

Jurayeva Shalolakhan Husanboyevna

*Fergana State University,
 French language teacher*

Annotation: *The article contains comments about the types of speech, the author’s speech, the representation of the author’s image, and his role in the text.*

Key words: *discourse analysis, author, authorship, blog, author image, internet, respondent*

In recent years, the development of discussions of the “author” and the “author image” in the field of discourse analysis calls into question the traditional distinctions: the author is neither the representative of the text nor the person. As for the “image of the author”, it belongs neither to the producer of the text nor to the public; it is the product of interaction between various stakeholders.

First of all, if we try to define the term “author”, it can be a correlation (the author of this paper) and a reference function (an important author). In the author’s concept, we distinguish three dimensions:

- 1) authority responding to the text: “author-respondent”
- 2) “author-actor”, he organizes his existence around the activity of text creation
- 3) the relative author of the work, the opus: the author who can be the “author-author”.

Next, we need to highlight the ways in which an object can qualify as an “author”.

When we try to study the concept of “author image”, we face three difficulties:

- this concept mobilizes not one, but two issues: the issue of the author and the image of the author. The easiest solution is to focus on the image, taking the author as stable information. Unfortunately, this is not the case: we are forced to ask ourselves which example of the author should be an “image”.

Although the concept of author has been in the dictionary of literary theory for a long time, we must say that it has caused heated discussions. Of course, we did not use the phrase “image of the author” here and there in the manner of “the image of such and such an author in such and such a place or such and such a time”, but these searches are described there or in such and such a time.

The questions that can be asked today on the basis of the concept of the image of the author were previously scattered across different sections of the history of literature and did not have a consistent theoretical basis.

The problem of the image of the author is developed primarily in the literary corpus. Therefore, it will not be possible to consider it from a broader perspective of speech analysis.

It can be said that the following text does not require the development of a structured theory, but rather the establishment of a certain set of criteria.

It should be noted that the problem of the “image of the author” appeared recently in literary studies. We can see this as another manifestation of the turning point that is taking place around pragmatic currents and discourse analysis. As I have tried to show in various situations, we see that this turning point occurs between the capitalized “Text” and its “context”.

This break became radicalized in the aesthetic mode from the 19th century onwards, finding its high point in Proust’s *Against Sainte-Beuve*, which “sets up an almost sacred opposition between creative self” and “social self”. Such aesthetics can only reject the problem of the “image of the author”.

This break was able to proceed without difficulty in pronunciation-type approaches. It is enough for us to observe “narrator” and “writer”, intratext and other parts of speech besides the text. It can even go to the concept of the author.

We see this in a few lines from a document presented by the future Pope Cardinal Ratzinger on behalf of the “Pontifical Biblical Commission”, which synthesizes and popularizes different approaches to the Bible, and in the “narrative analysis” section we find the following lines:

Several methods distinguish between “actual author” and “intended author,” “actual reader” and “intended reader.” The “real author” is the person who created the story. By “hidden author” we understand the image of the author (with his culture, temperament, inclinations, beliefs, etc.) that the text gradually creates during the reading process.

Such a distinction is unmistakable, but we see that, taken in a certain way, it reinforces the age-old theme of the text's inner and outer appearance.

This is evidenced by the interpretation of the concept of “author’s image” included in the text space. If we ask the question about the author as the authority signing the text, then, of course, everything is not so easy: in this case, in fact, there is no question of the person of the “real author” or the “implied author”.

In fact, the concepts of the author and the image of the author are divided into traditional categories. “Author image” belongs neither to the producer of the text nor to the public; it constitutes an unstable reality, a product of interaction between various stakeholders.

If today we can reflect on the image of the author, it is that the writer’s discursive staging is understood not as a set of activities that remain outside the scope of the text, but as a unique dimension. It is enough to express both literary communication and literary speech as an activity in a certain social space.

We found the principle of the “pronunciation scene” of the works to be a high level of complexity. Pronunciation in literature is not only the setting of a fictional world, but also the setting of the scene of speech, which is both a condition and a product of speech.

REFERENCES:

1. Adam, Jean-Michel & Gilles Lugin. 2000. “L’hyperstructure: a privileged mode of presentation of scientific events”, *Les Carnets du CEDISCOR* 6, 133-150.
2. Amossy, Ruth (dir.). 1999. *Images of self in discourse. La construction de l’ethos* (Lausanne-Paris : Delachaux & Niestlé)
3. Foucault, Michel. 1969a. “Qu’est ce qu’un auteur?” , conférence publiée dans le *Bulletin de la Société française de philosophie*, 63 : 3, 73-104 [reprint dans *Dits et écrits I, 1954-1975*. 1994 (Paris: Gallimard), 817-849]
4. Herman Jan, Mladen Kozul & Nathalie Kremer. 2008. *Le roman véritable. Stratégies préfacielles au XVIIIe siècle* (Oxford : Voltaire Foundation)
5. Khusanboyevna, J. S. (2023). THE TERM OF HISTORY AND ITS DEVELOPMENT IN LITERATURE. *IMRAS*, 6(6), 101-105.
6. Khusanboyevna, J. S. (2023). COMPOSITION DE ROMAN HISTORIQUE. *Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities*, 11(5), 2341-2350.
7. Khusanboyevna, J. S. (2023). L’ENSEIGNEMENT INTERACTIF. *INNOVATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS IN SCIENCE* 2022, 2(19), 1-4.
8. Khusanboyevna, J. S., & Ravshanbekovna, M. A. (2023). LA COMPETENCE DE COMMUNICATION. *SO ‘NGI ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR NAZARIYASI*, 6(5), 56-60.
9. Khusanboyevna, J. S., & Saidjonovna, M. M. (2023, April). MÉTHODOLOGIE D’ENSEIGNEMENT DES LANGUES ÉTRANGÈRES AUX CLASSES PRIMAIRES. In *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH CONFERENCE* (Vol. 2, No. 13, pp. 16-20).
10. Xusanboyevna, J. S. (2023). CHET TILINI O‘RGANISHDAGI SAMARALI USULLAR. *SO‘NGI ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR NAZARIYASI*, 6(4), 369-373.
11. Azimovich, R. Z., & Husanboyevna, J. S. (2023). FRENCH WRITER PROSPER MERIM HISTORICAL NOVEL THEME. *O‘ZBEKISTONDA FANLARARO INNOVATSIYALAR VA ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR JURNALI*, 2(17), 81-84.
12. Khusanboyevna, J. S., & Shukurjonovna, T. S. (2023). HISTOIRE DE LA LITTÉRATURE FRANÇAISE ET DE SON ÉVOLUTION. *PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES AND TEACHING METHODS*, 2(22), 138-141.