Abstract. This article is devoted to the determination of the discourse in linguistics. Four approaches were chosen to consider the concept of discourse: communicative, structural-syntactic, structural-stylistic and sociopragmatic. The author concludes that discourse is one of the main branches of linguistics.

Keywords: discourse, text, communicative approach, structural-syntactic approach, sociopragmatic.

In modern science, the text in most cases is considered as one of the aspects of the broader phenomenon of discourse, which is explored by the discipline of discourse analysis. Raising the question of the dynamism of the term "discourse" in the aspect of its semantic variation is quite legitimate, since in recent decades it has become the most commonly used in the linguistic branch. And it is not excluded that this was facilitated by the lack of a clear and generally accepted definition of discourse as covering all cases of its use. Currently functional-communicative approach considers discourse as the most important form of everyday life practice of a person and defines it as complex communicative phenomenon, including, in addition to the text, extra linguistic factors (knowledge of the world, opinions, attitudes, goals of the addressee), and necessary for understanding the text.

The definition of the concept of "discourse" causes considerable difficulties due to the fact that it turned out to be in demand within a number of scientific disciplines, such as linguistics, anthropology, literary criticism, ethnography,
sociology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology and some others. And it is quite natural that the ambiguity of the term "discourse" and its use in various fields of humanitarian knowledge gives rise to different approaches to the interpretation of the meaning and essence of this concept. Nevertheless, it can be said that thanks to the efforts of scientists from various areas, discourse theory is currently being formalized as an independent interdisciplinary field reflecting the general trend towards integration in the development of modern science.

Although Wiesemann Ursula also talks about the existence of discourse in texts, her vision of discourse “the different between text and discourse is mainly of perspective. Where as text refers simply to a continuous stretch of language, discourse focuses on language as a behavioral unit with an internal structure. [7,p.251]. Even before the advent of modern discourse theory, which began to become an independent branch of science only in the mid-60s of the XX century, there have been attempts to define the term. The word discourse means dialogue speech in French. Already in the 19th century, this term was polysemy: in the Dictionary of German language by Jakobov Wilhelm Grim "Deutsches Woerterbuch" of 1860 the following semantic parameters of the term "discourse": are indicated

1) dialogue, conversation;
2) lecture.

This approach was typical during the formation of the theory of discourse in the framework of numerous studies called linguistic text ticks. It was a period when linguistics went beyond the study isolated utterance (sentence) and moved on to the analysis of syntagmatic chain of statements that form the text, constituting the properties of completeness, integrity, coherence, etc. Interest to the study of the text was due to the desire to consider the language as a whole a means of communication, to study in depth the connections of the language with various parties of human activity realized through the text. Intensive development of text linguistics as a science of the essence, prerequisites and conditions of human communication has outlined a turn from linguistics of language to linguistics speech. From the very
beginning, in the framework of studies studying the organization of the text coherent speech, there was a controversy related to the terminological definition of the object of study, as well as the very field of linguistics that studies the text.

The term “linguistics of the text”, which originally arose, was suggested many scientists by is not entirely successful, and in some linguistic works the text connected speech is called discourse. The polysemy of the term "discourse" in the “Concise Dictionary of Text Linguistics Terms” by T.M. Nikolaev: “Discourse is a term of text linguistics, used by authors in meanings that are almost homonymous. The most important of them are:

1) a coherent text;
2) oral-colloquial form of the text;
3) dialogue;
4) a group of statements connected among themselves in meaning;
5) a speech work as a given – written or oral” [4,p.467].

The emergence of discourse theory marked a qualitative leap in development of the science of language and posed the most difficult task for researchers give a linguistic description of the discourse. Arising within linguistics text, discourse theory never lost touch with it, but consistently went to the differentiation of the subject of its research, to the delimitation of the concepts "text" and "discourse". For example, according to the definition of V.G. Borbotkov, discourse is a text, but one that consists of communicative units of the language proposals and their associations into larger unities that are in discontinuous semantic connection, which allows us to perceive it as a whole development [1, p. 8]. V.G. Borbotkov emphasizes the fact that the text as a linguistic material is not always a coherent speech, that is, a discourse. Text is more general concept than discourse. Discourse is always a text, but the reverse is incorrect. Not all texts are discourse. Discourse is a special text.

In modern linguistics, discourse is interpreted ambiguously. Can you share several approaches to the definition of discourse.

1. Communicative (functional) approach: discourse as verbal communication (speech, use, functioning of language), either as a dialogue, or a conversation, that is a type of dialogic utterance, or as a speech from the position of a speaker, as
opposed to narrative, which does not take into account such positions. Within the framework of the communicative approach, the term "discourse" is interpreted as "a certain sign structure, which makes discourse by its subject, object, place, time, circumstances of creation (production)".

2. Structural-syntactic approach: discourse as a fragment of text, that is education above the sentence level (super-Phrasal unity, complex syntaxes paragraph). Discourse refers to two or more statements that are in a semantic connection with each other, while the connection is considered as one of the main features of discourse.

3. Structural-stylistic approach: discourse as a non-textual organization of colloquial speech, characterized by fuzzy division into parts, dominance associations, spontaneity, situationality, high contextual stylistic specificity.

4. Socio-pragmatic approach: discourse as a text immersed into a situation of communication, into life, either as a social or ideological an inferior type of utterance, or as a "language within a language", presented by its own texts. This classification allows us to understand that the nature of discourse is threefold: one side of it is turned to pragmatics, to typical situations of communication, the other to the processes taking place in the minds of the participants in communication, and to the characteristics of their consciousness, the third – is actual text.

The selected approaches are somewhat contradictory. The concept of "discourse" is conceptualized is inextricably linked with the concepts of speech and text. The concept of "discourse" was introduced as a result of the urgent need in science. It is necessary to take into account not only the characteristics of the “text as such”, based on its internal specifics, but also the text as a "message" addressed to someone and expressing some needs of the addressee and the author. Discourse as "speech appropriated by the speaker": “Discourse is not a simple sum of phrases; but its connection the grammatical structure of the language. Discourse is such an empirical object encountered by the linguist as he discovers traces of the subject act of utterance, formal elements indicating the appropriation of language speaking, an essential feature of discourse is understanding in a broad sense, the correlation of discourse with specific participants in the act of communication, that is, the speaker
and the listener, as well as with communicative intention of the speaker in any way to influence the listener. The structure of conversational discourse is made up of a number of stages of communication. Communication action of the individual (entering into speech contact, advancing initial topic of conversation and its ratification, change of roles in the course of communication active act, change of topic of conversation, exit from the communicative act), each of them is due to a complex of external and internal factors. T.A. van.Dijk also has a definition that interprets discourse as a social phenomenon: “Discourse is a speech flow, language in its constant movement, absorbing all the diversity of the historical era, individual and social characteristics of both the communicant and the communicative situation, in which communication takes place. The discourse reflects the mentality and culture, both national, universal, and individual, private” [6,p. 47].

The term "discourse" was widely used in the works of the famous German Philosopher J.Habermas. In his works, discourse is a type of verbal communication, due to a critical examination of the values and norms of social life [2,p. 571–606].

The point of view of Yu.S.Stepanov, who connects discourse with the concept of the alternative world, fact and causality. Yu.S.Stepanov also gives shiftily philosophical interpretation of discourse as “a language in a language”. However, discourse cannot be reduced to style, grammar, or lexicon as a mere language. It "exists, first of all, and mainly in texts, but those that are followed by special grammar, special vocabulary, special rules of word usage and syntax, special semantics, ultimately - a special world" [5, p. 45].

Although Yu.S.Stepanov also talks about the existence of discourse in texts, his vision of discourse as a special, possible world takes the discourse far beyond the scope of the text.

Thus, summarizing the above definitions of the concept of “discourse", it can be argued that this term, as it is understood in modern linguistics, is close in meaning to the concept of "text", but emphasizes the dynamic nature of language communication unfolding in time; in contrast to this, he text is conceived primarily as a static sky object, the result of linguistic activity.
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