of mental actualization of the communicative use of language, "the same person is both the speaker and the addressee" (Kibrik 2003, 21).

In addition to this typology, it should be mentioned that differences between types of discourse can be described using the concept of genre, which is currently actively used in discursive analysis. This term applies not only to written versions of discourse, but also to oral ones. V. I. Karasik was engaged in the classification of discourse in connection with its genre affiliation. He believed that there is no complete and unambiguous classification of discourse in relation to its genre affiliation, since the problems of language specificity of genres have not yet been developed sufficiently (Karasik 2000).

In the definition of discourse, and in its structure, a certain place is given to the participants of communication and the channel of information transmission, the functions of discourse and its content, which makes it possible to apply the linguistic typology of texts to it. Speaking about the communicative situation as a basis for typologizing discourse, we take into account the specifics of the standard components of the communicative situation. The producer of a discourse determines its nature, its type. Focusing on the producer

of discourse, V. I. Karasik identifies two special types of discourse: personal (personality-oriented), in which the producer of discourse is a unique person, and institutional (status-oriented) discourse, where the speaker of the discourse is a representative of a particular social community. Personal discourse is divided into everyday (spoken language) and everyday (fiction). Institutional discourse is differentiated by the criteria of goals and participants of communication occurring within the specified framework of status-role relations (Karasik 2000).

The recipient of the communication also affects the type of discourse, since in most cases it is pragmatic-oriented. This pattern can be illustrated by the following example: a love novel is primarily aimed at women, which determines the features of this discourse: the choice of topic, the features of the syntactic structure, the selection of lexical units, etc. The uncertainty of the producer of the discourse and its addressee leads to their anonymity, which serves a specific purpose, which may consist in explicating the typicality of a particular situation. The channel of communication, as in the first classification, is an important criterion for characterizing the type of discourse. According to I. T. Kasavin, in this case, the channel (acoustic or visual) is closely related to the time factor that determines the degree of "canned discourse" and serves to distinguish three types of discourse: the primary (the author's text), the period of preservation, and the secondary discourse. Conservation allows secondary discourse to function in conditions different from those applicable to primary discourse, in a different place, time, and with other addressees (Kasavin 1998).

CONCLUSION

As a result of the analysis of discourse studies, it was found that the typologies of discourse are diverse and numerous. Discourse is one of the main concepts in modern linguistics, with many definitions and classifications, a complex structure, and a variety of functions. The possibility of various scientific interpretations and the wide use of this term in relation to the basic concepts of linguistics (language, speech, text, dialogue, etc.) make discourse and the study of its types one of the most promising areas of research.

REFERENCES

1. Dressler, V. *text Syntax [Text] / V. Dressler // New in foreign linguistics. Issue VIII. Text linguistics / comp., General ed. introductory article by T. M. Nikolaeva. - Moscow: Progress, 1978. - Pp. 111-137.*
2. Kibrik, A. A., Parshin P. B. *Discourse [Electronic resource] / A. A. Kibrik, P.B.Parshin//Krugosvet.URL:http://www.krugosvet.ru/enc/gumanitarnye_nauki/lingvistika/DISKURS.html*
3. Kubryakova, E. S. *On the concepts of discourse and discursive analysis in modern linguistics [Text] / E. S. Kubryakova // Discourse, speech, speech activity. Collection of reviews "Theory and history of linguistics" of the Russian Academy of Sciences. - Moscow: INION, 2000. - Pp. 7-26.*



4. T. A. van.Dyck *Language. Knowledge. Communication.* [Text] / T. A. van Dyck. - Blagoveshchensk: BGC. I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, 2000. - 308c.
5. *Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary* edited by V.N. Yartseva.
6. N. D. Arutyunova, *Discourse* [Text] / N. D. Arutyunova // *Big encyclopedic dictionary. Linguistics* / edited by V. N. Yartseva. - Moscow: Scientific publishing house "Big Russian encyclopedia", 1998. - Pp. 136-137.
7. V.I.Krasnikh *on categories of discourse* [Text] / V. I. Karasik // *Language personality: sociolinguistic and emotive aspects: Sat.nauch. tr. / VSPU; SGU.* - Volgograd: Peremena, 1998. - Pp. 185-197.
8. Paducheva, E. V. *Utterance and its correlation with reality* [Text] / E. V. Paducheva. - Moscow: URSS, 2001, 287s.
9. Paducheva, E. V. *Dynamic models in lexical semantics* [Text] / E. V. Paducheva. - Moscow: languages of Slavic culture. 2004. – 608 p.
10. Mann, W., Matthiessen, Ch., Thompson, S.A. *Rhetorical structure theory and text analysis* [Text] / W. Mann, Ch. Matthiessen, S.A. Thompson // *Discourse Description.* – Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1992. – PP. 39-78.
11. Givón, T. *Topic, pronoun, and grammatical agreement* [Text] / T. Givon // In: *Subject and topic* / ed. by C. Li. – N. Y.: Academic Press, 1976. – PP. 149-188.