

## SPECIFIC FEATURES OF FILM DISCUSSION

*Erkaeva Dilnoza Bakhtiyorovna*

*English literature department, Bukhara State University*

**Annotation.** This article gives full overview of specific features of film discussion. The development and current state of corpus lexicography is analyzed with the help of examples.

**Key word:** Peculiarities, gender, specific features, nationality and film discourse.

**Introduction.** Speaking about the specifics of film discourse, one should point out the presence of a multiple addressee.

**Main part.** A.N. Zaretskaya writes that the addressee of a message in film discourse is remote and plural (Zaretskaya, 2011, 152). The scientist emphasizes that “the peculiarity of the addressee of film discourse is that he is a group of people united by certain common features (gender, age, country of residence, nationality, cultural and intellectual level)” (Zaretskaya, 2011, 152). In the film industry, there is the concept of “movie rating”.

On the basis of this rating, it becomes possible, for example, to group the recipients of a film work by age. It is noted that the addresser of film discourse is also multiple, since it consists of a team of authors (Zaretskaya, 2011, 152). Indeed, the diversity of film professions involved in the production of 86 films is a confirmation of this, for example, “art director” (“art director”), “foley artist” (“noiseman”), “sound effect designer” (“sound effects sound engineer”), “stunt coordinator” (“stunt coordinator”), “gaffer” (“chief illuminator”), “boom operator” (“microphone operator”), “key grip” (“chief production worker”), “casting director” (“casting director”), “continuity girl” (“assistant director on the set”), etc. The observation of T.A. Varkhotov regarding the model of communication in the film (Varkhotov, 2004, 58). The scientist believes that not all films carry a message (information) that is subject to interpretation by the audience, especially the so-called “low genres - action, horror, etc.” (Varkhotov, 2004, 58). According to the researcher, the audience of these films does not aim to decipher the “message”, but only wants to experience some emotions while watching (Varkhotov, 2004, 58). Thus, there is no “message” component for “low genres” in the communication model, it looks like this: “message sender – addressee”.

- I. P. Mucha highlights another distinguishing feature of film discourse, related to the fact that there is a double-talk effect in the film dialogue, which she explains by the fact that the same replica can have different information content for the viewer and “for the film characters in the frame” (Fly, 2011, 37).
- II. V.E. Gorshkova also writes about the presence of the “double-telling” effect in film dialogue (Gorshkova, 2006, 5). At the same time, attention is focused on the fact that the film creates the effect of “eavesdropping” (overhearing), which implies that the audience is eavesdropping on the dialogues of the characters (Kozloff, 2000, 57). Later in his monograph, describing the process of eavesdropping on the speeches of heroes, S. Kozloff uses the verb “eavesdrop” (Kozloff, 2000, 57), which, in our opinion, most accurately conveys the feature of “eavesdropping” when watching a cinematic work, since the chosen verb 87 implies a method of eavesdropping in which the person being eavesdropped on does not know about it. T.G.

Voloshin and I.A. Guryeva analyzed the text of film scripts in order to find out the percentage of sentences depending on the purpose of the statement (Voloshina, Gurieva, 2016). The scientists found that the most frequent are declarative sentences (58%), followed by interrogative sentences (24%), incentive sentences (18%) and “the frequency of polypredicative sentences with parataxis and hypotaxis containing an incentive intention reaches 12% from all polypredicative constructions with composition and subordination” (Voloshina, Gurieva, 2016). It should be noted that many features of film discourse described in this paragraph are based on the understanding of film discourse as a film work, therefore it seems important to additionally focus on the author's understanding of film discourse, according to which it is considered as the language of film lovers, journalists and film professionals outside of a film work, namely in periodicals " Total Film " and " American Cinematographer ". Next, we list the lexical features of film discourse identified by researchers .

V.D. Shevchenko explores the linguistic aspects of film discourse at the phonetic level and gives examples of compression in film discourse : " innit " - " isn't it "; " fella " - " fellow "; " flippin ' - flipping "; " goin '" - " going "; " ya " - " you "; " meself " - " myself "; " nah " - " no "; " yeah " - " yes " (Shevchenko, 2005, 136-137). Thus, film discourse is characterized by a technique - graffon . The use of graffons in works of art can provide "additional information about the cultural and educational levels of the character, his age, physical and emotional characteristics, characterizes him as a representative of a certain social environment" (Polzunova, Nikitin, 2017, 150). Consequently, in order to create a believable image of the hero of a film work, the use of a graffon in some situations also becomes necessary. In turn, Yu.V. Onishchenko based on the TV project " Doctor Who " found out that "on the main channel of the country you can hear not only a regional accent, but also a territorial dialect that does not differ from the native pronunciation of the actor, not only the youth London sociolect Estuary English, but also the once stigmatized cockney” (Onishchenko, 2019, 115). Considering the morphological level, V.D. Shevchenko mentions the existence of linguistic compression in modern English colloquial speech of film discourse (Shevchenko, 2005, 136). The researcher gives illustrative examples from the film Bend it Like Beckham ", in which the -s morpheme is used to create truncated colloquial forms, for example, " Laters " - " See you later "; " Pinks " - " Pinkie "; " Jules " - " Juliet "; " Becks " - " Beckham " (Shevchenko, 2005, 137). The scientist focuses on the fact that truncated forms of words are more convenient for communicators, since "they add originality and novelty to the statement" (Shevchenko, 2005, 137). Speaking about the lexical level, it is necessary to note the study on the study of adverbs in film discourse . A.V. Beloborodova considers the English language film discourse through the description of the features of the functioning of adverbs with an evaluative component based on the material of the film dialogue in the TV series " Victoria " (Beloborodova, 2018). The scientist comes to the conclusion that, for example, the adverbs " earestly ", " purposely ", " vicariously ", " hesitatingly ", " obstinately ", " vigorously " convey the quality and nature of the action, the adverbs " perfectly ", " passionately " indicate the subjective assessment of the speaker, and the adverbs " so ", " much ", " very " are involved in the intensification of the assessment (Beloborodova, 2018). O.P. Dmitrieva studies English phrasal verbs from the point of view of semantics and pragmatics based on film texts (Dmitrieva, 2019). Phrasal verbs are divided into the following groups depending on the degree of meaning rethinking and their grammatical stability: - a phrasal verb with a transformed (new) meaning (" to give up ", " to blimp up ", " to fall for "); - a phrasal verb with a stable postpositive, specifying the meaning of the verb (" to bring back ", " to stand aside ", " to step forward "); - a phrasal verb with an unstable postpositive that does not affect the meaning of the verb (" to empty out ", " to fill in ", " to write down "); - a phrasal verb with a phrasematically related meaning (" to level off ", " to fade away ", " to look up ") (Dmitrieva, 2019,

13). V.D. Shevchenko also notes that film discourse is characterized by phrasal verbs and verb constructions with postpositions, as well as various interjections (Shevchenko, 2005, 138). Yu.S. Starostin and M.V. Cherkunova believe that "one of the leading characteristics of modern English-language film discourse should be recognized as its heightened emotionality and evaluation" (Starostina, Cherkunova, 2017, 119). Analyzing negative-evaluative statements (on the material of the English-language series "Sherlock"), scientists argue that the evaluation is formed due to evaluative adjectives in comparative and superlative degrees, for example, "the most dangerous criminal mind" (Starostina, Cherkunova, 2017, 119). The researchers come to the conclusion that "the evaluative aspect of the dialogic text consists of meanings that are realized at all levels of the language - in phonetics, morphology, vocabulary, syntax" (Starostina, Cherkunova, 2017, 121). If we consider the film review as a component of film discourse (in accordance with the scheme we proposed earlier about the genres of film discourse in § 2), then the selection of E.Yu. Garanina's appraisal in the film review genre (Garanina, 2013) boils down to the fact that appraisal is typical of film discourse in general, and therefore is one of the features of this type of discourse. In his work, E.Yu. Garanina defines ways of expressing 90 appraisal based on approximately 150 English-language film reviews (Garanina, 2013). It has been established that the reactive register of film reviews is expressed at the lexical level by quality adjectives ("The most powerful movie of all time"), verbs in a figurative sense ("I see the point of the film"), abstract nouns ("his artistic imagination runs wild"), and at the syntactic level - compound nominal predicates ("He is the driving creative force") (Garanina, 2013, 29). Describing the specific features of film discourse at the syntactic level, V.D. Shevchenko gives an example with the form "innit", which, according to the scientist, can be used in any disjunctive question, replacing the traditional variants "isn't it", "can't", "don't" (Shevchenko, 2005, 139). A.V. Gavrilova notes that intertextuality is present in film discourse and "represents an actual slice of perception of reality" (Gavrilova, 2016, 201). Following the researcher G.G. Slyshkin (Slyshkin, 2000), she believes that the implementation of this category is carried out in film discourse with the help of allusions, references, quotations and quasi-quotes (Gavrilova, 2016, 201-202). G.G. Slyshkin and M.A. Efremova point out that "it is the cinema and its later branch - television - that are the source of most textual reminiscences (quotes, allusions, references) that function in everyday communication" (Slyshkin, Efremova, 2004). T.V. Dukhovnaya emphasizes that there are cases when the discourse of a film penetrates the discourse of live speech (Dukhovnaya, 2014). The scientist gives illustrative examples of quotes from famous films: "Money in the morning - chairs in the evening, money in the evening - chairs at night", "I will command the parade!", "The ice has broken, gentlemen of the jury" ("The Twelve Chairs", 1976); "All! Keane will not be! The electricity is out!" ("Gentlemen of Fortune", 1971); "I successfully entered ...", "Leave me, old woman, I am in sorrow!" ("Ivan Vasilyevich is changing his profession", 1973); "What a disgusting thing this 91 jellied fish of yours is!" ("Irony of Fate or Enjoy Your Bath", 1975); "To live well! And to live well is even better!", "A student, a Komsomol member, an athlete and, finally, just a beauty!" ("Prisoner of the Caucasus", 1966) (Dukhovnaya, 2014). In addition, the colloquial speech of film discourse includes a large number of tropes, for example, metaphors, hyperbole, which, as V.D. Shevchenko, are "linguistic markers of character discourses" (Shevchenko, 2005, 140). V.A. Baranovskaya explores the animated genre of cinema from a linguistic point of view and notes that it is characterized by repetitions, personifications, epithets, comparisons, metaphors (Baranovskaya, 2020).

**Conclusion.** At the same time, in the film discourse, the presence of phraseological units is noted, the study of which is devoted to many scientific works. So, S.S. Kulidzhanyan considers the specifics of phraseology in comedy discourse (Kulidzhanyan, 2019), and E.M. Lyulchev's

# 2023: International Conference on Agriculture Sciences, Environment, Urban and Rural Development (Morocco)

<https://www.conferenceseries.info/index.php/morocco>

phraseology in the British detective series (Lulcheva, 2020). I.V. Zykova determined that the phrase game, as a kind of language game, is significant in film discourse (Zykova, 2019).

## References:

1. An American Dictionary of the English Language: Intended to Exhibit, 1828. - URL: <https://archive.org/details/america01websrich/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/crudenscomplet00crud/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.