American Journal Of Philological Sciences (ISSN – 2771-2273) VOLUME 04 ISSUE 08 PAGES: 78-81 OCLC – 1121105677 Crossref O S Google S WorldCat MENDELEY



Publisher: Oscar Publishing Services



Research Article

JournalWebsite:https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ajps

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

TYPES OF DISCOURSE AND DOMESTIC DISCOURSE

Submission Date: August 20, 2024, Accepted Date: August 25, 2024, Published Date: August 30, 2024 Crossref doi: https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume04Issue08-13

Khasanova Dilnoza Tajidinovna Andijan State University Teacher Of The Interfaculty Faculty Of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the difference between the concepts of discourse and text, the typology of discourse, types of person-oriented discourse, everyday discourse and its uniqueness.

KEYWORDS

Text, discourse, personal discourse, institutional discourse, domestic discourse, existential discourse, direct and indirect discourse, semantic transfer, new meaning.

INTRODUCTION

linguists struggle to Modern distinguish the differences between the terms of "text" and "discourse" while studying language based on anthropocentric theory. Contrasts such as functionality-structuralism, dynamic-static, actualityvirtuality are being used to distinguish the phenomena based on these two concepts. In order for knowledge to be transmitted and formed in a new, it is necessary to create a text, so the text begins to be created at the moment of discursive activity. It is better to study these two phenomena, which are being compared, in the relation of "hyperonym" - "hyponym". Discourse is a certain type and series of human conscious activity, and text is its manifestation. The interpretation of the discourse category in such a broad sense, generalizing content, is already recognized rule for communication system, other fields of science interested in human American Journal Of Philological Sciences (ISSN – 2771-2273) VOLUME 04 ISSUE 08 PAGES: 78-81 OCLC – 1121105677 Crossref O S Google S WorldCat[®] MENDELEY



Publisher: Oscar Publishing Services

conscious activity - philosophy, sociology, psychology, cybernetics, etc.

From the point of view of sociolinguistics, there are two main types of discourse: personal (personoriented) and institutional. In the first case, the speaker tries to show his inner world in all its richness as an individual, in the second case - as a representative of a certain social institution. According to V. I. Karasik, the person-oriented discourse manifests itself in two forms: domestic and life discourses. [p. 1, 27] A. V. Olyanich analyzed the types of discourse in the USA and Russia in the monograph "Prezentatsionnaya teoriya discursa".

Personal discourse is characterized by an attempt to minimize the time and reach a specific abbreviated code of communication in order to convey information that is considered relevant only in terms of highly emotional modal-evaluative qualifications and divided into 2 sub types: domestic discourse and existential discourse

Institutional discourse represents communication within the given framework of interpersonal social relations in society. It can be seen that the following types of institutional discourse can be distinguished: political, diplomatic, administrative, legal, military, pedagogical, religious, mystical, medical, business, advertising, sports, scientific, theatrical and public information. Domestic discourse occurs between familiar people to maintain contact and solve everyday problems. Its peculiarity is that this communication is dialogic in its essence, it continues in a pointed way, the participants of the dialogue know each other well, and therefore communicate at a reduced distance without telling in detail what is being discussed. This is a conversation about things that are clear and easy to understand. For this type of speech, I.N. Gorelov says that verbal communication only complements non-verbal things, and the main information is conveyed through facial expressions, gestures, speech-related actions, etc.

The specific features of domestic discourse are reflected in detail in the study of oral speech. Everyday communication is a natural initial type of speech that is organically acquired from childhood. This type of discourse is characterized by spontaneity, strong situational dependence, clear subjectivity, violation of logic and structural design of statements. Phonetically, vague fluency is the norm here. In everyday speech, people refer to abbreviated and slang vocabulary, although statistically colloquial words do not make up more than 10% of the lexical fund of statements in colloquial speech. Phonetically, vague fluent pronunciation is the norm here. The most important feature of colloquial speech units is the specific denotative direction of words (so they are easily replaced by non-verbal signs); in addition, a restrictive (restrictive, password) function of communication is

American Journal Of Philological Sciences (ISSN – 2771-2273) VOLUME 04 ISSUE 08 PAGES: 78-81 OCLC – 1121105677 Crossref

Publisher: Oscar Publishing Services

carried out within a narrow circle of famous people, they use symbols that emphasize belonging to the relevant group (family, group words) and are incomprehensible to outsiders. The ambiguity of pronunciation is related to the semantic ambiguity of units: the meanings of words are very flexible, words are easily replaced by approximate substitutes, pronouns and particles dominate in this speech. Domestic discourse differs in that the speaker must be understood at a glance. The active role of the addressee in this type of speech gives the addressee great opportunities to quickly change topics, as well as to easily translate information into subtext (irony, language games, hints, etc.).

In contrast to domestic discourse, attempts are made to reveal one's inner world in all its richness in existential speech, communication is broad, extremely rich in meaning, all forms of speech are used based on literary language; existential communication is mainly monologic and is represented by fiction and philosophical and psychological introspective texts.

Peculiarities of domestic discourse are reflected in colloquial discourse studies. Domestic discourse is characterized by situational dependence, spontaneity, breaking the structural expression of the statement. In everyday discourse, people may use abbreviated and slang vocabulary. The speaker easily moves from one topic to another, sarcasm, advice, etc. uses the addressee does not need much time to understand the

addressee. Domestic discourse can be direct or indirect. V. I. Karasik directly distinguishes two types of domestic discourse: semantic transfer and new meaning. Transfer of meaning is the expression of feelings and thoughts that help a person to define things that are not clear, phenomena that belong to the whole world are determined through verbal reasoning. A new meaning is realized by suddenly understanding the essence of the matter, clarifying the situation. In indirect domestic discourse, the story is depicted symbolically and the events are described in sequence. That is, the description is based on the principle of sequence, and the image develops the idea figuratively by describing the static characteristics of observable. concrete events. Narration and description, unlike parables, use stable socially embedded semantic connectors and do not require a broad cultural context.

REFERENCES

- V. I. KARASIK Rechevaya kommunikatsiya: diskursivnыy aspekt, Elektronnыy nauchnoobrazovatelnыy jurnal VGSPU «Grani poznaniya».№1(21). Fevral 2013
- Hamroyeva N.N. Shaxslararo muloqot jarayonida dialogik diskursning oʻrni va kommunikativ strategiyalar, Buxoro davlat universiteti ilmiy axbroti, 2023-3 (80-bet)



Publisher: Oscar Publishing Services

- S.V.Lukyanova, K VOPROSU O TIPOLOGII
 DISKURSA, Vestnik Pskovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta
- Kupsova Yu.A. K voprosu opredeleniya i tipologii diskursa,L.JOURNAL.ru IMG, Belgorod, Rossiya. https://doicode.ru/doifile/lj/20/lj-30-11-2016-3-10.pdf
- Karasik, V. I. Jazykovoj krug: lichnost', koncepty, diskurs, – M.: Gnozis, 2004.

