

Impact Factor:

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

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHLI (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](https://doi.org/10.1/TAS) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

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

Year: 2022 Issue: 01 Volume: 105

Published: 30.01.2022 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Anvar Gofurovich Mukhiddinov

Ferghana State University
Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor,
Department of Russian Philology, Faculty of Philology,
Ferghana City, Uzbekistan

Lyudmila Aleksandrovna Filippova

Ferghana State University
Master's Student Of Linguistics (Russian language) Direction,
Year 1, Faculty of Philology,
Ferghana City, Uzbekistan

THE PRAGMALINGUISTIC ASPECT OF STUDYING THE STRUCTURE OF DISCOURSE AS AN ELEMENT OF THE COMMUNICATIVE PROCESS

Abstract: *The article under discussion analyses the discourse as a linguistic unit and a factor of speech communication representation and studies the properties of its pragmalinguistic organization. The specifics of the situations of discourse generation and the global meaning embedded in its structure have been studied. According to the authors, considering the development of the structure of discourse in terms of pragmatics (theory of speech acts) reveals the nature of the ability of a language person to model facts and phenomena of reality by linguistic means in accordance with the characteristics of the communicative situation.*

Key words: *discourse, speech flow, language, text, communication, concept, lexeme, semantics.*

Language: *English*

Citation: *Mukhiddinov, A. G., & Filippova, L. A. (2022). The pragmalinguistic aspect of studying the structure of discourse as an element of the communicative process. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 01 (105), 713-716.*

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-01-105-48> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2022.01.105.48>

Scopus ASCC: *3310.*

Introduction

In recent decades, speech communication has been one of the most attractive areas of research. Language as a means of speech communication is studied by a science called pragmalinguistics or linguistic pragmatics (linguopragmatics).

Linguistic pragmatics is the discipline that studies language as a means used by humans in their activities. Domestic scientists have made and are making their best contribution to the development of different trends in pragmalinguistics. But this science started its way in the foreign linguistic research. It is the foreign scholars who have contributed to the emergence of this science and its development.

Main part

Linguopragmatics allows establishing the nature of language, peculiarities of functioning of its semantic side. As a relatively young branch of science, linguopragmatics does not yet have fully formed categories, they have common points of contact, as well as differences in interpretation among different researchers, which makes this study relevant.

The Dictionary of Linguistic Terms provides the following definition: "Pragmatics (linguopragmatics, linguistic pragmatics) is 1) one of the sides of linguistic sign (along with semantics and syntactics) 2) a modern scientific trend with the features of interdisciplinary, which is responsible for speech linguistics" [6, p.217].

Since the term "pragmatics" is translated from the Greek - deed, it is more suitable for the "study of

Impact Factor:

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

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (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 in action", its functioning. Linguistic pragmatics is a discipline that studies how a medium is used by humans in their various activities. C. Peirce and C. Morris defined it as a science whose subject is the attitude of the user to the signs he uses [11, p.66].

Thus, I.P. Susov believes that pragmalinguistics (linguistic pragmatics) should be distinguished as a field of linguistic research, having as its object the relationship between language units and the conditions of their use in a certain communicative and pragmatic space in which the speaker/writer and listener/reader interact and for which specific indications of place and time of their speech interaction, goals and expectations connected with the act of communication are important [8, p.79].

Different researchers define the subject, tasks and parameters of linguistic pragmatics in different ways. This theoretical polyphony is well reflected in the scientific collections devoted to this branch of language science.

E.V. Pugacheva refers to linguistic pragmatics as a scientific field, which considers "linguistic elements oriented towards speech interaction". The essence of such an approach in relation to the study of the text is revealed by the words of A.E. Kibrik. "Usually the linguist 'places himself' in the text and, on the basis of its elements and the relations linking these elements, constructs a system of functions served by it [8, p.140]. On the contrary, the (theoretically conceivable) linguistic model of linguistic interaction "places" the linguist directly in the SA (speech act), whose structure and goals should shed light on how the text is arranged".

In modern pragmalinguistics, the concept of "discourse" acquires terminological meaning and status. The term discourse is one of the most used words in modern linguistics, not only allowing for variations in pronunciation (some researchers put the accent on the first syllable, others on the second), but also having a variety of definitions, interpretations and uses.

Unfortunately, there is no clear definition of discourse recognized by most linguists, and perhaps this is also what has contributed to the popularity that the term has gained in recent times. Despite the fact that "in modern linguistics the concept of discourse is one of the most used ones", it "still does not have a clear definition".

It is possible to distinguish between a wider, socio-philosophical and a narrower, linguistic use of the term discourse, which are sometimes difficult to distinguish, as these uses are in constant interaction.

In linguistics, the term discourse was first used by Zellig Harris in the title of his 1952 article 'Discourse Analysis'. Harris argues that language does not exist in the form of individual words or sentences, but in the form of a coherent text consisting of statements. That is, the author introduced a new concept standing above the units of language in

isolation and the text as their relationship. Thus, by "discourse" the scholar means "a sequence of sentences spoken (or written) by one (or more) people in a particular situation".

The problem of studying discourse in their works was addressed by such prominent scholars as W. von Humboldt, F. de Saussure, L. Wittgenstein, L.V. Shcherba, E. Benveniste, M.M. Bakhtin and others. A. A. Kibrik, who defined that people do not use phonemes and morphemes in communication, but communicate in discourses, viewed discourse from a new perspective [8, p.142].

The discourse definitions given by scientists N.N. Mironova, V.E. Chernyavskaya, E.S. Kubryakova and A.A. Kibrik are significant for our research.

Referring to the works of N.N. Mironova, who was based on T.A. van Dyc's doctrine of discourse, one can consider discourse from the position of a speech flow or language in its constant movement, reflecting the diversity of the historical epoch, individual and social features of communicants and the situation in which communication takes place. Discourse can be seen as a reflection of mentality, national and individual culture [10, p.158].

B. E. Chernyavskaya considered the discourse within a specific communicative event, implemented in a specific cognitively and typologically conditioned communicative space, fixed in written texts and in oral speech [2, p.15]. A similar point of view can also be found in E.S. Kubryakova, who viewed discourse within the framework of the cognitive process associated with the actual production of speech, the creation of a speech product. Thus, the text is the result of the process of speech activity, recorded in a certain finished form [4, p.56].

In our work, we will adhere to the definition of "discourse" from the point of view of A. A. Kibrik who considers it in terms of the unity of the two components - the process of speech communication and the resulting object, i.e. the final text. In accordance with this, discourse can be studied as a process unfolding in time and a structural object, i.e., discourse is a maximally capacious concept containing all forms of language use [8, p.150].

H. D. Arutyunova singles out two aspects in the analysis of discourse: communicative (discourse is presented as a social action, so extralinguistic data come to the fore) and cognitive (discourse is a consciousness mechanism) [1, p. 42]. In continuation of the above, V.V. Savelyeva studies discourse within the framework of a special linguistic and sociocultural datum that allows reconstructing the mentality of a certain author's "artistic world" with which the mentality of the addressee is correlated [4, p.30]. Thus, discourse becomes a means of studying the mental spaces of communicants, who are in different roles of realising discursive activity and who use special means to harmonise this activity. This

Impact Factor:

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

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (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

interpretation allows the linguo-social aspect of discourse analysis to be supplemented by the linguo-cognitive component.

The author of numerous researches in the sphere of cognitive linguistics E. C. Kubryakova has developed a special classification of approaches in the context of studying discourse [4, p. 22].

The structural-syntactic approach considers discourse from the point of view of a text fragment, i.e. a formation higher than the sentence level (within a superphrase unity, a complex syntactic whole).

The structuralist approach examines discourse in the context of non-textual organisation of colloquial speech, which is characterised by vague division into parts, prevalence of associative links, spontaneity, situationality, high contextuality, and stylistic specificity.

The communicative approach analyses discourse within the framework of verbal communication (speech, use, language functioning) either as a dialogue, or as a conversation (a type of dialogic statement), or as speech from the perspective of the speaker as opposed to narrative that does not take this position into account.

Considering discourse from the position of a linguistic unit of communication implies that, like any linguistic unit, it has the signifier as a set of certain properties of the material (form) and the ideal (content). Any sign in itself acts as an object of the real world, its study is possible only in the context of the environment in which it functions.

Generalizing the views on the nature of discourse and its functions, O.L. Mikhaleva proposes to understand it as "the verbalization of a certain mentality, or a way of speaking and interpreting the surrounding reality, which not only reflects the surrounding world in a specific way, but also constructs a special reality, creates its own (specific to a certain society) way of seeing the world, a way of ordering reality" [4, p.50]. Thus, we regard discourse as an important and integral agent of communication, which acts as a carrier and retransmitter of values, ideas, images, opinions and other mental formations. Discourse is seen as the password of identification: you are what your discourse is. In the words of Richard Rorty, "language recruits the world" and therefore the most reliable knowledge about the world is encoded in language. The study of language is the key to the study of man and the world [4, p.53].

Obviously, in modern linguistics, the concept of discourse was introduced in order to clarify the categories of speech, text and dialogue that were developed at the time.

In recent decades, dialogic speech as the primary form of verbal influence has attracted increasing attention among language researchers. The word dialogue (Fr. dialogos, Eng. dialog[ue] derives from the Greek dialogos (δι᾿ἄλλογος) - conversation; lit. 'speech through'). Dialogue is thus a process of

communication, usually linguistic, between two or more persons. "It is a misconception that the term 'dialogue' implies that there are exactly two participants (the Greek prefix dia - 'through' in the word dialogue and the Greek di - two are only superficially similar). Dialogue can have any number of participants, so there is no need for the term 'polylogue', which is sometimes used to mean 'a conversation of many participants' [5]. If for the use of discourse it is important to include communication in a social context, then for dialogue it is mandatory to have such an attribute as an exchange of speech utterances, an interactive nature, a coherent coupling of speech acts. Speech acts are viewed as constitutive units of dialog in the works of F. Hundsnurher and W. Franke [7, p.16]. In their opinion, the fundamental structure for target dialogues is the general pattern of dialogue, which receives its specification in the course of the opening, the beginning of the dialogue. The initiating speech act provides the communicating partner with an opportunity to react, with the communicative competence of the dialogue partners having forms of utterance that help to correctly interpret and react to the speech moves of the partner. The study of dialogue is based on an analytically deductive method, with the categories of analysis are developed theoretically at the beginning and only afterwards the material is used as a verification and modification tools. In this point, the grammar of dialogue is unctionally different from empirically inductive research in discourse and conversational analysis. Conversational analysis considers, among other things, dialogue primarily not as a linguistic phenomenon, but as a social interaction governed by certain arrangements between members of society.

Thus, the object of study of both discourse theory and conversational analysis in a broad sense is human speech, speech interaction. Conversational analysis, however, aims primarily at studying the methods and mechanisms used in the organisation of conversation, the formal, recurring rules of the technology of conversation and communication mechanisms. Discourse analysis includes the study of the strategy and intention of speakers, the study of mental processes: ethnographic, psychological and socio-cultural rules and strategies for generating and understanding speech. The study of dialogue can be seen as a component of conversational analysis and discourse dialogue analysis. Its most important characteristics are its interactive nature, consistent coupling of speech acts.

Conclusion

Thus linguopragmatics allows us to establish the nature of language, the peculiarities of the functioning of its semantic side. Discourse in direct linguistic usage is defined as a linguistic unit not adequate, not synonymous with text, but much broader, standing a level higher and including extra-linguistic factors

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

(knowledge of the world, opinions, attitudes, goals of the addressee). Speech communication is represented by dialogic discourse. Consideration of the development of the structure of discourse in terms of pragmatics (theory of speech acts) reveals the nature

of the linguistic personality's ability to model facts and phenomena of reality by linguistic means in accordance with the peculiarities of the communicative situation.

References:

1. Arutyunova, N. D. (1990). *Discourse. Linguistic Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. (p.42). Moscow: Soviet Encyclopaedia.
2. Chernyavskaya, V.E. (2001). *Discourse as an object of linguistic research // Text and Discourse. Problems of Economic Discourse: Collection of scientific articles*. (pp.11-22). Publishing house of St.-Petersburg State University of Economics and Finance.
3. Coulthard, M. (1977). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. (p.195). L.: Longman.
4. (2013). *Discourse as a New Linguo-philosophical Paradigm: Textbook* / Comp. A. G. Gorbunov. (pp.22-56). Izhevsk: Publishing House of Udmurtia University.
5. (2002). *Encyclopaedia Krugosvet*.
6. Gracis, P. (1985). Logic and speech communication. *New in Foreign Linguistics*, Vol. 16, Moscow: Progress, pp. 217 - 237.
7. Hundsnurscher, F. (1995). *Future Perspectives of Dialogue Analysis* / F. Hundsnurscher, E. Weigand (eds.). (p.16). Tübingen.
8. Kibrik, A. A., & Podlesskaya, V. I. (2006). The Problem of Oral Discourse Segmentation and the Speaker's Cognitive System. *Cognitive Studies: Collection of Scientific Works* / Ed. by V. D. Solovyov. Vol. 1. Moscow: Int. of Psychology of RAS, pp. 138-158.
9. Kilmukhametova, E.Y. (2006). *Basic Concepts of Relevance Theory*. Human Psychology, p.66.
10. Mironova, N. N. (1997). *Discourse - An Analysis of Appreciative Semantics*. (p.158). Moscow: NVITeSaurus.
11. Susov, I.P. (2006). *Linguistic Pragmatics / Textbook for undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate students*. (pp.66-79). Moscow: Vostok - Zapad.
12. Sukhikh, S.A. (1998). *Personality in the Communicative Process*. (p.17). Krasnodar: Publishing house of the Southern Institute of Management.