
DISCOURSE AS THE BASIS OF PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

Tatiana Evgenyevna Soboleva¹, Yulia Evgenyevna Lomonosova²,
Natalia Nikolaevna Kopytina³, Oksana Vladimirovna Kuzmina⁴

^{1,2,4}Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor, ³Candidate of Philology, Assistant Professor,
Belgorod State University, 85 Pobedy St., Belgorod, 308015 (RUSSIA)

E-mails: soboleva@bsu.edu.ru, lomonosova@bsu.edu.ru,
kopytina@bsu.edu.ru, kusmina@bsu.edu.ru

DOI: 10.7813/jll.2015/6-2/49

Received: 12 Feb, 2015

Accepted: 17 Mar, 2015

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the problems of discourse definition and its types. The authors analyse different views which concern the including of the term "dialogue" into "discourse" along with "monologue". Special attention is paid to the description of a literary dialogue having its own features and special interest for pragmatic analysis as almost all utterances are performative.

Key words: discourse, monologic utterance, literary dialogue, pragma-linguistic analysis, theory of speech acts, interactivity

1. INTRODUCTION

The discourse activity may be determined as speech-reflective activity of communicants, connected with speaker's knowledge, comprehension and world outlook on the one hand and comprehension, reconstruction of the language picture of the producer's world by a recipient in the resulting communicative situation on other [1]. The discourse specificity is determined by its social and ideological nature which is in its turn predestined by firmly established types of speech interaction between members of some community [2].

Speech activity means the aim consciousness, planning and structuredness. The structuredness of speech activity is that it is realized by means of consecutive speech acts defined by communication aims. In accordance with the latest approaches to the discourse analysis (from the view point of pragma-linguistic) I.S. Shevchenko points out that the initial structure for discourse has the form of succession of elementary propositions connected with each other by logical relations of conjunction, disjunction and others [3].

The analysis of modern methods and theories concerning discourse research allows to interpret this phenomenon as "text" as "communication". V. Z. Demyankov considers discourse as free text fragment [4]. J. Habermas suggests that discourse is a form of communication which is defined as "an inherently consensual form of social coordination in which actors mobilize the potential for rationality" given with ordinary language and its telos of rationally motivated agreement" [5]. According to T. van Dijk discourse is a contextual macrostrategy and may be determined "as a communicative event that takes place between those who speak and those who listen to a specific temporal and spatial context" [6].

In this article discourse is considered as generally accepted form of a person's speech behaviour in some sphere of human activity determined by social and historical conditions and stereotypes of text organization and interpretation [2] in total of their linguistic parameters and linguistic context.

2. METHODS

The complex method based on the unity of systems and functional analyses and procedures of argument analysis is used in the article. Also the method of linguistic observation takes place here.

3. MAIN PART

Traditionally the text is considered as a monologue but there is another point of view which identifies a dialogue as the text. It is possible because the dialogue has characters (wholeness, reference and semantic connectedness of utterances and speech indicators of this connectedness) forming the text as a language unit. The difference of the dialogic text from the monologue one is that two speakers take place in formation of the semantic structure of the dialogic text and they are coauthors of the text from the view point of text origination and perception [7]. One of the main characteristic features of the dialogue is the interpenetration of multiple contexts brought to bear by the different interlocutors, especially when they are engaging in argumentation [8, 9]. In monologue, meaning is not seen as the product of interaction but the expression of one person's ordering of experience [10].

However the point of correlation between dialogue and monologue is still disputable. Some modern linguists and philosophers do not admit the speech division into dialogic and monologic ones. They consider the former as the meeting of two consciousnesses in the broad sense and thus there is no dialogic speech as any text is always biplane and has two subjects. [11]. As Bakhtin points out even a single person's utterance or monologic text is dialogic and multivocal and filled with "dialogic overtones" [12]. "One critical factor in determining what is monologue and what is dialogue is not the number of participants involved—even a monologue theoretically involves both a speaker and a listener" [13] That is, in constructing an utterance the speaker borrows and weaves together the words and voices of others while populating them with their own intentions and subjectivity. These voices interact and inter-animate each other, juxtaposing the different frames that people

use to organize experience in productive ways [14]. Thus there is traditional contrasting of dialogic and monologic speech lost as any forms of speech assume the existence of an addressee – as real as potential one.

M.N. Kozhina supposes that the problem of correlation between dialogue and monologue is not only solved yet but distinctive features of these phenomena indicated by one researcher are categorized as general or close by others [15].

"Monologue" is often used without definition of the essence and frames of this phenomenon in linguistic or literary research. In such cases the main criterion of it is the utterance length of one personage till his/her change to another one taking into consideration the type of monologic direction: monologue as an appeal to public, monologue as aloud thought and/or monologue as an address to the person. At the same time the number of sentences is not defined to change the dialogue into the monologue.

E.I. Motina suggests that monologic speech is generally characterized by narrative sentences and though other forms of utterances may take place, they do not function as usually [16]. So the author emphasizes that often interrogative sentences do not function as questions themselves but as rhetorical ones.

It should be paid special attention to literary dialogue and monologue should be used as inner dialogue which also reflects natural communication.

Scientists considering literary dialogue as the typification of conversational speech say about concretion of specific features of natural speech. If literary dialogue is considered as the stylization of oral speech, the imitation of its peculiarities is emphasized, first of all signaling of verbality and making the impression of similarity for the definite purposes [17]. The sorting out features of natural speech and literary dialogue makes the opposition row with the analysis of specificity of their realization on all levels of language: oral or written form of communication, spontaneity or preparedness, a great number of paralinguistic means or a few nonverbal communication [17].

In the literary text the speaker and he who listens to have the equality about propositions forming the inner communication system. As for a reader, there is no equality that forms the outer communication system. The literary dialogue has its own peculiarities – personages' communication with each other on the one hand and communication of the author and the reader from the other one. There are always two sides in it. More over one of the sides can dominate another one, for example, the first one makes literary dialogue similar to natural speech, another one contributes the discrepancy between them.

In case of inner communication system there is no direct interaction between the author and the reader, the author is even absent and communication takes place between personages and thus indirectly with the reader. If the main character narrates as the author, the latter communicates with the reader directly (outer communication system).

In other words, every utterance may have double addressing, i.e. it does not serve for the personage as the inner communicant but for the reader that stipulates the abovementioned peculiarities of literary dialogue.

4. CONCLUSION

From the view point of pragma-linguistic analysis the dialogue is interesting with the fact that almost every utterance has the performative character directed to the partner. I.P. Susov admits that only dialogic speech has the variety of forms of interaction between communicative intentions of those who speaks with each other and between their speech means. So the dialogue represents the most favourable possibilities for the pragma-linguistic research and for detecting the rules of interactive behaviour of speakers [18].

From the view point of pragmatics any speech act is not only saying the contents but also the intention. Every speech act makes preconditions for further verbal and nonverbal actions. So the theory of speech acts represents the pragma-linguistic branch of learning the subject of which is the discourse correlated with the main subjects, ego of the whole text and the person creating the text [19].

Discourse integrates the properties of language and speech systems which are adjusted under the influence of such factors as interactivity, context dynamism, parallelism of information transmission (para- and nonverbal sign systems) and so on. Also, cognitive factors (ideas which are understandable and obvious for interlocutors) are very important for the definition of discourse.

5. RESULTS

Unlike the language which is a virtual essence where integration of both semantics and pragmatics is represented in statics, discourse presents such integration in dynamism which becomes apparent as in dialogue as in monologue. So pragmatic elements are the most typical for the dialogue whereas in the monologue the canonical forms are used though, as it was mentioned above, the monologue is the fertile ground for the appearance of speech acts in the indirect function.

REFERENCES

1. Milevskaya, T.V., 2002. Discourse, speech activity, text. Collected research articles, Bulletin of Russian Communication Association "Theory of communication and applied communication", Issue 1 / Edited by I.N. Rozina, Rostov-on-Don: Institute of Management, Business and Law Publishing, pp.168. Date Views 02.02.2015 www.russcomm.ru/eng/rca_biblio/m/milevskaya01_eng.shtml.
2. Manaenko, G.N., 2006. Informazionno-diskursivny podkhod k analisu oslozhnennogo predlozheniya. Stavropol, pp: 263 (In Russian).
3. Shevchenko, I.S., 1999. K opredeleniyu ponyatiya diskursa v istoricheskoy pragmalingvistike. *Wisnik Charkivskogo Derzhavnogo Universitetu. Romano-germanska philologiya*, 435. Charkov: Izdatelstvo Constanta, pp. 15-153. (In Russian).
4. Demyankov, V.Z., 1982. Anglo-russkie terminy po prikladnoy lingvistike i avtomaticheskoy pererabotke teksta. *Metody analiza teksta. Vypusk 2. Tetrad' novykh terminov*, 39. Moscow: Izdatelstvo WZP, pp: 7. (In Russian).
5. Habermas, J., 2014. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Date Views 02.02.2015 plato.stanford.edu/entries/habermas/.
6. Dijk van, T., 1989. Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power. In J.A. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 12*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp: 40. Date Views 02.02.2015 www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Structures%20of%20discourse%20and%20structures%20of%20power.pdf.

-
7. Lisochenko, L.V., 1992. Vyskazyvaniya s implizitnoy semantikoy (logicheskiy, yazykovoy i pragmaticheskoy aspekty). Rostov na Donu: Izdatelstvo Rostovskogo universiteta, pp: 19. (In Russian).
 8. Sandoval, W. A., 2003. Conceptual and epistemic aspects of students' scientific explanations. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 12(1), pp: 5–51.
 9. Wegerif, R., 2006. A dialogic understanding of the relationship between CSCL and teaching thinking skills. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 1, pp: 143–157.
 10. Coutler, D., 1999. The epic and the novel: Dialogism and teacher research. *Educational Researcher*, 28(3), pp: 4–13.
 11. Bakhtin, M.M., 1986. Problema v lingvistike, filologii i drugikh gumanitarnykh naukakh. *Literaturno-kriticheskie statji*. Moscow, pp: 473-500. (In Russian).
 12. Bakhtin, M. M., 1984. Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics (C. Emerson, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, pp: 92.
 13. Enyedy N., Christopher M. Hoadley, 2006. From dialogue to monologue and back: Middle spaces in computer-mediated learning. # International Society of the Learning Sciences, Inc.; Springer Science + Business Media, LLC. *Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 1, pp: 413–439. Date Views 02.02.2015 pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/enyedy/assets/Projects/Teaching%20and%20Learning%20Science/enyedy_Hoadley.pdf.
 14. Eco, U., 1994. *Six walks in the fictional woods*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 15. Kozhina, M.N., 1986. O dialogichnosti pismennoy nauchnoy rechi. Perm: Izdatelstvo Permskogo universiteta, pp: 28. (In Russian).
 16. Motina, E.I., 1988. Yazyk i spezialnost. *Lingvo-metodicheskie osnovy obucheniya russkomu yazyku studentov-nephilologov*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Russkiy yazyk, pp: 10. (In Russian).
 17. Lagutin, V.I., 1991. Problemy analiza khudozhestvennogo dialoga (k pragmalingvisticheskoy teorii dramy). Kishinev: Izdatelstvo Shtiinza, pp: 18-19. (In Russian).
 18. Susov, I.P., 1984. Kommunikativno-pragmaticheskaya lingvistika i ee edinizy. *Pragmatika i semantika sintaksicheskikh ediniz*. – Kalinin: Izdatelstvo Kalininskogo universiteta, pp: 9. (In Russian).
 19. Stepanov, Y.S., 1981. V poiskakh pragmatiki. *Isvestiya AN USSR. Seriya literatury i yazyka* N 40. Moscow, pp: 325-332. (In Russian).