

4. Перепис населення УРСР 1989. URL: <http://surl.li/dspcg> (дата звернення: 14.11.2022)

5. Про національні меншини в Україні: Закон України від 25 червня 1992 р. № 2494-ХІІ: веб-сайт. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2494-12#Text> (дата звернення: 15.11.2022)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.36059/978-966-397-281-7-26>

Mykhailova H. M.

*fifth-year student at the Faculty of Foreign Languages,
Izmail State University of Humanities*

DISCOURSE INTERPRETATION IN MODERN LINGUISTIC SCIENCE

The theory of discourse as a pragmatized form of the text originates from the concept of E. Benvenist, who distinguished between the plan of discourse – speech that is appropriated by the person speaking and the plan of the recit. By discourse, E. Benvenist understands «every statement that determines the presence of communicants: the addressee, the addresser, as well as the intention of the addresser to influence his interlocutor in a certain way» [3, p. 276-279].

In modern linguistics, the concept of discourse is interpreted ambiguously. To define our understanding of discourse, all existing approaches can be reduced to the following.

1. Discourse is defined through text or text through discourse.
2. Discourse is understood as a cognitive process associated with the creation of speech behavior [7].
3. Discourse is considered as a sequence of interconnected statements united by the commonality of the target task [9].
4. Discourse is defined as a means of conversation and thinking, which, like genres, can become ritualized.
5. Discourse is interpreted as a speech formation, a unit of a higher level than a sentence [13].
6. Discourse is considered as a form of speech communication, which involves the relationship between the speaker and the listener, as an interpersonal activity.
7. Discourse is understood as a complex communicative event [2; 5].

8. Discourse is interpreted as a sociolinguistic structure created by the addressee in specific communicative, social and pragmatic situations [10].

In the first approach, the attempt to define text through discourse or discourse through text leads to the determination of text/discourse primacy.

So, A.I. Artemenko understands discourse as an elementary unit of the text, that is, a complex whole or meaningful unity that differs at the language level and, as a rule, is implemented in the form of sentences interconnected by semantic links [1, p. 17].

One of the worthy attention of the features of the text is that its interpretation is carried out through sentences, whereby sentences are considered as members of discourse. The presence of a meaningful superstructure capable of connecting separate sentences into a single whole and leads to the formation of a coherent text or discourse. The semantic interpretation of discourse coherence is the reason for the text's unfolding scheme.

G. Vezhbitskaya argues that the text is a unit of speech, a phenomenon of the communication system, that is, a phenomenon of the socio-speech level. In fact, the text is identified with the discourse and is considered as a communicative unit, where language elements and structures are used to realize certain communicative goals, tasks and attitudes [4, p. 40].

E.S. Kubryakova made an attempt to look at discourse from the point of view of cognitive structures that underlie linguistic competence. The text, in her opinion, is «an elementary (i.e., basic, minimal and main) unit of discourse» – a phenomenon not only linguistic, but also extralinguistic. The text has a formal content structure that helps to isolate it in the discourse. The text is a product of both speech and thinking, a product that first appears at the moment of generation by its author and can experience subsequent rebirths when it is perceived by the recipient. The formation of the text concept is influenced by two factors: the situation and the individual language space of the author [8].

O.T. Ishmuratov equates discourse with a certain type of text. Thus, discourse is a text containing considerations, that is, a text in which a certain train of thought is fixed, and communicative discourse is a text containing interconnected judgments of some subjects [6, p. 171].

Discourse is interpreted as a complex communicative phenomenon that includes the social context, information about the participants in communication, knowledge of the process of production and perception of texts. According to T. van Dijk, discourse is a complex communicative event, «an essential component of sociocultural interaction, the characteristic features of which are interests, goals and styles» [5].

N.D. Arutyunova defines discourse as «a coherent text combined with extralinguistic, sociocultural, pragmatic, psychological factors; this is a text taken in the aspect of events; speech, considered as a purposeful social

phenomenon, action as a component that takes part in the interaction between people and the mechanisms of their consciousness. Discourse is speech immersed in life» [2].

Discourse is also understood as a text «presented in the form of a special social given» [11, p. 44] and «formed as a result of the speech activity of representatives of a certain linguistic and cultural community, which is considered in the totality of its linguistic parameters and socio-cultural context» [12, p. 262].

So, analyzing all of the above, we can draw the following conclusion: although the theory of discourse has been developed and studied by linguists for quite a long time, there is still no generally accepted approach and universal definition of the concept of «discourse». It (the concept) is considered from the point of view of various aspects: both as a communicative process, and as a text, and as a system, and as a communicative event.

But, despite the fact that all these approaches are based on various features and characteristics, they are not mutually exclusive. Therefore, on the basis of the above information, we consider it expedient to try to give a generalized definition of discourse. Discourse is a communicative event that is determined by the relationship between the speaker and the listener and is predicted by the speech behavior of the latter.

References:

1. Артеменко А.І. Питання-перепити в прагмалінгвістичному аспекті // Наукові записки. Серія філологічні науки (мовознавство). – Вип. 22, част. І. – Кіровоград: Кіров. держ. пед. ун-т, 2002. – С. 14-23.
2. Арутюнова Н.Д. Типы языковых значений: Оценка. Событие. Факт. – М.: Наука, 1988. – 341 с.
3. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. / Пер. С фр. – М.: Прогресс, 1975. – 447 с.
4. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. – М.: Русские словари, 1996. – 411 с.
5. Дейк Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 270-312.
6. Ишмурагов А.Т. Логико-когнитивный анализ онтологии дискурса / Рациональность и семиотика дискурса. Сб. Трудов // АНУ Институт ф-и. – К.: Наук. Думка, 1994. – 252 с.
7. Кубрякова Е.С. Номинативный аспект речевой деятельности. – М.: Наука, 1986. – 158 с.
8. Кубрякова Е.С., Шахнарович А.М., Сахарный Л.В. Человеческий фактор в языке. Язык и порождение речи. – М.: Наука, 2001. – 237 с.

9. Мороховский А.И. К проблеме текста и его категорий. // Текст и его категориальные признаки: Сб. науч. Тр. / КГПИИЯ. К., 1986. – С. 3-8.

10. Почепцов Г.Г. Теория и практика коммуникации. – М.: Из-во «Центр», 1998. – 352 с.

11. Степанов Г.В. Язык. Литература. Поэтика. – М.: Наука, 1988. – 120 с.

12. Ушакова Т.А., Павлова Н.Д., Заясова И.А. Роль человека в общении. – М.: Наука, 1989. – 192 с.

13. Palek B. Reference and Text. // Grammars and Descriptions. / Ed by T.A. van Dijk and J. Petofi. – B.; N.Y.: de Gruyter, 1987. – P. 70-95.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.36059/978-966-397-281-7-27>

Михайлова Є. О.

студентка 4 курсу,

Навчально-науковий центр гуманітарної освіти

Українського державного університету залізничного транспорту

Науковий керівник:

Березний В. М.

старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов,

Український державний університет залізничного транспорту

**ПРОБЛЕМАТИКА ПЕРЕКЛАДУ КАЛАМБУРІВ
У КОМЕДІЙНИХ ФІЛЬМАХ НА ПРИКЛАДІ ТРИЛОГІЇ
ФІЛЬМІВ «НАЗАД У МАЙБУТНЄ»**

І.І. Коломієць у своїй роботі «Основні лінгвостилістичні поняття та категорії» вказав, що «каламбур – це стилістичний зворот, в основі якого лежить використання різних значень одного слова (омонімів), повторів слів та їхніх комбінацій, модифікацій із подібним звучанням (паронімів) й багатозначністю (полісемією) для комічного обігрування ситуації.» [1. с. 54]. Каламбур вважається одним з найскладніших елементів мови для перекладу. В більшості наукових робіт виділяють три основні прийоми для перекладу каламбурів:

- Калькування;
- Компенсація;
- Опущення.

Калькування – переклад побудований на точному (прямому) перекладі лексичної одиниці значимою частиною чи запозиченням окремих значень слів. Цим способом перекладу користуються рідко, так