

**THE THEORETICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONCEPT OF DISCOURSE IN
LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES**

Boltaeva Zilola

PhD student of SamSIFL

Abstract: In linguistics, the term "discourse" is traditionally interpreted in terms of concepts such as speech, communication, speech activity, text, communicative situation, monologue, dialogue, and conversation, and, unlike a language unit that is limited to the semantic syntactic analysis of a sentence, it refers to the essence of the content understood from the utterance. "Discourse analysis" The term was first used by the linguist Zellig,

In his 1952 article "Discourse Analysis," Harris defines discourse analysis as the analysis of the meaning and content relationships of connected communication or written speech that goes beyond the traditional analysis of utterances within the framework of descriptive linguistics [1].

Keywords: discourse, linguistic expression, communicative units, pragmatics, dynamic discourse space

Many scholars have conducted research on the concept of discourse and have tried to analyze and interpret it in different ways, and have divided it into types according to its content and function. According to English linguist Guy Cook (1991), discourse is a series of sentences that are interconnected and have a single meaning and are understandable to the listener. This integration is considered important for communication and is difficult to understand only through grammatical analysis of sentences. According to Cook, English exists as an object of study in two ways: the first is a form of teaching and learning, or a form of learning grammatical rules, and the second is discourse, which may or may not be grammatically complete, but is understandable to the speaker and listener - the actual English language. The development of discourse analysis as a separate discipline in the 1960s and early 1970s, as a result of research conducted in various disciplines, including linguistics, semiotics, anthropology, psychology and sociology, was formed as a result of in-depth study of the above. For example, the works of many scholars are evidence of the above. J. L. Austin, with his work *How to Do Words* (1962), gave an idea of his famous social theory, speech-act theory, Dell Hymes (1964) in his work *Toward a Brighter Social Future through the Study of Discourse*, and John Searle (1969) developed and improved on Austin's work. The linguist-philosopher, M. A. K. Halliday, did a great service in clarifying the linguistic characteristics of discourse (Halliday 1961) and in 1970 formulated to some extent the functional approach to language (Halliday 1973).

Celce Murcia and Olstein have defined discourse as a language that has a harmony of form and meaning and emphasizes the expression of mutual relations, and have analyzed it mainly as two types: written discourse and spoken discourse (Celce Murcia & Olstein 2000). Written discourse includes journalism (news articles and editorials), scientific works (books, scientific research papers and scientific journals), literature (fiction, historical works, poetry and drama), letters (personal, business, professional), scripts (film, television, radio), Internet writings (e-mails, electronic sites, etc.). Examples of spoken discourse include dialogue, conversation, lecture, interview, sermon, speech, news, etc.[2]

Discourse, as Harris argued, is the relationship between language and context, and he used the example of "The runway is full at the moment" to illustrate that discourse can have different

meanings in different contexts. The same discourse can be perceived differently in different situations: an air traffic controller telling ^{two} flight controllers that there is no room for the plane to land at the moment, or telling those waiting for it the reason for its delay. Hymes (1964)'s research on the concept of ethnography of communication has shown that communication in different cultural societies is different. Hymes' work was a challenge to the prevailing view in linguistics at the time that cultural and anthropological considerations were irrelevant to the study of language. In particular, he argued that speech acts are determined by who is speaking, to whom, about what, for what purpose, where and when, and by the cultural context of the speaker and his or her way of life. Hymes rightly pointed out that the process of speaking, understanding the meaning of words alone, does not help to understand the general meaning of the conversation, but that understanding the meaning depends largely on the context. The famous anthropologist Dell Hymes promoted this idea at a time when the analysis of grammatical rules played an important role in the linguistics of his time, and while being able to analyze phonemes and morphemes was interesting, it was not enough to fully understand communication, because he observed the way members of different nations and cultures use language elements and realized that it was different in different cultural societies.[3]

In some languages, direct instructions are not given to perform a task, otherwise they are understood as a call to fight/threat, and are manifested as an act of rudeness. For example, the phrase "Open the door" is grammatically correct, but culturally it can be perceived as derogatory or rude in a social context [4] and instead it is preferred to use the phrase "Let's leave the door open". In another cultural society, such expressions are considered normal. Hymes called the difference in such linguistic expressions between cultures the situation. In some situations (in the family circle, in the circle of friends, mourning, wedding, official ceremony, etc.) it is reflected by the active appearance of communication, while in others it is reflected by the absence of communication.

Gumperz and other linguists argue that it is necessary to consider broader socio-political contexts in terms of culture.

Locational communication occurs because these contexts can reveal features of communication that are not visible from a narrow focus based solely on communicative examples. An important development of ethnography and in related fields, attention has been paid to how socio-political contexts can be determined and reinforced by the characteristics of communication, as well as those that determine them. Mitchell (1957) was one of the first researchers to study the discursive structure of texts, examining the ways in which people engage in speech activity in the process of buying and selling. He examined the general structure of such texts and identified the stages of discursive analysis; the stages through which language users go through the process of communicating with each other.

At the same time, Mitchell emphasized how language is used, and how meaning is important in the context of a situation during general communication.

Discourse as a social construction of reality, texts as communicative units emerge as a result of social and cultural practices, and conversely, written texts and spoken ^{discourse} shape the world and discourse is shaped by changes in the world. In other words, discourse is able to shape the society in which a language is spoken and to shape the language people use. Discourse also takes on a certain form based on the interaction of what is said, what is said and what is spoken, and it shapes the range of possible purposes of texts (Johnstone 2007). Cook (1989) in his work on discourse argues that while pragmatics encompasses the physical, social and psychological

aspects of language, discourse shows the interaction of these elements. While pragmatics shows that the content develops around a single goal, discourse describes itself over time (sometimes over a long period), like a moving film.[3] Cook (1989) divides discourse into formal (pre-planned) and informal in terms of structure, and reciprocal (based on mutual communication) and non-reciprocal (lecture, book, etc.) in terms of type. Many linguists from the Commonwealth of Independent States have conducted research on discourse and expressed their opinions. For example, ND Arutyunova on discourse expressed the idea that "a coherent text, combined with extralinguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors", "speech embedded in life". EFKirov noted that discourse is the sum of written and oral texts in a given language within a given culture throughout the entire history of its existence. E.S.Kubryakova and O.V.Aleksandrova interpret discourse as a cognitive process associated with the production of speech, the creation of a speech work, and they imagine the text as the final result of the process of linguistic activity, which has a certain finished (and fixed) form.[5] Yu. S. Stepanov, on the other hand, defines discourse as the highest level of linguistic unity with structural and functional specificity, which is "a new feature of the language at the end of the 20th century. In other words, as a speech act, the speaker's speech expression (verbal-intonational and paralinguistic), extra-linguistic factors (social, cultural, psychological aspects necessary for effective speech interaction, etc.) are understood. Another Russian linguist defines discourse as follows: the structural-textual approach to defining speech shifts the emphasis to the text, its important component, and to a greater extent analyzes the text structure. In this regard, determining the position of the text in speech is of great importance: "In the dynamic speech field, the text occupies a central place: it can be defined as "folded" speech [6] according to the nature of its oral/written form. If speech is defined as the process of using language. In oral and written speech, text is usually understood as "any written speech (literary work, essay, document, etc., as well as a part of them, an excerpt)".[6]

References:

1. Harris ZS Discourse Analysis: Reprints. "Papers on Formal Linguistics". – The Hague, 1952. – P.16.
2. Brian Paltridge. Discourse analysis. An introduction 2012.- p. 2
3. Barbara Johnstone & Christopher Eisenhart. Rhetoric in detail. **ansi z39.48-1984**. Rhetoric in detail: discourse analyzes of rhetorical talk and text / edited by Barbara Johnstone and Christopher Eisenhart.
4. Aiman Reyaz, Priyanka Tripathi . School of Humanities and Social Sciences . Indian Institute of Technology Patna Bihta- 801 103 (Bihar), INDIA
5. Vasileva N. V. Kratkiy slovar lingvisticheskikh terminov / N. V. Vasileva, V. A. Vinogradov, A. M. Shakhnarovich / Otv. ed. chl.-corr. RAN Yu. N. Karaulov. - M.: Russian. write. 1996. – 175 p.
6. Andreeva V. A. Literary narrative: discourse and text: Monograph / V. A. Andreeva. - SPb.: Norma, 2006. - 182 p.
7. Yu. S. Stepanov Alternativnyy mir, Discourse, Fact and Principle Prichinnosti // Yazyk i nauka kontsa 20th century. Sat. state. - M.: RGGU, 1995. - P.35-73. (excerpt, section 1 - str. 36-45)