

Mussabekova U.E.¹, Taubayev Zh.T.²,

²Doctor of Philological science, professor, ²³rd year PhD student
of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: zharasxiangsheng@mail.ru

SIGNIFICANCE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND PRAGMALINGUISTICS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

The article considers modern research directions of modern linguistics such as discourse-analysis, pragmalinguistics and their interrelation, relevance. There is given comprehensive literature review of scientists, linguists who dealt with discourse, discourse analysis and pragmalinguistics. In addition to this, authors give their own standpoints and conclusions concerning these two notions. Author mentions about similarities of discourse analysis and pragmalinguistics, moreover one of the main tasks of pragmalinguistics is to reveal the nature of discourse / text. In other words, pragmalinguistics take into account all problems of discourse and text. The relevance of discourse analysis and pragmalinguistics lays on the fact that they are used within or under the latest, modern anthropocentric paradigm, by investigating discourse / text we can understand a person's cognitive structure, outlook, worldview. pragmalinguistics investigates how a language unit can influence on a certain audience. Thereby, above-mentioned two scientific directions play an important role and relevant to linguistics.

Key words: discourse, discourse analysis, pragmalinguistics, anthropocentric paradigm.

Мусабекова У.Е., Таубаев Ж.Т.
**Дискурс-талдау мен прагмалингвистиканың
қазіргі лингвистикадағы маңыздылығы**

Берілген мақала лингвистикадағы жаңа зерттеу бағыттары болып саналатын дискурс-талдау мен прагмалингвистиканың өзара байланысын, маңыздылығын қарастырады. Дискурс-талдау мен прагмалингвистика жайлы отандық және шетелдік зерттеген ғалымдар жайлы жаң-жақты ақпараттар беріліп, өз тараптарынан аталған ұғымдарға өз қорытындыларын жасайды. Прагмалингвистика мен дискурс-талдау арасындағы ұқсастықтары анықталады, тіпті прагмалингвистиканың негізгі мақсаты дискурс пен мәтіннің табиғатын ашу, оларға қатысты бүкіл мәселелерді шешу екендігі дәлелденіп айтылады. Автор аталған ғылыми зерттеу бағыттарының маңыздылығы, өзектілігі ретінде олардың лингвистиканың ең соңғы антропоцентрилік парадигмасына сәйкес жүзеге асатыны, дискурс-талдауда тілдік бірліктер арқылы адамның когнитивті дүниетанымын, әлемді қабылдауын, ой-өрісін анықтауға болатыны туралы ой қозғайды. Ал прагмалингвистика арқылы, тілдік бірліктер арқылы өзге аудиторияға ықпал етуге болатыны айтылады. Яғни, осылайша екі зерттеу бағыты қазіргі лингвистикада үлкен орын ала отырып, өзінің маңыздылығын көрсетеді.

Түйін сөздер: дискурс, дискурс-талдау, прагмалингвистика, антропоцентрикалық парадигма.

Мусабекова У.Е., Таубаев Ж. Т.
**Значимость дискурс-анализа и прагмалингвистики
в современной лингвистике**

Данная статья рассматривает новые исследовательские направления современной лингвистики, такие как дискурс-анализ и прагмалингвистика, их взаимосвязь и значимость. Дан всесторонний литературный обзор ученых, лингвистов, которые тщательно изучали дискурс, дискурс-анализ и прагмалингвистику. Автор даёт свои трактовки, умозаключения относительно этих понятий. Были выявлены схожие факторы дискурса-анализа и прагмалингвистики, более того одной из главных целей прагмалингвистики является выявление природы дискурса и

текста. Иными словами прагмалингвистика берёт на себя все вопросы, проблемы дискурса и текста. Автор в качестве значимости дискурс-анализа и прагмалингвистики оговаривают что они рассматриваются в рамках новейшей антропоцентрической парадигмы, дискурс-анализ исследуя тексты выявляет когнитивные структуры, мировоззрения, кругозор языковой личности. В свою очередь прагмалингвистика исследует способы воздействия на определенную аудиторию по средством языковых знаков. Таким образом, эти два направления занимают особую роль и являются значимым для современной лингвистики.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, дискурс-анализ, прагмалингвистика, антропоцентрическая парадигма.

We are aware of that there were a number of paradigm in linguistics from historical linguistics. There were comparative, structural, systemic. But nowadays the latest paradigm is anthropocentric. It investigates not language separately that used to do in the past. In studies real language with regard to human being. And in this circumstance we need to study words, sayings of people with their aims, intentions. So, with this issue deals Discourse analysis and pragmalinguistics.

At present time discourse, discourse analysis, pragmalinguistics play key role in modern linguistics. Because they are studied within the anthropocentric paradigm which the latest paradigm and directed to investigate language with it's owner. E.D. Suleimenova defines discourse as «one of the main object of modern linguistics, discourse theory – is the mean to bring language up to the real interaction with the help of discourse analysis» [1, 64-66]. It shows one more time that investigating discourse with discourse analysis is crucially important to modern linguistics. Because by examining it, you investigate entirely person's ideas, intentions and cognitive processes that take place in human being's mind. First of all, let me expand on what is discourse and discourse analysis.

There are a range of scientists, linguists who investigated discourse and discourse analysis such as J. Ostin, T. van Dijk, O.S. Issers, A.E. Karlinski, N. Arutunova. An important theory of discourse is cognitive-oriented analysis directed to mental structure, mechanisms, strategies which are relevant in producing and understanding speech and text [2, 53].

Discourse has very broad meaning and definitions because of four directions of defining it – formal, functional, situational and cognitive. From formal point of view «discourse is a language more than sentence. Correspondingly discourse is the semantic cohesion of two or more sentences» [3, 154,]. Functional way of explaining discourse shows that it is any «language use» and situational means that it should be to be considered in social-cultural context [4, 67]. So we see that discourse is the cohesion of

two or more sentences (written) or real language use (spoken) that should be scrutinized in social-cultural context (situation).

We smoothly move from defining the term discourse to the discourse analysis. According to M.L. Makarov «Discourse analysis studies socio-cultural, interactive sides of language conversation including even trivial written text» [4, 88]. E.S. Kubriyakova points out «Discourse analysis – is the text analysis not only texts, but also speech acts where we can analyze language semantics of different speech units. It would be insufficient without considering cognitive categories, because semantics of the words closely connected with the cognitive structures. Discourse analyses on the base of sending information to an addressee, on-line. In order to understand not all information is used, just classified information; secondly, to activate knowledge in the mind of addressee the sending text / speech production must have some language signals and the text must be structured with special rules («own» lexicon and «own» grammar)» [5, 20].

On the base of above mentioned definitions we think that in Discourse analysis (in analyzing speech production) there are three main principles:

- 1) analysis of cognitive structure which provides adequate data processing;
- 2) analysis language and speech semantics of speech units;
- 3) analysis of speech form an interpreter's position (interrelation between addresser's information intention and addressee's understanding that intention).

It enables us to understand discourse analysis investigates not only text / speech but also cognitive, mental processes that take place in human being's mind. Because under every word lays outlook, worldview, cognitive conception.

Nowadays there are different definitions of pragmalinguistics (pragmatics): the first one – Charles Morris's semantics – syntax – pragmatics; the second one – radical pragmatics, that means relationship between linguistics and pragmatics within the framework of the cognitive level. Even here we can

understand that discourse analysis and pragmalinguistics have deep relationship.

Pragmalinguistics was investigated by outstanding scientists such as A. Fetzer, T. van Dijk, Ch. Morris, J. Searle, J. Ostin, R. Vanderveken, I.P. Susov, V.V. Bagdanov, V.N. Komissarov, M.A. Danilova, Z.Sh. Ernazarova, G.A. Mashinbayeva, L.M. Shaikenova, D.A. Alkebayeva, A.Zh. Amanbayeva, K. Esenova and others.

According to I.P. Susov «Pragmalinguistics can be defined as a branch of linguistics, which studies usage of natural language by people as a mean of social action and interaction in real situation on the base of special system of rules, postulates and strategies. It is like a grammar of speech behaviour of people in society» [6, 17]. So that means the author considers Pragmalinguistics as a branch of linguistics which investigates how a person uses language in different social situations and demonstrates that it is the grammar of human being's speech act which is used in different situation.

The object of pragmalinguistics (pragmatics) is speech acts and Grice's cooperative principles. As we probably know speech acts comprise three stages: locutionary (uttering words), illocutionary (directing intentions with the help of performative verbs) and perlocutionary (it is the expected result). But J. Searle did not add perlocutionary act to the speech act. According to V.V. Bogdanov's opinion: «the problem lays on not concerning perlocutionary act belongs to linguistic or not. The issue is that in linguistic theory (especially in pragmatics) there is no any rules that can guarantee 100 percent realization of perlocutionary act» [7, 38].

V.N. Komissarov defines pragmalinguistics or process of influencing speech acts as «receptors by receiving information relates with the text. It is called pragmatic relation. A person may get just intellectual knowledge form the text. Secondly, information affects on receptor's feeling and may create emotional reaction. He calls it as pragmatic aspect (or pragmatic power of the text)» [8, 209].

In Kazakh linguistics, Z.Sh. Ernazarova mentions that «pragmatics is the science which investigates relationship of dynamic text / discourse with the creator of it» [9, 200]. G.A. Mashibayeva points out: «pragmalinguistics is the branch that teaches true based communication, substantial – functional peculiarities of language. Moreover it teaches how to share information, ideas with the help of verbal and nonverbal language approaches» [10, 7].

If Pragmalinguistics deals with speech acts, the realization of speech acts are performatives / perfor-

mative verbs. According to M.A. Danilova «Performatives are realized with this structure I + performative verb + addressee name» [11, 47]. Performative sentence is different from ordinary sentence because of this fact: the ordinary sentence conveys only information, description, utterance, whereas in contrast performative sentence conveys how to react and affect. Regarding this case L.M. Shaikenova points out «In speech act theory performatives are action oriented utterance». Examples for them could be war proclaim, declaration, begging apologize, military orders and others [12, 25]. In fact, we use performatives to influence on someone. For example, I sentence you for 25 years. I beg you pardon. I will forgive your betrayal.

The main form of communication is discourse and text. pragmalinguistics examines communication acts of people in two forms: spoken (discourse) and written (text). Thereby discourse theory and text theory identifies the main aim of pragmalinguistics. That's why Pragmalinguistics take all issues of discourse, text theories as it's purpose. The main aim is to discover, make clear the nature of discourse and text.

As we understand discourse analysis and pragmalinguistics are closely connected and even more one of the main tasks of pragmalinguistics is to discover the nature of discourse. That they are inseparable at present time. This good combination is one of the main directions of modern linguistics and plays crucially important role in Linguistics. Firstly, in correspondence with anthropocentric paradigm, they investigate language elements with it's owner not separately. Particularly, discourse analysis studies how the cognitive processes that take place in human's mind. So, discourse analysis investigation deals with not only with the text or oral information, but also cognitive perceptions of the people. That means it is person-oriented. When we understand that how people produce words due to a certain outlook, worldview, then we need to clarify how that cognitive, world view oriented words must influence, affect on something. Hence, we rely on pragmalinguistics, because it studies how express intentions, influence, agitate, convince somebody about something. Especially it is used in political discourse. IN comparison with the past, now there are many talk shows, TV shows, political debates, discussions concerning different problematic questions where scientists need to analyze discourse and understand how to attract people's attentions, as a result to persuade the audience.

Литература

- 1 Сулейменова Э.Д. Дискурс в дискурсе казахстанской лингвистики // Современные проблемы дискурса: теория и практика: Международная научно-практическая конференция. – Алматы: КазУМО и МЯ, 2006. – С. 64-66
- 2 Иссерс О.С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. – Изд. 3-е, стереотипное. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2003. – 284 с.
- 3 Звегинцев В.А. Предложение и его отношение к языку и речи. – М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1976. – 170 с.
- 4 Макаров М.Л. Основы теории дискурса. – М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2003. – 280 с.
- 5 Кубрякова Е.С. О понятиях дискурса и дискурсивного анализа в современной лингвистике // Дискурс, речь и речевая деятельность: функциональные и структурные аспекты. – М.: МГУ имени М.В. Ломоносова, 2000. – С. 7-25
- 6 Сусов И.П. Лингвистическая прагматика. – М.: Восток-Запад, 2006. – 200 с.
- 7 Богданов В.В. Речевое общение. Прагматические и семантические аспекты: учеб. Пос. – Л.: ЛГУ, 1991. – 87 с
- 8 Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода. – М.: Высшая школа, 2004. – 253 с.
- 9 Ернарарова С.Ш. Қазақ сөйлеу тілі синтаксисінің бірліктерінің прагматикалық негіздері: филол.ғыл.док. ...дис. – Алматы, 2001. – 246 б.
- 10 Машинбаева Г.А. Теледидар тілінің лингвопрагматикалық аспектілері: ғыл.канд.дисс. – Алматы, 2007. – 125 б.
- 11 Данилова М.А. Речевые акты в текстах евангельских притч: дис. ...канд.фил.наук. – Алматы, 2008. – 222с
- 12 Шайкенова Л.М. Функционально-семантическое описание ментальных перформативов: дис. ...канд.филол. наук. – Алматы, 1999. – 130 б.

References

- 1 Suleimenova E.D. Diskurs v diskurse kazakhstnaskoi lingvistiki // Sovremennye problemi diskursa: teoria i praktika: Mezhdunarodnaya nauchno-teoreticheskaya konferencia. – Almaty: KazUMO I MIYA, 2006. – S. 64-66
- 2 Issers O.S. Kommunikativnie strategii i taktiki russkoi rechi. – Izd. 3-e, stereotipnoe. – M.: Editorial URSS, 2003. – 284 s.
- 3 Zvegincev V.A. Predlozhenie i ego otnoshenie k yaziku i rechi. – M.: Izd-vo MGU, 1976. – 170 s.
- 4 Makarov M.L. Osnovi teorii diskursa. – M.: ITDGK «Gnozis», 2003. – 280 s.
- 5 Kubriyakova E.S. O poniyatiyakh diskursa i diskursivnogo analiza v sovremennoi lingvistike // Diskurs, rech i rechevaya deietelnost': funktsionalnie I strukturnie aspekti. – M.: MGU imeni M.V. Lomonosova, 2000. – S. 7-25
- 6 Susov I.P. Lingvisticheskaya pragmatika. – M.: Vostok-Zapad, 2006. – 200 s.
- 7 Bogdanov V.V. Rechevoe obchenie. Pragmaticheskie I semanticheskie aspekti: ucheb. pos. – L.: LGU, 1991. – 87 s.
- 8 Komissarov V.N. Teoriya perevoda. – M.: Visshaya shkola, 2004. – 253 s.
- 9 Ernazarova S.Sh. Kazakh soileu tili sintaksisinin birlikterinin pragmatikalik negizderi: philol.gil.dok. ...dis. – Almaty, 2001. – 246 b.
- 10 Mashinbaeva G.A. Teledidar tilinin lingvopragmatikalik aspektileri. gil.kand.diss. – Almaty, 2007. – 125 b.
- 11 Danilova M.A. Recheviye akti v tekstakh evangelskikh pritch: dis. ...kand.phil.nauk. – Almaty, 2008. – 222 s.
- 12 Shaikenova L.M. Funcionalno-semanticheskoe opisaniye mentalnikh performativov: dis. ...kand. philol. nauk. – Almaty, 1999. – 130 b.