

## Semiotic and Nature in Film Discourse

Nasriyeva Guzal Zulfiddin kizi

Master degree student of English literature department Foreign language faculty Bukhara State University

**Annotation:** This article gives full analysis of film discourse, dividing it into some categories as paradigmatic and syntagmatic categories. These two categories are defined by different ways with the addition of some well-known scientists' ideas. Critical and creative aspects, cultural aspects and results of film pedagogy are also represented and discussed in the first chapter.

**Keywords:** Discourse analysis, paradigmatic categories, syntagmatic categories, critical, cultural, creative peculiarities, verbal, non-verbal means, context, communicative-pragmatic orientation, media communicative-pragmatic orientation, media.

### I. Introduction

The cinema discourse, 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 film and other extra linguistic factors significant for the semantic completeness of the film, such as creolized education, which has properties of integrity, connectedness, communicative-pragmatic orientation, media and created collectively by a differentiated author for viewing by the recipient of the message (cinema viewer).

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 meta discursive 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.

### II. Literature review

S.S. Nazmutdinova as “a complicated, dynamic process of interaction between the author of the film recipient and the inter language and intercultural space using the means of a cinema language, which has the properties of syntax, verbal-visual cohesion of elements, inter textual, multiplicity of the addressee, contextual 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”.

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”. These researchers, firstly, drew attention to its coded nature, and, secondly, proposed language 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.

### III. Analysis

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.

It is distinguished that 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, image- reflection and image-attitude. 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 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, genre emotiveness (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.

Finally, film 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.).

#### IV. Discussion

Following the Lumière brothers' invention in 1895, considerable disagreement prevailed among critics, journalists, and the pioneer cinematographers on the social function that they attributed to, or predicted for, the moving visual spectacle : whether it was a means of preservation and medium for creating archives, whether it was an additional techno graphs for research and exploration in sciences like biology or physics, whether it was a new form of journalism, or an instrument of sentimental devotion, which could perpetuate the living image of the dear departed one. Amazingly though, over all prospective possibilities, the evolvement of motion picture into the medium of genuine story telling had never been really considered. The fusion of cinema and narration by no means was predestined nor was it strictly fortuitous. Rather it was a historical and social fact that in turn conditioned the later evolution of the film as a semiotic reality. “Reading” a film, irrespective of the critical methodology applied to the process, is to index and emphasize the manifestation of linguistic turn. Like books, films are regarded as texts for reading by viewers or critics concomitantly implying the activation of the semiotic decoding. The founder of semiotics of cinema, Christian Metz in mid-20th century initiated research on arranging different levels of filmic expression and reckoned that the cinema is a language without language system. An insight into this significant statement requires an introduction to the Saussure’s thought on linguistics structure and semiotics. Admittedly, Saussure's account of the sign representing an arbitrary and unmotivated relation of its structural components has been championed by the multitude of film theorists. One effect of the argument for the basic conventionality of cinematic images was to open the way for a utilization of the ideal of difference in cinematic signification. The presence of differential interpretation of signifier in film theory emphasized communication as discourse, culturally patterned activity by the unique social worlds of diverse groups of viewer. Signs, whether linguistic or cinematic is to be considered as cultural instantiation incapable of producing meaning outside of the social and cultural context from which they have evolved. Such concept of the sign made it possible to explicate many aspects of cinematic coding, from discrete optical devices like dissolves to more complex structures such as reverse-shot cutting and other subjective aspects of point-of-view editing. Symbolic codes enabled the construction of cinematic discourse, that is, the use of an elaborate semiotic system whose address, and affects, could be comprehensible. Peter Wollen, British film theorist, teacher, and screen-writer, finds several problems with Christian Metz's film semiotics. His influential work, *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*, written in 1969, is a response to Metz's *Film Language*, in particular his essay “The Cinema: Language or Language system”. Semiotics as a general theory of signs, and to the specific development of a film semiotics.

The semiotics of the cinema can be conceived of either as a semiotics of connotation or as a semiotics of denotation. Both directions are interesting, and it is obvious that on the day when the semiotic study of film makes some progress and begins to form a body of knowledge, it will have considered connotative and denotative significations together. The study of connotation brings us closer to the notion of the cinema as seventh art. The art of film is located on the same semiotic “plane” as literary art: The properly aesthetic orderings and constraints — versification, composition, and tropes in the first case; framing, camera movements, and light “effects” in the second — serve as the connoted instance, which is superimposed over the denoted meaning. In literature, the latter appears as the purely linguistic signification, which is linked, in the employed idiom, to the units used by the author. In the cinema, it is represented by the literal (that is, perceptual) meaning of the spectacle reproduced in the image, or of the sounds duplicated by the

sound-track. As for connotation, which plays a major role in all aesthetic languages, its signification is the literary or cinematographic “style,” “genre” (the epic, the western, etc.), “symbol” (philosophical, humanitarian, ideological, and so on), or “poetic atmosphere”—and its signifier is the whole denotative semiotic material, whether signified or signifying. In American gangster movies, where, for example, the slick pavement of the waterfront distills an impression of anxiety and hardness (signification of the connotation), the scene represented (dimly lit, deserted wharves, with stacks of crates and overhead cranes, the signification of denotation), and the technique of the shooting, which is dependent on the effects of lighting in order to produce a certain picture of the docks (signifier of denotation), converge to form the signifier of connotation. The same scene filmed in a different light would produce a different impression; and so would the same technique used on a different subject (for example, a child's smiling face). Film aestheticians have often remarked that filmic effects must not be “gratuitous,” but must remain “subordinate” to the plot. This is another way of saying that the signification of connotation can establish itself only when the corresponding signifier brings into play both the signifier and the signification of denotation.

## V. Conclusion

An analysis of discursive practice focuses on how text authors produce existing discourses and genres to create text and how text recipients apply these discourses and genres in the consumption and interpretation of texts. Thus, a film as a genre can involve various discourses, including those mentioned above, such as comedy, drama, action films, etc. Films, as a form of communication, show the audience the most relevant and general phenomena or situations in society and ways of interpretation through discursive practices.

## References:

1. Bart, R.(1994), “Selected Works. Semiotics. Poetics: monograph”, Moscow: Progress, 616-618.
2. Fairclough, N. (1995), “Critical Discourse Analysis,” Applied Psycholinguistics. Vol 18 (4), Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 537-546.
3. Gasheva, N.N. (2016), “Integration of film utterance: author's cinema of Russia of the 2000s,” Bulletin of Moscow State University of Culture and Arts, No. 3 (71), 68–79. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/integrativnost-kinovykazyvaniya-avtorskoe-kino-rossii-2000-h-gg>
4. Hrenov, N. A. (2008), “Images of the Great Gap. Cinema in the context of cultural meanings: monograph”, Moscow: Progress-Tradition, Received November 19, 536
5. Issers, O. (2015), “Modern Discourse Practices”, Moscow: LENAND,
6. Kazakova A. I.(2014), ”Features of the formation of phraseological semantics in the discursive space of Russian cinema.”, Diss. Cand. philol. sciences. Astrakhan, 231-233
7. Kondakov, I.V. (2008), “Audiovisual anthropology in the postmodern era”, Moscow: Heritage Institute, 298–319.
8. Lavrinenko I. N. (2012), “Criteria for the classification of film discourse.”, Bulletin of the Kharkov National University. No. 1003, 41–44.
9. Lotman Yu. M. (1973), “Semiotics of cinema and the problems of cinema aesthetics.”, Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 140-143
10. Metz K. (1993), “Cinema: language or speech?”, historical and theoretical journal No. 20 , 54–90.