DISCOURSE AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH

Akbarova Masuma Ismonali kizi
Teacher, the Department of English Linguistics
Faculty of Philology, National University of Uzbekistan

ANNOTATION
In this article, the term "discourse" is used in a direct linguistic sense and is defined as a linguistic unit of communication. The linguistic theory of speech should not consider statements based on individual sentences, as well as sequences of sentences with a text structure. In this context, the article discusses the coherence within the text.

Keywords: speech, linguistics, text, structure, speech analysis, text, dialogue, types of speech

The end of the 20th century - the beginning of the 21st century was marked by the announcement of the fundamental position in linguistics that the study of a language can be considered adequate only when it describes its functioning in the process of communication. "If the previous (essentially static) linguist in the knowledge of language is derived from linguistic objects such as a text, sentence, word or its grammatical form, the linguistics of activity (primarily represented by pragmatists in linguistics).[1] The interdisciplinary field that studies discourse, as well as the corresponding branch of linguistics, is called discursive analysis or discursive research. Although the interaction of linguistics has been the subject of disciplines such as rhetoric and oratory, then stylistics and literary studies for centuries, discursive analysis as a proper scientific direction was formed only in the following decades.

Recently, however, cognitive attitudes have begun to change in linguistics, and the view has grown that no linguistic phenomena can be adequately understood and described without taking into account their discursive aspects, apart from their use. Therefore, discursive analysis becomes one of the central branches of linguistics. In our opinion, three main classes of application of this term can be distinguished [2]:

1) properly linguistic, where speech is understood as written speech in a communicative situation;

2) the discourse used in journalism of the time;

3) speech used in formal linguistics, which tries to introduce elements of discursive concepts into the arsenal of generative grammar.

First, the use of the term "discourse" in the proper linguistic sense is quite diverse in itself, but in general, attempts are made to clarify and develop traditional concepts of language and speech units. Thus, according to the definition of V.V.Bogdanov, two unequal aspects of speech are speech and text. Speech means everything we say and write. "The terms speech and text are specific in relation to the general term speech that unites them [3].

Discourse is also a text, but it consists of communicative units of language - sentences and their combination into larger units with continuous internal semantic connection, which allows perceiving it as a whole formation. Speeches can be considered, for example, narrative text, articles, speeches, poems. Just as speech is opposed to speech, we believe that text is opposed to speech.

Since the structure of speech implies the existence of two roles - the speaker and the receiver - which are sharply opposed to each other, the process of linguistic communication itself can be considered from these two points of view.

Modelling the processes of speech construction (creation, synthesis) is not the same as modelling the processes of speech understanding (analysis). In the science of speech, two different groups of works are distinguished - those who study the construction of speech (for example, the selection of lexical means when naming an object) and those who study the understanding of speech by the receiver (for example, the question of how the listener understands reduced lexical means, for example, pronouns, connects them with certain objects).

In addition, there is a third point of view - to consider the process of linguistic communication that occurs in the speech process from the point of view of the text itself (for example, pronouns in the text can be considered regardless of the processes of their generation by generations. understanding by the speaker and receiver, simply other parts of the text as structural objects that have some relationship with).[4]

Speech is speech embedded in life. Therefore, the term Discourse, unlike the term text, is not applied to ancient and other texts, whose connections with living speech are not directly restored" [5]. Therefore, the concept of speech includes. Extra linguistic factors, rhythm. A. Kibrik as noted, "Communication is a broader concept than text." Discourse is both the process of linguistic activity and its result.

N. Enquist explains the difference between text and speech as follows: "If we consider the text separately from the situational context, the speech is perceived as part of the situation"

The terminological differences between "text" and "discourse" have given rise to another complex problem - how does textual linguistics differ from discursive analysis?

Discursive analysis is a more interdisciplinary field, attracting not only linguists but also sociologists and psychologists. Despite the difficulties in distinguishing the concepts of text and speech (hence the introduction of discursive analysis with text linguistics and text grammar), text can be distinguished from speech by a factor above.

The text, if its completeness is known, should be studied as a finished reality, and speech should be studied as a process of creating texts with specific characteristics [6]. However, speech is more complex, and in order to analyze it, we need to restore the intention, the thought of the sender of the text, i.e. In addition to the specific information in the text created before our eyes; we need to determine what the meaning behind the text is. Of course, speech, like any natural phenomenon, has a structure.

Despite the large amount of research in this area, linguists can be said to accept that there are similar relationships between components or units in speech. V. Mann and S. Thompson developed the theory of rhetorical structures and prepared an interesting model of speech structure [7]. According to this theory, any speech unit is connected with another unit through a link that has semantic completeness. These relations are called rhetorical relations.

It is impossible not to note one important aspect in the study of communication in speech. There is no semantic relationship between the components in their pure form, that is, in their isolated form. Each time, other semantic combinations are added to a certain degree on top of a certain semantic connection. Moreover, in multi-component discourses, it is not essential that one semantic relationship is expressed from beginning to end. Different types of semantic connections can be made within one speech [8].

It should be taken into account that a number of factors (including not only the deep processes occurring in the language itself, but also factors of a sociolinguistic nature) determines the use of linguistic tools that provide these semantic connections. Factors of a sociolinguistic nature include the characteristics of different functional styles and the requirements for them [9]. Changing these

requirements has a significant impact on the choice of appropriate language tools. However, by itself, one connection is not enough to understand the text.

Thus, the formation of a text that is closely connected between the components, although it does not pose a great enough difficulty, but it is not always possible to understand this text. "Connection" within a text is not based only on the existing connections between words, because there is a factor that allows the receiver of the text to distinguish a text that has semantic integrity from a text that does not. official communication. This factor is called semantic consistency or integrity [10]. The main characteristic of this factor is its presence in society, not in language.

Conclusion and perspective. These linguistic tools, in general, along with the function of organizing events in the plane of time and space, also participate in the thematic development that ensures consistency in speech. In fact, these tools, which play the role of a certain indicator for the recipient of the opposite text, have a certain information load, and finally, taking into account the ability of a person to store a certain amount of information in memory, these tools have a cognitive function that provides global communication in speech.

List of Used Literature:
1. Arutyunova N. D. Diskurs / N. D. Arutyunova // Katta ensiklopedik lug'at. Tilshunoslik. - M., 1998. - S. 136-137.
2. Bogdanov VV Matn va matnli aloqa / VV Bogdanov. - Sankt-Peterburg . : Sankt -Peterburg nashriyoti . davlat unta, 1993. - 68 b.
3. Kibrik A. A. Diskurs va funksionalizmning paydo bo'lishi / A. A. Kibrik , V. A. Plungyan // Zamonaviy Amerika tilshunosligi: asosiy yo'nalishlar. - M.: URSS tahririyati , 2002. -S. 307-309.
4. Mamedov A. Ya. Matnning kognitiv tuzilishi / A. Ya. Mamedov, M. E. Mamedov // Vestnik MSLU. - M.: Rema, 2007. - Nashr . 521. - S. 167-171.
5. Chafe V. Diskurs, ong va vaqt. Nutq va yozishda ongli tajribaning oqimi va o'zgarishi / Chafe V. - Chikago: Chikago universiteti. - Matbuot, 1994 yil.
6. Chomskiy N. Sintaksis nazariyasining aspektlari / N. Chomskiy // Kembrij: MIT Press, 1965 yil.
7. Daniyalik Fr. A. Sintaksisga uch darajali yondashuv / Daniyaliklar Fr. A.- Travaux linguistigue de Praga, 1966. -P. 56-58.
8. Enkvist NE Matndan talqin qilinishiga: matn tilshunosligidagi asosiy atamalarni muhokama qilishga hissa. Bog'lanish va uyg'unlik : matn va nutq tahlili / Enkvist NE - Nyu-York, 1989. - P. 369-382.
9. Ford C. O'zaro ta'sirdagi grammatika: Amerika ingliz tilidagi suhbatda qo'shimcha gaplar / Ford C. - Kembrij universiteti nashriyoti, 1993 yil.
10. Givon T. Sintaksis: Funktsional-tipologik kirish / Givon T. -Amsterdam, 1990. - 2-jild.
11. Hopper P. Emergent grammatikasi - Berkli tilshunosligining yillik yig'ilishi materiallari / Hopper P. 1987, Jamiyat 13: P. 139-157.