

Lala Huseynova
Azerbaijan University of Languages



10.30546/2518-752X.2.507.014

ON THE ISSUE OF STUDY OF MAIN TYPES OF DISCOURSE

Keywords: *discourse, language, type, text, speech*

Açar sözlər: *diskurs, dil, növ, mətn, nitq*

Ключевые слова: *дискурс, язык, тип, текст, речь*

Introduction. More and more linguists today have an ever- growing interest in studying discourse and its types. Modern scholars offer various definitions of discourse based on different approaches to its study which is explained by the complex multifaceted nature of discourse. Remaining in the focus of modern scientific discussions discourse confirms the complexity of its content and nature as well as the need and prospects for further research of the issue. The term discourse was first introduced by the American scholar Z.Harris in 1952. By the end of the 20th century discourse has been given a broader scientific interpretation and it has got terminological ambiguity. When studying discourse like any natural phenomenon the issue of classifying discourse types arises. Establishing a typology of discourses that serve society should contribute to extensive study of language as a multilevel, hierarchical and dynamic system in functioning, leading to much better understanding of it as a means of communication which will be manifested in discursive – textual activity. The issue of discourse typology remains open both within the scope of discursive analysis and in modern linguistics as a whole. Many classifications are not comprehensive and are therefore treated as research techniques. The diversity of definitions and classifications of such a complex, multifaceted and multifunctional concept as discourse is due to its nature and the multidisciplinary approach of discourse analysis as an independent scientific field. Thus, the relevance of this study is stipulated by the fact that it allows for the consideration of discourse typology from various perspectives and opens up prospects for its research in different semi-otic domains.

The analysis of the literature on the issue of discourse typology shows that discourse can be classified on different criteria. When writing the article such methods as descriptive, analytical, comparative, classification and inductive have been applied.

Discussion. The traditional division of discourse into spoken and written modes which is primarily due to communication channel is regarded as the most common. In the first case it is acoustic and in the second it is visual. It is quite clear that spoken discourse is the original form of the existence of language and written discourse is derivative. When comparing these forms the national character of oral speech and the secondary, artificial character of written texts are emphasized.

Comparing spoken and written discourse a whole range of differences can be identified in terms of both the process and outcomes. In spoken discourse there is contact between the speaker and the addressee in time and space. In written discourse such contact is not normally found. Unlike written discourse within the framework of spoken discourse the speaker and the addressee are involved in a single situation. In spoken discourse the stage of generation and the stage of understanding are synchronized, but it does not occur in written one. Spoken discourse, in contrast to written, necessarily includes paralinguistic information that can be transmitted by phonation, kinesics, proxemics and non-verbal components. Spoken discourse is characterized by spontaneity while written discourse is prepared. In spoken discourse, unlike written, the speaker had a feedback that allows him to adjust his communication tactics and moves depending on the reaction of the addressee. This, on the one hand, is the advantage of the speaker over the writer and, on the other hand, it requires susceptibility and quick reaction as well as the ability to control expression of emotions, especially while communicating face to face.

The difference between spoken discourse viewed as the final product, the result and written discourse is manifested in the fact that the former is less normative. It contains errors, pauses and is characterized by greater ellipticity which is due to the communicant's ability to ask again and clarify in real time. Written discourse, for lack of such an opportunity, forced to be quite complete and explicit. The syntax of oral speech is much more structured, it has many incomplete sentences, few subordinating connections, there is also predominance of active constructions over passive ones. The spoken discourse is abundant with words of broad and vague semantics. In spoken discourse a limited range of connecting elements are usually used, and these are often omitted. Written discourse is characterized by the widespread use of linguistic expressions that ensure the formal coherence of the text (firstly, secondly, in the conclusion, in addition however).

From a formal standpoint the differentiation of spoken and written discourse is not difficult, since oral speech is realized in the form of sound matter and is perceived acoustically, while written speech is embodied graphically and perceived visually. The matter is complicated by the fact that in recent decades this binary subdivision has become undermined by the emergence of various forms of electronic communication, which in terms of their manifestation and process are close to written discourse. From the point of view of the result characteristic features of oral speech are found, including ellipticity, non-normativity, weak structure.

Another fundamental division of the discursive space is associated with the opposition of everyday, informal and institutional, formal types of discourse. From the point of contemporary sociolinguistics there are two main types of discourse: personal, personality – oriented and institutional, status – oriented. In the first case the speaker can be identified as an individual, in the second one he comes forward as a representative of certain social institution. Institutional discourse is reduced to patterns of verbal behaviour that evolved in society in relation to fixed areas of communication [2, p.190].

Ontologically everyday discourse is primary while mastery of institutional discourse occurs in the process of socialization. Institutional discourse is historically variable and culturally specific. Institutional discourse represents communication

within the given framework of status – role relations. As applied to modern society the following types of institutional discourse can be distinguished: political, diplomatic, administrative, legal, military, pedagogical, religious medical, sports, scientific, business and others.

The differentiation between everyday and institutional discourse is not absolute, since the parameter of formality allows for gradation. The everyday chatter of girlfriends consists of an oral everyday discourse and their correspondence represents also an everyday discourse, but already either written or electronic. Institutional communication can also take various forms: job interview – oral discourse, official documents – written discourse, business e-mail correspondence – electronic discourse.

In addition to the varieties noted above, when distinguishing types of discourse, reliance on more particular criteria is also practised. A number of works consider such grounds for classifying discourse types as taking into account the factor of the sphere of use and the subsequent allocation of political, military, medical, religious, legal and other types of discourse; taking into account the factor of participants and their ideological attitudes and, accordingly, the allocation of the discourse of trade unions, left or right, feminist discourse and others ; taking into account the factor of the communicative goals of the participants and the subsequent allocation of such types of discourse as polemical, didactic, manipulative, provocative and others [6, p.7].

As practice shows one can list the types of discourses grouped according to cumulative characteristics; according to the field or place of application, there will be the division into political, official, economic, scientific, religious, advertising, media and internet discourse; on the subjective basis one can trace the identification of such types of discourse as volunteer, journalistic, reader, discourse of fans; on the objective basis such types as the discourse of city, village, war; on the theological basis such types as teaching discourse, propaganda, identifying and other types of discourse. According to the modal evaluative feature one can distinguish political neutral discourse, positive, moderate, critical, radical and other types of discourse [4].

The presence of the factor of the subject of discourse presupposes identifying the following types of discourses. Taking into account the number of participants in verbal communicative activity, as a subject discourse with a single subject, discourse with a group subject and discourse with an abstract subject are distinguished. Based on the gender of the discourse subject division of discourses into male, female and mixed types are proposed. Taking into account the age factor of the discourse subject one can trace division of the discourse into children's, youth, adults and other varieties. Taking into account the factor of geographical location of the discourse subject it is possible to identify such types of discourses as European, North American, Latin American, Asian, global, regional and others. The ethnicity of the discourse subject implies division into such types of discourses as german, french, american and other varieties.

Based on the presence and involvement of the discourse object in verbal communicative activity, monologue discourses and dialogue discourses can be distinguished. One of the dialogic discourses is polylogic discourse, where the subject converses not with one but several objects. At the same time dialogic and polylogic discourses aimed at proving something or uncovering the truth through

argued speech, which unfolds in the form of polemics, debate, discussion, dispute are called polemical discourses [1, p.6].

The joint participation of the subject and the object in verbal communication determines the identification of discourse types from the perspective of the target audience. According to this criterion discourses can be specialized, educational, popular or non-specialized. There is also a possible variant of non-specialized discourse, where the addressee is a specialist and the addressee is a non-specialist. In such discourse the initiative gradually shifts to the specialist and it can be classified as either educational or popular [8, p.17].

Of the multiple grounds for classifying texts proposed within the framework of text linguistics only a few are used in discursive studies. Thus, discourse like text is usually described in terms of monologue or dialogue. Nowadays multimodal texts which have taken a central place in electronic communication have been added to the division of texts into sign – uniform and sign – heterogeneous ones. In discursive analysis the concept of narrative and argumentative discourse is also widely used, which goes back to the corresponding functional and semantic types of speech – narration and reasoning [7]. Narrative discourse is of particular interest primarily in the cognitive and structural aspects, while argument – tative discourse associated with reasoning and persuasion is in the focus of attention of experts concerned with the issues of speech influence and manipulation.

A discourse type is defined as a class of text genres united by a communicative purpose and having certain linguistic characteristics. This is the use of specific aspect and tense forms of the verb, then the predominant use of words of a particular part of speech in a fixed form, the presence of its own vocabulary and regulating words and other means [9, p.37]. Other researchers understand the type of discourse as a certain sample or model of the homogeneous group that has common extra and intralinguistic features characteristic of this group, determined by the author's intention as well as the communicative situation [5]. Thus, this is the kind of virtual model in the human mind, which in a specific situation of written communication acts a real discourse. In N.Fairclough's opinion a discourse type is a relatively stable combination of genres and discourses within a series or system of discourses. Discursive types either include complex combinations of several genres and discourses or represent separate genres and discourses. In this sense genre acts as a way of using language that corresponds to the type of social activity and discourse is a way of constructing a certain social activity [1].

Conclusion. Existing classifications of varieties of discourse confirm the fact that discourse is a multifaceted and versatile phenomenon. This interpretation is sometimes contradictory and ambiguous. The availability of different interpretations of discourse indicates that the subject area of research dealing with issues of discourse typology is always open to further expansion. The study of varieties of discourse continues to arouse interest among linguists and careful consideration is still given to this issue.

References:

1. Вохрышева Е.В. Моделирование дискурса: социокультурный аспект. Самара, СФГАОУ ВОМППУ, 2016, 148 с.
2. Карасик В.И. О категориях // Языковая личность: лингвистические и эмотивные аспекты. Волгоград, ВГПУ, 1998, с. 185-197

3. Карасик В.И. Этнокультурные типы институционального дискурса // Этнокультурная специфика речевой деятельности. М, ИНИОН, 2000, с. 33-58
4. Краснова Т.И. Дискурс: идиологема или термин // Медиалингвистика. 2017, N 1, с. 16-28
5. Кучеренко О.И. Формирование дискурсивной компетенции в сфере устного общения. Автореферат дис.канд.пед.наук., 2000, 26 с.
6. Левшина Н.Г. Речевые тактики в предвыборном обращении.// Вестник СПбГУ. Сер. 9, 2005, N 1, с.47-56
7. Нечаева О.А. Функционально-смысловые типы речи. Улан -Удэ, Бурят.кн.изд-во, 1974, 261 с.
8. Хомутова Т.Н. Типология дискурса: интегральный подход // Вестник Южно - Уральского государственного университета. Серия 'Лингвистика', Челябинск, 2014, N 2(11), с.14-19
9. Хохлова Н.Б. Обучение письменному описательному дискурсу на первом курсе языкового вуза. Автореф. дис.канд.пед.наук, Тамбов, 2003, 22 с.
10. Fairclough N. Media discourse. London, Arnold, 1995, 214 p.

Lalə Hüseynova

Xülasə

DİSKURSUN ƏSAS NÖVLƏRİNİN ÖYRƏNİLMƏSİ MƏSƏLƏSİNƏ DAİR

Hazırda ümumi diskurs tipologiyasının yaradılması vəzifəsi əsas məsələdir, çünki ümumi diskurs nəzəriyyəsinin perspektivi və bütün diskursiv müxtəlifliyin müəyyən edilməsi onun həllindən asılıdır. Bu məqalədə diskurs tipologiyasının formalaşmasına müxtəlif yanaşmalar ətraflı araşdırılır. Məqalədə hər bir növün müəyyən diskursiv təcrübələrə uyğun olduğu əsas nitq növlərinin müəyyən edilməsinin mümkün yolları təklif edilir. Bu araşdırma şifahi, yazılı və elektron nitq növlərinin təhlilinin genişləndirilməsinin vacibliyi vurğulayır və həmçinin gündəlik və institusional nitq növlərini fərqləndirməyə ehtiyac olduğunu göstərir. Qeyd etmək lazımdır ki, müxtəlif diskurs növlərinin mövcudluğu bu elmi tədqiqat sahəsinin daha da genişlənmək üçün daim açıq olduğunu göstərir və müasir diskursiv tədqiqatlarının intensiv inkişaf edən istiqamətini təmsil edir.

Лала Гусейнова

Резюме

К ВОПРОСУ ИЗУЧЕНИЯ ОСНОВНЫХ ТИПОВ ДИСКУРСА

В настоящее время задача создания общей типологии дискурса является ключевой, так как от ее решения зависит перспектива общей теории дискурса и выявления всего дискурсивного многообразия. В данной статье подвергается тщательному рассмотрению различные подходы к формированию типологии дискурса. В статье предлагаются возможные варианты выделения основных типов дискурса, где каждый вид соответствует определенным дискурсивным практикам. В данном исследовании подчеркивается важность расширения процесса анализа устного, письменного и электронного разновидностей дискурса, а также подчеркивается необходимость дифференциации бытового и институционального типов дискурса. Следует отметить, что наличие разных типов дискурса свидетельствует о том, что данная область научных изысканий всегда открыта для дальнейшего расширения и представляет собой интенсивно развивающееся направление современных дискурсивных исследований.

Rəyçi: prof. A. Məmmədov