

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 10 Volume: 102

Published: 25.10.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Nurislom Iskandrovich Khursanov

Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi
Teacher, Department of “Intercultural Communication and Tourism”,

nurislomkhursanov92@gmail.com
khursanovnurislom@navoiy-uni.uz

Shahzoda Bahtiyor kizi Gulyamova

Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi
Teacher, Department of “English Language”,

Shahzodagulyamova1992@mail.ru

LINGUISTIC CLASSIFICATIONS RELATED TO DISCOURSE AND ITS CLASSIFICATIONS

Abstract: *Leaning language is rather different than from its investigation. Because language is defined as natural and social process; moreover, to clarify it changes through years and social interactions than accelerated by up to date technologies and social media. The present article is about linguistics classifications that related to discourse and its own classifications where two types of communication cross: oral and written. Furthermore, this paper discusses discourse and its own classifications from the point of pragmatics, conversation analysis, psychology, philosophy, anthropology, ethnology. In terms of sociology, discourse and speech is just a means of communication that is used by people. You can find more about these on the pages.*

Key words: *Discourse, discursive analysis, modern linguistics, method, feedback, pragmatics, conversation analysis, textual linguistics, and relevance theory, computer linguistics, artificial intelligence, psychology, philosophy, logic, sociology, anthropology, ethnology.*

Language: English

Citation: Khursanov, N. I., & Gulyamova, Sh. B. (2021). Linguistic classifications related to discourse and its classifications. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 10 (102), 825-829.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-10-102-92> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.10.102.92>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

As a result of the development of linguistics, new fields began to emerge. Different fields of modern linguistics differ from each other in the object of research, methodological issues, and at the same time require each other. Discourse is one of the most important issues in pragmatic linguistics and cognitive linguistics. Many modern linguists connect the concept of discourse directly with the text [1]. In some cases, it is recognized as a collection of combined texts. The text can be considered the same [2]. Zellig Harris was the first to use the terms discourse and discursive analysis as a method of connected speech and writing analysis. In general, if we look at the history of the emergence and formation of the concept

of discourse, the views expressed in the 60s of the last century can be divided into two:

- 1- Harris (1952)
- 2-Mitchell (1957) (Coulthard 1985: 3).

The main findings and results

Zellig Harris's article “Discourse Analysis” provides some initial comments on discourse. According to him, discourse analysis is a formal analysis of interconnected oral and written speech, while not requiring the analyst to analyze the meaning of each morpheme. Discourse, according to Zellig Harris (1951), “In modern descriptive linguistics, more than one word is usually not taken into account. The linguist usually considers the interdependence of the elements in only one sentence at a time. This gives

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

a possible description of the material because the interrelationship of the elements within each word (or word type) is developed and the other speech has a sequence of words, i.e. interrelationships described as a sequence of elements. This limitation means that nothing is said about the interrelationship between all the words in the sequence". As an example of the application of the Harris approach, he cites a text containing the following four sentences as an example:

Daraxtlar bu yerda kuzning o'rtalarida aylanadi.

Daraxtlar bu yerda oktyabr oyining oxirida aylanadi.

Birinchi sovuq kuzning o'rtasidan keyin keladi.

Biz oktyabr oyining oxiridan keyin isitishni boshlaymiz.

The trees rotate here in mid-autumn.

The trees here turn around in late October.

The first frost comes after mid-autumn.

We will start heating after the end of October.

The purpose of the analysis is to distinguish units of text that are equivalent in distribution but do not have the same meaning; these are only considered to be true equivalents for the text [3, p. 30].

Grenoble (2000), commenting on Harris's description of the discourse, says:

"Harris makes discourse-analytical research more interesting. He argues that linguistic research is based on feedback elements, that discourse should be considered a continuation of thought. Harris argues that the study of the relationship between words within the discourse required more information than the processing of the theoretical apparatus of the period in the volume of speech analysis. While this is true for the 1950s and 1960s, it is approximate, but in the 1970s a variety of approaches emerged, such as pragmatics, conversation analysis, textual linguistics, and relevance theory" [4].

According to Harris and Grenoble's definition of discourse, discourse is based on the interrelationship of words in any form of speech. This definition, as one of the first definitions of discourse, can be said to represent only one aspect of it. This is because the relationship between the words does not reveal the whole point of the discourse. At the same time it represents a certain aspect. The Collins concise English dictionary, published in 1988, provides seven different interpretations of discourse:

Discourse: 1. Verbal communication, talk, conversation. 2. A formal treatment of a subject in speech or writing. 3. A unit of text used by linguistic phenomena that range over more than one sentences. 4. To discourse: the ability to reason (archaic). 5. To discourse on/upon to speak or write about formally. 6. To hold discussion 7. To give forth (music) (archaic) [5]. It appears that discourse has the following 7 etymological meanings:

1. Verbal communication; conversation, conversation; 2. A means of formal communication in speaking or writing a topic 3. A unit of text used by linguists to analyze linguistic phenomena involving several sentences; 4. Speech: ability to think (archaic); 5. Formal speaking or writing; 6. Discussion; 7. (Music) (Archaic) (14th century, from Medieval Latin.)

The Longman Dictionary of English defines discourse as follows:

Discourse. 1. Conversation, especially of a formal nature; formal and orderly expression in the form of ideas in speech or writing [6].

While there is not enough clear information about the history of the origin of many concepts and terms in linguistics, there is still no clear explanation for the complexity of the interpretation of "text" and "discourse". Because the two concepts are so similar and interrelated, linguists need special research [15, pp. 37-50].

In the 1950s, in the process of developing Emile Benvenist's theory, he used the term discourse, which is characteristic of French linguistics, in a new sense, describing it as "speech mastered by the speaker" [7]. In 1952, Zelig Harris published an article entitled Discourse analysis, which deals with the method of speech in relation to complementary units. While Benwinist considered discourse to be the speaker's interpretation of speech, Harris's research was a sequence of sentences, a piece of text larger than a sentence.

Professor T.A. van Dyke interpreted the discourse in a much broader (complex speech phenomenon). Discourse is an event of communication between the listener and the speaker that takes place at a specific time and place in a particular context. This communication can be verbal, verbal, written, verbal or nonverbal. Examples include a regular conversation with a friend, a dialogue between a doctor and a patient, and reading a newspaper [1].

In the discourse, T.A. van Dyke emphasizes only the oral form of communication and calls it "text" or "conversation". In this case, the discourse is interpreted as a completed or ongoing "product" of the process of communication with the recipients, that is, in general, the discourse is the product of the written or oral communication process.

The broad and narrow concepts of discourse have the same general meaning in the context of the term "discourse", such as "this discourse", "these discourses", "its discourse" in the objects of the situation.

According to linguists, including T.A. Van Dyke and Z.Y. Turayeva [8], the concept of "discourse" is as vague as "concepts of language, society, ideology". There is no clear and generally accepted explanation that covers all aspects of the use of discourse.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

The same can be said of the text. Many linguists have not been able to explain the term “text” in the process of studying the text, its essence, and its characteristics [9-10]. Various authors have pointed to different aspects of this situation: D.S. Likhachev to the existence of its owner, which creates a certain content in the text; O.L. Kamensky on his important role as a tool in verbal communication; A.A. Leontyev noted the functional completeness of the speeches and others.

Another traditional interpretation of the text is, first, as a written form of language; secondly, there is a mixture of correct and metonymic meanings: the term “text” means a part of the text. Note the comment by I.R. Galperin: “Text is a written document that is objectified in the form of a document, literary in accordance with the type of document, rounded by various lexical, grammatical, logical, methodological links (title) and a number of units (expressive units) are the result of a speech process with a certain focus and a pragmatic structure completed content [11]. It should be noted that the definitions of the text given here may be questioned and may lead to objections.

As an example, Y.S. Kubryakov noted that “not all texts have a title (individual poems, advertising texts, announcements). About a number of texts it can be assumed that they were not completed by the author; in many cases the poems also end with three dots pointing to an unfinished content. In addition to written texts, texts for oral speeches can also be considered (usually referred to as “message / speech / lecture text”, etc.). Finally, not all texts can be presented as a sequence of super-phrase units - it must be admitted in any case, Entries such as “*No entry*” or “*Cutting flowers are strictly prohibited*” are considered separate texts [12].

However, it should be noted that the concepts of speech (discourse) and text have recently become more popular.

Discourse (speech) is an object of interdisciplinary research. In the study of speech, in addition to theoretical linguistics, computer linguistics, artificial intelligence, psychology, philosophy, logic, sociology, anthropology, ethnology, literature, samiotics, historiography, religion, law, pedagogy, translation practice and theory, etc. 'are permanently connected. Each of these subjects studies speech in its own way.

The concept of discourse changes traditional notions of speech, text, dialogue, style, and even language. There are three main classes of commentary that belong to individual authors and the use of the term “discourse” in accordance with different national traditions [16, pp. 311-318].

The first class includes the absolute linguistic use of the term, which was first used in Harris's Discourse-Analysis. The use of the term “discourse” in linguistics is also different, mainly considering the traditional formation and definition of concepts such

as text, speech and dialogue. On the one hand, discourse is considered as speech in a communicative situation, and therefore is seen as a category with a more explicit social meaning compared to an individual's speech activity. According to N.D. Arutyunov, “discourse is a conversation of life” [13]. On the other hand, the analysis of modern (mid-1970s) practice is concerned with the study of the laws of information movement in the process of communication through replication exchange; thus being a peculiar continuation of a rather structural lineage whose origin goes back to Harris (although it is not usually so called), it describes some structure of the interaction. At the same time, emphasis is placed on the dynamic nature of speech, which aims to distinguish between the traditional notion of speech and the stability of text. The first class of interpretation of the term “discourse” occurs mainly in the scientific tradition of the English language.

The second class of use of the term “discourse” has gone beyond the scope of science in recent years and has become popular in journalism, referring to French structures and poststructuralists, primarily M. Foucault. These expressions explain traditional notions of style (“style means man”) and individual language (“Dostoevsky's style”, “Pushkin's language”, etc.). The term “speech” understood in this way (also made as Foucault used and often used as a synonym with the term “speech practice”) describes a way of speaking and has an absolutely clear definition - WHICH or WHO is speaking because researchers are not interested in any speech, but its specific types are determined by a wide range of parameters. Here, speech is a stylistic identity that contains a specific idea. In addition, it is assumed that the way of speaking mainly determines and creates the subject of the conversation, the relevant institutions.

Finally, there is a third case of the term “discourse” associated with the name of the German philosopher and sociologist Y. Habermas. It may be more specific than the previous concept, but it has important features. In this third concept, “speech” is a special ideal type of communication that takes place in the maximum removal of social reality, traditions, authority, communication situations, etc., and is aimed at critically discussing and justifying the thoughts and actions of the participants.

The three macro concepts listed above (as well as their types) interact and interact with each other. Of course, these views are not exceptions, but complement each other.

The three macro concepts listed above (as well as their types) interact and interact with each other. Of course, these views are not exceptions, but complement each other.

Speaking about the difference between speech and text, T.A. van Dyke argues that speech is spoken text (parole - speech), and “text” is the abstract grammatical structure of spoken words (langue -

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

language). Thus, speech is a concept related to real speech movement, and “text” is a concept related to the language system or formal linguistic knowledge, linguistic competence. In addition, the concepts of “speech” and “text” are sometimes unreasonably divided into two forms of communicative activity - the use and non-use of the letter. However, the communication event can be oral or written, as the speech is “text + situation”. It is unreasonable to say that Dostoevsky’s “biblical speech” or “Dostoevsky’s speech”. There is “religious speech” but there is no “biblical speech” because there is no clear social situation, no portrait of the author, and no dialogue (interaction between author and recipient).

In modern linguistics, the term “discourse” is close to the concept of “text”, but refers to a dynamic, time-consuming feature of communication; on the contrary, text is mainly a static object, formed as a result of linguistic activity. As mentioned above, discourse is a “vital” speech. Therefore, unlike the term “text”, the term “speech” does not apply to ancient and other texts; their connection is not directly restored with living life [13, p. 137].

Sometimes “discourse” involves two components at the same time: the dynamic process of language activity written in its social context and its outcome (i.e., the text). Sometimes it is not appropriate to replace the notion of “discourse” with the phrase “linked text” because any simple text is in fact interconnected.

According to E.S. Kubryakova, from a cognitive and linguistic point of view, the concepts of “speech” and “text” are related to the cause-and-effect relationship: the text is created in speech and is its product. Although the text is formed in the course of a certain process, it is studied in its entirety. This separates him from speech. Speech is a phenomenon that is being studied in its current state and time in relation to its origin and development. In the encyclopedic dictionary of linguistics under the editorship of V.N.Yartsev, speech (discourse) is described as a coherent text with extra linguistic-pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors: secretion and their mechanisms of consciousness (cognitive processes) [14, pp. 85-90]. Speech includes speech paragraphic support, which performs the following basic functions determined by speech structure: rhythmic (“auto-dynamic”), referent, which connects words with the subject area of language use, semantic (see, facial expressions and gestures that accompany certain meanings), emotional and evaluative, the function of influencing the interlocutor, i.e. illocative power (gestures, motives, beliefs). On the one hand, the speech focuses on the pragmatic situation involved in determining its communicative adequacy, explaining its objections and contradictions.

The concepts of “discourse” and “dialogue” are very close in meaning. Speech, like any

communicative action, represents two main functions - the speaker (author) and the receiver. However, the role of speaker and receiver can be redistributed in turn as interlocutors; in which case they switch places around a particular conversation. If the task of the speaker during a speech (or an important part of the speech) belongs to one person, such a speech is a monologue, but it is also wrong to assume that the monologue is a person talking to him: along with the monologue his receiver will also be. In fact, monologue is considered to be a special case of communication, although it is completely different from traditional communication. The words “text” and “dialogue” in general differ in structure and content, and are formed by connotations that prevent their free use. That is why the term “speech” is so convenient to use as a general term that unites all types of language.

Since the structure of speech implies two opposite functions, such as the speaker and the listener (receiver), the process of language communication can be considered as a general situation. Modeling the construction processes of speech (origin, synthesis) is not the same as modeling the processes of speech comprehension (analysis). In linguistics, there are two types of actions - speech (e.g., choosing a lexical tool when calling a specific object) and those who learn the concept of speech by the receiver (e.g., how the listener understands lexical tools, words, and associating them with one or more objects) are available. There is also a third perspective - to consider the process of language communication in terms of the text that emerges in the speech process (e.g., the words in the text can be considered regardless of the origin of the speaker) and the text. The same is true of the compositions compared to other parts.

Conclusion

A text is a combined semantic connection of lexical units whose main features are connection and integrity. Oral and written text acquires “textuality” in terms of structure - external relations, internal meaning, the ability to comprehend in a timely manner, the implementation of the necessary communication conditions, etc., for both texts - something of written and oral significance, their identity, a special branch of philology - a legal form studied in textology. The correctness of the text is provided not only by the language units and their connections, but also by the general knowledge base, the communicative background, so the acceptance of the text depends on the presuppositions. Explaining the concepts of text and speech, modern researchers have argued that text as language material is not always consistent speech, that is, discourse. Not every text is speech, but speech is always text, and vice versa. Because every speech is a text, speech theory is characterized by a high degree of linguistic unity

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

(characterized by the completeness, integrity, connection, and other general features of the text and speech); as well as issues related to speech units, their structure, and segmentation methods with the linguistic text. In order to distinguish between the concepts of “discourse” and “text”, speech theory

always emphasizes the active, dynamic aspect of language: the concept of “discourse” differs from text because it represents language as a process that takes into account the influence of extra-linguistic factors in communication presented as text.

References:

1. Teun van Dijk (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach [Text]*. – London: Sage.
2. Raupova, L., Botirova, A., Musulmanova, N., & Kadyrova, H. (2020). Logical and Grammatical Relations in Word Categories: The Factor of Difference and Incarnation. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*.
3. Harris, Z.S. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*. Vol. 28, No. 1 (Jan. - Mar., 1952), pp. 1-30.
4. Grenoble, L.A. (2000). *Discourse analysis*. USA: Dartmouth College.
5. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/discourse>
6. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.ldoceonline.com/>
7. Benveniste, E. (1985). *On Discourse [Text]*. The Theoretical Essays: Film, Linguistics, Literature. – Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press.
8. Turaeva, Z. Ya. (1986). *Linguistics of the text [Text]*. – Moscow: Education.
9. Kubryakova, E.S. (1994). Text and its understanding [Text]. *Russian text*, No. 2.
10. Babenko, L.G., Vasiliev, I.E., & Kazarin, Yu.V. (2005). *Linguistic analysis of literary text [Text]*. – Moscow: Flinta.
11. Galperin, I.R. (2005). *Text as an object of linguistic research [Text]*. – Moscow: KomKniga.
12. Kubryakova, E.S. (1994). Text and its understanding [Text]. *Russian text*, No. 2.
13. Arutyunova, N. D. (1990). *Discourse. N. D. Arutyunov. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary*. – Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia.
14. Khursanov, N. I. (2021). Linguo-cognitive Analysis of the Verbs of Behavior Expressing Human Personality (Behavior) (On The Basis of Uzbek and English Languages Materials). *Current research journal of philological sciences* 2(5): 85-90, May 2021 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37547/philological-crjps-02-05-19> ISSN 2767-3758
15. Raupova, L. (2012). *yapısal dilbiliminde birleşik cümlelerle ilgili sorunlar*. Problems About Compound Sentences in Structural Linguistics. Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi. (pp. 37-50).
16. Khursanov, N. I. (2021). *On the Theoretical and Practical Foundations of Language Corpora*. ISSN: 2278-4853 Vol 10, Issue 9, September, 2021, pp.311-318. DOI:10.5958/2278-4853.2021.00675.3