

ЛІНГВІСТИК А ТЕКСТУ. ДИСКУРСОЛОГІЯ

УДК 811.111'42:001.8

THE DISCOURSE CONCEPT: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY

Ivan Teplyy

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,
1, Universytetska St., Lviv, 79000, Ukraine
i_teplyi@gmail.com*

The paper covers cognitively oriented studies of the discourse as a concept. It is claimed that the concept in question has gained its place in linguistics and other related fields. The problem is viewed in historical retrospect as well. Both terms viz. discourse and text were originally used indiscriminately, to develop, in the course of time, owing, primarily, to Van Dijk's works, into heterogeneous, mutually complementary phenomena. Nowadays, these terms are to be differentiated, each one covering a sphere of its own.

Keywords: discourse, concept, text, genre, conceptual categories, style, cultural component, heterogeneous.

Introductory remarks

The term “discourse” has a history of its own study now lasting for more than a century, perhaps. Its conceptualization, however, started some decades ago in this country, and has been going on ever since.

To begin with, let us clarify what a concept is. When providing its definition, the following theses are fundamental, viz.: a/ “unit designed to link together scientific research in the field of culture, consciousness and language” (Slyshkin, 2000, p. 9); b/ the concept's interrelation with the three above-mentioned areas can be expressed as follows: consciousness – the stay realm of the concept; culture delineates the concept (concept as a mental projection of cultural elements); language / speech as areas the concept is objectified in (Slyshkin, 2000, p. 9). Research shows that various linguistic, psycholinguistic, linguistic and cultural schools highlight this notion ambiguously, the common denominator being, however, an assertion of the undeniable relation of language and culture, while differences are due to different views on the role of language in shaping the concept (Segal, 2006, p. 138). V. Nikonova terms the concept as culture clot in the mind of an author, the author's personal outlook: the point is of the artistic concept, where concepts, ideas, emotions and feelings of the author are sublimated, and which is an integral entity capable of being replenished, changed, the entity that can reflect the human experience, concept itself being “an in-depth sense, right at the beginning absolutely minimized, to the maximum, semantic structure of the text, embodying the motive and intentions of the author, the sense leads to the generation of the text”, it is “a kind of the explosion point calling the text to life (Nikonova, 2005, 23–24).

The total concept of the text is associated with inner textual conventional and communicative implicatures ensuring its coherence.

What is Discourse?

The term “discourse” refers to large expanses of texts. “Discourse is not only respectively, on a logical basis, composed and pragmatically oriented text, but simultaneously the text (oral or written) with a specific cognitive, anthropologically conditioned semantics (*Dyskurs inozemnomovnoyi komunikaciyi: monohrafiya (Discourse of foreign language communication)*, 2002, p. 28). Alongside being written / oral, endowed with meaning, it is also a fragment reflecting social, epistemological, and rhetoric practices of a group, language’s ability to limit this practice in the group as well as influence it (Vinkvist & Tejlor, 2003, 126). The most acceptable definition is of discourse as a set of statements, reflections related to some issues, considered in connection with those issues, and relations between them (*Discourse*, 2013). We employ the concept of “discourse” to designate a broader, more global notion, in a closer way related, within a larger range, to nonlinguistic categories, viz. those of logic, philosophy, sociology, psychology and other sciences (*Dyskurs inozemnomovnoyi komunikaciyi: monohrafiya (Discourse of foreign language communication)*, 2002, p. 31). In terms of linguistics, discourse denotes *a segment of language larger than a sentence*. It is a text consisting of communicative units of language, text in conjunction with extralinguistic factors: pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological, text taken in the event-driven sense, speech being viewed as a purposeful social action (*Dyskurs inozemnomovnoyi komunikaciyi: monohrafiya (Discourse of foreign language communication)*, 2002, p. 182). To quote from P.Ricoeur, it belongs to situational speech and refers not so much to the already known reality as to *a possible being* [our emphasis – I. T.] in the world. Thus discourse acts as “an intermediary of man’s understanding of himself in the world, requiring from him a distancing from himself”, it is “an attempt to convey in speech of experience and manner of being-in-the-world” (Kudinova, 2003, p. 32). The most important peculiarities of a discourse are the combination of the lingual and extralingual in communication with an oral intercourse as a required component. Discourse is a coherent text together with extralinguistic (pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other) factors.

Types of discourse correlate with the functional styles as communication areas, and (in part) as the nature of communication (spontaneous, prepared, formal, informal), and its variants are in greater correspondence with genres. Styles, discourse, genres materialize in the text which can acquire an acoustic, manuscript, printed, or even electronic form (Belova, 2002; Kudinova, 2003; Myxajlenko, 2006). Discourse, according to V. Mykhaylenko, is both an author’s text, and an N-number of texts reflecting a temporal space (Myxajlenko, 2006, p. 126).

The approach to “discourse” dominating initially was a “textual” one, which used to cause a number of misunderstandings: “text” and “discourse” as synonyms → “text” as written recording, and “discourse” as oral realization of speech entities → “discourse” as “supratextual” concept that integrates not only the message itself (text), but there stofthecomunicationmodel components (sender, addressee, code, channel, context). Afterwards, gradually distinguishing discourse analysis, especially in the works by Van Dijk, “text” is begun to be conceived as abstract, formal construction, and “discourse” – as its particular actualization that arose as a result of mental processes and extralinguistic factors” (Bak’rdzhieva, 2003, 118-119). The present-day comprehension of *text* and *discourse* can be summarized as follows: “The text is as if “a frozen” discourse; it is the discourse they have halted, by eliminating the living circumstances, participants with their psychological, psychic, cognitive, social peculiarities, time, place, circumstances of communication etc.” (Matvyeyeva, 2008, p. 67). So, “the term *discourse*, unlike that of *text*, is not applicable to ancient texts, whose connections with life are not reproduced directly” (Matvyeyeva, 2008, p. 67). Text, being a speech-production act, a fixed segment of the communicative process, is a kind of a “suspended moment” of the process. The text reproduces that part of the overall “picture of the world”, which enters the field of view of the researcher (writer, scientist, publicist) at this particular moment of its perception (Gal’perin, 2006, p. 131).

The linguistic and literary theoretical interpretations of discourse differ. In Linguistics, it is for the most part a combination by which the speaker uses the language code: the supraphrasal unity of words, self-consistent text (oral-spoken form), a group of statements interlinked by mean-

ing; mechanism of the logical coherence of a text; polylogue or dialogue, i.e. the interaction of individuals, speech practice, written or oral reality of speech. The discourse in Literary Studies is, first and foremost, a work, the way socio-cultural senses are fixed as signs, a synthesizing field for all possible contexts (philosophic, mythological and syncretic, cultural studies one, historical, social, ideological, aesthetic etc.), where historical-discursive practices come to the foreground, further on – a dialogue or polylogue of various artistic personalities (artistic realms), literary trends, (literary) artistic eras. A discourse is always a language, yet for literary studies it is a “language in a language”, that of senses, language common to all those creating or interpreting this discourse. Thus, linguists researching the issue of literary artistic translation deal with the problem of reproducing the information, the monologue of language in its statics, whereas literary scholars focus on the iconic senses of enunciation, issue of reproducing the image, a language-entity (there are certain persons behind each text). The language acts here as a dialogue in the dynamics of deploying the meanings, hence – the talk is of semiotics, poetics, narrative, codes of aesthetics, culture, mythology, history, psychology, i.e. logosemosphere of an individual work of belles lettres, personal artistic world, an era or a nation. The linguist, therefore, in what concerns the historical development of literature, is interested in the history of the language, updating of its code, change of meanings, the expressive means, development of styles. As for literary scholars, these are interested, as far as this development is concerned, in the aesthetic systems’ change, the shifts caused by it in poetics and narration, as well as the issue of artistic works’ functioning, that of art reception and interliterary communication (Lanovyk, 2003, pp. 119-120).

The “neologic discourse” (V. Byalyk) is characterized by linguistic units that contain some elements of the new information in the structural-semantic and cognitive aspects. Usually, this information, i.e. epistemological constituent of a language unit, is revealed in the cognitive structure of a derivative regarded in our research as lexical quantifier. By the lexical quantifier (hereinafter – LQ) a multifaceted psychic-mental and linguistic entity that replaces a certain amount of knowledge gained in the human subject-cognitive activity, needed for successful communication, and given as a lexical unit. The cognitive structure of the derivative word can be detected on the basis of research into the procedure of inheriting the meanings. However, the intraverbal actualization of the derivative’s semantics is not always selfsufficient, so to get a more complete view of the semantic structure of the newly formed unit; one should turn to the word-building context. A word-building context like that, is, in our study, an utterance functioning as a unit of discourse, which, in its turn, is considered as an environment for implementing the pragmatics of the lexical quantifier (Byalyk, 2005; Byaluk, 2011; Slyshkin, 2000). One employs the concept of discourse in the following meaning as well: “By *discourse* in the given case we understand all Ivan Franko’s available living and creative relations with Jewry” (Mnich, 2013, p. 123). It is the footnote clarifying the researcher’s thesis: “In a context like this, there rises the question of possible methodological strategies in the study of Ivan Franko’s Jewish discourse” (Mnich, 2013, p. 123). The discourse is, according to Yu. Dorofeev, a verbalized speech and mental activity, a unity of linguistic and extralinguistic components. The analysis of a text as a unit of discourse is as follows: each utterance is the answer to the previous utterances of this or that field, where the object of study is the process of its functioning in speech, not separate works. The text is always functionally aimed (Dorofeev, 2006, pp. 193-196). In this connection, of importance is the notion of “hypertext” introduced by Umberto Eco (Eco, 2005, pp. 237-239). While differentiating the *language-system* and *text*, the scholar maintains that the lingual system enables to interpret *ad infinitum* (the principle of unlimited semiosis, following Charles Peirce). We are heading for a new, more emancipated society in which free creativity will coexist with the interpretation of

the already established, i.e. finished texts. Otherwise the eternal equilibrium will be violated, the development going to acquire a stochastic nature (*The Future of the Book*, pp. 5–6).

Concluding remarks

Linguistically speaking, discourse presents a segment of language larger than a sentence. It is a text consisting of communicative units of language, in combination, however, by all means with extralinguistic factors, such as pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological, etc. This is a text taken in the event-driven sense, speech being viewed as a purpose-oriented social action. The most acceptable definition of discourse could be as that of presenting a set of, reflections related to some issues, considered in connection with those issues, as well as the latter's interrelationships. Discourse refers to situational speech and deals not so much with the already known reality as with a probability of existence in the world. It acts, hereby, as intermediary of man's conceptualization of himself in the world, requiring that he/she should distance from himself / herself, it is an attempt at conveying in speech of the experience and manner of being-in-the-world. The most essential hallmark of a discourse is a combination of the linguistic and the extra-linguistic in communication with an oral intercourse as a required component. Discourse is a coherent text necessarily inclusive of pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and suchlike essential factors. An understanding like this one precludes any ambiguity of *text* and *discourse* being misconceived, i.e. confused. It is expedient that one should distinguish these two notions *sensu stricto*. Both the text and the discourse cover their respective areas of functioning which may intersect, but never overlap or match. The former encompasses a broader realm of semantics, the latter refers to large textual expanses, and has proved itself to be a convenient tool, as well as medium, of research in linguistic and literary, particularly comparative literary studies, the term "concept" felicitously combining linguistic and cultural aspects.

Discourse differs, as such, from one area to another. To mention here two major areas, those of Linguistics and Literary Studies, the concept in question operates as *language* in the former, and *language within a language* in the latter. The concept in question has undergone substantial changes throughout the course of its historical development, but it is too premature to put a final stop here yet.

References

- Bak'rdzhieva, G. (2003). Termin' diskurs (The Term of Discourse). *Slavistika II: Posluchaj XIII Mezhdunaroden kongres na slavistite v Ljubljana* (pp. 117–124). Plovdiv: Plovdivsko universitetsko izdatelstvo.
- Byalyk, V. (2011). Dekoduvannya prahmatychnoyi informaciyi v anhlijs'komu neolohichnomu diskursi (Decoding pragmatic information in English neological discourse). *Naukovyj visnyk Volyns'koho nacional'noho universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrayinky, II* (5), pp. 17–22.
- Byalyk, V. D. (2005). Korelyaciya leksychnoho kvantora v teksti-dzhereli ta teksti-perekladni (Correlation of a lexical quantor in source and target texts). *Naukovyj visnyk Chernivec'koho un-tu: zb-k naukovyx prac'. Hermans'ka filolohiya*(234), pp. 47–56.
- Belova, A. D. (2002). Ponjattja «stil'», «zhanr», «diskurs», «tekst» u suchasnij lingvistici (The concepts of style, genre, discourse, text in modern linguistics). *Inozemna filologija. Visnik*(32), pp. 11–14.
- Discourse. (2013, March 14). Retrieved from <http://hohlopedia.org.ua>
- Dorofeev, J. V. (2006). Tekst kak edinica diskursa (Text as a unit of discourse). *Uchenye zapiski Tavricheskogo nacional'nogo un-ta im. V.I.Vernadskogo: Nauchnyj zhurnal – Serija «Filogija»*, 19 (58)(2), pp. 193–197.
- Dyskurs inozemnomovnoyi komunikaciyi: monohrafiya (Discourse of foreign language communication). (2002). Lviv: Vyd-vo L'vivs'koho nacional'noho universytetu im. Ivana Franka.
- Eko, U. (2005). Majbutnye knyzhky: Dopovid', vyholoshena na sympoziumi «majbutnye knyzhky», un-t San-Maryno, lypen' 1994 roku (The Future of the Book: a speech pronounced at the symposium in San-Marino, 1994). *Majbutnye knyzhky: Dopovid', vyholoshena na sympoziumi «majbutnye knyzhky», un-t San-Maryno, lypen' 1994 roku / U. Eko // Svyatyj Volodymyr: Literaturno-xudozhnij al'manax studentiv In-tu zhurnalistyky Kyviv. nac. un-tu im. Tarasa Shevchenka*(8), pp. 228–242.
- Gal'perin, I. R. (2006). *Tekst kak ob'jekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya (Text as an object of linguistic research)* (4 ed.). Moscow: KomKniga.

- Kudinova, O. I. (2003). Interpretacijni modeli suchasnoyi literaturnoyi hermenevtyky (Interpetational models of modern literary hermeneutics). *Nauk. visnyk Izmayil's'SpecvypuskSpecvypuskk. derzh. humanitar. un-tu. Filol. nauky.* (15), pp. 29–35.
- Lanovyk, M. B. (2003). Do problemy rozmezhuvannya naukovyx sfer u suchasnomu perekladoznavstvi (Outlining scientific areas in modern translation studies). *Naukovi zapysky. Seriya: Literaturoznavstvo*(13), pp. 116–121.
- Matvyeyeva, O. O. (2008). Naukova polemika shhodo spivvidnoshennya ponyat' tekstu ta dyskursu (Scientific dispute about the correlation of the notions of text and discourse). *Nauk. visn. Cherniv. un-tu: Zb. nauk. prac'*(386), pp. 64–67.
- Mnich, R. (2013). Yevrejs'kyj dyskurs Ivana Franka: prychnok do istoriyi "prohresyvnoho antysemityzmu" v Halychyni (Jewish discourse of Ivan Franko). (W. Moskovich, Ed.) *Jews and Slavs*(23), pp. 117–144.
- Myxajlenko, V. V. (2006). Suchasni vektory hermenevtychnoho analizu (Modern vectors of hermeneutic analysis). *Pytannya literaturoznavstva: Naukovyj zb-k*(72), pp. 126–132.
- Nikonova, V. H. (2005). Xudozhnij koncept v trahedyax Shekspira: metodyka identyfikaciyi (Literary concept in Shakespeare's tragedies: methodology of identification). *Visnyk Cherkas'koho un-tu. Seriya «filolohichni nauky»*(78), pp. 21–32.
- Segal, N. A. (2006). Koncept kak bazovaja kategorija kognitivnoj paradigmy (k opredeleniju termina) (Concept as a basic category of the cognitive paradigm). *Uchenye zapiski Tavricheskogo nac. un-ta imeni V. I. Vernadskogo. Seriya «Filologija»*, 19 (58)(2), pp. 133–138.
- Slyshkin, G. G. (2000). *От текста к символу: лингвокультурные концепты прецедентных текстов в сознании и дискурсе (From text to symbol: linguocultural concepts of precedent texts in the consciousness and discourse)*. Moscow: Academia.
- The Future of the Book by Umberto Eco. From the July 1994 symposium "The Future of the Book", held at the University of San Marino. (n.d.). Retrieved from www.themodernword.com
- Vinkvist, Ch. & V. Tejlor. (2003). *Encyklopediya postmodernizmu (Encyclopedia of postmodernism)*. Kyiv: Vyd-vo Solomiyi Pavlychko «Osnovy».

КОНЦЕПТ ДИСКУРСУ: МІЖДИСЦИПЛІНАРНЕ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

Іван Теплий

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка
вул. Університетська 1, Львів 79000, Україна
i_teplyi@gmail.com*

У статті в когнітивному аспекті розглядається концепт дискурсу. Наголошується, що цей концепт утвердився як у мовознавстві, так і в споріднених дисциплінах, зокрема й у порівняльному літературознавстві. Порушено й історичний ракурс проблеми. Спершу як «дискурс», так і «текст» вживалися стохастично, як синоніми, однак з часом, завдяки насамперед працям Т. ван Дейка, стали розглядатися як різномірні явища, на правах взаємодоповнюваності. Тепер означені терміни охоплюють відповідні їм сфери функціонування.

Ключові слова: дискурс, концепт, текст, жанр, концептуальні категорії, стиль, культурна складова, різномірний.