COMPARATIVE DISCOURSE STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS

Kholboboeva Aziza Sherboboevna
Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences (PhD)
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
azizakholboboeva@mail.ru

Annotation
Discourse is sometimes considered another level of the language, or at least another level of language analysis. This article discusses the issue of "comparative discourse" as linguistic phenomen.

Keywords. methodological formation, written mode of discourse, intertextual, minimum units, macrostructure, discursive sphere, static and dynamic aspect.

Introduction
Linguistics until the end of the twentieth century lived under the thesis: "to study the language in oneself and for oneself" (words written by F. de Saussure).

In "Autonomous linguistics" (6,126) tried to explain language as a phenomenon without relying on external, that is, social, psychological, individual, etc. factors, which were bashfully called "extralinguistic". However, the technological needs of our time (linguodidactics, translation, linguistic technologies in various social spheres, etc.) gradually brought the study of the functioning of the living organism of language out of the shadows.

The term "linguistics of linguistic existence" appeared and became Klangwort, the language began to be studied "as a continuous environment, outside of which and without the participation of which nothing can happen in our life" As N. N. Boldyrev rightly notes, "in order to explain how the language is arranged and how it is used, it is necessary to go beyond the language system itself and connect it with everything that we know about perception, memory, human behavior, etc. etc." (3;12). Human behavior primarily includes discursive practices as the basis for organizing, categorizing, archiving and interpreting human praxis as a whole.

In comparative linguistics, the final methodological formation of which also took place in the second half of the last century, the currently distinguished levels of language are studied to varying degrees. Contrastive grammar is the most developed, there are a lot of works on comparative lexicology, there are works on contrastive phonology, and even on comparative text style. As for discourse, as such, comparative discourse studies are in the process of formation, as is the theory of discourse itself.

The concept of discourse in modern linguistics is probably one of the most vague and uncertain. Having gone beyond the limits of scientific linguistics proper and being practically in the hands of the "general public", including journalists, the term discourse began to be used in relation to the most diverse spheres of human activity. What is discourse? Discourse - is sometimes considered another level of language, or at least another level of language analysis. Indeed, such traditional levels as phonological (minimum unit: "phoneme") - morphological ("morpheme") - lexical ("lexeme") - syntactic ("phrase or sentence") are known. Do these levels follow the next - text or discourse, and what then are its minimum units, differential features and methods of analysis?

Table 1. Units of discourse analysis.

Discourse division level	Units of oral mode of discourse	Units of the written mode of discourse
strategic	communicative event	text
topical	communicative episode	paragraph
optimal	dialogic unity	superphrasal unity
tactical	replica, move	superphrasal unity
minimum	statement	phrase, sentence
pretext	speech act	speech act

The definition of discourse as a sphere of analysis of linguistic phenomena, apparently, requires the definition of its minimum units. As such, a statement or a phrase that is part of a dialogic unity (oral mode of discourse), or a superphrasal unity (written mode of discourse) is usually recognized as such. There are also units of a higher order: a communicative episode (fragment) and a discursive event (text).

The definition of discourse as a sphere of analysis of linguistic phenomena, apparently, requires the definition of its minimum units. As such, a statement or a phrase that is part of a dialogic unity (oral mode of discourse), or a superphrasal unity (written mode of discourse) is usually recognized as such. There are also units of a higher order: a communicative episode (fragment) and a discursive event (text).

Terminology can be quite different (11 ;180-190), but three main stages of analysis remain: utterance - a group of utterances united by discursive parameters - thematic unity of utterances.

Discourse is speech "immersed in life" (2: 137; 5: 230-232). This definition of discourse brings to the fore another side of discursive research, including phenomena that are outside the boundaries of the unity of statements and beyond the boundaries of a single text: aspects of the functioning of text and discourse in a social environment. Recent studies suggest the need to single out - in addition to micro- and macrostructure - also the hyperstructure of the text and discourse, the intertextual or interdiscursive level. At this level, the connections of the text (and individual

statements in it) with other texts, discourses, discursive and social practices are traced. In the discourse, there is also a connection not only with strangers, but also with the communicant's own discursive practices, his presuppositions, emotional and mental states, relationships, assessments, knowledge of norms and rules. This is the metastructure of discourse, the level of organization and monitoring of discursive practices.

The content of discursive processes is idioethnic in form and universal in essence and meaning. Understanding the correlation of the universal / idioethnic is the development of the ideas of S.D Katsnelson (4,123). There are probably universal and idio-ethnic features in the structuring of discourse. The presence of a universal base and idio-ethnic types provides a basis for comparing discursive processes in different linguistic cultures.

For example, American political discourse includes such a traditional genre as the President's Sabbath Address (in fact, a kind of political prayer aimed at uniting the nation, confirming power and national symbols). For Uzbek political discourse, such regular presidential speeches are not typical. At the same time, the genre of the "National holiday's address of the president" stands out, in which the conceptual content in terms of functions and means of their execution is comparable to the above-mentioned American one.

Thus, in all cultures, the sphere of political discourse is developing, which is the arena for the manifestation of universal strategies of aggression and reconciliation in discursive practices associated with the division, assertion and manifestation of power. Typical genres of a given discursive sphere will have idio-ethnic features both in terms of their typical set for a given linguoculture and in terms of their linguistic (and non-verbal) implementation.

The origins of the study of speech, discourse, dialogue and text, the distinction between static and dynamic aspects and increased attention to the dynamic, to real language processes lie in the works of W. von Humboldt (ενέργεια), F. de Saussure (parole, discours), L. Wittgenstein ("language game"), L. V. Shcherby (language/speech/speech activity/text material), E. Benvenista (double meaning: semiotic in language and semantic in speech) and others. and social processes. M. M. Bakhtin noted: "The organizing center of any statement, any expression is not inside, but outside: in the social environment surrounding the individual". Comparing discursive practices, we find differences in the social environment itself, which are characteristic of each culture. At the same time, it is the social environment that is the initial basis that provides a comparison of discourses and texts.

A communicative (discursive) event is a process, it is continuous, but it can be discretized, segmented, divided into units. The articulation of discourse is its constitutive property ("articulate speech").

Processuality and articulation, as well as subjectivity and intersubjectivity, are the constitutive features of discourse. Thus, discourse is the process and result of the activity of the subject and the interaction of subjects, linguistic (communicative, discursive) personalities.

The design of discursive units is determined by a complex of choice factors associated with hyper- and metastructure, the chronotope of the discursive situation, idio-ethnic features of the construction of micro- and macrostructural discourse units. These factors predetermine the communicant's choice of the appropriate means from the repertoire of possible discursive actions (individual grammatical actions and lexical choice, tactical steps in the formation of utterance connections, discursive strategy as a whole).

The formal division of the discourse flow is determined by the very course of the speech interaction of communicants (change of speech subjects: speaker/listener). An utterance (remark in a dialogue) is a minimal unit of discourse, characterized by a change in the subjects of speech, completeness, genre design, connection with other utterances of the dialogue, and integrity. The statement, first of all, is connected with the response statement of another communicant, the interlocutor [7]. In this regard, a unit of the next level of discourse analysis is singled out - interaction, transaction or dialogic unity. Question/answer, request/reaction, etc. pairs can serve as examples of dialogic unity [1]

The basic structure of the discourse, its minimal and tactical units are universal in essence and types, and idioethnic in terms of linguistic performance and colloquial preferences. Thus, the dialogical unity of gratitude/response to gratitude in English and Uzbek discourse demonstrates the difference in the use of lexically similar language means. So, in Uzbek, "please" is acceptable as a response to gratitude (Rahmat/ Minnatdorman/Tashakkur). In English, the lexical correspondence please implies a request situation and is found only in the language of Uzbek copywriters who write advertising texts like the following: Prize? – Please! The answer to thanks can be one of the options for the following selection field: *Not at all; Don't mention it; you are welcome; My pleasure* or even typically American: *Anytime!*

As we can see, the comparison of discourses and texts can play a significant role in solving linguodidactic and translation problems.

The speech act in the theory of speech acts professed by the followers of Austin-Searle does not indicate the possibility of one or another interpretation by the listener. To overcome this drawback of the theory of speech acts, in the analysis of discourse, the concepts of a communicative (speech) course or a discursive act are used. A communicative course can be implemented both in a single speech act and in a sequence of speech acts, under the auspices of a single communicative focus (goal): r*equest + argumentation + emotion.* For example: *Biz sayyohlarmiz,adashib qoldik,iltimos bizga yo'l ko'rsating!*

A communicative tactical move is determined by its role in the deployment of discourse, in the continuation of speech interaction, in a discursive strategy. A replica can formally coincide with a discursive act (move), but it can also include several moves: *Both, and preferably more, and also tell me what time it is*! The tactical organization of discourse, its connection with the general strategy of speech interaction is determined by the social status, psychological characteristics of the communicants, the chronotope of the situation and the state of the communicators. A communicative (discursive) strategy combines a chain of communicative tactical moves (sometimes retreats) aimed at achieving the global goal of speech interaction.

The list of used Literature

1. Abramov S. N. Germenevtika, interpretatsiya, tekst // Studia Linguistica 2. — SPb., 1996. — P. 114—119.
2. Arutyunova N.D. Yazik i mir cheloveka / N.D. Arutyunova. – M.: Yaziki russkoy kulturi, 1999. – 895 p.
3. Boldirev N.N. Kognitivnaya semantika: Kurs leksiy po angliyskoy filologii / N.N. Boldыrev. – Tambov: TGU, 2001. – 123p.
4. Katsnelson S.D. Tipologiya yazika i rechevoye mishleniya / S.D. Katsnelson. – L.: Nauka, 1972. – 216p.
5. Karasik V.I. Yazikovoy krug: lichnost, konsepti, diskurs / V.I. Karasik. – Volgograd: Peremena, 2002. – 477 p.
6. Kibrik A.A. Kognitivniy issledovaniya po diskursu / A.A. Kibrik // Voprosi yazikoznaniya. – 1994. – №5. – P. 126-139.
7. Kholboboeva A. Linguisic Characteristics Of Advertising Discourse:Creolized And Non-Creolized Advertising Texts nternational Journal of Aquatic Science , Vol 12, Issue 03, 2021. - P.2944-2951.
8. Kholboboeva Aziza "THE NOTION OF ADVERTISING DISCOURSE IN MODERN UZBEK LINGUISTICS", Philology Matters: Vol. 2020 : Iss. 2 , Article 9,2020. DOI: 10.36078/987654439
9. Lomov B. F. Metodologicheskiye i teoreticheskiye problemi psixologii. — M., 1984.
10. Ojegov S.I. Slovar russkogo yazika / S.I. Ojegov. – M.: Russkiy yazik,1987. – 797p.
11. Makarov M. L. Osnovi teori diskursa.— M.: ITDGK «Gnozis», 2003.— 280 p.