

O.Proisanyk

Associate Professor, Doctor of Science (Philology)
Department of Management of Social Communications
S.Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

S.Tarasenko

Senior Lecturer
Department of Pedagogy, Foreign Philology and Translation
S.Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Abstract. The article considers the understanding of the discourse as a functional-pragmatic variant of human linguosemiotic experience and a media discourse as the set of processes and products of speech activity, specified functionally / pragmatically, in the field of mass communication.

Keywords: media, discourse, linguosemiotics, activity

MEDIADISCOURSE AS A FORM OF LINGUOSEMIOTIC ACTIVITY

The term *discourse* was introduced into the scientific circulation by Zellig Harris in the early 1950s, calling the discourse a method of analyzing connected speech [7].

The history of the appearance of the term *discourse* testifies to the fact that it has become a reaction to dissatisfaction with a number of provisions in modern linguistics:

- a) static understanding of the language and the text;
- b) too high degree of abstraction of the language and the text from actual situations and linguistic procedures related to the language use and the generation / perception of texts;
- c) too high degree of abstraction of the language, the text and the linguistic procedures from the linguistic entity;

d) isolation of the language, the text and the linguistic procedures from all other semiotic factors, codes and functionally pragmatic circumstances of interpersonal communication.

It should be emphasized that, reflecting on discourse, it would be best not to narrow this concept to a purely verbal (linguistic, speech, textual) function, but to regard it as a macrofunction of linguosemiotic experience, since in real communication and in real explication of intentions the person uses not only the language but all other sign systems and factors (gestures, facial expressions, spatial factors, various signal objects, etc.). This means that discoursology may not only be part of the linguistics, but must be regarded as a linguosemiotic discipline.

If we consider the discourse statically and substantively – as a phenomenon of social life, then we can say that discourse is a sphere of human linguosemiotic experience, characterized by at least one of the following factors:

- pragmatics of the activities realized in it,
- social and psychological characteristics of participants of interaction,
- its spatio-temporal specificity or
- subject matter,

although usually these factors determine the discourse together. The same factors differentiate the types of discourses in various combinations. So, we can talk about the discourse educational, scientific, artistic, economic, religious, political, media, household, worldview, etc. In all these cases, it is about the specificity of the research activity and the pragmatics of the activities of people who communicate with each other in this field.

In addition, one can speak of the child or adolescent discourse, male, female or mixed, the discourse of communication in the system of relations «mother-child», «sick-healthy», «leader-subordinate», as well as socially egalitarian or hierarchical, intra- or cross-cultural, etc. In this case, the socio-psychological characteristics of the discourse participants are taken into account. It can be the discourse urban or rural, Ukrainian (inland) or transboundary, the discourse of the last third of the 20th or the beginning of the 21st century, i.e. taking into account the spatial or temporal factor.

Finally, there may be a discourse on gender inequality, international politics, customs of the contemporary youth, modern art, manifestation of bureaucracy, etc.

Usually, all these factors are combined, so we can speak, for example, about the Ukrainian feminist urban youth discourse of the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century on the topic of career advancement of women, or about the Kharkiv television discourse of the end of the Gorbachov's reformation period on the topic of bureaucratic abuse.

Therefore, the totality of all discourses is a linguosemiotic experience as a whole. Simply put, the discourse can be called that part of our linguosemiotic life that has a certain shade of isolation, chosen in one or all of the aspects listed at once, and thus the discourse belongs to the linguosemiotic experience as part to the whole.

It would probably be ineffective to reduce the concept of discourse to a one-time speech event (such a phenomenon could be called a discursive event or a discursive situation), since such temporal and spatial limitation would make it impossible to describe it. It would be difficult to outline a one-time phenomenon without resorting to generalizing and typifying markers such as subjects, purpose and pragmatics, causal circumstances, form and semantics. The essence of science is not to describe a unique situation that, firstly, is completely different from all other situations that occurred in the past, and secondly, it will never happen again in the future, but, on the contrary, to understand the essence of the phenomena that are happening and learn to master the experience in the future. That is why it would be most expedient to operate the term *discourse* not in actually individualizing but in generalizing and typifying meaning, that is, to understand this phenomenon as a certain model type of human linguosemiotic experience.

If to consider the discourse dynamically and procedurally, that is, to understand it as a type of human linguosemiotic activity, then it is necessary to single out in it the following:

1. a specific code (sign system) inherent in a particular area of experience that serves the corresponding purposes in this field, inherent in a particular group of people who use it at a specific time and place and / or intended to communicate on a specific topic,

2. a set of specific linguosemiotic actions characteristic for this research area, these carriers, this time, space and subject matter and aimed at achieving the stated purpose and

3. set of texts (semiotic works), which reflects the specifics of the research area, social and psychological peculiarities of users, time, place and subject matter, and in which the stated purposes are realized.

Unlike the static features of the discourse, which are its aspectually and purely attributive (typologizing) characteristics, its dynamic components (code, procedures and works) are obligatory and immanent to any discourse and in fact constitute its structure. In this sense, each particular discourse is a separate case of linguosemiotic activity as such. Simply put, the discourse belongs to the linguosemiotic activity as partial to general [1, p. 65].

It would be extremely inappropriate to reduce the discourse as a manifestation of activity only to speech acts or, moreover, to their results (text), as some scholars advise (we can recall the well-known formulation of N.Arutyunova that the discourse is a text immersed in life). With this understanding it is difficult to explain where the systematic characteristics of the discourse come from, why different discursive events have similar structural and functional components, how the effectiveness of this or that discursive behavior of the participants of the discourse is achieved. All this happens only through the use of linguistic-semiotic models (i.e. code).

The basic idea that the concept of discourse should contain is that discourse is not only and not so much a separate text in its active (pragmatic) functioning (and thus simultaneously with all cognitive-psychological and linguosemiotic procedures of generation, signaling and perception), but also a compulsory set of code conditions that make such functioning possible (that is, a specific system of signs and models of the generation and interpretation of this type of texts).

In the end, by reducing the discourse to the notion of the text immersed in life, we are actually losing the anthropic perspective. The discourse as a text that «immerses» itself in life, ceases to be human experience and human activity, it becomes a metaphysical entity or material reality. The cognitive and mental side of the discourse is lost. It is difficult to understand what ensures its semantics and

pragmatics. In order not to lose this perspective, it is better to conceptualise the discourse as a human purposeful activity, driven by the social experience of its participants.

Simply put, the discourse in anthropocentric sense is a person's own linguosemiotic activity (in the procedural way of describing an object) or his/her linguosemiotic experience (in a substantive way of description).

So, do you need a term that duplicates these two terms? The discourse is not the whole linguosemiotic experience and not all linguosemiotic activity as a whole, but only one of their functionally pragmatic varieties, their exemplification, specified by a number of factors. The definition of the discourse in functional-pragmatic linguistics can be as follows: this is a functional-pragmatic version of linguosemiotic experience (linguosemiotic activity), specified by:

a) the type and nature of the research activity (linguistic in particular) – macrodiscourses: by the essential principle this is the service of the real sphere of life: real / virtual, rational / emotional, externally - internally motivated; household, economic, socio-political, scientific-cognitive, aesthetic, philosophical (ideological). We regard the media discourse as a sub-discourse in socio-political discourse;

b) properties of subjects (number, gender, age, status, psychological and physiological features) – subject discourses: individual, microsocial, macrosocial, mass, female, male, mixed, child, adolescent, adult, elderly, healthy, sick and the like;

c) cultural-civilizational circumstances of activity (in particular ethnic, social, mental) – cultural discourses: monoethnic, polyethnic, mono- or multicultural, within the social layer, intersocial ones;

d) characteristic localization of activities (from micro- to macro-level) – local discourses, – from local media to global ones;

e) characteristic temporal properties of activity (from micro- to macro-level) – temporal discourses;

f) subject matter (semantics) – thematic discourses, – thematic media

g) signal form – formal discourses: oral, written, contact, distant, multimedia, etc. [1, p. 64].

The problem of discursive analysis of the language, speech, as well as linguistic (in a broader sense – linguosemiotic) activity has generally arisen recently. Taking into account the various trends (epistemological perspectives) that prevailed at one time or another in the long history of linguistics, we can say that the most ancient (not necessarily the most studied) of them are as follows:

- signal perspective (study of letters, ideograms, icons, as well as sounds of the language and phonological systems),
- nominative-morphological perspective (study of lexical signs – words, idioms, phrases and their linguistic forms, both from formal and semantic side, both in system-paradigmatic aspect and situational-linguistic terms),
- system-semiotic perspective (study of the language as a semiotic system and the language as a semiotic interaction in combination with other iconic forms of vital activity),
- syntactic perspective (the study of syntactic units – offers, utterances, super phrasal units, texts from the formal-grammatical or semantic-stylistic side, both in descriptive and model aspects),
- activity-discursive perspective (study of holistic linguosemiotic activity / linguosemiotic experience in functional unity of code and semiotic behavior, as well as in a pragmatic aspect as a discursive activity).

Based on the typological definition of discourse as a sphere of linguosemiotic experience, in the analysis of the so-called category of the linguistic picture of the world, we should take into account the discourse in which these or others ideas of people about the world are realized, because we have no other evidence of this function of human experience other than signaling products, communicative actions and linguosemiotic ideas.

Traditionally, people speak of two varieties of pictures of the world – the everyday picture and the scientific one. The first manifests itself most in the domestic discourse, the second - in the discourse of science¹. As to the texts about the artistic or ideological pictures of the world, the sphere of their realization is correspondingly aesthetic or socio-political discourses. Finally, people talk about the religious or mythological pictures of the world, but rarely consider the fact that the worldview

may have other reasons, for instance, atheistic, agnostic or positivist ones (and not coincide with scientific ones), and also be solipsic or metaphysical (and herewith not being religious). Therefore, in such cases, it is better to talk about the worldview, which is realized in the philosophical discourse. Finally, a person may have an absolutely rational, practical and utilitarian-productive view of the world, which a person uses in his/her economic activities. These are far more rational ideas than those which guide a person in everyday or public life, but are much less coherent and logically based than those used in scientific research or philosophical reasoning. This is a rational and practical picture of the world, which is realized in the economic discourse.

In summary, we can say that the typologization of the worldviews and discourses must be carried out on the same grounds – essential (essence of the object and the means) and pragmatic (domination of the purpose and the method).

By the first feature, the discourses (and their corresponding discourse worldviews) can be real and virtual. The first include domestic, economic and socio-political discourses, the second – philosophical, scientific and aesthetic ones.

By the second feature, they can be divided into rational (objective) and emotional (subjective) ones. The first include economic and scientific, the second – socio-political and aesthetic. Domestic and philosophical discourses in this respect are mixed in nature: the part of everyday discourse related to the provision of well-being can be conditionally attributed to the rational discourse, and the part related to the provision of security – to the emotional one. The part of the philosophical discourse in which the problems of sense are conditioned can be conditionally attributed to the rational discourse, and the part, at the center of which are worldview values, – to the emotional one. But it is the everyday and worldview pictures that are the nucleus that underpins the experience of each individual and on which all other specific discourse pictures of the world are added in layers. Herewith the practical and ideological pictures of the world are the derivatives of the everyday one and cognitive and artistic ones – of the worldview picture. This does not mean that the core of the human view of the world is an invariable immanent entity. It is constantly changing both under the influence of everyday and philosophical discourses and the derived discourses – the

economic, scientific, socio-political and aesthetic ones. Thus, the discourse pictures of the world, although united in one system of linguosemiotic experience, do not merge into one homogeneous whole. They complement each other, creating transitional mixed discourse spaces (such as, for example, educational, administrative, legal, religious, media, sports, technical, popular scientific and a lot of subcultural discourses).

There is also a third, causal feature, by which one can typologize all of the above mentioned ideas about the world (and the discourses accordingly). It indicates the degree of stereotype of the discourse picture of the world and, accordingly, the degree of its socialization or individualization. In the case of full acceptance and observance of social norms of linguosemiotic thinking and behavior, it is possible to speak about the socialized discourse (institutional in particular), in case of their rejection or creative transformation, – about the individualized discourse.

Thus, the discourse is a linguistic activity (linguistic experience) that is specified functionally or pragmatically. The notion of media discourse is derived from the general concept of discourse, so the media discourse is a set of processes and products of speech activity, specified functionally / pragmatically, in the field of mass communication. In contemporary linguistics, the media discourse appears either as a specific speech-thinking kind of activity, characteristic exclusively for the information mass media space, or as any kind of discourse realized in the media space and produced by the media. In view of the first understanding, the media discourse should be distinguished from other types of discourse, such as political, religious, scientific, etc. The difference between them is determined by the use of different language practices and the communicative situations of its realization. In view of the second understanding of the media discourse, we can speak of political, religious, scientific media discourses.

The contemporary media discourse is a field of language functioning in which we can see an intense development and steady tendency for new transformation processes [8]. The media discourse is integrated into all kinds of relationships – social, personal and professional – and is used to achieve a certain illocative effect [5].

Like any kind of discourse, the media discourse has its structural and organizational features. The media discourse is the process and result of the linguosemiotic activity of the linguistic personality. The model of the linguistic personality in the space of the mass media discourse consists of three levels: media-orientation, linguocognitive and motivational [3]. The levels of the linguistic personality subordinate the organization of the mass media discourse to four structural stages of the addressee's activity, general orientation in particular; the creation of referents reported by the media; establishing relationships between these referents; constructing events and their sequences [2].

Summarizing the above, we can conclude that the study of the media discourse is a complex study of a separate fragment of linguistic activity (according to F. de Saussure – langage [9]) in its entirety. Therefore, the media discourse is a global universal category of modern communication and information discourse that acts as a certain background and reflects the current mood of the society in various spheres of activity – politics, economy, culture etc., as well as dynamic innovative processes, such as lexical neologisms, semantic neologisms, "reanimated" archaisms, periphrases, catchphrases, borrowings from other languages [6, p. 227].

References:

1. Лещак О. В. Дискурс как функционально-прагматический вариант лингвосемиотического опыта // *Dyskurs: aspekty lingwistyczne, semiotyczne i komunikacyjne*, pod red. A.Kiklewicza i I. Uchwanowej-Szmygowej. Olsztyn. 2015. S. 57–66.
2. Лютянська Н. І. Мас-медійний дискурс: типологічні та структурно-організаційні особливості // *Наукові записки Ніжинського державного університету імені Миколи Гоголя. Серія :Філологічні науки*. Ніжин, 2014. – Кн. 2. –С. 136–141.
3. Потапенко С.І. Сучасний англомовний медіа-дискурс: лінгвокогнітивний і мотиваційний аспекти. Ніжин : Видавництво НДУ імені Миколи Гоголя, 2009. 391 с.

4. Просяник О. П. Интерпретация и перевод как средства мультипликации научной теории // *The Peculiarity of Man*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo "Adam Marszałek", 2013. № 17. s. 154-170.
5. Рогоза А. П. Ілокутивний мовленнєвий акт як мінімальна одиниця мовленнєвого спілкування. – Режим доступу: <http://www.kamts1.kpi.ua/node/1104> (Дата зверення: 09.07.2014).
6. Сибірякова О. Глобалізація соціальних трансформацій як засади для виникнення нового мультиплікативного медіадискурсу // *Теле- та радіожурналістика*. 2017. Випуск 16. С. 227–235.
7. Тракткування терміну “дискурс” у сучасній лінгвістиці. – Режим доступу: <https://naub.oa.edu.ua/2014/traktuvannya-terminu-dyskurs-u-suchasnij-linhvistytsi/> (Дата зверення: 17.10.2014).
8. Черниш О. А. (2013) Сутнісні характеристики понять «медіадискурс» та «медіатекст» у сучасній медіа лінгвістиці // *Наукові записки. Серія: Філологічні науки (мовознавство)* (118). pp. 309-313. – Режим доступу: <http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/9782/> (Дата зверення: 15.08.2015).
9. Saussure F. de. *Ecrits de linguistique générale, établis et édités par Simon Bouquet et Rudolf Engler, avec la collaboration d'Antoinette Weil*. Paris: Gallimard, «Bibliothèque des idées», 2002. 353 p.