A. Skoryk

MASS MEDIA DISCOURSE IN CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH SYSTEM OF CULTUROLOGICAL FIELD

The article is concerned with the study of discourse of a certain type which includes its own style, speech flow, certain sensual aspects represented by specific art form. Discourse is marked by communication within individual channels i.e. visual, auditory, tactile discourse; determined by the rules of communication, way of presentation and implementation of pragmatic goals of the speaker – didactic, abusive, etiquette discourse etc.

Key words: discourse, communication, practice, border, cultural communication, information, interpretation, theory.

The problem of the given research now is becoming more relevant and involves clarification of concepts of modern thinking as united conversation practice that is manifested in forms of sensory perception that are necessary for text comprehension and give the idea of the communication party. To emphasize the fact of correlation or crossing o f the philosophical understanding of the phenomenon of "discourse" with its ethical and aesthetic load. This subject was studied by V. Karasik, P. Boudier, S. Neretina, O. Ogurtsov, R. Bart, G. Markuze, M. Foucault, Yu. Habermas and others.

The word "discourse" comes from the Greek – Διεξοδοζ – presentation of information, narrative, Latin – discursus / discerre – wandering, branching, conversation, interlocution, French – discours – speech, address, words. In a broad sense, discourse represents a complex unity of conversation practice and extralingual factors (that are understood as significant behavior that is manifested in sensory perception forms available) required for understanding the text. Therefore this concept gives the idea of communication parties, their attitudes and objectives, conditions of message creation and perception.

Thus, leading its history from antiquity, the notion of "discourse" is one of the most important concepts of modern thinking.

The first who introduced the notion of discourse as a certain definition into the scholarly discussion was Rolan Bart: «Thus, hereinafter the words "language",

"discourse", "word" and etc will imply any significant unit or formation, either verbal or visual; photo is considered as the language at the level of newspaper articles; even the words may become a speech if they mean something » [1, p. 74].

The most reasonable for our research is the study of M. Foucault. To understand the whole fullness and meaning diversity of a definition of "discourse", there is represented rather broad definition of the philosopher: "Regarding the term "discourse", which we used herein and often abused by using it in different meanings, now we can understand the reason of its ambiguity: the most common and accurate way is when the term stood for a set of verbal realizations, and then by discourse we meant something that have been actually made of (sometimes – everything that was created out of) a set of signs. And this term we also understand as the set of acts of the formulation of certain proposals or judgments. Finally – this is the sense that eventually became the main (along with the first one which serves its horizon) – discourse is made with a combination of sequences of signs, if any, represent an expression, that is, if we can assign to them particular modalities of existence. And if I succeed in demonstrating, what I am going to do now, that the law of the similar range –   is the very thing that I still called discursive formation if I succeed in demonstrating that discursive formation really is the principle of scattering and placement not of the phrasing, suggestions, judgments, but namely the statements (in the sense that I gave to this word), thus the term "discourse" can be defined quite clearly now: a set of statements that are subject to one and the same system formation. So I can talk about clinical discourse, economic discourse, natural history discourse, psychiatric discourse " [6, p. 210].

So,   Foucault defined discourse in the most general sense, as "a set of statements belonging to one and the same system of formations," and appears to be an element of a discursive formation. To better understand what it is all about, we get down to the text of Michel Foucault: "... instead of restoring the chain of findings (as it often happens with the history of science or philosophy), rather than to establish a table of differences (as the linguists usually do), our analysis describes the system of dispersing. If between a certain number of statements we

can describe a similar system of dispersing, between subjects, types of statements, concepts, thematic choices, we can identify patterns (order value, positions, functioning and transformation). We can say that we are dealing with *discursive formations* (our in italics – A.S.) not to resort to such words as science, ideology, theory or industry objectivity (though they are not adequately indicate these dispersing). The conditions which specifies elements of such redistribution (objects modality of statement, concepts and thematic selections), are called formation rules – application rules (but at the same time existence, maintenance, modification and disappearance) of data discourse redistribution" [6, p. 92-93]. In other words, the discursive formation can be called a combination of knowledge, verbalized in natural way and necessary for the formation of any particular science. Thus, discourses are the means as well as the result of the formation of knowledge; they differ depending on the specifications of particular knowledge. Foucault therefore eliminates such discourses as economic, natural and historical, medical, philosophical, religious etc., but with an important precaution: the science (and knowledge i n general), within which discourse has been developing should be mature and already established.

Michel Foucault is trying to find rational forms of analysis that are not appealed to the idea of the subject. He points out the central structure in the form of "discourse about the experience-borders" that helps the subject to transform itself, and "discourse of transformation itself through the formation of knowledge" [9, p. 706-709]. By considering the subject as an intersection point of different discourses that have developed historically, Foucault confirms definition of the s u b j e c t a s language practices of domination that affect the individual consciousness. He singles out language, text, discourse as metaphorical designation of the universal principle that helps him to relate and optimize these sociocultural phenomena. So, according to Foucault, a t first the experience of border crossing practices within language is analyzed, and then work of thought self-improvement in the space of possible "experience-borders is actualized." It is referred to transgression of the experience of crossing borders as "border-directed

gesture" [7, p. 111-131]. Or more precisely – overrun out of borders where basic values loose their sense and meanings of traditional cultural world.

This point is of particular importance especially nowadays, as the discourse of modern mass-media in general has no limits in space, and hence understanding of the concept of "information space" is completely different that will be further discussed in our research. Expanding this limit Foucault associates with the formation of a new language (in wide sense), a new attitude to it, and hence the formation of a new community that refuses linguistic cultural tradition. According to French cultural studies scholar, contemporary culture can be expressed by another language, not completely related to the tradition. This language transformation leads to the change of style, and global changes in the type of thinking, immersion of mental experience in a language that "speaks what can not be said".

Thus, according to Michel Foucault discourse is "A set of verbal performances", "what was produced <...> symbolization", "set of formulation acts, a number of statements or proposals", and the discursive formation is the principle of dispersion and distribution of expression [6, p. 108]. "Discourse formation is a basic system of expression, which is subject to a group of verbal performances" [6, p. 116]. Thus, Foucault relates the discourse to socio-cultural factors. This immersion in the particular circumstances of time and place he performs using the concept of "discursive practice".

It should be pointed out that the famous German philosopher, sociologist, representative of a new generation of "Frankfurt School" Habermas repeatedly emphasized the fact of correlation or crossing of the philosophical understanding of the phenomenon of "discourse" with its ethical and aesthetic activity, and we'll add – modern understanding discourse is getting transcultural, omnipresence of this phenomenon in all spheres of life and existence. That is why contemporary research paradigms of mass-media discourse unites philosophers, sociologists, linguists, cultural studies scholars, fine art experts etc. Thus, by analysing the phenomenon of discourse the importance of interdisciplinary communication,

interpersonal and other relations in the modern informational environment, artistic (screen) culture and so can be better revealed.

The discourse according to Habermas i s constituted b y communication. Within the given context, the greatest interest causes social aspect of discourse, and the relationship "discourse– society", which was considered b y Habermas within the social and communicative approach. Notionalist identifies five types of discourse implemented in communication depending on the situation:

- Theoretical, organized on the basis of cognitive and instrumental arrangements;

- Practical, related to the moral and practical laying and is based on determining the correctness and norm of action;

- Discourse in the form of aesthetic criticism which is estimating by its nature and developed on the basis of the correlation with value standards;

- Discourse in the form of therapeutic criticism, the main characteristic of which is expressiveness, credibility of expressions;

- Discourse of self-expression and self-explanation that is defined by achieving clarity that is expressed by and based on the accuracy of formation of symbolic structures.

Habermas also insists that not discourse is based on the problem but problems are represented by discourse. In the book "Comprehension and interests", he suggests to distinguish three types of interests that according to the notionalist are transferred in more later period of creative work, in three human realm. First world – objective, the second – social or intersubjective, the third – subjective or expressive. The first one includes the world of cognitive-instrumental discourse, the second – moral and practical discourse, the third one – aesthetic and ethical discourse.

In addition, f o r our research is extremely important consideration of Habermas on discourse as dialogue, during which there is coordination of conflicting claims to the importance of something aiming at consensus achievement: "In discourses we try to find again, problematize consensus which

took place in communicative action by justification" [8, p. 67]. Consequently, the discourse is involved in the dialogue between "native" and "alien" word to the analysis of understanding of the world and outlook at the level of perception of a foreign language. Being on the fine line of mutual intentionality and reflexivity, discursive practices (in wide sense) become aids in the difficult search for sense-image structure of works of culture and especially art, screen culture.

Background of the discourse, according to Habermas, is the category of the public sphere: it is where the discourse is revealed. German notionalist defines two concepts of understanding of the public sphere. For the first one the origin point of considerations is civil society ("Structural change in the public sphere" [10]).

It should be noted that the operation of modern mass-media (media) in the public sphere makes the situation even more complicated. The dominant totality of discursive formations found in the media ideal mechanism for its existence. Usually much of the population has no opportunity to form their own opinion that means that consensus is imposed on them by those involved in the discourse. For example, political discourses are created for such purposes by politicians, and that are they who are most competent in these discourses. In this regard, Boudier describes such situation as a monopoly of professionals.

Another well-known researchers of the concept of "discourse" were L. Louis Althusser, Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan. This French school implies philosophy, discourse historicity, its analytical aspect. In this aspect discourse is seen as speech, public address, words. At a certain type of discourse is involved its own style, voice stream, certain sensitive aspects that are represented by specific art form. It is the reason of unclarity of boundaries of the concept of discourse defined by scientists. At the same time, the discourse is burdened with important areas of communication in society (verbal, nonverbal, linguistic, modern discursive practices, silence discourse, visual discourse, auditory etc.). Discourse is characterized by communication within individual channels, that is – visual, auditory, tactile discourse; defined by certain rules of communication, way of presentation and implementation of pragmatic goal of a speaker – didactic

discourse, abusive, etiquette, etc. In many texts he first perceived as an expression of cultural communication, because in the discourse, the discourse going through a kind of "crystallization and consolidation of upward communication parameters called 'communication available to the participants communicative action. This preliminary interpretation of information is transferred into the interpretation and explanation of community-level moves to the theoretical " [2, p. 57]. It should be noted that in postmodern world interpretation of information and its interpretation in the communication process "blurs" the borders between the "good old reality" and "text", ie all sorts of maps. An act of transgression, again "gesture, turned on the brink" (M. Foucault).

Thus, the category of "discourse" has many scientific interpretations, since it represents the nature of the intermediate phenomenon between speech and communication and also verbal behavior – on the one hand, and on the other – is set by the text. It should be pointed out that in the study of discourse in the late twentieth century there was finally established a communicative approach that is based not only on creating new categorical apparatus but also on rethinking of already existing terms.

The modern cultural studies scholar and linguist V. Karasik, mentioned by us, rather widely suggests to distinguish approaches to discourse. It is about the following approaches:

 - Prahmalinguistic that represents the activities of participants in interactive communication, establishing and maintaining contacts, experience and information exchange, influence o n each other, intertwining of instant, changeable communication strategies and their verbal and nonverbal communication incarnations in communication practice, the definition of communication passages in the unity of explicit and implicit content;

- Psycholinguistic dimension of discourse, as the deployment of code switching from internal to external verbalization in the process of generating language and its interpretation, considering the socio-psychological types of linguistic identity, role sets;

- Linguostylistic discourse that focused on isolating the communication registers, separation oral and written language in their genre varieties, identification of functional parameters of communication-based units (characteristic functional styles);

- Structural and linguistic discourse, which provides its segmentation and aims to highlight the actual textual features of communication (contextual and meaningful connectedness of discourse, discursive polyphony as communication simultaneously at multiple levels of depth text);

- Linguocultural discourse that aims at establishing the specific communication to a specific ethnic group, to determine the model formula of etiquette and verbal behavior in general, characterize the dominant culture of the community in the form of mental concepts as units of mental sphere, to identify ways to appeal to precedent texts for the given linguoculture;

- Cognitive and semantic discourse phenomenon that is studied in the form of frames, scenario, mental schemes that is different models of representation of communication in consciousness;

- Sociolinguistic approach to the study of discourse, which involves an analysis of the parties of communications as members of a social group and analyzing communication conditions in a broad socio-cultural context. These approaches are not mutually exclusive [4, p. 5-7].

In the context of our study special interest are caused by the institutional discourse that is like a dialogue within the prescribed limits of status-role relationships. Russian scientist finds it possible for modern society to distinguish the following types of institutional discourse: political, diplomatic, administrative, legal, military, educational, religious, mystical, medical, business advertising, sports, scientific, scenic and mass informative. Thus V. Karasik recognizes that this list may be supplemented or modified, "because public institutions are significantly different from each other and can not be regarded as homogeneous phenomenon, in addition, they are historically changeable, may merge with each other and occur as variations in Within a particular type "[4, p. 10]. The main participants are

representatives of institutional discourse (agents) and people who address them (clients). Also, according to the researcher, there is a fundamental openness of discourse between "clients" and "agents" in various institutional discourses. For example, clients in the scientific, business and diplomatic discourse don't differ from agents, while clients of the political, legal, medical, religious, mass-informational discourse reveal a sharp difference from agents of appropriate discourse.

The term "institutional discourse," the author explains: "Institutional discourse is specialized cliched kind of communication between people who may not know each other but have to communicate according to the norms of the society. Of course, any communication is multidimensional, has musical score and its types are distinguished by some degree of conditionality. Complete removal of personal principle turns the parties of institutional communication into dummies at the same time there is, intuitively perceptible by participants of communication, border crossing of which undermines the fundamentals of existence of any social institution "[3, p. 45-46].

Also in some texts the discourse is perceived as ethno-cultural characteristics of communication (intercultural, multilingual, foreign cultural) as cultural-historical (discourse of Modern Age, Renaissance and so on). Social, age characteristics of participants of the discourse are identified with its types – political, mighty Soviet, youth, radical, feminist and others.

Speech forms and principles of its construction are identified in the discourse with dialogical, rhetorical, monologic, narrative rhetoric of the discourse.

This "gamma" of the discourse characteristics indicates not only a wide range of meanings of the term "discourse" and a certain semantic "fuzziness" in the definition of this category. Ukrainian linguist N. Sukalenko believes that this term exists between text, context, functional style, speech and so on. Scientists have explain such "uncertainty" of the term by history of the notion of "discourse" in the system of existing categories and models of language manifestation.

O n considering the discourse in contemporary culture let's focus on its literary and theatrical samples as verbal and its spectacular and phenomenal manifestation. These discourses are combined with Word and concentrated on Word -Speech in infinite time and space of the world culture.

Literary is one of the oldest. Rhythm and rhyme were its generally accepted characteristics. Literary text is automatized: multiplicity of the text for each sounds comparable with the notion of its own content in a particular writing. Text is gaining personal meaning due to the reader, "ciphers" of the text are decoded each time by the other reader or viewer. Theatrical discourse can be considered as such that belong to a long life of society. Indeed, apart from the symbolism and symbolic positions of theatrical discourse, like – scenery, clothing, lighting – it is based on a ritual that begins with a foyer and theater wardrobe and ends up with the last replica of the actor's performance in the final.

Speech and Theatre are emerging as two parallel phenomena of socio-cultural communication. Examples of their singled out and parallel existence are examples of cooperation between individuals and groups, their roots date back to the ancient ages. Although community-tribal formation that preceded them, gave rise to communicativeness as phenomenon of primitive argue, conscious emergence of so-called meaningful discourse is considered to be the ancient theater and thus perhaps to distinguish the concept of ancient thought. The origin of ancient philosophical thought clearly outlines the shape of distinguishing and separating. Aristotle in his "Metaphysics" shows the readers restoration of the terms with different values. In fact, this conceptual dictionary shows that were the Greeks who created the world rhetoric. This means that we can talk about the beginning of the intellect, formative function of the mind. At the same time there is a gap between mental and physical labor. This gave rise to the development of new thinking and new culture.

The word – language – rhetoric: "As part of this type of culture rhetorical truth can play and you can laugh over it, could any reasons to overturn the truth, but truth can not be denied because within this kind of culture ultimately always

definitely know what is truth and what is truth, and also everything that is true is still moral and positive ... "[5, p. 308].

Thus it can be said without prejudice that an important feature of the discourse of the media in contemporary cultural studies is the possibility of a new integrative knowledge as traits postmodern era. It was the trait that was noted by American thinker Fr. Jameson, who writes: "Today we are all have a writing simply called "theory" that represents all disciplines at once and each of them separately. This new type of discourse is usually associated with France and so-called post-structuralism (French theory), is very widespread and marks the end of philosophy as such. Is it possible, for example, to call Michel Foucault's activity philosophy, history, social theory or political science? This issue is insoluble; I confirm that such "theoretical discourse" can also be attributed to manifestations of postmodernism. "

Apart from integrativity, among characteristic of mass-media discourse in contemporary cultural studies there should be mentioned, at first, communicativeness, because all the facts are included into the cultural context of certain discursive practices, and therefore it is not only a combination of certain characters (according to Michel Foucault).

Secondly – it is dialogueness, which implies and even demands from discursive practices interconnectedness, connection between them or exclusion of such practices. Culturological discourse of the mass-media is involved in the dialogue between "native" and "alien", analysis of outlook and attitude at the level of foreign language comprehension (in wide sense of understanding). And therefore the mass-media discourse is "language in the language" that is not possible outside of communicative acts (between subject and object, language, texts). Thus, it is confirmed that communicativeness of contemporary mass-media discourse always exists next to the "real-life" dialogue. In addition, by crossing borders between "native" and "alien", experience of crossing "experience-borders" (according to Michel Foucault), borders in the context of the mass-media discourse

is an act of transgression, it's step beyond the limit when basic understanding of values and traditional cultural meanings of life disappear.

REFERENCES

1. Bart R. Mythology / R. Bart // Selected works: Semiotics: Poetics: Tr. From French / Edition, general editorship and introduction by G. K. Kosikova.– M. : Progress, 1989 – 616 p.

2. Infosfera of Ukraine: peculiarities of mass media discourse in the context of aesthetic information / O.P. Polishchuk O.I. Svintsitskyi // History. Philosophy. Religious studies. – 2008. – № 2. – P. 56–59.

3. Karasik V.I. Ethno-cultural types of institutional discourse / V.I.Karasik // Ethnocultural specificity of speech activity: collection of reviews / INION RAN. – M., 2000. – P. 37–63.

4. Karasik V.I. About types of discourse // Linguistic personality: institutional and personal discourse: Collection of scientific treatises/ Volgograd : Peremena, 2000. – P. 5–20.

5. Mikhailov A. V. Antiquity as an ideal and cultural reality. – M. : Nauka, 1988. – 336p.

6. Foucault Michel. Archaeology of Knowledge / Tr. from French M. B. Rakovaya, A. Yu. Serebriannikova; introduction by A. S. Kolesnikova. – SPb. : publishing center «Humanitarian Academy»; University book, 2004. – 416 p. – (Seies «Ars Riga. French collection»).

7. Khabermas Yu. Philosophical discourse of Art Nouveau / Tr. from German M. M. Beliaeva and others – M. : Ves mir, 2003. – p. 67

8. Foucault M. About transgression // Ethos tanatography. – SPb, 1994. – 307 p.

9. Foucault M. L'ethique du souci de soi comme pratique de la liberte / / Dits et Ecrits. P., 1994. Vol. IV. – 801 p.

10.Habermas J. Strukturwandel der Oeffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der buergerlichen Gesellschaft. F.a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1990. (1962)