The Interpretation of the "Discourse" as a Term

Narmin Abulfaz Aliyeva [1]

[1] *Azerbaijan National Academy of Science, Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi*
115 H. Cavid Avenu, Baku, Azerbaijan

Abstract. The article is devoted to the interpretation of the term discourse in linguistics. As this topic is not unambiguously interpreted in various fields of science, including linguistics, the status of the term discourse is still debated. Given the tendency of the issue to develop in this direction, it should be noted that the subject of research is essential for linguistics. This type of scientific research and various theoretical sources are referred to as the material of scientific research. During the study, analyzes are carried out using the method of comparative descriptive linguistics. At the end of the article, the scientific results are reflected. It is noted here that discourse and text relations allow us to understand the creation of the texts by the persons within any communicative act.

Keywords: discourse; terminology; linguistics; comparative analysis; text; communicative act.

INTRODUCTION

Discourse has long been entrenched in science; there is no need to justify its development. In principle, its development in areas with different interpretations has led to different perceptions. This made it on the plan and replaced the concepts and terms used in linguistics. According to T. Van Dyke, sometimes vague and difficult-to-define ideas become more popular. Discourse is one of the concepts. However, despite its generality and the spread of its development, Discourse in linguistics has changed traditional notions of text, speech, dialogue, and language. However, it would not be correct to completely replace these terms with it, as "discourse" is a complex communicative phenomenon in which extra-linguistic factors are included in addition to the text for comprehension" [17].

When there was a controversy over the definition of the object of the study, in the linguistics field, the scholars did not accept the term "linguistics of the text". In many linguistics works, the text of the related speech was called Discourse [9].

The aim of the paper. Comparing Discourse with speech and text allows us to identify their similarities and differences. In this regard, firstly, the discourse concept will be clarified. Secondly, different approaches to its interpretation will be considered. Thirdly, its main feature will be highlighted.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Using the descriptive approach, we looked through many scientific works on Discourse.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The phenomenon of Discourse as a multidisciplinary term attracts the attention of philosophy, literary criticism, semiotics, social psychology and, above all, linguistics, namely cognitive linguistics, cultural linguistics, psycholinguistics, pragma-linguistics, etc., as it refers to the study of the functioning of language as a subject. There is no general definition of this term covering all areas. However, as a concept term, the "umbrella" term combines many interpretations depending on its research positions [3]. This word use has led to its widespread use [4]. Recently, it has become more widespread. There is no clear and generally accepted definition of Discourse, and it is safe to say that is why it has become so popular. Let's look at the descriptions.

"Discourse" (lat. *Discursus* – argument, conversation) means speech, talk, and text as the object of linguistic research [8]. Discourse (fr. discours – speech, judgment) represents a type of letter, text, or speech that presupposes a direct appeal to the listener. The term was coined by the Swiss scholar F. de Saussure. According to the Saussure, Discourse is the act of individual speech of the speaker and listener [16]. Discourse means a text related to extra-linguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors.

The polysemy of this term can be observed in T. Nikolaeva's [13]: "Discourse is an ambiguous term of text linguistics used by various authors, almost in homonymous meaning. The importance of these are: 1) related speech; s) oral spoken form of the text; 3) dialogue; 4) a group of words associated with each other in terms of meaning; 5) as the existence of a work of written or oral speech. The same idea can be found in the dictionary of A. Kubryakova and co-authors [10].

In A. Greimas and J. Kurten's "Explanatory dictionary of language theory", the Discourse is taken in a structural-semantic concept. They give Discourse as a semiotic process in different types of discursive practice [5]. J. Coquet defines Discourse as a "connection of structural meanings with its rules of transformation and combination" [2]. Here we can see that Discourse is perceived as a concept close to style, for example, "literary discourse" or "scientific discourse". We talk about the "scientific discourse" of the writer's style in different spheres of knowledge, such as philosophy. L. Phillips and M. Jorgensen note that there is no single idea about what Discourse is and how to analyze it [4]. Discourse, as a form of social behaviour, plays a tool in forming the social world and the world of science itself. V. Chernyavskaya perceives Discourse in two ways: 1) a specific communicative event identified in the oral and written texts, carried out in a certain cognitive and typologically conditioned communicative space; 2) a set of relevant thematic texts [1].

The text is opposed to Discourse. V. Zveginsev agrees. He notes: "Discourse means two or more sentences with semantic connection with each other" [18]. The models obtained from such an approach are characterized by a high degree of abstraction, which complicates the analysis of natural communication [12].

The German philosopher and sociologist Y. Habermas explains the term discourse interestingly. According to him, Discourse is a particular ideal type of communication that deviates as much as possible from communicative conservatism, traditions, and social reality, aimed at substantiating and critically judging the views and actions of participants [7].

At the same time, the word changes to a more traditional representation of speech, text, dialogue, style, and even language in different senses. In the foreword to the work on the discourse analysis of the French school, P. Serio emphasizes the eight meanings of this word [15]:

- any specific statement equivalent to the concept of "speech";

- a unit more significant than the expression;

- the effect of the speech on the listener (within the framework of pragmatics), taking into account the speech situation;

- conversation as the primary type of speech;

- use of speech units, their speech actualization;

- a socially or ideologically restricted type of Discourse, such as feminist Discourse;

- theoretical construction for the study of the conditions of text creation.

- discourse is actively used in political, mass media and business circles.

Nowadays, this word can be found in the vocabulary of scientists, journalists, cultural figures and even business people. The term is used in various areas of society, including virtual education. In the literature, we can find multiple interpretations called Discourse on websites. In our opinion, all these can be classified mainly as humanitarian and scientific-methodological approaches.

D. Schifrin defines Discourse as utterance by noting the relationship between form and function [14]. Here, the Discourse is not considered a set of units of "superfluous" language structure but a set of functionally organized, contextualized language units. But the difference between utterance and Discourse must be taken into account; Discourse is a unit of Discourse, and Discourse is a set of discourses. T. Gulyar writes by comparing speech and Discourse: "If there is a goal in speech, the discourse allows changing the original problem" [6]. D. Maingueneau later expanded the concept of "discourse". This can be seen in the table below [11].

Discourse types	Content
Discourse 1	Saussure's "word", the frequency of expression processing
Discourse 2	The combination of the main speech into a sentence, a globally understood expression, the object of "text" grammar
Discourse 3	Expression (Discourse) to the interactive dimension, its notation during the term, the object of theories of Discourse and pragmatics
Discourse 4	Conversation (conversation) is a fundamental type of expression, the purpose (object) of dialogue analysis.
Discourse 5	Language (a system of less specific values) is perceived as a superficial sort due to the diversity of those used in speech.
Discourse 6	A system of restrictions that allows for the emergence of a large number of expressions based on specific social and ideological positions
Discourse 7	The discursive mechanism as intended expression and its effect on it
Discourse 8	Equivalent to the text: narrowly formed expressions, their constraint in speech and their definition by social, historical, and mental issues

Etymologically, the term "discourse" goes back to the Latin word "discurrere", meaning "to describe", "to negotiate". In this sense, it was actively used in the XVI-XVIII centuries.

After reviewing the various theoretical literature, we would like to highlight the main approaches to interpreting Discourse:

1. Different linguistic approaches to the analysis of Discourse, including methods of sociolinguistics, linguo-culturology and other linguistics

2. Cratological interpretation of the Discourse, focusing on the robust nature of the Discourse

3. The semiotic interpretation of the Discourse, which considers the Discourse as a symbol, a cultural code of cultural origin

4. Socio-communicative interpretation of Discourse, focusing on the communicative purpose and social functions of Discourse

5. Postmodernist interpretation describes the Discourse as a communicative network space

6. An integrated discourse analysis approach combines all these interpretations' elements.

CONCLUSIONS

The study of the different concepts by different scholars has led to the deletion of the boundaries between them, which provide a further enrichment of this event with the joint study of this or that event in both fields of science. Discourse can be taken as proof of it, as it is developed in several areas of science. However, it should be noted that Discourse has found its definition in terminology and expanded the possibilities of linguistic analysis. As mentioned above, its comparison with such concepts as speech, speech activity, communication situation, monologue, and dialogue, on the one hand, gives the wrong impression that the Discourse is perceived correctly. On the other hand, it is the same as these events.

Discourse and text relations allow us to understand the creation of the texts by the persons within any communicative act. In addition, the texts formed due to the process of cognitive comprehension in the human mind are directly dependent on the Discourse. The latter, in turn, depends on the communicative requirements of the text. In this case, the main content of the text is a discursive act, in which the text is a communication.

REFERENCES

1. Chernyavskaya, V. (2001). Diskurs kak ob'ekt lingvisticheskih issledovanij [Discourse as an object of linguistic research]. *Tekst i diskurs. Problemy jekonomicheskogo diskursa,* 11–22 (in Russian)

2. Coquet, J.-K. (1973). *Semiotique litteraire.* Strasbourg: Mame

3. Danilova, S. (2015). Tipologija diskursa [Tipology of discourse]. *Humanities, social-economic and social sciences, 1,* 345–350 (in Russian)

4. Fillips, L., & Yogersen, M. (2008). *Diskurs-analiz: teorija i metod* [Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method]. Kharkiv: Gumanitarnyj centr (in Russian)

5. Greymas, A., & Kurte, J. (1983). *Semiotika. Ob'jasnitel'nyj slovar' teorii jazyka* [Semiotics. Explanatory Dictionary of Language Theory]. Moscow: Raduga (in Russian)

6. Gulyar, T. (1993). Pobuditel'nyj diskurs [Motive discourse]. In *Kommunikativno-funktsional'nyj aspekt jzykovykh edinits* (pp. 37–43). Tver: Tver State University Press (in Russian)

7. Habermas, J. (2010). *Vorstudien und Erganzungen communicative Handelns*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp

8. Insaj. (2011). *Diskurs jeto* [Discourse]. Retrieved March 1, 2022, from http://www.insai.ru/slovar/diskurs (in Russian)

9. Khurmatullin, A. (2009). Ponjatie diskursa v sovremennoj lingvistike [The concept of discourse in modern linguistics]. *Uchenye zapiski Kazanskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, 151*(6), 31–37 (in Russian)

10. Kubryakova, E. (Eds.). (1996). *Kratkij slovar' kognitivnyh terminov* [Concise Dictionary of Cognitive Terms]. Moscow: MSU (in Russian)

11. Maingueneau, D. (2000). *Eléments de linguistique pour le texte litteraire.* Paris: Nathan (in English)

12. Makarov, M. (2003). *Osnovy teorii diskursa* [Fundamentals of discourse theory]. Moscow: Gnozis (in Russian)

13. Nikolaeva, T. (1978). *Kratkij slovar' terminov lingvistiki* [Brief dictionary of terms of linguistics]. Moscow: Progress (in Russian)

14. Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse.* Oxford: Cambridge

15. Serio, P. (2001). *Analiz diskursa vo francuzskoj shkole* [Discourse analysis in the French school]. Moscow: Progress (in Russian)

16. Tolkovyj slovar' Kuznecova. (2022). *Dickurs.* Retrieved March 1, 2022, from http://www.endic.ru/kuzhecov/Diskurs-4258.html (in Russian)

17. Van Deyk, T. (1998). *K opredeleniju diskursa* [To the definition of discourse]. Retrieved from http://psyberlink.flogiston.ru/internet/bits/vandijk2.htm (in Russian)

18. Zvegintsev, V. (1976). *Predlojenie i ego otnoshenie k jazyku i rechi* [The sentence and its relation to language and speech]. Moscow: n. d. (in Russian)