

Hasanova Lala Ramiz Azerbaijan University of Languages, Azerbaijan, Baku,
e-mail: lala_hassanova@hotmail.com

DISCOURSE AND TEXT AS LANGUAGE UNITS

This article deals with the research of discourse and text such as language units. A short information is given on the differentiation of discourse and text. Many researcher's various thoughts are examined in this article. The study makes extensive use of the views of world scholars on these two coherent concepts; discourse and text. Although textual linguistics is a new field, there are a lot of interesting facts about it. Text, its types, tools of creating text, different types of discourse, markers, systematization, genres and so on has been researched. These are also continues to be done on the basis of it. The study of discourse began in the 1920s and is now a new field has found a place in linguistics. It is divided into Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis. So, many studies have been conducted in the branches.

At present, there are many definitions of discourse and text and many different approaches to it. This shows that the discourse and text are too complex to consider. However, it is important to clarify the meaning of these concepts, the sphere of development within certain limits, and other resembling issues. The purpose of discourse is to change the mind and behavior of the listener or reader for the utility of the speaker or writer, and the text is created to achieve this.

To clarify the content of the concept of discourse, it is expedient to consider its components. These components are divided into two groups, linguistic and extra-linguistic. Linguistic components are mainly included in the concept of text. This indicates that the discourse is a broader concept than the text.

In the article it is investigated that while coming to written discourse, text and contextual concepts come to the fore. In the comparative study of languages, the main focus is on the comparison of texts, and the analysis is carried out at the lexical and grammatical level. A text can be defined as an object that can be read, whether it is literature, a lesson written on a board, or a street sign. It is a collection of related signs that convey a kind of informative message. In linguistics, discourse is generally considered the use of written or spoken language in a social context. Thus, the text is considered not as a synonym of discourse, but as its result, its preserver in the article.

Key words: discourse, text, concept, interrelation, parameters.

Гасанова Лала Рамиз гызы

Әзірбайжан мемлекеттік тілдер университеті, Әзірбайжан, Баку қ.,
e-mail: lala_hassanova@hotmail.com

Дискурс пен мәтін тілдік бірлік ретінде

Бұл мақалада тілдік бірліктер сияқты дискурс пен мәтінді зерттеуге көп көңіл бөлінеді. Дискурс пен мәтіннің айырмашылығы туралы қысқаша ақпарат берілді. Мақалада көптеген зерттеушілердің әртүрлі ойлары талқыланды. Зерттеуде әлем ғалымдарының осы өзара байланысты екі ұғымға деген көзқарастары кең қолданылады: дискурс және мәтін. Мәтіндік лингвистика жаңа сала болғанымен, бұл туралы көптеген қызықты фактілер бар. Мәтін, оның түрлері, мәтін құру құралдары, дискурстың әр түрлі түрлері, маркерлер, жүйелеу, жанрлар және т.б. зерттелді. Бұл да соның негізінде жасалды. Дискурсты зерттеу ХХ ғасырдың 20-жылдарында басталды, енді бұл жаңа сала лингвистикада өз жолын тапты. Ол дискурстық талдау және сыни дискурсты талдау болып бөлінеді. Сонымен, филиалдарда көптеген зерттеулер жүргізілді. Қазіргі уақытта дискурс пен мәтіннің көптеген анықтамалары және оған деген әртүрлі көзқарастар бар. Бұл дискурс пен мәтін өте күрделі екенін көрсетеді. Алайда, бұл ұғымдардың мағынасын, белгілі бір шектердегі даму аясын және басқа да осыған ұқсас мәселелерді нақтылау маңызды. Дискурстың мақсаты – тыңдаушының немесе оқырманның ойлауы мен мінез-құлқын сөйлеушінің немесе жазушының пайдасына өзгерту, бұл үшін мәтін жасалады. Дискурс тұжырымдамасының мазмұнын нақтылау үшін оның компоненттерін қарастырған жөн. Бұл компоненттер екі топқа бөлінеді: лингвистикалық және экстралингвистикалық. Тілдік компоненттер негізінен мәтін ұғымына енеді. Бұл дискурстың мәтінге қарағанда кеңірек ұғым екенін көрсетеді. Мақалада жазбаша дискурсқа көшу кезінде мәтін мен мәнмәтіндік ұғымдар алдыңғы қатарға шығатындығы зерттелген. Салыстырмалы тілдік зерттеулер мәтіндерді салыстыруға бағытталған, ал талдау

лексикалық және грамматикалық деңгейде жүзеге асырылады. Мәтінді оқуға болатын нысан ретінде анықтауға болады, мейлі ол әдебиет болсын, тақтаға жазылған сабақ болсын немесе көше маңдайшасы болсын. Бұл ақпараттық хабарлама түрін беретін біріккен таңбалар жиынтығы. Тіл білімінде дискурс, әдетте, жазбаша немесе ауызекі сөйлеу тілін әлеуметтік мәнмәтінде қолдану деп саналады. Осылайша, мәтін дискурстың синонимі ретінде емес, оның нәтижесі ретінде қарастырылады.

Түйін сөздер: дискурс, мәтін, ұғым, байланыс, шамалар.

Гасанова Лала Рамиз гызы

Азербайджанский университет языков, Азербайджан, г. Баку,
e-mail: lala_hassanova@hotmail.com

Дискурс и текст как языковые единицы

Эта статья посвящена исследованию дискурса и текста, например языковых единиц. Дается краткая информация о различиях дискурса и текста. В статье рассматриваются различные мысли многих исследователей. В исследовании широко используются взгляды мировых ученых на эти две взаимосвязанные концепции: дискурс и текст. Хотя текстовая лингвистика – новая область, в ней есть много интересных фактов. Исследуются текст, его типы, средства создания текста, различные типы дискурса, маркеры, систематизация, жанры и т.д. Это также продолжает делаться на его основе. Изучение дискурса началось в 1920-х годах, и теперь эта новая область нашла свое место в лингвистике. Он разделен на анализ дискурса и анализ критического дискурса. Итак, в филиалах было проведено много исследований.

В настоящее время существует множество определений дискурса и текста и много разных подходов к нему. Это показывает, что дискурс и текст слишком сложны для рассмотрения. Однако важно уточнить смысл этих понятий, сферу развития в определенных пределах и другие сходные вопросы. Цель дискурса – изменить мышление и поведение слушателя или читателя в пользу говорящего или писателя, и для этого создается текст.

Чтобы уточнить содержание понятия дискурс, целесообразно рассмотреть его составляющие. Эти компоненты делятся на две группы: лингвистические и экстралингвистические. Лингвистические компоненты в основном входят в понятие текста. Это указывает на то, что дискурс – более широкое понятие, чем текст.

В статье исследуется, что при переходе к письменному дискурсу на первый план выходят текст и контекстные понятия. В сравнительном изучении языков основное внимание уделяется сравнению текстов, а анализ проводится на лексико-грамматическом уровне. Текст можно определить как объект, который можно прочитать, будь то литература, урок, написанный на доске, или уличный знак. Это набор связанных знаков, передающих своего рода информативное сообщение. В лингвистике дискурс обычно считается использованием письменной или устной речи в социальном контексте. Таким образом, текст рассматривается не как синоним дискурса, а как его результат, его хранитель в статье.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, текст, понятие, взаимосвязь, параметры.

Introduction

Discourse is one of the most current directions in linguistics in the twentieth century, among the terms of linguistics. The term discourse is used in many scientific fields such as critical theory, linguistics, pragmatics, sociology, philosophy and many other different fields. Discourse is approached from different perspectives. In the field of linguistics, discourse was first used as a term by Zellig Harris. He published an article entitled “Discourse Analysis” in 1952: “Discourse has become one of the important critical concepts of the social sciences and the vocabulary of mankind” (Harris, 1952: 4)

The term discourse is used differently by different researchers in different academic cultures. In

the context of Germany and Central Europe, there is a distinction between text and discourse based on linguistic tradition. It is obviously known that, discourse is often used for both written and oral texts in English-language literature.

Z.Y.Turayeva thinks that the structure of the text is a kind of complementary information. That structure is a method of global organization of the object. He considers it important that the relationship between its material units and its completeness as a whole should be investigated (Тураева, 1986: 56).

Other researchers distinguish different levels of abstraction. One of those researchers is Lemke. Lemke clarifies that, “text” is a concrete realization of abstract forms of knowledge (here the researcher

considers discourse) (Lemke, 1995: 68). Along with these views, he shows his engagement to Foucault's approach. The historical approach to discourse is that socio-cognitive theory refers to "discourse" as a memory of social experience and a structured form of knowledge. Besides it, according to the historical point of view "text" is clarified as a specific oral or written document and it creates a link between the views they refer to and further refines these views and socio-cognitive theory.

"The text can be considered meaningful and clear only if the listener-receiver of the text, can create a model that suits him/her. Along with the meaning, parts of the text (mental presentation of the text), information from previous models, as well as common knowledge patterns accepted by most people help to build such units" (Abdullayev, 2011: 240).

The structure that forms the general knowledge is restored by the cognitive-dynamic, socio-pragmatic and communicative-information components of the discourse and finds its verbal expression at the level of genre, composition, style and type of the text (Ульянова, 2004: 31).

Discourse is specially given in texts. There is a special grammar, special vocabulary, special rules and syntax, special semantics, special lexicology and, in one word, a special world behind them. In any world of discourse, it has its own rules of synonymous equivalent, its own rules of authenticity, its own rules of etiquette. Each of discourse is exactly one of the "possible worlds".

In recent years, most world-famous scholars have attached importance to the subject of discourse and text. Those researchers have conveyed various valuable opinions about the mentioned issues. Their research allows us to come such kind of conclusions about the problems of discourse and text, its place among the terms (concepts) of linguistics, its specific features and at the same time to determine the methodological basis of the research. One of the prominent scientist K.Y.Sigal tries to reconsider the relationship between these two large-scale concepts of "discourse" and "text". He clarifies that "text is a universal form of communication of knowledge. Text is organized by the categories of exhaustion, urgency, modality and their secondary categories". This researcher considers a discourse to be a linguistic specific event with a set of language units. Those units are texted and brought out the rules of their creation and use (Сигал, 2000: 223-224).

Another well-known scientist N.V.Malicheva also considers discourse and text as different occurrences. According to his point of view, the dis-

course is based on the choice of language means in accordance with the genre, intensity and style of the author. But the text is the result of this choice and the choice of the appropriate model. He believes that discourse is a broader and multifaced concept than text, because it surrounds both the process of language activity and its consequences. One of the main distinguishing features of discourse and text, according to the researcher, is that the text tends to be revived many times, and the discourse does not come to life again. While discussing this issue N.V.Malicheva writes: "The text is a polycommunicative and poly-thematic mechanism, it joins complicated syntactic units and independent sentences. The text has structural exasperation and forms a conceptually significant meaning that maintains a communicative and cognitive fragment of reality" (Мальчева, 2003: 10).

Experiment

In the study of this article, it is very difficult to clarify the relationship between the concepts of text and discourse because of the large number of definitions of the term discourse and the lack of a unified approach. Discourse is seen as a dialectical connection between a situation, an institution and a social structure and a particular discursive event. A discursive event is formed not only by the situation, the institution, the social structure, but also by them. Therefore, discourse is both socially organized and conditioned: it includes situations, the object of knowledge, the social identities of people and groups of people, the relationship between them and so on.

In the works of a number of researchers, discourse is understood as the process of creating and reading a text (N.A. Kulibina, V.A. Milovidov, V.I. Tyupa). In particular, N.A. Kulibina suggests distinguishing between a book and a book read by someone as a written text. In the first state, it is really text in all its graphic form, from the first word to the last punctuation mark. In the second state, it is a discourse that comes into being in the perception process (Кулибина, 2001).

Discourse is a relatively stable use of language that serves to organize and structure social life. There is only one question: there is no type-picture link between these two concepts. It means that the text is the type of discourse and the discourse is not the type of text. "Discourse is not an intermediate event among speech, communication and language behavior, or an intermediate stage between a system and a text. It is not a text with extra-linguistic pa-

rameters, it is not a discourse without these parameters” (Прохоров, 2006: 10).

While connecting to different speech situations on the basis of the same text, different kinds of discourses can appear. When mastering a text, the speaker turns it into personal information. That information is unique and full of individual meanings (for example, prayer or an anecdote) (Залевская, 2001: 36-44).

Result and discussion

All of the above confirms the fact that the reality of any language belongs to the realms of language and speech at the same time. All views on the problem can be located between two extremes: first, the discourse is text (part of any text, type of any text, state of any discourse), text is discourse (part of discourse, type of discourse, state of discourse); second, discourse is a work, discourse use, activity. Text and discourse are real events, they cannot be one; text and discourse are inseparable. Text and discourse are works that exist in the structure and content of communication. Discourse is understood as an abstract, unchanging description of the realized structural and semantic features that take place in particular texts (Богатырева, 2006).

G. Manaenko emphasizes that any discourse can create a text. While creating an information (data) environment in a specific field of activity it is a concrete material object which reflects the characteristics of human interactions (Маанаенко, 2005: 30).

One of the well-known researchers Chang Kim Bao understands the text as “in” and the discourse as “yan” in his work entitled “The Text and Discourse” (From the Perspective of the Inyan Concept), The essence of the “Inyan” concept is as follows:

1) Language and space are a combination of two opposite beginnings, “in” and “yan”. What we say or hear from our interlocutors, what we write or read is real, all of it is real, all of this we can perceive through our senses, all of it can be created by anyone who speaks a certain language. This is the “side”. He is constantly changing and changing everything around him. On the other hand, there is something deep behind all these real acts. These are images that are real but not perceived by our senses. This is the “in”. Not everyone, but only a person who has any idea about it including a scientist, a researcher, a theorist can “see” it. Different “views” lead to different tendencies. The movement, interrelationship, mutual penetration, and reciprocal transformation of “in” and “side” are the interrelationships of text and discourse.

2) Language is a combination of “in” and “yan”. Thus, text is a microcosm in relation to language. This means that everything that is specific to the macrocosm (language) must be reflected in the microcosm (text).

3) “Inyan” – concept recognizes the role of man as a perceptive force; thus, this force, together with the power of the system, forms a single whole, which we call the human language, that is the real subject and object of linguistic research.

The text itself does not exist as a goal. It plays a discourse role in speech. Text is potential (in), and discourse is the realization of this potential in speech activity (side). The “in-side” concept implies the solution of the discourse problem in close connection with the text problem as two opposite sides of the same essence. In this case, all the linguistic and extra-linguistic factors involved in the organization and functioning of the text as a means of speech communication are taken into account. Despite all their differences, text and discourse are united by two features: the volume of the organization (space) and the manifestation of linearity (time) in the speech of communicators (Чан Ким Бао, 2000: 3-7).

Discourse is an extravergent figure of communication. It means that, it is a set of verbal forms of the practice of organizing and compiling the content of communication of representatives of a certain linguocultural community. The text is an introvert figure of communication. We can explain this as a set of rules of linguistic and extralinguistic organization of the content of communication of representatives of a certain linguocultural community (Прохоров, 2006: 34).

The text provides the content-language basis of communication, because the text is inseparable from the language in all its manifestations. Discourse, in turn, provides the content-speech basis of the interaction of communication participants. The comprehension of discourse induces the participants of communication to refer to the text. Similarly, the text leads to the possibility of variability of the discourse.

Conclusion

Thus when we speak about the concepts of discourse and text, we must note that discourse is a complex linguistic phenomenon and does not have an unambiguous definition. It is known that discourse is a linguistic communication between its participants (addressee and addressee). “Discourse” in modern linguistics often come across the term. But the synthesis of background knowledge

and concrete context does not always lead to an understanding of the word unambiguous discourse. Therefore, discourse has a different purpose, even if it reflects the features of other types of discourse. In linguistics, there is also the idea that discourse is at the same time is the process of writing and reading. According to the first, indeed, the proposed material is a graphic text, and according to the second, created in the process of perception, is an established discourse. So the main differentiation factors of discourse and text are analyzed in this article.

In linguistics, discourse is a linguistic mean in which the world view formed in one cognitive space is encrypted by linguistic and extra-linguistic means and addressed to perception in another cognitive space. There is no common, universally accepted definition of discourse. Therefore, its components must be considered to clarify the meaning of dis-

course. Although discourse to some extent coincides with the concepts of “meaning” and “context”, they are not synonymous. Discourse appears in the process of direct communication such as oral and written. Discourse necessarily involves the presence of the sender and the receiver.

The text is the intersection of the various actions taken by the communicators, but which by their very nature are relevant. Understanding discourse as a process allows us to analyze the text as a static event. Analysis of the text structure allows us to divide the text into separate elements and to determine their hierarchical relationship (Шипова, 2017: 169).

In our opinion, it is more convincing to consider the text as an intermediate stage of discourse when considering the sum of speech and thought actions of both communicators as discourse. At the same time, the text can be considered as a product (result) of discourse, as an objective fact of reality.

Литература

- Harris Z. Discourse analysis: A small text. – NY: Linguistic Society of America, Language, vol.28, No.4, 1952. – P. 1-30.
- Тураева З.Я. Лингвистика текста. – М.: Просвещение, 1986. – 127 с.
- Lemke J.L. Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics. – London: Taylor&Francis, 1995. – 208 p.
- Abdullayev Ə.Ə. Aktual üzvlənmə, mətn və diskurs. – Bakı: Zərdabi LTD MMC, 2011. – 272 s.
- Ульянова Е.С. Реализация суперструктуры немецкоязычного энциклопедического дискурса: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., 2004. – 193 с.
- Сигал К.Я. Текст как функциональная среда синтаксической конструкции // Языковое сознание: содержание и функционирование. XIII Международный симпозиум по психолингвистике и теории коммуникации. – М.: ИЯз РАН; МГЛУ, 2000. – С. 223-224.
- Малычева Н.В. Текст и сложное синтаксическое целое: системно функциональный анализ. – Ростов-на-Дону: АПСН, 2003. – 180 с.
- Кулибина Н.В. Художественный дискурс как актуализация художественного текста в сознании читателя // Мир русского слова. – 2001. – №1 <http://www.gramota.ru/mirrs.html?problem03.htm> (1 апреля 2010 г.)
- Прохоров Ю.Е. Действительность. Текст. Дискурс. – М.: Флинта; Наука, 2006. – 224 с.
- Залевская А.А. Психолингвистический подход к проблеме концепта / А.А. Залевская // Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики: Научное издание / Под ред. И.А. Стернина. – Воронеж: Воронежский государственный университет, 2001. – С. 36-45.
- Богатырева И.И., Антонов А.В., Курзинер Е.С. Гипертекст, контекст и подтекст в поисково- аналитической системе “Галактика-Zoom” / Компьютерная лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии. Труды международной конференции Диалог 2006. – М.: РГГУ, 2006. – С. 73-77.
- Манаенко Г.Н. Когнитивные основания информационно-дискурсивного подхода к анализу языковых выражений и текста // Язык. Текст. Дискурс: межвузовский научный альманах / под ред. Г.Н. Манаенко. – Ставрополь: ПГЛУ, вып. 3, 2005. – С. 22-32.
- Чан Ким Бао. Русский текст как лингвистический феномен: Через призму лингвофилософской иньян-концепции: Дис. ... док. филол. наук. – М., 2000. – 395 с.
- Шипова И.А., Метасемиотика художественного текста: Дис... док. филол. наук. – М., 2017. – 364 с.
- Карасик В.И. О типах дискурса. // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс: сб. науч. трудов ВГПУ. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. – С. 5-20.

References

- Abdullayev E.E. (2011) Aktual uzvlenme, metn ve diskurs [Actual division text and discourse]. Bakı: Zerdabi LTD MMC, 272 s. (In Azerbaijani)
- Bogatyрева I.I., Antonov A.V., Kurziner E.S. (2006) Gipertekst. kontekst i podtekst v poiskovo- analiticheskoy sisteme “Galaktika-Zoom” [Hypertext, context and subtext in the search and analytical system “Galaktika-Zoom”] Kompyuternaya lingvistika i intellektualnyye tekhnologii. Trudy mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii Dialog 2006. M.: RGGU, S. 73-77 (In Russian)

- Chan Kim Bao. (2000) Russkiy tekst kak lingvisticheskiy fenomen: Cherez prizmu lingvofilosofskoy inyan-kontseptsii [Russian text as a linguistic phenomenon: Through the prism of the linguo-philosophical inyan-concept]: Dis. ... dok. filol. nauk. M., 395 s. (In Russian)
- Harris Z. (1952) Discourse analysis: A small text. NY: Linguistic Society of America, Language, vol.28, No.4, p. 1-30.
- Karasik V.I. (2000). O tipah diskursa [On the types of discourse] Yazykovaya lichnost: institutsionalnyy i personalnyy diskurs: sb. nauch. Trudov VGPU. Volgograd: Peremena, p. 5-20. (In Russian)
- Kulibina N.V. (2001) Khudozhestvennyy diskurs kak aktualizatsiya khudozhestvennogo teksta v soznanii chitatelya [Artistic discourse as actualization of a literary text in the mind of the reader] // Mir russkogo slova, №1 <http://www.gramota.ru/mirrs.html?problem03.htm> (1 April 2010) (In Russian)
- Lemke J.L. (1995) Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics. London: Taylor&Francis, 208 p.
- Malycheva N.V. (2003) Tekst i slozhnoye sintaksicheskoye tseloye: sistemno funktsionalnyy analiz [Text and a Complex Syntactic Whole: System Functional Analysis]. Rostov-na-Donu: APSN, 180 s. (In Russian)
- Manayenko G.N. (2005) Kognitivnyye osnovaniya informatsionno-diskursivnogo podkhoda k analizu yazykovykh vyrazheniy i teksta [Cognitive foundations of the information-discourse approach to the analysis of linguistic expressions and text] Yazyk. Tekst. Diskurs: mezhvuzovskiy nauchnyy almanakh / pod red. G.N.Manayenko. Stavropol: PGLU. Vyp. 3. S. 22-32 (In Russian)
- Prokhorov Yu.E. (2006) Deystvitelnost. Tekst. Diskurs [Reality. Text. Discourse]. M.: Flinta; Nauka, 224 s. (In Russian)
- Shipova I.A. (2017) Metasemiotika khudozhestvennogo teksta [Metasemiotics of literary text]: Dis... dok. filol. nauk. M., 364 s. (In Russian)
- Sigal K.Ya. (2000) Tekst kak funktsionalnaya sreda sintaksicheskoy konstruktssii [Text as a functional environment for syntactic construction] Yazykovoye soznaniye: sodержaniye i funktsionirovaniye. XIII Mezhdunarodnyy simpozium po psikholingvistike i teorii kommunikatsii. M.: IYaz RAN; MGLU. S. 223-224 (In Russian)
- Turayeva Z.Ya. (1986) Lingvistika teksta [Linguistics of the text]. M.: Prosveshcheniye, 127 s. (In Russian)
- Ulianova E.S. (2004) Realizatsiya superstruktury nemetskoyazychnogo entsiklopedicheskogo diskursa [Realization of the superstructure of the German-language encyclopedic discourse]: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. M., 193 s. (In Russian)
- Zalevskaya A.A. (2001) Psikholingvisticheskiy podkhod k probleme kontsepta [Psycholinguistic approach to the concept problem] A.A.Zalevskaya. Metodologicheskiye problemy kognitivnoy lingvistiki: Nauchnoye izdaniye. Pod red. I.A.Sternina. Voronezh: Voronezhskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet, S. 36-45 (In Russian)