

DISCURSIVE-PRAGMATIC STUDIES IN THE LIGHT OF ANTHROPOCENTRISM

Khamdamova Dilafroz

Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Khamdamova1994@list.ru

Annotation. In this article, main features and characteristics of discourse as a linguistic phenomenon are explained. Also, it reflects particular notions about discourse matters as a communicative process including anthropocentrism approach.

Keywords: discourse, text, discourse analysis, communication, linguacultural phenomenon, sociocultural, communicative essence, dry residue, fiction discourse, semantic connection, cognitive activity, communicants, extralinguistic factors, communicative essence of the discourse, situational context, concept, completeness.

The core concept in modern linguistics, oriented towards the anthropocentrism of language, is the concept of discourse. It should be noted that the problem of discourse and discourse analysis is widely discussed in linguistics. There are different approaches and points of view on this issue. It is known that for the first time the concept of discourse was introduced by the famous English scientist Harris in his book "Discourse analysis". The merit of this scientist is that he was one of the first to proclaim the thesis that the main unit of communication is a coherent text. An important role in the development of the theory of discourse was played by the works of E. Benveniste, who considered discourse as "speech in communication".

Discourse is a communicative process (addresser - text - addressee), allows you to study a person in the language. N.D. Arutyunova emphasizes that the presence of a person makes itself felt throughout the entire space of the language - the semantics of words, the structure of the sentence and the "organization of discourse" (emphasized by us. - N.N.)

An analysis of the linguistic literature on the problem of discourse shows that the theory of discourse covers a wide range of problematic issues related primarily to its definition. According to the definition of T. Van Dyck, discourse is language _ can be considered as a n item above the sentence or above the clause " - ("the language is above the level of the sentence", our translation) . In other words, the discourse is considered at the level of the utterance. The scientist considers discourse as a significant component of the socio-cultural correlation of interests, goals, attitudes, intentions and motives of communicants. Also, to these definitions of discourse, he adds a social context that involves consideration of the participants in communication (and their characteristics) and the process of creating and perceiving a message. Prikhodko analyzes discourse as a linguacultural phenomenon that can be interpreted in terms of linguistic (form), sociocultural (content) and communicative-pragmatic (function) , i.e. three-level parametrization. In this light, discourse appears as a complex cognitive -communicative whole [Kubryakova , 2005 , p. 202] of a procedural-resulting order.

The point of view of N.D. Arutyunova, who defines discourse as "speech immersed in life". This definition, on the one hand, emphasizes the communicative essence of the discourse, on the other hand, the cognitive one, since the process of communication is directly related to the cognitive activity of the communicants.

The concept of discourse is also developed in the works of E.S. Kubryakova , who considers discourse as a cognitive process aimed at creating a speech work . Thus, discourse is considered by many researchers as a complex communicative-cognitive process, which involves the interaction of

linguistic (text) and extralinguistic factors (communicative-pragmatic situation, purpose and conditions of communication, sociocultural context).

According to V.I. Karasik, "discourse is a phenomenon of an intermediate order between speech, communication, linguistic behavior, on the one hand, and a fixed text that remains in the "dry residue" of communication, on the other hand".

K. Wales notes that discourse includes not only the message and text, but also the recipient and sender of the speech, and the situation of communication. J. Leach and M. Short share this point of view. In their opinion, the concept of "discourse" refers to both oral conversation and written communication between a writer and a reader. Therefore, there is a so-called "fiction discourse".

At present, the theory of discourse seems to be so relevant that some researchers consider it as a new scientific paradigm. Despite different definitions of discourse, each of them highlights the most significant characteristics of discourse. Summing up all the features indicated in these definitions, we can define a set of essential characteristics of discourse. These include anthropocentrism, sociocultural determinism, situationality, intentionality, dynamism, procedural targeting.

Without going into details of different points of view on discourse, we note that one of the pressing problems of discourse theory is the distinction between the concepts of text and discourse. In this regard, three approaches can be noted:

1. Complete identification of the concepts of text and discourse;
2. Distinguishing between the concepts of text and discourse;
3. The inclusion of the concept of text in the concept of discourse.

According to first point vision the terms text and discourse are synonymous and interchangeable (Bellert, A. J. Greimas, J. Courtet). This is evidenced by the fact that many characteristics of text and discourse coincide. In Dressler and Bogrand's Introduction to Text Linguistics, the text is considered as a communicative phenomenon, the main features of which are connectedness, integrity, informativeness, intentionality and situationality. All these distinctive features equally characterize the discourse, which is the basis for their identification.

According to the second approach, text and discourse are characterized by different properties. The phenomenon of "discourse" expediently interprets how multidimensional cultural phenomenon in which carried out verbal continuous communication in a certain situational context, which contrasted with a text characterized by continuity.

Relationships text and discourse, their differences set out by A. Yu. Popov in the work "Basic differences text from discourse". Researcher opposes spontaneity of discourse - orderliness of the text, procedural discourse - effectiveness text, incomplete discourse - meaning completeness of the text a, dynamism discourse - static text etc. As N.F. Alefirenko, the text in its essence is a linear formation, united by a semantic connection of a sequence of language units. The nature of discourse is determined by its non-linear organization.

Summing up all points of view regarding the relationship between discourse and text, it is possible to determine the main parameters that distinguish between these two concepts according to the principle of opposition: the closedness of the text - the openness of discourse, the discreteness of the text - the indiscreteness of discourse, the static nature of the text - the dynamism of discourse, the effectiveness of the text - the procedural nature of discourse, the completeness of the text - incompleteness of discourse, linearity of the text - non-linearity of discourse.

USED LITERATURE:

1. Henne H., Rehbock H. Einführung in die Gesprächsanalyse – B.: West , 1979. – 345 p.
2. Lakoff G. Metaphors We Live by. – Chicago.: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980. – 456 p.
3. Searle J. R. Indirect Speech Acts // Syntax and Semantics / Ed. by P. Cole and J. L. Morgan. Vol. 3. – N. Y.: Academic Press Inc., 1975. – P. 110-118.
4. Spencer J. An approach to the study of style Text. Oxford University Press, 1964. – P. 57–105.
5. Swan M. Practical English Usage Text. – Oxford University Press, 1996. – 654 p.
6. Ahmadzoda, O. S. (2022). chet tillarni o 'qitishda o 'rganuvchilarning tinglab tushunish ko 'nikmalarini samarali rivojlantirish usullari. Conferencea, 83-85.
7. Ahmedov, Umidjon. "Interaction patterns in elt teaching: group work and pair work." Theoretical & Applied Science 12 (2019): 170-172.
8. Solijonov, Mukhammadjon. "On the linguocultural analysis of the conceptual field in the text." European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine 7.3 (2020): 3656-3660.
9. Verdonk P. Stylistics. Oxford Introductions to Language Study Text. Series Editor H.G. Widdowson. – Oxford University Press, 2002. – 124 p.
10. Wallace K. Reading Text. – Oxford University Press, 1992. – 161 p.
11. Xasanova M. Methods of teaching english vocabulary in primary school with the help of modern pedagogical technologies. Студенческий вестник. 2021. № 13-5 (158). С. 7-9.
12. Xasanova M. Using modern pedagogical technologies in teaching professional terminology. Экономика и социум. 2021. № 3-1 (82). С. 347-349.
13. Yigitaliyeva, M. "Structural semantic and communicative pragmatic types of temporal hypotaxemes in English and Uzbek languages." Theoretical & Applied Science 1 (2020): 751-755.
14. Yigitaliyeva, Mukhlisa Akhadovna. "Complex subordinate sentences with subordinate clauses of time with the conjunction" when"." European research: innovation in science, education and technology. 2020.
15. Yuldashev M. Writing intellectual stories as a personal style of Lydia Davis. Экономика и социум. 2021. № 2-1 (81). С. 413-415.
16. Yuldasheva, Diloram. "Philosophy of life-as a driving force." Theoretical & Applied Science 6 (2021): 633-635.
17. Zokirovna, Isakova Zilolakhon, Isakova Shoxidaxon Ikromovna, and Nishonova Shaxnoza Muh. "Expressing Linguistic Category Of Value In Lexicology In Comparison English And Uzbek Languages." European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine 7.03 (2020): 2020.
18. Алиева, Дилафруз Джамилкызы. "Литературная игра как эффективное средство активизации познавательной деятельности учащихся на уроках литературы." Студенческий форум 39-1 (2019): 88-92.
19. Ахмедов, Умиджон Усубович. "Номинасия жараёнинг hozirgi tilshunoslikdagi talqini masalasi." Международный журнал искусство слова 4.2 (2021).
20. Ахмедова Хикматхон Турсуновна. "Взгляды Алишер Навай на культуру речи и ораторскую духовность." Ученый XXI века (2017): 46.
21. Жуманов, А., and М. Йигиталиева. "Таълим тизимида инновацион технологиялардан интегратив мақсадларда фойдаланиш." Современное образование (Узбекистан) 1 (2014): 18-21.
22. Йигиталиева М.А. Фёъл замонларининг лингвокултурологик ифодаланиши. Научная дискуссия: инновации в современном мире. 2017. № 7 (66). С. 133-136.
23. Исакова, Шохидохон Икрамовна, and Мукаддам Ахмедовна Курбанова. "К проблеме передачи национального своеобразия пословиц, поговорок и других единиц в художественном переводе." Вестник науки и образования 5-2 (83) (2020): 12-14.

24. Исмадова, Нодира Махмудовна, and Мухлиса Ахадовна Йигиталиева. "Предложения в языке и речи." Молодой ученый 11 (2016): 1696-1698.
25. Олимов Х.Ю., Худойназарова Г. What is ESP? Молодой ученый. 2017. № 32 (166). С. 101-102.
26. Олимов, Хуршид Юнусалиевич, and Ойбек Абдубаннонович Насирдинов. "The role of Information technology in teaching English." Молодой ученый 12 (2016): 904-905.
27. Пармонов, Алишер Абдупаттоевич, and Хуршид Юнусалиевич Олимов. "Lingvo-Stylistic Features of Irony (in the Works of OHenry)." Молодой ученый 13 (2016): 701-703.
28. Тиляходжаева, Фазиля Мухамеджановна. "Задания для работы с кинофильмами в преподавании иностранных языков." Молодой исследователь: вызовы и перспективы. 2019.
29. У. Ахмедов, Н. Каримова Kasb-hunar kollejarida ingliz tili o'qitishning hozirgi ahvoli. - Молодой ученый, 2017. С.9-10.
30. Эрناзарова, Хилола Эргашевна, and Муяссар Иномовна Абдуллаева. "История развития периодов социальной педагогики." Исследование инновационного потенциала общества и формирование направлений его стратегического развития. 2014.
31. Эрназарова, Хилола Эргашевна. "Touch subordinates management of industrial robots improving the positional accuracy of the mathematical model." Молодой ученый 13 (2016): 292-295.
32. Эрназарова, Хилола Эргашевна. "Исходно-теоретические положения к проблеме классификации по частям речи в английском языке." Молодой ученый 13 (2016): 728-730.