196

Филология
Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н.И. Лобачевского, 2023, № 5, с. 196–204

ДИСКУРСИВНЫЕ СТРАТЕГИИ В ЛИНГВОФИЛОСОФСКОМ ПРОСТРАНСТВЕ

© 2023 г.   *Е.А. Либба*

Российская правовая академия Министерства юстиции Российской Федерации, Саранск

snezhinka_elena@mail.ru

Статья посвящена попытке выделить основные характеристики дискурсивных стратегий и пресуппозиции как механизма дискурса в коммуникативной лингвистике с целью объяснения сущности дискурсивных стратегий. Лингвистика нередко склонна отождествлять трудноопределимый термин *дискурс* просто с *речью*, которая воспроизводится снова и снова, сохраняя в себе имплицитные правила своего порождения. Для понимания природы дискурса и дискурсивных стратегий необходимо рассмотреть понятие преконструкта, не имеющее никакого собственно-логического значения и представляющее собой концепт пресуппозиции, трансформированный на основе теории дискурса. Особенность этого понятия заключается в том, что оно позволяет осмыслить понятие интердискурса, ставшее основным концептом теории дискурса. Преконструкты предстают как неотъемлемая часть любого дискурса. В отношении дискурса философского их роль приобретает особое значение, в чем заключается еще одна отличительная особенность философского дискурса, поскольку речь идет либо о простых высказываниях, либо взятых из предыдущих дискурсов, либо представленных таковыми. Методы исследования представляют собой комплексный анализ явлений на основе междисциплинарного подхода.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, интердискурс, коммуникативная лингвистика, преконструкт, пресуппозиция, филология, философия.

Introduction

Discourse analysis in France sought to create a text-reading technique adapted to reveal discursive strategies in the context of the fundamental instability of texts that are products of ideological work. Formally, the term «discourse analysis» is a translation from the French language of the term «discourse analysis», which denotes the method used by the American linguist Z. Harris to extend the distributive approach to super-phrasal units.

In addition, discourse analysis is a key phenomenon of social life «in language» in connection with which the researcher B.M. Gasparov calls discourse linguistic existence: part of the ever-moving stream of human experience. «In this capacity, it absorbs and reflects in itself the unique combination of circumstances under which and for which it was created» [1, p. 215]. These circumstances, according to the researcher, include: the communicative intentions of the author; relationship between the author and addressees; all sorts of circumstances, regular and accidental; general ideological parameters and stylistic climate of the epoch as a whole and of that specific environment and specific individuals to whom the message is directly or indirectly addressed; genre and style aspects of both the message itself and the communicative situation in which it is included; a set of associations with previous experience, one way or another caught in the sphere of a given linguistic action.

Along with the two main ideas about discourse (the identification of discourse and text, on the one hand, and discourse and speech, on the other), there is another one, according to which discourse is characterized as a discursive practice, representing the sphere of practical use of language in political science, social semiotics, and sociology; the last interpretation belongs to M. Foucault [2]. With this approach, the following components of discourse seem to be fundamental: discussion of a certain discourse that characterizes a particular person or group of subjects; specifics of the subject; stylistic features; linguistic distinguishing features.

From an objective point of view, a natural question arises: how to properly perceive such ambiguity in understanding discourse? As far as we know, there is no unanimity of opinion among researchers and scientists on this issue. In this regard, we are making an attempt to more deeply explore the problem of discourse and discursive strategies in linguistic and philosophical aspects.

Literature review

All studies directly or indirectly related to this topic can be conditionally divided into two groups: the first includes scientific research that touches on the problems of discursive analysis in general; to the second – research in the field of linguistic philosophy in general theoretical terms.

One of the modern scientists who studied the mechanisms of discourse was M. Foucault (Paul-

Michel Foucault), who developed the concept of «discursive formations», based on archaeological research, which implies the existence of historical boundaries of the relevance of a particular discursive model, beyond which a particular statement loses its discursive status. His work «The Archeology of Knowledge» appears to be one of the most important sources of data in the field of discourse research.

Research by A.I. Akopov, E.V. Aleshinskaya, T.G. Dobrosklonskaya, V.I. Karasik, A.A. Kibrik, M.L. Makarova, G.S. Melnik, N.N. Mironova significantly expanded their understanding of the overall picture of discursive analysis as such today. The author of this article also relied on the scientific works of N.D. Arutyunova, Yu.M. Lotman, E.N. Mishkurova, A.N. Moreva, V.A. Pogosyan, T.M. Rogozhnikova, L.P. Ryzhova, P. Serio (Patrick Sériot), L.N. Sinelnikova, A.A. Solovieva, J. Swales, who helped to identify a number of aspects related to the characteristics of discursive analysis in the linguistic and philosophical aspects.

The research literature of domestic and foreign scientists also covers problems of linguistic and philosophical nature. This includes the works of such researchers as N.S. Avtonomova, O.V. Alexandrova, L.G. Antonova, S.A. Arutyunov, N.G. Asmus, R. Barthes, I.V. Bogoslovskaya, E.M. Vereshchagin, B.M. Gasparov, V.G. Kostomarov, N.B. Mechkovskaya, A. Mole (Abraham Moles), V.V. Nalimov, V.P. Naroznak, X. Putnam (Hilary Whitehall Putnam), M. Polanyi (Michael Polanyi), S. Priest (Stephen Martin Priest), on the basis of which the author of the article analysed the process of changing discursive models as an ontologization of consciousness and thinking, expressed by linguistic means.

Among the most authoritative studies of the discursive aspects as a linguistic and philosophical phenomenon are the works by E.F. Serebrennikova. In these studies, socio-philosophical, philosophical-historical and axiological aspects of discourse as a phenomenon are considered. The author of this article also attracted the works of scientists who traced the strong and inseparable connection between linguistics and philosophy: these are the works of S.I. Smetanina, O.V. Sokolova, Yu.S. Stepanov, T.A. Tvanba, V.N. Teliya, S.G. Ter-Minasova, V.I. Tupa, M. Foucault. The basis for the conclusions about the essence of discursive analysis were the studies of G. Bouchard (Guy Bouchard), S. Brown (Sabine Braun), D. Gaskell (Delian Gaskell), L. Gavioli (Laura Gavioli), R. Carter (Ronald Carter), Sh Shirley Carter-Thomas, Thomas Cobb, Michael McCarthy, Hyland, Ken, Susan Hunston, Michael Handford.

Results

The definition of discourse by E. Benveniste leads to the formation of two opposite approaches in linguistics: E. Benveniste himself is a follower of F. Saussure (Ferdinand de Saussure) in recognizing the language-speech dichotomy, while the concept of discourse set out by the American linguist Z.S. Harris (Zellig Sabbettai Harris) in the article «Discourse Analysis» [3, p. 355–383]. The scientist considered discourse to be a simple chain of phrases, a continuous statement; thus, in his opinion, nothing forbids applying to discourse those approaches that descriptive linguistics uses when considering a sentence.

In this context, we note that in the study by A.A. Kibrik, another definition of discourse is given, which also reflects the diversity of its features: discourse should be considered as the interaction and intersection of four structures: 1) the structure of ideas expressed in the text; 2) the structure of the thinking processes of the speaker; 3) language structures used by the speaker; 4) the structure of the speech situation (the relationship between the speaker and the listener). With regard to the «discourse analysis» school, we note that it defines its subject of study, clearly distinguishing between the utterance and discourse: the utterance is considered as a sequence of phrases enclosed between two semantic gaps, that is, two stops in communication; discourse is an utterance viewed from the point of view of the discursive mechanism that governs it. Based on the foregoing, it seems legitimate to conclude that the basis of discourse is the cognitive processes of the writer or speaker, namely the processes of understanding, interpreting and constructing discourse.

First of all, to understand the concept of discourse and discursive strategies, it seems appropriate to define the essence of the term «presupposition». The concept of presupposition arose by extrapolation from the field of logic. Currently, this term is understood as one of the extra-linguistic factors (or means) that allows to achieve the linguistic coherence of the text.

Presupposition is a necessary means for the addressee of a philosophical text to be able to embrace and perceive the macrostructure of the text, i.e., the full amount of textual information; otherwise, the text will break up into separate semantic fragments, while it seems important to achieve precisely the coincidence of background knowledge.

In relation to discourse, presupposition develops into a more global concept of pre-construct. In this regard, we note that it was the question of the pre-construct that turned out to be the missing link, which in the field of discourse theory caused the

need to rely on linguistics (properly linguistic phenomena). Later, the French linguist O. Ducrot (Auguste-Alexandre Ducrot) developed in detail the concepts of presupposition and implication, the meaning of which for discourse was later noted in his writings by one of the most prominent representatives of the French school of «discourse analysis» Michel Pêcheux. Having transferred the problem of the presupposition of the German logician G. Frege (Friedrich Ludwig Gottlob Frege) onto the linguistic soil, O. Ducrot turned to the most important moment of discourse: the relation of discourse to «already heard», «already available».

In this regard, we note that it was the concept of presupposition that served as the source of the emergence of the pre-construct by M. Pesche and P. Henry (Pierre Henry). Thus, the concept of the pre-construct developed by these scientists was formed from a critical reading of G. Frege and O. Ducrot.

The main difference in the proposed research interpretations is that for O. Ducrot the issue of presupposition is included in the theory of speech acts, while for M. Pesche and P. Henri, on the contrary, the issue of presupposition correlates directly with the relationship of syntax and semantics: it is precisely at the point where discourse intersects with language. At the same time, having nothing to do with logical interpretation, syntactic structures that allow the presence of elements outside the explicit statement of the subject are interpreted as traces of previous constructions, as combinations of linguistic elements already formed in pre-existing discourses and which, precisely due to them, achieve their effect of obvious presence.

Thus, based on the foregoing, it seemed necessary to replace the logical term of presupposition.

In philosophical discourse, each new text is an intersection of a large number of already existing texts, statements, messages that are implied, but we do not find their direct expression, since it seems hardly possible to decipher all the huge number of pre-constructs contained in a philosophical text.

In addition, we note in this regard another important factor: the pre-construct is always built inside the discourse.

Particularly important is the circumstance that it is the nominalized utterance that is the pre-construct, since the subject of the act of producing the utterance does not take responsibility for it, but, rather, is itself part of an already existing text that precedes discourse, with the help of which one from places in a predicative relation (since the conditions for constructing an utterance seem to have already been erased).

Thus, at the level of the utterance, which is the final, concrete and only, immediately «given» product, mixed with each other (due to the alignment of both in the same act of utterance), two conceptual-semantic spheres turn out to be of two kinds: what is said and what is said about.

At the same time, these spheres differ from each other in their metalinguistic parameters: the moment and place of construction. A number of elements, designated as pre-constructs, are built before and outside the act of utterance, i.e., an act whose «linguistic traces» are found in formal markers (mainly verbal, but in relation to the Russian language – also equally nominal) of taking on oneself responsibility of the subject of the utterance.

Such antecedence (temporal displacement) in the alignment of a number of elements represents the object of discourse as something external to discourse: pre-constructs are always «available», since in terms of time they precede the operations of taking responsibility for a communicative statement. In other words, pre-constructs refer to the world of things, being in a certain sense «things» that the subject of the utterance can take possession of.

We believe that the question of the pre-construct, in turn, is directly related to the concept of inter-discourse, which seems fair to dwell on in more detail. It is obvious that the idea that the text, contrary to generally accepted ideas, is not created simply by its connecting elements, and that the unspoken, the implicit part is an integral component in any discourse, led to the formation of the concept of inter-discourse.

This remark is especially relevant for philosophical discourse, in which, as a rule, what is not said is many times greater than what is said.

In addition, in our opinion, in philosophical discourse the problem of the implicit becomes especially acute, since in philosophical discourse what is not said refers not only to the unsaid, understood as implicit (i.e., to what is not said), but which, in one way or another, necessarily enters into the composition of what has been said. In philosophical discourse, silence deals with the boundaries of different discourses and with their interpenetration. In other words, speaking as a communicative act in its totality is determined by the connections and relationships between different discourses.

Each discourse, in turn, determines what can and should be said from a certain point of view in certain circumstances. With regard to the «politics of silence» – and hence the «possibility of speaking» – the interaction between different discourses appears as the rhetoric of the anti-implicit, i.e., as an undesirable, discarded meaning, which seems necessary to be excluded from what has been said. This is a kind of «obscuring» the meanings that one wants to avoid: meanings that could make the mechanism of signification function in another discourse. At the same time, silence is also a means,

and as such it also acts on the boundaries of discourse, thus delineating the boundaries of speaking.

Returning to the concept of inter-discourse, it seems legitimate to note that the entire space of philosophical discourse in relation to its individual manifestations (texts) is inter-discourse that contains everything that has been «already said».

Inter-discourse is defined in this connection as a place of constituting meanings, a verticality (sphere of memory) of speaking, which manifests itself in the form of pre-constructs, in the form of the «already-said».

At the same time, exactly the same type of connection exists not only within philosophical discourse and its constituent texts, but also between different discourses. The existence of a common field of inter-discourse within the framework of the entire world culture and history determines the openness of each discourse to new original ideas, synthetic solutions, as well as to the interaction and interpenetration of discourses, which ultimately contributes to the creation of new discourses.

It seems, however, that no theological or philosophical system can serve as a justification for a linguistic theory, and vice versa – no linguistic data can prove the correctness of any philosophical system. Similarly, science cannot and should not prove the truth or falsity of philosophy: the intersection and interaction of scientific and philosophical discourses is very limited and should not crowd out each other in «disputed territory».

However, according to W. James, the temptation to bring a scientific theory in line with one's personal worldview is too great [4]. So, for example, when reading a text, a scientist must be aware of the paradigm affiliation and discursive genre of this text. So, a teacher, presenting any theory, should not remain within the framework of one paradigm or one discursive genre; Philosophical discourse requires especially great care from the teacher. It seems important to always distinguish between the goals and methods of science, on the one hand, and the goals and methods of philosophy, on the other. At the same time, we believe that if science should contain only reliable facts, then in matters of philosophy doubts are not only possible, but also necessary.

In this context, we consider it appropriate to mention an important typological difference between discourses – according to paradigm affiliation (anthropocentric, culture-centric, mystical, postclassical, extraverted, etc.). It has long been a generally accepted fact in philosophy that psychology sets significant limits on what exactly is included in the field of objectivity of scientific research. So, back in the century before last, the French philosopher Auguste Comte (Isidore Marie Auguste François Xavier Comte) wrote about the «law of three stages» of human thinking (metaphysical, positive (scientific) and theological) [5, p. 142]. Thus, it should be concluded that the view of the text from the point of view of its structuring «in the language» defines the given text as a statement, and the linguistic analysis of the conditions for constructing the text defines it as discourse.

Further, we note that since its inception in linguistics, the concept of discourse has undergone a number of changes: understood at the beginning of its development only as a set of features of textual data, at present this term is interpreted in linguistics as a coherent text in conjunction with extra-linguistic (pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological factors), i.e. as a text, considered in the event aspect, as well as speech, considered as a purposeful communicative and social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and in the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes).

Continuing the consideration of the essence of discursive strategies in linguistic and philosophical aspects, we note that most experts agree that different psychological types of personality have a different degree of predisposition to philosophy. In this regard, let us formulate the following question: what are the reasons for the social maladaptation of philosophers, and how are these reasons related to linguistic and philosophical strategies of discourse?

One of the possible answers to this question may be the fact that the philosopher systematically devalues the established attitude to the very question of complexity as a value-philosophical category. For example, one of the typical remarks with which, it seems, a philosopher traditionally begins an address to an interlocutor is a statement such as: «Not everything is as simple as you think...» or «In fact, everything is much simpler...». In other words, a philosopher, as a rule, either undertakes to point out a problem in the area where others do not see it, or to clarify an area that is expressed very vaguely.

Of course, the natural inclination of a person is the desire for simplification, and even, paradoxical as it may sound, such a complex scientific activity as the construction of theoretical schemes serves the same purpose of simplification, since, unlike one's own experience, they can be stored and transmitted to the next generations: after all, there is always not enough time to acquire one's own experience.

As it seems in this connection, complexity as a philosophical category has a dual nature: in a certain sense, we consider it possible to speak about the theoretical and practical hypostases of complexity, and these two hypostases correlate with each other in a negative aspect. For example, it seems fair to conclude that case law is more difficult to

learn than to apply in practice, while normative law, on the contrary, is easier to study at a theoretical level than to apply at a practical level, since it is easier to build a judgment by analogy than to categorize a particular case. Similarly, knowing the mechanics is unlikely to speed up the learning of a practical skill like playing billiards. It can also be argued that the categorical imperative is remarkably concise, while the interpretation of its practical applications seems to be a very laborious practice.

Thus, a peculiar natural structure of the distribution of complexity is formed: on the one hand there is the sphere of complexity of practical skills, in many respects alien to analysis, and on the other – the complexity of the theoretical sphere, which spreads from scientific discourse to mythological one.

At the same time, it is interesting to note that both practical and theoretical areas tend to be ritualized, since they tend to be transformed into mysticism. In other words, in the sphere of practical activity there are rituals of everyday life that do not need theoretical understanding, while in the sphere of theory there are secrets inaccessible to philosophical understanding, which are also transformed into rituals.

Philosophical discourse, represented in the personality of a philosopher, allows itself to reverse this relationship: by analysing the world and synthesizing theories, it denies the sphere of practical activity simplicity, and the sphere of theoretical activity – incomprehensible complexity. As a consequence, philosophical discourse as a strategy encroaches on psychological comfort: after all, the philosopher resists not only the «tricks» of power or commerce, but also the serious need of the social majority (the accusations levelled against Socrates, therefore, do not seem groundless in this light).

At the same time, an attempt by a philosopher to turn into a specialist harmless to society, deliberately narrowing and limiting the scope of quest would actually mean the cessation of philosophical activity as such. The alternative to a conflict society that expels the philosopher (however, never quite succeeding in this persecution) is, sadly, a completely harmonious society, but indifferent to philosophical questions.

This problem, in our opinion, is directly related to discursive practices carried out in society. Having appeared in linguistics, the concept of discourse turned out to be so complex, multifaceted and all-encompassing that it found a deeper and more global understanding in philosophy, the task of which, according to Paul Ricœur, is to «relentlessly open discourse towards being» [6, p. 121].

In this context, we note that the theory of myth by R. Barth describes the possibility of using a ready-made sign (of the first order) as an empty signifier for constructing a sign of the second order, which R. Barth calls «myth» [7]. The scientist believes that this process is deliberate in order to mask the meaning of the message and hide the name of the message's own addressee. In this regard, it seems that ritualization (beginning with the ritualization in animals described by ethnologists) aims to build a heuristic algorithm for solving a range of problems; at the same time, in order to identify whether a problem belongs to one class or another, the reproducibility of the corresponding affect is necessary.

Note, however, that the affect is in its essence single, therefore, the requirement of reproducibility leads to the need for generalization of the affect, which, in turn, leads to the fragmentation of the object of such a generalized affect, while the fundamental need for integrity (including affective) contributes (to restore integrity) to the construction of the myth. This means, obviously, that the higher the degree of generalization, the more mythological the object of affect appears (for example, «love for the motherland»). In the language space, discursiveness corresponds to the naming of the general, that is, generalization (only what affects is named, the individual is given its own name, common nouns are already class names, as a result of which they must denote contradictory concepts, indicating: «I'm on the edge of the class»).

It seems that a completely consistent language would have to consist of only proper names, besides being an idiolect, i.e., be both unacceptably complex for a finite being and unsuitable for communication in society. It seems legitimate to speak of «meaning» only when there are signs of the general, and not of the individual; however, signs of the general are also involved in discursive inconsistency, and, consequently, in the mythological completion of integrity. This means, in our opinion, that R. Barth's hypothesis about the possibility of an operational language free from mythologization, correlated only with practical activity and obviously devoid of the «double bottom» of mythology, in this light seems to be erroneous. Non-mythological language also appears to be meaningless (a possible example is glossolalia).

Further, in the context of the above, suppose that on one side of the border there is the wordless, on the other – the unspoken, then there remains a certain unfilled gap in speech. At the same time, the conditionality and limitation of speech itself by two opposite principles sets its internal, outwardly directed tension – ‘dis-cursion' in the proper sense of the word. This means, obviously, that discourse is nothing more than a structure of "what can be said", specific to a certain era and a particular

place. The coercive nature of this structure, it seems, can be described precisely as a discursive formation in the Foucault's sense.

At the same time, various ways and means of implementing this discursiveness as a possibility of speech are represented as strategies of communicative language practices. Thus, the deliberate fixation of perspective (temporal, social, epistemological, etc.) seems to be a discursive characteristic of journalism.

Philosophical discourse, on the other hand, tends to recognize the equivalence of perspectives (recall what Parmenides says to Socrates in one of Plato's dialogues about the ideas of sublime things).

The discursive strategy of fiction (artistic discourse) in such a case consists in a deliberate alternation of perspectives, which gives rise to a rhythmic structure that is the fundamental principle of any kind of art. Figuratively speaking, philosophical discourse seeks to «speak» the wordless and «choose words» for the inexpressible. In other words, by accepting the internal tension of discursiveness as its integral component, philosophy uses it in order to expand the boundaries of discourse.

With regard to scientific discourse, we note that science is limited, as a rule, to a fragment of the discursive field associated, as a result of such a choice, with this particular type of scientific activity.

Journalistic discourse, however, not measuredly changes the disposition of speech from text to text, while adhering to a temporarily chosen discursive localization.

The discourse of fiction is built into a rhythmic structure mainly by changing discursive perspectives; further, this construction follows at least the rules of rhetoric, and in its best examples, the principles of musicality.

With regard to ideological discourse, the situation, as a rule, in most cases turns out to be ambiguous and many-sided. As the twin of science, ideology adjusts questions to given answers; as a counterpart of journalism, it focuses on ethical ambiguity; as a counterpart of religion, it talks about the mystery, while remaining alien to apophaticism (that is, it talks about the secret as if it were obvious); as a counterpart of literature, ideology appears to be anti-cathartic (that is, it does not purify the affect, but, on the contrary, consolidates it). Thus, the four-term scheme of ideology forms (scientific – ethical – aesthetic – religious), adopted for the analysis of ideological discourse, in this case corresponds to journalism with its ethical pathos, science with its conscious self-restraint, religion, speculating on the unavoidable presence of the area of the inexpressible, and artistic literature with its aestheticism.

Based on the above research data, it seems possible to schematically depict the spectrum of discursive strategies as follows:

– scientific discourse: delimiting from the unsaid, pronounces the wordless;
– religious discourse: being in the wordless, strives to talk about the inexpressible;
– ethical discourse: starting from both the wordless and the unsaid, strives for a focused unambiguous ethical judgment;
– aesthetic discourse: speaks deliberately avoiding the extremes of the wordless and inexpressible;
– philosophical discourse: aspires to both horizons, crossing the boundaries set by other strategies.

We note in this regard that it is most difficult for an ideology to implement precisely a philosophical discursive strategy, since it seems very difficult to have freedom and opportunity in the face of limitations and necessity.

Discussion and conclusion

The first scientific interpretations of the concept of discourse in philosophy were still directly related to linguistics, and, consequently seemed to be somewhat contradictory, as philosophers tried to overcome linguistic approaches, at the same time relying on them.

Thus, P. Ricoeur, based on the researches by some linguists, in particular E. Benveniste (Émile Benveniste), A.-J. Greimas (Algirdas Julius Greimas) and N. Chomsky, notes that the basis of discourse is a statement, the purpose of which is the act of speaking. According to the scientist, it is this function, in contrast to the closeness of the universe of signs that makes the discourse open.

In addition, the term «discourse» is often used to «designate a system of restrictions that are imposed on an unlimited number of statements due to a certain social or ideological position» [Maingueneau D. http://dominique.maingueneau. pagespersoorange.fr/glossaire.html#Para]. In this context, discourse is understood as a certain type of statement inherent in the whole of a specific social group united by some position (for example, representatives of the administration). «The statement, first of all, is connected with the response statement of another communicant, the interlocutor» [8, p. 317]. Thus, it seems that discourse owes its eventful side mainly to the act of utterance: such factors as the choice of language means, the communicative event, the novelty of the utterance, the correspondence of the message to the event context, which includes the method of designating the subject of discourse, are the characteristic parameters of discourse.

In the objective space of discourse, the subject masters the system of signs; consequently, the subjectivity of the act of speaking is at the same time

inter-subjectivity. The specificity of discourse lies in the fact that it is located «on the other side» of the language, but at the same time «on this side» of the utterance. As it seems in this regard, in the interpretation of discourse, P. Ricoeur proceeds from Saussure's definition, but the communicative statement acquires a different meaning for him, clarifying what the essence of the event-related aspect of discourse is.

However, we believe that such an understanding of discourse is still too close to linguistics and does not give an idea of the essential parameters of discourse as a phenomenon. It seems to us that M. Foucault [Paul-Michel Foucault] in his work «The Archeology of Knowledge» marked the beginning of a deep development of research in the direction of discourse. Interestingly, M. Foucault does not deny that discourse belongs to the sphere of a sign: «Undoubtedly, discourse is an event of a sign, but what it does is something more than just using signs to designate things. It is this «something more» that allows it to be irreducible to language and speech» [2, p. 50]. According to M. Foucault, discourse is the existence of scattered and homogeneous statements, the system that regulates their redistribution, the points of support that they find in each other, the ways in which they are implied and excluded, the changes to which they are subject, as well as their interactions, substitutions and location.

Thus, based on the above research material, we note that the totality of scientific ideas about discourse, interacting with each other and being inseparable components of one concept, indicates the frequent use of this term in modern science, which at the same time emphasizes the absence of transparent boundaries and a finite number structural components of this concept.

In this regard, we also considered the strategies of mythological, ideological, religious, scientific, ethical, and aesthetic discourses in linguistic and philosophical aspects.

Список литературы

1. Полонский А.В. Медиалект: язык в контексте медийной культуры // Научные ведомости БелГУ. Сер.: Гуманитарные науки. 2018. Т. 37. № 2. С. 230–240.

2. Camilleri A.R. The Presentation Format of Review Score Information Influences Consumer Preferences through the Attribution of Outlier Reviews [Text] // Journal of Interactive Marketing. 2017. № 39. P. 1–14.

3. Кожемякин Е.А. Медиадискурс // Современный дискурс-анализ. Электронный журнал. 2010. Т. 2. Вып. 1. С. 72–80. Режим доступа: http://www.discourseanalysis.org/ada2_1.pdf.

4. Полонский А.В., Андриевская Г.П. Музыкальный текст и становление языка его описания в русской культуре // Наука. Искусство. Культура. 2014. Вып. 4. С. 18–23.

5. Рогожникова Т.М., Богословская И.В. Ассоциативная цветность нотного алфавита: предварительные результаты эксперимента // Теория языка и межкультурная коммуникация. Электронный научный журнал. 2016. № 3 (22). Режим доступа: http://tl-ic.kursksu.ru/pdf/022-016.pdf.

6. Якунин А.В. Семиотика медиатекста в эпоху интерактивности: от иконической знаковой системы к новым моделям визуальной коммуникации // Средства массовой информации в современном мире. Петербургские чтения: Матер. 52-й междунар. науч.-практ. конф. (г. Санкт-Петербург, 17–19 апреля 2013 г.) / Отв. ред.-сост. С.Г. Корносенко. СПб.: Изд-во СПбГУ, 2013. С. 160–163.

7. Плотникова С.Н. Языковое, дискурсивное и коммуникативное пространство // Вестник ИГЛУ. Серия: Филология. 2008. № 1. С. 131–136.

8. Фикс У. Проявляется ли культурная специфика в типах текста? // Вестник ВГУ. 2001. № 2. Режим доступа: http://www.vestnik.vsu.ru/pdf/lingvo/2001/02/willa_fix.pdf.

9. Барт Р. Избранные работы: Семиотика: Поэтика / Сост., общ. ред. и вступ. ст. Г.К. Косикова. М.: Прогресс, 1989. 616 с.

10. Берлин И. История свободы. Россия / Предисл. А. Эткинда. М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2001. 544 с.

11. Гаспаров Б.М. Язык, память, образ. Лингвистика языкового существования. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 1996. 352 с.

12. Джеймс У. Прагматизмъ. СПб.: Шиповникъ, 1910. 244 с.

13. Конт О. Дух позитивной философии / Пер. И.А. Шапиро. М.: Феникс, 2003. 6 т. 256 с.

14. Кушнина Л.В., Аликина Е.В. Система оценки качества устного последовательного перевода в свете теории гармонизации // Вестник Пермского ун-та. 2010. Вып. 4 (10). С. 46–51. Режим доступа: http://www.rfp.psu.ru/archive/4.2010/kushnina_alikina.pdf.

15. Ломов А.М. Русский синтаксис в алфавитном порядке: понятийный словарь-справочник. Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж. гос. ун-та, 2004. 400 с.

16. Погосян В.А. Дискурсивное сообщество университета // Вестник Герценовского университета. 2012. № 1. С. 228–231.

17. Рикёр П. Конфликт интерпретаций. Очерки о герменевтике. М., 1995. 318 с.

18. Серебренникова Е.Ф. Интернет-дискурс: к проблеме семиометрии значимых параметров лингвистического анализа // Magister Dixit: электронный научно-педагогический журнал Восточной Сибири. 2011. № 2. Режим доступа: http://md.islu.ru/sites/md.islu.ru/files/rar/statya_serebrennikova_ef_0.pdf.

19. Фуко М. Археология знания. Киев, 1996. 513 с.

20. Хайдеггер М. Феноменология и теология / Пер. В. Зелинского. Режим доступа: http://hpsy.ru/authors/x104.htm.

21. Шейкин А.Г. Знак // Культурология. XX век. Энциклопедия. Т. 1. Режим доступа: http://yanko.lib.ru/books/cultur/culturology20century2volumes1998sl.htm#_Toc29 9571874.

22. Якубинский Л.П. О диалогической речи // Архив Петербургской русистики. Режим доступа: http://www.ruthenia.ru/apr/textes/jacub/jacub1z.htm.

23. Якупов А.Н. Музыкальная коммуникация (история, теория, практика управления): Автореф. дис. … д-ра искусствоведения: 17.00.02. М., 1995. 48 с.

24. Якупов А.Н. Музыкальная коммуникация как универсум искусства // Культурное наследие России. 2016. № 2. С. 27–33.

25. Bradby B. Discourse analysis // Continuum Encyclopedia of Popular Music of the World. Vol. I: Media, Industry and Society / Ed. by J. Shepherd. London; New York: Continuum, 2007. P. 67–70.

26. Carter R., McCarthy M. Cambridge Grammar of English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 479 p.

27. Carter-Thomas Sh., Rowley-Jolivet E. Language learning as discourse analysis: Implications for the LSP learning en ASP. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. P. 51–52.

28. Harris Z.S. Discourse analysis / Repr. // The structure of language: Readings in the philosophy of language. Englewood Cliffs. № 1. Lg., 1952. P. 1–30.

29. Maingueneau D. Glossaire: paratopie [Electronic Resource]. URL: http://dominique.maingueneau.pages persoorange.fr/glossaire.html#Para (дата обращения: 09.03.2022).

30. Römer U. Pedagogical applications of corpora: Some reflections on the current scope and a wish list for future developments // Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik. 2006. 54/2. P. 121–134.

31. Sean A., Marangos J. A comparative political economy approach to farming interest groups in Australia and the United States // The American Journal of Economics and Sociology. 2006. 65/3. P. 497–524.

DISCOURSE STRATEGIES IN TERMS OF LINGUISTIC PHILOSOPHY

E.A. Libba

The paper states that linguistics is often inclined to identify the term *discourse* simply with speech that is reproduced over and over again, retaining the implicit rules of its generation. This article is devoted to an attempt to highlight the main characteristics of discourse strategies and presupposition as a mechanism of discourse in communicative linguistics. To understand the nature of discourse and discourse strategies, we need to first consider the concept of pre-construct, which has no proper logical meaning, and which is a transformed concept of presupposition based on the theory of discourse. One of the main features of this new concept is that it allows us to comprehend the concept of inter-discourse, which has become the main concept of discourse theory. Pre-constructs appear as an integral part of any discourse. In relation to philosophical discourse, their role is of particular importance, and this is another distinctive feature of philosophical discourse, since we are talking about either simple statements, or those taken from previous discourses, or those presented as such.

Keywords: communicative linguistics, discourse, inter-discourse, pre-construct, philology, philosophy, presupposition.

References

1. Polonsky A.V. Medialect: language in the context of media culture // Scientific bulletin of BelSU. Ser.: Humanities. 2018. Vol. 37. № 2. P. 230–240.

2. Camilleri A.R. The Presentation Format of Review Score Information Influences Consumer Preferences through the Attribution of Outlier Reviews [Text] // Journal of Interactive Marketing. 2017. № 39. P. 1–14.

3. Kozhemyakin E.A. Mediadiscourse // Modern discourse analysis. Electronic magazine. 2010. Vol. 2. Issue 1. P. 72–80. Access mode: http://www.discourseanalysis.org/ada2_1.pdf.

4. Polonsky A.V., Andrievskaya G.P. The musical text and the formation of the language of its description in Russian culture // Science. Art. Culture. 2014. Issue 4. P. 18–23.

5. Rogozhnikova T.M., Bogoslovskaya I.V. Associative chromaticity of the musical alphabet: preliminary experimental results // Theory of language and intercultural communication. Electronic scientific journal. 2016. № 3 (22). Access mode: http://tl-ic.kurksu.ru/pdf/022-016.pdf.

6. Yakunin A.V. Semiotics of media text in the age of interactivity: from an iconic sign system to new models of visual communication // Mass media in the modern world. St. Petersburg readings: Mater. 52nd International Scientific and Practical Conference (St. Petersburg, April 17–19, 2013) / Ed.-comp. S.G. Kornosenko. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of St. Petersburg State University, 2013. P. 160–163.

7. Plotnikova S.N. Linguistic, discursive and communicative space // Bulletin of the IGLOO. Series: Philology. 2008. № 1. P. 131–136.

8. Fix U. Does cultural specificity manifest itself in the types of text? // Bulletin of the VSU. 2001. № 2. Access mode: http://www.vestnik.vsu.ru/pdf/lingvo/2001/02/willa_fix.pdf.

9. Bart R. Selected works: semiotics: poetics / Comp., general ed. and the introductory article G.K. Kosikova. M.: Progress, 1989. 616 p.

10. Berlin I. The history of freedom. Russia / Preface by A. Etkind. M.: New Literary Review, 2001. 544 p.

11. Gasparov B.M. Language, memory, image. The linguistics of linguistic existence. M.: New Literary Review, 1996. 352 p.

12. James W. Pragmatism. St. Petersburg: Rosehip, 1910. 244 p.

13. Comte O. The spirit of positive philosophy / Trans. I.A. Shapiro. M.: Fenix, 2003. 6 vol. 256 p.

14. Kushnina L.V., Alikina E.V. The system of assessing the quality of consecutive interpretation in the light of the theory of harmonization // Bulletin of the Perm University. 2010. Issue 4 (10). P. 46–51. Access mode: http://www.rfp.psu.ru/archive/4.2010/kushnina_alikina.pdf .

15. Lomov A.M. Russian syntax in alphabetical order: a conceptual dictionary. Voronezh: Publishing House of Voronezh State University, 2004. 400 p.

16. Poghosyan V.A. The discursive community of the University // Bulletin of the Herzen University. 2012. № 1. P. 228–231.

17. Riker P. Conflict of interpretations. Essays on hermeneutics. M., 1995. 318 p.

18. Serebrennikova E.F. Internet discourse: on the problem of semiometry of significant parameters of linguistic analysis // Magister Dixit: electronic scientific and pedagogical journal of Eastern Siberia. 2011. № 2. Access mode: http://md.islu.ru/sites/md.islu.ru/files/rar/statya_serebrennikova_ef_0.pdf .

19. Foucault M. The archaeology of knowledge. Kiev, 1996. 513 p.

20. Heidegger M. Phenomenology and theology / Per. V. Zelinsky. Access mode: http://hpsy.ru/authors/x104.htm.

21. Sheikin A.G. Sign // Culturology. XX century. Encyclopedia. Vol. 1. Access mode: http://yanko.lib.ru/books/cultur/culturology20century2volumes1998sl.htm#_Toc29 9571874.

22. Yakubinsky L.P. On dialogic speech // Archive of St. Petersburg Russian Studies. Access mode: http://www.ruthenia.ru/apr/textes/jacub/jacub1z.htm .

23. Yakupov A.N. Musical communication (history, theory, management practice): Abstract of the dissertation of the Doctor of Art History: 17.00.02. M., 1995. 48 p.

24. Yakupov A.N. Musical communication as a universe of art // Cultural heritage of Russia. 2016. № 2. P. 27–33.

25. Bradby B. Discourse analysis // Continuum Encyclopedia of Popular Music of the World. Vol. I: Media, Industry and Society / Ed. by J. Shepherd. London; New York: Continuum, 2007. P. 67–70.

26. Carter R., McCarthy M. Cambridge Grammar of English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 479 p.

27. Carter-Thomas Sh., Rowley-Jolivet E. Language learning as discourse analysis: Implications for the LSP learning en ASP. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. P. 51–52.

28. Harris Z.S. Discourse analysis / Repr. // The structure of language: Readings in the philosophy of language. Englewood Cliffs. № 1. Lg., 1952. P. 1–30.

29. Maingueneau D. Glossaire: paratopie [Electronic Resource]. URL: http://dominique.maingueneau.pages persoorange.fr/glossaire.html#Para (Date of access: 09.03.2022).

30. Römer U. Pedagogical applications of corpora: Some reflections on the current scope and a wish list for future developments // Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik. 2006. 54/2. P. 121–134.

31. Sean A., Marangos J. A comparative political economy approach to farming interest groups in Australia and the United States // The American Journal of Economics and Sociology. 2006. 65/3. P. 497–524.