Ryzhkova S. V.,
Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,
Associate Professor at Foreign Languages Department
Donbas State Teachers' Training University

Radzievska O. V.,
Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,
Associate Professor at Foreign Languages Department
Donbas State Teachers' Training University

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS: THE MAIN PRINCIPALS OF PROVIDING AND CHARACTERISTICS

Summary. The article deals with the origins of discourse analysis, based on the traditions of ethnolinguistics. The author outlines the basic views on the issue of discourse analysis. The pathways of the analysis, the linguists and the linguistic schools that have worked on this issue are outlined. According to the author, the term "functional style" is sometimes used in conjunction with the term "discourse". However, they are still not interchangeable. In our view, this can be clearly demonstrated by analyzing the definitions of these terms. Functional style means a set of methods of selection and communication of linguistic means that are functionally determined by the content, purpose and circumstances of communication. The author also notes that functional stylistics studies the linguistic features of texts at a sufficiently high level of generalization, abstracting from specific, real speech. At the same time, "discourse" is seen as different kinds of speech works that are interpreted and related to each other in the light of non-lexical factors. This shows that the discourse is not based on the functional-stylistic principle of separating the communicative spheres and linguistic systems.

The main criterion for the allocation of discourse, in contrast to the functional style, is not the form of social consciousness, but the substantive-semantic similarity of texts. But one cannot deny the inextricable link between these terms: the term "discourse" arose precisely on the basis of the term "functional style". The author notes that the discourse analysis is based on the traditions of American ethnolinguistics (or anthropological linguistics) and Czech structuralism.

The penetration of discourse analysis in linguistics has helped to increase its status in the hierarchy of scientific disciplines. The result of the discursive stage of research was the fact that the study of discourse as a combination of verbal and non-verbal communication led to a closer interaction of linguistics with many anthropooriented disciplines, facilitated the penetration of linguistic information in other fields of knowledge. Discourse analysis as a method, principle, and independent discipline, open to other fields of knowledge, incorporates the general focus of research into a multifaceted, comprehensive study of such a complex multidimensional phenomenon as discourse.

Key words: discourse analysis, linguistics, ethnolinguistics, discourse, communicative method.

Discourse analysis is one of the most popular research methods in the field of social sciences and humanities. Mainly formulated as a response to positivism, discourse analysis was part of what has been classified as the interpretive or "linguistic turn" in urbanism in the 1980s. Since the 1990s, researchers have attempted to draw on a broader multidisciplinary theoretical tradition in their work, providing detailed analysis using interpretive frameworks and qualitative methodologies.

According to many scientists, as a special method of scientific philological research, discourse analysis is based on the traditions of American ethnolinguistics (or anthropological linguistics) and Czech structuralism.

The revelance research is not in doubt, since modern discourse analysis in linguistics is one of the most popular research methods in the field of social sciences and humanities.

The subject of the study is the process of forming a discussion analysis in linguistics.

Various linguistic schools and prominent linguists are **the object** of research.

The aim of the research is to study views on the problem of discourse analysis in linguistics of past centuries and today. Elucidation of the reasons for the formation of this discipline and familiarization with the activities of the leaders of various linguistic schools.

Analysis of research and publications. Discursive analysis was studied by such linguists as J. Herder, E. Sapir, U. Whorff, V. Matesii, and J. Mukarzhovskyi.

Main material. Among the ethnolinguistic schools, the American ethnolinguistic school, founded by Franz Boas, was of great importance for the development of discourse analysis.

The main task of US ethnolinguistics was the study of the languages of the Indian tribes of North and Central America, focusing on the recording and analysis of verbal texts, as well as the study of the interaction of the languages of the Indians and Indo-European languages. The conceptual foundations of American traditions in ethnolinguistics are also studied in the works of J. Herder and U. von Humboldt, where the emphasis was also placed on ethnographic material and the study of languages that do not have written traditions. As early as the beginning of the 19th century, V. von Humboldt wrote: "A person speaks in order not only to convey a message, while simultaneously achieving goals subject to joint activity, but also to understand the content of speech, it is necessary to know the activity in which it was created and perceived" [1, p. 11–13].

In our opinion, this statement clearly shows that, using the concept of "discourse", W. von Humboldt was one of the first to emphasize the need to account for extralinguistic factors for a correct understanding of the statement.

Most linguists associate the beginning of ethnolinguistics with the name of the famous American ethnologist F. Boas, who "carried out a theoretical and methodological revolution in ontology" [2, p. 13].

Subsequently, ethnolinguistics in the USA was successfully developed in the works of his students E. Sapir, W. Whorf and followers R. Hoyer, D. Lee, J. Clarkson, K. Voglin and Z. Harris in 1952. In their articles, the concept of " discourse analysis".

The emergence of Czech structuralism dates back to 1952, when the famous linguist V. Matezius invented the "Czech language circle" [3, p.23].

Structuralism is a humanities methodology that analyzes a certain field as a complex system of interconnected parts. In linguistics, structuralism developed on the basis of the ideas of F. de Saussure, the greatest contribution to their development and application was made by members of the Czech (or Prague) language circle R. Jakobson, Y. Mukarzhovskyi.

The main idea of the Prague circle was the interpretation of language as a functional system of means of expression that serves a certain purpose. Based on these ideas, the members of the circle developed the basics of functional grammar, studied functional styles and languages.

The term "functional style" is sometimes used in conjunction with the term "discourse". However, they are still not interchangeable. In our opinion, this can be clearly shown by analyzing the definitions of these terms.

A functional style is understood as a set of methods of selection and communication of linguistic means, which are functionally determined by the content, purpose and circumstances of communication [4, p. 12].

So, it can be concluded that functional stylistics studies linguistic features of texts at a fairly high level of generalization, abstracting from concrete, real speech. At the same time, "discourse" is considered as different types of speech works, which are interpreted and connected with each other taking into account non-lexical factors. This shows that the discourse is not based on the functional-stylistic principle of dividing communicative spheres and language systems.

The main criterion for the selection of discourse, in contrast to the functional style, is not the form of social consciousness, but the content-semantic similarity of the texts. But one cannot deny the inextricable connection between these terms: the term "discourse" arose precisely on the basis of the term "functional style".

As mentioned above, the term "discourse analysis" was first used in 1952 by the American linguist Z. Harris, but the formation of discourse analysis as a discipline took place in the 1970s. In these years, the main American works were published, which connected discourse analysis with traditional language topics. This is a study by V. Labov, J. Grimes, R. Langaker, T. Givon, and U. Chaif.

The main contribution of V. Labov was the study of whole narratives, not individual sentences, and the discovery of the principles of discourse theory. V. Labov and his students discovered for the language community the phenomenon of oral personal narratives, that is, the history of human experience, their own significant experience.

According to the author's idea, the research should not have a linguistic, but a welfare orientation. To solve these new problems, V. Labov needed a new theoretical apparatus, and that is why these studies, according to many scientists, were the beginning of the existence of oral discourse as a full-fledged object of language description. The works of V. Labov did not discover the phenomenon of "discourse", but became a catalyst for the need to take into account discursive phenomena in theories of language [2, p. 14].

Scientists such as J. Grimes, R. Langaker and T. Givon made an equally important contribution to the development of discourse analysis.

In particular, J. Grimes in his work "The Tread of Discourse" revealed the connection between discourse and generative semantics [3, p. 20].

It is worth noting that the language of the scientist was considered in two aspects: firstly, as a decision made by the speaker about what to say and what not to say, and secondly, as mechanisms and structures available to the speaker to implement these decisions for communication with another person In turn, R. Langaker, who is considered one of the founders of cognitive linguistics and the creator of cognitive grammar, discovered an integral and deep connection between language structure and discourse [4, p. 10]. A cognitive approach as it takes into account human memory, attention, and perception and the ways in which they influence human behavior. But at the same time, human behavior is the product of all processes working together, not just individual parts.

T. Givon is one of the founders of the discourse-oriented approach to syntax. The main idea of T. Givon's concept is that grammar is a set of instructions for the mental processing of discourse, which the speaker gives to the listener. This is one of the versions of the thesis that grammar subjects to communicative processes [2, p. 30].

The views of U. Chaif, who emphasized the unconditional connection between language and consciousness, are quite interesting. According to him, language and reason belong to a single system that makes us human along with other human qualities such as imagination, memory and social interaction.

In contrast to constructivist currents in linguistics, U. Chaif viewed language as a very complex phenomenon that is inseparable from the natural context in three physical forms: speaking, writing and thinking. His view of language was evolutionary: "Each type of language usually uses the type of language that best encodes what the users of that type of language consider most appropriate" [5, p. 15].

But he did not stop there, in his book "Discourse, Consciousness and Time: Transfer and Movement of Conscious Experience in Oral Speech and Writing", the scientist reflected the relationship between types of linguistic discourse and types of conscious mental actions with different levels of transfer. This work offers a comprehensive picture of the dynamic nature of language and consciousness that will interest linguists, psychologists, literary critics, computer scientists, anthropologists, and philosophers.

The results. The origins of discourse analysis as a discipline were laid at the beginning of the 20th century. The traditions of the American ethnolinguistic school, founded by F. Boas, and Czech structuralism, the emergence of which is connected with the Prague linguistic circle under the leadership of V. Matezius.

At the same time, the formation of the discipline of discourse analysis took place in the 1970s and was associated with

the activities of such famous American linguists as U. Labov, J. Grimes, R. Langaker, T. Givon, and U. Nachalnyk.

References:
1. Langacker Ronald Discourse in Cognitive Grammar. Washington: Freetime, 2005. 304 p.
2. Гумбольдт В. Избранные труды по языкознанию. М.: Прогресс, 1984. 400 с.
3. Chafe W. Discourse, consciousness and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994. 340 p.
4. Grimes Joseph E. The Thread of Discourse. N.Y.: The A-book, 1972. 374 p.
5. Хроленко А. Т., Бондалетов В. Д. Теория языка: Учебное пособие. М.: Флинта, 2006. 528 с.

Рижкова С. В., Радзієвська О. В. Дискурсний аналіз у когнітивній лінгвістиці: основні принципи провадження та характеристики

Анотація. У статті розглянуто питання витоків дискурс-аналізу, що базувався на традиціях етнолінгвістики. Автором виділено основні погляди на питання виникнення дискурсного аналізу. Зазначаються шляхи процесу становлення аналізу, лінгвісти та лінгвістичні школи, які працювали над цим питанням. На думку автора, Термін «функціональний стиль» іноді використовується в поєднанні з терміном «дискурс». Однак вони все одно не взаємозамінні. На нашу думку, це можна точно показати, проаналізувавши визначення цих термінів. Під функціональним стилем розуміється сукупність методів добору та повідомлень мовних засобів, які функціонально обумовлені змістом, метою та обставинами спілкування Автор також зазначає, що що функціональна стилістика вивчає мовні особливості текстів на досить високому рівні узагальнення, абстрагуючись від конкретного, реального мовлення. У той же час «дискурс» розглядають як різні види мовленнєвих творів, які інтерпретуються та пов'язані між собою з урахуванням нелексичних факторів. Це показує, що дискурс заснований не на функціонально-стилістичному принципі поділу комунікативних сфер і мовних систем.

Основним критерієм виділення дискурсу, на відміну від функціонального стилю, є не форма суспільної свідомості, а змістовно-смислова схожість текстів. Але не можна заперечувати нерозривний зв'язок між цими термінами: термін «дискурс» виник саме на основі терміна «функціональний стиль». Автор зазначає, що дискурсний аналіз ґрунтується на традиціях американської етнолінгвістики (або антропологічної лінгвістики) та чеського структуралізму.

Проникнення дискурс-аналізу в лінгвістику сприяло підвищенню її статусу в ієрархії наукових дисциплін. Результатом дискурсивного етапу досліджень став той факт, що вивчення дискурсу як поєднання вербального та невербального у комунікації призвело до більш тісної взаємодії лінгвістики з багатьма антропоорієнтованими дисциплінами, сприяло проникненню лінгвістичної інформації в інші галузі знань. Дискурс-аналіз як метод, принцип, самостійна дисципліна, відкрита для інших галузей знань, увібрав у себе загальну спрямованість дослідження на багатогранне, комплексне вивчення такого складного багатомірного феномена, як дискурс.

Ключові слова: дискурс ний аналіз, лінгвістика, етнолінгвістика, дискурс, комунікативний метод.