

## LITERARY TEXT AND LITERARY DISCOURSE

<sup>a</sup>NUSHABA RAMIZ İSGANDAROVA

*Azerbaijan Technical University, 5, Hussein Javid Ave., 370073,  
Baku, Azerbaijan  
email: <sup>a</sup>lingui80@mail.ru*

**Abstract:** This article examines literary text and literary discourse in a pragmatic light. With the advent of speech theory in linguistics, pragmatic research has become very popular. From this point of view, studies of the pragmatic potential of a literary text in the background of the literary discourse can be considered as actual topic. The article attempts to analyze the distinctive and similar features and functions of literary text and artistic discourse. The research material is scientific-theoretical and scientific-practical studies of the connection with the text and discourse in general. In the course of the research, the descriptive-comparative method of linguistics was used. The pragmatic potential of a literary text and literary discourse is assessed. It is noted that these concepts always complement each other and are closely interrelated.

**Keywords:** linguistics; text; pragmatics, speech; literary discourse.

### 1 Introduction

Since the end of the 20th century, the term “discourse” has often appeared in scientific literature on linguistics. “Discourse” began to be studied not only in linguistics, but also in philosophy and psychology, and this new direction of research is characterized as an anthropocentric approach. This is due to the emergence of the media, modern technologies, the emergence of new interdisciplinary areas based on the active spread of various disciplines, the relationship of linguistics with philosophy and psychology.

The term “discourse” originated in the Renaissance. This word comes from the Latin word “discursare”, which means “discuss”, “speak”, etc. Later, with the addition of new semantic shades to it, this word acquired the meaning of “to speak in accordance with the nature of the surrounding things.” I. T. Kasavin notes that this term was used in the Renaissance to refer to “a tiresome monologue that deviates from the main essence of the issue”, “a long, meaningless conversation” [9].

There are two meanings of discourse in modern linguistics. Conventionally, it can be grouped as follows: 1. Discourse is a specific communicative event recorded in written and oral speech. The discourse is formed in a cognitive space based on certain cognitive-typological conditions. This means that the prototypical nature of communication is consistent with patterns of text creation and perception. Text, on the other hand, refers to a certain mental activity containing certain knowledge. 2. Discourse in the German-Hungarian school of linguistics is interpreted in the second sense as follows: a set of relevant texts around concept can be formatted as the discourse.

Commenting on literature as a special kind of discourse, it is noted that “what is valued as literature varies from one society or culture within a society to another and it cannot be confirmed outside the study of the discourses that a society produces and lives in it. Even the term “literature” itself is changing, since in the 18th century, it was used to refer to writing in the broadest sense of the word” [8, p. 135].

So discourse is intertextual. This approach to the problem, the complex interaction of different texts operating within the framework of communication, sounds like a criterion for defining discourse and creates the types of discourse that we mentioned earlier.

Russian linguist Ye. V. Chernyavskaya concludes that the term “discourse refers to a text that is associated with social, cultural-historical, ideological, psychological factors in a situational context in which regulated language units are considered” [2, p. 25]. Thus, the concept of discourse is a text taken in a broad extralinguistic context. Such a context allows considering the use of language units in various semantic shells. In modern philosophy, discourse is viewed as a linguistically oriented pragmatic text based on the ideas of E. Benvenist. The

uncertainty of artistic discourse has always aroused the interest of researchers and the desire to explain the mechanism of multidimensionality. Multidimensionality is often used as a synonym for indirect expression and is regarded as a natural feature of artistic discourse.

This view primarily requires a scientific understanding of what can be done by analyzing the fundamental features of artistic discourse. Under the discourse, researchers understand the text involved in the situation of communication, or vice versa - communication through the text, which has become a product of speech in a variety of its cognitive and communicative functions, or as something related to the text. In all these definitions, the interpretive aspect of the text in the stream of perception is noted.

Discourse is a text that is related to an utterance in the same way as a sentence. In other words, discourse is understood as an abstraction, an invariant description of the structural and semantic features implemented in special texts. With this interpretation of discourse, one can speak of a set of texts (oral and written), in which certain features are considered characteristic features of the text.

### 2 Materials and Method

The material of the study is theoretical research on the nature of a literary text, discourse, the results of discursive analyzes of fiction, and other theoretical research works in linguistics. In the course of the study, a descriptive and comparative method of linguistics was used.

### 3 Results

A work of fiction affects the reader not only through a perlocutionary act (direct influence on feelings and thoughts), but also through the use of a certain type of speech act that creates a context for the perception of a certain idea or presents a model of “artistic reality”. In a work of art, the author's intention is not clearly reflected in the literary text, but it is transmitted to the reader through certain representations. These images include rhetorical means, figures of speech. The aesthetics of artistic discourse explains the nature of its action.

The literary text is presented to the reader not as a system with a positive content, but as a well-known scheme and riddle that the reader has yet to discover and add to it in a certain sense. Consequently, the literary text opens up new horizons for a variety of interpretations and requires that it should be approached according to pragmatic criteria.

It should be noted that, accepting the text as a key component of discourse, almost all researchers use background knowledge (knowledge about events, states, movements and processes, background knowledge of communication participants about the event and evaluation of these events), that is, they emphasize the need to take into account the context in the broadest sense of the word. In this case, discourse is understood as a link between the participants in the communicative process and is determined by the type, function, and pragmatic components of communication.

Discourse is the center of the dialectical system, which includes all stages of the development of the author's idea, that forms the basis of a literary text. Yu. Stepanov defines discourse as “a special grammar, a special vocabulary, a special syntax and rules of use, a special use of the language behind a special semantic.” All this creates a special “possible (alternative) world” [14, p. 38]. This special world is reflected in various institutional discourses: philosophical, psychological, etc. Here, this concept is not limited to a text or texts, it includes the entire verbalized “spiritual world” of special science. According to M. Ya. Dymarsky, discourse is the semiotization of a text, which is the result of both cultural and historical events and speech activity – therefore, it is wider and deeper than text [4, p. 28]. This opinion is also emphasized by G. N. Manaenko. He believes that “any

discourse creates a text — a specific material object that reflects the features of human interaction when creating an information environment in a particular field of activity” [11, p. 30].

However, the versatility of discourse makes it difficult to define it unambiguously. The uncertainty of this concept is reflected in the field of discursive analysis, which includes problems with discursive processes and structures, language and thought, social aspects and meaning.

All of the above is true for fiction as well. Nevertheless, the literary text, along with the general characteristics of all texts, has its own special qualities. In the “literary text”, unlike other texts, the reality in the text (in connection with the meta-text) is of a creative nature, that is, the artistic nature created by the imagination and creative energy of the author, as a rule, is conditional. The world created by the writer is not real, but fictional. “A work of art as an artistic and social phenomenon exists beyond reality and imagination. It combines the objective world and the reflection of fantasy.” [3, p. 37].

Many researchers involved in the pragmatics of the text agree on one thing: in a work of art, as a rule, we are dealing with two types of speech acts. The first type is a speech act that determines the discourse as a whole; the second type characterizes individual sentences of discourse. The interpretation of a literary text is complicated by the fact that the illocutionary force is the plot itself and the replicas of the characters.

At the heart of any work of art, lies the concept - the secret semantic structure of the text, which embodies the psychological category as the author's intention. The concept is basically intuitive and unconscious, but in the process of creation it is realized by the author at the “rational” level. The pragmatic duality of artistic discourse is closely related to the possibility of indirect representation of this point of view. In this duality, the author has the opportunity to weaken the interpretation, the existence of another point of view and the interpretation of another speech act, which implies the need for its direct presentation. For example, in the work of R. Bradbury, the concepts of “life” and “death”, individualized in the dialogue between the Mother of God and Death, have a special meaning and can create “internal dialogic features of the word” in a literary text. In this case, it can be argued that a new author's position has been won over the monologue.

From the foregoing, we can conclude that the characters of Death and the Maiden by R. Bradbury correspond to the characteristics of “artistic discourse with elements of indirect expression (hidden meaning)”. The literary text helps to understand the artistic picture of reality created by the writer, which expresses his worldview, attitude to the world, experiences, encyclopedic knowledge. It should be noted that the writer's fantasy does not oppose creative imagination to reality - it is just a special way of reflecting life, knowledge and generalization in the work.

Often works of art and literature (especially examples of modern literature) do not differ significantly from each other in terms of linguistic, grammatical, and semantic features. These signs do not play an important role in defining the concept of artistic discourse, but their pragmatic functions are important indicators. In the postmodern text, the pragmatic organization of the text is often modeled quite differently. Explaining the communicative rights of the author or reader, not only fully interpreting them, but also giving them the opportunity to participate in the creation of the text, or meaningless clues in the text, hidden “keys” can enter into a complex pragmatic game with the reader in artfully constructed traps or to some extent ignore communicative rights of the reader (for example, crossing the boundaries of the text, which makes it impossible to continuously identify characters).

A literary text or literary discourse can be distracted by the perception of its individual author, transformed in accordance with the author's intention, that is, a conceptually defined imaginary way in which the described world indirectly adapts to

reality. However, the worldview transmitted through the text is created not only by its author, but also by the recipient of the text: his intellect, culture, education, worldview.

Discourse arises in the process of interaction between the worldview of the addressee and the worldview of the sender. Like other texts, a literary text must have a structure. “In accordance with its characteristics, artistry can interact with interpretability — the ability to extract potential information about the meanings included in the text, based on its linguistic characteristics and its interaction with extralinguistic reality” [15, p. 175].

The most important element of a text is its title, that is, the only element that is related to the text and does not depend on it. Its function is to represent the text, to point to a subject or idea in perspective, to act as a kind of pointer that does not always have a direct determinant in the text, but is always accompanied by it and redefines its predicates in a disjointed form. “The title of the text is a symbol of the text, which is positionally accompanied by it and represents the entire content of the text in a concentrated form” [13, p. 169].

This connection is created by combining significant elements of the text in accordance with the principles of organizing the text as a functional unit of the language through formal components and content. The starting point in modeling the structure of the text is the concept of the adequacy of the perception of the text. In order to create a successful text in one way or another, each author uses this concept when creating a text. From a scientific point of view, this concept allows for a structural analysis of a text divided into semantically independent elements, the relationship between these elements is implemented in accordance with the rules of syntagmatics, the general meaning of the text is perceived by the pragmatic conditional intention of the speech product.

#### 4 Discussion

Before mastering the linguistic embodiment of the text, discovering the connections between the semantics and expression of words, phrases and sentences that are parts of the text, on the basis of certain assumptions, one must take into account that it exists as a kind of “situational background”, as a prerequisite that connects our views of the world.

Thus, the author and the recipient of the text use common rules that allow one to create the text, and the other to understand it. The structure of the text is determined not only by its content, but also by its type. This is where genre patterns come into play. They develop over time according to a particular textual paradigm, which can be described by passing the same content into different types of text (detective texts with court briefs, or a description of an experience in a scientific article and a comparison of a science fiction story). Although the content is common in both cases, the structure determined by the recipient's social identity and orientation, along with its stylistic characteristics, is different.

Almost all researchers agree that there are two levels of text structure: superficial and deep, and both levels are an integral part of any text. Z. Ya. Turaeva defines the structure of the text as a way of global organization of an object, which is a kind of additional information, and considers it important to study the relationship of its material elements and its generality as a whole [16, p. 56]. Since a sentence is followed by a definite sentence, expressed in a linguistic way dictated by a pragmatic intention, a text intended for a communicative task exists in the form of a definite intention with an appropriate content. This idea underlies the deep structure that forms the themes, ideas, and goals of the textual whole. At the superficial structural level, this judgment is expressed in a linguistic form in accordance with the existing rules for processing certain types of text. The fact that deep and superficial structures are a single whole in a literary text does not mean that there is a complete correspondence between these two levels. At the surface level, deep structure meanings are conveyed through linguistic signals. “In some

literary texts, the meaning contained in them is expressed by a minimum number of linguistic signs, and this is due to the richness and structural tension of the text and the process of information compression" [17, p. 242].

Of course, there is also the opposite situation, when the meaning is expressed by an excessive number of linguistic signs to enhance the semantic significance of a literary text. This and other situations play an important role in shaping the style. In general, the structure of the text allows combining and organizing the elements of the language system in such a way that these elements interact with each other and perform a function in accordance with the purpose of the text. The literary text is organized, first of all, to perform an aesthetic function based on the construction by the author of a certain model of the world in the text through language.

As it is known, the text acquires additional semantic nuances due to the uniqueness of the linguistic expression, which can be seen and recognized only by an attentive reader. The most important role in the creation of an object of aesthetic art is played by linguistic features that make it possible to increase the artistic value and expressiveness of the text. At the same time, the structure of the narrative should reflect the meaning that is laid down at the level of linguistic form, at the level of content, in the deep structure in accordance with the criteria of art. At a superficial level, many ways of understanding the meaning of a text acquire intensity and expressiveness due to the ability of a linguistic sign to reflect a larger number of sentences or, conversely, to increase the volume of a text without a fundamental increase in content.

The definition of the text by I. R. Galperin is as follows: "A text is a regular written association of linguistic signs, consisting of a number of specific units (phraseological units) in combination with lexical, grammatical, logical, and stylistic means of communication with a name, a specific purpose and a pragmatic purpose" [6, p. 55].

It should be noted that the difference between a literary text and other, non-literary texts, lies in the fact that when understanding an open text, the object of reflection is outside the text and is represented only by textual means, while when understanding a literary text, the object of reflection is the text itself. In other words, from a functional point of view, any verbal text within certain cultural boundaries is capable of performing an aesthetic function, and a text composed of signals that are constructed and focused on semantic organization is considered a literary text [10, p. 207].

According to N. E. Enkvist, three levels of competence are needed to understand a text or discourse: phonological, syntactic, and pragmatic [5]. All three levels are related to meaning: phonological competence is related to meaningful differences between sounds and sound patterns, syntactic competence is related to meaningful differences between words and syntactic structures, and pragmatic competence is related to semantic differences resulting from the use of different syntactic structures.

The understanding of discourse must be based on very complex interrelations of different levels (phonological, syntactic, pragmatic) and related types of competence. "Pragmatic competence is based on a factor called cultural competence, when one knows in advance what the other person will say (or want to say) in a given situation" [5, p. 175].

The acquaintance of readers with the content of a literary text, with the syntactic structure used by the writer, the vocabulary of the literary text and the lexical means used in it, as well as the purpose and reason for reading the text - all this plays an important role in understanding the literary text.

Many factors in text comprehension are manifested to varying degrees, including the interpretation of verbal connotations and meanings, understanding words in context and choosing words that are more appropriate for that context, and so on. According

to A. Abdullayev, "the text is a correct, informative, complete sequence of certain semantemes, since in most cases subsequent semantemes are already associated with the indicated semantemes (anaphoric relations) or vice versa; they also act as a means of communication (cataphoric relationships)" [1]. Along with logical relationships, extralinguistic factors are directly involved in creating the coherence of the text. Researchers even point to the impossibility of rearranging sentences in the text as an additional criterion for the coherence of the text. When reading or listening to a text, in order to understand and comprehend it, that is, to turn it into a discourse, the person who reads or listens to the text associates the concepts of language units (words) in his mind, as a result of which connections between these linguistic means are established at the conscious level and the process of understanding the text is realized.

"Concepts are pieces of knowledge that are stored and used in the human mind, and in turn are units of meaning that cannot be analyzed or broken down into smaller pieces" [1, p. 189].

A literary text is built on the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the potential reader's background knowledge. This background knowledge should allow unambiguous identification by constantly referring to people, and should also have signs of local and global connection.

If we take any text and separate it from previously acquired knowledge, then we will get a piece of incomprehensible information. Information about the time and place of political, economic, and social events that are described in any literary text plays an important role in the perception of the work, in the transfer of the intentions of the writer or poet. A text can be considered meaningful and understandable only if the recipient, the listener (reader) of the text, can create a model (at the level of consciousness) that suits him. Along with the meaning, certain key points or parts of the text, information from previous models, as well as general patterns of knowledge accepted by the majority, help to create such models that simplify the conscious process.

In the process of understanding the text by the addressee through language units, especially under the influence of words, the concepts corresponding to these words are activated in the human mind. If the addresser identifies the characteristics of the relationship between different concepts and combines them in the form of a single system of meanings, the text as a whole is perceived as a single whole.

## 5 Conclusion

Given the material presented, it can be concluded that in literary texts the writer skillfully uses coherence with the help of lexical indicators to convey his idea and intention.

On the whole, the structure of a literary text makes it possible to combine and organize the elements of a language system; these elements interact with each other and perform a function that suits the purpose of the text.

A literary text is built by a combination of the formed elements included in it, together with the categories implemented in the elements of the deep and surface structure defined in it. Since each element of the text has certain features that are perceived by their linguistic organization and meaning, it is more correct to consider them as signs belonging to a closed system of certain types of discourse.

By changing and replacing sign structures as elements of a literary text, writers create their own works, expressing a variety of meanings and ideas, creating their own artistic techniques.

## Literature:

1. Abdullayev, A. A. (2011). *Aktual uzylanma, matn va diskurs (Topical membership, text and discourse)*. Baku: Zardabi LTD MMC. [in Azer.].

2. Chernyavskaya, J.V. (2006). *Diskurs vlasti i vlast' diskursa: problemy rechevogo vozdejstviya. (Discourse of power and the power of discourse: problems of speech impact)*. Moscow: Flinta; Nauka. [in Russ.].
3. Chetverikova, O. V., & Baranova, A. Ju. (2016). Literary text as the basis for modeling the author's consciousness of a creative linguistic personality. *Bulletin ASU*, 3(182), 35-42. [in Russ.].
4. Dymarskij, M. Ja. (2006). *Problemy tekstoobrazovaniya i hudozhestvennyj tekst (na materiale russkoj prozy XIX-XX vv.) (Problems of text formation and literary text (based on the material of Russian prose of the 19th-20th centuries))*. Moscow: Editorial URSS. [in Russ.].
5. Enkvist, N. E. (1997). Thoughts about Discourse Comprehension. *Alternation*. Durban: University of Durban Westville, Vol.4. 170-187. [in Eng.].
6. Galperin, I. R. (1997). *Stylistics in English*. Moscow: Higher School. [in Eng.].
7. Habibova, K.A., & Jafarov, Y.M. (2018). Language policy in the virtual space. 1st International Scientific Conference "Modern Management Trends and the Digital Economy: from Regional Development to Global Economic Growth" (MTDE 2019): In the book: *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*. Vol. 81, pp. 789-792. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2991/mtde-19.2019.161>. (In Eng.).
8. Iljasov, R. S., & Gajlomazova, Je. S. (2020). Literary text as literary discourse: theoretical aspect. *Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5, 134-140. [in Russ.].
9. Kasavin, I. T. (2008). *Tekst. Diskurs. Kontekst. Vvedenie v social'nuju jepistemologiju jazyka (Text. Discourse. Context. Introduction to the Social Epistemology of Language)*. Moscow: KANON+POOI "Reabilitasiya". [in Russ.].
10. Lotman, Ju. M. (1992). O sodержanii i strukture ponjatija "hudozhestvennaja literature" (Vol.1. On the content and structure of the concept of "artistic literary"). Tallin: Aleksandra, 203-216. [in Russ.].
11. Manaenko, G. N. (2005). Cognitive foundations of the information-discursive approach to the analysis of linguistic expressions and text. *Language. Text. Discourse: interuniversity scientific almanac*. Stavropol: PGLU. Vol.3, 22-32. [in Russ.].
12. Rudnev, V. P. (1997). *Slovar' kul'tury XX veka (Dictionary of XX century culture)*. Moscow: Agraf. [in Russ.].
13. Shipova, I. A. (2017). *Metasemiotika khudozhestvennogo teksta (Metasemiotics of literary text): thesis of Doctor in Philology*. Moscow. [in Russ.].
14. Stepanov, Ju. S. (1995). *Alternative World, Discourse, Fact and the Principle of Causality. Language and Science of the Late 20th Century*. Moscow: RGTU, 39-47. [in Russ.].
15. Tashkinova, O. V. (2010). Problems of text interpretability. *Bulletin of the Sevastopol National Technical University: Philology*, 102, 173-175. [in Russ.].
16. Turaeva, Z. Ja. (1986). *Lingvistika teksta (Linguistics of the text)*. Moscow: Prosveshenie. [in Russ.].
17. Valgina, N. S. (2003). *Teoriya teksta (Text theory)*. Moscow: Logos. [in Russ.].

**Primary Paper Section: A**

**Secondary Paper Section: AI, AJ**