Philosophical and Linguistic Aspects of the Study of Modern Literary Discourse

Saidova Mukhayyo Umedilloevna,
Associate Professor of English Linguistics Department

Olimova Sharifa Siddiqovna
Master Student, Bukhara State University

Abstract: *This article delves deeper into the philosophical and linguistic aspects of contemporary artistic discourse, paying attention to the relationship between language, consciousness and the target horizon of meaning. It emphasizes the interdependence of language and cognition in the formation of the individual author's worldview, leading to the creation of a unique linguistic personality and speech. The concept of speech is studied as a type of cognitive activity that includes the construction of linguistic mechanisms of production and perception of speech messages.*

Key words: Komunikativ strategiyalar, muloqot, til ishlatish, o'z-o'zini so'z qilish, muruqatlik strategiyalari, so'zli olmaydigan kommunikatsiya, ikkalamchi strategiyalar.

One of the central problems of modern linguistics is the study of the human factor in language, the linguistic worldview of man at a new stage in the development of civilization. As a starting theoretical position, the thesis of W. von Humboldt is accepted that language cannot be explained without connection with its creator and user, which led to the expansion of the traditional framework of linguistic research, the rejection of the analysis of "language in itself and for itself." The mechanisms of language functioning began to be considered in interaction with the speaking personality cognizing the world intentions predetermined by the cognitive activity of the native speaker various types of knowledge, "which are stored in memory in the form of representation units knowledge about some stereotypical situations, which is part of the system of general knowledge about the world".

This determines our interest in the linguomental space of the linguistic personality of an individual author. In our work, linguomental space is understood as a set of mental and mental processes

occurring in the creative consciousness of the author and predetermining the modeling of a special picture of the world, which is reflected in the author's discourse.

Language, along with consciousness, is interpreted as the fundamental cognitive structure of the experience of the meaning of the world, and the problem of elucidation of the expressive capabilities of language turns into a question about the boundaries of the intentional horizon of the givens of consciousness. It is recognized that the unified cognitive structure "language - consciousness" allows only the meaning expressed in language as intentionally given. Or, more precisely, the meaning itself, along with intentional characteristics, reveals its linguistic nature.

The intentionality of linguistic and, more broadly, speech forms is realized in the complex unity of linguistic form, meaning and action, concentrated around a certain supporting concept, i.e. in discourse, which is realized in the text. In this regard, the discourse itself is interpreted by linguists as a type of cognitive activity of the speaking individual in structuring linguistic mechanisms, perception and production of speech messages (written or oral coherent text in combination with its extralinguistic and paralinguistic characteristics).

Analyzing the semantic and cognitive scope of the term "discourse", we have identified two points of view that allow us to show the significant distance between the definitions of this term. Yu.S. Stepanov, in particular, proposed defining "discourse" as a "possible alternative world" . This approach to the term, in our opinion, can be considered the most multifaceted. As for the extreme brevity of the definition, it seems to us that it was achieved in the "Experimental System Explanatory Dictionary of Stylistic Terms" by S.E. Nikitina and N.V. Vasilyeva, where discourse is understood as "a coherent text immersed in an extralinguistic context" .

Considering the specifics of the research we conduct, we adhere to the following definition of discourse given by NH Mironova: "Discourse is a fully formed unit of information, determined by linguistic and extralinguistic parameters and representing a set of texts that have similar principles of construction, that is, the same pragmatic parameters". The key point in this definition seems to us to be the emphasis on the integrity of the phenomenon under consideration: it is manifested in the semantic and grammatical structure of the discourse, determined both by linguistic factors themselves and by a direct connection with the pragmatic parameters of the author's retrospective understanding of objective reality.

The research significance of the completeness of a set of texts and the pragmatic parameters that determine it increases, in our opinion, when analyzing modern artistic discourse, which is postmodern in its essence and is characterized by a very strong textual orientation toward "vision and explanation." In modern conditions of deep structural transformations of objective reality, artistic postmodernist discourse is not carried out as a local phenomenon, but is established and expands its boundaries of actualization, directly and in many cases indirectly influencing the sociodynamics of language development. We define artistic discourse as a multidimensional, hierarchically organized set of relevant texts that are in dynamic interaction with various modifications of linguistic/non-linguistic expression under the influence of extralinguistic factors that predetermine the successful implementation of texts in a given cultural and historical context. The paradigm for studying a specific artistic discourse includes all types of artistic works, united by the same content, but having different forms of expression.

Modern artistic discourse is focused on the textual recreation of the author's subjective picture of the world within a certain framework of artistic space and time. This picture of the world is the result of a complex process of dialogical relationships that constitute mimesis:

- ➢ I am reality;
- ➢ I am possible worlds;
- ➢ I am Another (reflection, or self-expression).

The methodological basis for the study of modern artistic discourse in philosophy is the theory of text deconstruction of the French poststructuralist scientist J. Derrida. This thinker revised the logocentric concept of structure, where the structure depended on the center, which stabilized and organized the elements of any system, including the linguistic one. All centers had one goal - to determine "being as presence". Jacques Derrida's theory of text deconstruction as a school of thought strives to achieve an absolute absence of center. One of the concepts of deconstruction is the "trace," and the text is considered by J. Derrida as a chain of different traces. The concept of "trace" reveals the provisions of J. Derrida regarding the interpretation of the text, which is based on the discovery of meanings in it that are hidden not only from the reader, but also from the author himself. J. Derrida figuratively compares deconstruction with the magic door in Alice L. Carroll's Through the Looking Glass, where an endless confusion of explicit and indirect meanings and virtual dimensions begins. Many researchers of the French scientist's work explain the essence of the deconstruction method, drawing attention to the fact that there is no absolute meaning in the text . Derrida perceives the whole world as an endless, limitless text. As Derrida believes, "nothing exists outside the text," therefore, any individual is inside the text. Therefore, it can be argued that the world of today as a text is a multidimensional, multipolar artistic discourse. For linguistics, this means a mandatory understanding of the text, context and hypertext based on the ideas of M. Foucault, J. Derrida, J. Kristeva, J. Baudrillard, J.-F. Lyotard, R. Barta. When analyzing reality through the prism of written culture, the linguistic self-awareness of a speaking individual is likened to a certain sum of texts in the context of all texts that make up the culture of a given social community. Modern artistic discourse absorbs all possible textual traditions, while creating from them not linguistic integrity, but a kind of speech collage, devoid of time and cultural coordinates. ' Such discourse, from the point of view of I. Hassan, is essentially anti-discursive, since it transforms the grotesque and fantasy into textual antiforms that carry a charge of violence, madness and apocalypticism and turn the cosmos into chaos. For modern artistic discourse, everything extra-systemic appears valuable, since any order is illusory, being only a product of the human imagination. Such a theoretical concept successfully explains, in our opinion, the specifics of modern artistic discourse, which highlights the unrepresentable, the indepictable in the image itself (that which, at first glance, cannot be reconstructed through textual categories). The author does not need to indulge the tastes of the readership: his task is to look for new ways of artistic depiction not so that readers receive aesthetic pleasure, but for the linguistic expression of feelings of what is difficult to imagine within the text. In this case, the meaning turns out to be unnecessary, since real reality is unknowable, not determined by textual categories, not has a logical center, which means it is meaningless. Such an author's position (and method of creative thinking) becomes a reader's problem when entering artistic discourse. With this approach, the essence of artistic discourse comes down to the use of meaning in a new dimension, ultimately to metaphor. As a result, modern artistic discourse turns out to be oversaturated with endless semantic multiplicity. To identify this multiplicity, the reader's linguistic personality is integrated into the metasystem of the text, which in turn is constructed by the author's linguistic personality. "The immediate problem solved at the level of postmodern artistic narrative is how to express the improbability of the process of perception, to "split" the cognitive nature of the subject of perception in order to reveal the truth".

REFERENCES:

1. Arutyunova N. D. Diskurs / N. D. Arutyunova // Katta ensiklopedik lug'at. Tilshunoslik. - M., 1998. - S. 136-137.

2. Bogdanov VV Matn va matnli aloqa / VV Bogdanov. - Sankt-Peterburg . : Sankt -Peterburg nashriyoti . davlat unta, 1993. - 68 b.

3. Kibrik A. A. Diskurs va funksionalizmning paydo bo'lishi / A. A. Kibrik , V. A. Plungyan // Zamonaviy Amerika tilshunosligi: asosiy yo'nalishlar. - M.: URSS tahririyati , 2002. -S. 307-309.

4. Mamedov A. Ya. Matnning kognitiv tuzilishi / A. Ya. Mamedov, M. E. Mamedov // Vestnik MSLU. - M.: Rema, 2007. - Nashr . 521. - S. 167-171.

5. Chafe V. Diskurs, ong va vaqt. Nutq va yozishda ongli tajribaning oqimi va o'zgarishi / Chafe V. - Chikago: Chikago universiteti. - Matbuot, 1994 yil.

6. Chomskiy N. Sintaksis nazariyasining aspektlari / N. Chomskiy // Kembrij: MIT Press, 1965 yil.

7. Daniyalik Fr. A. Sintaksisga uch darajali yondashuv / Daniyaliklar Fr. A.- Travaux linguistigue de Praga, 1966. -P. 56-58.

8. Enkvist NE Matndan talqin qilinishiga: matn tilshunosligidagi asosiy atamalarni muhokama qilishga hissa. Bog'lanish va uyg'unlik : matn va nutq tahlili / Enkvist NE - Nyu-York, 1989. - P. 369-382.

9. Saidova, M. U. (2019). THE STRUCTURAL COMPOSITION OF THE LITERARY TERMS IN LITERARY DICTIONARY" LITERARY TERMS AND LITERARY THEORY" BY JA CUDDON. *Международный академический вестник*, (1), 73-76. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=w-pR1LIAAAAJ&citation_for_view=w-pR1LIAAAAJ:EYYDruWGBe4C

10. Umedilloevna, S. M. UDC: 1751 Lexicographic Analysis Of The Concise Oxford Dictionary Of Literary Terms By K. Boldik And Some Uzbek Literary Dictionaries. *Scientific Reports Of Bukhara State University*, *115*. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=w-pR1LIAAAAJ&citation_for_view=w-pR1LIAAAAJ:kuK5TVdYjLIC