

## The Problem Of Models Of Discourse In Linguistics

**Kuldasheva Shakhnoza Akramovna**

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Associate-Professor, UzSWLU, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: [skuldasheva@mail.ru](mailto:skuldasheva@mail.ru)

Tel.: +998909514685

**Ochilova Vazira Rustamovna**

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Associate-Professor, UzSWLU, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: [vazira.ochilova@gmail.com](mailto:vazira.ochilova@gmail.com)

Tel.: +998974125201

### Abstract

The present article discusses the issue of nomination and categorization of meanings manifested in the in discourse. In world linguistics, the basis of discourse theory is the study of linguistic phenomena and their formal aspects. From this point of view of semiotics, the necessity of studying the phenomenon from the linguacultural point of view is closely related to the growing interest to analyzing the interdisciplinary connection of the existing paradigm of modern knowledge, within the framework of which it determines the consideration of discourse, which is the first aspect of the linguistic phenomenon, on the basis of its connection with such branches of sciences as logic, psychology, sociology. The essence of discourse is based on the idea that home-eloquent of people speaking different languages have a different national, linguistic or cultural picture of the world, existence, based on the structural and functional capabilities of their language. This idea, put forward by W. von Humboldt, was later enthusiastically supported by the majority of the contemporary and preceding linguists and research was conducted using different languages as examples. However, linguists who have studied this theory practically used world languages as examples and they have tried and continue to try to verify whether this idea is correct or incorrect only through the example of language vocabulary composition.

**Keywords:** discourse, text, verbal communication, pragmatics, culture, context, explication, proposition, presupposition.

### Introduction

The main features of the category of discourse in English and Uzbek theoretical linguistics are considered from the point of view of the functional approach and the cognitive-discursive paradigm. In its turn, the study of phenomena reflecting not only the peculiarities of the languages at the center of the research, but also the national-mental characteristics formed on the basis of the culture, spirituality, customs, traditions, and values of the people, in particular, the category of discourse, was considered an important issue in the linguocognitive aspect.

The concept of discourse clearly reflects the integration of sciences, which is happening very rapidly in the modern period. It has a special definition in each of the fields of science, such as literary studies, linguistics, philosophy, history, sociology, anthropology, pedagogy, political science, and has also become one of the central problems of discursive analysis, which is considered one of the new directions today. As is known, discourse (Fr. Discourse - speech, action) is interpreted in several senses in world linguistics. This term initially denoted the concept of connected text, but later began to be used in relation to the concepts of conversation and dialogue. [2]

One of the main problems of linguistics is the issue of discourse. Discourse is derived from the Latin word "discourse," meaning sensory, direct, intuitive, that is, in contrast to knowledge that requires discussion, logical evidence - evidential knowledge - obtained directly through discussion.

### Literature analysis

The concept of discourse was first introduced by Z. Harris in 1952. Ten years later, the term discourse began to be used in new different meanings in a number of linguistic schools and doctrinal directions that existed in European linguistics. For example, in tagmemics (Pike 1967, Grimes 1975, Longacre 1976), in general linguistics (Halliday M.A.K. 1961, Hartman 1964, 1968, Harweg 1968, Petofi 1971, Van Dijk 1972, Dressler 1973, Schmidt 1973), in the study of grammar, stylistics, poetics (J. Leech 1966, D. Crystal, J. Javi 1969), in text grammar (Sinclair, Coulthavd 1975, Dressler 1981), in functional paradigm analysis (Givon 1979), in sociolinguistics (W. Labov 1972, Gumpers, Hymes 1972, Bauman Scherzer 1974, Sanches, Blount 1975), in ethnometodology (Sudnow 1972, Sacks, Scheglofg, Jefferson 1974, Schenkein 1978), in psycholinguistics (Clark and Clark 1977, Fodor, Bever and Garreff 1974). On the role of discourse in pedagogical and psychological issues of text comprehension, Rothkoff 1972, Meyer 1975, and from 1978, the scientific journal "Discourse Processing" began to be published in this direction. All this leads to the intensification of the process of diversification in the concept of discourse and its meaning and application.

### Theoretical basis

Theoretically, the category of discourse has a logical structure. In science, for a certain discourse, the initial structure has the form of a sequence of propositions of elements interconnected by conjunction, disjunction, and other logical relations. Here, the elements of discourse are not the described

events, phenomena, their participants, performative information, and phenomena, but a) expected situations after the events; b) the existing background that clarifies the events; c) the assessment of the participants of the event in this discourse; d) information that compares the focused discourse with the events. [7].

Discourse, together with all the extralinguistic factors inherent in it, can be understood as a text or speech in action, containing existing thoughts, views, assessments, the purpose of the addressee. In this case, discourse as a language cannot be considered simply as an object of theoretical grammar, stylistics, or lexicology. It exists, first of all, in texts, but in such texts, behind which there is a separate grammar, a separate vocabulary, its own use and less strict rules of syntax, and similar semantics, in a word, theoretically, discourse is a separate world.

### Results and Discussions

When discussing the theory of discourse and its main problems, it is also necessary to dwell on the most important categories of discourse - *explication* and *implication*. [4]

In the analysis of the speech process, the mutual theoretical correspondence of the phenomena of explicitness and implicitness in discourse is relevant. This shows that the expression of the proposition in the process of communication is not limited only to language units, and nonverbal means also play a certain role in this. The modern information-code model of communication requires considering the internal (cognitive) and external (perceptual) possibilities of the context for expressing thoughts, describing inferential mechanisms. In this case, the meaning of "explicitness" is important.

The degree of explicitness of the expressed thought is determined by the presence of formal (in particular, linguistic) components, the implicature of discourse ensures the assimilation of the original directions of conventionally undefined

meaning and content. According to G.P. Grays, the boundary between "to speak" and "to marry" determines the essence of modern linguopragmatics. In this case, the second direction of content is determined by the categories of discourse, implicature, which considers non-conforming, undefined conventional directions of meaning and content.

Communicative implicature is determined depending on the meaningful digression in the expression of intended and implied thoughts depending on the speech situation. Communicative implicature has a number of features that distinguish it from other types of implicit information in discourse. These are:

- their quantity is excluded from the meaning of the statement;
- unlike the presupposition, they are inseparable from the meaning of the thought; they are not conventional, nor are they a conventional part of the linguistic form.

There are several analytical methods of discourse analysis, and V.Z.Demyankov distinguishes two types. [5]

**1. Formal models** - they do not take into account the semantic qualities of language forms and are studied in isolation from the historical aspects of language. These include the theory of speech acts, speech analysis, and speech ethnography. These models are aimed at describing communicative competence. Formal theories of discourse consider the forms of the existence of spoken language from the point of view of considering human interaction in a sociological aspect. The units under study are at the sentence level, for example, speech acts and the course of communication and the exchange of replies can be included in these units. [3]

**2. Semantic models** - in which discourse analysis focuses on both theoretical and practical semantic and historical aspects. An example of this is M.Foucault's

approach. [8] He understands discourse as "the sum of performances by means of words," and his discourse analysis is aimed at explaining the phenomenon of speech activity, more precisely, the phenomenon of activity generated by a set of signs. [1]

The model of discourse analysis developed by T. van Dijk caused more controversy in linguistics. Let us analyse on the main aspects of this model.

1. T. van Dijk's discourse analysis encompasses both formal and semantic aspects, understood as a communicative phenomenon and verbal interaction, put forward by V.Z.Demyankov.

2. According to this model, discourse analysis is considered as a product of speech, and the text is considered as a product of writing the communicative phenomenon as a whole in context.

3. With this approach, T. van Dijk emphasizes that discourse is open, not closed. In his opinion, discourse analysis transfers us to other discourses using models and social contexts. [6] Discourse analysis moves from the macro environment to the micro environment and vice versa within the framework of speech, text, context, society.

According to T. van Dijk's models, the main principles of discourse analysis are as follows:

1. study of the natural language of text and speech;
2. application of context (social and cultural).
3. consideration of written and oral discourse as a social practice of its participants;
4. Study of oral speech, but this should not completely negate writing;
5. taking into account the categorization created by its participants in the analysis of discourse;
6. clarification of the general significance and function of discourse;

7. analysis of discourse in all directions and at all levels (sound, grammatical, semantic);
8. taking into account the constructiveness of discourse, since its constructive elements can be understood and studied as parts of other elements, functionally used;
9. consideration of general grammatical, communicative rules and rules of speech interaction, as well as consideration of changes, negations, and violations of existing rules in this discourse;
10. identify the strategies used by language users to achieve the discourse goal.

### Conclusion

As a result of studying the issue of nomination and categorization of meanings manifested in the discourse, we came to the following conclusions. The speaker's attitude towards discourse information can be as follows.

- a. In the discourse in which the speech takes place, the speaker believes in what he is saying and wants others to believe in him;
- b. In discourse, the speaker does not believe in what they are saying themselves but wants others to believe them.

In order to ensure the semantic structure and logical consistency of the discourse text and to perceive it in its entirety, it is necessary to understand the structural and compositional integrity in it and the connections and relationships between its constituent parts, and to be able to adequately assess it. If the relationship, the connection between the parts that make up the text is disrupted, if the beginning comes in place of the end, the middle comes out to the beginning, the contextual integrity of the transmitted information is disrupted, and the discourse cannot fulfill the communicative task expected from it.

### Bibliography

Dijk T.A. van. Studies in the pragmatics of discourse. The Hague. - Paris: Mouton: 1981, - 331pp.

Harris Z. Discourse Analysis. // Language. - Vol. 28, No. 1 - 1952. - pp. 1-30.

Qo'ldashev A.M. Tilni egallashda lisoniy va madaniy dunyoqarashning roli. NamDU Ilmiy Axborotnomasi. – 2024. - 4-son. - 704-706 bb.

Qo'ldasheva Sh. A. Tilshunoslik sohalari orasida lingvokulturologiyaning tutgan o'рни. NamDU Ilmiy Axborotnomasi. – 2025. - 2-son. - 426-428 bb.

Демьянков В.З. Функционализм в зарубежной лингвистике конца XX века. / В кн.: Дискурс, речь, речевая деятельность, - М: РАН, ИНИОН, 2000. - С. 26-136.

Ochilova V.R. Talabalarga ingliz tilidagi leksik birliklarni metakognitiv yondashuv asosida o'rgatish. (Monografiya) – Toshkent: "BAYOZ", 2023. – 120 bet.

Степанов, Ю.С. Альтернативный мир, Дискурс, Факт и принцип Причинности / Ю.С. Степанов. – Москва // Язык и наука конца XX века: сборник статей / Ред. Ю.С. Степанов. – Москва: Институт языкознания РАН, 1995. – С. 35-73.

Фуко М. Археология знания. / М.Фукокиев. Ника - центр, 2006. – 418 с.

Dunbar R.J.M. Grooming, Gossip, and the Evolution of Language. Current Anthropology. 34:2. – 1993. – P. 69-79.

Seabright P. The Company of Strangers: A Natural History of Economic life. – Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004. – 261 p.

Keeley H.L. War before Civilization: The Myth of the Peaceful Savage. – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996. – P. 57-73.