

УДК 811.111'373

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2022.25.1.17>**VARIABILITY OF THE CONCEPT “SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE”: MODERN DIMENSION****ВАРІАТИВНІСТЬ КОНЦЕПТУ «НАУКОВИЙ ДИСКУРС»: СУЧАСНИЙ ВИМІР****Holubova H.V.,***orcid.org/0000-0003-1420-0591**Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,**Senior Lecturer at the Department of Foreign Languages**Odessa National A.V. Nezhdanova Academy of Music*

The main task of the article is to consider theoretical grounds of the scientific discourse in the aspect of its tasks and peculiarities. It was found out that discourse in linguistics is considered as a coherent text in the context of numerous accompanying background factors (sociocultural, ontological, psychological, etc.); an enclosed integrated communicative situation (event), the components of which are communicators and the text as a sign mediator, determined by various factors that intermediate communication and understanding (social, cultural, ethnic, etc.); language communication style; a sample of speech behavior in a certain social sphere, which has a determined set of variables. The term «discourse» is often identified with the language in real use and is applied to describe a text in a direct communicative context.

Various types of discourse are distinguished in the domain of modern research, whereas modern scientific discourse is characterized by its social conditionality, which is a determining factor in the language structure formation of this type of discourse. In addition, in recent years, the researchers point out its special dynamism, causing a number of changes, the refusal to use standard clichés, the emotionality of scientific discourse through involving a number of expressive means. The purpose of scientific discourse is acquisition and transmission of new professional knowledge about the object and the subject of the research, its properties, rendering of a certain scientific problem, awareness of the results of research activities, representing the position on a certain scientific problem; transferring scientific propositions, scientific and technical information, solving a scientific problem, attracting the addressee. The main peculiarities of scientific discourse are as follows: intertextuality, dialogicity, pragmatism and genre variability. As a type of proper institutional discourse, the scientific discourse is characterized by creativity, objectivity, logic of transmitted information and professional value. It is prone to professional orientation, connection with the addressee, anthropocentrism, multidisciplinary.

Key words: discourse, scientific discourse, text, knowledge, communication.

Основним завданням статті є розгляд теоретичних засад наукового дискурсу. З'ясовано, що дискурс у лінгвістиці розглядається як зв'язний текст у контексті численних супутніх факторів (соціокультурних, онтологічних, психологічних тощо;) замкнена цілісна комунікативна ситуація (подія), компонентами якої є комунікатори та текст як знаковий посередник, детермінована різноманітними чинниками, що опосередковують спілкування та розуміння (соціальними, культурними, етнічними тощо); стиль мовного спілкування; зразок мовленнєвої поведінки в певній соціальній сфері, що має означений набір змінних. Термін «дискурс» часто ототожнюють із реальною мовою та застосовують для опису тексту в прямому комунікативному контексті. З'ясовано, що у сфері сучасного дослідження виокремлюють різні типи дискурсу. Для сучасного наукового дискурсу характерна його соціальна зумовленість, що є визначальним фактором формування мовної структури цього типу дискурсу. В останні роки дослідники відзначають його особливий динамізм, що спричиняє низку змін, відмову від використання стандартних кліше, емоційність наукового дискурсу через залучення низки виражальних засобів. Метою наукового дискурсу є здобуття та передача нових професійних знань про об'єкт і предмет дослідження, його властивості, постановка певної наукової проблеми, усвідомлення результатів дослідницької діяльності, репрезентація позиції з певної наукової проблеми; донесення наукових положень, науково-технічної інформації, вирішення наукової проблеми, зацікавлення адресата. Основними особливостями наукового дискурсу є інтертекстуальність, діалогічність, прагматизм та

жанрова варіативність. Як різновид власне інституційного дискурсу, науковий дискурс характеризується креативністю, об'єктивністю, логічністю передаваної інформації та професійною цінністю. Вирізняється професійною спрямованістю, зв'язком із адресатом, антропоцентризмом, мультидисциплінарністю.

Ключові слова: дискурс, науковий дискурс, текст, знання, комунікація.

Setting of the problem and relevancy substantiation. The investigation of discourse is implemented from the point of view of linguistics, philosophy, sociology, ethnography, stylistics, semiotics, communication theory, grammar, literary studies and in interdisciplinary areas of sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, linguistic and cultural studies, structural linguistics, linguistic stylistics, linguistic semantics, grammatical stylistics, cognitive semantics, etc.

As it is well known, in modern linguistics there is no explicit integrated definition of the concept «discourse», in particular, the scientific (academic) one, which varies depending on the approach.

The values of scientific discourse are revealed in its key concepts (truth, knowledge, research) and are reduced to recognizing the knowability of the world, the need to multiply knowledge and prove its objectivity, impartiality in the search for truth.

Various types of discourse are distinguished in the domain of modern research. Their number is not permanent, since in the process of social development they may disappear, transform, unite. There oftentimes appear new types of discourse. All the above necessitates the investigation of discourse and, of course, the relevance of the chosen issue.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

The first references of the scientific discourse are found in the classic treatises of Aristotle, R. Descartes, Democritus, I. Kant, I. Newton. The following researchers paid special attention to the study of the peculiarities of scientific discourse: O. Ilchenko, M. Kotyurova, N. Nepiyvoda, P. Seligey, and others. The linguistic analysis of the discourse was carried out by N. Arutyunova, T. Dake, J. Lakoff and others. The works of these researchers formed the methodological basis for the formulation of the term «scientific discourse».

The purpose of the article is to consider theoretical grounds of the scientific discourse and to review its tasks and peculiarities.

Presentation of the main research material. In the works of domestic and foreign scholars, discourse is traditionally considered as a holistic speech composition in the diversity of its cognitive-communicative functions. The term «discourse» is often identified with the language in real use and is applied to describe a text in the direct communicative context.

Discourse is often interpreted as a kind of dynamic model of the text, textual communication associated

with the subject's communicative activities [5, p. 11–12]. According to I. Bekhta, discourse is a broader concept than the text, it relates to the categories of logic, psychology, philosophy and is focused on a person, his / her experience, knowledge, intellectual level, way of expressing knowledge about the world around us [1, p. 193]. Discourse as a communicative event that takes place between the speaker and the listener in a certain temporal and spatial continuum. This event must include both verbal and non-verbal components, i.e. those mental processes that inevitably accompany the process of communication (T. van Dake, 1989).

Discourse in linguistics is considered as a coherent text in the context of numerous accompanying background factors (sociocultural, ontological, psychological, etc.); a closed whole communicative situation (event), the components of which are communicators and the text as a sign mediator, determined by various factors that mediate communication and understanding (social, cultural, ethnic, etc.); language communication style; a sample of speech behavior in a certain social sphere, which has a determined set of variables [7, p. 568–569].

According to J. Brown (1983), investigation of discourse cannot be limited only to the direct analysis of using the language without considering the purpose or functions that are implemented in the process of human activity. French scholar E. Benvenista was the first to propose the definition of discourse as any statement that determines the presence of communicators: the addressee, the sender, as well as the intentions of the sender to influence his interlocutor in some way. N. Fearclough noted that the concept of discourse should not be reduced to ordinary use of language, whereas oral or written speech should be considered as form of social practice. The same opinion was sustained by R. Fasold, emphasizing that the study of discourse is the study of all the language usage aspects.

There are different approaches to the classification of discourse. The most outspread is the one according to which there are two types of discourse: personal, focused on interpersonal communication; institutional, status-oriented. Such a discourse involves professional communication between persons in accordance with certain norms and is distinguished by the two features: purpose and participants of communication.

According to the followers of communicative, structural-semantic, structural-syntactic, socio-pragmatic, structural-stylistic approaches, scientific (academic) discourse is a non-textual organization of spoken language, characterized by a vague division into parts, the dominance of associative connections, spontaneity and high contextuality; the text immersed into the situation of communication, into life (N. Arutyunova); special language within a language that expresses special mentality and has its own texts (Yu. Stepanov), socially or ideologically limited type of expression (P. Serio). The scientists note that scientific (academic) discourse is a type of discursive activity in the field of communication verbalized in the text, speech interaction of representatives of the relevant social group / institute with the aim of realizing status-role opportunities within the limits set by this social institution [9, p. 164], i.e., according to Kolesnikova I. A., the component of the professional zone of professional discourse [4, p. 7]. In its turn, scientific discourse can be considered as a special type of interaction based on communicative strategies and tactics used by the speaker to influence his addressee, and which reflect both general typological and ethnospecific features [3, p. 7].

Modern scientific discourse is characterized by its social conditionality, which is a determining factor in the language structure formation of this type of discourse. In addition, in recent years, the researchers point out its special dynamism, causing a number of changes, the refusal to use standard clichés, the emotionality of scientific discourse through involving a number of expressive means. All this results from the changes in human behavior, which in its turn leads to the altering in tradition. The changes in the surroundings of scientific communication are caused by the current changes in society. Those changes are caused by the following reasons: personification of the scientific discourse, pluralization, as well as the emergence of new types of scientific activity [8, p. 156].

The task of scientific discourse is to prove certain provisions, hypotheses, arguments, precise and systematic presentation of scientific problems with the aim of describing, defining and explaining the phenomena of nature and social life; transfer the amount of knowledge, thoroughly explain the results of research [6]. The task of the communicator of scientific discourse is to decode the message on the same conditions and for the same purpose, which are intentionally set by the addressee of this message.

Scientific discourse is represented by a number of textual varieties that are used by scientific communities in everyday communication practice,

performing educational, scientific and administrative tasks. The selection of different genres of scientific texts is based on both internal (semantic) and external (formal) aspects. Thus, functional approach investigates the discourse through the lens of language functions. The linguistic stylistic approach is characterized by selecting the registers of communication based on discourse analysis dividing oral and written language in their genre varieties. The proponents of the cognitive-semantic approach understand discourse from the point of view of the implementation of certain communicative-cognitive structures, expressed by frame models, which contain socio-cultural information. Within the linguistic and cultural approach, the specifics of the discourse, inherent in a separate ethno-cultural community, with a characteristic set of language and etiquette communication formulas are established.

Scientific discourse has indications of creativity and professional values. It also has other signs of professional discourse, such as: professional orientation, anthropocentrism, multidisciplinary, disproportionality of individual development of its parts, dialogicity, selectivity, insularity, non-cyclicity, didacticism, dynamism, language normativity, stylistic layering [6].

The purpose of scientific discourse is acquisition and transmission of new professional knowledge about the object and the subject of the research, its properties, rendering of a certain scientific problem, awareness of the results of research activities, representing the position on a certain scientific problem; transferring scientific propositions, scientific and technical information, solving a scientific problem, attracting the addressee. Scientific discourse includes genres the purpose of which is to solve a theoretical or applied scientific problem. Scientific discourse is created by scientists, its participants are usually the specialists with the appropriate level of training, having the same status and pragmatic thesaurus as the author has [2].

The main peculiarities of scientific discourse are as follows: intertextuality, dialogicity, pragmatism and genre variability. As a type of proper institutional discourse scientific discourse is characterized by creativity, objectivity, logic of transmitted information and professional value. It is prone to professional orientation, connection with the addressee, anthropocentrism, multidisciplinary, etc.

Thus, we come to the conclusion that in a broad sense, discourse can be considered in two directions, each of which is complex and multi-component, those are the text, which is a means of fixing the discourse on writing, and the communicative process

in the form of a monologue or dialogue, which is the reflection of discourse in oral speech. Among the tasks of scientific discourse there can be noted: the analysis of scientific problems for the purpose of research and explanation, the transfer of knowledge

and investigation results, dissemination of scientific and technical information, investigation of scientific problems, etc. The **perspectives** for further research can be seen in the studying of scientific discourse both as communicative process and event.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Бехта І. А. Дискурс наратора в англомовній художній прозі. К. : Грамота, 2004. 304 с.
2. Дискурс у комунікативних системах : [зб. наук. ст.] / Київ, Міжнародний університет; [Редкол. : Денисова С. П. (головний редактор) та ін.]. Київ, 2004. 344 с.
3. Ільченко О. І. Етикетизація англо-американського наукового дискурсу : автореф. дис. ... д-ра філол. наук : 10.02.04 «Германські мови». Київський нац. ун-т ім. Т. Шевченка, 2002. 37 с.
4. Колеснікова І. А. Лінгвокогнітивні та комунікативно-прагматичні параметри професійного дискурсу : автореф. дис. ... доктора філол. наук : 10.02.15 «Загальне мовознавство». К., 2009. 33 с.
5. Литвиненко Н. П. Український медичний дискурс : монографія. Х. : Харківське історико-філологічне товариство, 2009. 304 с.
6. Петровська О. С., Баранова С. В. Науковий дискурс та його компоненти. URL: <https://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/bitstream-download/123456789/26210/1/Petrovs%27ka%20.pdf;jsessionid=9DD054148EA8B251D918B2DC4BE2B7FC>
7. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика : напрями та проблеми : підручник. Полтава : Довкілля. К. : 2008. 712 с.
8. Томахів М. В. Англомовний науковий дискурс : сучасний стан та перспективи подальших досліджень. *Одеський лінгвістичний вісник*. № 5. 2015. С. 154–157.
9. Шепітько С. Компонента наукового дискурсу. *Наукові записки. Випуск 89 (5). Серія : Філологічні науки (мовознавство)* : У 5 ч. Кіровоград : РВВ КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2010. С. 164–167.