

**WRITTEN FORM OF COMMUNICATION
AS ONE OF THE MAIN TYPES OF DISCOURSE**

*Ольга Крюкова
викладач*

Ізмаїльський державний гуманітарний університет

The intensive development of a communicative approach to the study of linguistic phenomena developed in the home and world linguistics gives impetus to a more profound interpretation of certain concepts of functional linguistics and text theory, opens the prospects for a successful reorientation of many traditional directions of linguistics for the study of speech communication, interpersonal speech communication, creation of an integrative conceptual apparatus of human communicative and speech activity. Modern linguistics pays great attention to the study of human speech activity and regards it as an object of its study.

The study of linguistic phenomena used to convey in the text the information about the social situation in which it is generated, as well as about the conditions of its functioning (the sphere of communication, the nature of the relationship between communicants, the purpose of communication, etc.) is an actual problem of modern linguistics.

Attention to the wide extralinguistic context of verbal communication, without which the study of the object of linguistics is limited, has increased with the development of a communicative and functional direction in linguistics, and also with the formation of pragmatics of the 1970s and 1980s. In the works of N.D. Arutyunova, O.O. Leontiev, L.V. Sakharny, Y.O. Sorokin, E.F. Tarasova the activity nature of speech, the urgency of studying the problems of speech interaction between the addresser and the addressee are emphasized. Therefore, it is not accidental that linguists are interested in text as a communicative unit of high rank, with the help of which, in fact, speech communication is realized.

We consider it expedient to adhere to the opinion that the text is a phenomenon of written speech [4, c. 18].

In the early stages of the study, the concepts of «text» and the less common «discourse» were used by most linguists as interchangeable terms; often «text» was used with respect to written communication, and «discourse» – with respect to oral communication. Reflecting the differences in the focus and goals of the study of speech, the terms «discourse» and «text» also reflect the distinction made in linguistic works, and often also the opposition of oral and written communication. However, such a mixture of oppositions is considered unjustified. In linguistics, discourse is understood as «coherent text in conjunction with extralinguistic (pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological, etc.) factors; text taken in the event aspect; speech, considered as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes)» [2, c. 136-137].

The term «discourse» has been consistently used by researchers to denote the object of research within the framework of a process-activity description of language communication, in the focus of which there is an active communicator and associated communicative and pragmatic, cognitive, semantic and other parameters that are actualized in the course of his speech activity [11, c. 129].

The development of the communicative and activity approach to the study of the functioning of language has concentrated the interest of researchers on the procedural aspects of linguistic activity. Stressing the activity nature of human communication, discourse is viewed as a form of interpersonal verbal interaction. This interpretation allows us to consider written communication within the framework of discursive analysis, highlighting the two main types of discourse – oral and written, that use different channels of communication (acoustic - visual). In

L.Tsurikova's opinion, the inclusion of written communication in the concept of «discourse» makes it possible to describe dynamic and activity, situational / contextual aspects of this type of language interaction and, thus, to consider both types of discourse from one angle, despite the obvious and significant differences between them [11, c. 130].

Communication through oral discourse differs in most cases in the fact that communicants come into direct contact and perceive each other not only with the help of hearing organs, but also visually. Communication through text is a deferred, postponed communication, carried out only by means of the linguistic means making up this text. Written discourse, i.e. the text, is characterized by reproducibility, and oral discourse is characterized by non-reproducibility, at least partial reproducibility [1, c. 63; 7, c. 15]. The linguostylistic analysis of the discourse is oriented towards the allocation of communication registers, the delineation of oral and written speech in their genre varieties, the definition of the functional parameters of communication on the basis of its units (characteristics of functional styles) [8, c. 5].

The analysis of the theoretical literature shows that written speech has been subjected to research from different aspects of linguistic study – genre; speech study; pragmatic; semiotic, graphic, graphological; punctuation and orthographic, systemic and level: phonetic, lexical and phraseological, morphological, syntactic, textual.

In linguistics, the study of the written form of speech has always been accompanied by a dichotomy «oral – written». In contrast to oral speech, written speech, especially the realization of artistic written speech, attracts less attention of researchers and is considered poorly studied. However, written speech functions and develops according to the laws inherent in it and forms a special sphere of human communication.

While in oral communication we pay attention to the specific speech activity of the speaker and the listener, in written speech, attention is focused on the roles of that who creates the text, the author of the produced speech work and that who reads the text [3, c. 9].

Oral communication is, as a rule, associated with the signs of contact and immediacy, and written communication – with the signs of distance and mediation. Oral speech – «is the most important form of language realization, which is «speaking», i.e., an act or speech acts that function as a consequence of the communicative activity of the interlocutor. Oral speech appears to us as a sounding variety of linguistic material, arising during the functioning of the mechanism of language; this speech is perceived immediately, directly by the organs of hearing, it exists as speaking with its own melody, rhythm, intonation» [9, c. 19].

Oral speech is focused on direct perception, it finds the corresponding expression of all that the speaker wants to express, and all that he wants to convey to the interlocutor. This type of language realization is characterized by expressiveness, verbal improvisation and some linguistic features (freedom in choosing vocabulary, using simple sentences, using stimulating, interrogative, exclamatory sentences of various kinds, repetitions, incompleteness of expression).

Written speech is graphically fixed, it can be preliminarily considered and corrected. In contrast to oral, written speech becomes a product of activity, a material object that is preserved, and the quality of which the addresser will judge about the subject of speech. Therefore, when a written message is generated, the addresser simultaneously perceives it with someone else's eyes, anticipating the evaluation of the addressee, which entails a greater share of responsibility, stricter control and more strict observance of the genre canons [6, c. 260].

Oral speech differs from writing also by the nature of the addressee. Written speech is usually addressed to the absent. The one who writes does not see his addressee, and can only imagine him in his mind. The written response is not affected by the reaction of those who read

it. On the contrary, oral speech implies the presence of an interlocutor. The speaker and the hearer do not only hear, but also see each other. Therefore, oral speech often depends on how it is perceived. The reaction of approval or disapproval, the replies of listeners, their facial expressions, gestures – all this can affect the character of speech, change it depending on how it is perceived [10, с. 9].

Thus, written and oral forms of communication differ in the form of implementation (written form is graphically fixed, follows spelling, punctuation norms, while oral form is sounding, follows orthoepic norms and norms of intonation); generation of form (in writing editing is possible, oral communication is produced spontaneously); the relation of the addresser to the addressee (written communication is mediated, the absence of the addressee has no influence, while oral communication is direct, the presence of the addressee has an effect).

References:

1. Адмони В. Г. Система форм речевого высказывания / В. Г. Адмони. – М., 1994. – 153 с.
2. Арутюнова Н. Д. Человеческий фактор в языке: Коммуникация, модальность, дейксис / Н. Д. Арутюнова, Т. В. Булыгина, А. А. Кибрик. – М., 1992. – 281 с.
3. Василик М. А. Основы теории коммуникации / М. А. Василик. – М., 2003. – 615 с.
4. Гальперин Н. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования / Н. Р. Гальперин. – М., 1981. – 139 с.
5. Дейк Т. А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация / Т. А. Дейк. – М., 1989. – 312 с.
6. Долинин К. А. Стилистика французского языка / К. А. Долинин. – М. : Просвещение, 1987. – 303 с.
7. Домашнев А. И. Интерпретация художественного текста / А. И. Домашнев, И. П. Шишкина, Е. А. Гончарова. – М., 1989. – 205 с.
8. Карасик В. И. О типах дискурса // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс / В. И. Карасик. – Волгоград, 2000. – С. 5-20.
9. Кожин А. Н. Функциональные типы русской речи : учебное пособие для студентов филологических специальностей университетов / А. Н. Кожин, О. А. Крылова, В. В. Одинцов. – М. : Высшая школа, 1982. – 222 с.
10. Формановская Н. И. Речевой этикет и культура общения / Н. И. Формановская. – М., 1989. – 159 с.
11. Цурикова Л. В. Проблемы когнитивного анализа дискурса в современной лингвистике / Л. В. Цурикова // Вестник ВГУ – Серия 1. Гуманитарные науки – 2001 – № 2. – С. 128-157.

**СЕМАНТИКА МОЖЛИВИХ СВІТІВ –
РЕАЛІЗАЦІЯ АВТОРСЬКОЇ СВІДОМОСТІ**

Галина Олейнікова

к.філол.н., доцент

Ізмаїльський державний гуманітарний університет

У семантичному просторі мови існують світи, які не є копіями того, що існує і розвивається в дійсному світі. Ці розумові простори отримали назву «можливих світів».

Семантика можливих світів – це концептуальна модель, яка розглядає «можливі світи» як семантичну інваріантність, в основі якої лежить здатність людини міркувати над ходом життєвих подій, представляти нинішній та гіпотетичний розвиток різноманітних учинків та явищ, конструювати і трансформувати можливі зміни ситуацій як у реальному, так і в ірреальному майбутньому, одночасно використовуючи свій попередній досвід, і моделювати інший результат уже звершених подій.

Людська свідомість здатна спрогнозувати альтернативу кожній дії чи факту, а так званий «ментальний зір» людини має можливість сягати далеко за межі реального світу