

AL-FARABI KAZAKH NATIONAL UNIVERSITY  
International Relations Department  
Chair of Diplomatic Translation  
**Translation business in the field of international and legal relations**  
**“Simultaneous Translation of Monologue and Dialogical Speech”**  
2022-2023 academic year fall semester

**Lecture 6**

**Module 2: Communicative situation in monologue and dialogical speech**

**Lecture 6: Anticipation of syntactic and stylistic structures of discourse**

**Plan of the lecture**

1. Introduction
2. Anticipation in discourse of news in mass media
3. Conclusion
4. References

**Aspects of the lecture**

1. Surface structure of the discourse
2. Modes of the manifestation and use of discourse
3. Rules and strategies of media discourse

**Goals of the lecture**

1. Explain rules and strategies that underlie the production and understanding of media discourse
2. Describe surface structure of the discourse
3. Classify social-psychological models of information processing.

**Basic concepts**

Dimensions, context, written/printed discourse, functionality, meaningfulness and etc.

Since the diversity of theoretical, methodological, and terminological persuasions is too impressive to allow a short synthesis, I will here formulate the main properties of discourse against the background of my own earlier work (12, 14, 16, 18). I refer to other work for details or different approaches. Verbal utterances, such as sentences, discourses, texts, or messages (I will henceforth use the term "discourse"), are usually analyzed first on different levels. The structures at each of these levels are accounted for by specific sub-theories or even sub-disciplines of linguistics. Thus, there is phonology, accounting for the structure of sounds and

intonation, morphology, formulating the principles of word formation, syntax, providing the rules according to which words of different categories can be combined into grammatical sentences, and semantics, dealing with the meaning of words, phrases, sentences, or whole discourses by formulating rules of interpretation. As opposed to such "underlying" meaning structures, the phonological, morphological, and syntactic expressions manifesting this meaning are sometimes simply called "surface structures." In practice, much of the work in discourse analysis has concentrated on semantic structures, that is, on meaning, because earlier work on sentence grammars tended to focus on surface structures. In addition to these levels, different units of analysis can be distinguished in discourse: individual words (lexical items), various structures of the clause, whole sentences, sequences of sentences (paragraphs), or whole discourses. The overall topic or theme of a discourse, for instance, can be studied only at the semantic level of the discourse as a whole, not at the level of individual words or sentences. Hence, a rather rough distinction is usually made between "local" and "global" structures of discourse, with the former pertaining to sentences and immediate sentence connections and the latter to larger segments of the discourse or the discourse as a whole.

Next, cutting through the various levels mentioned above, and both locally and globally, different dimensions of analysis can be distinguished. Thus, stylistic variation can occur at several levels, such as lexical choice, word formation, or syntactic structures. Similarly, rhetorical operations (such as alliteration, parallelism, metaphor, or irony) also require definition on various levels. Finally, there are different modes of the manifestation and use of discourse, such as spoken or written/printed discourse, monologues, and dialogues. The various units, categories, dimensions, and levels, along with the rules defining them, will all be called "textual." However, discourses are not just isolated linguistic "objects," but are integral parts of communicative acts in some sociocultural situation, which I will call "context." Thus, it is a contextual property of the discourse type "verdict" or "plea" that it is rightfully used only in the courtroom and by a judge or lawyer. At the boundary of text and context, the pragmatic analysis of discourse is concerned with the dimension of action in which a discourse is taken as some conventional form of social action (promise, threat, question, congratulation), called a "speech act." I have provided, in extremely succinct terms, some elementary notions of discourse analysis. The various schools of discourse analysis mentioned above can be distinguished, in part, on the basis of their specific interest in some textual or contextual property. Thus, some people will exclusively study discourse style, or intonation in spoken discourse, or overall meaning, or specific social constraints on the context. Similarly, there can also be specialization in certain discourse types or genres, such as everyday conversation, stories, classroom discourse, textbooks, proverbs, or news. Each discourse type, then, could—or rather, should—be

characterized in terms of a specific combination of various textual and contextual properties. A judge's verdict, for instance, should have a specific (formal) style and is constrained to specific overall meanings (themes, topics).

### **Follow-up questions**

1. Give the classification of models of discourse
2. Describe modes of the manifestation and use of discourse
3. Describe types of communicative acts

### **References**

1. Dijk, Teun A. van. Text and Context. London: Longman, 1977.
2. Dijk, Teun A. van. Tekstwetenschap. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1978. [German translation with Niemeyer, published by Tübingen, 1980.]
3. Dijk, Teun A. van. Macrostructures. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1980.