

Semantic Signs of Discourse

Khatira Avaz Gojayeva

PH.D., Associate Professor, Phonetics Department, Azerbaijan University of Languages.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20230518>

ABSTRACT

The article deals the semantic signs of discourse. It states that since the beginning of the 20th century, the concept called discourse has attracted wide attention and is beginning to be studied. Discourse is widely studied in linguistics, sociolinguistics, psychology, and various fields. The study of discourse attracts the attention of linguists when they want to study and study a language unit different from the text.

The term discourse is widely used, and its widespread use in linguistics literature has been referred to by linguists as 'discourse revolution'. The semantic signs of the discourse are widely studied in both foreign and local linguistics. Linguists conducting research in this field include D. Cristal, T.A. van Dijk, , D. Shifrin, Y. Stepanov, V. Makarov, V. Karasik, V. Borbotko, K. M. Abdullayev, F. Y. Veysalli, A. Y. Mammadov, A. A. Abdullayev and others can be mentioned.

For a long time, there was a debate about whether the terms text and discourse are the same. Although some consider them to be the same, others claim that they are completely different. Note that our position is that the terms discourse and text have different meanings. If we compare them, we can determine the differences between them as follows: there are linguistic and extralinguistic differences between them; while the text has its own borders and its own frame, the discourse also has its own scope and places of use.

The semantic signs of the discourse have been fully analyzed in the article. Eventuality is a content element of the discourse dedicated to a certain event. It is more open in the Internet discourse, because the author is more involved in the event in various forms.

The article highlights the importance of semantic signs of the discourse. Continuity

together with non-discreteness and dynamism are relevant properties of discourse.

Key words: *discourse, semantic, sign, continuity, relevance, mental, communication*

INTRODUCTION

The analysis of the discourse structure is closely related to its content. "Discourse analysis cannot be carried out without studying mental models, because they provide a real basis for selecting the necessary communicative information for strategic purposes, such as the formation of both general and specific semantic structures. ... language tools, along with the function of placing events in time and space, also participate in the thematic development that ensures coherence in the discourse in general" [Mammadov 2010, p. 26]. Differentiation of sub-discourses within the discourse on the basis of thematic affiliation leads to the distinction of certain parameters for describing the content aspect. In this case, we include temporality, locativeness, eventfulness, problematicity, authorship and addressability, etc. as content features of the discourse. we consider it appropriate to be attributed. Let us add that, although the listed content features are specific to the text, they can be applied to the study of the content aspect of the discourse with the same success. The temporality sign of the discourse means, first of all, the absoluteness of the time parameter (attachment to a certain time period, attachment to the time component of the description of something, the importance of transmitting information within a certain time frame). Temporality is a creative trait

for chronicled information. For example, narrating an event is its illumination, in which case the author must accurately describe the time frame in which the events took place.

Locativeness is one of the main signs that express the connection of the discourse to a certain place.

Eventuality is a content element of the discourse dedicated to a certain event. Eventuality is more open in the Internet discourse, because the author is more involved in the event in various forms (forum, social network, mass media, chats, video, portals, comments on other people's texts, etc.).

Problematicity is a sign that discourses are based on a certain problem. For example, the incident of J. Depardieu's acquisition of citizenship in Russia became the basis for the emergence of the following problem-subdiscourses - tax evasion, attitude of Russians towards foreign citizens, etc.

The "Meteorite Fall" event led to a long and serious analysis of many problems: preparation for emergency events, actualization of the activities of various services in force majeure situations, increasing the influence of scientists, the behavior of eyewitnesses, the activity of political circles, the emergence of mentality in conditions of danger and stress, and etc.

Authorship as a sign of discourse acquires a new direction. First, the author expands his text by referring to similar events and topics; second, by giving the information in parts (first the fact of the event, then the results, and then the evaluation of the event, etc.); thirdly, to communicate with the audience (commenting on the material, inciting inquiries, etc.).

The addressee, in turn, plays an important role in the formation of the discourse. Directed to the addressee, the author creates the information that ultimately leads to the creation of the discourse. When talking about the structural organization of the discourse, it is necessary to mention two aspects: integrity and consistency. The first of these is the possibility of transition from

one speech act or one speech intention to another. The transition of speech acts and intentions creates a sense of the communicative integrity of the text in the recipients. Second, integrity involves the purposefulness of utterances within a discourse. Third, the whole is considered at two levels - general (theme, idea) and specific (conceptual or understanding) levels.

In spite of today's picture, among the relevant features of the discourse, which are undoubtedly accepted, are anthropocentricity, non-discretion (integrativeness/syntheticity of cognition and communication), situationality (contextuality), processuality (dynamism). Consistency, openness, seriality and ambivalence based on the assumption that discourse is an unfinished communicative event can be attributed to the mentioned signs.

Continuity together with non-discreteness and dynamism are relevant properties of discourse, especially compared to text, which is characterized by exhaustion, discreteness. In other words, discourse does not recognize space-time limitations, and therefore it is impossible to determine when one discourse ends and another begins. Continuity echoes the "principled openness" of the discourse [Adamzik 2001, p. 254], the discourse represents such a continuum that there is no limitation in its filling with real texts. Separated from the discourse, the text represents an exhausted and closed system [Greimas 2004, p. 131]. Discourse, which is both potential and realized at the same time, is essentially an ambivalent manifestation, that is, it is amorphous, uncertain, and its boundaries are imprecise.

The seriality of the discourse is that it is one of the constantly changing forms of socio- and linguocultupological interaction of communicants. Linearity is inherent in the text that locates the discourses. It is also impossible not to feel that the linguist who talks about the discourse also talks about the text against his will. In fact, the coexistence of two linguistically relevant phenomena in the context of each other is not a

coincidence, but a dialectical regularity. The most common way of distinguishing them is their “general-specific” hypo-hyperonymic correlation, in which the “text” is special and it acts as a constitutive unit of discourse. Discourse represents a unit of a higher level of abstraction as “general”, under which there is potentially an infinite number of concrete and real texts [Chernyavskaya 2007, p. 7]. In this sense, between text and discourse, there are known language-speech, sentence-speech, phoneme-phone, etc. in linguistics. It is possible to draw a parallel according to the encounter. In other words, the abstraction “discourse” materializes in concrete existing texts: “discourse is a text immersed in a communication situation, it is communication through texts” [Abdullayev 2012, p. 350]. It is precisely at this level that no matter how many “storage units” there are in his annals, he is, as a rule, ready to accept new texts. The texts themselves are willing to move into the infinite space of discourse.

G.N. Manaenko writes that “...Any discourse creates a text” [Manaenko, p. 9]. Texts go back and forth, discourse remains. When confronting the closedness, exhaustion, linearity, discreteness, consequentiality, stativity of the text with the openness, non-exhaustion, continuity, processuality, dynamism of the discourse, we would like to point out that it is appropriate to understand the phenomenon of discourse as a multi-level socio-linguistic phenomenon, within its boundaries a certain subject - verbal communication is carried out in the subject sphere. Like other linguocultural phenomena, discourse can be interpreted at three levels of representation: - real language (form), sociocultural (content) and communicative-pragmatic (function). Bringing the sociocultural level to this triad system is a requirement of the communication environment, which frames the communicative-pragmatic structure of the discourse. From this point of view, discourse represents a processual-resultative

order [Shevchenko 2004, p. 11], a cognitive-communicative complex whole.

Discourse is an isotopic continuum; a space of verbal means of embodying socially important ideas reflected in the linguocultural consciousness.

Understanding discourse as the speech culture of society is also relevant for linguistic analysis. This point is considered as the highest stage of a person's life world in the Frankfurt school of communicative philosophy [Habermas 1984, p. 115].

F. Veysalli notes that “semantic, pragmatic and communicative functions manifest themselves more prominently” [Veysalli 2010, p. 10] in the discourse. Discourse is a complex communicative unit of language with structural-semantic features. If the discourse is characterized by exhaustion, i.e. if it has features such as coherence, integrity, completeness and autosemanticity (it is understood that all questions of reference within the text are resolved), then to understand it, it is enough to master the addressee, the syntax and semantics of the language in which it was created [Borbotko 1982, p. 9].

We would like to add that this definition of discourse raises serious objections. First, they are essentially the same definition of text; secondly, discourse cannot be considered a linguistic unit at all. Although language, speech, and discourse are not concepts of the same order, they are in any case not connected in terms of hierarchy. They, of course, mutually condition each other, but it is not correct to look at discourse as a language or a conversational unit, just as it is unreasonable to call a conversation a language unit or a conversational unit. And, finally, “the discourse structure, which is called the text of communicative speech, represents the speech-thought process” [Borbotko 1998, p. 3]. This definition, given by V.G. Borbotko, is quite typical, as it includes concepts that are sometimes denoted by the term “discourse” and should be distinguished from the latter: it is both a text, a communicative conversation, and a speech-

thought process, and any structure as a result of that process.

It should be noted that the discourse, which has found its full expression, does not include only speech (verbal and non-verbal, paralinguistic), taking into account all sociolinguistic factors (social, cultural, psychological). Discourse is not the result (work) itself, but also the activity from which the result (product) is created. Discourse is “a communicative situation containing the consciousness of communicators and a text created in the process of communication”.

Declaration by Authors

Acknowledgement: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Mammadov, A., Mammadov M. Cognitive perspectives of discourse analysis. Baku: Çashioğlu, 2010, 96 p.
2. Adamzik, K. Language: ways to understand. Tübingen: Francke, 2001, 335 p.
3. Greimas, A.Zh. Structural semantics: Search for a method / Per. from fr. Moscow: Academic project, 2004, 368 p.
4. Chernyavskaya, V.E. Open text and open discourse: intertextuality-discursivity-interdiscursivity // Text linguistics and discursive analysis: traditions and perspectives. Sat. scientific tr. SPb., SPbGUEF, 2007, p. 7-26.
5. Abdullayev, K.M., Mammadov A., Musayev M. and others. Complex syntactic units in the Azerbaijani language (Textbook). Baku: Mutercim, 2012, 608 p.
6. Manaenko, G.N. The Meanings of the "World of Text" and the Meanings of the "World of Discourse" // Language. Text. Discourse: Scientific. almanac. Stavropol, Krasnodar, APSN, Kuban regional branch, 2008, p. 9-23.
7. Shevchenko, I.S. Formation of the cognitive-communicative paradigm in linguistics // Bulletin of Kharkiv nat. un-tu, 2004, No. 635, p. 202-205.
8. Habermas, J. Preliminary Studies and Supplements to the Theory of Communicative Action. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1984, 356 p.
9. Veysalli, F.Y. An introduction to discourse analysis. Baku: Education NPM, 2010, 141 p.
10. Borbotko, V.G. Semantic organization and interpretation of discourse in cognitive and aesthetic communication // Text as psycholinguistic reality. Moscow, 1982, p. 7-13.
11. Borbotko, V.G. General theory of discourse (principles of formation and meaning generation): Abstract of the thesis. dis. ... Dr. Philol. Sciences. Krasnodar. 1998, 48 p.
12. Modeling of Language Activity in Intelligent Systems / Ed. A.E. Kibrik and A.S. Narinyani. Moscow: Nauka, 1987, 280 p.
13. Oleshkov, M.Yu. Fundamentals of functional linguistics: a discursive aspect. Russia, Nizhny Tagil, 2006, 146 p.
14. Crystal, D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. New York: Blackwell, 2003, 529 p.

How to cite this article: Khatira Avaz Gojayeva. Semantic Signs of Discourse. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2023; 10(5): 142-145.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20230518>
