DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN COGNITIVE PRAGMATICS

Juraev Sardor Abdulbasit o'g'li

O'zbekiston Davlat jahon tillari universiteti, Magistrant

brave0055@mail.ru

ABSTRACT. *This article depicts the cognitive world of a person which can be studied by his behavior, activities, with the participation of language. Linguistic expressions are connected with the perception of the world. It is very difficult to find access to the unobservable cognitive world of a person and the structures of his consciousness. Although among these structures both verbal and non-verbal are singled out, it is believed that the most significant are those that have already formed the meanings of linguistic signs, those that represent the structures of consciousness with the help of linguistic signs.*

KEY WORDS: *discourse, cognitive world, language, linguistic sign, verbal structure, text, concept.*

The study of text units outside the sentence has begun since the second half of the XX century. The text becomes one of the ways of presenting human communication as a process (Sorokin 1982: 68). In 1972, R. Lakoff wrote about the importance of the social context of a unit of speech, as well as the sentences used by participants in a particular discourse (Lakoff 1972: 907-927). Scholars have come to the conclusion that discursive analysis is a central aspect in functional linguistics, as functionalism seeks to explain *"observable linguistic form"*. Functionalists believe that form is "largely shaped and explained by real-time functioning, and real-time functioning of language is discourse". The rise in the study of discourse was

accompanied by the appearance of general works on this science, the main of which date back to the early 1980s (de Beaugrande и Dressier 1988; Brown и Yule 1983).

By the 1990s the most popular was the point of view that discourse is a coherent text plus extralinguistic factors; speech, considered as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (Arutyunova (1) 1990: 136). Discourse is *"speech immersed in life"* (Arutyunova (1) 1990: 137). From these definitions it can be seen that speech is a key aspect of study in linguistics. At the beginning of research on this topic, the concept of *"text"* was used in relation to written communication, and the concept of *"discourse"* – in relation to oral communication. M. Makarov notes that in the early 1970s. scientists have made attempts to differentiate the concepts of "text" and *"discourse"* by including the category *"situation"* in them (Makarov 2003: 87), i.e. discourse was proposed to be understood as *"text + situation"*, the text was understood as *"discourse + situation"*. The text meant an abstract construction, and the discourse meant various types of its actualization, considered from the point of view of mental processes (Dijk van 1989).

Discourse is beginning to be considered as a complex communicative phenomenon, including the act of creating a certain text and reflecting the dependence of a speech work on a large number of extralinguistic circumstances (Kubryakova 2000: 13-14).

For a long time literary texts served as material for linguistic analysis. The analysis of spontaneous natural speech was beyond the scope of the description, however, the development of the communicative-activity approach to the study of the functioning of the language drew the attention of scientists to the procedural aspects of language activity, which made oral speech, already called discourse, the object of linguistic analysis. This approach to the study of discourse involves, in addition to the use of language in the process of communication, the participants in communication perform certain communicative actions in relation to each other. Emphasizing the

activity orientation of human communication, discourse is considered as a way of interpersonal verbal interaction. This approach makes it possible not to limit the analysis of linguistic interaction only to the framework of oral communication, but to include written communication in consideration (Tsurikova 2002: 10).

Many scholars have distinguished different types of discourse. For example, T. van Dijk distinguishes two main types of discourse: oral (talk) and written (text), using different "channels" of communication (Dijk van 1997). Different "channels" of communication define the interactive features of these types of discourse. Written communication was included in the concept of "discourse", which gave unlimited opportunities to consider both types of discourse from the same angle, despite the obvious and significant differences between them.

In relation to modern society, business, advertising, sports, scientific, political, administrative, legal, military, pedagogical, medical and mass information discourses can be distinguished (Karasik 1998: 191). The above list may be supplemented.

It should be noted that different approaches to language learning are not mutually exclusive, but complementary. The communicative approach to the study of text, for example, is based on the analysis of communicative circumstances as the most important meaning-forming component of the text. Based on the concepts of pragmalinguistics and sociolinguistics, V.I. Karasik distinguishes the following components: 1) participants in communication (status-role and situational-communicative characteristics); 2) conditions of communication (sphere of communication, communicative environment); 3) organization of communication (motives and goals); 4) ways. communication (channel and mode, style and genre of communication, etc.) (Karasik 1998: 187).

Taking into account the external and internal text characteristics of speech, V.I. Karasik proposes a classification of discourse categories: 1) constitutive, allowing to distinguish text from non-text; 2) genre-stylistic characterizing texts in terms of their correspondence to functional varieties of speech; 3) meaningful (semantic-

pragmatic), revealing the meaning of the text; 4) formal-structural, characterizing the way the text is organized (Karasik 1998: 187).

Aspects of language structure do not exist autonomously, they depend on the mechanisms of real language activity and on the cognitive structures that a person uses (Kibrik (2) 1996: 232).

Language is considered inextricably linked with the process of cognition, which is the basis for the functioning of the language. The linguistic competence of people is not linguistic, but cognitive in nature (Sildmäe 1987:85). Language serves as one of the means of cognition, conveying how a person cognizes the world, the reality surrounding him (Sildmäe 1990: 132).

Knowledge is studied in cognitive sciences in different directions. The main question, the answer to which many scientists are looking for, is the form in which information is presented in the human mind. It should be noted that knowledge functions as an impersonal phenomenon, as a "field" of meanings (Katrechko 1999: 65). Any individual starts a new cognitive process not from scratch, but from common opinions already formed in society (Bakhtin 1979; Gadamer 1991; Katrechko 1999, etc.). Yu.G. Pankrats believes that the types of knowledge discussed in connection with the processes of verbal and intellectual activity of a person can be divided into verbal and non-verbal ones (Pankrats 1992: 79). There are different approaches to language. The author of the dissertation research relies on a cognitive-pragmatic approach. The linguistic form is the experience of cognitive structures, i.e. structures of human consciousness, cognition and thinking. Among the most important cognitive phenomena that form the linguistic form are the structure of the organization of knowledge and the ways of its conceptual representation in the processes of understanding and generating linguistic messages (Kibrik (1) 1994:126).

Used literature:

1. Arutyunova, N. D. Rechevoy akt / N. D. Arutyunova // Yazыkoznaniye: Bolshoy ensiklopedicheskiy slovar. – M., 1998. – S. 412−413.

2. Lakoff, D. Lingvisticheskiye geshtalty / D. Lakoff // Novoye v zarubejnoy lingvistike. Vyp. X. – M., 1981.

3. Karasik, V. I. Yazyk sosialnogo statusa / V. I. Karasik. – M.: In-t yazыkoznaniya RAN; Volgograd: Volgogr. gos. ped. in-t, 1992. – 330 s.

4. Kibrik, A. A. Analiz diskursa v kognitivnoy perspektive: dis… d-ra kand. filol. nauk [dissertasiya v vide nauchnogo doklada, sostavlennaya na osnove opublikovannyx rabot, predstavlennaya k zashite na soiskaniye uchenoy stepeni doktora filologicheskix nauk]: 10.02.19 / Kibrik Andrey Aleksandrovich. – M., 2003.