

THE DESCRIPTION OF LINGUISTIC COMPONENTS OF THE DISCOURSE

I.S. Oganeseva, *Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor*
Kuban State University, branch in Armavir
 (Russia, Armavir)

DOI:10.24412/2500-1000-2021-6-1-40-43

Abstract. *The analysis of theoretical and practical material describes explicit macrostructures as the components of linguistic meanings of the discourse. Consequently, the explicit macroproposition of discourse, we mean a statement that is the result of a cognitive-semantic operation.*

The appeal to explicit macropropositions, organized by the author's efforts into explicit macrostructures, provides a relatively rare opportunity to trace how semantic, pragmatic and referential bases are realized into macrostructures of discourse. When working with explicit macrostructures, we get the opportunity to operate not with hypothetical cognitive-semantic units, but with explicit units clothed in syntactic structures.

The material of research was the text of the English writer Jerome K. Jerome "Three Men in a Boat: To Say Nothing of the Dog!" This story includes the sequences of explicit macropropositions, combined into macrostructures in each chapters of the text.

Keywords: *discourse, macrostructure, explicit macroproposition, cognitive-semantic unit, macroproposition, linguo-cognitive direction.*

The linguistic description of the discourse will be based on the terms macrostructure and macroproposition. The author of these terms T. van Dijk introduced them to describe of the global content and the global coherence of discourse [1]. Macrostructure of discourse is defined as "that meaning - or propositional structure - which is the result of applying to the linear (sequential) semantic structure of the text, "fold" this semantic structure into a macrostructure, which serves as a short expression of the content of the text [2].

In the seminal work "Macrostructures" T. van Dijk and V. Kinch [1] pay a special attention to the fact that macrostructures are determined by macro rules that establish the nature of the relationship between sequences of propositions and the corresponding macropropositions of the macrostructure, as well as determine those semantic operations by means of which macropropositions are formed from the sequences of propositions that form the macrostructures of discourse.

The named authors distinguish three main macro-rules, which we give below in the author's definition: omission - in the presence of a sequence of propositions, it is necessary to omit those propositions that do not serve the conditions of interpretation; generalization -

in the presence of a sequence of propositions, it is necessary to replace this sequence with a proposition derived from each proposition of this sequence; construction - in the presence of a sequence of propositions, it is necessary to replace it with a proposition derived from the entire repertoire of propositions included in this sequence [1].

The authors themselves note that this list is not exhaustive and does not take into account many details and other restrictions, but at the same time the given rules organize the meaning of discourse - in the sense that propositions are organized at the level of conceptual units.

Although T. van Dijk and V. Kinch call such a description of the semantics of discourse - linguistic [1], it is obviously that the conceptual units with its formation can be attributed to the linguo-cognitive direction in discursive research. Assuming that, depending on different knowledge, opinions and attitudes, each user of the language can ascribe his own macrostructure to the discourse, the authors come to the conclusion that "successful verbal communication is possible if only the users of the language have common meanings and knowledge", and therefore, "An adequate cognitive model of macrostruc-

tures should specify the general principles followed by all users of the language" [1].

In other words, the study of discourse, that is, text, makes it possible to obtain objective data on the general principles of the formation of macrostructures and macropropositions. Further, on the basis of these provisions, T. van Dijk and V. Kinch come to the conclusion that the intentions of the addressee, expressed in the text and on this basis ascribed to him by the addressee, play a decisive role in the derivation of macrostructures.

The term "macroposition" presupposes a discursive approach in the dynamic description of the cognitive semantics of a text, which can be confirmed by the use of this term in a number of works by T. van Dijk and V. Kinch, united in the collection "Language. Cognition. Communication" [1], however, speaking about the most material embodiment of discourse, the authors freely operate with the concept of text. This approach testifies to the fact that "discourse" and "text" are concepts rather complementary to each other than opposed ones.

The next significant provision in the Dijk - Kinch concept is the provision that macrostructures can be components of the linguistic meaning of discourse, while the named authors provide the following arguments:

1. Macrostructures can be formally expressed in discourse, for example, in the titles, summaries.

2. The presence of macrostructures in the meaning of discourse can also be signaled by other means: pronouns, theme-rhematic divisions often reflect previous unexpressed propositions and cannot be explained only on the basis of the meanings of previous sentences; for example, the pronoun "this" in the sentence - It might not have happened, summarizing a message about a disaster or accident.

It seems that the above arguments fully indicate the possibility of considering macrostructures as components of the linguistic meanings of discourse, and not just as some kind of cognitive structures that are deduced only indirectly.

It seems that these arguments fully indicate the possibility of considering macrostructures as components of the linguistic meanings of

discourse, and not just as some kind of cognitive structures that can be deduced only indirectly.

Authors T. van Dijk and V. Kinch write that macrostructures can be expressed explicitly and macropropositions can be located in different places of discourse, but mainly at its beginning or ending [1].

To confirm the position that the text can contain macropropositions, we use the text of the English writer Jerome K. Jerome "Three Men in a Boat: To Say Nothing of the Dog!". The first chapter:

(1) *Three invalids.* – (2) *Sufferings of George and Harris.* – (3) *A victim to one hundred and seven fatal maladies.* – (4) *Useful prescriptions.* – (5) *Cure for liver complaint in children.* – (6) *We agree that we are overworked, and need rest.* – (7) *A week on the rolling deep?* – (8) *George suggests the river.* – (9) *Montmorency lodges an objection.* – (10) *Original motion carried by majority of three to one.*

As we can see, this sequence in its most general form represents the thematic content of the chapter, or, in other words, the sequence of linguistic meanings of a fragment of discourse [3].

Components (1), (2), (3), (4), (7) and (10) are not formal propositions, since they are nominative constructions. However, it seems that in the functional-pragmatic terms, nominative constructions (1), (2), (3), (4), (7) and (10) and verb constructions (5), (6), (8) and (9) do not differ in any way: both are "folded", sublimated to one phrase, the corresponding segments of the text, inform the reader of the main thing that is said in these segments, inform the topic, or topic, of the corresponding part of the text and in their the aggregates represent the macrostructure of the text of the first chapter in its classical version, as presented by T. van Dijk.

N.D. Arutyunova in a well-known work "A Proposition and Its Meaning" writes about nominative constructions: "Since our thinking and communication is based on abstract categories and the predicate of a sentence denotes a feature related to an object, then a substantivized (nominalized) construction, semanti-

cally equivalent to a sentence, means a property or action" [3].

If we consider in more detail the components (1), (2), (3), (4), (7) and (10) from these positions, it turns out that they either endow a person or a group of persons with some feature, for example (1) *Three invalids*, or a condition or action, such as (2) *Sufferings of George and Harris* and (4) *Useful prescriptions*. (It should be noted here that other interpretations of component (1) are also possible; for example, it is possible to interpret *There exist three invalids*, (three patients) especially in the initial position of the discourse, but we proceeded from the fact that, firstly, the addressee before reading of the first chapter read the author's preface, in which the participants of the Thames journey are named; secondly, the resulting interpretation of the macrostructures describing the thematic repertoire of the chapter occurs only after reading the corresponding segments of the text, that is, when reading the segment of the text designated by the explicit macrostruc-

ture as *Three invalids*, to the addressee it becomes clear that we are talking about *George, Harris* and the author of the work, who, in order to create a comic effect.

The same can be said about the components of the explicit macrostructure (3) *A victim to one hundred and seven fatal maladies* and (5) *Cure for liver complaint in children*, in which a certain feature is attributed to the face - component (3) - and the substance - component (5).

Thus, by the explicit macroproposition of discourse, we mean a statement that is the result of the cognitive-semantic operation of deriving the general propositional-linguistic meaning of a number of atomic propositions of statements included in the unit of the compositional-thematic division of the text, explicated in the text. Accordingly, the explicit macrostructure of the text, in our case, the text of the chapter, is a sequence of statements preceding the chapter and reflecting its thematic repertoire.

References

1. Dyck T.A. van. Episodic models in the processing of discourse // *Language. Cognition. Communication: Sat. works.* - M.: Progress, 1989 (c). - P. 68-110.
2. Dyck T.A. van. Questions of pragmatics of the text // *New in foreign linguistics: Linguistics of the text.* - Issue. VIII. - M.: Progress, 1978. P. 259-336.
3. Arutyunova N.D. *Sentence and its meaning: Logical-semantic problems.* - Moscow: LKI Publishing House, 2007. - 384 p.

ОПИСАНИЕ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИХ КОМПОНЕНТОВ ДИСКУРСА

И.С. Оганесова, канд. филол. наук, доцент
Кубанский государственный университет, филиал в г. Армавире
(Россия, г. Армавир)

***Аннотация.** Анализ теоретического и практического материала описывает эксплицитные макроструктуры как компоненты лингвистических значений дискурса. Следовательно, под эксплицитной макропропозицией дискурса мы понимаем высказывание, представляющее собой эксплицированный в тексте результат когнитивно-семантической операции.*

Обращение к эксплицитным макропропозициям, организованным усилиями автора в эксплицитные макроструктуры, предоставляет относительно редкую возможность проследить, каким образом, на каких семантических, прагматических и референциальных основаниях осуществляется макроструктура дискурса. При работе с эксплицитными макроструктурами мы получаем возможность оперировать не гипотетическими когнитивно-семантическими единицами, но единицами эксплицированными, облеченными в синтаксические структуры.

Материалом исследования послужил художественный текст английского писателя Джерома К. Джерома «Three Men in a Boat: To Say Nothing of the Dog!». История включает последовательность эксплицитных макропропозиций, объединенных в макроструктуры, предваряющие каждую из глав произведения.

***Ключевые слова:** дискурс, макроструктура, эксплицитная макропропозиция, когнитивно-семантическая единица, макропропозиция, лингво-когнитивное направление.*