

РОЗДІЛ III. ПРОБЛЕМИ ЛІНГВІСТИКИ ТЕКСТУ, ДИСКУРСОЛОГІЇ, КОГНІТИВНОЇ ЛІНГВІСТИКИ

Viktoriia Andrushchenko
ORCID: 0000-0002-3913-6947

UDC 81'42

DOI: 10.31558/1815-3070.2023.45.5

LITERARY TEXT IN ASPECT OF ITS COMMUNICATIVE STRUCTURE: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Висвітлено провідні підходи до аналізу текстової структури у сучасній лінгвістиці тексту. Запропоновано погляд на текстове ціле як структурну, семантичну, комунікативну й парадигматичну величину. Окреслено сутність тексту, художнього зокрема, в аспекті його комунікативної організації корелятивним виявом сукупності текстових соціолінгвістичних категорій зв'язності, адресантності, адресатності, інтенціональності, інформативності та інтертекстуальності як своєрідної техніки його мовно-комунікативного аналізу.

Ключові слова: *художній текст, комунікативна структура, соціолінгвістичні категорії зв'язності, адресантності, адресатності, інтенціональності, інформативності, інтертекстуальності.*

The study problem and its relevance. The development of the notion “text” as a proper linguistic concept with a number of terminological meanings (“supra-phrasal unity”, “complex syntactic whole”, “text”, “discourse”) dates from the end of the 40s of the 20th century, when it, being described structurally and grammatically, appeared to be one of the objects of linguistic research, which in the 60s and 70s determined the emergence of an independent linguistic study – text linguistics.

Since then, text unit has been examined in the following dimensions: 1) *structural-grammatical* (40–60s) – text formal means and types of coherence (cohesion) (R. De Beaugrand, T. Van Dijk, W. Dressler, R. Hasan, M. Halliday, H. Isenberg, I. Sevbo, D. Vieweger); 2) *semantic* (70s) – semantic contiguity of words, semantic repetition, etc. as text coherence expression (E. Agricola, V. Berzon, V. Buchbinder, T. van Dijk, S. Gindin, O. Paducheva); 3) *socio-communicative* (90s) – text as a tool of communication, a certain communicative act, a communication outcome, a type of speech act (N. Arutyunova, T. Matveeva, T. Radzievska, Z. Turaeva, O. Vorobyova); 4) *pragmatic* within a socio-communicative approach – text as a specifically constructed speech (V. Karasik, A. Kintsel, V. Krasnykh, M. Pravdin, Yu. Sorokin, I. Susov); 5) the interpretation of text in the light of the modern *synergistic* paradigm as a definite object, which only in contact with the human being who produces and perceives it, imbued with his / her energy, thought, comes to life, becomes mobile, dynamic, meaningful (K. Belousov, N. Blaznova, O. Korbut, G. Moskalchuk, V. Pyschalnikova) (Andrushchenko 5–6).

The present view considers text as a complex integration of the outlined approaches and current concepts of its analysis. In the research, we regard text as a level (a set of *formal, semantic, communicative, paradigmatic* levels (N. Bolotnova,

M. Brandes, I. Chernukhina, K. Filipov, A. Zahnitko)) horizontally and vertically structured content-functional theme-rheme whole of segmented text units – *supra-phrasal unities* (I. Halperin, O. Moskalska, T. Nikolayeva, E. Referovska, G. Solganyk, Z. Turaeva, A. Zahnitko), which formal-semantic and communicative-semantic structure is determined by *coherence category* (*cohesion / coherence*) as the most prominent text category (L. Babenko, R. De Bogrand, V. Dressler, M. Halliday, I. Halperin, R. Hasan, O. Selivanova, N. Valgina, A. Zahnitko) in its correlation with textual categories of *integrity*, *segmentation*, and *continuum* by language tools of its expression, which choice is predetermined by the addresser's intention (motive, idea) (I. Chernukhina, M. Pravdin, V. Rudnev, Yu. Sorokin, Z. Turayeva, M. Vsevolodova, A. Zahnitko, O. Zalevska), that is coded within a literary text (Andrushchenko 5–6).

In our opinion, such views at text, with the linguists' focus mainly on its structural and semantic analysis, lack a comprehensive interpretation of text as a communicative system. In addition, it is the emphasis on the communicative essence of text that allows penetrating deeper into its understanding as a speech act, the addresser and addressee's dialogue, which structure and development depend on both linguistic and extralinguistic factors of communication as well as cultural and national affiliation of the communicators.

Analysis and statement of the research problem. This approach, indeed, raises the issue of linguistic text analysis methods, since it gives insight into the problem of techniques of linguistic text analysis as a communicative entity, which seems possible due to the consideration of a broader number of text categories and their interrelation with category of coherence as a principal one among the others. Therefore, along with categories of segmentation, integrity, and continuum, these are categories of addresser, addressee, intentionality, informativity, and intertextuality, which appear to be essential in communicative analysis of text and its arrangement. The study of the set of the enumerated categories in their interdependence and correlation within text grammatical structure, which linguistic expression is represented by the manifestation of coherence (*cohesion / coherence*), enables to thoroughly clarify the communicative essence of text as a whole, to qualify text as a kind of communication activity between the producer and recipient with all its inherent specific features as well as to offer an in-depth look at the techniques of researching text communicative setting. The latter predetermines the **relevance** of the current study and its **theoretical value** by contributing to the expansion of knowledge of text communicative structure, its categories and their interrelationship in analysis of fiction texts.

Hence, the **purpose** of the article is to survey the communicative properties of the grammatical organization of text structure, literary in particular, constructed owing to correlation of the major text category – category of coherence (*cohesion / coherence*) – with text categories of addresser, addressee, intentionality, informativity, and intertextuality. The **tasks** of the analysis are: 1) to systematize scholars' existing views at text communicative structure, literary in particular; 2) to explain the interrelation of category of coherence with textual categories of addresser, addressee, intentionality, informativity, and intertextuality in the grammatical structure of the text; 3) to verify

text categories of coherence, addresser, addressee, intentionality, informativity, and intertextuality as communicative and sociolinguistic.

The **object** of the research is a communicative structure of a literary text. The **subject** of the study is the language correlation of category of coherence with textual categories of addresser, addressee, intentionality, informativity, and intertextuality in text production as prominent communicative markers of its grammatical shape.

To solve the stated problem, it is reasonable to apply structural and functional **methods**, which allow tracing structural-communicative nature of a fiction text through the analysis of its text categories and their linguistic expression.

Description of the actual material and the outcome received in the analysis process. In the 90s of the 20th century, with the development of pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and cognitive psychology, text began to be examined in text linguistics (due to consideration of procedural, functional, interactional aspects) as a means of communication, a certain communicative act, a communicative body, a type of speech act, which designated a sociocommunicative approach in study of text structure (Radzievska 53).

The most disputable issue in text linguistics along with questions of semantic or formal contiguity of successive positioned utterances concerns text communicative structure and tools of its arrangement. As a result, the researchers' thought moved in a slightly opposite way – from text to its elements: paragraphs, separate sentences, grammatical devices, lexical units began to be interpreted from the point of view of function they perform in a complete textual unity.

The conceptual apparatus of text linguistics includes the notions of text illocution (intention), textuality, intertextuality, addressee factor, generative types of texts, the type of communicative process, which the text belongs to (scientific, colloquial speech), the category of contact, communicative strategies of the author, communicative efficiency, communicative and functional typology of texts (scientific, publicistic, business, media, texts of instructions and announcements, astrological forecasts, anecdotes, letters, etc.) (Radzievska 5).

Inseparable from development of functional-communicative approach stands out pragmatic analysis of the text (V. Karasik, V. Krasnykh, O. Selivanova, T. Yeshchenko, A. Zahnitko), which objective is 1) a complex communicative speech act with the help of which the one who speaks (writes) tries to establish definite communicative relations with the one who listens (reads) (cited by: (Andrushchenko 2013: 6)); 2) the study of sociocultural, situational-behavioral, status, psychological, cognitive, and linguistic factors of the communicative interaction of individuals (Selivanova 2006: 243); 3) consideration of communicativeness as a foremost text characteristic (Yeshchenko 99); 4) analysis of text as a unit of communication with its inherent basic communicative functions in relation to other components / elements of communication system (Zahnitko 2006: 13).

This approach to text offers a comprehensive analysis of text structure, its semantics and pragmatics in communicative aspect regarding the linguistic personality behind the text that leads to text interpretation as a certainly arranged speech, a dialogue between the author, reader and cultural context which meaning unfolds in process of

its creation being actualized only while perceiving its material signs, since its grammatical and syntactic formalization is provided by linguistic tools of category of coherence (cohesion / coherence) realization. Though text coherence and its semantic integrity may not always have their external indicators on the level of natural language, being determined by not only a range of referential lexical units and syntactic structures of sentences, but also by inclusion of peculiar mechanisms of semantic coherence (i.e., non-linguistic structures, implications, presuppositions, background knowledge, concepts, extralinguistic factors, etc.) extracted by a certain type of culture and fixed in the consciousness of its speakers.

A literary text in the light of the objectives of communicative approach to the analysis of text whole is interpreted as a specific form of communication that requires consideration of such constituents as the addresser, message, addressee, code, coding, decoding, etc., as well as such parameters as: 1) identity of text informativity; 2) specificity of its communicativeness; 3) peculiarities of the system of codes interrelation; 4) character of coding-decoding processes; 5) the writer and reader's relationship; 6) interaction of concepts: historical, cultural, social background, etc.; 7) stylistic markers (cited by: (Yeshchenko 43)).

We believe that a literary text is a communicative act between the addresser-author and addressee-reader, in the process of which the latter, relying on his emotional and axiological values, decodes the information linguistically encoded in its content.

The study of text through prism of communicative aspect determined the extension of a list of text categories at the expense of communicative ones (N. Arutyunova, Z. Turaeva, O. Vorobyova); formation of communicative-functional and pragmatic concepts and text models (T. van Dijk, H. Pocheptsov, T. Radzievska); description of author-reader interactivity, text strategies, harmonization and efficiency (T. Matveeva, T. Radzievska, O. Vorobyova,) (Selivanova 2002: 49).

The vast majority of scholars (L. Babenko, V. Dressler, M. Halliday, I. Halperin, R. Hasan, O. Selivanova, A. Zahnitko, etc.) identify the categories of coherence and integrity as global, universal, interdependent, interrelated and interdetermined properties of the text, though identify them ambiguously.

Generally, there are two distinguished types of coherence: *cohesion* – a structural-grammatical type of coherence and *coherence* – a contentive-semantic type of coherence (O. Selivanova, A. Zahnitko, etc.); distinction between *local* and *global* coherence (N. Valgina, A. Zahnitko, etc.), where the first (cohesion) is defined as interconnection of linear sequences (utterances, supra-phrasal unities), so far as the second (coherence) is interpreted as semantic and internal integrity and unity of the text; *explicit* coherence (N. Valgina, A. Zahnitko, etc.) is indicated by cohesion signals (conjunctions, parenthetic words, word combinations, development from theme to rheme, etc.), since *implicit* coherence (N. Valgina, A. Zahnitko, etc.) is supplied by semantic and positional correlation of speech-language units (without special verbal communication signals).

To our mind, text coherence (*cohesion* (formal coherence – language tools) / *coherence* (semantic coherence – meanings attached to these language tools)) by horizontal-vertical manifestation of a hierarchical system of language markers aimed

at formal-semantic coding of functional intention of the author (*integrity*), put in a literary text by either conscious or unconscious selection by the latter, becomes a priority in the hierarchical interrelationship of the leading categorical-textual features.

The trace of the peculiarities of *coherence* (*cohesion / coherence*) of the components within a literary text as a unity determined by the category of *integrity* (the author's intention, idea), which, in its turn, is represented by linguistic expression of the coherence category, becomes possible under the condition of textual *continuum* delimitation into minimal text structural and content units – supra-phrasal unities – as certain microtexts (microthemes, microsenses), which number shapes a coherently meaningful macrotext (macrotheme, macrosense) of a fiction text, which, in fact, promotes the realization of category of coherence.

The actual analysis of text in communicative aspect enables to qualify text categories of *coherence*, *integrity*, *continuum*, and *segmentation* as *communicative* and to offer a broader list of text categories which, by establishing correlation with the latter, confirm the view at text structure as a communicative parameter, a specific semiotic universe of culture, mediated by the consciousness of the addresser and addressee.

In regard with this, T. Yeshchenko singles out the supercategory of communicativeness, within which the linguist differentiates textual categories of *anthropocentrism* (with subcategories of the *addresser* (the *addressee*)) and *dialogism* (with subcategories of *intertextuality*, *coherence*) (Yeshchenko 94), accordingly specifying coherence as a communicative one.

At that, categories of *integrity*, *segmentation*, and *continuum*, which manifestation is expressed by the linguistic markers of *coherence* category realization, also appear to be communicative. The language interrelation of these categories is aimed at facilitating the recipient's perception and awareness of the global macrosense (*integrity*) of a literary informatively complete *continuum* that turns out to be possible if analyzing the set of its microsenses within the boundaries of supra-phrasal unities (*segmentation*).

Consequently, the well-grounded communicativeness of the enumerated text categories in formal structure of the text allows reflecting on their sociolinguistic essence.

A. Zahnitko's statement in regard to the linguistic and social dimension of the grammatical text covers: 1) the status role of the author-linguoperson (category of *addresser*); 2) an instructional-intentional purpose (category of *intentionality*); 3) an overload with information bulks (category of *informativity*); 4) the duration of intertextual components (category of *intertextuality*); 5) the situational and pragmatic awareness of the addressee (category of *addressee*) (Zahnitko 2022: 155).

The scholar ascertains that the status role of the *addressee-linguoperson* (category of *addresser*) is core for text linguistic and social development. The author establishes the correspondence of text to his own communicative tasks, embodies situational motivations in it, recognizes himself by reflecting his emotional and expressive state as well as predicts the addressee's reactive capacity.

According to O. Selivanova, category of *addresser* is a textual category represented by the transformation of a real author's worldview positions, value principles, emotions, etc. in text as a definite program embedded within the text and addressed to a hypothetical reader, which should facilitate understanding and interpretation of the text by a real reader. The real reader's involvement in the structure of the message occurs due to special markers of the imperative mood, pronouns of the second person, abstract address, interrogative sentences implied by category of coherence linguistic expression (Selivanova 2006: 18).

Relevant to category of addresser is a category of *intentionality* – the preverbal, meaningful intention (motive) of the speaker, which determines communicative strategies, the internal program of speech and ways of its implementation (Selivanova 2006: 184) – in the linguistic and social grammar of the text; it is related to the status role of the author-linguoperson. In the dialogue, instructional-intentional purposes are associated with the use of various verbal and kinetic tools that are subordinate to the presentation of the author's inclination (Zahnitko 2022: 158).

The *addressee* is one of the communicators, who the speech action of the one who generates the utterance is directed and calculated on, that is, the interlocutor or reader, the recipient of the message (Selivanova 2006: 16). Besides, the *addressee*, being considered in relevant aspects: personal, social, cultural, ethnic, etc., has a particular status, positional, and situational roles; being guided by individual motives and attitudes, regulates his / her own receptive activity by constructing, proving or refuting hypotheses in dialogical textual interaction (Selivanova 2006: 17).

Category of *addressee* is completely linguistic and social, since both situationality and pragmatic awareness of the addressee depend on cultural and historical background, linguistic corporate values. Situational-pragmatic recognition of the addressee stimulates the implementation of the phatic function: the higher the potential of such awareness, the more effective communication and achievement of the corresponding communicative intention becomes (Zahnitko 2022: 160–161).

Informativity as a linguistic and social text category reflects information bulks and all discourse components interchange which informational balance of communicative interaction between the addresser and addressee provides, so far as its main objectives, trends, dimensions, contents, and levels depend on social factors of demand and need (Zahnitko 2022: 158).

As for *intertextuality*, it is the presence of traces of other texts within a text unity, its dialogical ties with the semiotic universe of the previous texts (recursive) and subsequent ones (procursive) (Selivanova 2006: 191).

Category of intertextuality based on intertextems (citation, development of ideas and / or themes, allusions, reminiscences, parody, imitation, tropes, etc.) is completely immersed in linguistic and social space; its depth, capacity, statics and dynamics are completely inferior with social values and needs, since its dimensions reveal the scope of the national cognitive base (Zahnitko 2022: 159).

Conclusions and perspectives of the study. As a consequence, the communicative vector of text analysis considers it as a certain information bulk, a semantic macrosign, the producer's intention, a global intertextual frame (categories

of *informativity*, *integrity*, *intentionality*, and *intertextuality*); the latter not only reveals text verbal environment determined by linguistic formalization of category of *coherence* within the boundaries of microtexts in a literary text – supraphrasal unities (categories of *segmentation* and *continuum*), but also witnesses its relation to the author's and reader's consciousness (categories of *addresser*, *addressee*).

Such communicative approach to the analysis of text formation with its interpretation as a communicative outcome, a dialogical act, allows qualifyink categories of *coherence*, *integrity*, *segmentation*, *continuum*, *addresser*, *addressee*, *intentionality*, *informativity*, and *intertextuality* as *communicative*.

The representativeness, expressiveness and appeal of the text as a linguistic message depends on the type of linguopsychomental activity of the addresser with the inherent structure of his consciousness, lexicon, thesaurus of various knowledge (social, everyday, cultural, encyclopedic, etc.), discursive (communicative) competence, intention (categories of *coherence*, *addresser*, *intentionality*, *informativity*, *intertextuality*, and *integrity*). Deep perception and successful qualitative interpretation of the author's intention (idea) by the addressee, which is linguistically embedded in the language message by the addresser, is grounded on personal, social, cultural, ethnic, status, etc. role of the recipient, who generates his own receptive activity in dialogical textual interaction with the producer, harmonizes his own awareness with the content of the text (category of *addressee*).

The above-mentioned approach enables to identification of categories of *coherence*, *addresser*, *addressee*, *intentionality*, *informativity*, and *intertextuality* as linguistic and social (A. Zahnitko), i.e., sociolinguistic, since categories of *continuum*, *segmentation*, and *integrity* we regard as *communicative*.

Such analysis of linguistic expression of categories of *addresser*, *addressee*, *intentionality*, *informativity*, and *intertextuality* by means of language devices of category of *coherence* realization will certainly make it possible to confirm the status of category of *coherence* as a hierarchical-priority text category in the communicative structure of a text, especially a literary one. This approach undoubtedly offers a peculiar technique (algorithm) for text study in communicative aspect, the use of which lets move from the research of linguistic manifestation of coherence to the formalization of categories of *addresser*, *addressee*, *intentionality*, *informativity*, and *intertextuality*.

The prospect for further study lies in tracing, establishing, and contrasting linguistic means of sociolinguistic textual categories expression in structure of modern English and Ukrainian fiction texts as emotionally marked bearers of peculiar linguistic images, national values, ideologies and cultural concepts. In this way, the research is designed to clarify the procedure of a literary text analysis by defining a number of its categories and constituents as a form of cultural communication and social interaction between the addresser and addressee.

References

1. Andrushchenko, Viktoriia O. Zakonomirnosti vyviavu katehoriinoi zv'iaznosti v horyzontalnii i vertykalnii vnutrishnii khudozhnotekstovii strukturii: avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.15. 2013. 20 s.
2. Andrushchenko, Viktoriia O. Typolohiia tekstovoi zviaznosti: Monohrafiia. Dnipropetrovsk: «Litohraf», 2016. 247 s.
3. Caselli, Tommaso, Sprugnoli, Rachele, Moretti, Giovanni. "Identifying communicative functions in discourse with content types". *Language Resources & Evaluation*. № 56, 2022. 417–450. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-021-09554-4>
4. Fairclough, Norman. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Routledge: London and New York, 269 p.
5. Longacre, Robert E. *The Grammar of Discourse (Topics in Language and Linguistics)*. 2nd ed. Springer, 2013. 379 p.
6. Radziievska, Tetiana V. Komunikatyvno-prahmatychni aspekty tekstotvorennia: dys. ... doktora filol. nauk: 10.02.15. Kyiv, 1999. 359 s.
7. Raymond, W. Gibbs Jr. Authorial Intentions in Text Understanding. *Discourse Processes*. Volume 32, Issue 1, 2001. P. 73–80. URL: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/S15326950DP3201_04?journalCode=hdsp20
8. Sielivanova, Yeliena A. *Osnovy lingvistichieskoy tieorii tieksta i kommunikatsii: monograf. uchieb. posob. K.: TsUL, „Fitosotsiotsientr”, 2002. 336 s.*
9. Selivanova, Olena O. *Suchasna linhvistyka: terminolohichna entsyklopediia*. Poltava: „Dovkillia-K”, 2006. 716 s.
10. Tanskanen, Sanna K. *Collaborating towards Coherence: Pragmatics & Beyond New Series*. University of Turku: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006. 192 p.
11. Tomusiak, Alina O. "Verbalizatsiia avtorskykh intentsii fihuralno-rytorychnymy syntaksychnymy zasobamy v amerykanskomu khudozhnomu teksti". *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Ser.: Filolohiia* 46. Odesa, 2020. Tom 2. 165–168.
12. Yeshchenko, Tetiana A. *Fenomen khudozhnoho tekstu: komunikatyvnyi, semantychnyi i prahmatychnyi aspekty: monohrafiia / naukovyi redaktor prof. Stepanenko M. I.* Lviv: Lvivskiy natsionalnyi medychnyi universytet imeni Danyla Halytskoho, 2021. 470 s.
13. Zahnitko, Anatolii P. "Hramatyka tekstu: movnosotsiumni katehorii". *Zapysky z ukrainskoho movoznavstva*, 29. 2022, 149–164.
14. Zahnitko, Anatolii P. *Linhvistyka tekstu: Teoriia i praktykum*. Donetsk: OOO „Yuhu-Vostok” Ltd, 2006. 289 s.
15. Zhurba, S. "«Hra v dialoh»: avtorska intentsiia v ukrainskii prozi 20-kh rokiv XX stolittia". *Filolohichni studii: Naukovyi visnyk Kryvorizkoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu*, 20. Kirovohrad, 2019, 114–125.

LITERARY TEXT IN ASPECT OF ITS COMMUNICATIVE STRUCTURE: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Viktoriia Andrushchenko

Department of English Philology and Translation, Horlivka Institute for Foreign Languages of the State Higher Educational Establishment "Donbas State Pedagogical University", Dnipro, Ukraine.

Abstract

Background: The study throws light at text as a structural, semantic, communicative, and paradigmatic unity. The research of text, literary in particular, has lately been carried out with basic focus on its structural and semantic characteristics. To analyze text as a communication system it is reasonable to trace and qualify communicative and sociolinguistic status of its categories.

Purpose: The purpose of the article is to survey communicative properties of the grammatical organization of text structure by coherence category interrelation with text categories of addresser, addressee, intentionality, informativity, and intertextuality.

Results: In the course of study, it has been ascertained that text as a linguistic message depends on the addresser's linguopsychomental activity (categories of *coherence*, *addresser*, *intentionality*, *informativity*, *intertextuality*, and *integrity*), since deep perception and successful interpretation of the addresser's intention, linguistically embedded in text content, by the addressee depends on his / her personal, social, cultural, ethnic, status, etc. role (category of *addressee*). The latter enables to identify categories of *coherence*, *addresser*, *addressee*, *intentionality*, *informativity*, and *intertextuality* as linguistic and social (A. Zahnitko), i.e., sociolinguistic; categories of *continuum*, *segmentation*, and *integrity* – as *communicative*.

Discussion: Text research in communicative aspect evokes issues of linguistic text analysis, its methods and techniques, which lie in consideration of a broader number of text categories and their interrelation with category of coherence as a principal one.

Keywords: literary text, communicative structure, sociolinguistic categories of coherence, addresser, addressee, intentionality, informativity, and intertextuality.

Vitae

Viktoriia Andrushchenko is Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor of Department of English Philology and Translation in Horlivka Institute for Foreign Languages of the State Higher Educational Establishment "Donbas State Pedagogical University"; Postdoctoral Applicant of Department of General and Applied Linguistics and Slavonic Philology at Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University. Her areas of research interests include text linguistics and comparative linguistics.

Correspondence: v.andrushchenko@donnu.edu.ua

Надійшла до редакції 15 лютого 2023 року
Рекомендована до друку 8 квітня 2023 року