

УДК 372.8

DOI: 10.26140/bg23-2019-0803-0051

ИЗУЧЕНИЕ ДИСКУРСА КАК МЕХАНИЗМА АКТУАЛИЗАЦИИ ЯЗЫКА  
В ПРЕПОДАВАНИИ «ФИЛОСОФИИ ЯЗЫКА»

© 2019

Шмелева Жанна Николаевна, кандидат философских наук, доцент,  
доцент кафедры «Иностранный язык» ЦМСИБ*Красноярский государственный аграрный университет  
(660049, Россия, Красноярск, пр. Мира, 90, e-mail: shmelevazhanna@mail.ru)*

**Аннотация.** Философия языка представляет собой философское исследование природы языка; отношений между языком, пользователями языка и миром; формирование языковой картины мира; исследование понятий, с помощью которых язык описывается и анализируется, как в повседневной речи, так и в научных лингвистических исследованиях. Думается, данный раздел философской науки представляет интерес для студентов гуманитарных, а особенно лингвистических направлений. Тем более, что философия языка отличается от лингвистики, поскольку философские исследования носят концептуальный, а не эмпирический характер. Автор придерживается точки зрения, что динамическая модель языка, подчеркивающая его деятельностный характер, должна опираться на информационно-коммуникативную парадигму, предполагающую обмен знаниями, информацией, ценностями, оценками, значениями, смыслами. Завершенной конвенциональной репрезентацией дискурса выступает текст, как дискретно организованная и линейно структурированная, основывающаяся на общем контексте и языковых значениях форма продуцирования языковой культуры. Проведенный в работе анализ, помог установить степень корреляции инвариантной, статической модели языка с вариативной, динамической. Степень корреляции зависит от эффективности реализации действия механизма, осуществляющего актуализацию языка. Другими словами, от дискурса. Мерой корреляции выступает сам дискурс. Например, в качестве последнего можно назвать рационально-логическую форму, представленную как развертывание лексических возможностей языкового сознания. Языковые отношения носят культурно-исторический характер, исследуя языковые системы (структуры, формы) и их динамику (изменения в процессе функционирования), мы можем корректно проследить, с одной стороны, влияние культурных и социальных факторов на содержание языковой культуры, а с другой – влияние языковой культуры на развитие социума, что, несомненно, поможет в воспитании и обучении гармонично развитой личности.

**Ключевые слова:** язык, философия, дискурс, модель, языковые отношения, репрезентация, информация, коммуникация, анализ, корреляция, текст, лингвистика, языковая картина мира, актуализация, механизм, рациональное, логическое, лексический конструкт.

STUDYING DISCOURSE AS A MECHANISM OF LANGUAGE ACTUALIZATION  
IN TEACHING “PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE”

© 2019

Shmeleva Zhanna Nickolaevna, candidate of philosophical sciences, associate professor,  
docent of the department of “Foreign Language”*Krasnoyarsk State Agrarian University  
(660049, Russia, Krasnoyarsk, Mira Av., 90, e-mail: shmelevazhanna@mail.ru)*

**Abstract.** The philosophy of language is a philosophical study of the nature of language; the relationship between language, language users and the world; the formation of the linguistic picture of the world, the study of the concepts by which language is described and analyzed, both in everyday speech and in scientific linguistic research. It seems that this section of philosophical science is of interest to students of Humanities, and especially linguistic areas. Moreover, the philosophy of language differs from linguistics because philosophical research is conceptual rather than empirical. The author holds the point of view that the dynamic model of the language, emphasizing its activity character, should be based on the information and communication paradigm, involving the exchange of knowledge, information, values, assessments, meanings. The text as a discretely organized and linearly structured form of producing language culture, based on the general context and linguistic meanings, is a complete conventional representative of discourse. The analysis helped to establish the degree of correlation of the invariant, static model of the language with the variable, dynamic. The degree of correlation depends on the effectiveness of the mechanism of actualization of the language. In other words, from discourse. The measure of correlation is the discourse itself. For example, as the latter can be called rational-logical form, presented as the deployment of lexical possibilities of linguistic consciousness. Language relations are of cultural and historical character, studying language systems (structures, forms) and their dynamics (changes in the process of functioning), we can correctly trace, on the one hand, the influence of cultural and social factors on the content of language culture, and on the other – the influence of language culture on the development of society, which will undoubtedly help in the education and training of harmoniously developed personality.

**Keywords:** language, philosophy, discourse, model, language relations, representation, information, communication, analysis, correlation, text, linguistics, language picture of the world, actualization, mechanism, rational, logical, lexical construct.

*Statement of the problem in general and its connection with important scientific and practical tasks.* The social nature of work and the necessity for collective knowledge led to the emergence of a universal means of communication – the natural language, first orally and then in writing. Nowadays, despite the presence of numerous means of non-verbal communication (symbolic signs, drawings, models, visual art, gestures), it is the natural language that plays the role of the main tool of communicative activity. Communication acts as an intermediary between individual and socially conscious information and the key problem is the mechanism of translation of the individual process of transmission and perception of information into a socially

significant process of personal and mass influence [1, p.13]. Previously, in earlier works, we defined the system of language as a set of linguistic elements, organized through the structure of their relationships into a holistic unity. We refer verbal signs, which in their structure and function represent different levels of the system – phonemic, morphological, lexical and syntactic to the basic elements of the language. This ideal, sign system is actualized in speech, where the language acts in one of its main functions – communicative and informative, which in turn act as a substantial and system-forming.

In the communication process information is reported through the statement as the basic minimal unit of language.

They constitute a relatively coherent thematic speech segment – a text that can be presented orally and in writing. The interrelations of utterances caused by linguistic and extra-linguistic factors determine the structure of the text, which predetermines its interpretation as a unit of language [1, p. 60]. The study of the text led to the emergence of many approaches and directions, the emergence of independent linguistic and philosophical disciplines. The *purpose of the article is to analyze* the influence of cultural and social factors on the content of language culture, and the influence of language culture on the development of society. In the course of the study the following *tasks* are solved: to consider the phenomena of “text” and “discourse”, to give own definition of “discourse”, to draw the demarcation line between these concepts, to include notions of “information” and “communication” into the language research.

*Presentation of the main material of the article.* To begin with, we should speak about the text. The text can be considered in terms of events, i.e. actualized in speech semantic unity used in the communicative function of influence. Modern scientific trends, focused on the study of social cognition, call such a text “discourse”. The problem of discourse is related to the understanding of the fundamental role language plays in social life. It (language) is ontologically, and, consequently, epistemically included in the activity of the individual, being not only its tool, but also the most valuable product. Researchers of discourse, according to V. I. Karasik, “are united by the desire to study not an abstract language system, but live speech in real communication” [2, p.5], and the phenomenon we are interested in is considered not as an abstract theoretical construct, but as a way and form of language practice in the real world.

The concept of discourse goes back to the Latin “discursus” – ‘reasoning’, ‘running back and forth’, ‘movement’, ‘circulation’, ‘conversation’, or the French “Discours” – ‘speech’. Since the term “discourse” is the basic one in the problem under consideration, we consider it necessary to dwell on various approaches to its definition. It is important to note that despite the popularity of this concept, its generally recognized and clear definition, which could cover all cases of the use of “discourse”, has not yet been formulated. This fact can be explained by the fact that discourse is the object of interdisciplinary study, and is at the junction of several border scientific areas: theoretical linguistics, philosophy and logic, sociology, literary studies, semiotics, translation theory, etc. The interpretation of the concept of discourse has changed in recent years, and its ambiguity can be confirmed by the fact that there is still no clear emphasis in the pronunciation of this lexeme. Philosophers, for example, stress the first syllable, while linguists are more likely to stress the second syllable. The modern theory of discourse dates back to ancient rhetoric, however, as an independent discipline it was formed only in the mid-60s of the twentieth century. It is possible to distinguish three main classes of interpretation of the concept of “discourse”, in accordance with different national traditions and positions of individual authors.

First of all, it is directly linguistic use of the concept. In the 50-s of the XX century E. Benveniste developing the theory of utterance first used the traditional French linguistics, the term “Discours” in the new value, as a characteristic of speech to assign to the speaker [3]. In 1952, an article by Z. Harris, “Discourse analysis”, was published on distribution in relation to super-phrasal unities [4]. E. Benveniste considers discourse as an explication of the speaker’s position in a statement, while Z. Harris treats it (discourse) as a sequence of statements greater than a sentence.

Linguistics goes beyond the study of an isolated statement (sentence) and proceeds to the analysis of the syntagmatic chain of statements that form the text, the constitutive properties of which are integrity, completeness, consistency, logic. This multidimensional concept has led to a variety of approaches to the use of discourse. For example, discourse

is thought of as speech (text) inscribed in a communicative situation, and therefore as a category with a more pronounced social content in comparison with the speech activity of the individual. This interpretation of discourse allows to apply many dimensions. For example, in pragma-linguistics discourse is a complex cognitive-semantic phenomenon, the interactive activities of communication participants, the exchange of information, the impact on each other, the development and use of communication strategies and their verbal and non-verbal embodiment in communication [5]. In linguistics, the analysis of discourse distinguishes between written and oral speech in their genre varieties, study the characteristics of functional styles [6]. From the standpoint of a formal approach, discourse is “a language above the level of a sentence or phrase” [7]. The functional approach leads to the analysis of the functions of discourse to the study of the functions of language in the broad socio-cultural context [8]. The linguistic-cultural studying of discourse establishes specificity of dialogue in the framework of the certain ethnos, defines formula models of etiquette and verbal behavior on the whole [9].

For sure, all the approaches, methods and directions of discourse analysis mentioned above are interrelated and explain the fact that there are so many definitions of the concept of interest to us. For example, P. Serio distinguishes the following meanings of the term “discourse”: 1) the equivalent of the concept of “speech”, i.e. any specific statement; 2) the unit that exceeds the size of the phrase; 3) the impact of the statement on its recipient, taking into account the situation of the statement; 4) the conversation as the main type of statement; 5) the use of language units, and their actualization in speech; 6) socially or ideologically limited type of statements, for example, administrative discourse, political discourse; 7) the theoretical construct designed to study the conditions of production of the text [10].

According to T.A. van Dijk “discourse is an essential component of social and cultural interaction, the characteristic features of which are interests, goals and styles” [11]. In addition, discourse is a “complex unity of language form, meaning and action” that is most appropriately characterized by the concepts of a communicative event or communicative act [12]. B.J. Grosz, C.L. Sidner also consider discourse to be a pattern of speech behavior that includes multiple statements and a number of participants (the discourse can be produced by one or more participants as a speaker or writer, and the audience can also include one or more participants – listening or reading) [13]. D. Schiffrin defines discourse as a statement, emphasizing the interaction of form and function, which means that discourse is not a simple combination of isolated units of language structure more than a sentence, but a holistic set of functionally organized, contextualized units of language use [14].

Of particular interest are the studies of Russian linguists who give the theory of text its own ontological status. They define discourse in terms of formal, functional and situational interpretation. The situational understanding of discourse is revealed in the definition of N.D. Arutyunova, who qualifies discourse as “coherent text in conjunction with extra-linguistic – pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other 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)” [15]. S.V. Borisnev defines discourse as a coherent text “created” in speech, considered in the event plan, which actualizes not only linguistic factors (the rules of combinability of words and the sequence of statements, their intonation, forms of questioning, types of reaction to certain types of statements), but also non-linguistic [1, p. 74]. In comparison with the statement, discourse seems to be a more complex speech act, which, along with private communicative attitudes, contains a strategic communicative attitude.

The author of the article believes that another important

property of discourse should be added that characterize language from the point of view of informational and communicative content. For us, discourse acts not so much as a speech act, but as a way of *rationalization and expression of information and communicative definiteness of lexical constructs*. Moreover, after analyzing the definition of discourse, it can be said that they are all more or less connected with exclusively by the concepts of “text” and “speech” and “dialogue” that need clarification. With a high degree of confidence we can say that the complexity of the transition from the concept of speech to the concept of discourse is associated with this position. Indeed, on the one hand, discourse is something “more verbal” than speech itself, and on the other hand – something that can be studied using traditional linguistic methods, more formal, and therefore “more linguistic”, which is consistent with our theoretical assumptions. As can be seen from the definition of discourse proposed by us, we are not inclined to put a sign of identity between them. Of course, we do not deny that the term “discourse” is close in meaning to the concept of “text”, this is evidenced by the presence in the Russian language of various equivalents: discourse, text, text type, coherent text, text of coherent speech, etc. Having arisen within the framework of the linguistics of the text, the theory of discourse, without losing the original connection with it, however, tends to the delimitation and differentiation of concepts of interest to us, in terms of forms of implementation of language, relative to the length of the syntagmatic chain, formal-content parameters in the text of coherent speeches.

Some linguists emphasize that discourse is an interactive way of speech interaction, in contrast to the text belonging to one author, i.e. the opposition is closer to the opposition dialogue – monologue. M.L. Makarov believes that this opposition is rather conditional, because even a monologue in its dialogical, addressed to the real or hypothetical addressee [16]. When differentiating the concepts of “text” and “discourse”, the theory of discourse emphasizes the dynamic, activity aspect of language. The dynamic model of language should be based on communication, in the process of which there is a generalization and exchange of information and knowledge, which, in turn, involves the objectification of this knowledge in the form of objects and texts. The concept of “discourse” is a language as a process that takes into account the impact of socio-cultural, paralinguistic, psychological factors, according to the aphoristic definition of N.D. Arutyunova “speech, immersed in life” [15]. Mainly static, abstract, formal, grammatical structure is understood under the text. That is why the term “discourse” cannot be applied, say, to ancient monuments of literature, because they have lost their direct connection with living life.

V.V. Bogdanov offers his way of solving the problem, considering speech and text as two aspects of discourse. It (discourse) is understood broadly as anything that is said or written, other than speech activity. The text in the narrow sense is understood as “language material fixed on a particular material medium ... Thus the terms speech and text will be specific to the generic term discourse uniting them” [17]. We can say that this interpretation emphasizes the generalizing nature of the concept of discourse, and removes the limitations of monologue/dialogue, oral/written. It is this broad understanding of discourse as a generic category in relation to the concepts of text, dialogue, speech, that is considered established in philosophical, linguistic and sociological literature. Clarifying the concepts of text and discourse, we emphasize that the text as a language material is not always a discourse. In his research, T. A. van Dijk notes that “discourse” is actually a spoken text, while “text” is an abstract grammatical structure of what has been said. Thus, the concept of “discourse” refers to the actual speech action, and the concept of “text” to the system of language.

We believe that text there with the specific structure of the symbolic object (the sign), ensuring the fulfillment of communicative functions in accordance with the plan of the author. This is quite consistent with the most

important properties of language that we have identified earlier – integrity, isolation, coherence, structure. From this we can conclude that we are talking about the text not only as an abstract static phenomenon, but also about the phenomenon that connects it with the actualization of the idea of the creator of the text in speech, that is, tends to situational, and therefore discursive understanding of it. The semantic localization of the said will be T. Milevskaya’s proposal to consider discourse as “a set of speech-making actions of communicants associated with the cognition, comprehension and presentation of the world by the speaker and comprehension, reconstruction of the language picture of the world of the producer by the recipient”, and the text as “a static, immanently connected (and integral) intermediate stage of discourse”, “a sequence of language signs concluded between two stops of communication” [18].

Interest in the study of discourse is caused by the desire to explain the language as a whole means of communication, to study the relationship of language with various aspects of human activity, which are implemented and updated through discourse. What does it mean? If we consider the relationship between language and discourse in philosophical categories, we can say that these phenomena are correlated as possible and actual, potential and actual. In considering this, it is possible to speak about complex spiritual operations of differentiation that separates the two components of what constitutes a dialectical unity. Language, being an ideal phenomenon, a potential reality that is not grasped by itself, is withdrawn from the natural state, is embodied, alienated, becomes, as it were, not “itself”, but is realized, actualized (i.e., passes from the state of possibility to the state of reality) precisely in discourse, at the moment when the individual carries out a certain way of expression. When the individual analyzes the discourse, he uses some kind of ideal, a language of the invisible mass that is not in actual existence, and selectively withdrawing them from potentially existing language. The language that emerges through speech and utterances is not identical to the totality of all existing speeches; it is always wider than what it says. It exists in a permanent state, abstracted from concrete speech, and is always independent, sovereign, self-identical. Being a synchronous quantity, language is present simultaneously and entirely in potential space. A specific method of questioning, interpretation (discourse) removes fragments from the language, translating the synchronous state of the language into a diachronic sequence. So, in addition to diachronically uttered speeches, arbitrarily developed verbal logical chains (discourse itself), there is a simultaneous synchronic reality of a constantly existing language. In other words, discourse as a mechanism of language actualization exists simultaneously “here-and-now”, and language as an eternal constant.

We consider it necessary to tell and about the second class of applications of this concept, which dates back primarily to Paul-Michel Foucault [19], Jacques Derrida [20], Julia Kristeva [21] etc. In the 60-70s of the last century, the discourse began to be understood as a coherent sequence of speech acts or sentences, and the priority is to establish the position of the speaker is already not in relation to the posed statement, as towards other interchangeable subjects of the statements and express their ideology. The term “discourse” in these concepts describes the way of speaking and certainly has an attribute – any one’s discourse: say, modern political discourse, D. Trump’s discourse, etc., and is often replaced by the term “discursive practices”. Representatives of this direction are not interested in discourse at all, but in its varieties, which are set by a wide range of parameters, such as the specifics of style, theme, belief systems, and purely linguistic characteristics of the discourse producer. In other words, discourse in this sense is a stylistic specificity of an individual language, including ideological attitudes of the speaker. We tend to attribute this interpretation of discourse to sociology, sociolinguistics rather than philosophy.

Finally, the third class of use of the term “discourse” is associated with the name of J. Habermas. The theory

of communicative action of the German philosopher and sociologist also studies the concept of interest to us. Under the discourse J. Habermas understands a special ideal type of communication, which is carried out in the maximum possible exclusion from traditions, social reality, authority, etc., which aims to critically discuss and justify the views and actions of participants in communication.

Certainly, all three classes of discourse understanding do not exist autonomously; they interact with each other, which undoubtedly complicate the definition of “discourse” in the Humanities. Based on the above definition of discourse as a way of rationalization of information and communicative certainty of lexical constructs, we will carry out its theoretical “inoculation” to the functioning of the language as an information and communication system. As a result, *discourse as a mechanism of language actualization in its content characteristics can be presented as an information and communicative phenomenon with its own multi-level structure and functional operations. We present the actualization of its capabilities in the form of speech behavior of an individual in the process of being and cognition, including a semantically related sequence of sentences-statements, extra-linguistic factors, social context and rational (non-rational, for example, artistic) ways of expression and interpretation of information.*

We believe that typology is of great importance for understanding the peculiarities of discourse functioning. It is necessary to clarify the classification of this phenomenon, in other words, to find out what types of discourse can be spoken about. Generally accepted in philosophical and linguistic literature is the opposition of oral and written discourses. This differentiation is due to different channels of information transmission: in written discourse it is transmitted by visual channel, in oral – by auditory. Considering the relationship between oral and written types of discourse, we proceed from the fact that the oral type is the original fundamental way of language existence, while the written type is derived from it, both genetically and functionally. The difference in the channel of information transmission of these types of discourse affects the processes of its perception, and provides oral discourse – contact between the producer and the recipient in time and space. Here, the participants of the discourse are directly involved in the situation of communication, while in writing, as a rule, there is no such contact. In the situation of oral discourse, reference is made to the thought processes and emotions of the participants in the discourse, gestures, facial expressions and other extra-linguistic means are used, pronouns of the first and second persons are more often used in speech. In the written discourse, there is a removal of the producer and the recipient from the information presented in the discourse, which can be confirmed, say, by the more frequent use of passive voice constructions. For example, oral discourse is more characterized by a statement like: “We discussed the problem of the genesis of language at the colloquium”, for written – “At the colloquium the problem of the genesis of language was discussed”.

The variety of types of discourse is not limited only to the division into oral and written types. In addition to these two fundamental forms can be identified more and cognitive. The individual is able to use language without producing any acoustic or graphic traces of language activity, and the language is also used communicatively, but the individual himself is both a producer and a recipient of discourse. This cognitive type of discourse, in the traditional terminology of “inner speech”, is presented in the works of L.S. Vygotskiy. Russian linguist V.I. Karasik distinguishes two special types of discourse: personal or personality-oriented and institutional or status-oriented. In the first, the producer acts as a person with his views, thoughts, beliefs, individual inner world, in the second – as a representative of a certain social group [22].

Thanks to the creation of physical media people began to talk about such varieties as printed discourse, radio, telephone

conversation, communication via SMS, messengers like Viber, WhatsApp, e-mail. The differences between the types of discourse are often described by the concept of “genre”, which was originally used in literary studies to separate literary works into essays, novels, short stories, etc. Subsequently, M. M. Bakhtin [23] in his research proposed to use the term more widely, extending it not only to literary but also to speech works, which led to a fairly wide application of the term in discourse analysis. No doubt, it seems quite difficult to give a comprehensive classification of genres of discourse, but as examples we can mention: everyday dialogue (conversation), story (narrative), interview, report, report, political speech, poem, novel, instruction.

To consider in more detail the strategies of producing, perceiving and processing discourse as a mechanism of language actualization, we consider it necessary to distinguish the communicative chain: producer – discourse – recipient. This elementary communicative chain is the minimal structure that allows to study the process of discourse functioning in communication and acts as a “quantum of communication”. In the framework of a communicative chain (producer – discourse – recipient) the following elements must be identified: speech-thinking activity of a producer of discourse and speech-thinking activity of the recipient. The activity of the producer is aimed at the transformation of “thought – discourse”, and the recipient – “discourse – thought”. These types of speech-thinking activities are characterized by mutual orientation, and have differences, although they contain a number of very close mental and motor acts. The product of the producer’s speech-making activity is discourse, either orally or in writing, which is alienated from the subject at the final stage. O.L. Kamenskaya characterizes the speech-thinking activity of the producer as “a set of latent and external processes covering a number of mental and motor acts of the individual (the author), ranging from speech intention to phonation/writing an external text” [24]. It is also appropriate to distinguish within both types of speech-thinking activity of a narrower phenomenon – speech activity of both participants of the elementary communicative chain. The most important characteristic of speech activity of both communicants is verbalization, which is directly related to the use of language in the process of discourse generation and perception. In the speech activity of the producer is verbalization, ie. objectification of thought with the help of linguistic means, in the speech activity of the recipient is the perception of signs by external receptors and the extraction of content-factual information discourse. Further, the information is transformed into the conceptual system of the recipient and proceeds in the framework of his / her speech-thinking activity, and then in the processes of thinking.

When producing a statement, the first stage is mental and linguistic activity (a set of mental operations with language means), during which the choice and transformation of language means into specific grammatical and lexical structures for further articulation/writing. The final stage is the external speech (oral or written), as a result of which the product of the producer’s speech – discourse alienated from the native speaker is formed. When perceiving a statement, the primary stage is the sign perception of written or oral discourse, transcoding the signs of discourse in the lexical-semantic code that identifies the content-factual information of discourse. Thus, speech-thinking activity acts as a means of realization of the mental content with the help of units of language, therefore, in any type of discourse the peculiarities of mental processes of communicants, their positions, subjective use of language are manifested. Mental categories are not formally expressed in the text, but can be identified by the interaction of the text with the conceptual system of communication participants. Language category speech-thinking activity find in the text the formal expression, however, are not a sufficient condition of meaningfulness of discourse. They serve as a condition of explication by the producer and reconstruction by the recipient of the semantic

structure of discourse. Thus, mental and linguistic activity cannot autonomously, in isolation from each other, provide the generation and perception of discourse by communicants.

According to O. L. Kamenskaya: "Individual knowledge of communicants is considered as a conceptual system – a continuously constructed and modified dynamic system of data (representations, opinions, knowledge), which the individual has" [24]. The whole body of knowledge of the individual as a whole cannot serve as an object of verbalization, only a separate fragment of the conceptual system of man is actualized in speech. We emphasize that the understanding of discourse as a complex system of hierarchy of the method of knowledge rationalization assumes the existence of integrated models of its processing. To analyze the semantic structure of discourse methodologically it is necessary to determine the form of knowledge representation in the conceptual system of communication participants. Given the complexity of this problem O.L. Kamenskaya proposes to solve a simpler problem: to find a more or less adequate form of presentation of the results of individual knowledge, on the basis of which it is possible to investigate the speech-thinking activity. The methodological basis for a possible solution to this problem is the use of the concept of model and modeling, and it is important to take into account the presence of two types of models: cognitive, ideal (which are combinations of different mental forms) and material (formed from physical components). Of course, this division is quite conditional, because before the implementation of any material model, the individual needs to mentally recreate its structure, components. Remember the dictum of Karl Marx that the worst architect in contrast to the best bee builds a cell in wax in his head, i.e. ideally [25].

Nevertheless, the method of modeling has undoubted advantages, since in reality the results of knowledge should be formulated in a simple, logical form that allows multiple analysis and synthesis of the results. The functional capabilities of the brain and the amount of memory of the individual have limitations, so consciousness in the process of perception of objective reality takes into account primarily the components of sensory images, the most essential for the individual, emphasizing some elements and omitting others. Ideal models consist of concepts (with which it is easier to operate than with the objects and processes of reality) and represent precisely those functional and structural properties of linguistic reality that are most essential for the individual. Thus, the set of these models forms a conceptual system of linguistic personality, as well as a functional basis for individual and social behavior in its subject activity and spiritual and practical development of the world.

Models are cognitive representations of situations that are described in discourses and include the accumulated experience of previous events with the same or similar objects, persons, phenomena. The base of the text in this case represents its (text) meaning in a certain context, and the model – the situation in question in the text, and plays an important role in such actions as reasoning, creating images, remembering and recognition. The nature of such models is expressed in the fact that they represent the time, place and source of new information about events. Cognitive models cannot be something separate from discourse. It is processed and interpreted to (re)produce, update existing models, or create new ones. Since discourses may contain different types of experience, it is necessary to build a new private model from the elements of the existing one. We can agree with M.L. Makarov that the construction of cognitive schemes is implemented in the discourse, which remains the main mode of their existence, implementation and origination [16].

Elements of language models are signs of language, the most important ontological property of which is linearity. In principle, they can be used to build a flat model that reflects the structure of the language world. Discourse is a model of a mental object, the structure of which is not expressed explicitly, but is described by a system of mental procedures and language means. Thus, there is an actualization of

language through discourse, and the unfolding speech is a sign model of the activity of consciousness. The mechanism assumes not only dynamic and procedural characteristics of discourse. We focused on this characteristic, which is represented primarily by the rational-logical form of expression. We can say that the features of the mechanism give certainty to the nature of discourse as a rational-logical phenomenon. But since the language is an information and communication sign system, they (signs), as we know, can be expressed not only in the word, but also in images. However, our task was not to analyze artistic discourse. For us, it was more important to show that the mechanism of language actualization as an information and communication system, which is based primarily on lexical constructs, is rational and logical discourse.

In conclusion, it should be noted that explication of rational conditionality of language relations (object-language, subject-language) helped us to establish the degree of correlation of invariant, static model of language with variable, dynamic. The degree of correlation depends on the effectiveness of the mechanism of actualization of the language. In other words, from discourse. The measure of correlation is the discourse itself. For example, as the latter we can name the rational-logical form, presented as the deployment of lexical possibilities of linguistic consciousness. If we talk about the artistic mechanism, this measure will be determined by the artistic-aesthetic, axiological forms, and will be represented by sensory-emotional design (artistic discourse), and not mental-conceptual (rational-logical discourse). We are of the opinion that the dynamic model of the language, emphasizing its activity character, should be based on the information and communication paradigm, involving the exchange of knowledge, information, values, assessments, meanings. The text as a discretely organized and linearly structured form of producing language culture, based on the general context and linguistic meanings, is a complete conventional representative of discourse. Language culture of communicative and information space is subject to the principle of patronimization, that is, the hierarchy of relations "parent-child", "senior-junior", "higher-lower" is transferred to it. Language relations (object language – subject language) are of cultural and historical character, studying language systems (structures, forms) and their dynamics (changes in the process of functioning), we can correctly trace, on the one hand, the influence of cultural and social factors on the content of language culture, and on the other – the influence of language culture on the development of society.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Бориснев, С.В. Социология коммуникации. – М.: Юнити, 2003. – С.13.
2. Карасик, В.И. Предисловие к монографии М.Л. Макарова. «Основы теории дискурса». – М., 2003. С.5.
3. Benveniste E. On Discourse// The Theoretical Essays: Film, Linguistics, Literature. Manchester, 1985.
4. Harris Z.S. Discourse analysis // Language, 1952. Vol. 28. P. 1-30; Harris Z.S. Discourse analysis/ Papers on Syntax. – Springer. - P107-143.
5. Dijk T. A. van, Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse. Chap.9: Context and Cognition: Knowledge frames and Speech Act Comprehension. The Hague, 1981, P. 215-241.
6. Bhatia V.K. Analyzing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. L., 1993.
7. Stubbs M. Discourse Analysis: The sociolinguistics Analysis of Natural Language. Oxford, 1983. P.1.
8. Brown G., Yule G., Discourse Analysis. Cambridge, 1983.
9. Карасик, В.И. О типах дискурса // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2000.
10. Серюю, П. Квадратура смысла: французская школа анализа дискурса. – М.: Прогресс, 2002.
11. Дейк, Т.А. ван. Макростратегии. /Т.А.ван Дейк. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. Благовещенск. 2000. С. 53.
12. Дейк, Т.А. ван. Анализ новостей как дискурс. / Т.А.ван Дейк. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. Благовещенск. 2000. С. 123.
13. B.J. Grosz, C.L. Sidner. Attention, Intentions, and the Structure of Discourse. //Computational linguistics, Volume12, Number3, 1986, p.176.
14. Schiffrin D. Approaches to Discourse. Oxford, 1994.
15. Арутюнова, Н.Д. Дискурс./Н.Д. Арутюнова. //Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. – М.: Советские энциклопедии, 1990. – С. 136-137.
16. Макаров, М.Л. Основы теории дискурса. – М.: Гнозис, 2003.

– С. 88.

17. Богданов, В.В. Текст и текстовое общение. – СПб.: Изд-во СПбГУ, 1993; См. об этом Богданов, В.В. Коммуникативная компетенция и коммуникативное лидерство/ В.В.Богданов// Язык, личность и дискурс. - Тверь, Изд-во Твер. гос. ун-та, 1990. – С. 26-31.

18. Милевская, Т. Дискурс и текст: проблема дефиниции. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://teneta.rinet.ru/rus/me/milevskat-discourseandtextdfn.htm>.

19. Фуко, М. Интеллектуалы и власть (избранные политические статьи, выступления, интервью). – М.: Праксис, 2002, ч. 1.; Фуко, М. Слова и вещи: Археология гуманитарных наук – М.: Прогресс, 1977.

20. Деррида, Ж. Эссе об имени. – СПб.: Алетейя, 1998

21. Кристева, Ю. Избранные труды. – М.: Росспэн, 2004.

22. Карасик, В.И. О типах дискурса // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2000.

23. Бахтин, М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества – М.: Искусство, 1979.

24. Каменская, О.Л. Текст и коммуникация. – М.: Высшая школа, 1990. – С.16.

25. Маркс, К. Процесс труда и процесс увеличения стоимости. /К.Маркс, Ф.Энгельс. Собр.соч. Т.23 - М.: Политиздат, 1960. С.189.

Статья поступила в редакцию 26.07.2019

Статья принята к публикации 27.08.2019