

DEFINITION OF THE TERM "FILM DISCOURSE" AND APPROACHES TO ITS STUDY IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

*Erkayeva Dilnoza Bakhtiyorovna,
Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute
Teacher of the Department of Foreign Language Teaching Methods
dilnozaerkayeva@buxdpi.uz*

Abstract. This article gives full overview of definition of the film discourse and approaches to its study in modern linguistics.

Key words. Term, film discourse, approach, modern linguistics.

Introduction. Currently, scientists are not interested in the functioning of isolated words, but words in context, because thanks to the context (communicative situation), it is possible to identify the features of the use of a word or phrase.

Literature Review. Thus, discourse becomes a special object of study in modern linguistics. T.V. Tolstova writes that “starting from the 60s-70s of the last century, linguistic studies increasingly began to take into account extralinguistic data ... the social context began to be involved in the analysis, the terms “discourse” and “discourse analysis” appeared” (Tolstova, 2018, 12).

N.D. Arutyunova identifies the following trends that contributed to the emergence of discourse theory: - the desire to bring syntax beyond the sentence; - development of pragmatics of speech; - approach to speech as a social action; - interest in speech use and the subjective aspect of speech; - General trends towards the integration of humanities studies (Arutyunova, 1990). M.V. Gorbunova emphasizes that “the introduction of the term “discourse” by Z. Harris into the conceptual apparatus of linguistic science is explained by the need to study the contextual use of language and language units” (Gorbunova, 2012, 246). It is true that just as it is impossible to analyze individual sentences outside their linguistic context, it is also impossible to consider discourse outside of context (Longacre, 1983, 18).

It is advisable to emphasize the change in the interpretation of the concept of "discourse". For example, “if in the 60-70s discourse was understood as a connected sequence of sentences or speech acts, then from the standpoint of modern approaches, discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, also extralinguistic factors (knowledge of the world, opinions, attitudes, the goals of the addressee) necessary for understanding the text” (Dyck, 2000, 8).

A. A. Kibrik believes that discourse appears as “the unity of two entities - the process of linguistic communication and the object resulting from it, i.e. text. Thanks to this dual unity, discourse can be studied both as a process unfolding in time and as a structural object” (Kibrik, 2009, 4).

Karasik notes that “discourse is a phenomenon of an intermediate order between speech, communication, linguistic behavior, on the one hand, and a fixed text that remains in the “dry residue” of communication, on the other hand” (Karasik, 2002, 192). V.P. Konetskaya claims that “the communicative sphere is actualized in a complex communicative unit”, which she calls “discourse” (Konetskaya, 1997, 29). Karasik understands discourse as a text “immersed in a situation of communication” (Karasik, 2000, 5).

D. Arutyunova believes that “discourse is speech “immersed in life” (Arutyunova, 1990, 137). As E.S. Kubryakova, discourse is not only speech, but also “the action of the speaker with all his intentions, knowledge, attitudes, personal experience and all his immersion in the cognitive-



communicative process he is performing” (Kubryakova, 2004, 419). N.D.Arutyunova offers a more extended definition of discourse, in her opinion, it is “a coherent text in conjunction with extralinguistic - pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors; text taken in the event aspect; speech, considered as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes)” (Arutyunova 1990, 136-137).

Analysis. Shchetinina refers to the discourse of cinema (to film discourse) as "a professional discourse that covers both the speech of actors in conjunction with the non-verbal communication that accompanies it, and the communication of specialists who create and shoot films" (Shchetinina, 2016, 165-166). Thus, the film discourse, in the above definitions, is associated with:

- a cultural phenomenon;
- the text in the film and the process of its production and consumption;
- interaction between the author and the film recipient;
- the process of reproduction and perception of the film;
- a fragment of a film, a movie;
- audiovisual discourse;
- verbal component of the film and non-verbal components;
- the speech of the actors along with their non-verbal communication of representatives of film professions.

In this work, film discourse is understood as the language used in the community of filmmakers and moviegoers, as well as by journalists outside the film itself, namely in the specialized publications *Film* and *American Cinematographer Research* (periodicals), the analyzed modern terminological layer of cinema appears before us in the context, the importance of which was noted earlier.

Thus, film discourse, in the above definitions, is a cultural phenomenon; the text in the film and the process of its production and consumption; interaction between the author and the film recipient; the process of reproduction and perception of the film; a fragment of a film, a movie; audiovisual discourse; verbal component of the film and non-verbal components; the speech of actors along with their non-verbal communication and communication of representatives of film professions.

In this work, film discourse is understood as the language used in the community of filmmakers and moviegoers, as well as by journalists outside of the film itself, namely in specialized editions of the *Cinematographer*.

Thus, film discourse, in the above definitions, is the text in the film and the process of its production and consumption; verbal component of the film and non-verbal components; and communication and film discourse is understood as the language used in the community of filmmakers and filmgoers, as well as by journalists outside the film itself, namely in specialized publications “Total Thus, based on the object of study (periodical magazines), the analyzed modern terminological layer of cinema appears before us in context.

In turn, N.A. Shchetinina believes that the terms “cinema discourse” and “film discourse” are synonymous, since these concepts include a whole array of cinematic techniques that are studied outside of linguistics.

Discussion. In our opinion, the terms "cinema discourse" and "film discourse" also have the same meaning. R. Janney distinguishes between the concepts of "film discourse" and "cinematic discourse", the latter of which she understands as a language not in the film itself, for example, in dialogues, but the language used, for example, in editing or sound editing (Janney, 2012) . M.



Dinel explains the meaning of the concepts "film discourse" and "cinematic discourse" as follows. The scientist believes that "cinematic discourse" combines a set of cinematic techniques that are studied outside of linguistics (Dynel, 2011, 42). From this we conclude that, according to M. Dinel, linguistics studies "film discourse". In our opinion, the difference between the two concepts is not presented by the researchers clearly enough, so we propose the following distinction between the terms "film discourse" and "cinematic discourse": "cinematic discourse" includes the language of cinematography outside of a film work, and "film discourse" implies the language directly film production (film). Thus, in this dissertation, it is the "cinematic discourse" that is studied, the observations made about which in Chapter II form the basis of the bilingual dictionary "Cinematography", the name of which is also intended to indicate the specifics of the language reflected in it. Currently, scientists have recorded the following types of film discourse. Thus, a kind of film discourse "telecinematic discourse".

In our opinion, the proposed name is very successful, since it harmoniously combines television discourse and film discourse. To confirm the close relationship between the two areas, we present the dissertation research by E.A. Mazurina, which describes the interaction of documentary forms of cinematography and television (Mazurina, 1984). T.A. Kubrak uses the concept of "post-event film discourse", by which she means "discussion after watching the film" (Kubrak, 2019, 601). A.G. Nikolenko makes an important clarification and notes that "before and after watching films, the audience is co-opted into a frame of expectation and commentary, which is translated into the local language as the main element of the cinematic experience" (Nikolenko, 2013, 59). In our opinion, since the "post-event film discourse", as the name implies, is characterized by the process of discussion after watching the film, the discussion preceding the film viewing is characterized by a different kind of film discourse. Based on the logic of T.A. Kubrak, regarding the formation of the phrase "post-event film discourse", the variety we have identified can be called "pre-event film discourse".

A. V. Koryachkina understands "genre film discourse" as "commercial popular cinema designed for the mass cinema audience, its main task is to entertain the audience" (Koryachkina, 2015, 94). A.A. Kutsenko considers another type of discourse, namely the "discourse of the TV format" (Kutsenko, 2017, 36). By "TV format", the scientist understands "a research construct, which is a set of information verbalized in a film, forming an integral cognitive television resource, both voiced and in the form of subtitles" (Kutsenko, 2017, 36). V.D. Shevchenko introduces the term "macrodiscourse", which, according to the scientist, includes "the discourses of various groups of the society depicted in the film" (Shevchenko, 2005, 136). V.D. Shevchenko notes that "everything in the discourse is subject to the socio-cultural context in which the communicants live" (Shevchenko, 2005, 136). Yu.A. Nelyubina believes that film discourse "is a channel of mass communication, i.e. a kind of media discourse (or media discourse, mass media discourse, media discourse)" (Nelubina, 2016, 313). 76 L.P. Saenkova-Melnitskaya also refers cinema to media discourse and notes that "with the advent of cinema, the media practice of presenting the "ubiquitous cinema" in newspaper and magazine periodicals began to take shape" (Saenkova-Melnitskaya, 2020, 332). T.G. Dobrosklonskaya points out that the subject of media linguistics is "the study of the functioning of language in the sphere of mass communication" (Dobrosklonskaya, 2008, 34). In accordance with the system of parameters proposed by T.G. Dobrosklonskaya, the media text considered in the study includes such characteristics as: - collegial (according to the method of text production); - written (according to the form of creation); - written (in the form of reproduction); - mass media - media: print/Internet (through distribution channel); - journalism (according to the functional-genre type of text); - cinematography

(according to the thematic dominant or belonging to one or another stable media topic) (Dobrosklonskaya, 2008, 40). Based on the characteristics of cinema discourse proposed by I.N. Lavrinenko, the film discourse studied in the dissertation meets the following criteria: - written discourse (through the channel of information transmission); - monological and dialogic communication (by type of communication); - institutional discourse (according to the criterion of the addressee); - cooperative discourse (by goals and communicative principles); - informative communication (according to the nature of the informative component) (Lavrinenko, 2012, 42-43). A.V. Koryachkina focuses on the rich terminological tools that are used in the linguistic study of cinema, for example, such terms as: “film discourse, cinematographic discourse, video-verbal text, film / video material, film dialogue, film narrative, film text, film (film), creolized text, text in cinema register” (Koryachkina, 2017, 13). Many of the terms named by the scientist are considered as components of film discourse, and film discourse itself is equated to a film. Despite the fact that we define film discourse as a language outside of a film work, it is further important to consider the components of film discourse listed by the scientist and describe their characteristic features in order to illuminate the concept of “film discourse” in many ways.

B. Kislitsyna, Service, 2019, 515). The main component of the film discourse, according to scientists, is the film text, which is represented by signs of a linguistic and non-linguistic system, which are divided into certain types. Hierarchy of relationships between the components of film discourse according to N.N. Kislitsyna, A.G. service. 78 M.A. Samkova distinguishes between the concepts of “film text” and “film discourse” (Samkova, 2011). The scientist notes that “film text in relation to film discourse can be considered as its fragment, and film discourse as a whole text or a set of texts united by some feature” (Samkova, 2011, 137). In turn, A.V. Fedorov understands cinema text as “a message containing information and presented in any form and genre of cinema (feature, documentary, animation, educational, popular science film)” (Fedorov, 2000, 35). E.A. Kolodina believes that “film text is a fragment of film discourse and includes two heterogeneous semiotic systems: linguistic and non-linguistic, film dialogue appears as a linguistic component of the film” (Kolodina, 2013, 332). T.A. Vinnikova in her work singles out such components of the film text as: a verbal series, a visual-pictorial series, a sound-musical series (Vinnikova, 2009, 9). M.B. Voroshilova focuses on the fact that, in accordance with the semiotic approach to film text, the film has a special language that can be considered within the framework of syntax and grammar (Voroshilova, 2007, 107)

References:

1. An American Dictionary of the English Language: Intended to Exhibit, 1828. - URL: <https://archive.org/details/americandictionary01webrich/page/1/mode/2up>.
2. Baker P., Hardie A., McEnery T. A Glossary of Corpus Linguistics. - Edinburgh University Press, 2006. - 192 p.
3. Cambridge Dictionary. - URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/ru/> - дата обращения 10.08.2020.
4. Collins Dictionary. - URL: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com> - дата обращения 07.08.2020.
5. Cruden's Complete Concordance to the Old and New Testaments. - URL: <https://archive.org/details/crudenscompletec00crud/page/6/mode/2up> - дата обращения 30.01.2020.



6. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. - 491 p.
7. ISLOMOV ELDOR YUSUPOVICH, AHMEDOVA MEHRINIGOR BAHODIROVNA. THE ESSENCE OF SPIRITUALITY IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE. XIII МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ НАУЧНО-ПРАКТИЧЕСКАЯ КОНФЕРЕНЦИЯ " ЯЗЫК И КУЛЬТУРА" Челябинск, 26 апреля 2018 года. - P.12-15
8. Akhmedova Mekhrinigor Bahodirovna. "ANALYSIS AND DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS OF THE CONCEPT OF SPIRITUALITY". Indonesian Journal of Innovation Studies, Vol. 18, May 2022, doi:10.21070/ijins.v18i.590.
9. Magdalena NGONGO, Akhmedova Mehrinigor. A Systemic Functional Linguistic Analysis of Clauses Relationship in Luke Gospel Text, Janji Baru Using Kupang Malay. Studies in Media and Communication Journal. Vol.11, 2023. - P. 33-40.
10. Fitria Nur Hasanah, Rahmania Sri Untari, Shofiyah Al Idrus, and Akhmedova Mehrinigor Bahodirovna. Excel in Critical and Creative Thinking in Object-Oriented Programming. H. Ku et al. (Eds.): ICARSE 2022, ASSEHR 748, 2023. - P. 301–305.
Hazim Hazim, Ratih Puspita Anggraenni, Akhmedova Mehrinigor Bahodirovna. Altruistic Actions in COVID-19 Corpses Care: Empathy, Modeling, and More. International Conference on Advance Research in Social and Economic Science (ICARSE 2022), 2023/4/27. - P.476-484 ".