

DISCOURSE AND ITS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS SPECIFICALLY TYPES

Laylo Muminbayevna Rakhimova,
Independent Researcher, Urganch State University

Abstract

The article discusses the concept of discourse, definitions of this term, and their types. Also, comments on the differences between oral and written discourse are also presented with the help of theoretical arguments.

Keywords: language signs, discourse, oral communication, taxonomy, theory of speech acts, sociolinguistics, ethnography, pragmatics.

Introduction

First, it is appropriate to pay attention to the definitions and approaches given to the term discourse. Many opinions have been expressed about the meaning of this term. There is much confusion in linguistics about its definition. The term is French for "speech" and its basic meaning is "to speak". In linguistics, it is often used in the sense of "sequence of words".

"Discourse is a term used by grammarians to refer to 'larger' parts of speech and writing: as a linguistic unit it is larger than a sentence."

But some scientists have assigned to this term a more precise meaning that implies and assumes more understanding: J. Habermas states that "Discourse is a free and fair form of linguistic communication, its goal is to find the truth." According to M. Foucault, the term "discourse" is a speech that he uses to describe the level of language that is organized in a way that differs from all traditional linguistic theories of language, but is nevertheless necessary for linguistic and philosophical research, and this is exactly what it is. is the concept of speech that I mainly accept.

Discourse is a term that defines the method of forming a sequence of sentences, participating in a whole, both homogeneous and heterogeneous. Therefore, discourse is an idea in the form of a meaningful message, command or question, intended by the author, expressed using language that is very suitable for sentences and texts. "The text is a source of information in written form with a beginning and an end in the course of normal events. Discourse is an expression of thought created by the interaction of all factors of a person and selected in accordance with the purpose and style of communication. Speech is through language. is related to the continuation of the exchange of meaning" and suggests that it should not be confused with the text and sentence category units emphasized by N. Chomsky. It contains elements of both and yet transcends this distinction, as it is an object of study regardless of language use, rules, or single topics of conversation. However, the discourse is the past and the future with all the possible and actual words that can be said. Each word is a part of the world of human linguistic speech. But if people are capable of understanding words, language users must at least believe that words are related to common knowledge. In order to make a language meaningful, there must be some reliable rules, recent patterns of language use that can be related to future implementations. The most widely accepted set of rules is grammar. But the same applies to other forms of use, for example, in relation to the topic under consideration or the choice of sign system and communicative channel (the difference between speech and writing, the qualities of

signs in written or printed language, accent and oral properties of sound in language). So we can define what is meant by the term "discourse". Discourse is a series of words with a definite order in relation to the means by which the words can be understood. It should be noted that this "string of words" in a discourse is not necessarily a string of words put in one order or another by one author. For example, in the discussion of a teacher-student interaction, he uses as many words as possible, regardless of "who it belongs to". In this case, it becomes clear that speech in the discourse of communication is largely related to the production of meaning. What can be done about the creation of meaning in general is transcendental (in transcendental-idealist philosophy: unattainable to knowledge, located outside of experience) may be asked, but this question, while certainly interesting and very important, refers to the fact that there are countless examples of this phenomenon (perlocution is the specific state of the response in this situation).

Discourse analysis in communicative discourse has become a large and heterogeneous discipline, which shows its unity in the description of the language above and behind the sentence, and in the interest in the context and cultural influences that affect the language in use. For example, the speaker asks:

'Why are you crying? The listener throws dice without answering. In this form of communication, the listener's response does not conform to the standard sentence form, but the meaning is clear, and the context leaves no doubt in the speaker's mind about the cause and effect of the listener's dice, so speech is both at the beginning and at the end of the sentence. requires finding a language of communication and taking additional measures if necessary. These are segments of language that may be larger or smaller than a single sentence, but the added meaning is always outside the topic of communication. This applies not only to the description and analysis of verbal interaction, but also to written speech. People encounter hundreds of written and printed words every day: newspapers, recipes, stories, letters, comics, notices, instructions, flyers, and more. They usually expect coherent, meaningful communication in which words or sentences are connected to each other in a way that conforms to conventional formulas, which we do only through speech.

Discourse analysis is gaining more and more attention in various disciplines. These include: taxonomy, speech act theory, sociolinguistics, ethnography, pragmatics, conversation analysis and variational discourse analysis (also critical discourse analysis, narrative analysis, discursive psychology, etc.) and from philosophy to linguistics, semiotics, sociology, is also related to anthropology. Such a wide range of its fields shows that the concept of speech itself is quite broad. It may also explain why discourse analysis has emerged as a special interest in the last few decades. The fact that different fields find the study of discourse useful represents a major cultural and epistemological shift.

Speaking and writing have slightly different requirements related to the functions they perform. Recording has the advantage of relative permanence, which allows the recording function to be independent of the memory of the record keeper. Written speech can communicate over long distances, i.e. through letters, newspapers, etc., and can be printed simultaneously in large numbers by all kinds of publications. The invention of the tape recorder, telephone, radio and television helped to overcome the limitations of spoken language in relation to time, distance and numbers.

Written speech is not only a constant, but also a visual expression of language signs. An important consequence of this is that the writer can review what he has already written, pause between each

word without fear of the interlocutor interrupting him. He can take his time choosing a particular word, and even look it up in a dictionary if necessary. Written language allows the creation of works of art in a way comparable to the creation of a painting or sculpture. Speaking, on the other hand, retains functions that writing can never perform. For example, quick, direct communication with the recipient's immediate feedback. The speaker must observe what he has just said and determine whether it corresponds to his desire to communicate or not, while he prepares to say his next thought, follows it, and at the same time chooses words that are suitable for the expression of his thought. zi adapts to the general pattern of the desired communication goal. Speaking and monitoring, in addition, it controls not only its performance, but also its reception by the audience.

The view that written and spoken speech, in general, perform completely different functions in society, has always been put forward by scientists whose main interest is in anthropology and sociology. Goody suggests that analytical thinking followed the acquisition of written language, "because the marking of this discourse enabled man to distinguish words clearly, to control their order, and to develop syllogistic forms of thought." However, we cannot deny that speaking is a daily activity for almost everyone, while written speech may not be. Speaking and writing are not complementary, and we cannot say that one is more important than the other.

The difference between oral and written discourse is manifested in its results and forms as well as its function. Non-linguistic features of speech, such as rhythm, intonation, sighs, gestures, and facial expressions, are absent in written speech. Verbal speech can also be accompanied by non-verbal communication such as gestures and facial expressions, as speech is usually used in face-to-face situations. These characteristics cannot be easily conveyed through written speech. Written speech also has several features that speech lacks. This includes punctuation, paragraphs, and capitalization of letters. In written speech, intonation can be conveyed by punctuation to some extent, but not completely. The intonation of the sentence "I'll buy you a dress from the High Street" varies depending on whether the action, object, person or place is the most important idea. Thus, without intonation differences, it is difficult to convey different meanings in written speech without changing the structure of the sentence.

REFERENCES:

1. Schiffrin D. Approaches to Discourse. Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1994. – P.363.
2. Schiffrin D. Discourse Markers. –Cambridge University Press, 1987.
3. Slembrouck, S., 2004. Reflexivity and the research interview. Habitus and class in parents' accounts of children in public care. *Critical Discourse Studies* 1 (1), 91–112.
4. Stubbs M. Discourse analysis. – Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983. – Pp. xiv + 272.
5. Habermas, J. Theory of communicative action, vol. 1, trans. T. McCarthy. – London: Heinemann, 1984.
6. Фуко М. Дискурс и истина. – Минск, 2006.
7. Goody J. The domestication of the savage mind. –New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977. – Pp. 179.