

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2018.16.4.5>**РИТУАЛЬНЫЙ ДИСКУРС В ПРОСТРАНСТВЕ ДИСКУРСИВНЫХ ПРАКТИК**

Научная статья

**Овчарова К.В. \***

Кубанский государственный университет, Краснодар, Россия

\* Корреспондирующий автор (ksenia\_kuban[at]mail.ru)

**Аннотация**

Актуальность предлагаемого исследования заключается в необходимости и возможности развития научного потенциала существующих изысканий в интегративном пространстве анализа дискурса в целом. В частности, ставится задача обоснования моделирования ритуального дискурса в аргументативном аспекте. Такой подход наилучшим образом обосновывает постановку проблемы изучения сути ритуального дискурса, равно как и любого другого вида дискурса.

**Ключевые слова:** дискурс, ритуальность, аргументативный аспект, интегративность, модель.

**RITUAL DISCOURSE WITHIN DISCURSIVE PRACTICES**

Research article

**Ovcharova K.V. \***

Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russia

\* Corresponding author (ksenia\_kuban[at]mail.ru)

**Abstract**

The relevance of the current issue consists in the necessity and the possibility to develop the scientific potential of the existing researches in the field of interdisciplinary study of discourse in general. Thus, the modeling of a ritual discourse in an argumentative aspect is undertaken. Such approach provides the best justification of the statement of the problem studying the nature of ritual discourse, like any other kind of discourse.

**Keywords:** discourse, rituality, argumentative aspect, integration, model.

**Introduction**

The original methodological position undertaken within our study is to justify the position that a new issue for speculation arises at the intersection of scientific fields. The scientific novelty of this research is based on the application of the method of linguistic problems projection to the argumentative field. In particular, the scientific approach to the categories of the argumentative field (truth/verity, epistemic context, causality, modality [10]) is approbated in terms of ritual discourse (RD) that allows us to represent the study of RD in argumentative dimension as the new and vital scientific problem.

**Method**

The conceptual and methodological framework of the current research is built in compliance with the statement of the problem consisting in the projection of argumentation to the theory of discourse in general and the theory of ritual discourse in particular. The methodological principles of our study are as follows: the sign (semiotic) nature of information; the unity of form and content of the sign; the dichotomy of natural and cultural signs; the dichotomy "activity" / "speech activity"; the interdependent connection between (speech) activity and thinking; the correlation of theoretical and empirical knowledge in the humanitarian sphere; the dialectic interrelation of information, knowledge and human culture; the double understanding of argumentation – wide (ontological) and narrow (procedural).

**Discussion**

The scientific problem of a research is based in general on theoretical provisions of the following relevant directions: the theory of a discourse in various measurements (N.D. Arutyunova, V.G. Borbotko, T.A. van Dijk, V.I. Karasik, E.S. Kubryakova, A.V. Olyanich, etc.); theoretical studying of a ritual in various forms (A.K. Bayburin, A.N. Baranov, V.V. Bogdanov, A. Vezhbitskaya, M.G. Izvekova, I.T. Mechkovskaya, V.N. Toporov, V.I., etc.); theory of the argument (Ivin, L.G. Vasilyev, V.Z. Demyankov, N.Yu. Fanyan, Ch. Perelman, J.R. Searle, etc.); research of argumentativny aspect in various types of a discourse (N.Yu. Fanyan, etc.).

Thus, there comes a hypothesis – rituality represents a discourse-integrated entity expressed in a double way – ontologically and procedurally. Such a perspective of the research has a bilateral perspective regarding the development of discourse theory in general and ritual discourse in an argumentative aspect in particular. The cross-solving of problems in the field of ritual discourse and argumentation contributes to the deepening of interdisciplinary humanitarian knowledge.

The possible contribution of the planned scientific results to the solution of applied tasks is linked to the implementation of an actual problem of formation and development of an effective universal model of cooperative interaction in various kinds of discourse in modern informative and communicative space, i.e. personal-oriented and institutional varieties of discourse. The practical application of scientific results is aimed at the integrative development of theoretical and practical courses on linguoargumentology, rhetorics, cognitive linguistics, semiotics, theory of text and discourse, theory of communication, theory of speech influence.

The fundamental level of the research is provided by means of an integrated approach based on the maximum coverage available in social sciences aspects. They are expressed in the following approaches: cognitive (contours and structures information space of a ritual discourse); psychoanalytic (allows unconscious "to explain" a "inexplicable" state of affairs); hermeneutical (positions the argumentation as a principal component of process of interpretation, an explanation and

understanding), phenomenological (justifies event character of components of a categorial field of the argumentation with a projection to a ritual context); synergy (updating of a dichotomy is promoted by "chaos" / "order" taking into account factors of conventionality / not conventionality); semiotics (envelops verbal and nonverbal forms of ritual communication). Complex updating of the called aspects expressed in the appropriate approaches is provided with an integrative entity of basis approaches / aspects – discursive (provides research material in different forms and types of a discourse) and argumentative (forms a methodological base of a research by means of updating of a categorial field of the argumentation).

The level of fundamentality and feasibility of the project is provided by means of a complex approach involving various – basic (discursive and argumentative) and complementary (cognitive, psychoanalytic, hermeneutic, phenomenological, synergetic, semiotical) – aspects and methods: analysis and generalization (theoretical provisions and empirical data); method of continuous selection (different types of discursive practices); a contextual method (a specification of the types of discursive practices concerning the category of rituality); an interpretive method (interpretation of specifics of realization of category of rituality in the chosen context); a method of the welfare analysis (for the purpose of role – personal and institutional – datings of participants of a ritual discourse, including cross-cultural and gender factors); a method of the argumentative analysis (with use of components of the categorial field of the argument – the truth, epistemic context, causality, modality); comparative method (forms of the knowledge and cultures) based on a technique of the analysis of pragmatological presupposition and implication; techniques of questioning / poll (for the purpose of identification, proceeding from a dichotomy conventionality / not conventionality, a cognitive dissonance and drawing up recommendations for his elimination); a taxonomy method (for confirmation of specifics of updating of category of rituality in different types of a discourse).

### Result

The argumentative model of a ritual discourse as a universal model of a cooperative interaction is suggested as the main achievement of this scientific project.

The projected model is predicted as the effective universal model of cooperative interaction integrating various kinds of a discourse. The analysis and synthesis of theoretical bases of a research of various types of texts / discourses (political, pedagogical, mass media, advertizing, computer, medical, religious, etc.), generalization of the received results with a projection of category of rituality to the categorial field of the argument and also carrying out a sociolinguistic experiment promote achievement of the goal of scientific research. A starting point in this direction the research of a discourse of chats in Internet communication in which the sign of rituality expressed in characteristics of forms of communication – at the same time oral and written is integrated (including interactivity, linearity/nonlinearity, proximity / distance, situational conditionality, synchronism / not synchronism, a relative personification) [7] is necessary.

Within this scientific direction the application of semiotics approach is quite relevant. The development of a problem (verbal and nonverbal representation of components of a statement with allocating in the structure of a chat dialogue iconic, conventional and the index signs) with a further projection to other types of discourse seems perspective. In particular, the studying of a problem, proceeding from a dichotomy “conventionality/non-conventionality” as a basic factor, is especially significant for a research of rituality as a linguistic category. The description of specifications of the language personality functioning in electronic hypertext [7] leads to the development of a problem of the research under study in a cognitive aspect.

Due to the impetuous increase of potential of information technologies the special importance is gained first of all by development of the situation connected with Internet communication space – “degree of knowledge of the members of the society, i.e. ability to plan the strategy of search and selection of information, further interaction in network, in many respects depend on that, how well participants of communication realize the potential and specifics of functioning of language means in the new communication environment” [7, P. 9]. The cognitive aspect, thus, is interfaced to synergetic aspect (approach) in respect of organic dispersal of elements of a discourse that the argumentative analysis of “the modeling activity of discursive reflection” [2], including the interpreting approach [4], [3].

The results received on the basis of the analysis of language of chats in Internet communication indicate the existence of various forms of updating of a discourse that allows the application of the problems under analysis upon a research of other types (personal and institutional) and types (for example, pedagogical, medical, tourist, religious, political, culinary) ([8]) a discourse with the integrated sign of rituality. It is obvious that “ability to plan the strategy of search and selection of information” a task essence, solved on the basis of discourse-integrated argumentative components (cf. “a presentation discourse” as “superlinear” type of a discourse [9]; semiotics updating of a ritual [6]; problem of “mental representations” [5]. For example, “transition – from a ritual to dialogue of various political subjects – is still far from end” [1, P. 117].

### Conclusion

Taking into consideration everything above mentioned, the construction of the argumentative model of ritual discourse as the specific objective of the study, involving finding the algorithm of argumentative mechanism together with the functioning of components of the categorial field of argumentation (epistemic context, causality, modality), is not only a relevant, but also perspective issue in the research area of different discursive practices.

### Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

### Conflict of Interest

None declared.

### Список литературы / References

1. Баранов А. Н. Политический дискурс: прощание с ритуалом? / А. Н. Баранов // Человек. –1997. – № 6. – С. 108-117.
2. Борботько В. Г. Принципы формирования дискурса: от психолингвистики к лингвосинергетике / В. Г. Борботько. 4-е изд-е. – М.: Либроком, 2011. – 288 с.
3. Васильев Л. Г. Аргументация и ее понимание: логико-лингвистический подход: монография / Л. Г. Васильев. – Калуга: Калужский гос. ун-т, 2014. – 330 с.

4. Ивин А. А. Основы теории аргументации: Учебник / А. А. Ивин. – М.: ВЛАДОС, 1997. – 352 с.
5. Кубрякова Е. С. К проблеме ментальных репрезентаций / Е. С. Кубрякова, В. З. Демьянков // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. – М.: Институт языкознания; Тамбов: Тамбовский гос. университет, 2007. – № 4. – С. 8-16.
6. Мечковская Н. Б. Семиотика: Язык. Природа. Культура: Курс лекций / Н. Б. Мечковская. – М.: Академия, 2004. – 432 с.
7. Овчарова К. В. Компьютерные чаты в Интернет-коммуникации: содержание и особенности функционирования: дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 / К. В. Овчарова – Краснодар, 2008. – 240 с.
8. Овчарова К. В. Ритуальность в дискурсе: многообразие проявлений [Текст] / К. В. Овчарова // Особенности исследования и конструирования актуальных типов дискурса и их категорий: монография / под ред. И.П. Хутыз. – Краснодар: Кубанский государственный университет, 2016. – С. 213-251.
9. Олянич А. В. Презентационная теория дискурса: монография / А. В. Олянич. – М.: Гнозис, 2007. – 407 с.
10. Фанян Н. Ю. Аргументация как лингвопрагматическая структура: дисс. ... д-ра филол. Наук / Н. Ю. Фанян. – Краснодар, 2000. – 354 с.

#### Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Baranov A. N. Politicheskij diskurs: proshhanie s ritualom? [Political discourse: a farewell to ritual? ] / A. N. Baranov // Chelovek [Man]. – 1997. – №6. – P. 108-117 [in Russian]
2. Borbotko V. G. Principy formirovaniya diskursa: ot psiholingvistiki k lingvosinergetike. 4-e izd-e. [Principles of formation of discourse: from psycholinguistics to linguistic synergy. 4th ed.] / V. G. Borbotko.– М.: Librokom, 2011. – 288 p. [in Russian]
3. Vasilyev L. G. Argumentacija i ee ponimanie: logiko-lingvisticheskij podhod: monografija [Argumentation and its understanding: logical-linguistic approach: monograph] / L. G. Vasilyev. – Kaluga: Kaluga State University, 2014. – 330 p. [in Russian]
4. Ivin A. A. Osnovy teorii argumentacii: Uchebnik [Fundamentals of argumentation theory: Textbook] / A. A. Ivin. – Moscow: VLADOS, 1997. – 352 p. [in Russian]
5. Kubryakova E. S. K probleme mental'nyh reprezentacij [On the problem of mental representations] // Voprosy kognitivnoj lingvistiki [Issues on cognitive linguistics] / E. S. Kubryakova, V. Z. Demyankov. – Moscow: Institute of Linguistics; Tambov: Tambov State University, 2007. – № 4. – P. 8-16 [in Russian]
6. Mechkovskaya N. B. Semiotika: Jazyk. Priroda. Kul'tura: Kurs lekcij [Semiotics: Language. Nature. Culture: a Course of lectures] / N. B. Mechkovskaya. – Moscow: Academy, 2004. – 432 p. [in Russian]
7. Ovcharova K. V. Komp'juternye chaty v Internet-kommunikacii: sodержanie i osobennosti funkcionirovaniya [Computer chat rooms in the Internet communication: the content and features of functioning: Candidate degree thesis in Phil. Sciences: 10.02.19] / K. V. Ovcharova – Krasnodar, 2008. – 240 p. [in Russian]
8. Ovcharova K. V. Ritual'nost' v diskurse: mnogoobrazie projavlenij [Rituality in discourse: the variety of manifestations] [Text] / K. V. Ovcharova // Osobennosti issledovanija i konstruirovaniya aktual'nyh tipov diskursa i ih kategorij: monografija [Features of the research and design of relevant types of discourse and their categories: monograph] / ed. I. P. Khoutyz. – Krasnodar: Kuban State University, 2016. – P. 213-251 [in Russian]
9. Olyanich A. V. Prezentsionnaja teorija diskursa: monografija [Presentation theory of discourse: monograph] / A. V. Olyanich. – М.: Gnosis, 2007. – 407 p. [in Russian]
10. Fanyan N. Yu. Argumentacija kak lingvopragmaticheskaja struktura [Argumentation as a linguopragmatic structure]: Doctorate degree thesis in Phil. Sciences / N. Yu. Fanyan. – Krasnodar, 2000. – 354 p. [in Russian]