Discourse Analysis of Film: Dialogue and Monologue

Erkaeva Dilnoza Bakhtiyorovna [1]

[1] Bukhara state university

Abstract: Film discourse is a complex lingual semiotic communicative cultural phenomenon related to civilization values accumulated by mankind from the late XIX - early XX centuries to the present.

Keywords: semiotic, film discourse, system, studies, definition, linguistics, cinema.

I. INTRODUCTION

A sign system known as "film discourse" that appears to be the outcome of interactions between texts in the semiosphere and numerous discourses in the discourse sphere. As texts and discourses constantly interact and have an impact on one another, the boundaries between various texts and discourses are not strict but rather flexible. Applying the semiotic approach, film discourse can be described as an infinite variety of films (or films considered as texts) - the outcome of interaction between a collective author's goal, a complex range of potential viewer reactions, and the film itself, all coming into close touch in the semiosphere. A film, or film text, is a coherent, whole message that expresses the author's representation of a problem using verbal and non-verbal cues. It is organized using cinematographic codes in accordance with the concept of a collective functionally differentiated author, recorded as a series of frames, and intended for display on a screen for individual or group audiovisual perception by the viewer.

II. Literature review

The semiotic and nature of this type of discourse is emphasized in a large number of linguistic studies of this phenomenon, though not always: for example, A. I. Kazakova understands film discourse very generally, as "... film text, as well as the film itself, the interpretation of the film by moviegoers and the meaning what the filmmakers, directors and scriptwriters put into it "[Kazakova, 2014]; in this definition, the semiotic characteristics of the author are not highlighted or "hidden" in the depths of a rather superficial and less linguistic definition. For A. N. Zaretskaya, the cinema discourse, on the contrary, the phenomenon of purely linguistic semiotics is "a coherent text, which is the verbal component of the film, together with non-verbal components — the audiovisual component of this film and other extra linguistic factors significant for the semantic completeness of the film, such as creolized education, which has properties of integrity, connectedness, informativeness, communicative-pragmatic orientation, media and created collectively by a differentiated author for viewing by the recipient of the message (cinema viewer). Extra linguistic factors include diverse cultural and historical background knowledge of the addressee, extra linguistic context - the situation, time and place to which the film belongs, various non-verbal means: drawings, gestures, facial expressions that are important in creating and perceiving the film" [Zaretskaya, 2010]. The cinema discourse of I.N. Lavrinenko has been studied in great detail: the researcher gives a detailed definition of the phenomenon and characterizes the cinema discourse as "... a multicode cognitive-communicative formation, a combination of various semiotic units in their inextricable unity, which is characterized by connectedness, wholeness, completeness, and targeting. Film discourse is expressed using verbal, non-verbal (including cinematic) signs in accordance with the plan of the collective author and is structured by means of exchanging communicative roles; it is

fixed on a material carrier and is intended for reproduction on the screen and audiovisual perception by the audience" [Lavrinenko, 2012].

III. Analysis

Let us pay attention to the introduction into the research field of the meta-discursive category of exchange of communicative roles as a system of strategies, tactics and techniques, which "... controls the process of dialogic communication using verbal and/or non-verbal means of taking, maintaining or transferring to one of the participants of the interaction the right to voice input, indicating to the point of potential transition or the point of relevant transition. The structurally regulatory metadiscursive nature of this system is manifested in its concomitant nature with respect to other discursive categories and the presence of specialized tactics and methods of changing roles". [Lavrinenko, 2012].

S.S. Nazmutdinova as "a semiotically complicated, dynamic process of interaction between the author of the film recipient and the interlanguage and intercultural space using the means of a cinema language, which has the properties of syntax, verbal-visual cohesion of elements, intertextuality, multiplicity of the addressee, contextuality of meaning, iconic accuracy, synthetics", and as well as "... a form of verbal-iconic behavior, correlated with a specific situation, culture, time, space and possessing the basic functions inherent in the language - informative, communicative, regulatory, artistic and aesthetic" (Nazmutdinova, 2008).

In the above definition, the concepts of addresser and addressee (agent and client of discourse) are introduced; in addition, it is valuable in addition to the semiotic nature of the phenomenon, its pragmatic-cognitive and behavioral aspects are highlighted in the definition. Film discourse (film text in the terminology of G. G. Slyshkin and M. A. Efremova) is "a coherent, complete message, expressed using verbal and non-verbal signs, organized in accordance with the intention of a collective functionally differentiated author using cinematic codes, recorded on material medium and intended for reproduction on the screen and audiovisual perception by the audience "[Slyshkin, Efremova, 2004]. These researchers, firstly, drew attention to its coded nature, and, secondly, proposed a linguosemiotic classification of film texts, according to which the differentiation of film texts is determined by the non-verbal level by the dominance of index or iconic characters, and by the verbal style by speech style. They also distinguish art (fiction) and documentary (non-fiction) film text and classify film discourse by genre.

IV. Discussion

Different entities are attributed to units of cinema discourse: for example, cinematographers use the term frame (cf. the theory of editing by S. M. Eisenstein, according to which the whole in a movie is obtained by comparing frames during editing, and each frame should carry some element of a common theme, which "pervades" them all). S. Worth suggests distinguishing between a cameraman's frame resulting from the continuous operation of a movie camera from the moment shooting starts to its end, and a editing frame (edema) - that part of the cadem that is actually used in the film [Worth, 1984].

Y. M. Lotman compares the frame with the word in its function in relation to the whole. Despite the fact that it can be decomposed into smaller details, and you can also consider a larger segment - a sequence of frames (as in a natural language there are smaller and larger units of meaning than a word), still the frame is basic, although not the only bearer of the meanings of cinema language. A feature of the frame is that it is not static, like a photograph or a picture; it allows movement within its limits, i.e. the frame is a dynamic phenomenon [Lotman 1973].

Y. G. Tsivyan believes that the unit of cinema text is always a pair of nuclear frames, which the author calls the basic chain, or syntagma of cinema text. Under a nuclear shot, Y. G. Tsivyan refers to a continuous segment of film text in which two elements are distinguished: the "subject" of the shoot (character, etc.) and the "space" in which or in relation to which this subject moves. A cinema text message can only be revealed by considering at least two nuclear frames [Tsivyan, 1984]. K.

Metz considers the plan as the minimum unit of cinema [Metz, 1993/1994]. P. P. Pasolini uses the term image-sign [Pazolini, 1984].

J. Deleuze distinguishes image-movement as the first dimension of the semiotics of cinema and derives six types of images from image-movement: image-perception, image-emotion, image-impulse, image-action, 164 165 Encyclopedia "Discourse" Encyclopedia "Discourse" image-reflection and image-attitude [Deleuze, 2004]. U. Eco believes that the minimal unit of the cinematic code is an iconic sign, however, not as an object representing reality, since in the films the objects in the frame often make sense only thanks to the expectation accumulated during the narrative to see something specific - this makes the viewer know in the object, what in a single frame would not be recognized.

The most complete characterization of film discourse as a sign system is given by S. S. Zaichenko. We give her postulates below.

1. Film discourse refers simultaneously to optical (perceived by sight) and auditory (perceived by hearing) sign systems.

2. Film discourse is non-biological (cultural) natural semiotics, the occurrence of which is not planned or organized.

3. Film discourse refers to complex multi-level semiotics. It has subsystems of signs that form a certain hierarchy. Signs in such semiotics are combined according to certain rules, and changing the order of the location of one sign we change the meaning of the whole combination of signs.

4. Film discourse is an open semiotics that has the ability to interact with the environment.

5. Depending on the approach to research, the units of cinema discourse can be considered the minimum non-discrete image units; large segments (frame, plan), which in addition to the visual component include movement, sound, etc.; chain of frames.

6. Cinema discourse is a multi-code semiotics, which is based on several codes that operate within each generating system. There are also codes that control the combination of different semiotic systems in the movie and work at their junction.

7. Film discourse is an open semiotics that has the ability to interact with the environment.

8. Depending on the approach to research, the units of cinema discourse can be considered the minimum non-discrete image units; large segments (frame, plan), which in addition to the visual component include movement, sound, etc.; chain of frames.

9. Cinema discourse is a multi-code semiotics, which is based on several codes that operate within each generating system. There are also codes that control the combination of different semiotic systems in the movie and work at their junction, genre emotiveness and emotionalogenicity (drama, comedy, tragedy, thriller, etc.), an artistic chronotope in the form of a temporal perspective of a retrospective (futurological film, historical drama) and localization of events - both fictional and real ones (alien life and events of an abandoned God of Texas town). The cinema discourse also reflects the ethno cultural specific features of both the creators of the film itself and the habitat, coupled with the socio-cultural environment of their artistic creations.

V. Conclusion

Finally, the cinema discourse contains concepts on the basis of which a distinct value component of the message of the director, cameraman and screenwriter is formed - masters of the image and word all rolled into one. Their formation is also facilitated by the imaginative worldview of film artists - the general and his assistants (decorators and costume designers, make-up artists, etc.).

References:

1. Deleuze J. Cinema / trans. with fr. B. Skuratov. M .: Ad Marginem, 2004.624 p.

2. Zaichenko S. S. Some features of film discourse as a sign system // Philological Sciences. Questions of Theory and Practice, No. 4 (11). Tambov: Diploma, 2011. P. 82–86

3. Zaretskaya A. N. Features of the implementation of the subtext in film discourse. Abstract. diss. Cand. philol. sciences. Chelyabinsk, 2010.22 p.

4. Kazakova A. I. Features of the formation of phraseological semantics in the discursive space of Russian cinema. Diss. Cand. philol. sciences. Astrakhan, 2014.231 p.

5. Lavrinenko I. N. Criteria for the classification of film discourse. - Bulletin of the Kharkov National University. - Discourse: semantics and pragmatics. No. 1003, 2012. p. 41–44.

6. Lotman Yu. M. Semiotics of cinema and the problems of cinema aesthetics. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 1973.140p.

7. Bahodirovna, A. M. . "Semantic Field of 'Spirituality': Lexical Analysis and Psychological, Philosophical Features". European Journal of Life Safety and Stability (2660-9630), vol. 14, Feb. 2022, pp. 124-31, http://ejlss.indexedresearch.org/index.php/ejlss/article/view/468.

8. Akhmedova M.B. Ways of translation of 'spirituality' terms in English and Uzbek languages. Proceedings of the ICECRS, November 2019 (https://doi.org/10.21070/icecrs.v4i0.124), DOI 10.21070/icecrs.v4i0.124

9. Akhmedova Mehrinigor Bahodirovna, "PROBLEMS IN TRANSLATING THE CONCEPT OF "SPIRITUALITY" ", IEJRD - International Multidisciplinary Journal, vol. 6, no. TITFL, pp. 290-295, Apr. 2021.

10. Akhmedova M.B. Semantic field of "Spirituality": Lexical Analysis and Psychological, Philosophical Features. European Journal of Life Safety and Stability (2660-9630). Volume 14, P.124-131