

TEXT IN THE MODERN PARADIGM OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE: CATEGORIZATION AND PRAGMATICS

Pavlo Struhanets

Postgraduate Student at the Department of General Linguistics and Slavic Languages,
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Ukraine
e-mail: struhanets.pavlo@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0001-7066-1523

Summary

The article analyzes the text in the modern paradigm of scientific knowledge from the perspective of categorization and pragmatics. A look at the text in a categorical dimension attests to a change in definitions, an expansion of the interpretation of the concept. It is noted that linguists differentiate text and discourse, study the text in semantic, grammatical, pragmatic-communicative and structural planes, study the categorical organization of the text. Focused on what, in addition to written texts, oral texts also attract the attention of scholars.

The analysis of the text as an object of linguistic research in a pragmatic dimension is presented on the material of an oral text – a football television report. Football live television reporting appears as a process and product of oral communication addressed to a multi-million audience of game fans. The features of the football television report as a text are explained through a system of text categories with units of a lower hierarchy (according to the concept of A. Yeshchenko) in three dimensions: from the perspective of semantics, from the perspective of communicativeness, at the level of pragmatics.

Summarized that, the correlation of text categories of different dimensions serves as a text-constitutive factor.

Key words: text, text category, pragmatics, mass media, reportage, text structures, language means.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/5827>

1. Introduction

The definition of text as an object of linguistic research was changed since the text linguistics had been evolved (in the 1960-ies of the XX century). "In the early stages, a unit of text linguistics was a certain sequence of sentences, correlated by structural and semantic relations – a complex syntactic whole, a superfragmentary unit, a paragraph, etc. – units that are longer than a sentence. These units are beginning to be considered as hypersyntactic but the interpretation of text does not go beyond the concept of "coherent text"; it covers a closed chain of several sentences and does not extend to the whole, complete piece of speech" (*Greshchuk, Greshchuk 2022: 12*).

As early as the 1970-ies of the XX century, the field of text linguistics was already talking about the whole text, or the whole piece of speech. In addition to written texts, spoken texts are also becoming an object of study. The French philosopher P. Ricoeur believed that text is always more than a linear sequence of phrases. And within this sense, the multiplicity of interpretation and even the conflict of interpretations is not a flaw but rather an advantage of understanding, which is the essence of interpretation (*Ricoeur, 2002*).

The logic of the development of text linguistics puts on the agenda the revision of the definitions of basic concepts in connection with the renewal of the paradigm of scientific knowledge. Despite the active research of linguists on the features of the text and its categorical organization (Zahnitko, 2006; Selivanova, 2010; Batsevych, Kochan, 2016; Yeshchenko, 2021), the comprehensive analysis of the concept of "text" and the implementation of the text in modern language practice does not lose its relevance.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the text in the modern paradigm of scientific knowledge from the perspective of categorization and pragmatics. The set goal presupposes the following tasks: to compare the definitions of the concept of "text" at different time intervals, to differentiate the concepts of "text" and "discourse", to characterize the main directions of studying the organization of the text, to highlight the results of the analysis of the football television report as an oral text. The following research methods were used: conceptual-linguistic – to analyze the views of linguists; continuous sampling method – to select the corpus of textual structures relevant for research; functional method – for interpreting the parameters of language means in football telereporting; descriptive-analytical – for interpretation and generalization of collected factual material. The source base of our research is reports in Ukrainian on the TV channels "Megogo 1" (MG1), "Setanta Sport" (SS).

2. The text in categorical dimension

At the beginning of the XXI century, *text* was interpreted as "a written or spoken speech array that constitutes a linear sequence of statements that are united in the nearer perspective by semantic and formal grammatical connections, and in the general compositional, distant plan – by a common thematic and plot task" (Barannyk, 2000: 627). In the 1920-ies of the XX century, A. Zahnitko explains the term "text" quite broadly – as a holistic semiotic form of psycho-speech and thought human activity that is conceptually and structurally organized, dialogically embedded in the internalized being, the semiotic universe of ethnic group or civilization, which is a pragmatically directed mediator of communication; as a result of communication, its structural and linguistic component and simultaneously its realization; as a structure, where the discourse is embodied after its completion; as an oral or written piece of language process, logically complete, consisting of a number of special linguistic expressions that are united by different types of lexical, grammatical, logical, stylistic relations, with appropriate focus and pragmatic guidance (Zahnitko, 2020: 793).

There is also the concept "discourse" in modern linguistic studies, in addition to concept "text". These terms have the similar or identical interpretations. A. Zahnitko defines "discourse" as it follows: "...a communicative event that can be described either as a sequence of interrelated speech acts (or statements) or as a certain sequence of sentences that form the basis of such description (i.e., predications; clauses – in Anglo-American tradition)" (Zahnitko, 2020: 138). The scholar notes that in modern interpretation there are several definitions of discourse, and immediately cites five formulations. Among them is the one that identifies discourse with text: "A coherent text in the context of many constitutive and background factors – socio-cultural, psychological ones, etc.; text, immersed in life with the whole range of extra-linguistic factors and events; text in the totality of socio-cultural, pragmatic, psychological, and other factors" (Zahnitko, 2020: 139).

The researchers of text linguistics F. Batsevych and I. Kochan believe that text appears as a result of communication (discourse), its structural and linguistic component; structure, where the "live" discourse is embodied after its completion. They highlight the most important

features that distinguish text and discourse: 1) text is a kind of "frozen" discourse; discourse that has been "stopped" by removing some live circumstances, specific participants with their psychological, mental, cognitive, social, and similar factors, as well as time, place, and circumstances of communication; 2) in contrast to discourse, text does not reveal any paralinguistic and non-linguistic means; they are presented only with description; 3) text is a unit of linguistic analysis, discourse is a unit of communicative analysis; 4) text is a linguistic unit; discourse is a sociolinguistic, interactive (and transactive) unit; 5) the term "discourse", in contrast to the term "text", is not applied to ancient texts, as well as to texts, which connections with real life cannot be reproduced directly (Batseyvych, Kochan, 2016: 63-64). In our study, we rely on the concept of *text* as "the nuclear, central component of discourse, its semantic "clot", where the information, related to linguistic factors of communication, is concentrated" (Batseyvych, Kochan, 2016: 64).

The term "text" is used to refer to any fragment of speech (oral or written) with various duration that forms a single whole. Text is both a process and a product of speech activity. Text as a linguistic category is studied in linguistics in the following areas: *semantic* (interaction of language signs to express some meaning: problems of distribution and choice of language signs to enhance the expressiveness and significance of text; semantic compatibility of meanings; contamination, condensation and other phenomena); *grammatical* (expression of grammatical categories and peculiarities of their interaction, influence of language units on the meaning of grammatical constructions; issues of syntactic synonymy and variants, possibilities of transformations; issues of textual and grammatical categories); *pragmatic-communicative* (text as a message, its locative, illocutionary and perlocutionary parameters, hermeneutics); *structural* (interaction of grammatical and semantic means in text generation) (Denyskina, 2005: 22). Therefore, for text analysis, it is necessary to take into account the system of lexical nominations and text structures.

However, text is not just a combination of its levels and other structural elements. Text has a categorical organization. Since any text is a multidimensional phenomenon, the various features can serve as the basis to distinguish its categories. In modern linguistics, there is no established opinion on the definitions, number and hierarchy of text categories.

Taking into account the basic coordinates of a particular sign-symbolic system, including the language system (semantics, syntax, pragmatics), on the one hand, and the specific formal and semantic organization of text, on the other hand, F. Batseyvych and I. Kochan proposed their own typology of text categories. The highest categorical feature of any text is considered to be *anthropicity*, which reflects the author's image. It is the human factor that contributed to text formation as a phenomenon of social life, and is the main source of structure generation and deployment of text's content. Anthropicity is embodied in text categories with lower level of abstraction: I. Formal-structural, syntactic categories by nature: 1) cohesion; 2) integration; 3) progression; 4) stagnation. II. Semantic categories: 1) ontological-semantic: a) time; b) space; 2) content-semantic: a) human; b) thing; c) state of affairs; d) event; e) case; f) fact; g) evaluation. III. Pragmatic categories: 1) point of view; 2) empathy, focus of empathy; 3) implications, implicatures; 4) modus, modality. As a result, the *text categories* are interpreted as the most general, hierarchically constructed, regularly materially (explicitly and implicitly) fixed embodiments with formal-structural and notional (semantic, syntactic and pragmatic) organization of any text. These are the text cores that bind and group all text means around them (Batseyvych, Kochan, 2016: 183-184).

Solving the problem to distinguish the text categories serves primarily to explain the nature of text and its status in language system and speech activity. O. Selivanova interprets

text category as "a supra-paradigmatic invariant feature that reproduces the most essential peculiarities of textemes and actualized texts" (Selivanova, 2008: 496). She considers that the attempts to determine the dominant text category (feature), as well as the definitions of text are unpromising. Given the unity of text's functional nature, she substantiated such text and discourse categories as integrity, membership, coherence, informativeness, referentiality, text continuum, anthropocentricity, interactivity, and intersemiotics (Selivanova, 2008: 499-516).

Based on thorough analysis of works, prepared by leading specialists in text linguistics, T. Yeshchenko considers it promising to identify such criteria of text categories as communicative, semantic and pragmatic. However, she does not ignore others since the classification of text categories should ideally cover the different components, "be based on understanding the text boundaries, the involvement degree of pragmatic parameters, and take into account the specifics in manifestation of text paradigmatics in cultural code of other Ukrainian texts" (Yeshchenko, 2021: 88). In the hierarchy of text categories, built by T. Yeshchenko, there is the following correlation: *supercategory – category – subcategory*. *Text supercategory – communicativeness* – serves as an expression for the main typological feature of the verbal whole, representing text both as a system and as a dynamic phenomenon. *Text category* is "an invariant, identical characteristic for all texts that reflects the general and essential features of the verbal whole and focuses text subcategories" (Yeshchenko, 2021: 89). Accordingly, *text subcategory* is defined as an invariant characteristic of text that emphasizes a separate aspect of text category. T. Yeshchenko proposed the concept on analysis of text categories, based on principle of hierarchical subordination: "one category is dependent on another, and, on the one hand, it is endowed with self-sufficiency, and on the other hand, it becomes an organic component of category with higher rank, being related by several or many differentiating features" (Yeshchenko, 2021: 94). The advantage of this concept lies in its integration since the correlated invariant features overlap in text.

3. The text in a pragmatic dimension

Our understanding of the text in terms of pragmatics correlates with the interpretation of the concept of "pragmatics" in modern linguistics. Of course, this concept is very broad, but in the first position of the definition of the concept, A. Zahnitko indicates that pragmatics "studies the nature of language use in human society, the functioning (load and role in communication) of language signs in speech" (Zahnitko, 2020: 584). Let's consider the implementation of linguistic means in modern language practice using the example of a football report as a media text. A football TV report has a fixed amount of time (2 halves, each 45 minutes) and is a complete symbolic structure. The audience of fans of the match decodes the text created by the journalist, taking into account the visual information during the report of the game. Football TV report as a text appears in the field of research as a process and product of oral speech activity.

We explain the signs of football television reporting according to the concept of T. Yeshchenko through a system of text categories. T. Yeshchenko singled out text categories with units of lower subordination in three dimensions: in the plane of semantics; from the perspective of communicativeness, at the level of pragmatics (Yeshchenko, 2021). The textual categories of informativeness, continuum of events and discreteness fall into the plane of semantics (according to T. Yeshchenko). For example, in a live football TV report, informativeness is one of the key categories. The text created by a football commentator must accurately convey information about a football match. Text structures verbalize the following factual indicators:

– "Game Status". The TV commentator outlines the level at which football matches are played. For example: *Якби цей нас пройшов, тоді, дійсно, могли б пакувати валізи і уболівальники Японії, і футболісти, оскільки такі передачі в настільки відповідальному моменті на Чемпіонаті Світу проходити просто не мають права* (MG1, 01.12.22, 21:14).

– "Participants of a football match". At the beginning of the match, operating with focal facts, the commentator informs about the composition of the teams, and during the entire match adds information about the players (often with a historical excursion). For example: *Еквадор нівелював усі ці прогнози і всі ці чутки; продемонструвавши дуже якісний футбол, виграв* (СК, 20.11.22, 20:01).

– "Game process". Text structures explain the course of the match through focal facts about all stages of the game, in particular the offensive actions of the teams: *Хорвати потрошку наближаються до воріт суперника* (MG1, 27.11.22, 18:35); protection of part of the field: *Потенційно мав би бути простір десь там, але Мексиканці встигли накрити і все призупинити на початку* (MG1, 26.11.22, 21:44). The journalist places emphasis on the technical elements of the game: *Слухай, Вінні стягнув навколо себе пів команди, якщо ми подивимося зараз* (MG1, 21.02.23, 22:35). In recent years, video assistant referees (VAR) have been used in football, so this procedure is also mentioned in TV reports: *Одного разу рефері вже застосовував допомогу VAR* (MG1, 21.04.23, 23:09).

– "Players". The information about the players provided by the commentator is reflected by text structures built on the basis of focal facts about the positions of football players on the field: *Гільєрмо Очоа, воротар-навок, проти форварда, теж навука-хижака. І чий хижацький інстинкт зараз перемаже?* (MG1, 22.11.22, 19:15). Quantitatively, the background facts that reflect the player's experience prevail: *Дуже розумний гравець в центрі захисту, футболіст на піку своїх можливостей. Це якраз Хосе Хіменес* (MG1, 28.11.22, 21:12); player age: *Це те, щоб 39-річний дід грав ногами* (MG1, 21.11.22, 19:49); biographical information: *Дуже цікавий футболіст, із спортивної сім'ї, тато у нього також був футболістом, грав на позиції вінгера, мама – баскетболістка, брат старший (Лука) також професійний футболіст...* (MG2, 22.04.23, 20:05); career features: *Депай з'являється на полі замість Вінсента Янсена, замість гравця, який зізнався, що навіть не мріяв поїхати на Чемпіонат світу, оскільки розумів, що не вдалося йому розкритися в топклубі. І поїхав він, зрештою, далеко, навіть за океан, однак з-за того океану його назад в збірну зтягнув Луї Вангал* (MG1, 21.11.22, 19:23).

– "Referees, assistant referees". Mostly there are violations in the matches, the essence of which is highlighted by the journalist: *Ну дуже-дуже сьогодні принципово-педантичний Сампая (бразильський арбітр), все до міліметра вимірює, усім футболістам дає чіткі вказівки, як потрібно грати* (MG1, 21.11.22, 18:33).

– "Coaching staff". *І Бету ось таким чином похнюпився, зрозуміло, що тренера корейської збірної це не влаштовує* (СК, 02.12.22, 17:05).

– "Fans". When commenting on the match, the journalist notes where the fans were located in the stands, how they behave while watching the match: *Як завжди гучна, яскрава підтримка у будь-якої африканської збірної. Але сенегальці, мені здається, тут можуть фору дати будь-кому* (MG1, 04.12.22, 21:19).

– "Game conditions". The journalist comments on the weather conditions, the quality of the football field, for example: *Газон сьогодні не надто приємний для обох команд* (MG1, 05.04.23, 22:34).

– "Football news". This indicator mainly includes information on the transfer of team players: *Будемо чесно казати, ми нормально ставимося до Михайла Мудрика, але, якщо б його не розкручували, і всі шалені гроші за нього б не дали* (MG1, 21.02.23, 22:30).

T. Yeshchenko (*Yeshchenko, 2021*) attributes the textual categories of anthropocentricity and dialogicity to the level of communicativeness. For example, dialogicity is an integral category of the text that reflects the two-vector interaction during the dialogue (the coherence of replicas, situational dependence). Note that in recent years, two journalists are sometimes involved in the process of football commentating. It is in such broadcasts that textual structures that verbalize dialogicity can be clearly traced. For example, the commentator appeals to his partner when considering the situation on the football field: *Я тобі хочу сказати, що якщо думати ще про дві заміни, які залишилися у Леонеля Скалоні, і говорити про атаку, то там, насправді, лише два варіанти* (MG1, 22.11.22, 13:27). We observe the emphasis of the statements of his colleague regarding moments of the game that could have been overlooked by the audience: *Ну ти правильно помітив, Тамбакті у другому таймі взагалі, скажімо так, з н'ятої точки не встає* (MG1, 22.11.22, 13:28). Dialogue cues reflect an emphasis on a moment that has gone unnoticed, but has an important impact on the game: *Зверни увагу, як Саудівська Аравія розтягнула збірну Аргентини, що збірна Аргентини починає грати довгими передачами* (MG1, 22.11.22, 13:44). In the comments, not only the author's (commentator's) «self» functions, but also the collective «self», in particular in the address to the audience: *Ми вам казали, що у нас, насправді, дуже солідна група С* (MG1, 22.11.22, 13:45).

The textual category of modality falls into the plane of pragmatics (according to T. Yeshchenko). It has a more detailed gradation through a system of subcategories: referentiality, expressiveness, emotionality, axiological. Without a doubt, these are the inherent characteristics of live football TV report. For example, when commenting, a journalist constantly follows an axiological scale with polar markers "+" and "-". The use of positive evaluation as a whole is aimed at creating a positive emotional background of the report. So, for example, the commentator notes the invaluable contribution of one of the football players to the success of the whole team: *Альмез Алі, звичайно, – це один із ковалів успіху Фелікса Санчеса і його команди, зокрема, на кубку Азії 2019 року* (СК, 20.11.22, 19:39). Emotional and evaluative approval of the actions of the entire team is also common: *Ну а Еквадор куражиться, Еквадор просто ганяє свого суперника, як білку в колесі і, по суті, просто дограє цей поєдинок* (СК, 20.11.22, 19:58). The most frequent, in our opinion, is the use of a positive text structure to indicate individual actions that have a significant impact on the course of the match: *Нападник португальського «Порто» знаходить шпарину в штрафному майданчику Англії* (MG1, 21.11.22, 16:35).

We observe a great variability of language means for expressing the negative characteristics of the football game. For example, the commentator expresses unpleasant surprise at the results of the team, which was considered the favorite, but could not get into the group stage of the tournament: *Італія примудрилася з першого місця рейтингу ФІФА не пройти кваліфікацію* (СК, 20.11.22, 19:28). The journalist conveys the hopeless situation of the team, which has no chance of victory and is doomed to defeat: *Уявляєте собі, команда горить 0:2 і, до того ж, тебе тягають по футбольному полі, не даючи продихнути, не даючи навіть перехопити м'яч* (СК, 20.11.22, 19:57). The commentator openly criticizes the actions of the defenders, who could not stop the attacker: *Стерлінг вперто стояв на ногах, я сказав би так, Сака зайшов у штрафний, два суперники були перед ним, але вони імітували відбір, вони не забирали м'яч* (MG1, 21.11.22, 16:32). In order to verbalize the assessment in direct speech, the journalist is forced to use the semantic and stylistic variety of linguistic means to the fullest. At the same time, it gives them an original form of expression and emphasizes the semantic load.

4. Conclusions

A look at the text in a categorical dimension attests to a change in definitions, an expansion of the interpretation of the concept. Linguists differentiate text and discourse, study the text in semantic, grammatical, pragmatic-communicative and structural planes, study the categorical organization of the text. In addition to written texts, oral texts also attract the attention of scholars.

The analysis of the text as an object of linguistic research in a pragmatic dimension is presented on the material of an oral text – a football television report. Football live television reporting appears as a process and product of oral communication addressed to a multi-million audience of game fans. The features of the football television report as a text are explained through a system of text categories with units of a lower hierarchy (according to the concept of T. Yeshchenko) in three dimensions: from the perspective of semantics, from the perspective of communicativeness, at the level of pragmatics. In the plane of semantics, the analysis of the key category of informativeness proved a wide range of textual structures for expressing the following factual indicators: "game status", "participants of a football match", "game process", "players", "referee, assistant referee", "coaching staff", "fans", "game conditions", "football news". The study of football TV report from the perspective of communicativeness turned out to be indicative through the category of dialogicity, which reflects two-vector interaction during the dialogue in the process of commenting (coherence of cues, situational dependence). The analysis of direct football commentary at the level of pragmatics through the category of axiologicality highlighted the verbalization of the axiological scale with polar markers "+" and "-". In general, we state that the correlation of text categories of different dimensions (from the perspective of semantics, communicativeness, and pragmatics) serves as a text-constitutive factor. We see the perspective of our research in the study of texts of various genres and speech styles.

References

1. Barannyk, D. KH. (2000). *Ukrainska mova. Entsyklopediya [Ukrainian language. Encyclopedia]*. Kyiv : *Ukrainska entsyklopediia [in Ukrainian]*.
2. Batsveych, F., & Kochan, I. (2016). *Linhvistyka tekstu: pidruchnyk [Linguistics of the text: a textbook]*. Lviv : *LNU imeni Ivana Franka [in Ukrainian]*.
3. Greshchuk, V., & Greshchuk, O. (2022). *Slovotvir i tekst: monohrafiya [Word work and text: a monograph]*. Ivano-Frankivsk : *Prykarpatskyi natsionalnyi universytet imeni Vasylia Stefanyka [in Ukrainian]*.
4. Denyskina, H. O. (2005). *Strukturni i komunikatyvni parametry zhanru vilnoho interviu (na materialy teleperedach 2000–2004 rokiv) [Structural and communicative parameters of the free interview genre (on the material of television programs of 2000–2004)]*. Candidate's thesis. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
5. Yeshchenko, T. A. (2021). *Fenomen khudozhnogo tekstu: komunikatyvnyi, semantychnyi i prahmatychnyi aspekty: monohrafiya [The phenomenon of artistic text: communicative, semantic and pragmatic aspects: monograph]*. Lviv: *Lvivskyi natsionalnyi medychnyi universytet imeni Danyla Halytskoho [in Ukrainian]*.
6. Zahnitko, A. (2020). *Suchasnyi linhvistychnyi slovnyk [Modern linguistic dictionary]*. Vinnytsia: *Tvory [in Ukrainian]*.
7. Ricœur, P. (2002). *Intelektualna avtobiohrafia. Liubov i spravedyvist [Intellectual autobiography. Love and justice]*. Kyiv: *Dukh i litera*. Retrieved from: https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Ricœur_Paul/Intelektualna_avtobiohrafia.pdf?PHPSESSID=6mf77sevtc55b07n23734offjg3 [in Ukrainian].
8. Selivanova, O. O. (2008). *Suchasna linhvistyka: napriamy ta problemy: pidruchnyk [Modern linguistics: directions and problems: a textbook]*. Poltava : *Dovkillia-k [in Ukrainian]*.