



UDK: 811.512

Nurislom XURSANOV,
Renessans ta'lim universiteti dotsent v.b., PhD
E-mail: nurislomkhursanov92@gmail.com
ORCID: ORCID: 0000-0001-5714-2745

Renessans ta'lim universiteti dostenti, f.f.d. I.X.Islomov taqrizi asosida

DISCOURSE STUDIES IN ANTHROPOCENTRIC LINGUISTICS

Annotation

The individual factor is the center of the research object in the research conducted in such directions as linguo-pragmatics, linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, ethnolinguistics, neurolinguistics, paralinguistics, gender linguistics. The emergence of these fields is related to the efforts to study linguistic activity in harmony with the person who owns it. In the anthropocentric paradigm, the human being is placed in the main place, and language is the main element that makes up the human personality. This article describes the study of the concept of discourse in linguistics in anthropocentric linguistics.

Key words: discourse, anthropocentric linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, extralinguistic factor.

ANTROPOSENTRIK TILSHUNOSLIKDA DISKURS TADQIQI

Annotatsiya

Jahon tilshunosligining lingvopragmatika, lingvokulturologiya, kognitiv tilshunoslik, sotsiolingvistika, psixolingvistika, etnolingvistika, neyrolingvistika, paralingvistika, gender lingvistikasi kabi yo'nalishlarida olib borilayotgan izlanishlarda shaxs omili tadqiqot obyektining markazini tashkil etadi. Mazkur sohalarning yuzaga kelishi lisoniy faoliyatni uning sohibi bo'lgan inson bilan uzviylikda tadqiq etish harakatlari bilan bog'liqdir. Antroposentrik paradigmada inson asosiy o'ringa chiqariladi, til esa inson shaxsini tarkib toptiruvchi bosh unsur hisoblanadi. Mazkur maqolada tilshunoslikdagi diskurs tushunchasining antroposentrik tilshunoslikda o'ragnilishi yoritilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: diskurs, antroposentrik tilshunoslik, pragmatika, nutq tahlili, ekstralingvistik omil.

ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ ДИСКУРСА В АНТРОПОЦЕНТРИЧЕСКОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ

Аннотация

Индивидуальный фактор является центром объекта исследования в исследованиях, проводимых по таким направлениям, как лингвопрагматика, лингвокультурология, когнитивная лингвистика, социолингвистика, психолингвистика, этнолингвистика, нейролингвистика, паралингвистика, гендерная лингвистика. Появление этих полей связано с попытками изучения языковой деятельности в гармонии с человеком, ею владеющим. В антропоцентрической парадигме на главное место ставится человек, а основным элементом, составляющим человеческую личность, является язык. В данной статье описывается исследование понятия дискурса в языкознании в рамках антропоцентрической лингвистики.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, антропоцентрическая лингвистика, прагматика, дискурс-анализ, экстралингвистический фактор.

From the first years of the 21st century, research based on the anthropocentric paradigm began to appear in Uzbek linguistics. These works were mainly carried out in the fields of sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, linguistic pragmatics, and psycholinguistics. These studies, although they did not express the reaction to the anthropocentric paradigm, are the first works that reflect the principles of this paradigm. For example, in S.M. Mominov's doctoral dissertation on the topic "Socio-linguistic characteristics of Uzbek communication behavior", the unique communication behavior of Uzbeks were studied from a socio-linguistic point of view [7].

One of the first works in Uzbek linguistics that analyzed the text based on the anthropocentric paradigm is I.A. Azimova's dissertation entitled "Psycholinguistic Study of the content perception of Newspaper Texts in the Uzbek Language". The main focus of the research is on the "identification of linguistic and extralinguistic factors affecting the understanding of the text based on psycholinguistic experiments, identification of units in the meaningful perception of the text, and analysis of their formal-semantic features" [1]. Using the method of associative experience, the scientist determines the following levels of perception of newspaper texts: associative level, lexical-morphological level, contextual level, structural level, and text level. The researcher identifies "linguistic factors in the stimulus text, exact memorization of the words in the text, concretization of the contextual meanings of the remembered words, the formation of a meaningful structure specific to the stimulus text, and the creation of a whole text projection" as the main processes in text perception. According to I. Azimova, word, word form, word

combination, and syntagma are units in the meaningful perception of the text.

In the article of the linguist scientist A. Rahimov devoted to the study of the language based on paradigms, the reaction to the anthropocentric paradigm was also expressed. According to the scientist, "The third macro-paradigm in the history of linguistics is the anthropocentric paradigm (communicative or nominative-pragmatic paradigm)" [8]. This paradigm studies language not as a dry structure, but as an open system based on lively dialogue and communication, analyzing it in an integral relationship with other systems - society, man, culture, psyche, etc.

A. Rahimov believes that a person serves as a "golden bridge" in illuminating the connection between language and various spheres of social life. According to the researcher, cognitive, sociolinguistic, ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistic, neurolinguistic, pragmatic and linguocultural paradigms are mini-paradigms that are part of the anthropocentric paradigm. In modern linguistics, the study of the language system from an anthropocentric point of view is mainly carried out in linguistic semantics, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmalinguistics, and linguocultural studies. Well-known Uzbek linguist, prof. N.Mahmudov expresses the following thoughts about the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics: "According to such an objective nature of the language, in the anthropocentric paradigm, man is given the main place, and language is the main element that makes up the human personality. Experts cite the famous Russian writer S. Dovlatov's wise saying that "language makes up 90 percent of a person's

personality" [6]. As stated by V.A. Maslova, the human mind cannot be imagined outside of language and the ability to create and perceive speech [19]. According to some linguists, the anthropocentric paradigm completely left aside the principle of "in and for itself", which arose as a result of the successes of structuralism in the last century. In this, the main attention was paid to the performer of speech activity, i.e. the speaker who composes speech and perceives it [15]. The inclusion of the category of "language owner" in the scientific paradigm requires further activation of such concepts as personality, linguistic consciousness, thinking, activity, mentality, and culture in linguistics.

In linguistics, the essence of the anthropocentric paradigm is explained by the shift from the issue of "how language is built" to the issue of "how language is used". To study how language is used, it is necessary to study the speech-cognitive processes of the person who owns it [5; 15]. Linguistics based on the anthropocentric approach is naturally responsible for comparative, systematic-structural, descriptive, and analytical research of linguistic and cultural units that exist as concepts or concepts in a person's language. This shows that the subject of linguocultural studies is the interrelated language and culture and related knowledge, concepts, and concepts. Researching the issue of discourse in anthropocentric linguistics in which a person is at the center makes it possible to study human speech in a communicative aspect.

The problem of syntactic discourse in foreign linguistics was raised by Z. Harris in the 50s of the last century [4]. By the 70s of the 20th century, the volume of work related to this issue increased somewhat. In the studied studies, discourse was interpreted as a mono-predicative unit of conversational speech [14]. By this time, terms such as text linguistics, relation of text research with speech theory, practical stylistics, communication theory, language teaching, and automatic translation began to be used in scientific sources. One of the biggest achievements in the syntax of the 70s of the last century is that the position of grammatical discourse in spoken speech was formed as a separate branch of linguistics and a separate source of research on the problem [17].

In some sources, the position of the term discourse in linguistics and objections to its use are also expressed. For example, in 1966, the linguist R. Godel's recognition that "the use of the term discourse in linguistic research may cast doubt on making clear conclusions about language and speech phenomena was noted by N.Slyusarev in his research [20], and this is R. Godel's There was a reasonable, scientific response against tyros [2]. Dialogic discourse is usually defined as "a conversation between two or more people". This is true, but it is a biased opinion. The fact is that dialogic discourse is considered one of the most difficult parts of the creative technique for an artist, while for a linguist its syntactic peculiarities, content and structure are of great importance.

There have been many definitions of discourse, each of which can be said to reflect certain aspects of this complex process. In order to justify our thoughts about the discourse, we will give some characteristic descriptions.

According to J.R. Geye, discourse is the result of language integration of factors such as actions, interactions, ways of thinking, beliefs, evaluations, necessary for the implementation of a certain type of social affiliation [3], while V.V. Krasnykh considers discourse to be based on linguistic and extralinguistic factors. believes that it should be understood as a set of speech activity process and results [18]. According to V.I. Karasik's definition of discourse, discourse is a linguistic process with many deviations from standardized written speech, therefore, it is a living language characterized by spontaneity, completeness, thematic coherence and comprehensibility of a conversation with people. It is recognized as oral communication [16].

Therefore, in the process of discourse, that is, in the process of mutual communication between speakers of the language, the phenomenon of language comes to life surrounded by intra-linguistic and extra-linguistic factors, that is, it comes into action.

Arutyunova's definition of the term discourse is accepted by many as the most favorable definition: Discourse - (French discourse - speech) - a perspective of reality consistent with extra-linguistic (pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological, and other) factors the text under consideration; speech, which is considered as a part of the interaction of people and their conscious mechanisms (cognitive processes) as a purposeful social action [12].

Through discursive analysis, comprehensive linguistic aspects of the sentence, which is a syntactic level linguistic unit, are revealed. Such a high-volume pragmatic analysis began to reveal various aspects related to the human phenomenon in the process of communication. In the process of linguistic activity, which begins with the acceptance of a certain idea or concept within the framework of the national and cultural conditions, the individual gathers the indicators specific to the social environment in which he exists. "The phenomenon of pragmatic information and precedent used in a literary text or in the process of communication is always understandable for all people who lived and live in a certain social environment, and its use in the process of speech and discourse is not always understandable for representatives of other languages" [10; 13].

Through discursive analysis, comprehensive linguistic aspects of the sentence, which is a syntactic level linguistic unit, are revealed. Such a high-volume pragmatic analysis began to reveal various aspects related to the human phenomenon in the process of communication. In the process of linguistic activity, which begins with the acceptance of a certain idea or concept within the framework of the national and cultural conditions, the individual gathers the indicators specific to the social environment in which he exists. "The phenomenon of pragmatic information and precedent used in a literary text or in the process of communication is always understandable for all people who lived and live in a certain social environment, and its use in the process of speech and discourse is not always understandable for representatives of other languages" [13].

Sh. Safarov, while analyzing these special aspects of the communication process, recognizes the existence of a shell specific to national culture. This shell, which consists of a collection of ethno-ethical norms, is a field where rules that govern communication strategy and tactics alike [10].

In particular, the problems of text-discourse pragmatics, psychological-pragmatic factors of the use of language units in the speaker-addressee relationship, and the interaction of language and the human factor caused the need to study communicative pragmatics. This requires the research of the discursive situation as a whole, that is, within the framework of all the processes related to the structure of the sentence.

Theorists and practitioners look for observable speech phenomena that are persistent, stable, and complex types that are repeated by speakers of the language either identically or with little variation [11].

Sometimes there is a need to use a syntactic device with completely different semantics for a specific expression. In this case, the meaning expressed especially is accepted within the framework of the language norm. The same tool can be in its material and logical sense, as well as in a figurative sense, like a directly expressed unit. This case shows that language units uniquely express reality, and in such cases, the compatibility between language units acquires a pragmatic character.

Therefore, not only the lexical units that carry the main meaning but also the correct perception of syntactic devices are important for the correct acceptance of the expression by the addressee. Each element in the structure of communication, regardless of whether it is big or small, main or auxiliary, has a certain importance in the emergence of a certain meaning and linguistic task, so that its insufficient evaluation by the addressee or its misunderstanding is the wrong idea of the speaker.

Conclusion. In conclusion, language units do not always appear in their commonly used speech patterns but sometimes acquire a special linguistic feature, which serves to convey a new pragmatic meaning. The grammatical form reflects the essence of the text in one way or another. Based on the modern cognitive approach to language, the idea of restoring appropriate cognitive

structures in the forms of language units lies in the organization. form.
The reconstruction is based on the main meanings of the linguistic

REFERENCES

1. Azimova I.A. O'zbek tilidagi gazeta matnlari mazmuniy persepsiyasining psixolingvistik tadqiqi: Filol.fanlari nomzodi diss avtoref. – Toshkent: O'zMU, 2008. – 24 b.
2. Benveniste E. Problèmes de linguistique général. – Paris: Gallimard, 1966. – 356 p.
3. Gee J. P. An introduction to discourse analysis. Theory and practice. – Routledge, 2005. – 209 p.
4. Harris Z.S. Analyse du discours // Languages, 1969. – №13. – 8-45 p.
5. Khursanov N.I. Some Views on the Linguistic-Pragmatic Study of Dramatic Texts. Мировая наука. 2023(5 (74)):14-9.
6. Mahmudov N. Tilning mukammal tadqiqi yo'llarini izlab...// O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. –Toshkent, 2012. -№ 5. – 6-7 b.
7. Mo'minov S.M. O'zbek muloqot xulqining ijtimoiy-lisoniy xususiyatlari: Filol. fan. d-ri ... dis. avtoref. – Toshkent: O'zR FA TAI, 2000. – 47 b.
8. Rahimov A., Turniyazov N. O'zbek tili. Toshkent. 2006. – 5 b.
9. Raupova L., Khursanov N., Khursanova L., Polatova S. Development of world modern linguistics and discourse interpretation in it. In E3S Web of Conferences 2023 (Vol. 413, p. 03023). EDP Sciences.
10. Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika. – Т. 2008. 267 b.
11. Алпатов В.М. Язык – система правил и язык – деятельность // Историческая психология и социология истории 2/2018. 202–220 с.
12. Арутюнова Н.Д. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. 1990 г. 136-137 с.
13. Бабенко Л.Г. Филологический анализ текста. 2004 г. – 303 с.
14. Гиндин С.И. Советская лингвистика текста. Некоторые проблемы и результаты (1968-1975) // Известия АН СССР, серия ЛЯ, 1977. – № 4. – 348-361 с.
15. Дорофеев Ю. Антропосентризм в лингвистике и предмет когнитивной грамматики. 2008.–60 с.
16. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. – 280 с.
17. Колшанский Г.В. Коммуникативная дискретность языка// Лингвистика текста, сб. науч. трудов. Вып. 103. – М: МГПИИЯ, 1976. – 15-22 с.
18. Красных В. В. Этнопсихоллингвистика и лингвокультурология: Курс лекций. М.: Гнозис, 2002. – 200 с.
19. Маслова В. А. Лингвокультурология. Учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений. –М.,2001.– 6 с.
20. Слюсарев Н.А. Проблемы функционального синтаксиса современного английского языка. – М.: Наука, 1981. – 206 с.