



Journal Website:  
<https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ajps>

Copyright: Original  
content from this work  
may be used under the  
terms of the creative  
commons attributes  
4.0 licence.

## EXTRALINGUISTIC FEATURES OF FRANCO-UZBEK DISCOURSE

Submission Date: April 17, 2023, Accepted Date: April 22, 2023,

Published Date: April 27, 2023

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume03Issue04-04>

Khayatova Nigina Ikromdjonovna

Teacher Of The Department Of French Philology Of Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

Xalilova Angelina Asanovna

Student Of Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

In this article we wrote about the extralinguistic Features of Franco-Uzbek Discourse. The analysis of discourse in its initial versions was the study of texts (sequences of sentences) from the standpoint of structuralism, that is, it was a structuralist- oriented grammar of the text.

### KEYWORDS

Authorization, scientific discourse, extralinguistic style-forming factors, epistemic situation, the subject of scientific activity.

### INTRODUCTION

Discursive phenomena are studied in linguistics in two main aspects. First, discourse can be studied as such, including as a structural object. Secondly, discourse is of interest to linguists not in itself, but as a central factor influencing morphosyntactic phenomena (for example, the word order in a sentence can be

explained on the basis of discursive factors that lie outside the given sentence). It is generally accepted that the concept of discourse was introduced by the founder of transformational and distributive analysis Z. Harris in 1952. Today, the category of discourse, one of the main ones in communicative linguistics and

modern social sciences, like any widely used concept, allows for various scientific interpretations and therefore requires clarification, especially in relation to the related terms text, speech and dialogue.

In the first sense, discourse is understood as a text, an utterance, immersed in a socio-cultural situation. Indeed, in the linguistics of the text of the 70s. 20th century the terms "discourse" and "text" were usually identified, which was explained by the absence in some European languages of a word equivalent to the Franco-English "discourse" - it was forced to be replaced by the name "text". This terminological identification led to the fact that discourse and text began to be considered as equivalents. To separate the concepts, the distinction between the aspects that they represented was first used: the discourse is social, and the text is linguistic. The "dynamic" nature of phenomena also played a role: in the concept of E. Benveniste discourse was considered speech, inseparable from the speaker, and in the works of van Dyck, the text was considered as a static object, and discourse as a way of its actualization in certain mental and pragmatic conditions. In this sense, discourse was also correlated with utterance.

## **METHODS**

We can say that the text as an utterance in the conditions of its generation and perception functions as a discourse. Discourse is called a text immersed in

life, which is studied along with those forms of human activity that form it: speeches, interviews, reports, etc. At the same time, D. Shifrin, emphasizing the interaction of form and function and defining "discourse as statements" (discourse as utterances) [96: 39-41], implies that discourse is not a primitive set of isolated units of the "more sentence" linguistic structure, but an integral set of functionally organized, contextualized units of language use. In this context, the ambiguity of approaches to the definition of a statement is manifested.

So, the first approach, carried out from the standpoint of formally or structurally oriented linguistics, defines discourse as a text, as "a language above the level of a sentence or phrase" - "langue au-dessus de la phrase ou au-dessus de la paragraphe" [97: 1]. "Under the discourse, therefore, will be understood two or more sentences that are in a semantic connection with each other" [25:170].

The second meaning of discourse comes from the first. It was the result of the development of the concept of the communicative nature of the text by T. A. van Dyck. In the early 80s. XX century. The Dutch researcher chose a different core concept of the definition of discourse: a communicative event. He emphasizes: "Discourse, in the broad sense of the word, is a complex unity of linguistic form, meaning and action, which could be best characterized by the concept of a communicative event or communicative act ... The

speaker and the listener, their personal and social characteristics, others aspects of the social situation are undoubtedly relevant to this event” [80].

This judgment contains the event-situational aspect of understanding discourse, which became the basis of the second meaning of the term as a communicative situation that integrates text with its other components: text, speech subject (addresser), addressee, time and place of utterance. The main parameters (characteristics) of discourse in the second meaning are contextuality, personality, processuality, situationality, isolation.

The third meaning of discourse is the most common in modern linguistic literature, it comes from the position of the French semiotic tradition about the identification of discourse with speech, mainly oral.

In his work "Le fil du discours" A. Zh. Greimas defines discourse as a concept identical to the text in the aspect of the semiotic process: "In the first approximation, discourse can be identified with the semiotic process, which ... should be understood as the whole variety of ways of discursive practice, including linguistic and non-linguistic practice ... »[87]. Correlating discourse with the communicative process and superimposing them on the relationship between language and speech, semiotics considered discourse as an event strictly tied to the act of speech, which models, varies and regulates the linguistic and

grammatical forms of linguistic consciousness, translating it into speech. Such a "pragmatic" concept led to the differentiation of the entire discursive array of the language and gave rise to the metonymization of the term "discourse", which was reflected, in particular, in the practice of using it in the fourth meaning - as a type of discursive practice. Discourse is a communicative-pragmatic pattern of speech behavior that takes place in a certain social sphere, having a certain set of variables: social norms, relationships, roles, conventions, indicators of interactivity, etc. The main property of discourse in this sense is the regular co-presence of the speaker and the listener (face-to-face interactions).

The question of the extralinguistic conditionality of linguistic phenomena also occupies an important place in discursive analysis, where, according to V. E. Chernyavskaya, "discursive analysis is focused on the degree and nature of the influence of the extralinguistic background - social institutions, cultural, ideological and other factors on the formation of certain language patterns. It is intended to answer the question of how the various components of the communicative process: the author of the message, its addressee, the sphere of communication, the channel of the message, the intention, etc., are reflected in the intratext organization and determine in it a specific, one, and not another, ordering of linguistic units and structures" [1, p. 142–143]. The discursive analysis takes

into account the content-semantic and compositional-speech organization of the text, the socio-historical context, i.e., psychological, political, pragmatic and other factors that are commonly called extralinguistic (in a different terminology, discursive conditions for generating an utterance/text). Turning to a substantive consideration of the issue of extralinguistic factors, it should be noted that the latter are usually divided into basic (primary) and secondary. The first group includes: the form of social consciousness and the type of activity and type of thinking corresponding to it and, as a result, the sphere of communication, the form of thinking, the purpose of communication, the type of content, the functions of the language, the typical situation of communication [3, p. 61–62]. Among the secondary extralinguistic factors that are objective in nature and have a certain, but different in strength, effect on the nature of the style for scientific speech, include: the type (branch) of science, the time of writing the text, the foundations of the substyle, the genre, the orientation of the content, the peculiarity of the subject of science, the applied research method, communicative-cognitive (cognitive) activity of the subject, structure of knowledge, wide socio-cultural context, subject matter, author's individuality.

## RESULTS

The theory of speech acts ([49],[60]) influenced the development of the problems of communicative grammar, discourse analysis, conversational analysis

(especially its German variety - conversation analysis).

In recent decades, discourse analysis has become widespread in world linguistics as a set of a number of trends in the study of discourse (usually differing in their dynamism from static linguistics of the text).

The analysis of discourse in its initial versions was the study of texts (sequences of sentences) from the standpoint of structuralism, that is, it was a structuralist-oriented grammar of the text.

M. L. Makarov notes that in modern linguistic literature there are three main uses of this term:

- 1) discourse analysis (in the broadest sense) as an integral area of study of linguistic communication in terms of its form, function and situational, socio-cultural conditioning;
- 2) discourse analysis (in the narrow sense) as the name of the tradition of analysis of the Birmingham Research Group (M. Coulthard, M. Montgomery, J. Sinclair);
- 3) discourse analysis as a "grammar of discourse" (R. Longacre, T. Givón), a direction close, but not identical to text linguistics [43: 3-14].

In our opinion, the most common is the use of the term in the first meaning.

The main reason discursive analysis plays a central role in functional linguistics is that, according to functionalists, form is largely shaped and explained by

the functioning of language in real time. This process, in fact, is discourse .

In general, we can say that the functional-linguistic trend in discourse analysis has developed under the influence of communicative-pragmatic models of language and the ideas of cognitive science. The focus of his attention is the dynamic nature of discourse as a process of constructing speech by the speaker/writer and processes of interpretation of the received information by the listener/reader. At the same time, such indicators as pragmatic factors and the context of discourse (reference, presuppositions , implicatures , inferences), the context of the situation, the role of the topic and topic, the information structure (this is new), cohesion and coherence , knowledge about the world (frames, scripts, scenarios, schemes, mental models).

## CONCLUSION

The ethnographic trend in discourse analysis was formed from the ethnography of speech and aims to explore the rules of conversational inferences ( inférences conversationnelles ), which are context-related interpretation processes based on contextualization rules . The founders and active researchers in this field are E. Goffman , the author of the sociological theory of interaction, and also F. Erickson , J. Schultz, A. Sicourel , J. Gamperz , J. Cook. The peculiarity of this direction of discourse analysis is that the context is understood not as given , but as created

communicants in the course of their verbal interaction, as a set of procedures involving the use of "indications" to background knowledge. At the same time, discourse strategies are studied (especially in connection with the rules for transferring the role of the speaker , the construction of connected pairs as sequences of mutually correlated speech moves, the choice of certain linguistic and non-linguistic means). The main difference between communicative studies of the same problems and proper linguistic ones lies in the focus on the process of linguistic interaction itself, based on the fund of culturally conditioned knowledge, which is commonly called communicative competence. The central position of the basic model of communication is that the processing of messages, including culturally determined information, proceeds as an assignment of meanings known to the communicants . At the same time, the main provision of the discursive approach to the study of communication is the postulate that any culture is a society characterized by its own discourse , the properties of which should be studied by communicative linguistics.

Currently, there are six main areas in the study of discourse : the theory of speech acts, interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, linguistic pragmatics , conversational analysis and analysis of variations.



Interactional sociolinguistics is an approach to discourse that focuses on situational meaning. Researchers working in this direction rely on the ideas of John Gumperz and Erwin Goffman.

### REFERENCES

1. Akhmanova O.S., Gubenett I.V. Vertical context as a philological problem // Questions of linguistics. - 1977.- No. 3. - S. 47-54.
2. Baiburin A.K., Toporkov A.L. At the origins of etiquette. Ethnographic essays. - L.: Leningrad branch of "Nauka", 1990. - 166 p.
3. Belyaeva E.I. The principle of politeness in verbal communication (Methods of designing declarative statements in colloquial English) // Foreign languages at school. - 1985. - No. 2. - S. 12-16.
4. Bulygina T.V., Shmelev A.D. Linguistic conceptualization of the world (based on Russian grammar). - M.: School "Languages of Russian culture", 1997.-576 p.
5. Vinogradov V.V. Pushkin's language: Pushkin and the history of the Russian literary language. - M.: Nauka, 2000. - 509 p.
6. Vorobyov V.V. Linguoculturology (theory and methods). - M.: Publishing house of RUDN University, 1997.-331 p.
7. Gak V.G. Phrase reflexes in the ethno-cultural aspect // Scientific reports of the higher school. Philological Sciences. - 1995. - No. 4. - P. 47-55.
8. Gak V.G. Language transformations. - M.: School "Languages of Russian Culture", 1998. - 768 p.
9. Gak V.G. / Language as a form of self-expression of the people // Language as a means of transmitting culture. - M.: Nauka, 2000. - S. 54-68
10. Д.Б.Нарзулаева Теоретико-лингвистическая лексема религиозного стиля Educational Research in Universal Sciences 1 (7), 332-338
11. DB Narzullaeva History of the translation of the quran into french international conferences 1 (2), 116-118
12. D.B.Narzullaeva Developing the communication competence of french-speaking students through dialogues in the development of oral speech Scientific Journal, 1(10), 53-57.