

DISCOURSE AND HERMENEUTICS IN MODERN TEXTOLOGY

Yulbarsova Umida

Lecturer, Ferghana state university

ABSTRACT

The article presents attempts to reveal the meanings of the text and discourse, their interdependence, inconsistency, dichotomy. Particular attention is paid to the role of discourse in understanding the text, the study of functional and pragmatic attitudes following the text-discourse, the prospect of such research and the opportunity to come close to understanding the key problems of language.

Keywords: *hermeneutics of text, discourse, text, tetrachotomic paradigm*

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье представлены попытки выявить смыслы текста и дискурса, их взаимозависимость, противоречивость, дихотомию. Особое внимание уделено роли дискурса в понимании текста, изучению функциональных и прагматических установок, следующих за текстом-дискурсом, перспективности такого исследования и возможности приблизиться к пониманию ключевых проблем языка.

Ключевые слова: *герменевтика текста, дискурс, текст, тетрачотомическая парадигма.*

INTRODUCTION

The term "discourse" entered linguistic dictionaries not so long ago, only by the middle of the 20th century the French linguist Emile Benveniste first considered this concept in the discours – récit dichotomy, in fact as types of speech by the nature of attachment to the speaker, losing sight of the understanding of the text [1]. Since then, little has changed, with the appearance of many definitions of discourse, various theories of its generation, numerous analyses of discourse (discursive analysis, discourse analysis, discourse analysis, discourse analysis, etc.), we are increasingly moving away from understanding the nature of the text itself as the primary basis of any discourse. L.Y. Buyanova defines discourse as a process, it includes two components: the dynamic process of language activity and its result (that is, the text). This process unfolds dynamically in time, there is a sequence of speech acts, communicative interaction of communication participants, a set of verbal and nonverbal actions, unlike static text [2, p. 29-30].

The definition of R. Bogrand "text is a language occurrence in communicative setting" is best suited for the definition of text [3]. Such a phenomenological

approach to understanding the text will determine it both at the level of communication and at the levels of thinking, language, speech. This is consistent with the formulation of N.D. Arutyunova: "Discourse is a text immersed in life" [4]. A text is a material embodiment of a person's thoughts through some semiotic system, or several systems. The text is organized as a system, therefore, it must be considered in several overlapping aspects of organization: linguistic and extra-linguistic, structural and functional. Whereas situativeness is already inherent in discourse.

Of course, discourse should be understood as a more private concept than a global one – a text, hence we have different versions of discourses: political, scientific, artistic, pharmaceutical, etc. That is, attempts are being made to typologize discourses. The practice of discourse research once again confirms the presence of various sets of pragmatic and semantic characteristics that form an indefinite conceptual field. S.A. Sukhoi includes discourse in the system of the empirical level, contrasting it with the text at the theoretical level of the global language system. Hence, the definition of discourse as the primary semiotic reality, the main instrument of actualization of the subject's psyche and at the same time the result of communicative influence. External factors – situativeness and internal – the psychoemotional state of the communicant are interpreted as dominant features of discourse. The generalization of the above is expressed in the following wording: "discourse is a unique symbolic event contextual and individually conditioned and is a communication tool."

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

Discursive activity manifests itself in constant fluctuations between the unconscious and consciousness. And the unconscious is the last level of consciousness according to V.V. Nalimov's "map of consciousness". It means that discourse is a manifestation of a higher order at the metalanguage level of the language. Discourse is not only a component of the text, its peculiarity, but also a product of communication, if we consider it in a tetrachotomic paradigm: language – thinking – speech – communication.

"Metalanguage competence, manifested in discourse, also indicates the formation of more abstract units in the unconscious." And further: "What breaks through to the surface of discourse is based on unconscious structures. Moreover, the very fact of fixing the unconscious in discourse fixes the structures of language and thinking in it." Discourse synthesizes such basic categories as activity, consciousness and thinking. Discourse qualifies as a kind of speech, as discursive speech, i.e. a speech constructed according to the rules of grammar and stylistics, developing a particular thought of the speaker (writer).

A.G. Baranov is an adherent of the "static–dynamic" direction in text linguistics, supports the theory of three levels of text idealization: actual text, virtual text and textotype. The actual text, the text in the context of communication, is determined in many studies as a discourse, and the virtual text, that is, the text in isolation from the context of communication, is understood as a text. A textotype is a set of rules for generating and understanding texts. The researcher conducts a hypothetical division of tests into functional textotypes: deontic, axiological, epistemic. Emphasizing that in practice the text is a homogeneous formation. Hence the conclusion: "... typologization does not affect texts as such, but functions – strategies and conventions of a certain level, which are guided by the subjects of communication." From the level of parameterization of texts by modal and propositional properties, a transition is necessary to the level of discursive practices, where the multifactorial nature of discursive activity is highlighted. The researcher himself is often forced to determine the type and boundaries of the discourse under study, since the basis for parameterization of discourses is too vague and subjective.

Discourse is a text, plus the communicatively significant circumstances in which this text is actualized, is more often interpreted as a complex multifactorial verbal phenomenon involving communication participants, the communication situation and the text. Discourse is an abstract invariant description of structural and semantic features implemented in specific texts. According to linguists, the ideal to strive for in the process of communication is the maximum correspondence between discourse as an abstract system of rules and discourse (or text). as a concrete verbal embodiment of these rules. The text and the discourse are very close, they mean the same thing, but they are understood from different perspectives. Therefore, representatives of the new school of discourse analysis, such as R. Robin, argue that the text is a connecting thread in language, that the text cannot be studied outside of linguistic facts and effects. Text analysis is a discovery procedure involving the historicity and materiality of the text.

When researching such a verbal work as a text, it is always necessary to rely on methodological attitudes and research positions. It is worth paying more attention to the pragmatic perspective of language as a methodological basis for text research. Moving on to the text–discourse dichotomy.

So, the unit of communication is always a sign, that is, a text, and the communication process itself, involving direct participants, involving all sides of the relationship – syntactics, semantics, pragmatics, is nothing but discourse. More precisely, discourse is the activity aspect of the text, the direct perception of the text by the participant of communication, the text in dynamics.

REFERENCES

1. Benveniste E. General Linguistics. M., 1974.
2. Buyanova L.Y. Discursive facets of communication: theoretical aspect. Philology as the foundation of humanitarian knowledge: A collection of scientific papers. Book 3. Krasnodar, 2013. pp. 29-33.
3. Beaugrande R. de. Text Linguistics in Discourse Studies // Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Vol. 1. London, etc. 1985, P. 41-70.
4. Fatihovich, G. E., Samadovna, A. Z., & ShukhratUgli, N. Z. (2021). Specific Features of Evtushenko's Lyrics. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture, 2(4), 23-26.
5. Abdugafurovich, A. A., & Tavakkalovna, K. N. (2021). Intertextual signs in the scientific style. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 11(3), 1658-1661.
6. Yulbarsova, U. M. (2022). THE MAIN PROBLEMS OF APPLIED LINGUOCULTUROLOGY. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(6), 822-827.
7. Nargiza, U., & Tamanno, K. (2022). THE COMPETENCE APPROACH IN TEACHING RUSSIAN AS FOREIGN. Involta Scientific Journal, 1(7), 204-206.