



TYPOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DISCOURSE

Nazirova Navruza Ravshan kizi

(Phd Researcher)

Uzbek State University Of World Languages

Ziyayeva Sevara Anvarovna

Scientific advisor: (prof, DsC)

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12187714>

ABSTRACT

The paper covers the issues related with the different types (newspaper, political, legal, literary, academic etc.) of discourse from the pragmatic and cognitive perspective of the discourse participant. It reveals that the characteristic feature of political, newspaper, academic, legal discourse is argumentation based on cause-effect relations. Grammatical and lexical elements are explicit signals of these relations.

Keywords: different types, discourse, reveal, relations.

Discourse is considered by different points of views, such as sociological, psychological, historical aspects. An interest has emerged in the study of discourse, since the functionalism is a fundamental characteristic of it and this factor differentiate it from other modern fields of linguistics, as well as, its previous ones.

The main reasons why the discourse analysis plays main role in the functional linguistics are followings:

Functionalism is to explore the definition of the observed language form. According to functionalists, the form is significantly developed and explained on basis of its function in real life. In fact, the function of the language in real time is discourse.

The terminological differences between discourse and text give a way to other problems which are quite difficult. How do the features of the text linguistics differ from discourse analysis? The essence of discourse analysis is to determine the meaningfulness of the text and what makes it linked and understandable. It is mentioned that it carries the inter-text character on the works about discourse analysis. At the same time, researchers who are engaged in the text attribute this character to the text. The discourse is considered as mental processes and extra-linguistics factors, while the text is mainly considered as an abstract formal structure. In fact, the discourse is the actualization of the formal structure in various forms.

Discourse is a related part of speech. Comparing it with the analogical definitions of the text, such an explanation of the discourse does not clarify its difference from the text. N. Enkvist clarified the difference between text and discourse as follows: Discourse is considered as a part of the situation while the text is viewed as an independent part. This example which is considered as a text in itself, becomes a part of the discourse in the frame of situational context while it is realized (hanging on the wall). [13; p.369-382]

Considering discourse analysis mainly as a relation within the texts, it attracts not only linguists, but also sociologists, and psychologists. Despite of the difficulties about understanding the differences between text and discourse (the differentiation appears between the text linguistics and the discourse analysis of text grammar), it is possible to

differentiate the text from the discourse according to above-mentioned factor. The discourse has to be studied as a process in which texts are set up with its typical characteristics, while the text can be studied in its completeness as reality. The text is a material existence and it is available to explore it on the basis of this approach. However, discourse is more complex. To analyze it, we have to catch the intention and idea of the "Text Sender", i.e. we have to determine what is considered in the text besides the explicit information in the text of the existing speech. So discourse concept contains the extra-linguistic factors and rhythm. A. Kibrik notes: "...discourse is a broader concept than the text. Discourse contains both the process of language activity and the result of it, and the result is namely the text..." [6; p. 307-309]

Social - cultural perspectives are effectively used to study its pragmatic and cognitive functions in the linguistic exploration of the communicative essence of language. Regarding this, it enables us to observe the inextricable relationship between language and social meaning. Some functional and critical linguistic studies [8; p. 92-112, 10; p. 367, 12; 352-371] reveal the close interaction and dynamism between language users. Such kind of relationship and dynamism demonstrate how dialectal relationships are maintained and how they are converted into socio-cultural structures. Discourse is viewed as "**the dialogue of cultures**" in the general context of intercultural communication. Intercultural communication is reflected not only in language choice as a means of constructing text, but also in the knowledge of its functioning in a social context which develops cognitive skills needed to understand discourse reality. It has strong connections to anthropology through the research of the relationship between language and culture and to the psychology through highlighting the relationship between language and thinking and finally to sociology and politics through the crucial role of the language that plays in the social life.

According to N.Enkvist, discourse means the synthesis of the text and existing context in social life. [13; p. 369-382] It gets certain meaning in context and this context is used for the certain purposes, in certain condition and in certain meaning by transmitter of language information. T. Van Dijk suggests that the context includes the participants of the communication process and their roles, goals, intentions, background knowledge. [9; p. 501] R.Wodak determines four types of context:

- Inter- texts and inter-discourses relations between speeches, texts, genre and discourses;
- Extra-linguistic, social/sociological types;
- History and archaeology of texts and organizations; and
- Situational - institutional frames of specific context

Regarding the above-mentioned types, R. Wodak suggests: "...in so doing, we can study how discourses, genres and texts change depending on the social-political context..." [18; p. 345]

It is not occasional that T. Van Dijk determines the relationship between ideology and discourse as following: "...discourse has an ideological essence or it creates an ideology..." [9; p. 33] R. Wodak also distinguishes between discourse and text, as being on the above-mentioned item, but he views this issue mainly through cognitive approach: "...discourse is the schemes and generalizations of the knowledge and structures, while the text is the specific and unique realization of the discourse..." [18; p. 39]



The studies on different types (literary, political, newspapers, legal) of discourse [1; p. 281, 3; p. 123, 11; p. 32-37] prove that they have the pragmatic, cognitive, ideological and cultural motivations. First, literary and scientific discourses differ from newspaper and political discourses, they do not exist in the real life, i.e. the prerequisites are different now. Secondly, though all types of discourses have certain pragmatic intentions, political and legal discourse texts seem more convincing, impressive, and even susceptible to manipulation. Though the literary discourse (text) has become the object of the study [1; p. 281, 2; p. 131], we also want to express our views. The main issues include the sender's (a writer or a poet) inner world, psychological state, style of thinking, his trend to imaginary.

Literary discourse deals with I.Galper's successful combination of the aesthetic, cognitive and pressing information functions. [2; p.131] However, it can be also attributed to other types of discourse, such as political and newspaper texts. On the other hand, literary, academic (scientific articles, monographs, lectures intended for a wide audience) and newspaper discourses (analytical articles, comments) are prone to chaos and virtuality. We think that the main characteristics of such discourse is as follows: sender invites his/her receiver to think. But political, legal and some academic discourses (lectures for audience) are away from such chaos and virtuality. Regarding this, N.Davidova puts forward an interesting idea: "...the goals of the authors of the political discourse are to convince the receivers that they are right, and to present a clear action plan..." It seems that the absence of the chaos concept in political discourse can be explained according to this factor. Accurate planning is contrary to the essence of the chaos concept. [4; p.62-72]

A number of factors can impact the situation of communication which we call it "**discourse**". Of course, the main factors are the type of the communication and the options of the Sender. This is a "choice" phenomenon which was widely interpreted in the field of linguistics. A. Kuznetsov writes: "...the person can start the verbal communication on functional, stylistic, pragmatic, social and territorial point of view..." [7; p. 30] T. Sorokina notes that the choice is attributed to "an inter-subject problem", and "a language user", a human stands in the center of this issue, and he considers the use of the language expressions in various contexts as a language activity performing in communicative and cognitive functions. [8; p. 100]

In all cases, a Sender affects to his/her Receiver by using various rhetoric means and inspires him/her towards cognitive, poetic and even literary activity and as a result, he gives an opportunity to perform different types of communicative functions. Here includes grammatical and lexical elements studied for several decades, events, as well as, humans, places, fictions, trade mark and others. They enable the Receiver to form the specific implication and provide him/her with cognitive opportunities.

Another typical feature of the political, media, legal and academic discourses is the predominance of an argumentation on these types. An argumentation is divided into two places: rhetoric and polemic argumentation. [18; p. 345] Rhetoric argumentation is realized by mono-logical speech and it faces obstacles such as the other party's opinion. [ibid] In rhetoric argumentation, the Sender aims to strengthen its position in the discourse, he is not interested in exchanging information with discourse participants. According to another approach of argumentation theory, the main distinctive feature of the rhetoric argumentation is to direct the text to the Receiver in order to change his/her position or attitude. Polemic

argumentation develops by dialogues and the participants assertively superimpose their own ideas to each other. [ibid]

Semantic relationships based on the cause and effect in which both argumentation types are reflected, are realized by different ways. The grammatical and lexical elements define cause and effect on bases of some researches [14; p. 486, 15; p. 374, 16; 203-211] and serve firstly the pragmatic objectives of the Sender. According to such types of argumentative discourses, logical explanation of any discretion is explicitly introduced. In addition to traditional means, logical explanations are explicitly given. Such means which realize rhetoric and polemic arguments, form the cognitive structure of discourse.

Though the above-mentioned rhetoric means are used in various types of discourse, their functions are mainly divided into two places: pragmatic and cognitive. Using these functions, the Sender aims to pass his pragmatic object to the Receiver, and such means create cognitive essence for the Receiver. The newspaper discourse differs significantly from other discourse types, because it considers such perspectives of both Sender and Receiver.

References:

- [1] Abdullayev K.M. Azərbaycan dili sintaksisinin nəzəri problemləri. Bakı, Maarif, 1998, səh. 281
- [2] Гальперин И.Р. 1981 Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. Москва, Наука, стр.131
- [3] Гаибова М.Т. Лингвистическое исследование единицы художественного текста. Баку, АДУ ММС, 2006, стр. 123
- [4] Давыдова Н.А. Лингвосинергетический анализ англоязычного дискурса. Вестник МГЛУ, Вып. 553, Москва, 2009, стр. 62 – 72
- [5] Ивин А.А. Риторика: искусство убеждать – Москва, Фаир Пресс, 2002, стр. 192
- [6] Кибрик А.А. и др. Дискурс и возникновение функционализма. В книге: Фундаментальные направления современной американской лингвистики, Москва: МГУ, 1997, стр. 307-309.
- [7] Кузнецов А.М. Вариативность в языке и варианты единиц на разных уровнях языковой структуры // Проблемы языковой вариативности. Ф.М. Березин и др. (ред.) Москва, 1990, стр. 25-43
- [8] Сорокина Т.С. Функциональные основы теории грамматической синонимии. Вопросы языкознания. №3, Москва, 2003, стр. 92-112
- [9] Эко У. Роль читателя. Исследования по семиотике текста. Москва, РГГУ, 2005, стр. 501
- [10] Dijk Teun A. van Ideology. Interdisciplinary approach. London: Sage Publications, 1998, p. 367
- [11] Dijk Teun A. van Discourse analyzes of news/ A Handbook of qualitative methodologies for Mass Media research. Edited by K. Brulin Jensen, London: Longman, vol. 5, 1999, p. 32-37
- [12] Dijk, Teun A. van Critical Discourse Analysis. In: A Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001, p. 352-371.
- [13] Enkvist. N.E. From Text to Interpretability: A. Contribution to the Discussion of Basic Terms in Text linguistics. Connexity and Coherence: Analysis of Text and Discourse Ed. By W. Heydrich. Berlin; New York. 1989. p. 369-382.



- [14] Givon T. Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction. Vol. 1, 1984. Vol. 2, 1990. Amsterdam: Benjamins, p. 486
- [15] Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R., Cohesion in English. London. 1976, p. 374
- [16] Mcdowell J.H. Verbal Dueling \\ Handbook of Discourse Analysis\ Ed. by T.A. van Dijk - London Academic Press - Vol. 3: Discourse and Dialogue. p. 203-211
- [17] Schiffrin D. Everyday Argument: Organization of Diversity in Talk \\ Handbook of Discourse Analysis \\ Ed. by T.A. van Dijk - London Academic Press - Vol. 3: Discourse and Dialogue. p. 35-46
- [18] Wodak R. The Discourse of Politics in Action. Politics as Usual. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, p. 345

