

TEXT AS A LINGUISTIC CONCEPT

Setting up the problem. Nowadays text linguistics has reached an especially advanced stage and lately they have tried to enrich it with theoretical comprehension. It is understood that research in the domain of text linguistics is capable of representing the theory of layered language structure to its best advantage as well as getting a fuller understanding of the character of its internal structure, functioning of language phenomena and the content of text.

Topicality of the research. Within the latest decades in the science of language the interest to study of text's structural formation and determination of its linguistic status has considerably grown. It's impossible to exclude text from the scope of linguists interests, because only there true essence of both the entire language system and all structures that in comprise can be revealed. The functions of units, belonging to different language strata become clearly understood in text only. Clear demarcation between super-phrasal unity and text is yet to be performed, it ensuring topicality of our research.

The objective of the article is to perform an analysis of scientific literature, devoted to text as an object of linguistic investigations, consider the main scientific prerequisites and theoretical postulates, that enable carrying out preliminary evaluation of informative and structural characteristics of text, as well as different aspects of its analysis. On the basis of the analysis of research works it will be possible to characterize oral text and show the difference between super-phrasal unity and text.

Statement of the main material of the research. An interest to investigating complex structures, existing in language and exceeding sentence in length originated long ago. It can be traced back to the times of M.V. Lomonosov, V.F. Buslayev and V.A. Bogoroditskiy. Presence of structures, consisting of two or more sentences in language was noted by A.A. Potebnya, A.A. Shakhmatov, A.M. Peshkovskiy.

During the last decades an interest to studying structural formation of text and determining its linguistic status grew considerably. P.A. Figurovskiy and N.S. Pospelov can be considered to be pioneers of this field of linguistics. First works of this domain date back to the forties of the previous century. Western scholars of that time also commenced similar investigations. L. Yelmslev, for instance, stated quite categorically: "Text, in its inseparable and absolute integrity is the only thing that is given to researcher as an initial point" [1, p. 273]. Then he noted: "Texts are essential objects of interest for linguistic theory. The objective of linguistic theory is to develop a technique, by means of which a specific text may be understood with application of non-conflicting and comprehensive description. However linguistic theory should also bear in mind how any other text of the same nature could be comprehended by means of this method" [1, p. 351].

E. Buissense, pointing out that the functions of units, belonging to different language strata wrote: "<...> each unit is determined by its function within bigger unit, so, it is required to start with whole and finish with part" [2, p. 86].

S.Y. Schmidt had the same point of view: "Since the time of Lock and Gerder language philosophers had been insisting on the fact that word itself had no meaning and could not be understood it was isolated completely; it is developed, acquiring a meaning of its own only in connection with sentences and texts in particular life situation" [3, p. 95].

At present time the bulk of the scholars agree that exchange of thoughts is normally realized not in the form of separate words or separate sentences, but in the form of units, that go outside the scope of a separate sentence, they being the subject of text linguistics [4; 5; 6; 7].

Text is certainly a many-aspect phenomenon. It is structured by units of different plans and levels. That's why it possesses a multitude of subjects of research. "The interest of modern science of language to text study is duly explained, first and foremost, by the desire to explain language as a global phenomenon and comprehensive means of communication", – G.V. Kolshanskiy wrote [8, p. 140]. Y.A. Zhluktenko and A.A. Leontiev noticed, just like in confirmation of the above idea that: "In theoretical sense investigating of language strata, superior to the sentence stratum makes it possible to understand the regularity, existing between lofty hierarchal syntax structures – texts and complex sense unities, that are expressed by means of them, corresponding to up-to-date ways of human thinking and communicating" [9, p. 3].

According to T.M. Nikolayeva: "It is possible to speak of the atmosphere of certain "boom", surrounding this sphere, that now is considered to be a foundation, an entire linguistic base, rather than just a linguistic sphere" [10, p. 34].

Still, we can see some discrepancies in defining the notion of "text", there existing a variety of approaches to text studying. It is possible to distinguish in investigation of units, bigger than a phrase or a sentence in length between the following approaches.

First of all – is the approach, characterized by opinion that text can exist in written form only. I.R. Galperin's saying: "Text is a message, objected into a form of a written document, consisting of a series of sayings, united by different types of grammar and logical links and possessing a definite modal character, pragmatic orientation and literarily adapted

in an appropriate way” [11, p. 67], – seems to be expressing that point view most completely. A number of other scholars have the same opinion, regarding text as a written document.

Still, nowadays, many researchers believe that text can exist not only in written form, but also may have a sound form, i.e. an oral text may be fixed on one or another material sound carrier. An oral text may, certainly, not be fixed in any written form, but in this case it can't be an object of linguistic research, as it actually ceases to exist the moment last sound of this text is pronounced. We suppose, that the point of view of those scholars, who admit existence of text in both oral and written forms is correct. This opinion takes into account text in the widest sense of the word, i.e. text as speech. In this case text has no limitations, neither in form, nor in volume.

It seems that quantitative characteristics is quite negligible as text is manifestation of language system, irrespective of its size. A linguist may not approach text with such wide interests. Text dimensions and characteristics should be set according to general tasks and objectives of text linguistics and according to objectives of a particular study. It is not at all difficult to distinguish between text and phrase. To determine a borderline between super-phrasal unity and text seem to be much more difficult, as these units often coincide in volume. There was not clear delimitation between super-phrasal unity and text before. All scholars, beginning with A. Peshkovskiy and L. Scherba wrote and spoke about units, extending sentence, not specifying the volume and peculiarities of a simple super-phrasal unity and what distinguished it from text. It is not volume that characterizes text, but unity, coherence and completeness. We are convinced that these characteristics bear main difference between text and super-phrasal unity.

As far as prosodic characteristics of text are concerned it would be wise to investigate them, applying to oral texts. Here, we determine an oral text as unlimited in volume, structured message, characterized by unity of communicative task and explicit means of all levels of its language organization.

Nowadays, at the present stage of language science nobody denies an important role of prosodic characteristics in text organization. “Prosody – as I. and G. Fonade wrote in the previous century – is supposed to realize expressive and distinctive function. As when you listen in another room, through the walls absorbing words and allowing only rhythmical structures to pass you can often determine the character of speech, it's possible to guess whether it is a scientific talk, a sports commentary or a news bulletin, to say nothing of political debate or religious sermon” [12, p. 193–195].

We have to agree with I. G. Torsuyeva, when she said: “All language units participate in formation of sayings, and all possible means are engaged, beginning with syntagmatic organization and ending with intonation” [13, p. 59].

The role of intonation seems to be quite important even for organization of written texts. According to V. Dressler's opinion “for written texts we can rest upon inner uttering or reading of writing of a person, who reads the more so, because the existence of intonation, pointing out at text continuation can be regarded as universal” [14, p. 121]. However, V. Dressler notes here that: “Oral speech should be initial point in linguistic research, whenever possible” [14, p. 116]. A. Martine concluded: “Writing just duplicates speech and not otherwise [15, p. 370].

A tendency to resort to investigation of prosodic structures of some or other parts of oral text has appeared lately. There appeared a number of theses, throwing some light upon certain aspects of this problem. Investigations of complicated speech unities bring some interesting data, that gradually approach us to comprehending phonetic nature of a resonant text.

Conclusions and prospects of further investigations. The analysis of research literature shows that the bulk of appropriate investigations of this problem is characterized by quantitative approach to text study, while its internal organization still remains largely unexplored. But these particular characteristics seem to be crucial for discovering peculiarities of functioning and language expressing of different types and sorts of oral texts.

We believe that the above works have a common trait: features of sentence and utterance are carried over to text. Text's structure, its functioning are explained through the prism of organization of sequence of sentences or phrases, that the text comprises. In such cases the picture of text structure always slips away and remains unclear.

We are firmly convinced that more attention should be paid to finding out constant characteristics, typical to certain types and sorts of texts.

References:

1. Ельмслев Л. Прологомены к теории языка. Новое в лингвистике. Вып. 1. М.: Изд-во иностр. лит-ры, 1960. С. 273.
2. Vuissens E. La communication et l'articulation linguistique. Bruxelles, Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles, 1967. P. 86.
3. Шмидт З. Й. «Текст» и «история» как базовые категории. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Серия «Лингвистика текста». М., 1978. Вып. 8. С. 89-108.
4. Фридман Л.Г. Грамматические проблемы лингвистики текста Л.Г. Фридман: автореф. дис. ... докт. филол. наук:10.02.04. Л., 1979. 61 с.
5. Кубрякова Е.С. О тексте и критериях его определения. Структура и семантика. М.: Наука, 2001. Т. 1. С. 72-81.
6. Кочерган М.П. Мовознавство на сучасному етапі. Дивослово. К.: Преса України, 2003. № 5. С. 24–29.
7. Перебийніс В.І., Бобкова Т.В. Частота мовних одиниць як відображення їхніх системних характеристик. Проблеми загального, германського та слов'янського мовознавства. Чернівці: Книги-XXI, 2008. С. 446–453.
8. Колшанский Г. В. О смысловой структуре текста. Г.В. Колшанский. Лингвистика текста: материалы конференции. М.: МГПИИЯ, 1974. Ч. 1. С. 140–145.
9. Психолингвистическая и лингвистическая природа текста и особенности его восприятия / под ред. Ю.А. Жлуктенко, А.А. Леонтьева. К.: Высшая школа, 1979. 245 с.
10. Николаева Т.М. Лингвистика начала 21 века: попытка прогнозирования. Лингвистика на исходе 20 века: итоги и перспективы. М. : Изд-во МГУ, 1995. Т. 2. С. 34.

11. Гальперин И.Р. О понятии «текст». Лингвистика текста: материалы конференции. М.: МГПИИЯ, 1974. Ч. 1. С. 67.
12. Fonady I. et J. Procodie professionnelle et changement prosodique. Le Français dans le monde. 1976. № 3. P. 193–195.
13. Торсуева И.Г. Теория высказывания и интонация. М.: Наука, 1976. 207 с.
14. Дресслер В. Синтаксис текста. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М.: Прогресс, 1978. Вып. 8: Лингвистика текста. С. 116–121.
15. Мартине А. Основы общей лингвистики. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М. : Изд-во иностр. лит-ры, 1963. Вып. 3. С. 370.

Summary

S. YELTSOVA, A. RUDE. THE TEXT AS A LINGUISTIC CONCEPT

The article represents the analysis of scientific literature on the problem of partitioning of the oral and written text; the main scientific prerequisites and theoretical issues, making it possible to perform a preliminary evaluation of informative and structural characteristics of a text, as well as different aspects of its investigation were analyzed. On the basis of the performed analysis the characteristics of oral text and the difference between super-phrasal unity of the text were shown.

Key words: levels of the language system, language units, written text, oral text, super-phrasal unity.

Анотація

С. ЄЛЬЦОВА, А. РУДЬ. ТЕКСТ ЯК ЛІНГВІСТИЧНЕ ПОНЯТТЯ

Стаття присвячена аналізу наукової літератури з проблеми членування усного та писемного тексту. Розглянуто основні наукові передумови і теоретичні положення, що дають можливість зробити попередню оцінку інформативних і структурних характеристик тексту та різних аспектів його розгляду. На основі проведеного аналізу наукових робіт надано характеристику усного тексту та показано різницю між надфразовою єдністю та текстом.

Ключові слова: рівні мовної системи, мовні одиниці, письмовий текст, усний текст, надфразова єдність.

Аннотация

С. ЕЛЬЦОВА, А. РУДЬ. ТЕКСТ КАК ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОЕ ПОНЯТИЕ

В статье представлен анализ научной литературы по вопросу членения устного и письменного текста, рассмотрены основные научные предпосылки и теоретические положения, дающие возможность сделать предварительную оценку информативных и структурных характеристик текста, а также различных аспектов его рассмотрения. На основе проведенного анализа научных работ дана характеристика устного текста и показано отличие сверхфразового единства от текста.

Ключевые слова: уровни языковой системы, единицы языка, письменный текст, устный текст, сверхфразовое единство.